

TABOR Limit Impact Analysis - FY 2006

The attached spreadsheet illustrates the impact the so-called TABOR (Taxpayer Bill of Rights) spending restriction system would have on Maine school administrative units (SAUs) for the current fiscal year. This information updates school impact information previously provided for the 2005 fiscal year.

As proposed in the TABOR initiative, changes in school spending would be limited to the percent change in student population plus inflation.

According to MMA's analysis, if TABOR were in effect today 70 (31%) of the SAUs that actually operate schools would be faced with budget cuts under the TABOR expenditure limitation formula.

The range in school spending restrictions would run from +60% to -97%, with the average spending limit being 1.7%.

Notes and Sources of Data

- Column A **CY 04 Student Population** - student enrollment figures. These numbers are found on the Dept. of Education's ED 281 form and are the result of averaging the 2004 April and October student census. Maine Department of Education.
- Column B **CY 05 Student Population** - student enrollment figures. These numbers are found on the Dept. of Education's ED 281 form and are the result of averaging the 2005 April and October student census. Maine Department of Education.
- Column C **% Change Student Population** - percent change in student population between 2004 and 2005.
- Column D **% Change 2004-2005 CPI-U** - percent change in inflation (CPI-U). Calculation of inflation (Consumer Price Index - all Urban Consumers) based on US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics data.
- Column E **TABOR Limit** - Column C plus Column D

TABOR Growth Limit Impact on SAU's for FY 06

School Administrative Unit	A CY 2004 Student Population	B CY 2005 Student Population	C % Change Student Population	D % Change 2004-2005 CPI-U	E TABOR Growth Limit
ACTON	298.5	279.0	(6.53)	3.39	(3.14)
ALEXANDER	77.5	72.5	(6.45)	3.39	(3.06)
ALTON	53.5	57.5	7.48	3.39	10.87
APPLETON	134.0	138.5	3.36	3.39	6.75
ARUNDEL	414.5	415.5	0.24	3.39	3.63
AUBURN	3,544.0	3,468.0	(2.14)	3.39	1.25
AUGUSTA	2,582.5	2,500.0	(3.19)	3.39	0.20
BAILEYVILLE	434.5	429.5	(1.15)	3.39	2.24
BANGOR	4,016.5	3,997.5	(0.47)	3.39	2.92
BAR HARBOR	431.5	417.0	(3.36)	3.39	0.03
BATH	1,784.0	1,746.5	(2.10)	3.39	1.29
BEALS	59.5	57.0	(4.20)	3.39	(0.81)
BIDDEFORD	2,914.5	2,884.0	(1.05)	3.39	2.34
BLUE HILL	198.0	194.5	(1.77)	3.39	1.62
BRADLEY	105.5	109.0	3.32	3.39	6.71
BREWER	1,790.0	1,807.5	0.98	3.39	4.37
BRIDGEWATER	37.0	41.5	12.16	3.39	15.55
BRISTOL	255.5	245.5	(3.91)	3.39	(0.52)
BROOKLIN	62.0	62.0	0.00	3.39	3.39
BROOKSVILLE	76.5	72.0	(5.88)	3.39	(2.49)
BRUNSWICK	3,360.5	3,332.0	(0.85)	3.39	2.54
BUCKSPORT	1,125.5	1,123.0	(0.22)	3.39	3.17
CALAIS	675.0	621.5	(7.93)	3.39	(4.54)
CAPE ELIZABETH	1,816.5	1,833.5	0.94	3.39	4.33
CARIBOU	1,666.0	1,656.5	(0.57)	3.39	2.82
CASTINE	60.5	60.0	(0.83)	3.39	2.56
CASWELL	45.5	51.0	12.09	3.39	15.48
CHARLOTTE	44.5	43.0	(3.37)	3.39	0.02
CHELSEA	277.0	259.5	(6.32)	3.39	(2.93)
CHINA	544.5	555.0	1.93	3.39	5.32
CRANBERRY ISLES	8.0	12.5	56.25	3.39	59.64
DAYTON	235.5	205.5	(12.74)	3.39	(9.35)
DEDHAM	173.0	166.0	(4.05)	3.39	(0.66)
DRESDEN	112.0	105.5	(5.80)	3.39	(2.41)
DURHAM	386.0	370.0	(4.15)	3.39	(0.76)
EAST MACHIAS	150.5	136.5	(9.30)	3.39	(5.91)
EAST MILLINOCKET	417.0	402.5	(3.48)	3.39	(0.09)
EASTON	222.0	219.0	(1.35)	3.39	2.04
EASTPORT	304.5	262.5	(13.79)	3.39	(10.40)
EDGECOMB	84.5	81.5	(3.55)	3.39	(0.16)
ELLSWORTH	1,347.5	1,316.0	(2.34)	3.39	1.05
FALMOUTH	2,166.0	2,144.5	(0.99)	3.39	2.40
FAYETTE	74.0	72.5	(2.03)	3.39	1.36

TABOR Growth Limit Impact on SAU's for FY 06

School Administrative Unit	CY 2004 Student Population	CY 2005 Student Population	% Change Student Population	% Change 2004-2005 CPI-U	TABOR Growth Limit
FREEPORT	1,309.5	1,283.0	(2.02)	3.39	1.37
GEORGETOWN	90.0	92.5	2.78	3.39	6.17
GLENBURN	432.5	419.0	(3.12)	3.39	0.27
GORHAM	2,752.0	2,734.5	(0.64)	3.39	2.75
GREENBUSH	178.0	182.5	2.53	3.39	5.92
GREENVILLE	272.5	258.5	(5.14)	3.39	(1.75)
HANCOCK	231.0	225.5	(2.38)	3.39	1.01
HARMONY	88.5	84.5	(4.52)	3.39	(1.13)
HERMON	1,124.0	1,159.5	3.16	3.39	6.55
HOPE	155.5	148.5	(4.50)	3.39	(1.11)
ISLE AU HAUT	9.5	10.5	10.53	3.39	13.92
ISLESBORO	83.5	87.0	4.19	3.39	7.58
JAY	865.0	840.0	(2.89)	3.39	0.50
JEFFERSON	234.5	236.0	0.64	3.39	4.03
JONESBORO	64.0	62.0	(3.13)	3.39	0.27
JONESPORT	129.0	123.0	(4.65)	3.39	(1.26)
KITTERY	1,145.0	1,097.5	(4.15)	3.39	(0.76)
LAMOINE	141.5	140.5	(0.71)	3.39	2.68
LEWISTON	4,502.5	4,530.0	0.61	3.39	4.00
LIMESTONE	354.5	340.0	(4.09)	3.39	(0.70)
LINCOLNVILLE	205.5	211.5	2.92	3.39	6.31
LISBON	1,414.0	1,430.0	1.13	3.39	4.52
LITCHFIELD	420.5	411.5	(2.14)	3.39	1.25
FRENCHBORO	5.0	7.5	50.00	3.39	53.39
MACHIAS	405.0	429.5	6.05	3.39	9.44
MADAWASKA	754.0	721.0	(4.38)	3.39	(0.99)
MANCHESTER	196.0	188.0	(4.08)	3.39	(0.69)
MECHANIC FALLS	360.5	344.0	(4.58)	3.39	(1.19)
MEDWAY	193.5	185.0	(4.39)	3.39	(1.00)
MILFORD	330.5	297.0	(10.14)	3.39	(6.75)
MILLINOCKET	762.5	706.5	(7.34)	3.39	(3.95)
MINOT	289.5	292.0	0.86	3.39	4.25
MONHEGAN PLT.	5.0	6.0	20.00	3.39	23.39
MONMOUTH	769.0	775.5	0.85	3.39	4.24
MOUNT DESERT	161.0	160.0	(0.62)	3.39	2.77
MOUNT VERNON	116.5	113.0	(3.00)	3.39	0.39
NEW SWEDEN	69.5	79.0	13.67	3.39	17.06
NOBLEBORO	169.0	161.5	(4.44)	3.39	(1.05)
OLD ORCHARD BEACH	1,034.0	994.0	(3.87)	3.39	(0.48)
OLD TOWN	1,566.5	1,475.5	(5.81)	3.39	(2.42)
ORLAND	197.5	183.5	(7.09)	3.39	(3.70)
ORONO	810.5	796.5	(1.73)	3.39	1.66
ORRINGTON	406.0	393.0	(3.20)	3.39	0.19
OTIS	104.0	103.0	(0.96)	3.39	2.43

TABOR Growth Limit Impact on SAU's for FY 06

School Administrative Unit	CY 2004 Student Population	CY 2005 Student Population	% Change Student Population	% Change 2004-2005 CPI-U	TABOR Growth Limit
PALERMO	152.5	153.5	0.66	3.39	4.05
PEMBROKE	112.0	114.5	2.23	3.39	5.62
PENOBSCOT	74.5	68.5	(8.05)	3.39	(4.66)
PERRY	111.5	122.0	9.42	3.39	12.81
PHIPPSBURG	145.5	145.5	0.00	3.39	3.39
POLAND	1,163.5	1,147.5	(1.38)	3.39	2.01
PORTLAND	7,402.0	7,208.5	(2.61)	3.39	0.78
LONG ISLAND	12.5	10.5	(16.00)	3.39	(12.61)
PRINCETON	148.5	138.5	(6.73)	3.39	(3.34)
RANGELEY	216.0	211.0	(2.31)	3.39	1.08
RAYMOND	577.0	575.5	(0.26)	3.39	3.13
READFIELD	226.5	217.0	(4.19)	3.39	(0.80)
REED PLT.	24.5	17.5	(28.57)	3.39	(25.18)
RICHMOND	600.0	602.0	0.33	3.39	3.72
ROBBINSTON	60.5	63.0	4.13	3.39	7.52
SACO	1,931.0	1,927.5	(0.18)	3.39	3.21
SANFORD	3,669.5	3,657.0	(0.34)	3.39	3.05
SCARBOROUGH	3,258.5	3,304.5	1.41	3.39	4.80
SEDGWICK	115.5	105.0	(9.09)	3.39	(5.70)
SHIRLEY	9.0	9.0	0.00	3.39	3.39
SOMERVILLE	47.5	40.5	(14.74)	3.39	(11.35)
SOUTH BRISTOL	76.0	73.0	(3.95)	3.39	(0.56)
SOUTHPORT	35.0	35.0	0.00	3.39	3.39
SOUTH PORTLAND	3,055.0	3,010.0	(1.47)	3.39	1.92
SOUTHWEST HARBOR	223.0	209.5	(6.05)	3.39	(2.66)
STEUBEN	124.5	110.5	(11.24)	3.39	(7.85)
STOCKHOLM*	14.0	-	(100.00)	3.39	(96.61)
SURRY	133.5	121.0	(9.36)	3.39	(5.97)
TREMONT	158.0	156.5	(0.95)	3.39	2.44
TRENTON	149.5	137.0	(8.36)	3.39	(4.97)
VANCEBORO	30.5	30.0	(1.64)	3.39	1.75
VASSALBORO	526.0	504.0	(4.18)	3.39	(0.79)
VEAZIE	187.5	177.0	(5.60)	3.39	(2.21)
WALES	187.0	180.5	(3.48)	3.39	(0.09)
WATERVILLE	1,983.5	2,006.5	1.16	3.39	4.55
WAYNE	62.0	70.5	13.71	3.39	17.10
SABATTUS	506.0	528.0	4.35	3.39	7.74
WESLEY	15.0	14.5	(3.33)	3.39	0.06
WEST BATH	143.0	148.5	3.85	3.39	7.24
WESTBROOK	2,698.0	2,625.0	(2.71)	3.39	0.68
WHITEFIELD	255.5	221.0	(13.50)	3.39	(10.11)
WINDHAM	2,797.0	2,842.5	1.63	3.39	5.02
WINDSOR	293.0	310.5	5.97	3.39	9.36
WINSLOW	1,429.5	1,417.5	(0.84)	3.39	2.55

TABOR Growth Limit Impact on SAU's for FY 06

School Administrative Unit	CY 2004 Student Population	CY 2005 Student Population	% Change Student Population	% Change 2004-2005 CPI-U	TABOR Growth Limit
WINTHROP	942.5	930.5	(1.27)	3.39	2.12
WISCASSET	901.0	860.0	(4.55)	3.39	(1.16)
WOODLAND	142.0	144.5	1.76	3.39	5.15
WOOLWICH	339.0	309.0	(8.85)	3.39	(5.46)
YARMOUTH	1,428.5	1,414.5	(0.98)	3.39	2.41
YORK	2,132.5	2,096.0	(1.71)	3.39	1.68
SAD #1 PRESQUE ISLE	2,108.0	2,089.5	(0.88)	3.39	2.51
SAD #3 THORNDIKE	1,588.5	1,563.5	(1.57)	3.39	1.82
SAD #4 GUILFORD	855.0	827.0	(3.27)	3.39	0.12
SAD #5 ROCKLAND	1,453.5	1,399.5	(3.72)	3.39	(0.33)
SAD #6 BUXTON	3,994.5	4,008.0	0.34	3.39	3.73
SAD #7 NORTH HAVEN	61.5	64.0	4.07	3.39	7.46
SAD #8 VINALHAVEN	210.5	207.5	(1.43)	3.39	1.96
SAD #9 FARMINGTON	2,597.0	2,526.0	(2.73)	3.39	0.66
SAD #11 GARDINER	2,332.0	2,312.0	(0.86)	3.39	2.53
SAD #12 JACKMAN	190.0	191.5	0.79	3.39	4.18
SAD #13 BINGHAM	314.5	299.5	(4.77)	3.39	(1.38)
SAD #14 DANFORTH	183.5	181.5	(1.09)	3.39	2.30
SAD #15 GRAY	2,060.0	2,045.5	(0.70)	3.39	2.69
SAD #16 HALLOWELL	992.5	967.5	(2.52)	3.39	0.87
SAD #17 NORWAY	3,677.0	3,631.5	(1.24)	3.39	2.15
SAD #19 LUBEC	185.5	177.5	(4.31)	3.39	(0.92)
SAD #20 FORT FAIRFIELD	642.0	594.0	(7.48)	3.39	(4.09)
SAD #21 DIXFIELD	1,022.0	1,032.5	1.03	3.39	4.42
SAD #22 HAMPDEN	2,283.5	2,259.5	(1.05)	3.39	2.34
SAD #23 CARMEL	682.5	659.5	(3.37)	3.39	0.02
SAD #24 VAN BUREN	438.0	411.5	(6.05)	3.39	(2.66)
SAD #25 SHERMAN	440.5	439.0	(0.34)	3.39	3.05
SAD #26 EASTBROOK	87.0	82.0	(5.75)	3.39	(2.36)
SAD #27 FORT KENT	1,187.5	1,157.0	(2.57)	3.39	0.82
SAD #28 CAMDEN	885.0	866.0	(2.15)	3.39	1.24
SAD #29 HOULTON	1,317.0	1,308.0	(0.68)	3.39	2.71
SAD #30 LEE	217.0	219.5	1.15	3.39	4.54
SAD #31 HOWLAND	701.5	665.5	(5.13)	3.39	(1.74)
SAD #32 ASHLAND	364.5	348.5	(4.39)	3.39	(1.00)
SAD #33 ST. AGATHA	342.0	337.5	(1.32)	3.39	2.07
SAD #34 BELFAST	1,989.5	1,951.0	(1.94)	3.39	1.45
SAD #35 ELIOT	2,697.5	2,630.0	(2.50)	3.39	0.89
SAD #36 LIVERMORE FALLS	1,054.0	1,044.5	(0.90)	3.39	2.49
SAD #37 MILBRIDGE	819.0	803.5	(1.89)	3.39	1.50
SAD #38 DIXMONT	283.5	280.0	(1.23)	3.39	2.16
SAD #39 BUCKFIELD	626.0	632.5	1.04	3.39	4.43
SAD #40 WALDOBORO	2,037.5	2,025.0	(0.61)	3.39	2.78
SAD #41 MILO	873.0	833.0	(4.58)	3.39	(1.19)

TABOR Growth Limit Impact on SAU's for FY 06

School Administrative Unit	CY 2004 Student Population	CY 2005 Student Population	% Change Student Population	% Change 2004-2005 CPI-U	TABOR Growth Limit
SAD #42 MARS HILL	465.5	449.0	(3.54)	3.39	(0.15)
SAD #43 MEXICO	1,604.0	1,595.5	(0.53)	3.39	2.86
SAD #44 BETHEL	1,059.0	1,008.0	(4.82)	3.39	(1.43)
SAD #45 WASHBURN	415.5	407.5	(1.93)	3.39	1.46
SAD #46 DEXTER	1,063.0	1,049.5	(1.27)	3.39	2.12
SAD #47 OAKLAND	2,644.5	2,598.5	(1.74)	3.39	1.65
SAD #48 NEWPORT	2,175.0	2,164.5	(0.48)	3.39	2.91
SAD #49 FAIRFIELD	2,663.0	2,645.5	(0.66)	3.39	2.73
SAD #50 THOMASTON	982.5	974.5	(0.81)	3.39	2.58
SAD #51 CUMBERLAND	2,338.0	2,318.5	(0.83)	3.39	2.56
SAD #52 TURNER	2,200.0	2,160.0	(1.82)	3.39	1.57
SAD #53 PITTSFIELD	806.5	785.5	(2.60)	3.39	0.79
SAD #54 SKOWHEGAN	2,872.0	2,849.5	(0.78)	3.39	2.61
SAD #55 PORTER	1,295.5	1,274.5	(1.62)	3.39	1.77
SAD #56 SEARSPORT	830.0	828.0	(0.24)	3.39	3.15
SAD #57 WATERBORO	3,693.5	3,626.5	(1.81)	3.39	1.58
SAD #58 KINGFIELD	962.5	959.0	(0.36)	3.39	3.03
SAD #59 MADISON	1,029.5	1,031.0	0.15	3.39	3.54
SAD #60 BERWICK	3,273.5	3,179.5	(2.87)	3.39	0.52
SAD #61 BRIDGTON	2,191.0	2,078.0	(5.16)	3.39	(1.77)
SAD #62 POWNAL	143.0	140.0	(2.10)	3.39	1.29
SAD #63 EDDINGTON	623.5	630.0	1.04	3.39	4.43
SAD #64 CORINTH	1,298.5	1,317.5	1.46	3.39	4.85
SAD #65 MATINICUS ISLE	4.5	5.5	22.22	3.39	25.61
SAD #67 LINCOLN	1,299.5	1,297.5	(0.15)	3.39	3.24
SAD #68 DOVER-FOXCROFT	746.0	767.0	2.82	3.39	6.21
SAD #70 HODGDON	632.0	617.5	(2.29)	3.39	1.10
SAD #71 KENNEBUNK	2,444.5	2,432.0	(0.51)	3.39	2.88
SAD #72 FRYEBURG	935.5	926.5	(0.96)	3.39	2.43
SAD #74 ANSON	900.0	858.5	(4.61)	3.39	(1.22)
SAD #75 TOPSHAM	3,266.0	3,114.5	(4.64)	3.39	(1.25)
SAD #76 SWAN'S ISLAND	30.5	33.0	8.20	3.39	11.59
SAD #77 EAST MACHIAS	192.0	200.5	4.43	3.39	7.82
INDIAN ISLAND	111.0	109.5	(1.35)	3.39	2.04
INDIAN TOWNSHIP	138.0	137.5	(0.36)	3.39	3.03
PLEASANT POINT	136.5	131.0	(4.03)	3.39	(0.64)
BOOTHBAY-BOOTHBAY HBR CSD	775.5	743.5	(4.13)	3.39	(0.74)
FLANDERS BAY CSD-SULLIVAN	325.0	321.0	(1.23)	3.39	2.16
MT. DESERT REGION DISTRICT	691.5	674.0	(2.53)	3.39	0.86
AIRLINE CSD-AURORA	47.0	45.5	(3.19)	3.39	0.20
SO. AROOSTOOK CSD-DYER BROOK	414.5	407.0	(1.81)	3.39	1.58
MARANACOOK CSD-READFIELD	891.0	886.0	(0.56)	3.39	2.83
SCHOODIC CSD-SULLIVAN	283.0	277.0	(2.12)	3.39	1.27
EAST RANGE II CSD-TOPSFIELD	44.5	40.0	(10.11)	3.39	(6.72)

TABOR Growth Limit Impact on SAU's for FY 06

School Administrative Unit	CY 2004 Student Population	CY 2005 Student Population	% Change Student Population	% Change 2004-2005 CPI-U	TABOR Growth Limit
DEER ISLE-STONINGTON CSD	457.5	434.5	(5.03)	3.39	(1.64)
GREAT SALT BAY CSD-DAMARISCOTTA	423.0	430.5	1.77	3.39	5.16
OAK HILL CSD-WALES	566.5	563.5	(0.53)	3.39	2.86
MOOSABEC CSD-JONESPORT	90.5	83.5	(7.73)	3.39	(4.34)
WELLS-OGUNQUIT CSD	1,526.0	1,485.0	(2.69)	3.39	0.70
FIVE TOWN CSD	726.5	719.5	(0.96)	3.39	2.43
PENINSULA CSD	186.0	179.0	(3.76)	3.39	(0.37)
Average	881	868	(1.72)	3.39	1.67

* In July 2004 Stockholm closed its K-8 school and started tuitioning students to New Sweden.

Source: Maine Department of Education - Student Enrollment Figures.

TABOR
School Impact Data Fact Sheet
Revised FY 2006 Analysis

The proposed Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR) has an impact on schools. Below is some basic information on TABOR and schools expenditures.

Expenditure Limit Formula

TABOR would put in place an expenditure limitation for schools. The limit reads as follows:

“2. Local expenditure limitation. Beginning with the first fiscal year that begins after the effective date of this section, the maximum annual percentage change in fiscal year spending for a local district that is a school administrative unit equals the inflation adjustment factor plus the change in its student enrollment and any increases attributable to measures approved under section 2043.”

Generally, this limit applies to all school spending although there are a few exceptions from this limitation. Relevant for schools would be the exceptions for federal money and grants and gifts. (See section 2044(3)(B) and (F).)

Note that the TABOR limit clearly applies to school administrative units – which includes municipal school departments such as the schools of Portland or Bangor.

Calculation of Limit

The limit formula has two components – inflation and school enrollment. The inflation adjustment factor is defined in the initiative (see section 2042(3)) and is the same for all communities.

The “change in student enrollment” term is not defined, nor is responsibility assigned to anyone for determining this factor.

For guidance, one can look to the definition of the “change in population” factor used in the municipal spending limit (section 2042(5)). The State Planning Office is charged with calculating the calendar year change in municipal population.

A safe assumption is that the state Department of Education, which currently tracks enrollment figures for each school administrative unit statewide, would be given this duty. It is possible, but very unlikely, that each school administrative unit would be charged with the responsibility of determining their own enrollment numbers.

MMA Analysis

MMA has done a “What If” analysis for School Years 2005 (7/04-6/05) and 2006 (7/05-6/06). The Department of Education has suggested that MMA use a different set of enrollment data than the data MMA originally used. The DOE collects enrollment data in April and again in October of the same calendar year. The data MMA originally

used was the only data available on the DOE website. It dates from October 2003, October 2004 and April 2006. Thus the original FY 2005 analysis compares October 2003 and 2004 enrollment while the original FY 2006 analysis compares October 2004 with April 2006 enrollment.

For purposes of state aid to education, the DOE does not use the data posted on its website. Instead, it “blends” the April and the October enrollment figures from a calendar year to generate a single enrollment data point for each unit for each calendar year.

DOE has indicated that if the Department were tasked with providing “change in enrollment data” for TABOR purposes it would most likely use this blended data.

Again, the initiative provides no guidance on who would make the enrollment calculations or on what basis (October, April or blend). But, our assumption is that DOE would do this work and since DOE is suggesting an alternative data set, we are providing a new analysis. Please note, the original data is “good” data and the original calculations were accurate. DOE has simply pointed out that for TABOR purposes there is better data than what is available on their website.

Based upon the “blended” enrollment data provided by DOE, MMA’s 2006 analysis changes in two ways. The number of school units facing a cut has decreased slightly. At the same time, the average school budget allowance has also decreased. Furthermore, the range of individual school budget allowances swings further to the negative.

	Number of Units Facing Cuts	Average Limit	Range of Limits
Original FY 2006	38% (84)	2.2%	+132% to -35%
Revised FY 2006	31% (70)	1.7%*	+60% to -97%*

As you can see the number of units negatively impacted decreases slightly, but for those units that face a negative impact, the magnitude of that impact jumps.

*Please note that one school unit (Stockholm) had a 97% reduction in its enrollment because it no longer operates a K-8 school; instead it has begun to tuition its children to another unit (New Sweden). If Stockholm were excluded from the analysis the average limit in the revised FY 2006 analysis would climb back to 2.1% and the lowest reduction imposed would be negative 25%. MMA has not previously made any adjustments to the DOE data and is not now either.

The Stockhom phenomenon raises another complicating factor for which the TABOR language provides no guidance. The “blended” data that is being used for this purpose is based upon a census of students according to where the students attend school (“attending data”). The DOE also maintains data based upon where the students reside (“residing data”). There is no direction in TABOR as to whether attending or residing

enrollment data should be used in the expenditure limitation calculation. Since the utilization of “residing data” would impose a school budget restriction on school administrative units that do not even operate schools (i.e., all the students are tuitioned to other school facilities), MMA is using the “attending” census data for this analysis. However, there is no guarantee that this is the data that would ultimately be used if TABOR were to pass.

As a matter of policy, the problems with TABOR remain.

1. TABOR imposes budget cuts, it does not simply limit increases;
2. Almost a third of school systems would have had cuts this year;
3. The formula is severely restrictive in that the average limit is one-half the rate of inflation.

MMA appreciates the Department of Education’s input on this analysis and we hope this helps the public better understand both MMA’s analysis, the DOE’s perspective and the TABOR proposal.