Approved: 3-30-94

### MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Don Sallee at 8:00 a.m. on March 22, 1994 in Room 423-S of the Capitol.

All members were present or excused:

Committee staff present: Raney Gilliland, Legislative Research Department

Dennis Hodgins, Legislative Research Department

Don Hayward, Revisor of Statutes Clarene Wilms, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Mrs. Terry Duvall, Policy Consultant and Staff Assistant, Kansas Water Office Gloria Timmer, Division of Budget, State of Kansas

## HB-3058 - concerning revenue bonds issued to acquire certain water supply storage capacity

Mrs. Terry Duvall, Policy Consultant and Staff Assistant, Kansas Water Office, appeared before the committee to explain the costs that would be associated with the acquisition of water storage supply capacity in federal reservoirs. Attachment 1 Mrs. Duval stated Milford and Perry storage was under contract but to obtain total control it must be called into service and payments started. Mrs. Duval stated the Water Office proposed to start this phase only when absolutely necessary.

Mrs. Duval told the committee that negotiation of contracts for purchase of the remaining storage by the state need to be put in place. Marion and Elk City reservoirs were included in the cost of purchase due to people in the Marion area feeling they were being excluded.

A member told the committee of a previous suggestion, discussed with the Governor who seemed to approve, to use idle funds from the pooled money investment fund for a shorter period of time. The member suggested that additional savings were possible using a possible 4 year period. Borrowing from the pooled money investment fund would allow with the addition of Marion and Elk City reservoirs.

Mrs. Duvall said the House subcommittee of Energy and Natural Resources had determined the first source of revenue used to make payment on bonds should come from those who would use the water with the second source coming from the state water plan fund.

A member wondered if this could possibly be funded at least for the first few years by up front funding to get through 1996 and 1997.

Gloria Timmer, Division of Budget, appeared to discuss alternative financing. Ms. Timmer told members that an ad hoc committee had looked into numerous funding possibilities such as bonds, combinations of sources such as the state water fund or EDIF funds. A sales tax increase was suggested to and turned down by the governor. In general a shorter financing period would cost less interest than bonding which would run 10 to 20 years. A great many people are very concerned about impacting the water fund so heavily that it might force some projected funding to be deleted or postponed for a long period of time. Those approached about such action stated there was nothing that could be deferred.

The purchase price for storage from all reservoirs except Milford and Perry would be \$13.6 million. Including Milford and Perry would total about \$17 million. A member asked about the inclusion of Marion Reservoir noting earlier testimony had questioned reliability of Marion Reservoir as a stable source. Mrs. Duval stated people in that area are very upset that they were left out of the plan.

Mrs. Duval told members the expenses for operations and maintenance would be over and above the storage purchase price. They are costs incurred by Corp of Engineers to operate and maintain that reservoir and are charged on a percentage of control the state has on the water in the reservoir. The costs are audited by the state but the state cannot control them.

A member stated that irrigators also pay the maintenance and operation fees with no control over costs. They have 45 year contracts and pay for the water, whatever is guaranteed in their original contract, whether they

#### **CONTINUATION SHEET**

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, Room 423-S Statehouse, at 8:00 a.m. on March 22, 1994.

get it or not. The irrigators would continue to buy from the federal government.

Attention was called to a report provided on the status of the State Water Plan Fund which indicates where the funds are used and future commitments of the funds. <u>Attachment 2</u> A member said that some years ago when the water plan fund was established there was a great deal of discussion concerning the use of it for the funding of additional water storage. Over a period of time the funds do not have the potential to cover everything desired.

Discussion again considered bonding and the use of pooled money investment funds with a shorter term payback. The state would receive the interest on them and it would require more money in a shorter period but ultimately cost much less. The dollars would be used to purchase the storage and it would be paid back with interest from the water fund or EDIF. The scenario would be to take \$4 million from the state water fund or EDIF each year to repay the pooled money investment fund from which the funds were originally borrowed. We are, in effect, making a decision to use water plan fund money, EDIF money or general fund, the same as with bonding only over a shorter period of time.

Mrs. Duvall stated that as the process goes the Water Authority would make decisions, then make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature who would have the final decision.

In answer to a member's question Ms. Duvall stated that all of the water that is to be committed in the next few years has been removed from these compacts.

A member questioned whether Kanopolis had been considered as a possibility and what additional costs would be incurred. Mrs. Duvall stated she could not answer with dollars and cents, that the federal government is now doing a study concerning reallocation. Funds were made available through the Kansas delegation for the study which is only in preliminary state. Ms. Duvall stated they hope to get Kanopolis included.

A member suggested amending Kanopolis into this bill with Mrs. Duvall stating the bill does not name the reservoirs, therefore it leaves it up to negotiation which reservoirs are included.

Ms. Duvall stated there is currently in existence a \$4 million dollar escrow account that is in made up of pooled investment board idle funds that has been in existence since 1985 and will be released in 1996. That \$4 million will go back to the pooled money investment board in 1996 when the MOU is no longer available to us. It was money that we were required under the MOU with the federal government to set aside in an escrow account to show good faith that we would follow through in purchasing the additional storage. That money earns interest, that interest going back to the pooled money investment board each year.

<u>Senator Wisdom made a conceptual motion to amend the bill to allow the state to contract with the pooled money investment board as an option.</u> <u>Senator Morris seconded the motion.</u>

A member questioned whether this was to be the first option or just an option, it was decided it was just an option. The question then arose who would decide which option would be used. A member suggested the amendment be changed and make it the first option. Another member suggested that members would see the bill again since it will have to be funded by Ways and Means appropriations. Another member stated the Kansas Water Office is authorized to sell these bonds or authorize use of the pooled money investment funds. The motion carried.

<u>Senator Lee moved to pass HB-3058 out favorable as amended.</u> <u>Senator Emert seconded the motion and the motion carried.</u>

<u>Senator Morris moved approval of the minutes for March 15, 16, 17 and 18.</u> <u>Senator Emert seconded the motion and the motion carried.</u>

House Bill 2732 dealing with Tree City, USA was discussed with a member stating that some years ago a bill was passed from Ways and Means which pledged a great deal of money to the forestry program. The member stated they felt it HB-2732 was a good bill and an important bill and would support it if there was any way to fund it. A member stated the feeling that this bill takes a good volunteer program and makes more bureaucracy. With no funding the bill is meaningless.

<u>Senator Walker moved to report HB-2732</u> <u>favorable for passage.</u> <u>Senator Lawrence seconded the motion.</u> <u>The motion failed.</u>

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m. No further meetings are scheduled as of this date.

FY 1995				FY 1996	
Appropriation needed			Appropriation need		
\$773,051 Annual capital payment Milfo	ord & Perry		eration & Maintenance for Elk City,	7	
\$277,983 Operation & Maintenance M			Cou	incil Grove, John Redmond, Marion	
	·	OTIATE CONTRACTS WITH	> Melv	vern, Pomona, Tuttle Creek	
\$1,051,034 To be placed in an interest b	pearing COR	PS FOR Elk City, Council Grove, Joi	าก		
account UNTIL NEEDED.		nond, Marion, Melvern, Pomona,		No appropriation needed	
	Tottle	Creek storage under MOU.	\$1	3,621,120 Bond issue to pay Corps for Elk Ci	ty, Council
				Grove, John Redmond, Marion, Me	elvern
				5.3% for 20 years	
			Appropriation need	dod.	
				ual capital payment Milford & Perry	<b>7</b>
	•			eration & Maintenance Milford & Perry	
			9277,900 Ope	sation a maintenance willord a reny	
			angen or at felicing highlight you take and days one page one days ?	alled into service due to drought	1
	•		<u> </u>	and district states of degree states and sta	<b></b>
FY 1997		FY 1998			
Appropriation needed		Appropriation needed			
\$312,000 Operation & Maintenance fo	r Elk City	\$324,000 Operation & Mai	ntenance for Flk City.		
Council Grove, John Redmo	· ,	1	ohn Redmond, Marion	Infinity	
Melvern, Pomona, Tuttle Cre		Melvern, Pomon		and the same of th	
Appropriation needed		Appropriation needed			
\$1,148,643 Annual payment on revenue bonds		\$1,148,643 Annual payment	on revenue bonds		
for Elk City, Council Grove, John		for Elk City, Cou	ncil Grove, John		
Redmond, Marion, Melvern,		Redmond, Mario	n, Melvern,	18 more years	
Pomona, Tuttle Creek storage		Pomona, Tuttle (	Creek storage		
İ					
Appropriation needed		Appropriation needed	المستعدي والمستعدد والمستعدد والمستعدد والمستعدد والمستعدد والمستعدد والمستعدد والمستعدد		
\$773,051 Annual capital payment Milfo		\$773.051 Annual capital p		46 more years	
\$289,102 Operation & Maintenance M	Mord & Perry	\$300,222 Operation & Mai	ntenance Milford &	Infinity	
		Perry			
\$1,062,153 IF called into service due to	drought	\$1.073,273 IF called into ser	vice due to drought		

#### EXPENDITURES FROM THE RESOURCES OF THE STATE WATER PLAN FUND

Bill No.	Agency/Program		Governor's Rec. FY 94		Governor's Rec. FY 95		House Rec. FY 95		Senate Rec. FY 95
H.B. 2753	State Conservation Commission Conservation District Aid Watershed Dam Construction Multipurpose Small Lakes Nonpoint Source Pollution Asst.	\$	778,700 1,261,102 1,171,151 1,687,327	\$	780,171 1,865,000  1,000,000	\$	780,171 1,865,000  1,400,000	\$	780,171 1,865,000  1,163,513
	Land Treatment Cost Share Riparian and Wetland Program Conservation District Prog. Coord. Total – Conservation Commission	e	5,725,896 100,000 	•	5,400,000 150,000 	•	5,400,000 150,000 	•	5,400,000 150,000 39,121
	Total – Conservation Commission	\$	10,724,176	\$	9,195,171	\$	9,595,171	\$	9,397,805
H.B. 2753	Kansas Water Office Water Related Research GIS Resource Manager GIS Data Base Development GIS Data Support Center Geography Resource Center Natural Resource Education Conservation Educational Assist.	\$	557,700 47,815 300,000 120,000 50,000	\$	495,000 50,103 280,000 120,000  50,000 75,000	\$	495,000 50,103 280,000 120,000  50,000 75,000	\$	495,000 50,103 280,000 120,000  50,000 75,000
	Conservation Plan Technical Asst.		75,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
	Stream Gaging Program		3,928			*		*	294,372
	Total - Kansas Water Office	\$	1,154,443	\$	1,220,103	\$	1,220,103	\$	1,514,475
H.B. 2753	Wildlife and Parks Cheyenne Bottoms Renovation Hillsdale Reservoir Facilities Dam Maintenance & Repair	\$	1,839,568 29,651	\$	1,000,000  500,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,000,000
Ch La Ea Bio	Cheney Reservoir Riprap Lake Crawford Dam Easement Aquisition Biological Assessment Total – Wildlife and Parks	\$	275,000 39,108 100,000 13,400 2,296,727	\$	50,000 74,200 1,624,200	\$	 50,000 74,200 1,124,200	\$	 50,000 74,200 1,124,200
S.B. 590	University of Kansas								
0.5. 000	Dakota Aquifer Study	\$	200,000	\$	200,000	\$		\$	200,000
H.B. 2753	Board of Agriculture Conservation Plan Coordination Interstate Water Issues Subbasin Management Plan Water Res. Info. Sys. Conversion	\$	118,640 136,071 575,286	\$	 142,959 904,759 	\$	 133,641 697,801 216,276	\$	 133,641 697,801 216,276
	Total - Board of Agriculture	\$	829,997	\$	1,047,718	\$	1,047,718	\$	1,047,718
S.B. 633	Health and Environment Contamination Remediation Local Environmental Protection Nonpoint Source Program	\$	2,489,579 1,620,000 256,352	\$	1,500,000 2,150,000 466,661	\$		\$	1,500,000 2,100,000 466,661
	Total - Health and Environment	\$	4,365,931	\$	4,116,661	\$		\$	4,066,661
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	<b>\$</b> 1	9,571,274	<b>\$</b> 1	7,403,853	<b>\$</b> 1	2,987,192	<b>\$</b> 1	7,350,859

<sup>\*</sup> Includes expenditures from prior year allocations from the State Water Plan Fund

Senate Energy & Modural Resc. March 22, 1994 Atlachment 2

# STATUS OF THE STATE WATER PLAN FUND

	Governor's Rec. FY 94		Governor's Rec. FY 95		House Rec. FY 95		Senate Rec. FY 95	
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$	857,433	\$	947,752	\$	947,752	\$	947,752
RECEIPTS: State General Fund EDIF Public Water Supply Fees Industrial Water Use Fees Stock Water Use Fees Fertilizer Inspection Fees Pesticide Registration Fees Fines	\$	5,760,000 1,980,000 3,000,000 1,300,000 275,000 2,300,000 764,500 57,277	\$	5,932,800 2,000,000 3,200,000 1,300,000 275,000 2,012,500 749,200 51,541	\$	6,000,000 2,000,000 3,200,000 1,300,000 275,000 2,012,500 749,200 51,541	\$	5,932,800 2,000,000 3,200,000 1,300,000 275,000 2,012,500 749,200 51,541
Subtotal - Receipts	\$	15,436,777	\$	15,521,041	\$	15,588,241	\$	15,521,041
TOTAL AVAILABLE	\$	16,294,210	\$	16,468,793	\$	16,535,993	\$	16,468,793
LESS TRANSFERS: State Conservation Commission Kansas Water Office Wildlife and Parks University of Kansas Board of Agriculture Health and Environment Subtotal — Transfers	\$	9,654,544 1,152,981 995,000 200,000 600,000 2,743,933 15,346,458	\$	8,495,171 1,219,731 1,574,200 200,000 1,047,718 3,616,661	\$	8,731,658 1,219,731 1,074,200 1,047,718	\$	8,534,292 1,514,103 1,074,200 200,000 1,047,718 3,566,661
ENDING BALANCE	\$	947,752	\$	315,312	\$	4,462,686	\$	531,819