

MINUTES

MONTANA SENATE
51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Call to Order: By Senator H. W. Hammond, on March 28, 1989,
at 1:00 pm in Room 402 at the State Capitol

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Senators: H. W. Hammond, Dennis Nathe,
Chet Blaylock, Bob Brown, R. J. "Dick" Pineseault,
William Farrell, Pat Regan, John Anderson Jr., and
Joe Mazurek

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Dave Cogley, Staff Researcher and
Julie Harmala, Committee Secretary

Announcements/Discussion:

None

DISPOSITION OF HB 618

Discussion:

Senator Hammond reminded the committee that HB 618 would give a 4% increase to all of the schools for the next school year 1989-90.

Senator Farrell stated that he had some proposed amendments to HB 618. (See Exhibit #1). He explained that these amendments basically put money into the schools that are under the 85 percentile of spending. It caps at 116%, by giving no increase to schools above that percent of average spending. 2.3 million dollars goes to equalize those secondary school districts that are below the spending level and 4.4 million dollars goes for the elementary school that are below the spending level. It takes the raise from the over-spending schools, because any school over the 116% will not receive any funds.

Senator Mazurek asked why the amendments were capping the funds that were based on an average expenditure categories

and not on budgets. He said actual spending is not being looked at, but average expenditures were. He said this will keep the same disparity because there are "over spenders and under spenders" in each category.

Senator Farrell replied that they had to be brought up to an average somewhere. The over spending can not be allowed at a higher level because the lower spending districts would never be able to catch up.

Senator Mazurek said that this is not being done here. In the same categories there are differences within them. This is based on a category and an average expenditure. There are high spenders within the category and there are low spenders within the category and everyone in the category will be given the same amount of money and everyone will be going up and the same will be paid with the same disparity up and down the category.

Senator Farrell said the high spenders at 116% get less money than the ones in the same category at 85%. The lower ones are given more money than the higher ones in that category.

Senator Mazurek said that there are disparities within that category. This is not based on the district's spending but its based on the general fund expenditures.

Senator Farrell said we are trying to bring the districts up that are under the average in their category.

Senator Mazurek said, "The basic fallacy is the perception that the foundation schedules have a problem, and they do not." The Loble Decision did not say there was anything wrong with the foundation schedules, it is the voted levies, where the problems arise. He said that Senator Farrell's amendments were trying to impose an equalization scheme to an already equalized foundation program schedule.

Senator Hammond said that if the foundation program is funded at a higher level then it is acceptable.

Senator Farrell presented to the committee a list of all the underfunded school districts. (See Exhibit #2)

Senator Mazurek stated that because this is in the schedules, they are basically equalized and the caps that Senator Farrell is suggesting are based on general fund expenditures. These he said were not based on any district that spends over the schedules but on the average general fund expenditure per pupil. This is not how much the foundation fund is exceeded.

Senator Regan commented that Senator Farrell is defining the general fund as all money expended by the district and not as she understands the general fund as it is within the foundation program and voted levies are something different.

Senator Farrell replied that general fund expenditure per pupil is the concern. The idea he explained is to get the state more involved and to get all the districts up to the 85% of average expenditures and to get rid of some of the voted levies. He said we must start somewhere closing the gap.

Senator Hammond asked Senator Farrell about where in the amendment it says "maximum general fund budget and expenditures and exceptions," he asked if this meant all the money that was spent in the school districts.

Senator Farrell replied that this was what exhibit #2 was based on. (all expenditures)

He went on to explain that the list of underfunded schools (See Exhibit #2) was a chart showing the amount of money that would have to be spent to bring these districts up to the 85th percentile. The remaining districts, those over 85% were not included on the list. In order to bring all these underfunded school districts up to 85% it would take 2.4 million dollars in the elementary and 4.4 for the high schools.

He said if these amendments are not passed the larger schools will get over a quarter of the 11 million dollars.

Senator Blaylock commented that this means for the districts that have been voting extra levies over and above what is necessary, "we are in effect kicking these districts when they are already hurting." He said even the high spending districts are hurting.

Senator Regan stated that it seems with these amendments the schools are being rewarded for not facing up to the fact that cuts should be considered. These amendments do not send these districts a message other than to say that there will be an extra 4% spent.

Senator Hammond stated that with HB 618, the gap is being widened, because the high spending schools are receiving 4% as well as the low spending districts.

Senator Mazurek stated that it was his understanding that there were problems within the categories, where there are wide disparities in spending and districts are going up and

down all over the chart. He said that it was his impression with these amendments that the disparities would be perpetuated.

Tom Millieux of the MEA, drew a chart on the board, explaining the foundation money that goes to the districts on a cost efficiency basis. He said that if actual school spending is looked at, there is a strong disparity.

He said that basically in the middle sized districts there was a concentration of high wealth that has a lot of PL 8 7 4 moneys coming into the one group. If a cap is built on average expenditures rather than a cap on the foundation program moneys there is nothing done to take care of the level of unequalized funding available to these districts because the cap will be set at 16% above average spending. Everything above the foundation money is unequalized. If the cap is going to be based on average expenditures basically it is being built on the unequalized portion. If it is built on the foundation program money and have some reasonable cap apply to these, then there would be an equalized cap. This would pull every one within a better range.

The big districts are few, 5 or 6. This is a very small group and this is the reason for the disparity of spending being narrow. They share also a low tax base and a high tax effort. They share these characteristics and this is why there is such a narrow spread. There is very little difference between the average and the spending level of any particular district. This is not true when we get to the middle spending districts because there is a lot more variance.

There are a lot of high spenders for a number of different reasons. But if a cap is built on spending rather than being built on the foundation program amounts, there is nothing that can be done about correcting the level of equalization.

He said a flat graph would not be possible even if PL 8 7 4 funds are taken out. There is no advantage in pulling some districts down, relative to the others. If they are not going to receive any funding (the high spending schools) all that is done is that spending disparities are maintained. There is some disparity being closed at the bottom end at the expense of the top end. This is equalizing down.

He said if everyone is give a 4% increase, the current levels of equalization is being maintained. Money is being provided by the only thing that has been found to be constitutional, that is by providing money through the

foundation schedule.

Another point he wanted to make was that there had been only a 1%, 0%, and 0% increase to the foundation program over the last 3 years and at the same time there has been a 3%, 4.4% and a 4.4% inflation increase. The foundation program is short on the inflation basis and this is about 1991's budget using 1988 funding levels. He said there will be some loss again, even under the 100% funding plan. This is starting to affect even the high spending districts. He used Scobey, Montana as an example, saying that they are beginning to reduce programs.

Senator Nathe pointed out that Scobey may be a high spending district, "But," he said, "back in the 1987 session, when Dave Hunter talked about going after the reserves, districts then moved reserves into the budgeted funds." He said that when this happened this increased the average expenditure per student. Actually he said Scobey only has 8 million dollars to finance 3 high schools, 4 towns, and all of county government.

Senator Farrell stated that he believes to reduce the disparity these amendments were a step toward this. He said he can not see perpetuating the problem and continuing to widen the gap.

Amendments and Votes:

Senator Farrell moved the amendments to HB 618.

A roll call vote was taken. (See Exhibit #4)

THE MOTION CARRIED TO MOVE THE AMENDMENTS TO HB 618, 5 TO 4.

Recommendation and Vote:

Senator Farrell moved that HB 618 be concurred in as amended.

He said that this bill as amended will equalize the school districts that were below 85%. The money that is in this bill is for those below the 85 percentile and it simply is dispersed at 1%, 2% and 3%, depending on the category the schools fall in. (See Exhibit #1)

Senator Farrell called for the question.

A roll call vote was taken. (See Exhibit #5)

THE MOTION CARRIED 8 TO 1, WITH SENATOR REGAN VOTING AGAINST IT.

Senator Farrell will carry HB 618 to the floor of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 2:00 pm


SENATOR H. W. HAMMOND, Chairman

HH/jh

Senmin.328

ROLL CALL

EDUCATION

COMMITTEE

5¹th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1989

Date 3-28-89

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
<u>Chairman Swede Hammond</u>	✓		
<u>Vice Chairman Dennis Nathe</u>	✓		
<u>Senator Chet Blaylock</u>	✓		
<u>Senator Bob Brown</u>	✓		
<u>Senator Dick Pinsoneault</u>	✓		
<u>Senator William Farrell</u>	✓		
<u>Senator Pat Regan</u>	✓		
<u>Senator John Anderson Jr.</u>	✓		
<u>Senator Joe Mazurek</u>	✓		

Each day attach to minutes.

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

page 1 of 2
March 28, 1989

MR. PRESIDENT:

We, your committee on Education and Cultural Resources, having had under consideration HB 618 (third reading copy -- blue), respectfully report that HB 618 be amended and as so amended be concurred in:

Sponsor: Schye (Farrell)

1. Title, line 9.

Following: "SECTIONS"

Strike: "20-9-316 AND"

Insert: "20-9-315 THROUGH"

2. Title, line 10.

Following: "DATE"

Insert: "AND TERMINATION DATE FOR CERTAIN PROVISIONS"

3. Page 1, line 13.

Insert: "Section 1. Section 20-9-315, MCA, is amended to read:

"20-9-315. Maximum general fund budget and expenditures and exceptions. (1) The total amount of the general fund budget of any district shall not be greater than the general fund budget amount specified in 20-9-316 through 20-9-321, except when a district has adopted an emergency general fund budget under the provisions of 20-9-165 or when a district satisfies the requirements of 20-9-353.

(2) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was 116% or more of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 4% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(3) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was between 109% and 115% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 3% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(4) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was between 101% and 108% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 2% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(5) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was between 93% and 100% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 1% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(6) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was less than 85% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive an equity supplement of an amount per pupil that would have been necessary to bring the district's general fund expenditures in 1988-89 to 85% of the average general fund expenditures per pupil of schools in that size category.

(7) Public Law 874 expenditures per pupil are not included in the calculation of averages or expenditures mentioned in subsections (2) through (6).

Renumber: subsequent sections

4. Page 5.

Following: line 7

Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 6. Termination. Subsections (2) through (7) of [section 1] terminate June 30, 1990."

AND AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN

Signed: _____
H. W. Hammond, Chairman

Proposed Amendments to HB 618
(Third reading copy -- blue)
March 14, 1989

1. Title, line 9.

Following: "SECTIONS"

Insert: "20-9-315,"

Following: "20-9-316"

Insert: ", "

2. Title, line 10.

Following: "DATE"

Insert: "AND PROVIDING FOR A TERMINATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS"

3. Page 1, line 13.

Insert: "Section 1. Section 20-9-315, MCA, is amended to read:

"20-9-315. Maximum general fund budget and expenditures and exceptions. (1) The total amount of the general fund budget of any district shall not be greater than the general fund budget amount specified in 20-9-316 through 20-9-321, except when a district has adopted an emergency general fund budget under the provisions of 20-9-165 or when a district satisfies the requirements of 20-9-353.

(2) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was 116% or more of the average general fund expenditures per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 4% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(3) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was between 109% and 115% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 3% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(4) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was between 101% and 108% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 2% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(5) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was between 93% and 100% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category, the district shall receive 1% less than the allowable maximum budget schedule amount per ANB for the district.

(6) If during the 1988-89 school year a district's general fund expenditure per pupil was less than 85% of the average general fund expenditure per pupil of all schools in the same foundation schedule size category the district shall receive an equity supplement of an amount per pupil that would have been necessary to bring the district's general fund expenditures in 1988-89 to 85% of the average general fund expenditures per pupil of schools in that size category

(7) PL-874 expenditures per pupil are not included in calculation of averages or expenditures mentioned above.
Renumber: subsequent sections

4. Page 5.

Following: line 7

Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 5. Termination. Subsections 2 through 5 of [section 1] terminate June 30, 1990."

SCHOOL FUNDING REPORT

CREDIT NO. # 2
 DATE 3-28-89
 HANDBOOK # 618

COUNTY	DISTRICT NAME	* ANB	* GF LESS SE* & PL-874	CATEGORY*	AVG/ANB*	DST. ACTUAL /ANB	% OF AVG	85% OF ANB	* ANB \$ DIFFERENCE	* ANB \$ DIFFERENCE
	REEDPOINT HS	19	\$175,010	9	\$12,298	\$9,211	74.90%	\$10,453.30	(\$1,242.30)	(\$23,603.70)
	LAVINA HS	25	\$185,742	10	\$8,850	\$7,430	83.95%	\$7,522.50	(\$92.50)	(\$2,312.50)
	JUDITH GAP HS	28	\$201,999	10	\$8,850	\$7,214	81.51%	\$7,522.50	(\$308.50)	(\$8,638.00)
	WILLOW CREEK HS	30	\$196,056	10	\$8,850	\$6,535	73.84%	\$7,522.50	(\$987.50)	(\$29,625.00)
	HARRISON HS	37	\$193,087	10	\$8,850	\$5,219	58.97%	\$7,522.50	(\$2,303.50)	(\$85,229.50)
	MOORE HS	38	\$284,218	10	\$8,850	\$7,479	84.51%	\$7,522.50	(\$43.50)	(\$1,653.00)
	WILSALL HS	38	\$259,245	10	\$8,850	\$6,822	77.08%	\$7,522.50	(\$700.50)	(\$26,619.00)
	ROBERTS HS	39	\$240,950	10	\$8,850	\$6,178	69.81%	\$7,522.50	(\$1,344.50)	(\$52,435.50)
	LEAVERHEAD	44	\$228,150	11	\$6,369	\$5,185	81.41%	\$5,413.65	(\$228.65)	(\$10,060.60)
	LINCOLN HS	57	\$287,190	11	\$6,369	\$5,038	79.10%	\$5,413.65	(\$375.65)	(\$21,412.05)
	CLYDE PARK HS	75	\$328,855	11	\$6,369	\$4,385	68.85%	\$5,413.65	(\$1,028.65)	(\$77,148.75)
	HOT SPRINGS HS	76	\$328,480	11	\$6,369	\$4,322	67.86%	\$5,413.65	(\$1,091.65)	(\$82,965.40)
	NASHUA HS	78	\$413,613	11	\$6,369	\$5,303	83.26%	\$5,413.65	(\$110.65)	(\$8,630.70)
	SHERIDAN HS	79	\$399,174	11	\$6,369	\$5,053	79.34%	\$5,413.65	(\$360.65)	(\$28,491.35)
	VICTOR HS	85	\$347,178	11	\$6,369	\$4,091	64.23%	\$5,413.65	(\$1,322.65)	(\$112,425.25)
	VALIER HS	86	\$420,814	11	\$6,369	\$4,893	76.83%	\$5,413.65	(\$520.65)	(\$44,775.90)
	GARFIELD CO HS	88	\$464,758	11	\$6,369	\$5,281	82.92%	\$5,413.65	(\$132.65)	(\$11,673.20)
	CARTER CO HS	88	\$456,219	11	\$6,369	\$5,184	81.39%	\$5,413.65	(\$228.65)	(\$20,709.20)
	CENTERVILLE HS	89	\$386,069	11	\$6,369	\$4,338	68.11%	\$5,413.65	(\$1,075.65)	(\$95,732.85)
	ASCANDE HS	89	\$458,962	11	\$6,369	\$5,157	80.97%	\$5,413.65	(\$256.65)	(\$22,841.85)
	DRUMMOND HS	89	\$371,192	11	\$6,369	\$4,171	65.49%	\$5,413.65	(\$1,242.65)	(\$110,595.85)
	CHARLO CO HS	90	\$431,148	11	\$6,369	\$4,791	75.22%	\$5,413.65	(\$622.65)	(\$56,038.50)
	JOLIET HS	94	\$476,745	11	\$6,369	\$5,072	79.64%	\$5,413.65	(\$341.65)	(\$32,115.10)
	NOXON HS	98	\$465,262	11	\$6,369	\$4,748	74.55%	\$5,413.65	(\$665.65)	(\$65,233.70)
	PARK CITY HS	109	\$390,157	12	\$4,574	\$3,579	78.25%	\$3,887.90	(\$308.90)	(\$33,670.10)
	ARLEE HS	132	\$469,522	12	\$4,574	\$3,557	77.77%	\$3,887.90	(\$330.90)	(\$43,678.80)
	COLUMBUS HS	151	\$568,178	12	\$4,574	\$3,763	82.27%	\$3,887.90	(\$124.90)	(\$18,859.90)
	FLORENCE-CARLTON HS	166	\$626,204	12	\$4,574	\$3,772	82.47%	\$3,887.90	(\$115.90)	(\$19,239.40)
	ST IGNATIUS HS	168	\$620,764	12	\$4,574	\$3,695	80.78%	\$3,887.90	(\$192.90)	(\$32,407.20)
	MANHATTEN HS	174	\$675,061	12	\$4,574	\$3,880	84.83%	\$3,887.90	(\$7.90)	(\$1,374.60)
	PLAINES HS	179	\$632,648	12	\$4,574	\$3,534	77.26%	\$3,887.90	(\$353.90)	(\$63,348.10)
	DARBY HS	218	\$711,668	12	\$4,574	\$3,524	77.04%	\$3,887.90	(\$363.90)	(\$71,688.30)
	HUNTLEY PROJ HS	226	\$784,562	13	\$4,128	\$3,472	79.09%	\$3,508.80	(\$243.80)	(\$53,148.40)
	WHITEHALL HS	233	\$767,347	13	\$4,128	\$3,293	79.77%	\$3,508.80	(\$36.80)	(\$8,316.80)
	BROADWATER CO HS	236	\$801,645	13	\$4,128	\$3,397	82.29%	\$3,508.80	(\$111.80)	(\$50,281.40)
	SHEPHERD HS	276	\$809,108	13	\$4,128	\$2,932	71.03%	\$3,508.80	(\$576.80)	(\$26,384.80)
	CORVALLIS HS	298	\$754,416	13	\$4,128	\$2,532	61.34%	\$3,508.80	(\$976.80)	(\$159,196.80)
	STEVENSVILLE HS	383	\$1,061,677	14	\$3,548	\$2,772	78.13%	\$3,015.80	(\$243.80)	(\$291,086.40)
	RONAN HS	395	\$1,054,135	14	\$3,548	\$2,669	75.23%	\$3,015.80	(\$346.80)	(\$93,375.40)
	HAMILTON HS	482	\$1,282,935	14	\$3,548	\$2,662	75.03%	\$3,015.80	(\$353.80)	(\$136,986.00)
	FERGUS HS	526	\$1,492,021	14	\$3,548	\$2,837	79.96%	\$3,015.80	(\$178.80)	(\$170,531.60)
										(\$94,048.80)
	SUBTOTAL	6108	\$22,196,911						(\$18,428.40)	(\$2,398,089.25)
	SEBUD	6	\$22,193	1	\$4,621	\$3,699	80.05%	\$3,927.85	(\$228.85)	(\$1,373.10)
	WDER RIVER	7	\$22,234	1	\$4,621	\$3,176	68.73%	\$3,927.85	(\$751.85)	(\$5,262.95)
	RGUS	7	\$23,578	1	\$4,621	\$3,368	72.88%	\$3,927.85	(\$559.85)	(\$3,918.95)
	STER	7	\$22,159	1	\$4,621	\$3,166	68.51%	\$3,927.85	(\$761.85)	(\$5,332.95)
	RFIELD	7	\$21,934	1	\$4,621	\$3,133	67.80%	\$3,927.85	(\$794.85)	(\$5,563.95)
	NDERS	7	\$14,299	1	\$4,621	\$2,043	44.21%	\$3,927.85	(\$1,884.85)	(\$13,193.95)
	STER	7	\$22,450	1	\$4,621	\$3,207	69.40%	\$3,927.85	(\$720.85)	(\$5,045.95)
	WDER RIVER	7	\$27,275	1	\$4,621	\$3,896	84.31%	\$3,927.85	(\$31.85)	(\$222.95)
	STER	7	\$22,549	1	\$4,621	\$3,221	69.70%	\$3,927.85	(\$706.85)	(\$4,947.95)
	ONE	8	\$27,959	1	\$4,621	\$3,495	75.63%	\$3,927.85	(\$432.85)	(\$3,462.80)
	RTER	8	\$23,941	1	\$4,621	\$2,993	64.77%	\$3,927.85	(\$934.85)	(\$7,478.80)

SENATE EDUCATION

EXHIBIT NO. # 2

DATE 3-28-89

ROLL NO. HB 618 (Sen)

(\$1,105.85) (\$1,461.85) (\$1,248.85) (\$1,480.85) (\$3,224.35) (\$284.35) (\$1,103.55) (\$1,103.55) (\$4,942.85) (\$88.25) (\$7,744.25) (\$1,864.25) (\$6,520.25) (\$6,712.25) (\$2,332.25) (\$1,108.25) (\$4,554.55) (\$8,389.55) (\$9,403.55) (\$6,279.00) (\$6,321.00) (\$1,027.50) (\$3,352.00) (\$5,816.00) (\$1,517.50) (\$4,094.10) (\$15,906.45) (\$1,390.35) (\$9,811.25) (\$10,111.25) (\$1,261.25) (\$1,805.70) (\$4,575.15) (\$4,737.15) (\$4,940.60) (\$6,676.60) (\$6,508.60) (\$13,962.05) (\$8,023.50) (\$20,690.95) (\$12,595.30) (\$16,444.65) (\$21,106.65) (\$26,214.30) (\$43,830.60) (\$16,296.75) (\$28,158.90) (\$45,408.90) (\$56,695.20) (\$62,090.35) (\$62,757.50) (\$59,685.95) (\$10,268.10) (\$31,058.10) (\$71,673.25) (\$1,922.70) (\$70,420.70) (\$64,731.85)

1	\$4,621	\$2,822	61.07%	\$3,927.85	(\$1,105.85)
1	\$4,621	\$2,466	53.37%	\$3,927.85	(\$1,461.85)
1	\$4,621	\$2,679	57.97%	\$3,927.85	(\$1,248.85)
1	\$4,621	\$2,447	52.95%	\$3,927.85	(\$1,480.85)
2	\$3,071	\$2,286	74.44%	\$2,610.35	(\$3,224.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,326	75.74%	\$2,610.35	(\$284.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,609	84.96%	\$2,610.35	(\$1,103.55)
2	\$3,071	\$2,300	74.89%	\$2,610.35	(\$1,103.55)
2	\$3,071	\$2,161	70.37%	\$2,610.35	(\$4,942.85)
2	\$3,071	\$2,161	70.37%	\$2,610.35	(\$4,942.85)
2	\$3,071	\$2,603	84.76%	\$2,610.35	(\$7.35)
2	\$3,071	\$1,965	63.99%	\$2,610.35	(\$645.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,455	79.94%	\$2,610.35	(\$155.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,067	67.31%	\$2,610.35	(\$543.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,051	66.79%	\$2,610.35	(\$559.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,416	78.67%	\$2,610.35	(\$194.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,518	81.99%	\$2,610.35	(\$92.35)
2	\$3,071	\$2,260	73.59%	\$2,610.35	(\$350.35)
2	\$3,071	\$1,965	63.99%	\$2,610.35	(\$645.35)
2	\$3,071	\$1,887	61.45%	\$2,610.35	(\$723.35)
3	\$3,490	\$2,518	72.15%	\$2,966.50	(\$448.50)
3	\$3,490	\$2,515	72.06%	\$2,966.50	(\$451.50)
3	\$3,490	\$2,898	83.04%	\$2,966.50	(\$68.50)
3	\$3,490	\$2,757	79.00%	\$2,966.50	(\$209.50)
3	\$3,490	\$2,603	74.58%	\$2,966.50	(\$363.50)
3	\$3,490	\$2,289	65.59%	\$2,966.50	(\$677.50)
3	\$3,490	\$2,762	78.53%	\$2,989.45	(\$227.45)
4	\$3,517	\$2,232	63.46%	\$2,989.45	(\$757.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,453	82.96%	\$2,513.45	(\$60.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,121	71.73%	\$2,513.45	(\$392.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,109	71.32%	\$2,513.45	(\$404.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,063	69.77%	\$2,513.45	(\$450.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,444	82.65%	\$2,513.45	(\$69.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,344	79.27%	\$2,513.45	(\$169.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,365	79.98%	\$2,513.45	(\$148.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,338	79.07%	\$2,513.45	(\$175.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,337	79.03%	\$2,513.45	(\$176.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,275	76.94%	\$2,513.45	(\$238.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,281	77.14%	\$2,513.45	(\$232.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,246	68.72%	\$2,513.45	(\$481.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,246	75.96%	\$2,513.45	(\$267.45)
5	\$2,957	\$1,846	62.43%	\$2,513.45	(\$667.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,143	72.47%	\$2,513.45	(\$370.45)
5	\$2,957	\$2,069	69.97%	\$2,513.45	(\$444.45)
5	\$2,957	\$1,943	65.71%	\$2,513.45	(\$624.45)
6	\$3,899	\$2,690	68.99%	\$3,314.15	(\$624.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,318	59.45%	\$3,314.15	(\$996.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,952	75.71%	\$3,314.15	(\$362.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,702	69.30%	\$3,314.15	(\$612.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,327	59.68%	\$3,314.15	(\$987.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,133	54.71%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,181.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,047	52.50%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,267.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,059	52.81%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,255.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,188	56.12%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,126.15)
6	\$3,899	\$3,124	80.12%	\$3,314.15	(\$190.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,739	70.25%	\$3,314.15	(\$575.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,011	51.58%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,303.15)
6	\$3,899	\$3,281	84.15%	\$3,314.15	(\$33.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,100	53.86%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,214.15)
6	\$3,899	\$2,217	56.86%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,097.15)

SCHOOL FUNDING REPORT

8	N HARLEM COLONY ELEM
9	BENZIEN ELEM
9	SECOND CRK ELEM
9	RIDGE ELEM
10	PINE GROVE ELEM
10	HORKAN CRK ELEM
10	MALMBORG ELEM
10	PASS CREEK ELEM
11	MOON CREEK ELEM
11	WHITNEY CRK ELEM
12	SHAWMUT ELEM
12	BIG DRY CREEK ELEM
12	SPRINGHILL ELEM
12	S Y ELEM
12	ALZADA ELEM
12	COTTONWOOD ELEM
12	LENNEP ELEM
13	GILDFORD COLONY ELEM
13	SPRINGDALE ELEM
13	BLACKFOOT ELEM
14	VALLEY VIEW ELEM
14	JACKSON ELEM
15	MCLEOD ELEM
16	PENDROY ELEM
16	YAAK ELEM
17	SYLVANITE ELEM
18	NYE ELEM
21	COTTONWOOD ELEM
23	BOYD ELEM
25	UPPER WEST SHORE EL
25	SEVILLE ELEM
25	LAACIER
26	WEEET GRASS
27	WEEET GRASS
27	WEEET GRASS
27	WEEET GRASS
27	WEEET GRASS
28	WEEET GRASS
28	WEEET GRASS
29	WEEET GRASS
30	WEEET GRASS
31	WEEET GRASS
34	WEEET GRASS
37	WEEET GRASS
37	WEEET GRASS
42	WEEET GRASS
44	WEEET GRASS
45	WEEET GRASS
46	WEEET GRASS
46	WEEET GRASS
48	WEEET GRASS
49	WEEET GRASS
50	WEEET GRASS
53	WEEET GRASS
54	WEEET GRASS
55	WEEET GRASS
58	WEEET GRASS
58	WEEET GRASS
59	WEEET GRASS

SCHOOL FUNDING REPORT

YELLOWSTONE	62	\$165,019	\$3,899	\$2,662	68.27%	\$3,314.15	(\$652.15)	16.73%	(\$40,433.31)
LINCOLN	63	\$153,594	\$3,899	\$2,438	62.53%	\$3,314.15	(\$876.15)	22.47%	(\$55,197.41)
TETON	71	\$175,463	\$3,899	\$2,471	63.38%	\$3,314.15	(\$843.15)	21.62%	(\$59,863.61)
LINCOLN	75	\$185,884	\$3,899	\$2,478	63.55%	\$3,314.15	(\$836.15)	21.45%	(\$62,711.21)
FATHEAD	75	\$154,351	\$3,899	\$2,058	52.78%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,256.15)	32.22%	(\$94,211.21)
MISSOULA	85	\$267,534	\$3,899	\$3,147	80.71%	\$3,314.15	(\$167.15)	4.29%	(\$14,207.71)
CARBON	89	\$280,376	\$3,899	\$3,150	80.79%	\$3,314.15	(\$164.15)	4.21%	(\$14,609.31)
SHERIDAN	94	\$256,780	\$3,899	\$2,732	70.07%	\$3,314.15	(\$582.15)	14.93%	(\$54,722.11)
ROOSEVELT	94	\$258,869	\$3,899	\$2,754	70.63%	\$3,314.15	(\$560.15)	14.37%	(\$52,654.11)
PARK	95	\$236,597	\$3,899	\$2,490	63.86%	\$3,314.15	(\$824.15)	21.14%	(\$78,294.21)
GALLATIN	95	\$289,869	\$3,899	\$3,051	78.25%	\$3,314.15	(\$263.15)	6.75%	(\$24,999.21)
YELLOWSTONE	98	\$212,749	\$3,899	\$2,171	55.68%	\$3,314.15	(\$1,143.15)	29.32%	(\$112,028.71)
FATHEAD	98	\$267,285	\$3,899	\$2,727	69.94%	\$3,314.15	(\$587.15)	15.06%	(\$57,540.71)
CASCADE	99	\$325,571	\$3,899	\$3,289	84.35%	\$3,314.15	(\$25.15)	0.65%	(\$2,489.81)
YELLOWSTONE	102	\$246,644	\$3,001	\$2,418	80.57%	\$2,550.85	(\$132.85)	4.43%	(\$13,550.71)
VALLEY	103	\$252,028	\$3,001	\$2,447	81.54%	\$2,550.85	(\$103.85)	3.46%	(\$10,696.51)
FATHEAD	103	\$225,606	\$3,001	\$2,190	72.98%	\$2,550.85	(\$360.85)	12.02%	(\$37,167.51)
FLATHEAD	118	\$243,905	\$3,001	\$2,067	68.88%	\$2,550.85	(\$483.85)	16.12%	(\$57,094.31)
YELLOWSTONE	154	\$308,058	\$3,001	\$2,000	66.64%	\$2,550.85	(\$550.85)	18.36%	(\$84,830.91)
SANDERS	157	\$394,123	\$3,001	\$2,510	83.64%	\$2,550.85	(\$40.85)	1.36%	(\$6,413.41)
FATHEAD	158	\$344,158	\$3,001	\$2,178	72.58%	\$2,550.85	(\$372.85)	12.42%	(\$58,910.31)
RAVALLI	162	\$375,613	\$3,001	\$2,319	77.27%	\$2,550.85	(\$231.85)	7.42%	(\$37,559.71)
WIBAUX	178	\$375,405	\$3,001	\$2,109	70.28%	\$2,550.85	(\$441.85)	14.72%	(\$78,649.31)
PONDERA	179	\$432,561	\$3,001	\$2,417	80.54%	\$2,550.85	(\$133.85)	4.46%	(\$23,959.11)
FLATHEAD	181	\$401,981	\$3,001	\$2,221	74.01%	\$2,550.85	(\$329.85)	10.99%	(\$59,702.81)
FLATHEAD	198	\$402,098	\$3,001	\$2,031	67.68%	\$2,550.85	(\$519.85)	17.32%	(\$102,930.31)
FLATHEAD	202	\$438,944	\$3,001	\$2,173	72.41%	\$2,550.85	(\$377.85)	12.59%	(\$76,325.71)
MADISON	214	\$494,356	\$3,001	\$2,313	76.97%	\$2,550.85	(\$240.85)	8.03%	(\$51,541.91)
TETON	217	\$483,030	\$3,001	\$2,226	74.18%	\$2,550.85	(\$324.85)	10.82%	(\$70,492.41)
YELLOWSTONE	221	\$490,390	\$3,001	\$2,219	73.94%	\$2,550.85	(\$331.85)	11.06%	(\$73,338.81)
CASCADE	239	\$510,524	\$3,001	\$2,136	71.18%	\$2,550.85	(\$414.85)	13.82%	(\$99,149.11)
STILLWATER	246	\$588,548	\$3,001	\$2,392	79.71%	\$2,550.85	(\$158.85)	5.29%	(\$39,077.11)
CARBON	249	\$582,482	\$3,001	\$2,339	77.94%	\$2,550.85	(\$211.85)	7.06%	(\$52,170.61)
LEWIS & CLARK	251	\$586,995	\$3,001	\$2,339	77.94%	\$2,550.85	(\$211.85)	7.06%	(\$52,174.31)
MISSOULA	279	\$634,665	\$3,001	\$2,275	75.81%	\$2,550.85	(\$275.85)	9.19%	(\$76,962.11)
FATHEAD	328	\$694,957	\$2,766	\$2,119	76.61%	\$2,351.10	(\$232.10)	8.39%	(\$76,128.81)
GALLATIN	367	\$838,710	\$2,766	\$2,285	82.61%	\$2,351.10	(\$66.10)	2.39%	(\$24,258.71)
SWEET GRASS	413	\$913,932	\$2,766	\$2,213	80.01%	\$2,351.10	(\$138.10)	4.99%	(\$57,035.31)
RAVALLI	428	\$978,148	\$2,766	\$2,296	83.01%	\$2,351.10	(\$55.10)	1.99%	(\$23,472.61)
MISSOULA	426	\$965,232	\$2,766	\$2,255	81.53%	\$2,351.10	(\$96.10)	3.47%	(\$41,130.81)
RAVALLI	430	\$888,875	\$2,766	\$2,067	74.73%	\$2,351.10	(\$284.10)	10.27%	(\$122,163.01)
YELLOWSTONE	467	\$1,007,010	\$2,766	\$2,156	77.95%	\$2,351.10	(\$195.10)	7.05%	(\$91,111.71)
LINCOLN	504	\$1,176,496	\$2,766	\$2,334	84.38%	\$2,351.10	(\$17.10)	0.62%	(\$8,618.41)
MUSSELSHEL	527	\$1,222,389	\$2,766	\$2,320	83.88%	\$2,351.10	(\$31.10)	1.12%	(\$16,389.71)
LINCOLN	573	\$1,318,497	\$2,766	\$2,301	83.19%	\$2,351.10	(\$50.10)	1.81%	(\$28,707.31)
RAVALLI	664	\$1,512,864	\$2,766	\$2,278	82.36%	\$2,351.10	(\$73.10)	2.64%	(\$48,538.41)
ROOSEVELT	716	\$1,578,242	\$2,766	\$2,204	79.68%	\$2,351.10	(\$147.10)	5.32%	(\$105,323.61)
FATHEAD	777	\$1,713,642	\$2,766	\$2,205	79.72%	\$2,351.10	(\$146.10)	5.28%	(\$113,519.71)
LEWIS & CLARK	935	\$2,071,356	\$2,766	\$2,215	80.08%	\$2,351.10	(\$136.10)	4.92%	(\$127,253.51)
LAKE	965	\$1,966,011	\$2,766	\$2,037	73.64%	\$2,351.10	(\$314.10)	11.36%	(\$303,106.51)
RAVALLI	984	\$2,097,285	\$2,766	\$2,131	77.04%	\$2,351.10	(\$220.10)	7.96%	(\$216,578.41)
GALLATIN	1033	\$2,410,426	\$2,766	\$2,333	84.35%	\$2,351.10	(\$18.10)	0.65%	(\$18,697.31)
YELLOWSTONE	1320	\$3,047,263	\$2,766	\$2,309	83.48%	\$2,351.10	(\$42.10)	1.52%	(\$55,572.01)

ELEM SUBTOTAL	18638	\$42,471,311					(\$57,483.90)		(\$4,400,203.61)
TOTAL	24746	\$64,668,222					(\$75,912.30)		(\$6,798,292.91)

OLEVDIST_NAME	DT_ANB	DIST_FP	4% INCREASE	9% INCREASE	DIST_FP/ANB	4% INCREASE	9% INCREASE
151 COLUMBIA FALLS ELEM	1567	\$2,197,624.10	\$87,904.96	\$197,786.17	\$1,402.44	\$56.10	\$126.22
211 HAVRE ELEM	1675	\$2,403,872.80	\$96,154.91	\$216,348.55	\$1,435.15	\$57.41	\$129.16
151 KALISPELL ELEM	2148	\$3,183,237.60	\$127,329.50	\$286,491.38	\$1,481.95	\$59.28	\$133.38
161 BOZEMAN ELEM	2668	\$3,824,186.40	\$152,967.46	\$344,176.78	\$1,433.35	\$57.33	\$129.00
471 BUTTE ELEM	3827	\$5,656,740.45	\$226,269.62	\$509,106.64	\$1,478.11	\$59.12	\$133.03
251 HELENA ELEM	4685	\$6,656,809.54	\$266,272.38	\$599,112.86	\$1,420.88	\$56.84	\$127.88
321 MISSOULA ELEM	5378	\$7,798,851.68	\$311,954.07	\$701,896.65	\$1,450.14	\$58.01	\$130.51
071 GREAT FALLS EL	8124	\$11,235,589.60	\$449,423.58	\$1,011,203.06	\$1,383.01	\$55.32	\$124.47
561 BILLINGS ELEM	10249	\$14,859,844.00	\$594,393.76	\$1,337,385.96	\$1,449.88	\$58.00	\$130.49
ELEM SUBTOTAL	40321	\$57,816,756.17	\$2,312,670.25	\$5,203,508.06	\$12,934.92	\$517.40	\$1,164.14
162 BOZEMAN H S	1380	\$2,287,767.20	\$91,510.69	\$205,899.05	\$1,657.80	\$56.31	\$149.20
472 BUTTE H S	1814	\$3,381,283.20	\$135,251.33	\$304,315.49	\$1,863.99	\$74.56	\$167.76
152 FLATHEAD H S	2245	\$3,751,570.40	\$150,062.82	\$337,641.34	\$1,671.08	\$66.84	\$150.40
252 HELENA H S	2818	\$4,945,844.00	\$197,833.76	\$445,125.96	\$1,755.09	\$70.20	\$157.96
322 MISSOULA H S	3619	\$6,532,832.48	\$261,313.30	\$587,954.92	\$1,805.15	\$72.21	\$162.46
072 GREAT FALLS H S	3825	\$6,924,204.00	\$276,968.16	\$623,178.36	\$1,810.25	\$72.41	\$162.92
562 BILLINGS H S	5258	\$9,300,531.20	\$372,021.25	\$837,047.81	\$1,768.83	\$70.75	\$159.20
HS SUBTOTALS	20959	\$37,124,032.48	\$1,484,961.30	\$3,341,162.92	\$12,332.20	\$493.29	\$1,109.90
TOTAL	61280	\$94,940,788.65	\$3,797,631.55	\$8,544,670.98	\$25,267.12	\$1,010.68	\$2,274.04

ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE EDUCATION

EXHIBIT NO. 3
DATE: 3-28-89
BILL NO. HB 618

SENATE COMMITTEE EDUCATION

Date 3-28-89 AMENDMENTS TO
HOUSE # Bill No. 618 Time _____

NAME	YES	NO
Vice Chairman Dennis Nathe	✓	
Senator Chet Blaylock		✓
Senator Bob Brown		✓
Senator Dick Pinsoneault	✓	
Senator William Farrell	✓	
Senator Pat Regan		✓
Senator John Anderson	✓	
Senator Joe Mazurek		✓
Chairman H.W. "Swede" Hammond	✓	

5 : 4

Julie Harmala
Secretary

H. W. Swede Hammond
Chairman

Motion: Senator moved that the
Amendments to HB 618 do
pass
Motion carried

ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE EDUCATION

EXHIBIT NO. 4

SENATE COMMITTEE EDUCATION

DATE 3-28-89

NO. HB 618

Date 3-28-89

House

HB
Bill No. 618

Time 2:50

NAME	YES	NO
Vice Chairman Dennis Nathe	7	
Senator Chet Blaylock	7	
Senator Bob Brown	7	
Senator Dick Pinsonneault	7	
Senator William Farrell	7	
Senator Pat Regan		7
Senator John Anderson	7	
Senator Joe Mazurek	7	
Chairman H.W. "Swede" Hammond	7	

8 to 1

Julie Harmala
Secretary

H. W. Swede Hammond
Chairman

Motion: Sen Farrell moved HB 618 be concurred
in as amended. - passed