Bill as Introduced

2003 SESSION

03-0172
04/09

HOUSE BILL ***751-FN-LOCAL***

AN ACT implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities, and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

SPONSORS: Rep. Alger, Graf 14; Rep. Giuda, Graf 13; Rep. Weyler, Rock 79; Rep. Hager, Merr 40; Rep Letourneau, Rock 77; Sen. Boyce, Dist 4; Sen. O'Hearn, Dist 12

COMMITTEE: Education

ANALYSIS

This bill creates an optional school building aid grant formula which shall be available to school districts beginning July 1, 2005, and establishes maximum cost and maximum size standards for the purpose of construction of school buildings or school administrative unit facilities.

The bill also authorizes high school vocational technical education programs which enter into a lease agreement for permanent space to be eligible for school building aid grants beginning July 1, 2003.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

03-0172
04/09

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 School Money; School Building Aid Annual Grant Amended. Amend RSA 198:15-a to read as follows:

198:15-a Annual Grant for the Payment of Debt Service for School Construction. To aid local school districts in meeting the costs of the payment of debt for school buildings and educational administration buildings, including office facilities for school administrative units, ***and to meet the costs of leasing permanent space in a building which is used for the operation of a high school vocational technical education program,*** the [~~state board~~] ***department*** of education shall, from funds appropriated by the general court to carry out the provisions of this subdivision, pay annually to the school districts of the state, sums in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision ***or the alternative school building aid provisions under RSA 198:15-u through RSA 198:15-w, depending on which option a school district elects***.

2 New Subdivision; Alternative School Building Aid. Amend RSA 198 by inserting after section 15-t the following new subdivision:

Alternative School Building Aid

198:15-u Definitions. As used in this subdivision:

I. "Median family income" means that income for each municipality using the most recent data available from the United States Bureau of the Census.

II. "Equalized valuation per pupil" means the average equalized valuation within the school district over the most recent 5 years divided by the current number of pupils within the school district expressed as an average from the most recent 5 years of available data collected by the department of education.

198:15-v Alternative School Building Aid Grants.

I. The amount of the annual grant to any school district duly organized, any city maintaining a school department within its corporate organization, any cooperative school district as defined in RSA 195:1, or any receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1, shall be determined as follows:

(a) Determine each municipality's equalized valuation per pupil by dividing the municipality's equalized valuation by the average daily membership in residence within each municipality. Assign each municipality a rank beginning with the municipality having the lowest equalized valuation per pupil ranked as number one, and continuing therefrom.

(b) Determine each municipality's median family income, and assign each municipality a rank beginning with the municipality having the lowest median family income ranked as number one and continuing therefrom.

(c) Add the rankings assigned in subparagraphs I(a) and I(b) and divide the sum by 2 to yield the building aid factor.

II.(a) The amount of the annual grant in this subdivision shall be a sum equal to a percentage of the amount of the annual payment of principal on all outstanding borrowings of the school district, city, cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district, for all approved costs of construction or purchase of school buildings and school administrative unit facilities, for which loans are approved after July 1, 2005 according to the following table:

Building Aid Factor	Single District	Preexisting District in a Cooperative School District, A.R.E.A. School, or Joint Maintenance Agreement
0-59	60 percent	60 percent
60-69	55 percent	60 percent
70-89	45 percent	55 percent
90-114	40 percent	50 percent
115 or greater	30 percent	40 percent

(b) The percentage once determined for a particular borrowing shall not thereafter be subject to change.

III. A cooperative school district, receiving district operating an A.R.E.A. school, or joint maintenance agreement grant amount shall be determined by calculating the percentage of the average daily membership in residence represented by each municipality which has entered into the agreement and multiplying this percentage by each municipality's percentage of annual building aid eligibility under paragraph II of this section. This product shall be multiplied by the projected cost of the building project. The sum of the resulting products shall be the annual building aid grant for the cooperative school district, A.R.E.A. school, or joint maintenance agreement.

198:15-w Alternative School Building Aid Grants; Procedures. The provisions of RSA 198:15-c through 198:15-h shall apply to any grant made under this subdivision.

3 School Building Aid; Amount of Annual Grant. Amend RSA 198:15-b, IV(c) to read as follows:

(c) Planning, construction, or both, of additions to existing buildings [~~to provide additional pupil capacity~~].

4 New Paragraph; School Building Aid; Cost and Size Standards. Amend RSA 198:15-b by inserting after paragraph VI the following new paragraph;

VII. In this paragraph, "new construction" means additional square footage but shall not mean the renovation of school buildings or school administrative unit facilities. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply to any school building aid grants made pursuant to RSA 198:15-a through RSA 198:15-w.

(a) The department of education shall issue annually maximum eligible cost standards for the construction of new school buildings or school administrative unit facilities, less site acquisition costs, qualifying for school building aid. These standards shall take into account the type, size, and location of the school or school administrative unit facility and shall be based on an appropriate construction cost index developed or adopted by the department which shall reflect cost differences in the several regions of the state. Maximum cost standards shall be computed and published annually and expressed as a maximum cost per square foot.

(b) Maximum size standards for new construction shall be as follows:

(1) Maximum gross square footage per pupil:

	Student Population	
	under 250	250 and over
Elementary school	144	120
Middle or junior high school	168	140
Senior high school (excluding vocational-technical centers)	192	160

(2) Maximum usable site size for new schools:

Elementary School	20 acres plus 1 acre for each 100 pupils
Middle or junior high school	25 acres plus 1 acre for each 100 pupils
Senior high school	30 acres plus 1 acre for each 100 pupils

(c) For the purpose of calculating the total school building aid grants made under RSA 198:15-a through RSA 198:15-w, the final approved cost for school construction or school project, shall not exceed the cost that would result if the project conformed to the maximum cost and size standards. The provisions of this section shall not preclude an eligible applicant from exceeding the maximum standards provided, however, the cost of the portion of the facilities which exceed the maximum standards shall not be eligible for school building aid. The maximum cost and size standards in effect at the time general contract work begins shall be used for the purposes of determining school building aid.

(d) The commissioner of the department of education shall have the authority to waive eligible cost and size standards for new construction for good reason shown.

5 New Section; School Building Aid; Grants for High School Vocational Technical Education Programs. Amend RSA 198 by inserting after section 15-h the following new section:

198:15-hh Annual Grant for Leased Space.

I. The amount of the annual grant for a lease to any school district duly organized, any city maintaining a school department within its corporate organization, any cooperative school district as defined in RSA 195:1, or any receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1, shall be a sum equal to 30 percent of the amount of the annual payment of the lease incurred, for the cost of leasing permanent space in a building or buildings not owned by the school district or school

administrative unit which is used for the operation of a high school vocational technical education program, to the extent approved by the state board of education, provided that the amount of the annual grant in the case of a cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or a receiving district operating an area school, shall be 40 percent plus 5 percent for each pre-existing district in excess of 2 and each sending district, in excess of one, and provided further that no cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district operating an area school, shall receive an annual grant in excess of 55 percent. For the purposes of this section, the amount of the annual grant for a lease to a vocational technical education center shall be calculated in the same manner as a cooperative school district. Such lease agreements shall be eligible for grants under this section, provided all of the following conditions apply:

(a) A school district, city, cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1, which receives grants under this section shall remain eligible to apply for, receive, and expend moneys from other state or federal sources made available for the purpose of purchasing new equipment, materials, or supplies necessary for the operation of the program. Moneys received from such other state or federal sources shall not be used to make permanent upgrades or renovations to the leased space.

(b) A lease agreement for permanent space shall be adopted in the same manner as required by law for the passage of construction bonds in the school district, city, cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1.

(c) An initial lease agreement for a term of 10 years or less shall be eligible to receive grants under this section. Upon renewal, a lease agreement may remain eligible to receive grants, provided the commissioner of the department of education determines that the lease agreement represents an efficient use of state and local resources.

(d) In any fiscal year where the state pays a pro rata share of school building aid grants, the state shall pay the same pro rata share for lease agreements approved under this section.

II. Lease agreements for the use of portable or modular classroom space shall not be eligible for grants.

III. A school district, city, cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1, shall submit details of the lease arrangement, including a copy of the proposed lease agreement, in writing to the state board of education on such forms as the state board may prescribe. Grant applications for leased space shall be submitted before January 1 of each year in order to be eligible for grants in the fiscal year following the year of submittal. The state board of education shall, no later than August 1, 2003, adopt rules pursuant to RSA 541-A, relative to procedures for grant applications for leased space.

6 Department of Education; School Building Aid Information. Beginning January 1, 2004, and every year thereafter, the commissioner of the department of education shall provide to the house

and senate education committees, the house and senate finance committees, and the governor, information from the most recent 5 years detailing the total square footage of school construction projects for which school building aid grants were disbursed categorized by existing building size, size of the addition, new building size, and in each case the type of school and number of pupils served.

7 Effective Date.

I. Sections 5 and 6 of this act shall take effect July 1, 2003.

II. The remainder of this act shall take effect July 1, 2005.

LBAO
03-0172
1/27/03

HB 751-FN-LOCAL - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities, and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Due to time constraints, the Office of Legislative Budget Assistant is unable to provide a fiscal note for this bill at this time. When completed, the fiscal note will be forwarded to the House Clerk's Office.

LBAO
03-0172
Revised 2/20/03

HB 751 FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities, and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Department of Education indicates this bill will increase state general fund expenditures and local revenue by $66,000 in FY 2004, $66,000 in FY 2005, $62,625 in FY 2006 and $34,250 in FY 2007. There will be no fiscal impact on state and county revenue or county and local expenditures.

METHODOLOGY:

This bill introduces three changes to the current building aid program. In FY 2004 it allows for reimbursement of a portion of lease costs, and beginning in FY 2006 establishes maximum cost and size standards, and establishes an alternative method for calculating school building aid. The Department made the following assumptions:

- The annual number of new construction projects under current law is assumed to be constant.
- Schools will be built within the new limits established in this bill.
- The alternative building aid formula established in this bill will result in 3 or 4 new projects in poorer communities that would not otherwise be built.
- Any leases for vocational education will cost no more than $66,000 per year.
- Construction costs remain constant year to year.

The Department estimated the increase in state general fund expenditures and local school district revenue using the last three years of available building aid data.

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Leased Vocational Tech. Facilities	$66,000	$66,000	$66,000	$66,000
Change in aid due to Alternative Building Aid Formula and Cost and Size Standards	0	0	(28,375)	(56,750)
Additional construction due to Alternative Building Aid formula	0	0	25,000	25,000
Total Fiscal Impact	$66,000	$66,000	$62,625	$34,250

Amendments

Rep. Alger, Graf. 14
May 2, 2003
2003-1482h
04/05

Amendment to HB 751-FN-LOCAL

Amend RSA 198:15-hh, III as inserted by section 5 of the bill by replacing it with the following:

III. A school district, city, cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1, shall submit details of the lease arrangement, including a copy of the proposed lease agreement, in writing to the state board of education on such forms as the state board may prescribe. Grant applications for leased space shall be submitted before January 1 of each year in order to be eligible for grants in the fiscal year following the year of submittal. The state board of education shall, no later than March 1, 2004, adopt rules pursuant to RSA 541-A, relative to procedures for grant applications for leased space.

Senate Education
May 15, 2003
2003-1657s
04/05

Amendment to HB 751-FN-LOCAL

Amend RSA 198:15-hh, III as inserted by section 5 of the bill by replacing it with the following:

III. A school district, city, cooperative school district, joint maintenance agreement, or receiving district operating an area school as defined in RSA 195-A:1, shall submit details of the lease arrangement, including a copy of the proposed lease agreement, in writing to the state board of education on such forms as the state board may prescribe. Grant applications for leased space shall be submitted before January 1 of each year in order to be eligible for grants in the fiscal year following the year of submittal. The state board of education shall, no later than March 1, 2004, adopt rules pursuant to RSA 541-A, relative to procedures for grant applications for leased space.

Committee Minutes

Date: May 7, 2003
Time: 2:30 PM
Room: 105-A, SH

The Senate Committee on Education held a hearing on the following:

HB 751-FN-L implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

Members of Committee present:
Senator O'Hearn
Senator Johnson
Senator Foster
Senator Green
Senator Larsen

The Chair, Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, opened the hearing.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: I will open the hearing on HB751, and call upon Representative Alger.

Representative Alger: Thank you madam chairman and members of the committee. I am delighted to be here with you and for the record my name is John Alger, I am state representative from District 14, Rumney, Wentworth, Ellsworth, Campton and Orford. With your indulgence, I have former Representative McKinney, whom you know very well, as the historian, the background on this bill, he began about six year ago, I guess. He struggled with it, and did a sub-committee, got it along very well and he decided not to run again, and he talked me into heading it up, and he continued to have an interest.

We were very fortunate, on my right is Ed Murdough from the Department of Education, who has done a fantastic job on putting this whole thing together. So I think you will find what you have here in this package is very appropriate to what this bill is.

Basically this bill is for the purpose of providing less wealthy towns an option in building aid which is not now available. We know, in the past, that is something that would be a sensible thing to do. What this bill does is provide an option in which less wealthy towns can get a higher percentage of their construction aid. It does not eliminate the original. So it is a hold harmless bill. It's a bill in which if you want to use the current law, you are allowed to use it. If you want to use the other law, you use that. Of course, that might say to you, well, that would make the bill cost more money. When we brought that concept to the Finance Committee a couple of years ago, or year ago, they made this point, and they also pointed out to us that the audit report, and Representative Weyler is here to talk about it. The audit report recommended that we do something about sizes.

So we have built into the bill now some material that says, if you are sizing it more than 120 sq. ft per elementary school, student for example, we won't pay for more than that, you can get that, so it's built in. You will see when you look at the data; you will see what it is. Fundamentally it is very well balanced on cost, there is not a big cost increase because the squeeze on the sizes.

You will also hear madam, chairman, I am sure you may hear from the Superintendents or other complaining that this bill, they don't care for the size constraint issue. Maybe they don't, and I appreciate they may not, because we don't have the large payments in Massachusetts. We don't pay 80%; we only pay 30-40-50%. The audit committee recommended that we include sizes. We have gone through the states locally to include it. The complaint about that, surely they will hear it, they certainly did in the House and I hope you will be able to overcome that thought in your mind.

If you look quickly in the bill, and I will move forward, then we will go to the package. If you look at the bill, we did include also, one other thing. On the first page, lines 5-7, we included the cost of leasing permanent space for vocational programs. In the discussion of this bill over the last two years. Particularly, when Representative Henderson was here, we were talking about the possibility of a leasing, particularly for vocational. In fact, today, I heard that the Conway people maybe considering vocational, so that is an example.

So we have included and built into this bill a leasing possibility for the vocational. The second thing on lines 10-11, talks about the alternative building (a) provisions. Then I will have you turn to the next page, on page 2, and you will look at that thing called, building factors, single district, pre-existing district, and so forth. That's where we will now go to the charts in the book.

The alternative form that you will see is the calculation alternative formula, and if you will go to page 1, of the third page in, you will see how this is being done, and its written in the bill, this way.

Basically, you see Acworth has a five-year valuation of $45 million. After much discussion we decided too not to use one year. If you remember in the year 2000, we had that big boom on construction and so the valuations went partially high. So we figured there was more sensible and more stable to have a 5-year average. So what we have done here is 5 year average, 80 MR. That is Average Daily Membership in residence.

You take the kids and divide them in there and that is what you get for a 5 year average. Then equalize value divided by 80 MR is $266 thousand, per kid, so that is what your valuation per child in that town, which is the fifth rank in the state.

The next thing is Median Family Income, and this is 2,000 and we were very fortunate today to have Richard Minard from the Public Policy Center to come again, as he has before, and if you need to talk about Median Family.

After discussion per capita under median, it seemed very appropriate from their point of view as well as ours to use median family as the indicator of wealth for a town. So what we are doing under this bill, is we are using 5-year average valuation and median family as the wealth concept of the town.

This town of Acworth is 24, in the rank. If you add those two together and divide it by two is 37, gives them a building aid factor of 37. If you look back on page 2, of the bill, you will see a rank of 37, so they will have 60%, on the preexisting. That is why the chart shows 66. So that is a town that's not very well to do. That was the concept all the way down here on all this information by town to give us a view of the wealth.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Just a verification, the first rank is where they ranked on your equalize valuation, 50th from the top?

Representative Alger: That is right, no fifth from the bottom. Look at Allenstown

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: That's what I wanted to clarify from the bottom or the top.

Representative Alger: Allenstown is the lowest, 158,000, so poor Allenstown has 158,000 per child.

Mr. McKinney: You start with the most needy.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: So these are ranking from the bottom up, and then the second ranking according to median income is your ranking from the bottom up?

Mr. McKinney: I like to look at the most needy first.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: So it's the most needy first.

Representative Alger: That is what we have done there and we crank through those through page 5, and after page five you go to Cooperative District. There is a question on how you do coops. To do coops you put together each town. Contoocook Valley which is the first big one there, there is their AMR, there is the presented total, their factor is 60%, so you take the presented total and multiply that and get a total of 46. It's basically a weighted average by 80 AMR.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: This is the second set of numbers here?

Representative Alger: That's the alternate SBA Eligibility Cooperative District FY3/2003, that" on the sixth page.

Mr. McKinney: If you want to get into more detail on how it is, next to the last page has the formula sitting out here and how this is done. It's really quite basic.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Next to the last page.

Representative Alger: Next to the last page shows the formula.

Mr. McKinney: It shows the formula and a sample and how to get there, it's really quite basis.

Representative Alger: You add it together, multiply and divide by two, then the area coops are down below.

On this chart with Alternative SBA, you can see that the current percentage and you can see the Alt percentage, and then you can see the larger of the two. Typically Contoocook Valley would presumably choose 55% because that is what they get now. Whereas the new funded only get 36. The top one would get 40. So you can see how that changes as you go down.

For example Haverhill Cooperative would get 60%, whereas before they only got 40, so they would get 60. So that is how the alternative formula would work better for them.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: In a Cooperative School District you would have to do this in making a choice for the alternative way or the current way they all have to go the same length.

Representative Alger: Yes, you have one choice. In other words if you are a coop, you make a choice. The coop is going to one barn. They do one barn so a coop is looked upon as one basic school doing a cooperative high school There wouldn't be a choice by town.

Mr. McKinney: The Dept. of Education deals with a coop as an entity. Then the coop has its own rules and regulations under it, and this just establishes that coop would get by calculating the wealth of each town within it and then coming up with a summary that says, alright.

In the coop, itself, we get so much. If we went to the new formula and in some cases if you have a number of wealthy towns in there, you would be better of staying with the old one.

Representative Alger: The next heading, Comparison of Current & Alternative Formula is labeled 3. And then the next page after that shows the different towns with current formula to high amounts. So Ed has put together a chart here summarizing every town by output and shows what grades they are covering and what the current formula is and if they are not there you have to note, afterwards see Fall Mountain, no school there, if you see that chart. So you can see Allenstown would go to 60%, resident 30. But Alton, Barnstead 48 and so forth. So that is just sort of a summary chart from the previous data.

Mr. McKinney: This chart also shows you different combinations of permutations that exist in the state from how we educate children.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: I'm looking a Claremont. Claremont area seems to be a single district school district aren't they?

Mr. McKinney: Unity is part of the Claremont area for high school.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: They are a coop, or an area?

Mr. McKinney: They are an area. Coop is an area(s) and calculation is the same, works the same. We are missing some data there. Unity is only 45% so that would bring the coop for the area "A" down. So they would be in the high 50's.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: To do the Claremont area, you are looking at Claremont at 30% and you are looking at Unity because Unity is the other town in the area "a".

Mr. McKinney: At Claremont 60%, Unity at 45%, and you take the proportionate way to figure is based on their enrollment. But Unity being so small, it would bring it down a little bit, but not very much.

Representative Alger: The higher amount would go as you say in the high 50's.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Weighted by equalized assessment, and...

Representative Alger: The number of students, in other words if you had a small town and a large town, we are weighing the total number of students in there. So much comes from this town at a certain weight and so much comes from that town at that number of students at a certain weight. Then you combine the two together to get the overall weight.

Mr. McKinney: Senator if you would go back to the very first chart and it is also on page two of the bill. When you calculate the formula you get a factor for a single district and factor to be used if that town is part of a coop or an area. So you end up with two factors if they are part of the coop or the area, then you use that number in the calculation for the overall coop or area percentage.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: How would you use the factor?

Mr. McKinney: For each town you multiply the coop factor by the percentage of enrollment that that town represents in the coop, and add them all together.

Representative Alger: That was in the previous charts.

Mr. McKinney: There is a lot of arithmetic to this.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Is there any questions on this before we go too far on this?

Representative Alger: Now you are ready for the numbers on this. We can go back any moment if you have any questions?

Section Four, three charts showing the impact of Alternative and most recent three years. So that is done here in these charts and there is one 2000, and 2001, and 2002. Ed why don't you explain that chart.

Mr. Ed Murdough: What we have done here, since we don't know what is going to happen in the future. The best way that we can assess the impact of the bill was to look at what would have happened if this bill had been in effect in the last three years. We took the new projects that were initiated in the last three years and applied the alternate formula to that particular project and you can see whether or not there would have been a change.

The first one, fiscal year 2001-2002, the new elementary school in Dublin, they currently get 55% under the alternate formula they get 46% so they would not benefit from the alternate formula there is no alternate gain.

If you go down to the first one, the gains in Gorham, the Middle School-High School elevators, they currently get 30%. Under the alternate formula, if it had been in effect at that time they would have gotten 60%. They would have gotten twice as much upon an annual basis from the state. So you can see the gain there of $15,000. This is the annual payment paid out over the life of the loan. In this case it was only a five-year project. If you run down the list you can see the net result of just the alternate formula in that particular year would have been an additional $191,000 dollars paid out in school buildings.

The next one does the same thing for the next year, fiscal year 2002-2003, which was a more expensive year in terms of the amount of work approved by the voters in that year.

The first one, Meredith, they don't benefit by the alternate formula, so they would see no change. Colebrook would have gone from 40% to 60% and would have gained an additional $77,000, had this bill been in effect. The net their being an increase of $413.

Mr. McKinney: We are only talking about the people who are gaining. Tell me how these people lose?

Mr. Murdough: That's coming in the next set of charts?

Mr. McKinney: The next set of charts, I guess I'm way ahead of you.

Mr. Murdough: In the fiscal year 2003-2004, these are the projects that are on the list are generally voted two fiscal years prior to when we start paying school building aid. So these are the projects that were approved for the most part in March of 2002 and these are the ones we will start paying school-building aid on in October of this fiscal year 2004.

This year happens to have been the highest number of projects ever approved since we started building aid of the 1950's.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: None of these are eligible for this, even if we passed this year, they would not be eligible?

Mr. Murdough: As the bill is currently written, it takes effect in the next biennium.

Representative Alger: Everything is grand fathered one way or the other.

Mr. Murdough: Yes, senator, it's whatever is in effect at the time you vote on in the project. So these are all grandfathered. We don't know what is going to happen in three years to be able to do this type of calculation. If this bill had been in effect in 2002, when these parties were voted, you can see that these people would have gained. This is strictly from the alternate formula without applying the other conditions in the bill.

If you go to the next set of charts, they are the same charts, the same projects but now we have added in the impact of the size restrictions. So if you look at the last few columns there you can see the square foot per student. That is what the project actually provided, the square foot limit from the bill, and if they exceed the limit then they would see a loss in the amount of building aid.

Strictly because of exceeding the limit, and then the very final column, shows the net gain or loss because you could have a gain from the ultimate formula and a loss resulting from the size limits and they are a few that could have that. So the net impact of both aspects of the bill is shown there. Again, in the first few, there is no impact on any of them by the bill. You go down there to the Gorham elevator; the elevator is not subject to a size restriction, so it really doesn't apply there. Go down to the high school addition in Weare. They built at 148 square feet per student, they are allowed 160, and they did not exceed the limit. They had a 110 percent increase from the current formula to the current alternate formula so they see a net gain of $2,900.

Go down to the new elementary school in Hudson, they built at 136; the limit is a 120 square feet per student, so they would have lost almost $16,000. They did not benefit from the alternate formula so they see a net loss of $16,000. We went through those calculations, again in this particular year, if the bill had been in effect, the school building aid would have been reduced by about $39,000.

Mr. Murdough: One point to be made is that this bill doesn't restrict, if you want to build over the limits you can do that. It's just that the state is not going to pay additional aid that's all. We are saying that you have to do that.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Is the square footage based on most averages?

Mr. Murdough: The chart at the end?

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Is that what it's basically, I have another question on this? Is it based on minimum, is that what you determine what is current, or is it the whole size of the school, for the number of students, how do you determine square footage?

Mr. Alger: How would you make the calculation? It's the total size of the school, divided by the number of students. The number of students which the school is designed.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: What is the number that you are using is your ultimate, the largest the town or school can build is it based on the law?

Mr. Alger: Basically what we have done is primarily based it on Vermont, Massachusetts, and Maine, and for the most part we have taken the most liberal of the three. In addition, at Ed's suggestion, on the smaller schools, we have increased the square footage, because it is very difficult to build the smaller schools on the same rules as you build the large schools. It's fairly generous, and it is based primarily on the New England Schools, and nationwide, it's fairly generous.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: I'm looking at Nashua, you consider not only square footage per student, but you also consider a plan. In reality, Nashua would be going back to their original formula. In other words, if this plan were in place today, under the alternative plan, Nashua, would lose $36,000.

Mr. Murdough: Size constraints are in both bills, that is why you are going to get some people upset. In order to meet the LBA Audit requirements, in order to do what other states are doing, we are putting the stuff together this way, and it does mean that under the current formula, you can build bigger than what we would pay.

Mr. Alger: If you build bigger than what you would pay for, but for a community that would be using the alternative and getting more also, limits those communities as well.

Mr. Murdough: Instead of getting 60% they may only be getting 55% as a result of overbuilding. If you look on page three of the bill, page three shows the square footage that we did. 144-220 students, $120, so we have included a factor of a 20% increase.

Mr. Alger: If I may follow-up on that, if you take all of the school's here you are going to get over 100 some odd schools that are less than 25% of those would have been adversely effected. If you look at types of schools, of course we have Nashua, being on the East Coast. Being familiar with the Spaulding Turnpike area, if you go to one of the ends of the Spaulding Turnpike and you look at the fiscal 2002-2003. You come down to Portsmouth, elementary addition, $1,700,000, they would have lost some money. Portsmouth is one of the so-called donor towns. They have the highest teacher rate in the entire area and so forth.

You go down to the other end of the Spaulding Turnpike, and you have Farmington, is down a little bit lower. They built a couple new schools, they now have 60%, and they have built it within the square footage area. The tenancy here is that the poor communities are building within the limitations. The more wealthy communities are building a little bit more.

On the next page 2003-2004, the Portsmouth high school gets 55%; again they would have lost some money. Rochester also, was building within the limits; again Rochester is a poorer community they are tending to build within the square foot limits which we have in this bill.

Mr. Murdough: Basically these three charts show the first year, the state would be out $300,000 less, and then next year we would pay $228 more and then the next year we pay $275 less, based on the size constraints. That is how this thing works, and again I want to repeat that this came to us from the finance committee and the audit report, Ken will talk about it a little bit. He recommended that we do this and the other states haven't.

I think, Senator, you spoke to us earlier about the need to have some kind of thing on the size, so hopefully the concepts of the bill make sense to you folks.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Do the other states put size limitations and also have the sliding scale and aid as well? They way I see this, the richer communities may get 30% or less if the built something more, they have less than 30%, but the poorer communities might get as high as 60%, and they have both, they have an alternate formula and size in general.

Mr. Alger: Every state is very unique, Senator, in how they do it. In Vermont, for example, it's flat 30% across the board, but they pay that 30% up front, which is a tremendous advantage to the district there. Connecticut has an extreme complicated sliding scale, based on the wealth of the community and I am not sure what they use to determine what the wealth is, but it actually have size limitations by grade. So K to 6 school year that is seven different limitations that they have to crank into this formula. Most states that do give aid, I believe there is nine that don't give any aid at all, most of them that do give aid do have some sort of a determination based on the communities need or wealth. I don't think there is any state that does it the way we do where it is strictly based on a single district versus a coop.

Mr. Murdough: Massachusetts, I think, starts at 50%, and if you can go up to 90%, even higher, if you are talking about people with disabilities. So we are going up to 55% or higher and 60% is closer their minimum.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Nashua gets 30% building aid for it being a single district school. Now they also have a technical high school, the technical private high school, is that considered a coop or is it considered an AREA and using 40%?

Mr. Murdough: The vocational centers are funded separately and a different RSA. This has no effect on that.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: This has no effect on that so this 25% is not under that RSA, would that be funded differently?

Mr. Murdough: The 25% that are not would be funded according to this.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: As a single district?

Mr. Murdough: As a single district.

Mr. Alger: We do at least have a feature building of this bill for a vocational, but that is the only difference.

Mr. Alger: The last chart in the book shows you by state, let's take a quick look and go to the financial results, but the last chart shows maximum square feet per student limits in different states. Elementary, middle and high schools, and it shows at the bottom, those bottom limits we have for the bigger schools.

Mr. McKinney: I think you should also note we have HB 751, but these are for the schools that are larger than 250, the class size is larger for those.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: It may be in the fiscal note.

Mr. Murdough: If you look at item 6 in the packet, the fiscal impact, this explains it a little better than the fiscal note. These numbers come from the charts that we looked at earlier. Again, looking at the most recent three years, if for 2002-2003, those are the amounts that we actually paid in school building aid for those fiscal years. 2004, that was the amount that was projected when I made this chart back on the third of February, so I should warn Senator Green that that number is perhaps a little different, I think it is a little higher, and it has since gone down a bit. The number bounces around as you go from estimates to bids, to actual costs as you finally cut the check. Those are the amounts we actually paid or projected to pay under the current law.

If the bill had been effect in those years, the next line shows the changes. You have to remember since we pay over the life of the bond; any change is cumulative until that bond pays off. So if we said in 2002, we said we would have paid $39,000 less total. That same $39,000 gets carried over into 2003, plus or minus whatever the adjustment is in that year. If you remember from the previous charts we were up over $200,000 in additional money that we would have paid in 2003. When you take the cumulative effect we have $189,000 or more. That illustrates a couple of things. It illustrates the up and down nature of school building aid. They are no trends, some years they are five projects, some years they are 50 projects, some years they are a lot of new high schools and other years they are additions to elementary schools. Some years they are more than 30% districts that are applying, and some years it's on the higher end.

If you look at it historically they are no trends. So what I have done here is use averages, but I do want to make a note that averages are a little bit dangerous. If in 2005, we suddenly come in needing 10 million dollars more because that is what the board approved, that is what it will be.

In 2003, we would have seen an increase, in 2004, we would have seen a net decrease of about $85,000 and that is the amount that is required. That is just a result of the size limitations in the alternate formula.

The bill does one other thing, which allows a lease for vocational centers, as Representative Alger mentioned. We don't know that there are any right now that want to do that to lease facilities. If there were a lease, that would be an increase in the building aid. Again, I do not know if there will be an aid, or how much space they need to lease or what the cost would be, but I put in an estimate there in the fiscal note to about $60,000 a year for one lease, should it be done.

You also have to make an assumption that this bill is going to encourage construction in the poorer communities. How much is anybody's guess, but you would have to assume there would be more projects that would not have been approved in the past that will now be approved so that results in the net increase of some of that.

Basically, looking at things on the average throwing those assumptions in, an estimate is that the total effect of the bill would see an increase in school building aid of about $50-60,000 a year, which is considerably less than the normal inflation in this program. The average inflation is around the order of 1-1 ½ million dollars a year. That is because you are paying off projects that were build 20 years ago in 1983 costs. Then you are adding projects that are being approved this year at cost. There is always going to be that normal inflation in the program, which is on average much higher than the impact of this bill.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Questions?

Mr. Murdough: I have an amendment on page four we have a little arrow a date, this just changes on line 34, page 4, the state board shall no later than August1, 2003, and that is for the rules adopting grants for leased space. We had a discussion Ed and I talked about that and recommended March 1st, next year to give time to work through the rules. Everything else is the same, except that date, it is just a minor change to be picked up.

The lease is fairly self-explanatory, basically it is focused like a cooperative school, and as far as the numbers are put together and Ed can explain that when he comes up, and we appreciate your time.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Thank you very much.

Mr. Murdough: We turn it over to you and hope that you will approve it. Thank you.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Representative Weyler.

Representative Weyler: Thank you madam chair, and senators. About eight years ago in this very room, I first was working on problems with school aid, My impression then was that it was a very lose operation and there were all sorts of problems. They would either have a gymnasium, or a cafeteria, they couldn't afford both. Then there were other horror stories about covered tennis courts and covered swimming pools that wealthy districts had and we were all paying just based upon a percentage of how many schools were in the district. I thought it was wrong, I was delighted that we began a progress on two fronts. One both in having legislation, and the second one, in having skilled people in the Department of Education. Ed MurDough was a great change and Sally Fellows is a great statistician, so we can finally get the data that I asked for literally three years before it was finally received in that legislative performance audit that we saw.

Finally, I had a chart, which I had been asking for literally for three years showing a comparison of what other states did. It was the first time I had any knowledge that they were really standards out there.

To give you a horror story of how I thought it saved money, we recently voted in a school budget in the Town of Kingston; it's a two-town district, Kingston and Newton. In our lasted school report there was a proposed new high school. It had a 190,000 square feet. It identified in the plan 66 teaching spaces. It not only included schoolrooms, but labs and so on. When I divided that by the 160 square feet, that was just short of twelve-hundred students could fit in that high school.

They were only 580 in our high school presently with the two towns, that's the sort of thing that if you don't have a standard will get put on the taxpayers both in towns of Kingston and Newton, and in the taxpayers that pay for constructing. It was on 86 acres of land, not 37 that would have been called for in this plan. We would have been paying for construction aid for 40% of the 86 acres, we would have been paying for 40%, for 190,000 square feet where less than half of that would have been required for that amount of students.

That is the sort of thing that went on if you don't have guidelines. So when this bill came to me from education a couple of years ago. It had this formula just for increasing the aid. I said to the sponsors what do we do to counter

balance this. There is an alternative formula. There ought to be a way to save for these horror stories we hear, and about that time we got that performance audit. We took the numbers in there and combined them both. The pluses would balance the minuses; I am delighted to find out that is really what came out when an engineer got to work the numbers. Happily it comes out with the state not paying for exorbitant but being able to put the money where it really needs. When you go to those smaller towns, in the rural areas where they have only a 200-student school.

At 120 square feet for an elementary school they don't have enough room to put the gym and the cafeteria in. Now we can give them a little bit more room so we go to a different standard for those small schools. I think it's been an excellent evolution on both sides, both legislatively and department wise, they have all the figures come together, and also the qualifications come together. I am very proud to be part of this, and if you can digest all the numbers before you, you will see that we are finally organizing a department that has been lose. I hope you will be proud of the results as I am and pass this bill thorough. Thank you very much.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Any questions? Is this going to hurt a community that has to buy a block of land to put their school on? The state will allow 36 acres and they they have to buy forty.

Mr. Weyler: What I hope to happen in my town about the 86 acres. There was a very nice piece of land; I walked it for years as a chairman of the planning board, because there was gravel pits all over it. It's very central. If you drew a circle around it, it would be one of the most central points in the town. Ideally, it could be used for a playground; it could be used for a fire station. It could be used for an office building.

If the school ever got a hold of it, they would never allow any use for it, except for the school. They would very selfishly guide those 86 acres. Make the towns pay for it, and the two towns pay for it, and make the state pay the 40%. We would never get any use for it for a cemetery, ball field or anything; but now suddenly, if we say only 37 acres of this are going to be paid for under this high school fund. Then the town can take the rest of it and the second town that's paid for roughly 45% of this can get reimbursed for the piece they can't use. We will have the use of it for those other uses that a town would have. It keeps them from being selfish than taking a bigger piece than they need and not allowing it to go to any hands than their own.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Where does it fit in if the town is buying the 40 acre piece of land for considerably less money than what 40 acres would go for. The school district is getting a deal in other words and just because you are buying the 40 acres and not the 36 acres they are going to get penalized for the 4 acres that they really got a deal on.

Mr. Weyler: For a matter of ten percent in the land, which would probably only be 20% of the total cost, so roughly 2%, they would have to eat. Hopefully there would be advantages worth that 2%. It would a very small part of the overall project. It would come out that way, perhaps on the other end it would free up another 50,000 for a town that really needed it, it couldn't find a space big enough and maybe had to go in for a waiver because they were short an acre or so. I think overall we would have some excellent results.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Thank you.

Mr. Weyler: Thank you very much for your patience on this long day.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: I also want to mention that Representative Dodge is supporting this bill but does not want to speak. Representative Cady, did you want to speak?

Representative Cady: Mr. Weyler covered most of what I wanted to say. In 1972, I got the town of Raymond where I used to live to finally approve a bond issue after six years. Once again, they are in the same throws. At the same time, they build their high school of cement blocks, which shared cafeteria and auditorium. Amherst, whom I visited, built a school with tennis courts, an auditorium, and gymnasium, out of brick and got more building aid then the very poor Town of Raymond.

I started then saying to the Department of Education that we needed to look at the funding of building aid for poor towns in a different way than rich towns, I am so glad to see this is being finally done.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Any questions? Thank you very much. Next I would like to call Richard Menard from the New Hampshire Center of Public Policy Studies.

Mr. Menard: Thank you madam chairman, my name is Richard Menard, the co-executor director of the New Hampshire Center of Public Policy Studies. I just want to talk about a very small technical piece of the bill that Representative Alger recommended that I come here and let you know that

we feel that a medium family income is a good measure to use in this context. It is far better than the more capita income because it excludes people that are living in group quarters, dormitories, prisons, nursing homes and so it has a better fit with the real wealth of the community. That is all I wanted to say and the center hasn't taken any other position on the bill.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Has the center viewed the bill and liked what it has seen.

Mr. Menard: We haven't studied the bill. Doug Hall has worked with the representatives who have drafted it over the years, but we don't take positions generally on bills. Occasionally we do.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Thank you very much. Questions?

Senator Foster: How faithfully is medium household updated?

Mr. Menard: The US Census does it, I believe, every ten years, so there is some lag that is going to happen with that. It's also the same with capita income. In the past the Department of Revenue Administration attempted to update per capita income figures for state aid formulas, and at this specific request to the legislature, no longer does that. The center published a report on the per capita income issue a couple of years ago, and I can leave that with you, and the chief exclusion of group homes in the population count. Which made towns like Hanover look far less wealthy then they really are because of the dormitory issue.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Thank you very much. Finally the last speaker is Dean Michener, from the New Hampshire School Board Association.

Dean Michener: Thank you madam chairman, I am here representing the New Hampshire School Board Association. The school board association has long supported and I want to share with you the fact that we have a current resolution that was adopted just last October at our delegate assembly that supports an increase in state support for a supplemental building aid. Targeted the school districts with low property evaluations as a supplement to the current building aid program.

That bill was adopted at our annual delegate assembly with representatives from school districts around the state. We as an association work with the original sponsor of the bill on an alternative formula. I stress alternative to

achieve this resolution. We want to make sure that we maintain the current commitment to local districts and those cooperatives that were formed regionally with efficiency under fair costs associated with their facility.

The concern that I bring with this bill is on section 4, relative to cost and size statements. I would also mention that my interpretation of section 4, and if you are on page 3, it would be line 16, it refers to maximum useable site size. I think if you had situations where you were looking to having to purchase land, if they were wet lands or whatever that you would be entitled to your aid based on your total purchase even to get at the access to the useable site size. My concern with those costs is that the department has indicated that about 60% of the projects build in the last three years would be impacted and have received less money based on the size standards.

I also have looked at some projections associated with looking at what would happen in FY 2002, 2003, and 2004, where you see real reductions in the amount of aid that districts would received based on the size standards.

(Beginning of tape two – continuation of Mr. Michener's speech)

... that the total extra aid on a statewide basis is not that much. If you look at the reductions in aid, just in FY 2004, they are very significant losses that would have been incurred by district such as the Oyster River District, Hooksett and Nashua. Those are real dollars that would be lost to the local district. I would just like to mention that local building projects are subject to intense scrutiny here in New Hampshire then subject to intense scrutiny and public review in what is finally approved. They are subject to a super majority vote at the local district level, either a 2/3 vote in traditional district meetings. They are three votes in Senate Bill 2, official ballot districts, that requires that super majority vote and approval before that construction can go through for a plan that works for the local community.

I would recommend that the size standard section be deleted from this and that districts continue to receive those monies based on the plans that are adopted at their local level. We are talking about for the traditional building aid anywhere between 30-55% of the annual principal payments. Districts are not increasing their building plans in hopes of more building aid because that they know that the burden of the cost, the multiple is born by the local taxpayer.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Questions – Senator Green.

Senator Richard Green, D. 6: What would that do to the fiscal note?

Mr. Michener: It would increase it, the fiscal note would increase.

Senator Richard Green, D. 6: I understand that, I want to know how much?

Mr. Michener: I have not added it up, based on these three pages, I could sum up that amount.

Senator Richard Green, D. 6: Please do that and get back to me and see how that works.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Any building project that is already in the makings will not be a building loss. So right there is not a loss to Nashua. Only if they are building in the future.

Mr. Michener: Correct, my comment was if this had been in place it would have been a real dollar loss. Some districts would be getting less; it's not the wash that was statewide total that was cut.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Senator Foster.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: The odd part when you look at some of these things, I was going to ask you a question that you think wealthier communities tend to build oversized projects more than less wealthy communities. After looking at some of these charts I think the answer is not necessarily all. There are certain situations where looking at Milan elementary addition where they are size loss with $51,000 and net gaining $2,000. Does it create sort of odd results?

Mr. Michener: I don't think it creates odd result, I think what you are seeing is the fact that it varies among districts what they are building. It depends upon local vote or approval. So most of these building projects the plans are started way in advance. They are worked through in public hearings with input from citizen groups and so forth. So the plans that come before the district are what works and what is hopefully going to be approved by the district vote. At that time then you need the super majority vote of the legislative body to get that approval. I think that is why you see a wide variation in the types of plans that are approved at the local levels.

In conclusion, not necessarily are property wealthy districts building the more expensive schools?

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: Any questions? Thank you.

Mr. Michener: Thank you for your time.

Senator Jane E. O'Hearn, D. 12: With that I will close the hearing on HB 751-FN-L.

The hearing on HB751-FN-L closed at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Livia Acdan

Livia Acdan
Senate Secretary

Recorded by Meredith Chandler, Senate Secretary
Transcribed by Livia Acdan, Senate Secretary

08/18/03

Attachment "A"

ATTACHMENT 'A'

HB 751
SCHOOL BUILDING AID
BACK UP DATA

1. CALCULATION OF ALTERNATE FORMULA BY TOWN
2. CALCULATION OF ALTERNATE FORMULA FOR COOPERATIVE DISTRICTS
3. COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS
4. THREE CHARTS SHOWING IMPACT OF ALTERNATE FORMULA ON MOST RECENT THREE YEARS
5. THREE CHARTS SHOWING IMPACT OF ALTERNATE FORMULA AND SIZE RESTRICTIONS ON MOST RECENT THREE YEARS
6. FISCAL IMPACT
7. ALTERNATE FORMULA
8. STATE COMPARISON

HB 751

1. CALCULATION OF ALTERNATE FORMULA BY TOWN

HB 751

ALTERNATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID CALCULATION FOR FY 2003

2/25/03

District	Five-Year Average Equalized Valuation	Five-Year Average ADM-R	Equal Val dividied by ADM-R	Rank	Median Family Income 2000	Rank	Building Aid Factor	Alternate % aid based on rank	
								Single	Coop/AREA Factor
ACWORTH	45,066,463	169.2	266,382	50	41,397	24	37.0	60	60
ALBANY	45,975,525	119.9	383,513	134	39,250	10	72.0	45	55
ALEXANDRIA	87,520,531	250.2	349,746	108	45,938	60	84.0	45	55
ALLENSTOWN	135,369,986	851.5	158,975	2	51,659	105	53.5	60	60
ALSTEAD	78,142,565	350.0	223,277	20	47,311	69	44.5	60	60
ALTON	595,136,270	660.2	901,394	209	46,467	64	136.5	30	40
AMHERST	897,916,865	2,379.8	377,308	130	97,913	236	183.0	30	40
ANDOVER	128,597,385	314.2	409,311	149	52,212	113	131.0	30	40
ANTRIM	110,845,904	528.0	209,943	12	50,650	99	55.5	60	60
ASHLAND	112,340,215	302.8	371,029	126	38,487	7	66.5	55	60
ATKINSON	509,117,251	899.1	566,239	186	77,631	225	205.5	30	40
AUBURN	286,036,840	890.8	321,101	95	72,578	213	154.0	30	40
BARNSTEAD	201,408,213	692.2	290,951	67	49,404	88	77.5	45	55
BARRINGTON	372,103,882	1,269.8	293,051	69	56,136	142	105.5	40	50
BARTLETT	460,786,561	428.4	1,075,699	217	43,203	39	128.0	30	40
BATH	54,923,129	158.1	347,483	105	47,000	67	86.0	45	55
BEDFORD	1,660,876,209	3,094.5	536,722	183	91,868	234	208.5	30	40
BELMONT	319,485,104	1,166.3	273,921	56	53,125	120	88.0	45	55
BENNINGTON	57,535,666	272.5	211,156	13	52,153	111	62.0	55	60
BENTON	13,555,465	39.5	342,829	101	40,417	13	57.0	60	60
BERLIN	316,498,186	1,461.1	216,616	17	38,750	8	12.5	60	60
BETHLEHEM	122,077,065	429.4	284,297	63	48,333	80	71.5	45	55
BOSCAWEN	126,501,200	548.7	230,530	27	45,850	59	43.0	60	60
BOW	643,135,725	1,584.4	405,912	147	83,567	231	189.0	30	40
BRADFORD	91,764,665	265.1	346,177	104	57,083	149	126.5	30	40
BRENTWOOD	205,235,321	483.1	424,830	152	71,875	210	181.0	30	40
BRIDGEWATER	160,131,044	137.9	1,161,380	221	54,722	132	176.5	30	40
BRISTOL	199,471,754	537.2	371,290	127	44,766	48	87.5	45	55
BROOKFIELD	47,219,518	104.8	450,740	165	54,688	130	147.5	30	40
BROOKLINE	241,446,568	817.4	295,391	73	80,214	228	150.5	30	40
CAMBRIDGE	4,566,989	1.6	2,854,368	235	40,654	15	125.0	30	40
CAMPTON	160,172,605	508.1	315,263	90	46,492	65	77.5	45	55
CANAAN	147,026,445	608.6	241,597	32	46,339	62	47.0	60	60
CANDIA	209,595,713	670.7	312,503	88	67,163	195	141.5	30	40
CANTERBURY	119,715,954	271.3	441,203	161	62,583	181	171.0	30	40
CARROLL	117,772,066	92.0	1,280,410	223	45,227	54	138.5	30	40
CENTER HARBOR	205,585,825	162.3	1,266,390	222	55,938	141	181.5	30	40
CHARLESTOWN	152,086,405	868.9	175,025	4	45,172	51	27.5	60	60
CHATHAM	24,534,077	49.6	495,038	176	40,156	12	94.0	40	50
CHESTER	231,628,930	665.7	347,948	106	75,092	220	163.0	30	40
CHESTERFIELD	264,313,084	646.0	409,141	148	58,516	156	152.0	30	40
CHICHESTER	116,677,980	351.1	332,340	99	60,333	167	133.0	30	40
CLAREMONT	465,799,552	2,072.8	224,718	22	42,849	36	29.0	60	60
CLARKSVILLE	17,704,863	39.6	447,545	164	44,688	47	105.5	40	50
COLEBROOK	89,181,538	385.2	231,508	28	42,260	32	30.0	60	60
COLUMBIA	39,210,650	122.4	320,348	93	42,143	31	62.0	55	60
CONCORD	1,838,006,974	5,322.6	345,320	103	52,418	116	109.5	40	50
CONWAY	720,574,136	1,461.2	493,132	174	41,818	28	101.0	40	50
CORNISH	79,981,178	309.1	258,789	44	60,313	166	105.0	40	50
CROYDON	36,117,363	98.8	365,560	118	50,556	97	107.5	40	50
DALTON	43,316,769	139.7	309,981	86	41,667	26	56.0	60	60
DANBURY	53,509,246	194.2	275,480	57	40,809	19	38.0	60	60
DANVILLE	195,244,472	662.1	294,878	72	63,239	185	128.5	30	40
DEERFIELD	216,512,422	707.2	306,137	81	64,737	190	135.5	30	40
DEERING	77,452,138	315.6	245,412	33	53,889	126	79.5	45	55
DERRY	1,478,409,645	6,699.4	220,679	19	61,625	173	96.0	40	50
DIXVILLE	14,299,270	1.8	7,944,039	239	40,654	16	127.5	30	40
DORCHESTER	19,109,088	66.8	285,893	64	42,292	33	48.5	60	60
DOVER	1,400,979,275	3,163.4	442,877	162	57,050	148	155.0	30	40

District	Five-Year Average Equalized Valuation	Five-Year Average ADM-R	Equal Val dividied by ADM-R	Rank	Median Family Income 2000	Rank	Building Aid Factor	Alternate % aid based on rank	
								Single	Coop/AREA Factor
DUBLIN	142,308,964	197.1	722,087	198	57,578	153	175.5	30	40
DUMMER	26,888,469	54.5	493,366	175	42,708	35	105.0	40	50
DUNBARTON	137,790,364	313.8	439,075	160	67,448	198	179.0	30	40
DURHAM	470,666,754	993.7	473,651	170	83,609	232	201.0	30	40
EAST KINGSTON	132,535,563	347.9	381,003	133	71,705	209	171.0	30	40
EASTON	27,943,355	37.0	755,226	201	69,375	202	201.5	30	40
EATON	40,928,553	63.0	649,866	194	53,750	124	159.0	30	40
EFFINGHAM	75,049,546	197.8	379,498	131	38,000	5	68.0	55	60
ELLSWORTH	6,675,131	12.7	524,774	180	34,750	3	91.5	40	50
ENFIELD	229,573,803	604.5	379,750	132	53,631	123	127.5	30	40
EPPING	258,097,888	924.5	279,188	61	54,722	133	97.0	40	50
EPSOM	180,972,899	631.3	286,676	65	56,875	146	105.5	40	50
ERROL	43,227,900	38.1	1,134,591	220	47,500	72	146.0	30	40
EXETER	846,046,655	2,302.6	367,428	120	63,088	184	152.0	30	40
FARMINGTON	206,870,116	1,176.3	175,871	5	44,788	49	27.0	60	60
FITZWILLIAM	115,826,738	373.5	310,079	87	55,476	137	112.0	40	50
FRANCESTOWN	103,595,566	267.6	387,099	137	71,471	208	172.5	30	40
FRANCONIA	112,629,307	141.3	797,206	205	46,979	66	135.5	30	40
FRANKLIN	296,486,704	1,380.6	214,755	15	41,698	27	21.0	60	60
FREEDOM	204,483,788	151.7	1,347,949	225	49,167	87	156.0	30	40
FREMONT	178,987,864	578.9	309,208	82	63,808	186	134.0	30	40
GILFORD	735,180,681	1,166.9	630,007	191	56,554	144	167.5	30	40
GILMANTON	189,565,420	533.6	355,244	111	51,712	106	108.5	40	50
GILSUM	31,628,450	118.8	266,233	49	50,469	96	72.5	45	55
GOFFSTOWN	729,728,845	2,334.5	312,585	89	61,718	175	132.0	30	40
GORHAM	164,253,130	505.2	325,151	97	41,008	21	59.0	60	60
GOSHEN	36,020,306	146.2	246,411	34	45,208	53	43.5	60	60
GRAFTON	53,003,089	201.4	263,199	46	41,875	29	37.5	60	60
GRANTHAM	257,256,104	279.3	921,074	210	69,271	201	205.5	30	40
GREENFIELD	75,318,680	283.9	265,337	48	56,250	143	95.5	40	50
GREENLAND	328,514,968	480.9	683,125	195	67,188	196	195.5	30	40
GREENVILLE	57,339,146	383.8	149,414	1	48,750	85	43.0	60	60
GROTON	31,053,127	86.4	359,328	112	46,250	61	86.5	45	55
HAMPSTEAD	566,978,750	1,619.3	350,143	109	79,114	227	168.0	30	40
HAMPTON	1,566,874,462	1,943.7	806,130	206	86,229	233	219.5	30	40
HAMPTON FALLS	235,952,378	311.8	756,646	202	66,000	192	197.0	30	40
HANCOCK	130,060,066	278.4	467,203	169	64,423	188	178.5	30	40
HANOVER	942,776,884	952.5	989,750	214	99,158	237	225.5	30	40
HARRISVILLE	89,053,567	139.9	636,370	192	55,083	135	163.5	30	40
HART'S LOCATION	7,057,790	5.0	1,405,934	227	70,833	206	216.5	30	40
HAVERHILL	167,615,249	548.2	305,767	80	44,816	50	65.0	55	60
HEBRON	115,162,416	50.6	2,275,937	234	54,688	131	182.5	30	40
HENNIKER	201,132,458	810.2	248,250	37	59,527	162	99.5	40	50
HILL	50,403,793	169.6	297,122	76	50,000	91	83.5	45	55
HILLSBORO	227,240,227	959.4	236,862	30	50,445	95	62.5	55	60
HINSDALE	158,622,903	778.6	203,718	10	43,413	42	26.0	60	60
HOLDERNESS	284,998,071	325.3	876,055	208	55,526	138	173.0	30	40
HOLLIS	682,482,034	1,283.4	531,785	182	104,737	239	210.5	30	40
HOOKSETT	731,611,916	1,726.9	423,651	151	68,673	200	175.5	30	40
HOPKINTON	375,501,618	961.4	390,570	140	69,737	204	172.0	30	40
HUDSON	1,433,491,645	3,943.3	363,522	115	71,313	207	161.0	30	40
JACKSON	177,904,752	86.3	2,060,514	233	59,327	159	196.0	30	40
JAFFREY	252,922,828	844.5	299,487	77	48,703	84	80.5	45	55
JEFFERSON	63,650,773	173.1	367,711	122	42,067	30	76.0	45	55
KEENE	1,041,200,227	3,117.4	334,001	100	49,935	90	95.0	40	50
KENSINGTON	152,005,901	312.8	485,921	171	72,679	214	192.5	30	40
KINGSTON	381,070,525	1,029.1	370,281	124	66,509	193	158.5	30	40
LACONIA	961,201,017	2,372.9	405,078	146	45,307	55	100.5	40	50
LANCASTER	136,775,389	598.9	228,362	23	43,333	40	31.5	60	60

District	Five-Year Average Equalized Valuation	Five-Year Average ADM-R	Equal Val dividied by ADM-R	Rank	Median Family Income 2000	Rank	Building Aid Factor	Alternate % aid based on rank	
								Single	Coop/AREA Factor
LANDAFF	19,292,204	51.9	371,432	128	48,500	82	105.0	40	50
LANGDON	30,934,606	98.1	315,466	91	43,125	38	64.5	55	60
LEBANON	992,586,290	1,869.0	531,067	181	52,133	110	145.5	30	40
LEE	230,456,207	907.2	254,019	42	62,330	180	111.0	40	50
LEMPSTER	45,824,604	161.5	283,744	62	45,385	56	59.0	60	60
LINCOLN	350,662,531	192.1	1,825,797	232	44,063	44	138.0	30	40
LISBON	61,987,803	283.4	218,729	18	41,250	23	20.5	60	60
LITCHFIELD	366,593,697	1,413.8	259,297	45	76,931	224	134.5	30	40
LITTLETON	325,064,842	995.4	326,574	98	49,915	89	93.5	40	50
LONDONDERRY	1,428,532,649	5,128.0	278,577	60	73,513	217	138.5	30	40
LOUDON	236,650,042	803.6	294,480	71	59,096	158	114.5	30	40
LYMAN	25,115,834	68.3	367,621	121	48,365	81	101.0	40	50
LYME	155,964,717	272.0	573,442	187	64,531	189	188.0	30	40
LYNDEBOROUGH	94,035,583	243.7	385,834	136	70,223	205	170.5	30	40
MADBURY	87,922,008	347.7	252,897	41	67,981	199	120.0	30	40
MADISON	188,424,958	384.4	490,128	173	51,080	103	138.0	30	40
MANCHESTER	4,580,716,601	14,783.5	309,853	85	50,039	93	89.0	45	55
MARLBORO	87,495,170	346.9	252,249	40	50,927	102	71.0	45	55
MARLOW	31,875,294	118.7	268,446	52	47,813	75	63.5	55	60
MASON	75,083,396	172.4	435,418	158	61,908	176	167.0	30	40
MEREDITH	704,371,918	945.0	745,367	200	54,764	134	167.0	30	40
MERRIMACK	1,642,307,682	4,777.2	343,782	102	72,011	211	156.5	30	40
MIDDLETON	67,582,036	274.2	246,434	35	48,529	83	59.0	60	60
MILAN	59,251,930	259.4	228,384	24	47,361	71	47.5	60	60
MILFORD	721,883,647	2,332.1	309,542	83	61,682	174	128.5	30	40
MILLSFIELD	3,864,012	2.1	1,805,613	230	40,654	17	123.5	30	40
MILTON	163,899,288	658.5	248,905	38	48,033	78	58.0	60	60
MONROE	134,888,417	143.2	942,221	211	46,346	63	137.0	30	40
MONT VERNON	124,059,382	400.5	309,730	84	77,869	226	155.0	30	40
MOULTONBOROUGH	1,265,465,016	705.7	1,793,104	229	51,729	107	168.0	30	40
NASHUA	5,061,655,444	12,834.1	394,391	141	61,102	169	155.0	30	40
NELSON	47,179,371	121.4	388,627	139	59,464	161	150.0	30	40
NEW BOSTON	232,488,635	725.7	320,373	94	69,458	203	148.5	30	40
NEW CASTLE	298,181,426	100.9	2,954,046	236	93,290	235	235.5	30	40
NEW DURHAM	182,357,687	425.2	428,895	156	52,941	119	137.5	30	40
NEW HAMPTON	127,697,783	297.8	428,804	155	52,366	114	134.5	30	40
NEW IPSWICH	165,835,857	860.2	192,792	9	57,865	154	81.5	45	55
NEW LONDON	440,723,929	389.8	1,130,699	219	82,201	230	224.5	30	40
NEWBURY	307,554,319	290.0	1,060,386	215	61,389	172	193.5	30	40
NEWFIELDS	143,873,331	280.1	513,613	178	75,078	219	198.5	30	40
NEWINGTON	499,696,029	97.9	5,105,190	238	76,202	223	230.5	30	40
NEWMARKET	343,951,614	1,075.3	319,878	92	53,750	125	108.5	40	50
NEWPORT	237,131,808	1,115.6	212,556	14	45,508	57	35.5	60	60
NEWTON	220,049,104	766.8	286,978	66	62,271	178	122.0	30	40
NORTH HAMPTON	469,070,362	648.2	723,651	199	72,500	212	205.5	30	40
NORTHFIELD	228,027,668	840.0	271,474	55	48,787	86	70.5	45	55
NORTHUMBERLAND	88,385,825	481.2	183,693	7	34,444	2	4.5	60	60
NORTHWOOD	213,210,719	701.0	304,161	79	53,953	127	103.0	40	50
NOTTINGHAM	235,915,758	648.0	364,056	117	65,510	191	154.0	30	40
ORANGE	15,610,219	53.2	293,425	70	40,625	14	42.0	60	60
ORFORD	67,615,101	158.0	428,052	153	50,577	98	125.5	30	40
OSSIPEE	279,364,289	719.0	388,567	138	38,790	9	73.5	45	55
PELHAM	699,234,168	1,885.5	370,848	125	73,365	216	170.5	30	40
PEMBROKE	277,432,318	1,211.6	228,973	26	57,106	150	88.0	45	55
PENACOOK	189,209,379	707.4	267,479	51	52,418	117	84.0	45	55
PETERBOROUGH	380,266,942	947.7	401,244	143	54,375	128	135.5	30	40
PIERMONT	44,486,944	115.8	384,303	135	44,531	46	90.5	40	50
PITTSBURG	111,101,084	139.5	796,424	204	42,500	34	119.0	30	40
PITTSFIELD	127,089,924	766.2	165,862	3	44,233	45	24.0	60	60

District	Five-Year Average Equalized Valuation	Five-Year Average ADM-R	Equal Val dividied by ADM-R	Rank	Median Family Income 2000	Rank	Building Aid Factor	Alternate % aid based on rank	
								Single	Coop/AREA Factor
PLAINFIELD	125,303,249	355.3	352,649	110	61,205	170	140.0	30	40
PLAISTOW	568,466,626	1,296.5	438,462	159	66,852	194	176.5	30	40
PLYMOUTH	169,832,611	724.7	234,362	29	43,797	43	36.0	60	60
PORTSMOUTH	2,181,276,642	2,241.1	973,315	213	59,630	163	188.0	30	40
RANDOLPH	37,155,984	53.1	700,000	197	52,083	109	153.0	30	40
RAYMOND	427,849,166	1,870.0	228,791	25	50,889	100	62.5	55	60
RICHMOND	51,482,850	191.2	269,290	54	54,625	129	91.5	40	50
RINDGE	277,203,534	761.7	363,927	116	52,500	118	117.0	30	40
ROCHESTER	1,113,937,298	4,439.9	250,892	39	47,324	70	54.5	60	60
ROLLINSFORD	138,998,726	324.2	428,691	154	60,625	168	161.0	30	40
ROXBURY	13,710,263	37.2	368,160	123	56,875	147	135.0	30	40
RUMNEY	93,939,697	259.2	362,422	114	42,895	37	75.5	45	55
RYE	918,527,931	688.1	1,334,876	224	74,956	218	221.0	30	40
SALEM	2,335,766,984	4,336.3	538,657	184	67,278	197	190.5	30	40
SALISBURY	69,029,552	188.6	366,010	119	62,321	179	149.0	30	40
SANBORNTON	181,287,876	391.4	463,131	168	52,179	112	140.0	30	40
SANDOWN	256,957,214	1,041.4	246,742	36	73,083	215	125.5	30	40
SANDWICH	204,200,706	192.0	1,063,324	216	55,417	136	176.0	30	40
SEABROOK	1,876,083,568	1,033.3	1,815,588	231	47,718	74	152.5	30	40
SHARON	24,920,657	54.5	457,428	167	75,325	221	194.0	30	40
SHELBURNE	44,271,313	74.1	597,776	189	59,375	160	174.5	30	40
SOMERSWORTH	439,989,212	1,635.3	269,064	53	47,933	77	65.0	55	60
SOUTH HAMPTON	80,795,924	129.6	623,618	190	75,778	222	206.0	30	40
SPRINGFIELD	88,195,411	161.3	546,643	185	58,068	155	170.0	30	40
STARK	31,462,038	104.1	302,287	78	40,089	11	44.5	60	60
STEWARTSTOWN	45,014,914	140.1	321,306	96	34,911	4	50.0	60	60
STODDARD	112,326,633	103.7	1,083,606	218	48,125	79	148.5	30	40
STRAFFORD	209,628,882	758.8	276,256	58	62,238	177	117.5	30	40
STRATFORD	38,310,377	150.6	254,419	43	33,295	1	22.0	60	60
STRATHAM	599,138,983	1,183.6	506,183	177	81,391	229	203.0	30	40
SUGAR HILL	69,908,268	73.3	954,249	212	60,288	165	188.5	30	40
SULLIVAN	24,088,113	116.0	207,692	11	52,386	115	63.0	55	60
SUNAPEE	450,526,546	532.2	846,504	207	55,909	140	173.5	30	40
SURRY	42,179,293	104.9	402,167	144	60,179	164	154.0	30	40
SUTTON	111,185,997	245.6	452,638	166	56,685	145	155.5	30	40
SWANZEY	295,099,538	1,237.6	238,441	31	51,500	104	67.5	55	60
TAMWORTH	169,754,784	401.9	422,360	150	41,121	22	86.0	45	55
TEMPLE	69,574,081	234.9	296,186	74	64,297	187	130.5	30	40
THORNTON	138,233,094	311.3	444,080	163	45,172	52	107.5	40	50
TILTON	246,006,466	567.1	433,782	157	50,143	94	125.5	30	40
TROY	71,701,695	395.8	181,138	6	47,500	73	39.5	60	60
TUFTONBORO	404,370,955	296.6	1,363,263	226	51,875	108	167.0	30	40
UNITY	55,885,069	188.5	296,473	75	47,045	68	71.5	45	55
WAKEFIELD	351,101,313	679.9	516,386	179	45,774	58	118.5	30	40
WALPOLE	231,613,328	581.2	398,509	142	53,561	122	132.0	30	40
WARNER	131,671,057	450.6	292,213	68	50,926	101	84.5	45	55
WARREN	36,907,012	164.5	224,386	21	38,125	6	13.5	60	60
WASHINGTON	90,887,612	132.5	686,151	196	50,000	92	144.0	30	40
WATERVILLE VALLEY	176,809,218	37.2	4,750,382	237	55,625	139	188.0	30	40
WEARE	353,435,988	1,644.1	214,975	16	62,661	182	99.0	40	50
WEBSTER	87,089,897	249.3	349,282	107	57,396	152	129.5	30	40
WENTWORTH	45,419,358	163.1	278,476	59	47,917	76	67.5	55	60
WENTWORTH LOCATION	6,422,839	4.0	1,621,929	228	40,654	18	123.0	30	40
WESTMORELAND	94,146,613	251.5	374,311	129	62,857	183	156.0	30	40
WHITEFIELD	95,218,840	360.1	264,438	47	41,528	25	36.0	60	60
WILMOT	76,800,748	190.9	402,351	145	57,143	151	148.0	30	40
WILTON	208,692,280	576.6	361,911	113	61,311	171	142.0	30	40
WINCHESTER	141,246,913	754.2	187,285	8	43,393	41	24.5	60	60
WINDHAM	958,480,668	1,970.3	486,454	172	99,570	238	205.0	30	40

ALTERNATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID CALCULATION FOR FY 2003

District	Five-Year Average Equalized Valuation	Five-Year Average ADM-R	Equal Val dividied by ADM-R	Rank	Median Family Income 2000	Rank	Building Aid Factor	Alternate % aid based on rank	
								Single	Coop/AREA Factor
WINDSOR	11,840,502	20.2	585,584	188	58,750	157	172.5	30	40
WOLFEBORO	762,277,793	957.1	796,412	203	53,269	121	162.0	30	40
WOODSTOCK	124,556,116	193.6	643,501	193	40,875	20	106.5	40	50

No ADM in last five years.

DIX GRANT	582,155	-
HALE'S LOCATION	27,085,999	-
MARTIN'S LOCATION	25,972	-
ODELL	1,241,946	-
PINKHAM'S GRANT	2,521,152	-
SUCCESS	6,419,912	-

2. CALCULATION OF ALTERNATE FORMULA FOR COOPERATIVE DISTRICTS

HB 751 ALTERNATE SBA ELIGIBILITY - COOPERATIVE DISTRICTS FY 2003

Calculations for schools under AREA agreements would be done in the same manner.
Grades K-12 except as indicated in parentheses

	Total ADM-R	% of Total	Alt Factor	Alt Coop %	Current %	Larger %
BARTLETT/JACKSON COOP (7-8)	130.8			40%	40%	40%
BARTLETT	109.0	0.833333	40%			
JACKSON	21.8	0.166667	40%			
CONTOOCOOK VALLEY	3090.0			46%	55%	55%
ANTRIM	559.6	0.181100	60%			
BENNINGTON	250.9	0.081197	60%			
DUBLIN	167.3	0.054142	40%			
FRANCESTOWN	272.3	0.088123	40%			
GREENFIELD	276.0	0.089320	50%			
HANCOCK	274.4	0.088803	40%			
PETERBOROUGH	1004.4	0.325049	40%			
SHARON	55.1	0.017832	40%			
TEMPLE	230.0	0.074434	40%			
DERRY COOPERATIVE	6,801.8		50%	50%	40%	50%
DRESDEN (7-12) (Interstate)	1,013.5			NA	45%	45%
HANOVER	577.7	0.570005	NA			
NORWICH, VT.	435.8	0.429995	NA			
EXETER REGION COOP (6-12)	2,841.0					
BRENTWOOD	302.8	0.106582	40%	40%	55%	55%
EAST KINGSTON	181.2	0.063780	40%			
EXETER	1346.2	0.473847	40%			
KENSINGTON	188.4	0.066315	40%			
NEWFIELDS	135.7	0.047765	40%			
STRATHAM	686.7	0.241711	40%			
FALL MOUNTAIN REG	2,065.9			54%	55%	55%
ACWORTH	159.9	0.077400	60%			
ALSTEAD	343.8	0.166417	60%			
CHARLESTOWN	873.0	0.422576	60%			
LANGDON	97.3	0.047098	60%			
WALPOLE	591.9	0.286509	40%			
GOSHEN-LEMPSTER	301.1			60%	40%	60%
GOSHEN	138.7	0.460644	60%			
LEMPSTER	162.4	0.539356	60%			
GOV WENTWORTH REG	2,749.5			46%	55%	55%
BROOKFIELD	99.2	0.036079	40%			
EFFINGHAM	223.5	0.081287	60%			
NEW DURHAM	432.9	0.157447	40%			
OSSIPEE	750.5	0.272959	55%			
TUFTONBORO	293.3	0.106674	40%			
WOLFEBORO	950.1	0.345554	40%			
HAVERHILL COOPERATIVE	727.2		60%	60%	40%	60%

	Total ADM-R	% of Total	Alt Factor	Alt Coop %	Current %	Larger %
HILLSBORO DEERING COOPERATIVE	1,238.9			59%	50%	59%
DEERING	298.4	0.240859	55%			
HILLSBORO	940.5	0.759141	60%			
HOLLIS/BROOKLINE COOP (7-12)	1,031.2			40%	40%	40%
BROOKLINE	404.1	0.391874	40%			
HOLLIS	627.1	0.608126	40%			
INTER-LAKES	1,319.9			40%	45%	45%
CENTER HARBOR	164.9	0.124934	40%			
MEREDITH	958.2	0.725964	40%			
SANDWICH	196.8	0.149102	40%			
JAFFREY-RINDGE COOP	1,658.6			48%	40%	48%
JAFFREY	871.2	0.525262	55%			
RINDGE	787.4	0.474738	40%			
JOHN STARK REGIONAL (9-12)	758.9			50%	40%	50%
HENNIKER	245.1	0.322967	50%			
WEARE	513.8	0.677033	50%			
KEARSARGE REGIONAL	2,065.1			43%	55%	55%
BRADFORD	255.1	0.123529	40%			
NEWBURY	299.8	0.145175	40%			
NEW LONDON	388.7	0.188223	40%			
SPRINGFIELD	187.5	0.090795	40%			
SUTTON	252.3	0.122173	40%			
WARNER	477.8	0.231369	55%			
WILMOT	203.9	0.098736	40%			
LAFAYETTE REGIONAL (K-6)	127.4			40%	45%	45%
EASTON	14.3	0.112245	40%			
FRANCONIA	69.4	0.544741	40%			
SUGAR HILL	43.7	0.343014	40%			
LINCOLN-WOODSTOCK	373.5			45%	40%	45%
LINCOLN	183.1	0.490228	40%			
WOODSTOCK	190.4	0.509772	50%			
LISBON REGIONAL	355.1			58%	45%	58%
LISBON TOWN	293.3	0.825965	60%			
LYMAN	61.8	0.174035	50%			
MASCENIC REGIONAL	1,454.2			55%	45%	55%
GREENVILLE	403.0	0.277128	60%			
MASON	169.0	0.116215	40%			
NEW IPSWICH	882.2	0.606657	55%			
MASCOMA VALLEY REG	1,511.7			52%	55%	55%
CANAAN	594.0	0.392935	60%			
DORCHESTER	67.8	0.044850	60%			
ENFIELD	601.6	0.397963	40%			
GRAFTON	196.4	0.129920	60%			
ORANGE	51.9	0.034332	60%			

	Total ADM-R	% of Total	Alt Factor	Alt Coop %	Current %	Larger %
MERRIMACK VALLEY	2,552.7			49%	55%	55%
BOSCAWEN	540.2	0.211619	60%			
LOUDON	845.4	0.331179	40%			
PENACOOK	728.0	0.285188	55%			
SALISBURY	185.7	0.072747	40%			
WEBSTER	253.4	0.099267	40%			
MONADNOCK REGIONAL	2,498.8			57%	55%	57%
FITZWILLIAM	345.9	0.138426	50%			
GILSUM	113.8	0.045542	55%			
RICHMOND	190.3	0.076157	50%			
ROXBURY	34.3	0.013727	40%			
SULLIVAN	101.7	0.040700	60%			
SURRY	95.1	0.038058	40%			
SWANZEY	1,230.3	0.492356	60%			
TROY	387.4	0.155034	60%			
NEWFOUND AREA	1,524.2			51%	55%	55%
ALEXANDRIA	250.7	0.164480	55%			
BRIDGEWATER	129.8	0.085160	40%			
BRISTOL	526.5	0.345427	55%			
DANBURY	178.9	0.117373	60%			
GROTON	87.5	0.057407	55%			
HEBRON	48.7	0.031951	40%			
NEW HAMPTON	302.1	0.198202	40%			
OYSTER RIVER COOP	2,322.3			44%	45%	45%
DURHAM	1,048.9	0.451664	40%			
LEE	923.2	0.397537	50%			
MADBURY	350.2	0.150799	40%			
PEMI-BAKER REGIONAL (9-12)	828.9			55%	55%	55%
ASHLAND	76.6	0.092412	60%			
CAMPTON	163.2	0.196887	55%			
HOLDERNESS	109.9	0.132585	40%			
PLYMOUTH	245.4	0.296055	60%			
RUMNEY	74.0	0.089275	55%			
THORNTON	107.8	0.130052	50%			
WENTWORTH	52.0	0.062734	60%			
RIVENDELL (Interstate)				NA	45%	45%
ORFORD	263.6		NA			
FAIRLEE, VT			NA			
WEST FAIRLEE, VT			NA			
PROFILE (7-12)	336.6			50%	50%	50%
BETHLEHEM	215.9	0.641414	55%			
EASTON	13.0	0.038621	40%			
FRANCONIA	77.6	0.230541	40%			
SUGAR HILL	30.1	0.089424	40%			
SANBORN REGIONAL	1,841.0			40%	40%	40%
KINGSTON	1,029.0	0.558935	40%			
NEWTON	812.0	0.441065	40%			
SHAKER REGIONAL	1,449.1			52%	40%	52%
BELMONT	1,161.5	0.801532	55%			
CANTERBURY	287.6	0.198468	40%			

	Total ADM-R	% of Total	Alt Factor	Alt Coop %	Current %	Larger %
SOUHEGAN COOP (9-12)	970.7			40%	40%	40%
AMHERST	854.4	0.880190	40%			
MONT VERNON	116.3	0.119810	40%			
TIMBERLANE REGIONAL	4,159.0			40%	50%	50%
ATKINSON	975.9	0.234648	40%			
DANVILLE	773.3	0.185934	40%			
PLAISTOW	1,326.3	0.318899	40%			
SANDOWN	1,083.5	0.260519	40%			
WHITE MOUNTAIN REG	1,384.2			58%	55%	58%
CARROLL	90.7	0.065525	40%			
DALTON	156.0	0.112700	60%			
JEFFERSON	160.2	0.115735	55%			
LANCASTER	630.9	0.455787	60%			
WHITEFIELD	346.4	0.250253	60%			
WILTON-LYNDEBORO (7-12)	356.1			40%	40%	40%
LYNDEBOROUGH	131.4	0.368997	40%			
WILTON	224.7	0.631003	40%			
WINNACUNNET COOP (9-12)	1,104.8			40%	50%	50%
HAMPTON	567.7	0.513849	40%			
HAMPTON FALLS	80.1	0.072502	40%			
NORTH HAMPTON	170.8	0.154598	40%			
SEABROOK	286.2	0.259051	40%			
WINNISQUAM REGIONAL	1,816.1			47%	45%	47%
NORTHFIELD	836.1	0.460382	55%			
SANBORNTON	401.5	0.221078	40%			
TILTON	578.5	0.318540	40%			

3. COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS

HB 751 COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING AID

2/25/03

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
ACWORTH	K-12				SEE FALL MOUNTAIN COOP
ALBANY	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE CONWAY AREA
ALEXANDRIA	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
ALLENSTOWN	K-8	30%	60%	60%	
	9-12				SEE PEMBROKE AREA
ALSTEAD	K-12				SEE FALL MOUNTAIN COOP
ALTON	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE ALTON-BARNSTEAD JMA
ALTON-BARNSTEAD JMA	9-12	40%	48%	48%	NEW HS UNDER CONSTRUCTION
AMHERST	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
AMHERST	9-12				SEE SOUHEGAN COOP
ANDOVER	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP
ANTRIM	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
ASHLAND	K-8	30%	55%	55%	
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
ATKINSON	K-12				SEE TIMBERLANE COOP
AUBURN	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO MANCHESTER & PINKERTON
BARNSTEAD	K-8	30%	45%	45%	
	9-12				SEE ALTON-BARNSTEAD JMA
BARRINGTON	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				TUITION TO DOVER
BARTLETT	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-8				SEE BARTLETT-JACKSON COOP
	9-12				SEE CONWAY AREA
BARTLETT-JACKSON COOP	7-8	40%	40%	40%	
BATH	K-6	30%	45%	45%	
	7-12				TUITION TO HAVERHILL COOP
BEDFORD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO MANCHESTER
BELMONT	K-12				SEE SHAKER COOP
BENNINGTON	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
BENTON	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE HAVERHILL COOP
BERLIN	K-6	30%	60%	60%	
BERLIN AREA	7-12	45%	60%	60%	
BETHLEHEM	K-6	30%	45%	45%	
	7-12				SEE PROFILE COOP
BOSCAWEN	K-12				SEE MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP
BOW	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
BRADFORD	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP
BRENTWOOD	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
	6-12				SEE EXETER COOP
BRIDGEWATER	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
BRISTOL	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
BROOKFIELD	K-12				SEE GOV WENTWORTH COOP
BROOKLINE	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE HOLLIS-BROOKLINE COOP
CAMBRIDGE	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE COOS COUNTY
CAMPTON	K-8	30%	45%	45%	
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
CANAAN	K-12				SEE MASCOMA COOP
CANDIA	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO MANCHESTER
CANTERBURY	K-12				SEE SHAKER COOP

HB 751 COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING AID

2/25/03

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
CARROLL	K-12				SEE WHITE MOUNTAIN COOP
CENTER HARBOR	K-12				SEE INTERLAKES COOP
CHARLESTOWN	K-12				SEE FALL MOUNTAIN COOP
CHATHAM	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, STUDENTS GO TO MAINE
CHESTER	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO PINKERTON ACADEMY
CHESTERFIELD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE KEENE AREA
CHICHESTER	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE PEMBROKE AREA
CLAREMONT	K-8	30%	60%	60%	
CLAREMONT AREA	9-12	40%			
CLARKSVILLE	K-12				SEE PITTSBURG AREA
COLEBROOK AREA	K-12	40%	60%	60%	
COLUMBIA	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE COLEBROOK AREA
CONCORD	K-12	30%	40%	40%	
CONVAL COOP	K-12	55%	46%	55%	
CONWAY AREA	K-6	45%	51%	51%	
	7-12	55%	47%	55%	
COOS COUNTY	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, TUITION TO OTHER TOWNS
CORNISH	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				TUITION TO CLAREMONT & VERMONT
CROYDON	K-3	30%	40%	40%	
	4-12				SEE NEWPORT AREA
DALTON	K-12				SEE WHITE MOUNTAIN COOP
DANBURY	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
DANVILLE	K-12				SEE TIMBERLANE COOP
DEERFIELD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO 3 HIGH SCHOOLS
DEERING	K-12				SEE HILLSBORO-DEERING COOP
DERRY COOP	K-8	40%	50%	50%	
	9-12				TUITION TO PINKERTON ACADEMY
DIXVILLE	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE COOS COUNTY
DORCHESTER	K-12				SEE MASCOMA VALLEY COOP
DOVER	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
DRESDEN COOP	7-12	45%	NA	45%	INTERSTATE COOP, RSA 200-B
DUBLIN	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
DUMMER	K-6				NO SCHOOLS,SEE MILAN AREA
	7-12				SEE BERLIN AREA
DUNBARTON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE GOFFSTOWN AREA
DURHAM	K-12				SEE OYSTER RIVER COOP
EAST KINGSTON	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
	6-12				SEE EXETER COOP
EASTON	K-6				SEE LAFAYETTE COOP
	7-12				SEE PROFILE COOP
EATON	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE CONWAY AREA
EFFINGHAM	K-12				SEE GOV. WENTWORTH COOP
ELLSWORTH	K-8				NO SCHOOLS, TUITION TO CAMPTON
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
ENFIELD	K-12				SEE MASCOMA VALLEY COOP
EPPING	K-12	30%	40%	40%	
EPSOM	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				SEE PEMBROKE AREA
ERROL	K-8	30%	30%	30%	

HB 751 COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING AID 2/25/03

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
	9-12				TUITION TO BERLIN & COLEBROOK
EXETER	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
EXETER REGION COOP	6-12	55%	40%	55%	
FALL MOUNTAIN COOP	K-12	55%	54%	55%	
FARMINGTON AREA	K-12	40%	60%	60%	
FITZWILLIAM	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
FRANCESTOWN	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
FRANCONIA	K-6				SEE LAFAYETTE COOP
	7-12				SEE PROFILE COOP
FRANKLIN	K-6	30%	60%	60%	
FRANKLIN AREA	7-12	40%	60%	60%	
FREEDOM	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE CONWAY AREA
FREMONT	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO EPPING & PINKERTON
GILFORD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
GILFORD AREA	9-12	40%	43%	43%	
GILMANTON	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				SEE GILFORD AREA
GILSUM	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
GOFFSTOWN	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
GOFFSTOWN AREA	7-12	45%	40%	45%	
GORHAM	K-12	30%	60%	60%	
GOSHEN	K-8				SEE GOSHEN-LEMPSTER COOP
	9-12				TUITION TO NEWPORT & SUNAPEE
GOSHEN-LEMPSTER COOP	K-8	40%	60%	60%	
GOV WENTWORTH COOP	K-12	55%	46%	55%	
GRAFTON	K-12				SEE MASCOMA COOP
GRANTHAM	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE LEBANON AREA
GREENFIELD	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
GREENLAND	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE PORTSMOUTH AREA
GREENVILLE	K-12				SEE MASCENIC COOP
GROTON	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
HAMPSTEAD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO PINKERTON ACADEMY
HAMPTON	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE WINNACUNNET COOP
HAMPTON FALLS	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE WINNACUNNET COOP
HANCOCK	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
HANOVER	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
	6				TUITION TO DRESDEN
	7-12				SEE DRESDEN COOP
HARRISVILLE	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE KEENE AREA
HART'S LOCATION	K-8				TUITION TO BARTLETT
	9-12				TUITION TO CONWAY
HAVERHILL	K-12				SEE HAVERHILL COOP
HAVERHILL COOP	K-12	40%	60%	60%	
HEBRON	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
HENNIKER	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				SEE JOHN STARK COOP
HILL	K-6	30%	45%	45%	

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
	7-12				SEE FRANKLIN AREA
HILLSBORO	K-12				SEE HILLSBORO-DEERING COOP
HILLSBORO-DEERING COOP	K-8	45%	58%	58%	
HILLSBORO-DEERING COOP AREA	9-12	50%	57%	57%	
HINSDALE	K-12	30%	60%	60%	
HOLDERNESS	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
HOLLIS	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
HOLLIS-BROOKLINE COOP	7-12	40%	40%	40%	
HOOKSETT	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO MANCHESTER
HOPKINTON	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
HUDSON	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
INTERLAKES COOP	K-12	45%	40%	45%	
JACKSON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-8				SEE BARTLETT JACKSON COOP
	9-12				SEE CONWAY AREA
JAFFREY	K-12				SEE JAFFREY-RINDGE COOP
JAFFREY-RINDGE COOP	K-12	40%	48%	48%	
JEFFERSON	K-12				SEE WHITE MOUNTAIN COOP
JOHN STARK COOP	9-12	40%	50%	50%	
KEARSARGE COOP	K-12	55%	43%	55%	
KEENE	K-6	30%	40%	40%	
KEENE AREA	7-12	55%	49%	55%	
KENSINGTON	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
	6-12				SEE EXETER COOP
KINGSTON	K-12				SEE SANBORN COOP
LACONIA	K-12	30%	40%	40%	
LAFAYETTE COOP	K-6	45%	40%	45%	
LANCASTER	K-12				SEE WHITE MOUNTAIN COOP
LANDAFF	K-3	30%	40%	40%	
	4-12				SEE LISBON COOP
LANGDON	K-12				SEE FALL MOUNTAIN COOP
LEBANON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
LEBANON AREA	7-8	40%	40%	40%	
LEBANON AREA	9-12	45%	40%	45%	
LEE	K-12				SEE OYSTER RIVER COOP
LEMPSTER	K-8				SEE GOSHEN-LEMPSTER COOP
	9-12				TUITION TO NEWPORT
LINCOLN	K-12				SEE LINWOOD COOP
LIN-WOOD COOP	K-12	40%	45%	45%	
LISBON	K-12				SEE LISBON COOP
LISBON COOP	K-12	45%	58%	58%	
LITCHFIELD	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
LITTLETON	K-12	30%	40%	40%	
LONDONDERRY	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
LOUDON	K-12				SEE MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP
LYMAN	K-12				SEE LISBON COOP
LYME	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO HS OF CHOICE
LYNDEBOROUGH	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOP
MADBURY	K-12				SEE OYSTER RIVER COOP
MADISON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE CONWAY AREA

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
MANCHESTER	K-12	30%	45%	45%	
MARLBOROUGH	K-8	30%	45%	45%	
	9-12				TUITION TO KEENE
MARLOW	K-6	30%	55%	55%	
	7-12				SEE KEENE AREA
MASCENIC COOP	K-12	45%	55%	55%	
MASCOMA VALLEY COOP	K-12	55%	52%	55%	
MASON	K-12				SEE MASCENIC COOP
MEREDITH	K-12				SEE INTER-LAKES COOP
MERRIMACK	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP	K-12	55%	49%	55%	
MIDDLETON	K-12				SEE FARMINGTON AREA
MILAN	K-6				SEE MILAN AREA
	7-12				SEE BERLIN AREA
MILAN AREA	K-6	40%	59%	59%	
MILFORD	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
MILLSFIELD	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, SEE COOS COUNTY
MILTON	K-12	30%	60%	60%	
MONADNOCK COOP	K-12	55%	57%	57%	
MONROE	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO VERMONT
MONT VERNON	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE SOUHEGAN COOP
MOULTONBOROUGH	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
NASHUA	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
NELSON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE KEENE AREA
NEW BOSTON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE GOFFSTOWN AREA
NEW CASTLE	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE PORTSMOUTH AREA
NEW DURHAM	K-12				SEE GOV. WENTWORTH COOP
NEW HAMPTON	K-12				SEE NEWFOUND AREA COOP
NEW IPSWICH	K-12				SEE MASCENIC COOP
NEW LONDON	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP
NEWBURY	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP
NEWFIELDS	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
	6-12				SEE EXETER COOP
NEWFOUND AREA COOP	K-12	55%	51%	55%	
NEWINGTON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-8				TUITION TO PORTSMOUTH
	9-12				SEE PORTSMOUTH AREA
NEWMARKET	K-12	30%	40%	40%	
NEWPORT	K-3	30%	60%	60%	
NEWPORT AREA	4-12	40%	60%	60%	
NEWTON	K-12				SEE SANBORN COOP
NORTH HAMPTON	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE WINNACUNNET COOP
NORTHFIELD	K-12				SEE WINNISQUAM COOP
NORTHUMBERLAND	K-6	30%	60%	60%	
NORTHUMBERLAND AREA	7-12	40%	60%	60%	
NORTHWOOD	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				TUITION TO COE-BROWN ACADEMY
NOTTINGHAM	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO DOVER

HB 751 COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING AID 2/25/03

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
ORANGE	K-12				SEE MASCOMA VALLEY COOP
ORFORD	K-12				SEE RIVENDELL COOP
OSSIPEE	K-12				SEE GOV. WENTWORTH COOP
OYSTER RIVER COOP	K-12	45%	44%	45%	
PELHAM	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
PEMBROKE	K-8	30%	45%	45%	
PEMBROKE AREA	9-12	50%			
PEMI-BAKER COOP	9-12	55%	55%	55%	
PENACOOK	K-12				SEE MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP
PETERBOROUGH	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
PIERMONT	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				TUITION TO HAVERHILL COOP
PITTSBURG	K-12				SEE PITTSBURG AREA
PITTSBURG AREA	K-12	40%	42%	42%	
PITTSFIELD	K-12	30%	60%	60%	
PLAINFIELD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE LEBANON AREA
PLAISTOW	K-12				SEE TIMBERLANE COOP
PLYMOUTH	K-8	30%	60%	60%	
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
PORTSMOUTH	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
PORTSMOUTH AREA	9-12	55%	40%	55%	
PROFILE COOP	7-12	50%	50%	50%	
RANDOLPH	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, TUITION TO GORHAM
RAYMOND	K-12	30%	55%	55%	
RICHMOND	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
RINDGE	K-12				SEE JAFFREY-RINDGE COOP
RIVENDELL COOP	K-12	45%	NA	45%	INTERSTATE COOP, RSA 200-B
ROCHESTER	K-8	30%	60%	60%	
ROCHESTER AREA	9-12	40%	58%	58%	
ROLLINSFORD	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE SOMERSWORTH AREA
ROXBURY	K-12				NO SCHOOLS,SEE MONADNOCK COOP
RUMNEY	K-8	30%	45%	45%	
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
RYE	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE PORTSMOUTH AREA
SALEM	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
SALEM AREA	9-12	40%	40%	40%	
SALISBURY	K-12				SEE MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP
SANBORN COOP	K-12	45%	40%	40%	
SANBORNTON	K-12				SEE WINNISQUAM COOP
SANDOWN	K-12				SEE TIMBERLANE COOP
SANDWICH	K-12				SEE INTER-LAKES COOP
SEABROOK	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE WINNACUNNET COOP
SHAKER COOP	K-12	40%	52%	52%	
SHARON	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
SHELBURNE	K-12				NO SCHOOLS, TUITION TO GORHAM
SOMERSWORTH	K-6	30%	55%	55%	
SOMERSWORTH AREA	7-12	40%	58%	58%	
SOUHEGAN COOP	9-12	40%	40%	40%	
SOUTH HAMPTON	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO AMESBURY, MA
SPRINGFIELD	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP

District	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
STARK	K-6	30%	60%	60%	
	7-12				SEE NORTHUMBERLAND AREA
STEWARTSTOWN	K-8	30%	60%	60%	
	9-12				TUITION TO COLEBROOK & VERMONT
STODDARD	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE KEENE AREA
STRAFFORD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO COE-BROWN ACADEMY
STRATFORD	K-12	30%	60%	60%	
STRATHAM	K-5	30%	30%	30%	
	6-12				SEE EXETER COOP
SUGAR HILL	K-6				SEE LAFAYETTE COOP
	7-12				SEE PROFILE COOP
SULLIVAN	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
SUNAPEE	K-12	30%	30%	30%	
SURRY	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
SUTTON	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP
SWANZEY	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
TAMWORTH	K-6	30%	45%	45%	
	7-12				SEE CONWAY AREA
TEMPLE	K-12				SEE CONVAL COOP
THORNTON	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
TILTON	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
TIMBERLANE COOP	K-12	50%	40%	50%	
TROY	K-12				SEE MONADNOCK COOP
TUFTONBORO	K-12				SEE GOV. WENTWORTH COOP
UNITY	K-8	30%	45%	45%	
	9-12				SEE CLAREMONT AREA
WAKEFIELD	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE ROCHESTER AREA
WALPOLE	K-12				SEE FALL MOUNTAIN COOP
WARNER	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP
WARREN	K-6	30%	60%	60%	
	7-12				TUITION TO OTHERS
WASHINGTON	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE HILLSBORO-DEERING COOP
WATERVILLE VALLEY	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				TUITION TO PEMI-BAKER COOP
WEARE	K-8	30%	40%	40%	
	9-12				SEE JOHN STARK COOP
WEBSTER	K-12				SEE MERRIMACK VALLEY COOP
WENTWORTH	K-8	30%	55%	55%	
	9-12				SEE PEMI-BAKER COOP
WENTWORTH LOCATION	K-12				SEE COOS COUNTY
WESTMORELAND	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE KEENE AREA
WHITE MOUNTAIN COOP	K-12	55%	58%	58%	
WILMOT	K-12				SEE KEARSARGE COOP
WILTON	K-6	30%	30%	30%	
	7-12				SEE WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOP
WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOP	7-12	40%	40%	40%	
WINCHESTER	K-12	30%	60%	60%	
WINDHAM	K-8	30%	30%	30%	
	9-12				SEE SALEM AREA
WINDSOR	K-12				SEE HILLSBORO-DEERING COOP

	Grades	Current Formula	Alternate Formula	Higher Amount	Comments
District					
WINNACUNNET COOP	9-12	50%	40%	50%	
WINNISQUAM COOP	K-12	45%	47%	47%	
WOLFEBORO	K-12				SEE GOV. WENTWORTH COOP
WOODSTOCK	K-12				SEE LIN-WOOD COOP
No ADM in last five years.					
DIX GRANT					
HALE'S LOCATION					
MARTIN'S LOCATION					
ODELL					
PINKHAM'S GRANT					
SUCCESS					

4. THREE CHARTS SHOWING THE IMPACT OF ALTERNATE FORMULA ON MOST RECENT THREE YEARS

HB 751 COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BUILDING AID UNDER CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR NEW PROJECTS

FY 2001-2002 NEW PROJECTS

SAU	TOWN/CITY	PROJECT	Total Cost	#Years	Capacity	Current %	Alt SBA %	Current Annual SBA Payment	New Annual SBA Payment	Gain
1	DUBLIN	NEW ELEMENTARY	$1,996,073.00	10	150	55%	46%	$109,784.02	$109,784.02	
13	MADISON	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$2,000,000.00	10	330	30%	30%	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	
14	FREMONT	FIRE SAFETY	$159,274.00	5	NA	30%	30%	$9,556.44	$9,556.44	
16	NEWFIELDS	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$763,585.00	10	336	30%	30%	$22,907.55	$22,907.55	
20	GORHAM	SAU OFFICE	$80,210.00	5	NA	40%	NA	$6,416.80	$6,416.80	
20	GORHAM	MS/HS ELEVATOR	$250,815.00	5	NA	30%	60%	$15,048.90	$30,097.80	$15,048.90
21	SOUTH HAMPTON	NEW ELEMENTARY	$1,788,000.00	15	160	30%	30%	$35,760.00	$35,760.00	
24	WEARE	HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	$145,744.00	5		40%	50%	$11,659.52	$14,574.40	$2,914.88
26	MERRIMACK	HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	$5,915,851.00	20	1750	30%	30%	$88,737.77	$88,737.77	
27	HUDSON	NEW ELEMENTARY	$9,043,000.00	20	550	30%	30%	$135,645.00	$135,645.00	
27	LITCHFIELD	NEW HIGH SCHOOL	$12,016,081.00	16	550	30%	30%	$225,301.52	$225,301.52	
30	LACONIA	PLEASANT ST ES ADD/RENO	$3,931,890.00	20	428	30%	40%	$58,978.35	$78,637.80	$19,659.45
30	LACONIA	ELM ST ES ADD/RENO	$4,028,110.00	20	434	30%	40%	$60,421.65	$80,562.20	$20,140.55
32	PLAINFIELD	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$957,234.00	10	400	30%	30%	$28,717.02	$28,717.02	
35	LITTLETON	SAU OFFICE	$104,300.00	5	NA	30%	40%	$6,258.00	$8,344.00	$2,086.00
36	WHITEFIELD	VENTILATION UPGRADE	$2,100,000.00	12	NA	55%	58%	$96,250.00	$101,500.00	$5,250.00
38	HINSDALE	FIRE SAFETY	$632,187.00	10	NA	30%	60%	$18,965.61	$37,931.22	$18,965.61
39	MONT VERNON	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$872,662.00	10	360	30%	30%	$26,179.86	$26,179.86	
40	MILFORD	JACQUES ES RENO	$1,586,238.00	20	250	30%	30%	$23,793.57	$23,793.57	
40	MILFORD	NEW ELEMENTARY	$9,309,000.00	20	700	30%	30%	$139,635.00	$139,635.00	
41	HOLLIS	HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	$3,200,000.00	15	900	40%	40%	$85,333.33	$85,333.33	
41	HOLLIS	SAU OFFICE	$60,000.00	5	NA	40%	NA	$4,800.00	$4,800.00	
42	NASHUA	NEW HIGH SCHOOL	$48,300,000.00	20	2000	30%	30%	$724,500.00	$724,500.00	
42	NASHUA	LAND PURCHASE	$7,000,000.00	20	NA	30%	30%	$105,000.00	$105,000.00	
42	NASHUA	PLANNING & DESIGN	$1,700,000.00	20	NA	30%	30%	$25,500.00	$25,500.00	
51	PITTSFIELD	MS/HS ADDITION	$5,925,396.00	20	570	30%	60%	$88,880.94	$177,761.88	$88,880.94
54	ROCHESTER	EAST ROCHESTER ADD	$1,267,796.00	20	100	30%	60%	$19,016.94	$38,033.88	$19,016.94
55	PLAISTOW	POLLARD ES ADD/RENO	$1,900,520.00	10	760	50%	40%	$95,026.00	$95,026.00	
55	PLAISTOW	MIDDLE SCHOOL ADD/RENO	$2,945,000.00	10	1020	50%	40%	$147,250.00	$147,250.00	
78	ORFORD	ES/MS/HS ADD/RENO	$4,196,623.00	25	450	45%	NA	$75,539.21	$75,539.21	
88	LEBANON	ROOF REPLACEMENT	$164,436.00	5	NA	30%	30%	$9,866.16	$9,866.16	
			$134,340,025.00					$2,560,729.16	$2,752,692.43	$191,963.27

HB 751 COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BUILDING AID UNDER CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR NEW PROJECTS

FY 2002-2003 NEW PROJECTS

SAU	TOWN/CITY	PROJECT	Total Cost	#Years	Capacity	Current %	Alt SBA %	Current Annual SBA Payment	New Annual SBA Payment	Gain
2	MERIDITH	INTER-LAKES MS/HS RENO	$1,361,346.00	10	NA	45%	40%	$61,260.57	$61,260.57	
7	COLEBROOK	ES ADD/RENO	$5,840,000.00	15	475	40%	60%	$155,733.33	$233,600.00	$77,866.67
11	DOVER	ALTERNATIVE HS	$852,996.00	15	36	30%	30%	$17,059.92	$17,059.92	
11	DOVER	HS RENOVATIONS	$400,000.00	15	NA	30%	30%	$8,000.00	$8,000.00	
12	LONDONDERRY	SEPARATE KINDERGARTEN	$1,810,235.00	5	495	30%	30%	$108,614.10	$108,614.10	
13	FREEDOM	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$2,000,000.00	10	200	30%	30%	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	
16	BRENTWOOD	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$5,873,873.00	20	415	30%	30%	$88,108.10	$88,108.10	
19	GOFFSTOWN	HS ADD/RENO	$11,995,000.00	20	1250	45%	40%	$269,887.50	$269,887.50	
23	HAVERHILL	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$86,461.00	5	NA	40%	60%	$6,916.88	$10,375.32	$3,458.44
24	WEARE	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$299,374.00	5	785	30%	40%	$17,962.44	$23,949.92	$5,987.48
25	BEDFORD	SAU OFFICE	$457,809.00	20	NA	40%	NA	$9,156.18	$9,156.18	
25	BEDFORD	VENTILATION UPGRADE	$147,625.00	10	NA	30%	30%	$4,428.75	$4,428.75	
25	BEDFORD	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,978,167.00	20	200	30%	30%	$29,672.51	$29,672.51	
27	HUDSON	MS ADDITION/RENO	$7,625,000.00	20	450	30%	30%	$114,375.00	$114,375.00	
34	WASHINGTON	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,105,012.00	15	125	30%	30%	$22,100.24	$22,100.24	
35	LITTLETON	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$313,465.00	5	411	30%	40%	$18,807.90	$25,077.20	$6,269.30
39	AMHERST	MS ADDITION	$3,799,000.00	20	850	30%	30%	$56,985.00	$56,985.00	
44	NORTHWOOD	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$4,370,000.00	15	600	30%	40%	$87,400.00	$116,533.33	$29,133.33
52	PORTSMOUTH	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,750,000.00	20	300	30%	30%	$26,250.00	$26,250.00	
57	SALEM	RENOVATIONS	$279,400.00	5	NA	30%	30%	$16,764.00	$16,764.00	
58	NORTHUMBERLAND	RENOVATIONS	$400,000.00	14	NA	30%	60%	$8,571.43	$17,142.86	$8,571.43
59	WINNISQUAM	HS ADD/RENO	$12,375,713.00	20	625	45%	47%	$278,453.54	$290,829.25	$12,375.71
59	WINNISQUAM	MS ADD/RENO	$3,366,000.00	20	525	45%	47%	$75,735.00	$79,101.00	$3,366.00
59	WINNISQUAM	SAU OFFICE	$448,000.00	20	NA	40%	NA	$8,960.00	$8,960.00	
60	FALL MT	FIRE SPRINKLER	$400,000.00	5	NA	55%	54%	$44,000.00	$44,000.00	
60	FALL MT	ELEVATOR	$600,000.00	5	NA	55%	54%	$66,000.00	$66,000.00	
61	FARMINGTON	NEW ELEMENTARY	$6,637,900.00	10	500	30%	60%	$199,137.00	$398,274.00	$199,137.00
61	FARMINGTON	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$2,245,220.00	10	750	30%	60%	$67,356.60	$134,713.20	$67,356.60
65	KEARSARGE	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$466,875.00	5	150	55%	43%	$51,356.25	$51,356.25	
72	ALTON	SAU OFFICE	$257,443.00	5	NA	40%	NA	$20,595.44	$20,595.44	
75	GRANTHAM	ES ADDITION	$720,000.00	5	80	30%	30%	$43,200.00	$43,200.00	
		TOTALS	$80,261,914.00					$2,042,847.67	$2,456,369.64	$413,521.96

HB 751 COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BUILDING AID UNDER CURRENT AND ALTERNATE FORMULAS FOR NEW PROJECTS

FY 2003-2004 NEW PROJECTS

SAU	TOWN/CITY	PROJECT	Total Cost	#Years	Capacity	Current %	Alt SBA %	Current Annual SBA Payment	New Annual SBA Payment	Gain
5	Durham	OYSTER RIVER HS ADD	$23,026,559.00	20	880	45%	44%	$518,097.58	$518,097.58	
8	Concord	BROKEN GROUND RENO	$435,000.00	5	NA	30%	40%	$26,100.00	$34,800.00	$8,700.00
11	Dover	HORNE ST ADD	$1,035,000.00	10	425	30%	30%	$31,050.00	$31,050.00	
11	Dover	WINDOWS & DOOR	$401,862.50	20	NA	30%	30%	$6,027.94	$6,027.94	
11	Dover	BUS LOOP	$342,512.00	15	NA	30%	30%	$6,850.24	$6,850.24	
11	Dover	HIGH SCHOOL HEATING	$1,000,000.00	10	NA	30%	30%	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	
12	Londonderry	HS & GYM ADD/RENO	$12,030,000.00	19	2000	30%	30%	$189,947.37	$189,947.37	
13	Tamworth	TAMWORTH	$3,200,000.00	20	140	30%	45%	$48,000.00	$72,000.00	$24,000.00
14	Chester	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$2,042,521.00	10	750	30%	30%	$61,275.63	$61,275.63	
15	Hooksett	NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	$20,668,850.00	20	900	30%	30%	$310,032.75	$310,032.75	
15	Hooksett	ELEMENTARY RENO	$7,958,600.00	20	675	30%	30%	$119,379.00	$119,379.00	
16	East Kingston	FIRE SAFETY	$157,750.00	7	NA	30%	30%	$6,760.71	$6,760.71	
16	Exeter	LINCOLN ST ELEVATOR	$278,700.00	7	NA	30%	30%	$11,944.29	$11,944.29	
16	Kensington	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,950,000.00	20	275	30%	30%	$29,250.00	$29,250.00	
20	Milan	MILAN ELEM ADDITION	$4,264,008.00	15	275	40%	59%	$113,706.88	$167,717.65	$54,010.77
24	Weare	JOHN STARK HS ADDITION	$5,000,000.00	10	1000	40%	50%	$200,000.00	$250,000.00	$50,000.00
29	Keene	VOC CTR UPGRADE	$1,500,000.00	10	NA	55%	49%	$82,500.00	$82,500.00	
30	Laconia	WOODLAND HEIGHTS ADD	$4,624,300.00	15	540	30%	40%	$92,486.00	$123,314.67	$30,828.67
35	Littleton	LITTLETON HS RENOV	$6,321,535.00	20	400	30%	40%	$94,823.03	$126,430.70	$31,607.68
36	Whitefield	HS SCIENCE RENOVATION	$1,970,000.00	10	650	55%	58%	$108,350.00	$114,260.00	$5,910.00
40	Milford	JACQUES ROOF REPLACE	$550,000.00	5	NA	30%	30%	$33,000.00	$33,000.00	
41	Brookline	BROOKLINE ELEM REVON	$600,000.00	5	407	30%	30%	$36,000.00	$36,000.00	
42	Nashua	South HS Phase II	$38,745,000.00	20	2000	30%	30%	$581,175.00	$581,175.00	
43	Newport	HS RENOVATIONS	$546,800.00	10	NA	30%	60%	$16,404.00	$32,808.00	$16,404.00
47	Jaffrey	JAFFERY-RINDGE GRADE	$1,221,014.00	20	900	40%	48%	$24,420.28	$29,304.34	$4,884.06
49	New Durham	NEW DURHAM ELEM ADD	$474,118.00	10	300	55%	46%	$26,076.49	$26,076.49	
49	Effingham	EFFINGHAM ELEM ADD	$2,583,425.00	10	160	55%	46%	$142,088.38	$142,088.38	
49	Wolfeboro	SAU OFFICE	$787,000.00	5	NA	40%	40%	$62,960.00	$62,960.00	
50	Greenland	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$6,569,133.00	20	300	30%	30%	$98,537.00	$98,537.00	
52	Portsmouth	HIGH SCHOOL ADD/RENO	$36,000,000.00	20	1400	55%	40%	$990,000.00	$990,000.00	
53	Chichester	CHICHESTER CENTRAL AD	$1,600,000.00	15	360	30%	30%	$32,000.00	$32,000.00	
54	Rochester	ROCHESTER MIDDLE ADD	$2,040,000.00	20	1200	30%	60%	$30,600.00	$61,200.00	$30,600.00
65	Sutton	KEARSARGE HS ROOF	$667,500.00	10	NA	55%	43%	$36,712.50	$36,712.50	
72	Alton	ALTON/BARNSTEAD HS	$19,266,000.00	20	800	40%	48%	$385,320.00	$457,567.50	$72,247.50
73	Gilford	HS Expansion	$8,442,372.00	20	560	40%	43%	$168,847.44	$181,511.00	$12,663.56
73	Gilford	MS Expansion	$5,100,600.00	20	520	30%	30%	$76,509.00	$76,509.00	
73	Gilford	ES Expansion	$4,045,303.00	20	600	30%	30%	$60,679.55	$60,679.55	
74	Barrington	New Middle School	$15,199,129.00	20	666	30%	40%	$227,986.94	$303,398.58	$75,411.65
88	Lebanon	LEBANON HEATING & VENT	$2,358,172.00	5	NA	45%	40%	$212,235.48	$212,235.48	
88	Lebanon	LEBANON SCIENCE ADD	$3,950,000.00	10	750	45%	40%	$177,750.00	$177,750.00	
		TOTALS	$248,952,763.50					$5,505,883.45	$5,923,151.33	$417,267.88

2/3/03

5. THREE CHARTS SHOWING IMPACT OF ALTERNATE FORMULA AND SIZE RESTRICTIONS ON MOST RECENT THREE YEARS

FY 2001-2002 NEW PROJECTS

SAU	TOWN/CITY	PROJECT	Total Cost	#Years	Current %	Alt SBA %	Current Annual SBA Payment	New Annual SBA Payment	SF/Student	SF Limit	Size Loss	Final Annual SBA Payment	Net Gain/Loss
1	DUBLIN	NEW ELEMENTARY	$1,996,073.00	10	55%	46%	$109,784.02	$109,784.02	122	144		$109,784.02	
13	MADISON	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$2,000,000.00	10	30%	30%	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	106	120		$60,000.00	
14	FREMONT	FIRE SAFETY	$159,274.00	5	30%	30%	$9,556.44	$9,556.44	NA			$9,556.44	
16	NEWFIELDS	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$763,585.00	10	30%	30%	$22,907.55	$22,907.55	NO DATA			$22,907.55	
20	GORHAM	SAU OFFICE	$80,210.00	5	40%	NA	$6,416.80	$6,416.80	NA			$6,416.80	
20	GORHAM	MS/HS ELEVATOR	$250,815.00	5	30%	60%	$15,048.90	$30,097.80	NA			$30,097.80	$15,048.90
21	SOUTH HAMPTON	NEW ELEMENTARY	$1,788,000.00	15	30%	30%	$35,760.00	$35,760.00	110	144		$35,760.00	
24	WEARE	HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	$145,744.00	5	40%	50%	$11,659.52	$14,574.40	148	160		$14,574.40	$2,914.88
26	MERRIMACK	HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	$5,915,851.00	20	30%	30%	$88,737.77	$88,737.77	NO DATA			$88,737.77	
27	HUDSON	NEW ELEMENTARY	$9,043,000.00	20	30%	30%	$135,645.00	$135,645.00	136	120	($15,958.24)	$119,686.76	($15,958.24)
27	LITCHFIELD	NEW HIGH SCHOOL	$12,016,081.00	16	30%	30%	$225,301.52	$225,301.52	204	160	($48,594.45)	$176,707.07	($48,594.45)
30	LACONIA	PLEASANT ST ES ADD/RENO	$3,931,890.00	20	30%	40%	$58,978.35	$78,637.80	148	120	($14,877.42)	$63,760.38	$4,782.03
30	LACONIA	ELM ST ES ADD/RENO	$4,028,110.00	20	30%	40%	$60,421.65	$80,562.20	147	120	($14,797.14)	$65,765.06	$5,343.41
32	PLAINFIELD	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$957,234.00	10	30%	30%	$28,717.02	$28,717.02	106	120		$28,717.02	
35	LITTLETON	SAU OFFICE	$104,300.00	5	30%	40%	$6,258.00	$8,344.00	NA			$8,344.00	$2,086.00
36	WHITEFIELD	VENTILATION UPGRADE	$2,100,000.00	12	55%	58%	$96,250.00	$101,500.00	NA			$101,500.00	$5,250.00
38	HINSDALE	FIRE SAFETY	$632,187.00	10	30%	60%	$18,965.61	$37,931.22	NA			$37,931.22	$18,965.61
39	MONT VERNON	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$872,662.00	10	30%	30%	$26,179.86	$26,179.86	126	120	($1,246.66)	$24,933.20	($1,246.66)
40	MILFORD	JACQUES ES RENO	$1,586,238.00	20	30%	30%	$23,793.57	$23,793.57	NA			$23,793.57	
40	MILFORD	NEW ELEMENTARY	$9,309,000.00	20	30%	30%	$139,635.00	$139,635.00	128	120	($8,727.19)	$130,907.81	($8,727.19)
41	HOLLIS	HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	$3,200,000.00	15	40%	40%	$85,333.33	$85,333.33	172	160	($5,953.49)	$79,379.84	($5,953.49)
41	HOLLIS	SAU OFFICE	$60,000.00	5	40%	NA	$4,800.00	$4,800.00	NA			$4,800.00	
42	NASHUA	NEW HIGH SCHOOL	$48,300,000.00	20	30%	30%	$724,500.00	$724,500.00	181	160	($84,058.01)	$640,441.99	($84,058.01)
42	NASHUA	LAND PURCHASE	$7,000,000.00	20	30%	30%	$105,000.00	$105,000.00	77 ACRES	50 ACRES	($36,750.00)	$68,250.00	($36,750.00)
42	NASHUA	PLANNING & DESIGN	$1,700,000.00	20	30%	30%	$25,500.00	$25,500.00	NA			$25,500.00	
51	PITTSFIELD	MS/HS ADDITION	$5,925,396.00	20	30%	60%	$88,880.94	$177,761.88	148	160		$177,761.88	$88,880.94
54	ROCHESTER	EAST ROCHESTER ADD	$1,267,796.00	20	30%	60%	$19,016.94	$38,033.88	126	144		$38,033.88	$19,016.94
55	PLAISTOW	POLLARD ES ADD/RENO	$1,900,520.00	10	50%	40%	$95,026.00	$95,026.00	NO DATA			$95,026.00	
55	PLAISTOW	MIDDLE SCHOOL ADD/RENO	$2,945,000.00	10	50%	40%	$147,250.00	$147,250.00	NO DATA			$147,250.00	
78	ORFORD	ES/MS/HS ADD/RENO	$4,196,623.00	25	45%	NA	$75,539.21	$75,539.21	NA			$75,539.21	
88	LEBANON	ROOF REPLACEMENT	$164,436.00	5	30%	30%	$9,866.16	$9,866.16	NA			$9,866.16	
			$134,340,025.00				$2,560,729.16	$2,752,692.43			($230,962.58)	$2,521,729.84	($38,999.31)

FY 2002-2003 NEW PROJECTS

SAU	TOWN/CITY	PROJECT	Total Cost	#Years	Current %	Alt SBA %	Current Annual SBA Payment	New Annual SBA Payment	SF/Student	SF Limit	Size Loss	Final Annual SBA Payment	Net Gain/Loss
2	MERIDITH	INTER-LAKES MS/HS RENO	$1,361,346.00	10	45%	40%	$61,260.57	$61,260.57	NA			$61,260.57	
7	COLEBROOK	ES ADD/RENO	$5,840,000.00	15	40%	60%	$155,733.33	$233,600.00	163	120	($61,624.54)	$171,975.46	$16,242.13
11	DOVER	ALTERNATIVE HS	$852,996.00	15	30%	30%	$17,059.92	$17,059.92	441	192	($9,632.47)	$7,427.45	($9,632.47)
11	DOVER	HS RENOVATIONS	$400,000.00	15	30%	30%	$8,000.00	$8,000.00	NA			$8,000.00	
12	LONDONDERRY	SEPARATE KINDERGARTEN	$1,810,235.00	5	30%	30%	$108,614.10	$108,614.10	70	120		$108,614.10	
13	FREEDOM	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$2,000,000.00	10	30%	30%	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	74	144		$63,157.90	$3,157.90
16	BRENTWOOD	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$5,873,873.00	20	30%	30%	$88,108.10	$88,108.10	144	120	($14,684.68)	$73,423.42	($14,684.68)
19	GOFFSTOWN	HS ADD/RENO	$11,995,000.00	20	45%	40%	$269,887.50	$269,887.50	137	160		$269,887.50	
23	HAVERHILL	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$86,461.00	5	40%	60%	$6,916.88	$10,375.32	NA			$10,375.32	$3,458.44
24	WEARE	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$299,374.00	5	30%	40%	$17,962.44	$23,949.92	78	120		$23,949.92	$5,987.48
25	BEDFORD	SAU OFFICE	$457,809.00	20	40%	NA	$9,156.18	$9,156.18	NA			$9,156.18	
25	BEDFORD	VENTILATION UPGRADE	$147,625.00	10	30%	30%	$4,428.75	$4,428.75	NA			$4,428.75	
25	BEDFORD	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,978,167.00	20	30%	30%	$29,672.51	$29,672.51	78	144		$29,672.51	
27	HUDSON	MS ADDITION/RENO	$7,625,000.00	20	30%	30%	$114,375.00	$114,375.00	195	140	($32,259.62)	$82,115.38	($32,259.62)
34	WASHINGTON	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,105,012.00	15	30%	30%	$22,100.24	$22,100.24	100	144		$22,100.24	
35	LITTLETON	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$313,465.00	5	30%	40%	$18,807.90	$25,077.20	NO DATA			$25,077.20	$6,269.30
39	AMHERST	MS ADDITION	$3,799,000.00	20	30%	30%	$56,985.00	$56,985.00	145	140	($1,965.00)	$55,020.00	($1,965.00)
44	NORTHWOOD	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$4,370,000.00	15	30%	40%	$87,400.00	$116,533.33	NO DATA			$116,533.33	$29,133.33
52	PORTSMOUTH	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,750,000.00	20	30%	30%	$26,250.00	$26,250.00	136	120	($3,088.24)	$23,161.76	($3,088.24)
57	SALEM	RENOVATIONS	$279,400.00	5	30%	30%	$16,764.00	$16,764.00	NA			$16,764.00	
58	NORTHUMBERLAND	RENOVATIONS	$400,000.00	14	30%	60%	$8,571.43	$17,142.86	NA			$17,142.86	$8,571.43
59	WINNISQUAM	HS ADD/RENO	$12,375,713.00	20	45%	47%	$278,453.54	$290,829.25	202	160	($60,469.45)	$230,359.80	($48,093.74)
59	WINNISQUAM	MS ADD/RENO	$3,366,000.00	20	45%	47%	$75,735.00	$79,101.00	148	140	($4,275.73)	$74,825.27	($909.73)
59	WINNISQUAM	SAU OFFICE	$448,000.00	20	40%	NA	$8,960.00	$8,960.00	NA			$8,960.00	
60	FALL MT	FIRE SPRINKLER	$400,000.00	5	55%	54%	$44,000.00	$44,000.00	NA			$44,000.00	
60	FALL MT	ELEVATOR	$600,000.00	5	55%	54%	$66,000.00	$66,000.00	NA			$66,000.00	
61	FARMINGTON	NEW ELEMENTARY	$6,637,900.00	10	30%	60%	$199,137.00	$398,274.00	112	120		$398,274.00	$199,137.00
61	FARMINGTON	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$2,245,220.00	10	30%	60%	$67,356.60	$134,713.20	109	120		$134,713.20	$67,356.60
65	KEARSARGE	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$466,875.00	5	55%	43%	$51,356.25	$51,356.25	NO DATA			$51,365.25	
72	ALTON	SAU OFFICE	$257,443.00	5	40%	NA	$20,595.44	$20,595.44	NA			$20,595.44	
75	GRANTHAM	ES ADDITION	$720,000.00	5	30%	30%	$43,200.00	$43,200.00	91	144		$43,200.00	
		TOTALS	$80,261,914.00				$ 2,042,847.67	$2,456,369.64			($184,832.82)	$2,271,536.82	$228,689.14

FY 2003-2004 NEW PROJECTS

SAU	TOWN/CITY	PROJECT	Total Cost	#Years	Current %	Alt SBA %	Current Annual SBA Payment	New Annual SBA Payment	SF/Student	SF Limit	Size Loss	Final Annual SBA Payment	Net Gain/Loss
5	Durham	OYSTER RIVER HS ADD	$23,026,559.00	20	45%	44%	$518,097.58	$518,097.58	225	160	($149,672.63)	$368,424.95	($149,672.63)
8	Concord	BROKEN GROUND RENOV	$435,000.00	5	30%	40%	$26,100.00	$34,800.00	NA			$34,800.00	$8,700.00
11	Dover	HORNE ST ADD	$1,035,000.00	10	30%	30%	$31,050.00	$31,050.00	113	120		$31,050.00	
11	Dover	WINDOWS & DOOR	$401,862.50	20	30%	30%	$6,027.94	$6,027.94	NA			$6,027.94	
11	Dover	BUS LOOP	$342,512.00	15	30%	30%	$6,850.24	$6,850.24	NA			$6,850.24	
11	Dover	HIGH SCHOOL HEATING	$1,000,000.00	10	30%	30%	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	NA			$30,000.00	
12	Londonderry	HS & GYM ADD/RENOV	$12,030,000.00	19	30%	30%	$189,947.37	$189,947.37	NA			$189,947.37	
13	Tamworth	TAMWORTH	$3,200,000.00	20	30%	45%	$48,000.00	$72,000.00	162	120	($18,666.67)	$53,333.33	$5,333.33
14	Chester	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$2,042,521.00	10	30%	30%	$61,275.63	$61,275.63	108	144		$61,275.63	
15	Hooksett	NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	$20,668,850.00	20	30%	30%	$310,032.75	$310,032.75	146	140	($12,741.07)	$297,291.68	($12,741.07)
15	Hooksett	ELEMENTARY RENO	$7,958,600.00	20	30%	30%	$119,379.00	$119,379.00	121	120	($986.60)	$118,392.40	($986.60)
16	East Kingston	FIRE SAFETY	$157,750.00	7	30%	30%	$6,760.71	$6,760.71	NA			$6,760.71	
16	Exeter	LINCOLN ST ELEVATOR	$278,700.00	7	30%	30%	$11,944.29	$11,944.29	NA			$11,944.29	
16	Kensington	ELEMENTARY ADDITION	$1,950,000.00	20	30%	30%	$29,250.00	$29,250.00	105	120		$29,250.00	
20	Milan	MILAN ELEM ADDITION	$4,264,008.00	15	40%	59%	$113,706.88	$167,717.65	173	120	($51,381.71)	$116,335.94	$2,629.06
24	Weare	JOHN STARK HS ADDITION	$5,000,000.00	10	40%	50%	$200,000.00	$250,000.00	118	160		$250,000.00	$50,000.00
29	Keene	VOC CTR UPGRADE	$1,500,000.00	10	55%	49%	$82,500.00	$82,500.00	NA			$82,500.00	
30	Laconia	WOODLAND HEIGHTS ADD	$4,624,300.00	15	30%	40%	$92,486.00	$123,314.67	121	120	($1,019.13)	$122,295.54	$29,809.54
35	Littleton	LITTLETON HS RENOV	$6,321,535.00	20	30%	40%	$94,823.03	$126,430.70	218	160	($33,637.53)	$92,793.17	($2,029.85)
36	Whitefield	HS SCIENCE RENOVATION	$1,970,000.00	10	55%	58%	$108,350.00	$114,260.00	NA			$114,260.00	$5,910.00
40	Milford	JACQUES ROOF REPLACE	$550,000.00	5	30%	30%	$33,000.00	$33,000.00	NA			$33,000.00	
41	Brookline	BROOKLINE ELEM REVON	$600,000.00	5	30%	30%	$36,000.00	$36,000.00	NA			$36,000.00	
42	Nashua	South HS Phase II	$38,745,000.00	20	30%	30%	$581,175.00	$581,175.00	182	160	($70,251.92)	$510,923.08	($70,251.92)
43	Newport	HS RENOVATIONS	$546,800.00	10	30%	60%	$16,404.00	$32,808.00	NA			$32,808.00	$16,404.00
47	Jaffrey	JAFFERY-RINDGE GRADE	$1,221,014.00	20	40%	48%	$24,420.28	$29,304.34	120	120		$29,304.34	$4,884.06
49	New Durham	NEW DURHAM ELEM ADD	$474,118.00	10	55%	46%	$26,076.49	$26,076.49	124	120		$25,235.31	($841.18)
49	Effingham	EFFINGHAM ELEM ADD	$2,583,425.00	10	55%	46%	$142,088.38	$142,088.38	148	144	($3,840.23)	$138,248.15	($3,840.22)
49	Wolfeboro	SAU OFFICE	$787,000.00	5	40%	40%	$62,960.00	$62,960.00	NA			$62,960.00	
50	Greenland	ELEMENTARY ADD/RENO	$6,569,133.00	20	30%	30%	$98,537.00	$98,537.00	169	120	($28,569.90)	$69,967.10	($28,569.90)
52	Portsmouth	HIGH SCHOOL ADD/RENO	$36,000,000.00	20	55%	40%	$990,000.00	$990,000.00	193	160	($169,274.61)	$820,725.39	($169,274.61)
53	Chichester	CHICHESTER CENTRAL ADD	$1,600,000.00	15	30%	30%	$32,000.00	$32,000.00	NO DATA	120		$32,000.00	
54	Rochester	ROCHESTER MIDDLE ADD	$2,040,000.00	20	30%	60%	$30,600.00	$61,200.00	125	140		$61,200.00	$30,600.00
65	Sutton	KEARSARGE HS ROOF	$667,500.00	10	55%	43%	$36,712.50	$36,712.50	NA			$36,712.50	
72	Alton	ALTON/BARNSTEAD HS	$19,266,000.00	20	40%	48%	$385,320.00	$457,567.50	170	160	($26,915.74)	$430,651.76	$45,331.76
73	Gilford	HS Expansion	$8,442,372.00	20	40%	43%	$168,847.44	$181,511.00	253	160	($66,721.43)	$114,789.56	($54,057.88)
73	Gilford	MS Expansion	$5,100,600.00	20	30%	30%	$76,509.00	$76,509.00	165	140	($11,592.27)	$64,916.73	($11,592.27)
73	Gilford	ES Expansion	$4,045,303.00	20	30%	30%	$60,679.55	$60,679.55	112	120		$60,679.55	
74	Barrington	New Middle School	$15,199,129.00	20	30%	40%	$227,986.94	$303,398.58	165	140	($45,969.48)	$257,429.10	$29,442.16
88	Lebanon	LEBANON HEATING & VENT	$2,358,172.00	5	45%	40%	$212,235.48	$212,235.48	NA			$212,235.48	
88	Lebanon	LEBANON SCIENCE ADD	$3,950,000.00	10	45%	40%	$177,750.00	$177,750.00	136	160		$177,750.00	
		TOTALS	$248,952,763.50				$5,505,883.45	$5,923,151.33			($692,082.09)	$5,231,069.24	($274,814.21)

6. FISCAL IMPACT

HB 751 **2/3/03**

THREE YEAR FISCAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON SCHOOL BUILDING AID

IF THE PROPOSED ALTERNATE FORMULA AND SIZE RESTRICTIONS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING AID HAD BEEN IN EFFECT STARTING WITH FY 2002 THE IMPACT WOULD HAVE BEEN AS FOLLOWS:

	2002	2003	2004
CURRENT TOTAL	$23,536,547.35	$25,194,323.48	$31,215,613.79
CUMULATIVE ANNUAL CHANGE	($38,999.31)	$189,689.83	($85,124.38)
TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED	$23,497,548.04	$25,384,013.31	$31,130,489.41

LONG-TERM IMPACT: ON AVERAGE, THIS LEGISLATION WOULD RESULT IN A SAVINGS OF ABOUT $28,000 PER YEAR ON PROJECTS THAT WOULD BE BUILT WITH OR WITHOUT THE ALTERNATE FORMULA. THE EFFECT OF THE LEGISLATION WILL BE TO ENCOURAGE CONSTRUCTION IN CERTAIN COMMUNITIES THAT WOULD NOT BE APPROVED UNDER THE CURRENT LAW. THIS LEGISLATION ALSO ALLOWS LEASES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. THE NUMBER OF LEASES IS EXPECTED TO BE RELATIVELY SMALL, PROBABLY NO MORE THAN ONE AT A TIME, COSTING NO MORE THAN $66,000 PER YEAR. THREE OR FOUR MORE PROJECTS, PLUS ONE LEASE, WOULD ADD COSTS SLIGHTLY GREATER THAN THE SAVINGS DEMONSTRATED ABOVE. ON AVERAGE, THERE SHOULD BE AN INCREASE OF APPROXIMATELY $60,000 PER YEAR IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SCHOOL BUILDING AID. NORMAL INFLATION WILL HAVE A MUCH MORE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

7. ALTERNATE FORMULA

Calculation of "Aid Factor" or District's eligible % of State Aid. R. McK 2/8/03

I. Determine Municipality's "rank"

1. **Determine each municipality's "median family income" and assign a rank beginning with the lowest Med. Family Income as number one, and continuing to the highest rank, what ever that number might be.**

2. **Determine each municipality's "equalized valuation per pupil" by dividing the *municipality's equalized valuation* (EQ.VAL) by the *Average Daily Membership in Residence* (ADM-R) within each municipality. Assign each municipality a rank beginning with the lowest as number one, and continuing there from.**

II. Determine municipality's "Aid Factor" by using the following formula

$$\text{"Aid Factor"} = \frac{\text{MED FAM INCOME "RANK"} + \text{EQ.VAL/ADM-R "RANK"}}{2}$$

Note; RSA 198:15u

1. "Medium family income" means that income for each municipality using the most recent data available from the U.S. Bureau of Census. For the purposes of this subdivision, median family income shall be recalculated at each decennial census.

2. Equalized valuation per pupil means the average equalized valuation within a school district over the most recent five years divided by the current number of pupils within the school district expressed (ADM-R) as an average from the most recent 5 years of available data collected by the department of education.

III. COOP & AREA SCHOOLS

Add 10% to the aid factor for each municipality. This becomes adjusted aid factor.

For each COOP, or AREA school;- Determine total number of pupils in COOP or AREA and the percentage of pupils that come from each municipality.. The final "aid factor" is the sum of the percentage of pupils in each municipality multiplied by the aid factor plus 10% for that municipality.

SAMPLE Assume COOP ""A" has three districts, "a", "b", and "c"

ADD PERCENT OF PUPILS in "a" x ("a" AID FACTOR +10%) =a%
" " " " "b" x ("b" " " ") =b%
" " " " "c" x ("c" " " ") =c%

COOP "A" AID FACTOR

8. STATE COMPARISON

MAXIMUM SF/STUDENT LIMITS FOR SCHOOLS

STATE	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE	HIGH	NOTES
ALASKA	110	157	157	
ARIZONA	90	100	134	HS ABOVE 1800 GETS 125 SF/PUPIL
CONNECTICUT	112-156	142-180	164-194	VARIES BY GRADE AND ENROLLMENT
DELAWARE	84	117	114	AVERAGE SIZES BASED ON FORMULA
MAINE	125	135	160	
MASSACHUSETTS	115	135	155	
NORTH DAKOTA	110		200	
RHODE ISLAND	115	135	165	
UTAH	76	125	165	
WASHINGTON	80	110	120	
WEST VIRGINIA	80-125	100-150	140-230	VARIES BY TOTAL ENROLLMENT
VERMONT	110-120	130-140	140-150	VARIES BY TOTAL ENROLLMENT
HB 751	120	140	160	

MAXIMUM SITE SIZE LIMITS

CONNECTICUT	ELEMENTARY	10 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	MIDDLE	15 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	HIGH	20 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
MAINE	ELEMENTARY	20 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	MIDDLE	25 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	HIGH	30 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
MASSACHUSETTS	NO STATE AID FOR LAND ACQUISITION	
RHODE ISLAND	ELEMENTARY	10 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	MIDDLE	20 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	HIGH	30 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
VERMONT	NO STATE AID FOR LAND ACQUISITION	
HB 751	ELEMENTARY	20 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	MIDDLE	25 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS
	HIGH	30 ACRES PLUS 1 ACRE FOR EVERY 100 STUDENTS

Speakers

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Date 05/07/03 Time 2:30 PM Public Hearing on **HB 751-FN-L**

implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities, and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

Please check box(es) that apply.

SPEAKING	FAVOR	OPPOSED	NAME (Please print)	REPRESENTING
☒	☒	☐	Representative Alger	Prime Sponsor
☒	☒	☐	HARRIET F Cady	Dist #73
☒	☐	☐	Richard Minard	NH Center for Pol'y Studies
☑	☐	☐	Dean Michener	NH School Boards Assn.
☐	☒	☐	ROBERT K. DIOFE	ROCK DIST 80
☒	☒	☐	Rep K. Weyler	Dist 29
☒	☒	☐	R McKINLEY	self
☒	☐	☐	Ed Murdough	Dept. of Ed.
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date: May 15, 2003

THE COMMITTEE ON Education

to which was referred House Bill 751-FN-L

AN ACT implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities, and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

VOTE: 5-0

2003-1657s

Having considered the same, report the same with the following amendment and recommend that the bill: **AS AMENDED OUGHT TO PASS.**

Senator Carl R. Johnson
For the Committee

HB751 Docket

Bill Title: implementing an alternative school building aid grant formula, establishing size and cost standards for the construction of new school facilities and permitting high school vocational technical education programs which lease space to be eligible for school building aid grants.

Date	Body	Description
1/30/2003	H	Introduced and ref to Education; HJ 12, p208
1/30/2003	H	Report due 3/6/2003
2/4/2003	H	Hearing Mar 3 10:00 RM205-207,LOB
3/4/2003	H	Maj Report OTP for Mar 12 (Vote 10-7;Reg)
3/4/2003	H	Min Report ITL
3/12/2003	H	Passed and ref to Finance VV; HJ23, p558
3/13/2003	H	Fin DivII Subcom Work & Exec Sess Mar 21 9:00 RM212,LOB
3/24/2003	H	Fin Maj Report OTP for Apr 10 (Vote17-3;Reg)
4/10/2003	H	Passed VV; HJ 34, p1128 + 1143
4/17/2003	S	Introduced and Ref. Education; SJ 13, Pg.329
4/24/2003	S	Hearing; May 7, 2003, Room 105-A, SH, 2:30 p.m.; SC20
5/16/2003	S	Committee Report; Ought to Pass with Amendment{1657}, [05/22/03]; SC23, Pg.40
5/22/2003	S	Committee Amendment{1657}, AA, VV; SJ 17, Pg.436
5/22/2003	S	Ought to Pass with Amendment{1657}, MA, VV; Refer to Finance [Rule 26]; SJ 17, Pg.436
6/3/2003	S	Committee Report; Ought to Pass [06/05/03]; SC25A
6/5/2003	S	Ought to Pass, MA, VV; SJ 19, Pg.622
6/5/2003	S	Sen. Clegg Rules Suspension for 3rd Reading and Final Passage 2/3 nec., MA, VV; SJ 19, Pg.622
6/5/2003	H	House Nonconc with Sen Am req Conf Comm, Rep MacKay MA; HJ 47, p1548
6/5/2003	H	(Spkr appts Reps: Alger, Laurent, Snyder & Mercer)
6/5/2003	S	Sen. O'Hearn Accede to House Request For Committee of Conference, MA, VV; SJ 19, Pg.667
6/5/2003	S	President Appoints; Senators O'Hearn, Boyce, Foster; SJ 19, Pg.667
6/11/2003	H	Conf Comm Meeting June 13 10:00 RM207,LOB
6/19/2003	S	Committee of Conference Report; Sen. Am{2116}, Filed;
6/24/2003	S	Conference Committee Report{2116}, Adopted, VV; SJ 20, Pg.807
6/24/2003	H	Conf Comm Report Adopted VV; HJ 51, p1630
6/30/2003	H	Enrolled
6/30/2003	S	Enrolled; SJ 21, Pg.870
7/18/2003	H	Signed by the Governor 7/18/03 Eff: 7/01/03* Chap: 0296
7/18/2003	H	*Multiple Effective Dates: All except Secs 5 & 6 eff: 7/01/05