

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, 2nd Session, 2022**

<b>Bill Number</b>	<u>HB119</u>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<u>Romero, GA</u>
<b>Tracking Number</b>	<u>.221580.1</u>	<b>Committee Referrals</b>	<u>HEC/HAFC; SEC</u>
<b>Short Title</b>	<u>Adjust Certain School Distributions</u>		
<b>Analyst</b>	<u>Simon/Hathaway</u>	<b>Original Date</b>	<u>1/24/2022</u>
		<b>Last Updated</b>	<u>2/14/2022</u>

---

---

**BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 119 (HB119) amends the Public School Capital Improvements Act, commonly known as “SB9,” state funding calculation to increase capital outlay funding for all school districts. HB119 maintains the current Public School Capital Improvements statutory structure, in that the state funding calculation is based on a program guarantee, and school districts either get a minimum or maximum guarantee adjustment depending on the funds school districts generate from a local two-mill levy. HB119 adjusts the amounts included through the minimum and maximum guarantee adjustment, as well as the types of program units included in the calculation.

HB119 also adds an additional factor to the state funding calculation so all school districts also receive an additional distribution adjusted by their Public School Capital Outlay Act phase two state match percentages.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

HB119 would increase state funding through the Public School Capital Outlay Act. Estimates using FY22 program units suggest HB119 could increase the state matching fund from \$20.1 million to \$31.1 million, an increase of \$10.9 million, or 54 percent. See **Attachment 1: Estimated Fiscal Impact of HB119**. The attachment assumes the maximum impact of HB119 and assumes all school districts will impose a full two-mill levy; school districts that do not currently levy a SB9 tax are highlighted in yellow.

The Public Education Department (PED) analysis of HB119 estimates the grand total of SB9 allocations would equal \$37.8 million, an increase of \$17.1 million over FY22. The PED calculation, however, uses final funded FY21 program units, which were significantly higher than the current preliminary FY22 program units used in the LESC estimate.

HB119 uses the Public School Capital Outlay Council (PSCOC) phase two state match calculation to target additional dollars to school districts with low property tax bases. All school districts would receive more funding under HB119, with school districts with a lower state match receiving

smaller increases than school districts with higher state matches pursuant to the Public School Capital Outlay Act. The PSCOC phase two calculation for determining the state and local share of public school capital outlay, enacted in 2018, is based on the net taxable value for a school district for the prior five years, the maximum allowable gross square footage per student pursuant to the adequacy planning guide, the cost per square foot of replacement facilities, and each school district's population density.

## **SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

During the 2019 interim, some members of the PSCOC members suggested eliminating awards for smaller “systems-based” projects, which target funds to specific systems with a goal of increasing the usable life of a building. Typically, these awards are smaller than larger “standards-based” awards, which are designed to renovate or replace an entire facility. Eliminating standards-based awards and reallocating these funds to a better designed Public School Capital Improvements Act state funding calculation could reduce the administrative burden of these projects which decreases the capacity of the Public School Facilities Authority (PSFA) staff to PSCOC, to administer other programs and require local school leaders to spend additional time applying for PSCOC funding.

As a result of these conversations, the Legislature passed Laws 2020, Chapter 64 (House Bill 254); however, following an oil price crash, the Legislature repealed that law over concerns there would be insufficient revenue for standards-based capital outlay projects. Since then, revenue available for capital outlay projects has recovered and there are currently large uncommitted balances in the fund that could be used to increase payments under the Public School Capital Improvements Act. According to PSFA's most recent financial plan, the fund will end FY22 with an estimated \$395.6 million. See **Attachment 2: PSCOC Financial Plan**.

**Proposed Calculation.** The proposed calculation in HB119 maintains a program guarantee calculation and a minimum guarantee, similar to the current formula, but changes the program units that are included in the calculation and the dollar amounts of each program unit in the calculation. HB119 would include only final funded units from the prior year from the following factors: early childhood education, basic education, special education, bilingual education, size adjustment, enrollment growth, and the at-risk index. The dollar amount for the program guarantee would be increased to \$89.25 per program unit; the dollar amount for the minimum guarantee would be decreased to \$5 per program unit. As with current law, these will automatically adjust each year per the consumer price index.

The state funding calculation in HB119 would provide for a school district to receive either a maximum program guarantee or a minimum guarantee, plus an additional match. School districts would receive the greater of the following two calculations: 1) the difference between the program guarantee, which is calculated by multiplying \$89.25 per program unit multiplied by the mill levy rate and the school district's estimated tax revenue, or 2) the minimum guarantee, which is calculated by multiplying \$5 per program unit multiplied by the mill levy rate. All school districts levying a tax would receive an additional match, which is calculated by multiplying \$53 per program unit multiplied by the mill levy rate multiplied by the state match percentage calculated pursuant to the phase two formula of the Public School Capital Outlay Act.

**Repeal of Section 22-24-4.4.** HB119 would repeal an obsolete section of law, which directed PSCOC to assist school districts in addressing serious roof deficiencies. The section required that funds be expended no later than September 30, 2008.

## **OTHER SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

Public school capital outlay funding, used to purchase capital assets like buildings, is both a local and state responsibility in New Mexico. The current standards-based public school capital outlay program was developed and established partially in response to a 1998 lawsuit filed in state district court by the Zuni public schools and later joined by the Gallup-McKinley county schools (GMCS) and the Grants-Cibola county schools. The state district court found that through its public school capital outlay funding system the state was violating that portion of the state constitution that guarantees establishment and maintenance of a “uniform system of free public schools sufficient for the education of, and open to, all children of school age” in the state. The court ordered the state to “establish and implement a uniform funding system for capital improvements... and for correcting past inequities” and set a deadline at the end of the 2001 legislative session. The court appointed a special master to review the state’s progress.

Although the quality of school facilities has improved significantly since the lawsuit, litigant school districts are still concerned the system is inequitable. These alleged ongoing disparities led GMCS to reopen the *Zuni* lawsuit – which had never been closed – and seek judicial intervention to cure what the school district characterizes as ongoing disparities in the current public school capital outlay funding system. For example, GMCS is concerned that property-wealthy school districts are able to build public school facilities significantly above adequacy without taxing themselves to the same extent that voters in the GMCS school district tax themselves.

## **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

- LESC Files

**JWS/JKH/cf/hg/mb**

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Proposed Bill

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
CURRENT					PROPOSED BILL: HB119				
School District <sup>4</sup>	FY22 Program Units Per PED	Estimated Local 2 Mill Levy Proceeds <sup>1</sup>	Estimated State Match	Estimated Total SB9 Proceeds (C + D)	FY22 Final Program Units Minus Discretionary Units <sup>3</sup>	Estimated PSCOC State Match After Full Phase in Of Phase Two	Proposed State Match	Difference Between Proposal and Current State Match (H - D)	Percent Change in State Matching Funds (I / D)
1 ALAMOGORDO	10,046	\$ 1,739,036	\$ 138,238	\$ 1,877,274	9,041	49%	\$ 559,984	\$ 421,746	305%
2 ALBUQUERQUE	185,908	\$ 35,971,322	\$ 2,558,096	\$ 38,529,418	171,969	8%	\$ 3,177,989	\$ 619,893	24%
3 ANIMAS	472	\$ 76,675	\$ 6,917	\$ 83,593	463	56%	\$ 33,456	\$ 26,538	384%
4 ARTESIA	6,602	\$ 3,421,176	\$ 90,839	\$ 3,512,015	6,083	6%	\$ 99,520	\$ 8,680	10%
5 AZTEC	5,203	\$ 1,158,474	\$ 71,596	\$ 1,230,070	4,687	6%	\$ 76,676	\$ 5,080	7%
6 BELEN	7,443	\$ 1,310,454	\$ 102,422	\$ 1,412,875	6,539	33%	\$ 294,136	\$ 191,714	187%
7 BERNALILLO	5,952	\$ 1,352,721	\$ 81,895	\$ 1,434,616	5,522	6%	\$ 90,343	\$ 8,448	10%
8 BLOOMFIELD	4,837	\$ 1,440,158	\$ 66,563	\$ 1,506,721	4,625	6%	\$ 75,663	\$ 9,100	14%
9 CAPITAN	1,077	\$ 915,786	\$ 14,824	\$ 930,610	1,025	6%	\$ 16,763	\$ 1,939	13%
10 CARLSBAD	15,812	\$ 10,646,012	\$ 217,580	\$ 10,863,591	14,390	6%	\$ 235,422	\$ 17,842	8%
11 CARRIZOZO	513	\$ 150,764	\$ 7,060	\$ 157,824	480	6%	\$ 7,850	\$ 790	11%
12 CENTRAL	11,476	\$ 1,610,517	\$ 423,985	\$ 2,034,502	9,654	52%	\$ 644,889	\$ 220,905	52%
13 CHAMA	1,228	\$ 237,668	\$ 16,898	\$ 254,566	1,106	6%	\$ 18,089	\$ 1,191	7%
14 CIMARRON	1,098	\$ 869,356	\$ 15,102	\$ 884,458	1,044	6%	\$ 17,074	\$ 1,972	13%
15 CLAYTON	1,086	\$ 319,524	\$ 14,941	\$ 334,465	1,034	6%	\$ 16,921	\$ 1,980	13%
16 CLOUDCROFT	1,041	\$ 441,706	\$ 14,322	\$ 456,028	944	6%	\$ 15,451	\$ 1,129	8%
17 CLOVIS	13,994	\$ 1,751,751	\$ 729,023	\$ 2,480,774	13,344	51%	\$ 1,353,869	\$ 624,846	86%
18 COBRE	2,687	\$ 455,728	\$ 36,973	\$ 492,700	2,454	27%	\$ 94,047	\$ 57,075	154%
19 CORONA	356	\$ 114,031	\$ 4,894	\$ 118,925	340	6%	\$ 5,556	\$ 661	14%
20 CUBA	1,901	\$ 319,086	\$ 26,160	\$ 345,246	1,653	26%	\$ 62,639	\$ 36,479	139%
21 DEMING	11,252	\$ 1,241,277	\$ 753,469	\$ 1,994,745	9,409	57%	\$ 1,007,688	\$ 254,219	34%
22 DES MOINES	377	\$ 79,574	\$ 5,188	\$ 84,761	367	28%	\$ 14,364	\$ 9,176	177%
23 DEXTER	1,823	\$ 155,810	\$ 167,338	\$ 323,148	1,702	73%	\$ 279,911	\$ 112,572	67%
24 DORA	605	\$ 147,043	\$ 8,322	\$ 155,365	551	72%	\$ 47,466	\$ 39,145	470%
25 DULCE	1,585	\$ 476,525	\$ 21,809	\$ 498,333	1,396	6%	\$ 22,839	\$ 1,030	5%
26 ELIDA	520	\$ 56,317	\$ 35,934	\$ 92,251	495	71%	\$ 69,315	\$ 33,381	93%
27 ESPANOLA	7,836	\$ 1,241,804	\$ 147,451	\$ 1,389,254	6,933	23%	\$ 237,076	\$ 89,626	61%
28 ESTANCIA	1,576	\$ 247,510	\$ 31,833	\$ 279,343	1,464	38%	\$ 72,485	\$ 40,652	128%
29 EUNICE	1,581	\$ 2,896,243	\$ 21,758	\$ 2,918,002	1,501	6%	\$ 24,561	\$ 2,803	13%
30 FARMINGTON	18,960	\$ 3,025,051	\$ 336,149	\$ 3,361,200	17,709	30%	\$ 696,386	\$ 360,237	107%
31 FLOYD	591	\$ 27,901	\$ 76,848	\$ 104,749	537	86%	\$ 117,255	\$ 40,407	53%
32 FORT SUMNER	722	\$ 188,254	\$ 9,931	\$ 198,185	684	8%	\$ 12,617	\$ 2,686	27%
33 GADSDEN	26,764	\$ 2,118,883	\$ 2,625,896	\$ 4,744,780	23,705	70%	\$ 3,865,346	\$ 1,239,450	47%
34 GALLUP	26,029	\$ 1,646,685	\$ 2,967,722	\$ 4,614,407	23,974	79%	\$ 4,630,889	\$ 1,663,168	56%
35 GRADY	525	\$ 20,953	\$ 72,111	\$ 93,064	503	94%	\$ 119,022	\$ 46,911	65%
36 GRANTS	7,157	\$ 682,656	\$ 586,184	\$ 1,268,841	5,983	70%	\$ 826,487	\$ 240,303	41%
37 HAGERMAN	1,098	\$ 75,564	\$ 119,079	\$ 194,642	967	80%	\$ 179,148	\$ 60,070	50%
38 HATCH	2,784	\$ 176,486	\$ 317,029	\$ 493,515	2,526	83%	\$ 497,898	\$ 180,869	57%

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Proposed Bill

Attachment 1

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	CURRENT					PROPOSED BILL: HB119				
	School District <sup>4</sup>	FY22 Program Units Per PED	Estimated Local 2 Mill Levy Proceeds <sup>1</sup>	Estimated State Match	Estimated Total SB9 Proceeds (C + D)	FY22 Final Program Units Minus Discretionary Units <sup>3</sup>	Estimated PSCOC State Match After Full Phase in Of Phase Two	Proposed State Match	Difference Between Proposal and Current State Match (H - D)	Percent Change in State Matching Funds (I / D)
39	HOBBS	19,438	\$ 3,758,310	\$ 267,470	\$ 4,025,780	17,158	16%	\$ 466,137	\$ 198,668	74%
40	HONDO	529	\$ 76,203	\$ 17,521	\$ 93,724	483	41%	\$ 31,107	\$ 13,586	78%
41	HOUSE	336	\$ 35,351	\$ 24,228	\$ 59,579	323	71%	\$ 46,702	\$ 22,474	93%
42	JAL	1,136	\$ 8,417,353	\$ 15,627	\$ 8,432,980	1,035	6%	\$ 16,930	\$ 1,304	8%
43	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	718	\$ 385,670	\$ 9,874	\$ 395,545	618	6%	\$ 10,103	\$ 229	2%
44	JEMEZ VALLEY	1,238	\$ 223,300	\$ 17,032	\$ 240,333	1,123	43%	\$ 62,419	\$ 45,387	266%
45	LAKE ARTHUR	481	\$ 127,504	\$ 6,619	\$ 134,123	442	6%	\$ 7,238	\$ 619	9%
46	LAS CRUCES	46,329	\$ 7,402,041	\$ 811,226	\$ 8,213,267	43,371	29%	\$ 1,668,162	\$ 856,936	106%
47	LAS VEGAS CITY	3,197	\$ 608,436	\$ 43,988	\$ 652,425	2,802	30%	\$ 116,260	\$ 72,271	164%
48	LOGAN	762	\$ 150,275	\$ 10,490	\$ 160,764	692	32%	\$ 30,696	\$ 20,206	193%
49	LORDSBURG	1,120	\$ 296,228	\$ 15,413	\$ 311,641	1,066	26%	\$ 39,571	\$ 24,159	157%
50	LOS ALAMOS	6,657	\$ 1,668,560	\$ 91,596	\$ 1,760,156	6,138	8%	\$ 112,638	\$ 21,042	23%
51	LOS LUNAS	16,053	\$ 1,946,897	\$ 898,929	\$ 2,845,826	14,105	50%	\$ 1,318,680	\$ 419,751	47%
52	LOVING	1,382	\$ 1,483,228	\$ 19,015	\$ 1,502,244	1,304	6%	\$ 21,336	\$ 2,321	12%
53	LOVINGTON	7,657	\$ 1,320,062	\$ 105,355	\$ 1,425,417	6,865	6%	\$ 112,317	\$ 6,963	7%
54	MAGDALENA	899	\$ 62,654	\$ 96,664	\$ 159,318	852	78%	\$ 160,159	\$ 63,495	66%
55	MAXWELL	443	\$ 43,970	\$ 34,631	\$ 78,600	425	73%	\$ 64,708	\$ 30,077	87%
56	MELROSE	668	\$ 77,182	\$ 41,284	\$ 118,465	620	71%	\$ 79,793	\$ 38,509	93%
57	MESA VISTA	739	\$ 182,744	\$ 10,166	\$ 192,910	703	26%	\$ 26,061	\$ 15,896	156%
58	MORA	1,180	\$ 219,385	\$ 16,231	\$ 235,615	1,016	32%	\$ 44,510	\$ 28,279	174%
59	MORIARTY	5,267	\$ 1,246,732	\$ 72,478	\$ 1,319,210	4,813	6%	\$ 78,737	\$ 6,259	9%
60	MOSQUERO	401	\$ 139,844	\$ 5,523	\$ 145,367	389	6%	\$ 6,371	\$ 847	15%
61	MOUNTAINAIR	701	\$ 141,527	\$ 9,650	\$ 151,178	676	22%	\$ 22,830	\$ 13,179	137%
62	PECOS	1,219	\$ 296,115	\$ 16,776	\$ 312,891	1,124	10%	\$ 23,035	\$ 6,259	37%
63	PENASCO	914	\$ 117,818	\$ 44,208	\$ 162,026	844	67%	\$ 92,415	\$ 48,207	109%
64	POJOAQUE	3,314	\$ 370,376	\$ 217,156	\$ 587,532	3,051	66%	\$ 387,254	\$ 170,099	78%
65	PORTALES	5,143	\$ 630,211	\$ 281,572	\$ 911,783	4,796	57%	\$ 515,223	\$ 233,650	83%
66	QUEMADO	539	\$ 196,132	\$ 7,419	\$ 203,552	515	6%	\$ 8,432	\$ 1,012	14%
67	QUESTA	1,184	\$ 409,670	\$ 16,293	\$ 425,963	1,128	6%	\$ 18,452	\$ 2,158	13%
68	RATON	1,885	\$ 307,768	\$ 26,476	\$ 334,244	1,692	42%	\$ 91,675	\$ 65,198	246%
69	RESERVE	439	\$ 93,059	\$ 6,034	\$ 99,093	425	7%	\$ 7,601	\$ 1,566	26%
70	RIO RANCHO	33,939	\$ 5,040,922	\$ 975,711	\$ 6,016,632	29,909	24%	\$ 1,052,727	\$ 77,016	8%
71	ROSWELL	18,125	\$ 2,199,271	\$ 1,013,853	\$ 3,213,124	16,548	57%	\$ 1,751,298	\$ 737,445	73%
72	ROY	311	\$ 20,817	\$ 34,229	\$ 55,046	303	86%	\$ 60,895	\$ 26,666	78%
73	RUIDOSO	3,318	\$ 1,539,179	\$ 45,660	\$ 1,584,839	3,080	6%	\$ 50,391	\$ 4,731	10%
74	SAN JON	424	\$ 32,563	\$ 42,566	\$ 75,129	396	80%	\$ 71,666	\$ 29,100	68%
75	SANTA FE	30,533	\$ 14,439,815	\$ 420,138	\$ 14,859,953	26,879	6%	\$ 439,734	\$ 19,595	5%
76	SANTA ROSA	1,534	\$ 259,865	\$ 21,109	\$ 280,974	1,417	57%	\$ 100,106	\$ 78,997	374%

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Proposed Bill

Attachment 1

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	CURRENT					PROPOSED BILL: HB119				
School District <sup>4</sup>	FY22 Program Units Per PED	Estimated Local 2 Mill Levy Proceeds <sup>1</sup>	Estimated State Match	Estimated Total SB9 Proceeds (C + D)	FY22 Final Program Units Minus Discretionary Units <sup>3</sup>	Estimated PSCOC State Match After Full Phase in Of Phase Two	Proposed State Match	Difference Between Proposal and Current State Match (H - D)	Percent Change in State Matching Funds (I / D)	
77 SILVER CITY	5,051	\$ 1,182,149	\$ 69,497	\$ 1,251,647	4,715	6%	\$ 77,138	\$ 7,641	11%	
78 SOCORRO	3,527	\$ 383,983	\$ 241,277	\$ 625,260	3,035	71%	\$ 387,502	\$ 146,225	61%	
79 SPRINGER	504	\$ 83,892	\$ 6,936	\$ 90,829	471	47%	\$ 23,773	\$ 16,837	243%	
80 TAOS	6,968	\$ 2,460,046	\$ 95,884	\$ 2,555,930	6,118	6%	\$ 100,089	\$ 4,204	4%	
81 TATUM	898	\$ 403,606	\$ 12,358	\$ 415,963	796	6%	\$ 13,023	\$ 665	5%	
82 TEXICO	1,264	\$ 169,438	\$ 54,568	\$ 224,006	1,136	54%	\$ 98,026	\$ 43,457	80%	
83 TRUTH OR CONS.	2,533	\$ 642,691	\$ 34,859	\$ 677,550	2,395	6%	\$ 39,175	\$ 4,316	12%	
84 TUCUMCARI	1,911	\$ 259,065	\$ 79,676	\$ 338,741	1,778	61%	\$ 173,355	\$ 93,679	118%	
85 TULAROSA	1,986	\$ 212,710	\$ 139,322	\$ 352,032	1,808	62%	\$ 229,480	\$ 90,158	65%	
86 VAUGHN	337	\$ 179,108	\$ 4,642	\$ 183,750	326	6%	\$ 5,341	\$ 699	15%	
87 WAGON MOUND	402	\$ 69,687	\$ 5,536	\$ 75,223	376	68%	\$ 13,530	\$ 7,994	144%	
88 WEST LAS VEGAS	3,226	\$ 428,727	\$ 143,234	\$ 571,961	3,102	25%	\$ 349,929	\$ 206,695	144%	
89 ZUNI	2,844	\$ 5,345	\$ 498,816	\$ 504,160	2,554	100%	\$ 721,384	\$ 222,569	45%	
90 <b>TOTAL</b>	<b>642,120</b>	<b>\$ 141,253,964</b>	<b>\$ 20,139,193</b>	<b>\$ 161,393,157</b>	<b>584,538</b>		<b>\$ 31,063,200</b>	<b>\$ 10,924,006.52</b>	<b>54%</b>	

<sup>1</sup>The chart assumes all school districts imposed a two mill levy in FY20 for the purpose of calculating the maximum potential impact of the bill; however, Los Alamos, Mora, Questa, and Reserve did not

<sup>3</sup>This calculation only includes program units for early childhood education, basic education, special education, size adjustment, enrollment growth, and the at-risk index.

<sup>4</sup>This analysis assumes all charter schools are included within a school district's program unit calculation, however, this bill will continue the requirement that charter schools work with the school district in which they are geographically located to receive funds.

PSCOC Financial Plan

(millions of dollars)

January 10, 2022

Attachment 2

<b>I. SOURCES &amp; USES</b>					
<b>SOURCES:</b>					
	<b>FY22 est.</b>	<b>FY23 est.</b>	<b>FY24 est.</b>	<b>FY25 est.</b>	<b>FY26 est.</b>
1 Uncommitted Balance (Period Beginning)	230.8	395.6	495.1	645.1	899.3
2 SSTB Notes (Revenue Budgeted July)	145.2	0.0	151.8	146.2	146.2
3 SB4 (Instructional Materials or Transportation Distribution)					
4 SSTB Notes (Revenue Budgeted January)	242.1	354.3	341.1	341.1	345.3
5 General Fund Appropriation - SB 280					
6 General Appropriation (Panic Button) Reform fund and GF					
7 General Fund Appropriation - HB 285 Grants-Cibola County Schools	0.9				
8 Long Term Bond	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9 Project Reversions	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
10 Operating Reversions					
11 Advance Repayments	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
12 Subtotal Sources :	620.1	751.1	989.2	1133.5	1391.9
<b>USES:</b>					
13 Capital Improvements Act (SB-9) Changes for FY21-FY24	21.7	22.2	22.6	23.1	23.5
14 Lease Payment Assistance Awards	18.0	18.5	19.1	19.7	20.3
15 Master Plan Assistance Awards	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
16 Legislative/Estimated Appropriation for School Buses	3.5	5.2	2.5	6.1	
17 Legislative Appropriation Capital Improvements Act - Impact Aid Districts					
18 General Appropriation (Panic Button) Reform fund and GF					
19 General Appropriation (Panic Button) PSCOF 2021 HB2	1.0				
20 General Fund Appropriation - HB 285 Grants-Cibola County Schools	0.9				
21 BDCP	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
22 BDCP Awards YTD					
23 Pre-K Capital Appropriation					
24 Pre-K Classroom Facilities Initiative	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
25 PSFA Operating Budget	5.9	6.1	6.4	6.7	7.0
26 CID/SFMO Inspections	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
27 Emergency Reserve for Contingencies	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
28 New Demolition Program	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
29 New Teacher Housing Program	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
30 Awards YTD (per Project Awards Schedule)					
31 Awards Planned in Remaining Quarters & Out Years (per Project Awards Schedule)	148.8	164.4	253.9	139.0	506.0
32 Subtotal Uses :	224.5	256.1	344.1	234.2	596.5
33 Estimated Uncommitted Balance Period Ending	395.6	495.1	645.1	899.3	795.4

<b>II. PROJECT AWARD SCHEDULE SUMMARY</b>							
	<b>Total</b>	<b>FY22 est.</b>	<b>FY23 est.</b>	<b>FY24 est.</b>	<b>FY25 est.</b>	<b>FY26 est.</b>	<b>Total</b>
2004-2005 Awards (Design & Const.) :							
34 Prior Year Awards	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
35 2013-2014 Awards Cycle (Design/Const) :	219.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
36 2014-2015 Awards Cycle (Design/Const) :	104.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.6
37 2015-2016 Awards Cycle (Design/Const) :	33.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
38 2016-2017 Awards Cycle (Const.) :	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
39 2016-2017 Awards Cycle (Design) :	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40 2017-2018 Awards Cycle (Design/Const) :	23.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5
41 2018-2019 Awards Cycle (Design) :	4.4	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.9
42 2018-2019 Awards Cycle (Const.) :	161.2	70.4	73.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	173.3
43 2019-2020 Awards Cycle (Design) :	8.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.6
44 2019-2020 Awards Cycle (Const.) :	110.0	55.6	49.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	111.9
45 2020-2021 Standards-Based Awards Cycle :	197.6	2.1	16.1	161.2	0.0	0.0	181.5
46 2020-2021 Systems-Based Awards Cycle :	5.0	2.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3
47 2021-2022 Standards-Based Awards Cycle :	138.3	1.1	17.1	69.7	0.0	50.4	138.3
48 2021-2022 Systems-Based Awards Cycle :	5.0	1.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	5.0
49 2022-2023 Standards-Based Awards Scenario :	138.3	0.0	2.0	16.0	120.3	0.0	138.3
50 2022-2023 Systems-Based Awards Scenario :	5.0	0.0	2.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	5.0
51 2023-2024 Standards Based Awards Scenario :	138.3	0.0	0.0	2.0	16.0	120.3	138.3
52 2023-2024 Systems-Based Awards Scenario :	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.7	0.0	5.0
Subtotal Uses :	1302.3	148.8	164.4	253.9	139.0	171.9	959.0

\*Actual SSTB/LTB Sale

787.1