

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Nancy Brown at 1:30 p.m. on February 3, 1993 in Room 521-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present: Michael Heim, Legislative Research Department
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes
Lois Hedrick, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Gerry Ray, Johnson County Commission
Willie Martin, Sedgwick County Commission

Others attending: See Guest List (Attachment 1).

Chairman Brown asked Committee members if in reviewing the drafts of the Committee minutes they felt it necessary to expand the minutes to include more of the various questions and discussions of individual members in order to insure that legislative intent is stated. Verbatim testimony is not recorded. She asked that if they had any thoughts on that to please visit with her privately.

Gerry Ray, Johnson County Commission, rose to a point of personal privilege, and thanked the Committee for graciously allowing her to state an apology with respect to her testimony as a proponent on **HB 2105**, relating to disorganization of townships. In her testimony she stated that the Monticello Township, in Johnson County, had no officials. Since that testimony, she has determined that statement was not correct. She also stated, however, that the landfill issue in the county still exists and has not changed.

The Chairman then opened the meeting for discussion and recommendations for introduction of new Committee bills. She stated that rather than utilizing individual motions for each one, if no objections are voiced by the members, that bills will be introduced.

Willie Martin, Sedgwick County Commission, then requested introduction of legislation to amend the procedures for sale of county property (see testimony, Attachment 2). By such amendment, it would allow the county commission flexibility in determining the best means of disposition of county property through a realtor or other means. All transactions would be conducted through public proceedings as specified by law.

Representative Welshimer then recommended legislation be introduced to require any contractor who enters into an agreement for repair or construction amounting to \$500 or more to enter into a bond to the state for a value of not less than \$10,000 (which currently would cost the contractor around \$80). The recent devastating storms in Kansas attracted unscrupulous contractors who have either performed shabby work or skipped the state after collecting money for such agreements and left the public holding the bag, so to speak. Representative Tomlinson asked if this particular request was germane to the committee's work and the Chairman stated that it had been researched and determined that it was appropriate.

Chairman Brown then recommended introduction of bills in behalf of Johnson County relating to: (1) amending the election process for a referendum situation on a park; (2) and (3) to provide accountability for the work of the Fire Department Board and the Recreation Commission Board to be placed with the board of county commissioners, who are elected officials. Another bill (4) is requested to provide a procedure for disposition of property in Johnson County not included in annexation as a result of consolidations.

There being no objections expressed by Committee members to the introduction of the various bills just recommended, the Chairman stated that the committee bills will be introduced.

Representative Mays questioned if **HB 2149** and Chairman Brown's recommended procedure for Johnson County for disposition of property could be combined into one bill. The Chairman responded that both bills will be discussed further and perhaps this may be accomplished.

The Chairman then announced that **HB 2102**, **HB 2103**, and **HB 2104** will be discussed at Monday's meeting (February 8th).

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled at 1:30 p.m., February 8, 1993, in Room 521-S of the State Capitol.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: House Local Government

DATE: February 3, 1993

[illegible]



SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

WILLIE MARTIN

COUNTY COURTHOUSE • 525 N. MAIN • SUITE 315 • WICHITA, KANSAS 67203 • TELEPHONE (316) 383-7552

TO: HOUSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

FROM: WILLIE MARTIN
SEDGWICK COUNTY

DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 1993

SUBJ: DISPOSITION OF COUNTY PROPERTY
INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Madam Chair and members of the committee, I am Willie Martin representing the Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners.

Madam Chair I appreciate you allowing me this time.

Sedgwick County would respectfully request the introduction of legislation addressing the disposition of county property.

Kansas Statutes require that when the Board of County Commissioners declares a piece of property to be surplus to the needs of the County, they adhere to the following procedures.

1. The Board publishes note of the proposed sale once each week for three consecutive weeks in the official newspaper of the County.
2. The Board receives sealed bids to be opened at a public meeting. The Board reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids.
3. If, within 45 days after the first publication of the notice of sale a petition is filed signed by no less than 2% of the qualified electors of the county, the Board may not sell or dispose of the real property until the proposition of sale or disposal is first submitted to a vote of the electors of the county.
4. Upon acceptance of one of those bids, the property is sold to the highest and best bidder upon such terms and conditions as the board deems appropriate.

ATTACHMENT 2-1
2-3-93

5. If a bid is accepted this ends the process.

On several occasions the County has published notification of the sale of property and received no bids.

The legislation we request provides that if no bids are received, or the board rejects all bids, the board can arrange a public or private sale of the property through a realtor or any other means.

Currently, if after receiving no bids, the County were to negotiate or receive an acceptable offer at a later date they would still be required to repeat the bid process.