

University of Denver

**Digital Commons @ DU**

---

All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)

Colorado Legislative Council Research  
Publications

---

12-1971

## 0180 State and Local Finance

Colorado Legislative Council

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\\_all](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all)

---

### Recommended Citation

Colorado Legislative Council, "0180 State and Local Finance" (1971). *All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)*. 188.

[https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\\_all/188](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all/188)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Colorado Legislative Council Research Publications at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

---

## 0180 State and Local Finance

S2  
Colo.6  
no.180

**Report to the Colorado General Assembly:**

**STATE AND LOCAL FINANCE**



**COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO.180**

**December, 1971**

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL  
OF THE  
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Representatives

C. P. (Doc) Lamb  
Chairman  
Ralph Cole  
Phillip Massari  
Harold McCormick  
Hiram McNeil  
Clarence Quinlan  
John Fuhr, Speaker  
of the House

Senators

Fay DeBerard, Vice  
Chairman  
Fred Anderson  
Joe Calabrese  
George Jackson  
Vincent Massari  
Ruth Stockton  
William Armstrong,  
Senator Majority  
Leader

\* \* \* \* \*

The Legislative Council, which is composed of six Senators, six Representatives, plus the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. Reports and memoranda both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

COMMITTEE  
ON  
STATE AND LOCAL  
FINANCE

Legislative Council  
Report To The  
Colorado General Assembly

Research Publication No. 180  
December, 1971

# COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## OFFICERS

REP. C. P. (DOC) LAMB  
*Chairman*

SEN. FAY DeBERARD  
*Vice Chairman*

## STAFF

LYLE C. KYLE  
*Director*

DAVID F. MORRISSEY  
*Assistant Director*

STANLEY ELOFSON  
*Principal Analyst*

JANET WILSON  
*Principal Analyst*

DAVID HITE  
*Senior Analyst*

RICHARD LEVENGOD  
*Senior Analyst*

MITCHEL BEVILLE  
*Research Associate*

KAY MILLER  
*Research Associate*

WALLACE PULLIAM  
*Research Associate*



## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 46 STATE CAPITOL  
DENVER, COLORADO 80203  
892-2285  
AREA CODE 303

December 1, 1971

## MEMBERS

SEN. FRED E. ANDERSON

SEN. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

SEN. JOSEPH V. CALABRESE

SEN. GEORGE F. JACKSON

SEN. VINCENT MASSARI

SEN RUTH S. STOCKTON

REP. RALPH A. COLE

REP. JOHN D. FUHR

REP. HAROLD L. McCORMICK

REP. HIRAM A. McNEIL

REP. PHILLIP MASSARI

REP. CLARENCE QUINLAN

To Members of the Forty-eighth Colorado General Assembly:

In accordance with the provisions of House Joint Resolution No. 1033, passed by the First Regular Session of the Forty-eighth General Assembly, the Legislative Council submits for your consideration the accompanying report pertaining to state and local finance.

The Committee appointed by the Legislative Council reported its findings and recommendations to the Legislative Council on November 29, 1971, and the Council accepted the report for transmission to the Governor and members of the General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb  
Chairman

CPL/mp

# COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## OFFICERS

REP. C. P. (DOC) LAMB  
*Chairman*

SEN. FAY DeBERARD  
*Vice Chairman*

## STAFF

LYLE C. KYLE  
*Director*

DAVID F. MORRISSEY  
*Assistant Director*

STANLEY ELOFSON  
*Principal Analyst*

JANET WILSON  
*Principal Analyst*

DAVID HITE  
*Senior Analyst*

RICHARD LEVENGOD  
*Senior Analyst*

MITCHEL BEVILLE  
*Research Associate*

KAY MILLER  
*Research Associate*

WALLACE PULLIAM  
*Research Associate*



## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 46 STATE CAPITOL  
DENVER, COLORADO 80203  
892-2285  
AREA CODE 303

November 26, 1971

## MEMBERS

SEN. FRED E. ANDERSON  
SEN. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG  
SEN. JOSEPH V. CALABRESE  
SEN. GEORGE F. JACKSON  
SEN. VINCENT MASSARI  
SEN RUTH S. STOCKTON  
REP. RALPH A. COLE  
REP. JOHN D. FUHR  
REP. HAROLD L. McCORMICK  
REP. HIRAM A. McNEIL  
REP. PHILLIP MASSARI  
REP. CLARENCE QUINLAN


Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb  
Chairman  
Room 46, State Capitol  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Representative Lamb:

This report is the first from this Committee appointed for a two year period. The recommendations are substantial and reflect much testimony which is not included in detail.

The Committee has been kept up to date by the Legislative Council, the Joint Budget Committee and the Revenue Department on the recommendations of other interim committees and the cost of these recommendations. This information together with revenue estimates and expenditures has enabled the Committee to weigh testimony and make decisions with good knowledge of the financial condition of the state. As a result, although many subjects were discussed, the Committee felt that no action should be taken in the area of tax shifts and revision of assessments procedures until further study has been completed.

Respectfully submitted,

  
/s/ Senator Les Fowler  
Chairman  
Committee on State and  
Local Finance

LF/mp

## FOREWORD

As prescribed by House Joint Resolution No. 1033, 1971 Session, the Legislative Council appointed the following Committee to conduct a study of state and local finance:

Sen. Les Fowler, Chairman	Rep. Harold Evetts
Rep. George Fentress, Vice Chairman	Rep. Carl Gustafson
Sen. Allen Dines	Rep. Don Horst
Sen. William Garnsey	Rep. Harold Koster
Sen. Kenneth Kinnie	Rep. Austin Moore
Sen. Harry Locke	Rep. Kay Munson
Sen. Kingston Minister	Rep. Jerry Rose
Sen. Dan Noble	Rep. Eric Schmidt
Sen. Al Ruland	Rep. Phil Stonebraker
Sen. Joe Shoemaker	
Sen. Ted Strickland	
Sen. Anthony Vollack	

During this first year of the Committee's work, a variety of subjects received attention although two topics consumed most of the agenda: financing public schools and state and local tax burdens.

In addition to studies conducted by Legislative Council staff members, the Committee was supplied valuable information for purposes of making final decisions from the Council on Educational Development (COED), and Mr. William Korbitz, manager, Metro Denver Sewage District. In addition, the Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the following individuals for making presentations during the 1971 interim: Representative Bob Schafer; Ken Bueche, Colorado Municipal League; Tom Kristopeit, Denver Regional Council of Governments; Byron Johnson, University of Colorado; William Korbitz; John Quigley and Clark Buckler, Colorado Public Expenditures Council; Beverly Bledsoe and Dave Rice, Colorado Cattlemen's Association; members of COED and in particular Dr. Frank Miles, President; John Heckers, Department of Revenue; Representative Sack; Ray Carper, Tax Commission; Ray Obrecht, State Grange; and J. D. Arehart, Division of Local Government.

David Hite, Senior Analyst was responsible for the preparation of the Committee's final report; he was assisted during the interim by Larry Thompson, Research Assistant.

November, 1971

Lyle C. Kyle  
Director



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL.....	iii
FOREWORD.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	1
The Public School Foundation Act.....	1
Correcting the Pyramiding Effect.....	1
Establishing a Definition of Categorical Programs.....	2
Responsibility for Administration.....	2
Declining Enrollments.....	3
Use of ADA or ADAE.....	5
Secretary's Annual Report.....	5
Distribution of Specific Ownership Taxes on Mobile Homes.....	6
Equalization Level of Support.....	7
Funds for the Construction of Sewage Treat- ment Facilities.....	13
Impact of H.B. 1306 on Individuals and Corporations.....	17
Estimated Tax Burden on Selected Cate- gories of Denver Residents.....	17
Impact Upon Owners, Tenants, Lessors, and Lessees.....	22
Items for Further Study.....	31

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX.....	33
Table I -- School District Comparative Financial Data, 1971.....	35
Table II -- School District Comparative Financial Data, 1872.....	45
Table III -- School District Comparative Finance Data Based on a \$521 per ADAE Support Level.....	55
Table IV -- Comparison of \$460 Foundation Level of Support for 1971 and 1971 with a \$521 Foundation Level of Support for 1973.....	65

## COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This 1971 interim report to the General Assembly from the Committee on State and Local Finance is divided into four segments. The first part deals with proposed changes to the Public School Foundation Act of 1969. The second segment examines the need for state funds for the construction of sewage treatment facilities. An examination of the potential impact on individuals and corporations of H.R. 1306 as introduced in the 1971 Session is found in the third section of the report. The final segment enumerates items the Committee suggests need legislative study during the 1972 interim.

### THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION ACT

#### Correcting the Pyramiding Effect

A source of major concern over the effectiveness of the Foundation Act centers on whether the six percent limit on current expense per pupil is being adhered to by local districts. Under the current statute, categorical programs, transportation costs, programs for the disadvantaged, debt service, capital outlay, and contingencies are excluded from the six percent limitation. The amount budgeted for the categorical programs is added in arriving at the authorized budget; however, only the categorical receipts are subtracted when the district later computes the current expense base for the school budget year. In short, the budgeted current expense per ADAE for a given fiscal year is established at the time of budget adoption and reestablished when developing a budget for the ensuing year. This causes a "pyramiding effect" in the budget authority of a district.

The Committee recommends a change in the statute so that the amount budgeted for categorical programs would be added in the budget building procedure but that the same amount would be subtracted when computing the base to be limited for the following year. This can be accomplished by amending section 123-38-2 (9) as follows:

(9) "Current expense" means the sum of all BUDGETED expenditures of the general fund of a school district, minus the aggregate of AMOUNTS BUDGETED FOR: Categorical support funds received by the district, excepting funds received from the state for transportation purposes, the total cost of PROGRAMS, INCLUDING AMOUNTS BUDGETED FOR THE transporting of pupils to and from

school; expenditures for capital outlay and debt service; the contingency reserve; and the estimated expenditures for specifically identified programs for the culturally and educationally disadvantaged.

As part of this change in the definition of current expense, Section 123-38-18 (1969 Supp.) should be repealed. The section now reads as follows:

Amounts necessary to meet the estimated expenditures of any school district for specifically identified programs for culturally and educationally disadvantaged pupils shall not be subject to the limitation on the general fund budget of a school district pursuant to the provisions of section 123-38-19.

#### Establishing A Definition of Categorical Programs

The Committee proposes that criteria be established for identifying the programs of a district which would be classified as categorical support. The State Board of Education should be vested with the responsibility of identification. These programs should be generally defined as (a) those which are dependent upon the receipt of support funds from the state or federal government; or (b) those which are substantially supported with categorical support funds. In order to implement this recommendation, the Committee proposes that a new subsection (11) be added to 123-38-2 as follows:

(11) "Categorical programs" means those programs of a school district which are so designated by the State Board. The Board shall so designate (a) those specifically identified programs of a school district for which categorical support funds are provided the district by the state or federal government; and (b) other specifically identified programs which are substantially financed with categorical support funds.

#### Responsibility for Administration

The language of the present statute establishes that the State Board of Education shall have authority to adopt such guidelines as may be necessary for the administration of the Act. Some question exists, however, as to the authority and responsibility of the Department of Education in the administration of the statute.



The Committee therefore recommends that the control and responsibility for administration of the Public School Foundation Act be clearly vested with the State Board of Education. The following language is recommended.

123-38-16. Rules and regulations. (1) The state board ~~is authorized to~~ SHALL make reasonable rules and regulations necessary for the administration AND ENFORCEMENT of this article.

### Declining Enrollments

Some districts which have experienced sudden and unexpected decreases in school enrollment have confronted serious difficulties in attempting to finance continuing programs with budgets which fall within the limitations of the law. It is recognized that certain financial commitments for the ensuing year, including the employment of teachers, are made long before a district's budget limit is established. It is also recognized that projecting a loss in numbers of pupils, which may come about during the summer months, is most difficult.

The Committee therefore recommends that the law be changed to grant districts experiencing a decline in enrollment the authority to use the average daily attendance entitlement of the current year as the base for determining the budgetary entitlement of the district for the ensuing fiscal year. The effect of this change would give a district one year to adjust its budget to a reduced number of pupils.

The proposed statutory language is detailed below. That portion of the suggested language relating to categorical programs conforms with the Committee recommendation regarding categorical programs enumerated earlier in this section.

123-38-19. Limitation on general fund budget. (1) The authority of a board of education to increase the general fund budget of any school district, which has budgeted for the current year a current expense

per pupil in average daily attendance entitlement in excess of six hundred twenty dollars, shall be limited to the sum of: One hundred six percent of the current expense per pupil in average daily attendance entitlement budgeted for the current year multiplied by the estimated number of pupils in average daily attendance ENTITLEMENT for the ensuing budget year OR THE CURRENT BUDGET YEAR, WHICHEVER IS GREATER; plus the ~~estimated-expenditures-for~~ AGGREGATE OF AMOUNTS TO BE BUDGETED FOR: Categorical purposes PROGRAMS, INCLUDING AMOUNTS TO BE BUDGETED FOR THE ~~plus-the-estimated-expenditures-for~~ transporting OF pupils to and from schools SCHOOL; ~~plus-the-estimated-expenditures-for~~ capital outlay and debt service; ~~plus-the~~ contingency reserve; AND SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED PROGRAMS FOR THE CULTURALLY AND EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED.

(2) The limitation imposed in subsection (1) of this section shall not apply to the board of education of a school district which has budgeted for the current year a current expense per pupil in average daily attendance entitlement of six hundred twenty dollars or less, until its budgeted current expense per estimated pupil in average daily attendance for the ensuing budget year exceeds six hundred twenty dollars, in which case the general fund budget of such district for such ensuing budget year shall be limited to the sum of: One hundred six percent of six hundred twenty dollars, multiplied by the estimated number of pupils in average daily attendance ENTITLEMENT for the ensuing budget year, OR THE CURRENT BUDGET YEAR, WHICHEVER IS GREATER; plus the ~~estimated-expenditures~~ AGGREGATE OF AMOUNTS TO BE BUDGETED for: Categorical purposes PROGRAMS, INCLUDING AMOUNTS TO BE BUDGETED FOR THE ~~plus-the-estimated-expenditures-for~~ transporting OF pupils to and from schools SCHOOL; ~~plus-the-estimated-expenditures-for~~ capital outlay and debt service; ~~plus-the~~ contingency reserve; AND SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED PROGRAMS FOR THE CULTURALLY AND EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED.



### Use of ADA or ADAE

It has been brought to the Committee's attention that minor changes are desirable to clarify priorities relating to the use of certain data for determining a district's budget limitation. Such a change would not conflict with the basic intent of the provisions in question and would not constitute a change in policy. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the section of the statute which pertains to limiting expenditures be changed so that the language clearly provides for the option of basing the limitation on either the average daily attendance entitlement or the average daily attendance for the entire year. This option is now being provided pursuant to state board rules interpreting present language. The proposed statutory language is detailed below.

123-38-3. Aggregate days of attendance - average daily attendance - average daily membership. (2) (a) Average daily attendance shall be computed by dividing aggregate days of attendance by the actual number of days of school taught during the four-week period ending the fourth Friday of October, or other four-week period as defined in subsection (1) of this section, in the current school year. The average daily attendance for groups of schools having varying lengths of school terms during the four-week period ending the fourth Friday of October is the sum of the average daily attendances obtained for individual schools.

(b) FOR PURPOSES OF 123-38-23, AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE FOR THE ENTIRE BUDGET YEAR SHALL BE BASED ON THE AGGREGATE DAYS OF ATTENDANCE AND THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF DAYS OF SCHOOL TAUGHT FOR THE PERIOD OF JANUARY 1 THROUGH DECEMBER 31.

### Secretary's Annual Report

The Secretary's annual report which supplies information to the Department of Education relative to all financial matters, enrollment, etc., is submitted after June 30 of each year and is based on a July 1 to June 30 reporting period. However, the "fiscal year" of all districts is the calendar year; there is no reporting of actual calendar year

accounting. The only calendar year data which can be compiled is taken from budget estimates and from a review of the audit reports which are usually received by the state some months after the end of the budget year. Federal programs require accurate reporting for the July 1 to June 30 period. State interests indicate the need for accurate reporting of school district financial accounting for the calendar year.

The Committee is therefore recommending that a semi-annual Secretary's report be submitted by each school district to the Department of Education. This would provide the information needed for developing data for both twelve month periods.

The proposed statutory language reads as follows:

123-38-4, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963 (1969 Supp.), is amended BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW SUBSECTION to read:

123-38-4. Reports to state board.  
(4) On or before February 15 and August 15 of each year, the secretary of the board of education of each school district shall file with the state board a semiannual report of the receipts and expenditures of each fund of the district during the six months ending on the December 31 or June 30 next preceding. Information concerning the general fund of the district shall be consistent with the provisions of this article. The report shall contain such additional information as may be specified by the state board.

#### Distribution of Specific Ownership Taxes on Mobile Homes

Under the present provisions of the Foundation Act, all of a school's share of mobile home tax collections are counted as a part of the Foundation program. For residential property, however, the school receives revenue through the Foundation levy which applies to the Foundation program, and excess costs are funded by an additional general fund levy. If a district's total school levy is 51 mills, then one-third of the revenue collected on residential property, etc., is applied to the Foundation program and the balance is applied to cost in excess of the Foundation Level of Support.



Many districts are experiencing a growth in the number of mobile homes within the district and, accordingly, an increase in numbers of children who reside in such homes. The effect of the current operation of law is such that each dollar received from mobile home tax collections offsets a dollar which the district would otherwise receive from the state.

The Committee therefore recommends that mobile home school tax collections be similarly allocated. For the sake of simplicity and economy in administration, it is recommended that the Foundation Act be amended to provide that one-third of all specific ownership taxes collected on mobile homes and distributed to schools be allocated to the district's share of the foundation support program.

Statutory language needed to implement the Committee's recommendation reads as follows:

123-39-9. State equalization program.  
(2) (b) (iii) The total of amounts received for deposit in the general fund of the district, during the next preceding fiscal year of the state, from federal mineral leases, federal forest lands, federal lands materials, federal lands marginal, federal flood control, ONE-THIRD OF THE specific ownership taxes ON MOBILE HOMES AND TRAILER COACHES, ALL SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES ON ALL OTHER VEHICLES, MACHINERY, AND EQUIPMENT, and, if and when such is permitted by federal law without penalty, seventy-five percent of the revenues received by the district through provisions of Title 1 of Public Law 81-874.

### Equalization Level of Support

As formulated in the 1969 Foundation Act and reiterated in interim committee reports since the adoption of the Act, the fundamental objectives of the financing segment of the Act are (a) that adequate financial resources should be available to the state's public schools to provide the educational programs needed; and (b) that a continuing effort be made to shift the burden of financing public schools away from the property tax to the end that the rate of property taxation might be stabilized or reduced throughout the state.

In support of that general philosophy, the Committee recommends that the foundation level of support for 1973 be increased to approximately \$520 recognizing that such a level will increase the general appropriation some \$15 million for the state's share toward financing public schools in fiscal year 1973.

The foundation level of support for 1970 was \$440 per average daily attendance entitlement (ADAE). At the time the Foundation Act was adopted, the foundation level of \$460 per ADAE was established for 1971. The General Assembly decided there should be no change in this support level for 1972 and thus it will remain at \$460 per ADAE for next calendar year. The Committee addressed itself to the support level for 1973 with the knowledge that the Colorado State Board of Education had endorsed a level of support at \$518 and the Council on Educational Development (COED) had supported a level at \$521.

The supportive data for a foundation level of support at \$521 was presented to the Committee as follows.

For 1971, the calculated average mill levy rate applied to the assessed valuation of the state to provide the property tax money to be collected for schools is 49.45 mills. Included is an average 16.1 mills for the foundation levy. It is anticipated that the average mill levy rate will increase by four mills in 1972 and that the average applied to the foundation program will be 16 mills.

It is estimated that the ADAE applicable to the 1973 school district budget year will be 542,500. This assumes a growth rate slightly in excess of 2-1/2 percent, plus some additional pupils in the public schools which may come about as some non-public schools cease to operate. If there is a significant closing of non-public schools the estimated number should be adjusted accordingly.

The assessed valuation of the state for 1971 is \$5,453,954,660 as taken from the county abstracts. The estimated assessed valuation for 1972 based on a 5 percent growth in valuation is \$5,726,652,435.

Specific Ownership taxes and other local revenues applied to the Foundation Act are estimated for 1972 at \$17,765,224 and for 1973 at \$20,770,000.

The school district General Fund Budgeted Expenditures for the calendar year 1971 are \$472,613,715. For 1972 the estimate is \$532,703,000.

This estimate is based on an assumption that there will be a 6 percent increase in budgeted current expenses per



pupil, that the slippage legally allowed through procedures of calculating limits will be budgeted, and that the per pupil budgeted expenditures for purposes not restricted by law will increase by some 16 percent. Implementing changes in the laws adopted during the 1971 session will be a factor, particularly as they related to the requirement that special education programs be made available to all who qualify. Program increases are anticipated for special education, vocational education, capital outlay, and for the disadvantaged.

The estimated General Fund Budgeted Expenditures for 1973 are \$586,442,500. This estimate is based on the assumption that the legislature will adopt the changes in the Foundation Act embodied in the other provisions of this Committee report. The estimate assumes a 6 percent increase in budgeted current expense per pupil and a 14 percent increase in per pupil costs not covered by the limitation section of the law.

Regarding other state, and federal funds, the money provided by the State for such purposes as special education, transportation, migrant education, NDEA, school lunch programs, and the like, amounts to about 3.58 percent of the budgeted per pupil cost. The money provided by the federal government amounts to about 4.67 percent of the budgeted per pupil cost. In computing what the foundation level requirement would be, it is assumed that these sources will continue to supply the same percentage of the total.

With the above estimates, the following computations were made:

Estimated 1973 Budgeted Expenditure.....	\$586,442,500
Estimated 1972 Budgeted Expenditure.....	<u>\$532,703,000</u>
Estimated Increase -- 1973 over 1972....	\$ 53,739,500

In determining what the foundation level for 1973 will need to be in order to stabilize property tax rates at the 1972 level, it is first necessary to determine what increases in revenue will be available to schools, exclusive of the foundation program. The estimates of these amounts are as follows:

Apply 1972 school district property tax rates, exclusive of foundation levy, to anticipated growth in assessed valuation. (37.45 mills x \$272,697,775).....	\$ 10,212,532
--	---------------

Increase in state support for programs  
in addition to the foundation act --  
maintaining 3.58% level..... \$ 1,923,874

Federal support increase -- maintain  
4.67% funding level..... 2,599,634

Total..... \$ 14,646,040

Assuming that 1973 Budgeted Expenditures will exceed 1972 bud-  
geted expenditures by \$53,739,500, and that increases from  
sources exclusive of the foundation program will amount to  
\$14,646,040, the increase needed for the calendar year through  
the foundation program is:

\$53,739,500  
less 14,646,040  
\$39,093,460

In summary, the 1973 Foundation level requirements  
were estimated as follows:

1972 Program Value -- \$460 x 529,000  
ADAE..... \$249,340,000  
Required Program Value Increase..... 29,093,460

Total..... \$282,433,460

1973 Program Value at \$521 per ADAE  
would be (\$521 x 542,500 ADAE)..... \$282,642,500

Such a level of funding would be met from the following major  
sources:

Foundation levy (16 mills effective  
rate)..... \$ 91,626,438  
Other Local share (specific owner-  
ship, etc.)..... 20,770,000  
State School Lands, Mineral leases..... 7,500,000  
State Funding share..... 162,746,062

Total Program Value..... \$282,642,500

The required state appropriation for fiscal year 1973  
would be:

1/2 1972 @ \$460 = \$ 68,883,048  
1/2 1973 @ \$521 = 85,123,076  
Total..... \$154,006,124  
Less State  
Land, etc..... -7,500,000  
\$146,506,124



The cost of the total program for calendar year 1973 at the \$521 support level would be:

329,000 ADAE (1972) @ \$521.....	\$275,609,000
13,500 ADAE (New) @ \$521.....	<u>7,033,500</u>
Total Value.....	\$282,642,500
Less District share.....	<u>112,396,348</u>
Total State share.....	\$170,246,152

Thus the additional appropriation sought from the state for fiscal year 1973 to support a Foundation Level at \$521 per ADAE is \$15,451,777.

Needed 1972-73 Appropriation	
@ \$521.....	\$146,506,124
1971-72 Appropriation @ \$460..	<u>131,054,347</u>
Difference.....	\$ 15,451,777

\* \* \* \* \*

To assist the General Assembly in making a final determination regarding the level of support for 1973 and to facilitate a greater understanding of the effect of the \$460 level of support for 1971 and 1972, Tables I, II, III, and IV are submitted, beginning on page 33 of this Report. Each table shows calculations for all 181 districts within the state. Table I details the effect of the present level of support -- \$460 -- for calendar 1971. Table II shows the established level of support -- again \$460 -- for calendar 1972. Table III indicates what a \$521 level of support would bring for each district. Finally, Table IV is a summary of the the first three tables in terms of state support.

## FUNDS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES

The Committee recommends initiating a policy of state aid for construction of sewage treatment facilities and interceptor sewers at a funding level to qualify for maximum federal moneys but also based on sound planning and construction schedules; and that the Governor place this proposal on his Call for the 1972 Session with the provision that if statutory change is needed, such a change be implemented, and that a sum of four million dollars be appropriated to implement the Committee's proposal with the understanding that the General Assembly will leave to the Executive the specific allocation of moneys received for distribution to localities throughout the state.

This recommendation results from an assessment of the overall needs of Colorado's towns and cities for new sewage treatment facilities and an understanding of the federal grant moneys available if the state provides a percentage of the funding.

Without a precise estimate of state needs for sewage construction costs, a reasonable figure for the next ten years may approximate \$120 million or more. Assuming proper coordination of construction projects throughout the state to take advantage of federal and state funds, some \$12 million per year would be required. If no state aid was made available, federal funds would constitute 33 percent of the cost and Colorado communities would pay 67 percent of the total cost. If the state contributes 25 percent of each year's needs or \$3 million, a \$6.6 million contribution -- 55 percent of the total -- would come from the federal government, leaving local communities to pick up 20 percent of the expense or approximately \$2.4 million.

Although an accurate figure of federal funds for construction in Colorado is not available, at least \$8.3 million is available for fiscal 1972 with the prospect that much more than this may be obtainable. The total state aid needed to match the federal funds now known to be available for fiscal

1972 is \$3,780,000. The new Water Quality Act before Congress may contain federal grant provisions which will change the state aid requirement picture. If upwards of \$22 million of federal funds are made available for fiscal 1972, some \$10 million in state funding would be necessary to secure the present maximum federal contribution of 55 percent.

It is conceivable that pending federal legislation will lower the percent of cost the state is required to contribute before the federal government provides funds. If this is the case, appropriate statutory alterations may be necessary on the part of the General Assembly since S.B. 298, 1971 Session, changed the provisions concerning the state's share of the cost of sewage treatment projects from a maximum of 30 percent to a minimum of 25 percent.

Whatever the outcome of federal legislation and its potential for increasing the amount of federal moneys available to Colorado and changing the required share of state funds for a project, the General Assembly should be aware that federal funds, in large proportions, are available and the Legislature should move to secure these funds. The following table gives an indication of the importance of state aid as applied to four of the smaller Colorado communities in need of new sewage treatment facilities.

Financing Local Needs Under Three  
Distribution Formulae

<u>Town</u>	<u>Federal Share</u>		<u>Local Share</u>		<u>Total Colorado Funds</u>	
	<u>33%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>67%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>No State Aid</u>	<u>25% State Aid</u>
Creede	\$14,361	\$23,900	\$29,100	\$8,790	\$29,100	\$19,561
Redcliff	20,190	33,700	41,000	12,230	41,000	27,490
Elizabeth	15,600	26,000	31,600	9,450	31,600	21,200
La Veta	20,739	34,500	42,000	12,540	42,000	28,239

For the Metropolitan Denver Sewage Disposal District No. 1, the needs for the next ten years are documented as follows:

Denver Metro District  
Needs -- 1972-81

<u>Year</u>	<u>Main Plant Expansion</u>	<u>Interceptors</u>	<u>New Plants</u>	<u>Total</u>
1972	\$ --	\$ 800,000	\$ --	\$ 800,000
1973	5,000,000	3,000,000	--	8,000,000
1974	10,000,000	2,000,000	--	12,000,000
1975	5,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	9,000,000
1976	--	3,000,000	4,000,000	7,000,000
1977	--	--	--	--
1978	5,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	9,000,000
1979	10,000,000	--	2,000,000	12,000,000
1980	2,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	7,000,000
1981	--	--	--	--
Total	<u>\$37,000,000</u>	<u>\$14,800,000</u>	<u>\$13,000,000</u>	<u>\$64,800,000</u>

The data on page 16 sets forth the distribution of construction costs for the Metropolitan Denver Sewage Disposal District for the period 1972-1981 with 25 percent state aid.



<u>Year</u>	<u>Total District Cost</u>	<u>State 25%</u>	<u>Federal 55%</u>	<u>District 20%</u>
1972	\$ 800,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 440,000	\$ 160,000
1973	8,000,000	2,000,000	4,400,000	1,600,000
1974	12,000,000	3,000,000	6,600,000	2,400,000
1975	9,000,000	2,250,000	4,950,000	1,800,000
1976	7,000,000	1,750,000	3,850,000	1,400,000
1977	--	--	--	--
1978	9,000,000	2,250,000	4,950,000	1,800,000
1979	12,000,000	3,000,000	6,600,000	2,400,000
1980	7,000,000	1,750,000	3,850,000	1,400,000
1981	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$64,800,000</b>	<b>\$16,200,000</b>	<b>\$35,640,000</b>	<b>\$12,960,000</b>

If the state does not contribute to the construction costs for Metro Denver, under the present federal aid formula, the Metro District would assume 67 percent of the costs with the federal government funding the remaining 33 percent. In dollars this would mean the following:

<u>Total District Cost</u>	<u>Federal 33%</u>	<u>Metro District 67%</u>
\$64,800,000	\$21,444,000	\$43,356,000

EXAMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF H.B. 1306, 1971  
SESSION, ON INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATIONS

The Committee devoted considerable attention to the concepts of H.B. 1306, as introduced in the 1971 Session. This measure called for a three percent adjusted gross income tax on individuals and a six percent income tax on corporations. Each of these taxes would be additions to the present taxes levied on the two groups. Revenues derived from the tax were to be distributed to counties on the basis of ADAE of the local school districts. In response to requests from the Committee, the staff provided the following data on the estimated impact, in a number of circumstances, of H.B. 1306.

The Estimated Tax Burden on Selected Categories of Denver Residents

The following analysis examines the various taxes and fees levied on fictional taxpayers, residing in Denver, in selected family groupings and adjusted gross incomes with calculations to reflect a three percent tax on adjusted gross income as proposed in H.B. 1306. The elements of the taxpayer composite were developed by the staff; the assignment of characteristics to various income categories was based on the collective judgment of the staff taking into account similar studies by other governmental agencies. Different assumptions could produce different results for families whose circumstances vary from the "typical" as defined for these comparisons. In applying the concepts of H.B. 1306, the following assumptions were made: (a) for those who rent, the application of a reduction in property tax would not be carried over to a reduction in rents; and (b) current Denver property tax was rounded to 80 mills and the reduction after the application of H.B. 1306 rounded to 53 mills.

Reading the Table. As an aid to reading the table on pages 20 and 21 it may be helpful to summarize the enumerated

tax impact for one family grouping at a specific income level, for example, a family of four with an AGI of \$12,000. This family grouping is found on page 20.

Line 1 indicates an estimated current property tax of \$504.

Line 2 shows the effect of H.B. 1306 -- a reduction in property tax of \$176.

Lines 3 and 4 show the estimated current state income tax and the effect of H.B. 1306; the addition of a three percent AGI tax increases the state income tax for our fictional taxpayer in this category by \$11.

Line 5 shows the new three percent AGI tax proposed by H.B. 1306: \$360 for our family.

Lines 6-14 specify current state and Denver taxes none of which are affected by H.B. 1306.

Line 16, "Dollars Including Property Tax Equivalent" is the total of lines 1, 3, and 6-14. Thus, it is a total of state and local taxes before the potential effects of H.B. 1306 are applied to those state and local taxes.

The phrase "property tax equivalent" applies in the calculating of property tax paid by a renter. A figure of 20 percent of rent has been given as a property tax equivalent payment.

Line 17 shows the effect of H.B. 1306 and as such is a total of lines 2, 4, 5, and 6-14. The effect of H.B. 1306 on our family of four with a \$12,000 adjusted gross income represents, in actual dollars thus far, a \$195 increase (line 17 minus line 16) over the estimated state and local tax impact of the present tax structure. Lines 18 and 19 do not apply to our family of four because the study assumes this category of taxpayers own their homes and thus do not pay "property tax equivalents".

Line 20 indicates our family of four with an AGI of \$12,000 pays 9.92 percent of their AGI in state and local taxes. Line 21 shows that the enactment of H.B. 1306 would increase that percentage to 11.54.

tax impact for one family grouping at a specific income level, for example, a family of four with an AGI of \$12,000. This family grouping is found on page 20.

Line 1 indicates an estimated current property tax of \$504.

Line 2 shows the effect of H.B. 1306 -- a reduction in property tax of \$176.

Lines 3 and 4 show the estimated current state income tax and the effect of H.B. 1306; the addition of a three percent AGI tax increases the state income tax for our fictional taxpayer in this category by \$11.

Line 5 shows the new three percent AGI tax proposed by H.B. 1306: \$360 for our family.

Lines 6-14 specify current state and Denver taxes none of which are affected by H.B. 1306.

Line 16, "Dollars Including Property Tax Equivalent" is the total of lines 1, 3, and 6-14. Thus, it is a total of state and local taxes before the potential effects of H.B. 1306 are applied to those state and local taxes.

The phrase "property tax equivalent" applies in the calculating of property tax paid by a renter. A figure of 20 percent of rent has been given as a property tax equivalent payment.

Line 17 shows the effect of H.B. 1306 and as such is a total of lines 2, 4, 5, and 6-14. The effect of H.B. 1306 on our family of four with a \$12,000 adjusted gross income represents, in actual dollars thus far, a \$195 increase (line 17 minus line 16) over the estimated state and local tax impact of the present tax structure. Lines 18 and 19 do not apply to our family of four because the study assumes this category of taxpayers own their homes and thus do not pay "property tax equivalents".

Line 20 indicates our family of four with an AGI of \$12,000 pays 9.92 percent of their AGI in state and local taxes. Line 21 shows that the enactment of H.B. 1306 would increase that percentage to 11.54.

Again lines 22-23 are important in looking at the tax impact on renters only.

Line 24, indicates a federal income tax of \$1,277 for our family of four and line 25 shows that application of H.B. 1306 would reduce that tax \$36, from \$1,277 to \$1,241.

The total tax burden -- state, local and federal -- is summarized below line 26. Line 27 indicates our family pays some \$2,467 of their \$12,000 AGI in state, local, and federal taxes. Line 28 applies to H.B. 1306; the dollar increase with the application of H.B. 1306 is \$159.

Finally, lines 29 and 30 express the tax impact as a percent of AGI: before H.B. 1306, the total burden on our fictional family of four with an AGI of \$12,000 is 20.56 percent; with the application of H.B. 1306 this percentage increases to 21.88.

Impact of H.B. 1306. The following summarizes the percentage increase that would be realized on each family group at each income level with the application of H.B. 1306 to the estimated tax impact of the present federal, state and local tax structure.

Percentage Increase Applying House Bill  
No. 1306 to the Tax Burden Study

<u>Adjusted Gross Income</u>	<u>Family of Four</u>	<u>Married Couple</u>	<u>Single Indi- vidual</u>	<u>Married Couple Over 65</u>	<u>Single Individual Over 65</u>
\$3,000	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
6,000	1.16	1.07	2.82	1.10	2.44
12,000	1.32	1.38	2.40	1.32	2.75
20,000	1.40	1.52	6.90	1.28	3.61

PRINCIPAL TAXES AND FEES IN DENVER, COLORADO, FOR SELECTED FAMILY GROUPINGS  
AND ADJUSTED GROSS INCOMES INCLUDING CALCULATIONS TO SHOW THE EFFECT OF  
A THREE PERCENT ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME TAX AS PRESCRIBED BY R.B. 1306

	Family of Four Adjusted Gross Income				Married Couple Adjusted Gross Income			
	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$20,000	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$20,000
1) Property Tax on Residence	(\$180) <u>1/</u>	\$ 288	\$ 504	\$ 744	(\$180) <u>1/</u>	\$ 288	\$ 504	\$ 744
2) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	-- <u>6/</u>	187	328	484	-- <u>6/</u>	187	328	484
3) State Income Tax	(28) <u>2/</u>	8	173	527	(5) <u>2/</u>	65	256	628
4) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	-- <u>6/</u>	12	184	554	-- <u>6/</u>	69	268	679
5) 3% ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME TAX	90	180	360	600	90	180	360	600
6) Local Occupational Tax <sup>3/</sup>	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
7) State Sales Tax <sup>4/</sup>	71	100	145	186	58	84	124	161
8) Local Sales Tax <sup>4/</sup>	71	100	145	186	58	84	124	161
9) State Cigarette Tax	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
10) Local Cigarette Tax	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
11) Liquor Tax	6	12	16	24	6	12	16	24
12) Gasoline Tax <sup>4/</sup>	36	53	100	110	31	41	63	100
13) Specific Ownership Tax	13	14	48	96	12	14	41	146
14) Auto Registration Fee	5	5	11	17	5	5	6	17
15) <u>Subtotal</u>								
16) Dollars Including Property Tax Equivalent	430	628	1,190	1,938	398	641	1,182	2,029
17) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	520	711	1,385	2,305	488	724	1,378	2,420
18) Dollars <u>Less</u> Property Tax Equiv.	250	628	1,190	1,938	218	641	1,182	2,029
19) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	340	711	1,385	2,305	308	724	1,378	2,420
20) Percent of AGI Including Property Tax Equivalent	14.33%	10.47%	9.92%	9.69%	13.27%	10.68%	9.85%	10.15%
21) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	17.33%	11.85%	11.54%	11.52%	16.27%	12.07%	11.48%	12.10%
22) Percent of AGI <u>Not</u> including Property Tax Equivalent	8.33%	10.47%	9.92%	9.69%	7.27%	10.68%	9.85%	10.15%
23) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	11.33%	11.85%	11.54%	11.52%	10.27%	12.07%	11.48%	12.10%
24) Federal Income Tax	\$ 0	\$ 324	\$ 1,277	\$ 2,920	\$ 142	\$ 546	\$ 1,556	\$ 3,207
25) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	-- <u>6/</u>	311	1,241	2,833	-- <u>6/</u>	533	1,526	3,120
26) <u>Grand Total</u>								
27) Dollars <u>Not</u> including Property Tax Equivalent	\$ 250	\$ 952	\$ 2,467	\$ 4,858	\$ 360	\$1,187	\$ 2,738	\$ 5,236
28) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	340	1,022	2,626	5,138	450	1,257	2,904	5,540
29) Percent of AGI	8.33%	15.87%	20.56%	24.29%	12.00%	19.78%	22.82%	26.18%
30) EFFECT OF 3% AGI TAX	11.33%	17.03%	21.88%	25.69%	15.00%	20.95%	24.20%	27.70%

	Single Individual			Married Couple Over 65			Single Individual Over 65				
	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income	Adjusted Gross Income		
	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$20,000	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$20,000	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$20,000
1)	(144)✓	(\$204)✓	(\$360)✓	(\$180)✓	\$ 288	\$ 504	\$ 744	(\$144)✓	(\$204)✓	(\$276)✓	(\$360)
2)	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	187	328	484	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	--
3)	17	98	326	(14)2/	19	185	534	2	74	293	649
4)	-- 5/	-- 5/	704	-- 5/	20	195	563	-- 5/	76	295	670
5)	90	180	600	90	180	360	600	90	180	360	600
6)	24	24	24	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	-- 5/	--
7)	44	96	126	58	84	124	161	44	64	96	126
8)	44	96	126	58	84	124	161	44	64	96	126
9)	8.50	8.50	8.50	17	17	17	17	8.50	8.50	8.50	8.50
10)	3.50	3.50	3.50	7	7	7	7	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50
11)	3	6	12	6	12	16	24	3	6	12	24
12)	31	41	67	--	23	36	36	--	26	36	36
13)	13	14	105	--	13	14	60	--	13	14	65
14)	5	5	7	--	5	6	7	--	5	6	7
16)	337	532	1,521	326	552	1,033	1,751	249	468	837	1,393
17)	427	712	2,143	416	632	1,227	2,120	339	650	1,199	2,014
18)	193	328	1,161	146	552	1,033	1,751	105	264	561	1,033
19)	283	508	1,813	236	632	1,227	2,120	195	448	923	1,654
20)	11.23%	8.87%	7.99%	10.87%	9.20%	8.61%	8.76%	8.30%	7.80%	6.98%	6.97%
21)	14.23%	11.87%	10.72%	13.87%	10.53%	10.23%	10.60%	11.30%	10.83%	9.99%	10.07%
22)	6.43%	5.47%	5.69%	4.87%	9.20%	8.61%	8.76%	3.50%	4.40%	4.68%	5.17%
23)	9.43%	8.47%	8.75%	7.87%	10.53%	10.23%	10.60%	6.50%	7.47%	7.69%	8.27%
24)	\$ 310	\$ 887	\$ 3,368	\$ 0	\$ 305	\$ 1,266	\$ 2,891	\$ 147	\$ 746	\$ 2,173	\$ 5,114
25)	-- 5/	876	2,290	-- 5/	291	1,230	2,778	-- 5/	708	2,141	4,855
27)	503	1,215	3,051	146	857	2,299	4,642	252	1,010	2,734	6,147
28)	593	1,384	3,340	236	923	2,457	4,898	342	1,156	3,064	6,869
29)	16.77%	20.25%	25.43%	4.87%	14.28%	19.16%	23.21%	8.40%	16.83%	22.78%	30.74%
30)	19.77%	23.07%	27.83%	7.87%	15.38%	20.48%	24.49%	11.40%	19.27%	25.53%	34.35%

1/ The assumption is that these individuals are renters. The figures indicate property tax equivalent payments @ 20 percent of rent.  
2/ These figures represent a refund.  
3/ The assumption is that in each composite category there is but one wage earner.  
4/ In computing this tax, the state tax tables in the Federal tax form for 1970 have been used.  
5/ It is assumed that there is no wage earner for these categories.  
6/ A dash indicates no change.

Prepared by:  
Colorado Legislative Council Staff  
October, 1971

## Impact Upon Owners, Tenants, Lessors and Lessees

The effect of H.B. 1306 on individuals and corporations as holders of real property can be seen from the following two analyses.

Study No. 1. Three groups of taxpayers are considered in each case. For individuals, they are: owners of the dwellings in which they live, tenants, and those who engage in the business of owning and operating apartment houses; and, for corporations, they are: those which have small real property holdings, those which have large real property holdings -- each of these with comparable net incomes, the latter having comparatively small equities in the properties owned -- and those which have large real property holdings as above, but with larger equities in them and correspondingly larger net incomes. In each category, several income levels are considered.

With reference to the assumptions, it should be noted that some of them -- not entirely realistic -- were made to simplify the analytical work required. For example, a fifty-year life was assumed for all properties owned (other than land), whether single residences, apartment houses, or properties of whatever kind owned by corporations; and it is assumed that they would be depreciated to zero values by the straight-line method in fifty years. The assessed value of the land was assumed to remain constant; and items of some irregularity over the period, which results from tax-bracket differences, were assumed to change by constant amounts from the first year to the last. In the computation of the capitalized losses for tenants, the losses shown for the first year -- with none of the gains of landlords passed on to them -- were assumed for each year of the fifty-year period. Finally, a reduction (because of H.B. 1306) of 27.61 mills in the tax levy, with assessment at 30 percent of market value was assumed throughout the period. Despite the lack of realism in some of the assumptions, it is believed that the comparisons of one group of taxpayers with another, as set forth in Table I, are reasonably valid.

Because the owner of a dwelling in which he lives would get a reduction in his property tax which a tenant would not get, the loss to a home owner -- after federal and state income taxes -- would be less than that to a tenant with comparable income. The loss to a home owner (under the assumptions made) who has an adjusted gross income of \$20,000 would be \$313 the first year (column 2 of the table) and the capitalized loss at 7 percent would be \$4,720 (column 3), while the corresponding figures for a tenant having the same adjusted



gross income would be \$462 and \$6,376, respectively. Landlords would, of course, benefit substantially, the extent of the gain being dependent -- for a given adjusted gross income -- upon the amount of real property owned.

Corporations with small real property holdings would sustain substantial losses, while those with large real property holdings might have either gains or losses depending upon the relationship of net income to the amount of property owned. For given amounts of property, this appears to be dependent in considerable part at least upon the corporation's equity in the property owned: the greater the equity in the property owned -- because of the effect of such equity upon net income -- the greater the loss to be sustained. Thus, as shown in the last two sections of the table, with conditions identical except for net income as affected by the extent of the equity, in one instance there is a modest capitalized gain and in the other a substantial loss.

Table I

IMPACT OF HOUSE BILL 1306 UPON TAXPAYERS IN DENVER, BOTH INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATIONS,  
ASSUMING IT TO BE ENACTED AS FIRST SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN 1971\*

Taxpayer Classification	Adjusted Gross Income (1)	Gain (+) or Loss (-) First Yr. (2)	Capitalized Gain (+) or Loss (-) to Taxpayer at			Market Value of Properties Owned (6)
			7% (3)	6% (4)	5% (5)	
Individual - Owning his Home						
(1)	\$ 8,000	\$ -119	\$ -1,864	\$ -2,155	\$ -2,529	\$ 12,000
(2)	12,000	-180	-2,819	-3,258	-3,823	18,000
(3)	20,000	-313	-4,720	-5,437	-6,357	26,000
(4)	30,000	-426	-6,339	-7,293	-8,515	36,000
(5)	50,000	-540	-8,280	-9,552	-11,187	75,000
Tenant						
(1)	8,000	-196	-2,708	-3,093	-3,582	--
(2)	12,000	-295	-4,076	-4,655	-5,392	--
(3)	20,000	-462	-6,376	-7,282	-8,434	--
(4)	30,000	-602	-8,307	-9,487	-10,989	--
(5)	50,000	-838	-11,560	-13,202	-15,291	--
Landlord						
(1)	20,000**	+4,869	+49,904	+54,997	+61,095	1,000,000
(2)	30,000**	+6,260	+64,158	+70,706	+78,545	1,500,000
(3)	40,000**	+7,289	+74,698	+82,321	+91,446	2,000,000
(4)	50,000**	+8,331	+85,385	+94,099	+104,531	2,500,000
(5)	60,000**	+9,482	+97,192	+107,112	+118,988	3,000,000

Table I  
(Continued)

Taxpayer Classification	Net Income Without 1306 (1)	Gain (+) or Loss (-) First Yr. (2)	Capitalized Gain (+) or Loss (-) to Taxpayer at		Market Value of Properties Owned (6)
			7% (3)	6% (4)	
Corporation with Small Real Property Holdings					
(1)	\$ 40,000	\$ -2,366	\$ -32,759	\$ -37,426	\$ 10,000
(2)	400,000	-23,660	-327,588	-374,262	100,000
(3)	2,000,000	-118,302	-1,637,940	-1,871,311	500,000
(4)	4,000,000	-236,604	-3,275,881	-3,742,622	1,000,000
Corporation with Large Real Prop- erty Holdings - Small Equity					
(1)	40,000	+996	+3,177	+2,406	1,000,000
(2)	400,000	+9,960	+31,765	+24,064	10,000,000
(3)	2,000,000	+49,802	+158,826	+120,322	50,000,000
(4)	4,000,000	+99,603	+317,652	+240,643	100,000,000
Corporation with Large Real Prop- erty Holdings - Moderate to Large Equity					
(1)	60,000	-204	-13,384	-16,508	1,000,000
(2)	600,000	-2,040	-133,844	-165,078	10,000,000
(3)	3,000,000	-10,198	-669,219	-825,390	50,000,000
(4)	6,000,000	-20,397	-1,338,438	-1,650,780	100,000,000

\* For a statement concerning the assumptions on which the computations are based, see the second paragraph of the memorandum and Attachment A: Assumptions.

\*\* Adjusted gross income without 1306.

Assumptions

The following are assumptions made -- in addition to those indicated in the second paragraph of this memorandum -- in the examination of the impact of H.B. 1306, Session of 1971, upon certain groups of taxpayers in Denver:

I. Individuals owning the dwellings in which they live

(A)	Adjusted Gross Income	Market Value of Dwelling		
		Land	Structure	Total
(1)	\$ 8,000	\$ 2,000	\$10,000	\$12,000
(2)	12,000	3,000	15,000	18,000
(3)	20,000	6,000	20,000	26,000
(4)	30,000	9,000	27,000	36,000
(5)	50,000	15,000	60,000	75,000

(B) Taxpayers married, filing joint returns.

(C) Taxpayers owning no real property except their homes.

II. Tenants

(A)	Adjusted Gross Income
(1)	\$ 8,000
(2)	12,000
(3)	20,000
(4)	30,000
(5)	50,000

(B) Taxpayers married, filing joint returns.

(C) Taxpayers owning no real property.

III. Individuals (landlords) engaged in the business of owning and operating apartment houses

(A)	Adjusted Gross Income Without 1306	Market Value of Apartments		
		Land	Structures	Total
(1)	\$20,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 950,000	\$1,000,000
(2)	30,000	75,000	1,425,000	1,500,000
(3)	40,000	100,000	1,900,000	2,000,000
(4)	50,000	125,000	2,375,000	2,500,000
(5)	60,000	150,000	2,850,000	3,000,000

- (B) Taxpayers married, filing joint returns.  
 (C) Taxpayers owning no real property except the indicated apartments, deriving entire income from the apartment house operation.

IV. Corporations having small real property holdings

(A)	Taxable Income	Market Value of Properties Owned		
		Land	Depreciable Property	Total
(1)	\$ 40,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 10,000
(2)	400,000	10,000	90,000	100,000
(3)	2,000,000	50,000	450,000	500,000
(4)	4,000,000	100,000	900,000	1,000,000

- (B) Colorado taxable income the same as the federal taxable income.

V. Corporations having large real property holdings, but with comparatively small equities in them

(A)	<u>Taxable Income</u>	<u>Market Value of Properties Owned</u>		
		<u>Land</u>	<u>Depreciable Property</u>	<u>Total</u>
(1)	\$ 40,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,000,000
(2)	400,000	1,000,000	9,000,000	10,000,000
(3)	2,000,000	5,000,000	45,000,000	50,000,000
(4)	4,000,000	10,000,000	90,000,000	100,000,000

(B) Colorado taxable income the same as the federal taxable income.

VI. Corporations having large real property holdings, but with moderate to large equities in them

(A)	<u>Taxable Income</u>	<u>Market Value of Properties Owned</u>		
		<u>Land</u>	<u>Depreciable Property</u>	<u>Total</u>
(1)	\$ 60,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,000,000
(2)	600,000	1,000,000	9,000,000	10,000,000
(3)	3,000,000	5,000,000	45,000,000	50,000,000
(4)	6,000,000	10,000,000	90,000,000	100,000,000

(B) Colorado taxable income the same as the federal taxable income.

Study No. 2. The assumptions made are similar to those enumerated above except that -- in addition to holding the assessed value of the land constant over the period of years in question -- the additional case wherein the assessed value of the land increases each year by 3 percent of the first-year amount is considered. (The lack of realism in the assumption of such year-to-year increases is recognized; in the interest of simplicity in the analytical work required, they are assumed to be the equivalent of rather substantial, irregular

increases which are believed to be realistic). A period of 95, rather than 99, years was chosen with the thought that lease agreements made four years ago were probably affected less by the possibility of legislation like that proposed in H.B. 1306 than is the case now. The property on which the computations for the accompanying table are based, thought of as an office building though not necessarily so, is assumed to have a market value today of \$2,000,000, the land and the structure having market values of \$400,000 and \$1,600,000, respectively, and assessed values of \$120,000 and \$480,000, respectively. Both the lessor and the lessee are assumed to be corporations.

The four annual incomes shown in Column (1) of Table II -- assumed for each year of the 95-year period -- amount, in the order presented, to 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, and 12 percent of today's market value of the property. Because the taxpayer who pays none of the property taxes has no off-set through property tax reduction against the 6 percent tax on the taxable income, the impact is more severe on such taxpayer than it is on the taxpayer who pays the property taxes. Thus, the losses sustained as shown in the third section of the table are greater in all cases -- for identical incomes -- than those shown in the other two sections of the table. Analogously, the impact upon the property taxpayer is greater when the assessed value of the land remains unchanged (first section of the table) than it is when the assessed value increases from year to year (second section).

To be more specific, if the lessee pays no property taxes and has an annual income of \$160,000 a year, his loss the first year from 1306 (line 2, column 2, third section of the table) is \$9,600, whereas the lessor who in this case pays the property taxes has a first-year loss of only \$2,808; and this loss is the same for the two assumptions pertaining to the assessed value of the land (line 2, column 2, first and second sections) because the first-year assumptions of such assessed value are identical. The corresponding capitalized losses -- the combined losses in the 95-year period discounted back to the present time -- at 7 percent per year are \$136,921 for the lessee (column 3) and \$51,576 and \$43,363, respectively, for the lessor when the assessed value of the land remains unchanged from year to year and when it increases each year by 3 percent of the first-year amount. As noted in the first footnote, "lessor" may be substituted for "lessee" in the table, and vice-versa, to indicate what the losses are with the roles of lessor and lessee reversed.

Table II

IMPACT OF HOUSE BILL 1306 (1971 SESSION), IF ENACTED, UPON LESSOR AND LESSEE CORPORATIONS IN A LEASE ENDING 95 YEARS HENCE<sup>a/</sup>

Role of Lessor and Lessee as to Property Tax Payment	Tax- payer	Annual Net Income of Taxpayer Without 1306 (1)	Loss to Taxpayer First Year (2)	Capitalized Loss to the Taxpayer at		
				7%	6%	5%
				(3)	(4)	(5)
<b>Lessor Paying All Property Taxes:</b>						
Assumption No. 1 <sup>b/</sup>						
(1)	Lessor	\$120,000	\$ 408	\$ 17,346	\$ 22,240	\$ 29,681
(2)	"	160,000	2,808	51,576	62,082	77,216
(3)	"	200,000	5,208	85,807	101,925	124,750
(4)	"	240,000	7,608	120,037	141,767	172,284
<b>Lessor Paying All Property Taxes:</b>						
Assumption No. 2 <sup>c/</sup>						
(1)	"	120,000	408	9,133	11,219	14,290
(2)	"	160,000	2,808	43,363	51,061	61,824
(3)	"	200,000	5,208	77,593	90,904	109,358
(4)	"	240,000	7,608	111,823	130,746	156,893
<b>Lessee Paying None of the Property Taxes<sup>d/</sup></b>						
(1)	Lessee	120,000	7,200	102,691	119,527	142,602
(2)	"	160,000	9,600	136,921	159,369	190,137
(3)	"	200,000	12,000	171,151	199,211	237,671
(4)	"	240,000	14,400	205,382	239,053	285,205

a/ The table as presented indicates the impact assuming that the lessor pays all property taxes and hence that the lessee pays none of them. It applies equally to the reverse assumption provided "lessor" is substituted for "lessee", wherever it occurs, and vice-versa.

b/ Assumption No. 1: The assessed value of the land will remain unchanged at \$120,000 throughout the 95-year period and the assessed value of the structure will decrease on a straight-line basis from the first-year amount of \$480,000 to zero at the end of 95 years.

c/ Assumption No. 2: The assessed value of the land will increase each year by three percent of the first-year amount of \$120,000 and the assessed value of the structure will decrease on a straight-line basis from the first-year amount of \$480,000 to zero at the end of 95 years.

d/ When the taxpayer pays none of the property taxes, the situation is the same -- in the case of identical net incomes as above -- for Assumption No. 1 as for Assumption No. 2.



ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION BY  
THE STATE AND LOCAL FINANCE COMMITTEE  
OR BY OTHER LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES  
DURING THE 1972 INTERIM

Many issues of major importance were discussed by the Committee during the 1971 interim; however, Committee resources did not allow full consideration of a number of these topics. Suggested areas of concern for study during the 1972 interim by either the State and Local Finance Committee or other committees of the General Assembly include a reappraisal of the 1969 School Foundation Act that would (a) reevaluate goals set by the 1969 Act; (b) analyze various formulae for state and local support of the public schools and the equities of these formulae; (c) study the potential impact of the 1971 California Supreme Court case (Serrano v. Priest) on Colorado's present mode of financing schools; (d) examine how county assessments are made and the equities of these assessments for the support of public schools; and (e) study the special burdens and problems of financing public education in core city areas.

A second major topic needing further examination is the tax base for support of state and local government. Colorado's property tax system -- its organization, methods of assessment, procedures, exemptions, and effects on agriculture as well as urban-slum and fringe areas -- needs to be fully studied. What inequities exist in the composition of the current tax base and what can be done to correct them? What items within like categories of items are being taxed differently, and why?

A P P E N D I X

TABLE I

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAЕ FROM FDN LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
ADAMS									
MAPLETON	\$ 52124130	17.00	53.79	6752.8	\$ 7.72	\$131.22	\$ 26.17	\$ 302.60	\$ 2043429
EASTLAKE	68592690	17.00	63.60	13994.7	4.90	83.32	19.23	357.46	5002486
ADAMS CITY	44525160	17.00	65.80	8109.8	5.49	93.33	26.02	340.64	2762543
BRIGHTON	26019750	17.00	52.55	3478.2	7.48	127.17	25.30	307.53	1069644
BENNETT	4635074	17.00	37.00	350.4	13.23	224.88	30.90	204.22	71559
STRASBURG	3667466	16.10	41.50	236.2	15.53	249.98	42.79	167.21	39494
WESTMINSTER	68928410	17.00	69.86	15439.6	4.46	75.89	18.49	365.62	5645013
ALAMOSA									
ALAMOSA	17315094	17.00	42.00	2324.2	7.45	126.65	13.04	315.31	732850
MOSCA	2725725	17.00	43.90	237.4	11.48	195.19	21.30	243.51	57810
ARAPAHOE									
ENGLEWOOD	61842495	17.00	57.77	5704.2	10.84	184.31	39.22	236.48	1348903
SHERIDAN	10586846	17.00	64.45	2066.4	5.12	87.10	30.23	342.68	708107
CHERRY CREEK	74865261	17.00	72.15	7526.6	9.95	169.09	38.00	252.91	1903567
LITTLETON	113611211	17.00	62.26	15830.2	7.18	122.01	27.49	310.50	4915268
DEER TRAIL	3583083	11.90	38.50	152.3	23.53	279.97	54.72	125.27	19079
AURORA	105753472	17.00	64.08	17764.5	5.95	101.20	22.84	335.96	5968106
BYERS	6116962	11.72	42.91	256.1	23.89	279.93	55.23	124.77	31954
ARCHULETA									
PAGOSA SPRINGS	7508610	17.00	29.33	684.3	10.97	186.54	47.72	225.74	154477
BACA									
WALSH	8453630	14.82	37.50	501.2	16.87	249.97	18.15	191.85	96155
PRITCHETT	3311075	10.10	41.31	111.5	29.70	299.93	70.75	89.96	10031
SPRINGFIELD	7895475	17.00	42.06	554.6	14.24	242.02	36.30	181.68	100760
VILAS	2429740	10.63	39.50	68.0	35.73	379.83	82.35	80.00	5440
CAMPO	2263990	17.00	47.90	159.4	14.20	241.45	45.12	180.06	28702
BENT									
LAS ANIMAS	9960030	17.00	43.02	1164.7	8.55	145.38	26.87	287.84	335242
MC CLAVE	5382900	12.14	29.83	217.8	24.71	300.04	44.03	115.96	25257
BOULDER									
ST VRAIN VALLEY	86293830	17.00	50.51	9979.7	8.65	147.00	25.61	287.39	2868097
BOULDER VALLEY	235849890	17.00	55.32	20860.0	11.31	192.21	35.14	232.66	4853197

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAЕ FROM FDN LEVY	OT-ER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
CHAFFEE									
BUENA VISTA	\$ 7628670	17.00	25.75	1134.0	\$ 6.73	\$114.36	\$ 17.18	\$ 328.46	\$ 372472
SALIDA	13482630	17.00	28.50	1450.5	9.30	158.02	23.02	278.96	404634
CHEYENNE									
KIT CARSON	6530609	10.26	34.11	176.3	37.04	380.06	48.70	80.00	14104
CHEYENNE WELLS	6992624	12.19	42.89	284.2	24.60	299.93	42.09	117.91	33509
ARAPAHOE	2835839	12.23	30.58	91.3	31.06	379.87	41.74	80.00	7304
CLEAR CRK IDAHO SPRINGS	29336400	12.16	31.21	1273.8	23.03	280.05	22.71	157.29	200362
CONEJOS									
NORTH CONEJOS	5893800	17.00	40.52	1336.3	4.41	74.98	2.74	382.28	510843
SANFORD	1849225	17.00	33.48	339.8	5.44	92.52	3.20	364.28	123783
SOUTH CONEJOS	4095845	17.00	32.54	832.5	4.92	83.64	1.90	374.46	311740
COSTILLA									
CENTENNIAL	3264155	17.00	56.90	674.0	4.84	82.33	13.15	364.79	245871
SIERRA GRANDE	3475325	17.00	30.18	285.0	12.19	207.30	9.86	243.00	69256
CROWLEY CROWLEY COUNTY	7740940	17.00	37.66	724.5	10.68	181.64	22.44	255.92	185414
CUSTER CUSTER COUNTY	4457060	13.36	31.20	212.6	20.96	280.09	30.31	156.98	33373
DELTA DELTA COUNTY	26509996	17.00	45.31	3555.2	7.46	126.76	29.83	303.41	1078679
DENVER DENVER	1388500000	16.19	48.63	89903.4	15.44	250.04	40.85	169.15	15207222
DOLORES DOLORES COUNTY	5220250	17.00	47.93	455.3	11.47	194.91	74.47	190.62	86788

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAE FROM FDN LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
-----									
DOUGLAS DOUGLAS COUNTY	\$ 24054925	17.00	53.23	2598.1	\$ 9.26	\$157.40	\$ 31.99	\$ 270.61	\$ 703077
EAGLE EAGLE COUNTY	28033230	15.43	40.40	1542.2	18.18	280.48	40.65	139.61	215308
ELBERT ELIZABETH	2414390	17.00	53.27	361.0	6.69	113.70	27.29	319.01	115162
KIOWA	2719388	14.12	42.36	137.0	19.85	280.28	42.27	137.86	18887
BIG SANDY	5270206	14.92	39.00	314.5	16.76	250.02	36.37	173.63	54608
ELBERT	1563613	17.00	43.00	140.2	11.15	189.60	31.56	238.84	33486
AGATE	3696359	6.64	22.41	64.6	57.22	379.94	66.53	80.00	5168
EL PASO CALHAN	2559168	17.00	47.50	239.9	10.67	181.35	36.41	242.24	58114
HARRISON	27473290	17.00	44.11	5509.3	4.99	84.77	13.90	361.32	1990632
SECURITY	23677820	17.00	54.30	7588.2	3.12	53.05	10.10	396.86	3011428
FOUNTAIN	5830960	17.00	27.92	2627.2	2.22	37.73	6.94	415.33	1091156
COLORADO SPRINGS	287235640	17.00	48.79	30533.8	9.41	159.92	27.93	272.15	8309668
CHEYENNE MT	31688280	16.30	55.16	2066.4	15.34	249.96	49.28	160.72	332104
MANITOU SPRINGS	11973400	17.00	48.40	1156.7	10.35	175.97	31.09	252.94	292572
AIR ACADEMY	14840080	17.00	31.35	4157.4	3.57	60.68	5.69	393.63	1636474
ELLICOTT	1760350	17.00	49.96	245.5	7.17	121.90	24.92	313.18	76886
PEYTON	1139601	17.00	86.37	136.3	8.36	142.14	43.95	273.90	37333
HANOVER	1984990	9.05	26.71	47.3	41.97	379.79	77.27	80.00	3784
LEWIS PALMER	6931570	17.00	49.00	705.3	9.83	167.07	25.21	267.71	188818
FALCON	2082500	17.00	55.84	256.7	8.11	137.91	30.48	291.60	74854
EDISON	1725470	10.68	31.00	48.5	35.58	379.96	66.25	80.00	3880
MIAMI YODER	2693584	12.61	34.58	121.3	22.21	280.02	47.86	132.13	16027
FREMONT CANON CITY	23154070	17.00	47.33	2998.2	7.72	131.29	13.92	314.79	943813
FLORENCE	10763890	17.00	37.90	1502.4	7.16	121.80	19.93	318.28	478180
COTOPAXI	2361650	14.83	50.56	140.1	16.86	249.99	49.96	160.03	22420
GARFIELD ROARING FORK	29769630	17.00	31.60	2824.2	10.54	179.20	34.74	246.06	694929
RIFLE	13876470	17.00	61.49	1292.1	10.74	182.57	46.63	230.79	298203
GRAND VALLEY	2968060	14.23	57.18	169.0	17.56	249.91	36.64	173.35	29296

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAE FROM FDN LEVY	CITY REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT
	\$				\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
GILPIN COUNTY	1839360	-0.00	50.69	69.9	26.31	0.00	65.18	.00	.00
GRAND CO WEST GRAND	6825760	14.77	37.89	403.4	16.92	249.92	37.47	172.53	69597
EAST GRAND	12417650	14.51	39.56	720.6	17.23	250.04	45.17	164.83	118780
GUNNISON GUNNISON WATER	15842590	17.00	43.32	1385.0	11.44	194.46	57.08	208.46	288718
HINSDALE LAKE CITY	2116210	2.53	18.35	14.1	150.09	379.72	1206.03	80.00	1128
HUERFANO WALSENBURG LA VETA	9832730	17.00	32.00	1124.5	8.74	148.65	7.84	296.23	333108
	2765775	17.00	37.84	200.5	13.79	234.50	50.25	181.52	36395
JACKSON NORTH PARK	9761026	13.65	31.41	475.9	20.51	279.97	66.46	113.54	54032
JEFFERSON JEFFERSON COUNTY	48021000	17.00	58.80	62089.7	7.73	131.48	35.62	292.90	18186157
KIOWA EADS PLAINVIEW	9145282	12.01	32.46	366.2	24.97	299.93	34.96	125.04	45791
	7419358	7.33	25.44	143.2	51.81	379.78	48.62	80.00	11456
KIT CARSON FLAGLER SIEBERT VONA STRATTON BETHUNE BURLINGTON	3492508	17.00	43.00	258.0	13.54	230.13	38.05	191.82	49489
	2401070	14.98	46.00	128.5	18.69	279.91	54.08	125.92	16181
	1982950	12.12	41.00	80.1	24.76	300.04	64.78	95.22	7627
	3772269	17.00	47.48	350.3	10.77	183.07	33.21	243.72	85376
	2238841	15.35	40.66	122.7	18.25	280.08	51.17	128.83	15807
	12691122	17.00	37.87	1105.1	11.48	195.23	32.25	232.52	256956

Gilpin County did not participate in the Foundation Program in 1971. They would have received \$6628 or \$94.82 per ADAE had they chosen to participate.

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAE FROM FDN LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
LAKE LEADVILLE	\$ 48266280	13.50	31.92	2327.4	\$ 20.74	\$279.97	\$ 22.17	\$ 157.83	\$ 367344
LA PLATA DURANGO	34243400	17.00	42.13	3691.1	9.28	157.71	22.72	279.57	1031905
BAYFIED	3922430	17.00	33.00	384.2	10.21	173.56	9.10	277.34	106553
IGNACIO	7695010	17.00	21.00	989.0	7.78	132.27	4.23	323.50	319939
LARIMER POUDRE	111999120	17.00	61.35	11513.2	9.73	165.37	38.35	256.28	2950576
THOMPSON	54873470	17.00	45.75	6190.8	8.86	150.68	26.27	283.04	1752269
ESTES PARK	17222560	13.53	38.60	832.1	20.70	280.04	54.17	125.83	104703
LAS ANIMAS TRINIDAD	10855650	17.00	45.30	2216.7	4.90	83.25	1.19	375.55	832489
PRIMERO	5175420	14.38	29.91	265.8	19.47	279.99	39.18	140.82	37431
HOEHNE	5429300	16.10	30.70	349.8	15.52	249.89	17.02	192.98	67504
AQUILAR	2597120	17.00	32.00	232.7	11.16	189.73	24.95	245.31	57083
BRANSON	2232780	10.06	32.74	74.9	29.81	299.89	54.18	105.81	7925
KIM	4325980	11.26	35.08	128.2	33.74	379.96	67.48	79.69	10216
LINCOLN HUGO	5250660	14.46	33.13	271.1	19.37	280.06	21.35	158.65	43011
LIMON	6592368	17.00	31.70	578.0	11.41	193.89	14.49	251.62	145434
GENOA	2062520	14.44	47.12	106.4	19.38	279.91	41.67	138.32	14717
KARVAL	3084500	10.08	28.99	103.6	29.77	300.11	49.92	109.91	11387
ARRIBA	3022240	13.70	38.62	147.9	20.43	279.95	33.11	146.89	21725
LOGAN VALLEY	47086750	17.00	48.38	4009.1	11.74	199.66	29.54	230.80	925288
FRENCHMAN	4738300	15.34	32.82	290.7	16.30	250.04	27.08	182.92	53175
BUFFALO	5409890	14.38	34.82	311.1	17.39	250.06	30.08	179.92	55973
PLATEAU	6877100	9.23	26.11	167.1	41.16	379.87	54.73	79.90	13352
MESA DE BEQUE	3933172	12.03	32.11	124.5	31.59	380.05	26.27	80.00	9960
PLATEAU VALLEY	5358379	14.93	29.94	285.8	18.75	279.92	43.01	136.99	39153
MESA VALLEY	102119309	17.00	53.68	12427.0	8.22	139.70	30.34	289.96	3603335

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAE FROM FDN LEVY	OT REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
MINERAL CREEDE	\$ 3026410	15.81	42.40	191.4	\$ 15.81	\$249.99	\$ 91.90	\$ 118.10	\$ 22604
MOFFAT MOFFAT COUNTY	25027520	16.85	35.97	1687.2	14.83	249.95	49.39	160.61	270975
MONTEZUMA CORTEZ	18635110	17.00	46.83	2756.9	6.76	114.91	33.41	311.68	859264
DOLORIS	3842435	17.00	41.10	561.3	6.85	116.38	27.48	316.14	177451
MANCOS	2810635	17.00	36.20	403.5	6.97	118.42	28.62	312.96	126280
MONTROSE MONTROSE	26229285	17.00	51.32	3907.8	6.71	114.10	25.16	320.74	1253375
WEST END	8568870	17.00	45.39	1066.6	8.03	136.57	28.09	295.34	315009
MORGAN BRUSH	15165175	17.00	40.30	1507.7	10.06	170.99	10.87	278.14	419350
FT MORGAN	32344770	17.00	52.95	3207.5	10.08	171.43	30.36	258.21	828218
WELDON VALLEY	3140130	16.23	55.61	203.8	15.41	250.07	4.51	205.49	41878
WIGGINS	7481910	16.91	43.64	506.0	14.79	250.04	42.90	167.10	84553
OTERO LA JUNTA	16106440	17.00	53.45	2519.6	6.39	108.67	23.47	327.86	826064
ROCKY FORD	15142483	17.00	38.86	1972.3	7.68	130.52	19.51	309.97	611363
MANZANOLA	2083277	17.00	53.50	324.3	6.42	109.21	17.76	333.03	108003
FOWLER	6271731	17.00	45.50	658.4	9.53	161.94	24.05	274.01	180409
CHERAW	2072142	17.00	47.91	248.9	8.33	141.53	25.35	292.93	72911
SWINK	2889405	17.00	47.29	367.9	7.85	133.51	19.64	306.84	112887
OURAY OURAY	2749520	17.00	30.30	196.0	14.03	238.48	23.40	198.12	38832
RIDGWAY	2046055	17.00	43.00	140.1	14.60	248.27	13.68	198.05	27747
PARK PLATTE CANYON	3667500	17.00	50.50	301.6	12.16	206.72	32.80	220.47	66495
PARK COUNTY	6999750	10.73	36.21	197.7	35.41	379.91	78.85	80.00	15816



SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAE FROM FDN LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
PHILLIPS HOLYOKE HAXTUN	\$ 13602168 8138512	13.26 13.46	37.67 43.07	644.2 391.1	\$ 21.11 20.81	\$279.98 280.09	\$ 38.71 42.55	\$ 141.29 137.45	\$ 91020 53758
PITKIN ASPEN	43931730	9.98	28.78	1153.4	38.09	380.13	55.54	80.00	92272
PROMERS GRANADA LAMAR HOLLY WILEY CONS	5014931 17647541 6434591 3424657	17.00 17.00 17.00 17.00	39.30 41.40 41.50 40.13	450.7 2227.8 548.4 289.2	11.13 7.92 11.73 11.84	189.16 134.67 199.47 201.31	23.95 20.35 28.40 52.82	246.89 304.99 232.13 205.87	111273 679454 127298 59537
PUEBLO CO CITY RURAL	177136200 29269232	17.00 17.00	48.00 47.94	24124.2 3957.5	7.34 7.40	124.83 125.73	18.13 23.48	317.05 310.79	7648555 1229938
RIO BLANCO MEEKER RANGELY	16405553 41502375	11.11 5.77	32.40 16.88	607.3 630.5	27.01 65.82	300.12 379.81	91.86 94.99	80.00 79.99	48584 50432
RIO GRANDE DEL NORTE MONTE VISTA SARGENT	6657450 11640390 6765576	17.00 17.00 15.04	44.24 44.70 41.63	771.9 1688.5 406.9	8.62 6.89 16.63	146.62 117.20 250.07	24.77 28.02 32.83	295.10 314.78 177.17	227790 531506 72091
ROUTT HAYDEN STEAMBOAT SPGS SOUTH ROUTT	10044750 11805750 5732225	10.44 17.00 16.50	27.09 45.22 47.08	349.5 1005.9 378.3	28.74 11.74 15.15	300.05 199.52 250.02	40.69 43.28 36.94	119.31 217.16 173.06	41698 218439 65468
SAGUACHE MOUNTAIN VALLEY MOFFAT CENTER CONS	3237850 1717620 7173920	17.00 10.48 17.00	45.00 36.46 39.82	254.4 60.0 801.5	12.73 28.63 8.95	216.37 300.01 152.16	70.26 64.18 50.13	173.38 95.82 257.71	44107 5749 206554

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAЕ FROM FDN LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
SAN JUAN SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$ 3690135	15.37	47.70	202.6	\$ 18.21	\$279.95	\$ 25.03	\$ 154.97	\$ 31396
SAN MIGUEL TELLURIDE	4894700	12.36	37.46	216.0	22.66	280.09	91.87	88.13	19035
NORWOOD	3525400	17.00	45.75	329.7	10.69	181.78	78.72	199.50	65774
EGNAR	1455190	14.62	40.00	76.0	19.15	279.93	99.67	80.33	6105
SEDGWICK JULESBURG	7698330	16.02	50.02	493.2	15.61	250.06	38.78	171.22	84446
PLATTE VALLEY	7665340	13.72	36.96	375.7	20.40	279.93	40.26	139.74	52499
SUMMIT SUMMIT COUNTY	13244940	14.56	43.68	688.7	19.23	280.01	39.64	140.36	96668
TELLER CRIPPLE CRK VIC	2950820	15.33	53.37	161.6	18.26	279.93	65.41	114.59	18517
WOODLAND PARK	5591440	17.00	50.12	839.7	6.66	113.20	5.95	340.84	286207
WASHINGTON AKRON	11836195	14.56	33.09	615.3	19.24	280.08	30.36	149.64	92073
ARICKAREE	7880115	11.92	28.30	247.1	31.89	380.13	38.60	79.97	19760
OTIS	4568490	15.58	42.18	254.2	17.97	280.00	31.49	148.51	37751
LONE STAR	2870350	7.45	32.22	56.3	50.98	379.82	66.91	81.42	4584
WOODLIN	12307815	5.50	19.52	178.2	69.07	379.87	57.96	80.36	14320
WELD VALLEY GILCREST	13962470	17.00	38.00	1468.7	9.51	161.61	16.03	282.36	414695
EATON	21990190	15.30	28.81	1202.0	18.29	279.91	22.87	157.13	188865
KEENESBURG	14221860	17.00	33.75	1381.9	10.29	174.96	24.15	260.89	360529
WINDSOR	10264700	17.00	44.18	966.5	10.62	180.55	18.04	261.41	252651
JOHNSTOWN	9881090	17.00	48.07	938.6	10.53	178.97	22.20	258.83	242942
GREELEY	75629520	17.00	55.24	9370.3	8.07	137.21	23.86	298.93	2801075
PLATTE VALLEY	8761290	17.00	45.10	844.8	10.37	176.30	25.52	258.18	218109
FORT LUPTON	9440380	17.00	44.64	1636.0	5.77	98.10	13.35	348.55	570232
HIGHLAND	12131470	17.00	54.31	905.0	13.40	227.88	40.51	191.60	173400
BRIGGS DALE	2073830	13.27	50.50	98.3	21.10	279.96	80.05	99.94	9824
PRAIRIE	5474690	12.04	37.27	173.5	31.55	379.92	80.33	80.00	13880
PAWNEE	3728900	12.21	41.35	151.8	24.56	299.93	82.48	80.37	12200

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1971 FDN. LEVY	1971 TOTAL GEN. FUND LEVY	1971 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	REV/ADAЕ FROM FDN LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1971 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
YUMA									
WEST YUMA	\$ 16331957	16.34	48.50	1067.4	\$ 15.30	\$250.01	\$ 38.81	\$ 171.19	\$ 182732
EAST YUMA	15597043	14.82	39.47	924.9	16.86	249.92	39.04	170.96	158121
TOTALS	\$ 5,158,678,384			513364.5			\$ 15601773		\$ 137,071,233

Tables Prepared By Colorado Association of School Boards, Research Staff  
for the Council on Educational Development.

Data Sources - Colorado Department of Education Files.

Colorado Public School Districts

Office of Division of Property Taxation, State of Colorado

TABLE II

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
ADAMS							
MAPLETON	\$ 54381490	17.00	6814.9	\$ 7.98	\$ 29.59	\$293.73	\$ 2001740
EASTLAKE	75942890	17.00	14982.2	5.07	17.70	356.13	5335591
ADAMS CITY	45296160	17.00	7695.9	5.89	27.87	332.07	2555589
BRIGHTON	27329260	17.00	3769.0	7.25	27.55	309.19	1165320
BENNETT	4915187	17.00	416.9	11.79	35.11	224.46	93578
STRASBURG	3846103	17.00	317.4	12.12	35.38	218.62	69391
WESTMINSTER	74799670	17.00	15920.0	4.70	17.96	362.17	5765760
ALAMOSA							
ALAMOSA	17979020	17.00	2327.7	7.72	27.76	300.94	700490
MOSCA	2819195	17.00	246.3	11.45	22.15	243.27	59917
ARAPAHOE							
ENGLEWOOD	66234552	17.00	5363.9	12.35	47.83	202.25	1084871
SHERIDAN	12434166	17.00	2180.0	5.70	29.07	341.79	745106
CHERRY CREEK	94977320	17.00	9043.1	10.50	41.97	239.48	2165662
LITTLETON	125609784	17.00	16494.2	7.62	30.90	299.64	4942279
DEER TRAIL	5338941	10.44	185.8	28.73	54.14	105.86	19669
AURORA	114576215	17.00	17906.7	6.40	29.39	321.83	5762969
BYERS	6184202	15.08	333.1	18.57	46.16	133.84	44582
ARCHULETA							
PAGOSA SPRINGS	7969520	17.00	664.6	11.99	34.66	221.48	147196
BACA							
WALSH	8529550	14.97	510.8	16.70	2.14	207.86	106175
PRITCHETT	3271000	12.52	107.8	30.34	19.65	80.00	8624
SPRINGFIELD	7624280	17.00	540.9	14.10	6.85	213.52	115494
VILAS	2395130	12.53	79.0	30.32	10.11	80.00	6320
CAMPO	2137860	17.00	147.9	14.45	18.26	196.01	28990
BENT							
LAS ANIMAS	9961515	17.00	1108.9	8.98	28.86	278.42	308744
MC CLAVE	5266580	11.73	206.0	25.57	48.57	111.43	22954
BOULDER							
ST VRAIN VALLEY	95338140	17.00	10785.1	8.84	25.17	284.55	3068894
BOULDER VALLEY	250211550	17.00	21611.8	11.58	34.11	229.07	4950683

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
CHAFFEE BUENA VISTA SALIDA	\$ 8185970 13880670	17.00 17.00	1184.6 1483.4	\$ 6.91 9.36	\$ 20.12 27.05	\$322.41 273.88	\$ 381926 406273
CHEYENNE KIT CARSON CHEYENNE WELLS ARAPAHOE	6531801 7418591 2795788	9.22 11.51 12.37	158.4 305.0 91.0	41.24 24.32 30.72	59.48 10.72 41.21	80.00 169.28 80.00	12672 51631 7280
CLEAR CRK IDAHO SPRINGS	31803910	11.97	1359.3	23.40	32.53	147.47	200451
CONEJOS NORTH CONEJOS SANFORD SOUTH CONEJOS	6032930 2082555 3428155	17.00 17.00 17.00	1335.4 327.8 859.2	4.52 6.35 3.99	26.13 34.79 31.85	357.07 317.21 360.32	476833 103980 309585
COSTILLA CENTENNIAL SIERRA GRANDE	4205920 4195320	17.00 17.00	695.2 300.5	6.05 13.96	10.96 6.92	346.20 215.74	240675 64830
CROWLEY CROWLEY COUNTY	7717830	17.00	726.7	10.62	17.87	261.58	190092
CUSTER CUSTER COUNTY	5125070	11.58	212.0	24.17	45.82	134.18	28447
DELTA DELTA COUNTY	27429070	17.00	3642.9	7.53	38.49	295.51	1076518
DENVER DENVER	1444626950	14.99	86645.6	16.67	45.19	164.81	14279794
DOLORES DOLORES COUNTY	5233430	17.00	439.7	11.90	54.84	202.82	89182

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
DOUGLAS DOUGLAS COUNTY	\$ 27758906	17.00	2838.2	\$ 9.78	\$ 37.08	\$256.65	\$ 728419
EAGLE EAGLE COUNTY	31985670	13.63	1557.1	20.54	54.00	126.00	196196
ELBERT							
ELIZABETH	2790180	17.00	417.0	6.69	26.84	319.41	133194
KIOWA	2818251	14.05	141.4	19.93	49.98	130.02	18385
BIG SANDY	5317945	14.50	308.4	17.24	47.24	162.76	50195
ELBERT	1565604	17.00	142.7	10.97	34.93	238.56	34042
AGATE	3666665	5.78	55.8	65.71	92.22	80.00	4464
EL PASO							
CALHAN	2660379	17.00	249.5	10.66	37.56	241.17	60172
HARRISON	31844440	17.00	6042.9	5.27	13.90	356.51	2154363
SECURITY	26172360	17.00	7764.4	3.37	10.75	391.94	3043196
FOUNTAIN	6096890	17.00	2803.7	2.17	6.14	416.90	1168851
COLORADO SPRINGS	306116130	17.00	31999.6	9.57	28.71	268.66	8597135
CHEYENNE MT	32875490	15.81	2079.1	15.81	81.03	157.83	328146
MANITOU SPRINGS	12312280	17.00	1134.3	10.85	33.04	242.43	274993
AIR ACADEMY	16879620	17.00	4228.8	3.99	7.08	385.06	1628342
ELLICOTT	1930820	17.00	260.2	7.42	26.54	307.31	79961
PEYTON	1232280	17.00	144.6	8.52	53.38	261.75	37849
HANOVER	2231290	6.49	38.1	58.56	137.77	80.00	3048
LEWIS PALMER	8829830	17.00	844.1	10.46	27.40	254.77	215048
FALCON	2376700	17.00	279.6	8.50	34.83	280.66	78473
EDISON	1389564	12.14	44.4	31.30	82.52	80.00	3552
MIAMI YODER	2665289	12.59	119.8	22.25	51.46	128.54	15399
FREMONT							
CANON CITY	23345450	17.00	3026.0	7.71	32.58	296.27	896507
FLORENCE	11127985	17.00	1511.4	7.36	21.06	313.77	474237
COTOPAXI	2641175	14.36	151.7	17.41	60.78	149.22	22637
GARFIELD							
ROARING FORK	31043999	17.00	2881.3	10.77	39.14	237.70	684872
RIFLE	14071590	17.00	1312.3	10.72	54.38	223.33	293079
GRAND VALLEY	2996660	14.50	173.8	17.24	77.00	133.00	23116

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
GILPIN GILPIN COUNTY	\$ 2001040	12.31	64.8	\$ 30.88	\$101.50	\$ 80.00	\$ 5184
GRAND CO WEST GRAND	7548281	15.58	470.4	16.05	50.57	159.43	74994
EAST GRAND	13668200	15.05	822.9	16.61	53.37	156.63	128894
GUNNISON GUNNISON WATER	16574425	17.00	1399.0	11.85	42.23	216.37	302697
HINSDALE LAKE CITY	2175660	5.36	30.7	70.87	275.34	80.00	2456
HUERFANO WALSENBERG	9891305	17.00	1185.6	8.34	18.40	299.77	355413
LA VETA	2855845	17.00	201.0	14.21	24.87	193.60	38913
JACKSON NORTH PARK	9881560	13.30	469.4	21.05	48.34	131.66	61801
JEFFERSON JEFFERSON COUNTY	521444240	17.00	65761.9	7.93	36.37	288.83	18993914
KIOWA EADS	8803757	11.71	368.2	23.91	24.19	155.81	57368
PLAINVIEW	7388583	7.02	136.5	54.13	44.26	80.00	10920
KIT CARSON FLAGLER	3501479	16.96	237.5	14.74	44.05	165.95	39412
SIEBERT	2437767	14.44	125.7	19.39	62.00	118.00	14833
VONA	2049780	12.18	81.2	25.24	70.26	93.68	7607
STRATTON	3931543	17.00	335.4	11.72	38.47	222.26	74546
BETHUNE	2314518	14.17	131.2	17.64	51.25	158.75	20828
BURLINGTON.	12891983	17.00	1030.7	12.51	36.15	211.21	217696

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
LAKE LEADVILLE	\$ 53779910	11.88	2282.0	\$ 23.57	\$ 31.94	\$148.06	\$ 337867
LA PLATA DURANGO	34596015	17.00	3766.9	9.18	35.41	278.45	1048912
BAYFIED	4175875	17.00	390.8	10.69	18.01	260.34	101740
IGNACIO	6392905	17.00	984.3	6.49	5.49	344.10	338697
LARIMER POUDRE	117858110	17.00	12064.0	9.77	41.61	252.31	3043826
THOMPSON	58824380	17.00	6756.9	8.71	26.27	285.73	1930639
ESTES PARK	20018480	12.27	876.9	22.83	47.37	132.63	116307
LAS ANIMAS TRINIDAD	10686090	17.00	2227.1	4.80	19.40	359.03	799594
PRIMERO	5049280	15.29	275.7	18.31	45.68	134.32	37032
HOEHNE	5231930	16.56	346.6	15.10	39.95	170.05	58939
AQUILAR	2672890	17.00	231.2	11.56	31.34	232.12	53667
BRANSON	2157450	10.89	78.3	27.55	76.51	83.49	6537
KIM	4304140	10.96	124.1	34.68	97.95	80.00	9928
LINCOLN HUGO	5260365	13.05	245.1	21.46	66.92	113.08	27715
LIMON	6705500	17.00	607.7	11.03	34.81	237.61	144397
GENOA	2144415	13.97	107.0	20.04	76.60	103.40	11064
KARVAL	3143645	11.58	95.8	32.81	60.56	80.00	7664
ARRIBA	3035485	10.91	110.4	27.50	69.76	90.24	9963
LOGAN VALLEY	47119298	17.00	3937.2	11.97	31.94	224.41	883548
FRENCHMAN	4784351	15.74	301.3	15.88	27.08	182.92	55115
BUFFALO	5390834	15.56	335.6	16.06	29.92	180.08	60434
PLATEAU	6597701	9.92	172.3	38.29	55.10	80.00	13784
MESA DE BEQUE	4041221	9.26	98.5	41.03	94.16	80.00	7880
PLATEAU VALLEY	5300806	14.09	298.7	17.75	40.09	169.91	50752
MESA VALLEY	104007236	17.00	12364.1	8.41	35.63	281.37	3478867



SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1971

\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAE	REV./ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
MINERAL CREEDE	\$ 3396680	14.23	193.4	\$ 17.56	\$ 65.84	\$144.16	\$ 27880
MOFFAT MOFFAT COUNTY	24325740	17.00	1686.3	14.43	71.93	142.83	240859
MONTEZUMA CORTEZ	19100495	17.00	2795.2	6.83	34.62	309.22	864327
DOLORES	4245445	17.00	521.7	8.14	34.17	287.49	149981
MANCOS	2814865	17.00	409.1	6.88	28.88	314.15	128519
MONTROSE MONTROSE WEST END	26603225 8421710	17.00 17.00	3803.0 989.6	7.00 8.51	31.41 35.90	309.67 279.43	1177687 276522
MORGAN BRUSH FT MORGAN WELDON VALLEY WIGGINS	15043600 32522160 3049160 8526040	17.00 17.00 17.00 14.51	1521.0 3201.6 223.1 495.0	9.89 10.16 13.67 17.22	37.58 35.77 50.17 43.65	254.28 251.54 177.48 166.35	386759 805345 39596 82341
OTERO LA JUNTA ROCKY FORD MANZANOLA FOWLER CHERAW SWINK	16171590 15413901 2059444 6329854 2079726 2997247	17.00 17.00 17.00 17.00 17.00 17.00	2838.0 1905.5 384.8 665.3 247.4 340.0	5.70 8.09 5.35 9.51 8.41 8.82	21.53 21.63 17.60 26.20 27.62 27.37	341.60 300.85 351.41 272.05 289.47 282.76	969467 573274 135224 180998 71614 96140
OURAY OURAY RIDGWAY	3097820 2242800	15.00 16.37	185.9 146.9	16.66 15.27	15.88 26.71	194.12 183.29	36086 26926
PARK PLATTE CANYON PARK COUNTY	4204020 7874070	17.00 10.68	366.8 221.2	11.46 35.60	41.98 86.42	223.18 80.00	81862 17696

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
PHILLIPS							
HOLYOKE	\$ 13823960	13.71	676.8	\$ 20.43	\$ 49.67	\$130.33	\$ 88208
HAXTUN	8279958	13.05	385.8	21.46	18.18	161.82	62429
PITKIN							
ASPEN	47425670	9.39	1172.3	40.46	69.36	80.00	93784
PROWERS							
GRANADA	4935208	17.00	447.2	11.04	30.53	241.86	108158
LAMAR	19558980	17.00	2214.3	8.83	25.87	283.97	628784
HOLLY	6506635	17.00	546.4	11.91	19.89	237.67	129864
WILEY CONS	3372447	17.00	272.5	12.38	33.54	216.07	58879
PUEBLO CO							
CITY	182486238	17.00	25640.1	7.12	19.86	319.15	8183039
RURAL	33483206	17.00	4314.8	7.76	20.67	307.40	1326389
RIO BLANCO							
MEEKER	16468385	10.96	601.6	27.37	96.63	80.00	48128
RANGELY	37949750	5.92	591.1	64.20	111.98	80.00	47288
RIO GRANDE							
DEL NORTE	7254650	17.00	797.6	9.10	28.13	277.24	221127
MONTE VISTA	11906115	17.00	1671.8	7.12	33.21	305.72	511100
SARGENT	7047600	14.13	398.3	17.69	8.67	201.33	80189
ROUTT							
HAYDEN	10071530	10.67	358.2	28.12	55.40	104.60	37469
STEAMBOAT SPGS	13927090	17.00	1034.6	13.46	46.18	184.98	191379
SOUTH ROUTT	5791885	17.00	401.9	14.41	42.71	172.29	69245
SAGUACHE							
MOUNTAIN VALLEY	3384100	17.00	252.9	13.38	14.24	218.28	55202
MOFFAT	1792500	10.44	62.4	28.73	12.18	147.82	9224
CENTER CONS	7423105	17.00	796.8	9.32	10.22	291.40	232190

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAE	REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAE	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$ 4148610	11.59	171.7	\$ 24.16	\$ 42.06	\$ 137.94	\$ 23685
SAN MIGUEL							
TELLURIDE	4145260	12.87	190.5	21.76	97.26	82.74	15762
NORWOOD	3476620	17.00	308.2	11.28	78.47	189.77	58486
EGNAR	1434370	13.27	68.0	21.09	104.00	80.00	5440
SEDGWICK							
JULESBURG	7791860	15.12	471.2	16.54	45.26	164.74	77626
PLATTE VALLEY	7637880	13.71	373.9	20.43	42.58	137.42	51380
SUMMIT							
SUMMIT COUNTY	18506590	12.15	803.3	23.04	17.57	162.43	130484
TELLER							
CRIPPLE CRK VIC	3423270	15.19	185.7	18.43	55.32	124.68	23154
WOODLAND PARK	6940690	17.00	1085.5	6.39	19.07	332.23	360637
WASHINGTON							
AKRON	11265700	14.89	599.2	18.80	32.00	148.00	88679
ARICKAREE	7814230	11.92	245.2	31.87	45.10	80.00	19616
OTIS	4626870	14.96	247.2	18.72	40.28	139.72	34538
LONE STAR	2893595	5.91	45.0	64.30	87.93	80.00	3600
WOODLIN	11246875	5.81	171.9	65.43	65.14	80.00	13752
WELD							
VALLEY GILCREST	22905310	16.21	1485.5	15.42	27.22	182.78	271523
EATON	21046590	14.24	1198.4	17.56	43.06	166.94	200059
KEENESBURG	14313890	17.00	1465.1	9.77	25.47	268.44	393287
WINDSOR	19246910	14.69	1009.5	19.07	37.28	217.28	219343
JOHNSTOWN	9980530	17.00	970.0	10.29	38.85	246.24	238849
GREENEY	79185040	17.00	9365.7	8.45	37.36	278.91	2612180
PLATTE VALLEY	8605900	17.00	867.2	9.92	32.80	258.50	224169
FORT LURTON	9619990	17.00	1701.4	5.65	22.05	341.83	581589
HIGHLAND	11457490	17.00	934.0	12.27	66.86	184.60	172418
BRIGGS DALE	2020830	12.35	89.1	22.68	178.06	80.00	7128
PRAIRIE	4794165	11.34	181.2	26.46	154.21	80.00	14496
PAWNEE	3675410	12.31	150.8	24.37	134.20	80.00	12064

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA - 1972  
\$460 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

COUNTY DISTRICT	ASSESSED VALUATION	1972 FDN. LEVY	1972 ADAЕ	REV/ADAЕ RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	OTHER REV. APPLIED PER ADAЕ	STATE FDN. SUPPORT PER ADAЕ	1972 STATE FDN. SUPPORT
YUMA							
WEST YUMA	\$ 16520110	16.20	1070.3	\$ 15.44	\$ 47.26	\$162.74	\$ 174176
EAST YUMA	16499430	14.27	941.9	17.52	41.09	168.91	159101
TOTALS	\$ 5464077579		526182.2		\$17,596,973		\$ 138225371

Tables Prepared By Colorado Association of School Boards, Research Staff  
for the Council on Educational Development.

Data Sources - Colorado Department of Education Files.

Colorado Public School Districts

Office of Division of Property Taxation, State of Colorado

TABLE III

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973

\$21 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	EST. 1973 ADAE	EST. REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
ADAMS						
MAPLETON	\$ 56747751	6904.0	8.22	\$ 36.99	\$344.27	\$ 2376940
EASTLAKE	42924443	16292.6	5.09	19.24	415.27	6768320
ADAMS CITY	45734138	7359.7	6.22	32.08	383.23	2519308
BRIGHTON	24349762	3927.3	7.22	31.83	366.45	1439159
BEANETT	5073326	519.4	9.94	37.23	314.78	150564
STRASBURG	3874571	400.3	9.64	39.71	316.74	126791
WESTMINSTER	79364194	16363.2	4.85	19.06	419.49	6864199
ALAMOSA						
ALAMOSA	14590911	2313.0	9.04	32.43	351.94	814037
BOSCA	2901230	248.9	11.66	26.11	296.69	73446
ARAPAHOE						
ENGLEWOOD	71408769	5111.7	13.97	54.39	229.13	1171244
SHERIDAN	13212105	2255.4	5.86	33.25	388.14	875556
CHEERY CREEK	114524136	10456.7	10.96	43.99	290.65	3039344
LITTLETON	134741793	16596.7	7.93	33.54	352.70	5994736
DEER TRAIL	6667414	216.0	30.87	69.44	80.00	17280
AURORA	122097481	18081.7	6.75	33.19	373.02	6744436
BYERS	6259741	418.2	14.97	44.82	226.14	94588
ARCHULFTA						
PAGOSA SPRINGS	4215472	531.4	13.01	42.89	256.91	162213
BACA						
WALSLEY	3550951	504.4	16.82	21.64	249.36	126775
PRITCHETT	3241321	107.0	30.29	60.75	80.25	8587
SPRINGFIELD	7424998	517.2	14.36	29.00	241.98	125152
VILAS	2435973	80.6	30.22	43.42	97.58	7365
CAMPO	2037272	140.1	14.54	39.25	234.54	32359
BEFNT						
LAS ANIMAS	10035823	1074.0	9.34	29.93	332.22	356804
MC CLAVE	5259655	200.4	26.19	67.29	153.71	30965
BOULDER						
ST VRAIN VALLEY	102917665	11451.9	8.83	27.88	342.97	3996218
BOULDER VALLEY	270057147	22345.4	12.09	38.32	277.23	6194815

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADE FOUNDATION POST LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	EST. 1973 ADE	EST. REV/ADE RAISED BY MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
CHAFFEE	5 8237619	1265.9	6.51	24.07	207.52	5 439030
BUENA VISTA	14635234	1527.5	9.19	32.41	233.00	507726
CHEYENNE						
KIT CARSON	6464486	154.7	+1.79	64.64	80.87	12376
CHEYENNE WELLS	8382479	307.0	27.30	21.66	199.34	61197
ARAPAHOE	2754352	91.1	30.23	41.15	86.53	7519
CLEAR CRK						
IDAHO SPRINGS	33904331	1493.4	22.70	33.38	207.52	310060
CONEJOS						
NORTH CONEJOS	6138791	1346.6	4.56	14.11	429.39	578217
SANFORD	2334460	315.1	7.41	19.83	375.20	118226
SOUTH CONEJOS	3147873	853.6	3.59	16.87	441.46	376919
COSTILLA						
CENTENNIAL	4871831	701.8	6.94	13.07	389.91	273639
SIERRA GRANDE	4836588	300.3	16.11	16.32	254.64	76480
CROWLEY						
CROWLEY COUNTY	7594070	737.5	10.30	20.34	325.61	240137
CUSTER						
CUSTER COUNTY	5605939	208.3	26.91	52.81	168.19	35034
DELTA						
DELTA COUNTY	28358407	3696.0	7.67	41.76	348.80	1289165
DENVER						
DENVER	1514619826	84964.9	17.83	49.96	221.04	18780641
DOLORES						
DOLORES COUNTY	5191572	428.1	12.10	64.24	251.00	107453

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	EST. 1973 ADAE	EST. REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
DOUGLAS DOUGLAS COUNTY	\$ 30700648	3135.7	9.75	\$ 40.86	\$313.69	\$ 983638
EAGLE EAGLE COUNTY	37561227	1610.0	23.39	64.72	176.28	283811
ELBERT ELIZABETH	3092484	460.5	6.72	26.48	380.36	175156
KINGS	2901048	142.0	20.43	60.56	180.44	25622
BIG SANDY	5349343	308.1	17.36	52.90	218.10	67197
ELBERT	1569914	152.5	10.29	36.07	309.93	47264
AGATE	3648904	51.2	71.27	129.98	80.00	4096
EL PASO CALHAN	2718391	258.2	10.53	36.79	305.23	78910
HARRISON	34215682	6672.9	5.73	14.24	409.40	2731885
SECURITY	28932883	8150.7	3.55	11.78	448.88	3658686
FOUNTAIN	6336119	2919.1	2.17	6.85	477.25	1393140
COLOPADO SPRINGS	330459709	33372.8	9.90	29.96	322.70	10769403
CHEYENNE MT	34848572	2100.1	16.59	83.33	187.67	394126
MANITOU SPRINGS	12690497	1151.7	11.02	34.73	298.95	344301
AIP ACADEMY	19624926	4406.0	4.45	6.81	438.47	1931899
ELLCOTT	2182423	279.8	7.44	26.90	367.67	102874
PEYTON	1273637	175.8	7.24	48.35	349.49	61440
HANOVER	2334030	38.9	60.00	159.38	80.00	3112
LEWIS PALMER	11651521	969.3	12.02	30.95	285.70	276929
FALCON	2623041	322.4	8.14	32.57	350.12	112879
EDISON	1221585	38.9	31.40	102.83	80.00	3112
MIAMI YODER	2663273	117.4	22.69	55.37	185.63	21793
FREMONT CANON CITY	23680173	3105.6	7.62	28.01	363.36	1128451
FLORENCE	11385946	1549.5	7.35	22.92	373.16	578211
COTOPAXI	2836000	170.2	16.66	58.75	212.25	36125
GARFIELD ROARING FORK	32038134	2948.3	10.87	40.70	295.57	871429
RIFLE	14052310	1341.4	10.48	64.57	278.34	373365
GRAND VALLEY	2292488	195.8	11.71	76.61	245.35	48040



SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	EST. 1973 DAE	EST. RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADAE	EST. STAFF FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
23016 CA						
GILPIN GILPIN COUNTY	\$ 2134528	73.8	28.92	\$101.63	\$119.37	\$ 8810
GRAND CO WEST GRAND EAST GRAND	8348384 14843370	513.8 507.8	16.25 16.35	46.71 48.47	224.29 222.53	115240 202013
GUNNISON GUNNISON WATER	17176416	1415.4	12.13	43.90	270.85	383469
MINSDALE LAKE CITY	2214784	31.7	69.87	370.03	80.00	2536
HUERFANO WALDENBURG LA VETA	9244623 2924471	1221.2 208.1	8.08 14.05	18.83 36.04	364.84 246.06	445543 51205
JACKSON NORTH PARK	10240082	494.9	20.69	45.94	195.06	96535
JEFFERSON JEFFERSON COUNTY	561016035	49230.1	8.10	35.03	348.21	24106613
KIOWA E405 PLAINVIEW	8653451 7789255	371.5 126.6	23.29 61.53	29.61 51.34	211.39 89.66	78531 11351
KIT CARSON FLAGLER SIERST VONA STRATTON RETHUNE HURLINGTON	3519381 2481748 2090154 4075424 2319240 13034695	223.1 119.3 78.7 349.0 148.3 1042.2	15.77 20.80 26.56 11.68 15.64 12.51	42.58 71.25 78.78 39.93 50.57 40.80	228.42 169.75 142.22 282.66 220.43 267.58	50961 20251 11193 98648 32690 278872

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	FST. 1973 ADAE	EST. REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
LAKE LEADVILLE	\$ 59099505	2309.6	25.55	\$ 34.64	\$186.36	\$ 430417
LA PLATA						
CURANGO	34925251	3870.2	9.02	26.61	340.59	1315661
HAYTID	4354005	410.1	10.63	18.29	322.06	132077
IGNACIO	5814334	1018.9	5.71	5.61	418.38	426287
LAPIER						
POUNCE	12770207	12531.0	10.15	44.85	302.90	3795640
THOMPSON	63555674	7293.7	8.71	25.59	347.27	2532883
ESTES PARK	22274936	922.9	24.14	49.84	191.16	176422
LAS ANIMAS						
TRINIDAD	10565405	2227.0	4.74	11.23	429.12	955650
PRINERO	5025293	282.4	17.75	46.03	224.57	63532
POHOF	5102328	370.3	13.72	37.81	248.95	92186
AGUIAR	2673291	229.4	11.63	36.55	286.68	65979
BRANSON	2133953	80.0	26.67	81.25	139.75	11180
KIM	4304080	116.6	36.91	120.07	80.00	9328
LINCOLN						
HUGO	5212467	238.8	21.83	62.81	178.19	42552
LINON	6735425	624.0	10.75	25.64	311.86	194601
GENOA	2195123	102.5	21.32	89.76	151.24	15502
KARVAL	3227371	91.9	35.12	67.46	80.00	7352
ARRI-A	3071901	106.9	28.74	70.16	150.84	16125
LOGAN						
VALLEY	48120369	3563.4	12.14	34.06	280.54	1111492
FRENCHMAN	4795934	306.6	15.64	30.02	240.98	73884
RUFFALO	5351452	346.6	15.44	39.04	231.96	80397
PLATEAU	6634766	172.8	38.40	57.87	83.16	14370
DE NEQUE	3056221	91.9	33.26	106.64	80.00	7352
PLATEAU VALLEY	5206911	309.2	16.84	42.04	228.56	70794
MESA VALLEY	104614405	12403.1	8.43	38.03	339.59	4211969

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	FST. 1973 ADE	EST. REV/ADE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OT-ER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
MINERAL CREENE	\$ 3795660	205.4	18.42	\$ 73.03	\$167.97	\$ 34501
WOFFAT WOFFAT COUNTY	2337213	154.2	14.05	90.68	190.20	315521
MONTZUMA CORTAZ	19300935	226.0	6.83	29.80	375.09	1062930
DOLORES	4833455	494.8	9.23	37.80	325.31	162763
MANCOS	2951560	412.6	7.15	29.68	369.71	152542
MONTROSE MONTROSE WEST END	26425998 7500314	3751.8 551.6	7.15 8.30	33.32 42.03	366.13 337.83	1373647 321479
MORGAN ARUS- FT MORGAN WELDON VALLEY WIGGINS	14425449 32345420 3009405 9433290	1549.2 3218.9 243.0 481.3	9.52 10.20 12.35 19.60	29.07 37.28 29.22 47.54	329.14 310.25 281.22 193.46	509575 998664 68336 93112
OTERO LA JUNTA ROCKY FORD PARIZANOLA FOHLER CHERAM SWINE	16200534 15346053 2067613 6337334 2073781 3199563	3008.6 1434.9 409.1 555.5 244.9 328.3	5.38 8.35 5.05 9.67 8.47 9.75	20.09 25.36 17.74 32.31 34.79 34.21	409.37 353.09 417.34 324.34 342.25 321.11	1231631 647885 170734 212605 83417 105420
GURAY GURAY PIDGAY	3246381 2339578	178.8 141.5	18.16 16.53	12.72 29.27	228.28 242.73	40916 34346
PARK PLATTE CANYON PARK COUNTY	4746475 8495965	446.3 234.3	10.64 36.26	35.85 89.63	304.35 80.00	135931 18744

SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	EST. 1973 ADAE	EST. REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
PHILLIPS HOLYOKE HARTIN	\$ 14111241 3406850	681.1 372.5	20.72 22.57	\$ 54.47 40.27	\$186.53 200.73	\$ 127046 74772
PITKIN ASPEL	53020736	1236.3	42.89	76.84	80.00	98904
PROWERS GRAMANA LAMAR HOLLY WILEY CONS	4401075 20520368 6579151 3515214	444.7 2208.8 547.3 263.9	11.02 9.29 12.02 13.32	35.98 29.37 19.33 45.47	297.66 333.70 297.32 249.08	132369 737077 162723 65732
PUERLO CO CITY RURAL	191310025 37837035	26589.8 4587.6	7.19 8.28	20.53 20.13	378.16 360.04	10055199 1644519
RIO BLANCO WEEKS DANSELY	16748732 33938707	599.1 566.8	27.99 59.88	113.50 132.53	107.50 80.00	64403 45344
RIO GRANDE DEL NORTE MONTE VISTA SAGEHAT	7666678 12337315 7266548	900.4 1693.4 399.0	9.58 7.29 18.68	32.38 39.94 24.42	325.78 357.30 216.58	260754 605052 84250
ROUTT HAYDEN STEAMBOAT SPRS SOUTH ROUTT	9925009 15960952 5819456	390.6 1082.6 420.7	26.09 14.74 13.83	57.80 46.19 61.80	163.20 224.81 224.02	62114 243379 94245
SAGUACHE MOUNTAIN VALLEY WOLFAT CENTRO CONS	3485457 1864524 7592437	246.1 60.9 791.7	14.16 30.62 9.55	36.57 32.02 31.57	243.66 108.98 326.40	59965 6637 258411



SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL DATA  
1973  
\$521 PER ADAE FOUNDATION SUPPORT LEVEL

COUNTY DISTRICT	EST. ASSESSED VALUATION	EST. 1973 ADAE	EST. REV/ADAE RAISED BY 1 MILL LEVY	EST. OTHER REVENUE APPLIED PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. 1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
-----						
YUMA						
WEST YUMA	\$ 17300982	1061.8	16.29	\$ 61.33	\$209.67	\$ 222628
EAST YUMA	17301669	937.1	18.46	50.53	190.47	178489
TOTALS	\$ 5,795,070,766	540,935.4		\$ 19,363,855		\$ 172,229,640

Tables prepared by the Colorado Association of School Boards, Research staff, for the Council on Educational Development.

Data Sources:

Colorado State Department of Education Files.

Colorado Public School Districts.

Office of Property Tax Administration, State of Colorado.

Projections of 1973 school district data provided by Dr. James Rose, University of Colorado, School of Education, and Edwin Steinbrecher, Colorado Association of School Boards.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH \$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
ADAMS						
MAPLETON	3302.60	2043325	2293.73	2001740	3344.27	\$ 2376840
EASTLAKE	357.46	5002486	356.13	5335591	415.27	6768320
ADAMS CITY	340.54	2762543	332.07	2555889	323.23	2819309
FRIGHTON	307.53	1069644	309.19	1165320	365.45	1439159
BENNETT	204.22	71553	224.46	93578	314.78	160664
STRASBURG	157.21	39494	218.52	59391	316.74	126791
WESTMINSTER	365.62	5645013	362.17	5765760	419.49	6864199
ALAMOSA						
ALAMOSA	315.31	732450	300.94	700490	351.94	814037
MOSCATEL	243.51	57410	243.27	59917	296.69	73846
ARAPAHOE						
ENGLEWOOD	236.48	1342903	202.25	1086871	229.13	1171244
SHERIDAN	342.68	704107	341.79	745106	388.18	875656
CHERRY CREEK	252.91	1913567	239.48	2155652	290.66	3039344
LITTLETON	310.50	4915264	299.64	4942279	352.70	5994736
DEER TRAIL	125.27	15074	105.86	19669	80.00	17280
AURORA	335.96	5962106	321.83	5762969	373.02	6744836
BYERS	124.77	31954	133.84	44522	226.18	94588
ARCHULETA						
PAGOSA SPRINGS	225.74	154477	221.48	147196	256.91	162213
SACA						
WALSHP	191.85	96155	207.86	106175	249.36	126775
BRITCHETT	89.96	10031	80.00	8624	80.25	8587
SPRINGFIELD	151.68	100760	213.52	115494	241.98	125152
VILLAGE	80.00	5440	80.00	5320	97.58	7865
CAYDEN	140.06	28702	196.01	28990	234.54	32859
BENT						
LAS ANIMAS	287.84	335242	278.42	309744	332.22	356804
MC CLAVE	115.46	25257	111.43	22454	153.71	30865
BOULDER						
ST VRAIN VALLEY	287.39	2868097	284.55	3068194	342.97	3996218
BOULDER VALLEY	232.66	4853197	229.07	4950633	277.23	6194815



COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
CHAFFEE	\$328.46	\$ 372472	\$322.41	\$ 381926	\$326.31	\$ 489030
RUFNA VISTA	278.96	414634	273.88	406273	332.39	507726
SALIDA						
CHEYENNE	40.00	14104	80.00	12672	80.00	12376
KIT CARSON	117.91	33509	169.28	51631	199.34	61197
CHEYENNE WELLS	80.00	7304	80.00	7280	86.93	7919
ARAPAHOE						
CLEAR CRK	157.29	200362	147.47	200451	207.62	310060
IDAHO SPRINGS						
CONEJOS	382.28	510843	357.07	476833	429.39	578217
NORTH CONEJOS	364.28	123783	317.21	103980	375.20	118226
SANFORD	374.46	311740	360.32	309585	441.46	376919
SOUTH CONEJOS						
COSTILLA	364.79	245871	346.20	240675	389.91	273639
CENTENNIAL	243.00	69256	215.74	64830	254.68	76480
SIERRA GRANDE						
CROWLEY	255.92	185414	261.58	190092	325.61	240137
CROWLEY COUNTY						
CUSTER	156.99	33373	134.18	28447	168.19	35034
CUSTER COUNTY						
DELTA	303.41	1078679	295.51	1076518	348.80	1289165
DELTA COUNTY						
DENVER	169.15	1520722	164.81	14279794	221.04	18780641
DENVER						
DOLORES	190.62	86789	202.82	89182	251.00	107453
DOLORES COUNTY						

COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
DOUGLAS DOUGLAS COUNTY	\$270.61	\$ 703077	\$256.65	\$ 728419	\$313.69	\$ 983638
EAGLE EAGLE COUNTY	139.61	215308	126.00	196196	176.28	283811
ELBERT ELIZABETH	319.01	115162	319.41	133194	380.36	175156
KIOWA	137.86	18887	130.02	18385	180.44	25622
BIG SANDY	173.63	54608	162.76	50195	218.10	67197
ELBERT	238.84	33486	238.56	34042	309.93	47264
AGATE	80.00	5168	80.00	4464	80.00	4096
EL PASO CALHAN	242.24	58114	241.17	60172	305.23	78810
HARRISON	361.32	1990632	356.51	2154363	409.40	2731885
SECURITY	396.86	3011428	391.94	3043196	448.88	3658686
FOUNTAIN	415.33	1091156	416.90	1168851	477.25	1393140
COLORADO SPRINGS	272.15	8309668	268.66	8597135	322.70	10769403
CHEYENNE MT	160.72	332104	157.83	328146	187.67	394126
MANITOU SPRINGS	252.94	292572	242.43	274993	298.95	344301
AIR ACADEMY	393.63	1636474	385.06	1628342	438.47	1931899
ELLCOTT	313.18	76886	307.31	79961	367.67	102874
PEYTON	273.90	37333	261.75	37849	349.49	61440
HANOVER	80.00	3784	80.00	3048	80.00	3112
LEWIS PALMER	267.71	188818	254.77	215048	285.70	276929
FALCON	291.60	74854	280.66	78473	350.12	112879
EDISON	80.00	3880	80.00	3552	80.00	3112
MIAMI YODER	132.13	14027	128.54	15399	185.63	21793
FREMONT CANON CITY	314.79	943813	296.27	896507	363.36	1128451
FLORENCE	318.28	478180	313.77	474237	373.16	578211
COTOPAXI	160.03	22420	149.22	22637	212.25	36125
GARFIELD ROARING FOPK	246.06	694929	237.70	684872	295.57	871429
RIFLE	230.79	299203	223.33	293079	278.34	373365
GRAND VALLEY	173.35	29296	133.00	23116	245.35	48040

COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
23016 98						
GILPIN GILPIN COUNTY	\$ 0.00	0	\$ 80.00	5194	\$ 119.37	\$ 8810
GRAND CO WEST GRAND EAST GRAND	172.53 164.43	69597 119780	159.43 156.63	74994 128494	224.29 222.53	115240 202013
GUNNISON GUNNISON WATER	203.46	288718	216.37	302597	270.85	393469
HINSDALE LAKE CITY	80.00	1128	80.00	2456	80.00	2536
HUERFANO WALSFBURG LA VETA	296.23 181.52	333104 36395	299.77 193.60	355413 38913	364.84 246.06	445543 51205
JACKSON NORTH PARK	113.54	54032	131.66	61801	195.06	96535
JEFFERSON JEFFERSON COUNTY	292.90	18144157	288.83	19993914	348.21	24106613
KIOWA EADS PLAINVIEW	125.04 80.00	45791 11456	155.81 80.00	57368 10920	211.39 89.66	78531 11351
KIT CARSON FLAGLER SIEBERT VONA STRATTON RETHINE BUPLINGTON	191.22 125.92 85.22 243.72 128.93 232.52	49489 16181 7627 85374 15807 256956	165.95 118.00 93.63 222.26 158.75 211.21	39412 14333 7607 74546 20428 217696	228.42 169.75 142.22 282.66 220.43 267.58	50961 20251 11193 98648 32690 278872

COMPARISON OF \$40 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$40 FDN. LEVEL			1972 \$40 FDN. LEVEL			1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL		
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	\$	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	\$	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
LAKE LEADWILLE	\$157.83	\$ 367344	\$148.06	\$337467	\$ 430417	\$186.36	\$ 430417		
LA PLATA DUBAISO	279.57	1031905	278.45	1048912	1319661	340.98	1319661		
RAYFORD	277.34	1045553	260.34	101740	132077	322.05	132077		
TALAMON	323.50	319939	344.10	336597	426227	418.38	426227		
LARIMER PRINCE	256.28	295575	252.31	3043226	3795640	302.90	3795640		
THOMPSON	283.74	1752269	285.73	1930639	2532883	347.27	2532883		
ESTES PARK	125.93	104703	132.63	116307	176422	151.16	176422		
LAS ANIMAS TRINIDAD	375.55	832485	359.03	799594	955650	429.12	955650		
PRINCE	140.52	37431	134.32	37032	63532	224.97	63532		
MOORE	142.98	47504	170.05	58939	92186	249.95	92186		
ADRIAN	245.31	57983	232.12	53457	65879	286.68	65879		
BRANSON	165.81	7225	83.49	6537	11180	139.75	11180		
KIM	79.65	10216	80.00	9928	9328	80.00	9328		
LINCOLN HUGG	158.65	43011	113.08	27715	42552	178.19	42552		
LINCOLN	251.62	145434	237.61	144397	194601	311.86	194601		
GENO	139.32	14717	103.40	11064	15502	151.24	15502		
KAPVAL	109.91	11387	80.00	7664	7352	80.00	7352		
ARAPA	146.99	21725	90.24	9963	16125	150.84	16125		
LOGAN VALLEY	230.80	92528	224.41	883548	1111892	280.54	1111892		
FRENCHMAN	182.92	52175	182.92	55115	73884	240.93	73884		
RUFFALO	179.92	55973	180.08	60434	80397	231.96	80397		
PLATEAU	79.90	13352	80.00	13784	14370	83.16	14370		
MESA DE HORNE	80.00	9960	80.00	7980	7352	80.00	7352		
PLATEAU VALLEY	136.99	39153	169.91	50752	70794	228.96	70794		
MESA VALLEY	289.96	360335	281.37	3478867	4211969	339.59	4211969		

COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
MINERAL CREEDE	\$118.10	\$ 22604	\$144.16	\$ 27880	\$167.97	\$ 34501
MOFFAT MOFFAT COUNTY	160.61	270975	142.83	240359	190.80	315621
MONTEZUMA CORTEZ	311.68	859264	309.22	864327	376.09	1062830
COLORES	316.14	177451	287.49	149991	326.31	162763
MANCOS	312.96	126280	314.15	128519	369.71	152542
MONTROSE MONTROSE	320.74	1253375	309.67	1177637	366.13	1373647
WEST END	295.34	315009	279.43	276522	337.83	321479
MORGAN BRUSH	278.14	419350	254.28	386759	329.14	509575
FT MORGAN	258.21	828218	251.54	805345	310.25	998664
WELDON VALLEY	205.49	41878	177.43	39596	281.22	68336
WIGGINS	167.10	84553	166.35	82341	193.46	93112
OTERO LA JUNTA	327.46	826064	341.60	969467	409.37	1231631
ROCKY FORD	309.97	611363	300.85	573274	353.09	647885
MANZANOLA	333.03	104003	351.41	135224	417.34	170734
FOUNTER	274.01	180409	272.05	180998	324.34	212605
CHEBAN	292.93	72911	289.47	71614	342.25	83817
SALOME	304.84	112887	282.76	96140	321.11	105420
OURAY OURAY	198.12	38932	194.12	36086	228.28	40816
RIDGWAY	198.05	27747	183.29	26926	242.73	34346
PARK PLATTE CANYON	220.47	66455	223.18	81862	304.35	135831
PARK COUNTY	80.00	15816	80.00	17696	80.00	18744

COMPARISON OF \$450 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$450 FDN. LEVEL			1972 \$450 FDN. LEVEL			1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL		
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	\$	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	\$	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1973 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
PHILLIPS									
HOLYOKE	\$141.29	91024	\$	\$130.33	88208	\$	\$126.53	\$	127046
HAXTON	137.45	53758		151.92	62429		209.73		74772
PITKIN									
ASPEN	80.00	92272		80.00	93784		80.00		98904
PROWERS									
GRAYBARK	246.89	111273		241.86	109158		257.66		132369
LAMAR	304.99	679454		283.97	628784		333.70		737077
HOLLY	232.13	127252		237.67	129464		297.32		162723
WILEY CONS	295.97	59537		215.07	58479		249.08		65732
PUEBLO CO									
CITY	317.85	764855		319.15	8183039		378.16		10055199
RURAN	318.79	1229939		307.40	1325399		350.04		1644519
RIO BLANCO									
MEeker	80.00	48524		80.00	48128		107.50		64403
RANGELY	79.99	50432		80.00	47298		80.00		45344
RIO GRANDE									
DEL NORTE	295.11	227750		277.24	221127		325.78		260754
MONTE VISTA	314.74	531506		305.72	511100		357.30		605052
SARAFAT	177.17	72691		201.33	80189		216.58		94250
ROUff									
PAYSON	119.31	41698		104.60	37469		163.20		62114
STEAMBOAT SPRING	217.14	218439		184.98	191379		224.81		243379
SOUTH ROUff	173.86	65468		172.29	69245		224.02		94245
SAGUACHE									
MOUNTAIN VALLEY	173.34	44107		218.28	55202		243.66		59965
WOLFAT	95.82	5743		147.82	9224		108.98		6637
CENTER COUS	257.71	206554		241.40	232190		326.40		258411

COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ACRE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ACRE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ACRE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$154.97	\$ 31396	\$137.94	\$ 23695	\$165.91	\$ 35600
SAN MIGUEL						
TELLIPIDE	88.13	19035	82.74	15762	116.82	21505
NORWOOD	199.50	65774	189.77	58486	223.96	7278
EGGARS	80.33	6105	80.00	5440	126.15	8238
SEDMICK						
JULESBURG	171.22	84446	164.74	77626	215.02	96587
PLATTE VALLEY	139.74	52459	137.42	51350	195.52	73085
SUMMIT COUNTY	140.36	94668	162.43	130484	197.91	188588
TELLER						
CRIPPLE CRK VIC	114.59	14517	124.68	23154	185.11	36430
WOODLAND PARK	340.84	284207	332.23	360537	401.47	521028
WASHINGTON						
AKRON	149.64	92673	148.00	88579	202.80	118658
APICKAREE	79.97	13760	80.00	19416	22.23	19808
OTTIS	148.51	37751	139.72	34538	191.28	48317
LONE STAR	81.42	4584	80.00	3500	80.00	3328
WOODFIN	80.36	14320	80.00	13752	80.00	14024
WELD						
VALLEY GILCREST	282.36	414655	182.78	271523	206.92	314415
FATO	157.13	188865	166.94	200059	218.55	262632
KEEFERSBURG	260.49	360529	268.44	393287	339.59	524734
HINDSOR	261.41	252651	217.28	219343	171.13	183434
JOHNSTOWN	258.83	242942	246.24	238249	309.57	321612
GREELEY	298.93	2801075	278.91	2612120	320.12	3010376
PLATTE VALLEY	258.14	212109	258.50	224169	321.83	245238
FORT LUPTON	348.55	572232	341.83	581589	401.75	715115
HIGHLAND	131.60	173400	184.60	172418	244.76	229487
BRIGGSDALE	99.94	9824	80.00	7128	80.00	7280
PRAIRIE	80.00	13880	80.00	14496	80.00	15896
PAWNEE	80.37	12200	80.00	12664	80.00	11528

COMPARISON OF \$460 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT  
FOR 1971 AND 1972 WITH  
\$521 FOUNDATION LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR 1973

COUNTY DISTRICT	1971 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1972 \$460 FDN. LEVEL		1973 \$521 FDN. LEVEL	
	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1971 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	1972 STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT PER ADAE	EST. STATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT
YUMA						
WEST YUMA	\$171.19	\$ 152732	\$162.74	\$ 174175	\$209.67	\$ 222628
EAST YUMA	170.96	158121	168.91	159101	190.47	178489
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$ 267.00</b>	<b>\$ 137,071,233</b>	<b>\$ 262.69</b>	<b>\$ 138,225,371</b>	<b>\$ 318.39</b>	<b>\$ 172,229,640</b>

Tables prepared by the Colorado Association of School Boards, Research staff, for the Council on Educational Development.

Data Sources:

Colorado State Department of Education Files.

Colorado Public School Districts.

Office of Property Tax Administration, State of Colorado.

Projections of 1973 school district data provided by Dr. James Rose, University of Colorado, School of Education, and Edwin Steinbrecher, Colorado Association of School Boards.