

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LAMB: ...severe penalty and that that's enough of a penalty without having a monetary penalty. I'll support the amendment, but I'll still oppose the bill. I don't think...I don't think we've gone far enough in reducing the negative impact on the students that remain in the resident district and I think we should still have another funding mechanism which would not penalize the resident district even to the extent that Senator Baack is suggesting in this amendment. I do support the amendment, I'll be opposing the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore, please, followed by Senator Ashford.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, if Senator Baack would yield to a couple of questions just for...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Baack, please.

SENATOR BAACK: Certainly.

SENATOR MOORE: The way I understand it, as the bill now reads, if I have a school district, it has a per pupil cost at \$6,000, that's what they would now pay into the option fund, under the present bill.

SENATOR BAACK: Under the present bill, that's correct.

SENATOR MOORE: And with your amendment the impact of that school district would be lessened dramatically from...if their per pupil cost is \$6,000 under the present bill, what would the financial impact be to this school district under this amendment, roughly, give me a ballpark?

SENATOR BAACK: It would be...right now with the factor, if we use a needs factor from this year, it would be approximately \$1,045 per pupil.

SENATOR MOORE: Okay. That's what I wanted to let the body know just exactly what we're talking about, because the fact of the matter is now, you know, my school district that has a \$6,000 per pupil cost, there, of course, under this bill, if someone opted out of their district they would have to pay a \$6,000 fee into the option fund and obviously they cannot, as Senator Lamb