

**NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used in any other situation.**

**Only the most recent FIR version, excluding attachments, is available on the Intranet. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC office in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.**

**FISCAL IMPACT REPORT**

SPONSOR:	Taylor, J.G.	DATE TYPED:	02/1/00	HB	HJM 40
SHORT TITLE:	Review Sambrano Agreement			SB	
				ANALYST:	Baca

**APPROPRIATION**

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY00	FY01	FY00	FY01		
	NFI				

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates SJM 40

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

LFC files

## **SUMMARY**

### Synopsis of Bill

The memorial requests that the LESC review the Sambrano Agreement and work with the appropriate entities to ensure adherence to the provisions of the agreement. In addition to the LESC, the memorial requests the involvement of the SBE, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the superintendent of the Albuquerque Public Schools (APS), and the south valley community.

### Significant Issues

For many years, complaints were voiced that schools in the south valley were being discriminated against in the allocation of funds for programs, buildings and the quality and number of teachers assigned to south valley schools. Officials from the U.S. Department of Justice responded to formal complaints filed by south valley parents and investigated the validity of the complaints. The evidence obtained by federal officials validated the allegations of discriminatory treatment. In 1987, school district officials, representatives from the south valley and federal officials reached agreement on steps the district would take to correct the inequities found. Allegations of discriminatory treatments continued, and an addendum was signed in 1997. Because allegations of discrimination continue despite the 1997 addendum, this bill requests that steps be taken to ensure that APS adheres to its obligations as stipulated in the agreement.

## **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

None apparent.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

None apparent.

**POSSIBLE QUESTIONS**

1. If the Sambrano agreement has not been adhered to, why not?
  
2. What evidence exists that the district has failed to carry out its responsibilities pursuant to the Sambrano Agreement?

LB/njw