

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 20, 2005

LB 126

SENATOR HEIDEMANN: Why do we want to compensate these schools?

SENATOR RAIKES: Senator, these...this was part of the discussion on...at the end of General File, as I tried to point out. These are the Class I-Class VI schools that would lose all of this REAP money. As you pointed out, there's about \$2.3 million that goes to schools now in the state through that program. There would be...as near as we can tell, that would be reduced by about \$1 million statewide. In other words, there are a number of schools that would continue to qualify for REAP funding, even after LB 126, because they would have fewer than 600 students. These are the ones who would lose all of the REAP funding, these six...five, excuse me, five Class I-Class VI systems.

SENATOR HEIDEMANN: You are right. The school districts where these children will be assimilated with will receive some money. It will go down from sometimes on the average of \$2,000 per student, according to the formula,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR HEIDEMANN: ...\$100 per student. Isn't that correct, Senator Raikes?

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes. The formula is spelled out there in those footnotes, and it...I think the maximum size that can be is 600 students, to receive. And then there is a decline...I think, as schools get smaller, the amount per school goes down, but the amount per student goes up. And it's a particular quirk of the way they've decided to define this.

SENATOR HEIDEMANN: And according to the funding formula, the maximum that a school can receive is \$60,000. Why...how can we justify giving some schools \$165,000? If the maximum they would receive under the REAP program, or under that Rural Small Schools Association (sic) is \$60,000, why do we want to give them \$165,000?

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, quickly, before you run out of time, there were...this is a part of the...putting the districts