

MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Energy and Natural Resources

The meeting was called to order by Senator Charlie L. Angell at
Chairperson

8:00 a.m. ~~PM~~ on Thursday, February 10, 1983 in room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Senator Paul Hess
Senator Tom Rehorn (Excused)

Committee staff present:
Ramon Powers, Research Department
Don Hayward, Revisor's Office
LaVonne Mumert, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Doyle Rahjes, Kansas Water Authority
Paul E. Fleener, Kansas Farm Bureau
Ron Gaches, Kansas Association of Commerce and Industry

S.B. 62 - Interbasin transfers of water.

Doyle Rahjes read his written testimony (Attachment 1). Mr. Rahjes emphasized the virtual permanency of decisions to approve water movements. He said it is crucial that the decision-making process outlined in the bill apply to all waters in Kansas. He stressed the importance of weighing the interests of the entire state on interbasin transfers. Mr. Rahjes discussed the Kansas Water Authority's (Authority) reasoning for eliminating legislative review of contracts for interbasin transfers.

In response to a question from Senator Werts about the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Mr. Rahjes said the Corps of Engineers has held at least two hearings to consider whether to reallocate the water in this reservoir. Mr. Rahjes said it was certainly in the realm of possibility that the water could be reallocated and the State of Kansas have an opportunity to purchase it. He did not know who initiated the hearings but it was not the Authority. Mr. Rahjes answered questions about the Authority making the final decision on interbasin transfers. The Authority is concerned about the possibility of coalitions of votes in the legislature stopping a transfer after extensive hearings and consideration of the Authority. Senator Chaney pointed out that some members of the Authority are politically influenced as well. Responding to questions from Senator Kerr about the relationship of the hearing board, Mr. Rahjes said this three-member panel would be made up of the Chief Engineer, or his representative, as chairman, and representatives of the Division of Environment and Kansas Water Office. This panel will report their findings along with a recommendation to the Authority. Senator Feleciano asked what would happen if an applicant did not provide all the information the hearing board needed. Mr. Rahjes said he would expect the application to be denied if there was insufficient information. He said the Authority would have the right to modify the recommendations of the hearing board. Responding to questions from Senator Angell, Mr. Rahjes said the bill does not specifically address existing interbasin transfers but the Authority would not expect to change anything presently in existence.

Paul E. Fleener reviewed his written testimony (Attachment 2). He suggested that S.B. 62 contain a definition of "person" and that the following language be added to line 36 after the period following the word "act": "No interbasin transfer of water shall be approved unless the person requesting such transfer shall have developed and implemented a water conservation plan." He also suggested that the sentence beginning on line 76 and ending in the middle of line 78 should read: "Any recommendation by the panel for an interbasin transfer of water shall have the unanimous approval of the three panel members." Mr. Fleener also urged that the legislature contemplate a resolution memorializing Congress to act on a project such as the North American Water and Power Alliance.

Ron Gaches testified in favor of S.B. 62. He said his association did not deal with some of the specific questions the Committee has raised, but they do feel it is important that Kansas move forward with developing long-range plans and management of the state's water resources. They do endorse the major concepts embodied in the bill. Responding to questions from Senator Kerr, Mr. Gaches said his association does not necessarily endorse the concept of interbasin transfers because the association has members on both sides of the issue, but they do agree that a formal review process should be a necessary ingredient to the decision-making process.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Energy and Natural Resources,
room 123-S, Statehouse, at 8:00 a.m./~~PM~~ on Thursday, February 10, 1983

The meeting was adjourned at 8:59 a.m. by Vice Chairman Kerr.

The next meeting of the Committee will be at 8:00 a.m. on February 11, 1983.

Senate Energy & Natural Resources

Feb. 10, 1983

Name	Organization
M. Hawser	capital-lawyer
M. Clark	KEPCo
JOE HAMMAN	KEPCo
Gilbert Rundell	KFB
Mary Fand	Kansas Rural Center
Tony Beddy	KFB
Roger Hoff	Close Up: Ks.
Shawn Legere	Close Up: Ks.
Rachel Flood	Close Up: Ks.
Denise Hull	Close Up: Ks.
Ch. Duffy	KWR Staff
Glen E. Kirk	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
DALE BAJEMA	KGS
Rosemary O'Leary	KCC
R. E. Pella	City of Topeka
Bill Anderson	Water Dist. #1 of Johnson Co
S. B. Stovall	Cities Service Co. - Tulsa, Ok
Jeff Henry	Close-up Ks.
Sam Doan	Close-up Kansas
Mary Fulves	Close-up Kansas
Tom Jensen	Close-up - Kansas
Jim Aiken	KDHE
DAVID TURNAS	Wichita Chamber
Ron Caches	KACT
Ralph Zehlick	Haye High School
Bram Schudeman	Close-up - Kansas
Lee Whittington	"
Chris Powers	Close-Up Kansas
John A. Henderson	KWO

None

Leland E. Rolf
 Kenny Wedel
 Lon Stanta
 Kent Weatherly
 Dill F. Byron
 Paul E. Fleener
 Elaine Hassler
 Jessy Conrad
 John Blythe
 Bill Henry
 Roy D. Shenkel
 Brock Alexander
 Martha Mangelsdorf
 Cathy Behar
 M.S. Conlee
 Del Miller
 Barbara Jassle
 Miane Juber

organization

Ke. St. Bd of Ag. - DWR
 Kansas Natural Resource Council
 KPL
 KPL
 CITIES SERVICE COMPANY
 Kansas Farm Bureau
 Legislator
 KGS&E
 Ks Farm Bureau
 Ks Engineering Society
 K. C. P. C.
 K.W.H.
 Kansas Water Authority
 AD
 City of Wichita
 Gov's office
 KDHE
 University Daily Kansan

Remarks of Doyle Rahjes
To The Senate Committee
On Energy & Natural Resources

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Doyle Rahjes, an Agra, Kansas, farmer and appointee of Senate President Ross Doyen to the Kansas Water Authority. I serve on the Executive Committee of the Authority and I served as chairman of the Authority's Committee charged with drafting legislation designed to guide the State of Kansas in dealing with proposed transfers of water across river basin boundaries.

Mr. Eugene Shore, a Johnson, Kansas, farmer who represents the western Kansas Groundwater Management Districts and Mr. Henry Strick of Kansas City who represented the Kansas Association of Commerce and Industry also served on the committee.

In the Kansas Water Authority's report to the Legislature, submitted January 18th, we tried to provide you a detailed discussion of the issues that were brought before the authority during months of deliberation on this legislation. The report suggests that there is a deep concern, shared by interests throughout this state, about the imminent interbasin transfers of water.

I commend that report to you along with the report and map that are valuable background on the water supply and demand picture that appears to be developing in this state.

Today, I would like to highlight some of the reasoning that went into the development of Senate Bill 62. I would also like to relate to you the sense of urgency my colleagues and I share regarding action by this Legislature to address interbasin transfers of water.

The job of the Authority is to be a proponent of water law and policy that is in the best interest of this state as a whole and all of its water users' interests. Its job is to advise the Legislature of our recommendations for action that are in the best interest of the State of Kansas. I believe this proposed legislation meets those tests.

Frankly, it is no secret. A major interbasin water transfer proposal is expected to be presented to the state shortly. It is at once good that we can perceive the magnitude of water supply that interbasin transfers can deal with. It is also, at the same time difficult, to think beyond a specific example to try to develop legislation that will stand the test of foresight and time that our water laws must stand to some degree.

The limited potential sites for major new water supply development in Kansas, coupled with the very real potential for water supply deficits in nearly every region of this state, indicate there will likely develop more and more proposals to move significant amounts of water substantial distances. We are talking about water that will, for the most part, be piped at great expense.

ALB. 1

The decisions to approve water movements may be virtually permanent. There may be no second chance to rectify a mistake. For the sake of all water users in this state, we cannot afford a mistake in allocating water to one area at the expense of another area of the state or several areas of the state.

This bill establishes a factfinding hearing process by a board of three water experts, representing the state's knowledge and interest in the current water availability and allocation situation; the public health and welfare of the people of this state and the protection of our environment; plus the future plans and abilities of this state to meet water demands with sufficient supplies.

The bill provides guidelines for weighing all water users' interests and most significantly, a decision finally turns on the public interest of the state as a whole -- a decision made by an Authority whose members represent virtually all water use interests in this state. There is a process for an appeal to court from the decision of the Authority.

The bill is a water management tool. It is designed to provide guidelines, a mechanism for making the best possible check before a decision is made. It is not restrictive. It does not prohibit transfers.

This state has worked to share its tax burdens in the best interest of the state as a whole. If once in a while we make a mistake in allocating taxes, it can be rectified with legislation in the next session. But sharing and allocating water is different. When you have approved a water allocation and a \$200 million pipeline has been put down for more than 100 miles and a tremendous investment has been made in new treatment plants, a mistake is next to impossible, if not impossible, to rectify in the next session.

This state has relied to the extent possible on diversifying its economy so that we can all share in production to the best of our collective abilities to produce for the good of the state as a whole. The question now is how are we to best share and balance economic opportunity in this state which is unquestionably underpinned by the availability of sufficient water supplies?

Water supplies have always been unevenly distributed in Kansas. To date, we have allocated and shared that resource within our own regions of the state. We are now faced with the prospects of allocating and sharing among regions.

This bill applies to all waters in Kansas. I believe that it is crucial we all play by the same rules in this ballgame. More importantly, water, whether it is taken from the ground or the surface, is an equally valuable commodity. I do not believe it would be possible, for example, to fully weigh all alternative sources of water for both the applicant or the basin of origin if one process and person or group of people decided a surface water proposal and another process and person or group of people decided a groundwater issue.

I believe it will be short-sighted and very likely will be a disservice to the people of this state to limit the application of this hearing and decisionmaking process to reservoir storage.

State-owned municipal and industrial storage exists in only nine of our reservoirs. There are major utilities and cities in Kansas now using a combination of groundwater from well fields, reservoir storage and flowing river water to fully supply their needs.

I believe that it is possible in the future that proposals will be made to condemn existing groundwater wells and move water. I believe it is possible that proposals will be made to buy up surface rights or groundwater or alluvial well rights and move water. I do not think the movement of significant amounts of water will always be limited to reservoir storage or to municipal or industrial water supplies. I believe it is imperative that any proposed interbasin transfer of any water for any purpose come under the close scrutiny that is proposed.

Neither current law nor Senate Bill 61, the marketing act which addresses reservoir storage waters, involve as deliberately the wisdom and expertise of the chief engineer and the Department of Health and Environment in the decisionmaking process. Senate Bill 62, the interbasin transfer legislation, does that very deliberately because when you talk about moving water out of its basin of origin never to generate side benefits or recycling benefits or exchange of uses to the people in that basin of origin again -- you can have effects very different from when water is used within the basin where it originates.

These interbasin transfer decisions must involve every bit of expertise this state can muster. Interbasin transfer decisions must involve weighing the interests of the entire state, not just the two basins involved.

For example, if there is a proposal to move water from Milford or Tuttle Creek reservoirs, if the Corps of Engineers reallocates and the state buys Tuttle Creek storage, then water would be moving from the lower Kansas basin to the Arkansas River Basin. It is not just a question of whether the lower Kansas basin should retain the water or the Arkansas Basin users should have it.

Where the state as a whole is concerned, it is also a question of whether it is more prudent to drop that water off the Kansas River to the Neosho Basin or the Marais des Cygnes Basin where there are deficits developing that could be relieved by transfers in that direction. There is also a question of whether, if Milford or Tuttle Creek water is to move, if it is in the state's best interest to allocate some to the west toward Hays and Russell and the towns interested in developing the Post Rock Public Wholesale Water Supply District because groundwater and surface water supplies in parts of the upper Kansas Basin are very tight too.

The interbasin transfer legislation recognizes that the ramifications of moving water out of a basin of origin are significant. It provides a very special hearing process designed to force the interests involved to deal with the state rather than circumventing it by withholding information and trying only to find the fastest route to court.

The bill provides that three people, experts in their water-related fields with a collective depth of knowledge nearly unmatched elsewhere in the state, would make findings. Their findings and recommendation would be reviewed by the Authority

whose members represent virtually all of our water user interests. I believe that the hearing process, and a court appeal only to determine whether the Authority's decision was based on insufficient evidence or whether it was arbitrary, capricious or fraudulent, is crucial. The bill is designed to protect the state as best we can from abdicating water allocation decisions to the courts.

I would like to highlight another issue of this bill -- the question of whether it places an undue burden upon very small water users by this process of scrutiny. We considered this very seriously. Currently, both the chief engineer and the Water Office do conduct public hearings regarding appropriations and sales of water. At Section 3(b) on Page 2 of the bill, we have provided that if the proposed transfer is for an amount of water of 100 million gallons per year or less (or 307 acre feet or less), the chief engineer may suspend the formal hearing and take on the burden himself of making the findings required under this act.

That may appear to be a small amount of water, especially if you are use to looking at irrigation water use figures. There may be some pressure to raise that exemption. But I would bring to your attention the fact, that by way of measurement, at least 30 percent of our current reservoir water purchase contracts are for this amount of water or less. Most of these smaller purchases are for rural water districts, but I do not believe it would be advisable to consider exempting all rural water districts. Some rural water districts have much larger water demands than our towns. At least one has contracted for a maximum 720 million gallons of water per year and another for about 240 million gallons per year.

I would like to speak to one final element of this bill. The Authority's recommendation to you was that the Authority be the final decision on a transfer of water, subject to appeal to the courts. That did eliminate legislative review and possible revocation of a contract for transfers from reservoir water supply storage. Under current law, you do review the contracts for water purchase, but there is no legislative review or revocation opportunity if an interbasin transfer proposal is to move 100 million gallons of water per day out of the flow of the Kansas River below a reservoir.

The Water Authority would of course yield to your decision on this issue. But we made the recommendation after a good deal of consideration. First, we believed you should consider this alternative. Most importantly, we were very deeply concerned about the inevitable politics of these transfers.

It is not as much a concern about stopping ill-advised proposals, but the politics of approving one. There is a very real possibility that a reservoir transfer proposal could go all the way through the hearing process. Opponents and proponents would make their arguments and enter all their evidence which would be considered in depth. The transfer could be recommended by the panel of experts and approved by the Authority making very detailed public interest findings and yet stopped on the floor of the Legislature by sheer numbers or coalitions of numbers of votes.

We would only ask you to consider whether we really want to strive to develop the best possible guidelines for making tough decisions on allocating water and then, in the end, leave that decision potentially vulnerable to who can line up the most votes one way or another. If the Authority's proposal is not acceptable, I would strongly urge you to give your best effort possible to developing yet another alternative that would protect or remove water allocation decisions from politics as best we can. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would be pleased to answer any questions.

STATEMENT TO THE
SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEERE: SB 62 - Interbasin Transfers of Water
February 10, 1983
Topeka, Kansasby
Paul E. Fleener, Director
Public Affairs Division
Kansas Farm Bureau

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

Farmers and ranchers throughout Kansas have a keen interest in water law. Farm Bureau members in Kansas, through their voting delegates, expressed themselves in several areas that in some way pertain to water, its use, its management, the maintenance of quality standards, and the administration of water law in this state. Attached to our brief statement you will find all of the water related resolutions adopted at our most recent (Dec. 5-7, 1982) Annual Meeting. We invite your particular attention to the resolution headed: STATE WATER AGENCIES.

In the resolution concerning State Water Agencies some of the language carries over from prior years. In our December, 1982, Annual Meeting the delegates added new language as follows:

We believe Kansas needs a Master Plan for water management. We further believe the Kansas Water Authority is the appropriate entity to develop such a plan and should be directed by the Kansas Legislature to do so. Kansas water planning should promote conservation, and should contemplate far-sighted, well-conceived, and carefully controlled use of international, interstate, and intrastate interbasin transfers of water to benefit agricultural producers and all other Kansans.

Legislation for interbasin transfer of water should require that any applicant must have developed and im-

plemented a water conservation plan before the application gets final approval.

You are moving into uncharted waters as you contemplate interbasin transfers of water. The research paper we prepared for our members in 1982, so that they might examine intrastate interbasin water transfers, told them something you already know: Our Kansas Constitution is silent, as are our statutes when the question of interbasin transfers of water arises. The Kansas Constitution does permit that the state "may be a party to flood control works and works for the conservation or development of water resources." That amendment to the Constitution was proposed by the Legislature in 1957 and adopted by the people of Kansas in 1958. There is a question of constitutionality of intrastate interbasin transfers. Notwithstanding that question, our members through their voting delegates, suggest that Kansas "should contemplate far-sighted, well-conceived, and carefully controlled use of international, interstate, and intrastate interbasin transfers of water."

You will certainly hear from conferees on both sides of this issue. We (Farm Bureau), in cooperation with five other organizations had a very good discussion on interbasin transfers at a "Kansas Water Policy Conference" held in Hutchinson on November 10-11, 1982. At that time, Mr. John C. Peck, Associate Professor of Law at the University of Kansas, spoke on "Legal Constraints on Interbasin Transfers in Kansas." Mr. Peck has written, and reprints are available from the Kansas Law Review (Vol. 30, No. 2, Winter, 1982) on legal constraints on diverting water from Eastern Kansas to Western Kansas.

Knowing many of these "legal problems" to interbasin transfers, our people still . . . to repeat briefly from our resolution . . . suggest that the Legislature should contemplate, as you are, "far-sighted, well-conceived, and carefully controlled use of" interbasin transfers of water to benefit agricultural producers and all other Kansans.

We have this further observation to make concerning SB 62: In Sec. 3, Subsection (c), this legislation establishes the make-up of an interbasin transfer hearing panel. There are but three members on this panel. We would respectfully suggest that there should be unanimous agreement of the three members of the panel prior to recommending an interbasin transfer of water. We suggest that the sentence beginning on line 76 and ending in the middle of line 78 should be amended to read: Any recommendation by the panel for an interbasin transfer of water shall have the unanimous approval of the three panel members.

Surely, something as important as an interbasin transfer of water, when such has not been contemplated previously in Kansas, the three panel members should all agree after hearing the facts. In trial by jury in major cases we expect nothing less than a unanimous verdict from 12 people. We believe all three members of the interbasin transfer hearing panel should agree on a transfer.

We conclude with just a brief observation of American Farm Bureau policy regarding water diversion. Our policy position in that regard states: "We support an international surface water transfer program that would insure the interests of American agriculture."

There have been major studies of international interbasin transfers of water. We have examined a number of those at our various water conferences in the past five years. We have, and would be pleased to make available to this committee a number of papers on the NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance) project, the ROCKY MOUNTAIN PLAN, and others. Your colleague in the Legislature, Representative Keith Farrar, a Republican, has been working closely with Mr. Nicholas Benton of the National Democratic Policy Committee to bring the international water transfer proposals to the attention of members of Congress. We would submit to you that this committee, indeed, the full Kansas Legislature may want to contemplate a resolution memorializing Congress to act

with some dispatch on a project such as NAWAPA that could benefit many millions of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to appear on SB 62.

Soil and Water Conservation

We believe the owners and operators of agricultural land can best be served by a voluntary approach to soil conservation using federal and state cost-sharing funds as an incentive for developing and maintaining farm plans, and constructing and maintaining soil and water conservation structures. We ask the Kansas Legislature to adequately fund the state share of cost-sharing programs.

An intensive educational program conducted by the KSU Agricultural Extension Service, in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service, the Soil Conservation Districts, and county Farm Bureaus, could improve our rangeland and cultural practices on cultivated acres.

State Water Agencies

Water is one of our most precious and important natural resources. All segments of our population and all component parts of our economy require an adequate supply of water.

We will continue to oppose changes in Kansas water laws that would result in major reorganization of state water agencies. We believe that a separation of powers and a system of checks and balances in the administration of water programs gives Kansans a better result than any further consolidation would produce.

The legislature, after rejecting major reorganization, created the Kansas Water Authority to provide coordination, oversight, and review of the programs and budgets of various state agencies which have responsibility for administering water laws.

We believe Kansas needs a Master Plan for water management. We further believe the Kansas Water Authority is the appropriate entity to develop such a plan and should be directed by the Kansas Legislature to do so. Kansas water planning should promote conservation, and should contemplate far-sighted, well-conceived, and carefully controlled use of international, interstate, and intrastate interbasin transfers of water to benefit agricultural producers and all other Kansans.

Legislation for interbasin transfer of water should require that any applicant must have developed and implemented a water conservation plan before the application gets final approval.

Water Districts

We recognize the benefits of Rural Water Districts. Those benefits should be assured by legislation and regulations that guarantee and protect water rights for original rural water district patrons.

We will support legislation—both on a national and state level—that will make funds available for grants to be used in the construction of Rural Water Districts.

We will support legislation—both on a national and state level—that will finance, through federal funds (Farmers Home Administration), Rural Water Districts from watershed structures.

Water Management in Kansas

Kansas farmers and ranchers recognize the importance of securing a Kansas water right as provided by law.

We support the Kansas Ground Water Management District Act, as amended in the 1978 Session of the Kansas Legislature, which gives local water users a voice in determining the use of ground water.

We encourage our members to participate in the organization and management of Ground Water Management Districts. Through participation they will be in a position to have an effective voice in calling for any needed changes, additions or deletions to the Ground Water Management District Act.

Water Quality Standards

We urge the Legislature to make adequate appropriation of funds, to assure that the agency or agencies responsible for issuance of well drilling permits and the maintenance of water quality are enforcing existing statutes and regulations relating to salt water disposal and proper plugging of dry holes.

The Kansas Corporation Commission and the Department of Health and Environment should, prior to giving approval for disposal of salt brines, determine that the proposed method of disposal will assure that there will be no contamination of any fresh water. No well drilled on leased property should be used for disposal of salt water from wells on other property without consent from and compensation to the landowner. The power of eminent domain should NOT be granted for the purpose of salt brine disposal.

We ask that legislation be enacted to require that surface pipes shall be set to a depth sufficient to protect all fresh water formations from contamination.

Watershed Programs

The Kansas Governor and Legislature have recognized the vital need for water storage and flood control to the urban and rural economies of the state. To accelerate development of this program they have established a cost-sharing agreement with organized watersheds and local landowners.

Since there are many urgently needed structures yet to be built in Kansas, and because there have been no new watershed projects undertaken since 1978, we request that this funding, furnished by the state and supervised by the State Conservation Commission, be continued and increased to facilitate and encourage this statewide program.

Planning for new watersheds has been taking 10 to 15 years and complete construction 20 years. To expedite planning and construction we urge the Kansas Legislature to consider permissive legislation authorizing the levy of one mill on the acreage of potential watershed areas for a period no longer than two years for the purpose of creating a trust fund, with the annual interest earned from such trust fund to be used for planning expenses involved in new watershed projects.

Rep. Farrar Has Eyes For Canadian Water

By JOHN PETTERSON
Of Our Topeka Bureau

TOPEKA — Rep. Keith Farrar can foresee the day when western Kansas farmers may irrigate their crops with water from a huge reservoir high in the Canadian Rockies.

The Hugoton Republican and a conservative political action committee based in New York are pressing for congressional authorization of an international water study they hope could result in millions of acre-feet of water for water-starved states with some left over for Mexico.

Farrar and Nicholas Benton of the National Democratic Policy Committee met with U.S. Rep. Pat Roberts, R-Kan., in Dodge City Monday to enlist his aid. They met in Wichita last Tuesday with U.S. Rep. Dan Glickman, D-Kan.

Benton said the major study proposal, estimated to cost in the neighborhood of \$10 million, was developed by the NDPC and a model bill has been readied for introduction in Congress.

ROBERTS SAID it might be time for this country to launch a long-range

● From Page 1B

ern Kansas would cost between \$400 and \$1,500 per acre-foot.

An acre-foot is the amount of water needed to cover one acre to the depth of one foot.

Benton said the international proposal called for a study of the possibility of damming a portion of the Canadian Rockies, forming a 200-mile-long reservoir to be fed by both Alaskan and Canadian waters that otherwise would flow to the sea.

Water from the reservoir would be diverted south through a feeder system of canals, rivers and pipelines to dry states and eventually to Mexico.

Roberts said the proposal had a lot of appeal, particularly if it was able to provide cheap hydroelectric power, assure high production in the farm states and help Mexico develop its agricultural potential.

HELP FOR Mexico might provide jobs for Mexican workers who otherwise migrate to the U.S. There also might be some oil trade-off benefits.

"I'm not saying this is the only way," Farrar said, "but we've got to explore the possibilities."

"I'm not saying this is the only way, but we've got to explore the possibilities."

— Rep. Keith Farrar

water study with some new approaches.

"We just agreed to take a good, hard look at it," Roberts said. "I think it's worth taking a serious look at."

Farrar said Glickman was "well aware that helping the agricultural economy would help Wichita and he agreed it was wishful thinking to take water out of the Missouri (River)."

Benton said the three-country study might have more appeal since it now appears regional studies have failed to come up with cost-effective alternatives.

He said the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' plan to divert water from the Missouri River to western Kansas would be too expensive and too politically explosive to be feasible.

HE SAID THE Corps' "big ditch" approach for providing water to west-

(See KANSAS, 4B, Col. 1)

He asked the High Plains Study Council to endorse the idea but action on the proposal was delayed until studies now under way are completed.

The council consists of six states, including Kansas, that have portions of the Ogallala Aquifer within their boundaries.

Farrar, a member of the council, said, "I don't think we're going to do more than just prove it's going to cost too much to import water from adjacent states. There just isn't that much more water available."

THE LEGISLATOR said he became involved with NDPC after he received a package of material from it outlining the study plan.

"I don't agree with the \$10 million figure," he said. "I don't know if it's too much or not enough, but I agree with the concept. We've got to explore the possibility. If it won't work, it won't work."

In the 1960s, an independent study was prepared that projected that 80 million acre-feet of water per year could be diverted into the lower 48 states from Alaskan and Canadian headwaters.

From the
WICHITA EAGLE
Sept. 1, 1981