MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M

ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2377

The micrographic images on this film are accurate reproductions of records delivered to Modern Information Systems for microfilming and were filmed in the regular course of business. The photographic process meets standards of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for archival microfilm. NOTICE: If the filmed image above is less legible than this Notice, it is due to the quality of the document being filmed.

Operator's Signature

10/22/03
Date

2003 SENATE EDUCATION

SB 2377

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2377

Senate Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 02-05-03

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1	x		0 - 45.3

Committee Clerk Signature Sandra Johnson

Minutes: CHAIRMAN FREBORG called the committee to order. Roll Call was taken with all (6) members present.

CHAIRMAN FREBORG opened the hearing on SB 2377 relating to a student's school district of residence.

Testimony in support of SB 2377:

MARK LEMERE, Business Manager West Fargo School Dist., presented testimony. (see attached).

SENATOR JUDY LEE , Dist. 13, supports this bill and also brings support from REP. KATHY HAWKIN. The Fargo School district also struggles with this issue.

MARY WAHL, ND Council of Education Leaders, feels this bill defines "school district of residence" more clearly. Section 15.1-29-14 (see attached) gives two different definitions for residency. (subsection 1 and 3a). If it is not possible to determine residency for a student, she feels the state should be responsible for the costs to educate the student. If the parents move, the

child moves also and the new district then becomes the "district of residency". SENATOR COOK asked if a student was court-ordered to move from his home district to YCC, would the home school district have any financial obligations to YCC? She stated the home school district would be responsible. SENATOR COOK asked if we could put the children in two categories when they are not living with their parents: 1. the parent made the decision for the child to live somewhere else. 2. The courts of ND made a placement decision. Do we have to treat these two categories differently? MS. WAHL feels you go back to the fundamental question of who has custodial care of the child, the parent or the state. In either case, the school district of residence would be determined by the parent's residency or by the guardianship that had been placed with the court. SENATOR COOK asked if this section of code deals mostly with court placement of students.

MIKE AHMAN, Director of Special Education, Bismarck Public Schools, testified. He stated the intention of the bill is to clarify issues from the past. He questions what is an "emancipated" youth? A student who is 18 is his own guardian. His specific concern is with "mildly disabled" students who turn 18 and has not finished their education. Who is responsible for the cost to educate this student? Now it is the district of the parents who pay. The decision making of special education students is cause for concern. In today's society, it is more transient than 1932. He thinks this bill maybe doesn't go far enough. This bill addresses decisions made by parents as to where residency of the student lies and who is responsible for the cost of education.

SENATOR COOK asked about students who are court ordered to a facility, does their home school district assume responsibility? MR. AHMAN stated YCC is exception to the rule. It is state operated and there is no cost to home school district. Dakota Boys Ranch, Home On the

Range For Boys, etc. are private run facilities and there is a cost sharing between the local school district and the state, but each entity seems to have different rules on the payments.

BEV NIELSON, ND School Board Assn., applauds this effort to clarify the issue of residency. We have to know who is the decision-maker for the child. There is a fairness issue, especially in special education. There is a conflict now in the state code. She hopes the committee will work on the confusion of residency. The issue needs to be at the very least studied. Her definition of "emancipation" is "if a child is taken as a tax deduction and is on the parent's insurance, they are not on their own.

TOM DECKER, DPI, supports the concept. He has several points to bring to the committee's attention. 1. Living arrangement for children are changing. 2. We need to try to educate the child where they are. 3. We need to maintain district of responsibility (children without a home educationally). 4. We need to fix responsibility for education 5. We need to find ways to establish "chain of responsibility". 6. There is the issue of cost management, when the state is responsible, we are finding the costs are high and rising. 7. On the issue of responsibility, do we need a court order for such? 8. Should the State Board of Public School Education be included in the mix.(see attached from Dr. Charles Brickner). He would recommend a study. There are many issues, a new set of issues, and many questions.

ARVIN WINKLER, Barnes County Assessor, feels equalization is a factor. He presented a graph showing the difference in the mill levies in his township which deals with three different school districts. .

ROSELLA SAND, DPI, stated she has a problem or concern with the language on line 16 where a physician determines incapacitated parent. She feels only a court can make that determination.

There was no opposition to this bill.

CHAIRMAN FREBORG closed the hearing on SB 2377.

SENATOR LEE is to get additional information on this bill and on HB 1155 before we have discussion on this bill and do action on it.

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2377

Senate Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 2-11-03

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1	x		4.5 - 6.9

Committee Clerk Signature Sandra Johnson

Minutes:CHAIRMAN FREBORG called the committee to order. Roll call was taken with all (6) members present.

SENATOR LEE said there is a companion bill in the House (1155) which deals with a similar issue only it is student placement for non-educational purposes. The recommendation from a subcommittee on the House side was to put HB 1155 into a study resolution, which is currently being drafted. The "residency" issue needs to be defined. It has been suggested that this bill be put into the same study resolution with HB 1155. This bill creates a lot of issues that are not definable in the short period of time available to work with it.

SENATOR LEE moved a DO NOT PASS. Seconded by SENATOR CHRISTENSON.

Roll Call Vote: 6 YES. 0 NO. 0 Absent. Motion Carried.

Carrier: SENATOR LEE

FISCAL NOTE

Requested by Legislative Council
01/28/2003

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2377

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2001-2003 Biennium		2003-2005 Biennium		2005-2007 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Expenditures	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Appropriations	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2001-2003 Biennium			2003-2005 Biennium			2005-2007 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

2. **Narrative:** *Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.*

This bill relates to determining a student's school district of residence. Fiscal consequences relate to financial responsibility for education and related costs. Since these costs are at the school district level, there is no esimated fiscal impact on the state appropriation.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*
   A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

   B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

   C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.*

Name:	Jerry Coleman	**Agency:**	Department of Public Instruction
Phone Number:	701-328-4051	**Date Prepared:**	01/29/2003

Date: 2/11/03
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2003 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2377

Senate EDUCATION Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Not Pass

Motion Made By Sen. G. Lee Seconded By Sen. Christenson

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
LAYTON FREBORG, CHAIR.	✓		LINDA CHRISTENSON	✓	
GARY A. LEE, V. CHAIR.	✓		RYAN M. TAYLOR	✓	
DWIGHT COOK	✓				
TIM FLAKOLL	✓				

Total (Yes) 6 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Sen. Lee

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
February 11, 2003 10:45 a.m.

Module No: SR-26-2245
Carrier: G. Lee
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2377: Education Committee (Sen. Freborg, Chairman) recommends **DO NOT PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2377 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

2003 TESTIMONY

SB 2377

Testimony on Senate Bill 2377
Presented by Mark Lemer, Business Manager, West Fargo Schools
February 5, 2003

Senate Freborg and members of the Senate Education Committee, I am here today to testify in favor of Senate Bill 2377.

The purpose of this bill would be to more clearly define the residency of a student for attending the public schools in the state.

In 1932, the North Dakota Supreme Court issued a ruling in the Anderson vs. Breithbarth case. In this case, a child from another state was living with an aunt and uncle in North Dakota who were furnishing the child a decent home and lightening the financial burden on the child's mother. The school district in which the aunt and uncle lived considered the child to be a non-resident and asked that tuition be paid. The Supreme Court ruled that since the child had for all intents and purposes become a member of the aunt and uncle's family, the child should be treated as a resident of the district for school attendance purposes.

The State Constitution requires a system of free public schools for all students who reside in North Dakota. However, it is up to the Legislature to define the system of public education. To date, the Legislature has not provided any clarification to the issue of residency for school attendance purposes. As a result, the Anderson vs. Breithbarth case continues to be the basis for additional court rulings and Attorney General opinion letters.

The Legislature has defined processes through the open enrollment and tuition statutes that provide for attendance in a school district other than the one in which a child resides. Unfortunately, there are an increasing number of instances where families are bypassing these provisions by finding alternate living arrangements for their children.

As school districts, we are faced with making decisions about when a child should be admitted. We have to decide if the child is truly a resident of the school district or is there solely for school attendances purposes. Unless we can show that the child is there solely for school attendance purposes, we must admit the child, even though the person that the child lives with may have no legal relationship with the child.

When a child is living with someone other than the parent or legal guardian, the school is put in a precarious position. We are essentially forced to violate the provisions of the federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, which prohibit the sharing of information with anyone other than the parent or guardian. It also leaves us vulnerable in cases of medical emergencies, educational placements, permission slips, and a myriad of other issues that occur on a daily basis in schools.

While the language in this bill may not be perfect, at the very least it will provide school districts with some assistance when they are dealing with students who are not living with a parent or legal guardian.

The Constitution requires that every child have access to a free and appropriate public education. Anderson vs. Breithbarth reaffirms this requirement. This bill is not intended to deprive a child the right to a free public education. The intent is only to more clearly define which school district is the district of residence for each child residing in North Dakota.

I would encourage your support for the concepts contained in Senate Bill 2377.

Mary Wahl
SB 2377

e. A school district may admit a nonresident student described in section 15.1-31-07 from another school district in this state without a charge and collection of tuition and without a written agreement.

3. A school district may not charge or collect from a nonresident student, the student's parent, or the student's district of residence any fees or charges not otherwise assessed to all resident students.

15.1-29-14. Student placement for noneducational purposes - Residency determination - Payment of tuition.

1. For purposes of applying this chapter, a student's school district of residence is the district in which the student resides:

   a. At the time that a state court, tribal court, juvenile supervisor, or the division of juvenile services issues an order requiring the student to stay for a prescribed period at a state-licensed foster home or at a state-licensed child care home or facility;

   b. At the time a county or state social service agency places the student, with the consent of the student's parent or legal guardian, at a state-licensed foster home or at a state-licensed child care home or facility;

   c. At the time the student is initially placed in a state-operated institution, even if the student is later placed at a state-licensed foster home or at a state-licensed child care home or facility; or

   d. At the time the student is voluntarily admitted to a state-operated institution or to a state-licensed child care home or facility.

2. The student's school district of residence is obligated to pay:

   a. All charges for tuition upon claim of the admitting district; and

   b. All charges for tutoring services upon claim of an admitting facility, provided that the tutoring services are delivered by an individual who is licensed to teach by the education standards and practices board or approved to teach by the education standards and practices board.

3. a. If, after a student placement is made as provided for under subsection 1, the student's custodial parent establishes residency in another school district in this state, the school district in which the custodial parent has established residency becomes the student's school district of residence for purposes of paying tuition and tutoring charges under subsection 2.

   b. The state shall pay the tuition and tutoring charges under subsection 2 from funds appropriated by the legislative assembly for per student and transportation aid:

      (1) If, after a student placement is made as provided for under subsection 1, the student's custodial parent establishes residency outside this state; or

      (2) If a court orders a termination of parental rights with respect to the student's parents.

4. If the student is voluntarily admitted to a state-licensed child care home or facility, or to a state-operated institution, the student's parent or, if one has been appointed, the student's legal guardian may appeal a determination under section 15.1-29-05 regarding the payment of tuition by filing a petition with the county superintendent of

CARRINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 10
100 3rd AVENUE SOUTH :: P.O. BOX 48
CARRINGTON, NORTH DAKOTA 58421
PHONE 701-652-3136
FAX 701-652-1243

KENT GUSSIAAS, PRESIDENT
WARREN JAMISON, VICE PRESIDENT
STACEY D. GUSSIAAS, SECOND VICE PRESIDENT
FRED SAUBY, DIRECTOR
DR. JAY BAUER, DIRECTOR

DR. CHARLES BRICKNER, SUPERINTENDENT
DEAN RALSTON, HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
JUANITA SHORT, ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL
KIMARY EDLAND, BUSINESS MANAGER

February 4, 2003

To: Tom Decker, DPI
Re: SB 2377
From: Dr. Charles Brickner, Chairperson
State Board of Public School Education

I am writing this correspondence to inform you of my concern regarding SB 2377. I do agree that school district residence determination is an important issue that needs resolution; however, assigning this determination to the State Board of Public School Education would be an undue burden. The State Board of Public School Education simply does not have the staff to carry out such a mandate.

I would recommend that this issue be referred for further study and given a priority status.

Please convey my concerns to the appropriate committee.

2002colvysht

Arvin Winkler
SB 2317

BARNES COUNTY
STATE/COUNTY MILL LEVIES FOR 2002

Twp #	SD #	FD #	Entity	Valuation	Co-Wide	Twp	School	Park	Fire	State	Total
1	2		Alta	564,021	108.15	24.82	231.07			1.00	365.04
1	13		Alta		108.15	24.82	10.08			1.00	144
2	65	3	Anderson	532,302	108.15	20.70	137.60		5.00	1.00	272
2	65	17	Anderson		108.15	20.70	137.60		8.28	1.00	275.73
3	2		Ashtabula	461,139	108.15	15.61	231.07			1.00	355.83
3	65		Ashtabula		108.15	15.61	137.60			1.00	262.36
4	2	9	Baldwin	398,808	107.24	18.00	231.07		7.14	1.00	364.45
4	65	9	Baldwin		107.24	18.00	137.60		7.14	1.00	270.98
4	18	9	Baldwin		107.24	18.00	233.44		7.14	1.00	366.82
4	120	9	Baldwin		107.24	18.00	190.13		7.14	1.00	323.51
5	130	7	Binghampton	459,236	108.15	25.91	140.84		5.00	1.00	280.90
5	100	7	Binghampton		108.15	25.91	224.29		5.00	1.00	364.35
6	65	17	Brimer	388,210	108.15	35.63	137.60		8.28	1.00	290.66
6	82	17	Brimer		108.15	35.63	136.18		8.28	1.00	289.24
7	2		Cuba	586,001	108.15	30.72	231.07			1.00	370.94
7	13		Cuba		108.15	30.72	10.08			1.00	149.95
7	130		Cuba		108.15	30.72	140.84			1.00	280.71
8	65	1	Dazey	398,447	108.15	19.31	137.60		5.00	1.00	271.06
8	18	1	Dazey		108.15	19.31	233.44		5.00	1.00	366.90
9	2	17	Eckelson	499,552	108.15	21.09	231.07		8.28	1.00	369.59
9	65	17	Eckelson		108.15	21.09	137.60		8.28	1.00	276.12
9	82	17	Eckelson		108.15	21.09	136.18		8.28	1.00	274.70
10	65	3	Edna	1,190,078	108.15	15.63	137.60		5.00	1.00	267.38
11	2	9	Ellsbury	504,444	108.15	27.00	231.07		7.14	1.00	374.36
11	120	9	Ellsbury		108.15	27.00	190.13		7.14	1.00	333.42
11	160	9	Ellsbury		108.15	27.00	179.57		7.14	1.00	322.86
12	2		Getchell	471,361	108.15	31.90	231.07			1.00	372.12
12	65		Getchell		108.15	31.90	137.60			1.00	278.65
13	2		Grand Prairie	396,540	108.15	39.60	231.07			1.00	379.82
13	13		Grand Prairie		108.15	39.60	10.08			1.00	158.83
13	65		Grand Prairie		108.15	39.60	137.60			1.00	286.35
13	120		Grand Prairie		108.15	39.60	190.13			1.00	338.88
13	160		Grand Prairie		108.15	39.60	179.57			1.00	328.32
14	2		Green	420,777	108.15	36.04	231.07			1.00	376.26
14	65		Green		108.15	36.04	137.60			1.00	282
15	140		Greenland	452,678	108.15	18.00	131.61			1.00	258.76
16	2	17	Hemen	366,476	108.15	25.92	231.07		8.28	1.00	374.42
16	52	17	Hemen		108.15	25.92	112.05		8.28	1.00	255.40
16	65	17	Hemen		108.15	25.92	137.60		8.28	1.00	280.95
17	2		Hobart	1,065,208	108.15	27.00	231.07			1.00	367.22
17	65		Hobart		108.15	27.00	137.60			1.00	273.75
18	65	1	Laketown	399,395	108.15	16.55	137.60		5.00	1.00	268.30
18	82	1	Laketown		108.15	16.55	136.18		5.00	1.00	266.88
18	18	1	Laketown		108.15	16.55	233.44		5.00	1.00	364.14
19	2	17	Mansfield	415,481	108.15	26.30	231.07		8.28	1.00	374.80
19	52	17	Mansfield		108.15	26.30	112.05		8.28	1.00	255.78
19	150	17	Mansfield		108.15	26.30	210.28		8.28	1.00	354.01
20	2		Marsh	1,075,916	108.15	24.17	231.07			1.00	364.39
21	52		Meadow Lake	415,779	108.15	29.15	112.05			1.00	250.35
21	140		Meadow Lake		108.15	29.15	131.61			1.00	269.91
21	150		Meadow Lake		108.15	29.15	210.28			1.00	348.58
22	13	15	Minnie Lake	433,232	108.15	23.89	10.08		4.74	1.00	147.86
22	160	15	Minnie Lake		108.15	23.89	179.57		4.74	1.00	317.35
23	2	11	Nelson	369,520	108.15	23.91	231.07		5.00	1.00	369.13
23	52	11	Nelson		108.15	23.91	112.05		5.00	1.00	250.11
23	130	11	Nelson		108.15	23.91	140.84		5.00	1.00	278.90
24	2		Noltimier	397,064	108.15	36.53	231.07			1.00	376.75
24	13		Noltimier		108.15	36.53	10.08			1.00	155.76
25	2		Norma	822,755	108.15	18.54	231.07			1.00	358.76
25	2	11	Norma		108.15	18.54	231.07		5.00	1.00	363.76
25	130		Norma		108.15	18.54	140.84			1.00	268.53
25	130	7	Norma		108.15	18.54	140.84		5.00	1.00	273.53
25	130	11	Norma		108.15	18.54	140.84		5.00	1.00	273.53
25	130	13	Norma		108.15	18.54	140.84		5.00	1.00	273.53
26	2	11	Oakhill	325,072	108.15	15.38	231.07		5.00	1.00	360.60
26	52	11	Oakhill		108.15	15.38	112.05		5.00	1.00	241.58
27	13	19	Oriska	501,151	108.15	18.00	10.08		2.29	1.00	139.52
27	130	19	Oriska		108.15	18.00	140.84		2.29	1.00	270.28
28	65	21	Pierce	1,904,088	108.15	6.56	137.60		5.26	1.00	258.57
28	82	21	Pierce		108.15	6.56	136.18		5.26	1.00	257.15
29	2	17	Potter	446,702	108.15	16.29	231.07		8.28	1.00	364.79
29	65	17	Potter		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]				

BARNES COUNTY
STATE/COUNTY MILL LEVIES FOR 2002

Twp #	SD #	FD #	Entity	Valuation	Co-Wide	Twp	School	Park	Fire	State	Total
30	100	5	Raritan	913,458	108.15	12.59	224.29		9.49	1.00	355.52
30	100	13	Raritan		108.15	12.59	224.29		5.00	1.00	351.03
30	130	13	Raritan		108.15	12.59	140.84		5.00	1.00	267.58
31	65		Rogers	395,482	108.15	20.26	137.60			1.00	267.01
31	65	1	Rogers		108.15	20.26	137.60		5.00	1.00	272.01
32	52		Rosebud	429,972	108.15	24.03	112.05			1.00	245.23
32	140		Rosebud		108.15	24.03	131.61			1.00	264.79
33	2	1	Sibley Trail	351,477	108.15	19.08	231.07		5.00	1.00	364.30
33	65	1	Sibley Trail		108.15	19.08	137.60		5.00	1.00	270.83
33	18	1	Sibley Trail		108.15	19.08	233.44		5.00	1.00	366.67
34	2		Skandia	351,951	108.15	22.98	231.07			1.00	363.20
34	52		Skandia		108.15	22.98	112.05			1.00	244.18
35	2		Spring Creek	447,846	108.15	22.08	231.07			1.00	362.30
35	2	11	Spring Creek		108.15	22.08	231.07		5.00	1.00	367.30
35	52		Spring Creek		108.15	22.08	112.05			1.00	243.28
36	13	7	Springvale	427,710	108.15	31.40	10.08		5.00	1.00	155.63
36	13	19	Springvale		108.15	31.40	10.08		2.29	1.00	152.92
36	130	7	Springvale		108.15	31.40	140.84		5.00	1.00	286.39
36	130	19	Springvale		108.15	31.40	140.84		2.29	1.00	283.68
37	2		Stewart	897,195	108.15	18.95	231.07			1.00	359.17
37	65		Stewart		108.15	18.95	137.60			1.00	265.70
38	52		Svea	365,593	108.15	27.00	112.05			1.00	248.20
39	2	11	Thordenskjold	397,646	108.15	31.10	231.07		5.00	1.00	376.32
39	2	13	Thordenskjold		108.15	31.10	231.07		5.00	1.00	376.32
39	52	11	Thordenskjold		108.15	31.10	112.05		5.00	1.00	257.30
39	130	13	Thordenskjold		108.15	31.10	140.84		5.00	1.00	286.09
39	100	11	Thordenskjold		108.15	31.10	224.29		5.00	1.00	369.54
39	100	13	Thordenskjold		108.15	31.10	224.29		5.00	1.00	369.54
40	65	21	Uxbridge	510,267	108.15	18.00	137.60		5.26	1.00	270.01
40	82	21	Uxbridge		108.15	18.00	136.18		5.26	1.00	268.59
41	2		Valley	1,378,610	108.15	27.00	231.07			1.00	367.22
42	13	19	Welmer	466,263	108.15	18.00	10.08		2.29	1.00	139.52
42	130	19	Welmer		108.15	18.00	140.84		2.29	1.00	270.28

City #	SD #	FD #	Entity	Valuation	Co-Wide	City	School	Park	Fire	State	Total
50	65	1	City of Dazey	41,749	108.15	61.68	137.60		5.00	1.00	313.43
51	130	7	City of Fingal	75,449	108.15	84.37	140.84	6.63	5.00	1.00	345.99
52	2	11	City of Kathryn	59,350	108.15	44.47	231.07	3.37	5.00	1.00	393.06
53	65	3	City of Leal	36,953	108.15	47.83	137.60		5.00	1.00	299.58
54	52		City of Litchville	119,482	107.15	156.29	112.05	7.87		1.00	384.36
55	100	13	City of Nome	25,153	107.15	46.32	224.29	4.00	5.00	1.00	387.76
56	13		City of Oriska	72,384	108.15	43.18	10.08			1.00	162.41
57	120	9	City of Pillsbury	38,405	107.24	62.09	190.13		7.14	1.00	367.60
58	65		City of Rogers	117,218	108.15	56.45	137.60			1.00	303.20
59	65	17	City of Sanborn	122,087	108.15	111.42	137.60	4.20	8.28	1.00	370.65
60	65		City of Sibley	55,086	108.15	44.43	137.60			1.00	291.18
61	130		City of Tower City	16,555	108.15	47.64	140.84			1.00	297.63
62	82	21	City of Wimbledon	260,841	105.78	92.35	136.18		5.26	1.00	340.57
63	2		City of Valley City	7,306,232	105.29	109.94	231.07	39.54		1.00	486.84
			County Valuation	32,321,849	1 Mill = $32,321.85						

STATE & COUNTY LEVIES					
General Fund	23.00	Oasis & Soc Security	5.21	Garrison Diversion	1.00
Road & Bridge	0.50	County Extension	2.83	Airport	2.37
City/County Health	2.52	Farm to Market 15 Ml	20.23	Winter Show	2.16
Veterans Services	1.13	BC Economic Devlpmnt	4.00	Older Persons	1.05
County Poor Relief	20.00	Correctional Center	5.00	Ambulance	0.91
County Park	1.00	Comp Health Care	3.28	Water Resources	2.35
Weed Control	2.00	Insurance Reserve	0.62	Historical Society	0.25
Leafy Spurge	1.00	2000 Bridge Sinking	2.50	Library	1.86
Advertising	0.36	Soil Conservation	1.00	State Medical Center	1.00

#2 - Valley City School District	#130 - Maple Valley School District	#9 - Hope Rural Fire District
#13 - Oriska School District	#140 - Marion School District	#11 - Kathryn Rural Fire District
#52 - Litchville School District	#150 - Montpelier School District	#13 - Nome Rural Fire District
#65 - North Central School District	#160 - Page School District	#15 - Page Rural Fire District
#82 - Wimbledon-Courtenay School District	#1 - Dazey Rural Fire District	#17 - Sanborn Rural Fire District
#100 - Enderlin School District	#3 - Edna Rural Fire District	#19 - Tower City Rural Fire District
#18 - Griggs Co Central SD #18	#5 - Enderlin Rural Fire District	#21 - Wimbledon Rural Fire District
#120 - Hope School District	#7 - Fingal Rural Fire District	