HB 3003

School District Amendments

Purposes

1. Clear Ballot
2. Clear Result

Issues Created

Problem

April 30: 2 Interlocal Agreements (non-overlapping) for proposed splits submitted to UTCO Clerk

May 3: School District submits 2 additional splits to the UTCO Clerk (one was rejected)

Issues Created

1. **Messy Ballot**

ASD board member: "I want to point out how important it is that we put out something clear and understandable that is going to be on the ballot... there is a problem for our public when they see two things that are interrelated on the ballot."

"I don't believe that the three processes outlined in code for dividing a school district were ever intended to be enacted at the same time. The potential for confusion on the ballot cannot be overstated."

2. **Messy Result**

- If multiple splits pass, which proposal is implemented?
- If an interlocal passes but the district proposal fails, what happens?

Issues Created

HB 3003

School District Amendments

Options

- First in gets priority
  Con: Can result in "blocking" maneuvers.
- Create a prioritization system
  Con: More complex than typical for special session
- Reality: Moving forward, both of these have merit, but finding the right balance moving forward needs a regular session bill.

Key Provisions

1. Removes District Option

2. Creates a clear withdrawal process

3. Provides clarity on the districting and terms of board members

Amendment

- Clarifies that the exemption from PAPEA is VERY narrow
- Removes some ambiguous language regarding an 80% threshold of interlocal area versus interlocal total population
- Allows the public comment efforts already underway to count

HB 3003

School District Amendments