

through equalization and it's going to go to those districts as if they had not reorganized because, and this is the policy rationale of the bill, if we didn't have this, they probably wouldn't have reorganized anyway. So it's probably not going to have, unlike some of the other things that are being proposed that take a minor little shot at Senator Bohlke's idea that's part of the bill that she will be bringing forward later on which genuinely would take money out of equalization. I don't see this as a drain on equalization at all. As a matter of fact in the long run, it's going to support more equalization because after these districts have made the tough decision to reorganize, have gone through their first three or four years of being a reorganized district, in all likelihood they're going to become a more efficient operation. They will need fewer administrators, fewer teachers, other things that go with efficiency of size so they will be down in a lower district. They won't be receiving as much equalization money. That money then will be at that time free to be recirculated within the equalization pot. Secondly, I think, you know we're talking about this money being used up. As I pointed out over the last three or four years there have only been three of these reorganizations take place. The way I have been calculating, \$2.9 million, if it would have \$1,000 impact per student on their needs, it would take 2,900 students in our state being involved in a reorganization effort to use up all of that money. If it would be an average of \$2,000 per student, it would be 1,450 students. The likelihood of that many school districts in the state rushing to reorganize at any one time to have that many students involved, I don't think is that likely. I didn't realize until a few moments ago that there was this proration in here and I appreciate that it's there to protect the Equalization Fund, but I don't know, I suspect we'll never get to that particular point anyway in any given year where more than \$2.9 million are being expended so I don't think...either of those issues are good as far as making people better understand the bill and what it does, but I don't think that they're likely to happen. If they do, I don't think the impact will be that great. So with that I again support the bill in it's green copy form and have even, even sat here and talked myself, Senator Bohlke, out of even offering either of those amendments that are up there, so we'll just get on with the bill when the time comes.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Withem. Seeing no other lights to discuss the Bohlke amendment, Senator Bohlke, to close