Approved: Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Barbara Lawrence at 9:00 a.m. on March 25, 1997 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Jones

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department

Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes Jackie Breymeyer, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Others attending: See attached list

Chairperson Lawrence called the meeting to order. She stated the House Education Committee was briefed yesterday on the Local Option Budget. The outcome of that is not clear and the issue will be addressed from the Senate side also. Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department will explain the issue and Dale Dennis, Deputy Education Commissioner, have some information on how the school districts will be affected. This LOB plan will be amended into **HB 2098**--school districts; enrollment and transportation of nonresident pupils. The bill will be withdrawn from the floor and sent back to Senate Education Committee for amendment of the LOB plan and then sent back to the floor.

Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department, distributed a summary of the LOB to Committee and began his presentation. He said that one thing to be remembered is that in the aggregate, there is still a 25% cap on LOB authority; this always applies. (Attachment 1)

On page 2 Mr. Barrett focused on two ways to provide LOB authority under this proposal.

One applies to schools districts that already have an LOB in 1996-97. Those districts under this proposal could adopt an LOB equal to the following percentage of the district's general fund budget based upon the LOB percentage the district was authorized to adopt in 1996-97: 100.0 percent in 1997-98; 90.0 percent in 1998-99; and 80.0 percent in 1999-2000 and thereafter.

An example would be if Shawnee Mission had a 25% LOB. The 25% would be the 100% of its LOB.

Another provision applies to districts without LOBs. Any school district that did not have an LOB in 1996-97 would be authorized to adopt on its own motion, not subject to protest petition, a specified LOB percentage determined by the State Board of Education.

The procedure that would be followed is that school districts would be grouped into four enrollment groupings. For each of these groupings the average budget per full-time equivalent pupil for the preceding school year would be computed. The FTE budget per pupil of each school district for the preceding school year would be determined by a combination of the general fund budget and the LOB. This computation would exclude any amount resulting from a district's successful LOB increase resolution.

The district's FTE budget per pupil would be subtracted from the average budget per pupil for the district's enrollment grouping for the dollar amount per pupil.

This dollar amount per pupil is multiplied by the enrollment of the district which would produce a sum of money. That sum of money would be divided by the district's general fund budget in the preceding year. This result would be the percentage of the LOB authority that would be available for the district in the next school year. This new LOB authority under this provision is phased in over a five-year period. The bottom of page 2 shows that of the LOB amount calculated above, a district could utilize 20% of the amount calculated would be available in 1997-98; 40% in 1998-99; 60% in 1999-2000; 80% 2000-01; and 100% in 2001-02 and thereafter.

Mr. Barrett stated that these are the two approaches for LOB authority that are available to the district without protest petition election.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ROOM 123-S-Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 25, 1997.

One difference between this provision and the current law is that the district will specify in its resolution the number of years it wants the resolution to be effective or adopt a resolution that gives it authority for good.

A district that is operating under an initial resolution to increase its LOB authority is authorized to adopt subsequent resolutions to increase its LOB authority, subject to the 25.0 percent aggregate cap. The duration of a subsequent resolution could not exceed that contained in the initial resolution. The duration limitation would not apply if the board if permanently authorized to adopt an LOB.

This is the way districts will increase local authority under this proposal.

There is a transitional provision which states that a district operating under LOB authority obtained prior to passage of this bill, with authority that extends to the 1997-98 school year or beyond, could either continue to operate under that resolution until its expiration or abandon the resolution and operate under the new provisions.

Mr. Barrett gave an example of how this would work.

District A has a 25% LOB through the 1997-98 school year. The board would like to continue this authority permanently. To do this for 1998-99, the Board would have 90% authority it could adopt on its own. In essence, it could adopt 22.5% LOB on its own and then could adopt a resolution that called for an additional 2.5% LOB authority. The district would have to repeat the same exercise in the following year if it wanted to continue at the 25% level because the hold harmless base is protected at 80% in 1999-2000. Since the district had 20% LOB authority, it would have gotten 2.5 from the previous year which would have given them 22.5%, then adopted a resolution for an additional 2.5% so that it could continue at 25% for the following year.

Another example given was of a district like the other which adopts a resolution, but there is a protest petition; there is an election and the LOB increase proposal loses. That district, on its own motion, in 1998-99 can have the 22.5% LOB, the 90% guarantee, and the following year it could have the 20% LOB, the 80%, and decide it wanted to go back to the voters. It would have the 20% 1999-2000.

The third example was the same as the other two districts, but didn't want to bother with the adoption of a resolution or take a chance at an election; it also is held harmless in 1998-99 at 22.5% and 20% in 1999-2000 and thereafter.

The final example was of a district that never had an LOB and would like to have one. Mr. Barrett provided the figures that went with the explanation of what the district would qualify for.

In this example, the average budget in the enrollment grouping for the district is: The district's own budget per pupil is:

\$4500 per pupil. \$4200 per pupil \$ 300

Difference:

 $$300 \times 2,000 \text{ (unweighted enrollment)} =$

\$600,000

\$600,000 divided \$8,000,000 (the district's general fund budget) = LOB authority of 7.5 percent

This authority is phased in over a five-year period.

LOB authorization upon the motion of the district's board would be the following, depending on the current school year: 1.5% in 1997-98; 3.0% in 1998-99; 4.5% in 1999-2000; 6.0% in 2000-01; and 7.5% in 2001-02 and thereafter.

The last page showed the grouping of school district enrollments and how the average FTE amount would be determined.

The question was asked what would happen if a district is at 10% now and pass a resolution for 25% and there is a protest petition?

The response was that if a district has 10% now and wanted to increase by 15% to go to 25%, if there was an election and protest petition and the authorization failed, the district would still have the 10% for 1997-98. [Then they would have the 90% of the base].

Another clarification was made that the protest petition would still remain at 5%; this has not changed. If districts do decide to continue the source of revenue would still be property tax. It doesn't change in any way the way LOBs are financed.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ROOM 123-S-Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 25, 1997.

The comment was made that someone on the House side is wanting to include income tax in the mix.

In response to another question, the Chairperson commented that the reason they averaged within enrollment districts was because of the surprise at the runs that were given. The disparity between those within one classification or category.

The only amendments or ideas at this time are: increasing to some number, the percentage that has to sign on a protest petition and then looking at the mix.

The comment was made that the calculation of the gap between one's own budget per pupil and the average for the enrollment categories is a moving number. With this piece of information it could be assumed that some of the voter pressure being removed from the holding down of LOBs would probably result in more LOBs being adopted over time. The state participates in funding so this will have an increasing pressure on state expenditures. The first year this would happen is 1997-98; a reconsideration of the 1998 budget.

The Ranking Minority Member shared with the Committee some of the beliefs that went into the process. One was that there should be local involvement or responsibility in financing education; the second was an effort on their part to lessen the inequities in the local effort. A third belief was that some districts, because of societal factors, will never raise an LOB. Fourth, the state is ultimately responsible for financing adequate education. An attempt has been made to devise a system that addresses those districts that will not ever be able to address an LOB and therefore lessen the inequity.

The question was asked if the LOB group had taken into consideration the fact that 1 mill can raise quite different amounts of money.

The response was that Dale Dennis, Deputy Education Commissioner, will show that this all works under equalization. The group worked hard to come up with this plan. What appears to be the only trend is the poorer school districts can't pass LOBs. What Mr. Dennis' figure will show is that this is addressing helping the poorer school districts to come up somewhat and the state is kicking in. What the people at the low end of the spectrum get without a vote is very little, but it is bringing them up.

The comment was made that when taxes and voter protests are taken into consideration, the responsibility lies in making sure adequate funding is provided for equitable education across the state. The courts have indicated that they will be watching that. It is legal to have different amounts of money being generated at individual districts, but because a district has permission to raise an LOB doesn't mean that it will be able to. In the final evaluation, if schools are not funded adequately, the Legislation is in violation.

The chairperson stated a home rule bill was passed out of Committee, giving powers back to the boards in policy making and yet if we don't want them to take a portion of the finance part it seems like a dichotomy to her.

Another Committee member stated that everything can't be put to a vote of the people; Legislators are elected and sent to Topeka to make tough decisions; school boards have accountability.

Dale Dennis distributed a computer printout which showed the general fund and supplemental general fund budgets and the general fund and supplemental general fund budgets per pupil (based on FTE enrollment) for the 1996-97 school year. (Attachment 2)

Column 1 showed the current FTE enrollment; column 2 is estimated general fund budget for the current year; Column is the supplemental general fund budget, the LOBs for the current year; Column 4 is the general and supplemental and general fund budget combined; Column 5 is the general fund budget per pupil, this is Column 1 divided into Column 2; Column 6 is the supplemental general fund budget per pupil which is Column 1 divided into Column 3; Column 7 is Column 5 and Column 6 added together or Column 4 divided by Column 1.Column 8 is the computed average as it is used for the district's appropriate enrollment and is referred to as an average, but there is a linear transaction to take the bumps out of it so an extra student doesn't take a lot of money or lose a lot of money. Column 9 shows the amount a district is below the state average. If there is a zero there, that means it is above the state average. Column 10 is Column 9, the amount per pupil, multiplied by the FTE enrollment. This is the potential LOB amount that it would take for that particular district to get up to the state average. Column 11 - Mr. Dennis referred to the five-year phase in - it is 20% of the amount shown in Column 11. In Column 12 is the estimated supplemental state aid that was referred to by Senator Kerr. Those percentages will vary depending upon wealth; the poorer the district, the higher the percentage, it is equalized to the 75th percentile. To clarify, Mr. Dennis used the Humboldt figures. Column 11 equates to 1.62% of their general fund and the state would pay 18, 893 of that amount. The district would pay the 51,313 minus the 18,893.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ROOM 123-S-Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 25, 1997.

Mr. Dennis stated that in Column 12 there may be zeros that are in Column 11. This means they are in the top 22 percentile in assessed valuation per pupil. There are also some percentages of state aid that are rather high. Taking Hoisington in Barton County as an example, they get \$76,782 in authority and \$31,035 from the state. This means the state would be paying 40% and the locals would pay the remainder. Some will be higher and some lower, depending on wealth.

Using Hoisington again as an example, Mr. Dennis stated the 1.79 in Column 13 is for next year. This is the amount that 76,782 is of Column 4, which is 4,278,374. Without a vote they can do an LOB of 1.79. The next year the averages will be recomputed annually.

Mr. Dennis directed attention to the last page of the printout and said that in computing this on an individual district bases, it would take 7.1 million if everyone participated. Not everyone will participate; some boards will choose not to participate. The number will be somewhat less than the 7.1 million. The reason for non-participation would be the property tax sensitivity.

The statement was made to Mr. Dennis that we are looking for the five-year impact on the state budget and the five-year impact on property taxes. From this it will be known what it is if the average wasn't a creeping average, but the average will creep.

Mr. Dennis agreed. In looking at the impact on property taxes \$91 million minus \$35 million as the first, then look at whatever the creeping is over the five-year period. The \$56 million would amount to 3.3 mills; the creep would be above that.

The comment was that the impact on the state budget would be about \$35 million dollars a year.

Mr. Dennis stated that was if all districts would go and some will not go because of the taxes.

The Chairperson told the Committee it would meet tomorrow. The meeting was adjourned.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 26, 1997.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: March 25, 1997

NAME	REPRESENTING
Veine apl	USA
Aman Doubles	AAB
Jacque Dakes	50E
Su Chase	KNEA
M. Kevin Ireland	KSOE
Stove McChine	USD 450
Bralla Scott	(esA
Sheila Frahm	KACC
Tom Brono	Allen & Assac
Tim Potter	Wilhita Eagle
Diane Gierslad	USDASS
Ken Bohr	PACC

Rm. 545N-Statehouse, 300 SW 10th Av-Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504 (913) 296-3181 ◆ FAX (913) 296-3824

KSLegRes@lr01.wpo.state.ks.us

http://www.kumc.edu/kansas/ksleg/KLRD/klrd.html

March 24, 1997

THE LOCAL OPTION BUDGET (LOB)

Current Law

Following is a listing of key facts about school district LOB authority:

- A school district is authorized to adopt an LOB in an amount of up to 25.0 percent of the district's general fund budget.
- A district's use of LOB authority is subject to a 5.0 percent protest petition election procedure.
- A district's LOB authority, if not rejected by the electors, is good for up to four years, as proposed by the local school board. During this period, additional increases in LOB authority are authorized, subject to the same protest petition election procedure. However, no LOB resolution may extend beyond the expiration date of the initial resolution. The "combined" LOB authority may not exceed 25.0 percent of the district's general fund budget.

1996 legislation applies to any school district that has an LOB in the 1996-97 school year and which, in order to adopt an LOB in 1997-98, would be required to adopt a new LOB resolution subject to the protest petition election provisions of the law. Such a district, by a majority vote of its board, is authorized to adopt an LOB for the 1997-98 school year in an amount not in excess of the percentage of the general fund budget the district's resolution authorized the board to adopt in 1996-97.

PROPOSED CHANGE

The use of LOB authority would continue to be subject to a limitation of 25.0 percent of the district's general fund budget. There would, however, be several changes in the procedures for accessing this authority.

Senate Education
3-25-97
Attachment 1

School Districts with LOBs in 1996-97

Any school district with LOB authority in the 1996-97 school year on its own motion could adopt an LOB equal to the following percentage of the district's general fund budget based upon the LOB percentage the district was authorized to adopt in 1996-97:

- 100.0 percent in 1997-98;
- 90.0 percent in 1998-99; and
- 80.0 percent in 1999-2000 and thereafter.

School Districts Without LOBs in 1996-97 (Low-Spending Districts)

Any school district that did not have an LOB in 1996-97 would be authorized to adopt on its own motion a specified LOB percentage, determined by the State Board of Education (SBOE) as follows:

- The average budget per full-time equivalent (FTE) pupil (unweighted) for the preceding school year would be computed for each of four enrollment groupings—under 100, 100-299, 300-1,799, and 1,800 and over. This computation would use the combined school district general fund and LOB.
- The FTE budget per pupil (unweighted) of <u>each</u> school district for the preceding school year would be determined (combined general fund and LOB).
 This computation would exclude any amount resulting from a district's successful LOB increase resolution.
- The district's FTE budget per pupil would be subtracted from the average budget per pupil for the district's enrollment grouping (also, see Attachment 2).
- The budget per pupil difference would be multiplied by the district's FTE pupil (unweighted) enrollment in the preceding year.
- The product (of multiplying the district's budget per pupil by FTE enrollment) would be divided by the amount of the district's general fund budget in the preceding year. The result would be the LOB percentage available to the district in the next school year. This new LOB authority would be phased in over a five-year period. Of the LOB amount calculated above, a district could utilize:

20.0 percent in 1997-98; 40.0 percent in 1998-99; 60.0 percent in 1999-2000; 80.0 percent in 2000-01; and 100.0 percent in 2001-02, and thereafter.

"Additional" LOB Authority-Subject to Protest Petition Election

In addition to the LOB authority available under the foregoing provisions, beginning in 1997-98 a school district would be authorized to adopt a resolution to increase its LOB authority in any amount, subject to an aggregate cap of 25.0 percent of the school district general fund budget, either permanently or for the number of years specified by the board in its resolution. This resolution would be subject to the same protest petition election provisions as contained in the current law.

A district that is operating under an initial resolution to increase its LOB authority is authorized to adopt subsequent resolutions to increase its LOB authority, subject to the 25.0 percent aggregate cap. The duration of a subsequent resolution could not exceed that contained in the initial resolution. The duration limitation would not apply if the board is permanently authorized to adopt an LOB.

Transitional Provision

A district operating under LOB authority obtained prior to passage of this bill, with authority that extends to the 1997-98 school year or beyond, could either continue to operate under that resolution until its expiration or abandon the resolution and operate under the new provisions.

ATTACHMENT 1

Examples

- District A presently has 25.0 percent LOB authority through the 1997-98 school year. The board wants to continue this authority permanently. To do this, the board successfully adopts a resolution to increase its LOB authority commencing in 1998-99 by 2.5 percentage points. A similar action would again be required commencing in 1999-2000. Then, District A would have permanent 25.0 percent LOB authority.
- 2. District B is in the same position as District A. However, in District B, a protest petition is filed, an election is held, and the LOB increase proposal loses. The board, on its own motion, may adopt a 22.5 percent LOB in 1998-99. Absent adoption of another resolution to increase the LOB, the district could, on its own motion, adopt a 20.0 percent LOB in 1999-2000 and thereafter.
- 3. District C is in the same situation as Districts A and B, but chooses not to adopt a resolution to increase its LOB for the purpose of maintaining it at the 25.0 percent level. The board, on its own motion, may adopt an LOB in 1998-99 of 22.5 percent and at 20.0 percent in 1999-2000 and each year thereafter.
- 4. District D has never had an LOB. For 1997-98 the district, on its own motion, could adopt an LOB under the new provision applicable to low spending districts. This LOB authority would be computed (based on the preceding year's data), as follows:

	Average Budget Per Pupil of District Grouping	\$ 4	4,500
<u>Minus</u>	Budget Per Pupil of District D*		4,200
	Difference	\$	300

<u>then</u>

 $$300 \times 2,000 \text{ (unweighted enrollment)} = $600,000$

 $$600,000 \div $8,000,000$ (District D's general fund budget) = 7.5 percent so

LOB authorization upon the motion of District D's board would be the following, depending upon the current school year:

- 1.5 percent in 1997-98;
- 3.0 percent in 1998-99;
- 4.5 percent in 1999-2000;
- 6.0 percent in 2000-01; and
- 7.5 percent in 2001-02 and thereafter.

1-4

^{*} This computation is net of any LOB authority increase added by the district pursuant to an LOB resolution.

ATTACHMENT 2

- For the grouping of school districts with enrollments under 100, the average FTE amount would be determined in relation to school districts having enrollments of 75-125.
- For the grouping of school districts with enrollments of 100-299.9, the average FTE amount would be determined under a linear transition schedule beginning with the average FTE amount for districts having enrollments of 75-125 and ending with the average FTE amount of districts having enrollments of 200-399.9.
- For the grouping of school districts with enrollments of 300-1,799.9, the average FTE amount would be determined under a linear transition schedule beginning with the average FTE amount of districts having enrollments of 200-399.9 and ending with the average FTE amount of districts having enrollments of 1,800 and over.
- For the grouping of school districts with enrollments of 1,800 and over, the average FTE amount would be determined based upon the average amount for all such districts.

0020403.01(3/24/97{12:16PM})

1-5

nansas State Department of Education

Home Page: http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us

120 S.E. 10th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

March 21, 1997

TO:

House Education Committee

FROM:

Kansas State Department of Education and Legislative Research Department

SUBJECT:

Supplemental General Fund Budget

(Local Option Budget)

Attached is the computer printout (L9733) you requested which shows the general fund and supplemental general fund budgets and the general fund and supplemental general fund budgets per pupil (based on FTE enrollment) for the 1996-97 school year.

The computer printout also shows the effects on each school district budget if the school district's general fund and supplemental general fund budget per pupil are below the state average for their enrollment category. See the per pupil computation in Column 8 of the Column Explanation.

The amount school districts are below the state average are shown in Column 9. Any school district whose amount per pupil is below the state average may increase their local option budget, by that amount, over a five-year period with approval of the local board of education.

We have also shown the estimated supplemental general state aid in Column 12.

Column 11 shows the estimated amount that local boards of education could utilize in local option budget authority under the provisions of this proposal which is 20 percent of the potential amount shown in Column 10.

Column 13 shows the percentage of supplemental general fund (local option budget) authority the board could utilize in 1997-98 based upon the preceding year's data.

Dale M. Dennis
Deputy Commissioner
Assistant Commissioner for
Fiscal Services and Quality Control
(913) 296-3871
Fax No. (913) 296-7933

Attachment 2

COLUMN EXPLANATION

Column

- 1 -- September 20, 1996, Estimated FTE enrollment
- 2 -- 1996-97 Estimated general fund budget
- 3 -- 1996-97 Estimated supplemental general fund budget
- 4 -- 1996-97 Estimated total general fund and supplemental general fund budget
- 5 -- 1996-97 Estimated general fund budget per pupil
- 6 -- 1996-97 Estimated supplemental general fund budget per pupil
- 7 -- 1996-97 Estimated general fund and supplemental general fund budget per pupil
- 8 -- 1997-98 Estimated general and supplemental general fund amount per pupil based upon the following linear transition.

```
0 - 99.9 $ 9,206

100 - 299.9 $ 9,296 - 13.695 (E-100)

300 - 1,799.9 $ 6,557 - 1.34 (E-300)

1,800 and over $ 4,547
```

- 9 -- Difference (Column 8 7) If the number is positive, that is the amount the school district is spending less than the average as provided by the linear transition in Column 8
- 10 -- 1997-98 Estimated local option budget with board approval (Column 9 x 1)
- 11 -- 1997-98 Estimated maximum amount with board approval (Column 10 x 20 percent)
- 12 -- 1997-98 Estimated additional supplemental general fund state aid (Column 11 X estimated state aid ratio)
- 13 -- 1997-98 Estimated potential percentage increase in supplemental general fund (local option budget) budget authority

)	RUN# L9733	PROCES	SED ON 03/2	1/97											
	PAGE 1		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5)	(6) 994-97 FTF	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
3 3	COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME **********	# # E	1996-97 FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEHENTAL	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET	FUND BUDGET	GEN + SUPP! FUND ! BUDGET ! PER PUPIL !	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPIL	DIFF (8 - 7)	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1)	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%)	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2)
3	ALLEN HARMATON VALLEY IOLA HUHBOLDT	001 D0256 D0257 D0258	440.0 1,742.5 551.5	2,707,546 7,152,269 3,173,760	715,227	2,707,546 7,867,496 3,173,760	6,153.51 4,104.60 5,754.78	0.00 410.46 0.00	6,153.51 4,515.06 5,754.78	6,369.40 4,624.05 6,219.99	215.89 108.99 465.21	94,992 189,915 256,563	18,998 37,983 51,313	6,528 22,611 18,893	0.70 0.53 1.62
3	ANDERSON GARNETT CREST	002 D0365 D0479	1,118.8 321.5	5,672,275 2,009,683	0 29,250	5,672,275 2,038,933	5,069.96 6,250.96	0.00 90.98	5,069.96 6,341.94	5,459.81 6,528.19	389.85 186.25	436,164 59,879	87,233 11,976	24,722 3,947	1.54 0.60
Ð	ATCHISON CO COM	003 D0377 D0409	779.5 1,608.3	4,475,366 6,835,717	0 102,551	4,475,366 6,939,268	5,741.33 4,250.90	0.00 63.76	5,741.33 4,314.66	5,914.47 4,803.88	173.14 489.22	134,963 786,813	26,993 157,363	10,006 60,475	0.60 2.30
•	BARBER BARBER COUNTY N SOUTH BARBER	004 D0254 D0255	753.5 368.5	4,179,878 2,277,446	0	4,179,878 2,277,446	5,547.28 6,180.31	0.00	5,547.28 6,180.31	5,949.31 6,465.21	402.03 284.90	302,930 104,986	60,586 20,997	1,206	1.45 0.92
9	BARTON CLAFLIN ELLINWOOD PUBLI GREAT BEND HOISINGTON	005 D0354 D0355 D0428 D0431	358.5 577.5 3,248.9 790.2	2,177,856 3,264,230 12,886,195 4,278,374	165,000 109,239 0	2,342,856 3,373,469 12,886,195 4,278,374	6,074.91 5,652.35 3,966.33 5,414.29	460.25 189.16 0.00 0.00	6,535.16 5,841.51 3,966.33 5,414.29	6,478.61 6,185.15 4,547.00 5,900.13	0.00 343.64 580.67 485.84	198,452 1,886,539 383,911	39,690 377,308 76,782	0 10,641 156,545 31,035	0.00 1.22 2.93 1.79
)	BOURBON FORT SCOTT UNIONTOWN	006 D0234 D0235	2,133.4 501.3	8,467,373 3,023,098	0	8,467,373 3,023,098	3,968.96 6,030.52	0.00	3,968.96 6,030.52	4,547.00 6,287.26	578.04 256.74	1,233,191 128,704	246,638 25,741	132,691 12,309	2.91 0.85
3	BROWN HIAWATHA SOUTH BROWN COU	007 D0415 D0430	1,194.6 757.4	6,045,466 4,251,744	417,331	6,045,466 4,669,075	5,060.66 5,613.60	0.00 551.00	5,060.66 6,164.60	5,358.24 5,944.08	297.58 0.00	355,489 0	71,098 0	26,022	1.18 0.00
)	BUTLER BLUESTEM REMINGTON-WHITE CIRCLE ANDOVER ROSE HILL PUBLI DOUGLASS PUBLIC	D0375 D0385 D0394 D0396	826.7 572.5 1,400.4 2,443.7 1,719.5 883.5	4,543,949 3,370,752 6,531,379 9,697,478 7,057,421 4,657,402	381,800 0 186,296	4,543,949 3,540,293 6,531,379 10,079,278 7,057,421 4,843,698	5,496.49 5,887.78 4,663.94 3,968.36 4,104.34 5,271.54 3,868.16	0.00 296.14 0.00 156.24 0.00 210.86 0.00	5,496.49 6,183.92 4,663.94 4,124.60 4,104.34 5,482.40 3,868.16	5,851.22 6,191.85 5,082.46 4,547.00 4,654.87 5,775.11 4,547.00	354.73 7.93 418.52 422.40 550.53 292.71 678.84	293,255 4,540 586,095 1,032,219 946,636 258,609 1,483,673	58,651 908 117,219 206,444 189,327 51,722 296,735	25,472 106 0 80,121 119,598 33,712 166,290	1.29 0.03 1.79 2.13 2.68 1.11 3.51
•	AUGUSTA EL DORADO FLINTHILLS	D0402 D0490 D0492	2,185.6 2,180.7 294.0	8,454,240 8,600,525 1,884,557	756,846 0	8,454,240 9,357,371 1,884,557	3,943.93 6,410.06	347.07 0.00	4,291.00 6,410.06	4,547.00 6,639.17	256.00 229.11	558,259 67,358	111,652 13,472	42,271 1,140	1.30
•	CHASE CHASE COUNTY	009 D0284	535.0	3,329,894	0	3,329,894	6,224.10	0.00	6,224.10	6,242.10	18.00	9,630	1,926	12	0.06

ت	PAGE 2		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
9	COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME ************************************	# # E	1996-97 FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEHENTAL	TOTAL :	GENERAL FUND BUDGET	SUPP.GEN FUND RUDGET	GEN + SUPP FUND BUDGET PER PUPT	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPIL	DIFF (8 - 7)	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1)	1997-98 HAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%)	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2)
•		010 D0285	184.5 555.0	1,373,472 3,272,986	0	1,373,472 3,272,986	7,444.29 5,897.27	0.00	7,444.29 5,897.27	8,138.77 6,215.30	694.48 318.03	128,132 176,507	25,626 35,301	3,160 14,971	1.87 1.08
3	CHEROKEE RIVERTON COLUMBUS GALENA BAXTER SPRINGS	011 D0404 D0493 D0499 D0508	790.0 1,411.0 771.5 896.0	4,333,459 6,684,595 4,084,666 4,637,338	160,000	4,333,459 6,844,595 4,084,666 4,637,338	5,485.39 4,737.49 5,294.45 5,175.60	0.00 113.39 0.00 0.00	5,485.39 4,850.88 5,294.45 5,175.60	5,900.40 5,068.26 5,925.19 5,758.36	415.01 217.38 630.74 582.76	327,858 306,723 486,616 522,153	65,572 61,345 97,323 104,431	28,235 19,140 74,355 60,319	1.51 0.92 2.38 2.25
•	CHEYENNE CHEYLIN ST FRANCIS COMM	012 D0103 D0297	199.0 439.5	1,517,933 2,623,642	103,880	1,621,813 2,623,642	7,627.80 5,969.61	522.01 0.00	8,149.81 5,969.61	7,940.20 6,370.07	0.00 400.46	176,002	35,200	0 739	0.00 1.34
•	CLARK MINNEOLA ASHLAND	013 D0219 D0220	287.0 239.5	1,764,173 1,647,802	187,000	1,764,173 1,834,802	6,146.94 6,880.18	0.00 780.79	6,146.94 7,660.97	6,735.04 7,385.55	588.10 0.00	168,785 0	33,757 0	0	1.91 0.00
9	CLAY CLAY CENTER	014 D0379	1,684.7	7,248,576	0	7,248,576	4,302.59	0.00	4,302.59	4,701.50	398.91	672,044	134,409	64,946	1.85
0	CLOUD CONCORDIA SOUTHERN CLOUD	015 D0333 D0334	1,329.0 298.0	6,286,963 1,802,842	157,958 0	6,444,921 1,802,842	4,730.60 6,049.81	118.85 0.00	4,849.45 6,049.81	5,178.14 6,584.39	328.69 534.58	436,829 159,305	87,366 31,861	40,686 1,685	1.39 1.77
•	COFFEY LEBO-WAVERLY BURLINGTON LEROY-GRIDLEY	016 D0243 D0244 D0245	577.5 974.1 357.5	3,320,045 5,004,691 2,189,165	409,000 0 0	3,729,045 5,004,691 2,189,165	5,749.00 5,137.76 6,123.54	708.23 0.00 0.00	6,457.23 5,137.76 6,123.54	6,185.15 5,653.71 6,479.95	0.00 515.95 356.41	502,587 127,417	0 100,517 25,483	0 0 2,133	0.00 2.01 1.16
3	COMANCHE COMANCHE COUNTY	017 D0300	374.5	2,350,771	587,693	2,938,464	6,277.09	1,569.27	7,846.36	6,457.17	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
٥	COWLEY CENTRAL UDALL WINFIELD ARKANSAS CITY DEXTER	018 D0462 D0463 D0465 D0470 D0471	410.0 389.0 2,639.0 3,012.4 191.0	2,531,347 2,360,986 10,389,869 12,151,853 1,387,334	0 0 1,981,000 1,215,185 0	2,531,347 2,360,986 12,370,869 13,367,038 1,387,334	6,174.02 6,069.37 3,937.05 4,033.94 7,263.53	0.00 0.00 750.66 403.39 0.00	6,174.02 6,069.37 4,687.71 4,437.33 7,263.53	6,409.60 6,437.74 4,547.00 4,547.00 8,049.76	235.58 368.37 0.00 109.67 786.23	96,588 143,296 0 330,370 150,170	19,318 28,659 0 66,074 30,034	7,333 13,842 0 35,277 7,869	0.76 1.21 0.00 0.54 2.16
a	CRAWFORD NORTHEAST CHEROKEE GIRARD FRONTENAC PUBLI PITTSBURG	019 D0246 D0247 D0248 D0249 D0250	601.0 857.4 1,109.5 637.0 2,655.8	3,423,648 4,622,381 5,597,126 3,465,600 10,457,357	190,000 41,601 0 0 721,558	3,613,648 4,663,982 5,597,126 3,465,600 11,178,915	5,696.59 5,391.16 5,044.73 5,440.50 3,937.55	316.14 48.52 0.00 0.00 271.69	6,012.73 5,439.68 5,044.73 5,440.50 4,209.24	6,153.66 5,810.08 5,472.27 6,105.42 4,547.00	140.93 370.40 427.54 664.92 337.76	84,699 317,581 474,356 423,554 897,023	16,940 63,516 94,871 84,711 179,405	9,869 31,479 48,147 43,525 64,568	0.49 1.37 1.69 2.44 1.72

There ex a

PAGE 3		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	. (4)	(5) 1	996-97 FTE -	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME *********	# # E *****	1996-97 FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET	GEN + SUPP FUND BUDGET PER PURT	BUDGET AUTH PER PURTI	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) *********	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) *******	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2) ******
DECATUR OBERLIN PRAIRIE HEIGHTS	020 D0294 D0295	58B.0 94.5	3,403,584 807,302	80,730	3,403,584 888,032	5,788.41 8,542.88	0.00 854.29	5,788.41 9,397.17	6,171.08 9,296.00	382.67 0.00	225,010	45,002 0	4,653 0	1.32
DICKINSON SOLOMON ABILENE CHAPMAN RURAL VISTA HERINGTON	021 D0393 D0435 D0473 D0481 D0487	406.4 1,416.8 1,305.4 432.0 578.0	2,449,997 6,536,122 6,575,885 2,632,397 3,322,234	0 0 0 0 431,000	2,449,997 6,536,122 6,575,885 2,632,397 3,753,234	6,028.54 4,613.30 5,037.45 6,093.51 5,747.81	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 745.67	6,028.54 4,613.30 5,037.45 6,093.51 6,493.48	6,414.42 5,060.49 5,209.76 6,380.12 6,184.48	385.88 447.19 172.31 286.61 0.00	156,822 633,579 224,933 123,816 0	31,364 126,716 44,987 24,763 0	10,099 58,948 15,700 6,146	1.28 1.94 0.68 0.94 0.00
DONIPHAN WATHENA HIGHLAND TROY PUBLIC SCH MIDWAY SCHOOLS ELWOOD	022 D0406 D0425 D0429 D0433 D0486	444.0 294.5 403.2 215.5 251.4	2,649,178 1,825,824 2,421,542 1,548,941 1,609,862	54,096 55,000 0	2,649,178 1,879,920 2,476,542 1,548,941 1,609,862	5,966.62 6,199.74 6,005.81 7,187.66 6,403.59	0.00 183.69 136.41 0.00 0.00	5,966.62 6,383.43 6,142.22 7,187.66 6,403.59	6,364.04 6,632.32 6,418.71 7,714.23 7,222.58	397-42 248-89 276-49 526-57 818-99	176,454 73,298 111,481 113,476 205,894	35,291 14,660 22,296 22,695 41,179	20,998 6,440 14,842 3,736	1.33 0.80 0.92 1.47 2.56
DOUGLAS BALDWIN CITY EUDORA LAWRENCE	023 D0348 D0491 D0497	1,230.0 1,008.5 9,613.1	5,935,296 5,018,918 37,010,419	153,818 125,700 8,800,000	6,089,114 5,144,618 45,810,419	4,825.44 4,976.62 3,850.00	125.06 124.64 915.42	4,950.50 5,101.26 4,765.42	5,310.80 5,607.61 4,547.00	360.30 506.35 0.00	443,169 510,654 0	88,634 102,131 0	44,556 52,475 0	1.49 2.03 0.00
EDWARDS KINSLEY-OFFERLE LEWIS	024 D0347 D0502	392.5 194.5	2,420,448 1,399,008	130,000	2,550,448 1,399,008	6,166.75 7,192.84	331.21 0.00	6,497.96 7,192.84	6,433.05 8,001.82	0.00 808.98	157,347	31,469	0	0.00 2.25
ELK WEST ELK ELK VALLEY	025 D0282 D0283	525.0 262.6	3,179,962 1,733,165	0	3,179,962 1,733,165	6,057.07 6,600.02	0.00	6,057.07 6,600.02	6,255.50 7,069.19	198.43 469.17	104,176 123,204	20,835 24,641	4,669 11,973	0.66 1.42
ELLIS ELLIS VICTORIA HAYS	026 D0388 D0432 D0489	367.8 326.5 3,519.1	2,220,173 2,027,194 14,038,234	140,000 0 3,426,658	2,360,173 2,027,194 17,464,892	6,036.36 6,208.86 3,989.15	380.64 0.00 973.73	6,417.00 6,208.86 4,962.88	6,466.15 6,521.49 4,547.00	49.15 312.63 0.00	18,077 102,074 0	3,615 20,415 0	566 2,160 0	0.16 1.01 0.00
ELLSWORTH ELLSWORTH LORRAINE	027 D0327 D0328	868.0 528.5	4,743,494 3,225,197	270,000 467,582	5,013,494 3,692,779	5,464.85 6,102.55	311.06 884.73	5,775.91 6,987.28	5,795.88 6,250.81	19.97 0.00	17,334 0	3,467 0	1,423	0.07 0.00
FINNEY HOLCOMB GARDEN CITY	028 D0363 D0457	829.5 6,914.9	4,359,360 28,155,994	1,089,840 1,970,920	5,449,200 30,126,914	5,255.41 4,071.79	1,313.85 285.03	6,569.26 4,356.82	5,847.47 4,547.00	0.00 190.18	1,315,076	263,015	101,813	0.00 0.93
FORD SPEARVILLE DODGE CITY BUCKLIN	029 D0381 D0443 D0459	347.0 4,809.3 376.0	2,056,013 15,537,229 2,270,944	0 0 0	2,056,013 19,537,229 2,290,944	5,925.11 4,062.39 6,092.94	0.00 0.00 0.00	5,725.11 4,062.39 6,092.94	6,494.02 4,547.00 6,455.16	568.91 484.61 362.22	197,412 2,330,635 136,195	39,482 466,127 27,239	13,783 180,531 4,358	1.92 2.39 1.19

9	PAGE 4		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5) + 19	(6) 96-97 FTE	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
9	COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME ***********	‡ ‡ ******	1996-97	GENERAL	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET PER PURTI	GEN + SUPP! FUND : BUDGET : PER PUPIL :	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPIL *******	DIFF (8 - 7)	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) **********	1997-98 MAX AHT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) *******	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2) ******
•	FRANKLIN WEST FRANKLIN CENTRAL HEIGHTS WELLSVILLE OTTAWA	030 D0287 D0288 D0289 D0290	888.8 690.4 743.5 2,360.8	4,796,390 3,942,394 4,072,992 9,157,574	480,000 0 200,293 412,967	5,276,390 3,942,394 4,273,285 9,570,541	5,396.48 5,710.30 5,478.13 3,879.01	540.05 0.00 269.39 174.93	5,936.53 5,710.30 5,747.52 4,053.94	5,768.01 6,033.86 5,962.71 4,547.00	0.00 323.56 215.19 493.06	223,386 159,994 1,164,016	44,677 31,999 232,803	25,274 12,796 108,672	0.00 1.13 0.79 2.54
	GEARY JUNCTION CITY	031 D0475	6,124.8	25,5 77,158	0	25,557,158	4,172.73	0.00	4,172.73	4,547.00	374.27	2,292,329	458,466	312,582	1.79
•	GOVE GRINNELL PUBLIC WHEATLAND QUINTER PUBLIC	032 D0291 D0292 D0293	172.0 186.0 374.0	1,313,280 1,423,085 2,266,867	0 0 199,000	1,313,280 1,423,085 2,465,867	7,635.35 7,650.99 6,061.14	0.00 0.00 532.09	7,635.35 7,650.99 6,593.23	8,309.96 8,118.23 6,457.84	674.61 467.24 0.00	116,033 86,907 0	23,207 17,381 0	0 0 0	1.77 1.22 0.00
•	GRAHAM WEST GRAHAM-MOR HILL CITY	033 D0280 D0281	109.0 464.5	893,030 2,801,299	208,301	1,101,331 2,801,299	8,192.94 6,030.78	1,911.02	10,103.96 6,030.78	9,172.75 6,336.57	0.00 305.79	142,039	0 28,408	6,116	0.00
9	GRANT ULYSSES	034 D0214	1,750.5	7,269,005	1,695,871	8,964,876	4,152.53	968.79	5,121.32	4,613.33	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
0	GRAY CIMARRON-ENSIGN MONTEZUMA COPELAND INGALLS	035 D0102 D0371 D0476 D0477	628.0 181.5 125.0 296.0	3,555,706 1,366,906 1,008,672 1,846,982	285,000 203,568 0	3,555,706 1,651,906 1,212,240 1,846,982	5,661.95 7,531.16 8,069.38 6,239.80	0.00 1,570.25 1,628.54 0.00	5,661.95 9,101.41 9,697.92 6,239.80	6,117.48 8,179.86 8,953.63 6,611.78	455.53 0.00 0.00 371.98	286,073 0 0 110,106	57,215 0 0 22,021	10,625 0 0 689	1.61 0.00 0.00 1.19
•	GREELEY GREELEY COUNTY	036 D0200	348.0	2,160,346	0	2,160,346	6,207.89	0.00	6,207.89	6,492.68	284.79	99,107	19,821	0	0.92
•	GREENWOOD HADISON-VIRGIL EUREKA HAMILTON	037 D0386 D0389 D0390	287.0 857.0 139.2	1,811,232 4,656,672 1,081,267	0 0 0	1,811,232 4,656,672 1,081,267	6,310.91 5,433.69 7,767.72	0.00 0.00 0.00	6,310.91 5,433.69 7,767.72	6,735.04 5,810.62 8,759.16	424.13 376.93 991.44	121,725 323,029 138,008	24,345 64,606 27,602	4,419 21,746 0	1.34 1.39 2.55
0	HAMILTON SYRACUSE	038 D0494	446.5	2,655,379	355,000	3,010,379	5,947.10	795.07	6,742.17	6,360.69	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
(b)	HARPER ANTHONY-HARPER ATTICA	039 D0361 D0511	1,040.2 210.5	5,435,155 1,443,514	0 124,249	5,435,155 1,567,763	5,225.11 6,857.55	0.00 590.26	5,225.11 7,447.81	5,565.13 7,782.70	340.02 334.89	353,689 70,494	70,738 14,099	15,704 0	1.30 0.98
∂ ○∧	HARVEY BURRTON NEWTON SEDGWICK PUBLIC HALSTEAD HESSTON	040 D0369 D0373 D0439 D0440 D0460	278.5 3,462.2 441.5 734.0 820.7	1,743,379 13,353,504 2,549,952 4,046,726 4,311,571	257,622 667,675 225,000 386,500 422,438	2,001,001 14,021,179 2,774,952 4,433,226 4,734,009	6,259.89 3,856.94 5,775.66 5,513.25 5,253.53	925.03 192.85 509.63 526.57 514.73	7,184.92 4,049.79 6,285.29 6,039.82 5,768.26	6,851.44 4,547.00 6,367.39 5,975.44 5,859.26	0.00 497.21 82.10 0.00 91.00	1,721,440 36,247 0 74,684	0 344,288 7,249 0 14,937	158,131 4,198 0 4,692	0.00 2.58 0.28 0.00 0.35

PAGE 5		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME *********	# # ******	1996-97	GENERAL	1996-97 BUDGET Supplehental Fund	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET PER PURTI	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET PER PURT	GEN + SUPP! FUND : BUDGET : PER PUPT! !	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPTI	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 % 1)	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) ********	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2) ******
HASKELL SUBLETTE SATANTA	041 D0374 D0507	502.5 389.5	2,966,554 2,366,458	0 267,258	2,966,554 2,633,716	5,903.59 6,075.63	0.00 686.16	5,903.59 6,761.79	6,285.65 6,437.07	382.06 0.00	191,985 0	38,397 0	0	1.29
HODGEMAN JETMORE HANSTON	042 D0227 D0228	332.5 139.5	2,047,258 1,099,872	19,974 32,568	2,067,232 1,132,440	6,157.17 7,884.39	60.07 233.46	6,217.24 8,117.85	6,513.45 8,755.05	296.21 637.20	98,490 88,889	19,698 17,778	0	0.96 1.62
JACKSON NORTH JACKSON HOLTON ROYAL VALLEY	043 D0335 D0336 D0337	445.5 1,019.0 857.5	2,718,854 5,182,714 4,707,744	0 0 385,000	2,718,854 5,182,714 5,092,744	6,102.93 5,086.08 5,490.08	0.00 0.00 448.98	6,102.93 5,086.08 5,939.06	6,362.03 5,593.54 5,809.95	259.10 507.46 0.00	115,429 517,102 0	23,086 103,420 0	11,294 52,082 0	0.85 2.00 0.00
JEFFERSON VALLEY FALLS JEFFERSON COUNT JEFFERSON WEST OSKALOOSA PUBLI KCLOUTH PERRY PUBLIC SC	D0341 D0342	474.0 488.0 919.4 756.5 591.7 1,052.5	2,816,621 2,905,632 4,835,059 4,239,706 3,380,237 5,470,176	86,447 0 477,363 0 164,105	2,816,621 2,992,079 4,835,059 4,717,069 3,380,237 5,634,281	5,942.24 5,954.16 5,258.93 5,604.37 5,712.75 5,197.32	0.00 177.15 0.00 631.02 0.00 155.92	5,942.24 6,131.31 5,258.93 6,235.39 5,712.75 5,353.24	6,323.84 6,305.08 5,727.00 5,945.29 6,166.12 5,548.65	381.60 173.77 468.07 0.00 453.37 195.41	180,878 84,800 430,344 0 268,259 205,669	36,176 16,960 86,069 0 53,652 41,134	21,814 8,914 45,531 0 24,041 16,470	1.28 0.58 1.78 0.00 1.59 0.75
JEWELL WHITE ROCK MANKATO JEWELL	045 D0104 D0278 D0279	180.0 297.0 192.5	1,393,171 1,819,987 1,468,320	135,100 90,000 70,000	1,528,271 1,909,987 1,538,320	7,739.84 6,127.90 7,627.64	750.56 303.03 363.64	8,490.40 6,430.93 7,991.28	8,200.40 6,598.09 8,029.21	0.00 167.16 37.93	49,647 7,302	9,929 1,460	4,227 164	0.00 0.55 0.10
JOHNSON BLUE VALLEY SPRING HILL GARDNER-EDGERTO DESOTO OLATHE SHAWNEE MISSION	D0232 D0233	13,858.0 1,298.5 2,170.4 2,146.5 17,559.0 30,508.1	54,906,648 6,126,451 8,547,994 8,651,232 69,029,645 118,825,210	13,696,781 814,744 1,628,250 1,730,246 17,231,693 29,706,303	68,602,829 6,941,195 10,176,244 10,381,478 86,261,338 148,531,513	3,962.05 4,718.10 3,938.44 4,030.39 3,931.30 3,894.87	988.37 627.45 750.21 806.08 981.36 973.72	4,950.42 5,345.55 4,688.65 4,836.47 4,912.66 4,868.59	4,547.00 5,219.01 4,547.00 4,547.00 4,547.00 4,547.00	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00
KEARNY LAKIN DEERFIELD	047 D0215 D0216	748.8 386.1	4,061,318 2,423,731	503,603 229,204	4,564,921 2,652,935	5,423.77 6,277.47	672.55 593.64	6,096.32 6,871.11	5,955.61 6,441.63	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
KINGMAN KINGMAN CUNNINGHAM	048 D0331 D0332	1,211.6 327.5	5,960,467 2,037,043	0 101,852	5,960,467 2,138,895	4,919.50 6,219.98	0.00 311.00	4,919.50 6,530.98	5,335.46 6,520.15	415.96 0.00	503,977 0	100,795	12,831	1.69
KIOWA GREENSBURG MULLINVILLE HAVILAND	049 D0422 D0424 D0474	346.0 98.0 157.5	2,063,674 841,229 1,210,771	218,500 204,197 128,084	2,282,174 1,045,426 1,338,855	5,964.38 8,583.97 7,687.43	631.50 2,083.64 813.23	6,595.88 10,667.61 8,500.66	6,495.36 9,296.00 8,508.54	0.00 0.00 7.88	0 0 1,241	0 0 248	0 0 0	0.00 0.00 0.02

OK

7

Э	PAGE 6		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5)	(6) 996-97 FTE -	(7) -	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
•	COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME **********	# # E ******	1996-97 FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET	GEN + SUPP! FUND : BUDGET : PER PUPIL :	BUDGET AUTH PER PURTI	DIFF (8 - 7) ******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) *********	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) ********	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB % (11 / 2) *******
•	LABETTE PARSONS OSWEGO CHETOPA LABETTE COUNTY	050 D0503 D0504 D0505 D0506	1,814.3 474.5 259.0 1,790.5	7,139,501 2,708,640 1,662,029 7,674,662	1,142,320 0 66,481 306,140	8,281,821 2,708,640 1,728,510 7,980,802	3,935.13 5,708.41 6,417.10 4,286.32	629.62 0.00 256.68 170.98	4,564.75 5,708.41 6,673.78 4,457.30	4,547.00 6,323.17 7,118.50 4,559.73	0.00 614.76 444.72 102.43	291,704 115,182 183,401	58,341 23,036 36,680	0 27,864 12,960 21,674	0.00 2.15 1.39 0.48
•	LANE HEALY PUBLIC SC DIGHTON	051 D0468 D0482	110.0 366.5	878,438 2,217,619	83,430 125,000	961,868 2,342,619	7,985.80 6,050.80	758.45 341.06	8,744.25 6,391.86	9,159.05 6,467.89	414.80 76.03	45,628 27,865	9,126 5,573	0	1.04 0.25
•	LEAVENWORTH FT LEAVENWORTH EASTON LEAVENWORTH BASEHOR-LINWOOD TONGANOXIE LANSING	052 D0207 D0449 D0453 D0458 D0464 D0469	1,744.0 652.0 4,239.3 1,633.8 1,488.5 1,921.9	6,735,667 3,730,080 16,417,824 7,068,365 6,674,746 7,432,070	1,010,350 110,392 0 0 0 222,962	7,746,017 3,840,472 16,417,824 7,068,365 6,674,746 7,655,032	3,862-19 5,720.98 3,872.77 4,326.33 4,484.21 3,867.04	579.33 169.31 0.00 0.00 0.00 116.01	4,441.52 5,890.29 3,872.77 4,326.33 4,484.21 3,983.05	4,622.04 6,085.32 4,547.00 4,769.71 4,964.41 4,547.00	180.52 195.03 674.23 443.38 480.20 563.95	314,827 127,160 2,858,263 724,394 714,778 1,083,856	62,965 25,432 571,653 144,879 142,956 216,771	62,140 12,721 261,245 74,439 78,283 127,570	0.93 0.68 3.48 2.05 2.14 2.92
9	LINCOLN LINCOLN SYLVAN GROVE	053 D0298 D0299	397.0 203.0	2,460,211 1,493,126	0	2,460,211 1,493,126	6,197.01 7,355.30	0.00	6,197.01 7,355.30	6,427.02 7,885.42	230.01 530.12	91,314 107,614	18,263 21,523	2,140 702	0.74 1.44
0	LINN PLEASANTON JAYHAWK PRAIRIE VIEW	054 D0344 D0346 D0362	434.2 606.5 943.0	2,539,008 3,530,899 5,174,688	0 0 1,293,672	2,539,008 3,530,899 6,468,360	5,847.55 5,821.76 5,487.47	0.00 0.00 1,371.87	5,847.55 5,821.76 6,859.34	6,377.17 6,146.29 5,695.38	529.62 324.53 0.00	229,961 196,827 0	45,992 39,365 0	26,399 14,286 0	1.81 1.11 0.00
•	LOGAN DAKLEY TRIPLAINS	055 D0274 D0275	520.7 107.0	3,084,384 897,773	308,438 143,213	3,392,822 1,040,986	5,923.53 8,390.40	592.35 1,338.44	6,515.88 9,728.84	6,261.26 9,200.14	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
•	LYON NORTH LYON COUN SOUTHERN LYON C EHPORIA		726.5 660.5 4,548.1	4,119,686 3,801,946 18,115,238	0 0 0	4,119,686 3,801,946 18,115,238	5,670.59 5,756.16 3,983.03	0.00 0.00 0.00	5,670.59 5,756.16 3,983.03	5,985.49 6,073.93 4,547.00	314.90 317.77 563.97	228,775 209,887 2,564,992	45,755 41,977 512,998	16,765 14,742 233,773	1.11 1.10 2.83
O	MARION CENTRE PEABODY-BURNS MARION DURHAM-HILLSBOR GOESSEL	057 D0397 D0398 D0408 D0410 D0411	316.7 460.5 719.0 720.8 341.5	2,066,957 2,719,949 4,015,354 3,943,123 2,081,184	27,000 0 0 204,000 0	2,093,957 2,719,949 4,015,354 4,147,123 2,081,184	6,526.55 5,906.51 5,584.64 5,470.48 6,094.24	85.25 0.00 0.00 283.02 0.00	6,611.80 5,906.51 5,584.64 5,753.50 6,094.24	6,534.62 6,341.93 5,995.54 5,993.13 6,501.39	0.00 435.42 410.90 239.63 407.15	0 200,511 295,437 172,725 139,042	0 40,102 59,087 34,545 27,808	0 12,909 25,957 12,364 13,367	0.00 1.47 1.47 0.88 1.34
345678891111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111<l< th=""><th>HARSHALL HARYSVILLE VERMILLION AXTELL VALLEY HEIGHTS</th><th>058 D0364 D0380 D0488 D0498</th><th>1,016.4 649.5 352.0 478.2</th><th>5,311,123 3,736,646 2,167,277 2,858,938</th><th>0 0 43,484 0</th><th>5,311,123 3,736,646 2,210,761 2,858,938</th><th>5,225.43 5,753.11 6,157.04 5,978.54</th><th>0.00 0.00 123.53 0.00</th><th>5,225.43 5,753.11 6,280.57 5,978.54</th><th>5,597.02 6,088.67 6,487.32 6,318.21</th><th>371.59 335.56 206.75 339.67</th><th>377,684 217,946 72,776 162,430</th><th>75,537 43,589 14,555 32,486</th><th>21,052 15,391 4,078 14,502</th><th>1.42 1.17 0.67 1.14</th></l<>	HARSHALL HARYSVILLE VERMILLION AXTELL VALLEY HEIGHTS	058 D0364 D0380 D0488 D0498	1,016.4 649.5 352.0 478.2	5,311,123 3,736,646 2,167,277 2,858,938	0 0 43,484 0	5,311,123 3,736,646 2,210,761 2,858,938	5,225.43 5,753.11 6,157.04 5,978.54	0.00 0.00 123.53 0.00	5,225.43 5,753.11 6,280.57 5,978.54	5,597.02 6,088.67 6,487.32 6,318.21	371.59 335.56 206.75 339.67	377,684 217,946 72,776 162,430	75,537 43,589 14,555 32,486	21,052 15,391 4,078 14,502	1.42 1.17 0.67 1.14

)

PAGE 7		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5)	(6) 996-97 FTE -	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
CDUNTY NAME DISTRICT HAME ***********	‡ ******	1996-97 FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEMENTAL FIIND	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET PER PUPIL	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET PER PUPI	GEN + SUPP! FUND BUDGET PER PUPIL !	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPIL	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) ********	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) ********	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2)
MCPHERSON LINDSBORG HCPHERSON CANTON-GALVA HOUNDRIDGE INHAN	059 D0400 D0418 D0419 D0423 D0448	1,009.0 2,737.2 464.0 470.0 499.8	5,233,056 10,535,402 2,768,832 2,748,403 2,895,782	0 1,840,379 0 402,302 59,224	5,233,056 12,425,781 2,768,832 3,150,705 2,955,006	5,186.38 3,867.24 5,967.31 5,847.67 5,793.88	0.00 672.36 0.00 855.96 118.50	5,186.38 4,539.60 5,967.31 6,703.63 5,912.38	5,606.94 4,547.00 6,337.24 6,329.20 6,289.27	420.56 7.40 369.93 0.00 376.89	424,345 20,255 171,648 0 188,370	84,869 4,051 34,330 0 37,674	23,891 804 11,415 0 10,033	1.62 0.04 1.24 0.00 1.30
HEADE FOWLER HEADE	060 D0225 D0226	171.0 436.5	1,276,435 2,577,312	319,109 278,216	1,595,544 2,855,528	7,464.53 5,904.49	1,866.13 637.38	9,330.66 6,541.87	8,323.66 6,374.09	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00
HIAMI OSA₩ATOMIE PAOLA LOUISBURG	061 D0367 D0368 D0416	1,206.0 1,941.2 1,258.0	5,761,286 7,811,098 6,057,869	0 623,110 298,087	5,761,286 8,434,208 6,355,956	4,777.19 4,023.85 4,815.48	0.00 320.99 236.95	4,777.19 4,344.84 5,052.43	5,342.96 4,547.00 5,273.28	565.77 202.16 220.85	682,319 392,433 277,829	136,464 78,487 55,566	71,384 27,259 12,308	2.37 1.00 0.92
MITCHELL WACONDA BELOIT	062 D0272 D0273	581.5 824.1	3,361,267 4,473,907	134,173 262,265	3,495,440 4,736,172	5,780.34 5,428.84	230.74 318.24	6,011.08 5,747.08	6,179.79 5,854.71	168.71 107.63	98,105 88,698	19,621 17,740	7,487 5,003	0.58 0.40
HONTGOHERY CANEY VALLEY COFFEYVILLE INDEPENDENCE CHERRYVALE	063 D0436 D0445 D0446 D0447	916.0 2,413.2 2,252.6 703.5	4,789,459 9,557,760 8,879,661 3,809,606	0 0 0 0	4,789,459 9,557,760 8,899,661 3,809,606	5,228.67 3,960.62 3,950.84 5,415.22	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	5,228.67 3,960.62 3,950.84 5,415.22	5,731.56 4,547.00 4,547.00 6,016.31	502.89 586.38 596.16 601.09	460,647 1,415,052 1,342,910 422,867	92,129 283,010 268,582 84,573	56,484 111,817 111,086 52,368	1.92 2.96 3.02 2.22
HORRIS HORRIS COUNTY	064 D0417	1,087.0	5,609,165	0	5,609,165	5,160.23	0.00	5,160.23	5,502.42	342.19	371,961	74,392	27,257	1.33
MORTON ROLLA ELKHART	065 D0217 D0218	175.5 543.5	1,368,730 3,067,603	342,183 637,305	1,710,913 3,704,908	7,799.03 5,644.16	1,949.76 1,172.59	9,748.79 6,816.75	8,262.03 6,230.71	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
NEMAHA SABETHA NEMAHA VALLEY S B & B	066 D0441 D0442 D0451	1,081.5 509.8 257.5	5,531,462 3,020,179 1,743,014	401,756 0 0	5,933,218 3,020,179 1,743,014	5,114.62 5,924.24 6,768.99	371.48 0.00 0.00	5,486.10 5,924.24 6,768.99	5,509.79 6,275.87 7,139.04	23.69 351.63 370.05	25,621 179,261 95,288	5,124 35,852 19,058	2,154 9,121 8,530	0.09 1.19 1.09
NEOSHO ERIE-ST PAUL CHANUTE PUBLIC	067 D0101 D0413	1,179.5 2,004.7	5,829,139 7,800,154	512,250 745,633	6,341,389 8,545,787	4,942.04 3,890.93	434.29 371.94	5,376.33 4,262.87	5,378.47 4,547.00	2.14 284.13	2,524 569,595	505 113,919	254 63,601	0.01 1.46
NESS NES TRE LA GO SHOKY HILL NESS CITY BAZINE	068 D0301 D0302 D0303 D0304	76.1 173.5 320.0 117.0	620,890 1,319,117 1,952,410 947,750	154,402 75,000 160,000	775,292 1,394,117 2,112,410 947,750	8,158.87 7,602.98 6,101.28 8,100.43	2,028.94 432.28 500.00 0.00	10,187.81 8,035.26 6,601.28 8,100.43	9,296.00 8,289.42 6,530.20 9,063.19	0.00 254.16 0.00 962.76	0 44,097 0 112,643	8,819 0 22,529	0 0 0	0.00 0.67 0.00 2.38

PAGE 8		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5)	(6) 996-97 FTE -	(7) -	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME **********	# # ******	1996-97 FTE ENROLLMENT **********	GENERAL Fund ******	SUPPLEMENTAL FUND	EIIND	PER PURTI	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET PER PUPIL *********	GEN + SUPP! FUND : BUDGET : PER PUPIL : ********	BUDGET AUTH PER FUPIL *******	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) *********	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) *******	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2) ******
NORTON NORTON COHMUNIT NORTHERN VALLEY WEST SOLOMON VA	D0212	791.5 193.0 90.5	4,186,810 1,424,909 782,131	204,744 150,000 162,480	4,391,554 1,574,909 944,611	5,289.72 7,382.95 8,642.33	258.68 777.20 1,795.36	5,548.40 8,160.15 10,437.69	5,898.39 8,022.37 9,296.00	349.99 0.00 0.00	277,017 0 0	55,403 0 0	29,779 0 0	1.32 0.00 0.00
OSAGE OSAGE CITY LYMDON SANTA FE TRAIL BURLINGAME MARAIS DES CYGN	070 D0420 D0421 D0434 D0454 D0456	676.1 527.5 1,336.0 375.0 301.5	3,700,166 3,044,621 6,331,834 2,215,430 1,882,733	760,433 0 153,500	3,700,166 3,044,621 7,092,267 2,215,430 2,036,233	5,472.81 5,771.79 4,739.40 5,907.81 6,244.55	0.00 0.00 569.19 0.00 509.12	5,472.81 5,771.79 5,308.59 5,907.81 6,753.67	6,053.03 6,252.15 5,168.76 6,456.50 6,554.99	580.22 480.36 0.00 548.69 0.00	392,287 253,390 0 205,759	78,457 50,678 0 41,152	36,129 27,305 0 25,267	2.12 1.66 0.00 1.86 0.00
OSBORNE OSBORNE COUNTY	071 D0392	513.0	3,048,269	0	3,048,269	5,942.04	0.00	5,942.04	6,271.58	329.54	169,054	33,811	12,615	1.11
OTTAWA NORTH OTTAWA CO TWIN VALLEY	072 D0239 D0240	764.5 604.0	4,215,264 3,477,638	0	4,215,264 3,477,638	5,513.75 5,757.68	0.00	5,513.75 5,757.68	5,934.57 6,149.64	420.82 391.96	321,717 236,744	64,343 47,349	25,126 20,142	1.53 1.36
PAWNEE FT LARNED PAWNEE HEIGHTS	073 D0495 D0496	1,127.4 161.5	5,670,816 1,280,418	345,000 0	6,015,816 1,280,448	5,029.99 7,928.47	306.01 0.00	5,336.00 7,928.47	5,448.28 8,453.76	112.28 525.29	126,584 84,834	25,317 16,967	7,322 0	0.45 1.33
PHILLIPS EASTERN HEIGHTS PHILLIPSBURG LOGAN	074 D0324 D0325 D0326	177.0 723.6 220.0	1,355,232 3,999,302 1,537,632	0 199,965 142,700	1,355,232 4,199,267 1,680,332	7,656.68 5,526.95 6,989.24	0.00 276.35 648.64	7,656.68 5,803.30 7,637.88	8,241.49 5,989.38 7,652.60	584.81 186.08 14.72	103,511 134,647 3,238	20,702 26,929 648	4,294 8,962 0	1.53 0.67 0.04
POTTAWATOMIE WAMEGO KAW VALLEY ONAGA-HAVENSVIL ROCK CREEK	D0320 D0321	1,412.0 1,050.5 441.5 740.0	6,459,514 5,338,118 2,688,576 4,265,971	978,913 100,000 0	6,459,514 6,317,031 2,788,576 4,265,971	4,574.73 5,081.50 6,089.64 5,764.83	0.00 931.85 226.50 0.00	4,574.73 6,013.35 6,316.14 5,764.83	5,066.92 5,551.33 6,367.39 5,967.40	492.19 0.00 51.25 202.57	694,972 0 22,627 149,902	138,994 0 4,525 29,980	69,122 0 1,208 18,003	2.15 0.00 0.17 0.70
PRATT PRATT SKYLINE SCHOOLS	076 D0382 D0438	1,412.0 338.5	6,378,528 2,172,019	0	6,378,528 2,172,019	4,517.37 6,416.60	0.00	4,517.37 6,416.60	5,066.92 6,505.41	549.55 88.81	775,965 30,062	155,193 6,012	51,648 0	2.43 0.28
RAWLINS HERNDON ATWOOD	077 D0317 D0318	109.5 456.0	899,962 2,767,73B	0	899,962 2,767,738	8,218.83 6,069.60	0.00	8,218.83 6,069.60	9,165.90 6,347.96	947.07 278.36	103,704 126,932	20,741 25,386	892 5,747	2.30 0.92
RENO HUTCHINSON PUBL NICKERSON FAIRFIELD PRETTY PRAIRIE HAVEN PUBLIC SC	D0309 D0310 D0311	4,956.1 1,411.8 465.3 313.0 1,189.8	19,237,728 6,539,770 2,880,826 1,929,792 5,892,979	2,212,339 556,764 141,871 115,788 350,000	21,450,067 7,096,534 3,022,697 2,045,580 6,242,979	3,881.63 4,632.22 6,191.33 6,165.47 4,952.92	446.39 394.36 304.90 369.93 294.17	4,328.02 5,026.58 6,496.23 6,535.40 5,247.09	4,547.00 5,067.19 6,335.50 6,539.58 5,364.67	218.98 40.61 0.00 4.18 117.58	1,085,287 57,333 0 1,308 139,897	217,057 11,467 0 262 27,979	83,089 4,218 0 53 8,175	1.13 0.18 0.00 0.01 0.47

J

	PAGE 9		(1) 1996-97	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5) 1' GENERAL	(6) 996-97 FTE - SUPP.GEN	(7) + GEN + SUPP!	(8)	(9)	(10) POTENTIAL	(11) 1997-98	(12)	(13)
	COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME ************************************	# # *******	FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEMENTAL FUND	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	FUND BUDGET	FUND BUDGET	FUND :	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPTI	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) *********	MAX AHT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) ********	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2) *******
	RENO BUHLER	078 D0313	2,207.3	8,878,502	886,573	9,765,075	4,022.34	401.65	4,423.99	4,547.00	123.01	271,520	54,304	19,001	0.61
	REPUBLIC PIKE VALLEY BELLEVILLE HILLCREST RURAL	079 D0426 D0427 D0455	305.0 636.5 157.5	1,939,642 3,616,992 1,268,045	333,556 0	1,939,642 3,950,548 1,268,045	6,359.48 5,682.63 B,051.08	0.00 524.05 0.00	6,359.48 6,206.68 8,051.08	6,550.30 6,106.09 8,508.54	190.82 0.00 457.46	58,200 0 72,050	11,640 0 14,410	3,057 0 1,314	0.60 0.00 1.14
	RICE STERLING CHASE LYONS LITTLE RIVER	080 D0376 D0401 D0405 D0444	564.8 199.0 931.1 268.6	3,188,352 1,448,256 4,742,765 1,798,464	300,000 100,816 0 125,892	3,488,352 1,549,072 4,742,765 1,924,356	5,645.10 7,277.67 5,093.72 6,695.70	531.16 506.61 0.00 468.70	6,176.26 7,784.28 5,093.72 7,164.40	6,202.17 7,940.20 5,711.33 6,987.02	25.91 155.92 617.61 0.00	14,634 31,028 575,057 0	2,927 6,206 115,011 0	851 0 50,708 0	0.09 0.43 2.42 0.00
	RILEY RILEY COUNTY MANHATTAN BLUE VALLEY	081 D0378 D0383 D0384	6,034.1 326.0	3,805,594 24,691,123 2,136,634	65,000 740,734 0	3,870,594 25,431,857 2,136,634	5,745.16 4,091.93 6,554.09	98.13 122.76 0.00	5,843.29 4,214.69 6,554.09	6,071.38 4,547.00 6,522.16	228.09 332.31 0.00	151,087 2,005,192 0	30,217 401,038 0	15,988 116,341 0	0.79 1.62 0.00
	ROOKS PALCO PLAINVILLE STOCKTON	082 D0269 D0270 D0271	190.5 473.2 441.0	1,424,544 2,743,296 2,633,126	165,254 267,253 0	1,589,798 3,010,549 2,633,126	7,477.92 5,797.33 5,970.81	867.48 564.78 0.00	8,345.40 6,362.11 5,970.81	8,056.60 6,324.91 6,368.06	0.00 0.00 397.25	0 0 175,187	0 0 35,037	0 0 6,219	0.00 0.00 1.33
	RUSH LACROSSE OTIS-BISON	083 D0395 D0403	341.5 372.5	2,161,440 2,328,518	147,879 0	2,309,319 2,328,518	6,329.25 6,251.06	433.03 0.00	6,762.28 6,251.06	6,501.39 6,459.85	0.00 208.79	77,774	0 15,555	0 299	0.00 0.67
	RUSSELL PARADISE RUSSELL COUNTY	084 D0399 D0407	150.5 1,242.0	1,190,707 6,002,784	242,620 605,854	1,433,327 6,608,638	7,911.67 4,833.16	1,612.09 487.81	9,523.76 5,320.97	8,604.40 5,294.72	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
	SALINE SALINA SOUTHEAST OF SA ELL-SALINE	085 D0305 D0306 D0307	7,343.7 675.5 428.2	28,072,454 3,892,051 2,640,422	0 0 0	28,072,454 3,892,051 2,640,422	3,822.66 5,761.73 6,166.33	0.00 0.00 0.00	3,822.66 5,761.73 6,166.33	4,547.00 6,053.83 6,385.21	724.34 292.10 218.88	5,319,336 197,314 93,724	1,063,867 39,463 18,745	300,649 0 8,836	3.79 1.01 0.71
	SCOTT SCOTT COUNTY	086 D0466	1,118.5	5,565,389	389,577	5,954,966	4,975.76	348.30	5,324.06	5,460.21	136.15	152,284	30,457	189	0.55
S	SEDGWICK WICHITA DERBY HAYSVILLE VALLEY CENTER F HULVANE CLEARWATER GODDARD	087 D0259 D0260 D0261 D0262 D0263 D0264 D0265	43,983.8 6,495.8 3,986.3 2,235.6 1,881.0 1,060.5 2,773.2	175,408,608 25,207,315 15,799,488 8,814,298 7,376,986 5,333,011 11,082,624	0	204,107,991 25,207,315 18,599,488 9,688,636 7,376,986 5,333,011 12,047,491	3,988.03 3,880.56 3,963.45 3,942.70 3,921.84 5,028.77 3,996.33	652.50 0.00 702.41 391.10 0.00 0.00 347.93	4,640.53 3,880.56 4,665.86 4,333.80 3,921.84 5,928.77 4,344.26	4,547.00 4,547.00 4,547.00 4,547.00 4,547.00 5,537.93 4,547.00	0.00 666.44 0.00 213.20 625.16 509.16 202.74	476,630 1,175,926 539,964 562,239	95,326 235,185 107,993 112,448	365,459 0 50,809 152,235 0 51,153	0.00 3.43 0.00 1.08 3.19 2.02 1.01

PAGE 10		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5)	(6) 996-97 FTE -	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME ************	‡ # *****	1996-97 FTE :	GENERAL FIIND	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET PER PUPTI	SUPP.GEN FUND BYDGET PER PUPTI	GEN + SUPP! FUND : BUDGET : PER PUPIL : *********	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPIL *******	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) *********	1997-98 HAX AHT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) *******	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2)
SEDGWICK HAIZE RENWICK CHENEY	087 D0266 D0267 D0268	4,460.9 1,655.0 690.B	19,150,906 6,975,706 3,785,894	4,786,267 415,587 0	23,937,173 7,391,293 3,785,894	4,293.06 4,214.93 5,480.45	1,072.94 251.11 0.00	5,366.00 4,466.04 5,480.45	4,547.00 4,741.30 6,033.33	0.00 275.26 552.88	455,555 381,930	91,111 76,386	0 31,734 39,056	0.00 1.31 2.02
SEWARD LIBERAL KISMET-PLAINS	088 D0480 D0483	4,148.0 688.0	16,225,574 4,009,882	0	16,225,574 4,009,882	3,911.66 5,828.32	0.00	3,911.66 5,828.32	4,547.00 6,037.08	635.34 208.76	2,635,390 143,627	527,078 28,725	174,621 0	3.25 0.72
SHAWNEE SEAHAN SILVER LAKE AUBURN WASHBURN SHAWNEE HEIGHTS TOPEKA PUBLIC S	D0450	3,356.3 680.5 4,989.8 3,428.3 13,375.2	13,348,762 3,728,621 19,896,922 13,845,984 53,355,283	800,926 74,170 0 1,107,679 13,218,619	14,149,688 3,802,791 19,896,922 14,953,663 66,573,902	3,977.23 5,479.24 3,987.52 4,038.73 3,989.12	238.63 108.99 0.00 323.10 988.29	4,215.86 5,588.23 3,987.52 4,361.83 4,977.41	4,547.00 6,047.13 4,547.00 4,547.00 4,547.00	331.14 458.90 559.48 185.17 0.00	1,111,405 312,281 2,791,693 634,818 0	222,281 62,456 558,339 126,964 0	31,431 31,965 54,047 46,837 0	1.67 1.68 2.81 0.92 0.00
SHERIDAN HOXIE COMMUNITY	090 D0412	478.0	2,850,182	0	2,850,182	5,962.72	0.00	5,962.72	6,318.48	355.76	170,053	34,011	0	1.19
SHERMAN GOODLAND	091 D0352	1,208.0	5,928,365	612,000	6,540,365	4,907.59	506.62	5,414.21	5,340.28	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
SMITH SMITH CENTER WEST SMITH COUN	092 D0237 D0238	604.0 197.5	3,544,397 1,459,200	0	3,544,397 1,459,200	5,868.21 7,388.35	0.00	5,868.21 7,388.35	6,149.64 7,960.74	281.43 572.39	169,984 113,047	33,997 22,609	6,813 4,983	0.96 1.55
STAFFORD STAFFORD ST JOHN-HUDSON MACKSVILLE	093 D0349 D0350 D0351	334.5 505.0 313.3	2,039,962 2,958,163 1,955,693	84,700 104,712 0	2,124,662 3,062,875 1,955,693	6,098.54 5,857.75 6,242.24	253.21 207.35 0.00	6,351.75 6,065.10 6,242.24	6,510.77 6,282.30 6,539.18	159.02 217.20 296.94	53,192 109,686 93,031	10,638 21,937 18,606	682 0	0.52 0.74 0.95
STANTON STANTON COUNTY	094 D0452	522.3	3,235,776	80,238	3,316,014	6,195.24	153.62	6,348.86	6,259.12	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
STEVENS MOSCOW PUBLIC S HUGOTON PUBLIC	095 D0209 D0210	216.7 982.0	1,674,067 5,098,080	412,133 866,674	2,086,200 5,964,754	7,725.27 5,191.53	1,901.86 882.56	9,627.13 6,074.09	7,697.79 5,643.12	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
SUMMER WELLINGTON COMWAY SPRINGS RELLE PLAINE OXFORD ARGONIA PUBLIC CALDWELL SOUTH HAVEN	096 D0353 D0356 D0357 D0358 D0359 D0360 D0509	2,031.0 505.7 796.0 465.0 235.0 328.0 252.0	7,880,045 2,924,237 4,270,714 2,734,541 1,645,248 1,985,242 1,675,162	21,529 178,000 0 0 0 34,211	7,901,574 3,102,237 4,270,714 2,734,541 1,645,248 2,019,453 1,675,162	3,879.88 5,782.55 5,365.22 5,880.73 7,001.06 6,052.57 6,647.47	10.60 351.99 0.00 0.00 0.00 104.30 0.00	3,890.48 6,134.54 5,365.22 5,880.73 7,001.06 6,156.87 6,647.47	4,547.00 6,281.36 5,892.36 6,335.90 7,447.18 6,519.48 7,214.36	656.52 146.82 527.14 455.17 446.12 362.61 566.89	1,333,392 74,247 419,603 211,654 104,838 118,936 142,856	266,678 14,849 83,921 42,331 20,968 23,787 28,571	146,006 7,081 52,879 21,415 4,460 4,234 11,123	3.38 0.51 1.97 1.55 1.27 1.20 1.71

PAGE 11		(1)	(2)	(3) 1996-97 BUDGET	(4)	(5) + 1	(6) 996-97 FTE -	(7) -	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
COUNTY NAME DISTRICT NAME **********	# # !*****	1996-97 FTE	GENERAL	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL GEN + SUPP	GENERAL FUND BUDGET	SUPP.GEN FUND BUDGET	GEN + SUPP: FUND : BUDGET : PER FUPIL : ********	BUDGET AUTH PER PUPIL	DIFF (8 - 7) *******	POTENTIAL LOB BOARD APP (9 * 1) ********	1997-98 MAX AMT BOARD APP (10 * 20%) ********	EST SUP GEN STATE AID	LOB X (11 / 2)
THOMAS BREWSTER COLBY PUBLIC SC GOLDEN PLAINS	097 D0314 D0315 D0316	155.5 1,224.6 184.0	1,199,827 5,995,853 1,401,926	0 0	1,199,827 5,995,853 1,401,926	7,715.93 4,896.17 7,619.16	0.00 0.00 0.00	7,715.93 4,896.17 7,619.16	8,535.93 5,318.04 8,145.62	820.00 421.87 526.46	127,510 516,622 96,869	25,502 103,324 19,374	22,442	2.13 1.72 1.38
TREGO WAKEENEY	098 D0208	613.5	3,529,075	80,000	3,609,075	5,752.36	130.40	5,882.76	6,136.91	254.15	155,921	31,184	4,032	0.88
WABAUNSEE MILL CREEK VALL WABAUNSEE EAST	099 D0329 D0330	612.6 658.0	3,560,448 3,931,814	345,502 0	3,905,950 3,931,814	5,812.03 5,975.40	563.99 0.00	6,376.02 5,975.40	6,138.12 6,077.28	0.00 101.88	67,037	13,407	0 5,579	0.00 0.34
WALLACE WALLACE COUNTY WESKAN	100 D0241 D0242	281.5 113.5	1,328,378 9.3,674	0	1,828,378 923,674	6,495.13 8,138.10	0.00	6,495.13 8,138.10	6,810.36 9,111.12	315.23 973.02	88,737 110,438	17,747 22,088	0	0.97 2.39
WASHINGTON NORTH CENTRAL WASHINGTON SCHO BARNES CLIFTON-CLYDE	101 D0221 D0222 D0223 D0224	163.5 412.0 335.0 405.4	1,293,216 2,448,538 2,172,749 2,472,979	180,388 0 217,275 150,000	1,473,604 2,448,538 2,390,024 2,622,979	7,909.58 5,943.05 6,485.82 6,100.10	1,103.29 0.00 648.58 370.00	9,012.87 5,943.05 7,134.40 6,470.10	8,426.37 6,406.92 6,510.10 6,415.76	0.00 463.87 0.00 0.00	191,114 0 0	38,223 0 0	17,055 0 0	0.00 1.56 0.00 0.00
WICHITA LEOTI	102 D0467	512.0	3,101,165	155,058	3,256,223	6,056.96	302.85	6,359.81	6,272.92	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
WILSON ALTOONA-MIDWAY NEODESHA FREDONIA	103 D0387 D0461 D0484	375.5 835.4 910.0	2,380,685 4,396,934 4,862,784	38,000 0 465,000	2,418,685 4,396,934 5,327,784	6,340.04 5,263.27 5,343.72	101.20 0.00 510.99	6,441.24 5,263.27 5,854.71	6,455.83 5,839.56 5,739.60	14.59 576.29 0.00	5,479 481,433 0	1,096 96,287 0	57,570 0	0.05 2.19 0.00
WOODSON YATES CENTER	104 D0366	638.5	3,649,459	0	3,649,459	5,715.68	0.00	5,715.68	6,103.41	3 87.73	247,566	49,513	13,101	1.36
WYANDOTTE TURNER-KANSAS C PIPER-KANSAS CI BONNER SPRINGS KANSAS CITY	D0203 D0204 D0500	3,759.5 1,266.2 2,047.0 20,404.8	14,871,437 6,054,950 8,963,136 81,181,133	3,588,395 181,000 2,186,976 17,852,635	18,459,832 6,235,950 11,150,112 99,033,768	3,955.70 4,781.99 4,378.67 3,978.53	954.49 142.95 1,068.38 874.92	4,910.19 4,924.94 5,447.05 4,853.45	4,547.00 5,262.29 4,547.00 4,547.00	0.00 337.35 0.00 0.00	427,153 0 0	85,431 0 0	35,052 0 0	0.00 1.41 0.00 0.00
**************************************	*****	446.137.2		204 882 099	1	********** ,724,636.28		1.816.903.29		82,019.94		18,335,861		303.62
STATE TOTALS		1,	,998,367,475	2,	203,249,574	10-01-5-5-5	92,267.01	1,	866,897.06		91,679,316		7,127,955	

8-15