

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 22, 1965

The meeting was called to order, and the Chairman asked to discuss H.B. 1068, the proposal to change the Restaurant Board. He states that the definitions are changed to read the same as they did in the old Act, except that it excludes certain non-profit institutions, including hospitals. He states that this bill adds two members to the Board, which gives the motels a seat on the Board, and everyone involved is agreed to this bill. Miss Jacquart moved that HB 1068 as amended, be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and passed unanimously.

Mr. Doyen asked to discuss H.B. 920, the proposal to place the Buildings and Grounds detail under the Department of Administration, and directly under the control of the State Architect. Mr. Kiger, Mr. Bibb and Mr. Knauft appeared in support of this proposal, and Mr. Kiger stated that the Architect works closely with the Purchasing Department anyway and that it seems logical to make this change. Testimony established that the Architect is appointed by the Governor, and this bill proposed to continue this, except that he will also be under Civil Service thereafter. Mr. Bibb pointed out that he had worked under four different architects, and that this does not lend itself to continuity in developing preliminary planning or capital improvements. Mr. Hoffman appeared in support of the bill, stating that he had assisted in drafting it; that generally speaking, it transfers the functions of the Executive Council into a single division, and that the responsibility is pretty well fixed. Mr. Rogers stated that he was afraid we are taking a professional man and making him sort of a "chief janitor" and Mr. Bibb stated that he will be given all the help he needs in the way of employees. Mr. Turner inquired how much this would cost, and Mr. Bibb replied that it would depend on how much the legislature wanted to improve the building. He stated that funds had been appropriated from time to time for various jobs and the Executive Council just never got around to the particular jobs; that there is presently money on hand for certain improvements and that it will just be up to the legislature what they want to do. Mr. Fribley pointed out that this is not an appropriation bill anyway; that anything of that nature would come from the Ways and Means Committee and is not a State Affairs function. Miss Jacquart stated that this does not provide for any new positions, and Mr. Bibb replied that it is a redrawing of lines of authority and provides actually for one new position, but that it gives enough authority to really do a proper maintenance job on the building.

HCR 515 was brought up for discussion and Mr. Mikesic moved that same be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr.

Jelinek and Mr. Griffith requested a secret ballot. Upon vote the motion carried with 13 yes and 6 no.

H.B. 993 came before the committee for hearing, and Mr. Kiger introduced Mr. Hoffman who had the bill drafted. Mr. Hoffman stated that it simply proposed to provide for surety bonds for employees on a blanket basis, giving examples of cases where a great deal of money had been saved by placing this type of bond up for bid. Mr. Kiger stated that there are about 125 persons bonded now at an approximate cost of \$25,000 and that he believed a great deal could be saved on a blanket bid. Mr. Rogers stated that he represents a firm which does its bonding this way and that there is a terrific difference in bids; that this is a field where there is apparently a terrific mark-up.

Mr. Perry appeared in opposition to this bill, stating that the Treasurer's office should be exempt; that he should be allowed to conduct his business as he pleases; that he isn't being extravagant. He spoke of his various kinds of bonds, and Mr. Knauft explained that they weren't talking about those--only the surety bond on Mr. Perry for \$500,000. Mr. Knauft stated that the "blanket" could provide coverage for some employees not now covered who probably should be bonded.

The Chairman inquired if anyone knew where H.B. 992 originated, and Mr. Brown of Reno stated that it is Mr. Lindahl's proposal -- that it would remove the County Auditor and place his duties in the hands of the County Attorney. The Chairman stated that he would talk to some of the people involved and the bill would be taken up later.

Mr. Manley of the League of Kansas Municipalities appeared to discuss H.B. 1029. He stated that he was appearing on behalf of the County Engineers but that there might be some other individuals involved; that it deals with retirement for employees and granting of prior service when a transfer has occurred, such as from one county to another or for example in Jefferson County where a man moved to Leavenworth County with 30 Years service, but was not eligible to transfer his credit; that the actuaries state it will cost something like 1/10 or 1% for the few individuals involved; that it is simply a matter of equity. Mr. Rogers inquired how Mr. Corkhill feels about this bill, and Mr. Manley replied that he had been most cooperative and that so far as he knows he is willing that this bill be adopted; that this particular phase is not in the bill they have over in the Senate. The Chairman stated that additional discussion would be had at a later date.

Mr. Rogers discussed H.B. 890 and 891 stating that they were companion bills, and that they had been requested by the Governor. He states that 890 would set up a Commission, or rather designate a commission, to accept federal funds that are available for use around the reservoirs, etc., and discusses a joint council on recreation as described in 891. This commission has 15 members to be appointed by the Governor from certain Boards. Mr. Fribley moved that H.B. 890 be recommended for passage. Motion was seconded by Mr. Jelinek and carried with a vote of 10 yes and one abstained. Mr. Jelinek moved that H.B. 891 be recommended for passage and Mr. Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried with a vote of 10 yes. One member abstained.

With regard to HCR 526, Mr. Rogers states that this also came from the Governor's office; that it is similar to Mr. Angell's 524, providing for about the same thing except that Mr. Angell goes in to more specifics regarding the area of water itself. It was established that this would seek to provide adequate policing and safety regulations at recreational areas and water impoundments. Mr. Bunten stated that he felt it was an administrative problem, not requiring a legislative council study and Mr. Fribley replied that nobody will take the responsibility--the Park Authority, the Highway Patrol and others all say that someone else has authority, and we are asking merely for a recommendation. Mr. Brown stated that he thought it needed immediate attention and that we shouldn't wait two years.

Mr. Fribley moved that HCR 526 recommended for adoption. Motion was seconded by Mr. Buchele and carried unanimously.

Thereupon Mr. Fribley moved that HCR 524 be recommended favorably. Upon second by Mr. Buchele, motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Rogers stated that with regard to HB 926, he felt some hearings should be held. The Chairman stated that if members would advise him of anyone wishing to appear, that a hearing date would be set.

Meeting was adjourned.