

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The meeting was called to order by Representative Ron Fox at
Chairperson

3:30 ~~am~~/p.m. on February 7, 1985 in room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

All members were present.

Committee staff present:

Ramon Powers, Legislative Research
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes' Office
Betty Ellison, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Paul E. Fleenor, Director, Public Affairs Division, Kansas Farm Bureau

Chairman Ron Fox began the meeting by introducing Mr. Paul Fleenor who testified on the proposed State Water Plan as a representative of the Kansas Farm Bureau. Mr. Fleenor called attention to his written testimony which included a statement of the policy positions of the Farm Bureau. (Attachment 1) He expressed his organization's approval of the water plan in general, but noted some concerns, particularly regarding the minimum desirable streamflows section of the plan.

Chairman Fox called attention to written testimony from the Northwest Kansas Groundwater Management District No. 4, Colby, Kansas (Attachment 2) and comments of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce. (Attachment 3) A motion was made by Representative Grotewiel and seconded by Representative Ott that those be incorporated into the minutes. Motion carried.

Representative Ott moved that a resolution for a feasibility study on the Cheyenne Bottoms be introduced as a committee. Representative Sughrue seconded the motion. It was noted that this resolution would be referred back to committee. Motion carried.

Representative Ott made a motion to introduce as a committee and refer back to committee a bill dealing with 24 hour fishing licenses. The motion was seconded by Representative Sutter. Motion carried.

Representative Guldner moved to introduce a bill to raise the vendor fee for out-of-state hunting and fishing licenses. Representative Barr seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Representative Ott moved that House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 RS 0772 relating to the State Water Plan be introduced and sent to the House floor. Representative Sutter seconded the motion. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Representative Ott to pass favorably House Bill 2099, which would adopt the State Water Plan as a planning process. The motion was seconded by Representative Grotewiel. During brief discussion, Chairman Fox explained that adopting this bill would provide for an annual review process of the state water planning document and that the committee would be endorsing generally the concept of the State water plan. Motion carried.

Next in the order of business, the minutes of January 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30 and 31 were adopted.

Representative Barr made a motion to introduce a committee bill which would set up an advisory committee on regulation of groundwater

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
room 313-S, Statehouse, at 3:30 ~~am~~ p.m. on February 7, 19 85

activities. The motion was seconded by Representative Heinemann.
Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

The next meeting of the House Energy and Natural Resources Committee will be held on February 11, 1985 at 3:30 p.m. in Room 527-S.

Statement To
HOUSE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

RE: State Water Plan
February 7, 1985
Topeka, Kansas

Presented By
Paul E. Fleener, Director
Public Affairs Division
Kansas Farm Bureau

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

We appreciate the opportunity to make some observations on the very important issue before your committee - the State Water Plan. Farmers and ranchers have a vital interest in water law and water planning in this state. We use much water. It is a part of the farming and ranching operation through irrigation and in other means of crop and livestock production.

We commend and applaud the efforts of the Kansas Water Office and the Kansas Water Authority for the development of the document which has been so thoroughly studied by your committee. It has been a difficult path over the course of two years to arrive at the document before you called now the Kansas Water Plan. To its credit, the Kansas Water Office has gone to the public to seek input and has made numerous modifications of the Water Plan to accommodate the needs of all of our citizens in a framework of planning for the future of this state to meet water needs.

Attached to our statement, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, you will find policy positions relating to water which were adopted at the December, 1984, annual meeting of Kansas Farm Bureau. Those statements range from soil and water conservation

Attachment 1 -- 2/7/85
Energy and Natural Resources

through watershed programs. Some of the things we would share with you today, topics of the Kansas Water Plan, are addressed as legislative and regulatory concerns by our members.

There are 65 recommendations advanced with the Kansas Water Plan, recommendations in four major areas: management, conservation, quality, and development. There is perhaps no more important recommendation among the 65 than that which relates to basin planning. The Water Office and the Kansas Water Authority has incorporated in this version of the Kansas Water Plan the concept of planning in 12 clearly delineated and indentifiable basins of major rivers and their tributaries.

Foremost in the minds of our people, farmers and ranchers who took the time to go to the public input meetings when the Water Plan was being developed, is maintaining local input as basin plans are developed. It is clear that the local input, the citizen input, has brought this Plan to you today with some general agreement of the programs and concepts embodied therein. It should also be clear that in the on-going process of planning for utilization, conservation and development of our water resources that those entities which have some responsibility for managing our water such as groundwater management districts, watershed districts and others should continue to play an important role in the process. This Water Plan contains yet another opportunity for citizen input through basin advisory committees. That is one of the major strengths of this Water Plan and we appreciate its inclusion.

In order to utilize this time wisely with you we would take time only to point out two or three items in our adopted policy positions. Prior to doing that we would indicate that our reading of the 65 recommendations contained in the Water Plan would lead us to believe that 26 of the recommendations require no legislation whatsoever. Other recommendations require modest change or amendment to existing statutes. Still other recommendations chart a new course and will require the serious consideration of the full Legislature for enactment of new legislation. There are, two, recommendations which call for expenditure of money . . . in many instances an investment for citizens living in Kansas today and those who will succeed us in future generations of Kansans.

We firmly believe that the state has a role in some of the cost-sharing programs for soil and water conservation. We urge those investments to be made. We have supported the development of this Plan. We think there should be additional planning for transfers where those can be shown as feasible and always to have a strong conservation ethic in the water related activities of this state.

We have new language in one of our resolutions that very strongly speaks to one portion of the State Water Plan as it relates to "minimum desirable streamflows." That language I would like to share with you at this time. Our members said in the policy adopted last December: "We recognize the need for reasonable standards to protect and maintain the quality of our surface waters and groundwater. We are not convinced that establishment

of "minimum desirable streamflows" is the solution to water quality problems. We believe additional study of the economic and environmental impact of legislation or regulation requiring minimum streamflow is necessary. We oppose additional minimum streamflow designations until such studies are completed."

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, farmers and ranchers will stand ready at any time to be participants in a reasonable plan for the use of water. They will also call into question those items which appear to be unreasonable, unstudied, or inappropriate for the economic and environmentally sound condition they strive daily to protect and enhance through their farming and ranching operations.

We encourage this Committee and the Legislature to give a clear signal to the Kansas Water Office and to the Kansas Water Authority that you approve in general terms the Kansas Water Plan presented to you. In the appropriate ways that you will deal with this document it should be remembered that it is only a document and it can become a live and vital part of our state and the development of the resources of our state if it is considered only a process and not an end-product. Therefore we urge you to send that clear signal, that, yes you like what you've seen so far but you want that process to go on and you want the citizens of this state to be involved in the process for the management, development and conservation of the water resources of this state.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

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.

We believe KDOT and county highway departments should require that highway construction procedures are conducted in such a way that soil conservation practices are implemented. We further believe pipeline companies, as well as electric and telephone utilities, should be required to preserve and replace top soil, and to reseed those portions of native grass pastures disturbed during construction of underground facility projects.

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.

State Water Policy

We support development of a State Water Plan for Kansas. We believe the Kansas Water Authority should have responsibility for development of the State Water Plan. The Authority should be the agency for water management in Kansas.

The State Water Plan should promote conservation of water by all users. It should also contain far-sighted, well-conceived, and carefully controlled use of international, interstate, and intrastate transfers of water to benefit agricultural producers and all other Kansans.

We urge the KWA to incorporate into the State Water Plan a strong conservation ethic, and methodology for recycling water to extend the life of this limited resource.

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. Irrigation wells within a GWMD should not be subject to "user fees."

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 recognize the need for reasonable standards to protect and maintain the quality of our surface waters and groundwater. We are not convinced that establishment of "minimum desirable streamflows" is the solution to water quality problems. We believe additional study of the economic and environmental impact of legislation or regulation requiring minimum streamflow is necessary. We oppose additional minimum streamflow designations until such studies are completed.

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

There are many urgently needed watershed structures yet to be built in Kansas. We request that funding for those structures, furnished by the state and supervised by the State Conservation Commission, be increased to facilitate and encourage this statewide program.

In order to expedite planning and construction of watersheds, 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.



**NORTHWEST KANSAS
GROUNDWATER
MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT NO. 4**

1175 South Range Avenue
P.O. Box 905
Colby, Kansas 67701-0905
Phone: (913) 462-3915

January 29, 1985

Representative Ron Fox, Chairman
House Energy & Natural Resources Committee
Room 525 South, State House
Topeka, KS 66612

RE: Testimony on State Water Plan

Dear Representative Fox:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of Northwest Kansas Groundwater Management District No. 4, please accept the following testimony into the hearing record concerning the State Water Plan.

We would object to what appears to us to be a recent change in the Quality Section, Oil and Gas Regulatory Program subsection.

It was our understanding that as a result of testimony given during the 2 public hearings held in early November, 1984, attention to the impacts of existing and historical activity was to be considered by the Kansas Water Office during the next planning cycle (refer to minutes of November, 1984 Kansas Water Authority meeting in Wichita, Kansas).

Upon a motion at the December Authority meeting, this idea was in fact changed to read "expansion of the scope of the program should be examined in more detail in a future planning cycle, by the Kansas Corporation Commission, and Kansas Department of Health and Environment!"

Not only do we feel that the KDH&E or KCC should not be authoring this important subsection, but also that they now have bought additional years to prepare the plan at their discretion. The original wording is much more appropriate in order to address the pressing issues in a more timely manner.

Regarding the Development section, Basin Planning subsection. This part indicates that "Basin Planning must involve the active participation of local entities to assure that plans are developed which are responsive to local and regional water needs!" Should there be some clearer language in this section regarding the interaction and involvement level of the advisory groups? We bring this up because a recent discussion with a Kansas Water Office staff member indicated that the agency's most current idea was to have the Kansas Water Office develop the planning documents and have the advisory groups review and critique them. This, to some, does not mean active participation

Attachment 2 -- 2/7/85
Energy and Natural Resources

"Planning for Our Most Precious Resource"

in the development of these plans. This may be a minor point, but without a clearer picture, the broad nature of the subsection allows quite a bit of flexibility in how the Kansas Water Office perceives and reacts to the various basin advisory committees.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Wayne A. Bossert
Manager
Groundwater Management
District No. 4

WAB:pab

cc: Board of Directors
Joseph Harkins



WICHITA

AREA
CHAMBER
OF
COMMERCE

COMMENTS REGARDING THE

State Water Plan -

January 1985 Final Draft

Prepared by The

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

February 4, 1985

Attachment 3 -- 2/7/85
Energy and Natural Resources

POSITION REGARDING THE
STATE WATER PLAN
FINAL DRAFT
JANUARY 1985

Water in the state of Kansas is a vital but scarce resource. Consumption is increasing while supplies are being depleted or endangered by salt or other mineral intrusion. It is incumbent upon State Government, Legislators and the citizenry to effectively and efficiently manage existing water resources in the state and to plan now for the development of additional water supplies to meet future needs.

For these reasons, the City of Wichita, Sedgwick County and the Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce prepared a joint resolution and position paper on the State Water Plan in February 1984. Since then, we have reviewed each revision of the Plan, providing comments to the Kansas Water Office. Our objective has been to assist in preparing the best Plan for the state.

At the November 9, 1984 public hearing in Topeka, we provided preliminary comments conceptually supporting the proposed Plan with four provisions. The provisions were:

1. Final comments would be submitted in written form following review of the revised Plan.
2. Progress not be delayed in developing the water solution for the Wichita/Sedgwick County area, or other critical areas of the state, in event the Plan is not approved by the 1985 Legislature or in event other detailed basin plans are not completed in a timely manner.
3. State funding would be provided to assist in preparation of detailed basin plans including necessary research. Funding should be provided to local entities and the local Basin Advisory Committees should have primary responsibility for preparation of the detailed Basin plans, with oversight, review and coordination by the Kansas Water Office.
4. A common data base and research methodology should be established, including use of existing information where appropriate, for use in preparing the twelve detailed basin plans, as well as in determining future resource needs.

A number of comments were also provided regarding individual sections of the Plan.

We have now reviewed the Final Draft of the Plan. Many of our earlier comments are still valid, including the provisions noted

above. Following are comments summarizing our position and recommendations, much of which is repeated from earlier positions.

A. Overall Comments

1. The format of the Final Draft is excellent. Including statutory authority, background information, a review of concepts and alternatives, as well as financial and scheduling considerations greatly assists in its review. The Kansas Water Office and Kansas Water Authority is to be commended for its work in developing the Plan to its current state.
2. The Plan in its current form places extensive responsibilities at local levels while expanding state government personnel as well as shifting considerable authority to the state level. An accurate count of newly created state positions cannot be determined nor can a total estimate be made of the total plan cost. A ten year cost estimate by Plan section is included as Attachment A and totals more than \$54 million. This amount does not consider new resource costs, research activities, federal and local funds, incremental increases as suggested in many sections of the Plan, and several sections for which cost estimates were not provided.

While we continue to support the concept of a State Water Plan, we have become most concerned about the financial impact the proposed Plan has upon the state as a whole. We recommend thorough review to avoid excessive administrative and personnel cost commitments.

3. The Plan places considerable emphasis on small lake development and meeting future water needs of small communities in the state. Equal emphasis should be placed on all future water needs utilizing consistent policies.
4. The composition of Basin Advisory Committees must be consistent with primary water needs while considering basin demographics. The process of committee member selection must also permit these considerations to be achieved.

B. Management Section

1. Large Reservoir Management

We recommend the purchase now of all available suitable water in existing federal reservoirs, to avoid price escalation. Purchasing storage only if an ultimate user

commits to that storage is short sighted in view of overall long term state needs. This policy is also inconsistent with the Multipurpose Small Lakes Program under which the state will develop small lakes in cases where a local entity is either "unable or unwilling to assume the financial obligations."

2. New Reservoirs

The Kansas Water Office is to be commended for its proposal to finance new reservoirs without federal participation. We would also recommend as a part of the New Reservoirs policy the purchase of flowage easements to prevent continued economic development in the proposed reservoir area once a reservoir site has been selected. This action can avoid cost escalation and increased opposition to the dam construction.

Legislative action is suggested to repeal K.S.A. 82a-938 in order to rank order projects. Before repeal is pursued, a thorough review must be made of the impact of such action on the continuing development of authorized reservoirs, such as the Corbin and Douglass reservoirs, which may have "grandfather" financial benefits from either state or federal governments.

A rank ordering of projects must be developed through the basin planning process. We reiterate that this approach must not delay progress in developing the solution for the Wichita/Sedgwick area, nor delay any other area in the state where a critical need exists. Additionally, Wichita/Sedgwick County, or any other area, must not be penalized if other basin plans are not submitted in a timely manner.

3. Water Marketing

A policy recommendation is made in the Plan to market M&I water for short term irrigation purposes. This policy, if approved, may result in long term conflicts once a precedent is set. Timing of irrigation needs may not be compatible with municipal supply needs, and therefore, be contrary to public interest. The policy deserves thorough consideration but should not be approved if any doubt exists as to its long term impact. Also, irrigation use may require re-authorization by Congress. State efforts could best be exercised in purchasing existing federal storage to meet future needs, rather than seeking re-authorization of existing water under state control.

We support the graduated use schedule since it is consistent with the current marketing program and

provides an important incentive for prospective water purchasers.

4. Large Reservoir Finance

We support a revenue bond financing approach to develop needed new reservoirs. The proposed savings account will assist in development so long as funds are sufficient to develop future reservoirs. Funds should be co-mingled into one account while being segregated for either the conservation fund or the "savings account" to ensure the lowest possible interest rate on state projects.

5. Multipurpose Small Lakes Program

The emphasis placed on the small lakes program is disproportionate to the benefits it may potentially offer. On-going management of small lakes will be the responsibility of local governments, some of which may lack financial ability or expertise. Development of numerous small lakes could result in health and financial burdens for the state.

The Plan remains vague on the definition of a small lake. This should be clarified.

State participation is extensive even if potential users are "unable or unwilling to assume financial obligations." Yet, signed contracts must exist before any existing federal storage may be purchased or new large reservoirs may receive state financial assistance. These policies are inconsistent and do not provide equity for all water users in the state.

An alternative to the small lakes program may be to purchase existing federal storage and construct pipelines to areas of need. Also, we recommend the state conduct a cost/benefit analysis of all possible solutions before proceeding with any small lake development.

6. Minimum Desirable Stream Flows

Minimum stream flows are desirable so long as water is available for release and a higher priority for water use does not exist. Flows must be based on historic data for each stream to best ensure the perpetuation of the native environment. Water taken from streams anywhere along alluvial corridors must be allocated and purchased by the taker, including any increased amount of water released for maintenance of minimum stream flows.

Water supply, according to the Plan, is the major consideration for future reservoir projects. Minimum stream flows must be a secondary consideration and should not preclude continuing development of proposed water supply projects. Potential projects on the Rattlesnake Creek and Ninnescah River are two examples.

7. Urban Flood Management

Flood plain management and regulation are generally accepted as the most effective ways to prevent future urban flood damages. In Kansas, the major tool for flood plain management is the NFIP. The federal role is diminishing and NFIP has already identified and mapped all urban flood plains where the risk of damage is significant. Thus, little can be gained by extending the mapping. The NFIP offers subsidized flood insurance to all residents of communities which participate and threatens sanctions against residents of communities which do not. Reactivating a State Coordinator could be a powerful force in assisting communities to complete detailed studies when needed and in advocating that results of those studies be accepted by and made part of the regulatory data base of the NFIP. We question whether or not this section should be in the Plan.

8. Rural Flood Management

The three policy issues mentioned are directed toward land improvement activities initiated by the federal government as part of its soil conservation program and are not flood management issues. We question whether or not this section should be in the Plan.

9. Local Planning Policy

We support the Basin Advisory Committees with representation consistent with the primary water needs within each basin, while considering the demographic makeup of each Basin. Basin Advisory Committees should work in coordination with the Kansas Water Office staff and other local officials. The emphasis should be on local development and planning rather than state direction.

This approach requires the Kansas Water Office to:

- a. Coordinate local planning activities between basins.
- b. Provide technical data as needed from a common research data base.
- c. Monitor the Basin Advisory Committee's activities, providing guidance and other assistance as needed to ensure coordination.
- d. Be in a facilitating rather than lead role.

Since the State Water Plan mandates creation of Basin Advisory Boards and requires the formulation of basin water plans, it seems reasonable the State should provide financial assistance. The financial assistance should be directed to appropriate local entities to enable them to complete the planning process. This assistance would include consultant services, if needed.

Basin Advisory Committees should also have major responsibilities in recommending specific research projects in their basins to facilitate long term water resource planning. State funding for local research should be made available to Basin Advisory Committees, as needed.

We support submittal of basin plans for legislative approval in 1987. The state must recognize that only partial plans may be available from each basin since less than two years will be available for plan preparation.

10. Research

We support the emphasis placed on research as it is the foundation of successful basin planning. We encourage use of a common data base and research methodology for all basin plans. Selection of an existing methodology recognized by various planning groups would be appropriate, rather than developing a new approach. We support the suggestion in the Plan for research into technologies to improve ground water quality for domestic use and research into mineral intrusion problems associated with the Ninnescah River and Rattlesnake Creek.

C. Conservation Section

1. Agricultural, Municipal and Industrial Water Conservation

Conservation programs for irrigators, municipalities and industries are needed. The Kansas Water Office should establish guidelines while permitting voluntary plan selection and development at local levels. The Kansas Water Office should be responsible for enforcement of conservation plans for water purchased from the state rather than the Chief Engineer. If state water is not involved, local governments should have this responsibility.

Metering should be required for agricultural, municipal, and industrial uses. The 50% cost sharing program for industries and irrigators should encourage additional metering for improved water management. A similar

program should exist for municipalities to encourage more efficient management of all water resources.

Conservation programs should also be required for water obtained from the multipurpose small lakes program.

The Plan currently suggests voluntary or mandatory conservation programs as the only options. In times of sever conditions, pricing controls may be more effective and acceptable to users rather than mandatory rationing.

D. Quality Section

1. Overview of Existing Policy

Water quality is the responsibility of the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. We support the overall concept of the quality section which is to recommend new policies as possible additions to the Water Quality Management Plan, rather than duplicating existing legislation and regulation.

2. Organic Chemicals in Public Drinking Water

We support monitoring water for priority pollutants in order to preserve or improve the quality of water in the state. We are concerned, particularly as it relates to small communities, with costs for the volume and frequency of testing and possible corrective action should a problem be identified.

3. Public Water Supply Protection Plan for Small Water Impoundments

The multipurpose small lakes program has the potential of developing health, management and financial burdens for the state. Protection of existing and future small lakes is important. Land use around public water supplies should be at the direction of local governments following generally accepted land use practices. Control of the potential sources of surface water contamination will be difficult. We recommend thorough review of possible approaches before policy implementation.

4. Public Water Supply Aquifer Protection Plan

Aquifer protection is important. Land use around public aquifers should be at the direction of local governments following generally accepted land use practices. Control of the potential sources of ground water contamination will be difficult. We recommend thorough review of possible approaches before policy implementation.

5. Oil and Gas Regulatory Program

A number of state geologists are currently on staff with oil and gas responsibilities. We recommend utilizing existing personnel to accomplish the intent of this section.

6. Countywide Water/Wastewater Management Plans

We support the policy recommendation except that all counties should prepare plans not just those with population in excess of 30,000. Storm water should be excluded from the management plans.

7. New Subdivision Water/Wastewater Plan

It is appropriate that local units of government have control over the certification process as it relates to wastewater management and new subdivisions. Jurisdictions which presently have zoning ordinances and subdivision regulation may wish to incorporate a section which would assure the protection of water quality. The State could certify the local regulations and review procedures under which the individual plats are received, reviewed and approved.

In rural counties and small communities without zoning and subdivision controls, state assistance may be necessary to develop a review and control system for ensuring that new development does not have an adverse impact on water quality.

8. A State Groundwater Information System

We support this policy recommendation as it compliments the section on Research. Data obtained must have a practical application rather than the gathering of statistics. Other comments included in the Research section are also appropriate.

9. Mineral Intrusion

Use of \$7 million in federal funds is recommended in the Plan, and the U.S. Geological Survey is extensively involved in the state. In view of this, research and development assistance should be obtained from the U.S. Geological Survey in addition to the Kansas Geological Survey.

E. Development Section

1. Basin Planning

Local planning is essential for effective and meaningful basin plans to be developed. In this regard, our comments in the Local Planning Policy section are appropriate. Planning guidelines are essential so that each basin utilizes common methodologies and data.

2. Lower Arkansas Basin

We agree with and support the seven issues presented. Additional research is needed into mineral intrusion affecting the Norwich and Kingman sites. While considerable water exists in the overall basin, the plan acknowledges that much of it has quality problems and also that Sedgwick County has an immediate need for a new major resource such as the Corbin Reservoir and/or the Milford Pipeline project. The Douglass Lake project has been proposed to meet water needs primarily of rural and small town residents in a three county area and, as such, should be listed in the Walnut Basin section. We retain an interest in the project and will continue to be active in supporting its development.

ATTACHMENT A

STATE WATER PLAN COSTS

SOURCE: JANUARY 1985 FINAL DRAFT

<u>Section</u>	<u>First Year</u>	<u>Ongoing Annual Costs</u>	<u>Special Project Costs</u>	<u>10 Year Plan Cost</u>
Southeast Kansas-Mining Pollution		TBD		TBD
Large Reservoir Management	35,000	136,000		1,295,000
New Reservoirs		TBD		TBD
Water Marketing		(4)		(4)
Large Reservoir Finance		TBD		TBD
Multipurpose Small Lakes Program		TBD		TBD
Minimum Desirable Streamflows		221,000		2,210,000
Urban Flood Management		35,000	150,000/YR	1,850,000
Rural Flood Management	1,700,000	1,700,000 (3)		17,000,000
Local Planning Policy Research		30,000		300,000
Agricultural Water Conservation	650,000	600,000 (3) +450,000		10,100,000
Municipal Water Conservation	75,000	115,000		1,100,000
Industrial Water Conservation		185,000		1,850,000
Organic Chemicals in Public Drinking Water	150,000	100,000		1,150,000
Public Water Supply Aquifer Protection Plan for Small Water Impoundments		11,000		110,000
Public Water Supply Aquifer Protection Plan		11,000		110,000
Agricultural Runoff	640,000	640,000 (3)		6,400,000
Oil and Gas Regulatory Program		800,000		8,000,000
Countywide Water/Wastewater Management Plans			700,000	700,000
New Subdivision Water and Wastewater Plans		40,000		400,000
A State Groundwater Information System		40,000	300,000	700,000
Mineral Intrusion		<u>100,000</u>	\$7M (Federal)	<u>1,000,000</u>
TOTAL		\$5,214,000		\$54,275,000

- NOTES:
- (1) COSTS FOR NEW RESOURCES, RESEARCH, MINING POLLUTION AND FEDERAL AND LOCAL FUNDS ARE NOT INCLUDED.
 - (2) "TBD": COST TO BE DETERMINED
 - (3) INCREMENTAL INCREASES ARE RECOMMENDED IN THE PLAN.
 - (4) COULD GENERATE REVENUES TO OFFSET OTHER PLAN COSTS.
 - (5) THE "SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS" REPORT LISTS COSTS WHICH IN SOME CASES VARY TO THOSE LISTED IN THE FULL PLAN.
 - (6) \$7 MILLION FEDERAL MONEY FOR MINERAL INTRUSION IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE 10 YEAR PLAN COST.