



**Colorado  
Legislative  
Council  
Staff**

**HB16-1422**

**REVISED  
FISCAL NOTE**

(replaces fiscal note dated May 2, 2016)

**FISCAL IMPACT:**  State  Local  Statutory Public Entity  Conditional  No Fiscal Impact

**Drafting Number:** LLS 16-1208 **Date:** May 9, 2016  
**Prime Sponsor(s):** Rep. Hamner; Rankin **Bill Status:** Conference Committee  
 Sen. Lambert; Steadman **Fiscal Analyst:** Marc Carey (303-866-4102)

**BILL TOPIC:** FINANCING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Fiscal Impact Summary	FY 2015-2016	FY 2016-2017	FY 2017-2018
<b>State Revenue</b>			
<b>State Expenditures</b>	<b><u>\$286,801</u></b>	<b><u>\$3,574,900</u></b>	<b><u>\$3,574,900</u></b>
General Fund	286,801	3,450,236	3,450,236
Cash Funds		124,664	124,664
<b>FTE Position Change</b>			
<b>Appropriation Required:</b> \$286,801 - Department of Education (FY2015-16) \$3,574,900 - Department of Education (FY2016-17)			
<b>Future Year Impacts:</b> Ongoing expenditure impact.			

**Summary of Legislation**

This *revised bill* changes the "Public School Finance Act of 1994" by modifying the funding for K-12 public schools in FY 2016-17.

**Total Program Funding.** The bill increases base per pupil funding to \$6,367.90, to reflect a 1.2 percent inflation rate. The bill also makes the following changes in the calculation of total program:

- for FY 2016-17, holds the negative factor at the FY 2015-16 level; and
- specifies that for FY 2017-18, the negative factor cannot exceed the FY 2016-17 level.

**Size Factor Adjustment.** Current law includes a graduated size factor for districts with a funded pupil count of less than 4,023. This bill adjusts the size factor by creating a new tier for districts with a funded pupil count between 3,500 and 5,000. The bill thus increases the factor for districts with between 3,500 and 5,000 pupils.

**Categorical Buyout Penalty.** Current law requires school districts that are sufficiently locally funded such that they are unable to fully implement the negative factor to use local property tax revenue to "buy-out" any categorical program support received from the state. This bill requires the buy-out to occur by the end of the fiscal year in which the district received the support. If unpaid, the Commissioner of Education is required to withhold the amount due, with interest, from any state money due to the district for any reason, beginning in the following fiscal year. The commissioner may waive accrued interest upon payment of the amount due from the district.

**Total Program Reserve Fund.** Under current law, if a school district's total program mill levy generates more revenue than the districts total program and categorical buyout requirements, the mill levy must fall. In such years, this bill authorizes the district to hold its total program mill levy constant. The additional revenue generated must be deposited in the district's newly created total program reserve fund. Money in the fund may only be used to replace state aid lost through application of the negative factor.

**BEST funding for improvements.** Under current law, the Public School Capital Construction Assistance Board may provide matching grants to schools or school districts for capital construction on school facilities owned by the school or district or covered by a lease-purchase agreement. This bill permits the Board to award matching grants to schools or districts for a public school that is operated or will operate in a qualified, state-owned facility leased to the school or district.

**Supplemental Assistance from Contingency Reserve Fund.** The bill permits the state to provide supplemental assistance from the contingency reserve fund to help districts that, because of a significant decline in their assessed values, must implement the full negative factor when the district did not receive state aid in the previous fiscal year. Such assistance is capped at 50 percent of the district's reduction in state share due to application of the negative factor.

**Facility School Funding.** The bill clarifies that facility schools are to receive funding based on pupil enrollment multiplied by an amount equal to 1.73 of the statewide base per pupil funding, rather than the state average per pupil revenue, for the applicable budget year.

The *revised bill* also includes the following provisions pertaining to charter schools:

**Institute chartering authority.** Under current law, a local board of education may permit the establishment of one or more institute charter schools within the geographic boundaries of the school district. This bill specifies that an institute charter school that is established with permission by the local board continues to be authorized by and accountable to the Charter School Institute, regardless of later actions by the local board, unless the institute charter school voluntarily converts to a district charter school.

**Open meetings.** The bill specifies that the governing board of an institute charter school is a local public body, not a state public body under the state's open meeting laws.

**Automatic waivers of statute and state rule.** Under current law, charter schools receive certain automatic waivers from state law; however, the State Board of Education may not waive certain other laws, e.g., laws related to accountability or educator evaluations. This bill prohibits the state board from automatically waiving statutory requirements for the minimum number of teacher-pupil contact hours.

**Charter school network audits.** Charter school networks must be audited as a single legal entity. The bill waives the requirement that each public school undergo a separate audit if that school is included in a charter network. An authorizing school district may request and the network is required to provide an audit of a network school located within that school district.

**School district overhead accounting.** Under current law, a chartering school district may retain a portion of a charter school's per pupil revenue to pay for central administrative costs and services provided by the district. School districts are required, if asked by a charter school, to give

the school an itemized accounting of all its central administrative costs. If the accounting includes services provided by school district personnel, the accounting must include a list of the personnel positions and services provided. Each school district is required to distribute to each charter school, on a per pupil basis, any other state or federal money the school district receives that was based on a per pupil calculation and includes the students enrolled in the charter school.

**Underused school district buildings.** Beginning no later than November 2016, and annually thereafter, school districts must notify charter schools of available vacant or underused buildings or land. The district must notify currently authorized schools and schools applying for new charters, and post the notification on its website. Schools may apply to the district for use of the property and the local board of education must review applications and approve or disapprove applications in a public meeting. A building is considered underused if it has unused capacity to accommodate 250 students or more.

**State Expenditures**

**The bill is expected to increase state expenditures by \$286,801 in FY 2015-16 and \$3,574,000 in FY 2016-17 and subsequent years.**

**Total Program Funding.** House Bill 16-1422 sets total program funding for FY 2016-17 at \$6.396 billion. This represents a 11.51 percent reduction from what funding levels would have been without the negative factor. The appendix details the funding changes that occur at the school district level as a result of this bill.

The \$6.396 billion in total program funding represents an estimated increase of \$156.3 million in FY 2016-17 compared with actual funding levels for FY 2015-16, and increases formula funding by \$124,664 for FY 2016-17 relative to current law. State expenditures for school finance will increase by \$124,664, with local funding remaining unchanged. Since the negative factor is set at 11.51 percent, each district's total program funding will be reduced by 11.51 percent from the level set by the funding formula before application of the negative factor, provided the district receives at least an amount of state aid that is greater than this percentage reduction. Table 1 shows the estimate of school finance act funding under House Bill 16-1422.

<b>Table 1. School Finance Act Funding under House Bill 16-1422</b>					
	<b>Pupil Count</b>	<b>Per Pupil Funding</b>	<b>Total Program Funding</b>	<b>State Aid</b>	<b>Local Share</b>
FY 2015-16 Act.	853,251	\$7,313	\$6,239,564,775	\$3,979,778,973	\$2,259,785,802
FY 2016-17 Est.	861,441	\$7,425	\$6,395,910,214	\$4,115,127,505	\$2,280,782,709
Percent change	0.96%	1.53%	2.51%	3.40%	0.93%
Increase	8,190	\$112	\$156,345,439	\$135,348,532	\$20,996,907

**Negative Factor in FY 2017-18.** The bill specifies that the negative factor in FY 2017-18 may not exceed the level set in FY 2016-17. Current law does not define the negative factor in FY 2017-18, but this fiscal note assumes that the negative factor remains at the FY 2016-17 level.

**Size Factor Adjustment.** Implementation of the size factor adjustments specified in the bill will increase total program and state aid by \$124,664 in FY 2016-17, relative to current law. Six districts currently have a funded pupil count between 3,500 and 5,000 and would thus receive additional funding under this provision. Other districts will receive minimal additional increases due to the slight reduction of the negative factor from this provision.

**Supplemental Assistance from Contingency Reserve Fund.** The bill allows supplemental assistance from the Contingency Reserve Fund to districts that meet three criteria:

- the district was fully locally funded in the prior fiscal year;
- the district saw a decline in its assessed values; and
- the district receives state aid, which is reduced by application of the negative factor.

The amount of assistance is capped at 50 percent of the reduction in the district's state share as a result of the application of the negative factor.

For FY 2015-16, three districts met all of the above criteria. The Clear Creek, Cripple Creek and Pawnee school districts will be eligible for assistance from the Contingency Reserve Fund for a maximum amount of \$286,801 which is half of the aggregate amount of their negative factor reductions in FY 2015-16. In FY 2016-17, however, 10 districts will be eligible for such assistance totaling nearly \$3.5 million. Table 2 presents information on the projected negative factor in FY 2016-17 and the supplemental assistance for the 10 districts that did not receive state aid in FY 2015-16, and whose assessed values declined.

<b>Table 2. Affected Districts, Projected FY 2016-17 Negative Factor</b>			
<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2016-17 Negative Factor</b>	<b>Maximum Assistance</b>
Clear Creek	Clear Creek	\$58,426	\$29,213
Lincoln	Genoa-Hugo	\$153,501	\$76,751
Morgan	Wiggins	\$562,747	\$281,373
Teller	Cripple Creek	\$431,075	\$215,538
Weld	Keenesburg	\$1,758,334	\$879,167
Weld	Platte Valley	\$1,109,761	\$554,881
Weld	Fort Lupton	\$2,208,110	\$1,104,055
Weld	Briggsdale	\$273,842	\$136,921
Weld	Prairie	\$180,636	\$90,318
Weld	Pawnee	\$164,038	\$82,019
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$6,900,470</b>	<b>\$3,450,236</b>

Currently, the Contingency Reserve Fund has a balance of \$1 million, and an appropriation for FY 2016-17 of \$1.0 million contained in the 2016 Long Bill. Any assistance over this amount will have to be funded with the General Fund.

**School District Impact**

Table 1 above shows the estimate of school finance act funding under House Bill 16-1422. The table compares estimated FY 2016-17 funding levels with actual funding in the prior year. In FY 2016-17, the bill increases funding by \$112 per pupil and funds 8,190 new pupils. Total program funding increases from \$6.240 billion to \$6.396 billion. Of this amount, the state's share increases by \$135 million, from \$3.980 billion to \$4.115 billion. The appendix to this fiscal note contains a district-by-district overview of the school finance impacts of House Bill 16-1422, relative to current law.

**Total Program Reserve Fund.** In FY 2015-16, there are 4 districts whose total program mill levy declined because they generated more revenue than the sum of the district's total program and categorical buyout requirements. This bill will effectively hold the mill levy constant for districts in similar circumstances starting in FY 2016-17, and require the additional revenue generated to be deposited in a newly created total program reserve fund. For informational purposes only, Table 3 presents data on districts that would have been impacted by this provision in FY 2015-16 if it had been effective that year.

<b>Table 3. Districts with Declining Total Program Mill Levies and Estimated Deposits in the District's Total Program Reserve</b>				
<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2014-15 Mill Levy</b>	<b>FY 2015-16 Mill Levy</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>Amount to Reserve Fund</b>
Genoa-Hugo	22.809	17.087	5.722	\$718,718
Wiggins	25.885	24.545	1.342	\$60,589
Platte Valley	6.181	5.624	0.557	\$921,370
Prairie	8.597	5.145	3.452	1,671,565
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$3,372,242</b>

*\* For informational purposes only.*

**School District overhead Accounting.** The bill increases workload for school districts, as districts, if asked, are required to provide a charter school with an itemized list of accounting and central administrative services and related costs that are supplied by the district to the charter school. If the accounting includes services provided by school district personnel, the accounting must also include a list of the personnel positions and services provided. It is estimated that for larger districts that host multiple charter schools, central administrative workload will increase by up to one hour per person per month to track and document these administrative services.

**Under Utilized Buildings.** School districts will have increased workload to make an annual inventory of available vacant land and underused buildings, and to notify their currently authorized and pending authorized charter schools of the potential availability of these capital resources.

Pursuant to Section 22-32-143, C.R.S., school districts and Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) may submit estimates of fiscal impacts within seven days of a bill's introduction. As of the date of this fiscal note, no summaries of fiscal impacts were submitted by districts or BOCES for this bill. If summaries of fiscal impacts are submitted by districts or BOCES in the future, they will be noted in subsequent revisions to the fiscal note and posted at this address: <http://www.colorado.gov/lcs>.

## Effective Date

The bill takes effect upon signature of the Governor, or upon becoming law without his signature.

## State Appropriations

For FY 2015-16, the bill requires the following General Fund appropriation:

- \$286,801 to the Department of Education for supplemental assistance.

For FY 2016-17, the bill contains the following cash funds appropriation from the State Education Fund:

- \$124,664 to the Department of Education for the state's share of total program.

In addition, the bill also requires the following General Fund appropriation:

- \$3,450,236 to the Department of Education for supplemental assistance.

## State and Local Government Contacts

Education

Legislative Council Staff

Joint Budget Committee Staff

# HB16-1422

**Table 1**  
**School Finance Funding, Current Law vs. Reengrossed HB 16-1422, FY 2016-17**

			FY 2016-17 Under Current Law			FY 2016-17 Under HB 16-1422			Change from Current Law		
County	District		Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil
1	ADAMS	MAPLETON	8,298	\$61,592,138	\$7,422	8,298	\$61,592,276	\$7,422	-	\$139	\$0
2	ADAMS	ADAMS 12 FIVE STAR	42,204	\$306,570,292	\$7,264	42,204	\$306,570,983	\$7,264	-	\$691	\$0
3	ADAMS	COMMERCE CITY	8,120	\$63,419,938	\$7,810	8,120	\$63,420,081	\$7,810	-	\$143	\$0
4	ADAMS	BRIGHTON	17,195	\$123,035,873	\$7,155	17,195	\$123,036,150	\$7,155	-	\$277	\$0
5	ADAMS	BENNETT	1,030	\$7,926,344	\$7,694	1,030	\$7,926,362	\$7,694	-	\$18	\$0
6	ADAMS	STRASBURG	971	\$7,437,701	\$7,659	971	\$7,437,718	\$7,659	-	\$17	\$0
7	ADAMS	WESTMINSTER	10,580	\$81,429,144	\$7,697	10,580	\$81,429,327	\$7,697	-	\$184	\$0
8	ALAMOSA	ALAMOSA	2,287	\$16,265,189	\$7,112	2,287	\$16,265,225	\$7,112	-	\$37	\$0
9	ALAMOSA	SANGRE DE CRISTO	304	\$2,941,697	\$9,667	304	\$2,941,703	\$9,667	-	\$7	\$0
10	ARAPAHOE	ENGLEWOOD	2,710	\$20,711,625	\$7,643	2,710	\$20,711,671	\$7,643	-	\$47	\$0
11	ARAPAHOE	SHERIDAN	1,417	\$12,181,719	\$8,600	1,417	\$12,181,747	\$8,600	-	\$27	\$0
12	ARAPAHOE	CHERRY CREEK	51,656	\$381,401,336	\$7,383	51,656	\$381,402,196	\$7,384	-	\$860	\$0
13	ARAPAHOE	LITTLETON	14,891	\$106,477,858	\$7,150	14,891	\$106,478,098	\$7,150	-	\$240	\$0
14	ARAPAHOE	DEER TRAIL	167	\$2,260,547	\$13,520	167	\$2,260,552	\$13,520	-	\$5	\$0
15	ARAPAHOE	AURORA	40,304	\$311,056,941	\$7,718	40,304	\$311,057,643	\$7,718	-	\$701	\$0
16	ARAPAHOE	BYERS	3,348	\$23,994,927	\$7,167	3,348	\$23,994,981	\$7,167	-	\$54	\$0
17	ARCHULETA	ARCHULETA	1,393	\$10,563,804	\$7,586	1,393	\$10,563,828	\$7,586	-	\$24	\$0
18	BACA	WALSH	143	\$1,841,468	\$12,923	143	\$1,841,472	\$12,923	-	\$4	\$0
19	BACA	PRITCHETT	50	\$746,932	\$14,939	50	\$746,934	\$14,939	-	\$2	\$0
20	BACA	SPRINGFIELD	269	\$2,694,440	\$10,009	269	\$2,694,447	\$10,009	-	\$6	\$0
21	BACA	VILAS	61	\$771,667	\$12,734	61	\$771,669	\$12,734	-	\$2	\$0
22	BACA	CAMPO	50	\$742,942	\$14,859	50	\$742,943	\$14,859	-	\$2	\$0
23	BENT	LAS ANIMAS	495	\$3,960,764	\$7,998	495	\$3,960,773	\$7,998	-	\$9	\$0
24	BENT	MCCLAVE	252	\$2,537,677	\$10,090	252	\$2,537,682	\$10,090	-	\$6	\$0
25	BOULDER	ST VRAIN	30,253	\$219,670,259	\$7,261	30,253	\$219,670,754	\$7,261	-	\$495	\$0
26	BOULDER	BOULDER	30,034	\$220,843,381	\$7,353	30,034	\$220,843,879	\$7,353	-	\$498	\$0
27	CHAFFEE	BUENA VISTA	953	\$7,233,971	\$7,595	953	\$7,233,987	\$7,595	-	\$16	\$0
28	CHAFFEE	SALIDA	1,213	\$8,887,908	\$7,328	1,213	\$8,887,929	\$7,328	-	\$20	\$0
29	CHEYENNE	KIT CARSON	120	\$1,585,157	\$13,265	120	\$1,585,161	\$13,265	-	\$4	\$0
30	CHEYENNE	CHEYENNE	177	\$2,201,262	\$12,472	177	\$2,201,267	\$12,472	-	\$5	\$0
31	CLEAR CREEK	CLEAR CREEK	831	\$7,379,248	\$8,877	831	\$7,379,248	\$8,877	-	\$0	\$0
32	CONEJOS	NORTH CONEJOS	1,003	\$7,418,311	\$7,398	1,003	\$7,418,328	\$7,398	-	\$17	\$0
33	CONEJOS	SANFORD	371	\$3,290,924	\$8,866	371	\$3,290,932	\$8,866	-	\$7	\$0
34	CONEJOS	SOUTH CONEJOS	215	\$2,605,015	\$12,094	215	\$2,605,021	\$12,094	-	\$6	\$0
35	COSTILLA	CENTENNIAL	225	\$2,558,915	\$11,398	225	\$2,558,921	\$11,398	-	\$6	\$0

# HB16-1422

			FY 2016-17 Under Current Law			FY 2016-17 Under HB 16-1422			Change from Current Law		
County	District		Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil
36	COSTILLA	SIERRA GRANDE	299	\$2,998,652	\$10,022	299	\$2,998,659	\$10,022	-	\$7	\$0
37	CROWLEY	CROWLEY	453	\$3,757,563	\$8,291	453	\$3,757,571	\$8,291	-	\$8	\$0
38	CUSTER	WESTCLIFFE	365	\$3,359,689	\$9,205	365	\$3,359,696	\$9,205	-	\$8	\$0
39	DELTA	DELTA	4,767	\$34,227,527	\$7,179	4,767	\$34,264,147	\$7,187	-	\$36,620	\$8
40	DENVER	DENVER	86,552	\$669,186,076	\$7,732	86,552	\$669,187,584	\$7,732	-	\$1,509	\$0
41	DOLORES	DOLORES	269	\$2,832,957	\$10,547	269	\$2,832,963	\$10,547	-	\$6	\$0
42	DOUGLAS	DOUGLAS	63,575	\$455,357,907	\$7,163	63,575	\$455,358,934	\$7,163	-	\$1,027	\$0
43	EAGLE	EAGLE	6,999	\$54,008,816	\$7,717	6,999	\$54,008,938	\$7,717	-	\$122	\$0
44	ELBERT	ELIZABETH	2,374	\$17,339,765	\$7,303	2,374	\$17,339,804	\$7,303	-	\$39	\$0
45	ELBERT	KIOWA	287	\$2,995,562	\$10,427	287	\$2,995,569	\$10,427	-	\$7	\$0
46	ELBERT	BIG SANDY	281	\$2,940,107	\$10,459	281	\$2,940,113	\$10,459	-	\$7	\$0
47	ELBERT	ELBERT	202	\$2,486,700	\$12,304	202	\$2,486,706	\$12,304	-	\$6	\$0
48	ELBERT	AGATE	50	\$785,084	\$15,702	50	\$785,085	\$15,702	-	\$2	\$0
49	EL PASO	CALHAN	510	\$4,306,037	\$8,447	510	\$4,306,046	\$8,447	-	\$10	\$0
50	EL PASO	HARRISON	11,918	\$89,564,033	\$7,515	11,918	\$89,564,235	\$7,515	-	\$202	\$0
51	EL PASO	WIDEFIELD	8,973	\$63,265,923	\$7,051	8,973	\$63,268,208	\$7,051	-	\$2,285	\$0
52	EL PASO	FOUNTAIN	7,735	\$54,537,777	\$7,051	7,735	\$54,539,747	\$7,051	-	\$1,971	\$0
53	EL PASO	COLORADO SPRINGS	30,000	\$219,935,348	\$7,331	30,000	\$219,935,844	\$7,331	-	\$496	\$0
54	EL PASO	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN	4,853	\$34,219,643	\$7,051	4,853	\$34,220,880	\$7,051	-	\$1,237	\$0
55	EL PASO	MANITOU SPRINGS	1,438	\$10,801,176	\$7,513	1,438	\$10,801,200	\$7,513	-	\$24	\$0
56	EL PASO	ACADEMY	23,886	\$168,264,636	\$7,044	23,886	\$168,270,569	\$7,045	-	\$5,933	\$0
57	EL PASO	ELLCOTT	994	\$7,904,056	\$7,954	994	\$7,904,074	\$7,954	-	\$18	\$0
58	EL PASO	PEYTON	646	\$5,260,594	\$8,146	646	\$5,260,606	\$8,146	-	\$12	\$0
59	EL PASO	HANOVER	254	\$2,853,586	\$11,257	254	\$2,853,592	\$11,257	-	\$6	\$0
60	EL PASO	LEWIS-PALMER	6,155	\$43,402,466	\$7,051	6,155	\$43,404,035	\$7,051	-	\$1,568	\$0
61	EL PASO	FALCON	22,216	\$157,437,598	\$7,087	22,216	\$157,437,952	\$7,087	-	\$355	\$0
62	EL PASO	EDISON	189	\$2,308,391	\$12,233	189	\$2,308,396	\$12,233	-	\$5	\$0
63	EL PASO	MIAMI-YODER	271	\$2,886,310	\$10,670	271	\$2,886,316	\$10,670	-	\$7	\$0
64	FREMONT	CANON CITY	3,714	\$26,186,171	\$7,051	3,714	\$26,187,117	\$7,051	-	\$946	\$0
65	FREMONT	FLORENCE	1,395	\$10,190,123	\$7,305	1,395	\$10,190,146	\$7,305	-	\$23	\$0
66	FREMONT	COTOPAXI	200	\$2,363,520	\$11,824	200	\$2,363,525	\$11,824	-	\$5	\$0
67	GARFIELD	ROARING FORK	5,980	\$45,809,424	\$7,660	5,980	\$45,809,527	\$7,660	-	\$103	\$0
68	GARFIELD	RIFLE	4,753	\$34,188,802	\$7,193	4,753	\$34,228,722	\$7,202	-	\$39,920	\$8
69	GARFIELD	PARACHUTE	1,088	\$8,582,858	\$7,892	1,088	\$8,582,878	\$7,892	-	\$19	\$0
70	GILPIN	GILPIN	406	\$3,733,973	\$9,202	406	\$3,733,981	\$9,202	-	\$8	\$0
71	GRAND	WEST GRAND	442	\$3,928,854	\$8,881	442	\$3,928,863	\$8,881	-	\$9	\$0
72	GRAND	EAST GRAND	1,236	\$9,280,866	\$7,507	1,236	\$9,280,887	\$7,507	-	\$21	\$0
73	GUNNISON	GUNNISON	1,922	\$14,185,768	\$7,380	1,922	\$14,185,800	\$7,380	-	\$32	\$0
74	HINSDALE	HINSDALE	101	\$1,509,352	\$14,989	101	\$1,509,356	\$14,989	-	\$3	\$0

# HB16-1422

			FY 2016-17 Under Current Law			FY 2016-17 Under HB 16-1422			Change from Current Law		
County	District		Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil
75	HUERFANO	HUERFANO	515	\$4,205,899	\$8,172	515	\$4,205,908	\$8,172	-	\$9	\$0
76	HUERFANO	LA VETA	209	\$2,362,975	\$11,322	209	\$2,362,981	\$11,322	-	\$5	\$0
77	JACKSON	NORTH PARK	183	\$2,329,864	\$12,738	183	\$2,329,870	\$12,738	-	\$5	\$0
78	JEFFERSON	JEFFERSON	81,405	\$589,110,212	\$7,237	81,405	\$589,111,540	\$7,237	-	\$1,328	\$0
79	KIOWA	EADS	155	\$1,909,143	\$12,285	155	\$1,909,147	\$12,285	-	\$4	\$0
80	KIOWA	PLAINVIEW	64	\$909,584	\$14,234	64	\$909,586	\$14,235	-	\$2	\$0
81	KIT CARSON	ARRIBA-FLAGLER	165	\$2,017,811	\$12,251	165	\$2,017,815	\$12,251	-	\$5	\$0
82	KIT CARSON	HI PLAINS	112	\$1,470,963	\$13,181	112	\$1,470,966	\$13,181	-	\$3	\$0
83	KIT CARSON	STRATTON	187	\$2,176,961	\$11,654	187	\$2,176,966	\$11,654	-	\$5	\$0
84	KIT CARSON	BETHUNE	115	\$1,565,344	\$13,565	115	\$1,565,348	\$13,565	-	\$4	\$0
85	KIT CARSON	BURLINGTON	715	\$5,426,675	\$7,595	715	\$5,426,687	\$7,595	-	\$12	\$0
86	LAKE	LAKE	998	\$7,885,841	\$7,902	998	\$7,885,859	\$7,902	-	\$18	\$0
87	LA PLATA	DURANGO	4,994	\$36,492,687	\$7,307	4,994	\$36,492,770	\$7,307	-	\$82	\$0
88	LA PLATA	BAYFIELD	1,328	\$10,170,900	\$7,662	1,328	\$10,170,923	\$7,662	-	\$23	\$0
89	LA PLATA	IGNACIO	861	\$7,009,051	\$8,141	861	\$7,009,067	\$8,141	-	\$16	\$0
90	LARIMER	POUDRE	29,820	\$210,218,016	\$7,050	29,820	\$210,225,567	\$7,050	-	\$7,551	\$0
91	LARIMER	THOMPSON	15,066	\$106,228,393	\$7,051	15,066	\$106,232,228	\$7,051	-	\$3,835	\$0
92	LARIMER	ESTES PARK	1,073	\$8,356,739	\$7,791	1,073	\$8,356,758	\$7,791	-	\$19	\$0
93	LAS ANIMAS	TRINIDAD	1,087	\$8,554,312	\$7,871	1,087	\$8,554,331	\$7,871	-	\$19	\$0
94	LAS ANIMAS	PRIMERO	188	\$2,251,087	\$12,006	188	\$2,251,093	\$12,006	-	\$5	\$0
95	LAS ANIMAS	HOEHNE	354	\$3,221,308	\$9,107	354	\$3,221,315	\$9,107	-	\$7	\$0
96	LAS ANIMAS	AGUILAR	111	\$1,541,416	\$13,924	111	\$1,541,420	\$13,924	-	\$3	\$0
97	LAS ANIMAS	BRANSON	443	\$3,109,879	\$7,018	443	\$3,109,886	\$7,018	-	\$7	\$0
98	LAS ANIMAS	KIM	50	\$701,077	\$14,022	50	\$701,079	\$14,022	-	\$2	\$0
99	LINCOLN	GENOA-HUGO	161	\$2,137,448	\$13,243	161	\$2,137,448	\$13,243	-	\$0	\$0
100	LINCOLN	LIMON	495	\$3,971,198	\$8,021	495	\$3,971,207	\$8,021	-	\$9	\$0
101	LINCOLN	KARVAL	50	\$744,545	\$14,891	50	\$744,547	\$14,891	-	\$2	\$0
102	LOGAN	VALLEY	2,186	\$15,622,607	\$7,145	2,186	\$15,622,642	\$7,145	-	\$35	\$0
103	LOGAN	FRENCHMAN	186	\$2,258,750	\$12,118	186	\$2,258,755	\$12,118	-	\$5	\$0
104	LOGAN	BUFFALO	311	\$2,992,430	\$9,610	311	\$2,992,436	\$9,610	-	\$7	\$0
105	LOGAN	PLATEAU	171	\$2,119,349	\$12,372	171	\$2,119,354	\$12,372	-	\$5	\$0
106	MESA	DEBEQUE	151	\$1,960,211	\$13,007	151	\$1,960,216	\$13,007	-	\$4	\$0
107	MESA	PLATEAU VALLEY	446	\$3,682,323	\$8,262	446	\$3,682,332	\$8,262	-	\$8	\$0
108	MESA	MESA VALLEY	21,742	\$153,303,014	\$7,051	21,742	\$153,308,551	\$7,051	-	\$5,537	\$0
109	MINERAL	CREEDE	83	\$1,232,841	\$14,871	83	\$1,232,844	\$14,871	-	\$3	\$0
110	MOFFAT	MOFFAT	2,086	\$14,707,209	\$7,051	2,086	\$14,707,741	\$7,051	-	\$531	\$0
111	MONTEZUMA	MONTEZUMA	2,674	\$18,950,492	\$7,087	2,674	\$18,950,534	\$7,087	-	\$43	\$0
112	MONTEZUMA	DOLORES	729	\$5,734,684	\$7,865	729	\$5,734,697	\$7,865	-	\$13	\$0
113	MONTEZUMA	MANCOS	469	\$3,885,966	\$8,287	469	\$3,885,975	\$8,287	-	\$9	\$0

# HB16-1422

			FY 2016-17 Under Current Law			FY 2016-17 Under HB 16-1422			Change from Current Law		
County	District		Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil
114	MONTROSE	MONTROSE	6,208	\$45,662,559	\$7,355	6,208	\$45,662,662	\$7,355	-	\$103	\$0
115	MONTROSE	WEST END	266	\$3,174,639	\$11,953	266	\$3,174,646	\$11,953	-	\$7	\$0
116	MORGAN	BRUSH	1,448	\$10,952,304	\$7,566	1,448	\$10,952,329	\$7,566	-	\$25	\$0
117	MORGAN	FT. MORGAN	2,958	\$22,060,618	\$7,459	2,958	\$22,060,668	\$7,459	-	\$50	\$0
118	MORGAN	WELDON	226	\$2,610,959	\$11,579	226	\$2,610,965	\$11,579	-	\$6	\$0
119	MORGAN	WIGGINS	530	\$4,324,677	\$8,161	530	\$4,324,686	\$8,161	-	\$10	\$0
120	OTERO	EAST OTERO	1,312	\$10,295,782	\$7,845	1,312	\$10,295,805	\$7,845	-	\$23	\$0
121	OTERO	ROCKY FORD	788	\$6,490,272	\$8,232	788	\$6,490,287	\$8,232	-	\$15	\$0
122	OTERO	MANZANOLA	133	\$1,842,507	\$13,874	133	\$1,842,511	\$13,874	-	\$4	\$0
123	OTERO	FOWLER	398	\$3,492,292	\$8,777	398	\$3,492,300	\$8,777	-	\$8	\$0
124	OTERO	CHERAW	201	\$2,379,919	\$11,840	201	\$2,379,924	\$11,840	-	\$5	\$0
125	OTERO	SWINK	367	\$3,333,922	\$9,079	367	\$3,333,930	\$9,079	-	\$8	\$0
126	OURAY	OURAY	175	\$2,438,172	\$13,956	175	\$2,438,178	\$13,956	-	\$5	\$0
127	OURAY	RIDGWAY	337	\$3,461,139	\$10,258	337	\$3,461,147	\$10,258	-	\$8	\$0
128	PARK	PLATTE CANYON	983	\$7,731,701	\$7,867	983	\$7,731,719	\$7,867	-	\$17	\$0
129	PARK	PARK	569	\$4,774,567	\$8,397	569	\$4,774,577	\$8,397	-	\$11	\$0
130	PHILLIPS	HOLYOKE	608	\$4,747,909	\$7,814	608	\$4,747,920	\$7,814	-	\$11	\$0
131	PHILLIPS	HAXTUN	302	\$2,782,302	\$9,219	302	\$2,782,308	\$9,219	-	\$6	\$0
132	PITKIN	ASPEN	1,667	\$15,969,551	\$9,579	1,667	\$15,969,587	\$9,579	-	\$36	\$0
133	PROWERS	GRANADA	201	\$2,298,512	\$11,452	201	\$2,298,517	\$11,453	-	\$5	\$0
134	PROWERS	LAMAR	1,509	\$11,276,865	\$7,474	1,509	\$11,276,890	\$7,474	-	\$25	\$0
135	PROWERS	HOLLY	274	\$2,652,609	\$9,681	274	\$2,652,615	\$9,681	-	\$6	\$0
136	PROWERS	WILEY	235	\$2,487,944	\$10,596	235	\$2,487,950	\$10,596	-	\$6	\$0
137	PUEBLO	PUEBLO CITY	17,058	\$126,029,461	\$7,389	17,058	\$126,029,745	\$7,389	-	\$284	\$0
138	PUEBLO	PUEBLO RURAL	9,535	\$67,232,628	\$7,051	9,535	\$67,235,055	\$7,051	-	\$2,427	\$0
139	RIO BLANCO	MEEKER	645	\$4,968,644	\$7,707	645	\$4,968,655	\$7,707	-	\$11	\$0
140	RIO BLANCO	RANGELY	511	\$4,005,421	\$7,832	511	\$4,005,430	\$7,832	-	\$9	\$0
141	RIO GRANDE	DEL NORTE	448	\$3,690,412	\$8,234	448	\$3,690,421	\$8,234	-	\$8	\$0
142	RIO GRANDE	MONTE VISTA	1,140	\$8,651,982	\$7,592	1,140	\$8,652,001	\$7,592	-	\$20	\$0
143	RIO GRANDE	SARGENT	434	\$3,520,427	\$8,108	434	\$3,520,435	\$8,108	-	\$8	\$0
144	ROUTT	HAYDEN	371	\$3,603,731	\$9,711	371	\$3,603,739	\$9,711	-	\$8	\$0
145	ROUTT	STEAMBOAT SPRINGS	2,642	\$19,609,200	\$7,424	2,642	\$19,609,244	\$7,424	-	\$44	\$0
146	ROUTT	SOUTH ROUTT	355	\$3,542,961	\$9,986	355	\$3,542,969	\$9,986	-	\$8	\$0
147	SAGUACHE	MOUNTAIN VALLEY	126	\$1,716,153	\$13,631	126	\$1,716,157	\$13,631	-	\$4	\$0
148	SAGUACHE	MOFFAT	193	\$2,624,616	\$13,578	193	\$2,624,622	\$13,578	-	\$6	\$0
149	SAGUACHE	CENTER	650	\$5,493,747	\$8,449	650	\$5,493,759	\$8,449	-	\$12	\$0
150	SAN JUAN	SILVERTON	70	\$1,111,158	\$15,783	70	\$1,111,160	\$15,784	-	\$3	\$0
151	SAN MIGUEL	TELLURIDE	944	\$9,265,700	\$9,812	944	\$9,265,721	\$9,812	-	\$21	\$0
152	SAN MIGUEL	NORWOOD	265	\$2,952,325	\$11,158	265	\$2,952,332	\$11,158	-	\$7	\$0

# HB16-1422

			FY 2016-17 Under Current Law			FY 2016-17 Under HB 16-1422			Change from Current Law		
County	District	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	Funded Pupil Count	Total Program after Negative Factor	Total Funding Per Pupil	
153	SEDGWICK	JULESBURG	627	\$4,609,088	\$7,352	627	\$4,609,098	\$7,352	-	\$10	\$0
154	SEDGWICK	PLATTE VALLEY	130	\$1,743,543	\$13,391	130	\$1,743,547	\$13,391	-	\$4	\$0
155	SUMMIT	SUMMIT	3,375	\$26,008,814	\$7,705	3,375	\$26,008,872	\$7,705	-	\$59	\$0
156	TELLER	CRIPPLE CREEK	345	\$3,312,789	\$9,611	345	\$3,312,797	\$9,611	-	\$7	\$0
157	TELLER	WOODLAND PARK	2,385	\$16,986,763	\$7,124	2,385	\$16,986,801	\$7,124	-	\$38	\$0
158	WASHINGTON	AKRON	335	\$3,184,473	\$9,512	335	\$3,184,480	\$9,512	-	\$7	\$0
159	WASHINGTON	ARICKAREE	105	\$1,460,397	\$13,935	105	\$1,460,400	\$13,935	-	\$3	\$0
160	WASHINGTON	OTIS	224	\$2,553,296	\$11,394	224	\$2,553,302	\$11,394	-	\$6	\$0
161	WASHINGTON	LONE STAR	107	\$1,525,388	\$14,256	107	\$1,525,391	\$14,256	-	\$3	\$0
162	WASHINGTON	WOODLIN	96	\$1,385,133	\$14,428	96	\$1,385,136	\$14,428	-	\$3	\$0
163	WELD	GILCREST	1,878	\$13,899,567	\$7,402	1,878	\$13,899,598	\$7,402	-	\$31	\$0
164	WELD	EATON	1,931	\$13,776,489	\$7,133	1,931	\$13,776,520	\$7,133	-	\$31	\$0
165	WELD	KEENESBURG	2,247	\$16,589,147	\$7,384	2,247	\$16,589,147	\$7,384	-	\$0	\$0
166	WELD	WINDSOR	5,529	\$38,984,163	\$7,051	5,529	\$38,985,571	\$7,051	-	\$1,409	\$0
167	WELD	JOHNSTOWN	3,778	\$26,642,386	\$7,051	3,778	\$26,643,349	\$7,051	-	\$963	\$0
168	WELD	GREELEY	21,409	\$156,568,630	\$7,313	21,409	\$156,568,983	\$7,313	-	\$353	\$0
169	WELD	PLATTE VALLEY	1,129	\$8,528,449	\$7,556	1,129	\$8,528,468	\$7,556	-	\$19	\$0
170	WELD	FT. LUPTON	2,213	\$16,969,195	\$7,668	2,213	\$16,969,233	\$7,668	-	\$38	\$0
171	WELD	AULT-HIGHLAND	838	\$6,519,263	\$7,784	838	\$6,519,277	\$7,784	-	\$15	\$0
172	WELD	BRIGGSDALE	165	\$2,104,459	\$12,778	165	\$2,104,463	\$12,778	-	\$5	\$0
173	WELD	PRAIRIE	194	\$2,420,109	\$12,468	194	\$2,420,109	\$12,468	-	\$0	\$0
174	WELD	PAWNEE	85	\$1,260,619	\$14,919	85	\$1,260,622	\$14,919	-	\$3	\$0
175	YUMA	YUMA 1	743	\$6,119,061	\$8,236	743	\$6,119,075	\$8,236	-	\$14	\$0
176	YUMA	WRAY RD-2	759	\$5,937,407	\$7,828	759	\$5,937,420	\$7,828	-	\$13	\$0
177	YUMA	IDALIA RJ-3	202	\$2,425,461	\$12,019	202	\$2,425,466	\$12,019	-	\$5	\$0
178	YUMA	LIBERTY J-4	69	\$1,060,972	\$15,354	69	\$1,060,974	\$15,354	-	\$2	\$0
<b>STATE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>861,441</b>	<b>\$6,395,785,551</b>	<b>\$7,425</b>	<b>861,441</b>	<b>\$6,395,910,214</b>	<b>\$7,425</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$124,664</b>	<b>\$0</b>	