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# SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATION 

 Compittee ProceduresThe statutorily created Committee on School Finance was established by Senate Bill No. 25 ( 1978 Sessfon) to "... study school finance during the 1978 and 1979 interim periods ..." and .... submit a preliminary report to the first regular session of the fifty-second general assembly ...n. The comittee is comprised of fifteen nembers; ten legislators, and five non-legislators.

The committee conducted five meetings during the 1978 . interim, including two two-day meetings. In accordance with its broad charge, the committee's efforts were concentrated simultaneously in two areas: 1) an evaluation of the provisions and effects of colorado's public school finance system; and 2) an analysis of the potential impacts of proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Colorado Constitution (1)miting the per capita spending of the state and its political subdivisions) on Colorado's current system of school finance.

Impacts of Amendment No. 2
In pursuing the committee's analysis of the Impacts of Amendment No. 2, it was the committee's intent to be prepared to address the need for implementing legislation in a well considered fashion in the event of the proposal's passage. To that end, the committee directed the staffs of the Legislative Council, Legislative Drafting Office, and Department of Education to identify potential problems in the proposal's interpretation and application to school finance. In addition, the fiscal impacts of al ternate interpretations of Amendment No. 2 on the state and local districts were examined in detall by the committee. The committee received staff presentations in this regard at its second, third, and fourth meetings.

Because of the proposal's defeat by the voters, no legislation, findings, or recommendations concerning Amendment No. 2 are advanced by the committee.

## Examination of Colorado's Public School Finance System

As the committee's study of school finance was established on a two-year basis, the comittee divided its work into two one-year increments: i) a fact-finding and data gathering phase to be pursued during the 1978 legislative interim; and 2) a policy making phase to result in recommended legislation during the 1979 interim. Pursuant to this division of its workload, the committee's first phase was primarily dedicated to receiving presentations from the staffs of the Legislative Council, Legislative Drafting Office, and Department of Education. It is anticipated that pubilc testimony will be accommodated during the 1979 phase of the complttee's activities.
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## Commiftee Findings and Recommendation

## Findings

As the result of the Committee's first phase of study, the following findings were adopted at the final meeting.
(1) S.B. No. 25. S.B. No: 25 appears to be providing property tax rellef by lowering the projected average statewlde mill levy for school districts to $37.78 \mathrm{mil1s}$ in 1979 , compared to a projected 42.76 mills without S.B. No. 25. The mill levy under S.B. No. 25 is expected to remain stable in 1980. However, unless state equalization is increased in 1981 and 1982 beyond the 1980 level, mill levies can be anticipated to increase significantly in those two years.

In addition to its effect on property taxes, S.B. No. 25 has had a positive impact on equalization of school district expenditures by raising the ARB of the lower spending districts while restricting the ARB growth of the state's higher spending districts. It is projected that the state's lowest ARB district will increase in 1979 by the equivalent of 23.46 percent while the state's highest ARB district will be restricted to a 4.02 percent increase. By 1982, the ARB disparity between the state's lowest ARB district and the statewide average ARB will be reduced from $\$ 417.89$ in 1978 to $\$ 207.96$, a 50 percent reduction in disparity. The ARB disparity between the state's low and median ARB districts will also be reduced from $\$ 355.24$ in 1973 to $\$ 163.26$, a 54 percent reduction by 1982 .
(2) School District Operating Expenses. The largest single component of school district operating expenses is employee salaries, which accounted for 69.6 percent of operating expenses in 1977. When combined with employee benefits, this component amounted to nearly 30 percent of operating expenses. Of the salary component, roughly twothirds of all salaries were paid for instructional personnel and roughly one-third for support personnel.

Salaries tend to occupy a larger portion of the budget in larger school districts than in small school districts. The reverse trend appears to be the case for general administration expenses.
(3) Rates of Increase in Per Pupil Education Expenses, Teacher Salaries and Various Indices. During the ten year pertod 1968-77, statewide per pupil school district operating expenditures increased at a more rapid rate than either the local and national consumer price indices, the local and national hourly earnings indices, or the classroom teacher or state employee average salaries. Increases in average daily attendance entitiement were minor, with declines in enrollment statewide during the last four years. Increases in instructional salaries and fixed charges (employee retirement, insurance, etc, ) appear to have accounted for nearly 75 percent of the operating expenditure increase, with increases in the areas of operations maintenance, administration, and pupil transportation accounting for the remaining
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milition). The reverse trend was true for agricultural land. In 1966, egricultural land accounted for 13.0 percent of total assessed valuation ( $\$ 552.4$ million), while by 1977, this figure had declined to 5.9 percent ( $\$ 631.7$ mil1ion).
(10) Trends In the Property Tax and State Equalization Components of Total School District General fund Budgeted Experidtures. buring the perfod $1970-73$, state equalizatfon payments have risen to a level nearly equal to local property tax revenues as a percentage of total school district general fund budgeted expenditures. These two sources have accounted for approximately $80-84$ percent of total school district general fund budgeted expenditures during the nine year period, with the remaining $16-20$ percent made up of state categorical grants and other state funds, other local funds, and federal funds. State equalization payments have risen most dramatically since 1974, the initial year of the impact of the Public School Finance Act of 1973.
(11) The Capital Reserve Fund. All but five school districts are levying mitls for use in the capital reserve fund in 1978. The vast majority of the districts ( 75.7 percent) are levying the maximum number of four mills per year. Most of the districts appear to be accumulating and holding over revenues in the fund each year rather than expending the entire balance each year. Districts with low assessed valuations are levying the maximum number of wills on the same scale as districts with high assessed valuations; property weal th does not appear to be a factor in the use of the fund.
(12) Small Attendance Center Aid. Nearly one-half of the school districts in the state are receiving small attendance center aid. Some districts receive more state financial assistance from small attendance center aid than from state equalization payments. If the amount of small attendance center aid were added to the average ARB of those districts receiving the ald, the average ARB would increase by approximately 2.7 percent.
(13) Cost of the Minimum Guarantee., If the minimum, state guarantee were elfminated and all schoof districts were placed under the general equalization program, the amount of state equalization would decrease and the number of mills levied by those districts currently on the minimum would increase through 1982. In 1979, the projected state equalization decrease would be approximately $\$ 8.4$ milIon, with an average projected mill levy increase of 0.7 mills per district statewide. In 1982, the projected state equalization decrease would be approximately $\$ 44.9$ million, with an average projected mill levy increase of 3.4 mills per district statewide.
(14) Cost of Stabilizing, the Statewide Average Mill Levy in 1981 and 1982. In order to stablize the statewide average mill levy in 1981 and 1982 at the estimated 1980 level of 37.59 mills, state equalization would have to increase from $\$ 507.3$ million in 1980 to $\$ 556.7$ million in 1981, and to $\$ 603.5$ million in 1982. That would amount to a $\$ 49.4$ million increase in 1981 over the current S.B. No.
 rent S.A. H. 2 lewi for 1984 .
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# EXAMINATION OF COLORADO'S CURRENT PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEM <br> BACKGROUND INFORMATION 

To achieve a thorough understanding of the posture of Colorado's current public school financing system, it is necessary to examine its general background in terms of the historical development of the "Public School Finance Act of 1973", the current mechanics of the most recent amendments to the 1973 act , and the expenditure patterns and fiscal pressures within the state's 181 school districts.

## Historical Information

The historical development and continued evaluation of the "Public School Finance Act of 1973" must be analyzed by examining two interrelated influences: 1) the legislative history of school finance in Colorado; and 2) the continuing development of a vast corpus of legal precedent concerning state systems of school funding in the early 1970s in the fifty states.

## Legislative History

## Legislative Action Prior to 1952

Under the provisions of the Constitution of the State of Colorado, adopted March 14, 1876, the General Assembly was directed to "... provide for the establishment and maintenance of a thorough and uniform system of free public schools throughout the state". Legislation adopted in 1877 to implement this requirement provided for the funding of such schools, on a county flow-through basis, from local property taxes levied by local boards of education and from the state Public School Income Fund.

The state Public School Income Fund was established by the Constitution and includes the proceeds from lands granted to the state for education purposes, estates that escheat to the state, and other grants, gifts, or devises. Primary income to the fund is from proceeds of the state school lands, granted to the state by the Congress in the Enabling Act.

In 1877, the General Assembly provided for semi-annual disbursements of the Public School Fund on the basis of the number of school age children in each county. The first distribution in July, 1879, totaled $\$ 7,041.30$, or 26.6 cents per child.

In 1908, Congress passed the Forest Reserve Act and provided for the return of 25 percent of federal revenues from national forests
to the county of origin for the support of roads and schools. Under state law, the county is required to allocate its receipts from this source to roads and schools, with the provision that not less than five percent may be allocated to either.

In 1917, the first indirect appropriation from the state general fund to school districts was enacted for purposes of matching federal support for vocational education. The moneys were to be paid out of funds appropriated for the maintenance and support of institutions under the control of the State Board of Agriculture.

In 1921, legislation was adopted providing that minimum teacher salaries be set at $\$ 1000$ per year for teachers with two years of college education, and $\$ 1200$ per year for teachers with four years of college education. In addition, salaries were not to be less than $\$ 75$ per month and teachers were to be paid on an annual basis.

Related legislation was also adopted at that time requiring that districts levy an amount sufficient to raise $\$ 75$ per month per teacher. Further provisions stated that only one teacher per 25 students could be certified for the first 100 students enrolled in any district, and one teacher per 40 students for enroliments exceeding 100. More teachers were required to be funded in districts in sparsely populated areas, poor areas, and areas with particularly small enrollments. An additional provision related to the number of high school teachers, and required that one be funded for each 25 students. If the amount necessary to raise such funds exceeded five mills, only five mills would be levied and the difference made up out of priority disbursements from the Public School Income Fund, before the per capita disbursements of such fund. Districts were allowed to make additional levies to pay for general operating expenses and teacher salaries in excess of the minimums specified in the law.

In 1930, total general purpose school revenues totaled some $\$ 24.8$ milion, of which the state contributed approximately $\$ 750,000$ from the Public School Income Fund. County school revenues totaled $\$ 5.8$ million, with school districts raising an additional $\$ 18.3 \mathrm{mil}$ lion from the property tax.

In 1935, as a means of bringing a court test of the validity of direct state support for local school districts, an appropriation of $\$ 500$ was made from the state general fund to the public schools. The appropriation for this purpose was upheld by the Colorado Supreme Court in 1937 (Wilmore v. Annear, 100 Colo. 106, 65 P.2d 1433), stating that:
...[t]he establishment and financial maintenance of the public schools of the state is the carrying out of a state, and not a local or municipal purpose.

In 1937, legislation was adopted to implement the state income tax passed by the voters at the 1936 general election as an amendment to the State Constitution. The apparent purpose of the constitutional
amendment was to supplant property taxes as the source of funding for public education and the act provided that the funds derived from the income tax would be distributed to school districts in order to pay for the minimum teacher salary provisions in the 1921 law. The first allocation of moneys under this law was approximately $\$ 878,000$, and was based on the number of school age children in each district, as compared to the state total. If a district's share of such funds was in excess of the required minimum teacher salaries, they were redistributed to all districts on the basis of pupils. Conversely, if the monies so distributed were not sufficient the district would levy an amount sufficient to make up the difference.

Also, in 1937, the General Assembly adopted legislation providing for a state program of home instruction for handicapped children. In addition, ad valorem taxes on motor vehicles were replaced with annual graduated specific ownership taxes which were distributed in the same manner as property taxes. Accordingly, school districts received a proportional amount of the tax relative to their mill levy as compared to the total of other levies.

In 1939, the amount of income taxes reserved for public schools was changed. Under the 1937 law, all amounts in excess of a five percent retention for refunds, and three percent for administration, were for schools. Under the 1939 amendment, the two deductions were retained and the public schools given 65 percent of the remainder of collections from 1937, 1938, and 1939 taxes. The other 35 percent was set aside for a special general fund reserve for the state. Allocations on the basis of numbers of students were continued, and directed to fund the minimum teacher salary program. An amendment to the law required districts to reduce property tax levies by an amount comparable to their receipts from the state income tax.

By 1940, total school general fund revenues were $\$ 21.2$ million, down slightly from 1930. The state now contributed almost $\$ 1.8 \mathrm{mil-}$ lion to schools, while both county and school district property taxes were down from 1930 , to $\$ 4.1$ million, and $\$ 15.3$ million respectively.

In 1941, the allocations from the income tax, after deduction for refunds and administration, were 10 percent for school districts and 90 percent general fund reserve. After June 30 , 1941, the 35 percent schools and 65 percent state general fund distribution was reinstated utilizing the 1937 distribution scheme on the basis of student populations.

Under the Flood Control Lands Act of 1941 ( 30 USC 701c-3), 75 percent of federal receipts realized from the leasing of lands acquired for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes were to be returned through the state to the county of origin for roads or schools.

In 1943, the administration expense deduction from the income tax was increased to five percent; of the remainder, 35 percent went to schools under the per student allocation formula adopted in 1937 to
fund the minimum teacher salary program, and 65 percent was retained by the state for the general fund, with the provision that for 1943 to 1945, 15 percent of the net receipts were set aside in a special State School Equalization Fund -- such amount coming from the state's 65 percent share.

Under the Minimum Educational Program Act, also adopted in 1943, the State School Equalization Fund was utilized to aid districts on the basis of classroom units. Under this act, the state setminimum revenue needs per classroom unit at $\$ 1,000$ for elementary students and $\$ 1,333$ for high school students. The county was required to levy an amount sufficient to raise the $\$ 75$ per month minimum teacher salary (up to 5 mills), and the state continued to provide any difference between the five mill levy and the minimum teacher salary levels from Public School Income Fund priority disbursements and continuing per student distributions. The provision of the 1937 law to distribute income taxes on the basis of student population was also retained. The state continued to recapture any excess of local revenues, plus the state distribution for teacher salaries, and to reallocate these monies to all districts on the basis of student population.

Under this new law, the state required the county to levy enough revenue, regardless of the five mill limit, to fund the minimum teacher salaries at their full level, after taking into account state distributions under the income tax law and Public School Income Fund. In addition, each district was required to notify the county of the difference between such local teacher salary revenues plus state support and the amount necessary to raise the minimum classroom revenue specified by the state. The county commissioners could then make an additional levy of up to one mill to raise that amount. If this additional levy plus state revenues did not meet the minimum classroom value, an additional 2.5 mills could be levied by the commissioners, or 1.5 mills for union or county high school districts. This revenue was set aside in a separate special fund for each district known as the "Minimum Educational Needs Fund".

The state then made disbursements from the Special State School Equalization Fund equal to one-half of the difference between the local revenues under the Minimurn Educational Needs Fund and the totar required for the minimum classroom amount. Such distributions were only made if the district certified a levy to the comnissioners equal to an amount which would raise the other half of the deficiency. However, in no case could the total levy of third class districts exceed 20 mills, and any deficiency was made up by the state from the equalization fund.

In 1945, refinements to the 1943 law were made, with the state funding the total difference between local and other state funds and the minimum classroom value. Junior college districts were also provided with state support for the first time, based on the number of students taking a full-time program. The distributions from the income tax continued to be 35 percent schools, 50 percent state, and 15 percent special equalization aid to districts. This allocation was
of the amount remaining after deduction of the refund and administration costs of 10 percent from the total receipts of the income tax.

Also in 1945, the state program for the education of handicapped children was revised. Under the Handicapped Children's Education Act, the state could make payments to school districts for the education of handicapped children and also make payments to enroll children who lived in districts without programs in districts with such programs.

In 1947, all remaining revenues from the income tax, after deduction of refunds and administration costs, were credited to the state general fund. Automatic allocations to the special school aid funds were discontinued.

The state support programs for minimum teacher salaries and classroom-unit revenues were continued. These were now funded by appropriations rather than direct earmarking of the income tax.

An additional state program was adopted whereby each district received 15 cents per day of average daily attendance for each pupil, funded by any excess from the appropriation for classrooms. Minimum levies were set for the various classes of districts in order to participate.

In 1949, legislation was adopted concerning equalization of property assessments. The act provided that no district could receive state funds for classroom units, or the spillover from that fund, if they were assessed at more than five percent below the state average. The State Tax Commission made such determinations on the basis of sales ratio data and the State Board of Equalization was required to make horizontal adjustments in classes to effect equalization of assessments.

Also in 1949, the minimum classroom value was increased to $\$ 2000$ and allocations from the spillover of the equalization fund given a $\$ 50$ per year per pupil maximum.

By 1950, the total cost of public school general fund expenditures had more than doubled from 1940 to $\$ 49.4$ million. State funds increased to about 20 percent of the total, or $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$. County property taxes totaled $\$ 4.3$ million and school district property taxes $\$ 35$ million.

In 1950, Congress adopted Public Law 81-874 under which the federal government makes payments to "impacted" school districts in lieu of property taxes. Such impact was defined as either the existence of a large amount of tax exempt federal property or requirements for educating a large number of pupils living on federal property (e.g., military bases).

In 1951, the amount of the minimum classroom unit was increased to $\$ 2100$, and the requirement for equalized assessments for receipt of
state funds was repealed.
In 1952, legislation was adopted requiring that county revenues under the Federal Flood Control Lands Act of 1941 be credited 25 percent to the road and bridge fund and 75 percent to schools. If there is more than one district in the county, allocations are made on the basis of average daily attendance. Although other federal programs provide payments in lieu of property taxes to local governments for roads or schools, these payments go to the county of origin and there are no statutory provisions specifying what portion, if any, is to be allocated to school districts. Included in this latter category are county receipts under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1935 (7 USC 1012), and the Materials Act of 1947 (Public Law 82-136).

The Public School Finance Act of 1952
The state's first educational foundation program was enacted following a two-year study by a conmittee appointed by the Governor. The recommendations were embodied in the "Public School Finance Act of 1952", and established the principle of state financing to ensure the availability of a "foundation program" of education in each school district.

Under this act, the state guaranteed each school district revenues of $\$ 2625$ per classroom unit served by a graduate certified teacher and $\$ 2425$ per classroom unit served by other certified personnel. Classroom units were determined on the basis of aggregate days of attendance and one unit was granted for the first 12 student180 days of attendance; a second one for the next 16 student-130 days of attendance; and additional units for each 20 student-180 days of attendance. Special provisions in the act were made for districts in sparsely populated areas or with necessarily isolated schools.

To be eligible to receive such state aid, districts could not pay teachers less than 75 percent of the state guarantee per classrom unit. The minimum school year was set at 170 days. In addition, certain levy requirements were imposed: six mills for the county public school fund (distributed to each district educating students from such county), or less, if allowed by the State Board of Education on the basis of excess revenue. In addition, county or union high school districts were required to levy two mills; class 1, 2, and 3 districts comprising a portion of county or union high school districts, an additional six mills; and other districts eight mills. Single district counties were required to levy 14 mills.

Districts received from the state the difference between their share of the county's revenue plus their own revenue and the amount guaranteed by the state. Nothing in the act prevented the levying and expenditure of greater amounts if so desired locally.

The act was funded by combining appropriations from the General Assembly and revenues in the Public School Income Fund. A distri-
bution of such monies was made in advance of the school year and final entitlements determined half-way through the year and distributed. Any remaining funds were distributed proportionately on the basis of attendance at the close of the school year. The appropriation for the 1952-1953 school year was $\$ 12.5$ million and total state aid approached $\$ 15$ million.

Junior college districts were also eligible for state funds at a rate specified in the act.

A contingency fund equal to 1.5 percent of appropriations was held by the State Board of Education and could be distributed to districts, upon application, for needs resulting from acts of God, enrollment increases, and temporary enrollments. Any funds left over at the end of the year were distributed to all districts on the basis of attendance.

Philosophically, the act established several state principles regarding public education. By establishing a basic expenditure level per classroom, the state was accepting responsibility for providing in partnership with county and school districts, a foundation program of education opportunity to all children. Second, the act recognized that state funding should be established for a minimum educational program while allowing districts freedom to develop expanded programs. Third, the act attempted to ensure tax equity through the setting of uniform levies for the foundation program. Fourth, the act encouraged use of qualified, college educated personnel. Fifth, mechanisms were established for uniform school district accounting and budgeting. Finally, these problems were addressed in a single, comprehensive piece of legislation rather than in the traditional piecemeal fashion.

In 1953, adjustments to the act were made in the form of the local mill Tevy requirements for participation. In addition, the state guaranteed revenue level per classroom was increased.

Also in 1953, the state established provisions for the distribution of federal Mineral Leasing Act monies. Since its adoption by Congress in 1920, the state received 37.5 percent of such federal revenues, which were to be used for roads and schools. This money had been flowing directly through the state to the counties of origin with no allocation requirements. Under the new law, the state retained one-third of all revenues from this source and used it for funding the state support program. The remaining two-thirds were still distributed to counties, but with a maximum limit of $\$ 200,000$, except for new discoveries. Counties could receive up to $\$ 500,000$ annually from revenues derived from the discovery of new oil fields, although only for three years. Any excess that was recaptured was also used to fund the finance act. Of the two-thirds county share, the law specified that neither roads nor schools could receive less than 25 percent of the county's total share. Again in 1955, mill levy requirements were adjusted and the funding level per classroom increased. Minor changes were also made in the payment dates of the State Public School Fund under the act.

In addition, handicapped education was made a function of local districts and a state aid program was set up for the purpose of providing funds for such programs.

In 1955, attention was directed to alleged inequities in property tax assessment between the several counties. The State Board of Education was directed to compute the relation between actual assessed valuation and appraised valuation in each county (as determined by the State Board of Equalization and at that time 100 percent of actual value). This factor was to be applied to the assessed valuation of each county and each school district in order to arrive at an adjusted valuation to be used in calculating the amounts that should have been produced by the minimum levies. The State Tax Commission reported in 1955 that the State Board of Equalization found no differences between the appraised valuation and the assessed valuation of any county in the state and, therefore, this provision was never utilized.

In 1956, a new state categorical aid program was established for school district transportation expenditures. Districts were entitled to four cents per mile and two cents per day for each pupil actually transported. Allowances to pupils for board, in lieu of district transportation, were funded at 15 cents per day per pupil.

## The Public School Foundation Act of 1957

After the 1955 session, a Legislative Council committee began a study of several aspects of education including educational finance. The following principles used as guides for this study were developed by a subcommittee on school finance:

- Provide for a state-local partnership in the financing of a realistic foundation program.
- Encourage the development and exercise of local leadership and responsibility for education.
- Ensure that all taxpayers in the state provide their fair share of the cost of public education.
- Seek to secure optimum educational returns from all expenditures.
- Provide that the law should be as simple, equitable, and as administratively sound as possible.
- Encourage the development of school districts and attendance areas large enough to facilitate the operation of complete, economical, and efficient schools.

The findings and recommendations of the subcommittee were prefaced by the following statement summarizing the difficulties found in the 1952 school finance act:

Most of the difficulty and confusion concerning Colorado's School Finance Act stems from the failure to differentiate between this act as a means of distributing a fixed amount of revenue and a bona fide foundation program. While the act has some characteristics of both types of programs, it is fundamentally a distribution plan.

Many of the recommendations of the interim study were incorporated in the rewrite of the Public School Finance Act of 1952, reenacted as the Public School Foundation Act in 1957. Although the foundation concept remained the same, several significant changes were made.

Under the new law, classroom units remained the basis of state funding, but were determined on the basis of average daily attendance rather than aggregate daily attendance. One classroom unit was allowed for the first 15 students of average daily attendance (ADA); second, third and fourth classroom units were allowed for 20 ADA each; and additional units for each additional 25 ADA. Guaranteed revenue from county property taxes plus state support for such classroom units was increased to $\$ 4500$ for non-graduate certified teachers and $\$ 5200$ for teachers with graduate certificates. The sparsity factor was eliminated but small attendance center aid was revised and refined.

The minimum level of teacher salaries, as a percentage of classroom guaranteed revenue, was reduced from 75 to 65 percent. The minimum school year was increased two days to 172.

The required county school levy for participation in the program was increased to 12 mills , whereas the requirements for district levies were discontinued. As under the $1952 \mathrm{act}, 1.5$ percent of the appropriation was retained by the state board for contingency distributions. The contingency for enrollment increases was replaced by a formal program providing funds, in the discretion of the State Board of Education, to districts with increases of more than seven percent over the previous year. As under the 1952 law, any amounts remaining in the contingency fund were distributed at the end of the school year in the same manner as other funds distributed by the act.

The state funding mechanism changed slightly from the 1952 law. Rather than combine appropriations and income from the Public School Fund, the appropriation was used to fund classroom units and amounts from income on state school lands were utilized to provide a "direct grant" program on the basis of aggregate attendance. Receipts under the federal Mineral Leasing Act continued to be used to fund the main act. Another change was that excess appropriations were not distributed but reverted to the state general fund.

In brief, this act represented Colorado's first serious attempt to provide equalization of the burden of taxation for the support of schools. Under the 1957 act each county was required to levy 12 mills for the support of schools and the state would add enough money to
provide $\$ 5,200$ for each classroom unit of the school districts. Revenues derived from state school lands were distributed on the basis of aggregate attendance and provided approximately $\$ 200$ more for each classroom unit being once again separated from the state appropriations in terms of the distribution method.

The theory behind this plan was that it would provide the same number of dollars for the support of each child through similar effort on the part of each taxpayer. The interim committee recognized at that time, however, that the amount provided was not adequate to provide a reasonable minimum education program.

Also in 1957, the transportation entitlement was raised to eight cents per mile and four cents per pupil. A limitation was added that no district could receive more than 75 percent of actual transportation costs.

In 1960, the act was amended to return to the concept of the 1952 law and eliminate reversions from the funding of classroom units. Any excess in the appropriation was distributed under the same "direct grant" program then utilized to distribute income from state school lands.

Also in 1960, a 50 percent sales ratio factor was added. A sales ratio is the percentage the assessed valuation is of the market sale price of property. The state average sales ratio and the sales ratio of each of the counties was determined by studies conducted by the Legislative Council over a three year period.

Under the plan adopted, the county's assessed valuation for purposes of computing the amount to be raised by the 12 mill county levy was adjusted from the county's actual sales ratio halfway toward the state average sales ratio, resulting in a theoretical amount of property taxes that would be raised if the assessed values were accordingly adjusted. In those districts whose assessed values were adjusted upwards, the approach indicated a larger local share, and hence reduced state support, than was actually collected. This left a void funded neither locally or at the state level. The theory was that higher assessing counties should not be penalized and lower assessing counties should not be rewarded for their assessment practices in terms of the amount of state aid distributed under the Public School Foundation Act.

Despite the passage of this 1960 amendment, there was less than total agreement in the General Assembly on the merlts of such a change, and an interim legislative committee was appointed to review this question prior to the 1961 session. This committee reconmended the continuation of the 50 percent sales ratio adjustment for one more year, followed by revision of the act when more information became available. The committee also recommended the use of appraisal ratio studies to supplement sales ratio data, the inclusion of additional information on recorded deeds, and the use of calendar year data in the sales ratio computation.

For 1960, total state funds to public schools were $\$ 30.9 \mathrm{mil-}$ lion, while local property taxes had increased to $\$ 115.2 \mathrm{million}$.

In 1961, after much discussion and controversy, the General Assembly agreed upon a one-year program whereby state school aid under the School Foundation Act would be distributed during 1961-1962 using a sales ratio adjustment applied at 100 percent to urban real property only. No adjustment in the assessed valuation of all other property was directed. In addition, the General Assembly provided in a "grandfather" clause that no county would receive any less money per classroom unit than it had in 1960-1961, with due consideration given to changes in the number of classroom units and in a county's assessed valuation.

The funds provided to implement the program for 1961-1962 were less than the total needed. Owing to the existence of a "grandfather" clause in the amendment, allocations were not based upon a pro-rata formula and varied from about 57 percent to about 105 percent. Thus the grandfather clause in the 1961 bill for the most part negated the basic formula adopted, i.e., adjusting the assessed valuation of urban real property by sales ratio. Furthermore, those counties which the act was designed to penalize because of under-assessment of urban real property actually gained state aid as a result of the interpretation of the bill's grandfather clause by the state Department of Education and the Attorney General.

In 1961, transportation entitlements were changed to ten cents per mile and three cents per pupil.

The 1961 amendments called for a Legislative Council committee to study revision of the act. Major points that were recommended by. the committee included funding junior college districts in separate legislation. Other recommendations were to fund all classroom units on the basis of 25 students in average daily attendance rather than the graduated scale provided by the 1957 act. The committee also concluded that the differentiation between classrooms on the basis of teacher qualifications be eliminated and that all classrooms be funded equally. Significantly, the committee recommended against both the "grandfather" clause and the use of sales ratio to adjust county valuations for determining local revenue requirements for state aid.

Also in 1961, the General Assembly adopted a program for the education of migrant children and provided implementation funds to local school districts to implement the act.

## The Public School Foundation Act of 1962

The 1957 act was extensively rewritten and reenacted by the 1962 session of the General Assembly. The act retained the basic approach of the 1957 program, and the amendments thereto, but made substantial changes to the determination of the amount counties would be required to raise for participation.

Under the terms of the 1962 act, each county was required to levy an amount which would raise $\$ 200$ per classroom unit. In addition, each county was required to raise an additional amount based upon a determination of county "adjusted gross income" under the state income tax law and its adjusted assessed valuation based on a 100 percent adjustment of urban real property to conform to sales ratio data. The remaining amount per classroom unit, now one for each 25 students in average daily attendance, was funded by the state. The guarantee per classroom was also set uniformly at $\$ 5200$, regardless of teacher qualifications.

The excess growth program was continued based on enrollment increases during the first twelve weeks of the year exceeding seven percent of the previous school year, but was separately funded. In addition, any overfunding of the program reverted to the state general fund.

A new and separate program was also established for small attendance centers whereby additional classroom units for state funding would be granted for schools with average daily attendance of less than 175, if located 20 miles or more from the nearest other such center. Like the excess enrollment program, this program was separately funded and any excess appropriations reverted to the general fund.

Another new program was also adopted relating to low income counties, which were defined to be those counties with an adjusted gross income per classroom unit of less than $\$ 103,000$. Distributions of $\$ 200$ per classroom were made to such eligible districts from the contingency fund of the State Board of Education, rather than from a separate appropriation.

The contingency reserve fund was continued, but was given a separate, independent appropriation that reverted to the state general fund if unspent.

Funding of the act returned to the 1952 provisions of combining state general fund appropriations and income from state public school lands for distribution to districts. In addition, revenues that the state retained from the federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 were also placed in the fund. Any excess appropriation reverted to the general fund, but other amounts remained in the fund, if in excess. In practice, earmarked funds were totally expended and any excess reverted to the general fund.

In 1963, the sales ratio adjustment of assessed value was eliminated and a number of minor "housekeeping" amendments to the Foundation Act were adopted. The changes in the local requirements tended to slightly increase the county share, whereas changes to the small attendance center and low income programs made more districts eligible for this special aid.

In 1965 the only change to the act was an expansion of the uses
of the contingency reserve to allow distributions in the event of local district financial problems that would force closure of schools.

Also in 1965, a new fund was created, entitled the Property Tax Relief Fund, from which distributions to local districts were made. The intent of the fund was to substitute state dollars for local property tax dollars that might otherwise have been levied to accomodate increased costs. There was, however, no requirement for local levy reductions as a result of the grants. The grants were for 1966 and provided $\$ 40$ for each pupil in average daily attendance. In total, the fund added some $\$ 18$ million to the regular appropriation of $\$ 46.1$ million to the school fund. This legislation was an outgrowth of a 1964 interim committee that concluded that property taxes were approaching the "saturation point" and should not be further increased. This was the first recent attempt to stabilize school district mill levies.

In 1967, (for the year 1968) the amount of the grants under the Property Tax Relief Fund was increased to $\$ 52$ per pupil in average daily attendance. Another increase was also authorized in 1968, this time to $\$ 65$ per pupil for 1969.

## The Public School Foundation Act of 1969

In its 1969 session, the General Assembly enacted a foundation program to assure each school district $\$ 440$ per pupil in average daily attendance from combined local and state sources, with the provision that no district was to receive less state aid than $\$ 60$ per pupil in average daily attendance. In addition, this was the first year since 1876 that no county property tax funds were utilized and that all required local revenues were raised by the districts themselves.

The portion of the $\$ 440$ per pupil paid by the district was:
(a) the district's share of revenue raised through a 17 mill levy; which was adjusted downward (but revenue requirements upward) if 17 mills would raise more than $\$ 250$ per ADA;
(b) the district's specific ownership tax receipts; and
(c) district revenue provided from state and federal sources (excluding Public Law 81-874 moneys), which were available for use as determined by the board for the basic education program, i.e., non-categorical funds. These included federal mineral leasing, flood control, and timber reserve payments.

The state provided the difference between the amount determined to be the local share and the amount required to provide $\$ 440$ for each pupil. Normally, the basis for determining a school district's entitlement in the following calendar year was the average daily attendance during a four week counting period ending the fourth Friday
of October, although provision was made for year-around schools. Since prior finance acts had relied on the attendance of the previous year, use of this basis removed the need for the increasing enrollment program as it had been structured, and the program was eliminated.

The small attendance center program, with revisions, and the contingency reserve program were continued from the 1962 act. These were separately funded by general fund appropriations, with unspent monies reverting to the general fund. The low-income district program was discontinued. In another change, school districts were required to schedule 180 days of instruction, and requirements for minimum teacher salaries were eliminated.

The act was funded, as under the 1962 revision, by a combination of general fund appropriations, income from state public school lands, and federal Mineral Leasing Act monies retained by the state for this purpose. Any excess appropriation reverted to the general fund.

Also under the 1969 act, expenditure increases, without a vote of the electorate, were limited to 106 percent of the previous year. Prior to the amendment, school districts had been covered as other taxing jurisdictions, and limited to five percent annual increases without voter or Tax Cormission approval.

Two new programs of categorical aid to school districts were adopted in 1969. First, the Education Achievement Act of Colorado provided funding for special reading programs. Secondly, the Public Education Incentive Program Act provided state financial support for the development of new programs to either increase efficiency or improve the economy of public education.

In 1970, state foundation support totaled $\$ 98.7 \mathrm{million}$ and local property taxes $\$ 249$ milition.

For 1971, the act increased the state foundation level from $\$ 440$ to $\$ 460$ per pupil.

Also in 1971, the act was amended to provide monthly, rather than quarterly, disbursements of state aid to districts. This changed the provision that had been in effect since adoption of the 1957 finance act.

In 1972, the support levels were increased from $\$ 460$ to $\$ 518$ for the 1973 school district budget year. In addition, minor housekeeping amendments were made relative to changes in the structure of state government.

## The Public School Finance Act of 1973

Prior to 1973, Colorado's school finance act was a "foundation" program, meaning the state guaranteed revenues to a set level per
pupil in an attempt to ensure the existence of a minimum "foundation" program of education in each district of the state. Under this formula, each district was required to generate from $\$ 250$ to $\$ 380$ per student, depending on district wealth, or the revenue from 17 mills , whichever was less. Without a vote of the people, districts were limited to a six percent increase in general fund expenditures each year. Districts spending less than $\$ 620$ per pupil ( $\$ 102$ over the foundation program), were not limited. The limitation could be exceeded by a vote of the electorate.

## Goals of the Act

The first major goal of the act was to increase educational opportunity by ensuring that adequate funds would be available to meet educational needs and to prevent educational opportunity from being a function of local. property tax raising abilities. Second, the act attempted to address problems with the local property tax. In particular, the provisions of the act reduced property taxes to a lower level, provided for a more equally distributed property tax burden throughout the state, and limited increases in subsequent tax bills.

The 1972 interim committee, in recommending the concept of the 1973 act, identified the following goals:

1. To assure that adequate funds are available to meet the educational needs of the children, youth, and adults served by the public schools of Colorado;
2. To provide equalization of educational opportunities for all students; and to assure a student's educational opportunities should not be a function of the wealth of the district or community in which he lives;
3. To provide more equity in distribution of tax burden;
4. To reduce dependence on property tax for financing public schools;
5. To mitigate the burden placed on property taxes due to annual increased educational costs;
6. To lessen the property tax burden on agriculture;
7. To enhance the concept of local control of education and provide opportunity for citizens in the local communities to help make decisions concerning education; and
8. To place some kind of limitation on increased school district budgets from year to year to achieve a reduction or stabilization of school district mill levies.

Additional goals that were of great concern to some of the participants included:

1. To foster the concept of the year around school;
2. To continue the financing of excess costs of necessary small attendance centers;
3. To continue financing categorical programs such as special education, vocational education, and transportation;
4. To provide for accommodating budgetary needs in school districts with declining enrollments;
5. To require school districts to file semi-annual reports of actual revenues and actual expenditures so that comparable financial data can be compiled on a calendar year basis as well as a July-June basis;
6. To allocate annually a percentage of the state general fund revenue growth to school districts to provide further equalization and to help stabilize mill levies; and
7. To lessen the property tax burden on people with fixed incomes.

## Theory

The theory adopted to meet these goals was a modified "power equalization" formula. Under this program, the state guarantees that each district will be able to raise a minimum number of dollars per pupil for each mill levied. For 1979, this level is $\$ 42.25$ per mill per pupil and the state makes up the difference between what the district can raise on its own from the property tax and that guarantee level.

In addition to equalizing the revenue raising abilities of each district on a per pupil basis, a provision was enacted to equalize expenditures among the districts. Under this provision, each district computed its "authorized revenue base", which was the sum of the 1973 district general fund and state equalization expenditures. For 1974 through 1977, the district's authorized revenue base was a percentage increase over the previous year, with lower spending districts granted a greater percentage increase than the higher spending districts. For 1978 and subsequent years, ARB increases are provided at fixed dollar levels. This provision was intended to narrow the variation between district expenditures.

Both of these provisions also aided in meeting goals for reforming the property tax. The equalization of the revenue raising abilities of each district's mill levy had the effect of reducing the variation in mill levies among the districts and bringing tax rates
more closely in line with state averages. Second, the restriction on increased spending under the authorized revenue base program worked to limit increases in local school district expenditures from year to year and, as a side benefit, limit property tax increases. Most importantly, along with enactment of the new financing formula, state aid to school districts was increased almost $\$ 120 \mathrm{million}$ from 1973 to 1974 for an overall increase in the state's share of local school district general fund expenditures from 23 percent (1973) to 42 percent (1974) of the total. This reduced average school district general fund mill levies from 52.69 mills in 1973 to 37.67 mills in 1974 (projected at 37.78 mills in 1979).

A related provision of the equalization formula was also adopted to reduce property taxes. Because the assessed value of some districts of the state was high enough so that all of the revenue guaranteed per pupil per mill by the state could be raised locally, a special provision was added giving a minimum amount of state aid to each district for each pupil for each mill levied. As a result, property taxes in these districts were reduced. Also as a result of this provision, only one district received less state aid in 1974 than 1973, although nearly 80 of the state's 181 districts qualified under the minimum guarantee.

How It Works
Authorized revenue base. The School Finance Act of 1973 adopted the philosophy that the appropriate measure of education costs to be funded was the district's previous year's expenditure per eligible pupil from the general fund. Accordingly, the act funds each district on the basis of its "authorized revenue base" (ARB) which is defined to be the sum of the district's general fund property tax expenditures and the state's equalization payments, per eligible pupil, for the year preceding the budget year. A percentage factor is then applied to the previous year's general fund expenditures to determine the new ARB to be funded by the state and local school district. For 1978, each district's ARB was determined by adding $\$ 120$ to its 1977 general fund expenditure. For 1979 each district's ARB is determined by adding $\$ 130$ to its 1978 general fund expenditure.

State guarantee. After calculation of each district's ARB, or how much revenue is to be available per pupil, the mix between state and local sources for such revenue is computed. In attempting to equalize the tax generating resources of each district, the act provides for a "state guarantee" level of revenue for each mill levied by each district for each eligible pupil. For 1979, the state has guaranteed that each mill per pupil will raise $\$ 42.25$ of combined state and local funds. The act further guarantees that each mill levied will generate $\$ 45.35$ per pupil in 1980 , and that the state guarantee for 1981, 1982, and thereafter will be established at a level which will ensure distribution of the same amount of state equalization as for 1980. Each district's expenditure level, or authorized revenue base, is then divided by the state guaranteed
revenue per mill per pupil to determine the number of mills that each district must levy in order to raise the corresponding amount of revenue. For example, if a district's authorized revenue base is $\$ 1,500$ per pupil, $\$ 1,500$ divided by $\$ 42.25$, the state guaranteed level of revenue per pupil, equals a mill levy of 35.50 mills which will be necessary to fully fund the district's ARB from combined state and local sources ( $\$ 42.25$ per mill per pupil times 35.50 mills equals the district's ARB of $\$ 1,500$ ).

Minimum guarantee. In order that all districts may share in state education support and benefit from the property tax relief offered, the act contains a minimum aid provision that guarantees that each district will receive a minimum of $\$ 11.35$ per mill per eligible pupil, even if local revenues are sufficient to raise more than the difference between the minimum and the state guaranteed level of support. If the mill levy of the district computed at the $\$ 11.35$ minimum guarantee level exceeds 20 mills , the district can receive $\$ 12.35 \mathrm{per}$ mill per pupil in 1979 , and $\$ 13.35$ per mill per pupil in 1980 , of state support. Again, to compute the mill levy required to raise the amount of state and local revenues necessary to fund the district's $A R B$, the $A R B$ is divided by the state guarantee, in this instance the sum of local revenue capabilities per mill per pupil plus $\$ 11.35$. For example, if a district's ARB is $\$ 1,500$ per pupil, and local revenues will raise $\$ 35.00$ per pupil per mill, the ARB is divided by the sum of the district's local revenue raising capability per mill per pupil and the minimum guarantee, or $\$ 35.00$ plus $\$ 11.35$ ( $\$ 46.35$ ). This computes a mill levy of 32.36 mills necessary to raise the appropriate amount of state and local funds to equal the district's ARB. Since, in this instance, the mill levy computed at the $\$ 11.35$ minimum quarantee level ( 32.36 mills ) exceeds 20 mills , the district qualifies for a minimum guarantee level of $\$ 12.35$ per mill per pupil, and the mill levy is recomputed as follows: the local district revenue raising capability ( $\$ 35.00$ per mill) is added to the alternate minimum quarantee level ( $\$ 12.35$ ) and the sum ( $\$ 47.35$ ) is divided into the district's ARB $(\$ 1,500)$. The new mill levy is then computed to be 31.68 mills ( $\$ 37.35$ per mill per pupil times 31.68 mills equals the ARB of $\$ 1,500$ per pupil).

State/local share. The local share per mill per pupil is equal to the amount that can be raised from the district's property tax base per mill, divided by the number of eligible pupils. The state's share per mill per pupil is equal to the difference between the amount that the local property tax can raise and the state quarantee. For example, if the local tax base can raise $\$ 15.00$ per mill per pupil and the state guarantee is $\$ 42.25$, the state's share is $\$ 27.25$. For those districts whose local tax base is sufficient to raise more than $\$ 30.90$ per mill per pupil, and thus would receive less than $\$ 11.35$ under the state guarantee per mill of $\$ 42.25$, the state's share is $\$ 11.35$ per mill per pupil, or $\$ 12.35$ as discussed above, depending upon the district's mill levy. The total expenditure per pupil is the ARB. The total local share per pupil is the local share per mill times the mill levy. The total state share per pupil is the state share times the mill levy. Together, the total state and local shares per pupil
are equal to the authorized revenue base, or expenditure level.
Attendance entitlement. A district's attendance entitlement is the number of eligible pupils for which it may raise revenues, equal to the district's ARB, for expenditure. The attendance entitlement is determined on the basis of average daily attendance during a special four week counting period ending the fourth Friday of October preceding the budget year. (A special provision is available for full-year programs which allows for a similar four week counting period ending about two months after the start of the school year.)

Total revenue. The total revenue of a district for its general fund program comes from both state and local sources. The local share of the total is the result of the school district's mill levy, computed as noted above, times the district's total valuation for assessment for property tax purposes. The state's share is the state's share per pupil per mill, times the number of pupils, times the mill levy. Together these two sources equal the amount of revenue required to fund each attendance entitlement at the full ARB level.

Special Provisions
Increases in ARB above allowed level. In recognition of the fact that special conditions can arise causing a school district to need more revenue than might be authorized, the act allows districts to request an increase in their authorized revenue base from a special "State School District Budget Review Board" composed of the Lt. Governor, State Treasurer, and Chairman of the State Board of Education. Any such increase that might be allowed would not be included in the district's authorized revenue base for computation of the district's state aid for the first year. The district's mill levy, and state and local share would be computed in the normal manner exclusive of the increase and then an additional computation made to determine the increase in the local mill levy necessary to fund the increase. As a result, the increase would be entirely locally funded for the first year, but for subsequent years, the increase would be included in the district's authorized revenue base and the state would share in its funding in accordance with the formula described above.

The district may also have a vote of the people to authorize an increase in the district's revenue base not granted by the review board. Such a vote can only be taken after action by the state review board and, again, the state does not participate in funding the increase until the following year when it becomes a normal portion of the district's authorized revenue base.

ARB increases and minimum ARBs. S.B. No. 25 (1978 Session) established annual ARB increases over the prior year's ARB of $\$ 140$ for 1980, $\$ 150$ for 1931 , and $\$ 160$ for 1982. In addition, the bill provided that no district be required to have an ARB lower than $\$ 1,400$ for 1979, $\$ 1,600$ for 1980, and $\$ 1,800$ for 1981, and thereafter. The effect of allowing the lower spending districts to increase at the
$\$ 200$ per year minimum ARB level while other districts increase at a lesser rate is to narrow the variation in local district expenditures.

Density factor. The act was amended in 1978 to provide that if a district's attendance entitlement is greater than 50,000, and it averages more than 500 pupils per square mile of pupil density, it qualifies for one hundred seven and one-half percent of the state guarantee. For 1979, if a district met the requirements of the density factor, it would receive a state guarantee of $\$ 45.42$ ( $\$ 42.25$ times $107 \mathrm{l} / 2 \%$ equals $\$ 45.42$ ). Since a district's mill levy is determined by dividing its ARB by the state guarantee, increases in the state guarantee will have the overall effect of lowering the mill levy in a qualified district.

Declining enrollments. Another provision of the act relates to districts that have deciining enrollments. In recognition of the fact that costs do not necessarily decrease in direct proportion to small decreases in enrollment, optional methods of determining the number of pupils used to determine a district's funding are provided. Although normally the average daily attendance count made in the fall precedina the budget year is utilized, the count for the second preceding year, or an average of the three preceding years, is used if these numbers are larger. This provision inflates the number of students funded over those in actual attendance and provides a bonus in state and local funds to such districts to allow a longer phase-down of expenditures.

Increasing enrollment. A special provision was enacted in 1977 to provide additional aid to districts with increasing enrollments during a budget year. For any district with an increase in its attendance entitlement of greater than three percent or 350 pupils, whichever is less, the state provides a special payment equal to 40 percent of the district's authorized revenue base for the budget year for each pupil exceeding the lesser of the three percent or 350 pupll increase. Attendance entitlement changes are measured during a district's normal counting period.

Small attendance centers. The 1973 act continued a special provision providing addfional state aid to districts with small attendance centers. Small attendance centers are defined by the act to be elementary or secondary schools with less than 175 pupils enrolled, and located at least 20 miles from the nearest other such center not in a reorganized district.

Bonus pupils are allowed for attendance in small attendance centers based on the following statutory schedule:
Elementary
(Grades $1-6$ or 1-8)

| Attendance <br> Entitlement | Factor |  | Maximum <br> Allowed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $0-20$ | Allow 24 |  | 24 |
| $20.1-50$ | 1.2 |  | 55 |
| $50.1-80$ |  | 1.1 |  |
| $80.1-115$ |  | 1.05 | 120 |
| $115.1-150$ |  | 1.04 | 150 |

## Secondary <br> (Grades 7-12 or 9-12)

Attendance Maximum Entitlement Factor Allowed

| $0-25$ | 2.0 | 40 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $25.1-50$ | 1.6 | 75 |
| $50.1-75$ | 1.5 | 105 |
| $75.1-125$ | 1.4 | 150 |
| $125.1-150$ | 1.2 | 165 |
| $150.1-175$ | 1.1 | 175 |

If the product resulting from multiplication of the factor, times the center's actual average daily attendance is greater than the maximum allowed, the number of bonus pupils is reduced to the maximum allowed. From this number is subtracted the attendance center's actual average daily attendance to derive the bonus pupils eligible for additional state aid.

State small attendance aid is equal to the lesser of the district's authorized revenue base times the number of bonus pupils, or $\$ 35$ for each mill levied in the district times the number of bonus pupils (1973). Small attendance aid is comprised entirely of additional state dollars provided for these bonus pupils and no local dollars are required. This provision places small attendance aid on an equal basis for all districts, regardless of property wealth. In effect, this provision increases the total number of dollars available to the district to educate the pupils actually in attendance at a center.

In order that the small attendance aid provision not serve as a deterrent to school district reorganization, the act provides that the provision would be phased out over a four year period. If a district is reorganized so as to locate a previously eligible center within 20 miles of another such center, the center may still receive aid: 100 percent for the first year following such reorganization, 75 percent the second following year, 50 percent in the third year, and 25 percent in the fourth year, with no small attendance aid granted five or more years after the reorganization.

Aid to low income pupils. A new general aid provision to the "Public School Finance Act of 1973" was enacted in 1977 to provide aid to districts with high concentrations of pupils from low income families. To be eligible, the number of children from low income families in a district must exceed 15 percent of its attendance entitlement. The aid is $\$ 125$ per year for each such pupil exceeding 15 percent of the district's attendance entitlement. The mechanism used to determine the number of students from low income families is the number counted under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Aid to instructional television. Another new program enacted
in 1977 provides state support to eligible districts that support or operate instructional television stations. For districts operating instructional television (Denver only), the aid is equal to one dollar for each pupil residing in the primary coverage area. For districts that support public educational televiston, the state aid is on a one dollar per pupil basis and limited to a total of $\$ 100,000$.

## Example catculations

The following hypothetical example of a school district illustrates the calculation sequence for a district being funded under the state guarantee formula of $\$ 42.25$ per pupil per mill.

## Authorized Expenditures-Pep-Pupil

Funded with state participation:

Tदा: general fund expenditures

Eunded locally:
ITEFEESE 6Fand by State School
District Budget Review Board
Increase granted by electorate
Total Authorized Expenditures 1979 ARB
plus Increase granted by review board
plus Increase granted by electorate equals total authorized expenditure
$\$ 1,380.00$
130.00
$\$ 1.510 .00$
$\$ 25.00$
20.00
\$1,510.00
25.00
20.00
$\$ 7,555.00$

## Eliaible Pupils

Fall 1976 average daily attendance $\quad 1,330$
Fall 1977 average daily attendance $\quad 1,250$
Fall 1978 average daily attendance $\quad 1,200$
Three year average of ADA 1,260
Since three year average is largest Attendance Entitlement equals

1,260

## District Mill Levy

1979 ARB
divided by State guaranteed revenue per pupil equals State participation mill levy
\$1,510.00
42.25
35.74 mills

Increased expenditure granted by board and vote
divided by Local revenue per mill per pupil equals Additional local mill levy
\$ 45.00
15.00

|  | State Participation mill levy | 35.74 mills |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| plus | Additional local mill levy | 3.00 |
| equals | Total district general fund mill levy | 38.74 mills |

State and Local Shares Per Pupil
State Share:

State guaranteed revenue per pupil
less Local revenue per mill per pupil equals State share per mill per pupil times State participation mill levy equals State share per pupil
\$ 42.25
15.00
27.25
35.74
$\$ 973.90$
Local Share:
Local valuation for assessment \$18,900,000.00
divided by Attendance entitlement
1,260 pupils
One mill equals Local Share per mill per pupil times Total district mill levy equals Local share per pupil
$\frac{38.74}{81.10} \mathrm{mills}$

Total State and Local Shares

|  | State Share: |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | State share per pupi1 | $\$$ |
| times | Attendance entitlement | 973.90 |
| equals | Total State Share | $\$ 1,260.00$ |
|  | Local Share: |  |
|  | Local Share per pupil | $581,114.00$ |
| times | Attendance entitlement |  |
| equals | Total local share |  |
|  |  |  |

Total Revenues
Total State Share $\$ 1,227,114$
plus Total Local Share $\quad 732,186$
equals Total Revenue $\$ 1,959,300$

Total Expenditures
Note:
Totals agree

Total allowed expend. $\quad 1,555$
times Attendance entitlement equals Total expenditures
$\$ 1,959,300$

## History of School Finance Litigation <br> in the United States

In the period since 1970, a number of decisions have been handed down in cases which challenged state school financing systems as having wealth-related disparities in per pupil spending among districts within a state. It has usually been alleged that the quality of a child's education may not be "a function of the wealth of his parents and neighbors" and that a "public school financing system which relies heavily on local property taxes and causes substantial disparities among individual school districts in amount of revenue available per pupil for the districts' educational grants invidiously discriminates against the poor ...".l/

These allegations have been variously based on provisions of the United States Constitution and provisions contained in the constitution of the state wherein the discrimination was alleged to have occurred. Specifically, the sources have been: (1) the equal protection clause contained in the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; (2) the equal protection provisions of a state constitution; $2 /$ and (3) the education clause of a state constitution. 3/

Traditionally, courts have used the "rational basis" test when analyzing a state statute for possible violations of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Under this standard of review, the court presumes the law under attack to be valid. The plaintiff has the burden of proving that the law bears no rational relationship to a legitimate state purpose and thus is irrational or arbitrary.

17 Serrano v. Priest, 5 Cal. 3d 584, 589, 487 P.2d 1241, 1244, 96 Ca1. Rptr. 601, 604 (1971).
2) The due process clause of article II, section 25 of the Colorado Constitution has been construed to require equal protection of the law. People v. Max, 70 Colo. 100, 148P. 150 (1921); Cf. Vanderhoof V. People, 152 Colo. 147, 380 P.2d 903 (1963); Trueblood v. Tinstey, 148 Colo. 503, 366 P.2d 655 (1961).

3/ The Colorado Constitution provides that "[T]he general assembly shall ... provide for the establishment and maintenance of a thorough and uniform system of free public schools." Colo. Const. art. IX, sec. 2.

A more strict standard of review, the "strict scrutiny" test, is triggered if the legislation under attack differentiates between affected parties on the basis of a classification which the Supreme Court has declared to be "suspect", such as race, or if a right which has been declared to be fundamental, such as the right to travel or the right to vote, is involved. If the court employs the strict scrutiny standard, the defendant state has the burden of showing: (1) a compelling state interest which justifies its use of the law under attack; (2) that no other reasonable, less discriminatory legislative scheme could accomplish the same objective; and (3) that the distinctions drawn by the law are necessary to further the law's purpose.

If an education clause exists in the state constitution, another approach has been taken by some plaintiffs, alleging that a state school finance system violates the state's constitutional command to the legislature to provide a "thorough and efficient" or a "general and uniform" system of free public schools. The argument generally used to challenge the constitutionality of school financing systems as violative of the education clause is that because of substantial interdistrict disparities in spending, the education clause has not been complied with. State education clauses have been utilized by plaintiffs in New Jersey and Connecticut to strike down the existing school financing systems, whereas Oregon, Idaho, and Washington have held that their systems did not violate any state constitutional mandate despite substantial spending disparities per pupil between districts.

An education clause may also be important in analyzing a case under the equal protection clause. If a state constitution contains an education clause, a court may regard it as evidence that education is a fundamental right in that state and that the strict scrutiny test should therefore be applied. A court's finding that a fundamental right to education exists may be based on its determination that the effective exercise of other fundamental rights, such as the right to vote, depends on a right to education.

The Rodriguez Case
Facts. In 1973, the United States Supreme Court handed down San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1, 93 S. Ct. 1278, 36 L. Ed. 2 d 16. The plaintiffs brought a class action on behalf of school children from poor families who resided in school districts having a low property tax base, alleging that the Texas school system, which relied heavily on local ad valorem property taxes to supplement state aid to school districts, violated equal protection requirements because of substantial interdistrict disparities in per pupil expenditures resulting primarily from differences in the value of assessable property among the districts. In order to understand the Supreme Court opinion, it is necessary to examine the Texas school financing system.

The Texas constitution provides for the establishment of free schools by the state. Further amendments to that constitution provided for the creation of local school districts empowered to levy ad valorem taxes for the "erection ... of school buildings" and for the "further maintenance of public free schools." $4 /$ Local funds were supplemented by funds from the State's Permanent and Available School Funds. These funds received moneys from various state lands and property and other designated taxes and disbursed them to the local school districts. As Texas became more industrialized, the amount of tax resources available to each district varied according to the commercial and industrial property located therein. Growing disparities in population and taxable property accounted to a large extent for the increasing differences in local expenditures for education.

The Texas state legislature realized that a reevaluation of the school financing scheme was necessary to ameliorate these differences, and in the late 1940's established the Texas Minimum Foundation School Program, which eventually accounted for approximately one-half of the total educational expenditures in Texas. The nature of the Foundation Program was explained by the Court:

The Program calls for state and local contributions to a fund earmarked specifically for teacher salaries, operating expenses, and transportation costs. The State, supplying funds from its general revenues, finances approximately $80 \%$ of the Program, and the school districts are responsible - as a unit - for providing the remaining 20\%. The districts' share, known as the Local Fund Assignment, is apportioned among the school districts under a formula designed to reflect each district's relative taxpaying ability. The Assignment is first divided among Texas' 254 counties pursuant to a complicated economic index ... Each county's assignment is then divided among its school districts on the basis of each district's share of assessable property within the county. The district, in turn, finances its share of the Assignment out of revenues from local property taxation. 5/

It was hoped that the Foundation Program would have an equalizing influence on expenditure levels by placing the heaviest burden on school districts most capable of paying and that by establishing the Local Fund Assignment each school district would contribute to the education of its children but would not exhaust its resources.

[^0]Throughout the course of the Rodriguez litigation, comparison was made between the most affluent and the least affluent school districts in the San Antonio area. The Court pointed out the disparities that existed between the two:

Edgewood is one of seven public school districts in the metropolitan area. Approximately 22,000 students are enrolled in its 25 elementary and secondary schools. The district is situated in the core-city sector of San Antonio in a residential neighborhood that has little commercial or industrial property. The residents are predominantly of Mexican-American descent: approximately $90 \%$ of the student population is Mexican-American and over $6 \%$ is Negro. The average assessed property value per pupil is $\$ 5,960$ - the lowest in the metropolitan area - and the median family income ( $\$ 4,686$ ) is also the lowest. At an equalized tax rate of $\$ 1.05$ per $\$ 100$ of assessed property - the highest in the metropolitan area - the district contributed $\$ 26$ to the education of each child for the 1967-1968 school year above its Local Fund Assignment for the Minimum Foundation Program. The Foundation Program contributed $\$ 222$ per pupil for a state-local total of \$248. Federal funds added another $\$ 108$ for a total of $\$ 356$ per pupil.

Alamo Heights is the most affluent school district in San Antonio. Its six schools, housing approximately 5,000 students, are situated in a residential community quite unlike the Edgewood District. The school population is predominantly "Anglo," having only 18\% Mexican-Americans and less than 1\% Negroes. The assessed property value per pupil exceeds $\$ 49,000$ and the median family income is \$8,001. In 1967-1968 the local tax rate of $\$ .85$ per $\$ 100$ of valuation yielded $\$ 333$ per pupil over and above its contribution to the Foundation Program. Coupled with the $\$ 225$ provided from that Program, the district was able to supply $\$ 558$ per student. Supplemented by a $\$ 36$ per-pupil grant from federal sources, Alamo Heights spent $\$ 594$ per pupil. $6 /$

To demonstrate how the Local Fund Assignment attempted to mitigate these disparities in the 1970-1971 school year, data was offered showing that Alamo Heights was required, because of its relative wealth, to contribute out of its local property tax $\$ 100$ per pupil, which was $20 \%$ of its Foundation grant of $\$ 491$ per pupil. Edgewood, a district with much less property, was only required to pay $\$ 8.46$ per pupil, which was $2.4 \%$ of its Foundation grant of $\$ 356$ per pupil. The

Local Fund Assignment, in this respect, reflected a rough approximation of the relative taxpaying potential of each district. Despite this, the District Court held that the system

> discriminates on the basis of wealth in the manner in which education is provided for its people.... Finding that wealth is a 'suspect' classification and that education is a 'fundamental' interest, the District Court held that the Texas system could be sustained only if the State could show that it was premised upon some compelling state interest ..... On this issue the court concluded that 'not only are defendants unable to demonstrate compelling state interests... they fail even to establish a reasonable basis for these classifications.' ...I]

The questions presented to the Supreme Court on appeal were: (1) whether the Texas school financing scheme operated to the disadvantage of some suspect class or impinged upon a fundamental right explicitly or implicitly protected by the United States Constitution such that the system would be subject to strict judicial scrutiny; and (2) if the system were not held to this strict scrutiny standard, did it rationally further some legitimate, articulated state purpose and therefore not constitute an invidious discrimination in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?

Suspect classification analysis. The Supreme Court pointed out that the individuals or groups of individuals that constituted the class or classes discriminated against in prior cases in which the strict scrutiny test was applied showed two distinguishing characteristics: (1) because of their impecunity they were completely unable to pay for some desired benefit; and (2) they sustained an absolute deprivation of a meaningful opportunity to enjoy that benefit as a result of that impecunity. The Court stated that the plaintiffs did not show that the Texas school-financing system discriminated against a class "fairly definable as indigent, or as composed of persons whose incomes are beneath any designated poverty level." However, even if a class could have been defined, the Court found that the class did not suffer from an absolute deprivation of education. It said, in essence, that the equal protection clause does not require absolute equality or precisely equal advantages, at least where wealth is involved.

The plaintiffs also argued that the classification scheme was unconstitutional on the basis of what the Court termed "district wealth discrimination", i.e., discrimination without regard to the individual income characteristics of district residents. Once again, the Court determined that the class alleged to be discriminated against was too amorphous and had none of the traditional characteristics of suspectness.

IT Id. at 16 .

Fundamental interest analysis. The plaintiffs also asserted that the system interfered with a "fundamental right" and that the Supreme Court should subject it to a strict scrutiny standard of review. The Court, while agreeing that the right to education is strongly rooted in our society (quoting from Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S.Ct. 686, 98 L.Ed, 873 (1954)), indicated that the mere importance of a service performed by the state did not determine whether it must be regarded as fundamental for purposes of examination under the equal protection clause. The Court stated that substantive constitutional rights are not created under the guise of the equal protection clause; rather, it must determine whether there is a right, in this case a right to education, explicitly or implicitly guaranteed by the constitution. The Court found no explicit right to education in the federal constitution. $8 /$

The plaintiffs contended that there is an implicit right to education which should be deemed fundamental because of its nexus to other rights and liberties guaranteed by the constitution, specifically First Amendment freedoms of speech and participation in the electoral process. In reply, the Court stated that they "have never presumed to possess either the ability or the authority to guarantee to the citizenry the most effective speech or the most informed electoral choice. "9/ Furthermore, "a statute is not invalid under the Constitution because it might have gone farther than it did,'... 'reform may take one step at a time, addressing itself to the phase of the problem which seems most acute to the legislative mind ..."".10/ For these reasons, the Court refused to find that education is a fundamental right requiring the application of the strict scrutiny standard of review. Instead, the traditional standard, requiring that the state's system be shown to bear some rational relationship to legitimate state purposes, was held applicable.

Rational relationship to a legitimate state purpose. In this portion of the Rodriguez decision, the Court added some detail to its earlier explanation of the Texas school financing system and described how it operated in relation to the demands of the equal protection clause. While agreeing that interdistrict disparities in spending were based primarily on the amount of assessable property available within the district, the Court stated that the Texas system was comparable to the systems in virtually all other states. The "foundation grant" system used by Texas was designed to guarantee a minimum statewide educational program without sacrificing local participation in or control of education. The Court said of the Texas system: "While assuring a basic education for every child in the State, it permits

and encourages a large measure of participation in and control of each district's schools at the local level."11/ The attack made by the plaintiffs on the system was not that it failed in these objectives but that it did not provide the same level of control and fiscal flexibility in all districts. Replying to this, the Court once again emphasized that only where the state action impinges on the exercise of fundamental constitutional rights or liberties or employs a suspect classification must the State choose the least restrictive alternative. In the Court's judgment, the system was not invidiously discriminatory merely because the state imperfectly effected its goals.

Conclusion. The Court made every effort to emphasize the importance of education in modern society but did not go so far as to find an explicit or implicit right to education in the United States Constitution to education. Therefore, in a constitutional challenge to any state school finance plan, under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, the correct standard of review is whether the challenged state action rationally furthers a legitimate state purpose or interest. $12 /$ The Court held that the Texas plan abundantly satisfied that standard.

## Summaries of State Court Decisions

Decisions invalidating foundation plans. As a general proposition, "foundation" plans or programs assure each district of a basic number of dollars per pupil. This may take the form of a flat grant per pupil, or state educational aid for the purposes of "equalizing" unequal district property tax burdens, or both. Some foundation programs may have limitations on district per pupil expenditures and others may not. This section of this report contains descriptions of the state court decisions in cases challenging school finance systems based on foundation plans or programs. The decisions overturning state school finance systems should not be accorded greater weight merely because these decisions have been discussed in greater detail; these decisions are treated at greater length in order that their evidentiary and legal bases can be more fully understood and because the reported decisions in these cases were more detailed and lengthy than decisions upholding school finance systems. School finance decisions often are lengthy and complex; oversimplification was necessary in order to discuss these cases properly in the context of this report.

12/ Cf. McGinnis v. Royster, 410 U.S. 263, 270, 93 S. Ct. 1055, 1059, 35 L.Ed. 2 d 282 (1973).

California. The California Supreme Court decisions in Serrano V. Priest I, 5 Ca1. 3rd 584, 487 P.2d 1241, 96 Cal. Rptr. 601 (1971), (hereinafter referred to as Serrano I) and Serrano v. Priest II, 18 Ca1. 3rd _, 557 P.2d 929, 135 Cal. Rptr. 345 (1976), (hereinafter referred to as Serrano II) have been landmarks in school finance litigation. Although these cases have not been frequently followed since their decision, their nationwide influence in school finance litigation and school finance reform is widely acknowledged.

Serrano I
Among other things, the complaint in Serrano I alleged that the financing system for California public schools relied heavily on local property taxes, causing substantial disparities among individual school districts in the amount of revenue available for the districts' educational programs and resulting in substantial disparities in the quality and extent of availability of educational opportunities. The relief requested was a declaration of the unconstitutionality of the school finance system and an injunction against the system's enforcement.

The defendants filed demurrers to the complaint, in effect saying to the plaintiffs, "We think there is nothing legally wrong with the California school finance system and a court will not grant you relief even if you prove all the allegations in your complaint". The trial court agreed with the defendants and eventually granted their motion to dismiss. The plaintiffs appealed the dismissal to the California Supreme Court and the Court's answer was the Serrano I decision (rendered before the decision in Rodriguez), which said that if the plaintiffs could prove the allegations of their complaint at trial, the California school finance system did work a substantial wrong in that it violated the equal protection provisions of the federal and California constitutions. The Court's reasoning will now be set forth.

First, the Court noted that the major revenue source for schools was the local property tax (for 1968-69, the sources of educational revenues were as follows: local property taxes $55.7 \%$, state aid $35.5 \%$, federal funds $6.1 \%$, and miscellaneous sources $2.7 \%$ ) and that district tax bases varied widely throughout the state. In addition, although state law placed ceilings on district tax rates, nearly all districts had surpassed their ceilings in "tax override" elections.

The California school finance system was characterized by the Court as a "foundation program" and consisted of the following components: (1) "basic aid" - each district received $\$ 125$ per pupil per year, regardless of the property wealth of the district; (2) "equalization aid" - which consisted of the difference between basic aid plus the amount of local property tax which could be raised with a tax rate of $\$ 1$ for each $\$ 100$ of valuation for assessment (for elementary school districts) and the state foundation program minimum. In short,
the state would supply as "equalization aid" the difference between the foundation program minimum per pupil and an amount determined by adding basic aid per pupil to the amount of local property tax which would be raised by applying a uniform tax rate in each district. (The uniform tax rate was used merely for determining equalization aid and had no relation to the actual millage imposed for the school district.)

A further program entitled "supplemental aid" was provided to those districts which had low valuations for assessment but exhibited extra "tax effort" (a high tax rate or mill levy).

Then came what appears to be the critical juncture of Serrano I; at this point the Court noted that, despite the admittedty "tempering" effect of the California school finance system on disparities between district tax bases, those districts with lower per pupil expenditures tended to be those districts with low property tax bases per pupil and those districts with high per pupil expenditures tended to be those districts with high tax bases per pupil. From this fact the Court inferred that a district's low tax base per pupil caused a district's low expenditure per pupil and that the California schoot finance system did not offset inherent inequalities. In addition, the Court concluded that basic aid widened the gap between rich and poor districts. This was because, while a poor district might need basic aid plus equalization aid plus local property taxes at a specified rate to reach the foundation program minimum per pupil, a rich district could fully fund the foundation program minimum from local property taxes at the same specified tax rate and still receive basic aid (a major portion of state aid in California) which was distributed without regard to district wealth. Basic aid was meaningless to poor districts because, in the absence of basic aid, a poor district would still receive the same amount of money, even though it would all be called equalization aid.

The Court rejected the claim that the California school finance system was invalid under that state's education clause because "[W]e have never interpreted the constitutional provision to require equal school spending; we have ruled only that the education system must be uniform in terms of the prescribed course of study and educational progression from grade to grade.".13/

Turning to the equal protection claims, the Court had little trouble finding that the California public school finance system established the "suspect classification" necessary to subject the scheme to strict scrutiny, because the Court had already decided that the system discriminated on the basis of district wealth. First citing cases prohibiting discrimination on the basis of wealth (apparently to show that wealth was a suspect classification), the Court
then disposed of the following arguments advanced in support of the financing system:
(1) That the system did equalize to some extent (the Court found that the alleviation of district wealth disparities was not sufficient to outweigh the essential defect that, as a whole, school revenue was generated in proportion to district wealth);
(2) That neither valuation per pupil nor expenditure per pupil was a reliable index of district wealth (the Court answered that district valuation for assessment and expenditures had to be related to the number of pupils in order to have any significance at all);
(3) That the tax rate was at least partly determinative of available school revenues and should be taken into account (the court discounted the tax rate's importance because the amount of revenue raised by the same tax rate varied from district to district); and
(4) That district property tax wealth does not necessarily reflect the wealth of individuals residing in the district (since this fact was alleged by the plaintiffs and since the issue before the Court was whether to sustain or reverse the trial court's dismissal of the action, the Court merely treated this fact as admitted by the defendants ${ }^{\text {i }}$ demurrers).

That the system discriminated on the basis of district wealth rather than individual wealth and that the discrimination was unintentional were not viewed as obstacles barring the finding that the system discriminated on the basis of wealth and that wealth was a suspect classification. The Court felt that government participation in the discriminatory scheme was evident in that zoning and other governmental land use decisions affect property values and that school district boundaries are the product of governmental action.

The plaintiffs in Serrane I also alleged that education was the type of fundamental interest which was required to bring the strict scrutiny test into play; they may have wished to establish this second string to their bow because wealth had been recognized as a suspect classification only in cases involving the criminal rights of defendants and voting rights. Noting that the assertion of education as a fundamental interest under the federal constitution was novel, the Court discussed this point at length before concluding "[T]hat the distinctive and priceless function of education in our society warrants, indeed compels, our treating it as a 'fundamental interest." "14/

Having found a suspect class and a fundamental interest (one probably would have been sufficient), the Court went on to apply the remainder of the strict scrutiny test, determining whether the California school finance system was necessary to achieve a compelling state interest. The defendants asserted that the state interests supported by the system were: (1) Local district control over administrative decision-making; and (2) Local control over educational expenditures. The Court found the first interest was not tied to the school finance system because local control over administrative decision-making could be preserved regardless of how the state decided to parcel out state aid to education. The Court handled the second interest asserted by noting that poor districts had little or no "fiscal freewill" when compared to rich districts; because of the system's reliance on the property tax, residents of poor districts could tax themselves heavily and still have per pupil expenditures far below per pupil expenditures of rich districts which imposed less severe tax rates. The Court characterized local fiscal control under the California system as a "cruel illusion".15/

The Court, noting that if the allegations of the complaint were proven the plaintiffs would be entitled to the relief requested, reversed the trial court's dismissal and returned the case for trial.

## Serrano II

In reaction to Serrano I, the California legislature passed two bills substantially amending the California school finance system. The parties to the action stipulated that these amendments should be considered as part of the litigation.

The nature of the California school finance system after these changes can be summarized as follows:
(1) The $\$ 125$ per pupil basic aid was retained;
(2) Supplemental aid was dropped;
(3) The foundation program minimums were substantially increased from $\$ 355$ per ADA to $\$ 765$ per ADA for elementary school districts and from $\$ 488$ per ADA to $\$ 950$ per ADA for high school districts and the computational rates for determining equalization aid were increased; and
(4) District revenue limits were established allowing the expenditures per pupil to increase over the previous year according to an inflation factor. Increases in expenditures for wealthy districts were 1 imited in that inflation adjustments decreased in proportion to

15 Id. at 1260.
the districts' wealth while poorer districts were allowed a greater rate of increase in expenditures. (It was hoped that this mechanism would result in reduction in the disparities between per pupil expenditures.) The revenue limits applied only to general purpose tax revenues and were subject to override by the district's voters. Permissive overrides were allowed for special purposes such as capital outlay.

The trial court had found that the changes in the school finance scheme were not sufficient to overcome the constitutional defects described in Serrano I because: (1) the retention of basic aid continued the anti-equalizing effect found in Serrano I by benefitting only those districts not qualifying for equalization aid (rich districts); (2) rich districts were favored because a smaller tax effort was required to reach the foundation program minimum level of support; and (3) the revenue limit feature was defective in that it perpetuated previous inequities by using the level of expenditures from a previous year as a base and that "convergence" of district expenditures per pupil would take a long time, even assuming no voted overrides. At bottom, the trial court found that the system would "continue to generate school revenue in proportion to the wealth of the individual district."16/

The California Supreme Court affirmed the trial court's conclusions of law and found them to be supported by the findings and the evidence.

It should be noted that the decision in Rodriguez occurred after Serrano I and before Serrano II. Although Serrano I was grounded on application of the strict scrutiny test, Rodriguez's rejection of strict scrutiny under the federal constitution did not overrule Serrano I, since the California Court had specifically stated that the same analysis would be employed and the same result reached under the equal protection provisions of the California constitution.

The Court rejected an alternative test of the California school finance system's constitutionality proposed by the defendants; this was because the Court believed the test set forth in Serrano I remained appropriate and had been followed by the trial court, because the data upon which the defendants' alternative test was based was defective, and because the findings of fact by the trial court conflicted with the assertions upon which the defendants' alternative test was based.

The defendants argued that, if their alternative test was not acceptable, at least the Court should employ the rational basis test used by the U.S. Supreme Court in Rodriguez. The Court discounted this argument, noting that the Serrano I decision was based upon the
equal protection provisions of the California constitution as well as the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the federal constitution and that California courts had the authority to impose a stricter test of equal protection under the state constitution than the U.S. Supreme Court applied in the case of an asserted violation of federal equal protection rights. The Court specifically affirmed Serrano I and concluded that the California school finance system, as amended since Serrano I, failed to meet the standards set forth in Serrano I.

Finally, the Court summarily rejected the defendants' arguments that the California school finance system under challenge was mandated by certain provisions of the California constitution and should be upheld despite the asserted violations of equal protection.

New Jersey. In Robinson V. Cahill, 62 N.J. 473, 303 A.2d 273, decided April 3, 1973, the New Jersey Supreme Court dealt with many of the same issues confronting the California Supreme Court in Serrano I and II. The New Jersey school finance system was similar in several respects to the California system but was declared unconstitutional on a different basis. (It should be noted that the Robinson case was argued in the New Jersey Supreme Court prior to the U. S. Supreme Court decision in Rodriguez, but that the decision in Robinson was announced a few weeks after the decision in Rodriguez; the decision in Robinson had to be revised to some extent to reflect the decision in Rodriguez.)

A discussion of the trial court decision in Robinson v. Cahill, 118 N.J. Super. 223, 287 A.2d 187 (1972), may be helpful in analyzing the New Jersey Supreme Court's decision.

After summarizing the allegations in the complaint and the defendant's responses thereto (which in many respects were similar to the allegations and responses in Serrano I and II), the trial court discussed the New Jersey school finance system. Prior to 1970, New Jersey had a "foundation program" which could be briefly described as follows: Every district received $\$ 100$ per pupil, plus the difference, if any, between $\$ 325$ per pupil and the local fair share (the equivalent of the amount of revenue that could be raised locally with a tax rate of $10 \mathrm{l} / 2$ mills per dollar) plus $\$ 27$ per pupil if the district was in one of the six largest cities in New Jersey. In 1970, the "State School Incentive Equalization Aid Law" (referred to as the Bateman Act) was enacted and funded at the amount which would have been paid in 1971-72 under the foundation program, plus $20 \%$ of the difference between the amount of aid under the foundation program and Bateman Act aid if the Bateman Act were fully funded. The complaint had been amended to include the Bateman Act in the constitutional challenge; the Bateman Act will be discussed in more detail later in this section of this report.

The trial court noted that local property taxes yielded $67 \%$ of statewide school operating expenses, state aid yielded $28 \%$, and federal aid yielded the balance of $5 \%$. Under the New Jersey school
finance system, districts with high property tax wealth spent more money per pupil than poor districts, spent more money on teachers' salaries per pupil, and had more teachers and professional staff per pupil; this was true despite lower tax rates in wealthy districts and despite "equalization aid" given by the state to poor districts. In addition, the trial court pointed out that poor districts often had larger minority populations to educate and that central cities were fighting a losing tax battle with suburbs. Further, the New Jersey school finance system failed to address the problems of poor suburban and rural districts. Thus the trial court found that districts with low property tax wealth per pupil suffered a fiscal disadvantage. Whether this disadvantage was related to educational deficiencies was the next point to be addressed.

While allowing that the quality of elementary and secondary education in New Jersey probably was good to excellent in the vast majority of districts, the trial court said:

The question is not how well we are doing on the average; the question is whether New Jersey's system of financing public schools creates impermissible disparities between rich and poor districts in educational opportunity, as well as tax burden.17/

After wrestling with the problem whether educational quality should be measured by "input" (dollars spent) or "output" (test results), the trial court resolved the issue by finding both input and output deficiencies in certain districts with per pupil property valuations below the state average. These districts were characterized by fewer teachers with postgraduate degrees, high turnover, old and outdated school buildings, equipment, textbooks, and library facilities, and test results below the national norm.

In answering the objection that the level of educational expenditures does not necessarily define quality of education, the trial court, while acknowledging that family background and social composition of the student body were important determinants, noted that "[T]he only evidence offered in the case does show correlation between educational expenditures and pupil achievement over and above the influence of family and other environmental factors."18/ Having reviewed the evidence on this branch of the case, the trial court concluded that "a large number of New Jersey children are not getting an adequate education"19/ and that this was traceable to differences in district property tax wealth.

[^1]The trial court then turned its attention to the New Jersey school finance system under the Bateman Act. The Bateman Act appears to have been a comprehensive and involved statute which had been enacted but neither fully funded (the " $20 \%$ " level of funding was previously discussed in this report) nor fully implemented (while the act provided for classification of school districts into five categories, criteria for classification of districts had not been developed at the time of the trial court decision and had not been developed at the time of the New Jersey Supreme Court's decision nearly a year later; the result was that all districts were given the same "basic" classification.) Among other things, the Bateman Act provided for: (1) "minimum support aid" of $\$ 100$ per pupil for each district on a weighted pupil basis reflecting lesser costs for education of kindergarten pupils and greater costs for secondary pupils; (2) "incentive equalization aid", the purpose of which was to give aid to those districts which had "equalized valuations per pupil" which were less than "guaranteed valuations"; and (3) additional weight for pupils who were children in families residing in the school district who received aid to families with dependent children.

Based upon a statistical model projecting the operation of the Bateman Act, the trial court concluded that, although the Bateman Act employed a wealth-based formula, the act was more acceptable than the "foundation program"; in addition, the AFDC factor would have an appreciable effect if the Bateman Act were fully funded.

The trial court then took up discussion of the education clause in the New Jersey Constitution which read as follows:

The Legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of free public schools for the instruction of all the children in the state between the ages of five and eighteen years.20/

Pointing out that the state was bearing up to $75 \%$ of the expenses of public education during the time this clause was adopted, the trial court concluded that it was a state legislative obligation to provide a thorough education for all pupils wherever located. The trial court interpreted the word "thorough" as connoting completeness and attention to detail and as meaning more than simply adequate or minimal and concluded, on the basis of the findings described above relating to unequal expenditures per pupil, that a thorough education was not being afforded to all pupils in New Jersey. However, the trial court stated that the requirements of the education clause would probably be fulfilled if the Bateman Act, with a few deletions, were fully funded.

The trial court also found the New Jersey school finance system was in violation of the equal protection provisions of the United States and New Jersey constitutions. The trial court applied the strict scrutiny test accepted in Serrano I and held that not only did the New Jersey school finance system discriminate against pupils in districts with low real property wealth, but it discriminated against taxpayers by imposing unequal burdens for a common state purpose. (It should be remembered that the trial court decision in Robinson was announced well in advance of the U. S. Supreme Court's decision in Rodriguez).

Upon review, the New Jersey Supreme Court accepted the trial court's findings that there were interdistrict disparities in the number of dollars spent per pupil and that quality of educational opportunity depended in substantial measure upon the number of dollars invested, and it held that the New Jersey school finance system violated the education clause of the New Jersey constitution. The Supreme Court then devoted most of its opinion to a rejection of the other bases for the trial court's decision.

The Supreme Court rejected the equal protection basis for the trial court's decision primarily because the Court feared the implications of the application of such a theory to all important services provided by local governments. Describing several governmental services which were neither funded nor provided on a strictly equal basis, the Court could not find any requirement of law that dictated such equality if inequality was not connected with some invidious end. The Court discussed in some detail the U. S. Supreme Court's reasons for rejection of the strict scrutiny test in Rodriguez, citing the concern that application of the strict scrutiny test strikes at the heart of the time-honored concept of "local government with local fiscal responsibility",21/ and reluctance to apply a single solution to myriad problems in the provision of governmental services.

While accepting that wealth might be a suspect classification in some cases, the New Jersey Supreme Court found that wealth was not suspect as a basis for raising revenues and that taxation has never been required to be uniform as among taxing districts; further, the Court generally rejected the concept of according different rights special protection according to their "fundamentality". Even assuming wealth was a suspect classification and education was a fundamental right, the Court pointed out that there may be a compelling state interest in preserving the institution of local government and its concomitant, local fiscal responsibility.

The New Jersey Supreme Court also rejected the contentions that, under the state constitution:
(1) The state could not delegate the responsibility for raising taxes for school purposes to local governments; and (2) Statewide equality among taxpayers must be assured.

However, the Court found that the education clause required equal educational opportunity for children. Equal educational opportunity did not mean just a minimal education; instead

The constitution's guarantee must be understood to embrace that educational opportunity which is needed in the contemporary setting to equip a child for his role as a citizen and as a competitor in the labor market.22/

The Court then tested the New Jersey school finance system against its interpretation of the constitutional requirement and found that the system did not pass constitutional muster because of "discrepancies in dollar input per pupil.".23/ The Court could find no other viable criterion for measuring compliance with the constitution and refused to assume that the lowest level of dollar performance complied with the constitution.

Since the state had delegated most of the responsibility for funding schools to the local level, it was incumbent on the state to spell out the meaning of equal educational opportunity so that local districts had a more concrete standard to satisfy. Noting that the Bateman Act had no apparent relationship to equal educational opportunity, the Supreme Court specifically rejected the trial court's conclusion that full-funding of the Bateman Act would satisfy the requirements of the education clause. The Court went on to observe that, if the state wished to delegate to the local level the state's obligation to provide a thorough and efficient education, the state must define this obligation, compel local districts to raise the necessary funds to fulfill the obligation, and, perhaps, compensate for local failures to meet the obligation. Further observing that these requirements apply not only to school operating expenditures but to capital expenditures, the Court closed by noting that, upon the record in this case, the Court doubted that a thorough and efficient system of schools could be achieved by reliance on local taxation.

Connecticut. In Horton v. Meskill, 172 Conn. 615, 376 A.2d 359, decided April 19, 1977, the Connecticut Supreme Court analyzed the trial court's findings and upheld the trial court's conclusion that the Connecticut school finance system was unconstitutional under the Connecticut constitutional provisions relating to equal protection and the state's obligation to provide a free education.
22/ Id. at 295.
23/ Id.

The Supreme Court first noted that the local property tax was the primary source of educational revenue. The percentage contributions were local property tax 70 percent, state aid 20 to 25 percent, and federal aid 5 percent or less, compared to the national average of 51 percent local property taxes, 41 percent state aid, and 8 percent federal aid. Eighty-one percent of the aid to education from the state was distributed as a flat grant depending on the average number of pupils attending school daily; in 1973-74 the grant was $\$ 215$ per pupil and had been increased to $\$ 250$ per pupil. The Court further noted that a mill raised different amounts in each town (under Connecticut statutes, each town constituted a separate school district), and that mill rates varied widely among towns. The Court's opinion contains a table showing property tax revenue yield per pupil, per pupil operating expenditures, and net school mill rates. The table illustrates that districts with low property tax wealth per pupil had low per pupil expenditures but had higher net school mill rates (sometimes two to two and one-half times higher) than districts with high property tax wealth per pupil.

The Court went on to point out that property-rich towns tend to have a wider range and higher quality of educational services than property-poor towns and cites several examples. Listing criteria it believed were related to "quality of education", the Supreme Court found that the "optimal version of the criteria is achieved by higher per pupil operating expenditures"24/ and concluded there was a direct relationship between per pupil school expenditures and the breadth and quality of educational programs. The Supreme Court then cited other findings of the trial court relating generally to Connecticut's poor national ranking relating to the amount and method of distribution of state aid to education, and relating to the state legislature's recent efforts to bolster the Connecticut system of school finance by enlarging the basic grant and providing extra funds for school finance from lottery proceeds for districts with low property wealth. The trial court had found that the effect of enlarging the basic grant was small, and the impact of the extra funds from the lottery was "miniscule and not significant.".25/

The Supreme Court then listed the essential conclusions of law which were contested on appeal. These can be summarized as follows: (1) education was a fundamental right under the Connecticut constitution; (2) the state school finance system interfered with said right and required "strict scrutiny"; (3) the state school finance system violated state equal protection guarantees; (4) variation in revenues available for schools produced variations in quality of instruction and therefor produced discrimination against students from districts with low property tax wealth (this conclusion also resulted in viola-
tions of the Connecticut "education clause"); (5) more effective equalization would not diminish local control and therefor retention 9f local control was not a rational basis for the present school finance system; (6) Connecticut had not selected the least drastic means of reaching the objective of local control; and (7) the legislature's attempts to remedy the situation had not succeeded.

The Court next turned to the merits of application of "strict scrutiny" analysis under the Connecticut equal protection of laws provision and, citing Serrano I and II and Robinson, concluded that the right to an education was so basic and fundamental as to deserve strict judicial scrutiny. Indicating that the Connecticut school finance scheme was notable for its "sheer irrationality"26/ and was a result of a delegation by the state of its responsibility to provide an education to each town without regard to the town's capability of raising revenues for education, the Connecticut Supreme Court upheld the trial court's conclusions on the equal protection branch and on the other branches of the case.

## Decisions Upholding Foundation Plans

Arizona. Shortly after the Rodriguez decision, the Supreme Court of Arizona upheld the Arizona school finance plan against claims that it was discriminatory because of the disparity of wealth between districts, because the disparity resulted in unequal education, and because of the unequal burden on taxpayers. Shofstall v. Hollins, 110 Ariz. 88, 515 P.2d 590 (1973). Even though education was held to be a fundamental right under the Arizona constitution (which would ordinarily have the effect of subjecting the school finance statute to the strict scrutiny test), the Court concluded that a financing system which meets the constitutional criteria of uniformity and availability to all "need otherwise be only rational, reasonable and neither discriminatory nor capricious." 27/ Applying this test, the Court in a brief opinion stated that it found "no magic in the fact that the school district taxes herein complained of are greater in some districts than in others" 28/ and that the plaintiffs were to be compared with taxpayers of other governmental units who shoulder different tax burdens and receive varying degrees of services. It expressly disagreed with the Serrano analysis under the state equal protection clause.

Michigan. In Milliken v. Green, 390 Mich. 389, 212 N.W. 2d 711 (1973), the Supreme Court of Michigan vacated (reversed) its earlier opinion, rendered prior to the decision in Rodriguez, which had

| 26/ | Id. at 373. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27/ | 515 P.2d at 592. |
| $28 /$ | Id. at 593. |

invalidated Michigan's school finance system under the state equal protection clause. On rehearing the Court adopted a rational basis test, thereby placing the burden of proving invalidity on the plaintiffs who challenged the financing scheme. Pointing out that many different standards have been proposed to measure "educational opportunity", the Court declined to offer its own definition. It found that neither the education clause (which does not include the "thorough" or "uniform" language found in many constitutions) nor the equal protection clause of the Michigan constitution required equality of tax resources, as the plaintiffs had contended. Its ultimate holding was that the plaintiffs had not met their burden of proof -- the evidence and statistics offered did not establish that the disparity in educational expenditures between districts resulted in significant educational inequities and that "the state's obligation to provide a system of public schools is not the same as the claimed obligation to provide equality of educational opportunity." 29/

The Milliken case can be distinguished from most other school finance cases on the basis of the Michigan constitution's lack of language requiring a "thorough", "efficient", "general", or "uniform" system of education. However, the Michigan Court seemed motivated not so much by the text of the state constitution as by its difficulty with the concept of equal educational opportunity, how to measure it, and whether equal dollars per pupil would actually alleviate disparities in opportunity. The Court concluded that it should not discard the existing financing system in the face of its uncertainty about the fiscal and educational consequences.

Washington. In an original proceeding before the Supreme Court of Washington, petitioners claimed that the Washington school finance system violated the equal protection clauses of the federal and state constitutions and the state education clauses, which provide that it is "the paramount duty of the state to make ample provision for the education of all children" and that the system must be "general and uniform". 30/ The Washington system guaranteed each school district a specified number of dollars per weighted pupil and allowed districts to utilize other funds raised by a local property tax if approved by the voters at special millage elections. The petitioners alleged that voters in districts having low assessed valuations per pupil were less inclined to approve special millages and thus offered less educational opportunity due to their relatively lesser wealth.

The Court, in Northshore School District No. 417 v. Kinnear, 84 Wash. 2d 685, 530 P.2d 178 (1975), upheld the Washington school finance system. Like the Michigan court, it found no satisfactory definition of "educational opportunity". The defendants presented evidence that disparities in per pupil spending were more closely
related to disparities in district enrollment rather than to assessed valuation per pupil. The Court then disposed of the federal and state equal protection claims by holding that the Rodriguez case controlled, since prior cases tied the meaning of the state equal protection clause to that of the federal clause.

Turning to the claims under the state education clauses, the Court addressed the plaintiffs' contention that the phrase, "the paramount duty of the state" to provide education, be given special emphasis. The Court cited the principle of construction which requires that all parts of an instrument should be harmonized whenever possible in order to give effect to each, and it noted that the constitution gives both the legislature and the superintendent of public instruction roles in assuring the availability of education. It held that the nature and extent of the paramount duty, and the means for carrying it out, are for the legislature and the superintendent to determine, so long as there is no invidious discrimination. Since whatever variations may have existed were caused by differences in district size, geography, and location and by differences in the aspirations of the people of the district (and not by disparities in assessed valuation per pupil), the court concluded that the financing system was a valid exercise of legislative power.

Further, in analyzing the claim under the clause requiring a "general and uniform system" of education, the Court defined a general and uniform system to be
one in which every child in the state has free access to certain minimum and reasonably standardized educational and instructional facilities and opportunities....--a system administered with that degree of uniformity which enables a child to transfer from one district to another within the same grade without substantial loss of credit or standing and with access by each student of whatever grade to acquire those skills and training that are reasonably understood to be fundamental and basic to a sound education. $31 /$

Since the plaintiffs' evidence was not sufficient to prove that Washington's system violated this standard, the system was upheld. $32 /$
$31 / 530$ P.2d at 202.
32/ Another case, raising the issue of the level of state funding for education, has been decided by a trial court in Washington and is being appealed. Seattle School District No. 1 of King County, Washington v. State of Washington, No. 53950 (Thurston County Supreior Court, Jan. 14, 1977).

Idaho. In Thompson V. Engelking, 96 Idaho 793, 537 P.2d 634 (1975), the Supreme Court of Idaho upheld Idaho's school financing system against similar contentions. The trial court had held that equal expenditures per pupil were required to meet a standard of "complete equal educational opportunity". The Supreme Court alluded to the controversy over whether equal educational opportunity results from equal expenditures per pupil but refused to enter an area which it characterized as "a turbulent field of social, economic, and political policy".33/

The case is notable for its emphasis on the importance of the legislative role in school finance. The Court stated that it would not convene as a "super-legislature", and that it was "ill-suited to a task which is the province of the legislature ${ }^{\mu}$. 34/ Perhaps influenced by its disinclination to overturn what it perceived as decisions properly belonging to the legislature, the Court adopted a rational basis test and not a strict scrutiny test. (It stated, however, that even if strict scrutiny were applicable, the Idaho constitution did not create a fundamental right to education.) After finding that the legislature acted rationally and without unconstitutional discrimination in enacting a financing system which preserved local control and direction of education, the Court approached the education clause claims with the same deference to legislative action and held that equal expenditures were not required.

Oregon. The Supreme Court of Oregon found Oregon's school finance Taw to be constitutionally valid in 01sen v. State, 276 Or. 9, 554 P.2d 139 (1976). Instead of a strict scrutiny test, the Court approved a balancing test which it stated was modelled after the test articulated in the equal protection portion of Robinson v. Cahill, that is, whether the detriment of the education of children in some districts is outweighed by the justification of the school finance scheme. As in Rodriguez, the interest advanced to justify the scheme was local control over education; the plaintiffs' reply was that there was no meaningful local control in districts with few property tax resources. The Court answered with an extension of the plaintiffs' argument to other services financed locally from the property tax. Just because some districts have greater property wealth than others, the Court said, it does not follow that the equal protection clause is violated; there is no reason for such a severe denigration of local control. In the education clause portion of the opinion, the Court determined that the provision of a "uniform and general" system of education did not entail a requirement that the amounts available must approach equality.

34/Id. at 640, 642.

We are of the opinion that Art. VIII, Section 3, is complied with if the state requires and provides for a minimum of educational opportunities in the district and permits the districts to exercise local control over what they desire, and can furnish, over the minimum. 35/

## Power equalization and other solutions

At least two basic financing methods which continue to rely on the property tax have been advanced to meet the legal objections directed toward most foundation plans: (1) a state-imposed property tax, with a uniform levy on all property throughout the state and the proceeds distributed according to school population and district budgets; and (2) power equalization. Since Colorado's school finance law is a modified power equalization scheme, the focus of this portion of the report will be placed on power equalization. The essence of a power equalization scheme is that the state guarantees, by means of the formula for state funding of local districts, that a mill levied in any district, regardless of its wealth, will raise the same number of dollars per pupil. That number of dollars is set by statute, and local districts are free (usually within limits, as discussed below) to adopt budgets at any level they find advisable. A relatively high budget per pupil would require the imposition of a higher mill levy than a lower budget per pupil, but the district's choice would theoretically be made on educational grounds and would not be a function of the valuation for assessment. The proponents of power equalization cite the preservation of decision-making at the local level as one of the major advantages of such a plan.
"Pure" power equalization, however, has the disadvantage of being fiscally open-ended; that is, the level of state expenditures for education is governed by the choices made by local districts about the amount of their budgets. Such choices could vary from year to year, making the state's obligation somewhat unpredictable. To meet these objectives, a state can set a maximum on school districts' per pupil budgets or on the number of mills a district may levy. In addition or as an alternative to such maximums, a state might require that district budgets be submitted to the state department of education for review, in order to insure that additional moneys are being wisely spent. Consistent with a power equalization plan, a state could also require a minimum level of expenditures or a minimum mill levy on the theory that the pupils' interests in equal educational opportunity do not permit a district to choose an expenditure level which is substantially below some defined point.

Although power equalization is usually discussed as a state "guarantee", pure power equalization is not merely a guarantee that every district will have available some minimum amount of funding. Without placing some kind of limit on wealthier districts, such a plan would in essence be a foundation plan with all its attendant constitutional problems. A pure power equalization plan, in which the legislature has set the per pupil per mill guaranteed amount somewhere below the actual per pupil per mill amount of the wealthiest district, would require districts in which the actual amount raised per pupil per mill is greater than the statutory guarantee to return the excess to the state for distribution to poorer districts. Thus wealthy districts would be "equalized down", while poor districts would be "equalized up".

This requirement of returning some portion of property tax revenues to the state raises several legal questions. In Buse $\mathrm{V}_{0}$ Smith, 247 N.W. 2d 141 (Wis. 1976), the Supreme Court of Wisconsin invafidated a power equalization plan because it violated the rule which requires local taxes to be spent for local purposes and not for the benefit of other areas or of the state. This rule was held to be mandated by the uniformity of taxation clause of Wisconsin's constitution. Woodahl v. Straub, 520 P. 2d 776 (Mont. 1974), reaches the opposite result, upholding a school finance plan which involved a statewide forty-mill levy and required those districts in which the levy produced mare funds than needed for the "foundation program" to remit the excess to the state. The Supreme Court of Montana characterized the forty-mill levy as a state, not a local, property tax and held that the proceeds of such a state tax could be used for any public purpose, including education.

Since Colorado's present law does not require any district to remit locally generated funds to the state, these decisions raise only hypothetical problems; however, it is useful to set forth the issues which would need to be resolved if a pure power equalization plan were to be considered for Colorado:
(1) Is the levy required to be imposed by a school district (i.e., district budget per pupil divided by the guaranteed per pupil per mill amount) a state or a local property tax?
(2) If it is a local property tax, does the Colorado constitution require that it be spent only for local purposes?
(3) If it is a state property tax, is it subject to the limitation of section 11 of article $X$ of the state constitution, which prohibits the imposition of a tax on property for state purposes of more than four mills?
(4) If it is a state property tax, does it violate section 15 of article IX of the state constitution, which provides that local boards of education shall have control of instruction in the public schools of thetr districts?

The theoretical problem posed by a limitation on the use of locally raised taxes at the local level is related to the question of limitations on budgets generally. It is noteworthy that both the Montana case cited above, which upheld such a limit, and an opinion of the Colorado Attorney General which seems to endorse a pure power equalization bill (S.B. No. 538, 1977 session) refer to the options avallable to local districts to increase their levy in order to exceed the guaranteed budget amount per pupil. Even the Wisconsin law examined in Buse v. Smith allowed districts to increase their budgets over the state-guaranteed amount, albeit with a penalty in the form of a diversion to the state of a percentage of the additional revenues raised. It is fair to say that the idea of imposing a maximum on district expenditures in a comparatively wealthy district, and at the same time requiring it to return excess property taxes to the state, is discomforting and that some type of outlet, usually in the form of an additional levy authorized by the voters, the local board of education, or some state agency, may be desirable even though it tends to favor wealthy districts.

In this connection, the case of Askew v. Hargrave, 401 U.S. 436, 91 S.Ct. 856 (1971), should be kept in mind. A FTorida statute which limited property taxes for school purposes to ten mills was challenged on the ground that it discriminated ag̣ainst poor districts in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The federal district court agreed, $36 /$ but the U.S. Supreme Court vacated the decision based on the doctrine of federal court abstention, since another case raising similar issues under the Florida constitution was pending in a state court. The case is cited in Rodriguez, 37/ apparently for the proposition that if a state ceiling on levies or expenditures has the effect of absolutely barring desired tax increases, at least in poorer districts, it may be unconstitutional.

## Implications for the Colorado Statute

It is now possible to discuss the application of the legal principles set forth above to Colorado's "Public School Finance Act of 1973", article 50 of title 22, C.R.S. 1973. Several features of the Colorado law are fairly comparable to features of other state laws which have been litigated.

The authorized revenue base. The authorized revenue base per pupil ("ARB") is the level of expenditure of a district, and it determines the annual mill levy for the district. The law as enacted in 1973 allowed districts to increase their expenditures annually by a given percentage over their ARB per pupil for the prior budget year, building on actual per-pupil expenditure as they stood in 1973. In recent years the percentage increase has been eliminated and replaced

367 Hargrave V. Kirk, 313 F.Supp. 944 (M.D. FTa. 1970).
37/ 411 U.S. at 50.
with an authorized increase of a flat dollar amount. Thus wealthy districts will no longer be able to increase budgets by applying a percentage to a larger amount than poorer districts, thereby widening the difference between the richer and poorer districts. By this means, and by spectfying in the law that no district need have an ARB of less than a stated amount per pupil, poorer districts can increase their expenditures at a faster rate than wealthier districts and aradually "catch up", if they so choose.

Issue: In spite of the possibility of poorer districts' increasing their expenditures over a period of years so that they spend approximately the same amount per pupil as wealthier districts, does the fact that the ARB was based on 1973 spending levels (which may have reflected differences in district property weal th) constitute an unlawful discrimination between districts on the basis of weal th or a denial of a thorough and uniform education?

The minimum state share. Section 22-50-105 (2), C.R.S. 1973, provides that every district, regardless of how much is raised by local property taxes, will receive at least a stated amount per pupil from the state. Practically speaking, the effect of this provision is to give this minunum amount to those districts in which a one-mill levy will raise more than the quaranteed per pupil per mill amount and which are therefore not eligible for basic equalization sunport.

Issue: Does the minimum state share exacerbate wealth differentials between districts in an unconstitutional manner in that it requires a grant of state funds to districts in which property wealth is already over the equalization level set by the state?

It would be useful in this connection to determine whether the minimum state share serves a policy purpose other than simply assuring that every district receives something from the state. If the purpose of the minimum state share is to compensate districts for special needs which have not been taken into consideration in fixing the guaranteed per-pupil-per-mill amount, the minimum state share may be reasonably related to a valid state goal. 38/

The option to override the ARB limitation. The Colorado law permits a district which determines that its needs require per-punil expenditures in excess of the $A R B$ per punil limit to apply to the state school district hudget review hoard for permission to increase its property tax levy and, if denied in whole or in part, to submit the question to the electors of the district. If an increased ARB is authorized, the district itself absorbs the additional cost during the first year through property taxes; subsequently the increase becomes part of the ARB and is funded according to the usual formula.

38/ J. Coons, W. CTune, and S. Sugarman, Private Wealth and Public Education, suggest that nower equalization can be combined with such a flat grant, although they visualize the grant's being available to all districts and not fust to wealthier ones.

Issues: Since wealthier districts can more easily bear the burden of excess levies and will thus he more likely to avail themselves of the option to override ARB limits, does the option discriminate unlawfully in favor of wealthy districts? Does the funding of budgets which have been increased over ARB limits from state as well as local sources (after the first vear) unlawfully perpetuate such discrimination?

Excluded categories of expenditures. Colorado's school finance law pertains only to expenditures from a district's general fund. It therefore has no application to capital expenditures, such as the construction or improvement of school buildings or the purchase of capital equipment. It also does not encompass expenditures for so-called "categorical" programs, such as education of the handicapped or bilingual education, for which state grant moneys are made available to local districts under different statutes and accordina to different criteria and formulae.

Issue: If equal educational opportunity cannot be assured unless all types of expenditures are equalized, does the exclusion of certain categories of expenditures render the Colorado law unconstitutional?

This issue might be resolved with certain data. For example, if it can be shown that handicapped children are not distributed evenly throughout the state, there may be justification for funding special education according to a separate formula. Similarly, if the greatest demand for capital construction is in property-wealthy districts, there may be a rational hasis for reliance on the property tax (the traditional source) for funding capital construction.

The outcome on any of these issues will almost certainly be affected by whether the court determines to apply the rational basis test or the strict scrutiny test outlined above.

Piscellaneous nroblems and trends
Measures of quality. The court decisions invalidating school finance plans have assumed, not without some reluctance, that educational quality is directly related to the level of dollars spent per pupil. On the other hand, the decisions upholding plans of ten include a finding that the evidence does not establish that equal dollars create equal opportunity. While the primary determinant of the effectiveness of education may not be the dollars spent, and while spendina without wise planning is probably doomed, it is surely true that most proposals for enhancing educational quality involve increasina expenditures. Thus the issue of whether equal dollars (or the availability thereof) measures equality of educational opportunity is a continuing problem.

Some courts have tried to contend with output, instead of input, measures. The federal district court in McInnes v. Shapiro, 293 F.Supp. 327 (D. Ill. 1968), aff'd sub. nom. mer. McInnes v.

Ogilvie, 394 U.S. 322 (1969), found that it had no standards to measure the school's product, i.e., the quality of the education actually delivered, and thus refused to adjudicate the equal protection question raised there. If the equality sought in the context of public education is defined to be an equal quality of education, the question of how to measure such quality -- whether dollars spent, tax effort, educational product, or something else -- remains a thorny one.

Tax effort. Many references are made in the writing on school finance to the term tax effort". The heart of a power equalization plan is the equalization of tax effort, in that a property tax levy at the same rate in every district produces equal revenues. Realistically, however, the "tax effort" required to raise an additional mill's worth of property taxes may vary widely between districts. For example, in a school district suffering from "municipal overburden" (qenerally defined as a district, probably in an urban area, where many jurisdictions levy property taxes and many public services are required), the combined levies of all taxina jurisdictions result in a relatively high tax rate, and higher school taxes must compete to their fisadvantage with requests for other worthy programs. Such a district might be relatively proderty-wealthy and still have difficulty in raising school taxes because of an already high millage. A further example: A district in which the average residence is valued at $\$ 25,000$ would probably have greater difficulty in increasing its levy by one mill than would a district in which the average residence is valued at $\$ 100,000$, because the taxpayers of the latter district almost surely have much more discretionary personal income than the former.

These examples raise questions about the fairness of court decisions and school finance laws which measure the wealth of a school district solely according to its valuation for assessment and which tie state school aid to property tax revenues. The ultimate question is, of course, what portion of school funding, if any, is properly borne by the property tax.

Equalized assessments. The fairness of a power equalization plan is in very large part dependent on equalized property assessments. It should be noted that the court decisions appear to assume that equalized assessments exist; Colorado's recent experience indicates that this very basic prerequisite is not so easily attained.

Special needs. Any school finance dlan must cope with the question of whether to fund programs fulfilling special needs, such as special education, poverty, bilinqual education, small attendance centers, declining enrollments, or transportation, within the basic school finance law or by using a cateqorical approach. A "weiahting" approach, in which a student with special needs is multiplied by a statutorily-set factor and is then funded through the general school finance formula, is fairly common. An illustration of this approach may be found in S.B. No. 525 from the 1977 session.

Courts have found a requirement of compensating for special
needs in federal and state equal protection clauses, state education clauses, and other legislation such as the federal "Civil Rinhts Act of 1964 ". The U.S. Supreme Court, in Lau v. Nichols, 114 II.S. 563, 94 S.Ct. 786, 39 L.Ed.2d 1 (1974), held that spectal Enalish proarams for Chinese-speaking pupils in San Francisco were mandated by the Civil Rights Act's prohibition on discrimination on the around of race, color, or national origin in any program receiving federal aid, and the federal quideline promulgated pursuant thereto requiring federally funded school districts to rectify lanauage deficiencies in order to assure that students of a particular race, color, or national oriain are not denied the opportunity to obtain the education generally obtained by other students in the system.

Another line of cases, which rely on state education clauses and the mandate of equal protection, holds that states must provide for the educational needs of the mentally retarded. See FARC v. Pennsylvania, 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa. 1972). In one of the most recent cases of this type, a federal district court in Pennsylvania employed the Rodriguez reasoning and held that retarded children are a suspect class because of their history of purposeful unequal treatment and their relegation to a position of political powerlessness; accordingly, strict judicial scrutiny of laws concerning the education of the handicapped is warranted. Fialkowski v. Shapp, 405 F. Supp. 916 (E.D. Pa. 1975). The court noted that complete exclusion of the retarded from the educational system might not even satisfy the less stringent rational basis test, since it might be shown that all retarded children could benefit from some type of education.

The separation of powers theme. While it is surely the duty of the judicial branch to interpret and apply the federal and state constitutions, the courts have approached that duty with differing degrees of deference to legislative enactments. The Idaho case discussed earlier comes close to characterizing school finance as a political question, which the courts have traditionally refused to adjudicate. On the other hand, in the Seranno decisions and others, the courts have retained jurisdiction to oversee leaislation enacted in response to the decisions. Although not much emphasis has been placed on it in the cases, it is noteworthy that most state education clauses are phrased in terms of the legislature's duty to provide a thorough, uniform, or general education. Wherever a particular court may draw the line between proper and improper judicial intervention in the educational system, it would appear that many courts are reluctant to invade the spheres of the legislative and executive branches except in the clearest cases. 39 /

As Judge Barrett pointed out in his concurring opinion in Keyes v. School District No. 1, 521 F.2d 465 (10th Cir. 1975), the school finance and deseareqation cases decided by the federal courts may also offend notions about the proper roles of federal and state governments:
(Continued on following page)

The "equal sewers problem". $40 /$ One of the most far-reaching aspects of Seranno 1 and II lies in their determination that equal protection requires equallty of educational services (or equality of opportunity therefor) between districts and not just within a district. If the availability of other services is deemed to approach the importance of education, the Serrano cases imply that the provision of such other services may also not depend on the wealth of the political unit supplying them. Earlier cases have held that municipal services or education may not be provided in a discriminatory manner based on race, 41/ for instance by using public funds to install street paving or lighting and the like only in white areas of a town, but thus far such decisions have involved only areas within a political unit. At least one law review comment suggests that the interdistrict-intradistrict distinction is not significant and that discrimination between districts based on wealth may be unlawful. $42 /$ It is possible that the interest in an equal education will be viewed as so much more fundamental than any interest in equal treatment in the provision of highways, water, sewer, or fire and police protection that the Serrano rationale will not be transferable; However, the possibility of such a development poses profound questions for leaislative consideration.

## 391 (Continued)

...[T]he School Board and administrative officials of the District are no longer managing, operating or controlling the system. The result from my point of view is at direct odds with the proper balance of Federal-State relations. As heretofore noted, it imposes an onerous and overwhelming task on a federal judiciary which is already 'smothered' with tremendous dockets involving issues designed for true judicial treatment, adjudicative rather than administrative in nature. No one would contend that the federal judiciary is the body to allocate available state funds to the integrative objectives of the school systems in such a manner that it will decide the priority and amount of remaining funds for other necessary and proper state governmental functions. The Tenth Amendment did reserve to the people of the various sovereign states those powers not otherwise expressly delegated to the Federal Government. 52.1 F.2d at 490.

40/J. Coons, W. Clune, and S. Sugarman, supra, at 386.
41/ Hawkins v. Town of Shaw, 437 F.2d 1286 (5th Cir. 1971); Hobson V. Hanson, 269 F. Supp. 401 (D.D.C. 1967), aff'd sub nom. Smuck V. Hobson, 408 F.2d 175 (D.C.Cir. 1969).

## General Information on the Current Act

S.B. No. 25 -- 1978 Session

The most recent amendments to the "Public School Finance Act of 1973" were enacted in 1978 in the form of S.B. No. 25. S.B. No. 25 , one of the most significant amendments to the act since its inception, broke from the existing system of percentage ARB increases and estahlished a system of minimum $A R B s$ and flat dollar ARB increases to more rapidly reduce interdistrict $A R B$ disparities across the state. The significant features of S.B. No. 25 are summarized below.

Summary of S.B. No. 25
S.B. No. 25, as enacted by the 1978 session of the General Assembly, increased the "guaranteed mill" (the amount which the state guarantees that each district can raise per pupil for each mill it levies, regardless of its assessed valuation) from the calendar year 1978 level of $\$ 35.00$ per mill per pupil to a 1979 level of $\$ 42.25$ per mill per pupil. A 1980 "guaranteed mill" level of $\$ 45.85$ was also established in the bill. A provision was added which specifies that the equalization support level for budget years 1981, 1982, and thereafter would be the same as for 1980. An additional provision stipulates that a district containing more than 50,000 pupils and a pupil density of at least 500 pupils per square mile can receive up to one hundred seven and one-half percent of the "guaranteed mill" level specified for the budget year.

The "minimum guarantee" (the minimum amount of state equalization which each district is entitled to receive per pupil for each mill levied, regardless of the size of its assessed valuation) was modified to provide continuation of the 1978 level of $\$ 11.35$ per mill per pupil through 1982 unless such minimum guarantee level requires that the district levy more than twenty mills. In the event that the district's mill levy exceeds twenty mills at the $\$ 11.35$ minimum guarantee level, the district is entitled to receive a minimum guarantee of $\$ 12.35$ per mill per pupil for 1979 , and $\$ 13.35$ per mill per pupil for 1980 and each year thereafter.

The bill provided for "authorized revenue base" (the dollar amount which each district is allowed to spend, per pupil, of combined local property tax and state equalization support) increases over the prior years' level and minimum authorized revenue base (ARB) levels as follows:

| Budget Year |  | ARB Increase |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Minimum ARB |
| 1979 | $\$ 130$ |  |  |
| 1980 |  | $\$ 140$ |  |
| 1981 |  | $\$ 150$ |  |
| 1982 |  | $\$ 160$ | $\$ 1,600$ |
|  |  | $\$ 1,800$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\$ 1,800$ |

## Conclusions

It is impossible to precisely chart the course which will be followed by the Colorado courts in deciding the issues posed in school finance litiqation. The constitutionality of nine fairly typical foundation plans has been decided by courts of last resort, and the totals thus far are slightly in favor of their constitutionality. Only one power equalization plan has reached a final decision, but the plan was invalidated on state constitutional grounds other than equal protection and education clause requirements. Any of the courses outlined in this section of the report is a possibility for Colorado, and other courses not discussed may be chosen. The Colorado courts could apply the strict scrutiny test under the Colorado constitutional provisions relating to equal protection or construe the Colorado education clause so as to find that, amona other things, interdistrict per pupil spending disparities produced under the Colorado school finance system render the system unconstitutional. The courts could apply the "rational basis" test, find that test to be satisfied, and therefore defer to the legislative branch in school finance matters. Whatever course is followed, it will likely resemble in large part the courses already traveled by other states and reviewed in this memo.

There continue to be a number of vital questions involved in school finance litigation which the courts appear to feel inadequate to resolve, the most important of which are probably the relationship of dollars to educational quality and the broad policy issue raised for the tax structure by the traditional reliance on the property tax for financing schools. While all can probably agree on the ultimate goal of equal educational opportunity for every child, these uncertainties, and the other issues articulated in this section of the report, leave ample room for an evolving legislative solution.

421 Comment, The Evolution of Equal Protection - Education, Municipal Services, and Wealth, 7 Harv. Civ. Rights-Civ. Lib. L. Rev. 103 (1972).

Legislative declarations pertaining to the propriety of utilizing property tax relief funds to fund the act, and the intent of the "Public School Finance Act of 1973" to recognize a variety of factors in the funding of public education in Colorado, were included in the bill.

The law concerning state aid to instructional television was amended to provide $\$ 1.00$ for each pupil of attendance entitlement in a qualified district in lieu of the dollar for dollar state match then contained in the law.

A provision was added which directed each property tax taxpayer to be notified of the additional mill levy which would be necessary if state funds were not provided his school district.

The one-year limitation on the counting of kindergarten pupils for attendance entitlement purposes was continued through June 30, 1979. An appropriation of $\$ 34,967,000$ was made to fund the bill.

## Costs of the Current Act

The following table (Table I) compares various cost features of the current act -- as modified by S.B. No. 25 -- with the act had S.B. No. 25 not been passed. District-by-district simulations of the act for 1978, the act without passage of S.B. No. 25 for 1979, assuming seven percent ARB increases, and the act with S.B. No. 75 for budget years 1979 through 1982, are attached as Appendix A.

三 =
1/ Assunes \$2.0 million annual growth in school lands/mineral lease funds with no roll forward for years subseduent to 1979 .

Equalization [ffects of the Current Act
Table II shows the ARBS, mill levies and the local and state shares for the state's highest, lowest, average, and median ARil districts. The table compares the current act as amended by S.B. No. 25 for budget years 1979-1982 with the 1973 actual figures and the act without S.B. No. 25 for 1979, assuming seven percent across-the-board ARB increases.

As shown in the table, after four years of operation, S.B. No. 25 will have lowered the ARB disparity from $\$ 417.89$ between the low and average districts for 1978 to $\$ 2.07 .96$ for 1982 with S.B. No. 25, a 50 percent reduction in disparity. The overall disparity between the state's highest ARB district and the lowest ARB district is similarly reduced by $\$ 242.01$ in 1982 under S.B. Ho. 25 (a 12 percent reduction), and the disparity between the lowest $\triangle R B$ district and the median ARB district is reduced by $\$ 191.98$ by (a 54 percent reduction).

| Calence： $-\mathrm{Yemen}^{-}$ | Bisさxit |  | $\frac{102315}{32125}$ | $\frac{\operatorname{tr} \frac{1}{5} t}{\frac{5}{13}}$ | $\frac{S S}{(\sqrt[v]{v})^{3}}$ | District |  | $\frac{\operatorname{lng} \text { Dis }}{\text { Milis }}$ | $\frac{t-10 t}{\frac{1}{4}}$ | $\frac{35}{32}$ | $\frac{\text { Stat }}{\frac{\text { Ali }}{(1)}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { e Averag } \\ & \text { Minles } \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\text { ge } D_{i} s t}{\left.\frac{i 5}{5}\right)^{1 /}}$ | $\frac{1 c t}{\frac{15}{(5)^{2}}}$ | $\frac{k_{e}}{\text { pristrict }}$ | $\frac{\text { edian Spen }}{\frac{\operatorname{AR}}{(\hat{S})}}$ | $\frac{\text { ding } 21}{415}$ | $\frac{s+\frac{t i c e}{5}}{\frac{5}{i d}}$ | $\frac{5 S}{(\$)} 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1978 | nascingtor －こごミ ラごス | 3，229．79 | 49.69 | 53．64 | 11.35 | La Plata－ Hayfield | －，230．17 | 32.40 | 20.94 | 14.06 | 1，552．06 | 41.20 | 19.92 | 15.81 | Otero－ <br> Fowler | 1，489．41 | 42.55 | 13.81 | 21.19 |
| 1979 |  | 3，455．88 | 58.90 | ＋？．23 | 11.35 | ＂ | 1，2i3．56 | 33.56 | 24.81 | 21.35 | 1，659．20 | 42.76 | 21.70 | 15.16 | ＂ | 1，593．67 | 45．5？ | 15.59 | 19.41 |
| 3，$\overline{3}$ ， $2 \times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 290 |  | 3，363．61 | 56.45 | 47.23 | 12.35 | ＂ | 1，－00．00 | 33.14 | 24.81 | 17.44 | 1，686．18 | 37.78 | 21.70 | 19.70 | ＂ | 1，615．87 | 38.25 | 15.59 | 26.66 |
| 298 |  | 3，503．61 | 65.06 | 40.50 | 33.35 | ＂ | 1，600．00 | 34.90 | 28.88 | 16.97 | 1，851．60 | 38.13 | 23.18 | 21.61 | ＊ | 1，813．26 | 39.55 | 17.40 | 28.45 |
| 2982 |  | 3，653．61 | 75.96 | 34.75 | 13.35 | ＂ | 1．E02． | 38.33 | 33.002 | 13.35 | 2，009．38 | 41．94 | 24.76 | 20.09 | ＂ | 1，963．26 | 44.05 | 19.49 | 25.08 |
| 10ミ |  | 3，813．61 | 88.59 | 29.81 | 13.24 | ＂ | 1，000．00 | 37.35 | 30.13 | 13.35 | 2，167．96 | 45.16 | 26.48 | 18.69 | ＂ | 2，123．26 | 49.32 | 21.82 | 21.23 |

## 

$1 /$ Local Sfare－－amount which can be raised per mill per pupil of local property tax revenues．
2／State Shave－－amount per mill per pupil of state equalization program support．

ARB Percentage Increases Produced by S.B. No. 25
The system of minimum $A R B s$ and flat dollar ARB increases adopted in S.B. Ho. 25 , expressed as percentage ARB increases from 1978 to 1979, range from 4.02 percent for the Washington Lone Star school district to 23.16 percent in the La Plata Bayfield school district. The average percentage ARB increase produced by S.B. No. 25 is 8.6 percent. The following frequency distribution (Chart I) shows the number of districts falling within each percentage of increase within the range. The district-by-district percentage ARB increases for the period are attached as Appendix $B$.

Increases in Authorized Revenue Base (ARB)
Due to SB :lo. 25-1979 Over 1978


## Information on School District Operating Expenses and Financial Pressures

After examining the history and current law concerning distribution of state revenues for school finance, the committee's next step was to examine the patterns according to which such funds are actually expended. Examination of school district operating expenditure patterns is critical for two reasons: 1) analysis of expenditure patterns can reveal the relative proportions of school budget components for the purpose of identifying those areas of school spending wherein inflationary increases can cause extreme budgetary pressures; and 2) investigation of the spending patterns of districts of various enrollment size can assist identification of factors producing the diseconomies of small scale which appear to exist in the state's smaller enrollment districts.

## Analysis of School District Operating Expenses

The following series of tables depict, both on a statewide basis, and for one school district selected randomly from each attendance quartile, school district operating expenses for 1977 by object and function. The school districts selected from each attendance quartile are Denver, Boulder Valley, Greeley, and Platte Valley (Sedgewick County).

Objects of expenditure included on each table are:
a) salaries -- these are amounts paid to employees who are considered to be in positions of a permanent nature or hired temporarily, including substitute personnel and overtime salaries;
b) employee benefits -- includes amounts paid on behalf of employees not included in the gross salary. Such payments include employer contributions to group health or life insurance, retirement, workmen's compensation, and the like;
c) purchased services -- amounts paid for personal services rendered by personnel who are not on the payroll, and other services purchased;
d) supplies and materials -- amounts paid for material items of an expendable nature that are consumed, worn out, or deteriorated by use. Examples include workbooks, textbooks, library books, and heating fuels;
e) capital outlay -- expenditures for the acquisition of fixed assets or additions to fixed assets. They include expenditures for land or existing buildings; improvements of grounds; construction of buildings; additions to buildings; remodeling; initial equipment; and addition to or replacement of equipment;
f) other expenses -- this includes expenditures for payment of dues and fees, liability insurance, and judgment payments; and
g) transfers -- this object does not represent a purchase; rather, it is used as an accounting entity to show that funds have been handled without having goods and services rendered in return. Included here are transactions for interchanging money from one fund to another and for transmitting flow-through funds to the recipient.

School district functions enumerated on the tables are:
a) instruction -- includes activities dealing directly with the teaching of pupils, or the interaction between teacher and pupils. Included are the activities of aides or assistants of any type (clerk, graders, teaching machines, and the like) which assist in the instructional process;
b) support services -- this cluster of activities is further broken into:

1) pupils -- activities designed to improve the well-being of pupils, including social work and counseling services, information and records maintenance services, placement and other guidance services, and health, psychological, speech pathology and audiology services;
2) instructional staff -- activities associated with assisting the instructional staff with the content and process of pupil learning. These activities include improvement of instruction services and providing educational media services. Emphasis is on assisting instructional staff in planning, developing and evaluating the process of teaching and upon the use of all teaching and learning resources including hardware and content materials;
3) general administration -- includes activities of the board of education, legal services, activities associated with the general administration or executive responsibility for the entire district, including expenses of the office of the superintendent, community relations, staff relations and negotiations services;
4) school administration -- these are activities concerned with overall administrative responsibility for a single school or a group of schools. The primary activities are those of the principal and assistants and clerical staff;
5) operations and maintenance -- activities concerned with keeping the physical plant open and keeping the grounds, buildings, and equipment in working condition, and maintaining safetv in buildings and on the grounds;
6) pupil transportation -- activities concerned with the conveyance of pupils to and from school and trips to school activities, including vehicle servicing and maintenance;
7) food services -- providing food to students and staff including preparing and dispensing food;
8) other business services -- these activities include budgeting, receiving and disbursing, financial accounting, payroll, inventory control, duplicating and printing, planning, and data processing services;
9) central support services -- these activities include planning, research, development, public information, and evaluation services; and
10) other support services -- includes any activity not accounted in any of the above functions;
(c) community services -- incudes activities which are not directly related to the provision of education for pupils in the district, such as community recreation programs, civic activities, public libraries, and community welfare activities provided by the district to the community as a whole;
(d) nonprogrammed charges -- includes tuition payments for students attending facilities in other districts, community centers, residential child care facilities, the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind, or Boards of Cooperative Services; and
(e) debt services -- includes interest payments on short-term indebtedness (loans).

Beneath each figure, two percentages are shown. The percentage on the left shows the percentage that the item comprises of the function total in which it is found (its percentage of general adninistration, for example). The percentage on the right depicts the percentage which the item comprises of the object total in which it is located (its percentage of total salaries, for example).

Because of data reporting procedures utilized by the Department of Education, Enterprise, Intra-Intergovernmental, and Trust and Agency funds are not reflected in the attached tables. However, these funds account for an extremely small portion of most districts' budgets. In addition, food service funds were apportioned on the basis of general fund distributions between objects. Student activity funds are, for the purposes of the tables, accounted within the supplies and materials object in the instruction function. Governmental Designated Purpose Grant Funds are included only in the instruction function.

The expenditure figures contained in the tables are not total operating expenses and are inexact in the sense that not all funds are included; but the major funds included are intended to offer a representative flavor of the components of school district budgets.

| Object |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salaries | Employee Benefits | Purchased Seryices | Supplies/ Materials | Capital <br> Outlay | Other <br> Expenses | Transfers | Total |
| INSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ```Total Instruction % Function/% Obj``` | $\frac{3463,575,798}{77.3 / 68.3}$ | $\frac{63.153,041}{10.5 / 62.5}$ | $\$ \frac{7,943,335}{1.3 / 11.4}$ | $\frac{\$ 48.617,959}{8.1 / 65.0}$ | $\frac{\$ 7.183,473}{1.2 / 39.5}$ | $\frac{\$ 2,036,019}{0.3 / 25.1}$ | $\frac{.7 .427 .678}{1.3 / 29.5}$ | $\frac{\$ 599,937,303}{100.0 / 61.5}$ |
| SUPPORT SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pupils | 28,593,467 | 4,078.093 | 921,351 | 710,165 | 120,035 | 101,352 | 191,842 | 34,716,306 |
| \$ Function/ Object | $82.4 / 4.2$ | $11.7 / 4.0$ | - $2.7 / 1.3$ | 2.0/0.9 | 0.4/0.7 | 0.3/1.2 | $0.5 \% 0.8$ | $100.0 / 3.6$ |
| Instructional Staff | 24,295,959 | 3,803,560 | 1,395,840 | 3,718,977 | 794,306 | 239,429 | 20,706 | 34,268,777 |
| \% Function/\%. Object | 70.9/3.6 | $11.0 / 3.8$ | $4.1 / 2.0$ | 10.9/5.0 | 2.3/4.3 | $0.7 / 2.9$ | $0.1 / 0.1$ | 100.0/3.5 |
| General Adainistration | 10,265,148 | 1,480,941 | 4,382,901 | 648,596 3.410 .9 | 360,175 | 1,886,394 | 64,058 | 19,089,213 |
| School Administration | $51,881,805$ | 7,471,047 | 1,237,661 | 658,857 | 373,165 | 259,738 | 18,853 | 61,901,126 |
| \% Function/\% Object | 83.8/7.6 | 12.1/7.4 | 2.0/1.8 | 1.1/0.9 | 0.6/2.1 | $0.4 / 3.3$ | -10.1 | 100.0/6. 3 |
| Operations - Maintenance | 51,646,717 | 7,716,979 | 33,760,676 | 9,889,091 | 2,600,558 | 1,122,655 | 47,895 | 106,784,571 |
| \% Function/\% Object | 48.4/7.6 | $7.2 / 7.6$ | $31.6 / 48.3$ | $9.3 / 13.2$ | 2.4/14.3 | 1.1/13.9 | -10.2 | 100.0/10.9 |
| Pupil Transportation | 18,114,540 | 2,368,087 | 3,591,668 | 5,742,986 | 2,217,740 | 530,030 | 27,233 | 32,592,284 |
| \% Function \% Object | 55.6/2.7 | 7.3/2.3 | $11.0 / 5.1$ | 17.6/7.7 | 6.8/12.2 | 1.6/6.5 | $0.1 / 0.1$ | 100.0/3.3 |
| Food Services | 13,939,125 | 7,386,906 | 992,825 | 3,086,846 | 1,298,721 | 331,330 | 17,061,431 | 44,086,744 |
| \% Function $/ \%$ Object | 31.6/2.1 | 16.8/7.3 | 2.2/1. 4 | $7.0 / 4.1$ | 2.9/7.1 | 0.8/4.1 | 38.7/6'7.7 | 100.0/4.5 |
| Other Business Services | 9,310,905 | 1,889,460 | 3,092,370 | 1,107,373 | 3,011,590 | 862,275 | 5,663 | 19,279,636 |
| \% Function/\% Object | 48.3/1.4 | 9.8/1.9 | 16.0/4.4 | 5.8/1.5 | 15.6/16.5 | $4.5 / 10.6$ | -- | 100.0/2.0 |
| Central Support Services | 6,091,829 | 933.677 | 2,317,434 | 548,914 | 221,750 | 263,448 | -- | 10,377,052 |
| \% Function/\$ Object | 58.710 .8 | 9.1/0.9 | 22.3/3.3 | 5.310.7 | 2.1/1.2 | 2.5/3.2 |  | 100.0/1.1 |
| Other Support Services | 659,591 | 666,004 | 388,319 | 21,906 | 14,070 | 52,340 | 188,937 | 1,991,167 |
| \% Function/\% Object | 33.1/0.1 | 33.4/0.7 | 19.5\%0.6 | 1.1/- | 0.7\%0.1 | 2.710.6 | 9.510 .7 | 100.0/0.2 |
| TOTAL | 214,790,086 | 37.794 .754 | 52,080,505 | 26.133.711 | 11,012,110 | 5,648,991 | 17,626,619. | 365.086 .776 |
| \% Function/\% Object | 58.8/31.6 | 10.4/37.4 | 14.3/74.5 | 7.2/34.9 | 3.0/60.5 | 1.5/69.6 | 4.8/70.0 | 100.0/37.4 |
| COMRUNITY SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Community Services | 514,261 | 63,539 | 484,104 | 35,946 | 4,625 | 149,426 | 125,064 | 1,376,965 |
| \& Function/\% Object | 37.3/0.1 | 4.6/0.1 | $35.2 / 0.7$ | 2.6/0.1 | 0.3/- | $10.9 / 1.8$ | 9.1/0.5 | 100.0/0.1 |
| NONPROGRAMMED CEARGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tuition to Other Districts | -- | -- | 2,577,285 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,577,285 |
| \% Function/\% Object | -- | -- | 100.0/3.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100.0/0.3 |
| BOCS | -- | -- | 5,010,772 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5,010,772 |
| \% Punction/\% Object | -- | -- | $100.0 / 7.2$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100.0/0.5 |
| Other | -- | -- | 1,778,752 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,778,752 |
| \% Function/\% Object | -- | -- | 100.0/2.5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100.6\%0.2 |
| TOTAL | -- | -- | 9,366,809 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,366,809 |
| \% Function/ \% Object |  |  | $100.0 / 13.4$ |  |  |  |  | 100.0/1.0 |
| DEBT SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Debt Services \% Function/\% Object | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\frac{284-206}{100.0 / 3.5}$ | -- | $\frac{284,206}{100.0 /-}$ |
| GRand totals | \$678,880, 145 | \$101,011,334 | \$69,874,753 | \$74,787,616 | \$18,200,208 | \$8,118,642 | \$25,179,361 | \$976,052,059 |
| \% Function/\% Obiest | 69.6/100.0 | 10.3/100.0 | 7.2/100.0 | 7.7/100.0 | 1.9/100.0 | 0.7/100.0 | 2.6/100.0 | 100.0/100.0 |
| ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $)$ |
| $\cdots 1$ | $i$ |  | ( | ' | , 1 |  | ; | $f$ |






Chart II shows the relative proportions of the objects of school district expenditures on a statewide basis. The bar in the center of the chart represents total budgeted operating expenditures, and shows that employee salaries comprise 69.6 percent of local district operating budgets statewide, with employee benefits, supplies/materials, purchased services, and other objects accounting for 10.3 percent, 7.7 percent, 7.2 percent, and 5.2 percent of expenditures respectively. Each of the four pie charts indicate the proportions of the components within each of the expenditure objects. Hence, for example, the salary pie chart shows that 68.3 percent of all salaries paid by local districts were for instructional personnel (teachers) and 31.6 percent for support personnel (principals, janitors, school bus drivers, etc.).


Table VIII displays discernible trends within major objects and functions. Shown on each table is the percentage of the total hudget which the particular object or function comprises for each of the four districts indicated.

When viewed within the object trends, salaries, for example, tend to occupy a larger portion of the budget in larger districts than in smaller districts. General administration, within the function trends, tends to comprise a larger portion of small district budgets than large district budgets.

## Trends in Selected Objects and Functions Expressed As A Percentage of Total Buतnet By Districts

## Districts

Platte
Valley

Groeley | Boulder |
| :---: |
| Valley | Denver

OBJECT

| Salaries | $55.6 \%$ | $68.9 \%$ | $72.0 \%$ | $77.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benefits | 8.7 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 10.4 |
| Purchased Services | 12.3 | 7.6 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| Supplies/Materials | 12.1 | 8.6 | 6.8 | 5.0 |
| Capital Outlay: | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.6 |

## FUNCTION

| Instruction | $56.8 \%$ | $59.8 \%$ | $63.1 \%$ | $62.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Administration | 7.8 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Operations/Maintenance | 14.1 | 13.5 | 11.7 | 10.6 |
| Transportation | 5.2 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 4.2 |
| Support | 41.5 | 39.5 | 36.8 | 37.1 |

## Diseconomies of Scale

Diseconomies of Scale in Small School Districts
Chart III depicts the average per pupil operating expenditures for 1977, by function, for thirteen groups of school districts ranked (from left to right) according to attendance size. The chart generally shows that for all functions, except for school administration, per-pupil costs tend to decrease in relation to increases in district attendance size. The converse relation appears to exist for school administration. Table IX following the bar chart shows the average per-pupil expenditure for each group by function.

Chart III and Table IX show that the average per pupil current operating expense for the state's smallest fourteen schnol districts is more than twice as much ( $101.7 \%$ ) as the average current operating expense for the nine districts in group 11, and more than sixty percent higher ( $62 \%$ ) than the state's two largest districts.


Chart $V$ shows the average per pupil cost of basic educational operating expenses for twenty-one groups of the state's 131 school districts during the 1976-77 school year. For purposes of the chart, basic educational operating expense is defined to be current operating expenses less expenditures for handicapped education, vocational education, transportation, and all federal programs.

Chart $V$ shows that for the 117 districts over 300 ADAE, excluding Denver, basic education costs vary only $\$ 265$ per pupil (from $\$ 1,069$ per pupil to $\$ 1,334$ per pupil), but the total variation for districts with less than 300 ADAE is $\$ 1,112$. The lack of uniformity of Denver with the per pupil basic education operating expenses for districts over 300 ADAE may reflect special circumstances unique to that district and will be discussed in a subsequent section of this report.
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## Diseconomies of Scaile in Small Schools

Based upon actual 1975 total expenditures in the Jefferson County School District, ič appears that per pupil costs are lower in larger schools than they are in smaller schools. Table $X$ indicates that in Jefferson County, elementary schools with enrcllments of greater than 900 students average expenditures of $\$ 817$ per pupil, compared to an average per pupil cost of $\$ 1,050$ in elementary schools with enrollments of less than 250 students (a difference of $\$ 233$ per pupil).

In Jefferson County junior high schools, the difference in average per pupil costs was $\$ 268$ between schools with enrollments of greater than 1,000 students ( $\$ 903$ per pupil) and schools with enrollments of less than 500 students ( $\$ 1,171$ per pupil).

TABLE X
JEFFERSON COUNTY TOTAL EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL BY SIZE OF SCHOOL, 1975

## Elementary Schools

Total Cost Per Pupil

| Enrollment | Low | Hligh |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| less than 250 |  | $\$ 935$ | $\$ 1,174$ |
| $250-399$ | 737 | 1,065 | $\$ 1,050$ |
| $400-649$ | 763 | 965 | 918 |
| $650-399$ | 763 | 909 | 827 |
| more than 900 | 802 | 834 | 822 |
| mana |  | 817 |  |

$\frac{\text { Junior High Schools - }}{\text { Total Cost Per Pupil }}$

| Enrollment | Low | High | Average |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| less than 500 | $\$ 1,119$ | $\$ 1,308$ | $\$ 1,171$ |
| $500-999$ | 896 | 994 | 943 |
| more than 1,000 | 378 | 933 | 903 |

Increases in Per Pupil Operating Expenditures -- 1968 Through 1977

To evaluate increases in per-pupil operating expenditures over the last ten years, it is necessary to compare them to inflationary pressures in the general economy over the same period.

Table XI compares rates of increase in ADAE, per pupil school district operating expenditures, Denver and National Consumer Price indices, average classroom teacher salaries, averaqe state employee salaries, and Colorado and National Hourly Earnings indices.

Figures in column (3) of the table relate only to operating expenditures. Excluded are capital outlay, transfers, debt service, building, and capital reserve funds.

Figures in columns (6) and (7) are average salaries paid to classroom teachers and state employees, and do not include employers' contributions to benefits.

The hourly earnings index figures contained in columns (8) and (9) pertain only to production and non-supervisory personnel employed in the private, non-farm economy.

The table shows that per pupil increases in total operating expenses have increased at a significantly faster rate over the past ten years than other salary and consumer related indices, but that average classroom teacher salaries have risen at a lesser rate than for state employees.


In order to isolate the functions which have accounted for the increases, Table XII shows per pupil operating expenditures by function for the period. Because of changes in accounting and reporting procedures implemented by the Department of Education in 1976, the functions contained on the table do not correspond to functions described elsewhere in this report. A brief summary of functions used in the attached chart is contained below.

| Administration | -- all centralized administrative activities of the district including activities of the Board of Education, legal services, personnel, public relations, business administration, fiscal control, etc. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Instruction | -- all activities at the school level pertaining to instruction of pupils. Included are activities of the principal, assistant principal, teachers, clerical personnel, etc. |
| Pupil Transportation | -- included are all expenses incurred in transporting pupils, such as salaries of supervisors, drivers, mechanics, clerks, contracts with public carriers, insurance, repair parts, gasoline, oil, etc. |
| Operations/Maintenance | -- activities concerned with keeping the physical plant open and keeping grounds, buildings, and equipment in safe working order. |
| Fixed Charges | -- school district contributions to employee retirement, insurance, judgments, rental of land and buildings, and interest on short term loans. |
| Other | -- all other operating expenditures of the district, including pupil activities, attendance services, health services, etc. |

The final column on the table computes the total percentage increase over the period for each function.

TABLE XII
Per Pupil Total Current Operating Expense by Function.
1967-68 Through 1976-77

$\cdots \quad)$
$\{1$

Chart VI compares the level of total current operating expenses per pupil for 1967-68 with the level for 1976-77, and accounts for the increase by function. The shaded portion of the bar depicts the 1967-68 per pupil operating expenditure level. Within each section of the unshaded portion of the bar is found the percentage of the increase from 1967-68 to 1976-77 attributable to each function. Actual dollar per pupil increases by function are shown to the left of the bar. The bar chart shows that instruction and fixed charges account for 74 percent of the per pupil operating expenditure increase from 1967-68 to 1976-77, and operations/maintenance, administration, pupil transportation, and other account for 10 percent, 6 percent, 4 percent, and 6 percent, respectively.


On a statewide average basis, unreimbursed costs of selected mandated state and federal programs of school districts (i.e., special education, vocational education, transportation, employee retirement, unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation) are projected to amount to approximately 20 percent of the ARB in 1979 ( $\$ 170.0$ million out of a total ARB amount for all districts of $\$ 896.3$ million). The largest single component of mandated costs is emplovep retirement benefits ( $\$ 91.6$ million).

Mandated program costs tend to widen the disparity in the ARB between high spending districts and low spending districts. For example, the projected ARB for Washington - Lone Star (the highest spending district) is $\$ 3,363.61$ for 1979. The projected ARB for La Plata - Bayfield (the lowest spending district) is $\$ 1,400.00$ in 1979; a difference of $\$ 1,963.61$. After deducting mandated costs, the remaining ARBs are $\$ 2,567.30$ for Washington - Lone Star and $\$ 1,174.36$ for La Plata - Bayfield; a difference of $\$ 1,392.94$. In this example between the highest and lowest spending districts, mandated costs have increased the disparity in ARB by $\$ 570.67$.

Appendix $C$ at the end of this report contains mandated cost figures and their impact on the ARB for all districts and the state for 1979.

## Denver School District's Unique Needs

The calendar year 1979 general fund operating budget for the Denver public school system is $\$ 168.4$ million ( 48.55 mills ). This represents a 4.4 percent increase over the 1978 budget. llowever, inflation in Denver is estimated to be at an annual rate of 9.0 percent. In order to achieve a no-tax-increase budget, $\$ 3.9$ million was cut from the budget, and 153 staff positions were terminated. The beginning balance for 1979 has decreased to $\$ 2.7$ million (or 1.6 percent of operating expenditures) from a beginning balance of $\$ 9.0 \mathrm{mil}$ lion in 1974.

The Denver school district may be unique in many ways. It contains 9.1 percent of the state's enrollment, but a much larger percentage of students with special educational needs; such as students from low income families, and students with mental or physical handicaps. In addition, 66 percent of the state's black children, 26 percent of the state's Hispanic children, 25 percent of the state's impacted area children, and 35 percent of the state's ADC children, attend school in Denver. As a result, Denver has a much higher percentage of special educational requirements than other districts. In addition, Denver has 31 percent of the state's free and part-pay lunches and 74 percent of the state's free and part-pay breakfasts.

Special education requirements mean lower teacher/pupil ratios which may add to operating costs. The total cost for all special education programs in Denver is estimated at $\$ 13.3$ million. Programs mandated by the state and federal government drive up costs to the district and are only reimburseable at the rate of 50 percent. These special circumstances, in addition to large proportions of teachers at the high end of the salary schedule due to high tenure and high qualifications, and Denver's high pupil transportation costs resulting from court ordered desegregation, may make Denver's financial needs unique among all districts in the state.

## Average Classroom Teacher

## Salaries

School districts with larger pupil attendance tend to have higher average classroom teacher salaries than school districts with smaller attendance. The following table compares average classroom teacher salaries in each of the four attendance quartiles. Each quartile contains approximately 25 percent of the state's average daily attendance entitlement (ADAE). The first quartile contains the two largest school districts (Jefferson and Denver counties), the second quartile contains the next six largest districts, the third quartile contains the next 13 largest districts, and the fourth quartile contains the remaining 160 districts. The more urban districts are found in the first three quartiles and the more rural districts are found in the fourth quartile. The average salary figures are compared for each of the years 1970, 1973, 1974, and 1977.

## YEAR

|  | 1970 | $\underline{1973}$ | $\underline{1974}$ | $\underline{1977}$ | Percent <br> Increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $(1)$ | $\$ 9,542$ | $\$ 11,614$ | $\$ 12,602$ | $\$ 16,871$ | 75.8 |
| $(2)$ | 8,914 | 10,502 | 11,206 | 14,920 | 67.4 |
| $(3)$ | 8,311 | 9,764 | 10,407 | 13,127 | 57.9 |
| $(4)$ | 8,007 | 3,828 | 9,435 | 11,365 | 41.9 |

Fourth
Quartile
As a Per-
cent of
First
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Quartile } & 83.9 & 76.0 & 74.9 & 67.4\end{array}$
In addition to showing the correlation between high salaries and high attendance districts, the figures also indicate that the sal-
aries in the larger attendance districts have increased at a more rapid rate than in the smaller attendance districts. In addition, the figures show that the average salaries in the fourth quartile have decreased as a percentage of the average salaries in the first quartile since 1970. This appears to indicate a widening disparity in average salaries between higher attendance districts and lower attendance districts.

It should be noted, however, that there are several factors which may help to explain the variance in teacher salaries. For example, teachers in the first quartile tend to have more experience, longevity, tenure, and higher qualifications than teachers in the fourth quartile. As a result, teachers in the first quartile would be at a higher end of the pay scale than teachers in the fourth quartile.

The following table compares the average classroom teacher salary pay scales in each of the four attendance quartiles for 1078. The pay scales are divided into four categories; B.A. degree; B.A. degree plus five years experience; M.A. degree; and M.A. deṇree plus five years experience.

1978
$\left.\begin{array}{rrrrr}\text { B.A. } & \text { B.A. }+5 & & \text { M.A. } & \\ & \$ 10,418 & \$ 12,558 & & \$ 11,364\end{array}\right)$

Fourth Quartile As a Percent of First Quartile

$$
87.4
$$

$$
83.0
$$

$$
34.4
$$

76.4

The figures indicate that average classroom teacher salary pay scales in larger attendance districts are higher than in small attendance districts. The disparity is more apparent at the higher degree and experience levels.

In addition, as a general rule, districts with small ADAEs tend to have high ARBs. This would suggest that if all districts were required to adopt identical pay scales, ARB disparities between districts could be expected to increase.

## PROPERTY TAX EFFECTS OF THE ACT

Because two of the goals of the 1973 act were to reduce the reliance of school funding on the property tax and to ease the burden of school finance on the property tax, the committee decided that examination of the effects of the act on property taxes would comprise the next step in its deliberations. In order to examine the property tax effects of the "Public School Finance Act of 1973", the committee selected four areas of inquiry:
(1) evaluation of assessment criteria and Colorado's shifting property tax base;
(2) investigation of the residential property tax effects of the act;
(3) comparison of mill levy levels necessary to fund education in the absence of state revenues with actual 1977 mill levies; and
(4) examination of trends in the property tax and state equalization components of school finance since 1970.

Assessment Criteria and Colorado's Shifting Property Tax Base

Colorado witnessed a substantial increase in the assessed value of property in the state during the period 1966-77. The assessed valuation increased by roughly 150 percent from $\$ 4,232.0 \mathrm{million}$ in 1966, to $\$ 10,686.7$ million in 1977. The major shifts in classes of assessed valuation occurred between residential and agricultural property. Residential property accounted for 40.3 percent of total assessed valuation in 1966 ( $\$ 1,725.4$ million), and rose to 44.8 percent in 1977 ( $\$ 4,790.1 \mathrm{million})$. The reverse trend was true for agricultural land. In 1966, agricultural land accounted for 13.0 percent of total assessed valuation ( $\$ 552.4$ million), while by 1977, this figure had declined to 5.9 percent ( $\$ 631.7$ million). Chart VII illustrates the assessed valuation by class of property for 1966 and 1977.

## Total State Assessed Valuation <br> by Class of Property

(Millions of Dollars)


Total $=\$ 4,232.1$ million

1977


Total $=\$ 10,686.7$ million

## Residential Property Tax Effects

 of the ActIn an attempt to show the property tax effects of the "Public School Finance Act of 1973" and S.B. No. 25 of 1978, the percentage of per capita adjusted gross income (AGI) comprised of property taxes paid on residential property was examined. The figures were based on a selected 20 county basis (AGI figures were not available on a school district basis, except for 1975), and the state average was also determined.

Table XIII was computed for the period 1972-77, and statewide averages were projected three additional years through 1980. It indicates that the residential school property tax declined as a percentage of per capita AGI from approximately 1.46 percent in 1972 , to 1.37 percent in 1977, on a statewide basis (there was a large decline between 1973 and 1974, the initial year of the act's impact, from 1.42 to 1.06 percent, and then an increase and leveling off trend through 1977). When projected through 1980, the statewide averages indicate an estimated decline in the percentage of per capita AGI to 1.11 percent in 1980. Although the statewide average figures contained on Chart VIII for 1978-80 are based upon projections, they appear to indicate that the act is providing residential property tax relief.

|  | Residential School Property Tax Burden As A Percentage Of Per Capita Adjusted Gross Income |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | $\begin{gathered} \text { CY } \\ 1972 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CY } \\ 1973 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CY } \\ 1974 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C Y \\ 1975 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C Y \\ 1976 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CY } \\ 1977 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Adams | 1.56 | 1.50 | 0.85 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.09 |
| Arapahoe | 1.83 | 1.77 | 1.22 | 1.43 | 1.54 | 1.42 |
| Boulder | 1.77 | 1.71 | 1.15 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.30 |
| Conejos | 0.68 | 0.63 | 0.45 | 0.59 | 0.53 | 0.87 |
| Denver | 1.41 | 1.40 | 1.18 | 1.40 | 1.31 | 1.27 |
| El Paso | 1.82 | 1.82 | 1.53 | 1.81 | 1.83 | 1.73 |
| Jefferson | 1.71 | 1.73 | 1.01 | 1.41 | 1.39 | 1.78 |
| Kit Carson | 0.60 | 0.46 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 1.13 |
| Larimer | 1.71 | 1.67 | 1.14 | 1.45 | 1.33 | 1.41 |
| Las Animas | 0.67 | 0.86 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 0.87 | 1.01 |
| Logan | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.70 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 0.96 |
| Mesa | 1.50 | 1.36 | 0.78 | 0.84 | 0.74 | 0.84 |
| Phillips | 0.57 | 0.46 | 0.32 | 0.40 | 0.45 | 0.58 |
| Pitkin | 1.69 | 1.72 | 1.44 | 1.87 | 1.91 | 2.43 |
| Pueblo | 1.27 | 1.22 | 0.81 | 0.96 | 1.11 | 1.14 |
| Rio Blanco | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.27 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.24 |
| San Miguel | 0.65 | 0.96 | 0.90 | 1.38 | 2.25 | 2.04 |
| Washington | 0.36 | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 0.47 |
| Weld | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.52 | 0.64 | 0.61 | 0.79 |
| Yuma | 0.66 | 0.52 | 0.38 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.78 |
| STATE | 1.46 | 1.42 | 1.06 | 1.30 | 1.28 | 1.37 |

NOTE: Using projected individual adjusted gross income, population, and school property tax revenue figures on a statewide basis only, the percentage of per capita adjusted gross income figures for calendar years 1978, 1979, and 1980 would be 1.31, 1.16, and 1.11, respectively. These are shown as broken lines on the attached bar graph.


> Mill Levy Levels Necessary to Fund
> Education in the Absence of State Revenues

In the absence of state revenues for school finance purposes, the number of mills most districts would have to levy to fund the same programs each year would increase dramatically over existing levels. In 1977, in terms of actual mills levied, all 181 districts fell within a mill levy range of $1-60$ mills and nearly 100 districts were concentrated in the $30-40$ mill levy range. In the absence of state aid, the mill levy range would have expanded to $1-270$, with less than 20 districts in the $30-40$ mill levy range. Chart IX illustrates this frequency distribution, and a district breakdown of estimated general fund mill levies in the absence of state revenues appears at the end of this report as Appendix D.

Appendix $E$ at the end of this report divides total state revenues per district into two components: receipts from the general equalization program, and categorical, grant and other miscellaneous receipts. Appendix $F$ is a frequency distribution differentiating state school aid for 1977 into state equalization and categorical program support.


> Trends in the Property Tax and State Equalization Components of School Finance Since 1970

During the period 1970-78, state equalization payments have risen to a level nearly equal to local property tax revenues as a percentage of total school district general fund budgeted expenditures. These two sources have accounted for approximately 80-84 percent of total school district general fund budgeted expenditures during the nine year period, with the remaining $16-20$ percent made up of state categorical grants and other state funds, other local funds, and federal funds. State equalization payments have risen most dramatically since 1974, the initial year of the impact of the "Public School Finance Act of 1973".

Since 1970, state equalization payments have risen by 209.7 percent, compared with an increase in local property tax revenues of 97.1 percent (the increase on a dollars per pupil basis is 195.7 percent and 88.2 percent, respectively). State equalization payments have increased to account for approximately 37.6 percent of total school district general fund budgeted expenditures in 1978 (compared to 30.5 percent in 1970), while local property tax revenues have decreased to approximately 42.1 percent (compared to 53.7 percent in 1970). Table XIV indicates total dollars, dollars per ADAE, and percent of total general fund budgeted expenditures for state equalization payments and general fund property tax revenues during the period 1970-78.

| Comparison of State Equalization and |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Property tax as a Percentage of Total School District General |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Fund Budgeted Expenditures }}{1970-1978}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| (\$ in Millions of Dollars; \$/ADAE in Dollars) |  |  |  |
| Total School <br> District General <br> Fund Budgeted <br> Expendjtures |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | State | General Fund |
|  |  | Equalization | Property Tax |
| 1970 |  |  |  |
| \$ | 413.5 | 126.1 | 222.2 |
| \% | 100.0 | 30.5 | 53.7 |
| \$/adal | 826.39 | 251.98 | +44.00 |
| 1971 472.6 235.1 |  |  |  |
| \% | 4100.0 | 139.0 | 54.1 |
| \$/ADAE 920.72 267.02 498.00 |  |  |  |
| 1972 201 238.1 |  |  |  |
| \$ | 521.1 | 138.1 | 293.1 |
| \$/ADAE | 990.32 | 262.53 | 557.00 |
| $\frac{1973}{4} \quad 579.2160 .3$ 315.5 |  |  |  |
| \$ | 579.2 100.0 | 160.3 27.7 | 315.5 54.5 |
| \$/ADAE | $\xrightarrow{1,084.84}$ | 300.19 | 591.00 |
|  |  |  |  |
| \% | 656.3 100.0 | 277.9 42.3 | 38.8 |
| \$/ADAE | 1,233.01 | 522.11 | 477.97 |
| 1975 |  |  |  |
| \% | 756.4 100.0 | 295.5 39.1 | 313.5 41.5 |
| \$/ADAE | 1,428.32 | 558.00 | 592.09 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\frac{1976}{5} & 866.9 & 340.3 & 354.7\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| \% | $\begin{aligned} & 866.9 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 340.3 39.3 | 354.7 40.9 |
| \$/ADAE | 1,643.56 | 645.14 | 672.49 |
| 1977 936. 342.6 |  |  |  |
| \% | 936.9 100.0 | 342.6 36.6 | 43.9 |
| \$/ADAE | 1,778.07 | 650.30 | 780.38 |
| 1978 2905 437.9 |  |  |  |
| $\$$ | $1,039.3$ 100.0 | 390.5 37.6 | 437.9 42.1 |
| \$/ADAE | 1,982.88 | 745.01 | 835.50 |
| Total Percent |  |  |  |
| Increase in |  |  |  |
| \$ Over Period | 151.3 | 209.7 | 97.1 |
| Average Annual |  |  |  |
| Percent Increase in Over Period | e 12.2 | 15.2 | 8.8 |
| Total Percent |  |  |  |
| Increase in |  |  |  |
| Period | 139.9 | 195.7 | 88.2 |
| Average Annual |  |  |  |
| Percent Increase |  |  |  |
| in \$/ADAE |  |  |  |
| Over Period | 11.6 | 14.5 | 8.2 |

## ANALYSIS OF SELECTED COMPONENTS <br> OF THE SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEM

Subsequent to its examination of the background, workings, and effects of the act, the committee focused its attention on four components of the school finance system:
(1) The capital reserve fund;
(2) small attendance center aid;
(3) cost of the minimum state guarantee; and
(4) cost of stabilizing the statewide average mill levy for the 1981 and 1982 budget years.

> | Analysis of the |
| :--- |
| Capital Reserve Fund |

## History and Provisions

School districts in Colorado were first authorized to establish a capital reserve fund in 1945 for the purpose of paying the costs of long-range building programs (L. 45, p. 610, Sec. 1). The fund contained revenues raised from a tax levy limited to no more than one mill per year on property in the district (L. 45, p. 611, Sec. 2). In 1964, the mill levy limit was raised to two mills (L. 64, p. 538, Sec. 1). The mill levy was raised to its current level of not more than four mills per year in 1973 (L. 73, p. 1239, Sec. 1). The fund may also contain revenues from gifts, donations and tuition receipts.

Expenditures from the capital reserve fund are limited to longrange future programs and for the following purposes only:
(1) acquisition of 1 and and construction of structures on such land, or acquisition of land with existing structures thereon (the latter provision was added by L. 73, p. 1292, sec. 1);
(2) construction of additions to existing structures;
(3) procurement of equipment for new buildings and additions to existing buildings;
(4) alterations and improvements to existing structures where the total cost is in excess of $\$ 5,000$;
(5) acquisition of school buses or other equipment with a cost in excess of $\$ 2,500$ per unit (L. 65, p. 1026, sec. 3 lowered the maximum cost from $\$ 5,000$ per unit to $\$ 2,500$ per unit); and
(6) installment purchase or lease agreements with an option to purchase for a period of at least one year but not more than five years (this provision was added by L. 77, p. 1051, sec. 4 and 5).

The expenditure of monies from the fund must be authorized by a resolution adopted by the board of education of a school district (in the case of installment purchase or lease aqreements not to exceed five years, authorization must also be by a majority vote of the qualified electors in the district). Any balance in the fund remaining after completion of a project may be encumbered for future projects.

Case Law: Does the State Have a Constitutional Obligation to Fund Capital Programs?

Several court decisions discussed earlier in this report concerning school finance cases touch upon the question of whether there are constitutional requirements applicable to capital expenditures, as well as operating expenditures. The constitutional provisions on which those cases rest are primarily state education clauses and equal protection requirements.

Only one of those cases, the New Jersey case of Robinson $\mathbf{v}$. Cahill, 62 N.J. 473, 303 A.2d 273 (1973), clearly holds that the state is required to fund capital projects on an equalized basis. That decision was based upon the state's duty to assure a "thorough and efficient system of free public schools". For at least a century, capital expenditures had been funded entirely from the local property tax, separately from other expenditures. The court did not analyze the issue of capital expenditures in detail but simply stated:
"We have discussed the existing scene in terms of current operating expenses. The State's obligation includes as well the capital expenditures without which the required educational opportunity could not be provided."

$$
303 \text { A.2d, at } 297
$$

Shile alluding to the problems posed for school districts by the need for capital projects, other cases do not treat the issue of the state's obligation directly. Under the finance plan struck down in Serrano v. Priest II, 18 Cal.3d _, 557 P.2d 929, 135 Cal.Rptr. 345 (1976), expenditures for repaying bonded indebtedness and state aid loans for capital projects were apparently subject to statutory revenue limits. Voter approval to levy a property tax in excess of such limits was required. The court pointed out that wealthier school districts (measured by assessed valuation per pupil) which voted to override the limit could generate greater revenues at a given tax rate than poorer districts, thus perpetuating the wealth-caused inequalities between districts. Moreover, relatively poor districts could not raise as many capital funds within their bonding capacities as richer districts; thus they were compelled to resort to state loans for capital projects. Poor districts were therefore more likely to be
in the position of seeking to override revenue limits for repayment of such loans. These factors provided additional grounds for holding the voter override provisions of the California law unconstitutional under the equal protection clause of the California constitution.

The Supreme Courts of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington seemed to say, very indirectly, that the education clauses of those states' constitutions do not require the state to fund, or to equalize the funding, of capital programs.
(1) The Idaho Supreme Court in Thompson v. Engelking, 96 Idaho 793, 537 P.2d 634 (1975), while upholding the state's foundation act (which did not provide funds for capital construction), noted that the Idaho education clause "does not guarantee to the children of this state a right to be educated in such a manner that all services and facilities are equal throughout the State." 537 P.2d, at 647.
(2) The court in 01sen v. State, 276 Or. 9, 554 P. 2d 139 (1976), pointed out that the plaintiffs did not raise the issue of whether the education clause required equality in areas other than "educational opportunities", for example, in physical facilities. It then stated:
"Because of plaintiffs' regard for local control of education, we assume they do not believe uniformity is required in other areas. We cannot determine any logical difference between uniformity in finances and uniformity in other areas."

554 P.2d, at 148
Thus it is implied (although it cannot be said to be held, since the issue was not litigated) that the state has no obligation to equalize the facilities themselves, and presumably the financing thereof, just as it had no duty to assure that the amounts available for operating expenses approach equality.
(3) Only the dissenters in Northshore School District No. 417 v. Kinnear, 84 Wash.2d 685, 530 P. 2 d 178 (1975), touched on the issue of capital construction. In contrast to the majority, which held that Washington's foundation act discharged "the paramount duty of the state to make ample provision for the education of all children" as required by the education clause, the dissenters would have held the act invalid under that clause. Justice Stafford would have found that children living in districts "having an inadequate tax base to support even operating and maintenance budgets" cannot be said to have had ample provision made for their education. (Emphasis supplied.) 530 P.2d, at 221. Justice Utter, also dissenting, stated what he felt to be the state's obligation very clearly:
"These sections impose a duty on the State government to directly finance at least the basic operation and maintenance budget of the schools."

530 P.2d, at 224

Citing these dissenting opinions, the trial court in Seattle School District No. 1 of King County, Washington v. State of Washington, Na. 53950 (Thurston County Superior Court, Jan. 14, 1977), found that Washington's then-existing school finance plan (which was apparently somewhat different and was being contested on different grounds than in Northshore) was invalid under the state education clause. The trial judge endorsed the "operating and maintenance" obligation proposed in the Northshore dissents and did not hold that the state had an additional duty in the area of capital construction. In defining the content of a basic program of education, which he held the state was required to fund, he referred to legislation enacted in 1973 which set forth a definition of basic education which did not include capital programs. Since Washington has a separate grant program to aid local districts with their capital projects (see Memorandum No. 3), the fact that the court's holding does not include a capital construction component may not be significant.

It appears that the issue of the state's obligation with respect to capital construction, if any, has not been treated as a separate concept in the cases litigating school finance issues. The cases have focused mainly on laws which govern state aid only for operating expenses. In New Jersey, capital expenditures have been held subject to the same constitutional requirements as apply to operating expenses. On the other hand, other cases have indirectly upheld the absence of a capital construction component from foundation plans. Therefore, the constitutional obligation of the state as to capital construction remains undefined.

## Growth in Use of the Fund

The maximum number of mills that can be levied by a school district for use in its capital reserve fund was raised from two to four beginning in calendar year 1974. The table which appears below shows the number of districts levying the maximum and zero mills for 1973, 1974, and 1978, with the percentage of the total number of districts that that figure represents.

| Year | Maximum | \% of Total | Zero | \% of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1973 | 152 | 84.0 | 9 | 5.0 |
| 1974 | 131 | 72.4 | 7 | 3.9 |
| 1978 | 137 | 75.7 | 5 | 2.8 |

The table indicates that the number of districts levying the maximum number of mills decreased from 152 to 131 between 1973 and 1974, but that was when the maximum changed from two to four mills per year. Since 1974, the number of districts levying the maximum of four mills per year has increased from 131 to 137 (a 4.6 percent increase). The number of districts levying zero mills has declined from 9 in 1973 to 5 in 1978 (a 44.1 percent decrease). On a statewide basis, the average number of mills levied has increased from 3.30 in 1974 to 3.67
in 1978 (an 11.2 percent increase). This appears to indicate that the use of the capital reserve fund has been gradually increasing.

Mill Levies, Dollars/Pupil/Mill, and Type of District
The attached Appendix $G$ contains figures which represent the following information for each district for 1978:
(1) the number of mills levied for use in the capital reserve fund;
(2) the dollars per pupil (ADAE) that one mill will raise; and
(3) in terms of enrollment, whether the district is an increasing, stable, or declining district.

The figures indicate that of the 176 districts that levied mills in 1978, 40 were increasing enrollment districts ( $22.7 \%$ ), 17 were stable enrollment districts (9.7\%), and 119 were declining enrollment districts ( $67.6 \%$ ). Of the five districts that did not levy any mills in 1978, one was an increasing enrollment district and four were declining enrollment districts. The figures further breakdown as follows:

| Number of Mills | Number of Districts | $\%$ of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 5 | 2.8 |
| 0.1-0.9 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1-1.9 | 8 | 4.4 |
| 2-2.9 | 17 | 9.4 |
| 3-3.9 | 13 | 7.2 |
| 4 | 137 | $\frac{75.7}{100.0}$ |
|  | 181 | 100.0 |

Spending/Saving Fund
In an attempt to determine whether school districts are spending monies in the capital reserve fund on a "pay-as-you-go" basis each year or whether they are saving a certain amount each year and accumulating it for future spending, the committee staff examined the beginning fund balance of each district for calendar year 1978 and computed that as a percentage of the total amount of revenue in the fund for the year. The beginning fund balance is referred to as "carryover" from the preceding year. Those districts with a high percentage of carryover can be assumed to be saving the monies in the fund (at least for one year), and those districts with a low percentage of carryover can be assumed to be spending the monies in the fund (once again, at least for one year).

The attached Appendix $H$ contains figures representing the 1978 beginning balance in the capital reserve fund (or carryover) as a percentage of the estimated total revenues in the fund for that year. Only seven districts spent the entire amount of monies in the fund during 1977, and hence have no carryover. The percentage figures breakdown as follows:

Carryover as a
\% of Estimated
Total Revenue

| Number of Districts |  | $\%$ of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 |  | 14.4 |
| 16 |  | 12.9 |
| 23 | 7.7 |  |
| 14 | 15.5 |  |
| 28 | 10.5 |  |
| 19 | 14.4 |  |
| 26 | 8.8 |  |
| 16 | 3.3 |  |
| 6 | 100.9 |  |

The above figures are illustrated graphically on Chart $X$. The vertical axis represents the number of districts in groupings of five, and the horizontal axis represents the carryover as a percentage of estimated total revenue in deciles.

## Carryover As A Percentage of

Estimated Total Revenue of
Capital Reserve Fund, 1978


Districtr with low assessed valuations per pupil per mill appear to be levying the maximum number of mills for use in the capitol reserve fund to the same or higher degree as all districts statewide. Property wealth does not appear to be a factor in levying mills for use in the fund. For 1978, 53 districts have an assessed valuation per pupil per mill of less than $\$ 15.00$. Of that number, 44 -- or 83.0 percent -- are levying the maximum number of four mills. This compares with a statewide total of 137 -- or 57.7 percent -levying the maximum.

Smal1 Attendance Center Aid

## Provisions

Definition. Section 22-50-113, Colorado Revised Statutes 1973, provides a mechanism for granting additional state assistance to qualified school districts which operate one or more small attendance centers. A small attendance center is defined as an elementary or secondary school with fewer than one hundred seventy-five pupils enrolled.

Criteria. Each attendance center is entitled to receive the state assistance provided by the statutory formula if:

1) the center is twenty or more miles from a similar attendance center; or
2) the center is twenty or more miles from a similar attendance center within the district if the district has been reorganized under either the "School District Reorganization Act of 1949" or the "School District Organization Act of 1965".

Bonus pupils. The additional state aid provided the districts is based upon the number of bonus pupils in attendance in small attendance centers derived as follows:

Step 1- the attendance entitlement of the center is determined in the same fashion as for general equalization support;

Step 2 - the attendance entitlement derived from step 1 is then multiplied by a statutory factor; I/ and

Step 3- the product from step 2 is reduced by the attendance entitlement from step 1, and the resulting sum then represents the "bonus pupils" for which the district qualifies.

17 The bonus pupil formula is contained in section 22-50-113 (2) (a).

For example, if a district has an elementary small attendance center containing 67 children ( $A E$ ), the bonus pupils for that center would be computed as follows:

Step 1 Statutory Formula
Elementary
(Grades 1-6 or 1-8)

| AE | Factor |  | Maximum <br> Allowed |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-20$ | Al low 24 |  | 24 |  |
| $20.1-50$ | 1.2 | 55 |  |  |
| $50.1-80$ | 1.1 |  | 84 | 67 times $1.1=$ |
| $80.1-115$ | 1.05 | 120 | 73.7 |  |
| $115.1-150$ | 1.04 | 150 |  |  |

## Step 2

73.7 (Product from step 1)
minus 67.0 (Attendance entitlement) equals $\overline{6.7}$

## Step 3

Bonus pupils from all such centers in the district are added together, and the sum is then funded as provided by law.

Funding. State small attendance center aid is provided to each of the qualified districts for each bonus pupil according to the lesser of the following computations:

1) the district's ARB; or
2) the district's general fund mill levy times the state guarantee.

For example, if a district had a 1978 general fund mill levy of 27.31 mills (in the case of a district on the minimum guarantee) and a $\$ 1,500.00 \mathrm{ARB}$, the following computations would ensue:

1) $\mathrm{ARB}=\$ 1,500.00$
2) $\begin{array}{cr}\text { State guarantee } & \$ 35.00 \\ \text { times mill levy } & \frac{27.31}{} \\ \text { Equals } & \$ 955.85\end{array}$

Since $\$ 955.35$ is the lesser of the two figures, it is used for funding purposes.

If the elementary small attendance center exemplified in the bonus pupil illustration above were the only small attendance center in the district, and the district's $A R B$ of $\$ 1,500.00$, mill levy of
27.31 mills , and $\$ 35.00$ guarantee illustrated above were assumed, the district would receive state small attendance center aid as calculated below:

```
Bonus pupils
times entitlement
        Equals
```

```
    6.7
```

    6.7
    $955.85
    $955.85
    \$6,404.20 total state small
\$6,404.20 total state small
attendance center aid

```
attendance center aid
```

Other provisions. The law also provides for a phasedown of small attendance center aid if an otherwise qualified district reogranizes and, hence, is no longer qualified under the provision.

Other provisions specify that, in cases when state appropriations for small attendance center aid do not fully fund district entitlements, districts receive amounts apportioned on a pro rata basis; and that certification by a district of the information required under the provision constitutes automatic application for small attendance center support.

## Financial Information

Nearly one-half of the school districts in the state are receiving small attendance center (SAC) aid (between 87 and 89 districts per year since fiscal year 1973-74). Total statewide SAC receipts have risen from $\$ 1.3$ million in FY $1973-74$, to $\$ 3.2 \mathrm{million}$ in FY 1977-78. On a dollar per bonus pupil basis, SAC receipts have increased from $\$ 494.80$ in FY 1973-74, to $\$ 1,152.82$ in FY 1977-78.

Some districts receive more state financial assistance from small attendance center aid than from state equalization payments (between 8 and 12 districts since FY 1974-75). If the amount of small attendance center aid were added to the average ARB of those districts receiving the aid, the ARB would have increased by approximately 2.7 percent per year since FY 1974-75.

Appendix I at the end of this report provides the followina information concerning small attendance center aid for FY 1973-74 through FY 1977-78:
(1) the number of districts receiving small attendance center aid;
(2) total small attendance center aid receipts;
(3) number of bonus pupils;
(4) SAC dollars per bonus pupil;
(5) SAC dollars per attendance entitlement (AE);
(6) state equalization (SE) dollars per AE;
(7) ARB;
(8) number of districts receiving greater SAC \$/AE than SE \$/AE; and
(9) $S A C$ \$/AE as a percentage of ARB.

> Cost of the Minimum Guarantee

If the minimum state guarantee were eliminated and all school districts were placed under the general equalization program, the amount of state equalization would decrease and the number of mills levied by those districts currently on the minimum would increase through 1982 (under S.B. No. 25). In 1979, the projected state equalization decrease would be approximately $\$ 8.4$ million, with an average projected statewide mill levy increase of 0.7 mills per district. In 1982, the projected decrease in state equalization would be approximately $\$ 25.2$ million, with an average projected statewide mill levy increase of 1.81 mills per district.

Table XV provides state equalization property tax and mill levy figures under S.B. No. 25 with and without the minimum guarantee for the period 1979-82. Appendix $J$ at the end of this report contains simulations of S.B. No. 25 without the minimum guarantee on a district and statewide basis for all four years of the period.

TABLE XV
S.B. No. 25

| Year | Mill | PT | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1979 | 37.78 | \$435.188 | \$460.093 |
| 1980 | 38.13 | 466.682 | 510.849 |
| 1981 | 41.94 | 546.565 | 510.936 |
| 1982 | 45.16 | 62.8 .463 | 510.344 |

S.B. No. 25 Without Minimum

| Year | Mil1 | PT | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1979 | 38.51 | $\$ 443.614$ | $\$ 451.667$ |
| 1980 | 38.86 | 475.606 | 501.924 |
| 1981 | 42.73 | 556.922 | 500.530 |
| 1982 | 46.97 | 653.701 | 485.605 |

## Difference

| Year |  | Mill |  | PT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | SE | SE |  |
| 1979 | 0.73 |  | $\$ 8.426$ | $(\$ 8.426)$ |
| 1980 | 0.73 |  | 8.924 | $(8.925)$ |
| 1981 | 0.79 |  | 10.357 | $(10.356)$ |
| 1982 | 1.81 |  | 25.238 | $(25.239)$ |

## Cost of Stabilizing the Statewide Average Mill Levy in 1981 and 1982

In order to stabilize the statewide average mill levy in 1981 and 1982 at the estimated 1980 level of 38.13 mills, state equalization payments would have to increase from $\$ 510.8$ million in 1980 , to $\$ 560.6$ million in 1981 , and to $\$ 608.7 \mathrm{million}$ in 1982 . That would amount to a $\$ 49.6 \mathrm{million}$ increase in 1981 over the current S.B. No. 25 level for 1981 , and a $\$ 97.8$ million increase in 1982 over the current S.B. No. 25 level for 1982.

Table XVI compares the cost components and mill levies which would be generated by stabilizing the statewide average mill levy for 1981 and 1982 under S.B. No. 25. Simulations of S.B. No. 25 with a stabilized statewide average mill levy for 1981 and 1982 are attached as Appendix K.

TABLE XVI

Current S.B. No. 25

| Year | Guarantee | Mill | PT | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1979 | \$ 42.25 | 37.78 | \$435.188 | \$460.093 |
| 1980 | 45.85 | 38.13 | 466.682 | 510.849 |
| 1981 | 44.57 | 41.94 | 546.565 | 510.936 |
| 1982 | 43.05 | 45.16 | 628.463 | 510.844 |

S.B. No. 25 with Stabilized Levy for 1981 and 1982

| Year | Guarantee | Mill | PT | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1979 | \$ 42.25 | 37.78 | \$435.188 | \$460.093 |
| 1980 | 45.85 | 38.13 | 466.682 | 510.849 |
| 1981 | 49.59 | 38.13 | 496.945 | 560.557 |
| 1982 | 53.27 | 38.13 | 530.651 | 608.654 |

Difference

| Year | Guarantee | Mill | PT | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1979 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1930 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1981 | \$ 5.02 | (3.81) | \$(49.60) | \$ 49.621 |
| 1932. | 10.22 | (7.03) | (97.812 | 97.810 |

APPENDICES

## APPENDIX

## $\frac{\text { SIMULATION OF THE "PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF } 1973^{\prime \prime}-\text { COMPARISON OF }}{\text { ACT WITHOUT S.B. NO. } 25 \text { AND WITH SB.B. NO. } 25}$

## ASSUMPTIONS:

Without S.B. NO. 25
1978 -- Guarantee $\$ 35.00$; Minimum $=\$ 11.35$; ARB Increase $=\$ 120.00$ (Includes SSDBRB Changes) 1979 -- Guarantee $=\$ 35.00 ;$ Minimum $=\$ 11.35 ;$ ARB Increase $=7 \%$
S.B. NO. 25

1979 -- Guarantee $=\$ 42.25$; Minimum $=\$ 11.35 / \$ 12.35$; ARB Increase $=\$ 130.00$; Minimum ARB $=\$ 1400.00$
$1980-$ Guarantee $=\$ 45.85$; Minimum $=\$ 11.35 / \$ 13.35 ;$ ARB Increase $=\$ 140.00$; Minimum ARB $=\$ 1600.00$ $1981-$ Guarantee $=\$ 44.57$; Minimum $=\$ 11.35 / \$ 13.35$; ARB Increase $=\$ 150.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1800.00$ 1982 -- Guarantee $=\$ 4.05 ;$ Minimum $=\$ 11.35 / \$ 13.35 ;$ ARB Increase $=\$ 160.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1800.00$







|  |  |  | AV |  | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CONEJOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | South Conejos w/O SB No. 25 | 1978 | \$ | 4.772 | 750.0 | 782.1 | \$1181.08 |  | \$ |  | \$ | .161 | \$.072 | \$. 000 | 6.10 |  |
|  |  | 1979 | - | 4.610 | 706.1 | 750.0 | $\$ 1263.76$ | 36.11 |  | .781 |  | . 166 | . 073 | . 0000 | 6.15 | 28.85 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 4.610 | 706.1 | 750.0 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | . 897 |  | . 153 | . 073 | . 000 | 6.15 | 36.10 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 4.625 | 664.8 | 707.0 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 970 |  | .161 | . 073 | . 000 | 6.54 | 39.31 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 4.640 | 625.9 | 665.6 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 1.011 |  | . 187 | . 074 | . 000 | 6.97 | 37.60 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 4.655 | 589.3 | 626.7 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 1.016 |  | . 212 | . 075 | . 000 | 7.43 | 35.62 |
|  | COSTILLA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | W/O SB No. 25 | $1978$ |  | $11.402$ | $676.8$ | $617.8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1257.44 \\ & 1345.46 \end{aligned}$ | 35.93 38.44 |  | $\begin{array}{r} .367 \\ .363 \end{array}$ |  | . 410 | .043 .043 | . 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 18.46 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.54 \\ & 15.30 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 12.169 | 569.4 | 617.8 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | . 462 |  | . 403 | . 043 | . 000 | 19.70 | 22.55 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 12.500 | 524.8 | 570.7 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 477 |  | . 436 | . 044 | . 000 | 21.90 | 23.95 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 12.840 | 483.7 | 526.0 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 428 |  | . 519 | . 045 | . 000 | 24.41 | 20.16 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 13.190 | 445.8 | 484.8 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 350 |  | . 601 | . 045 | . 000 | 27.21 | 15.84 |
|  | Sierra Grande W/0 SB No. 25 | 1978 |  |  |  | 281.3 | 1549.37 |  |  | . 075 |  | . 361 | . 009 | . 013 | 49.48 |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 15.552 | 270.2 | 281.3 | 1657.83 | 24.88 |  | . 079 |  | .387 | . 009 | . 000 | 55.29 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 15.552 | 270.2 | 281.3 | 1680.07 | 24.84 |  | . 086 |  | . 386 | . 009 | . 000 | 55.29 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 16.200 | 259.5 | 270.3 | 1820.07 | 24.84 |  | . 090 |  | . 402 | . 009 | . 000 | 59.93 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 16.875 | 249.2 | 259.6 | 1970.07 | 25.15 |  | . 087 |  | . 424 | . 009 | . 000 | 65.00 | 13.35 |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | 1982 |  | 17.578 | 239.3 | 249.3 | 2130.07 | 25.40 |  | . 085 |  | . 447 | . 009 | . 000 | 70.50 | 13.35 |
|  | CROWLEY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crowloy } \\ & \text { W/O SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 10.701 | 541.8 | 600.4 | 1272.01 | 36.34 |  | . 375 |  | . 389 | . 020 | . 000 | 17.82 |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 10.259 | 508.0 | 550.1 | 1361.05 | 38.89 |  | . 350 |  | . 399 | . 021 | . 000 | 18.65 | 16.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 10.259 | 508.0 | 550.1 | 1403.67 | 33.22 |  | . 431 |  | . 341 | . 021 | . 000 | 18.65 | 23.60 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 10.515 | 476.3 | 508.7 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 447 |  | . 367 | . 022 | . 000 | 20.67 | 25.18 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 10.777 | 446.6 | 477.0 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 423 |  | .435 | . 022 | . 000 | 22.60 | 21.97 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 11.046 | 418.8 | 447.2 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 374 |  | . 503 | . 023 | . 000 | 24.70 | 18.35 |
|  | CUSTER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Consolidated 1 W/O SB No. 25 |  |  |  |  |  | 1494.01 |  |  | . 064 |  | . 281 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 11.776 | 259.7 | 259.7 | 1598.59 | 28.20 |  | . 083 |  | . 332 | . 003 | . 013 | 45.34 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 11.776 | 259.7 | 259.7 | 1624.12 | 28.15 |  | . 090 |  | . 331 | . 003 | . 014 | 45.34 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 12.070 | 292.1 | 292.1 | 1764.12 | 32.27 |  | . 126 |  | . 389 | . 002 | . 017 | 41.32 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 1982 |  | 12.371 12.680 | 328.5 369.4 | 328.5 369.4 | 1914.12 2074.12 | 37.52 43.51 |  | . 165 |  | . 464 | . 001 | . 021 | 37.66 34.32 | 13.35 13.35 |
|  | $\frac{\text { DELTA }}{\text { Delta }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | W/O SB No. 25 | 1978 |  | 59.031 | 3924.2 | 4019.9 | 1216.83 | 34.77 |  | 2.839 |  | 2.052 | . 102 | . 000 | 14.68 | 20.32 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 70.889 | 3905.6 | 3949.9 | 1302.01 | 37.20 |  | 2.506 |  | 2.637 | . 103 | . 000 | 17.95 | 17.05 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 70.889 | 3905.6 | 3949.9 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 3.181 |  | 2.349 | . 103 | . 000 | 17.95 | 24.30 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 78.000 | 3887.1 | 3905.6 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | 3.527 |  | 2.722 | . 104 | . 000 | 19.97 | 25.88 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 85.824 94.433 | 3868.7 3850.4 | 38878 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | 3.2817 |  | 3.466 4.299 | :104 | :000 | $24: 41$ | 18.49 |



|  |  |  |  | AV | $\triangle \underline{D A}$ | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | L. ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ELBERT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${\underset{\mathrm{BIg}}{\mathrm{B} / 0 \mathrm{SB}} \mathrm{Sanc}_{\mathrm{No}} .25}$ | 1978 | \$ | 5.489 | 257.3 | 283.0 | \$1405.24 | 40.15 | \$ | . 177 | \$ | . 220 | \$.003 | \$.000 | 19.40 | 15.60 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 5.615 | 262.2 | 267.5 | 1503.61 | 42.96 |  | . 161 |  | . 241 | . 003 | . 000 | 20.99 | 14.01 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 5.615 | 262.2 | 267.5 | 1534.45 | 36.32 |  | . 207 |  | . 204 | . 003 | . 000 | 20.99 | 21.26 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 5.615 | 267.2 | 267.2 | 1674.45 | 36.52 |  | . 242 |  | . 205 | .003 | . 000 | 21.01 | 24.84 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 5.615 | 272.3 | 272.3 | 1824.45 | 40.93 |  | . 267 |  | . 230 | . 003 | . 000 | 20.62 | 23.95 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 5.615 | 277.5 | 277.5 | 1984.45 | 46.10 |  | . 292 |  | . 259 | . 003 | . 000 | 20.23 | 22.82 |
|  | Elbert <br> W/O SB No. 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 128 |  | . 086 | . 000 | . 00 C | 14.02 |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 2.125 | 161.1 | 161.1 | 1487.49 | 42.50 |  | . 149 |  | . 090 | . 000 | . 005 | 14.02 13.19 | 21.81 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 2.125 | 161.1 | 161.1 | 1520.49 | 35.99 |  | . 168 |  | . 076 | . 000 | . 006 | 13.19 | 29.06 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 2.150 | 176.7 | 176.7 | 1660.49 | 36.22 |  | . 216 |  | . 078 | . 000 | . 007 | 12.17 | 33.68 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 2.175 | 193.8 | 193.8 | 1810.49 | 40.62 |  | . 263 |  | . 088 | . 000 | . 009 | 11.22 | 33.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 2.200 | 212.6 | 212.6 | 1970.49 | 45.77 |  | . 318 |  | . 101 | . 000 | . 010 | 10.35 | 32.70 |
|  | AgateW/O SB No. 25 |  |  |  | 41.0 | 48.4 | 2786.03 |  |  | . 013 |  | . 122 | . 000 | . 000 | 105.27 |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1978 \\ & 1979 \end{aligned}$ |  | 4.914 | 41.2 | 43.1 | 2981.05 | 23.78 |  | . 012 |  | .117 | . 001 | . 000 | 114.01 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 4.914 | 41.2 | 43.1 | 2914.99 | 23.07 |  | . 012 |  | . 113 | . 001 | . 000 | 114.01 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 4.938 | 41.4 | 41.4 | 3520.96 | 26.55 |  | . 015 |  | . 131 | . 001 | . 000 | 119.28 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 4.962 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 3670.96 | 27.68 |  | . 015 |  | . 137 | . 001 | . 000 | 119.29 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 4.987 | 41.8 | 41.8 | 3830.96 | 28.88 |  | . 016 |  | . 14.4 | . 001 | . 000 | 119.31 | 13.35 |
| $\underset{1}{\sim}$ | EL PASO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {Calhan }}^{\text {Colo SB No. }}$ | 1978 |  | 3.781 | 288.0 | 288.9 | 1384.61 |  |  | . 250 |  | . 150 | . 003 | . 000 | 13.09 | 21.91 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 3.932 | 286.0 | 288.0 | 1481.53 | 42.33 |  | . 260 |  | . 166 | . 003 | . 000 | 13.65 | 21.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 |  |  |  | 286.0 | 288.0 | 1515.79 | 35.88 |  | . 295 |  | . 141 | . 003 | . 000 | 13.65 | 28.60 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 3.950 | 284.0 | 286.0 | 1655.79 | 36.11 |  | . 331 |  | . 143 | . 003 | . 000 | 13.81 | 32.04 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 3.968 | 282.0 | 284.0 | 1805.79 | 40.52 |  | . 352 |  | . 161 | . 003 | . 000 | 13.97 | 30.60 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 3.987 | 280.0 | 282.0 | 1965.79 | 45.66 |  | . 372 |  | . 182 | . 003 | . 000 | 14.14 | 28.91 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Harr1son } \\ & \text { W/O SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 78.091 | 6438.9 | 6438.9 | 1292.54 | 36.93 |  | 5.439 |  | 2.884 | . 012 | . 000 | 12.13 | 22.87 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 82.419 | 6615.6 | 6615.6 | 1383.02 | 39.51 |  | 5.893 |  | 3.257 | . 009 | . 000 | 12.46 | 22.54 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 82.419 | 6615.6 | 6615.6 | 1422.32 | 33.66 |  | 6.635 |  | 2.775 | . 009 | . 000 | 12.46 | 29.79 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 86.000 | 6797.1 | 6797.1 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | 7.874 |  | 3.001 | . 005 | . 000 | 12.65 | 33.20 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 89.736 | 6983.6 | 6983.6 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 8.946 |  | 3.624 | . 002 | . 000 | 12.85 | 31.72 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 93.635 | 7175.2 | 7175.2 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 9.800 |  | 4.263 | . 000 | . 000 | 13.05 | 30.00 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Widefield } \\ & \text { W/O SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1978 |  | 49.927 53.898 | 6882.3 6820.2 | 7020.0 6896.6 | 1254.77 | 33.85 |  | 6.599 6.721 |  | 1.9732 | . 040 | . 000 | 7.82 | 27.18 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 53.898 | 6820.2 | 6896.6 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 7.869 |  | 1.786 | . 040 | . 000 | 7.82 | 34.43 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 56.500 | 6758.7 | 6820.4 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | 8.941 |  | 1.972 | . 042 | . 000 | 8.28 | 37.57 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 59.228 | 6697.8 | 6758.9 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 9.774 |  | 2.392 | . 043 | . 000 | 8.76 | 35.81 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 62.087 | 6637.4 | 6698.0 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 10.301 |  | 2.827 | . 044 | . 000 | 9.27 | 33.78 |








－





|  |  | $$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{H}} \end{aligned}$ |  | － |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\cdots$ |  | n | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mranson Reorg. } \\ & w / 6 \text { SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{n}{\sim}$ |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\dot{\circ}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ |  | $\dot{0}$ | $\dot{\square}$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{\text {Ofo }}$ | $\stackrel{8}{2}$ |  | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ |  | \％ | ：${ }^{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{8}{2}$ |
| ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 最 |  | 罥 | 出䍙 | 罝 |  | 男 |  | 9 |  | 詈 |
| 래우ํ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{50}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |  |
| 包 5 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |
| （2）${ }_{4}$ |  |  |  | （1） |  |  |  |  |  | 年 |  |







|  |  |  | AV |  | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | ST |  | PT | PVRTY |  | GRTH | $\underline{L S}$ | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OURAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ridgway } \\ & \text { W/O SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 | \$ | 2.948 | 176.4 | 179.8 | \$1414.91 | 40.43 | \$ |  | $\pm$ | . 119 | \$. 002 | \$ |  | 16.40 | 18.60 |
|  |  | 1979 | , | 2.863 | 194.5 | 194.5 | \$1513.95 | 43.26 |  | .171 |  | . 124 | . 001 |  | .007 | 14.72 | 20.28 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 2.863 | 194.5 | 194.5 | 1547.32 | 36.62 |  | . 196 |  | . 105 | . 001 |  | . 008 | 14.72 | 27.53 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 2.932 | 214.5 | 214.5 | 1687.32 | 36.80 |  | . 254 |  | . 108 | . 001 |  | . 010 | 13.67 | 32.18 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 3.003 | 236.6 | 236.6 | 1837.32 | 41.22 |  | . 311 |  | . 124 | . 001 |  | . 012 | 12.69 | 31.88 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 3.076 | 261.0 | 261.0 | 1997.32 | 46.40 |  | . 379 |  | . 143 | . 000 |  | . 014 | 11.79 | 31.26 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 14.896 | 760.5 | 760.5 | 1827.47 | 52.21 |  | . 612 |  | . 778 | . 000 |  | . 077 | 19.59 | 15.41 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 14.896 | 760.5 | 760.5 | 1748.63 | 41.39 |  | . 713 |  | . 617 | . 000 |  | . 079 | 19.59 | 22.66 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 15.510 | 920.4 | 920.4 | 1913.49 | 41.73 |  | 1.114 |  | . 647 | . 000 |  | . 105 | 16.85 | 29.00 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 16.149 | 1113.9 | 1113.9 | 2063.49 | 46.30 |  | 1.551 |  | . 748 | . 000 |  | . 137 | 14.50 | 30.07 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 16.815 | 1348.1 | 134+8.1 | 2223.49 | 51.65 |  | 2.129 |  | . 868 | . 000 |  | . 179 | 12.47 | 30.58 |
| ParkW/O SB Nic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1978 |  | 30.050 | 313.2 | 313.2 | 2488.80 | 23.20 |  | . 082 |  | . 697 | . 003 |  | . 038 | 95.95 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 33.381 | 328.8 | 328.8 | 2663.02 | 23.59 |  | . 088 |  | . 788 | . 002 |  | . 006 | 101.52 | 11.35 |
| 灾 SE NO. 25 |  | 1979 |  | 33.381 | 328.8 | 328.8 | 2592.44 | 22.77 |  | . 092 |  | . 760 | . 002 |  | . 006 | 101.52 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 34.765 | 345.2 | 345.2 | 2732.44 | 23.96 |  | . 110 |  | . 833 | . 002 |  | . 007 | 100.71 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 36.206 | 362.4 | 362.4 | 2882.44 | 25.45 |  | . 123 |  | . 921 | . 002 |  | . 008 | 99.91 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 37.707 | 380.5 | 380.5 | 3042.44 | 27.05 |  | . 137 |  | 1.020 | . 001 |  | . 009 | 99.11 | 13.35 |
|  | PHILLIPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Holyoke <br> W/0 SB No. 25 | 1978 |  | 17.762 | 588.9 | 627.0 | 1464.51 | 36.91 |  | . 263 |  | . 656 | . 001 |  | . 000 | 28.33 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 19.107 | 573.2 | 596.4 | 1567.03 | 36.12 |  | .244 |  | . 690 | . 002 |  | . 000 | 32.04 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 19.107 | 573.2 | 596.4 | 1595.28 | 35.94 |  | . 265 |  | . 687 | . 002 |  | . 000 | 32.04 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 19.790 | 557.9 | 573.3 | 1851.79 | 38.69 |  | . 296 |  | . 766 | . 002 |  | . 000 | 34.52 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 20.497 | 543.0 | 558.0 | 2001.79 | 39.97 |  | . 298 |  | . 819 | . 003 |  | . 000 | 36.73 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 21.229 | 528.5 | 543.1 | 2161.79 | 41.23 |  | . 299 |  | . 875 | . 003 |  | . 000 | 39.09 | $13 \cdot 35$ |
| W/O S3: 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 9.687 9.856 | 346.4 333.6 | 346.4 346.4 | 1645.20 1760.36 | 41.85 44.23 |  | . 174 |  | . 436 | . 017 |  | . 000 | 28.45 | 11.35 11.35 |
| $38 \therefore 25$ |  | 1979 |  | 9.856 | 333.6 | 346.4 | 1774.06 | 41.99 |  | . 201 |  | . 414 | . 017 |  | . 000 | 28.45 | 13.80 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 10.021 | 321.3 | 333.8 | 1914.06 | 41.75 |  | . 221 |  | . 418 | . 017 |  | . 000 | 30.02 | 15.83 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 10.188 | 309.5 | 321.5 | 2064.06 | 46.31 |  | . 192 |  | . 472 | . 018 |  | . 000 | 31.69 | 12.88 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 10.359 | 298.1 | 309.6 | 2224.06 | 47.52 |  | . 196 |  | . 492 | . 018 |  | . 000 | 33.45 | 13.35 |
|  | PITKIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Aspen <br> W/O SB No. 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.328 | . 000 |  | . 000 |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 122.093 | 1033.6 | 1140.2 | 2164.52 | 18.28 |  | . 237 |  | 2.232 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 107.08 | 11.35 |
|  | SB NO. 25 | 1979 |  | 122.093 | 1033.6 | 1140.2 | 2153.40 | 18.18 |  | . 235 |  | 2.220 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 107.08 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 131.792 | 964.1 | 1035.3 | 2381.49 | 17.18 |  | . 202 |  | 2.264 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 127.30 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 142.262 | 899.3 | 965.7 | 2531.49 | 15.95 |  | . 175 |  | 2.270 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 147.32 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 153.563 | 838.9 | 900.8 | 2691.49 | 14.80 |  | . 151 |  | 2.273 | . 000 |  | :000 | 170.48 | 11.35 |




|  |  | AV |  | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY |  | GRTH | $\underline{L S}$ | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTT ${ }^{\text {Steat }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steamboat Springs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1978 1979 | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.192 \\ & 58.471 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1312.2 \\ & 1366.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1312.2 \\ & 1366.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1834.39 \\ 1962.80 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.16 \\ & 36.26 \end{aligned}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} .568 \\ .562 \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.839 \\ & 2.120 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ .000 \\ .000 \end{array}$ | \$ | . 053 | 36.73 42.78 | 11.35 11.35 |
| SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 58.471 | 1366.7 | 1366.7 | 1962.89 | 35.60 |  | . 601 |  | 2.082 | . 000 |  | . 012 | 42.78 | 12.35 |
|  | 1980 |  | 67.275 | 1423.5 | 1423.5 | 2102.89 | 34.70 |  | . 659 |  | 2.334 | . 000 |  | . 013 | 47.26 | 13.35 |
|  | 1981 |  | 77.405 | 1482.7 | 1482.7 | 2252.89 | 34.37 |  | . 680 |  | 2.660 | . 000 |  | . 01.5 | 52.21 | 13.35 |
|  | 1982 |  | 89.060 | 1544.4 | 1544.4 | 2412.89 | 33.98 |  | . 700 |  | 3.026 | . 000 |  | . 017 | 57.67 | 13.35 |
| South Routt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W/O SB No. 25 | 1978 |  | 18.726 | 440.3 | 440.3 | 2023.17 | 37.55 |  | . 188 |  | . 703 | . 008 |  | . 001 | 42.53 | 11.35 |
|  | 1979 |  | 20.118 | 464.7 | 464.7 | 2164.79 | 39.62 |  | . 209 |  | . 797 | . 008 |  | . 009 | 43.29 | 11.35 |
| SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 20.118 | 464.7 | 464.7 | 2151.41 | 38.66 |  | . 222 |  | . 778 | . 008 |  | . 010 | 43.29 | 12.35 |
|  | 1980 |  | 21.507 | 490.5 | 490.5 | 2291.41 | 40.06 |  | . 262 |  | . 862 | . 007 |  | . 011 | 43.85 | 13.35 |
|  | 1981 |  | 22.992 | 517.7 | 517.7 | 2441.41 | 42.27 |  | . 292 |  | . 972 | . 007 |  | . 012 | 44.41 | 13.35 |
|  | 1982 |  | 24.579 | 546.4 | 546.4 | 2601.41 | 44.60 |  | . 325 |  | 1.096 | . 0066 |  | . 014 | 44.98 | 13.35 |
| SAGUACHE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 4.116 | 242.9 | 256.7 | 1398.40 | 39.95 |  | . 195 |  | . 164 | . 027 |  | . 000 | 16.03 | 18.97 |
| SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 4.116 | 242.9 | 256.7 | 1436.76 | 34.01 |  | . 229 |  | . 140 | . 027 |  | . 000 | 16.03 | 26.22 |
|  | 1980 |  | 4.150 | 229.8 | 243.1 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 244 |  | . 145 | . 027 |  | . 000 | 17.07 | 28.78 |
|  | 1981 |  | 4.184 | 217.4 | 230.0 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 245 |  | . 169 | . 027 |  | . 000 | 18.19 | 26.38 |
|  | 1982 |  | 4.219 | 205.7 | 217.6 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 234 |  | . 192 | . 027 |  | . 000 | 19.38 | 23.67 |
| Morfat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W/O SB No. 25 | 1978 |  | 5.967 | 73.1 | 73.9 | 2493.91 | 27.08 |  | . 023 |  | . 162 | . 006 |  | . 000 | 80.75 | 11.35 |
|  | 1979 |  | 7.248 | 76.9 | 76.9 | 2668.48 | 25.27 |  | . 022 |  | . 183 | . 006 |  | . 002 | 94.25 | 11.35 |
| SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 7.248 | 76.9 | 76.9 | 2625.18 | 24.63 |  | . 023 |  | . 178 | . 006 |  | . 002 | 94.25 | 12.35 |
|  | 1980 |  | 7.301 | 80.9 | 80.9 | 2765.18 | 26.69 |  | . 029 |  | . 195 | . 006 |  | . 002 | 90.25 | 13.35 |
|  | 1981 |  | 7.354 | 85.1 | 85.1 | 2915.18 | 29.22 |  | . 033 |  | . 215 | . 000 |  | . 002 | 86.42 | 13.35 |
|  | 1982 |  | 7.408 | 89.5 | 89.5 | 3075.18 | 32.00 |  | . 038 |  | . 237 | . 006 |  | . 002 | 82.75 | 13.35 |
| Center |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 9.556 | 566.6 | 654.9 | 1321.12 | 37.75 |  | . 505 |  | . 361 | . 046 |  | . 000 | 14.59 | 20.41 |
| SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 9.556 | 566.6 | 654.9 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | . 600 |  | . 317 | . 046 |  | . 000 | 14.59 | 27.66 |
|  | 1980 |  | 9.75 | 490.2 | 570.6 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 573 |  | . 340 | . 048 |  | . 000 | 17.09 | 28.76 |
|  | 1981 |  | 8.950 | $42^{4} .1$ | 493.6 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 487 |  | . 402 | . 049 |  | . 000 | 20.16 | 24.41 |
|  | 1982 |  | 10.154 | 366.9 | 427.1 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | - 375 |  | . 462 | . 051 |  | . 000 | 23.78 | 19.27 |
| SAN JUAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 6.540 | 164.5 | 168.9 | 2326.94 | 46.43 |  | . 089 |  | . 304 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 38.77 | 11.35 |
| SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 6.548 | 164.5 | 168.9 | 2296.75 | 44.93 |  | . 094 |  | . 294 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 38.77 | 12.35 |
|  | 1980 |  | 6.549 | 160.2 | 164.5 | 2436.75 | 45.84 |  | . 101 |  | . 300 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 39.80 | 13.35 |
|  | 1981 |  | 6.550 | 156.0 | 160.2 | 2586.75 | 47.70 |  | . 102 |  | - 312 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 40.88 | 13.35 |
|  | 1982 |  | 6.550 | 151.9 | 156.0 | 2746.75 | 49.64 |  | . 103 |  | . 325 | . 000 |  | . 000 | 41.98 | 13.35 |




|  |  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY |  | HTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WASHINGTON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Woodlin <br> W/O SB No. 25 | 1978 | \$ | 13.958 | 137.9 | 149.3 |  | 22.83 | \$ | . 039 | * | . 319 | \$. 002 | \$ | . 000 | 93.49 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 13.285 | 123.1 | 137.9 | 2560.51 | 23.78 |  | . 037 |  | . 316 | . 002 |  | . 000 | 96.34 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 13.285 | 123.1 | 137.9 | 2533.28 | 23.31 |  | . 040 |  | . 310 | . 002 |  | . 000 | 96.34 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 13.473 | 109.9 | 123.6 | 2673.28 | 21.85 |  | . 036 |  | . 294 | . 002 |  | . 000 | 108.98 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 13.664 | 98.1 | 110.4 | 2823.28 | 20.58 |  | . 030 |  | . 281 | . 003 |  | . 000 | 123.80 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 13.858 | 87.6 | 98.5 | 2983.28 | 19.63 |  | . 022 |  | . 272 | . 003 |  | . 000 | 140.65 | 11.35 |
|  | WELD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gilcrest } \\ & \text { W/0 SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 54.843 | 1644.2 | 1644.2 | 1296.71 | 29.01 |  | . 541 |  | 1.591 | . 019 |  | . 000 | 33.36 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 64.264 | 1702.5 | 1702.5 | 1387.48 | 28.26 |  | . 546 |  | 1.816 | . 018 |  | . 005 | 37.75 | 11.35 |
|  | Sb No. 25 | 1979 |  | 64.264 | 1702.5 | 1702.5 | 1426.66 | 28.48 |  | . 599 |  | 1.830 | . 018 |  | . 005 | 37.75 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 71.900 | 1762.9 | 1762.9 | 1600.00 | 29.56 |  | . 696 |  | 2.125 | . 017 |  | . 006 | 40.79 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 80.443 | 1825.4 | 1825.4 | 1800.00 | 31.35 |  | . 764 |  | 2.522 | . 015 |  | . 007 | 44.07 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 90.001 | 1890.1 | 1890.1 | 1960.00 | 32.15 |  | . 811 |  | 2.893 | . 014 |  | . 008 | 47.62 | 13.35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | W/O ${ }^{\text {WB No. } 25}$ | 1978 |  | 19.769 | 1090.8 | 1121.7 | 1302.31 | 37.21 |  | .725 |  | .735 | . 044 |  | . 000 | 17.62 | 17.38 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 21.329 | 1086.2 | 1097.7 | 1393.47 | 39.81 |  | . 680 |  | . 849 | . 044 |  | . 000 | 19.43 | 15.57 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 21.329 | 1086.2 | 1097.7 | 1432.19 | 33.90 |  | . 849 |  | . 723 | . 044 |  | . 000 | 19.43 | 22.82 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 22.791 | 1081.6 | 1086.2 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 943 |  | . 795 | . 045 |  | . 000 | 20.98 | 24.87 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 24.354 | 1077.0 | 1081.6 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 963 |  | . 984 | . $04+5$ |  | . 000 | 22.52 | 22.05 |
| $\stackrel{+}{4}$ |  | 1982 |  | 26.023 | 1072.4 | 1077.0 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 926 |  | 1.185 | . 045 |  | . 000 | 24.16 | 18.89 |
|  | Keenesburg <br> W/O SB No. 25 |  |  | 45.512 |  | 1403.5 | 1216.48 |  |  |  |  | 1.265 | . 025 |  | . 000 | 32.43 |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 46.009 | 1314.8 | 1357.0 | 1301.63 | 28.76 |  | . 443 |  | 1.323 | . 026 |  | . 000 | 33.91 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 46.009 | 1314.8 | 1357.0 | 1400.00 | 30.27 |  | . 507 |  | 1.393 | . 026 |  | . 000 | 33.91 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 46.500 | 1274.8 | 1315.2 | 1600.00 | 32.85 |  | . 577 |  | 1.528 | . 026 |  | . 000 | 35.35 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 46.997 47 | 1236.0 | 1275.2 | 1800.00 | 35.85 |  | . 610 |  | 1.685 | . 027 |  | . 000 | 36.85 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 47.499 | 1198.4 | 1236.4 | 1960.00 | 37.86 |  | . 625 |  | 1.798 | . 028 |  | . 000 | 38.42 | 13.35 |
|  | Windsor w/O SB No. 25 | 1978 |  | 87.762 | 1168.8 | 1168.8 | 1695.84 | 19.77 |  | . 247 |  | 1.735 | . 009 |  | . 001 |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 90.644 | 1256.4 | 1256.4 | 1814.55 | 21.73 |  | . 310 |  | 1.970 | . 007 |  | . 036 | 72.15 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 90.644 | 1256.4 | 1256.4 | 1825.84 | 21.61 |  | . 335 |  | 1.959 | . 007 |  | . 038 | 72.15 |  |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 93.369 | 1350.6 | 1350.6 | 1965.84 | 23.83 |  | . 430 |  | 2.225 | . 006 |  | . 044 | 69.13 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 96.176 | 1451.9 | 1451.9 | 2115.84 | 26.58 |  | . 515 |  | 2.557 | . 004 |  | . 051 | 66.24 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 99.068 | 1560.8 | 1560.8 | 2275.84 | 29.62 |  | . 617 |  | 2.935 | . 002 |  | . 059 | 63.47 | 13.35 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Johnstown } \\ & \text { W/0 SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 15.389 | 1080.3 | 1130.2 | 1349.37 | 42.95 |  | . 921 |  | . 661 | . 015 |  | . 000 | 13.62 | 21.38 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 15.802 | 1127.7 | 1127.7 | 1497.33 | 42.78 |  | 1.013 |  | . 676 | . 015 |  | . 008 | 14.01 | 20.99 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 15.802 | 1127.7 | 1127.7 | 1528.98 | 36.19 |  | 1.152 |  | . 572 | . 015 |  | . 009 | 14.01 | 28.24 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 16.275 | 1177.2 | 1177.2 | 1668.98 | 36.40 |  | 1.372 |  | . 592 | . 014 |  | . 010 | 13.83 | 32.02 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 16.762 | 1228.9 | 1228.9 | 1818.98 | 40.81 |  | 1.551 |  | . 684 | . 013 |  | . 012 | 13.64 | 30.93 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 17.264 | 1282.9 | 1282.9 | 1978.98 | 45.97 |  | 1.745 |  | . 794 | . 012 |  | . 014 | 13.46 | 29.59 |


|  |  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MLLL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | $\underline{L S}$ | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WELD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Greeley W/O SB No. 25 |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |  | -. 000 | $18.44$ | $16.56$ |
|  |  | 1979 | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 178.843 \\ & 196.309 \end{aligned}$ | $9601.5$ | $9601.5$ | $1497.20$ | 42.78 |  | $5.978$ |  | 8.398 | . 117 | . 000 | $20.45$ | $14.55$ |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  |  | 9601.5 | 9601.5 | 1529.11 | 36.19 |  | 7.577 |  | 7.105 | . 117 | . 000 | 20.45 | 21.80 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 212.980 | 9718.3 | 9718.3 | 1709.54 | 37.29 |  | 8.673 |  | 7.941 | .115 | . 000 | 21.92 | 23.93 |
|  |  |  |  | 231.067 | 9836.5 | 9836.5 | 1859.54 | 41.72 |  | 8.651 |  | 9.641 | .113 | . 000 | 23.49 | 21.08 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 250.689 | 9956.1 | 9956.1 | 2019.54 | 46.91 |  | 8.347 |  | 11.760 | . 111 | . 000 |  |  |
|  | Platte Valley W/O SB No. 25 |  |  | 14.585 | 880.6 | 914.1 | 1541.32 | 46.38 |  | . 732 |  | . 677 | . 023 | . 000 | 15.96 | $19.0{ }^{1}$ |
|  |  | 1978 |  | 14.585 15.572 | 827.3 | 880.6 | 1649.21 | 47.12 |  | . 719 |  | . 734 | . 024 | . 000 | 17.68 | 17.32 |
|  | SB No. 25 |  |  | 15.572 | 827.3 | 880.6 | 1670.94 | 39.55 |  | . 856 |  | . 616 | . 024 | . 000 | 17.68 | 24.57 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 16.500 | 777.2 | 828.4 | 1810.94 | 39.50 |  | . 848 |  | . 652 | . 025 | . 000 | 19.92 | 25.93 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 17.484 | 730.1 | 778.2 | 1960.94 | 44.00 |  | . 757 |  | . 769 | . 026 | . 000 | 22.47 | 22.10 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 18.526 | 685.9 | 731.1 | 2130.94 | 49.27 |  | . 638 |  | - 713 | . 027 | . 000 | 25.34 |  |
|  | Fort Lupton w/o SB No. 25 |  |  |  |  | 1630.7 | 1412.31 | 25.65 |  | . 441 |  | 1.862 | . 038 | . 005 | 44.50 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 72.572 96.126 | 1709.2 | 1709.2 | 1511.17 | 22.36 |  | . 434 |  | 2.149 | . 037 | . 017 | 56.24 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 96.126 | 1709.2 |  |  | 22.40 |  | . 473 |  | 2.153 | . 037 | . 018 |  |  |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 120.125 | 1791.5 | 1791.5 | 1676.13 | 20.85 |  | . 499 |  | 2.504 | . 0335 | . 021 | 67.05 79.94 | 13.35 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 1982 |  | 150.115 187.592 | 1877.8 1968.3 | 1877.8 1968.3 | 1826.13 1986.13 | 19.57 18.62 |  | .491 .416 |  | 2.938 3.493 | . 0332 | . 024 | 79.94 95.31 | 13.35 11.35 |
| 宝 |  | 1982 |  | 187.592 | 1968.3 | 1968.3 | 1986.13 |  |  | . 416 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| t | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ault-Highland } \\ & \text { W/OSBNo. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 16.112 | 844.0 | 895.5 | 1498.34 | 42.81 |  | . 652 |  | . 690 | . 022 | . 000 | 17.99 | 17.01 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 16.515 | 816.8 | 852.1 | 1603.22 | 45.81 |  | . 610 |  | . 7.56 | . 022 | . 000 | 19.38 | 15.62 |
|  | 3B No. 25 | 1979 |  | 16.515 | 816.8 | 852.1 | 1628.17 | 38.54 |  | . 751 |  |  | . 022 |  | 19.38 | 22.87 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 16.995 | 790.5 | 817.1 | 1768.17 | 38.56 |  | . 789 |  | . 655 | . 023 | . 000 | 20.80 | 25.05 22.45 |
|  |  | 1981 1982 |  | 17.489 17.997 | 765.0 740.3 | 790.8 765.3 | 1918.17 2078.17 | 43.04 48.27 |  | . .724 |  | . 859 | . 0224 | . 000 | 23.52 | 19.53 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Briggsdale } \\ & \text { w/O SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 2.866 | 87.7 | 88.4 | 1962.79 | 44.85 |  | . 045 |  | . 129 | . 001 | . 000 | 32.41 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 3.316 | 88.4 | 88.4 | 2100.19 | 42.99 |  | . 043 |  | . 143 | .001 | . 000 | 37.51 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 |  |  |  | 88.4 | 88.4 | 2092.53 | 41.97 |  | . 046 |  | . 139 | . 001 | . 000 | 37.51 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 3.696 | 89.1 | 89.1 | 2232.53 | 40.72 |  | . 048 |  | . 150 | . 001 | . 000 | 41.48 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 4.120 | 89.8 | 89.8 | 2382.53 | 40.23 |  | . 048 |  | . 166 | . 001 | . 000 | 45.88 50 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 4.593 | 90.5 | 90.5 | 2542.53 | 39.67 |  | . 048 |  | . 182 | . 001 | . 000 | 50.75 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prairie } \\ & \text { W/O SB No. } 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1978 |  | 5.584 | 111.3 | 132.6 | 1870.54 | 34.99 |  | . 053 |  | . 195 | . 005 | . 000 | 42.11 | 11.35 |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 5.505 | 108.7 | 117.5 | 2001.48 | 34.40 |  | . 046 |  | . 189 | . 005 | . 000 | 46.84 | 11.35 |
|  | SB No. 25 | 1979 |  | 5.505 | 108.7 | 117.5 | 2003.94 | 33.86 |  | . 049 |  | . 186 | . 005 | . 000 | 46.48 | 12.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 5.550 | 106.2 | 108.7 | 2143.94 | 33.29 |  | . 048 |  | . 185 | . 005 | . 000 | 51.04 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 5.596 | 103.8 | 106.2 | 2293.94 | 34.74 |  | . 049 |  | . 194 | . 005 | . 000 | 52.67 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 5.642 | 101.5 | 103.8 | 2453.94 | 36.25 |  | . 050 |  | . 205 | . 005 | . 000 | 54.34 | 13.35 |



## APPENDIX B

INCREASES IN AU'THORIZED REVENUE BASE (ARB) DUE TO SB NO. $25-1979$ OVER 1978

| COUNTY <br> District | 1978 <br> ARB | Est. 1979 <br> ARB/SB 25 | Difference | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Change |  |  |  |  |


| COUNTY District | $1978$ $\mathrm{ARB}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } 1979 \\ & \text { ARB/SB } 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Difference | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHEYENNE |  |  |  |  |
| Kit Carson | \$2921 | \$3051 | \$. 230 | 4.45 |
| Cheyenne Wells | 1689 | 1819 | 130 | 7.70 |
| Arapahoe | 2824 | 2954 | 130 | 4.60 |
| CLEAR CREEK |  |  |  |  |
| Idaho Springs | 1636 | 1766 | 130 | 7.95 |
| CONEJOS |  |  |  |  |
| La Jara | 1199 | 1400 | 201 | 16.76 |
| Sanford | 1191 | 1400 | 209 | 17.55 |
| Antonito | 1181 | 1400 | 219 | 18.54 |
| COSTILLA |  |  |  |  |
| San Luis | 1257 | 1400 | 143 | 11.38 |
| Sierra Grande | 1549 | 1679 | 130 | 8.39 |
| CROWLEY |  |  |  |  |
| Ordway | 1272 | 1402 | 130 | 10.22 |
| CUSTER |  |  |  |  |
| Westcliffe | 1494 | 1624 | 130 | 8.70 |
| DELTA |  |  |  |  |
| Delta | 1217 | 1400 | 183 | 15.04 |
| DENVER |  |  |  |  |
| Denver | 1968 | 2098 | 130 | 6.61 |
| DOLORES |  |  |  |  |
| Dove Creek | 1377 | 1507 | 130 | 9.44 |
| DOUGLAS |  |  |  |  |
| Castle Rock | 1435 | 1565 | 130 | 9.06 |
| EAGLE |  |  |  |  |
| Eagle | 2150 | 2280 | 130 | 6.05 |
| ELBERT |  |  |  |  |
| Elizabeth | 1426 | 1556 | 130 | 9.12 |
| Kiowa | 1835 | 1965 | 130 | 7.08 |
| Big Sandy | 1405 | 1535 | 130 | 9.25 |
| Elbert | 1390 | 1520 | 130 | 9.35 |
| Agate | 2786 | 2916 | 130 | 4.67 |
| EL PASO |  |  |  |  |
| Calhan | 1385 | 1515 | 130 | 9.39 |
| Harrison | 1293 | 1423 | 130 | 10.05 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { D1strict } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $1978$ <br> ARB | Est. 1979 <br> ARB/SB 25 | Difference | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Security | \$1173 | \$1400 | \$227 | 19.35 |
| Fountain | 1166 | 1400 | 234 | 20.07 |
| Colorado Springs | 1390 | 1520 | 130 | 9.35 |
| Cheyenne Mountain | 1972 | 2102 | 130 | 6.59 |
| Manitou Springs | 1375 | 2505 | 130 | 9.45 |
| Academy | 1183 | 1400 | 217 | 18.34 |
| Ellicott | 1305 | 1435 | 130 | 9.96 |
| Peyton | 1625 | 1755 | 130 | 8.00 |
| Hanover | 2062 | 2192 | 130 | 6.30 |
| Lewis-Palmer | 1451 | 1581 | 130 | 8.96 |
| Falcon | 1428 | 1558 | 130 | 9.10 |
| Edison | 2754 | 2884 | 130 | 4.72 |
| Miami Yoder | 1650 | 1780 | 130 | 7.88 |
| FREMONT |  |  |  |  |
| Canon City | 1284 | 1414 | 130 | 10.12 |
| Florence | 1197 | 1400 | 203 | 16.96 |
| Cotopaxi | 1960 | 2090 | 130 | 6.63 |
| GARFIELD |  |  |  |  |
| Glenwood Springs | 1225 | 1400 | 175 | 14.29 |
| Rifle | 1434 | 1564 | 130 | 9.07 |
| Grand Valley | 2083 | 2213 | 130 | 6.24 |
| GILPIN <br> Central City | 2488 | 2618 | 130 | 5.23 |
| GRAND |  |  |  |  |
| Kremmling | 1817 | 1947 | 130 | 7.15 |
| Granby | 1775 | 1905 | 130 | 7.32 |
| GUNN ISON |  |  |  |  |
| Gunnison | 1419 | 1549 | 130 | 9.16 |
| HINSDALE |  |  |  |  |
| Lake City | 1297 | 1427 | 130 | 10.02 |
| HUERFANO |  |  |  |  |
| Walsenburg | 1374 | 1504 | 130 | 9.46 |
| La Veta | 1372 | 1502 | 130 | 9.48 |
| JACKSON 2474 |  |  |  |  |
| Walden | 1414 | 1544 | 130 | 9.19 |
| JEFFERSON |  |  |  |  |
| Jefferson | 1600 | 1730 | 130 | 8.13 |


| COUNTY <br> District | $\begin{aligned} & 1978 \\ & \text { ARB } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } 1979 \\ & \text { ARB/SB } 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Difference | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KIOWA |  |  |  |  |
| Eads | \$1566 | \$1696 | \$130 | 8.30 |
| Plainview | 2094 | 2224 | 130 | 6.21 |
| KIT CARSON |  |  |  |  |
| Flagler | 1582 | 1712 | 130 | 8.22 |
| Seibert | 1797 | 1927 | 130 | 7.23 |
| Vona | 2264 | 2394 | 130 | 5.74 |
| Stratton | 1485 | 1615 | 130 | 8.75 |
| Bethune | 1621 | 1751 | 130 | 8.02 |
| Burlington | 1327 | 1457 | 130 | 9.80 |
| LAKE |  |  |  |  |
| Leadville | 1730 | 1860 | 130 | 7.51 |
| IA PLATA |  |  |  |  |
| Durango | 1358 | 1488 | 130 | 9.57 |
| Bayfield | 1134 | 1400 | 266 | 23.46 |
| Ignacio | 1168 | 1400 | 232 | 19.86 |
| LARIMER |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Collins | 1577 | 1707 | 130 | 8.24 |
| Loveland | 1301 | 1431 | 130 | 9.99 |
| Estes Park | 1536 | 1666 | 130 | 8.46 |
| LAS ANIMAS |  |  |  |  |
| Trinidad | 1308 | 1438 | 130 | 9.94 |
| Primero | 1567 | 1697 | 130 | 8.30 |
| Hoehne | 1310 | 1440 | 130 | 9.92 |
| Aguilar | 1170 | 1400 | 230 | 19.66 |
| Branson | 2205 | 2335 | 130 | 5.90 |
| Kim | 2091 | 2221 | 130 | 6.22 |
| LINCOLN |  |  |  |  |
| Hugo | 1516 | 1646 | 130 | 8.58 |
| Limon | 1170 | 1400 | 230 | 19.66 |
| Genoa | 1651 | 1781 | 130 | 7.87 |
| Karval | 1588 | 1718 | 130 | 8.19 |
| Arriba | 1854 | 1984 | 130 | 7.01 |
| LOGAN |  |  |  |  |
| Sterling | 1467 | 1597 | 130 | 8.86 |
| Frenchman | 1546 | 1676 | 130 | 8.41 |
| Buffalo | 1422 | 1552 | 130 | 9.14 |
| Peetz | 2393 | 2523 | 130 | 5.43 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { District } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1978 \\ & \text { ARB } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Est. 1979 <br> ARB/SB 25 | Difference | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MESA |  |  |  |  |
| DeBeque | 2172 | 2302 | 130 | 5.99 |
| Collbran | 1263 | 1400 | 137 | 10.85 |
| Grand Junction | 1333 | 1463 | 130 | 9.75 |
| MINERAL |  |  |  |  |
| Creede | 1546 | 1676 | 130 | 8.41 |
| MOFFAT |  |  |  |  |
| Craig | 1324 | 1454 | 130 | 9.82 |
| MONTEZUMA |  |  |  |  |
| Cortez | 1168 | 1400 | 232 | 19.86 |
| Dolores | 1258 | 1400 | 142 | 11.29 |
| Mancos | 1196 | 1400 | 204 | 17.06 |
| MONTROSE |  |  |  |  |
| Montrose | 1351 | 1481 | 130 | 9.62 |
| Naturita | 1414 | 1544 | 130 | 9.19 |
| MORGAN |  |  |  |  |
| Brush | 1310 | 1440 | 130 | 9.92 |
| Fort Morgan | 1503 | 1633 | 130 | 8.65 |
| Weldona | 1511 | 1641 | 130 | 8.60 |
| Wiggins | 1559 | 1689 | 130 | 8.34 |
| OTERO |  |  |  |  |
| La Junta | 1286 | 1416 | 130 | 10.11 |
| Rocky Ford | 1288 | 1418 | 130 | 10.09 |
| Manzanola | 1253 | 1400 | 147 | 11.73 |
| Fowler | 1489 | 1619 | 130 | 8.73 |
| Cheraw | 1375 | 1505 | 130 | 9.45 |
| Swink | 1438 | 1568 | 130 | 9.04 |
| OURAY |  |  |  |  |
| Ouray | 1527 | 1657 | 130 | 8.51 |
| Ridgway | 1415 | 1545 | 130 | 9.19 |
| PARK |  |  |  |  |
| Platte Canyon | 1708 | 1838 | 130 | 7.61 |
| Fairplay | 2489 | 2619 | 130 | 5.22 |
| PHILLIPS |  |  |  |  |
| Holyoke | 1465 | 1595 | 130 | 8.87 |
| Haxtun | 1645 | 1775 | 130 | 7.90 |
| PITKIN |  |  |  |  |
| Aspen | 2023 | 2153 | 130 | 6.43 |


| COUNTY <br> District | $\begin{aligned} & 1978 \\ & \text { ARB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } 1979 \\ & \text { ARB/SB } 25 \end{aligned}$ | Difference | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROWERS |  |  |  |  |
| Granada | \$1285 | \$1415 | \$130 | 10.12 |
| Lamar | 1257 | 1400 | 143 | 11.38 |
| Holly | 1384 | 1514 | ].30 | 9.39 |
| Wiley | 1376 | 1506 | 130 | 9.45 |
| PUEBLO |  |  |  |  |
| City | 1382 | 1512 | 130 | 9.41 |
| Rural | 1474 | 1604 | 130 | 8.82 |
| RIO BLANCO |  |  |  |  |
| Meeker | 1734 | 1864 | 130 | 7.50 |
| Rangely | 2014 | 2144 | 130 | 6.45 |
| RIO GRANDE |  |  |  |  |
| Del Norte | 1240 | 1400 | 160 | 12.90 |
| Monte Vista | 1247 | 1400 | 153 | 12.27 |
| Sargent | 1749 | 1879 | 130 | 7.43 |
| ROUTT |  |  |  |  |
| Hayden | 1909 | 2039 | 130 | 6.81 |
| Steamboat | 1834 | 1964 | 130 | 7.09 |
| Oak Creek | 2023 | 2153 | 130 | 6.43 |
| SAGUACHE |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain Valley | 1307 | 1437 | 130 | 9.95 |
| Moffat | 2494 | 2624 | 130 | 5.21 |
| Center | 1235 | 1400 | 165 | 13.36 |
| SAN JUAN |  |  |  |  |
| Silverton | 2175 | 2305 | 130 | 5.98 |
| SAN MIGUEL |  |  |  |  |
| Telluride | 1757 | 1887 | 130 | 7.40 |
| Norwood | 1313 | 1443 | 130 | 9.90 |
| Egnar | 1549 | 1679 | 130 | 8.39 |
| SEDGWICK |  |  |  |  |
| Julesburg | 1573 | 1703 | 130 | 8.26 |
| Platte Valley | 1673 | 1803 | 130 | 7.77 |
| SUMMIT |  |  |  |  |
| Frisco | 2022 | 2152 | 130 | 6.43 |
| TELLER |  |  |  |  |
| Cripple Creek-Vic. | 1687 | 1817 | 130 | 7.71 |
| Woodland Park | 1313 | $141+3$ | 130 | 9.90 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { District } \end{aligned}$ | $1978$ ARB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } 1979 \\ & \text { ARB/SB } 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Difference | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WASHINGTON |  |  |  |  |
| Akron | \$1427 | \$1557 | \$130 | 9.11 |
| Arickaree | 2132 | 2262 | 130 | 6.10 |
| Otis | 1577 | 1707 | 130 | 8.24 |
| Lone Star | 3230 | 3360 | 130 | 4.02 |
| Woodlin | 2393 | 2523 | 130 | 5.43 |
| WELD |  |  |  |  |
| Gilcrest | 1297 | 1427 | 130 | 10.02 |
| Eaton | 1302 | 1432 | 130 | 9.98 |
| Keenesburg | 1216 | 1400 | 184 | 15.13 |
| Windsor | 1696 | 1826 | 130 | 7.67 |
| Johnstown | 1399 | 1529 | 130 | 9.29 |
| Greeley | 1399 | 1529 | 130 | 9.29 |
| Kersey | 1541 | 1671 | 130 | 8.44 |
| Fort Lupton | 1412 | 1542 | 130 | 9.21 |
| Ault-Highland | 1498 | 1628 | 130 | 8.68 |
| Briggsdale | 1963 | 2093 | 130 | 6.62 |
| New Raymer | 1871 | 2001 | 130 | 6.95 |
| Grover | 1786 | 1916 | 130 | 7.28 |
| YUMA |  |  |  |  |
| West Yuma | 1665 | 1795 | 130 | 7.81 |
| East Yuma | 1374 | 1504 | 130 | 9.46 |

APPENDIX C

## ESTIMATED IMPACT OF SPECIFIC PROGRAMS ON ARB FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1979

|  | COUHTY District | $\underline{\Delta E}$ | ARB | Special <br> Education | Vocational <br> Education | Transportation | P.E.R.A. | Unemployment Compensation | Workmen's Compensetion | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Remaining } \\ & \hline A B B \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ADAYS <br> Mapleton Total: Per Unit: | 5,388.5 | \$ 9,231,631.87 $1,713.21$ | \$ $\begin{array}{r}395,804.16 \\ 73.45\end{array}$ | \$ $183,272.42$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.4,952.95 \\ 17.62 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,173,475.74 \\ 217.77 \end{array}$ | $29,094.44$ 5.40 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ \quad 39,224.47 \\ 7.28 \end{array}$ | \$ $7,315,807.69$ $1,357.67$ |
|  | Morthglenn Total: Per Unit: | 18,588.5 | 29,571,889.17 | $906,487.75$ 48.77 | $918,043.59$ 49.39 | $\begin{array}{r} 334,077.81 \\ 17.97 \end{array}$ | $2,520,001.22$ 135.57 | $\begin{array}{r} 62,479.37 \\ 3.36 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.776 .54 \\ 5.21 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24,734,022.89 \\ 1,330.61 \end{array}$ |
|  | Commerce City Total: Per Unit: | 5,890.9 | $9,990,670.57$ $1,695.95$ | $480,734.62$ 81.61 | $199,136.82$ 33.80 | $132,899.29$ 22.56 | $1,107,493.64$ 188.00 | $27,458.52$ 4.66 | $45,742.98$ 7.77 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,997,204.70 \\ 1,357.55 \end{array}$ |
|  | Brighton Total: Per Unit: | 3,911.8 | $6,759,590.06$ $1,728.00$ | $\begin{array}{r} 249.216 .08 \\ 63.71 \end{array}$ | 185.340 .20 47.38 | $105,498.01$ 26.97 | $699,569.58$ 178.84 | $17,344.71$ 4.43 | $25,937.99$ 6.63 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,476,683.49 \\ 1,400.04 \end{array}$ |
|  | Bennett <br> Total: <br> Per Unit: | 454.3 | $749,372.38$ $1,649.51$ | $19,600.61$ 43.14 | $29,429.95$ 64.78 | $15,106.02$ 33.25 | $62,559.79$ 137.71 | 1,551.06 | $2,226.10$ 4.90 | $\begin{array}{r} 618,898.85 \\ 1,362.31 \end{array}$ |
| Y | Strasburg Total: Per Unit: | 397.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 687,175.41 \\ 1,730.63 \end{array}$ | $17,819.60$ 44.88 | $17,278.07$ 43.51 | $14,713.79$ 37.06 | $61,173.35$ 154.06 | $1,516.69$ 3.82 | $2,539.74$ 6.40 | $\begin{array}{r} 572,134.16 \\ 1,440.90 \end{array}$ |
|  | Westininster Total: Per Unit: | 13,936.4 | $22,65.2,642.33$ $1,625.43$ | 1,173,113.43 | $338,393.48$ 24.28 | $208,102.31$ 14.93 | $2,353,789.75$ 168.90 | $58,358.42$ 4.19 | $83,722.53$ 6.01 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,437,162.42 \\ 1,322.95 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\frac{\text { ALAYOSA }}{\text { Alamosa }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Alamosa Total: Per Unit | 2,219.2 | $3,277,785.52$ $1,476.99$ | 106,261.13 | $132,708.51$ 59.80 | $61,987.04$ 27.93 | $\begin{array}{r} 303,385.62 \\ 136.71 \end{array}$ | $7,521.96$ 3.39 | $11,103.89$ 5.00 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,654,817.37 \\ 1,196.28 \end{array}$ |
|  | Sangre DeCrist Total: Per Unit: | 258.7 | 374.063 .72 $1,445.75$ | $14,489.83$ 56.00 | $9,259.37$ 35.79 | $\begin{array}{r} 9,339.94 \\ 36.10 \end{array}$ | $36,824.12$ 142.32 | $\begin{array}{r} 913.00 \\ 3.53 \end{array}$ | $1,579.17$ 6.10 | $\begin{array}{r} 301,658.28 \\ 1,165.90 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ARAPABOE } \\ & \text { Raglewod } \\ & \text { Total: } \\ & \text { Per Unit: } \end{aligned}$ | 4,030.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,458,936.34 \\ 1,850.47 \end{array}$ | 359,235.94 | $\begin{array}{r} 96,364.25 \\ 23.91 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25,351.28 \\ 6.29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 780,542.74 \\ 193.64 \end{array}$ | $19,352.30$ 4.80 | $30,202.87$ 7.49 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,147,886.97 \\ 1,525.21 \end{array}$ |
|  | Sheridan Total: Per Unit: | 1,738.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,054,911.15 \\ 1,756.84 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 168,204.33 \\ 96.73 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87,903.55 \\ 50.55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38,075.50 \\ 21.90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 305,709.10 \\ 175.81 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,579.57 \\ 4.36 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,115.31 \\ 6.97 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,435,323.80 \\ 1,400.52 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cherry Creek } \\ & \text { Total: } \\ & \text { Per Unit: } \end{aligned}$ | 18,292.6 | $35,659,404.98$ $1,949.39$ | 1,328,484.51 | $478,987.97$ 26.18 | 873,732.76 | $2,844,498.56$ 155.50 | $70,524.75$ 3.86 | 118,461.65 | $\begin{array}{r} 29,944.714 .76 \\ 1,636.99 \end{array}$ |




| $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { District } \end{aligned}$ | AE | ARB |  | Special Education |  | Vocational <br> Education |  | ansportation |  | P.E.R.A. |  | nemployment ompensation |  | Workmen's ompensation |  | $\underset{A R B}{\substack{\text { Kemaining }}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CROWLEY <br> Crowley Total: Per Unit: | 547.0 | $767,854.22$ $1,403.67$ | \$ | $30,879.17$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 37,818.36 \\ 69.13 \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29,451.28 \\ 53.84 \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 86,011.05 \\ 157.23 \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,132.50 \\ 3.90 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,249.51 \\ 5.94 \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 578,312.35 \\ 1,057.18 \end{array}$ |
| CUSTER <br> Consolidated Total: <br> Per Unit: | 248.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 403,431.43 \\ 1,624.12 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 21,942.12 \\ 88.33 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8,655.03 \\ 34.84 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 11,041.56 \\ 44.45 \end{array}$ |  | $34,340.50$ 138.25 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 851.42 \\ 3.43 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1,329.00 \\ 5.35 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 325,271.80 \\ 1,309.47 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { DELTA }}{\text { Deİta }} \\ & \text { Total: } \\ & \text { Per Unit: } \end{aligned}$ | 3,962.3 | 5,547,172.56 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 411,269.22 \\ 103.8 \mathrm{C} \end{array}$ |  | $137,137.93$ 34.61 |  | $144,642.35$ 36.50 |  | $576,460.39$ $=45.49$ |  | $14,292.40$ 3.61 |  | $21,409.19$ 5.40 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4,241,961.07 \\ 1,070.59 \end{array}$ |
| DENVER <br> Denver Total: <br> Per Unit: | 65,464.6 | $\begin{array}{r} 137,396,519.26 \\ 2,098.79 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 7,918,865.51 \\ 120.96 \end{array}$ |  | $3,575,481.81$ |  | $3,599,619.73$ 54.99 |  | 17,015,021.03 |  | +21,860.0 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 690,593.09 \\ 10.55 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 104,155,078.07 \\ 1,591.01 \end{array}$ |
| DOLORES <br> Dolores Total: <br> Per Unit: | 401.1 | $605,697.10$ $1,510.09$ |  | $25,696.11$ 64.06 |  | 27,211.68 |  | $22,539.34$ 56.19 |  | 67,339.31 |  | $1,669.57$ 4.16 |  | $2,942.22$ 7.34 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 458,298.86 \\ 1,142.61 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 出 DOUGLAS } \\ & \text { Douglas } \\ & \text { Total: } \\ & \text { Per Unit: } \end{aligned}$ | 5,690.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,900,012.15 \\ 1,563.93 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 241,185.53 \\ 42.38 \end{array}$ |  | $72,130.40$ 12.67 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 344,534.00 \\ 60.54 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 814,103.03 \\ 143.06 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 20,184 \cdot 38 \\ 3 \cdot 55 \end{array}$ |  | $37,338.24$ 6.56 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 7,370,536.57 \\ 1,295.17 \end{array}$ |
| EAGLE <br> Eagle Total: Per Unit: | 1,669.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,808,813.54 \\ 2,281.82 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 65,318.00 \\ 39.13 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 101,989.31 \\ 61.10 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 179,232.85 \\ 107.38 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 382,193.52 \\ 228.97 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 9,475.88 \\ 5.68 \end{array}$ |  | $16,477.93$ 9.87 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,054,126.06 \\ 1,829.69 \end{array}$ |
| ELBERT <br> Elizabeth Total: Per Unit: | 694.4 | 1,079,604.35 |  | $28,023.39$ 40.36 |  | $18,593.39$ 26.78 |  | $17,831.45$ 25.68 |  | 78,947.95 |  | $1,957.39$ 2.82 |  | 2,939.11 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 931,311.67 \\ 1,341.17 \end{array}$ |
| Kiowa Total: Per Unit: | 168.9 | $332,297.21$ $1,967.42$ |  | 14,011.10 |  | . 00 |  | $6,163.04$ 36.49 |  | $26,642.23$ 157.74 |  | 660.55 3.91 |  | $1,238.74$ 7.33 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 283,581.56 \\ 1,678.99 \end{array}$ |
| Big Sandy Total Per Unit: | 261.3 | $401,002.89$ $1,534.45$ |  | 14,011.10 |  | 24,331.02 |  | $11,762.03$ 45.01 |  | $40,075.90$ 153.35 |  | 993.61 3.80 |  | 1,617.61 6.19 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 308,211.62 \\ 1,179.38 \end{array}$ |
| EIbert <br> Total: <br> Per Unit: | 149.9 | 227,921.44 |  | 14,011.10 93.47 |  | $5,257.72$ 35.07 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8,611.19 \\ 57.45 \end{array}$ |  | $22,073.28$ 147.25 |  | 547.27 3.65 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 852.55 \\ 5.69 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 176,568.33 \\ 1,177.91 \end{array}$ |
| Agate <br> Total: <br> Per Unit: | 41.6 | $\begin{array}{r} 121,166.45 \\ 2,914.99 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1,782.20 \\ 42.88 \end{array}$ |  | . 00 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4,386.76 \\ 105.54 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 21,165.47 \\ 509.19 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 524.76 \\ 12.62 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 901.70 \\ 21.69 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 92,405.55 \\ 2,223.07 \end{array}$ |
| ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ) |
| $\cdots \quad 10$ | , ' | 1 |  | , |  | $\cdots 1$ |  | $\because+\cdots$ |  | $!$ |  | 1 $\%$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |





| COUNTY <br> District | $\underline{\text { AE }}$ | ARB |  | Special Education |  | Vocational <br> Education | Tranaportation |  | P.E.R.A. | Unemployment Compensation | Workmen's Compensation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Remaining } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LA PLATA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Durango Total: Per Unit: | 3,512.0 | 5,238,920.54 $1,491.72$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 116,739.83 \\ 33.24 \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 102,579.42 \\ 29.21 \end{array}$ | $\$ \quad 234,986.02$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 494,618.64 \\ 140.84+ \end{array}$ | $\$ \quad 12,263.27$ 3.49 | * $\begin{array}{r}19,929.13 \\ 5.67\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4,357,804.22 \\ 1,240.83 \end{array}$ |
| Baypield <br> Total: <br> Per Unit: | 590.6 | $826,839.97$ $1,400.00$ |  | $22,026.25$ 37.29 |  | $24,443.59$ 41.39 | $18,287.66$ 30.96 |  | $64,471.27$ 109.16 | $1,598.46$ 2.71 | 2,435.13 | $\begin{array}{r} 693,577.60 \\ 1,174.36 \end{array}$ |
| Ignacio <br> Total: <br> Per Unit: | 984.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,377,600.00 \\ 1,400.00 \end{array}$ |  | $35,242.24$ 35.82 |  | $2,760.98$ 2.81 | $40,443.08$ 41.10 |  | $182,153.98$ 185.12 | $4,516.22$ 4.59 | 5,342.40 | 1,107,141.11 |
| LARIMER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poudre Total: Per Unit: | 13,500.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,058,993.97 \\ 1,707.96 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 757,726.11 \\ 56.07 \end{array}$ |  | 564, $\begin{array}{r}534.61 \\ 41.81\end{array}$ | $242,755.62$ 17.98 |  | $2,325,049.99$ 172.21 | 57,54-87 | $83,762.19$ 6.22 | $\begin{array}{r} 19,028, \because 9.58 \\ 1,409.39 \end{array}$ |
| LARIMER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thompson Total: Per Unit: | 9,255.7 | $13,253,975.99$ $1,431.98$ |  | 414, 396.36 |  | 359,705.19 | $210,370.35$ 22.73 |  | 1,129,929.32 | $28,014.77$ 3.03 | $39,648.60$ 4.28 | 11,071,911.39 |
| Park (Estes Park Total: Per Unit: | (k) $1,115.5$ | $1,858,043.63$ $1,665.66$ |  | $52,855.65$ 47.38 |  | 53,397.18 | $42,201.57$ 37.83 |  | 157,294.66 | $3,899.87$ 3.50 | $5,178.13$ 4.64 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,543,216.56 \\ 1,383.43 \end{array}$ |
| ¢ LAS ANIMAS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: Per Unit: | 1,904.1 | $2,737,904.99$ $1,437.90$ |  | $153,592.44$ 80.66 |  | $138,991.22$ 73.00 | $59,066.09$ 31.02 |  | $292,633.81$ 153.69 | $7,255.38$ 3.81 | $10,286.39$ 5.40 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,076,079.66 \\ 1,090.32 \end{array}$ |
| Primero Reorg. Total: Per Unit: | 222.3 | $377,387.60$ $1,697.65$ |  | $14,628.47$ 65.81 |  | . 00 | $16,674.92$ 75.01 |  | $41,133.18$ 185.03 | $1,019.83$ 4.59 | $1,975.63$ 8.89 | $301,955.57$ $1,358.32$ |
| Hoehne Reorg. Total: Per Unit: | 340.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 486,486.02 \\ 1,430.00 \end{array}$ |  | $29,255.76$ 86.00 |  | $19,606.54$ 57.63 | $29,067.35$ 85.44 |  | $51,015.01$ 149.96 | $1,264.84$ 3.72 | $2,386.27$ 7.01 | $\begin{array}{r} 353,890.25 \\ 1,040.24 \end{array}$ |
| Aguilar Reorg. Total: Per Unit: | 242.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 339,079.97 \\ 1,400.00 \end{array}$ |  | $21,9+2.12$ 90.60 |  | $4,844.16$ 20.00 | $13,143.70$ 54.27 |  | $41,866.43$ 172.86 | $1,038.01$ 4.29 | $1,945.96$ 8.03 | $\begin{array}{r} 254,299.58 \\ 1,04+9.96 \end{array}$ |
| Branson, Reorg. Total: Per Unit: | 61.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 143,354.86 \\ 2,334.77 \end{array}$ |  | 7,313.64 |  | $9,132.57$ 148.74 | $2,189.83$ 35.66 |  | $18,479.31$ 300.97 | $\begin{array}{r} 458.17 \\ 7.46 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 695.82 \\ 11.33 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105,085 \cdot 52 \\ 1,711.49 \end{array}$ |
| Kim Reorg. Total: Per Unit: | 118.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 262,927.31 \\ 2,220.67 \end{array}$ |  | $7,338.53$ 61.98 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 10,809 \cdot 31 \\ 91.29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,496.13 \\ 63.31 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 27,788.04 \\ 234.70 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 688.95 \\ 5.82 \end{array}$ | $1,118.69$ 9.45 | $\begin{array}{r} 207,687.65 \\ 1,754.12 \end{array}$ |
| LINCOLN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ```Hugo Total: Per Unit:``` | 199.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 329,034.50 \\ 1,646.27 \end{array}$ |  | $8,909.80$ 44.58 |  | . 00 | $10,757.17$ 53.82 |  | $35,343.34$ 176.83 | 876.28 4.38 | $1,445.49$ 7.23 | $\begin{array}{r} 271,702.41 \\ 1,359.42 \end{array}$ |









APPENDIX D

| 1977 ESTIMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEYLES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) <br> County | (2) District Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ \text { Property } \\ \text { Tax } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (4) <br> State <br> Revenue | (5) Total | (6) <br> Assessed <br> Value (000) | (7) <br> 1977 Actual Levy | $\begin{gathered} \text { (8) } \\ 1977 \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { Levy } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (9) <br> Difference |
| Adams | Mapleton | 4,079,025 | 4,981,996 | 9,061,021 | 94,952.240 | 42.85 | 95.43 | 52.58 |
| Adams | NorthglennThornton | 7,414,199 | 17,569,273 | 24,983,472 | 175,855.400 | 42.92 | 142.07 | 99.15 |
| Adams | Adams County | 3,880,242 | 5,899,525 | 9,779,767 | 81,114.070 | 48.39 | 120.57 | 72.18 |
| Adams | Brighton | 3,250,005 | 2,972,303 | 6,222,308 | 70,472.560 | 46.79 | 38.29 | 41.50 |
| Adams | Bennett | 408,875 | 245,616 | 654,491 | 9,821.220 | 41.93 | 66.64 | 24.71 |
| Adams | Strasburg | 504,644 | 158,947 | 663,591 | 18,245.470 | 27.59 | 36.37 | 8.78 |
| Adams | Westminster | 6,531,783 | 14,796,310 | 21,328,093 | 145,830.570 | 45.23 | 146.25 | 101.02 |
| Alamosa | Alamosa | 1,125,205 | 1,825,749 | 2,950,954 | 30,476.850 | 36.44 | 96.83 | 60.30 |
| Alamosa | Sangre De Cristo | 181,190 | 235,823 | 417,013 | 4,679.480 | 37.22 | 89.12 | 51.90 |
| Arapahoe | Englewood | 4,900,428 | 2,392,005 | 7,292,433 | 102,744.200 | 47.64 | 70.98 | 23.34 |
| Arapahoe | Sheridan | 1,120,411 | 1,781,893 | 2,902,304 | 25,100.040 | 44.80 | 115.63 | 70.83 |
| Arapahoe | Cherry Creek | 17,555,366 | 10,087,338 | 27,642,704 | 334,256.730 | 52.70 | 82.70 | 30.00 |
| Arapahoe | Littleton | 9,779,768 | 14,604,364 | 24,384,132 | 230,474.000 | 42.46 | 105.30 | 63.34 |
| Arapahoe | Deer Trail | 397,100 | 56,091 | 453,191 | 19,391.080 | 19.10 | 23.37 | 4.27 |
| Arapahoe | Adams-Arapahoe | 11,973,424 | 18,217,910 | 30,191,334 | 253,735.090 | 47.34 | 118.99 | 71.65 |
| Arapahoe | Byers | 329,195 | 203,636 | 532,831 | 9,527.940 | 33.07 | 55.92 | 22.85 |
| Archuleta | Archuleta Co. | 653,324 | 413,423 | 1,066,747 | 23,454.690 | 28.78 | 45.48 | 16.70 |
| Baca | Halsh | 399,798 | 267,919 | 667,717 | 10,753.440 | 38.53 | 62.09 | 23.56 |
| Baca | Pritchett | 141,958 | 109,419 | 251,377 | 3,542.200 | 37.20 | 65.43 | 28.23 |
| Baca | Springfield | 397,238 | 321,663 | 718,901 | 9,966.880 | 39.60 | 72.13 | 32.53 |
| Baca | Vilas | 140,212 | 100,238 | 240,450 | 3,294.450 | 42.56 | 72.99 | 30.43 |
| Baca | Campo | 103,513 | 139,552 | 243,065 | 2,660.120 | 39.30 | 91.37 | 52.07 |
| Bent | Las Animas | 470,274 | 1,033,936 | 1,504,210 | 11,239.940 | 40.37 | 133.83 | 93.46 |
| Bent | McClave | 235,472 | 189,479 | 424,951 | 6,660.640 | 35.25 | 63.80 | 28.55 |
| Boulder | St. Vrain Valley | 7,367,225 | 11,725,635 | 19,092,833 | 180,022.030 | 40.97 | 106.06 | 65.09 |

1977 ESTIMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEVIES
IN THE ABSENCE OF STATE REVENUES

|  | (1) <br> County | $\begin{gathered} (2) \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Name } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ \text { Property } \\ \text { Tax } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (4) <br> State <br> Revenue | (5) Total | (6) <br> Assessed <br> Value (000) | (7) <br> 1977 Actual Levy |  | (9) <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boulder | Boulder Valley | 19,349,932 | 16,128,588 | 35,478,520 | 406,950.580 | 47.67 | 87.18 | 39.51 |
|  | Chaffee | Buena Vista | 564,945 | 741,859 | 1,306,804 | 16,111.380 | 34.17 | 81.11 | 46.94 |
|  | Chaffee | Salida | 775,970 | 844,018 | 1,619,988 | 23,916.860 | 32.67 | 67.73 | 35.06 |
|  | Cheyenne | Kit Carson | 245,657 | 119,361 | 365,018 | 7,322.490 | 33.71 | 49.85 | 16.14 |
|  | Cheyenne | Cheyenne Wells | 379,527 | 130,213 | 509,740 | 11,970.920 | 31.67 | 42.58 | 10.91 |
|  | Cheyenne | Arapahoe | 139,104 | 79,101 | 218,205 | 3,785.270 | 36.46 | 57.65 | 21.19 |
|  | Clear Creek | Clear Creek | 1,482,494 | 491,133 | 1,973,627 | 55,111.240 | 27.01 | 35.81 | 8.80 |
|  | Conejos | North Conejos | 279,483 | 1,187,173 | 1,466,656 | 7,247.580 | 39.20 | 202.36 | 163.16 |
|  | Conejos | South Conejos | 187,340 | 815,741 | 1,003,081 | 4,675.100 | 35.34 | 214.56 | 179.22 |
|  | Conejos | Sanford | 87,093 | 301,177 | 388,270 | 2,487.530 | 33.48 | 156.09 | 122.61 |
|  | Costilla | Centennial | 390,063 | 310,694 | 700,757 | 11,657.380 | 35.52 | 60.11 | 24.59 |
|  | Costilla | Sierra Grande | 276,474 | 118,574 | 395,048 | 13.575.680 | 20.48 | 29.10 | 8.62 |
|  | Crowley | Crowley | 375,746 | 425,983 | 801,729 | 10,529.130 | 36.02 | 76.14 | 40.12 |
| 1 | Custer | Consolidated | 250,801 | 129,804 | 380,605 | 10,842.890 | 22.69 | 35.10 | 12.41 |
|  | Delta | Delta | 1,625,075 | 3,490,865 | 5,115,940 | 48,440.660 | 34.05 | 105.61 | 71.56 |
|  | Denver | Denver | 92,332,999 | 44,855,519 | 137,188,518 | 1,957,908.930 | 46.94 | 70.07 | 23.13 |
|  | Dolores | Dolores | 339,398 | 337,306 | 676,704 | 8,088.050 | 39.22 | 83.67 | 44.45 |
|  | Douglas | Douglas | 3,866,535 | 3,235,589 | 7,103,124 | 94,264.590 | 41.10 | 75.35 | 34.25 |
|  | Eagle | Eagle | 2,770,261 | 950,779 | 3,721,040 | 96,493.790 | 28.81 | 38.56 | 9.75 |
|  | Elbert | Elizabeth | 299,220 | 556,285 | 855,505 | 8,308.240 | 35.77 | 102.97 | 67.20 |
|  | Elbert | Kiowa | 190,985 | 82,712 | 273,697 | 4,397.340 | 43.52 | 62.24 | 18.72 |
|  | Elbert |  |  |  |  | 5,420.130 |  |  |  |
|  | Elbert | Elbert | 81,534 | 178,940 | 260,474 | 2,075.130 | 39.57 | 125.52 | 85.95 |
|  | Elbert | Agate | 142,142 | 57,335 | 199,477 | 4,647.580 | 29.84 | 42.92 | 13.08 |
|  | El Paso | Calhan | 141,731 | 306,081 | 447,812 | 3,618.210 | 39.27 | 123.77 | 84.50 |
|  | El Paso | Harrison | 2,875,886 | 4,968,759 | 7,844,645 | 75,946.110 | 38.02 | 103.29 | 65.27 |

1977 ESTIMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEVIES
IN THE ABSENCE OF STATE REVENUES

|  | (1) <br> County | $\begin{gathered} (2) \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Name } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ \text { Property } \\ \text { Tax } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (4) <br> State <br> Revenue | (5) <br> Total | (6) <br> Assessed <br> Value (000) | $\begin{gathered} \text { (7) } \\ 1977 \text { Actual } \\ \text { Levy } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (8) } \\ 1977 \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { Levy } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (9) <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | El Paso | Widefield | 1,646,478 | 6,175,730 | 7,822,208 | 48,090.860 | 34.45 | 162.65 | 123.20 |
|  | El Paso | Fountain | 442,552 | 3,179,432 | 3,621,984 | 13,547.280 | 32.67 | 267.36 | 234.69 |
|  | El Paso | Colorado Spgs. | 20,327,345 | 23,400,103 | 43,727,448 | 511,455.780 | 39.72 | 85.50 | 45.78 |
|  | El Paso | Cheyenne Mtn. | 2,394,516 | 964,410 | 3,358,926 | 51,848.910 | 46.17 | 64.73 | 18.61 |
|  | El Paso | Manitou Spgs. | 748,634 | 669,399 | 1,418,033 | 18,442.900 | 40.53 | 76.89 | 36.36 |
|  | El Paso | Academy | 1,664,452 | 3,244,235 | 4,908,687 | 50,134.570 | 33.26 | 07.91 | 64.65 |
|  | El Paso | Ellicott | 147,021 | 306,890 | 453,911 | 4,102.990 | 36.51 | 110.63 | 74.12 |
|  | El Paso | Peyton | 124,492 | 187,766 | 312,258 | 2,684.970 | 49.54 | 116.30 | 66.76 |
|  | El Paso | Hanover | 101,139 | 33,243 | 134,382 | 4,179.240 | 24.19 | 32.15 | 7.96 |
|  | El Paso | Lewis-Palmer | 927,928 | 473,194 | 1,400,762 | 21,993.810 | 39.94 | 63.69 | 23.75 |
|  | El Paso | Falcon | 532,366 | 781,704 | 1,314,070 | 13,044.510 | 40.72 | 100.74 | 60.02 |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ | El Paso | Edison | 71,353 | 23,999 | 95,352 | 1,739.890 | 40.87 | 54.80 | 13.93 |
| $\cdots$ | El Paso | Miami-Yoder | 156,436 | 110,859 | 267,295 | 3,358. 310 | 46.70 | 79.59 | 32.89 |
| 1 | Fremont | Canon City | 1,413,062 | 2,723,499 | 4,136,561 | 39,146.270 | 36.15 | 105.67 | 69.52 |
|  | Fremont | Florence | 815,246 | 1,006,589 | 1,821,835 | 23,534.360 | 34.58 | 77.41 | 42.83 |
|  | Fremont | Cotopaxi | 210,335 | 134,725 | 345,060 | 6,547.570 | 32.55 | 52.70 | 20.15 |
|  | Garfield | Roaring Fork | 2,070,033 | 1,413,185 | 3,483,218 | 63,389.540 | 32.79 | 54.95 | 22.16 |
|  | Garfield | Garfield | 758,483 | 1,321,209 | 2,079,692 | 18,554.630 | 40.88 | 112.08 | 71.20 |
|  | Garfield | Grand Valley | 229,917 | 124,609 | 354,526 | 3,917.370 | 58.34 | 90.50 | 32.16 |
|  | Gilpin | Gilpin County | 362,782 | 136,077 | 498,859 | 7,060.390 | 50.50 | 70.66 | 20.16 |
|  | Grand | West Grand | 678,615 | 169,587 | 848,202 | 40,794.420 | 16.69 | 20.79 | 4.10 |
|  | Grand | East Grand | 1,133,096 | 358,131 | 1,491,227 | 40,866.900 | 27.78 | 36.49 | 8.71 |
|  | Gunnison | Gunnison Watershed | 1,281,659 | 554,112 | 1,835,771 | 43,818.280 | 29.68 | 41.90 | 12.22 |
|  | Hinsdale | Hinsdale | 67,003 | 27,565 | 94,568 | 4,934.200 | 13.50 | 19.17 | 5.67 |
|  | Huerfano | Huerfano | 593,715 | 930,630 | 1,524,345 | 14,420.760 | 40.43 | 105.70 | 65.27 |

## 1977 ESTIMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEVIES

in THE ABSENCE OF STATE REVENUES

|  | (1) <br> County | $\begin{gathered} (2) \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Name } \end{gathered}$ | (3) <br> Property <br> Tax | (4) State <br> Revenue | (5) <br> Total | (6) <br> Assessed <br> Value (000) | $\begin{gathered} \text { (7) } \\ 1977 \text { Actual } \\ \text { Levy } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (8) } \\ 1977 \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { Levy } \end{gathered}$ | (9) <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Huerfano | La Veta | 177,120 | 157,316 | 334,436 | 4,871.530 | 37.30 | 62.65 | 31.35 |
|  | Jackson | North Park | 414,784 | 194,724 | 609,508 | 16,638.520 | 24.72 | 36.63 | 11.91 |
|  | Jefferson | Jefferson | 58,481,690 | 60,051,388 | 118,533,078 | 1,322,099.670 | 46.78 | 89.66 | 42.83 |
|  | Kiowa | Eads | 355,088 | 225,610 | 580,698 | 10,112.160 | 35.14 | 57.43 | 22.29 |
|  | Kiowa | Plainview | 199,765 | 89,589 | 289,354 | 7,806.190 | 25.62 | 37.07 | 11.45 |
|  | Kit Carson | Flagler | 186,698 | 178,698 | 365,396 | 4,476.790 | 41.65 | 81.62 | 32.97 |
|  | Kit Carson | Seibert | 111,326 | 83,050 | 194,376 | 2,862.950 | 33.76 | 67.39 | 29.13 |
|  | Kit Carson | Vona | 82,233 | 40,659 | 122,892 | 2,379.450 | 34.67 | 51.65 | 16.98 |
|  | Kit Carson | Stratton | 225,372 | 262,191 | 487,563 | 5,326.310 | 42.01 | 91.54 | 49.53 |
|  | Kit Carson | Bethune | 123,933 | 115,791 | 239,724 | 3,079.990 | 40.22 | 77.83 | 37.C1 |
|  | Kit Carson | Burlington | 715,125 | 619,234 | 1,334,359 | 19,145.390 | 37.29 | 69.70 | 32.41 |
|  | Lake | Lake | 2,612,658 | 843,065 | 3,455,723 | 81,579.940 | 32.23 | 42.36 | 10.13 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | La Plata | Durango | 2,624,247 | 2,143,077 | 4,767,324 | 64,788.500 | 40.75 | 73.53 | 32.83 |
| ${ }_{1}$ | La Plata | Bayfield | 348,259 | 198,792 | 547,051 | 10,878.820 | 30.81 | 50.29 | 19.43 |
|  | La Plata | Ignacio | 261,302 | 836,681 | 1,097,983 | 9,380.840 | 32.66 | 117.05 | 34.39 |
|  | Larimer | Poudre | 9,588,046 | 11,302,950 | 20,890,996 | 211,922.740 | 45.43 | 98.58 | 53.15 |
|  | Larimer | Thomp son | 4,665,679 | 6,162,427 | 10,828,106 | 127,182.240 | 36.36 | 85.14 | 48.23 |
|  | Larimer | Park(Estes Park) | 1,139,693 | 403,098 | 1,547,791 | 40,957.780 | 27.84 | 37.79 | 9.95 |
|  | Las Animas | Trinidad | 562,435 | 2,041,538 | 2,603,973 | 14,990.860 | 37.11 | 173.70 | 136.59 |
|  | Las Animas | Primero Reorganized | 265,412 | 145,073 | 410,485 | 6,725.730 | 39.67 | 61.03 | 21.36 |
|  | Las Animas | :Hoehne Reorganized | 201,745 | 325,606 | 527,351 | 5,747.190 | 34.96 | 01.76 | 56.89 |
|  | Las Animas | Aguilar Reorganized | 103,146 | 223,358 | 326,504 | 3,193.080 | 32.81 | 102.25 | 6.9 .44 |
|  | Las Animas | Branson Reorganized | 104,240 | 87,566 | 191,806 | 2,311.310 | 45.16 | 82.09 | 37.33 |
|  | Las Animas | Kim Reorganized | 178,021 | 161,688 | 339,709 | 4,006.100 | 44.82 | 84.80 | 39.98 |
|  | Lincoln | Hugo | 225,465 | 159,443 | 384,908 | 6,361.530 | 35.40 | 60.51 | 25.11 |


| 1977 EST IMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEVIES <br> IN THE ABSENCE OF STATE REVEiNUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) <br> County | (2) <br> District <br> Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ \text { Property } \\ \text { Tax } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (4) <br> State <br> Revenue | (5) <br> Total | (6) <br> Assessed Vaiue (000) | (7) <br> 1977 Actual <br> Levy | (E) <br> 1077 Adiusted <br> Levy | (9) Difference |
| Lincoln | Limon | 286,188 | 362,635 | 648,823 | 8,816.250 | 32.66 | 73.59 | 40.03 |
| Lincoln | Genoa | 90,762 | 76,919 | 167,601 | 2,723.350 | 33.36 | 6?.4E | 23.10 |
| Lincoln | Karval | 108,354 | 101,350 | 209,704 | 3,286.650 | 33.98 | C3. 89 | 37.72 |
| Lincoln | Arriba | 145,491 | 105,367 | 250,853 | 3,864.800 | 37.00 | 6.4 .91 | 27.71 |
| Logan | Valley | 2,741,586 | 2,424,185 | 5,165,771 | 64,348.380 | 41.98 | 79.6E | 27.68 |
| Logan | Frenchman | 225,660 | 223,276 | 448,936 | 5,078.540 | 44.32 | 30.10 | 44.08 |
| Logan | Buffalo | 238,596 | 218,406 | 457,002 | 6,903.160 | 39.77 | 6E.2n | 20.50 |
| Logan | Plateau | 283,061 | 139,773 | 422,834 | 6,897.370 | 41.90 | 61.35 | 20.3 ? |
| Mesa | De Beque | 196,007 | 117,033 | 313,049 | 5,909.862 | 33.98 | 52.17 | 13.10 |
| Mesa | Plateau Valley | 201,018 | 180,419 | 381,437 | 5,683.460 | 35.33 | 67.75 | 23.72 |
| Mesa | Mesa Valley | 6,039,247 | 10,496,094 | 16,535,341 | 160,218.650 | 37.63 | 103.20 | $65.5 ?$ |
| Mineral | Creede Consolidated | d 229,093 | 128,343 | 357,436 | 7,433.370 | 31.32 | 43.09 | 16.77 |
| Moffat | Moffat | 1,899,981 | 1,095,443 | 2,995,424 | 60,246.860 | 31.35 | 49.72 | 18.37 |
| Montezuma | Montezuma | 882,140 | 2,459,940 | 3,342,980 | 26,940.680 | 32.66 | 124.05 | 91.30 |
| Montezuma | Dolores | 193,574 | 456,489 | 650,063 | 5,429.500 | 35.59 | 119.73 | 84.94 |
| Montezuma | Mancos | 154,271 | 437,312 | 591,583 | 4,240.810 | 35.67 | 139.50 | 103.83 |
| Montrose | Montrose | 1,925,648 | 3,689,984 | 5,615,632 | 45,528.890 | 42.50 | 123.34 | 80.83 |
| Montrose | West End | 367,295 | 858,931 | 1,226,226 | 3,262.510 | 43.44 | 148.41 | 104.97 |
| Morgan | Brush | 794,390 | 1,154,289 | 1,948,679 | 21,376.350 | 37.10 | 91.16 | 54.06 |
| Morgan | Fort Morgan | 2,045,693 | 2,249,537 | 4,295,230 | 44,476.080 | 45.39 | 96.57 | 50.68 |
| Morgan | Weldon Valley | 157,348 | 200,676 | 358,024 | 3,656.540 | 42.99 | 97.91 | 54.92 |
| Morgan | Wiggins | 450,360 | 363,070 | 313,430 | 9,532.980 | 47.82 | 35.33 | 37.51 |
| Otero | East Otero | 732,451 | 2,765,188 | 3,497,639 | 19,320.940 | 36. 39 | 176.16 | 140.77 |
| Otero | Rocky Ford | 651,419 | 1,464,676 | 2,116,095 | 17,662.700 | 36.52 | 119.8 i | 83.29 |
| Otero | Manzalola | 83,214 | 323,819 | 407,033 | 2,361.110 | 35.23 | $171.0{ }^{1}$ | i 36.75 |
| Otero | Fowler | 333,143 | 582,978 | 916,121 | 7,164.630 | 46.87 | 127.87 | 81.00 |

1977 ESTIMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEVIES
In the absence of state revenues

|  | (1) <br> County | $\begin{gathered} (2) \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Name } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (3) \\ \text { Property } \\ \text { Tax } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (4) <br> State <br> Revenue | (5) <br> Total | (6) <br> Assessed <br> Value (000) | $\begin{gathered} (7) \\ 1977 \text { Actual } \\ \text { Levy } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (8) } \\ 1977 \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { Levy } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (9) <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Otero | Cheraw | 101,215 | 245,118 | 346,333 | 2,331.730 | 43.47 | 148.53 | 105.96 |
|  | Otero | Swink | 159,489 | 314,323 | 473,812 | 3,459.710 | 46.39 | 136.95 | 99.56 |
|  | Ouray | Ouray | 212,585 | 131,662 | 344,250 | 6,769.030 | 30.63 | 50.86 | 20.23 |
|  | Ouray | Ridgway | 132,020 | 153,972 | 285,992 | 3,434.790 | 40.19 | 83.26 | 43.07 |
|  | Park | Platte Canyon | 595,846 | 376,057 | 971,903 | 12,838.580 | 46.30 | 75.70 | 29.40 |
|  | Park | Park | 552,075 | 194,758 | 746,833 | 29,269.200 | 19.55 | 25.52 | 5.97 |
|  | Phillips | Holyoke | 610,714 | 357,746 | 968,460 | 16,245.630 | 37.48 | 59.61 | 22.13 |
|  | Phillips | Haxtun | 361,169 | 261,039 | 622,208 | 8,706.220 | 41.14 | 71.47 | 30.33 |
|  | Pitkin | Aspen | 1,915,290 | 371,529 | 2,286,819 | 117,380.570 | 16.94 | 19.48 | 2.54 |
|  | Prowers | Granada | 195,252 | 457,302 | 652,554 | 5,420.080 | 36.33 | 120.4n | 34.07 |
|  | Prowers | Lamar | 1,001,437 | 1,633,698 | 2,635,135 | 27,302.220 | 36.53 | 96.52 | 59.09 |
|  | Prowers | Holly | 233,103 | 410,022 | 693,125 | 7,220.100 | 39.37 | 96.00 | 56.63 |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | Prowers | Wiley | 179,639 | 213,521 | 393,160 | 4,189.120 | 39.10 | 93.85 | 54.75 |
| o | Pueblo | Pueblo City | 11,402,776 | 19,482,843 | 30,885,619 | 286,869.830 | 39. 92 | 107.66 | 67.74 |
|  | Pueblo | Pueblo Rural | 3,021,302 | 3,531,916 | 6,553,218 | 76,766.580 | 39.24 | 85.37 | 46.13 |
|  | Rio Elanco | Meeker | 816,299 | 339,130 | 1,155,429 | 23,686.620 | 35.07 | 48.79 | 13.71 |
|  | Rio Blanco | Rangely | 997,637 | 65,593 | 1,063,230 | 177,849.420 | 5.60 | 5.98 | 3.38 |
|  | Rio Grande | Del Norte | 394,470 | 543,555 | 938,025 | 11,258.990 | 35.00 | 83.24 | 48.64 |
|  | Rio Grande | Monte Vista | 599,545 | 1,279,074 | 1,878,619 | 16,353.030 | 36.25 | 114.38 | 78.63 |
|  | Rio Grande | Sargent | 481,743 | 248,604 | 730,347 | -,407.640 | 50.87 | 77.63 | 26.76 |
|  | Routt | Hayden | 723,637 | 150,920 | 874,557 | 30,778.760 | 23.33 | 28.41 | 5.08 |
|  | Routt | Steamboat Spgs. | 1,709,788 | 522,364 | 2,232,152 | 53,061.910 | 31.12 | 42.07 | 10.95 |
|  | Routt | South Routt | 558,432 | 262,845 | 821,277 | 18,463.170 | 34.92 | 44.48 | 9.56 |
|  | Saguache | Mountain Valley | 146,379 | 219,779 | 366,158 | 3,979.650 | 36.95 | 92.01 | 55.06 |
|  | Saguache | Moffat | 165,189 | 51,379 | 216,568 | 6,844.390 | 23.86 | 31.64 | 7.78 |

## 1977 ESTIMATED GENERAL FUND MILL LEVIES <br> in the absence of state revenues















FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION: CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS AND GIRANTS
AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL STATE FUNDS PROVIDED TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS -1977


$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Range: } & \text { Low -- 0\% _- El Paso, Widefield } \\
& \text { Avg -- } 16.3 \% \\
& \text { High -- } 71.3 \% \text {-- Park, Park }
\end{aligned}
$$

CAPITAL RESERVE FUND MILL LEVIES, DOLLARS/PIJPIL/MILL, AND TYPE OF DISTRICT, 1978

| County/S.D. | Mill Levy | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dollars/Pupil } \\ \text { (ADAE)/Mi11 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type of District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADAMS |  |  |  |
| Mapleton | 4 | \$ 18.34 | Declining |
| Horthglenn | 4 | 9.98 | Stable |
| Commerce City | 4 | 14.69 | Declining |
| Brighton | 4 | 18.56 | Stable |
| Bennett | 4 | 25.67 | Increasing |
| Strasburg | 4 | 50.56 | Declining |
| Westminster | 4 | 10.61 | Declining |
| ALAMOSA |  |  |  |
| Alamosa | 2 | 15.22 | Declining |
| Sangre de Cristo | 4 | 20.20 | Declining |
| ARAPAHOE |  |  |  |
| Englewood | 2 | 26.37 | Declining |
| Sheridan | 4 | 15.32 | Declining |
| Cherry Creek | 4 | 21.93 | Increasing |
| Littleton | 4 | 14.65 | Declining |
| Deer Trail | 1 | 155.53 | Declining |
| Aurora | 4 | 13.54 | Increasing |
| Byers | 4 | 30.80 | Declining |
| ARCHULETA |  |  |  |
| Archuleta | 4 | 23.02 | Increasing |
| BACA |  |  |  |
| Walsh | 4 | 27.86 | Declining |
| Prichett | 3 | 42.21 | Declining |
| Springfield | 4 | 27.23 | Increasing |
| Vilas | 4 | 40.89 | Stable |
| Campo | 4 | 21.27 | Declining |
| BEiNT |  |  |  |
| Las Animas | 4 | 12.19 | Declining |
| :cclave | 0 | 35.36 | Declining |
| BOULDER |  |  |  |
| St. Vrain | 4 | 16.07 | Stable |
| Boulder Valley | 4 | 20.63 | Declining |
| CHAFFEE |  |  |  |
| Buena Vista | 3 | 18.48 |  |
| Salida | 4 | 18.54 | Declining |


| County/S.D. | Mill Levy | Dollars/Pupil <br> (ADAE)/Mill | Type of District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHEYCINE |  |  |  |
| Kit Carson | 4 | \$ 70.35 | Declining |
| Cheyenne Wells | 2 | 49.54 | Declining |
| Arapahoe | 4 | 62.96 | Declining |
| CLEAR CREEK |  |  |  |
| Clear Creek | 4 | 45.83 | Declining |
| CONEJOS |  |  |  |
| Horth Conejos | 4 | 6.25 | Declining |
| Sanford | 1 | 8.01 | Declining |
| South Conejos | 4 | 6.36 | Declining |
| COSTILLA |  |  |  |
| Centennial | 4 | 13.46 | Stable |
| Sierra Grande | 3 | 49.48 | Increasing |
| CROWLEY |  |  |  |
| Crowley | 4 | 19.75 | Declining |
| CUSTER |  |  |  |
| Consolidated | 2 | 49.85 | Increasing |
| DELTA |  |  |  |
| Delta | 4 | 15.07 | Declining |
| DENVER |  |  |  |
| Denver | 4 | 30.) 1 | Declining |
| DOLORES |  |  |  |
| Dolores | 4 | 20.23 | Declining |
| DOUGLAS |  |  |  |
| Douglas | 4 | 18.62 | Increasing |
| EAGLE |  |  |  |
| Eagle | 4 | 58.18 | Declining |
| ELBERT |  |  |  |
| Elizabeth | 4 | 13.60 | Increasing |
| Kiowa | . 50 | 29.39 | Increasing |
| Big Sandy | 4 | 21.33 | Declining |
| Elbert | 4 | 14.70 | Declining |
| Agate | 2 | 124.27 | Declining |
| EL PASO |  |  |  |
| Calhan | 2 | 13.13 | Declining |
| Harrison | 4 | 12.13 | Stable |
| Widefield | 4 | 7.21 | Declining |
| Fountain | 4 | 4.45 | Declinin's |


| County/S.D. | Mill Levy | Dollars/Pupil (ADAE)/Mill | Type of District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coln. Springs | 1.75 | \$ 17.06 | Declining |
| Cheyenne Mtn. | 2 | 31.02 | Declining |
| Planitou Spgs. | 4 | 18.02 | Declining |
| Academy | 4 | 12.15 | Stable |
| Ellicott | 4 | 12.16 | Declining |
| Peyton | 4 | 13.20 | Stable |
| Hanover | 4 | 74.30 | Declining |
| Lewis-Palmer | 4 | 20.69 | Increasing |
| Falcon | 4 | 12.66 | Increasing |
| Edison | 4 | 64.14 | Declining |
| Miami-Yoder | 3.50 | 25.77 | Declining |
| FREMOIIT |  |  |  |
| Canon City | 4 | 12.45 | Declining |
| Florence | 2 | 16.13 | Declining |
| Cotopaxi | 4 | 39.16 | Declining |
| GARFIELD |  |  |  |
| Roaring Fork | 4 | 21.27 | Declining |
| Garfield | 4 | 12.35 | Declining |
| Grand Valley | 4 | 26.10 | Declining |
| $\frac{\text { GILPIN }}{\text { Gilpin }}$ | 4 | 35.34 | Increasing |
| GRAND |  |  |  |
| West Grand | 4 | 121.39 | Declining |
| East Grand | 4 | 52.95 | Declining |
| GUNMISON |  |  |  |
| Gunnison | 4 | 21.63 | Declining |
| HINSDALE |  |  |  |
| Hinsdale | 4 | 74.02 | Increasing |
| HUERFAINO |  |  |  |
| Huerfano | 4 | 13.99 | Declining |
| La Veta | 4 | 28.35 | Declining |
| JACKSO:I |  |  |  |
| North Park | 4 | 36.72 | Increasing |
| JEFFERSO*i |  |  |  |
| Jefferson | 4 | 17.24 | Increasing |
| KIOHA |  |  |  |
| Eads | 3 | 34.58 | Declining |
| Plainview | 4 | 76.93 | Declining |


| County/S.D. | Mill Lewy | Dollars/Pupil <br> (ADAE)/Mill | Type of District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KIT CARSON |  |  |  |
| Flagler | 3.25 | \$ 25.32 | Increasing |
| Seibert | 4 | 31.90 | Declining |
| Vona | 0 | 50.01 | Beclining |
| Stratton | 4 | 23.37 | Declining |
| Bethune | 4 | 26.78 | Increasing |
| Burlington | 3.51 | 20.64 | Declining |
| LAKE ${ }^{\text {La }}$ |  |  |  |
| Lake | 2 | 43.58 | Declining |
| LA PLATA |  |  |  |
| Durango | 4 | 20.27 | Declining |
| Bayfield | 2 | 20.35 | Increasing |
| Ignacio | 2 | 10.21 | Increasing |
| LARIMER |  |  |  |
| Poudre | 4 | 18.34 | Stable |
| Thompson | 4 | 14.29 | Increasing |
| Park | 4 | 43.77 | Increasing |
| LAS ANINAS |  |  |  |
| Trinidad | 4 | 8.12 | Declining |
| Primero | 4 | 33.30 | Declining |
| Hoehne | 4 | 17.93 | Declining |
| Aguilar | 4 | 13.92 | Declining |
| Branson | 4 | 39.13 | Increasing |
| Kim | 1 | 34.56 | Declining |
| LINCOLN |  |  |  |
| Hugo | 4 | 33.84 | Declining |
| Limon | 4 | 20.86 | Declining |
| Genoa | 4 | 37.25 | Declining |
| Karval | 4 | 37.74 | Declining |
| Arriba | 4 | 57.25 | Declining |
| LOGAN |  |  |  |
| Valley | 3 | 20.52 | Declining |
| Frenchman | 4 | 22.41 | Declining |
| Buffalo | 4 | 25.56 | Declining |
| Plateau | 0 | 45.05 | Declining |
| MESA |  |  |  |
| DeBeque | 3.50 | 57.05 | Declining |
| Plateau Valley | 2 | 22.89 | Increasing |
| Mesa Valley | 4 | 15.21 | Increasing |
| MINERAL |  |  |  |
| Creede | 4 | 42.66 | Declining |


| County/S.D. | Mill Levy | Dollars/Pupil <br> (ADAE)/Mill | Type of District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOFFAT |  |  |  |
| Moffat | 4 | \$ 45.66 | Increasing |
| MONTEZUMA |  |  |  |
| Mont.-Cortez | 4 | 10.42 | Stable |
| Dolores | 4 | 11.01 | Increasing |
| Mancos | 4 | 10.18 | Declining |
| MOHTROSE |  |  |  |
| Montrose | 4 | 11.72 | Stable |
| West End | 4 | 15.22 | Declining |
| M10RGAII |  |  |  |
| Brush | 4 | 17.56 | Declining |
| Fort Morgan | 4 | 18.08 | Declining |
| Weldon Valley | 4 | 23.38 | Declining |
| Wiggins | 4 | 22.35 | Declining |
| OTERO |  |  |  |
| East Otero | 4 | 9.32 | Declining |
| Rocky Ford | 4 | 12.72 | Declining |
| Manzanola | 4 | 3.50 | Declining |
| Fowler | 4 | 15.27 | Declining |
| Cheraw | 4 | 10.81 | Declining |
| Swink | 4 | 10.94 | Stable |
| OURAY |  |  |  |
| Ouray | 1.40 | 27.85 | Declining |
| Ridgway | 4 | 16.71 | Declining |
| PARK |  |  |  |
| Platte Canon | 4 | 21.20 | Increasing |
| Park | 4 | 95.95 | Increasing |
| PHILLIPS |  |  |  |
| Holyoke | 4 | 30.16 | Declining |
| Haxtun | 4 | 27.96 | Increasing |
| PITKI: |  |  |  |
| Aspen | 0 | 101.51 | Declining |
| PROWERS |  |  |  |
| Granada | 4 | 14.79 | Declining |
| Lamar | 4 | 13.81 | Declining |
| Holly | 2 | 16.28 | Declining |
| Wiley | 4 | 22.08 | Declining |
| PUEBLO |  |  |  |
| Pueblo City | 4 | 14.17 | Declining |
| Pueblo Rural | 4 | 16.89 | Declining |


| County/S.D. | Mill Levy | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dollars/Pupil } \\ \text { (ADAE)/Mill } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type of District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIO BLANCO |  |  |  |
| Meeker | 1.44 | \$ 33.77 | Stable |
| Rangely | 1.25 | 339.68 | Stable |
| RIO GRANDE |  |  |  |
| Del Norte | 4 | 14.81 | Increasing |
| Monte Vista | 4 | 11.63 | Declining |
| Sargent | 2 | 25.56 | Declining |
| RUUTT |  |  |  |
| Hayden | 3.19 | 96.57 | Declining |
| Steamboat | 4 | 36.73 | Increasing |
| South Routt | 4 | 42.53 | Increasing |
| SAGUACHE |  |  |  |
| Mountain Valley | 4 | 15.31 | Stable |
| Moffat | 4 | 81.63 | Declining |
| Center | 4 | 14.00 | Declining |
| SAN JUAN |  |  |  |
| Silverton | 0 | 3). 85 | Increasing |
| SAN MIGUEL |  |  |  |
| Telluride | 4 | 54.57 | Declining |
| Norwood | 1 | 14.53 | Increasing |
| Egnar | 2 | 52.04 | Increasing |
| SEDGWICK |  |  |  |
| Julesburg | 4 | 20.64 | Stable |
| Platte Valley | 4 | 28.85 | Declining |
| SUMMIT |  |  |  |
| Summit | 3.38 | 84.87 | Increasing |
| TELLER |  |  |  |
| Cripple Creek | 2 | 46.84 | Increasing |
| Woodland Park | 4 | 18.44 | Increasing |
| WASHINGTO: |  |  |  |
| Akron | 3.75 | 31.40 | Declining |
| Arickaree | 2 | 88.46 | Declining |
| Otis | 4 | 34.04 | Declining |
| Lone Star | 4 | 56.06 | Declining |
| Woodlin | 4 | 101.51 | Declining |
| WELT |  |  |  |
| Gilcrest | 1 | 33.36 | Stable |
| Eaton | 4 | 17.91 | Declining |
| Keenesburg | 4 | 33.30 | Declining |

$\left.\begin{array}{lcccc}\text { County/S.D. } & \text { Mill Levy } & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Dollars/Pupil } \\ \text { (ADAE)/Mill }\end{array} & \end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Type of } \\ \text { District }\end{array}\right]$

| County/S.D. | Beg. Fund Balance |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est. } 1978 \\ \text { Rev. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | t. Total $1978 \text { Rev. }$ | Beg. Fund Bal. as \% of Est. Total Rev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADAMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mapleton | \$ | 40,000 | \$ | 416,284 | \$ | 456,284 | 8.8\% |
| Northglenn |  | , -0- |  | 767,700 |  | 767,700 | -0- |
| Commerce City |  | 259,194 |  | 402,928 |  | 662,122 | 39.1 |
| Brighton |  | -0- |  | 330,500 |  | 330,500 | -0- |
| Bennett |  | 1,050 |  | 52,016 |  | 53,066 | 2.0 |
| Strasburg |  | 69,686 |  | 85,882 |  | 155,568 | 44.8 |
| Westminster |  | 40,000 |  | 649,866 |  | 689,866 | 5.8 |
| ALAMOSA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alamosa |  | 78,243 |  | 216,500 |  | 294,743 | 26.5 |
| Sangre de Cristo |  | 250,000 |  | 211,100 |  | 461,100 | 54.2 |
| ARAPAHOE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Englewood |  | 62,000 |  | 238,000 |  | 300,000 | 20.7 |
| Sheridan |  | 209,750 |  | 117,400 |  | 327,150 | 64.1 |
| Cherry Creek |  | -0- |  | 1,569,983 |  | 1,569,983 | -0- |
| Littleton |  | 72,959 |  | 1,040,510 |  | 1,113,469 | 6.6 |
| Deer Trail |  | 239,954 |  | 1,20,156 |  | 1,113,110 | 92.3 |
| Aurora |  | 34,088 |  | 1,178,803 |  | 1,212,891 | 2.8 |
| Byers |  | 64,000 |  | 43,800 |  | 107,800 | 59.4 |
| ARCHULETA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archuleta |  | 15,000 |  | 147,496 |  | 162,496 | 9.2 |
| BACA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walsh |  | 12,261 |  | 49,535 |  | 61,796 | 19.8 |
| Pritchett |  | 16,200 |  | 11,800 |  | 28,000 | 57.9 |
| Springfield |  | 25,000 |  | 48,596 |  | 73,596 | 34.0 |
| Vilas |  | 1,425 |  | 15,162 |  | 16,587 | 8.6 |
| Campo |  | 11,600 |  | 11,400 |  | 23,000 | 50.4 |
| BENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Las Animas |  |  |  | 57,016 |  |  | 67.5 |
| McClave |  | $8,013$ |  | 418 |  | 8,494 | 94.3 |
| BOULDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| St. Vrain |  |  |  | 942,600 |  | 1,242,600 | 24.1 |
| Boulder Valley |  | 411,898 |  | 2,044,544 |  | 2,456,442 | 16.8 |


| County/S.D. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beg. Fund } \\ & \text { Baiance } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est. } 1978 \\ \mathbf{R e v} . \end{gathered}$ | Est. Total 1978 Rev. |  | Beg. Fun Bal. as of Est. Total Re |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHAFFEE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buena Vista | \$ | -0- | \$ | 60,700 | \$ | 60,700 | -0-\% |
| Salida |  | 40,000 |  | 113,000 |  | 153,000 | 26.1 |
| CHEYENNE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kit Carson |  | 34,008 |  | 35,945 |  | 99,953 | 64.0 |
| Cheyenne Wells |  | 60,000 |  | 29,087 |  | 89,087 | 67.3 |
| Arapahoe |  | 1,000 |  | 19,000 |  | 20,000 | 5.0 |
| CLEAR CREEK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear Creek |  | 25,000 |  | 211,661 |  | 236,661 | 10.6 |
| CONEJOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Conejos |  | 13,500 |  | 39,169 |  | 52,669 | 25.6 |
| Sanford |  | 8,000 |  | 3,790 |  | 11,790 | 67.9 |
| South Conejos |  | 64,380 |  | 19,589 |  | 83,969 | 76.7 |
| COSTILLA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Centennial |  | 47,000 |  | 45,607 |  | 92,607 | 50.8 |
| Sierra Grande |  | 39,500 |  | 42,258 |  | 81,758 | 48.3 |
| CROWLEY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crowley |  | 53,895 |  | 44,802 |  | 98,697 | 54.6 |
| CUSTER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consolidated |  | 67,704 |  | 27,089 |  | 94,793 | 71.4 |
| DELTA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delta |  | 629,935 |  | 244,128 |  | 874,063 | 72.1 |
| DENVER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denver |  | 5,465,541 |  | 9,197,292 |  | 14,662,833 | 37.3 |
| DOLORES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dolores |  | 1,582 |  | 33,214 |  | 34,796 | 4.5 |
| DOUGLAS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Douglas |  | 175,000 |  | 573,000 |  | 748,000 | 24.0 |
| EAGLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eagle |  | 120,000 |  | 394,773 |  | 514,773 | 23.3 |
| ELBERT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elizabeth |  | -0- |  | 36,618 |  | 36,618 | -0- |
| ${ }_{\text {Kig Sand }}$ |  | 26,000 |  | 2,545 |  | 28,545 | 91.1 |
| Big Sandy |  | 120,000 |  | 31,250 |  | 151,250 | 79.3 |


| County/S.D. | Beg. Fund Balance | + | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est. } 1978 \\ \text { Rev. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. Total } \\ & 1978 \mathrm{Rev} . \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Bal. as \% of Est. Total Rev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elbert | \$ 13,500 |  | \$ 9,338 |  | \$ 22,838 | 59.1 |
| Agate | 36,382 |  | 10,189 |  | 46,571 | 78.1 |
| EL PASO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Calhan | 4,000 |  | 7,710 |  | 11,710 | 34.2 |
| Harrison | 925,561 |  | 347,362 |  | 1,272,923 | 72.7 |
| Widefield | 179,896 |  | 213,710 |  | 393,606 | 45.7 |
| Fountain | 302,000 |  | 72,049 |  | 374,049 | 80.7 |
| Colorado Springs | 1,060,000 |  | 1,008,373 |  | 2,068,373 | 51.2 |
| Cheyenne Mountain | 1,20,000 |  | 131,960 |  | 551,960 | 76.1 |
| Manitou Springs | 31,000 |  | 82,575 |  | 113,575 | 27.3 |
| Academy | 103,068 |  | 225,392 |  | 328,460 | 31.4 |
| Ellicott | 12,000 |  | 18,866 |  | 30,866 | 38.9 |
| Peyton | 10,373 |  | 11,280 |  | 21,653 | 47.9 |
| Hanover | 66,127 |  | 18,384 |  | 84,511 | 78.2 |
| Lewis-Palmer | 6,800 |  | 94,299 |  | 101,099 | 6.7 |
| Falcon | 5,428 |  | 54,808 |  | 60,236 | 9.0 |
| Edison | -0- |  | 7,338 |  | 7,338 | -0- |
| Miami-Yoder | 20,500 |  | 13,094 |  | 33,594 | 61.0 |
| FREMONT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canon City | 371,688 |  | 180,280 |  | 551,968 | 67.3 |
| Florence | 104,201 |  | 63,386 |  | 167,587 | 62.2 |
| Cotopaxi | 28,923 |  | 29,265 |  | 58,188 | 49.7 |
| GARFIELD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roaring Fork | 257,810 |  | 286,993 |  | 544,803 | 47.3 |
| Garfield | 153,956 |  | 78,000 |  | 231,956 | 66.4 |
| Grand Valley | 30,000 |  | 17,715 |  | 47,715 | 62.9 |
| GILPIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gilpin | 43,000 |  | 16,756 |  | 59,756 | 72.0 |
| GRAND |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Grand |  |  |  |  |  | 26.8 |
| East Grand | 60,000 |  | 187,226 |  | 247,226 | 24.3 |
| GUNNISON |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gunnison | 91,000 |  | 126,500 |  | 217,500 | 41.8 |
| HINSDALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hinsdale | 27,000 |  | 23,000 |  | 50,000 | 54.0 |
| HUERFANO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Huerfano | 61,303 |  | 60,142 |  | 121,445 | 50.5 |
| La Veta | . 26,200 |  | 23,080 |  | 49,280 | 53.2 |



Beg. Fund
Bal. as \% of Est. Total Rev.

LOGAN Valley
Frenchman
Buffalo
Plateau
MESA

DeBeque<br>Plateau Valley<br>Mesa Valley

MINERAL
Creede
MOFFA'T
Moffat
MONTEZUMA
Montezuma-Cortez
Dolores
Mancos
MONTROSE
Montrose
West End
MORGAN
Brush
Fort Morgan
Weldon Valley
Wiggins
OTERO
East Otero
Rocky Ford
Manzanola
Fowler
Cheraw
Swink
OURAY
Ouray
Ridgway
PARK
Platte Canyon Park
\$ 262,000
24,855
9,100
289

21,318
539
596,000

34,000

40,845

100,000
5,000
58,000

10,000
12,335

200,000
105,000
14,000
90,000
145,700
62,995
17,500
5,000
6,500
36,254

47,000
27,520

34,000
120,000
\$ 213,495
21,121
$29,0.90$
-0.
\$ $\begin{array}{r}475,495 \\ 45,976 \\ 38,190 \\ 289\end{array}$
$55.1 \%$
54.1
23.8
100.0
47.7
3.5
39.2
50.1

33,861
67,861
7.5
44.2
18.5
74.5
3.8
18.4
63.8

113,300
313,300
211,217 316,217 16,418 30,418
44,100
134,100
46.0
67.1
56.7
41.8
63.8
13.2
37.2
65.9
87.4 70.0
37.7
49.5

| County/S.D. | Beg. Fund Balance |  | + | Est. 1978 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & t . \text { Total } \\ & 1978 \text { Rev. } \end{aligned}$ | Beg. Fund Bal. as \% of Est. Total Rev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHILLIPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holyoke | \$ | 118,000 |  | \$ 95,000 |  | \$ | 213,000 | 55.4\% |
| Haxtun |  | 235,000 |  | 44,746 |  |  | 279,746 | 84.0 |
| PITKIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aspen |  | 425,000 |  | -0- |  |  | 425,000 | 100.0 |
| PROWERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Granada |  | 9,034 |  | 21,476 |  |  | 30,510 | 29.6 |
| Lamar |  | 19,166 |  | 123,556 |  |  | 142,722 | 13.4 |
| Holly |  | 36,838 |  | 14,946 |  |  | 51,784 | 71.1 |
| Wiley |  | 11,874 |  | 22,791 |  |  | 34,665 | 34.3 |
| PUEBLO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pueblo City |  | 200,000 |  | 1,302,558 |  |  | 1,502,558 | 13.3 |
| Pueblo Rural |  | 79,325 |  | 377,260 |  |  | 456,585 | 17.4 |
| RIO BLANCO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeker |  | 57,373 |  | 69,420 |  |  | 126,793 | 45.2 |
| Rangley |  | 237,217 |  | 233,159 |  |  | 470,376 | 50.4 |
| RIO GRANDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Del Norte |  | 36,824 |  | 48,956 |  |  | 85,780 | 42.9 |
| Monte Vista |  | 100,000 |  | 72,975 |  |  | 172,975 | 57.8 |
| Sargent |  | 31,600 |  | 20,000 |  |  | 51,600 | 61.2 |
| ROUTT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hayden |  | 51,900 |  | 149,595 |  |  | 201,495 | 25.8 |
| Steamboat |  | 125,000 |  | 180,750 |  |  | 305,750 | 40.9 |
| South Routt |  | 28,000 |  | 79,300 |  |  | 107,300 | 26.1 |
| SAGUACHE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain Valley |  | 47,000 |  | 17,181 |  |  | 64,181 | 73.2 |
| Moffat |  | 5,000 |  | 23,868 |  |  | 28,868 | 17.3 |
| Center |  | 12,640 |  | 36,951 |  |  | 49,591 | 25.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Silverton |  | 190,000 |  | -0- |  |  | 190,000 | 100.0 |
| SAN MIGUEL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Telluride |  | 165,957 |  |  |  |  |  | 74.6 |
| Norwood |  | 25,860 |  | 6,663 |  |  | 32,523 | 79.5 |
| Egnar |  | 5,285 |  | 6,490 |  |  | 11,775 | 44.9 |
| SEDGWICK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Julesburg |  | 252,490 |  | 36,422 |  |  | 288,912 | 87.4 |
| Platte Valley |  | 10,000 |  | 32,646 |  |  | 42,646 | $23.1+$ |


| County/S.D. | Beg. Fund Balance |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est. } 1978 \\ \text { Rev. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | t. Total $1978 \text { Rev. }$ | Beg. Fund <br> Bal. as $\$$ of Est. <br> Total Rev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { SUMMIT }}{\text { Summi }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | 383,198 | \$ | 683,198 | 43.9 |
| TELLER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cripple Creek |  | $46,800$ |  | 27,825 |  | 74,625 | 62.7 |
| Woodland Park |  | $165,000$ |  | 102,000 |  | 267,000 | 61.8 |
| WASH INGTON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Akron |  | 82,000 |  | 79,742 |  | 161,742 | 50.7 |
| Arickaree |  | 43,000 |  | 31,301 |  | 74,301 | 57.9 |
| Otis |  | 7,200 |  | 27,050 |  | 34,250 | 21.0 |
| Lone Star |  | 4,100 |  | 12,700 |  | 16,800 | 24.4 |
| Woodlin |  | 4,000 |  | 55,830 |  | 59,830 | 6.7 |
| WELD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gilcrest |  | 373,000 |  | 233,373 |  | 606,373 | 61.5 |
| Eaton |  | 380,000 |  | 78,000 |  | 458,000 | 83.0 |
| Keenes burg |  | 360,891 |  | 190,046 |  | 550,937 | 65.5 |
| Windsor |  | 288,640 |  | 386,050 |  | 674,690 | 42.8 |
| Johnstown |  | 25,000 |  | 59,135 |  | 84,135 | 29.7 |
| Greeley |  | 374,579 |  | 788,171 |  | 1,162,750 | 32.2 |
| Platte Valley |  | 58,105 |  | 58,338 |  | 116,443 | 49.9 |
| Fort Lupton |  | 3,000 |  | 303,289 |  | 306,289 | 1.0 |
| Ault-Highland |  | 80,000 |  | 64,000 |  | 144,000 | 55.6 |
| Briggsdale |  | 2,675 |  | 11,465 |  | 14,140 | 18.9 |
| Prairie |  | 17,500 |  | 22,000 |  | 39,500 | 44.3 |
| Grover |  | 55,406 |  | 15,832 |  | 71,238 | 77.8 |
| YUMA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Yuma |  | 4,000 |  | 117,400 |  | 121,400 | $3 \cdot 3$ |
| East Yuma |  | 86,212 |  | 129,788 |  | 216,000 | 39.9 |


| County/S.D. | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADAMS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bennett |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  | 26,718.68 | 23,030.25 | 27,530.01 | 22,992.10 |
| Bonus Pupils |  | 31.8 | 25.2 | 26.5 | 17.2 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil |  | 840.21 | 932.55 | 1,027.76 | 1,336.75 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 60 | 53 | 64 | 55 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 344 | 363 | 389 | 356 |
| ARB |  | 840 | 933 | 1,050 | 1,337 |
| Strasburg |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  | 29,996.75 | 17,501.14 | 12,247.00 | 16,778.20 |
| Bonus Pupils |  | 28.1 | 18.7 | 14.7 | 19.1 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil |  | 1,067.50 | 954.99 | 824.18 | 878.44 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 74 | 43 | 29 | 40 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 341 | $\begin{array}{r}318 \\ \hline 157\end{array}$ | 294 | , 272 |
| ARB |  | 1,081 | 1,157 | 1,262 | 1,461 |

ALAMOSA

| Sangre de C. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total $\$$ | $15,141.13$ | $25,125.73$ | $28,317.53$ | $35,717.91$ | $38,493.14$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 30.6 | 27.2 | 28.7 | 32.5 | 32.4 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | 923.74 | $1,006.82$ | $1,087.21$ | $1,188.06$ |
| SAC $\$ / A E$ |  | 100 | 106 | 125 | 135 |
| SE $\$ /$ AE |  | 438 | 511 | 540 | 579 |
| ARB |  | 924 | 1,007 | 1,111 | 1,188 |

ARAPAHOE
Deer Trail

|  | $22,662.22$ | $31,280.25$ | $33,397.39$ | $25,991.81$ | $22,226.93$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | 45.8 | 46.6 | 46.2 | 41.6 | 36.4 |
| Bonus Pupi1s | 494.80 | 671.25 | 737.64 | 618.28 | 610.63 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 |  | 165 | 176 | 145 | 130 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 214 | 246 | 221 | 208 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 1,933 | 2,068 | 2,236 | 2,392 |
| ARB |  |  |  |  |  |

Byers
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
8,461.22 & 12,759.50 \\
17.1 & 13.0 \\
494.80 & 981.50 \\
& 28 \\
& 333 \\
& 982 \\
& \\
& -207-
\end{array}
$$

County/S.D. 1973-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78

BACA

| Pritchett |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | $16,031.79$ | $28,863.20$ | $37,606.94$ | $43,848.75$ | $40,404.07$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 32.4 | 33.1 | 40.9 | 42.7 | 34.1 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 872.00 | 938.25 | $1,015.87$ | $1,184.87$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 251 | 336 | 392 | 360 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 279 | 313 | 363 | 403 |
| ARB |  | 1,343 | 1,437 | 1,563 | 1,673 |

Vilas
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

| Total \$ | $13,656.71$ | $24,745.63$ | $25,978.07$ | $42,920.67$ | $45,646.27$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bonus Pupils | 27.6 | 28.9 | 30.7 | 32.5 | 33.6 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | 856.25 | 863.46 | $1,306.45$ | $1,358.52$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 297 | 338 | 498 | 507 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 274 | 288 | 372 | 462 |
| ARB |  | 1,358 | 1,452 | 1,899 | 2,021 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ampo |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | $19,347.00$ | $38,392.60$ | 37.773 .78 | $43,274.56$ | $46,162.65$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 39.1 | 38.8 | 36.2 | 37.3 | 36.8 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 989.50 | $1,064.77$ | $1,147.82$ | $1,254.42$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 271 | 262 | 300 | 331 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 331 | 417 | 470 | 505 |
| ARB |  | 989 | 1,069 | 1,173 | 1,254 |

BENT
McClave
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

BOULDER

```
Bldr. Valley
    Total $
    Bonus Pupils
    $/Bonus Pupil
    SAC $/AE
    SE $/AE
    ARB
```

| $2,375.08$ | $6,649.50$ | $5,465.22$ | $6,409.32$ | $6,514.54$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.3 |
| 494.80 | $1,108.25$ | $1,239.28$ | $1,407.83$ | $1,515.01$ |
|  | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
|  | 516 | 540 | 620 | 627 |
|  | 1,108 | 1,240 | 1,408 | 1,515 |



CONEJOS

| North Conejos |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | $3,711.06$ | $8,750.00$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 7.5 | 12.5 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 700.00 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 7 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 617 |
| ARB |  | 750 |

## COSTILLA

| Sierra Grande |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total $\$$ | $16,130.75$ | $24,486.00$ | $23,503.47$ | $22,856.37$ | $20,722.92$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 32.6 | 38.5 | 33.8 | 31.2 | 31.7 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 636.00 | 709.56 | 724.71 | 653.72 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 89 | 85 | 87 | 80 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 203 | 215 | 259 | 222 |
| ARB |  | 938 | 1,100 | 1,211 | 1,295 |

County/S.D. 1973-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78 CUSTER

```
Consolidated
    Total $
    Bonus Pupils
    $/Bonus Pupil
    SAC $/AE
    SE $/AE
    ARB
```

DOLORES

```
```

Dolores

```
```

Dolores
Total \$
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

```
```

    ARB
    ```
```


## EAGLE

## Eagle

Total
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE ARB

| $2,671.96$ | $16,457.70$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.4 | 20.4 |
| 494.80 | 306.75 |
|  | 10 |
|  | 1,102 |

19,668.51
22,914.43
20,957.34

| $10,588.90$ | $29,705.63$ | $32,379.52$ | $45,854.38$ | $48,698.91$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.4 | 30.2 | 31.1 | 39.6 | 38.9 |
| 494.80 | 983.63 | $1,062.39$ | $1,145.50$ | $1,251.90$ |
|  | 68 | 78 | 105 | 112 |
|  | 494 | 452 | 432 | 524 |
|  | 984 | 1,062 | 1,170 | 1,252 |


| $23,503.39$ | $30,430.40$ | $30,265.61$ | $19,150.60$ | $22,089.93$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47.5 | 44.8 | 45.3 | 29.4 | 30.5 |
| 494.80 | 679.25 | 681.75 | 644.38 | 724.26 |
|  | 152 | 160 | 100 | 101 |
|  | 217 | 227 | 230 | 246 |
|  | 1,093 | 1,170 | 1,281 | 1,367 |

DOLORES
ARB

## ELBERT

Big Sandy
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB
Elbert

| Total \$ | $18,753.23$ | $32,696.30$ | $36,122.66$ | $48,252.07$ | $49,003.23$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bonus Pupils | 37.9 | 36.4 | 37.3 | 41.3 | 38.8 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | 398.25 | 989.20 | $1,180.49$ | $1,262.97$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 200 | 247 | 341 | 318 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 507 | 548 | 597 | 730 |
| ARB |  | 398 | 988 | 1,181 | 1,263 |

```
County/S.D. 1973-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78
Agate
    Total $
    Bonus Pupils
    $/Bonus Pupil
    SAC $/AE
    SE $/AE
    ARB
```


## EL PASO

Calhan
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

FREMONT

| Cotopaxi |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total $\$$ | $19,099.60$ | $36,427.31$ | $41,976.88$ | $50,029.52$ | $45,404.30$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 38.6 | 36.4 | 39.8 | 46.2 | 43.7 |
| $\$ /$ Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | $1,000.75$ | $1,076.22$ | $1,071.26$ | $1,039.00$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 243 | 280 | 346 | 270 |
| SE $\$ / A E$ | 320 | 356 | 382 | 353 |  |
| ARB |  | 1,295 | 1,385 | 1,515 | 1,621 |

GILPIN
Gilpin

| Total \$ | $3,463.66$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Bonus Pupils | 7.0 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 |
| SAC \$/AE |  |
| SE \$/AE |  |
| ARB |  |


| $5,541.25$ | $6,525.40$ | $8,059.80$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.4 | 4.4 | 5.0 |
| 764.10 | $1,467.11$ | $1,611.96$ |
| 69 | 41 | 41 |
| 255 | 524 | 548 |
| 2,036 | 2,212 | 2,366 |

GRAHD

| West Grand |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | $13,062.94$ | $22,461.50$ | $25,686.87$ | $18,808.52$ | $14,277.43$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 26.4 | 26.9 | 27.4 | 26.7 | 26.8 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 835.00 | 956.61 | 696.87 | 532.74 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 50 | 57 | 41 | 31 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 267 | 237 | 249 | 156 |
| ARB |  | 1,069 | 1,240 | 1,348 | 1,670 |

County/S.D. $\quad 1973$ 1974 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78

## GUNNI ISON

Gunnison
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil SAC \$/AE SE \$/AE ARB

$4,279.48$
4.2
5,782. 33
4,921.44
5.2

946.43
4

450
1,040

$$
306
$$

1,273

## HINSDALE

Hinsdale
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $2,276.12$ | $2,347.80$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.6 | 5.2 |
| 494.80 | 451,50 |
|  | 100 |
|  | 144 |
|  | 1,931 |

$4,009.53$
8.6
475.74
141
171
2,066

| $4,338.81$ | $3,059.53$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 8.4 | 7.1 |
| 510.98 | 430.92 |
| 89 | 47 |
| 182 | 146 |
| 2,061 | 1,626 |

## HUERFANO

Huerfano
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

| $2,820.41$ | $5,098.57$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.7 | 6.2 |
| 494.80 | 822.35 |
|  | 4 |
|  | 480 |
|  | 822 |


| $6,493.83$ | $8,138.15$ | $5,867.95$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.1 | 7.5 | 4.8 |
| 933.29 | $1,096.38$ | $1,222.49$ |
| 6 | 8 | 5 |
| 523 | 609 | 680 |
| 934 | 1,096 | 1,222 |

La Veta
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB
13,953.59 28,768.00
28.2
32.0
494.80
899.00

42,355. 35

| $51,022.48$ | $51,077.60$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 46.8 | 42.9 |
| $1,078.51$ | $1,190.62$ |
| 221 | 246 |
| 513 | 372 |
| 1,102 | 1,249 |

## JACKSON

```
North Park
    Total $
    Bonus Pupils
    $/Bonus Pupil
    SAC $/AE
    SE $/AE
    ARB
```

| $13,508.27$ | $18,492.15$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 27.3 | 25.8 |
| 494.80 | 716.75 |
|  | 35 |
|  | 229 |
|  | 939 |

$21,528.12$
29.5
744.66
47
226
1,100

| $23,227.60$ | $12,624.96$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 32.2 | 16.0 |
| 715.14 | 789.06 |
| 55 | 31 |
| 255 | 268 |
| 1,201 | 1,286 |



| County/S.D. | 1973-74 |  | 1974-75 |  | $1975-76$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KIT CARSON (cont'd) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## LA PLATA

Durango
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

| $2,177.16$ | $3,901.95$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.4 | 4.6 |
| 494.80 | 848.25 |
|  | 1 |
|  | 484 |
|  | 848 |


| $4,059.71$ | $5,242.99$ | $6,503.95$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.4 | 5.0 | 5.3 |
| 941.49 | $1,037.33$ | $1,227.16$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 513 | 564 | 499 |
| 942 | 1,060 | 1,227 |

Bayfield
Total
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $9,302.39$ | $12,900.00$ | $19,756.03$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18.8 | 17.2 | 24.0 |
| 494.80 | 750.00 | 839.97 |
|  | 31 | 44 |
|  | 269 | 316 |
|  | 750 | 840 |

## LARIMER

Poudre
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

## LAS ANIMAS

Primero
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $18,109.98$ | $24,764.60$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 36.6 | 36.1 |
| 494.80 | 686.00 |
|  | 97 |
|  | 219 |
|  | 833 |


| $24,147.25$ | $39,845.01$ | $47,485.13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35.1 | 35.6 | 37.5 |
| 789.21 | $1,107.22$ | $1,266.27$ |
| 92 | 152 | 191 |
| 263 | 319 | 370 |
| 925 | 1,208 | 1,444 |


| County/S.D. | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LAS ANIMAS (Cont' d ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hoehne |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 20,138.70 | 25,033.20 | 32,491. 29 | 30,449.25 | 46,422.27 |
| Bonus Pupils | 40.7 | 30.0 | 35.8 | 29.5 | 41.6 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 834.44 | 926.10 | 1,021.09 | 1,115.92 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 73 | 91 | 85 | 124 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 322 | 388 | 476 | 579 |
| ARB |  | 835 | 926 | 1,043 | 1,116 |
| Aguilar |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 23,552.87 | 35,568.00 | 38,460.48 | 45,586.32 | 48,280.07 |
| Bonus Pupils | 47.6 | 46.8 | 46.1 | 47.5 | 46.1 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 760.00 | 851.31 | 949.46 | 1,047.29 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 148 | 160 | 188 | 200 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 447 | 496 | 590 | 614 |
| ARB |  | 760 | 851 | 970 | 1,047 |
| Branson |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 14,398.92 | 34,618.50 | 29,240.32 | 32,539.98 | 37,335.11 |
| Bonus Pupils | 29.1 | 31.4 | 24.4 | 23.3 | 25.9 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 1,102.50 | 1,222.93 | 1,381.56 | 1,441.51 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 470 | 376 | 418 | 568 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 352 | 408 | 493 | 490 |
| ARB |  | 1,679 | 1,797 | 1,943 | 2,079 |
| Kim |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 16,130.75 | 32,699.50 | 28,321.07 | 39,607.50 | 51,217.28 |
| Bonus Pupils | 32.6 | 34.0 | 26.5 | 32.3 | 35.8 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 961.75 | 1,090.53 | 1,213.07 | 1,430.65 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 268 | 227 | 317 | 422 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 309 | 364 | 433 | 486 |
| ARB |  | 1,582 | 1,686 | 1,837 | 1,965 |
| LINCOLN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hugo |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 15,685.42 | 22,897.88 | 25,577.40 | 29,526.93 | 46,554.77 |
| Bonus Pupils | 31.7 | 30.5 | 31.6 | 31.3 | 41.2 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 750.75 | 825.93 | 933.22 | 1,129.97 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 97 | 108 | 129 | 203 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 240 | 275 | 321 | 359 |
| ARB |  | 984 | 1,063 | 1,202 | 1,369 |
| Limon |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 197.92 |  |  |  |  |
| Bonus Pupils | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 |  |  |  |  |
| SAC \$/AE |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE \$/AE |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARB |  |  |  |  |  |

County/S.D.
LINCOLN (Cont'd)

## Genoa

Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Karval
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Arriba
Total \$
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

## LOGAN

Frenchman
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Buffalo
Total
Bonus Pupils \$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Plateau
Total
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

1973-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78

| $17,961.54$ | $34,094,63$ | $30,658.47$ | $30,014.02$ | $33,436.30$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36.3 | 33.5 | 30.3 | 30.7 | 31.4 |
| 494.80 | $1,017.55$ | $1,032.48$ | 967.15 | $1,064.85$ |
|  | 334 | 333 | 366 | 426 |
|  | 326 | 344 | 345 | 362 |
|  | 1,226 | 1,312 | 1,437 | 1,523 |

18,456.35 22,196,00
29,4
37.57

28,863.43
34,718.71
$37.3 \quad 35.8$
$494.80 \quad 620.00$
8 86. 22
32.7
32.9

| 225 | 299 | 292 | 351 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 203 | 235 | 312 | 359 |
| 1,074 | 1,250 | 1,366 | 1,456 |

$\begin{array}{cc}18,753.23 & 37,125.00 \\ 37.9 & 39.6 \\ 494.80 & 937.50 \\ & 341 \\ & 299 \\ & 1,389\end{array}$
$44,286.11$
42.0
44,071.27
38,944.30
1,075.95 1,103.74 1,209.45
$387 \quad 385 \quad 350$
359
1,487
394
1,614
411
1,727

| $20,781.95$ | $34,237.81$ | $35,286.15$ | $49,859.59$ | $54,324.09$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42.0 | 38.6 | 36.7 | 38.1 | 38.4 |
| 494.80 | 886.99 | 975.78 | $1,322.27$ | $1,414.69$ |
|  | 113 | 126 | 188 | 213 |
|  | 236 | 309 | 328 | 395 |
|  | 887 | 976 | 1,322 | 1,415 |


| $20,435.58$ | $40,716.00$ | $44,419.73$ | $45,400.07$ | $48,537.84$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41.3 | 41.6 | 42.5 | 39.7 | 39.0 |
| 494.80 | 978.75 | $1,066.50$ | $1,131.29$ | $1,244.56$ |
|  | 127 | 140 | 143 | 157 |
|  | 313 | 356 | 404 | 423 |
|  | 1,033 | 1,106 | 1,212 | 1,296 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $19,248.04$ | $29,211.43$ | $45,557.74$ | $43,746.80$ | $51,170.96$ |
| 38.9 | 37.9 | 37.7 | 39.5 | 39.1 |
| 494.80 | 770.75 | $1,233.09$ | $1,095.62$ | $1,308.72$ |
|  | 181 | 283 | 283 | 330 |
|  | 246 | 285 | 391 | 445 |
|  | 1,398 | 2,026 | 2,193 | 2,347 |


| County/S.D. | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MESA |  |  |  |  |  |
| DeBeque |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  | 44,917.07 |
| Bonus Pupils |  |  |  |  | 36.1 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil |  |  |  |  | 1,244.24 |
| SAC \$/AE |  |  |  |  | 310 |
| SE \$/AE |  |  |  |  | 423 |
| ARB |  |  |  |  | 2,036 |
| Plateau Valley |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 18,654.27 | 31,364.55 | 32,483.35 | 39,875.60 | 43,868.70 |
| Bonus Pupils | 37.7 | 37.8 | , 37.6 | 39.2 | 38.9 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 829.75 | 881.55 | 1,006.30 | 1,127.73 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 108 | 120 | 148 | 159 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 265 | 294 | 360 | 397 |
| ARB |  | 866 | 952 | 1,058 | 1,128 |
| Mesa Valley |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 11,281.63 | 26,199.00 | 20,277.56 | 23,578.75 | 25,017.21 |
| Bonus Pupils | 22.8 | 28.4 | 20.3 | 21.2 | 20.8 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 922.50 | 1,019.28 | 1,100.26 | 1,202.75 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 585 | 631 | 719 | 728 |
| ARB |  | 922 | 1,020 | 1,124 | 1,203 |

MINERAL
Creede
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $17,318.29$ | $37,648.00$ | $30,809.98$ | $41,270.03$ | $49,421.02$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35.0 | 41.6 | 39.1 | 42.7 | 49.8 |
| 494.80 | 905.00 | 804.06 | 956.13 | 992.39 |
|  | 226 | 162 | 192 | 230 |
|  | 289 | 268 | 341 | 337 |
|  | 1,132 | 1,300 | 1,322 | 1,415 |

## MOFFAT

            37,857.44
            38.9
    993.06
        20
        420
    993
                51,154.54
                                    54,137.33
        54.1
    ```
Moffat
```

Moffat
Total \$
Total \$
Total \$
Total \$
Total \$
Total \$
Total \$
Total \$
SE \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

```
    ARB
```

```
16,279.19 31,064.42
    32.9
    494.80 910.98
            34.1
            17
16,279.19 31,064.42
32.9
34.1
910.98
```

38.9
49.9 54.1
$\begin{array}{llll}383 & 420 & 362 & 340\end{array}$
$911 \quad 993 \quad 1,106 \quad 1,183$

| Dolores | $3,958.47$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total $\$$ | 8.0 |
| Bonus Pupils | 494.80 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil |  |
| SAC \$/AE |  |
| SE \$/AE |  |
| ARB |  |


| Mancos |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tota1 \$ | $17,219.33$ | $18,900.00$ | $22,057.82$ | $10,319.78$ | $16,275.40$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 34.8 | 25.2 | 26.8 | 10.8 | 15.2 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | 750.00 | 839.85 | 945.40 | $1,070.75$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 46 | 53 | 24 | 36 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 531 | 593 | 678 | 737 |
| ARB |  | 750 | 840 | 965 | 1,134 |

MONTROSE

| Montrose |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | $9,054.99$ | $16,783.80$ | $18,257.40$ | $21,269.44$ |  |
| Bonus Pupils | 18.3 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 837.19 | 931.50 | $1,074.54$ |  |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 4 | 4 | 5 |  |
| SE \$/AE |  | 600 | 664 | 765 |  |
| ARB | 839 | 932 | 1,075 |  |  |
| West End |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bonus Pupils | $2,573.00$ | $4,350.00$ | $5,748.60$ | $10,170.45$ | $8,580.36$ |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 59.2 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 8.9 | 6.7 |
| SAC \$/AE | 494.80 | 870.00 | 994.12 | $1,154.64$ | $1,280.65$ |
| SE \$/AE |  | 5 | 7 | 12 | 10 |
| ARB |  | 581 | 627 | 756 | 864 |
|  |  | 870 | 995 | 1,155 | 1,281 |

## MORGAN

Weldon Valley

| Total \$ | $19,495.45$ | $45,842.16$ | $46,684.11$ | $52,041.31$ | $60,510.05$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bonus Pupils | 39.4 | 42.0 | 40.8 | 41.0 | 44.1 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | $1,091.48$ | $1,167.57$ | $1,255.70$ | $1,372.11$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 217 | 221 | 261 | 320 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 400 | 464 | 487 | 540 |
| ARB |  | 1,092 | 1,068 | 1,283 | 1,372 |

Wiggins
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $7,471.60$ | $15,770.48$ | $12,753.70$ | $18,629.34$ | $17,569.07$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15.1 | 15.3 | 11.8 | 14.1 | 12.3 |
| 494.80 | $1,030.75$ | $1,102.88$ | $1,334.98$ | $1,428.38$ |
|  | 31 | 25 | 37 | 36 |
|  | 344 | 391 | 487 | 558 |
|  | 1,031 | 1,103 | 1,335 | 1,428 |
|  | $-218-$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



Duray Total \$
Bonus Pupils \$/Bonus Pupil SAC \$/AE SE \$/AE ARB

Ridgway
Total \$ Bonus Pupils \$/Bonus Pupil SAC \$/AE SE \$/AE ARB

PARK
Platte Canyon Total \$ Bonus Pupils \$/Bonus Pupil SAC \$/AE SE \$/AE ARB

Park
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE ARB

## PHILLIPS

```
Haxtun
```

| Total \$ | $12,766.05$ | $28,477.58$ | $45,719.07$ | $45,588.26$ | $51,739.69$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bonus Pupils | 25.8 | 28.7 | 42.6 | 38.2 | 39.4 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 922.25 | $1,095.12$ | $1,180.59$ | $1,313.19$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 77 | 134 | 138 | 155 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 318 | 365 | 421 | 446 |
| ARB |  | 1,216 | 1,301 | 1,408 | 1,517 |

County/S.D. 1973-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78
PROWERS

| Granada |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total $\$$ | $17,961.54$ | $34,652.80$ | $38,409.49$ | $37,858.85$ | $45,457.50$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 36.3 | 39.2 | 40.3 | 35.3 | 39.2 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 884.00 | 972.54 | $1,061.11$ | $1,159.63$ |
| SAC $\$ /$ AE |  | 79 | 82 | 81 | 101 |
| SE $\$ / A E$ | 473 | 578 | 682 | 722 |  |
| ARB |  | 884 | 972 | 1,084 | 1,160 |

Holly
Total
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $7,422.13$ | $15,539.60$ | $20,410.75$ | $1,975.97$ | $24,268.58$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15.0 | 17.2 | 21.2 | 1.7 | 19.6 |
| 494.80 | 893.00 | 982.42 | $1,174.43$ | $1,256.56$ |
|  | 28 | 39 | 4 | 49 |
|  | 471 | 522 | 596 | 677 |
|  | 893 | 982 | 1,174 | 1,257 |

Wiley
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

PUEBLO

| Pueblo Rural |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total $\$$ | $2,523.52$ | $30,010.13$ | $31,426.40$ | $42,409.91$ | $39,455.01$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 5.1 | 34.8 | 33.8 | 36.6 | 31.5 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 862.36 | 948.75 | $1,170.80$ | $1,252.54$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 538 | 573 | 639 | 621 |
| ARB | 862 | 949 | 1,171 | 1,253 |  |

RIO BLANCO
Meeker
Total $\$$
Bonus Pupils
$\$ / B o n u s$ Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

| $2,869.89$ | $4,000.88$ | $4,491.01$ | $7,234,80$ | $7,500.18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 7.1 | 6.7 |
| 494.80 | 851.25 | 954.72 | $1,008.04$ | $1,119.43$ |
|  | 6 | 7 | 11 | 11 |
|  | 272 | 298 | 360 | 370 |
|  | 1,198 | 1,350 | 1,471 | 1,609 |


| County/S.D. | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIO GRANDE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sargent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 17,664.65 | 25,137.50 | 31,632.08 | 31,224.78 | 43,625.34 |
| Bonus Pupils | 35.7 | 25.0 | 28.1 | 26.3 | 26.9 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 1,005.50 | 1,148.67 | 1,174.50 | 1,621.76 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 61 | 76 | 75 | 109 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 305 | 359 | 419 | 427 |
| ARB |  | 1,026 | 1,099 | 1,262 | 1,623 |

ROUTT
Hayden
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

| $21,029.35$ | $20,277.30$ | $15,561.46$ | $5,337.97$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42.5 | 25.7 | 15.4 | 6.9 |
| 494.80 | 789.00 | $1,037.07$ | 765.31 |
|  | 52 | 37 | 12 |
|  | 252 | 268 | 273 |
|  | 1,109 | 1,450 | 1,570 |

South Routt
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

SAGUACHE

```
Mtn. Valley
    Total $
    Bonus Pupils
    $/Bonus Pupil
    SAC $/AE
    SE $/AE
    ARB
Moffat
    Total $
    $/Bonus Pupil
    SAC $/AE
    SE $/AE
    ARB
```

| $18,951.16$ | $30,299.82$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 38.3 | 32.7 |
| 494.80 | 926.60 |
|  | 113 |
|  | 425 |
|  | 927 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $16,081.26$ | $20,668.70$ |
| 32.5 | 33.8 |
| 494.80 | 611.50 |
|  | 255 |
|  | 195 |
|  | 2,123 |

County/S.D. $\quad 1973$-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78
SAN JUAN

| Silverton |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | $20,435,58$ | $43,216.00$ | $41,253,39$ | $45,569,82$ | $59,234.39$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 41,3 | 37,0 | 36,3 | 37.1 | 43.5 |
| $\$ /$ Bonus Pupil | 494,80 | $1,168.00$ | $1,159.65$ | $1,215.10$ | $1,361.71$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 255 | 253 | 302 | 403 |
| SE \$/AE | 373 | 337 | 401 | 462 |  |
| ARB |  | 1,386 | 1,650 | 1,902 | 2,035 |

SAN MIGUEL
Telluride
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $22,563,26$ | $35,647.50$ | $39,183.13$ | $26,512.24$ | $27,367.55$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45.6 | 42.0 | 47.8 | 42.6 | 37.1 |
| 494,80 | 848,75 | 836.46 | 615.67 | 737.67 |
|  | 165 | 181 | 115 | 118 |
|  | 271 | 265 | 202 | 251 |
|  | 1,117 | 1,245 | 1,455 | 1,556 |

Norwood
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $31,618.25$. | $46,905.89$ | $59,273.63$ | $68,834.85$ | $71,682.11$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63.9 | 53.1 | 60.7 | 62.7 | 60.4 |
| 494.80 | 883.35 | 976.43 | $1,086.05$ | $1,186.79$ |
|  | 151 | 191 | 215 | 224 |
|  | 493 | 568 | 649 | 697 |
|  | 883 | 997 | 1,109 | 1,187 |

SEDGWICK

| Julesburg |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | $7,867,45$ | $17,652,38$ | $32,542.31$ | $33,775,10$ | $36,664.00$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 15,9 | 15.3 | 26,9 | 25.2 | 25.3 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494,80 | $1,153.75$ | $1,234.44$ | $1,325.88$ | $1,449.17$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 40 | 76 | 79 | 90 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 376 | 485 | 555 | 618 |
| ARB |  | 1,154 | 1,235 | 1,354 | 1,449 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Platte Valley |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bonus Pupils | 5,4 | $14,734.45$ | $19,723.71$ | $31,509.00$ | $35,733.11$ |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494,80 | 938.50 | 991.44 | $1,049.51$ | $1,423.63$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 40 | 62 | 103 | 121 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 300 | 330 | 375 | 405 |
| ARB |  | 1,086 | 1,162 | 1,274 | 1,543 |


| County/S.D. | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TELLER |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cripple Creek |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | 11,034.22 | 29,108.63 | 31,711.86 | 36,783,91 | 28,078.52 |
| Bonus Pupils | 22.3 | 27.3 | 31.9 | 41.1 | 30.8 |
| \$/Bonus Pupil | 494.80 | 1,066.25 | 1,014.39 | 885.37 | 911.64 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 112 | 116 | 134 | 109 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 341 | 338 | 316 | 310 |
| ARB |  | 1,253 | 1,341 | 1,461 | 1,563 |

## WASHINGTON

Arickaree
Total \$
Bonus Pupils \$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Otis
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC $\$ / A E$
SE $\$ / A E$
ARB

| $20,287.14$ | $29,466.15$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 41.0 | 39.9 |
| 494.80 | 732.50 |
|  | 133 |
|  | 236 |
|  | 1,301 |

$31,690.61$
44.0
734.94
155
245
1,391

32,326.73
37,848. 33
$\begin{array}{lllll}41.0 & 39.9 & 44.0 & 45.7 & 41.0\end{array}$
$494.80 \quad 732.50$
699.77
923.13

191
248
2,000

| $17,367.77$ | $32,107.35$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 35.1 | 31.9 |
| 494.80 | $1,006.50$ |
|  | 133 |
|  | 327 |
|  | 1,151 |

$48,164.48$
42.5

56,030. 68
54,161.08
156.5
$45.4 \quad 43.0$
$494.80 \quad 1,006.50$
1,156.41
1,220.90 1,259.56
194
225
233
$385 \quad 436 \quad 428$
1,151
1,239
1,352
1,447
Lone Star Total \$ Bonus Pupils \$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE ARB

Woodlin
Total \$
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

27,
141.88

35,979.61
$\begin{array}{lllll}22.8 & 24.6 & 24.6 & 20.9 & 23.4\end{array}$
$494.80 \quad 942.75$
$459 \quad 536$
$\begin{array}{rr}301 & 375 \\ 506 & 2,681\end{array}$
2,506
$\begin{array}{cc}22,860.14 & 26,091.00 \\ 46.2 & 46.8 \\ 494.80 & 557.50 \\ & 149 \\ & 178 \\ & 1,464\end{array}$
$27,091.13$
24.6
$1,123.74$
536
375
2,681
1,284.70
1,537.59
$540 \quad 675$
$459 \quad 523$
2,898 3,101
$26,039.82$
41.7
637.20
149
212
1,558

27,568.19
28,943.46
$38.7 \quad 39.0$
$704.70 \quad 742.14$
$165 \quad 181$
196
2,139
252
2,265
County/S.D. $\quad 1973$-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78

WELD
Briggsdale Total \$ Bonus Pupils
$\begin{array}{cc}17,664.66 & 43,039,53 \\ 35.7 & 35,3 \\ 494.80 & 1,219,25 \\ & 456 \\ & 390 \\ & 1,482\end{array}$
46,546.04
53,108,48
50,250,35
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Prairie
Total \$
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB
Grover
Total
Bonus Pupils
\$/Bonus Pupil
SAC \$/AE
SE \$/AE
ARB

| $19,841.81$ | $38,110.00$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 40.1 | 41.2 |
| 494.80 | 925.00 |
|  | 247 |
|  | 1,399 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $18,802.71$ | $37,712.20$ |
| 38.0 | 38.6 |
| 494.80 | 977.00 |
|  | 267 |
|  | 312 |
|  | 1,392 |

47,045.46 47,386.42
44,668.70

| 40.1 | 41.2 | 41.6 | 43.5 | 38.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | $494.80 \quad 925.00 \quad 1,153.98 \quad 1,077.64 \quad 1,154.23$


| 247 | 308 | 311 | 309 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 296 | 385 | 385 | 397 |
| 1,399 | 1,497 | 1,633 | 1,747 |

YUMA

| West Yuma |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total \$ | 19,099.60 | $39,197.03$ | $42,418.66$ | $51,025.24$ | $59,600.80$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 38.6 | 36.9 | 35.8 | 37.4 | 40.6 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | $1,062.25$ | $1,209.06$ | $1,349.66$ | $1,468.00$ |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 37 | 41 | 49 | 55 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 339 | 376 | 448 | 499 |
| ARB |  | 1,113 | 1,191 | 1,436 | 1,536 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Yuma |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ | $18,951.16$ | $34,516.95$ | $32,662.75$ | $35,400.25$ | $36,918.91$ |
| Bonus Pupils | 38.3 | 40.3 | 36.2 | 35.7 | 38.4 |
| \$/Bonus Pupi1 | 494.80 | 856.50 | 920.70 | 980.78 | 961.43 |
| SAC \$/AE |  | 38 | 38 | 40 | 42 |
| SE \$/AE |  | 274 | 307 | 350 | 327 |
| ARB |  | 984 | 1,062 | 1,168 | 1,250 |


| County/S.D. | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATE TOTALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) Number of Districts Receiving SAC Dollars | 89 | 89 | 89 | 88 | 87 |
| (2) Total Receipts 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,320,000.00 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $440,665.93^{2,}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,593.72 \\ 2, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3, \\ 900,000.00 \end{array}$ | $68,592.01$ |
| (3) Total Bonus Pupils | 2,667.7 | 2,738.8 | 2,736.7 | 2,746.7 | 2,748.5 |
| (4) Receipts/Bonus Pupils | 494.80 | 891.14 | 953.55 | 1,055.81 | 1,152.82 |
| (5) SAC \$/AE |  | 27.58 | 29.65 | 33.01 | 38.03 |
| (6) SE \$/AE |  | 485.95 | 519.14 | 595.54 | 591.99 |
| (7) ARB |  | 1,012.70 | 1,100.01 | 1,260.02 | 1,394.73 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (9) SAC \$/AE as a Percentage of ARB |  | 2.72 | 2.70 | 2.62 | 2.73 |

$\frac{\text { SIMULATION OF THE "PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF 1973" AS AMENDED }}{\text { BY SB NO }}$
BY SB NO. $25-$ WITHOUT THE MINIMUM GUARANTEE

## ASSUMPTIONS:

1979 -- Guarantee $=\$ 42.25$; ARB Increase $=\$ 130.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1400.00$ $1980-$ Guarantee $=\$ 45.85 ;$ ARB Increase $=\$ 140.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1600.00$
1981 - Guarantee $=\$ 44.57$ ARB Increase $=\$ 150.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1800.00$ $1981--G u a r a n t e e=\$ 4.57 ;$ ARB Increase $=\$ 150.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1800.00$
$1982-$ Guarantee $=\$ 43.05 ;$ ARB Increase $-\$ 160.00 ;$ Minimum ARB $=\$ 1800.00$



|  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { ARCHULETA }}{\text { Archuleta }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Archuleta 1979 | \$ | 27.329 | 894.3 | 894.3 | \$1400.00 | 33.14 | \$ | . 346 | \$ | . 906 | \$ . 006 | \$.000 | 30.56 | 11.69 |
|  | 1980 |  | 28.000 | 919.5 | 919.5 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 494 |  | . 977 | . 006 | . 000 | 30.45 | 15.40 |
|  | 1981 |  | 28.688 | 945.4 | 945.4 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 543 |  | 1.159 | . 005 | . 000 | 30.34 | 14.23 |
|  | 1982 |  | 29.392 | 972.0 | 972.0 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 567 |  | 1.338 | . 005 | . 000 | 30.24 | 12.81 |
|  | $\frac{B A C A}{\text { Walsh }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 12.487 | 396.7 | 474.0 | 1531.84 | 36.26 |  | . 273 |  | . 453 | . 008 | . 000 | 26.34 | 15.91 |
|  | 1980 |  | 12.500 | 332.0 | 400.9 | 1775.41 | 38.72 |  | . 228 |  | . 484 | . 010 | . 000 | 31.18 | 14.67 |
|  | 1981 |  | 12.513 | 277.9 | 335.5 | 1955.41 | 43.20 |  | . 205 |  | . 541 | . 011 | . 000 | 37.29 | 7.28 |
|  | 1982 |  | 12.585 | 232.6 |  | 2085.41 |  |  | . 000 |  | - 586 | . 012 | . 000 |  | . 00 |
|  | Campo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 2.907 | 122.4 | 134.0 | 1508.28 | 35.70 |  | . 098 |  | . 104 | . 003 | . 000 | 21.69 | 20.56 22.06 |
|  | 1981 |  | 2.923 | 102.1 | 122.1 | 1840.28 180000 | 35.95 40.39 |  | . 083 |  | . 118 | . 004 | .000 | 23.79 26.17 | 18.40 |
|  | 1982 |  | 2.946 | 93.2 | 102.4 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 067 |  | . 134 | . 004 | . 000 | 28.78 | 14.27 |
|  | $\frac{\text { BENT }}{\text { Las Animas }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 12.597 | 971.2 | 990.3 | 1470.72 | 34.81 |  | 1.018 |  | . 438 | . 041 | . 000 | 12.72 | 29.53 |
|  | 1980 |  | 12.800 | 963.4 | 971.2 | 1653.00 | 36.05 |  | 1.144 |  | . 461 | . 042 | . 000 | 13.18 | 32.67 |
|  | 1981 |  | 13.057 | 955.7 | 963.4 | 1803.00 | 40.45 |  | 1.211 |  | . 526 | . 042 | . 000 | 13.50 | 31.07 |
|  | 1982 |  | 13.217 | 948.1 | 955.7 | 1963.00 | 45.60 |  | 1.273 |  | . 603 | . 042 | . 000 | 13.83 | 29.22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 |  | 8.623 | 201.9 | 202.6 | 2025.57 | 45.45 |  | . 018 |  | . 392 | . 005 | . 000 | 42.56 | 2.01 |
|  | 1982 |  | 8.697 | 201.2 | 201.9 | 2185.57 | 50.74 |  | . 000 |  | . 441 | . 005 | . 000 | 43.07 | . 00 |
|  | $\frac{\text { BOULDER }}{\text { St. Vrain }}$ Valley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1980 |  | 300.000 | 13908.1 | 13908.1 | 1699.94 | 37.08 |  | 12.520 |  | 11.123 | . 000 | . 000 | 21.57 | 24.28 |
|  | 1981 |  | 345.423 | 13964.8 | 13964.8 | 1849.94 | 41.51 |  | 11.497 |  | 14.337 | . 000 | . 000 | 24.74 | 19.83 |
|  | 1982 |  | 397.724 | 14021.7 | 14021.7 | 2009.94 | 46.69 |  | 9.614 |  | 18.569 | . 000 | . 000 | 28.36 | 14.69 |
|  | Boulder Valley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 483.836 | 20756.3 | 21443.4 | 1768.31 | 41.85 |  | 17.668 |  | 20.250 | . 000 | . 000 | 22.56 | 19.69 |
|  | 1980 |  | 495.000 506.421 | 20091.2 19447 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 0000 |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 |  | 506.421 518.106 | 19847.4 18824.2 | 20098.3 19454.3 | 2075.47 2235.47 | 46.47 51.93 |  | 18.1586 |  | 23.582 26.904 | . .000 | . 000 | 25.20 26.63 | 19.37 16.42 |
|  | CHAFFEE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 1980 |  | 19.538 20.000 | 1142.3 1191.5 | 1142.3 | 1400.00 1600.00 | 33.14 34.90 |  | .952 1.208 |  | . 6478 | . .000 | . 008 | 17.10 16.79 | 25.15 29.06 |
|  | 1981 |  | 20.473 | 1242.8 | 1242.8 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 1.410 |  | . 827 | . 000 | . 011 | 16.47 | 28.10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.53 |  | 1.587 |  | . 954 | . 000 | . 013 | 16.17 | 26.88 |
|  | 1979 |  | 27.166 | 1381.5 | 1403.1 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 1.064 |  | . 900 | . 011 | . 000 | 19.36 | 22.89 |
|  | 1980 |  | 28.000 | 1372.0 | 1381.5 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | 1.233 |  | . 977 | . 012 | . 000 | 20.27 | 25.58 |
|  | 1981 |  | 28.857 | 1362.6 | $13 ?$ | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 1.304 |  | 1.166 | . 012 | . 000 | 21.03 | 23.54 |
|  | 1982 |  | 29.745 | 1353.3 | 1362.6 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 1.316 |  | 1.354 | . 012 | . 000 | 21.83 | 21.22 |



|  |  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { CROWLEY }}{\text { CrowIey }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 | \$ | 10.259 | 508.0 | 550.1 | \$1403.67 | 33.22 | \$ | . 431 | - . 341 | \$ . 021 | \$ . 000 | 18.65 | 23.60 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 10.515 | 476.3 | 508.7 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 447 | - 367 | . 022 | . 000 | 20.67 | 25.18 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 10.777 11.046 | 446.6 418.8 | 477.0 447.2 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | . .423 | . .435 | . 022 | . 0000 | 22.60 24.70 | 21.97 18.35 |
|  | $\frac{\text { CUSTER }}{\text { Consolidated_1 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 12.776 | 292.1 | 292.1 | 1764.12 | 38.48 |  | . 051 | . 464 | . 002 | . 017 | 45.34 41.32 | 4.53 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 12.371 | 328.5 | 328.5 | 1914.12 | 42.95 |  | . 097 | . 531 | . 001 | . 021 | 37.66 | 8.91 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 12.680 | 369.4 | 369.4 | 2074.12 | 48.18 |  | . 155 | . 611 | . 001 | . 026 | 34.32 | 8.73 |
|  | DELTA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Delta | 1979 |  | 70.889 78.000 | 3905.6 | 3949.9 3905.6 | 1400.00 1600.00 | 33.14 34.90 |  | 3.1827 | 2.349 2.722 | . 104 | . 000 | 19.97 | 24.88 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 85.824 | 3868.7 | 3887.1 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 3.531 | 3.466 | . 104 | . 000 | 22.08 | 22.49 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 94.433 | 3850.4 | 3868.7 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 3.283 | 4.299 | . 105 | . 000 | 24.41 | 18.64 |
|  | DENVER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Denver | 1979 |  | 2099.145 | 62835.4 | 65460.4 | 2098.79 | 46.21 |  | 40.387 | 97.001 | 2.816 | . 000 | 32.07 | 13.35 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 2132.900 | 60315.7 | 62870.5 | 2313.43 |  |  | 45.336 | 100.110 | 2.865 | . 000 | 33.93 | 15.36 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 2167.198 | 57897.1 | 60349.4 | 2463.43 | 51.41 |  | 37.240 |  |  | . 000 | 35.91 | 12.00 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 2202.049 | 55575.5 | 57929.4 | 2623.43 | 56.69 |  | 27.145 | 124.829 | 2.958 | . 000 | 38.01 | 8.27 |
| N | DOLORES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | Dolores | 1979 |  | 8.106 | 359.5 | 401.1 | 1510.09 | 35.74 |  | . 316 | . 290 | . 000 | . 000 | 20.21 | 22.04 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 8.106 | 322.2 | 360.9 | 1650.09 | 35.99 |  | . 304 | . 292 | . 000 | . 000 | 22.46 | 23.39 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 8.106 | 288.8 | 323.5 | 1800.09 | 40.39 |  | . 255 | . 327 | . 000 | . 000 | 25.06 | 19.51 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 8.106 | 258.9 | 290.0 | 1960.09 | 45.53 |  | . 199 | . 369 | . 000 | . 000 | 27.95 | 15.10 |
|  | $\frac{\text { DOUGLAS }}{\text { Dougia }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 105.372 | 5714.5 | 5714.5 | 1563.93 | 37.02 |  | 5.037 | 3.900 | . 000 | . 217 | 18.44 | 23.81 |
|  |  | 1980 1981 |  | 113.900 123.119 | 6266.3 6871.4 | 6266.3 6871.4 | 1703.93 1853.93 | 37.16 41.60 |  |  | 4.233 5.121 | . 0000 | .259 .309 |  | 27.67 26.65 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 133.084 | 7534.9 | 7534.9 | 2013.93 | 46.78 |  | 8.949 | 6.226 | . 000 | . 368 | 17.66 | 25.39 |
|  | $\frac{\text { EAGLE }}{\text { EagIe }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 110.303 | 1727.0 | 1727.0 | 2281.82 | 35.73 |  | . 000 | 3.941 | . 005 | . 012 | 63.87 | . 00 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 115.000 | 1792.3 | 1792.3 | 2421.82 | 37.74 |  | . 000 | 4.341 | . 003 | . 013 | 64.16 | . 00 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 119.897 | 1860.1 | 1860.1 | 2571.82 | 39.90 |  | . 000 | 4.784 | . 002 | . 014 | 64.46 | . 00 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 125.003 | 1930.5 | 1930.5 | 2731.82 | 42.19 |  | . 000 | 5.274 | . 001 | . 016 | 64.75 | . 00 |
|  | $\frac{\text { ELBERT }}{\text { E11zabeth }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 10.221 | 753.8 | 753.8 | 1554.73 | 36.80 |  | . 796 | . 376 | . 000 | . 040 | 13.56 | 28.69 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 11.242 | 848.7 | 848.7 | 1694.73 | 36.96 |  | 1.023 | . 416 | . 000 | . 049 | 13.25 | 32.60 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 12.365 13.601 | 955.5 1075.7 | 955.5 1075.7 | 1844.73 2004.73 | 41.39 46.57 |  | 1.251 1.523 | . 512 | . 000 | . 073 | 12.94 12.64 | 31.63 30.41 |


|  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{B A C A}{P r i t c h e t t}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 | \$ | 3.884 | 85.0 | 97.1 | \$1930.19 | 45.68 | \$ | . 010 | \$ | . 177 | \$.002 | \$.000 | 39.99 | 2.26 |
|  | 1980 |  | 3.900 3.916 | 76.8 69.4 | 85.3 77.1 | 2070.19 220.19 | 45.15 43.69 |  | . .000 |  | . 1771 | . 003 | . 0000 | 45.72 50.81 | . 13 |
|  | 1982 |  | 3.932 | 62.7 | 69.6 | 2380.19 | 42.15 |  | . 000 |  | . 166 | . 003 | . 000 | 56.47 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 10.879 | 493.2 | 516.6 | 1518.21 | 35.93 |  | - 393 |  | . 391 | . 007 | . 000 | 21.06 | 21.19 |
|  | 1980 |  | 10.900 10.921 | 470.9 449.6 | 493.6 471.2 | 1658.21 1808.21 | 36.17 <br> 40.57 |  | . 424 |  | . 394 | . 0007 | . 0000 | 22.08 23.18 | 23.77 21.39 |
|  | 1982 |  | 10.943 | 429.3 | 449.9 | 1968.21 | 45.72 |  | . 385 |  | . 500 | . 008 | . 000 | 24.32 | 18.73 |
|  | Vilas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 5.509 | 89.0 | 92.7 | 2276.75 | 38.31 |  | . 000 |  | . 211 | . 002 | . 000 | 59.43 | . 00 |
|  | 1980 |  | 5.525 | 85.4 | 89.0 | 2416.75 | 38.94 |  | . 000 |  | . 215 | . 002 | . 000 | 62.06 64.86 | .00 |
|  | 1982 |  | 5.541 5.557 | 81.9 | 85.4 81.9 | 2566.75 2726.75 | 39.57 40.21 |  | . .000 |  | . 2123 | . 002 | . 000 | 64.86 67.81 | . 00 |
|  | $\frac{\text { ELBERT }}{\text { KIowa }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 6.303 | 168.3 | 168.3 | 1967.42 | 46.57 |  | . 038 |  | . 293 | . 000 | . 003 | 37.45 | 4.80 3.24 |
|  | 1980 |  | 7.563 9.075 | 177.5 187.2 | 177.5 187.2 | 2107.42 2257.42 | 45.96 46.56 |  | . 0200 |  | . 423 | . 0000 | . 0003 | 42.61 48.48 | 3.24 .00 |
|  | 1982 |  | 10.890 | 197.4 | 197.4 | 2417.42 | 43.83 |  | . 000 |  | . 477 | . 000 | . 004 | 55.16 | . 00 |
| z |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\because$ | 1979 |  | 5.615 | 262.2 267.2 | 267.5 267.2 | 1534.45 1674.45 | 36.32 36.52 |  | . 207 |  | . 204 | . 003 | . 000 | 21.01 | 21.26 24.84 |
|  | 1981 |  | 5.615 | 272.3 | 272.3 | 1824.45 | 40.93 |  | . 267 |  | . 230 | . 003 | . 000 | 20.62 | 23.95 |
|  | 1982 |  | 5.615 | 277.5 | 277.5 | 1984.45 | 46.10 |  | . 292 |  | . 259 | . 003 | . 000 | 20.23 | 22.82 |
|  | Elbert |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 2.125 2.150 | 161.1 | 161.1 | 1520.49 1660.49 | 35.99 36.22 |  | . 168 |  | . 076 | . 0000 | . 0007 | 13.19 | 29.06 <br> 33.68 <br> 3 |
|  | 1981 |  | 2.175 | 193.8 | 193.8 | 1810.49 | 40.62 |  | . 263 |  | . 088 | . 000 | . 009 | 11.22 | 33.35 |
|  | 1982 |  | 2.200 | 212.6 | 212.6 | 1970.49 | 45.77 |  | . 318 |  | . 101 | . 000 | . 010 | 10.35 | 32.70 |
|  | Agate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 1980 |  | 4.914 4.938 | 41.2 41.4 | 43.1 41.4 | 2914.99 3520.96 | 25.57 29.52 |  | . 0000 |  | .126 .146 | . 0001 | . 0000 | 114.01 119.28 | . 00 |
|  | 1981 |  | 4.962 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 3670.96 | 30.77 |  | . 000 |  | . 153 | . 001 | . 000 | 119.29 | . 00 |
|  | 1982 |  | 4.987 | 41.8 | 41.8 | 3830.96 | 32.11 |  | . 000 |  | . 160 | . 001 | . 000 | 119.31 | . 00 |
|  | $\frac{E L \text { PASO }}{\text { Calhan }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 3.932 | 286.0 | 288.0 | 1515.79 | 35.88 |  | . 295 |  | . 141 | . 003 | . 000 | 13.65 | 28.60 |
|  | 1980 1981 |  | 3.950 3.968 | 284.0 282.0 | 286.0 284.0 | 1655.79 1805.79 | 36.11 40.52 |  | . 331 |  | . 143 | . 003 | . 0000 | 13.81 13.97 | 32.04 30.60 |
|  | 1982 |  | 3.987 | 280.0 | 282.0 | 1965.79 | 45.66 |  | -372 |  | . 182 | . 003 | . 000 | 14.14 | 28.91 |
|  | Harrison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 82.419 86.000 | 6615.6 | 6615.6 6797.1 | 1422.32 1600.00 | 33.66 34.90 |  | 6.635 7.874 |  | 2.775 3.001 | . 009 | .000 .000 | 12.46 12.65 | 29.79 <br> 33.20 |
|  | 1981 |  | 89.736 | 6983.6 | 6983.6 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 8.946 |  | 3.624 | . 002 | . 000 | 12.85 | 31.72 |
|  | 1982 |  | 93.635 | 7175.2 | 7175.2 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 9.800 |  | 4.263 | . 000 | . 000 | 13.05 | 30.00 |


|  |  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MLLL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { EL PASO }}{\text { WIdefield }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 | \$ | 53.898 | 6820.2 | 6896.6 | \$1400.00 | 33.14 | \$ | 7.869 | \$ | 1.786 | \$. 040 | \$.000 | 7.82 | 34.43 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 56.500 | 6758.7 | 6820.4 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | 8.941 |  | 1.972 | . 042 | . 000 | 8.28 | 37.57 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 59.228 | 6697.8 | 6758.9 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 9.774 |  | 2.392 | . 043 | . 000 | 8.76 | 35.81 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 62.087 | 6637.4 | 6698.0 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 10.301 |  | 2.827 | . 044 | . 000 | 9.27 | 33.78 |
|  | Fountain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 15.951 | 3059.3 | 3147.4 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 3.878 |  | . 529 | . 009 | . 000 | 5.07 | 37.18 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 17.490 | 2973.7 | 3060.1 | 1600.00 | 33.90 |  | 4.286 4 |  | . 610 | . 011 | . 000 | 5.72 6.45 | 40.13 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 19.177 21.027 | 2809.6 | 2891.3 | 1860.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | 4.860 4.710 |  | . 957 | . 014 | . 000 | 7.27 | 35.78 |
|  | Colorado Springs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 566.723 | 30666.0 | 31580.2 30674.8 | 1560.02 | 35.98 36.21 |  | 29.338 |  | 20.389 | . 228 | . 000 | 19.43 | 24.30 26.42 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 627.023 | 28916.3 | 29786.9 | 1810.02 | 40.61 |  | 28.451 |  | 25.464 | . 244 | . 000 | 21.05 | 23.52 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 659.537 | 28079.3 | 28924.6 | 1970.02 | 45.76 |  | 26.801 |  | 30.181 | . 261 | . 000 | 22.80 | 20.25 |
|  | Cheyenne Mountain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 59.490 | 1901.2 | 1901.2 | 2136.31 | 50.56 |  | 1.054 |  | 3.008 | . 0000 | . 041 | 31.29 | 10.96 14.37 |
|  |  | 1980 1981 |  | 63.230 67.205 | 2008.3 2121.4 | 2121.4 | 2276.31 2426.31 | 49.65 54.44 |  | 1.432 1.489 |  | 3.659 | . 000 | . 051 | 31.68 | 12.89 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 71.430 | 2240.9 | 2240.9 | 2586.31 | 60.08 |  | 1.504 |  | 4.291 | . 000 | . 058 | 31.88 | 11.17 |
| $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ | Manitou Springs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 20.221 | 1093.4 | 1093.4 | 1505.13 | 35.62 |  | . 925 |  | . 720 | . 003 | . 000 | 18.49 |  |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 21.060 21.934 | 1110.7 1128.3 | 1110.7 1128.3 | 1645.13 1800.00 | 35.88 40.39 |  | 1.072 |  | . 7586 | .002 | . 0000 | 18.96 19.4 | 26.89 25.13 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 22.845 | 1146.2 | 1146.2 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 1.206 |  | 1.040 | . 002 | . 000 | 19.93 | 23.12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 61.162 67.210 | 4641.2 4906.9 | 4641.2 4906.9 | 1400.00 1600.00 | 33.14 34.90 |  | 4.471 5.506 |  | 2.027 2.345 | . 0000 | . 067 | 13.18 13.70 | 29.07 32.15 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 73.856 | 5187.8 | 5187.8 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | 6.355 |  | 2.983 | . 000 | . 096 | 14.24 | 30.33 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 81.158 | 5484.8 | 5484.8 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 7.055 |  | 3.695 | . 000 | . 111 | 14.80 | 28.25 |
|  | Ellicott |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 4.562 | 371.0 | 371.0 | 1430.00 | 33.85 |  | . 376 |  | . 154 | . 001 | . 007 | 12.30 | 29.95 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 4.925 | 394.6 | 394.6 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 459 |  | . 172 | . 001 | . 008 | 12.48 | 33.37 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 5.317 | 419.7 | 419.7 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 541 |  | . 215 | . 000 | . 010 | 12.67 | 31.90 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 5.741 | $4+6.4$ | 446.4 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 614 |  | . 261 | . 000 | . 011 | 12.86 | 30.19 |
|  | Peyton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 2.868 | 201.6 | 201.6 | 1748.20 | 41.38 |  | . 234 |  | . 119 | . 001 | . 000 | 14.23 | 28.02 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 2.900 | 205.5 | 205.5 | 1960.45 | 42.76 4.75 |  | . 279 |  | . 124 | . 001 | . 0000 |  |  |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 2.932 2.964 | 209.5 213.6 | 209.5 213.6 | 2110.45 2270.45 | 47.35 52.74 |  | . 329 |  | . 139 | .000 | . 0000 | 14.00 13.88 | 30.57 29.17 |
|  | Hanover |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1979 |  | 4.277 | 61.4 | 61.4 | 2195.40 | 31.51 |  | . 000 |  | . 135 | . 000 | . 001 | 69.66 | . 00 |
|  |  | 1980 |  | 4.278 | 64.9 | 64.9 | 2335.40 | 35.43 |  | . 000 |  | . 152 | . 000 | . 002 | 65.92 | . 00 |
|  |  | 1981 |  | 4.279 | 68.6 | 68.6 | 2485.40 | 39.85 |  | . 000 |  | -170 | . 000 | . 002 | 62.37 | . 00 |
|  |  | 1982 |  | 4.279 | 72.5 | 72.5 | 2645.40 | 44.82 |  | . 000 |  | . 192 | . 000 | . 002 | 59.02 | . 00 |


|  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IL PASO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lewis-Palmer 1979 | \$ | 23.748 | 1165.0 | 1165.0 | \$1581.76 | 37.44 | \$ | . 954 | \$ | . 889 | \$ . 000 | \$. 041 | 20.38 | 21.87 |
|  | 1980 |  | 25.360 | 1270.3 | 1270.3 | 1721.76 | 37.55 |  | 1.235 |  | . 952 | . 000 | . 048 | 19.96 | 25.89 |
|  | 1981 |  | 27.081 | 1385.1 | 1385.1 | 1871.76 | 42.00 |  | 1.455 |  | 1.137 | . 0000 | . 057 | 19.55 19.15 | 25.02 23.90 |
|  | 1982 |  | 28.919 | 1510.3 | 1510.3 | 2031.76 | 47.20 |  | 1.704 |  | 1.365 | . 000 |  |  |  |
|  | Palcon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 15.279 17.325 | 1167.2 1288.6 | 1167.2 1288.6 | 1558.28 1698.28 | 36.88 37.04 |  | 1.255 |  | . 564 | . 0000 | . 049 | 13.09 13.44 | 29.16 32.41 |
|  | 1981 |  | 19.645 | 1422.6 | 1422.6 | 1848.28 | 41.47 |  | 1.815 |  | . 815 | . 000 | .070 | 13.81 | 30.76 |
|  | 1982 |  | 22.277 | 1570.5 | 1570.5 | 2008.28 | 46.65 |  | 2.115 |  | 1.039 | . 000 | . 085 | 14.18 | 28.87 |
|  | Edison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 1.811 | 24.3 | 28.6 | 2879.73 | 45.47 |  | . 000 |  | . 082 | . 001 | . 000 | 63.33 | . 00 |
|  | 1980 |  | 1.812 | 20.6 | 24.5 | 3019.73 | 40.83 |  | . 000 |  | . 074 | . 001 | . 0000 | 73.96 87.16 |  |
|  | 1982 |  | 1.814 | 14.9 | 17.7 | 3329.73 | 32.41 |  | . 000 |  | . 059 | . 001 | . 000 | 102.73 | . 00 |
|  | Mami-Yoder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 3.634 | 129.7 | 138.9 | 1774.99 | 42.01 |  | . 094 |  | . 153 | . 000 | . 000 | 26.17 |  |
|  | 1980 1981 |  | 3.785 3.942 | 125.4 121.2 | 129.7 | 1914.99 2064.99 | 41.77 46.33 |  | . 0976 |  | . 158 | . 000 | .000 | 29.18 31.43 | 16.67 13.14 |
|  | 1982 |  | 4.106 | 117.1 | 121.2 | 2224.99 | 51.68 |  | . 058 |  | . 212 | . 001 | . 000 | 33.87 | 9.18 |
|  | $\frac{\text { FREMONT }}{\text { Canon }} \text { City }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 44.151 | 3291.5 | 3291.5 | 1413.48 | 33.46 |  | 3.175 |  | 1.477 | . 028 | . 000 | 13.41 | 28.84 |
|  |  |  | 45.152 46.175 | 3320.9 3350.6 | 3320.9 3350.6 | 1600.00 1800.00 | 34.90 <br> 40.39 |  | 3.738 4.166 |  | 1.576 | . 028 | . .000 | 13.60 13.78 | 32.25 30.79 |
|  | 1982 |  | 47.222 | 3380.6 | 3380.6 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 4.476 |  | 2.150 | . 026 | . 000 | 13.97 | 29.08 |
|  | Florence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 27.992 | 1513.5 | 1550.8 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 1.244 |  | . 928 | . 024 | . 000 | 18.05 | 24.20 |
|  | 1980 |  | 28.112 | 1487.4 1461.8 | 1513.7 1487.6 | 1600.00 1800.00 | 34.90 40.39 |  | 1.441 |  |  | . 025 | . .000 |  | 27.28 25.59 |
|  | 1982 |  | 28.353 | 1436.6 | 1461.9 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 1.575 |  | 1.291 | . 026 | . 000 | 19.39 | 23.66 |
|  | Cotopaxi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 7.356 | 185.3 | 185.3 | 2097.97 | 49.66 |  | . 024 |  | . 365 | . 000 | . 015 | 39.70 | 2.55 |
|  | 1980 |  | 7.425 | 210.7 | 210.7 | 2237.97 | 48.81 |  | . 109 |  | - 362 | . 000 | . 018 | 35.24 | 10.61 |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 7.495 | 239.6 272.5 | 239.6 272.5 | 2387.97 2547.97 | 53.58 59.19 |  | . 171 |  | . .402 | . 0000 | . 022 | 31.28 27.77 | 13.29 15.28 |
|  | GABFIELD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Roaring Fork |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 71.730 | 3022.9 | 3022.9 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 1.855 |  | 2.377 | . 000 | . 000 | 23.73 | 18.52 |
|  | 1980 1981 |  | 74.229 76.815 | 3025.2 3027.5 | 3025.2 3027.5 | 1600.00 1800.00 | 34.90 40.39 |  | 2.250 2.347 |  | 2.590 3.102 | . 0000 | . 0000 | 24.54 25.37 | 21.31 19.20 |
|  | 1982 |  | 79.492 | 3029.8 | 3029.8 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | 2.319 |  | 3.619 | . 000 | . 000 | $26.21+$ | 16.81 |
|  | Garfield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 21.168 | 1600.6 | 1600.6 | 1562.29 | 36.98 |  | 1.718 |  | . 783 | . 009 | . 056 | 13.22 | 29.03 |
|  | 1980 |  | 21.897 | 1746.5 1905.7 | 1746.5 1905.7 | 1702.29 1852.29 | 37.13 41.56 |  | 2.160 2.589 |  | . 813 | . 0003 | . 0679 | 12.54 11.89 | 33.31 <br> 32.68 <br> 3.78 |
|  | 1982 |  | 23.431 | 2079.4 | 2079.4 | 2012.29 | 46.74 |  | 3.089 |  | 1.095 | . 000 | . 094 | 11.27 | 31.78 |




|  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { KIT CARSON }}{\text { Burlington }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 | \$ | 27.934 | 969.8 | 1006.2 | \$1450.30 | 34.33 | \$ | . 500 | \$ | . 959 | \$ . 009 | \$.000 | 27.76 | 14.49 |
|  | 1980 |  | 28.772 | 938.5 | 970.1 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 548 |  | 1.004 | . 010 | . 000 | 29.66 | 16.19 |
|  | 1981 |  | 29.635 | 908.2 | 938.8 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | . 493 |  | 1.197 1.390 | . 011 | . 0000 | 31.57 33.60 | 13.00 |
|  |  |  | 30.524 | 878.9 | 908.5 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | - 391 |  | 1.390 | . 011 | . 000 | 33.60 | 9.45 |
|  | $\frac{\text { LAKE }}{\text { Lake County }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 109.206 | 1854.9 | 1944.5 | 1858.39 | 33.09 |  | . 000 |  | 3.614 | . 005 | . 000 | 56.16 | . 00 |
|  | 1980 |  | 122.000 | 1773.7 | 1856.1 | 2133.34 | 32.46 |  | . 000 |  | 3.960 | . 006 | . 000 | 65.73 | . 00 |
|  | 1981 |  | 133.293 | 1696.1 | 1774.9 | 2283.34 | 29.73 |  | . 000 |  | 4.053 | . 008 | . 000 | 76.79 | . 00 |
|  | 1982 |  | 152.261 | 1621.9 | 1697.2 | $24+3.34$ | 27.24 |  | . 000 |  | 4.147 | . 009 | . 000 | 89.71 | . 00 |
|  | $\frac{\text { LA PLATA }}{\text { Durango }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 82.607 | 3521.5 | 3523.1 | 1491.65 | 35.31 |  | 2.339 |  | 2.916 | . 046 | . 000 | 23.45 | 18.80 |
|  | 1980 |  | 91.006 | 3533.8 | 3533.8 | 1631.65 | 35.59 |  | 2.527 |  | 3.239 | . 046 | . 000 | 25.75 | 20.10 |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 100.259 110.453 | 3546.1 3558.4 | 3546.1 358.4 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | 2.334 1.946 |  | 4.049 5.029 | . 046 | . 0000 | 28.27 31.04 | 16.30 12.01 |
|  | Bayfield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 13.261 | 517.9 | 534.4 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | . 309 |  | . 439 | . 005 | . 000 | 24.81 | 17.44 |
|  | 1980 |  | 14.960 | 501.9 | 518.1 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | . 307 |  | . 522 | . 006 | . 000 | 28.88 | 16.97 |
|  | 1981 |  | 16.877 | 486.4 | 502.1 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 222 |  | . 682 | . 006 | . 000 | 33.62 | 10.95 |
|  | 1982 |  | 19.040 | 471.4 | 486.6 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 087 |  | . 867 | . 006 | . 000 | 39.13 | 3.92 |
| ※ | Ignacio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1979 |  | 12.339 | 908.2 | 953.3 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | . 926 |  | . 409 | . 029 | . 000 | 12.94 | 29.31 |
|  | 1980 |  |  |  | 908.9 | 1600.00 |  |  | . 954 |  | . 500 | . 030 | . 000 | 15.78 | 30.07 |
|  | 1981 |  | 16.663 | 824.2 | 865.9 | 1800.00 | 40.39 |  | . 886 |  | . 673 | . 031 | . 000 | 19.24 | 25.38 |
|  | 1982 |  | 19.663 | 785.1 | 824.8 | 1960.00 | 45.53 |  | . 735 |  | . 882 | . 032 | . 000 | 23.47 | 19.58 |
|  | $\frac{\text { LARIMER }}{\text { Poudre }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 285.660 | 13614.7 | 13614.7 | 1707.96 | 40.43 |  | 11.706 |  | 11.548 | . 000 | . 000 | 20.98 | 21.27 |
|  | 1980 |  | 295.360 | 13777.1 | 13777.1 | 1847.96 | 40.30 |  | 13.555 |  | 11.904 | . 000 | . 000 | 21.44 | 24.41 |
|  | 1981 |  | 305.389 | 13941.4 | 13941.4 | 1997.96 | 4.83 |  | 14.165 |  | 13.690 | . 000 | . 000 | 21.91 | 22.66 |
|  | 1982 |  | 315.759 | 14107.7 | 14107.7 | 2157.96 | 50.13 |  | 14.616 |  | 15.828 | . 000 | . 000 | 22.38 | 20.67 |
|  | Thompson |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 143.812 | 9312.8 | 9312.8 | 1431.98 | 33.89 |  | 8.462 |  | 4.874 | . 000 | . 098 | 15.44 | 26.81 |
|  | 1980 |  | 147.923 | 9771.3 | 9771.3 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | 10.472 |  | 5.162 | . 000 | . 115 | 15.14 | 30.71 |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 152.152 156.502 | 10252.4 10757.2 | 10252.4 10757.2 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | 12.310 13.959 |  | 6.145 7.125 | . 0000 | .135 .155 | 14.84 14.55 | 29.73 28.50 |
|  | Park (Estes Park) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 52.027 | 1073.0 | 1073.0 | 1665.66 | 34.35 |  | . 000 |  | 1.787 | . 000 | . 000 | 48.49 | . 00 |
|  | 1981 |  | 53.351 54.709 | 1083.3 | 1083.6 | 1955.66 | 36.49 38.73 |  | . .000 |  | 1.119 | . 000 | . 000 | 49.48 50.49 | . 00 |
|  | 1982 |  | 56.101 | 1088.9 | 1088.9 | 2115.66 | 41.06 |  | . 000 |  | 2.304 | . 000 | . 000 | 51.52 | . 00 |







|  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | $\underline{L S}$ | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { PROWERS }}{W_{\text {I }} 1 \operatorname{loy}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 | \$ | 6.060 | 241.8 | 242.8 | \$1508.13 | 35.70 | \$ | . 150 | \$ | . 216 | \$ .000 | \$ .000 | 24.96 | 17.29 |
|  | 1980 |  | 6.147 | 242.5 | 242.5 | 1786.56 | 38.97 |  | . 194 |  | . 240 | . 000 | . 000 | 25.35 | 20.50 |
|  | 1981 |  | 6.235 6.324 | 243.2 | 243.2 243 | 1936.56 | 43.45 48.70 |  | . 200 |  | . 271 | . 000 | . 000 | 25.64 | 18.93 |
|  | 1982 |  | 6.324 |  |  | 2096.56 |  |  |  |  | -308 |  | . 000 |  |  |
|  | $\frac{\text { PUEBLO }}{\text { Pueblo City }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1980 |  | 319.546 | 20052.0 | 20620.1 | 1651.23 | 36.01 |  | 22.540 |  | 11.508 | . 069 | . 000 | 15.50 | 30.35 |
|  | 1981 |  | 327.337 | 19504.6 | 20057.1 | 1801.23 | 40.41 |  | 22.899 |  | 13.229 | . 619 | . 000 | 16.32 | 28.25 |
|  | 1982 |  | 335.318 | 18972.1 | 19509.6 | 1961.23 | 45.56 |  | 22.987 |  | 15.276 | . 630 | . 000 | 17.19 | 25.86 |
|  | Pueblo Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 81.809 | 4703.8 | 4720.0 | 1602.22 | 37.92 |  | 4.460 |  | 3.102 | . 051 | . 000 | 17.33 | 24.92 |
|  | 1980 |  | 93.802 | 4722.1 | 4722.1 | 1742.22 | 38.00 |  | 4.663 |  | 3.564 | . 051 | . 000 | 19.86 | 25.98 |
|  | 1981 |  | 107.553 123.320 | 4740.5 4759.0 | 4740.5 4759.0 | 1892.22 2052.22 | 42.46 47.67 |  | 4.404 3.888 |  | 4.566 5.879 | . 050 | . 0000 | 22.69 25.91 | 21.88 17.14 |
|  | $\frac{\text { RIO BLANCO }}{\text { Meeker }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1980 |  | 24.350 | 928.7 | 928.7 | 2005.04 | 43.73 |  | . 806 |  | 1.056 | .000 | . 084 | 26.00 | 13.07 19.85 |
|  | 1981 |  | 24.968 | 1077.6 | 1077.6 | 2155.04 | 48.35 |  | 1.115 |  | 1.207 | .000 | . 104 | 23.17 | 21.40 |
|  | 1982 |  | 25.814 | 1250.4 | 1250.4 | 2315.04 | 53.78 |  | 1.507 |  | 1.388 | . 000 | . 130 | 20.64 | 22.41 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{+} \end{aligned}$ | Rangley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 157.886 |  | 534.1 | 2144.87 | 7.26 |  | . 000 |  | 1.146 | . 000 | . 000 | 295.52 | . 00 |
|  | 1980 |  | 165.690 | 470.7 | 502.1 | 2479.59 | 7.51 |  | . 000 |  | 1.245 | . 000 | . 000 | 330.02 | . 00 |
|  | 1981 |  | 173.934 | 441.9 | 471.3 | 2629.59 | 7.13 |  | . 000 |  | 1.239 | . 001 | . 000 | 369.03 | . 0 |
|  | 1982 |  | 182.589 | 414.9 | 442.5 | 2789.59 | 6.76 |  | . 000 |  | 1.234 | . 001 | . 000 | 412.64 | . 00 |
|  | Del Norte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 12.053 | 764.0 | 784.4 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | . 699 |  | - 399 | . 027 | . 000 | 15.37 | 26.88 |
|  | 1980 |  | 12.904 | 74.1 | 764.2 | 1600.00 | 34.90 |  | .772 |  | . 450 | . 027 | . 000 | 16.89 | 28.96 |
|  | 1981 |  | 13.815 14.790 | 724.7 705.8 | 744.3 724.9 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | .782 .74 |  | . 558 | . 027 | . 0000 | 18.56 20.40 | 26.01 22.65 |
|  | RIO GRANDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Monte Vista |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 17.009 | 1371.2 | 1431.3 | 1400.00 | 33.14 |  | 1.440 |  | . 564 | . 060 | . 000 | 11.88 | 30.37 |
|  | 1980 |  | 17.292 | 1313.6 | 1332.0 | 1600.00 | 33.90 |  | 1.592 |  | .603 | . 061 | . 000 | 12.60 | 33.25 |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 17.579 | 1258.4 1205.5 | 1314.4 1259.2 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 40.39 45.53 |  | 1.656 1.654 |  | . .710 | . 062 | .000 | 13.37 14.19 | 31.20 28.86 |
|  | Sargent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1979 |  | 10.082 |  | 388.1 | 1876.70 | 44.42 |  | . 281 |  | . 448 | . 016 | . 000 | 25.90 | 16.27 |
|  | 1980 |  | 10.249 | 345.5 | 366.6 | 2016.70 | 43.98 |  | . 289 |  | . 451 | . 016 | . 000 | 27.96 | 17.89 |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 10.419 10.591 | 326.0 307.6 | 345.9 326.4 | 2166.70 2326.70 | 48.61 54.05 |  | .243 .187 |  | . 506 | . 017 | . 0000 | 30.12 32.45 | 14.45 10.60 |






APPENDIX K

SIMULATION OF THE "PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF 1973" AS AMENDED BY S.B. NO. $25-$ WITH STABILIZED STATEWIDE, AVERAGE MILL LEVY

ASSUMPTIONS:







|  |  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARP | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { EL PASO }}{\text { Falcon }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} 1981 \\ 1982 \end{array}$ | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 19.645 \\ & 22.277 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1422.6 \\ & 1570.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1422.6 \\ & 1570.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1848.28 \\ 2008.28 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.27 \\ & 37.70 \end{aligned}$ | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.897 \\ & 2.314 \end{aligned}$ | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & .73 ? \\ & .840 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ .000 \\ .000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .070 \\ .085 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 13.81 \\ 14.18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 35.78 \\ 39.09 \end{array}$ |
|  | Edison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 1.813 1.814 | 17.5 14.9 | 20.8 | 3169.73 3329.73 | 31.54 28.68 |  | . 009 |  | .057 .052 | . 0001 | .000 | 87.16 102.73 | 13.35 13.35 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Miami-Yoder } \\ 1981 \\ 1982 \end{array}$ |  | 3.942 4.106 | 121.2 | 125.4 121.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 2064.99 \\ & 2224.99 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.64 \\ & 41.77 \end{aligned}$ |  | .095 .098 |  | . 164 | . 001 | . 0000 | 31.43 33.87 | 18.16 19.40 |
|  | $\frac{\text { FREMONT }}{\text { Canon }} \text { city }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 1982 |  | 46.175 47.222 | 3350.6 3380.6 | 3350.6 3380.6 | 1800.00 1960.00 | 36.30 36.79 |  | 4.355 4.888 |  | $1.6 \% 6$ 1.737 | .027 | . 0000 | 13.78 13.97 | 35.81 39.30 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Florence } \\ & 1981 \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 28.232 \\ & 28.353 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1461.8 \\ & 1436.6 \end{aligned}$ | 1487.6 1461.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 1800.00 \\ & 1960.00 \end{aligned}$ | 36.30 36.79 |  | 1.653 1.822 |  | 1.025 1.043 | . 025 | .000 .000 | 18.98 19.39 | 30.61 33.88 |
|  | Cotopaxi $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ |  | 7.495 7.566 | 239.6 272.5 | 239.6 272.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 2387.97 \\ & 2547.97 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.15 \\ & 47.83 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & .211 \\ & .332 \end{aligned}$ |  | .361 .362 | . 0000 | . 022 | 31.28 27.77 | $\begin{aligned} & 18.31 \\ & 25.50 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { GARFIELDD } \\ \begin{aligned} \text { Roaring Fork } \\ 1981 \\ 1982 \end{aligned} \\ \\ \end{array}$ |  | 76.815 79.492 | 3027.5 3029.8 | 3027.5 3029.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 1800.00 \\ & 1960.00 \end{aligned}$ | 36.30 36.79 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2.661 \\ & 3.014 \end{aligned}$ |  | 2.788 2.925 | . 000 | .000 .000 | 25.37 26.24 | $\begin{aligned} & 24.22 \\ & 27.03 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Garfield } & \\ & 1981 \\ 1982 \end{array}$ |  | 22.651 23.431 | 1905.7 2079.4 | 1905.7 2079.4 | 1852.29 2012.29 | 37.35 37.78 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2.684 \\ & 3.299 \end{aligned}$ |  | . 846 | . 0003 | . 079 | 11.89 11.27 | 37.70 42.00 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grand Valley } \\ 1981 \\ 1982 \end{array}$ |  | 3.967 3.967 | 177.2 | 177.2 187.1 | 2501.16 | 50.44 49.96 |  | .243 .300 |  | . 200 | . 001 | . 004 | 22.39 21.20 | 27.20 32.07 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { GILPIN } \\ \left.\begin{array}{r} \text { GI1pin } \\ \\ \\ \\ 1988 \end{array}\right) \\ \\ 1982 \end{array}$ |  | 7.478 7.510 | 282.1 | 2828.1 | 2815.18 2975.18 | 56.77 55.85 |  | . 311 |  | .425 .49 | . 0000 | .014 .016 | 28.64 26.57 | 20.95 26.70 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \frac{\text { GRAND }}{\text { West }} \text { Grand } \\ \\ \\ 1981 \\ 1982 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 53.878 \\ & 54.770 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 458.3 \\ & 470.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 458.3 \\ & 470.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2218.54 \\ & 2378.54 \end{aligned}$ | 17.21 18.61 |  | $\begin{array}{r} .090 \\ .099 \end{array}$ |  | .927 1.020 | . 0000 | $\text { . } 0000$ | $\begin{aligned} & 117.56 \\ & 116.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.35 \\ & 11.35 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { East Grand } \\ 1981 \\ 1982 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 52.513 \\ & 55.152 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 909.2 \\ & 935.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 909.2 \\ & 935.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2232.51 \\ & 2392.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.40 \\ & 33.09 \end{aligned}$ |  | $.381$ |  | 1.649 1.825 | . 001 | .000 .000 | 57.76 58.95 | 13.35 13.35 |
|  | ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ) |
|  | ' |  |  |  | 1 | ; | ! | $i$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1" | ' |


|  |  | AV | ADAE | AE | ARB | MILL |  | SE |  | PT | PVRTY | GRTH | LS | SS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GUNNISON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gunnison | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Watershed } \\ & \hline 1981 \end{aligned}$ | 32.620 | 1376.0 | 1376.0 | \$1834.29 | 36.99 | $\bigcirc$ | 1.317 | \$ | 1.207 | \$.002 | \$.000 | \$23.71 | \$25.88 |
|  | 1982 | 34.275 | 1405.2 | 1405.2 | 1994.29 | 37.44 |  | 1.519 |  | 1.283 | . 002 | . 000 | 24.39 | 28.88 |
| HTNSDALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hinsdale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 | 6.497 | 67.1 | 68.9 | \$1800.00 | 17.05 | \$ | . 013 |  | . 111 | . 000 | . 000 | 94.24 | 11.35 |
|  | 1982 | 6.710 | 65.3 | 67.1 | 1960.00 | 17.61 |  | . 013 |  | . 118 | . 000 | . 000 | 99.98 | 11.35 |
| HUERFANO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Huerfano |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 1982 | 11.015 11.015 | 908.2 865.1 | 954.2 908.9 | 1819.36 1979.36 | 36.69 37.16 |  | 1.332 1.390 |  | .404 .409 | . 0666 | . 0000 | 11.54 | 38.05 41.15 |
| La Veta |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 | 4.418 | 157.7 | 166.8 | 1918.98 | 38.70 |  | . 149 |  | . 171 | . 005 | . 000 | 26.49 | 23.10 |
|  | 1982 | 4.418 | 149.3 | 157.9 | 2078.98 | 39.03 |  | . 156 |  | . 172 | . 005 | . 000 | 27.99 | 25.28 |
| JACKSON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 000 | 48.01 |  |
|  | 1982 | 16.746 | 264.7 | 304.1 | 1994.81 | 29.16 |  | .118 |  | . 488 | . 001 | . 000 | 55.07 | 13.35 |
| JEPFERSON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 1982 | $\begin{aligned} & 1691.098 \\ & 1826.385 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76075.2 \\ & 76127.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76075.2 \\ & 76127.4 \end{aligned}$ | 2020.28 2180.28 | 40.74 40.93 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 84.798 \\ & 91.227 \end{aligned}$ |  | 68.895 74.752 | . 0000 | . 0000 | 23.23 23.99 | 27.36 29.38 |
| $\frac{\text { KIOWA }}{\text { Eads }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 1982 | 11.523 11.534 | 297.1 294.4 | 299.8 297.1 | 1985.26 2145.26 | 38.34 40.27 |  | .153 .173 |  | .153 .464 | .000 .000 | .000 | 38.44 38.82 | 13.35 14.45 |
| Plainview |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 | 8.214 | 93.5 | 95.5 | 2514.39 | 25.31 |  | . 032 |  | . 208 | . 001 | . 000 | 86.01 | 13.35 |
|  | 1982 | 8.256 | 91.5 | 93.5 | 2674.39 | 26.31 |  | . 033 |  | . 217 | . 001 | . 000 | 88.29 | 13.35 |
| KIT CARSON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flagler |  |  |  |  |  | 40.17 |  | . 126 |  | . 207 | . 004 | . 000 | 30.85 |  |
|  | 1982 | 5.320 | 154.2 | 160.7 | 2152.07 | 40.40 |  | . 131 |  | . 215 | . 005 | . 000 | 33.11 | 20.16 |
| KIT CARSON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selbert | 1981 |  |  | 72.8 | 2198.07 |  |  | . 036 |  | . 124 | . 003 | . 000 | 46.06 |  |
|  | 1982 | 3.453 | 55.7 | 63.9 | 2358.07 | 34.98 |  | . 030 |  | .121 | .003 | . 000 | 54.06 | 13.35 |
| Vona |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 | 2.688 | 40.9 | 43.5 | 2680.25 | 35.44 |  | . 021 |  | . 096 | -002 | . 000 | 61.85 | 13.35 |
|  | 1982 | 2.768 | 38.5 | 40.9 | 2840.25 | 35.09 |  | . 019 |  | . 097 | . 002 | . 000 | 67.60 | 13.35 |
| Stratton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1981 1982 | 6.489 6.683 | 257.8 260.9 | 257.8 260.9 | 2037.32 2197.32 | 41.08 41.25 |  | .259 .298 |  | .267 .276 | . 0000 | . 000 | 25.17 25.61 | 24.42 27.66 |










## BILL 1

## A BILL FOR AN ACT

1 CONCERNING THE COUNTING OF KINDERGARTEN FUPILS UNDER THE "PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF 1973".

## Bill Summary

(Note: This summary applies to this bill as introduced and does not necessarily reflect any amendments which may be subsequently adopted.)

Continues for one year the present method of counting kindergartners under the "Public School Finance Act of 1973".

3 Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:
SECTION 1. 22-50-102 (1) (b), Colorado Revised Statutes
5 1973, as amended, is amended to read:

22-50-102. Definitions. (1) (b) For the period July 1 , 1976, through June 30, 3979 1980, pupils enrolled in kindergarten classes shall be counted as one-half day of attendance or, alternatively, not more than a total of ninety full days per year of attendance, regardless of the number of days or hours of actual attendance; except that a district shall be entitled to count as one full day of attendance for the entire year the number of pupils enrolled in kindergarten classes of four hours

## Capital letters indicate new material to be added to existing statute.

 Dashes through the words indicate detetions from existing statute.1 and fifteen!minutes per day or more; not to exceed the number 2 counted by the district as full-day pupils during the four-week 3 period ending the fourth Friday of October, 1975, or other 4 counting period as provided in section 22-50-104 (1), during the 5 calendar year 1975. The total number of pupils enrolled in 6 kindergarten classes statewide who may be counted as one full day 7 of attendance for the entire year shall not exceed three thousand 8 five hundred.

9 SECTION 2. Safety clause. The general assembly hereby 10 finds, determines, and declares that this act is necessary for 11 the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and 12 safety.


[^0]:    4/ Tex. Const. art. 7, sec. 3.
    5/ 411 U.S. at 9.

[^1]:    171 237 A.2d at 200.
    18/ Id. at 203.
    19/ Id. at 205.

