Approved: February 19, 2015

## MINUTES OF THE SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Mike Petersen at 8:30 am on Thursday, January 29, 2015, 546-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Senator Anthony Hensley – Excused

Senator Jacob LaTurner – Excused

Committee staff present:

Jill Shelley, Legislative Research Department

Whitney Howard, Legislative Research Department

Adam Siebers, Office of Revisor of Statutes

Carolyn Long, Kansas Legislative Committee Assistant

Scott Wells, Office of Revisor of Statutes

Conferees appearing before the Committee:

No conferees present

Others in attendance:

See Attached List

Chairman Petersen opened the meeting by calling for any bill introductions. There were none.

## <u>Final action on: SB5 — Designating a portion of U.S. highway 69 as the 2nd Lieutenant Justin L. Sisson memorial highway.</u>

The Chairperson called for <u>Final Action on SB 5</u>. Adam Siebers, Assistant Revisor, reminded the committee that this proposed legislation would create a memorial highway designation on a portion of US Highway 69 between 135th Street and 167th Street in Johnson County. The Committee was reminded that a funding mechanism for signs indicating the designation was not included in this bill.

Senator Wolf expressed her concern over the funding structure in this bill. She reminded the Committee that in 2004 a policy was initiated wherein the parties requesting the signage would be responsible for 100% of the cost for planning, manufacturing, and installing the sign and 50% of the sign's maintenance. This language has been included in each such bill since then.

Senator Donovan suggested this bill be brought to the attention of the caucus. Perhaps representatives from Lt. Sisson's district would wish to contribute as a one- time gesture. He also noted that in 2004 a policy was initiated to allow the Kansas Department of Transportation to include the 150% cost defrayment. He suggested that the bill be amended to include cost concerns.

Senator Schmidt noted that as written the current proposed bill does not specify funding and regardless of future discussions would need to be amended. If exceptions are made in this situation, what about those who have already adhered to the funding provision--would they be eligible for a refund?

Senator King said that present policy was good but exceptions make the rule and this may be one of

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

## CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES of the Committee on Transportation at 8:30 am on Thursday, January 29, 2015, 546-S of the Capitol.

them. Perhaps in honor of fallen soldiers the required expenditure could be lowered as a way of honoring our fallen. When asked if campaign contributions could be a source of funding, he replied in the affirmative.

Senator Wolf again expressed her hesitation stating that exceptions are not good precedent. There have been four other situations in the past where no exception to funding were made and that a long-term policy needs to be in place.

Senator Pettey suggested it was just an oversight in preparing the bill and no policy would be required under these circumstances.

Senator Petersen informed the committee that the maker of the bill intentionally used the language as presented.

<u>Senator Fitzgerald moved that SB5 be amended to add the standard signage language regarding funding. Seconded by Senator Wolf. The motion carried.</u> Senator Donovan again urged this bill be brought to the attention of the caucus; Senator Fitzgerald voiced agreement.

Senator Wolf requested a bill that would require inclusion of current policy of 1000% funding of the planning, manufacturing, and installation of signs related to proposed designations, and an additional 50% funding to maintain signs. There were no objections from the Committee.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 a.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 3, 2015.