

LESC bill analyses are available on the New Mexico Legislature website ([www.nmlegis.gov](http://www.nmlegis.gov)). Bill analyses are prepared by LESC staff for standing education committees of the New Mexico Legislature. LESC does not assume any responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

**LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE**  
**BILL ANALYSIS**  
**55th Legislature, 1st Session, 2021**

<b>Bill Number</b>	<u>SB41/aSEC/aSFC</u>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<u>Stewart</u>
<b>Tracking Number</b>	<u>218640.3</u>	<b>Committee Referrals</b>	<u>SEC/SFC; HEC/HAFC</u>
<b>Short Title</b>	<u>School Funding Changes</u>		
<b>Analyst</b>	<u>Simon, Bedeaux</u>	<b>Original Date</b>	<u>1/25/21</u>
		<b>Last Updated</b>	<u>3/9/21</u>

---

---

**FOR THE LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE**

**BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis of Senate Finance Committee Amendment

The Senate Finance Committee Amendment to Senate Bill 41 (SB41/aSEC/aSFC) amends the calculation of the state equalization guarantee distribution for school districts and charter schools with fewer than 200 students. The amendment specifies enrollment growth program units in the current year are not included in the calculation of save harmless program units.

Synopsis of Senate Education Committee Amendment

The Senate Education Committee Amendment to Senate Bill 41 (SB41/aSEC) strikes the contingency for the effective date of the bill. If enacted, the provisions of SB41/aSEC would become effective July 1, 2021.

Synopsis of Original Bill

Senate Bill 41 (SB41) amends the public school funding formula to eliminate credits for local and federal revenue, which includes federal Impact Aid revenue, federal forest reserve payments, and the local half-mill property tax levy. It further requires school districts and charter schools that receive this revenue include in their annual educational plans an explanation of how the school district or charter school will use this revenue to improve outcomes for students. SB41 also amends the Public School Capital Outlay Act “phase two” state and local match calculation to consider a rolling 10-year average of any unrestricted revenue used for capital outlay expenditures in setting the percent of funding the state will provide for projects funded with public school capital outlay fund revenue. The effective date of the bill is contingent on the dismissal of the *Zuni* capital outlay lawsuit and the withdrawal of school districts that receive federal Impact Aid funds from the *Martinez-Yazzie* education sufficiency lawsuit, but no earlier than July 1, 2021.

## FISCAL IMPACT

SB41/aSEC/aSFC makes changes to the public school funding formula that could have a disequalizing effect on school district and charter school operational funding. New Mexico's public school funding formula is designed to equitably distribute state funding to school districts and charter schools to minimize disparities in revenue available for operations. To maintain an equalized operational funding, the public school funding formula considers additional unrestricted revenue received by school districts and charter schools and reduces state revenue to these school districts and charter schools. The Public School Finance Act directs the Public Education Department (PED) to take credit for 75 percent of federal Impact Aid, federal forest reserve payments, and the local half-mill levy when calculating a school district's or state-chartered charter school's state equalization guarantee distribution (SEG). SB41/aSEC/aSFC would eliminate these credits from the calculation and direct additional state revenue to those school districts and charter schools with outside revenue sources. **Attachment 4: Operational and Average Capital Outlay Revenue per Student** shows average per student revenue by school district.

In FY20, school districts and charter schools in New Mexico received \$109.7 million in these funds and the state took an \$82.3 million credit for this revenue. Of this, \$80 million of the revenue was for federal Impact Aid, resulting in a \$60 million credit.

Reducing these credits without an appropriation to the SEG would reduce the pool of money available for program cost, the amount of money the state assumes public schools need to operate, and reduce the amount distributed through the formula to some school districts and charter schools; the House Appropriation and Finance Committee substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 (HB2/HAFCS) includes funds for the elimination of funding formula credits. During the June 2020 special session, the Legislature appropriated \$31 million to partially backfill an assumed \$67 million reduction to program cost due to an April 2020 determination from the U.S. Department of Education that the state could not take credit for Impact Aid in FY20 because the difference in per student funding was more than what was allowed by federal law. PED estimates the additional cost to eliminate the credit for federal Impact Aid at \$35 million, which would backfill what remains of the reduction. In addition to the \$31 million appropriated for FY21, HB2/HAFCS includes \$35 million for the full elimination of the Impact Aid credit and \$16.7 million to eliminate the credits for federal forest reserve payments and the local half mill property tax levy, for a total of \$82.7 million. This appropriation is contingent on the passage of HB6 or similar legislation removing local and federal revenue credits and allocating an equal amount of SEG for select purposes. As written, SB41/aSEC/aSFC would remove local and federal revenue credits but would not meet the full contingency.

With additional appropriations to the SEG to offset the loss of the credits, SB41/aSEC/aSFC would result in an \$82.7 million increase in state revenue for 89 school districts and five state-chartered charter schools, representing a 2.7 percent increase when compared with FY20 total statewide program cost. The budget impact to school districts and charter schools would vary by entity: 11 school districts and one state-chartered charter school would see an increase in state funding of more than 10 percent, providing these entities with additional funding to improve programs for at-risk students or for capital outlay expenses. Charter schools without this revenue would not see additional funds. See **Attachment 1: Funding Formula Revenue With and Without Consideration of Impact Aid, Forest Reserve Payments, and the Half Mill Levy, Using FY20 Data**.

**Capital Outlay.** By amending the capital outlay state and local match calculation to consider discretionary funds used for capital expenses, SB41/aSEC/aSFC would reduce the state's

responsibility to fund projects in school districts that opt to spend noncapital funds on capital projects. Staff anticipate school districts receiving a large amount of new funding from the elimination of SEG credits will use a significant amount of funding on capital outlay expenses, including the litigant school districts in the *Zuni* capital outlay lawsuit, which have historically had high capital needs. Assuming all affected school districts spend 50 percent of the additional revenue they will receive on capital expenditures, the bill would have the greatest impact on the state and local match amounts in Central, Gallup, Jemez Valley, and Grants, as summarized in the table below.

**Summary of Impact to Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculations**  
(FY24, estimated midpoint impact after full phase-in)

School District	Restricted Capital Outlay Revenue	10-Year Average Annual Unrestricted Revenue Spent on Capital Outlay*	Total Annual Capital Outlay Revenue	Current Law		FY24 Bill Scenario		Change in State Match	Change in Local Match
				State Match	Local Match	State Match	Local Match		
1 CENTRAL	\$3,555.3	\$1,324.0	\$4,879.3	52%	48%	29%	71%	-23%	23%
2 GALLUP	\$3,780.0	\$2,113.2	\$5,893.2	78%	22%	59%	41%	-19%	19%
3 DES MOINES	\$163.5	\$45.0	\$208.5	25%	75%	6%	94%	-19%	19%
4 JEMEZ VALLEY	\$454.7	\$104.4	\$559.1	40%	60%	23%	77%	-17%	17%
5 GRANTS	\$1,471.7	\$552.3	\$2,024.0	68%	32%	52%	48%	-17%	17%
6 PECOS	\$609.1	\$53.8	\$662.8	22%	78%	6%	94%	-16%	16%
7 ZUNI	\$10.4	\$360.3	\$370.7	100%	0%	84%	16%	-16%	16%
8 TEXICO	\$387.1	\$74.4	\$461.4	53%	47%	42%	58%	-11%	11%
9 LOVINGTON	\$3,199.4	\$192.6	\$3,392.1	20%	80%	8%	92%	-11%	11%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b>\$271,078.8</b>	<b>\$8,422.0</b>	<b>\$279,500.8</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>2%</b>

Source: LESC Files

\*Note: Revenue includes actual 10-year average of capital expenditures from school district general funds and local grant funds, plus an amount equivalent to 50 percent of FY20 credited revenues.

The phase two state and local match calculation, a revised formula intended to bring greater equity to public school capital outlay distribution, will be fully phased in in FY24; currently, the state and local match calculation is an average of the phase one and phase two calculations. Additional revenues considered in the state and local match calculation would reduce the state funding required for new capital projects, while increasing the local share of funding in some individual school districts. See **Attachment 2, Estimated FY24 Impact SB41 on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation**. School districts that opt to use a substantial amount of unrestricted revenue on capital expenditures each year over 10 years would see additional reductions to the state match and an increasing local responsibility to fund capital projects. See **Attachment 3, Estimated 10-Year Impact of SB41 on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation**.

**Save Harmless Program Units.** SB41/aSEC/aSFC would amend the calculation of save harmless program units to provide that a calculation of save harmless program units excludes enrollment growth program units. Save harmless program units are the result of language included in Section 22-8-25 NMSA 1978 that provides a school district or charter school with 200 or fewer students is entitled to program units based on the greater of current year enrollment on the first reporting date or the average enrollment on the prior year second and third reporting date. See page 10, line 24 through page 11, line 3 of SB41.

According to PED staff, the department has traditionally excluded enrollment growth program units when calculating save harmless program units, but recently some charter schools expressed concern excluding these program units did not align with the plain text of the statute. As a result, PED adopted an administrative rule specifying that from January 12, 2021 the calculation of save harmless program units would include enrollment growth program units and changes in small

school adjustment program units. This rule change had the effect of increasing the number of save harmless program units. PED staff cited the additional save harmless program units in FY21 as one of several factor in the relatively small unit value increase passed along to school districts and charter schools in January 2021. The language in SB41/aSEC/aSFC would return PED to the previous practice of excluding enrollment growth program units from the calculation of save harmless program units.

In 1986, the Legislature amended the Public School Finance Act to provide that a school district with 200 or fewer students would have the number of funding formula program units calculated based on the number of students enrolled in the current year or the prior year, whichever was greater. At the time, school districts were generally funded on current year enrollment. This provision had the effect of boosting funding for small school districts with declining enrollment, reflected by the name “save harmless.” A small school district with an enrollment decline was “saved” from the financial effects of that enrollment decline and held “harmless” in the current school year. In 1999, the state switched from a current year funding system to a prior-year funding system, essentially transforming the “save harmless” program from one that protects shrinking school districts from funding declines to a program that assists growing school districts. In that way, the program functions similarly to enrollment growth program units, enacted in 1990 to provide additional funding for growing school districts. In 2006, the statute was amended to make charter schools eligible for enrollment growth.

## **SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

Recently, the Legislature has considered several bills that proposed to eliminate the credit for federal Impact Aid payments from the SEG calculation. The federal Impact Aid program provides grants to school districts and state-chartered charter schools impacted by federal activity, based on the number of students enrolled in a school district or charter school with a connection to federal activity. Children living on Indian lands; children who live on federal property, including military bases and low-rent housing; children with parents who work on federal property; and children of military personnel are all considered “federally connected children.”

***State Equalization Guarantee Distribution.*** Prior to the adoption of the funding formula in 1974, operational revenue to school districts was highly disequalized, and school districts with high levels of property wealth had more funding available for their schools. With the adoption of the funding formula in 1974, New Mexico agreed to equalize operational revenue across school districts, including both federal revenues and local property taxes, although property taxes were assessed at a much higher rate before 1981. The funding formula currently assesses the unique circumstances and individualized needs of school districts and charter schools to determine program cost, an amount of revenue which each school district and charter school is guaranteed to receive. A school district or charter school will receive its full program cost through some combination of the SEG distribution, 75 percent of operational Impact Aid, 75 percent of federal forest reserve payments, and 75 percent of the local half mill levy.

The federal Impact Aid law allows a state with a program designed to equalized education funding to consider Impact Aid payments and reduce state aid payments when allocating state funds to school districts. Since the 1970s, New Mexico has been certified by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) as an equalized state, but in April 2020, USDE found the state was ineligible to consider federal Impact Aid funding in FY20 because the state failed to meet the disparity standard set in federal law. Following the withdrawal of PED’s appeal of this decision, an administrative law judge ordered the state to repay credited revenue from FY20. For FY21, USDE

has certified New Mexico as an equalized state, allowing the state to take credit for federal Impact Aid payments. Four school districts requested a hearing from USDE challenging the ability of the state to take credit, but USDE found the preliminary data submitted by the state met the requirements of federal law. A school district or state-chartered charter school could appeal this determination and final data submitted by the state must confirm USDE’s analysis of preliminary data.

***Funding for Capital Projects.*** Due to an inability to raise sufficient local funding, the Gallup-McKinley County, Grants, and Zuni school boards reopened the *Zuni* lawsuit in 2016, arguing the capital outlay system remains inequitable and continues to be based heavily on local property wealth. The plaintiff school districts, now including only Gallup and Zuni, have argued property-wealthy school districts are able to use revenues from industrial revenue bonds, payments in lieu of taxes, and other sources to build spaces above the statewide adequacy standards, creating nonuniform facilities statewide. The plaintiff school districts offered elimination of the Impact Aid credit as a solution to their local capital revenue issues and have explained they would likely spend the uncredited Impact Aid revenue on capital needs.

The Public School Capital Outlay Act “phase two state and local match calculation” was designed to more equitably distribute state funding for capital projects based on the amount of revenue each school district is able to raise. The calculation estimates the amount of local revenue school districts receive from mill levies on residential and nonresidential properties annually, then calculates whether that amount is sufficient to replace facilities on a 45-year schedule. School districts with lower amounts of property wealth, such as those that receive federal Impact Aid payments, receive larger contributions from the state toward construction projects. SB41/aSEC/aSFC would amend this calculation to begin considering the amount of unrestricted funding school districts choose to spend on capital outlay annually, operating under the assumption that any revenue source used for capital should count toward local wealth.

In December 2020, the 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial District court issued a ruling in the *Zuni* lawsuit, finding the Public School Capital Outlay Act and the Public School Capital Improvements Act have exacerbated “gross disparities” between property-wealthy and property-poor school districts. The judge’s ruling does not appear to consider the phase two state and local match calculation and does not cite specific evidence of disparities, leaving policymakers without a clear understanding of why the court found the systems unconstitutional. However, if the state appeals the ruling, the court’s order will be “stayed” until the case is heard in a higher court. The deadline for the state to file a notice of appeal is January 28, 2021.

***Reporting Requirements.*** SB41/aSEC/aSFC would require school district and charter schools to report to PED on the use of funds no longer subject to a funding formula credit. Eliminating funding formula credits would give school districts an additional revenue source to satisfy the requirements of the *Martinez-Yazzie* education sufficiency lawsuit and the *Zuni* capital outlay lawsuit. School districts would be required to include information in their annual educational plan on the intended uses of the funds and how the programs and services funded are designed to improve outcomes for students. Following the close of the fiscal year, school districts and charter schools would be required to report on the actual use of these funds and evaluate how the funded programs and services improved student results.

Each school district or charter school that receives Impact Aid for students residing on tribal land would be required to report on their consultations with tribal authorities. These school districts are already required under federal law to consult with tribal authorities.

SB41/aSEC/aSFC also requires PED to report to the Legislature on how school districts and charter schools are using these funds and to identify best practices on how school districts and charter schools are using these funds to improve student results.

***Public School Utility Conservation Fund.*** SB41/aSEC/aSFC makes a technical correction to Section 6-23-7 NMSA 1978, deleting a reference to Paragraph 7 of Subsection D of Section 22-8-25 NMSA 1978 (see page 2, line 13 of SB41) to maintain a correct statutory reference given changes in Section 22-8-25 NMSA 1978 (see page 11, line 15 of SB41). The law would still require the secretary of public education to determine deductions pursuant to Section 22-8-25 but does not refer to a specific paragraph to avoid the need for an additional technical amendment if Section 22-8-25 NMSA 1978 is amended in the future. SB41/aSEC/aSFC also makes technical corrections to update references to the state department of education and the superintendent of public instruction.

SB41/aSEC/aSFC would also amend section 6-23-7 NMSA 1978 to add LESC to the agencies informed prior to each regular legislative session of the list of school districts proposing to enter into a guaranteed utility savings contract.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

SB41/aSEC/aSFC requires PED to change calculations of the SEG, which would make the total amount of revenue available for distribution to school districts and charter schools more predictable, particularly during the budgeting process. Because of the uncertainty in Impact Aid payments, PED typically makes conservative estimates of Impact Aid revenue; reducing this uncertainty could lead PED to set a higher preliminary unit value before the start of the fiscal year and reduce the need to increase the unit value in January, half way through the fiscal year. However, there are alternatives that would allow PED to set a higher preliminary unit value while maintaining an equalized funding formula.

SB41/aSEC/aSFC requires PED to certify to the Public School Capital Outlay Council the annual amount of unrestricted revenue used to make capital outlay expenditures and the annual amount of inter-fund transfers from an unrestricted fund to a fund restricted for capital outlay. The Public School Facilities Authority would be required to recalculate the annual state and local match amounts for school districts using this new certified amount.

## **RELATED BILLS**

SB41/aSEC/aSFC conflicts with House Bill 6, which would eliminate the funding formula credits for federal Impact Aid, federal forest reserve payments, and the local half mill levy and require school districts and state-chartered charter schools to budget an amount equal to 75 percent of those revenue sources for expenses related to the Indian Education Act, the Public School Capital Outlay Act, the Public School Capital Improvements Act, the Public School Building Act, and the Community Schools Act.

## **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

- LESC Files
- Public School Facilities Authority

Funding Formula Revenue With and Without Consideration of Impact Aid, Forest Reserve Payments, and the Half Mill Levy, Using FY20 Data

School District or Charter School	FY20 Actual Amounts					Amount Assuming No Credit and Flat Program Cost					Difference	Percent of Total
	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy	Total Revenue	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy	Total Revenue		
1 ALAMOGORDO	\$45,883,078	\$696,890	\$221,591	\$253,316	\$47,054,875	\$46,761,926	\$696,890	\$221,591	\$253,316	\$47,933,723	\$878,848	1.9%
2 ALBUQUERQUE	\$718,022,132	\$81,501	\$26,179	\$5,508,134	\$723,637,946	\$722,233,992	\$81,501	\$26,179	\$5,508,134	\$727,849,806	\$4,211,860	0.6%
3 ACE LEADERSHIP	\$3,093,315	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,093,315	\$3,093,315	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,093,315	\$0	0.0%
4 ALBUQUERQUE CHARTER ACADEMY	\$3,375,475	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,375,475	\$3,375,475	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,375,475	\$0	0.0%
5 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY	\$1,848,842	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,848,842	\$1,848,842	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,848,842	\$0	0.0%
6 ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,973,660	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,973,660	\$3,973,660	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,973,660	\$0	0.0%
7 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	\$3,799,685	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,799,685	\$3,799,685	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,799,685	\$0	0.0%
8 CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL	\$3,781,915	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,781,915	\$3,781,915	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,781,915	\$0	0.0%
9 CORAL COMMUNITY	\$1,950,925	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,950,925	\$1,950,925	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,950,925	\$0	0.0%
10 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL	\$2,950,354	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,950,354	\$2,950,354	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,950,354	\$0	0.0%
11 COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL ST. CHARTER	\$5,654,823	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,654,823	\$5,654,823	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,654,823	\$0	0.0%
12 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	\$2,716,587	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,716,587	\$2,716,587	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,716,587	\$0	0.0%
13 EAST MOUNTAIN	\$3,314,592	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,314,592	\$3,314,592	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,314,592	\$0	0.0%
14 EL CAMINO REAL	\$3,364,563	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,364,563	\$3,364,563	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,364,563	\$0	0.0%
15 GILBERT L. SENA STATE CHARTER	\$2,053,602	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,053,602	\$2,053,602	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,053,602	\$0	0.0%
16 GORDON BERNELL	\$3,343,480	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,343,480	\$3,343,480	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,343,480	\$0	0.0%
17 HEALTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER	\$2,723,159	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,723,159	\$2,723,159	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,723,159	\$0	0.0%
18 INT'L SCHOOL MESA DEL SOL ST. CHARTER	\$3,065,972	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,065,972	\$3,065,972	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,065,972	\$0	0.0%
19 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	\$4,102,003	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,102,003	\$4,102,003	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,102,003	\$0	0.0%
20 LOS PUENTES	\$2,120,174	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,120,174	\$2,120,174	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,120,174	\$0	0.0%
21 MARK ARMIJO (NUESTROS VALORES)	\$2,155,542	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,155,542	\$2,155,542	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,155,542	\$0	0.0%
22 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	\$1,793,275	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,793,275	\$1,793,275	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,793,275	\$0	0.0%
23 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	\$1,936,377	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,936,377	\$1,936,377	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,936,377	\$0	0.0%
24 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	\$4,111,479	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,111,479	\$4,111,479	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,111,479	\$0	0.0%
25 NEW AMERICA CHARTER SCHOOL ST. CH.	\$2,597,954	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,597,954	\$2,597,954	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,597,954	\$0	0.0%
26 NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL	\$2,794,770	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,794,770	\$2,794,770	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,794,770	\$0	0.0%
27 PAPA	\$3,519,816	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,519,816	\$3,519,816	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,519,816	\$0	0.0%
28 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	\$3,745,166	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,745,166	\$3,745,166	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,745,166	\$0	0.0%
29 SIEMBRA LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	\$1,644,773	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,644,773	\$1,644,773	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,644,773	\$0	0.0%
30 SOUTH VALLEY	\$6,019,502	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,019,502	\$6,019,502	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,019,502	\$0	0.0%
31 TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP	\$2,449,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,449,600	\$2,449,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,449,600	\$0	0.0%
32 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	\$2,789,261	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,789,261	\$2,789,261	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,789,261	\$0	0.0%
33 WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER	\$752,411	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$752,411	\$752,411	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$752,411	\$0	0.0%
34 ANIMAS	\$2,363,601	\$0	\$7,809	\$17,781	\$2,389,191	\$2,382,793	\$0	\$7,809	\$17,781	\$2,408,383	\$19,192	0.8%
35 ARTESIA	\$31,769,051	\$0	\$11,190	\$838,095	\$32,618,336	\$32,406,014	\$0	\$11,190	\$838,095	\$33,255,299	\$636,963	2.0%
36 AZTEC	\$2,627,020	\$0	\$0	\$229,382	\$2,856,402	\$2,799,056	\$0	\$0	\$229,382	\$2,302,838	\$553,564	19.4%
37 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	\$1,536,141	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,536,141	\$1,536,141	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,536,141	\$0	0.0%
38 BELEN	\$34,502,047	\$0	\$3,032	\$234,755	\$34,739,834	\$34,680,387	\$0	\$3,032	\$234,755	\$34,918,174	\$178,340	0.5%
39 BERNALILLO	\$25,407,372	\$4,535,563	\$19,360	\$176,368	\$30,138,663	\$28,955,840	\$4,535,563	\$19,360	\$176,368	\$33,687,131	\$3,548,468	11.8%
40 BLOOMFIELD	\$22,943,555	\$564,595	\$0	\$349,427	\$23,857,577	\$23,629,071	\$564,595	\$0	\$349,427	\$24,543,093	\$685,516	2.9%
41 CAPITAN	\$5,206,955	\$0	\$24,147	\$121,000	\$5,352,102	\$5,315,815	\$0	\$24,147	\$121,000	\$5,460,962	\$108,860	2.0%
42 CARLSBAD	\$60,508,843	\$0	\$20,557	\$2,304,808	\$62,834,208	\$62,252,867	\$0	\$20,557	\$2,304,808	\$64,578,232	\$1,744,024	2.8%
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	\$2,274,258	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,274,258	\$2,274,258	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,274,258	\$0	0.0%
44 PECOS CONNECTIONS	\$10,411,241	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,411,241	\$10,411,241	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,411,241	\$0	0.0%
45 CARRIZOZO	\$2,422,307	\$0	\$6,271	\$30,537	\$2,459,115	\$2,449,913	\$0	\$6,271	\$30,537	\$2,486,721	\$27,606	1.1%
46 CENTRAL CONS.	\$35,044,142	\$21,887,302	\$0	\$459,572	\$57,391,016	\$51,804,297	\$21,887,302	\$0	\$459,572	\$74,151,171	\$16,760,155	29.2%
47 DREAM DINE'	\$202,146	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$202,146	\$202,146	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$202,146	\$0	0.0%
48 CHAMA VALLEY	\$5,178,071	\$0	\$65,155	\$54,410	\$5,297,636	\$5,267,744	\$0	\$65,155	\$54,410	\$5,387,309	\$89,673	1.7%

Funding Formula Revenue With and Without Consideration of Impact Aid, Forest Reserve Payments, and the Half Mill Levy, Using FY20 Data

	FY20 Actual Amounts					Amount Assuming No Credit and Flat Program Cost					Difference	Percent of Total		
	School District or Charter School	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy	Total Revenue	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy			Total Revenue	
49	CIMARRON	\$4,371,155	\$0	\$7,320	\$186,151	\$4,564,626	\$4,516,258	\$0	\$7,320	\$186,151	\$4,709,729	\$145,103	3.2%	49
50	MORENO VALLEY HIGH	\$909,017	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$909,017	\$909,017	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$909,017	\$0	0.0%	50
51	CLAYTON	\$5,385,328	\$0	\$0	\$83,007	\$5,468,335	\$5,447,583	\$0	\$0	\$83,007	\$5,530,590	\$62,255	1.1%	51
52	CLOUDCROFT	\$4,885,175	\$0	\$16,186	\$54,954	\$4,956,315	\$4,938,530	\$0	\$16,186	\$54,954	\$5,009,670	\$53,355	1.1%	52
53	CLOVIS	\$65,930,386	\$294,254	\$0	\$382,929	\$66,607,569	\$66,438,273	\$294,254	\$0	\$382,929	\$67,115,456	\$507,887	0.8%	53
54	COBRE CONS.	\$13,640,057	\$0	\$92,564	\$96,815	\$13,829,436	\$13,782,091	\$0	\$92,564	\$96,815	\$13,971,470	\$142,034	1.0%	54
55	CORONA	\$1,538,663	\$0	\$2,797	\$31,634	\$1,573,094	\$1,564,486	\$0	\$2,797	\$31,634	\$1,598,917	\$25,823	1.6%	55
56	CUBA	\$6,470,359	\$1,368,585	\$3,465	\$7,916,637	\$7,516,637	\$7,555,068	\$1,368,585	\$3,465	\$7,4228	\$9,001,346	\$1,084,709	13.7%	56
57	DEMING	\$50,478,465	\$0	\$0	\$345,681	\$50,824,146	\$50,737,726	\$0	\$0	\$345,681	\$51,083,407	\$259,261	0.5%	57
58	DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	\$1,750,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,750,874	\$1,750,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,750,874	\$0	0.0%	58
59	DES MOINES	\$1,719,266	\$0	\$0	\$17,163	\$1,736,429	\$1,732,138	\$0	\$0	\$17,163	\$1,749,301	\$12,872	0.7%	59
60	DEXTER	\$8,802,399	\$0	\$1,262	\$30,670	\$8,834,331	\$8,826,348	\$0	\$1,262	\$30,670	\$8,858,280	\$23,949	0.3%	60
61	DORA	\$2,924,449	\$0	\$0	\$17,585	\$2,942,034	\$2,937,638	\$0	\$0	\$17,585	\$2,955,223	\$13,189	0.4%	61
62	DULCE	\$4,624,105	\$3,392,437	\$92,543	\$120,454	\$8,229,539	\$7,328,181	\$3,392,437	\$92,543	\$120,454	\$10,933,615	\$2,704,076	32.9%	62
63	ELIDA	\$2,361,722	\$0	\$0	\$12,453	\$2,374,175	\$2,371,062	\$0	\$0	\$12,453	\$2,383,515	\$9,340	0.4%	63
64	ESPAÑOLA	\$31,536,450	\$3,377	\$520,921	\$127,381	\$32,188,129	\$32,025,209	\$3,377	\$520,921	\$127,381	\$32,676,888	\$488,759	1.5%	64
65	ESTANCIA	\$7,306,790	\$0	\$18,580	\$55,160	\$7,380,530	\$7,362,095	\$0	\$18,580	\$55,160	\$7,435,835	\$55,305	0.7%	65
66	EUNICE	\$7,611,271	\$0	\$0	\$677,092	\$8,288,363	\$8,119,090	\$0	\$0	\$677,092	\$8,796,182	\$507,819	6.1%	66
67	FARMINGTON	\$89,710,293	\$120,531	\$0	\$603,839	\$90,434,663	\$90,253,571	\$120,531	\$0	\$603,839	\$90,977,941	\$543,278	0.6%	67
68	FLOYD	\$2,902,651	\$0	\$0	\$7,021	\$2,909,672	\$2,907,917	\$0	\$0	\$7,021	\$2,914,938	\$5,266	0.2%	68
69	FT. SUMNER	\$3,514,488	\$0	\$0	\$35,086	\$3,549,574	\$3,540,802	\$0	\$0	\$35,086	\$3,575,888	\$26,314	0.7%	69
70	GADSDEN	\$127,727,290	\$0	\$0	\$412,458	\$128,139,748	\$128,036,633	\$0	\$0	\$412,458	\$128,449,091	\$309,343	0.2%	70
71	GALLUP	\$83,626,806	\$32,290,702	\$130,243	\$354,583	\$116,402,334	\$108,208,453	\$32,290,702	\$130,243	\$354,583	\$140,983,981	\$24,581,647	21.1%	71
72	GRADY	\$2,264,725	\$0	\$0	\$5,697	\$2,270,422	\$2,268,997	\$0	\$0	\$5,697	\$2,274,694	\$4,272	0.2%	72
73	GRANTS	\$29,698,744	\$2,563,649	\$222,764	\$151,859	\$32,637,016	\$31,902,448	\$2,563,649	\$222,764	\$151,859	\$34,840,720	\$2,203,704	6.8%	73
74	HAGERMAN	\$5,297,777	\$0	\$583	\$13,620	\$5,311,980	\$5,308,429	\$0	\$583	\$13,620	\$5,322,632	\$10,652	0.2%	74
75	HATCH	\$11,589,105	\$0	\$0	\$32,191	\$11,621,296	\$11,613,248	\$0	\$0	\$32,191	\$11,645,439	\$24,143	0.2%	75
76	HOBBS	\$86,395,558	\$0	\$0	\$799,456	\$87,195,014	\$86,995,150	\$0	\$0	\$799,456	\$87,994,606	\$599,592	0.7%	76
77	HONDO	\$2,455,783	\$0	\$6,853	\$17,320	\$2,479,956	\$2,473,913	\$0	\$6,853	\$17,320	\$2,498,086	\$18,130	0.7%	77
78	HOUSE	\$1,569,937	\$0	\$0	\$6,797	\$1,576,734	\$1,575,035	\$0	\$0	\$6,797	\$1,581,832	\$5,098	0.3%	78
79	JAL	\$3,541,390	\$0	\$0	\$1,999,228	\$5,540,618	\$5,040,811	\$0	\$0	\$1,999,228	\$7,040,039	\$1,499,421	27.1%	79
80	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$2,860,109	\$126,086	\$32,418	\$88,619	\$3,107,232	\$3,045,451	\$126,086	\$32,418	\$88,619	\$3,292,574	\$185,342	6.0%	80
81	LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	\$223,380	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$223,380	\$223,380	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$223,380	\$0	0.0%	81
82	JEMEZ VALLEY	\$2,379,996	\$1,346,497	\$1,644	\$35,128	\$3,763,265	\$3,417,448	\$1,346,497	\$1,644	\$35,128	\$4,800,717	\$1,037,452	27.6%	82
83	SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	\$1,068,693	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,068,693	\$1,068,693	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,068,693	\$0	0.0%	83
84	LAKE ARTHUR	\$1,895,251	\$0	\$135	\$28,780	\$1,924,166	\$1,916,938	\$0	\$135	\$28,780	\$1,945,853	\$21,687	1.1%	84
85	LAS CRUCES	\$214,398,174	\$0	\$0	\$1,461,037	\$215,859,211	\$215,493,952	\$0	\$0	\$1,461,037	\$216,954,989	\$1,095,778	0.5%	85
86	LAS VEGAS CITY	\$14,502,407	\$0	\$78,036	\$79,576	\$14,660,019	\$14,620,616	\$0	\$78,036	\$79,576	\$14,778,228	\$118,209	0.8%	86
87	LOGAN	\$3,647,238	\$0	\$0	\$34,948	\$3,682,186	\$3,673,449	\$0	\$0	\$34,948	\$3,708,397	\$26,211	0.7%	87
88	LORDBURG	\$5,352,583	\$0	\$22,624	\$68,864	\$5,444,071	\$5,421,198	\$0	\$22,624	\$68,864	\$5,512,686	\$68,615	1.3%	88
89	LOS ALAMOS	\$31,067,326	\$436,664	\$4,417	\$230,387	\$31,738,794	\$31,570,928	\$436,664	\$4,417	\$230,387	\$32,242,396	\$503,602	1.6%	89
90	LOS LUNAS	\$72,706,666	\$222,859	\$6,592	\$261,611	\$73,197,728	\$73,074,963	\$222,859	\$6,592	\$261,611	\$73,566,025	\$368,297	0.5%	90
91	LOVING	\$6,205,232	\$0	\$1,685	\$301,254	\$6,508,171	\$6,432,436	\$0	\$1,685	\$301,254	\$6,735,375	\$227,204	3.5%	91
92	LOVINGTON	\$36,145,622	\$0	\$0	\$335,167	\$36,480,789	\$36,396,997	\$0	\$0	\$335,167	\$36,732,164	\$251,375	0.7%	92
93	MAGDALENA	\$3,819,460	\$557,624	\$52,195	\$11,850	\$4,441,129	\$4,285,712	\$557,624	\$52,195	\$11,850	\$4,907,381	\$466,252	10.5%	93
94	MAXWELL	\$2,128,553	\$374	\$3,009	\$9,745	\$2,141,681	\$2,138,399	\$374	\$3,009	\$9,745	\$2,151,527	\$9,846	0.5%	94
95	MELROSE	\$2,983,982	\$0	\$0	\$18,104	\$3,002,086	\$2,997,560	\$0	\$0	\$18,104	\$3,015,664	\$13,578	0.5%	95
96	MESA VISTA	\$3,554,188	\$0	\$18,312	\$20,018	\$3,592,518	\$3,582,936	\$0	\$18,312	\$20,018	\$3,621,266	\$28,748	0.8%	96



Funding Formula Revenue With and Without Consideration of Impact Aid, Forest Reserve Payments, and the Half Mill Levy, Using FY20 Data

	School District or Charter School	FY20 Actual Amounts					Amount Assuming No Credit and Flat Program Cost					Difference	Percent of Total	
		General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy	Total Revenue	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy	Total Revenue			
97	MORA	\$4,797,821	\$0	\$42,467	\$31,457	\$4,871,745	\$4,853,264	\$0	\$42,467	\$31,457	\$4,927,188	\$55,443	1.1%	97
98	MORIARTY	\$19,934,303	\$0	\$72,728	\$266,535	\$20,273,566	\$20,188,750	\$0	\$72,728	\$266,535	\$20,528,013	\$254,447	1.3%	98
99	MOSQUERO	\$1,599,100	\$0	\$0	\$32,302	\$1,631,402	\$1,623,326	\$0	\$0	\$32,302	\$1,655,628	\$24,226	1.5%	99
100	MOUNTAINAIR	\$3,258,391	\$0	\$6,761	\$32,765	\$3,297,917	\$3,288,035	\$0	\$6,761	\$32,765	\$3,327,561	\$29,644	0.9%	100
101	PECOS	\$6,225,390	\$0	\$27,805	\$15,860	\$6,269,055	\$6,258,139	\$0	\$27,805	\$15,860	\$6,301,804	\$32,749	0.5%	101
102	PEÑASCO	\$4,139,843	\$35,580	\$24,989	\$12,681	\$4,213,093	\$4,194,780	\$35,580	\$24,989	\$12,681	\$4,268,030	\$54,937	1.3%	102
103	POJOAQUE	\$15,212,328	\$1,666,617	\$5,486	\$49,547	\$16,933,978	\$16,503,565	\$1,666,617	\$5,486	\$49,547	\$18,225,215	\$1,291,237	7.6%	103
104	PORTALES	\$24,676,163	\$0	\$0	\$137,894	\$24,814,057	\$24,779,584	\$0	\$0	\$137,894	\$24,917,478	\$103,421	0.4%	104
105	QUEMADO	\$1,902,469	\$0	\$761,182	\$39,832	\$2,703,483	\$2,503,230	\$0	\$761,182	\$39,832	\$3,304,244	\$600,761	22.2%	105
106	QUESTA	\$4,497,733	\$0	\$20,455	\$86,325	\$4,604,513	\$4,577,818	\$0	\$20,455	\$86,325	\$4,684,598	\$80,085	1.7%	106
107	RATON	\$8,279,106	\$13,556	\$19,625	\$65,861	\$8,378,148	\$8,353,387	\$13,556	\$19,625	\$65,861	\$8,452,429	\$74,281	0.9%	107
108	RESERVE	\$1,924,762	\$0	\$537,448	\$21,561	\$2,483,771	\$2,344,019	\$0	\$537,448	\$21,561	\$2,903,028	\$419,257	16.9%	108
109	RIO RANCHO	\$145,709,122	\$0	\$146,595,111	\$776,311	\$146,595,111	\$146,373,614	\$0	\$109,678	\$776,311	\$147,259,603	\$664,492	0.5%	109
110	ROSWELL	\$90,951,535	\$0	\$14,900	\$389,618	\$91,356,053	\$91,254,923	\$0	\$14,900	\$389,618	\$91,659,441	\$303,388	0.3%	110
111	ROY	\$1,492,966	\$0	\$0	\$3,432	\$1,496,398	\$1,495,540	\$0	\$0	\$3,432	\$1,498,972	\$2,574	0.2%	111
112	RUIDOSO	\$16,425,999	\$104,393	\$98,348	\$270,556	\$16,899,296	\$16,780,972	\$104,393	\$98,348	\$270,556	\$17,254,269	\$354,973	2.1%	112
113	SAN JON	\$2,130,153	\$0	\$0	\$7,890	\$2,138,043	\$2,136,070	\$0	\$0	\$7,890	\$2,143,960	\$5,917	0.3%	113
114	SANTA FE	\$110,491,291	\$0	\$36,432	\$1,612,794	\$112,140,517	\$111,728,211	\$0	\$36,432	\$1,612,794	\$113,377,437	\$1,236,920	1.1%	114
115	ACAD FOR TECH & CLASSICS	\$3,124,108	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,124,108	\$3,124,108	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,124,108	\$0	0.0%	115
116	SANTA ROSA	\$6,833,512	\$0	\$0	\$90,570	\$6,924,082	\$6,901,440	\$0	\$0	\$90,570	\$6,992,010	\$67,928	1.0%	116
117	SILVER CITY CONS.	\$22,690,840	\$0	\$201,195	\$180,669	\$23,072,704	\$22,977,238	\$0	\$201,195	\$180,669	\$23,359,102	\$286,398	1.2%	117
118	SOCORRO	\$13,440,640	\$0	\$243,061	\$103,777	\$13,787,478	\$13,700,769	\$0	\$243,061	\$103,777	\$14,047,607	\$260,129	1.9%	118
119	COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER	\$1,625,282	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,625,282	\$1,625,282	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,625,282	\$0	0.0%	119
120	SPRINGER	\$2,321,434	\$0	\$2,965	\$12,819	\$2,337,218	\$2,333,273	\$0	\$2,965	\$12,819	\$2,349,057	\$11,839	0.5%	120
121	TAOS	\$19,445,058	\$50,602	\$151,564	\$235,493	\$19,882,717	\$19,773,303	\$50,602	\$151,564	\$235,493	\$20,210,962	\$328,245	1.7%	121
122	ANANSI CHARTER	\$1,815,669	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,815,669	\$1,815,669	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,815,669	\$0	0.0%	122
123	TAOS CHARTER	\$1,848,327	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,848,327	\$1,848,327	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,848,327	\$0	0.0%	123
124	VISTA GRANDE	\$1,200,433	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,433	\$1,200,433	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,433	\$0	0.0%	124
125	TATUM	\$4,058,742	\$0	\$0	\$74,532	\$4,133,274	\$4,114,641	\$0	\$0	\$74,532	\$4,189,173	\$55,899	1.4%	125
126	TEXICO	\$5,725,798	\$0	\$0	\$43,723	\$5,769,521	\$5,758,590	\$0	\$0	\$43,723	\$5,802,313	\$32,792	0.6%	126
127	TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	\$11,719,015	\$0	\$151,035	\$156,124	\$12,026,174	\$11,949,384	\$0	\$151,035	\$156,124	\$12,256,543	\$230,369	1.9%	127
128	TUCUMCARI	\$9,271,860	\$0	\$0	\$53,689	\$9,325,549	\$9,312,127	\$0	\$0	\$53,689	\$9,365,816	\$40,267	0.4%	128
129	TULAROSA	\$9,132,716	\$190,167	\$32,948	\$39,302	\$9,395,133	\$9,329,528	\$190,167	\$32,948	\$39,302	\$9,591,945	\$196,812	2.1%	129
130	VAUGHN	\$1,723,616	\$0	\$0	\$50,832	\$1,774,448	\$1,761,740	\$0	\$0	\$50,832	\$1,812,572	\$38,124	2.1%	130
131	WAGON MOUND	\$1,662,038	\$0	\$6,470	\$15,269	\$1,683,777	\$1,678,342	\$0	\$6,470	\$15,269	\$1,700,081	\$16,304	1.0%	131
132	WEST LAS VEGAS	\$14,937,916	\$0	\$70,481	\$57,730	\$15,066,127	\$15,034,074	\$0	\$70,481	\$57,730	\$15,162,285	\$96,158	0.6%	132
133	RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	\$910,090	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$910,090	\$910,090	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$910,090	\$0	0.0%	133
134	ZUNI	\$7,105,901	\$7,150,394	\$13,990	\$1,203	\$14,271,488	\$12,480,091	\$7,150,394	\$13,990	\$1,203	\$19,645,678	\$5,374,190	37.7%	134
135	ALBUQUERQUE INSTI. MATH & SCI. (AIMS) ST. (APS)	\$3,194,010	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,194,010	\$3,194,010	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,194,010	\$0	0.0%	135
136	ALBUQUERQUE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$766,328	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$766,328	\$766,328	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$766,328	\$0	0.0%	136
137	ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ST. CHAR (APS)	\$4,603,591	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,603,591	\$4,603,591	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,603,591	\$0	0.0%	137
138	ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,293,851	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,293,851	\$2,293,851	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,293,851	\$0	0.0%	138
139	ALDO LEOPOLD ST. CHARTER (SILVER CITY)	\$2,192,659	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,192,659	\$2,192,659	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,192,659	\$0	0.0%	139
140	ALMA D' ARTE STATE CHARTER (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,718,481	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,718,481	\$1,718,481	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,718,481	\$0	0.0%	140
141	ALTURA PREPARATORY SCHOOL (APS)	\$821,190	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$821,190	\$821,190	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$821,190	\$0	0.0%	141
142	AMY BIEHL ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,359,463	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,359,463	\$3,359,463	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,359,463	\$0	0.0%	142
143	ASK ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (RIO RANCHO)	\$4,379,257	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,379,257	\$4,379,257	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,379,257	\$0	0.0%	143
144	CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,297,914	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,297,914	\$2,297,914	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,297,914	\$0	0.0%	144

Funding Formula Revenue With and Without Consideration of Impact Aid, Forest Reserve Payments, and the Half Mill Levy, Using FY20 Data

	FY20 Actual Amounts					Amount Assuming No Credit and Flat Program Cost					Difference	Percent of Total	
	School District or Charter School	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy	Total Revenue	General Fund	Impact Aid	Forest Reserve	Half Mill Levy			Total Revenue
145	DZIT DIT LOOL DEAP (GALLUP)	\$519,325	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$519,325	\$519,325	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$519,325	\$0	0.0%
146	ESTANCIA VALLEY (MORIARTY)	\$4,017,207	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,017,207	\$4,017,207	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,017,207	\$0	0.0%
147	EXPLORE ACADEMY (APS)	\$4,054,944	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,054,944	\$4,054,944	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,054,944	\$0	0.0%
148	HORIZON ACADEMY WEST ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,501,066	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,501,066	\$3,501,066	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,501,066	\$0	0.0%
149	HOZHO ACADEMY (GALLUP)	\$3,041,217	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,041,217	\$3,041,217	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,041,217	\$0	0.0%
150	J. PAUL TAYLOR ACADEMY (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,614,895	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,614,895	\$1,614,895	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,614,895	\$0	0.0%
151	LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,218,875	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,218,875	\$1,218,875	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,218,875	\$0	0.0%
152	LA PROMESA ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,722,839	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,722,839	\$3,722,839	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,722,839	\$0	0.0%
153	LAS MONTANAS (LAS CRUCES)	\$2,332,422	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,332,422	\$2,332,422	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,332,422	\$0	0.0%
154	LA TIERRA MONTESSORI (ESPANOLA)	\$817,699	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$817,699	\$817,699	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$817,699	\$0	0.0%
155	MASTERS PROGRAM ST. CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,645,472	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,645,472	\$2,645,472	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,645,472	\$0	0.0%
156	MCCURDY CHARTER SCHOOL (ESPANOLA)	\$4,117,886	\$44,216	\$0	\$0	\$4,162,102	\$4,151,048	\$44,216	\$0	\$0	\$4,195,264	\$33,162	0.8%
157	MEDIA ARTS COLLAB. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,777,739	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,777,739	\$2,777,739	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,777,739	\$0	0.0%
158	MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH (GALLUP)	\$1,581,907	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,581,907	\$1,581,907	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,581,907	\$0	0.0%
159	MISSION ACHIEVEMENT & SUCCESS-MAS (APS)	\$10,183,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,183,154	\$10,183,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,183,154	\$0	0.0%
160	MONTE DEL SOL (SANTA FE)	\$3,398,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,398,630	\$3,398,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,398,630	\$0	0.0%
161	MONTESSORI ELEMMENTARY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,887,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,887,874	\$2,887,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,887,874	\$0	0.0%
162	NEW AMERICA SCHOOL (LAS CRUCES)	\$2,088,058	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,088,058	\$2,088,058	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,088,058	\$0	0.0%
163	NEW MEXCIO CONNECTIONS VIRTUAL (SANTA FE)	\$8,763,006	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,763,006	\$8,763,006	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,763,006	\$0	0.0%
164	NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS ST. CH (SANTA FE)	\$2,565,925	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,565,925	\$2,565,925	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,565,925	\$0	0.0%
165	NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$4,174,420	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,174,420	\$4,174,420	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,174,420	\$0	0.0%
166	RAICES DEL SABER XINACHTLI (LAS CRUCES)	\$320,415	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$320,415	\$320,415	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$320,415	\$0	0.0%
167	RED RIVER VALLEY (QUESTA)	\$927,014	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$927,014	\$927,014	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$927,014	\$0	0.0%
168	ROOTS & WINGS (QUESTA)	\$595,539	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$595,539	\$595,539	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$595,539	\$0	0.0%
169	SANDOVAL ACADEMY OF BIL ED SABA (RIO RANCHO)	\$1,596,403	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,596,403	\$1,596,403	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,596,403	\$0	0.0%
170	SCHOOL OF DREAMS ST. CHARTER (LOS LUNAS)	\$4,776,152	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,776,152	\$4,776,152	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,776,152	\$0	0.0%
171	SIX DIRECTIONS (GALLUP)	\$808,638	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$808,638	\$808,638	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$808,638	\$0	0.0%
172	SOLARE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$1,258,285	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,258,285	\$1,258,285	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,258,285	\$0	0.0%
173	SOUTH VALLEY PREP ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$1,534,482	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,534,482	\$1,534,482	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,534,482	\$0	0.0%
174	SOUTHWEST AER.,MATH & SCIENCE-SAMS (APS)	\$2,580,635	\$6,402	\$0	\$0	\$2,587,037	\$2,585,437	\$6,402	\$0	\$0	\$2,591,839	\$4,802	0.2%
175	SOUTHWEST PREPATORY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$1,709,715	\$7,635	\$0	\$0	\$1,717,350	\$1,715,441	\$7,635	\$0	\$0	\$1,723,076	\$5,726	0.3%
176	SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$2,279,323	\$7,150	\$0	\$0	\$2,286,473	\$2,284,686	\$7,150	\$0	\$0	\$2,291,836	\$5,363	0.2%
177	TAOS ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (TAOS)	\$2,504,217	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,504,217	\$2,504,217	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,504,217	\$0	0.0%
178	TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS ST. (TAOS)	\$1,457,912	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,457,912	\$1,457,912	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,457,912	\$0	0.0%
179	TAOS INTERNATIONAL (TAOS)	\$1,568,169	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,568,169	\$1,568,169	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,568,169	\$0	0.0%
180	THE GREAT ACADEMY (APS)	\$1,833,749	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,833,749	\$1,833,749	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,833,749	\$0	0.0%
181	TIERRA ADENTRO ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,964,539	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,964,539	\$2,964,539	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,964,539	\$0	0.0%
182	TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$3,065,257	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,065,257	\$3,065,257	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,065,257	\$0	0.0%
183	TURQUOISE TRAIL (SANTA FE)	\$5,224,617	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,224,617	\$5,224,617	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,224,617	\$0	0.0%
184	WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH (JEMEZ VALLEY)	\$573,638	\$223,454	\$0	\$0	\$797,092	\$741,228	\$223,454	\$0	\$0	\$964,682	\$167,590	21.0%
187	<b>STATEWIDE TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,934,795,823</b>	<b>\$79,989,656</b>	<b>\$4,394,452</b>	<b>\$25,284,138</b>	<b>\$3,044,464,069</b>	<b>\$3,017,047,005</b>	<b>\$79,989,656</b>	<b>\$4,394,452</b>	<b>\$25,284,138</b>	<b>\$3,126,715,251</b>	<b>\$82,251,182</b>	<b>2.7%</b>

Source: LESC Analysis

Estimated FY24 Impact of SB41/aSEC/aSFC on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation

Current Law						SB41/aSEC/aSFC FY24 Low-End Impact <sup>1</sup>			SB41/aSEC/aSFC FY24 High-End Impact <sup>2</sup>			
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	
School District	Assumed Annual Revenue (Five-Year Land Valuation Times .0009)	Annual Facility Replacement Cost (Total Sq. Ft. times \$307.47 divided by 45 Years)	Preliminary Local Match (B/C)	Population Density Adjustment	Final Local Match (D-E, max 94%)	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	
1	ALAMOGORDO	\$3,664.5	\$5,384.7	68%	12%	56%	\$3,762.3	58%	1.8%	\$3,831.2	59%	3.1%
2	ALBUQUERQUE	\$73,782.0	\$77,748.0	95%	0%	94%	\$74,086.0	94%		\$74,365.0	94%	
3	ANIMAS	\$168.3	\$268.9	63%	12%	51%	\$168.7	51%	0.2%	\$169.5	51%	0.5%
4	ARTESIA	\$8,047.1	\$3,719.1	216%	12%	94%	\$8,120.3	94%		\$8,158.8	94%	
5	AZTEC	\$2,958.4	\$2,958.1	100%	6%	94%	\$3,049.6	94%		\$3,062.5	94%	
6	BELEN	\$2,781.5	\$3,701.1	75%	6%	69%	\$2,787.2	69%	0.2%	\$2,798.6	70%	0.5%
7	BERNALILLO	\$2,868.5	\$2,861.0	100%	6%	94%	\$3,101.9	94%		\$3,334.3	94%	
8	BLOOMFIELD	\$3,504.7	\$2,657.5	132%	12%	94%	\$3,540.9	94%		\$3,609.4	94%	
9	CAPITAN	\$1,881.8	\$596.2	316%	12%	94%	\$1,884.7	94%		\$1,890.3	94%	
10	CARLSBAD	\$12,704.0	\$6,310.5	201%	12%	94%	\$12,775.2	94%		\$12,840.1	94%	
11	CARRIZOZO	\$300.1	\$225.2	133%	12%	94%	\$303.6	94%		\$305.1	94%	
12	CENTRAL	\$3,555.3	\$5,883.0	60%	12%	48%	\$4,353.9	62%	13.6%	\$5,404.7	92%	43.4%
13	CHAMA	\$652.3	\$576.7	113%	12%	94%	\$656.1	94%		\$658.7	94%	
14	CIMARRON	\$1,965.5	\$767.7	256%	12%	94%	\$1,969.8	94%		\$1,978.5	94%	
15	CLAYTON	\$668.2	\$613.7	109%	12%	94%	\$669.8	94%		\$673.0	94%	
16	CLOUDCROFT	\$898.9	\$526.1	171%	12%	94%	\$962.6	94%		\$965.4	94%	
17	CLOVIS	\$3,658.1	\$9,723.9	38%	0%	38%	\$3,877.1	40%	2.3%	\$3,915.2	40%	2.6%
18	COBRE	\$1,140.2	\$1,330.8	86%	12%	74%	\$1,142.7	74%	0.2%	\$1,147.6	74%	0.6%
19	CORONA	\$264.5	\$168.5	157%	12%	94%	\$266.5	94%		\$268.1	94%	
20	CUBA	\$627.6	\$696.4	90%	12%	90%	\$664.1	94%	3.9%	\$737.1	94%	3.9%
21	DEMING	\$2,645.2	\$4,839.4	55%	12%	43%	\$2,652.6	43%	0.2%	\$2,667.4	43%	0.5%
22	DES MOINES	\$163.5	\$187.2	87%	12%	75%	\$208.0	94%	18.7%	\$208.9	94%	18.7%
23	DEXTER	\$379.8	\$1,039.5	37%	12%	25%	\$409.2	27%	2.8%	\$424.2	29%	4.3%
24	DORA	\$125.9	\$306.5	41%	12%	29%	\$126.2	29%	0.1%	\$126.9	29%	0.3%
25	DULCE	\$1,591.2	\$716.2	222%	12%	94%	\$1,690.8	94%		\$1,890.2	94%	
26	ELIDA	\$120.9	\$281.8	43%	12%	31%	\$121.2	31%	0.1%	\$121.8	31%	0.3%
27	ESPANOLA	\$2,654.3	\$3,311.4	80%	0%	80%	\$2,679.8	81%	0.8%	\$2,695.1	81%	1.2%
28	ESTANCIA	\$520.2	\$821.8	63%	12%	51%	\$556.5	56%	4.4%	\$559.0	56%	4.7%
29	EUNICE	\$3,289.3	\$888.1	370%	12%	94%	\$3,342.7	94%		\$3,360.5	94%	
30	FARMINGTON	\$6,785.3	\$9,852.9	69%	0%	69%	\$6,800.3	69%	0.2%	\$6,830.4	69%	0.5%
31	FLOYD	\$74.0	\$279.2	26%	12%	14%	\$74.2	15%	0.1%	\$74.5	15%	0.2%

Estimated FY24 Impact of SB41/aSEC/aSFC on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation

Current Law						SB41/aSEC/aSFC FY24 Low-End Impact <sup>1</sup>			SB41/aSEC/aSFC FY24 High-End Impact <sup>2</sup>				
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
School District	Assumed Annual Revenue (Five-Year Land Valuation Times .0009)	Annual Facility Replacement Cost (Total Sq. Ft. times \$307.47 divided by 45 Years)	Preliminary Local Match (B/C)	Population Density Adjustment	Final Local Match (D-E, max 94%)	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match		
32	FORT SUMNER	\$386.2	\$221.5	174%	12%	94%	\$425.0	94%		\$426.7	94%		32
33	GADSDEN	\$4,318.9	\$11,448.3	38%	0%	38%	\$4,395.0	38%	0.7%	\$4,414.3	39%	0.8%	33
34	GALLUP	\$3,780.0	\$11,116.7	34%	12%	22%	\$5,147.5	34%	12.3%	\$6,639.0	48%	25.7%	34
35	GRADY	\$43.9	\$242.0	18%	12%	6%	\$44.1	6%	0.1%	\$44.3	6%	0.2%	35
36	GRANTS	\$1,471.7	\$3,345.9	44%	12%	32%	\$1,931.6	46%	13.7%	\$2,116.5	51%	19.3%	36
37	HAGERMAN	\$169.8	\$498.1	34%	12%	22%	\$177.0	24%	1.4%	\$177.9	24%	1.6%	37
38	HATCH	\$372.8	\$1,344.0	28%	12%	16%	\$373.8	16%	0.1%	\$375.6	16%	0.2%	38
39	HOBBS	\$7,200.4	\$8,798.8	82%	0%	82%	\$7,236.4	82%	0.4%	\$7,270.6	83%	0.8%	39
40	HONDO	\$165.0	\$232.3	71%	12%	59%	\$165.5	59%	0.2%	\$166.4	60%	0.6%	40
41	HOUSE	\$68.3	\$175.0	39%	12%	27%	\$68.5	27%	0.1%	\$68.8	27%	0.3%	41
42	JAL	\$7,351.5	\$584.4	1258%	12%	94%	\$7,385.5	94%		\$7,453.6	94%		42
43	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$1,148.5	\$427.9	268%	12%	94%	\$1,164.2	94%		\$1,180.8	94%		43
44	JEMEZ VALLEY	\$454.7	\$629.6	72%	12%	60%	\$526.1	72%	11.3%	\$592.1	94%	33.8%	44
45	LAKE ARTHUR	\$245.7	\$183.9	134%	12%	94%	\$248.2	94%		\$249.4	94%		45
46	LAS CRUCES	\$15,058.8	\$20,328.9	74%	0%	74%	\$15,179.8	75%	0.6%	\$15,245.5	75%	0.9%	46
47	LAS VEGAS CITY	\$1,256.0	\$1,664.2	75%	12%	63%	\$1,258.1	64%	0.1%	\$1,262.3	64%	0.4%	47
48	LAS VEGAS WEST	\$869.2	\$1,924.7	45%	12%	33%	\$871.4	33%	0.1%	\$875.6	33%	0.3%	48
49	LOGAN	\$302.2	\$339.1	89%	12%	77%	\$303.0	77%	0.3%	\$304.8	78%	0.8%	49
50	LORDSBURG	\$603.2	\$569.1	106%	12%	94%	\$604.8	94%		\$608.0	94%		50
51	LOS ALAMOS	\$3,279.1	\$3,498.5	94%	0%	94%	\$3,298.7	94%	0.3%	\$3,335.3	94%	0.3%	51
52	LOS LUNAS	\$3,913.8	\$6,649.6	59%	0%	59%	\$3,945.5	59%	0.5%	\$3,970.7	60%	0.9%	52
53	LOVING	\$1,078.6	\$764.4	141%	6%	94%	\$1,081.4	94%		\$1,086.9	94%		53
54	LOVINGTON	\$3,199.4	\$3,705.2	86%	6%	80%	\$3,384.2	91%	11.0%	\$3,399.9	92%	11.4%	54
55	MAGDALENA	\$138.8	\$392.6	35%	12%	23%	\$155.5	28%	4.3%	\$180.8	34%	10.7%	55
56	MAXWELL	\$92.7	\$226.6	41%	12%	29%	\$94.8	30%	0.9%	\$95.3	30%	1.2%	56
57	MELROSE	\$148.5	\$355.7	42%	12%	30%	\$149.0	30%	0.1%	\$149.8	30%	0.3%	57
58	MESA VISTA	\$365.5	\$420.2	87%	12%	75%	\$366.0	75%	0.1%	\$367.1	75%	0.4%	58
59	MORA	\$455.5	\$568.3	80%	12%	68%	\$467.0	70%	2.0%	\$468.5	70%	2.3%	59
60	MORIARTY	\$2,508.1	\$3,515.2	71%	6%	65%	\$2,514.1	66%	0.2%	\$2,526.1	66%	0.5%	60
61	MOSQUERO	\$412.6	\$168.5	245%	12%	94%	\$431.1	94%		\$433.0	94%		61

Estimated FY24 Impact of SB41/aSEC/aSFC on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation

Current Law						SB41/aSEC/aSFC FY24 Low-End Impact <sup>1</sup>			SB41/aSEC/aSFC FY24 High-End Impact <sup>2</sup>				
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
School District	Assumed Annual Revenue (Five-Year Land Valuation Times .0009)	Annual Facility Replacement Cost (Total Sq. Ft. times \$307.47 divided by 45 Years)	Preliminary Local Match (B/C)	Population Density Adjustment	Final Local Match (D-E, max 94%)	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match		
62	MOUNTAINAIR	\$306.7	\$344.9	89%	12%	77%	\$307.5	77%	0.2%	\$309.2	78%	0.7%	62
63	PECOS	\$609.1	\$676.8	90%	12%	78%	\$662.4	94%	16.0%	\$663.2	94%	16.0%	63
64	PENASCO	\$247.9	\$535.1	46%	12%	34%	\$249.5	35%	0.3%	\$252.7	35%	0.9%	64
65	POJOAQUE	\$801.7	\$1,963.6	41%	6%	35%	\$834.0	36%	1.6%	\$898.6	40%	4.9%	65
66	PORTALES	\$1,279.6	\$2,520.1	51%	6%	45%	\$1,324.9	47%	1.8%	\$1,331.7	47%	2.1%	66
67	QUEMADO	\$411.7	\$272.9	151%	12%	94%	\$412.7	94%		\$414.6	94%		67
68	QUESTA	\$875.9	\$526.5	166%	12%	94%	\$882.0	94%		\$886.3	94%		68
69	RATON	\$704.9	\$1,036.2	68%	12%	56%	\$728.8	58%	2.3%	\$732.2	59%	2.6%	69
70	RESERVE	\$207.7	\$199.8	104%	12%	94%	\$230.7	94%		\$231.7	94%		70
71	RIO RANCHO	\$10,092.4	\$12,292.0	82%	0%	82%	\$10,523.7	86%	3.5%	\$10,560.3	86%	3.8%	71
72	ROSWELL	\$4,745.1	\$9,276.4	51%	6%	45%	\$4,914.2	47%	1.8%	\$4,933.9	47%	2.0%	72
73	ROY	\$40.0	\$161.6	25%	12%	13%	\$40.1	13%	0.1%	\$40.2	13%	0.2%	73
74	RUIDOSO	\$3,132.4	\$1,943.1	161%	0%	94%	\$3,146.3	94%		\$3,174.2	94%		74
75	SAN JON	\$71.1	\$228.0	31%	12%	19%	\$85.2	25%	6.2%	\$85.6	26%	6.4%	75
76	SANTA FE	\$29,034.3	\$11,554.0	251%	0%	94%	\$29,071.6	94%		\$29,146.1	94%		76
77	SANTA ROSA	\$499.4	\$872.4	57%	12%	45%	\$525.0	48%	2.9%	\$527.6	48%	3.2%	77
78	SILVER	\$2,606.5	\$2,513.7	104%	12%	94%	\$2,611.2	94%		\$2,620.7	94%		78
79	SOCORRO	\$814.6	\$1,929.8	42%	12%	30%	\$816.5	30%	0.1%	\$820.1	30%	0.3%	79
80	SPRINGER	\$182.3	\$268.3	68%	12%	56%	\$185.3	57%	1.1%	\$186.1	57%	1.4%	80
81	TAOS	\$5,257.9	\$2,695.2	195%	12%	94%	\$5,264.8	94%		\$5,278.4	94%		81
82	TATUM	\$554.5	\$412.7	134%	12%	94%	\$555.7	94%		\$558.0	94%		82
83	TEXICO	\$387.1	\$656.3	59%	12%	47%	\$460.4	58%	11.2%	\$462.5	58%	11.5%	83
84	T OR C	\$1,412.8	\$1,331.2	106%	6%	94%	\$1,416.8	94%		\$1,424.8	94%		84
85	TUCUMCARI	\$527.8	\$976.9	54%	12%	42%	\$530.4	42%	0.3%	\$532.9	43%	0.5%	85
86	TULAROSA	\$444.7	\$994.3	45%	12%	33%	\$454.7	34%	1.0%	\$474.7	36%	3.0%	86
87	VAUGHN	\$373.9	\$163.6	229%	12%	94%	\$387.1	94%		\$390.2	94%		87
88	WAGON MOUND	\$146.3	\$162.5	90%	12%	90%	\$147.9	91%	1.0%	\$151.0	93%	2.9%	88
89	ZUNI	\$10.4	\$1,343.6	1%	12%	0%	\$196.1	3%	2.6%	\$545.3	29%	28.6%	89

<sup>1</sup> Revenue includes actual 10-year average of capital expenditures from school district general funds and local grants, plus an amount equivalent to one tenth of 25 percent of FY20 credited revenue.

Source: PSFA, PED, LESC Files

<sup>2</sup> Revenue includes actual 10-year average of capital expenditures from school district general funds and local grants, plus an amount equivalent to one tenth of 75 percent of FY20 credited revenue.

Estimated 10-Year Impact of SB41/aSEC/aSFC on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation

Current Law						SB41/aSEC/aSFC 10-Year Low-End Impact <sup>1</sup>			SB41/aSEC/aSFC 10-Year High-End Impact <sup>2</sup>			
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	
School District	Assumed Annual Revenue (Five-Year Land Valuation Times .0009)	Annual Facility Replacement Cost (Total Sq. Ft. times \$307.47 divided by 45 Years)	Preliminary Local Match (B/C)	Population Density Adjustment	Final Local Match (D-E, max 94%)	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	
1	ALAMOGORDO	\$3,664.5	\$5,384.7	68%	12%	56%	\$4,072.2	64%	7.6%	\$4,760.8	76%	20.4%
2	ALBUQUERQUE	\$73,782.0	\$77,748.0	95%	0%	94%	\$75,341.1	94%		\$78,130.2	94%	
3	ANIMAS	\$168.3	\$268.9	63%	12%	51%	\$172.4	52%	1.6%	\$180.8	55%	4.7%
4	ARTESIA	\$8,047.1	\$3,719.1	216%	12%	94%	\$8,293.5	94%		\$8,678.2	94%	
5	AZTEC	\$2,958.4	\$2,958.1	100%	6%	94%	\$3,108.0	94%		\$3,237.8	94%	
6	BELEN	\$2,781.5	\$3,701.1	75%	6%	69%	\$2,838.4	71%	1.5%	\$2,952.2	74%	4.6%
7	BERNALILLO	\$2,868.5	\$2,861.0	100%	6%	94%	\$4,147.8	94%		\$6,472.0	94%	
8	BLOOMFIELD	\$3,504.7	\$2,657.5	132%	12%	94%	\$3,849.2	94%		\$4,534.1	94%	
9	CAPITAN	\$1,881.8	\$596.2	316%	12%	94%	\$1,910.0	94%		\$1,966.4	94%	
10	CARLSBAD	\$12,704.0	\$6,310.5	201%	12%	94%	\$13,067.2	94%		\$13,716.2	94%	
11	CARRIZOZO	\$300.1	\$225.2	133%	12%	94%	\$310.1	94%		\$324.6	94%	
12	CENTRAL	\$3,555.3	\$5,883.0	60%	12%	48%	\$9,082.8	94%	45.6%	\$19,591.6	94%	45.6%
13	CHAMA	\$652.3	\$576.7	113%	12%	94%	\$667.6	94%		\$693.2	94%	
14	CIMARRON	\$1,965.5	\$767.7	256%	12%	94%	\$2,008.6	94%		\$2,094.7	94%	
15	CLAYTON	\$668.2	\$613.7	109%	12%	94%	\$684.2	94%		\$716.3	94%	
16	CLOUDCROFT	\$898.9	\$526.1	171%	12%	94%	\$975.0	94%		\$1,002.5	94%	
17	CLOVIS	\$3,658.1	\$9,723.9	38%	0%	38%	\$4,048.7	42%	4.0%	\$4,429.9	46%	7.9%
18	COBRE	\$1,140.2	\$1,330.8	86%	12%	74%	\$1,164.8	76%	1.8%	\$1,214.0	91%	17.5%
19	CORONA	\$264.5	\$168.5	157%	12%	94%	\$273.7	94%		\$289.7	94%	
20	CUBA	\$627.6	\$696.4	90%	12%	90%	\$992.7	94%	3.9%	\$1,722.7	94%	3.9%
21	DEMING	\$2,645.2	\$4,839.4	55%	12%	43%	\$2,719.4	44%	1.5%	\$2,867.8	47%	4.6%
22	DES MOINES	\$163.5	\$187.2	87%	12%	75%	\$212.0	94%	18.7%	\$220.8	94%	18.7%
23	DEXTER	\$379.8	\$1,039.5	37%	12%	25%	\$476.8	34%	9.3%	\$626.9	48%	23.8%
24	DORA	\$125.9	\$306.5	41%	12%	29%	\$129.3	30%	1.1%	\$136.1	32%	3.3%
25	DULCE	\$1,591.2	\$716.2	222%	12%	94%	\$2,587.8	94%		\$4,581.0	94%	
26	ELIDA	\$120.9	\$281.8	43%	12%	31%	\$123.9	32%	1.1%	\$129.9	34%	3.2%
27	ESPANOLA	\$2,654.3	\$3,311.4	80%	0%	80%	\$2,748.8	83%	2.9%	\$2,902.1	88%	7.5%
28	ESTANCIA	\$520.2	\$821.8	63%	12%	51%	\$567.9	57%	5.8%	\$593.4	60%	8.9%
29	EUNICE	\$3,289.3	\$888.1	370%	12%	94%	\$3,422.8	94%		\$3,600.6	94%	
30	FARMINGTON	\$6,785.3	\$9,852.9	69%	0%	69%	\$6,935.8	70%	1.5%	\$7,236.8	73%	4.6%
31	FLOYD	\$74.0	\$279.2	26%	12%	14%	\$75.8	15%	0.7%	\$79.5	16%	2.0%

Estimated 10-Year Impact of SB41/aSEC/aSFC on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation

Current Law						SB41/aSEC/aSFC 10-Year Low-End Impact <sup>1</sup>			SB41/aSEC/aSFC 10-Year High-End Impact <sup>2</sup>				
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
School District	Assumed Annual Revenue (Five-Year Land Valuation Times .0009)	Annual Facility Replacement Cost (Total Sq. Ft. times \$307.47 divided by 45 Years)	Preliminary Local Match (B/C)	Population Density Adjustment	Final Local Match (D-E, max 94%)	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match		
32	FORT SUMNER	\$386.2	\$221.5	174%	12%	94%	\$432.7	94%		\$449.8	94%	32	
33	GADSDEN	\$4,318.9	\$11,448.3	38%	0%	38%	\$4,481.9	39%	1.4%	\$4,675.0	41%	3.1%	33
34	GALLUP	\$3,780.0	\$11,116.7	34%	12%	22%	\$11,859.4	94%	72.0%	\$26,774.7	94%	72.0%	34
35	GRADY	\$43.9	\$242.0	18%	12%	6%	\$45.2	7%	0.5%	\$47.6	8%	1.5%	35
36	GRANTS	\$1,471.7	\$3,345.9	44%	12%	32%	\$2,763.7	71%	38.6%	\$4,612.8	94%	62.0%	36
37	HAGERMAN	\$169.8	\$498.1	34%	12%	22%	\$180.9	24%	2.2%	\$189.5	26%	3.9%	37
38	HATCH	\$372.8	\$1,344.0	28%	12%	16%	\$382.3	16%	0.7%	\$401.2	18%	2.1%	38
39	HOBBS	\$7,200.4	\$8,798.8	82%	0%	82%	\$7,390.4	84%	2.2%	\$7,732.5	88%	6.0%	39
40	HONDO	\$165.0	\$232.3	71%	12%	59%	\$169.6	61%	2.0%	\$178.8	65%	5.9%	40
41	HOUSE	\$68.3	\$175.0	39%	12%	27%	\$70.0	28%	1.0%	\$73.5	30%	3.0%	41
42	JAL	\$7,351.5	\$584.4	1258%	12%	94%	\$7,691.7	94%		\$8,372.3	94%		42
43	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$1,148.5	\$427.9	268%	12%	94%	\$1,239.1	94%		\$1,405.7	94%		43
44	JEMEZ VALLEY	\$454.7	\$629.6	72%	12%	60%	\$823.2	94%	33.8%	\$1,483.4	94%	33.8%	44
45	LAKE ARTHUR	\$245.7	\$183.9	134%	12%	94%	\$253.6	94%		\$265.5	94%		45
46	LAS CRUCES	\$15,058.8	\$20,328.9	74%	0%	74%	\$15,475.5	76%	2.1%	\$16,132.8	79%	5.3%	46
47	LAS VEGAS CITY	\$1,256.0	\$1,664.2	75%	12%	63%	\$1,277.2	65%	1.3%	\$1,319.6	67%	3.8%	47
48	LAS VEGAS WEST	\$869.2	\$1,924.7	45%	12%	33%	\$890.4	34%	1.1%	\$932.8	36%	3.3%	48
49	LOGAN	\$302.2	\$339.1	89%	12%	77%	\$310.8	92%	14.5%	\$328.0	94%	16.9%	49
50	LORDSBURG	\$603.2	\$569.1	106%	12%	94%	\$619.4	94%		\$651.8	94%		50
51	LOS ALAMOS	\$3,279.1	\$3,498.5	94%	0%	94%	\$3,463.4	94%	0.3%	\$3,829.5	94%	0.3%	51
52	LOS LUNAS	\$3,913.8	\$6,649.6	59%	0%	59%	\$4,058.9	61%	2.2%	\$4,310.8	65%	6.0%	52
53	LOVING	\$1,078.6	\$764.4	141%	6%	94%	\$1,106.5	94%		\$1,162.3	94%		53
54	LOVINGTON	\$3,199.4	\$3,705.2	86%	6%	80%	\$3,454.8	93%	12.9%	\$3,611.6	94%	13.7%	54
55	MAGDALENA	\$138.8	\$392.6	35%	12%	23%	\$269.4	57%	33.3%	\$522.4	94%	70.7%	55
56	MAXWELL	\$92.7	\$226.6	41%	12%	29%	\$97.1	31%	1.9%	\$102.2	33%	4.2%	56
57	MELROSE	\$148.5	\$355.7	42%	12%	30%	\$152.7	31%	1.2%	\$161.0	33%	3.5%	57
58	MESA VISTA	\$365.5	\$420.2	87%	12%	75%	\$370.8	76%	1.3%	\$381.5	91%	15.8%	58
59	MORA	\$455.5	\$568.3	80%	12%	68%	\$473.8	71%	3.2%	\$488.9	74%	5.9%	59
60	MORIARTY	\$2,508.1	\$3,515.2	71%	6%	65%	\$2,568.2	67%	1.7%	\$2,688.4	70%	5.1%	60
61	MOSQUERO	\$412.6	\$168.5	245%	12%	94%	\$439.3	94%		\$457.5	94%		61

Estimated 10-Year Impact of SB41/aSEC/aSFC on Capital Outlay State and Local Match Calculation


Current Law						SB41/aSEC/aSFC 10-Year Low-End Impact <sup>1</sup>			SB41/aSEC/aSFC 10-Year High-End Impact <sup>2</sup>				
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
School District	Assumed Annual Revenue (Five-Year Land Valuation Times .0009)	Annual Facility Replacement Cost (Total Sq. Ft. times \$307.47 divided by 45 Years)	Preliminary Local Match (B/C)	Population Density Adjustment	Final Local Match (D-E, max 94%)	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match	SB41 Assumed Annual Revenue (Compare with Column B)	SB41 Local Match (Compare with Column F)	Change in Local Match		
62	MOUNTAINAIR	\$306.7	\$344.9	89%	12%	77%	\$315.2	91%	14.5%	\$332.3	94%	17.1%	62
63	PECOS	\$609.1	\$676.8	90%	12%	78%	\$666.1	94%	16.0%	\$674.4	94%	16.0%	63
64	PENASCO	\$247.9	\$535.1	46%	12%	34%	\$263.9	37%	3.0%	\$295.9	43%	9.0%	64
65	POJOAQUE	\$801.7	\$1,963.6	41%	6%	35%	\$1,124.8	51%	16.5%	\$1,770.9	90%	55.4%	65
66	PORTALES	\$1,279.6	\$2,520.1	51%	6%	45%	\$1,355.4	48%	3.0%	\$1,423.2	50%	5.7%	66
67	QUEMADO	\$411.7	\$272.9	151%	12%	94%	\$421.5	94%		\$441.2	94%		67
68	QUESTA	\$875.9	\$526.5	166%	12%	94%	\$901.0	94%		\$943.2	94%		68
69	RATON	\$704.9	\$1,036.2	68%	12%	56%	\$744.0	60%	3.8%	\$777.8	63%	7.0%	69
70	RESERVE	\$207.7	\$199.8	104%	12%	94%	\$235.6	94%		\$246.5	94%		70
71	RIO RANCHO	\$10,092.4	\$12,292.0	82%	0%	82%	\$10,688.3	87%	4.8%	\$11,054.2	90%	7.8%	71
72	ROSWELL	\$4,745.1	\$9,276.4	51%	6%	45%	\$5,002.8	48%	2.8%	\$5,199.6	50%	4.9%	72
73	ROY	\$40.0	\$161.6	25%	12%	13%	\$40.8	13%	0.5%	\$42.4	14%	1.5%	73
74	RUIDOSO	\$3,132.4	\$1,943.1	161%	0%	94%	\$3,271.7	94%		\$3,550.4	94%		74
75	SAN JON	\$71.1	\$228.0	31%	12%	19%	\$86.9	26%	6.9%	\$90.5	28%	8.5%	75
76	SANTA FE	\$29,034.3	\$11,554.0	251%	0%	94%	\$29,406.9	94%		\$30,152.2	94%		76
77	SANTA ROSA	\$499.4	\$872.4	57%	12%	45%	\$536.6	50%	4.3%	\$562.2	52%	7.2%	77
78	SILVER	\$2,606.5	\$2,513.7	104%	12%	94%	\$2,654.0	94%		\$2,749.2	94%		78
79	SOCORRO	\$814.6	\$1,929.8	42%	12%	30%	\$832.8	31%	0.9%	\$869.0	33%	2.8%	79
80	SPRINGER	\$182.3	\$268.3	68%	12%	56%	\$188.9	58%	2.5%	\$196.8	61%	5.4%	80
81	TAOS	\$5,257.9	\$2,695.2	195%	12%	94%	\$5,326.3	94%		\$5,462.9	94%		81
82	TATUM	\$554.5	\$412.7	134%	12%	94%	\$566.0	94%		\$589.0	94%		82
83	TEXICO	\$387.1	\$656.3	59%	12%	47%	\$469.8	60%	12.6%	\$490.6	63%	15.8%	83
84	T OR C	\$1,412.8	\$1,331.2	106%	6%	94%	\$1,452.8	94%		\$1,533.0	94%		84
85	TUCUMCARI	\$527.8	\$976.9	54%	12%	42%	\$541.6	43%	1.4%	\$566.4	46%	4.0%	85
86	TULAROSA	\$444.7	\$994.3	45%	12%	33%	\$544.7	43%	10.1%	\$744.8	63%	30.2%	86
87	VAUGHN	\$373.9	\$163.6	229%	12%	94%	\$401.1	94%		\$432.1	94%		87
88	WAGON MOUND	\$146.3	\$162.5	90%	12%	90%	\$161.8	94%	4.0%	\$192.9	94%	4.0%	88
89	ZUNI	\$10.4	\$1,343.6	1%	12%	0%	\$1,767.5	94%	94.0%	\$5,259.5	94%	94.0%	89

<sup>1</sup> Revenue includes actual 10-year average of capital expenditures from school district general funds and local grants, plus an amount equivalent to 25 percent of FY20 credited revenue.


Source: PSFA, PED, LESC Files

<sup>2</sup> Revenue includes actual 10-year average of capital expenditures from school district general funds and local grants, plus an amount equivalent to 75 percent of FY20 credited revenue.





### Operational and Average Capital Outlay Revenue per Student (MEM)



Source: PSFA and PED Files

Source: LFC