

1 tially except with the number of pupils in each.

2 So that it was perfectly clear that what Dr.
3 Sensenbaugh and Mr. Perkins told me was that income was
4 not in the formula. Now, you are saying it is. I don't
5 know which one of you to believe.

6 MR. RAVER: Mr. Chairman, this must have been
7 a lack of communication. Each side must have misunder-
8 stood the other, because if you have your book here, Article
9 77, I can find for you in ^avery few minutes the changes
10 made in 1964, which puts in the net taxable income as a
11 product with assessable bases and then this factor of
12 1.228 is applied to that. You see, it is no longer a tax
13 rate. It is a kind of a percentage of this product, so
14 obviously that is not \$1.228 cents, you see, so that they
15 have the factor correct, but the answers are not coming
16 across correctly. The net taxable income per school system
17 is the part of the calculation of the local effort. This
18 product is achieved by multiplying the net taxable income
19 times the assessable base and then applying this 1.228.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Where do they get the net tax-
21 able income from?