

Dr. Wayne Burke Superintendent 101 E. South Street Spring Hill, KS 66083 Ph: (913) 592-7200 Fax: (913) 592-7270

March 8, 2018

Testimony for K-12 Education Budget Committee

Thank you for allowing us to share our thoughts as a <u>proponent</u> for <u>HB 2636</u>. We appreciate the amount of work that went into this bill. The bond cap has been a subject of many conversations with administrators, patrons, bond attorney, and our Vision for Growth Committee who is trying to determine the timing and size of our next bond issue.

My name is Wayne Burke and I'm the Superintendent of Spring Hill USD 230. We are located in southern Johnson and northern Miami counties. We are a small, rapidly growing district with a student population of a little over 3,000 brick and mortar students. When including our virtual students, we increase our population to over 4,000 students.

In the recent past, we were considered a rural district, but with our rapid growth we are fast becoming a suburban district. We are currently building our fourth elementary (opening fall 2018) and a second middle school (opening fall 2019). Even with these new buildings we are still facing capacity issues in the very near future.

See Exhibit A – Building Level Projections (Page 30 of RSP report presented to Spring Hill Board of Education 1/22/2018 and also the Vision for Growth Committee)

The bond cap creates several concerns for our district

- Our district is being required to get in line by 7/1/2018 or potentially wait an additional year if the entire cap is allocated to July 1st applicants. We are fearful districts are going to request funds sooner than later so they can withstand a potential full year delay on an upcoming project. A rapidly growing district doesn't have the luxury of surviving a full year delay.
- What happens if a large district takes up a majority of the cap on 7/1/2018, but then doesn't hold the election until 5/1/2019 and the election fails? That doesn't give enough time for districts to put an application together and apply for those funds before they expire on 6/30/2019?
- A cap based on debt retired the previous year fails to account for inflationary costs. A typical bond
 has a 20 year repayment schedule. We are currently building a 528 student elementary at a cost of
 \$20 million. 20 years ago the same building would have only cost \$10 million to construct.
- Our last two governors have supported and encouraged growth in our state, but a bond cap seems
 to penalize those districts who are growing by potentially limiting the size of their project. Building
 schools adds jobs to the community through construction and teaching and support staff.
- What happens with unused bond cap dollars? There is no provision to increase the bond cap, but it would appear it can decline if there are unused dollars in a given fiscal year.

• Most importantly, the bond cap potentially limits a community from addressing the educational needs of their children. Patrons of a district know firsthand the need for more classroom space, safe schools, access to technology, opportunities for career and technical education, and more. Providing quality opportunities and educational spaces for students should not be limited by the number of other districts seeking this same opportunity for their students in a given year.

As a fast-growing district, we would like to receive help in continuing to be economically viable in providing a quality education for all students. A bond cap has the opposite effect.

Again, we appreciate the effort that went into this bill to eliminate the hardships created by the recent bond cap. Thank you for investing in the education of the next generation of Kansans.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Wayne Burke Superintendent - USD 230 Spring Hill

Exhibit A

