

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 30, 1965

The meeting was called to order and the Chairman asked about amendments which were proposed yesterday. Mr. Fribley discussed removing the description of city, stating that it should not be limited to first class cities because some of the smaller places are interested now. Mr. Turner expressed the desire that he would like to have Wichita excluded because he didn't want his City Commission to have blanket authority like this. Mr. Rogers asked what was the reason for putting in the requirement about low income and elderly people. Mr. Rogers stated that if these amendments as proposed are put in without the Committee knowing what was really asked for, it might keep Kansas City or some other place from properly utilizing federal funds or something. Mr. Mikesic agreed to find out about the matter, and he consulted Mr. VanCleave who agreed to have an amendment prepared and return later.

Mr. Light discussed S.B. 28, stating that it proposed amendments to the present Real Estate law; that it defines auctioneers as being licensed by virtue of a ruling by the Attorney General; that it also defines education requirements, and Mr. Dawson, Director of the Real Estate Board and Mr. Bennett, attorney for the Board appeared also. Mr. Rogers stated that most auctioneers are already licensed, and Mr. Bennett explained that this change in the law is just to clarify the matter since the ruling by the Attorney General. Mr. Woodworth inquired if he, if he wished to speculate in real estate, would be required to utilize a broker to conduct the sale of real estate. It was established that this is probably true. He, Turner asked if he owned a corporation and only 1/3 of the stock, he would have to employ a broker? It was established that this is correct. Mr. Woodworth discussed home builders who do their own selling, stating that it appeared to him that they couldn't handle their own business under this bill.

Mr. Brown of Pottawatomie explained S.B. 100, stating that this would simply give a new title to the now Executive Officer of the Board of Regents; that it would place him as an Executive Secretary. Mr. Rogers explained that this is not something that Mr. Bickford is asking for, but rather has been requested by the Chancellors and the Board; that it is just a matter of a little more prestige. It was moved by Mr. Rogers that the bill be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Brown and carried unanimously.

Mr. Mikesic discussed S.B. 212, stating that it defines what structures are below minimum standards and providing that if they are not taken care of and brought up to standard, the repairs can be made and taxed against the property. After some discussion, Mr. Mikesic moved that SB 212 be recommended favorable. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and carried unanimously.

Mr. Woodworth stated that he is having an amendment prepared on S.B. 237 and asked that it be passed over until he can obtain it.

Mr. Doyen stated that S.B. 308 creates a planning commission for long-range planning in the capital building area; that it sets out the membership; that this has been recommended by the Legislative Council. Mr. Rogers asked if it had been drafted in keeping with HB 920. Mr. Doyen replied that it had. Mr. Griffith stated that he was afraid that it might work out so the state could tell the city of Topeka whether or not an area could be rezoned. Mr. Bunten replied that a member of the Commission for the City would be on this State Planning Commission. Mr. Rogers stated that it seemed to him that maybe the area should be better defined and Mr. Doyen stated he would look into it and report back later.

Senator Ferguson appeared and discussed S.B. 154, stating that this bill grew out of a concern where out of state contractors came in and built buildings or materials, they bring in out of state materials and don't use local labor; that he feels that where it is available it should be specified.

Senator Harder asked to discuss S.B. 143, and testified that the bill repeals the statute affecting the shipment of embalmed human bodies; that the death certificate has been changed in recent years so that all the necessary information is included, making the shipping paster a duplication; that originally it was used for the purpose of certifying that there is no danger from contagious diseases, and now the death certificate takes care of that. Mr. Brown of Pottawatomie moved that this bill be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Doyen and carried unanimously.

Mr. Rogers asked to go back to S.B. 308, and stated that as he studied in more detail, it seems that the State Capital area is adequately defined as the area designated by the Commission, and that is good enough so far as he is concerned. Mr. Brown stated that there isn't too much area left.

Mr. Meckel discussed S.B. 317, dealing with an executive director in the management of the automatic processing equipment. He stated that the specialist would be classified exempt service under Kansas Civil Service. Mr. Fribley stated that this has come up several times since the advent of the machine age, and expressed his approval. Thereupon, he moved the favorable recommendation of the bill. Motion was seconded by Mr. Meckel and passed unanimously.

Rep. Louis W. Rogers appeared in rebuttal to Senator Ferguson's remarks concerning S.B. 154. He states that with regard to specifying state manufactured materials in building projects in Kansas, it would damage the cement industry; that in the several plants he knows of in the Eastern part of the state, that a great deal is shipped into Missouri for use there and a lot is manufactured in Kansas and sent to Missouri with Missouri labels; that if we start doing this, then the other states will no longer buy from Kansas, and things will be very bad. He states that a plant is being built in Olathe at the present time, with the plan and agreement that it will be shipped to Kansas City. He states that fundamentally, such a plan sounds good but that considering retaliation, it will be bad for business in Kansas.

Mr. VanCleave returned to present an amendment on S.B. 14. Page two line 15, strike all after the work "by" and all of line 16 before the work "Such", and inserting "any urban renewal project or any slum clearance project and for elderly persons of low income." Also on page 3, delete line 18. Mr. Fribley moved that the amendments be adopted. Motion was seconded by Mr. Mikesic and carried 15 to 1. Mr. Fribley then moved that SB 14 as amended be recommended for passage. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion which carried with a vote of 13 yes. Mr. Turner said he was just not ready to give his commission authority to give housing to everyone under the sun. Mr. Bunten stated that he felt much the same way; that urban renewal has not done what it was supposed to do. Mr. Mikesic pointed out that the bill retains the work "displaced". The Chairman reminded the members that action had been taken and if they wanted to do something they could try a floor amendment, or unless the Committee wanted to reconsider it, we would turn the report in this way.

Miss Jacquart explained S.B. 294, stating that the Senate had amended the act to prohibit the giving of stamps for anything of value. She then moved that the bill be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and carried 11 to 1.

Mr. Fribley moved that SB 154 be reported adversely, which motion was seconded by Mr. Bunten. Mr. Griffity asked if there would be any objection to amending the bill to state Kansas labor, and Mr. Bunten pointed out that these firms must bring in supervisory personnel. Mr. Fribley stated he had no objection and withdrew his motion. Mr. Turner suggested that something be done to determine the facts and Miss Jacquart inquired if a study wasn't going to be requested along this line. The Chairman stated that the study was to be made on preference for in-state firms on bids for supplies. After further discussion, Mr. Fribley moved that the bill be tabled. Motion was seconded by Mr. Griffith and passed without objection.

Mr. Bunten discussed S.B. 208, stating that it is a proposal to allow the City of Topeka to purchase land from the Department of Social Welfare, on the KNI site, for the purpose of building a golf course. He states there is a real need for this and cited that golfers must tee off at 4:45 in order to get to play. He states that the state is buying this land from the federal government on a 20-year plan and that this will help in the purchase of the land for the state on the rest of the acreage involved. Mr. Fribley stated that he was in sympathy with the proposed project but cited cases where the state had sold land and then found they had to buy more for expansion and then it cost more money than they had gotten for their sale. The City attorney was introduced by Mr. Bunten (Pat Connely) who pointed out this was a lease arrangement, not a sale arrangement, and that the lease was proposed for 30 years; that it is well located for this purpose, the land in question is now waste land used for dumping, etc. and that the Park Department would improve and beautify it, making pathway and picnic areas adjacent to the course, for the use of the children at KNI; that in fact the land is not usable as it is for any purpose for the children. The Chairman asked if this is a straight lease, and if after 30 years the land would revert back to the State and Mr. Connely stated that would occur unless a re-negotiation was effected. The cost of leasing, it was pointed out, would pay the payments pledged by the state, and Miss Jacquart inquired about the differential quoted. Mr. Connely stated that only a portion of the acreage was involved in this lease and that explained the differential in the amount to be paid by the city and the amount to be paid by the Board of Social Welfare. Mr. Fribley stated that this is different from the way it was explained by Mr. Bunten. Mr. Unruh asked if there was any income from the land now, and Mr. Connely stated there was not. Mr. Rogers stated that this seemed to be a pretty good way to get the land developed and beautified. Rep. Dierdorff appeared in opposition to the proposal, stating that it looked like a good deal for the city of Topeka, and a poor deal for the State of Kansas. He states that the way our programs are growing at KNI that there certainly may be need for expansion in the future, before the end of 30 years. Mr. Brown of Pottawatomie stated that since he has been in the legislature, the state has had to twice buy back land it had previously sold, and at a premium. Mr. Bunten pointed out that the title does not change and the City will be helping the state to finance their purchase.

The meeting was adjourned.