

Approved March 8, 1961
Date

Joint
House and
MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Transportation

The meeting was called to order by Senator Bill Morris at
Chairperson

9:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on August 18, 1961 in room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Herman Dillon

Committee staff present:

Hank Avila, Legislative Research
Robin Hunn, Legislative Research
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research
Bruce Kinzie, Revisor of Statutes

Louise Cunningham, Committee Secretary
Donna Mulligan, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

U. S. Congressman Bob Whittaker
Ed Roitz, Pittsburg, Kansas
Don Munsell, Parsons, Kansas
Stan Stewart, El Dorado, Kansas
Stephen Funk, El Dorado, Kansas
Glen Coulter, Kansas Contractors
Paul Fleenor, Kansas Farm Bureau
Don Willoughby, IBP, Inc.
Gail Stout, Independence, Kansas
Dr. John Connelly, Pittsburg, Kansas
Emerson Lynn, Iola Register
Paul Sasse, S.E. Ks. Cities Coalition
Bud Grant, KCCI, Topeka, Kansas
Jon Jossierand, Wichita, Kansas
Richard Becker, Lenexa, Kansas
Robert Bennett, Overland, Park, Ks.
Clayton Connell, Fredonia, Kansas
Jay Westervelt, Parsons, Kansas
Henry Boaten, Topeka, Kansas
Dr. Warren Thomas, Coffeyville, Ks.
Jesse Jackson, Chanute, Kansas
Rep. William Bryant, Washington, Kansas
Bob Knight, Wichita, Kansas
Mark Schroeder, Sedgwick County, Kansas
Paul Dugan, Wichita, Kansas
Terry Scanlon, Wichita, Kansas
Bob Goebel, Wichita, Kansas
Betsy Langston Gwin, Wichita, Kansas

Bob Bradford, Wichita, Kansas
Mayor Doug Wright, Topeka, Kansas
Tom Pickford, Topeka, Kansas
Christy Young, Topeka, Kansas
Al Tikwart, Westwood Hills, Kansas
Stanley Basler, Coffeyville, Kansas
Art Collins, Northwest Passage
Highway Coalition
Dr. Jack Walker, Lt. Governor
Mark Mingenback, Great Bend, Kans
Edward Minges, Barton Cty., Kansa
Bob McCurdy, Russell, Kansas
Dick Nichols, McPherson, Kansas
Leland Flint, Pratt, Kansas
Al Goering, Neodesha, Kansas
Don Laird, Garden City, Kansas
Gerry Petty, Manhattan, Kansas
John Sherwood, Oswego, Kansas
William Wycoff, Altamont, Kansas
Ted Barkley, Arkansas City, Kansas
J. D. Baumgardner, Oswego, Kansas
Calvin Thomas, Parsons, Kansas
Charlie Hostetter, Manhattan, Kansas
Ron Gaches, Boeing Company
Shelby Smith, Economic Lifelines
Brenda Manske, Southeast Kansas
Tourism Region, Inc.
Clyde Townsend, Wyandotte, Kansas

The meeting was called to order by Senator Bill Morris. It was announced that the proponents of Governor Mike Hayden's highway program would be allowed to testify.

U. S. Congressman Bob Whittaker, Fifth District, Kansas, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. He said it is important to the future of Kansas to develop new and improved highways which are vital to a strong economy.

Congressman Whittaker said that young people are leaving Kansas due to lack of employment, and with the implementation of the highway program, new jobs would be created. He cited the particular need for a super-highway in southeast Kansas, which is economically depressed.

Congressman Whittaker said that new highways in Kansas would greatly enhance the safety, as well as the future, of generations to come.

CONTINUATION SHEET

Joint
House and
MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Transportation,
room 313-S, Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m.~~pm~~ on August 18, 1987

Mr. Edward J. Roitz, Pittsburg, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 1)

Mr. Don Munsell, Mid-America, Inc., Parsons, Kansas, presented testimony supporting Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 2)

Mr. Stan Stewart, City Manager, El Dorado, Kansas, testified in favor of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Mr. Stephen Funk, President, El Dorado Chamber of Commerce, El Dorado, Kansas, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. Mr. Funk stated Highway 254 is a major link between Wichita and El Dorado, and is heavily traveled by tourists. He expressed concern that Highway 254 should be widened in the interest of safety.

Mr. Glen Coulter, Kansas Contractors Association, Topeka, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's Highway program. (See Attachment 3)

Mr. Paul Fleenor, Kansas Farm Bureau, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 4)

Mr. Don Willoughby, IBP, Inc., Dakota City, Nebraska, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 5)

Mr. Gail Stout, Independence Area Chamber of Commerce, Independence, Kansas, testified in favor of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 6)

Dr. John Connelly, Pittsburg Area Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg, Kansas, gave favorable testimony concerning Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 7)

Mr. Emerson Lynn, Editor, Iola Register, Iola, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 8)

Mr. Paul Sasse, Southeast Kansas Cities Coalition, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 9)

Mr. Bud Grant, Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Topeka, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 10)

Mr. Jon Jossierand, Wichita Chamber of Commerce, Wichita, Kansas, testified in favor of Governor Hayden's highway program. He said the Chamber of Commerce supports the adoption of an aggressive highway plan.

Mr. Richard Becker, Mayor, Lenexa, Kansas, spoke in favor of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Mr. Robert Bennett, former Governor of Kansas, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Mr. Clayton Connell, Fredonia Chamber of Commerce, Fredonia, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 11)

CONTINUATION SHEET

Joint
House and
MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Transportation,
room 313-S, Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. ~~xxx~~ on August 18, 19 87

Mr. Jay Westervelt, Parsons, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 12)

Mr. Henry Boaten, Association of Disadvantaged Enterprises, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. He requested that if a highway program is adopted in Kansas, a certain percentage of the contracts be awarded to minority companies.

Dr. Warren Thomas, Coffeyville, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 13)

Mr. Jesse Jackson, Chanute, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program.

The afternoon portion of the meeting was chaired by Representative Rex Crowell.

Representative William M. Bryant, D.V.M., testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 14)

Mr. Bob Knight, Mayor, Wichita, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 15)

Mr. Mark Schroeder, Sedgwick County, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 16)

Mr. Paul Dugan, Wichita, Kansas, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. He urged that the highway plan be adopted as proposed.

Mr. Terry Scanlon, Publisher of the Wichita Business Journal, Wichita, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 17)

Mr. Bob Goebel, Wichita, Kansas, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. He expressed a concern for safety, and urged that the highway plan be adopted. Mr. Goebel added that there has been a loss in business due to poor roads in and out of Wichita.

Ms. Betsy Langston Gwin, Wichita Metropolitan Area Board of Realtors, Wichita, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 18)

Mr. Robert W. Bradford, Wichita Engineering Association, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 19)

Mr. Doug Wright, Mayor, Topeka, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 20)

Mr. Tom Pickford, Director of Public Works, Topeka, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's Highway program. (See Attachment 21)

Ms. Christy Young, Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce, Topeka, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 22)

Mr. Al W. Tikwart, Jr. Mayor, Westwood Hills, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 23)

CONTINUATION SHEET

Joint
House and
Senate
MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON Transportation,
room 313-S, Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m./~~pm~~ on August 18, 1987

Mr. Stanley L. Basler, Coffeyville, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 24)

Mr. Arthur J. Collins, Northwest Passage Highway Coalition, Hutchinson, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 25 and 26)

Dr. Jack Walker, Lt. Governor, State of Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. He reviewed the Governor's Task Force report, and stated he endorses a major highway program in Kansas.

Mr. Mark Mingenback, Mid-Kansas Economic Development Commission, Great Bend, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 27)

Mr. Edward Minges, Barton County Community College, Great Bend, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 28)

Testimony from Ms. Wendy Schiappa, Manhattan Chamber of Commerce, Manhattan, Kansas, was distributed among Committee members. (See Attachment 29) She did not appear as a conferee.

Mr. Robert I. McCurdy, Russell Highway Task Force, Russell, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 30)

Mr. Dick Nichols, Kansas Bankers Association, Mc Pherson, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 31)

Mr. Leland Flint, Flint Sales & Service, Inc., Pratt, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 32)

Mr. Al Goering, Neodesha, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Mr. Don Laird, Garden City, spoke in favor of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Mr. Gerry Petty, Manhattan, Kansas, spoke in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 33)

Mr. John D. Sherwood, Oswego, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 34)

Mr. William M. Wyckoff, Labette County State Bank, Altamont, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 35)

Mr. Ted Barkley, Arkansas City, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 36)

Mr. J. D. Baumgardner, Oswego, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 37)

CONTINUATION SHEET

Joint
House and
MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Transportation

room 313-S, Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. ~~p.m.~~ on August 18, 1987

Mr. Calvin Thomas, Parsons Chamber of Commerce, Parsons, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 38)

Mr. Charles Hostetler, Manhattan, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Mr. Ron Gaches, Boeing Military Airplane Company, Wichita, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 39)

Mr. Shelby Smith, Economic Lifelines, Inc., Wichita, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program.

Ms. Brenda M. Manske, Southeast Kansas Tourism Region, Inc., testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 40)


Mr. Clyde A. Townsend, Board of County Commissions, Kansas City, Kansas, testified in support of Governor Hayden's highway program. (See Attachment 41)

Testimony in support of Governor Hayden's highway program was distributed among Committee members from Mr. Fred D. Allen, Kansas Association of Counties. Mr. Allen did not appear as a conferee. (See Attachment 42)

Testimony in support of Governor Hayden's highway program was distributed among Committee members from Mr. William M. Henry, Kansas Engineering Society. Mr. Henry did not appear as a conferee. (See Attachment 43)


The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Approved:



Representative Rex Crowell
Chairman, House Transportation
Committee

Approved;



Senator Bill Morris
Chairman, Senate
Transportation Committee

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Ken Bahr	Topeka	Shawnee City Hwy Coal
Paul Sasse	Independence	City of Independence
KEVIN GORCATSON	TOPEKA	Pro. Const. Eng.
LARRY HULSE	MANHATTAN	City of MANHATTAN
Jerry E. Petty	"	"
DALE PALER	INDEPENDENCE	CITY OF INDEP.
TED BARKLEY	ARKANSAS CITY	CITY OF ARKANSAS CITY <small>ALL OF ARKANSAS COUNTY</small>
Al Rush	Topeka	Gov. Office
Dennis J. Avery	Arkansas City	Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Gallen	Neotoma, Ks	
EMERSON Lynn	Topeka, Kansas	Folk Register
DOU MUNSELI	PARSONS, KS	MID-AMERICA INC.
Stan Stewart	El Dorado Ks	City of El Dorado
Ed Macchar	Topeka	League of Ks Municipalities
David L. Corbin	Topeka	" "
Craig Grant	Topeka	K-NEA
Tom Whitaker	Topeka	Ks Motor Carriers Assn
John D. VanMorden	Pittsburg	City of Pittsburg
Virginia Wilbest	✓	
Alan E. Sims	Overland Park	City of Overland Park
Mike Germand	Topeka	Ks Railroad Association
Ed Laungrader	Parsons	Southwest Ks Reg Plan
Jay Westinwell	Parsons	Parsons Chamber
J. William Orr	Parsons	Chamber of Commerce
Timothy Orr	Parsons	Cete
Leroy Hoy	2015 Lakin	Great Bend, Ks
Frank Eaton	Manhattan	Mid Ks Econ. Dev. Chamber of Comm.

COMM: House Transportation

DATE: 8-18-

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
AL GOERING	Neodesha	City of Neodesha
R.S. Delmotte P.E.	Wichita 1	Wichita Co. Kansas
Bill Denny	Topeka	KS Engineering Society
Willie Martin	Wichita	Sedgewick Co
Marla Howard	Wichita	City of Wichita
Mary Kelly	Cherryvale	Montgomery County Agricultural
Don Mueller	Parsons	KPL Gas Service
John W. Skuwood	Oswego, Kansas	City of Oswego
T.M. PICKFORD	TOPEKA, KS.	SHAWNEE CO.
XXXXXXXXXX	KANSAS XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
Ed Yeager	Topeka	Yeager & Co
Ken R. ...	Topeka	KS Consulting Eng
John Botterly	Topeka	Eco. L. Fulmer
Bill Denny	Topeka	KS Engineering

[Large handwritten scribbles and a signature in a circle at the bottom of the page.]



**TESTIMONY BEFORE THE
JOINT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**
August 18, 1987

Mister Chairman, and Members of the Joint Transportation Committee,
I am grateful for this opportunity to present my testimony in support of the
Comprehensive Kansas Highway Program.

I testify today not only in my official capacity with the City of
Pittsburg, having served both in the local and State levels of government,
but as a lifelong citizen of Southeast Kansas.

I strongly support Governor Hayden's effort to make this highway
proposal a reality. Only a unified commitment from all of us in Kansas to
bring a highway project to passage, benefits not only those along and in
the affected areas, but all Kansans.

What we have been discussing for several years, and are discussing
here today, is an investment. An investment that stands to increase all
economic activity in the State. This includes the construction jobs needed
to actually build the highways and bridges, and also gives the communities
an added tool in which to work towards helping themselves in economic
development and investment in which to add to their jobs base.

The State of Kansas can benefit in increased revenues of sales, income, and motor fuel taxes. Local units of government (cities, counties and local school districts) profit by the way of property and local sales taxes.

In addition, many parts of this State that would be affected by this proposal, there would be a higher percentage of return of the State's investment. These regions are ripe and eager to grow and provide increased industrial activity.

I should testify today, not only in general for the entire Statewide proposal, but more particularly I can speak to the needs of Southeast Kansas.

An important aspect of a good highway system is to insure a good flow of our State's agricultural products from "farm to market". This highway plan enhances movement of goods to and from the west-central wheat fields to the Port of Catoosa, near Tulsa, and processing points east.

Those of us in Pittsburg, like folks in many parts of the State, know only too well the importance of surface transportation. Abandonments of rail service to small and medium size towns leave us with little choice but increased reliance for truck hauling of our goods.

Tourism is another significant benefit from this. The Toronto, Fall River, Elk City, and Big Hill Lakes are wonderful places to fish, boat, and to camp out, and improved highway access to these recreational areas will not only help keep Kansans in Kansas, but will encourage those from Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma to visit Kansas and spend their money!

In conclusion, I would state, without reservation, that a new highway does more for increased job creation, economic development, and ultimate career development for young Kansans by accident than any other single individual project or specific endeavor does on purpose. Surface transportation is one of the top six considerations for industrial expansion and/or relocation and, in today's emphasis, on not only attracting new industry to our State, but to insure that we keep what we already have, highways are a vital tool in fostering a proper and appropriate atmosphere for jobs.

Thank you, and I would stand for any questions.



**MID-AMERICA
INCORPORATED**

Joint Senate and House Transportation Committee

Public Hearing - August 18, 1987

Re: Report of the Governor's Highway Task Force

Presented by: Don Munsell, Executive Vice President
Mid-America, Inc.
Parsons, Kansas

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

On behalf of the Board of Trustees of Mid-America, Inc., I come before you today to voice support for serious consideration of Governor Hayden's Highway Task Force recommendations.

Mid-America, Inc., a non-profit industrial development corporation, founded in 1957, represents ten counties in Southeast Kansas; Anderson, Allen, Bourbon, Crawford, Cherokee, Labette, Montgomery, Neosho, Wilson and Woodson. The Mid-America region's population exceeds 210,000 with 70% residing in 72 incorporated communities, of which 24 are in excess of 1,000 persons, ranging from Altamont (1,047) to Pittsburg (18,759). Economically, in comparison with other areas of the state, the region for several years has continually experienced a sluggish economy with higher unemployment.

While the need for highway improvements has surfaced several times over the years, area leaders are unified in

President
Jack Templin
President-Elect
Walter Wulf, Jr.
Chairman
Jerry D. Carson

Executive Vice-President
Don Munsell

Vice-Presidents
Steve Begshaw
James S. (Tex) Crutcher
Mike Harris
Wes Houser
Roger Leeseberg
Jeff Mourning
Lyle Springer
David Wheeler
G. E. Worley

Secretary-Treasurer
John G. McNay

Trustees
Troy Borum
Bruce Buchanan
Al Burgert
Phyllis Cambers
Marvin Cinotto
Tom Collinson
David Conine
Harold Culver
Carl Daugherty
John Diehl
Richard Graue
Richard Hay
Mike Jeffers
Dan Kinney
Ken Kneebone
Bill Lanham
Ted Lucas
Joe Marshall
David Mullies
Tom Murrill
Mike Reid
Dipak Sarkar
Danny Scott
Dick Stevens
Tom Studebaker
Victor Sullivan
Chuck Sweeton
Bill Thompson
Steve Turner
Dale Wells
Bill Wyckoff

expressing the critical need for highway improvements to secure the long-range economic welfare of Southeast Kansas.

This belief has been reinforced by findings of two independent economic research studies. First, Mid-America, Inc. in 1985, contracted with the prestigious national research firm, Battelle Institute, Columbus, Ohio, to undertake extensive economic research of the area. Not to anyone's surprise, lack of adequate highway facilities was a documented central weakness and stated barrier to future economic development.

Second, earlier this year, findings of the Southeast Kansas Freeway Economic Benefits Study, prepared by Emporia State University, University of Kansas, Pittsburg State University, and Wichita State University, demonstrated clearly the significant positive economic impact of freeway construction for the area.

Therefore, our organization strongly supports consideration for upgrading the proposed improvements from Neodesha east on US 160 to expressway standards.

As Kansans, we are not naive as to the political process and constraints for effective legislative action on matters of this magnitude. Nevertheless, current negative economic trends require bold initiatives to address our changing economic structure. Passage of this comprehensive program represents such a bold step. We firmly believe this action is a crucial factor to reach the long-range economic recover, stability and growth of Kansas.

3

The Kansas Contractors Association, Inc.

OFFICERS

DENIS KURTENBACH, President
Paola, Kansas

HOWARD SHERWOOD, Senior Vice President
Wichita, Kansas

STAN SCUDDER, Vice President
Newton, Kansas

CHARLES E. STEVENS, JR., Treasurer
Salina, Kansas



316 WEST 33rd STREET P.O. BOX 5061
Topeka, Kansas 66605-0061

Phone 913-266-4152

GLENN R. COULTER, Manager
DANIEL W. RAMLOW, Assistant Manager
CRIS MILLARD, Office Manager
CARRIE KRUSOR, Bulletin Editor

DIRECTORS

BYRON R. BRAYMEN
Topeka, Kansas

GARY BROWN
Salina, Kansas

RANDALL HARDY
Scandia, Kansas

R. H. KISTNER
Marysville, Kansas

JACK LOGAN
Emporia, Kansas

SHAUN O'ROURKE
Kansas City, Kansas

JIM POWELL
Hays, Kansas

TOM RITCHIE
Wichita, Kansas

TESTIMONY

By the Kansas Contractors Association
Before the Joint Transportation Committee
August 18, 1987

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to give very brief testimony. My name is Glenn Coulter and I am the manager of the Kansas Contractors Association. Our members build between 85 and 90 percent of the highways and bridges in Kansas. Our association represents 332 members and associate members.

We sincerely believe that Kansas has an opportunity to take a very bold step forward with a double phased economic benefit program. The first will take place during construction and the second phase after the segments are completed.

The Kansas Good Roads Association recently released an economic impact study which was prepared by a national research organization and copies have been sent to all of you at your homes. We hope that you find a few minutes to read the study because we believe it has some very helpful information about the importance of a good highway system.

Members of the Kansas Contractors Association wish to thank you ladies and gentlemen and other members of the Kansas Legislature for your interest and concern in making sure that contractors who have traditionally bid on

Attach. 3

TESTIMONY
Before Joint Transportation Committee
August 18, 1987

KDOT projects have ample opportunity to continue to do so on any accelerated building program that might be authorized by the legislature.

A large number of these contractors are now building highways in Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Colorado and Nebraska. Their employees, who are life long residents of Kansas, would like to return to their native state and our contractors would greatly prefer to work in Kansas.

At the same time we do not want or ask for any preferential treatment. This would not be in the best interest of the citizens of Kansas who will be paying for the highways. All we ask is that we be given the opportunity to submit sealed, competitive bids and that the projects be broken down into reasonable segments by specialities so that Kansans can obtain bid bonds. A series of big projects costing more than \$15 to \$20 million could work a hardship. We have complete faith in the Kansas Department of Transportation that this will not happen.

Thank you very much for your consideration.



PUBLIC POLICY STATEMENT

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES

- RE: (I) - Highway Construction, Improvement and Maintenance in Kansas;
 (II) - Increasing Motor Fuel Taxes and Vehicle Registration Fees; and
 (III) - An **EQUITABLE** Distribution of Funds to Counties!

August 18, 1987
Topeka, Kansas

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

Chairman Crowell, Chairman Morris, Committee Members:

My name is Paul E. Fleener. I am the Director of Public Affairs for Kansas Farm Bureau. We appreciate the opportunity to address your committees today on **Highway Development in Kansas**. The points we will make are from the RESOLUTIONS (adopted policy positions) established by voting delegates representing farmers and ranchers in the 105 counties of Kansas. Resolutions pertaining to the subject before you are attached to our testimony. We come before you today to stress these points:

* Farmers and ranchers want to see a **good** highway, road and bridge system **throughout** Kansas.

* We want a **comprehensive** program of highway development and road and bridge construction.

* Farmers and ranchers in Kansas are willing to pay a **fair share** ... an equitable share of motor fuel taxes and registration fees for a system of highways that will help our **whole state** and will assist us in moving our commodities.

* We **support** the concept of "highway users paying, through gallonage taxes and vehicle registration fees for the construction and maintenance of highways, roads and bridges."

* Farmers and ranchers insist on a **more equitable distribution formula** for monies going to counties and other local units of government.

Farmers and ranchers in this state are very supportive of a sound and solid highway program in Kansas. We have been a participant ... a **supportive participant** ... in helping this legislature develop a consensus for each of the past increases in motor fuel taxes and registration fees. In fact, in the mid-70's, we suggested an additional increase in motor fuel taxes **with the proviso** that additional funds be allocated back to local units of government "under a new and equitable formula." Farmers and ranchers recognize the opportunity for economic development in rural communities and rural counties will come to pass when there is a road and highway program which will facilitate the movement of goods produced or manufactured in this state. Our definition of "a comprehensive highway program" is one which provides for the general well-being in 105 counties. It is a highway, road and bridge program which is for the good of the **whole** state. It is an "overall" program. An **extensive** program. A "thorough" program.

Our people believe such a comprehensive, thorough program would be appropriate and best obtained when, for the most part, it is done on existing right of way. Farmers and ranchers recognize that is not possible at all times. It is quite possible to achieve a significant improvement in roads and highways for Kansas by adhering to that whenever possible. We cannot pave this state over and continue to be the great agricultural state we have been and will continue to be.

Our support for a comprehensive highway program is contingent upon equity in three areas: equity in terms of motor fuel taxes, equity in terms of vehicle registration fees, and, most importantly, an **EQUITABLE** distribution of funds to counties in this state.

Please understand this point: Farmers and ranchers in Kansas did not originate the idea, did not initiate the plea for, and are not clamoring for a five cent motor fuel tax increase. But please understand this as well: farmers and ranchers are willing to pay their fair share of user taxes and fees for a system of roads and highways that will help us develop economically and will help provide access to locations which will be developed by agribusiness and industry in Kansas.

The most important thing we can share with you today is this **strong feeling** among farmers and ranchers: there must be a more equitable distribution formula for local units of government for them to give you the whole-hearted support many desire for this comprehensive highway program we are talking about. The present law (in K.S.A. 79-3425c) provides for an initial \$5,000 payment to each county. Of the balance remaining which is apportioned to local units of government, 50 percent is paid out on the basis of the number of motor vehicles registered in a county. Fifty percent (50%) is paid out on the basis of average daily vehicle miles traveled in a county. We will give our whole-hearted support to your effort in the upcoming Special Session of the Kansas Legislature to amend that formula to give **major weight** to miles of road that a county must maintain and the number of bridges or the surface area of bridges that a county must maintain. The most equitable way to treat that would be to make

each of the four factors worth 25 percent. If a consensus does not develop to move to that full degree of equity, we then suggest you find the most equitable way of distributing funds using all four factors. We solicit your support for this effort. We will give our support to a major and comprehensive highway program which accommodates this request.

Another point: Registration fees have been made a part of the discussion, as rightly they should. We would simply remind your committees that in 1984, **with our support**, there was a major restructuring of the weight limits and registration fees for farm trucks. Prior to 1984 the top farm tag was \$62. The top farm tag weight was 42,000 pounds. Farmers need additional weight capability and we agreed to a structure of registration fees which now progresses to \$150 for 54,000 to 60,000 pound vehicles ... \$300 for 60,000-66,000 pound vehicles ... and \$500 for farm trucks in excess of 66,000 pounds.

The indexing for motor fuels and for registration fees should be considered **most seriously** before writing that into law. It becomes an entitlement. We believe you should look at these registration fees and the motor fuel tax periodically, then, to meet the needs of the time, address both and increase both when appropriate.

Our final point: We have indicated we support user fees ... gallonage taxes and registration fees. We do not ... **DO NOT** support increasing sales or income taxes for use in the highway program. We will be pleased to respond to questions on any of the points we have raised in our testimony. We appreciate the opportunity to appear.

KANSAS FARM BUREAU

Printed below are policy positions on County Bridge Construction, County Highway Fund Distribution, and Highway Development and Funding which were adopted by the voting delegates from 105 County Farm Bureaus, representing farmers and ranchers in the 105 counties of Kansas, at the November 30, December 1-2, 1986 Annual Meeting of Kansas Farm Bureau.

County Bridge Construction

We believe there should be county, state and federal government cost-sharing and financing so that bridge construction and bridge replacement may proceed without further delay. Specifications and standards for bridges should be determined cooperatively by state and local engineers to meet local needs. Where practicable, we urge the use of prestressed, precast materials, as well as dirt fills in connection with conservation dams, for bridge construction, as opposed to costly "over-designed," over-built bridges. We further believe that in some cases, low-water bridges would be adequate.

County Highway Fund Distribution

The present Kansas law which distributes highway user revenues to counties uses a formula which gives excessive weight to motor vehicle registrations. This results in glaring inequities of fund distributions. We support an amended formula with major weight given to miles of county federal-aid secondary, rural road and highway travel, plus consideration of miles of roads that must be maintained by county highway departments.

Highway Development and Funding

We believe upgrading and improving existing roads and highways is preferable to building additional freeways, limited access highways, toll roads or turnpikes.

We urge that efficiencies be achieved in the operation of the Kansas Department of Transportation and that assurance be provided to protect against misuse of funds through bid-rigging or any other fraud.

We support the concept of highway users paying, through gallonage taxes and vehicle registration fees, for the construction and maintenance of highways, roads and bridges. We believe the federal government should provide for a tax credit equal to the federal motor fuel tax for ethanol used in motor fuel. We also believe there should continue to be a Kansas motor fuel tax exemption for ethanol until a federal tax credit program is in effect.

Toll road and turnpike construction in Kansas should not be contemplated unless a feasibility study on any such project shows the toll road or turnpike will pay its own way.

We are opposed to the use of any highway revenue or State General Fund revenue to guarantee toll road or turnpike bonds.

Highway design and planning should avoid, where feasible, diagonal routing. Diagonal cuts are most disruptive to agricultural operations.

TESTIMONY OF DONALD E. WILLOUGHBY
MANAGER OF GOVERNMENT & INDUSTRY AFFAIRS
IBP, INC.
BEFORE THE
JOINT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Good morning. My name is Don Willoughby and I'm the Manager of Government and Industry Affairs for IBP, inc. at Dakota City, Nebraska.

It is a pleasure to be here today to talk about a positive step in economic development for the State of Kansas. I have reviewed the task force's recommendations and found them to be very comprehensive, much needed and ambitious.

The mobility afforded by automotive transport and the modern highway system has given impetus to industrial growth and location and has broadened the social and economic opportunities of a vast number of people. Modern highways are an essential part of a vital economic development program. One that is necessary to insure Kansas' continued leadership in this arena.

Another primary benefit of improved highways is an improvement in safety. A benefit that is measured in lives saved - an important consideration in the highway improvement/construction program being deliberated.

Highway improvements bring additional benefits to highway users through reduction in time travel and savings in fuel use. Travel time is saved whenever highway improvements reduce distance, permit higher speeds, or reduce the frequency of speed changes. Fuel savings are affected when highway improvements reduce travel distance, reduce the frequency of stop-and-go operations or slowdowns, or reduce traffic congestion. A study of the affect of traffic

congestion upon fuel consumption of trucks showed that the number of times a truck had to change its speed in a mile of travel increases with the density of traffic on different types of highways.

Improved highways usually cause an increase in the value of land and property close to highways. Conditions are often created which result in new or more intensified uses of nearby land. Farmland values are affected by highway improvements as they reduce travel time and increase the marketing radius for perishable commodities. Moreover, improved roads will increase the commuting radius which broadens the availability of labor supply.

IBP is not supporting any one plan or funding mechanism at this time. Our plants, along with the Kansas red meat industry in general, would benefit by having better accessibility for those bringing cattle to our plants. Improved highways would allow us better access to our markets in the south and southeast.

Even though we are not supporting a particular funding plan at this time, we would like the committee to consider in its deliberations the placement of caps on the revenue generating proposals and staggering the increases to reflect actual expenditure needs.

As the committee's plan on highway improvement/construction becomes firmer, we will be in a better position to testify on the specifics of the plan and funding.

Until that time, IBP supports the need for new highway construction and modification of maintenance of existing roadways in the state of Kansas. A step necessary for continued economic development.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

6

GAIL STOUT
INDEPENDENCE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

To: Transportation Committee
Kansas House of Representatives &
Kansas Senate

Chairmen Mr. Rex Crowell & Mr. Ross Doyen, and members of the committee:

Thank you for the opportunity and privilege to speak to you today as a proponent of the Governor's Highway Task Force proposal.

My name is Gail Stout. I am a retired officer and director of ARCO Pipe Line Co. I have served on the transportation and energy committees of the Kansas Chamber of Commerce. Today I represent the Independence Area Chamber of Commerce as their Vice President for Economic Development.

Please allow me to refer to economic benefits in addition to the well known statistical \$1,000 per capita improvement in income attributable to areas with access to 4-lane highway transportation linkage to metropolitan areas.

° OTHER ECONOMIC BENEFITS:

Oklahoma, in spite of severe economic problems, continues with progress on its 4-lane limited access highway from the Kansas border to Tulsa. The Port of Catoosa on the Verdigris River at Tulsa provides that area with ready access to ocean-going vessels. Our new highway system connecting to the Oklahoma system would provide the Kansas farm community as well as other industrial concerns a connection to U.S. and international ports, which should provide significant transportation savings as well as new horizons in the marketplace.

Tourism is listed as the second largest industry in Kansas. Improved highway systems will allow our area to attract more tourists. Community

income which a community receives from 24 tourists a day is equivalent to a factory with an annual payroll of one hundred thousand dollars. This income regenerates within the community for goods and services. This in turn generates additional salaries, profits and taxes. Southeast Kansas has lagged in tourism as well as other economic development because "there is just no suitable, safe way to get from there to here".

° WE HAVE SOME NOTABLE ASSETS IN ADDITION TO BEING A NICE AREA IN WHICH TO LIVE AND WORK. SOME ARE:

Five large lakes are located in the area. They are: Big Hill, Elk City, Melvern, Fall River and Toronto. Most have significant excess reservoir capacity and provide suitable water supply and recreational facilities.

We have an ample supply of willing workers who are ready to adapt to our country's changing requirements. Southeast Kansas has the highest unemployment rate in the state.

We have more than adequate power to serve new industry and all added power requirements. Wolf Creek is under-utilized. Added power use would also aid by reducing existing charges.

° OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Residents of this area are much more likely to go to Oklahoma facilities (Bartlesville, Tulsa, Oklahoma City) for medical treatment solely because of suitable highways which connect but do not exist in Kansas.

And safety! You only need to drive from Independence to Wichita once to realize the drive is something to be avoided if at all possible.

° THIS CONCLUDES OUR STATEMENT. We wish you well in your work and consideration of this very important project.



7

Pittsburg Area Chamber of Commerce

P. O. Box 1115
117 East Fourth Street
Pittsburg, KS 66762
(316) 231-1000

TESTIMONY TO: JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEES by Dr. John F. Connelly, President
Elect and Chair, Legislative Committee

A consortium of Chambers of Commerce, from Joplin through
Wichita, to Great Bend, met in Fredonia, Kansas, two and a
half weeks ago. As a consortium, they strongly and
unanimously supported the generic idea of the Kansas Highway
plan developed by Governor Hayden's Highway Task Force.

On behalf of the Chambers of Commerce, and specifically the
Pittsburg Area Chamber of Commerce, I would like to very
briefly highlight several points agreed upon at this
consortium, that have been dramatically emphasized in the
last two and a half weeks.

First, many advantages were cited in support of the Kansas
Highway Plan; new highways would:

- a) stimulate economic development along highway
corridors,
- b) lead to safer travel, particularly across the
southern part of Kansas,
- c) produce less wear and tear on commercial vehicles

Att. 7

such as trucks and busses,

d) perhaps reduce prices of goods which are delivered over our highways,

e) provide a positive, forward-looking community attitude within communities not yet serviced by highways of the caliber proposed by the Kansas Highway Plan.

Second, There is grassroots support for the Kansas Highway Plan. For example, according to the August 17, 1987 "News from the Southeast Kansas Community Action Program", "the majority of the Senior Citizens of Southeast Kansas are in favor of new and improved highways." As reported in this publication, 464 respondents voted Yes, 414 voted No, 53 voted Maybe, and 75 voted with No Opinion (total vote = 1,006.) Removing the 75 with no opinion, a full 50% of the respondents voted yes. If we include the Yes and Maybe categories, over 55% of the Senior Citizens in Southeast Kansas generally favor improved highways, even in spite of the special economic hardship a highway plan would impose for citizens more likely to have fixed incomes.

Third, Grassroots support for the Kansas Highway Plan crosses political boundaries: There are registered democrats, registered republicans and registered independents among the Chamber memberships, the cities coalitions, and the other citizens I have spoken with, who in large numbers support this highway plan.

Fourth: Of course I am speaking on behalf of Southeast Kansas; however, the majority that favor the Kansas Highway Plan from this area are not regionalized in their support, they realize and totally support the overall, state-wide plan. Economic studies, which you will undoubtedly hear about in detail, here, today, clearly demonstrate that what benefits, economically, one section of a state, also benefits the health of the entire state.

Fifth: Generally speaking, the consortium of Chambers did not specifically support any particular funding package for the Kansas Highway Plan. Those decisions, it was agreed, were complex and better left to the legislative expertise that could be exercised during your committee hearings and the special legislative session. However, on one issue of budgetary support, there does seem to be both majority support and also inordinately vocal minority opposition. This concerns the gas tax. According to Representative Whittaker's literature on economic benefits, Kansas gas tax is currently at least 5 cents a gallon less than that of the bordering states of Colorado, Nebraska and Oklahoma. A 5 cents increase in gasoline tax for Kansas, according to the Kansas Department of Transportation, would, on the average, increase an average household's gasoline bill by \$44 per year, by about \$4 per month.

Also, most citizens I have heard from do not disfavor placing a "lid" on this gasoline tax increase.

Sixth, The grassroots supporters of the Kansas Highway Plan realize that better highways provide a potential for better economic development. This potential can only be actualized by aggressive actions following highway improvement: we in Southeast Kansas are poised and ready, in ways, to actualize this potential, which will, in turn, support statewide economic improvement.



Pittsburg Area Chamber of Commerce

P. O. Box 1115
117 East Fourth Street
Pittsburg, KS 66762
(316) 231-1000

TESTIMONY TO: JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEES by Dr. John F. Connelly, President
Elect and Chair, Legislative Committee

A consortium of Chambers of Commerce, from Joplin through
Wichita, to Great Bend, met in Fredonia, Kansas, two and a
half weeks ago. As a consortium, they strongly and
unanimously supported the generic idea of the Kansas Highway
plan developed by Governor Hayden's Highway Task Force.

On behalf of the Chambers of Commerce, and specifically the
Pittsburg Area Chamber of Commerce, I would like to very
briefly highlight several points agreed upon at this
consortium, that have been dramatically emphasized in the
last two and a half weeks.

First, many advantages were cited in support of the Kansas
Highway Plan; new highways would:

- a) stimulate economic development along highway
corridors,
- b) lead to safer travel, particularly across the
southern part of Kansas,
- c) produce less wear and tear on commercial vehicles

such as trucks and busses,

d) perhaps reduce prices of goods which are delivered over our highways,

e) provide a positive, forward-looking community attitude within communities not yet serviced by highways of the caliber proposed by the Kansas Highway Plan.

Second, There is grassroots support for the Kansas Highway Plan. For example, according to the August 17, 1987 "News from the Southeast Kansas Community Action Program", "the majority of the Senior Citizens of Southeast Kansas are in favor of new and improved highways." As reported in this publication, 464 respondents voted Yes, 414 voted No, 53 voted Maybe, and 75 voted with No Opinion (total vote = 1,006.) Removing the 75 with no opinion, a full 50% of the respondents voted yes. If we include the Yes and Maybe categories, over 55% of the Senior Citizens in Southeast Kansas generally favor improved highways, even in spite of the special economic hardship a highway plan would impose for citizens more likely to have fixed incomes.

Third, Grassroots support for the Kansas Highway Plan crosses political boundaries: There are registered democrats, registered republicans and registered independents among the Chamber memberships, the cities coalitions, and the other citizens I have spoken with, who in large numbers support this highway plan.

Fourth: Of course I am speaking on behalf of Southeast Kansas; however, the majority that favor the Kansas Highway Plan from this area are not regionalized in their support, they realize and totally support the overall, state-wide plan. Economic studies, which you will undoubtedly hear about in detail, here, today, clearly demonstrate that what benefits, economically, one section of a state, also benefits the health of the entire state.

Fifth: Generally speaking, the consortium of Chambers did not specifically support any particular funding package for the Kansas Highway Plan. Those decisions, it was agreed, were complex and better left to the legislative expertise that could be exercised during your committee hearings and the special legislative session. However, on one issue of budgetary support, there does seem to be both majority support and also inordinately vocal minority opposition. This concerns the gas tax. According to Representative Whittaker's literature on economic benefits, Kansas gas tax is currently at least 5 cents a gallon less than that of the bordering states of Colorado, Nebraska and Oklahoma. A 5 cents increase in gasoline tax for Kansas, according to the Kansas Department of Transportation, would, on the average, increase an average household's gasoline bill by \$44 per year, by about \$4 per month.

Also, most citizens I have heard from do not disfavor placing a "lid" on this gasoline tax increase.

Sixth, The grassroots supporters of the Kansas Highway Plan realize that better highways provide a potential for better economic development. This potential can only be actualized by aggressive actions following highway improvement: we in Southeast Kansas are poised and ready, in ways, to actualize this potential, which will, in turn, support statewide economic improvement.

My name is Emerson Lynn. I am editor of The Iola Register and a member of the Southeast Kansas Highways for Progress association.

Sen. Morris and members of the committees, thank you for taking time away from your other jobs and your families in the midst of summer to consider this important initiative for the future of Kansas. Your service to the state is appreciated.

Providing a good transportation system is a basic. Your committees are charged with seeing that the essential framework of our economy is kept strong. Good highways mean as much to the commonwealth as good schools, good law enforcement, good health services.

But I am certain that all of you are equally convinced that a top-flight highway system is vital to Kansas and its future. Otherwise you would not be giving so much of your time, imagination and energy to these committees -- and I want you to know that the public shares your conviction.

I think that's why I'm here this morning. I'm certainly not here to inform you about highways, to offer any new insights about Gov. Hayden's highway plan or to give you technical advice on highway financing. All of you know far more than I about all these things and you have experts at your elbow to give you any additional information you might want.

So, unless I am mistaken, I and most of the others who will appear before you today, are here mostly to give you moral support -- to urge you to build the highways that you know the state needs and to assure you that we and our friends at home will back you up when it comes time to pay the bill.

We are the cheering section; you are the players.

The game plan that Gov. Hayden and his advisers have recommended to your committees and to the state at large is well accepted throughout Southeast Kansas, which has so much to gain from the improvements it proposes.

Let me recite one specific example.

The Southeast Kansas Community Action Program sent out a questionnaire to 1,000 of its clients on July 24 asking if they supported the governor's highway plan. 464 said yes; 414 said no; 53 said maybe and 75 had no opinion.

It should encourage every good roads advocate to know that the Kansans who have the lowest incomes in Southeast Kansas -- the poorest region in the state -- are willing to bear extra expense to give Kansas a chance to compete on the national level.

When those who live at poverty's door can say yes to this important investment, it should shame every cry-baby critic of the program into silence.

The word investment brings to mind increasing wealth -- or saving. That's something Americans aren't so good at -- or so we are told. The saving rate in this country, for instance, is often compared to that in Japan most unfavorably. But one of the reasons is a difference in definition. The Japanese consider all of the money they spend through government on capital items to be money saved. In U.S. accounting, such spending goes into the consumption column.

The millions of yen invest in Japan's railways, universities and, yes, its highway go straight to the money-saved account on its balance sheet.

Ah, so! Good thinking!

There is a very important difference between money invested in an essential capital improvement which will create new wealth for the state for years to come and money spent in an operating account which is merely consumed.

So it makes sense to borrow money to invest in wealth-generating highways just as it makes sense for an industry to borrow to buy wealth-generating machinery.

The wealth generated by a modern highway system will more than pay the interest cost and help retire the principal.

The same basic economics should convince us all that an ambitious long-range highway construction program needs protection from inflation. Indexing can provide that protection -- protection that is without cost in real dollars. For if there is no inflation, the fuel taxes and registration fees would not rise; and if there were inflation, the dollars flowing into the Department of Transportation coffers would be worth less and therefore would be that more more plentiful. The cost in constant dollars would be the same to the taxpayers.

What indexing does is insure that the promises the Legislature makes to the people when it adopts a highway program can be kept. Indexing is insurance. Kansas needs the coverage.

Gov. Hayden said that he expected the highway program to grow when the Legislature gave it full consideration. To underline his point, he added \$131 million to it himself yesterday.

With his example in mind, I have a modest proposal of my own to make.

U.S. 169 from the Oklahoma border north to Garnett and U.S. 59 from Garnett to Lawrence should be raised to expressway standards and U.S. 54 from the Missouri border west to El Dorado should be improved to two-lane expressway standards.

These proposals do not originate with me nor were they hatched to provide tidbits for today's gathering.

They were proposed in the Jorgensen Report in 1962 and ratified by the Legislature in 1969 when it decided to issue \$320 million in bonds to translate that comprehensive statewide highway program from paper dreams into solid asphalt and concrete.

It made great good sense to upgrade U.S. 169, U.S. 59 and U.S. 54 into modern highways back in 1962 when Jorgensen urged the state to do so. It is an even more urgent need today -- because those highways are 25 years older and the region is now 25 years farther behind the rest of the state.

With this special plea, allow me to enroll Iola and Allen County in the volunteer army of optimistic Kansans who urge you to take heart and plunge forward. We're with you all the way.



Working Together for Southeast Kansas

August 18, 1987

- Altamont
- Caney
- Chanute
- Cherryvale
- Chetopa
- Coffeyville
- Columbus
- Fort Scott
- Fredonia
- Girard
- Independence
- Iola
- Neodesha
- Oswego
- Parsons
- Pittsburg

Senator Bill Morris, Chairman
 Senate Standing Committee on Transportation
 State Capitol
 Topeka, KS 66612

Representative Rex Crowell, Chairman
 House Standing Committee on Transportation
 State Capitol
 Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Chairmen Morris and Crowell:

Since the inception of the Southeast Kansas Cities Coalition in February, 1986, we have established as our No. 1 priority; the construction of a highway from Wichita to Joplin. Our strong support for this highway relates to the economic needs of our region which is best stated in a paragraph included in Research Paper #125 (June, 1987) prepared by the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research of the University of Kansas:

"The Southeast Kansas region is in a situation of serious economic decline. Yet the region has most of the features that are associated with potential economic growth. The one essential factor that is missing is a good highway transportation system. Such a system needs to be put in place now if we are not to abandon the Southeast region of the state. The calculation of the economic benefits to the citizens of the region as well as the calculations of the tax benefits that will accrue from economic development supports the argument that serious consideration should be given to the construction of a four-lane highway in the region."

We believe that the initiatives generated in Southeast Kansas for needed highway improvements evolved into a statewide concern of the adequacy of the

A++ 9

Senator Bill Morris
Representative Rex Crowell
August 18, 1987
Page 2

present highway system. In early April, the Coalition endorsed the Governor's approach for a comprehensive statewide highway program through the appointment of a special task force. It is our belief that not only our highway needs, but the needs of other under served areas of our state should now be addressed. You have before you such a comprehensive statewide highway plan.

This plan pin points those areas of the state which have been neglected in past years. The report further addresses a comprehensive approach to dealing with continued maintenance of the current system and needed improvements.

The financing package which has been presented to you is far reaching and will create controversy. However, these increases should be looked at as an investment in Kansas' future. The plan further provides for indexing certain revenue sources to inflation, which we endorse to the extent they are necessary to amortize the bonds to carry out the proposed highway program. If the state had provided for such an indexing approach in past years, we believe we would not be looking at the significant level of improvements and costs that are now being presented to you concerning highway needs, upgrading and improvements.

The task force report further proposes to provide a sharing of the additional motor fuel tax receipts with local units as follows:

1. Increases in connecting links monies; and
2. A five percent share of the additional motor fuel taxes.

The Coalition endorses this recommendation of sharing motor fuel tax monies with local units as presented. Any adjustments in the above distribution should be considered only if it does not alter the proposed new construction initiatives.

One of the issues you will address is the consideration of a four lane highway in southeast Kansas. The Coalition believes that providing a four lane highway is vital for the economic growth of our region as well as the State of Kansas.

We would again like to briefly quote from Research Paper #125. This report documents the anticipated benefit of a four lane highway:


" . . . the cumulative twenty-year incremental increase in population from building a four-lane instead of a super-two would be 12,655; in employment would be 6,809; in personal income would be \$1.599 billion; and in retail sales would be \$715 million. Thus the economic benefits from building a four-lane instead of a super-two would be substantial according to the results of this study."

Senator Bill Morris
Representative Rex Crowell
August 18, 1987
Page 3

These gains will not only effect Southeast Kansas, but the entire state. It is also our belief that a four-lane highway through Southeast Kansas will benefit the western portion of the state as well as all other areas of the state interconnected to the proposed Southeast Kansas highway improvements. These benefits will occur by generating and facilitating business and other traffic from Southwest Missouri and Arkansas as well as Southeast Kansas.

We ask your support for approval of a comprehensive highway program which will meet the current and future needs of Southeast Kansas as well as the rest of the state.

Sincerely yours,




Paul A. Sasse, Chairman

PAS/sr

cc: Senate Standing Committee on Transportation
House Standing Committee on Transportation

LEGISLATIVE TESTIMONY



Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry

500 First National Tower One Townsite Plaza Topeka, KS 66603-3460 (913) 357-6321

A consolidation of the
Kansas State Chamber
of Commerce,
Associated Industries
of Kansas,
Kansas Retail Council

August 18, 1987

KANSAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
Testimony Before the
Joint Senate and House Transportation Committees
by
Bud Grant
Vice President

Chairman Morris and Chairman Crowell. My name is Bud Grant, Vice President of the Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I welcome the opportunity to appear before your joint committees today in support of future highway and economic development in Kansas. I am very pleased that the Chairman of KCCI's Transportation Committee, and former Chairman of the Senate Committee on Transportation and Utilities, John Crofoot is here with me and available to answer questions from committee members.

The Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KCCI) is a statewide organization dedicated to the promotion of economic growth and job creation within Kansas, and to the protection and support of the private competitive enterprise system.

KCCI is comprised of more than 3,000 businesses which includes 200 local and regional chambers of commerce and trade organizations which represent over 161,000 business men and women. The organization represents both large and small employers in Kansas, with 55% of KCCI's members having less than 25 employees, and 86% having less than 100 employees. KCCI receives no government funding.

The KCCI Board of Directors establishes policies through the work of hundreds of the organization's members who make up its various committees. These policies are the guiding principles of the organization and translate into views such as those expressed here.

KCCI's Transportation Committee met only yesterday to develop a position on the important question of future highway programs for Kansas. It was the desire of the Committee and Chairman Crofoot that the latest information be available for review. Even the Governor's proposal, announced yesterday, was taken under consideration.

The following statement was developed by the committee yesterday morning, and approved for this presentation by the KCCI Executive Committee yesterday afternoon:

Consistent with KCCI's strong support for improved highways and their relationship to economic development, we commend the work of Secretary Edwards and the task force and recommend that its report be given careful consideration. Specifically we recommend:

1. That a comprehensive highway construction program be adopted using the task force report as the guideline for adoption of a final plan;
2. That a highway construction plan be initiated in 1987 that will be subject to review by future legislatures;
3. Consistent with that recommendation, that the legislature should periodically review any indexing involving the highway program;
4. That KDOT size and schedule projects to permit Kansas contractors maximum opportunity to compete for these contracts; and,
5. That in the discussion of taxes and expanded KDOT budgets, consideration be given the general fund-KDOT transfers and their impact on other important areas of economic development recognizing that a balanced utilization of the state's resources is essential for economic development initiatives. Other major programs also must have affordable tax revenues.

Thank you Chairman Morris and Chairman Crowell. Chairman Crofoot and I would be pleased to attempt to answer any questions.

FREDONIA CHAMBER *of* COMMERCE

606 MADISON - PHONE (316) 378-3221

FREDONIA, KANSAS

66736-0449

The Fredonia Chamber of Commerce believes that an improved highway system is essential for the growth and vitality of the state of Kansas and, in particular, for the Southeast area of the state. To this end, the Chamber of Commerce supports an aggressive, comprehensive highway construction program and generally endorses the plan recently proposed by the Governor's Task Force on Highways. Specifically, the Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the following features of the proposal :

1. The Fredonia Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the link between Wichita and Joplin as spelled out in the task force report and the connecting routes which will relieve serious bottlenecks throughout Southeast Kansas.
2. The Chamber of Commerce supports route improvement in the Southeast, Southwest, and Northwest corridors and believes these roads should be four lane wherever possible.
3. Recognizing that small communities must have adequate access to new highways to assure their continued viability, the Chamber of Commerce supports adequate funding of sufficient access roads to provide for a free flow of traffic to and from these small communities.
4. The Fredonia Chamber of Commerce supports a significant increase in the current level of maintainance for roads and bridges for the existing system and an aggressive "major modification" which recognizes the deficiencies which are not on the above mentioned routes but which exist otherwise in the system.
5. The Fredonia Chamber of Commerce believes that the use of Kansas resources, including materials and labor, should be maximized and that individual projects should be of a size to allow Kansas contractors to compete for all projects.
6. The Chamber of Commerce supports a funding plan utilizing user fees.
7. We urge prompt adoption of the proposed state highway plan in order to take advantage of present favorable financing conditions and as a hedge against future inflation.

adopted 8/12/87

Att. 11

Statement of

Jay Westervelt
Parsons, Kansas

Testimony presented to the House and Senate Transportation Committees, August 18, 1987.

My name is Jay Westervelt, and I would like to thank the members of the House and Senate Transportation Committees for the opportunity to visit with you for a few minutes about why I think it is vital for the state of Kansas to embark on a major, comprehensive highway program.

I am a semi-retired certified public accountant in Parsons, the community I adopted in 1955, and a place that I'm proud to call home. I am a native of Southeast Kansas. I was born in Cherokee County and reared in Cherokee and Labette Counties. I have lived in the area all my life except for about 12 years because of work in Wichita and Kansas City and fulfilling an obligation during World War 2.

I'm not here to endorse a specific program. I'll leave that to experts.

What I would like to share with you are my thoughts about the need for highway improvements and how they can fit into efforts to improve the state and more specifically, what a new highway would do for Southeast Kansas.

Planning for highways must be a careful process. Roads should not be thrown together on the basis of who has the most political clout. Rather they should be put together into a comprehensive transportation plan serving the needs of people and business.

As Representative Rex Crowell, the chairman of the House Transportation Committee, said at one of the first meetings of the Southeast Kansas highway group:

"It's not that we don't have highways in Southeast Kansas. It's that we have too many."

Now, I'm sure the people served by all those miles of highway would dispute the nature of that message. However, his words have a deeper meaning we should not ignore.

There are lots of highways in Southeast Kansas. The problem we have is that many of them are dangerous to travel and inadequate to meet the needs of a modern economy.

We lack a single major highway that ties us together with other areas of the state. It is difficult to get from one end of our region to the other, and through traffic is almost non-existent.

The Southeast Kansas highway contained in the governor's proposal would give us that needed link.

Few people in Southeast Kansas would argue that a highway construction program would bring economic prosperity all by itself.

A new and improved highway would be just one tool, albeit an important one, in our efforts to build the local economy.

In 1957, we put together Mid-America Inc., one of the first regional economic development organizations in the country. In the 30 years since, Mid-America and the region have worked diligently to attract jobs.

This has been a long-term process with long-term success. We have made use of all the tools we could.

Now, we need more help. With reduced air and rail service to our area, we are desperate for the added incentive of the proposed Southeast Kansas highway.

Please rest assured that we will not dry up and blow away if we don't get the highway. The region has withstood many years of adversity, and it could withstand this loss.

Nor should you think that we will rest on the success of a highway if we get it. No, we are prepared to add it to the many things we already offer and get back out and work even harder.

I have focused on Southeast Kansas and its need for a highway, because it is the area I know best. Let me assure you, though, we in Southeast Kansas are not blind to the needs of the rest of the state. We do not have an exclusive hold on economic problems, nor do we have the only highways that are not as safe as they should be.

For too long, residents of the state of Kansas have been willing to accept a highway system falling apart because of a lack of maintenance money. We have too much invested and we have too much to gain to allow the current system to remain as it is.

As you deliberate in wise fashion the needs of Kansas, I am confident you will recognize the importance of moving ahead. The future of Kansas depends on you.

August 18, 1987

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I am Dr. Warren Thomas, Chairman of the Highway Committee for the Coffeyville Chamber of Commerce.

Kansas has the opportunity to lay a foundation for strong economic development, one that the State has never experienced before. We as a State must reach out and grasp the future or remain rooted in the past.

Pockets of second generation unemployment exist in large areas of the Southeast; and general underemployment exists in most areas of the State not bounded by the interstate highway system often referred to as the "Golden Triangle" of Kansas. However, we are not here to ask for more welfare money, more aid for the aged poor, training and summer job money for the children of the disadvantaged of Southeast Kansas, which are problems that neglect and the lack of development have aggravated in our region.

We are here to ask you for action now to resolve the highway problems of Kansas. John F. Kennedy said, "There are risks and costs to a program of action; but they are far less than the long-range risks and costs of comfortable inaction." We urge you to act.

The people of Southeast Kansas are united in efforts to improve the economic climate of their region and ask no more than good roads to safely get their goods and services to market.

Past legislatures have heard the reports and studies prepared for them in the 1960's and 70's. Their failure to take positive and appropriate action has resulted in the legacy of decayed and unsafe roadways throughout much of the

State of Kansas.

As the Committee is aware, the current comprehensive highway program under consideration is the summation of years of effort and exhaustive study. The Task Force stated that, "A multi-year comprehensive highway improvement plan providing stability and direction for the future is critical to the effective use of available resources." The proposal before you is well thought out, comprehensive, and fiscally responsible.

People will come before you opposed to indexing taxes, and other fees associated with the proposed highway legislation. They would have you attempt to pay for highways in the 21st century with 1987 dollars. In 1975, the Wilbur Smith study pointed to four billion dollars worth of maintenance and improvements; and the same arguments were heard and fear of the price of the project resulted in no action. If action had been taken, the project would be paid for; and a generation of Kansans would have grown up with a higher quality of life. The State of Kansas would have billions of dollars in additional tax revenue because of the higher level of economic activity that would have resulted. Millions in welfare, unemployment and related transfer payments would have been saved.

Consider for a moment, a study developed by the University of Kansas for the Department of Economic Development about five years ago. One hundred new jobs will create 66 million dollars of personal income in a ten-year period and 3.1 million in bank deposits. The ripple affect will add 458 additional jobs over five years and 1.76 million dollars of additional property taxes will have been generated. What if we made that 1,000 new jobs? The affect would be tremendous.

Opponents will show charts with projections of 60 cents per gallon gas taxes in the year 2014. We offer that with their five percent compounded inflation rate, the Big Mac \$1.45 hamburger will be \$5.41. If economic growth and development in Kansas keeps pace with the rest of the nation there will be no additional true costs borne. But as the Governor's Task Force stated, "There are costs whether or not a comprehensive plan is adopted. Inaction ultimately may be as costly to the public as increased taxes." Taking the projected five percent escalator the opponents try to scare us with-a 1.56 billion dollar highway program deferred until the year 2014 will cost the taxpayer 5.82 billion dollars if not one additional pothole develops, one additional bridge deteriorates and no additional bottlenecks develop in the next 26 years.

Some will stand before you and cry "Pork Barrel." Let us turn to Pat Chaote and Susan Walter in their acclaimed 1981 publication entitled, "America In Ruins: Beyond the Public Works Pork Barrel": "Without a huge infusion of new dollars to maintain and repair "infrastructure" and to build for the future, the economy will suffer, the quality of life will be eroded, and our standard of living will decline." I am sure the committee is aware that federal statistics on pavement conditions, based on a 1981 sampling, indicate that Kansas' more heavily traveled roads were among the worst in the country. Sampling statistics from 1983 indicate that pavement conditions have deteriorated even more.

Even though we view the proposed improvements in Montgomery County as inadequate in comparison to population ratios between the county and the balance of the state, we still firmly support the proposed program because

of the tremendous positive affect on the whole state.

The State of Kansas needs to implement the program under consideration before our highways deteriorate to a level our children will be unable to restore. The cost of 3.33 dollars per passenger vehicle per month in Kansas seems a small amount to pay for the improved economic climate and the safety modern roads would provide.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today.

PROPOSED MOTOR FUELS TAX INCREASES
INDEXED TO THE GNP/IPD

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>GASOLINE</u>	<u>gal. gas</u>	<u>DIESEL</u>	<u>new auto</u>
Current	\$.11	\$ 1.85	\$.13	\$15000
January 1, 1988	.16	1.89	.18	15750
July 1, 1988	.168	1.93	.188	16537
July 1, 1989	.177	1.98	.197	17364
July 1, 1990	.185	1.03	.205	18232
July 1, 1991	.195	1.08	.215	19144
July 1, 1992	.204	1.13	.224	20101
July 1, 1993	.215	1.19	.235	21106
July 1, 1994	.225	1.25	.245	22161
July 1, 1995	.236	1.31	.256	23269
July 1, 1996	.248	1.38	.268	24433
July 1, 1997	.261	1.45	.281	25655
July 1, 1998	.274	1.52	.294	26937
July 1, 1999	.288	1.60	.308	28284
July 1, 2000	.302	1.68	.322	29698
July 1, 2001	.317	1.76	.337	31183
July 1, 2002	.333	1.85	.353	32743
July 1, 2003	.350	1.94	.370	34380
July 1, 2004	.367	2.04	.397	36099
July 1, 2005	.385	2.14	.405	37904
July 1, 2006	.405	2.25	.425	39799
July 1, 2007	.425	2.36	.445	41789
July 1, 2008	.446	2.48	.466	43878
July 1, 2009	.469	2.60	.489	46072
July 1, 2010	.492	2.73	.512	48376
July 1, 2011	.517	2.87	.537	50795
July 1, 2012	.543	3.01	.563	53335
July 1, 2013	.570	3.16	.590	56001
July 1, 2014	.599	3.32	.619	58802

WILLIAM M. BRYANT, D.V.M.
REPRESENTATIVE, SIXTY-THIRD DISTRICT
WASHINGTON, REPUBLIC AND
NORTHERN RILEY COUNTIES
RURAL ROUTE 2
WASHINGTON, KANSAS 66968



TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
VICE-CHAIRMAN INSURANCE
MEMBER AGRICULTURE AND SMALL BUSINESS
FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS

August 18, 1987

To The Joint House and Senate Transportation Committee

My comments today may vary a little from what they would have prior to reviewing the Governor's proposal yesterday which included as a priority project US 81 from the end of the 4-Lane at Minneapolis to the Nebraska line. I hope my comments will shed some light on some factors which might make it a favorable proposal to you.

Much was said yesterday about priority factors. In my opinion three factors certainly need to be kept in mind: **safety, traffic count, and structural need.** I have also included a few comments on **economic development.**

The **safety, or hazard factor,** as the case may be, can be easily pointed out if you turn with me to the accompanying chart on accident statistics for US Highway 81 from its junction with I-70 to the Nebraska border.

Traffic count speaks for itself on US 81. That portion of US 81 in the northern part of the state has as high a traffic count as any road under consideration unless it is some of those with shorter mileage close to a large metropolitan area. Of particular importance is the number of commercial vehicles per day. This exceeds 800 per day in all areas and is largely close to the towns. With nearly 800 vehicles where it exits our state, it carries more commercial traffic than any other road on three of our borders with the exception of I-70 to the west which is a little over 1,000 and I-35 to the south which picks off the southern 81 traffic as it leaves Wichita. Keep in mind also that I-70 is carrying 1,000 trucks on four lanes while US 81 is carrying 800 plus commercial vehicles on two lanes.

If there is a road that needs an extra two lanes for traffic and safety, it is the remaining portion of US 81 in our state north of Minneapolis that is still two lanes wide.

Need is based on geometric design and deficiencies and those figures are available. Not currently available will be the just completed two lanes from Concordia to Belleville which are now in good shape.

I would tie the **economic factor** in with what our neighbor to the north, Nebraska, is considering. Last year a \$250 million road bill was introduced. Hearings were held, but no action was taken. This year a group of their Senators is proposing a \$700 million road improvement package, the major factor of which is making US 81 a 4-Lane road across their state. Their main argument is to keep or bring more traffic through the rural center of their state hoping to boost their industry there and create jobs in their rural areas. They are building a head of steam, and you know how those projects go, if they get their proposal up large enough it just might pass. I think we should be conscious of what our neighboring states are considering when we are making plans. Our completion of US 81 as a 4-Lane will certainly be encouraging to them as they view their project, and it would be a shame if they completed theirs and we were left with an 80 mile bottleneck for ten to twenty years until we could come up with new funds.

One last personal observation before I leave the highway 81 issue. On June 17th I had the occasion to drive that highway from Belleville to Salina and drove the entire distance from Belleville to Minneapolis before I was able to find an area that I could safely pass.

The issue of **economic development** is also brought to light by the fact that US 81 and US 36 both serve the northern tier of counties and according to the most recent Kansas demographic publication from the KSU Cooperative Extension Service, "The highest poverty levels of Kansas are found mostly in counties

Representative Bryant
Page Three

along the northern tier which have relatively large farm populations and very little industry or other possible source of employment."

Safety is certainly a factor along some stretches of US 36. This is due mainly to two factors, hills and lack of shoulders. The lack of shoulders along many stretches of US 36, particularly in the eastern one-half of the state, have contributed to many accidents. Cuts in the hills of some areas in combination with wind and no shoulders have put many vehicles in the ditch along 36 highway.

US 36 has lost much of its traffic count to I-80 and I-70, but is still the straightest shot from Ft. Wayne, Indiana to Denver, Colorado. It is a scenic route and is steeped in historical sites along its length. If maintained properly, it will once again be one of the main tourist routes across our state.

In conclusion: US 36 from St. Joe to the US 81 junction and US 81 which is a part of the Pan American Highway crossing our entire continent from south to north have both been on every state or federal study ever done as priority roads and they are still waiting. I think those folds have surely paid their dues by now, haven't they?

Respectfully submitted,
William M. Bryant, D.V.M.
Representative
Sixty-Third District

Accident Statistics US 81
US 81/I-70 Junction to Nebraska State Line

<u>Years</u>	<u>Total Accidents</u>	<u>Total Injury Accidents</u>	<u>Fatalities</u>	<u>People Injured</u>	<u>No. of Accidents per 1 million Vehicle miles Traveled</u>	<u>Statewide Rate for similar Roadways</u>
* ³ 1972 - 76	594	228	18	394	* ¹ 1.571	1.429
1978 - 82	717	231	11	406	* ² 1.817	1.538
1983 - Sept. 86	<u>479</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>235</u>	1.538	
TOTALS	1,790	592	40	1,035		

*¹ Critical Accident Rate
(Statistically Significant) 1.551

*² Critical Accident Rate
(Statistically Significant) 1.662

*³ 1977 Omitted

THE CITY OF WICHITA



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY HALL — FIRST FLOOR
455 NORTH MAIN STREET
WICHITA, KANSAS 67202
(316) 268-4331

TO: CHAIRMAN MORRIS, CHAIRMAN CROWELL, AND MEMBERS OF
THE SENATE AND HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES

FROM: BOB KNIGHT, MAYOR

DATE: AUGUST 18, 1987

SUBJECT: TESTIMONY ON STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

GOOD AFTERNOON. THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO TESTIFY BEFORE YOU TODAY IN SUPPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE STATE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

WHILE NO PLAN IS PERFECT, THE CITY OF WICHITA IS PLEASED OVERALL WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS PUT FORTH BY THE GOVERNOR'S HIGHWAY TASK FORCE. WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE GOVERNOR PROPOSES SOME MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLAN AND, OF COURSE, YOU AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE MAY ALSO DETERMINE THAT ADDITIONAL CHANGES ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE.

IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION "WHAT THREE CRITERIA ARE USED TO DETERMINE THE VALUE OF A PROPERTY?", AN APPRAISER WILL ANSWER "LOCATION, LOCATION AND LOCATION." TO A LARGE EXTENT, THE "VALUE" OF A CITY -- IN TERMS OF ITS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL -- IS LARGELY BASED ON LOCATION. AND LOCATION IN TURN IS BASED LARGELY ON THE AVAILABILITY OF GOOD TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM THAT CITY. I BELIEVE THAT A STATE-WIDE COMPREHENSIVE HIGHWAY PLAN THAT INCLUDES BOTH MAINTENANCE OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM AND NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL ECONOMICALLY BENEFIT WICHITA, SEDGWICK COUNTY AND THE ENTIRE STATE.

THE PLAN PROPOSED TO DATE WILL HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT ON IMPROVING THE LOCATIONAL VALUE OF WICHITA/SEDGWICK COUNTY AND SHOULD ENCOURAGE NEW INVESTMENT THROUGHOUT OUR AREA. AN IMPROVED HIGHWAY SYSTEM LINKING THE SOUTHERN HALF OF THE STATE WITH MISSOURI, OKLAHOMA AND COLORADO WILL ASSIST IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS. WE PROMOTE THE ADVANTAGE OF OUR CENTRAL LOCATION FOR WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTION ACTIVITIES, BUT, IN FACT, THESE ACTIVITIES WILL CONTINUE TO ONLY REPRESENT A DISPROPORTIONATELY SMALL PART OF OUR LOCAL ECONOMY WITHOUT AN IMPROVED HIGHWAY SYSTEM ACROSS THE STATE.

INCREASED TOURISM WILL RESULT. MISSOURI AND COLORADO ARE MAJOR NATIONAL TOURIST DESTINATIONS AND TRAVELERS MAPPING OUT THEIR ROUTES NATURALLY LOOK FOR THE BEST HIGHWAYS. OUR CURRENT SYSTEM DOES NOT ENCOURAGE TOURIST TRAVEL.

IMPROVED AIR TRAVEL SERVICE IS ALSO A KEY COMPONENT TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. AN IMPROVED HIGHWAY SYSTEM WILL EXPAND WICHITA MID CONTINENT AIRPORT'S MARKET AREA. THE RESULTING INCREASE IN PASSENGERS WILL PROVIDE THE DEMAND NEEDED FOR EXPANDED SERVICES AND WILL ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF A 'HUB' FACILITY. MORE KANSANS WILL BE ABLE TO EASILY REACH WICHITA AND TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE IMPROVED AIR SERVICE. RIGHT NOW WE LOSE THAT BUSINESS TO CITIES SUCH AS TULSA OR OKLAHOMA CITY.

THE WICHITA/SEDGWICK COUNTY AREA IS WELL KNOWN FOR ITS HIGH QUALITY MEDICAL FACILITIES. AN IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WOULD ALLOW MORE KANSANS AND OTHER PEOPLE TO UTILIZE AND TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THOSE FACILITIES; PEOPLE THAT NOW TRAVEL TO OTHER STATES BECAUSE YOU CAN GET THERE MORE COMFORTABLY AND IN LESS TIME.

THE KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PREDICTED THAT THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS FOR THE WICHITA/SEDGWICK COUNTY REGION WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY \$800 MILLION IN INCREASED PERSONAL INCOME AND OVER 1,000 NEW CONSTRUCTION-RELATED JOBS OVER A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS. FOUR UNIVERSITIES, INCLUDING WICHITA STATE, ANALYZED THE PERMANENT, LONG-TERM IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED SOUTHEAST CORRIDOR ON 15 COUNTIES OVER A 20-YEAR PERIOD AND ESTIMATED THAT A ROAD IMPROVEMENT SUCH AS THE ONE RECOMMENDED BY THE HIGHWAY TASK FORCE WOULD RESULT IN UP TO 20,000 ADDITIONAL PERMANENT JOBS AND \$5 BILLION IN INCREASED PERSONAL INCOME. WICHITA, SEDGWICK COUNTY AND THE ENTIRE STATE WOULD SHARE SIGNIFICANTLY IN THE BENEFITS OF SUCH AN IMPROVEMENT TO THIS AREA.

THE CITY OF WICHITA WAS TOLD ONLY TWO YEARS AGO THAT THE STATE WOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF OUR ROAD PROJECTS, SO WE VIEW THE RECENT TURN OF EVENTS AS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS THAT COULD HAVE OCCURRED TO FURTHER THE CAUSE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH. TOO OFTEN WE HEAR THAT WICHITA DOESN'T NEED STATE OR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE; THAT WE ARE A LARGE CITY AND THEREFORE HAVE THE RESOURCES TO PAY FOR THESE BADLY NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS. THAT IS NOT THE CASE AND THESE IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT OCCUR WITHOUT HELP. U.S. 54 HAS NEEDED MAJOR UPGRADING FOR MORE THAN TEN YEARS, BUT THE MONEY JUST HASN'T BEEN AVAILABLE. AND THE MUCH-NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS AND UPGRADING OF THE CITY'S ARTERIALS AND FREEWAYS WILL COST WELL BEYOND THE PROPOSED STATE ASSISTANCE; A COST THAT WICHITANS WILL HAVE TO SOMEHOW COVER. WE HAVE BEEN PREPARING TO TACKLE OUR SHARE WITH THE LOCAL SALES TAX PASSED TWO YEARS AGO, BUT EVEN THOSE FUNDS ARE NOT NEARLY SUFFICIENT TO SOLVE ALL OF OUR ROADWAY PROBLEMS.

YOU, AS LEGISLATORS, HAVE A DIFFICULT JOB AHEAD TO DETERMINE WHAT THE FINAL PLAN SHOULD CONTAIN. THE CITY OF WICHITA ASKS THAT THE MOST COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM POSSIBLE BE ADOPTED FOR THE ECONOMIC BENEFIT OF OUR STATE, OUR CITIES AND COUNTIES, AND THE PEOPLE OF KANSAS. THANK YOU.

Schroeder 16

SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS



TOM SCOTT
CHAIRMAN
SECOND DISTRICT

DAVE BAYOUTH
COMMISSIONER
FIRST DISTRICT

BUD HENTZEN
COMMISSIONER
THIRD DISTRICT

BILLY Q. McCRAY
COMMISSIONER
FOURTH DISTRICT

MARK F. SCHROEDER
CHAIRMAN PRO-TEM
FIFTH DISTRICT

COUNTY COURTHOUSE • SUITE 320 • WICHITA, KANSAS 67203-3759 • TELEPHONE (316) 268-7411

TO: Senate and House Standing Committees on Transportation
DATE: August 18, 1987
RE: Comprehensive Highway Plan

Chairman Morris, Chairman Crowell, and members of the Senate and House Transportation Committees:

I am Mark Schroeder, Vice Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners. I appreciate this opportunity to present the position of Sedgwick County regarding a State Comprehensive Highway Program. I would also like to state that I appreciate the monumental responsibility each of you as members of the Senate and House Transportation Committees face in refining a comprehensive highway program into legislation.

The southern third of Kansas, including Wichita and Sedgwick County, is at an economic crossroads. The decisions of your Committees, the Legislature, and the Governor on the important question of highways will dynamically impact the future growth and development of not only Wichita and Sedgwick County and the entire southern third of the State, but all of Kansas.

We have worked closely with our neighboring counties and cities in southcentral, southeastern, and southwestern Kansas in an examination of long-term highway needs. An adequate highway system, both rural and urban, will provide the strong potential for positive impact on jobs, income, population, and tax base at both the state and local level. It increases the potential for development in all of southern Kansas. The economic development benefits of a comprehensive road plan are both near-term and long-range.

Economic and political challenges have been the history of special sessions of the Kansas Legislature. The State has adopted a policy to enhance economic development in Kansas in a variety of ways. A comprehensive highway system is a vital part of that policy. We sincerely hope that the legislative debate on a comprehensive road program will be conducted in a spirit of enhancing Kansas' economic well-being.

Sedgwick County is truly interested in a program that is good for Kansas. Not one that is only good for Wichita and Sedgwick County, not one that is only good for the southern third of Kansas, but a program that is in the best interest of all Kansas residents. Our goal is to work cooperatively with the Legislature during this special session, to develop a truly comprehensive objective and professionally-managed highway program.

Senate and House Standing
Committees on Transportation
August 18, 1987
Page 3

A comprehensive road program is a commitment to our future and a signal to individuals and industry that Kansas is willing to compete for jobs and business, willing to assure its residents a strong economic future and the opportunity for prosperity.

The economic battle does not pit Sedgwick County against Johnson County, nor western Kansans against eastern. In the economic battle, it is "us", all Kansans, against "them", other states and countries. There is going to be a winner.

Why shouldn't it be Kansas?

Remarks of Terence J. Scanlon
Before the
House and Senate Transportation Committees
August 18, 1987

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees, I am Terry Scanlon,
Publisher of the Wichita Business Journal.

I do not appear here today as a member of the press. I appear
here today because of a long time belief in good highways as a
necessary ingredient to progress and economic survival.

In 1967, I joined the administration of Governor Robert
Docking as Director of the Department of Administration. During
the early months of the Governor's term, I became familiar with the
Jorgensen Report on Kansas Highways and through discussions with
Legislators and highway officials soon convinced myself of the
importance of improving the Kansas Highway system.

As time passed, I found myself allied with Highway Director
John Montgomery, long time highway advocate Rex Dewe and many other
highway boosters. In 1969, Governor Docking appointed me to a
term on the Kansas Turnpike Authority.

Over the years, the Governor and the Legislature wrestled
over highway needs and eventually the Kansas Freeway system
emerged financed through ^{lands and} an increase in motor fuel taxes. It was,
indeed, a compromise and it came very late in the game.

I left State government in 1970 but returned in 1972 as the
Director of the Kansas Department of Economic Development. It was

this position which really convinced me that Kansas was severely handicapped by lack of a really modern highway system.

As a part of my responsibilities, I traveled the State holding informational sessions on the State's economic development program and assisting local communities in developing Pride programs. Everywhere I traveled they said "we need better highways"! Worse yet, when I would take out-of-state industrial prospects to various towns to inspect sites and meet local business leaders. I heard time and again about the needs for good highway connections.

Cities, like Larned and Fredonia, were very difficult to sell not because of site problems, labor, utility rates or attitudes, but because access to good highways was lacking. Emporia, on the other hand, was easier to sell. It had the Turnpike north to Topeka and south to Wichita and it had I-35 east to Kansas City.

I grew up in El Dorado. In those years, El Dorado, Emporia, Ark City and Winfield were about the same size ...10,000 to 12,000 people. Today Emporia has grown to ~~25,000~~^{30,000} but El Dorado, Ark City and Wellington have not. I truly believe highways had a great deal to do with that.

In the last ten years, I have been Vice President for Economic Development and Vice President for Conventions and Tourism for the Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce. For one year, I served full time as the President of the Foundation for Wichita Development. I mention these because in every case, I found good highways

to be an essential element.

Governor Hayden's Highway Program as developed by the Task Force is very comprehensive in that it provides for the maintenance and preservation of the entire highway system, safety, convenience, aid to cities and, of course, the new construction and upgrading.

While each element is important, I would like to comment on the new construction because that is the part which will finally give Kansas a real network of modern highways.

Everyone is getting pretty familiar with the map which shows the proposed expressways and super two's. At a glance, it would appear that the list was an attempt to get a little something for everyone. In fact, critics have called it a "pork barrell" package. What this map fails to clearly illustrate is how these improvements fit into what we already have. What we already have *built, however* ~~by the way~~ is probably a better example of "pork barrell" projects. because these were built to some extent based upon political muscle.

To really see the impact of the proposed projects, we need to add in the existing highways and see what kind of a system we will have in 1997. I have done this on this map and it dramatically shows a system connecting the entire State to a network which will give Kansas the kind of transportation offered by other states which continually out score us in new development.

Kansas recently had a very disappointing experience in the competition for a regional office for State Farm Insurance. That company chose Tulsa as its site. There were, of course, several factors which tipped the scale to Oklahoma but access was one of them.

Oklahoma has always been aggressive in highway construction and they have not slacked off in recent years. Here is a map illustration of Oklahoma's highway system. Some refer to it as the Nigh system.

During the term of Governor George Nigh, who left office in January, 1987, nearly 1.4 billion dollars was spent to improve the system.

	Oklahoma (Toll) (#)	Kansas (Toll) (#)
Interstate	926	633
Turnpike	486 (260)	234 (234)
Total system	12,235	10,000

Andy Oden of the Oklahoma Department of Transportation said in a recent interview with a Wichita Business Journal reporter, "We're devoted to continuing our road program. The Legislature and the DOT have responded with a loud yes when it comes to recognizing highways as a key to economic development and now recovery."


Oden stressed the importance of user taxes and said the 1987 Oklahoma Legislature passed a 6-cent per gallon tax increase on gasoline and a 3-cent increase on diesel fuel. The increase of 5 cents called for in the Governor's plan would make the Kansas tax equal to that of Oklahoma. By the way, there are 40 states in the Union with higher gasoline taxes than Kansas at the present time.

I have heard some say we ought to do less than is proposed in the Governor's Highway Plan. I think this would be as disastrous as our piece-meal efforts of the past. Kansas needs a total system and it needs it without sacrifices to safety and maintenance.

Oklahoma is talking about "recovery". I think we are talking about survival.

Thank you.


PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION INITIATIVES



STATE FUNDED DE-BOTTLENECKERS
STATE/LOCAL FUNDED DE-BOTTLENECKERS

4 LANE EXISTING
4 LANE FREEWAY

2 LANE SUPER TWO
EXPRESSWAY 2 LANE ON 4 LANE R/W



Oklahoma's 926-mile interstate system and additional 486-mile turnpike system far outreach Kansas' 633 miles of interstate and 243 turnpike system. Currently, Oklahomans pay 16 cents per gallon of gas in taxes, which is the proposed rate Kansans would pay if the Governor's highway plan is implemented.

Good Afternoon - My name is Betsy Langston Gwin. I'm President-Elect of the Wichita Metropolitan Area Board of REALTORS . The Wichita Area Board currently has a total membership of over 1500 active members. Our Board was chartered in 1921 making it over 65 years old. Yet, you probably don't recall the Wichita Realtors being before you on many occasions. We haven't been. But, that's going to change. As Realtors we realize more vividly every day the importance of being politically active and vocal. As Realtors, we also realize the importance of a stable, healthy economy and the impact the economy has on our clients, our customers and our business.

We, like everyone else, have been hearing a lot lately about economic development. It seems like everything you pick up to read has something about economic development - it's on the T.V., the radio, at meetings. And that brings me to the point of why I'm here today. The Realtors of Wichita want to stop talking about economic development and put our money where our mouth is. We want this State to become modern, thriving, progressive. Our current highway system is a painful and very visable reminder that we're not there yet. The comprehensive highway plan that is being proposed will be a tremendous beginning for the new thrust in economic development. In fact, we don't feel like we can "get there" without it.

The proposed highway system is going to be very costly - we all know that. So, apparently, the question becomes - are Kansans willing to pay for progress? The people of Kansas are already starting to pay dearly for the lack of progress. We

Att. 18

would much rather pay now to put this state in a progressive mode, then to pay more later because of a weakened tax base and economy.

We realize there are some parts of the State that feel they are not going to benefit from the proposed system as much as others. We contend, however, that the entire state is going to benefit. We would only hope that all Kansans join together and take this major step to improve our State.

The Realtors of Wichita support the proposed highway plan and urge you to make a positive recommendation for its passage at the special session beginning August 31, 1987.

Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT SUBMITTED BY:
THE WICHITA ENGINEERING ASSOCIATION

AND

THE UNITED PLANT GUARD WORKERS OF AMERICA

TO: Members of Senate Transportation and Utilities Committee
and
Members of the House Transportation Committee

On behalf of two major labor organizations representing a large segment of the Boeing workforce including Guards, Firemen, Engineers and Scientists, who live and work in South-Central Kansas, we would like to speak in favor of a comprehensive highway program for the State of Kansas.

We believe, in order for Kansas to enjoy strong economic development that it must address the obsolete antiquated highway system that is clearly a detractor for Firms and Industries to move to Kansas or expand current operations in Kansas.

We believe that it is vital if not absolutely necessary for the State to develop a comprehensive highway program and undertake the proposed bold new construction initiatives that would have a major impact in the development of our economy.

Considering the economic realities facing all of us where job creation will be the key to economic survival of Kansas and its citizens, bold economic initiatives such as the proposed comprehensive highway program is a vital part of the future of Kansas economic development. Clearly one of the State's key resources is its industrious and highly educated workforce. It is our opinion that the state has an obligation to provide a transportation system that is safe, convenient, innovative and well thought out.

Robert W Bradford
ROBERT W. BRADFORD
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
WICHITA ENGINEERING ASSOCIATION

Douglas Peterson
DOUGLAS PETERSON
PRESIDENT OF LOCAL 255
UNITED PLANT GUARD WORKERS OF AMERICA

Corbin R. Benham
CORBIN R. BENHAM
INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE
UNITED PLANT GUARD WORKERS OF AMERICA

20
28

HOUSE AND SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES
August 18, 1987

I am Doug Wright, Mayor of Topeka. First, let me thank the committees for allowing me to appear before you on the issue of highways and their importance to the State of Kansas and the City of Topeka.

There is not a doubt in my mind that highways lure people, investment and jobs. We in Kansas have capitalized on this connection in the past as we developed the third largest state highway system in America, and we need to continue to capitalize on this relationship between roads and jobs and use a strong, comprehensive state highway system as the foundation upon which we can build our state's economic future.

The relationship between roads and jobs is too obvious for any American to have missed. If among you are those who doubt the existence of this connection, I urge you to read the article entitled "Cruising into the 21st century " by Edwin A. Finn Jr., in the August 24, 1987 edition of Forbes magazine. The article uses Interstate 75, which stretches from Northern Michigan to Miami, Florida to support their observation that America's economy for most of this century has been a history of highways.

I've had the opportunity to hear Secretary of Transportation Horace Edwards and Governor Hayden speak in support of the plan outlined by the Governor's Highway Task Force and in my opinion, they are convincing. Certainly there are costs involved in building new highways, but more disturbing to me are the losses we suffer when we fail to accept the responsibility and challenge of providing adequate systems of transportation to move our Kansas-based goods and products in interstate commerce.

As this special session of the Legislature focuses attention on the development of a comprehensive statewide highway plan, I urge you to remember that our cities, counties and other local jurisdictions throughout Kansas are your partner in the implementation of that plan. A comprehensive state highway plan intended to benefit our state's economy cannot be limited to roads in rural areas alone. Our state's economy depends as well on urban roads and city streets. While it is important to build roads and highways to connect our State's urban areas, it is just as important to move the traffic within the urban areas.

It is my estimate that Kansas has more miles of city streets than state highways and that a majority of the vehicle miles driven in Kansas are driven in cities. Those miles of city streets and vehicle miles driven further our state's economy and mean jobs for Kansans. My point is that the policy reasons which support cities and other local jurisdictions in receiving a share of state highway revenues are sound and a comprehensive statewide highway plan is worthy of being built on those policies.

The Governor's Task Force recommends an increased share of state revenues to local jurisdictions. For Topeka, the proposed increase in revenues amounts to nearly \$6 million of additional revenue over the next 9 years. Those are dollars Topeka needs to help us develop our local economy by building and improving city streets and I am sure other local jurisdictions around the State need them as well. I urge your continued support of the sharing of revenues with Topeka and other local jurisdictions as you develop the State's comprehensive highway program.

I've not tried to direct my remarks to you to the projects proposed for Topeka and Shawnee County. I've already addressed our local legislative delegation and feel that they will effectively carry the ball for us with regard to those projects. Let me just say to you, though, that some of the projects recommended for Topeka and Shawnee County which can have a dramatic impact on our local and state economic future will never be built if they aren't built as a part of this highway plan. I'm sure that Topeka's situation isn't unique and that other cities across our great state are looking to the Legislature to authorize similar projects which will be of equal benefit to them.

Highways lure people, investment and jobs. Because of the entrepreneurial spirit that is alive in Topeka today, we are experiencing dramatic growth, and it is growth in spite of our highway system. But, we in Topeka need the help of the State if we are going to build on and sustain this growth. The Task Force recommendation offers us that plan for growth and I urge its favorable consideration.

DOUGLAS S. WRIGHT
Mayor

THE ECONOMICS OF SHAWNEE COUNTY PROJECTS

A. I-70/I-470 Wanamaker (100% State)

Estimated Cost \$17.7 Million

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	528
(2) Corporate Taxes:	2.1 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.18 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.1 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	4.1 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	4.6 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	24.58 Million

B. I-70/KTA East Interchange (100% State)

Estimated Cost \$4.1 Million

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	122
(2) Corporate Taxes:	.48 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.04 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.02 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	.94 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	1.07 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	5.69 Million

C. US 75/Old 75 South Interchange (100% State)

Estimated Cost \$6.1 Million

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	182
(2) Corporate Taxes:	.71 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.06 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.02 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	1.39 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	1.59 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	8.47 Million

D. I-70 Modernization (US 75 East to Viaduct) (100% State)

Estimated Cost \$21.0 Million

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	626
(2) Corporate Taxes:	2.46 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.21 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.08 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	4.79 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	5.46 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	29.2 Million

E. I-470 Modernization (I-70 to KTA) (100% State)

Estimated Cost \$20.2 Million

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	603
(2) Corporate Taxes:	2.36 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.24 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.08 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	4.61 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	5.25 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	28.1 Million

F. US 75 North (Topeka to Holton) (100% State)

Estimated Cost \$70.1 Million

(These Benefits Would Be Area Benefits With
A Large Portion Ending Up In Shawnee County.)

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	2092
(2) Corporate Taxes:	8.2 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.70 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.28 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	15.98 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	18.2 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	97.4 Million

G. East Bypass (Oakland Expressway (75% State)

Estimated Cost \$25.5 Million. Area Cost \$6.37 Million.

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	761
(2) Corporate Taxes:	2.98 Million,
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.25 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.10 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	5.81 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	6.63 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	35.4 Million

H. US 75 By Pass South (75% State)

Estimated Cost \$34.7 Million. Area Cost \$8.67 Million.

Benefits:

(1) Jobs Created:	1036
(2) Corporate Taxes:	4.06 Million
(3) Personal Income Taxes:	.35 Million
(4) Sales Taxes:	.14 Million
(5) Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs:	7.91 Million
(6) New Disposable Income:	9.02 Million
(7) Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	48.2 Million

In Summary, the eight year program will generate the following economic motors for the Topeka-Shawnee County Area:

	Total 8 Year Program	Yearly Average
1. Jobs Created:	5950	744
2. Corporate Taxes:	23.35 Million	2.92 Million
3. Personal Income Taxes:	2.03 Million	.25 Million
4. Sales Taxes:	.82 Million	.10 Million
5. Reduces Vehicle Operating Costs:	45.53 Million	5.69 Million
6. New Disposable Income:	51.82 Million	6.48 Million
7. Generated Goods and Services (Ripple Effect):	277.0 Million	34.6 Million

Economic factors taken from KDOT, Federal Highway Administration, US Department of Labor and Commerce, IRS and Other Sources.

Some Miscellaneous Facts:

Cost to one car owner driving 12,500 miles a year will be approximately \$.105 per day, \$3.15 per month or \$37.80 per year.

The cost to drive a vehicle on a rough road vs. a smooth, well maintained road is between \$250.00 and \$300.00 per vehicle per year above normal maintenance.

Building the Shawnee County Projects will result in reduced maintenance costs for the average citizen of \$35.35 per year. The real cost then to a citizen with one car and driving 12,500 miles will be \$2.45 per year (\$37.80 - \$35.35)

The above numbers do not take into account the improved safety that will result upon their completion. Improvement will occur in reduced property damage and loss, reduced injuries and deaths, lost time and wages, and possible reductions in average insurance costs and court settlements.

Comprehensive Highway Construction Plan

The Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce supports the Governor's Plan to build, improve, and maintain highways throughout the State of Kansas. A multi-year comprehensive highway improvement plan, providing stability and direction for the future, is both critical to the effective and efficient use of available resources and the continued growth and development of our city and state.

The Topeka Chamber recognizes the use of debt should be included in the financial program in addition to an increase in fuel taxes and registration fees sufficient to retire the debt and further maintain Kansas highways.

The Topeka Chamber firmly endorses the projects listed below (not in order of priority) as a part of the final plan to be approved by the legislature and the governor:

CORRIDOR PROJECTS

- * "Super-Two" US-75 from Oklahoma border north to I-35
- * "Super-Two" US-75 from I-35 north to existing four-lane at US-56, then north to Topeka on existing four-lane, then four-lane expressway from Topeka north to Holton, then "Super-Two" north to the Nebraska border.

DEBOTTLENECKING PROJECTS (100% state funded)

- * US-75/Old US-75 Intersection in Shawnee County
- * I-70/I-470/Wanamaker Interchange in Topeka
- * I-70/East KTA Interchange in Topeka

DEBOTTLENECKING PROJECTS (75% state, 25% local funded)

- * US-75 South Bypass in Topeka
- * Oakland Expressway in Topeka

August 18, 1987

House Transportation Committee
Senate Transportation Committee

17
Testimony of Al W. Tikwart, Jr.
Mayor of Westwood Hills, Kansas
Home (913) 432-0304
Office (816) 561-5443
8. Elected Terms - 6 Terms as Mayor

Something has to be done:

1. Farming - worst since the great depression
2. Oil - thousands of wells capped
3. Aircraft manufacturing from 1000's to 100's

We can try to cut the existing pie into smaller and smaller pieces.

Bleed material resources - severance tax

Go after the Gold Coast - income tax, surcharges, etc.

These taxes will in the long run be a negative influence - move to neighboring states - legislature has helped take away neighborhood schools - 40% of schools in school districts - less exploration, etc.

Why not put off the "poor me" role and take on a positive approach to the challenges of the 80's and 90's. Harry Truman - GI bill - millions of men and women moved back into labor force on a gradual basis, thus averting a depression. Before this, every war the US engaged in was followed by a depression. Dwight Eisenhower in the 50's - "pump needed priming" - did the highway program - what another stroke of genius. With all the lemons how can we make lemonade?

Unique opportunity - I-35 and I-29 go from Canada to tip of South America. I-70 is the main highway east and west in the United States. There needs to be a capital infusion and work opportunity with jobs now that lay the groundwork for future diversified business growth. Take the Highway Mega Buck program as a positive. Kansas is pulling itself up. Kansas is working on its own and deserves serious consideration for the multi billion dollar "Super Collider." We stand strong not looking for a federal crumb.

Can it be done? Is it possible? Submit a parallel with our city of Westwood Hills. Our motto is "The Most Beautiful Little City in Kansas." Our sidewalks were crumbling, curbs broken, streets

cracked, storm sewers tied into sanitary sewers. We tried to merge with wealthy Westwood. That is the city that gave back the Federal Revenue Sharing, the first city to do it. They didn't want us and our problems. So I and five others ran as a mayorial council state to do something positive. We worked hard and came up with a city-wide plan which cost approximately \$335,000. If you divide \$335,000, our 20 year bond, by 475 residents (men, women and children), you have an expenditure in 1974 of \$701/man woman and child in our city.


Looking back and doing some extrapolations, I found that in 1974, there was approximately 213.8 million Americans and the federal debt at that time was 595.4 billion dollars or \$2,785/man, woman and child. Thus, Westwood Hills residents assumed a debt on a ratio of one-fourth of the amount of the national debt at that time. Remember, in 1974 trillions were not even in our vocabulary. We had town meetings. We had opposition. We had possible law suits, etc. We had a non binding poll by household. Eighty-four percent of the people voted, 42 percent for and 42% against. We said that the 16 percent we didn't hear from would probably go for it so we "bit the bullet" and did it. The project won the 1975 Kansas Engineering Award for small city improvement. Even more important, the people took a pride in their property. Additions were added, people invested in their homes. In 1985, Westwood Hills was chosen one of the top six neighborhood areas in the seven county metro areas. Also, our homes are small, but according to several large real estate companies, we have the highest per square foot value of property.

In 1973, we had deficits of \$100-200 or carried over about the same. The most beautiful little city was like the Phoenix that rose from the ashes. We attracted several quality retail shops and now the 1 percent sales tax generates more income than our real estate tax. Our city now has two years operating monies of \$160,000+ in reserves. We have codified our laws. We have purchased two parcels of land for our city green area. We added a fountain and other capital additions that would easily total over \$100,000. Plus, we have maintained our present infrastructure at a very high level.

The indebtedness of \$701/person was a large amount. If you would multiply it by the 81,178 residents of Overland Park, Kansas, the Flagship City of Johnson County, you would have a general obligation bond of \$62,513,000 dollars. Even to this day, Overland Park has only \$25,330,000 in general obligation bonds, 16 million was added in the last two years.

What is it going to take to get the job done? If a small city could do it, I believe our state can. We need to be unified. We need to make sure that health, education and our senior citizens are taken care of. We need to compromise. Remember Johnson County in the school formula. Some place might need to take the low level, nuclear waste. We can't be all takers, each of us has to do our share.

Finally, we need to think big, to go after the "Super Collider," the new technology of the 21st century. We need to begin the journey with strong unified support, Democrat and Republican - Rural and Urban. The choice is ours. We can try to cut the pie into smaller and smaller pieces and have blood baths of smaller pieces or we can GO FOR IT. Thank you for this opportunity to present these ideas. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.



Montgomery County



P.O. BOX 479 • PLAZA BLDG. • COFFEYVILLE, KANSAS 67337 • 316/251-5312

- Stanley L. Basler, President
- Thomas R. Burke, Vice President
- Pat Marso, Treasurer
- Ganny Scott, Secretary
- Steven W. Rockwell, Executive Vice President

August 17, 1987

The Senate and Legislature
of the State of Kansas

RE: Proposed Highway Plan

CANEY

Gentlemen:

J.J. Bridenstine, Mayor

Julie Biggerstaff

Paul Taylor

CHERRYVALE

John Littell, Mayor

Mike Curtin

Norman Fink

Jim Gill

COFFEYVILLE

Phillip Bernhart

Ray Caldwell, County Commissioner

Al Liebert

Robert Pratt

Perl Schmid

Bernard Wade

David Wheeler

INDEPENDENCE

Dale Faler, Mayor

Harrison Johnson

Nate Persky

Jim Thornton

Paul Viets

George Walt

Ray Woods

I am addressing you on behalf of the Montgomery County Action Council of Montgomery County, Kansas. In the way of background, I direct your attention to the fact that so strong is a sense of rivalry, historically, in Montgomery County, Kansas, that pursuant to Kansas statute, District Court meets both in Coffeyville and in Independence. In addition, both communities have separate community colleges.

In spite of the above, prompted by severe economic woes which hit the County in the latter part of 1981, Montgomery County Action Council was born. The organization was first formed as an ad hoc committee to the Board of County Commissioners in the Spring of 1983. The first two years of its existence, it functioned on a volunteer basis although it was composed of elected representatives from the Board of County Commissioners, the City of Independence, the City of Coffeyville, the City of Cherryvale, and the City of Caney, Kansas.

In the latter part of 1985, a full time paid economic developer, was hired and made Executive Vice President of the organization. In the Spring of 1987, the organization became a not for profit corporation.

In summary, because of the severity of the economic crisis within our county, years of rivalry have been swept aside and this organization has been born from a spirit of unity to conquer and overcome an economic crisis which all of us still believe is severe in nature. As president of this organization, I speak to you as a representative from the four largest incorporated cities as well as county government and of a number of citizen volunteers, drawn from the business, professional and industrial communities.

Everything that we have studied or learned about economic development emphasizes the importance of good highway systems to encourage the growth of existing local industry or to attract new industry. Our part of the state is desperate for these kinds of highway connections. The proposed plan would offer highways which we believe would considerably enable us to rise above our present economic crisis.


I recently went on the Kansas Calvary expedition to the State of Michigan. During those times when I was questioned individually about the part of Kansas that I lived in, I was asked about the proximity to interstate highways. It was discouraging to see the interest subside somewhat as I explained to them that interstate highway connections could be found in Joplin, Missouri and Tulsa, Oklahoma, and that we had traditional unimproved two lane highways to connect them to those two points.

The informational materials produced by the Kansas Department of Commerce and distributed by the Kansas Calvary to industrial prospects emphasizes the quality of our educational institutions in the State of Kansas and the individuals that we produce to enter the work force. It also emphasizes the willingness of our educational institutions to help train individuals to meet the needs of private industry. It is, indeed, a shame that a large part of the time the children who are sent through the educational system that we promote are forced to leave Kansas to find suitable employment. It is my desire that the State of Kansas, which I love and believe has a high degree of livability, provide employment futures for our children.

Further, as the Department of Commerce literature points out, Kansas has a number of advantages to offer industry to produce the jobs we so desperately need as we see the economy of our state transform from one highly dependent on agriculture and oil into some different form. One of those advantages that is so critical to attracting new industry is one that we must yet provide, and that is an abundance of quality highways connecting into the interstate system to make our state attractive from a number of different directions.

As a taxpayer, I like all other taxpayers, wish that we could have the roads built without the tax burden that is necessary in making them a reality. Unfortunately, these roads cannot be built without creating a financial burden. It is the opinion of the organization that I represent that this burden must be assumed if the State of Kansas is going to have the kind of future that we believe that it should have, the kind of future that we hope for.

Respectfully submitted,


Stanley L. Basler
President

SLB:bmw

25

Statement Concerning
RECOMMENDED HIGHWAY PROGRAM BY GOVERNOR'S TASKFORCE
presented to a joint hearing of the
SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE
and
HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
by
Arthur J. Collins, Chairman
Northwest Passage Highway Coalition
August 18, 1987

As we consider the recommendations of the Governor's Highway Taskforce this week, we must keep in mind the big picture. We should not be so provincial as to overlook that our major roads lead to someplace other than Kansas. The Legislature as it deliberates the matter of highways during the next few weeks has a great opportunity to do much to enhance Kansas' position on the national highway system.

Construction and upgrading of the three major corridors contained in this program will be like adding three spokes to the wheel of which Wichita, our largest city, is the hub. The Southwest Corridor (US54) will lead to Liberal and, eventually, on to form a junction with Interstate 40 in New Mexico. The Southeast Corridor (K96/US160) will lead to the southeast corner where it will form a junction with Interstate 44, near Joplin, Missouri. The Northwest Corridor will lead to a junction with Interstate 70 at Russell and on to Denver. These highways, together with Interstates 35 and 135 and Highway US 54 to the east which already radiate out from Wichita, will form a major portion of the Kansas highway system for the future.

The greatly improved corridor from Joplin to I-70 is deserving of particular attention. This highway (K96/US160) is the only really new highway in this very comprehensive plan which you will be studying. It is not just a coincidence that it contains a preponderance of the four-lane highways which the plan envisions.

The fact this corridor has been recognized for many years is attested by the fact it has been designated as Kansas Highway 96 over much of this route. It has also been the subject of several studies and legislative proposals during the past thirty years. It is time its disjointed routing be corrected and K-96 be allowed to assume its rightful place as one of Kansas' major highways.

We are talking about a 1.6 billion dollar program. A close look at the recommendations from the Taskforce show the only new roads to be portions of the K96 corridor we have already discussed. This proposed program is really a major improvement program--not a new roads program. In the terms of my profession, which is banking, Kansas has been living on depreciation as far as its highways are concerned. Most of us at one time or another have

had an automobile which when it approached 25,000 miles, we considered trading and then did not. We proceeded to drive that automobile until it had 60, or 70, or 80,000 miles; at which time we did trade for a new one. At that point we learned we had nearly used up the value of our automobile. In addition to this, we found inflation had greatly increased to cost of the new automobile. It really hurt when we got to that point. Kansas is in the same situation today as regards its highways; not by choice, but by circumstance. The question we are asking ourselves is "can we afford to put our highway system into first-class condition?"

If you have had the opportunity and/or time to read the Briefing Paper covering the Taskforce Recommendations, you probably saw the average cost of this entire proposed program is estimated to be \$39.92 per vehicle (not per individual) per year. To bring this down to realistic everyday terms, this is \$3.33 per month which is the equivalent of a hamburger, french fries, and a soft drink. As you ponder about our highways over the next few weeks, please keep this analogy in mind.

Since the Governor's Taskforce began meeting in February, I was privileged to attend nearly all of their meetings. Considering the makeup of the Taskforce, their deliberations were surprising free of partisanship. Some Republican legislators were very critical of the proposals at times. Some Democrats were very supportive. Nearly all participated freely and sincerely in working out the recommendations. There has been much talk in the media that the recommended program is one huge pork barrel. I personally observed nothing in the conduct of the Taskforce members which appeared to be pork barrel or trade-offs. No project is regarded as pork-barrel by those citizens who use that particular portion of our roads. I take this opportunity to publicly commend the members of the Taskforce for their efforts on behalf of all of us.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing here today.



DILLON STORES, A DIVISION OF DILLON COMPANIES, INC.
2700 EAST FOURTH - P.O. BOX 1608
HUTCHINSON, KANSAS 67504-1608 - (316)665-5511

JOHN L. BALDWIN
President

August 14, 1987

First Name *Last Name*
Address
City, *State* *Zip*

Dear Senator *Last Name:*

As a major company, serving customers in 27 communities throughout Kansas, Dillon Stores feels it is our obligation to step forward and publicly state our position on proposed highway improvements, currently under consideration in the State Legislature.

First, we wish to commend the Governor's task force committee for developing a most comprehensive plan that creatively addresses a pressing need in our state.

As a company logging over six million miles a year on Kansas highways, Dillons has more than a passive interest in this program. There is no doubt that this proposed highway plan will represent a significant expense to Dillons through increased fuel costs and user taxes in the years ahead.

At the same time, we have weighed this study from a broader perspective of its effect on the future growth and economy of our state. It is our feeling that the necessity of a good highway system for Kansas far exceeds the costs in seeing it become a reality. We realize that a program of such scope cannot possibly answer every need or priority, but we do believe it to be a positive and realistic approach to our state's highway needs and a fair and equitable plan overall.

It is our opinion that the plan of highway improvements be adopted in total. We would, however, encourage the legislature to continue to carefully study every method of funding and search for the very best means of financing this project. It is very important that Kansas remains in balance with neighboring states on fuel tax rates in the years ahead. We feel that further review of the indexing method is necessary and that some type of safeguards and constraints may be necessary, in order that our fuel rates do not exceed those of surrounding states in the years ahead.


There is no question in our minds that a good system of highways is vital to the future of our state. If our communities and our people are to prosper, we must start now. The greatest threat we see to that future is to ignore the work and study that has already been done and simply do nothing. We urge the legislature to move forward with this plan for a better Kansas.

Sincerely,

DILLON STORES DIVISION

John L. Baldwin
President

JLB:jc



Economic Development Commission

2015 Lakin • Great Bend, KS 67530 • (316) 792-1375

TESTIMONY

TO: Members of the Kansas Senate Transportation Committee and Members of the Kansas House of Representatives Transportation Committee

DATE: Aug. 18, 1987

Honorable Chairmen and Members of the Transportation Committees:

I'm Mark Mingenback, a member of the Governor's Highway Task Force, from Great Bend representing the Mid-Kansas Economic Development Commission, the Great Bend Chamber of Commerce, and various local governmental entities within Barton County.

For the past two years, numerous persons representing interests in Barton County have appeared before the Transportation Committees to testify as proponents of new and improved highways in Kansas. Again today I am here to confirm widespread and solid support of the highway initiatives as recommended by the Governor's Highway Task Force.

There are numerous reasons for our support and I want to briefly outline these for your consideration.

First, we've been saying for many months that it is our opinion that successful economic development in Kansas cannot be separated from the issue of adequate highway transportation to all corners of the state. We still believe this. Without a modern, cost-efficient highway system which expedites the rapid shipment of products and people, the task of encouraging new businesses to invest capital and create new jobs is a most difficult objective. How, I ask, can we successfully attract new manufacturing operations to Kansas when we have an obsolete highway system which does not now expedite shipment of finished products to the fastest growing areas in the United States? There is a booming population growth occurring in southwestern states, particularly Arizona, New Mexico and California, and in the sunbelt states of the southeast such as Florida which now has the third highest population in the United States. These are important markets for Kansas Manufacturers, both new and existing, and we must upgrade and modernize our highway system such as that envisioned by the Task Force if we are to remain competitive with other states in the securement of new industry and other businesses.

Barton County Speaks For Itself!

The same holds true for existing industry. Attached to my testimony is a copy of an article on the Fuller Brush Company, Great Bend's largest employer with 550 employees and an annual payroll of \$6.5 million. This article is contained in the August issue of Kansas Business News. In it Mr. Russ Imler, Senior Vice-President of Operations says: "This state has to deal with the highway situation if it wants to attract industry". He goes on to say that more companies would find Kansas ideal for shipping if roads could support the traffic. Remember that Fuller Brush is a subsidiary of the Sara Lee Corporation, Chicago, Illinois, which has many companies under its corporate umbrella. Attempting to secure additional investment and an accompanied expansion from any one of these companies remains a top objective of our local economic development efforts. But we will never succeed without the state sending clear signals that it is serious about upgrading and modernizing our highway system. So if we want more jobs in Kansas for Kansas citizens, we'd better listen to what companies like Fuller Brush are saying and we had better take appropriate action.

While railroads historically played a major role in the development of Kansas, few companies extensively utilize shipment by rail. Thus highways become increasingly important to rural Kansas.

It is also important for legislators to realize that the population center of the United States creeps a little more each day to the southwest. Now located near St. Louis, this westward movement is significant for Kansas. Kansas is already located in the geographical center of the continental United States and as the population of western and southwestern states increases, the population center moves closer to Kansas. Within a few years, Kansas will have the distinct advantage of boasting that companies in Kansas can more cost-efficiently serve markets in all of the 48 contiguous United States. But being central will not do the job unless we adopt a highway plan which expedites the movement of finished products from our Kansas-based facilities to the borders where our highways link up with major super-two or four lane highways in neighboring states.

We must think now in terms of market to market roads; not just farm to market roads.

Tied closely to this issue of highways for economic development is the need to link Kansas "cities of commerce" together with a modern, statewide highway system. We define "cities of commerce" as being those cities having more than 10,000 in population. The plan proposed by the Task Force accomplishes this. For the first time, the cities of Pittsburg, Parsons, Coffeyville, Independence, Winfield, Chanute, Arkansas City, Hutchinson, Great Bend, Dodge City, Garden City, Liberal, and Manhattan would have either super-two or four lane highway access. More importantly, these cities of commerce would be connected with Wichita, our major center of commercial activity.

Through the years, these communities along with the other cities of more than 10,000 population have proven they have the local commitment it takes to grow economically. They have become the predominant trade centers of the state and now the State should consider making a sizeable investment to encourage these cities and the community leaders in them to continue to expand their economies. Adoption of the highway plan as recommended by the Task Force and Governor will accomplish this.

There is no question but that we in Barton County likewise support the proposed new diagonal highway plan because of the inclusion of the so-called Northwest Passage. But this new diagonal highway is vital to our future and there are solid reasons for including this highway in the new highway program. Mr. Ed Minges, Barton County Community College, will testify in a few minutes to present our case in this regard.

In conclusion, let me say that we feel its time for us to readjust our thinking about Kansas highways. We must think of an improved highway system as an investment which will help insure our future. We cannot guarantee that every improved highway will bring new business investment and new jobs. But we can guarantee that without some major improvements in our highway system, we will continue to pay a big price in lost economic opportunities. Community leaders in communities along the improved highways at least want the opportunity to compete and many are pledging to renew their efforts in economic development to prove the point. We in Barton County certainly are included in this group.

Perhaps a letter for A.C. Truck Service in Great Bend says it best. While I'm also attaching a copy of this letter to my testimony, let me emphasize a few of the important statements. "The state of Kansas needs to remember that they are the center of the U.S. and with a few minor road changes they could be the hub of the U.S.". And, "It might surprise the politicians in Topeka to know how many industries and big transportation companies would set up terminals in the center of the United States if they could transport commodities both ways to the major coast areas".

Concerning the Northwest Passage, A.C. Truck claims: "If the State of Kansas would put a major highway from Wichita to Hays there would be a completely different outlook at most terminals where trucks are dispatched and at all truckstops where the drivers are looking at road maps to find the best routes".

As you consider this important highways issue during the Special Legislative Session, I encourage you to consider the points I've tried to make. We are at a critical crossroads. Our future and indeed the future of our children and grandchildren are in your hands. May you choose wisely so that the present and future development of Kansas will be enhanced, not impaired.

Fuller Brush: Largest Employer In Great Bend

By MARGARET SHAUERS

When the Fuller Brush Co. moved its U.S. plant from Hartford, Ct. to Central Kansas 16 years ago, it was the largest manufacturing concern in the Great Bend area. With 500-550 persons employed, it still is.

Size isn't the only surprising thing about the company, though. While it still makes the same brushes Alfred Fuller began selling door-to-door after hand-twisting them together in the basement of his sister's Boston home—production has grown to include more than 500 different brushes. Moreover, brushes comprise only a fraction of the company's business.


Compared to most manufacturers, Fuller has what former president and present chairman, Len Dunlap, calls, "an extremely diversified" product line. "Most manufacturers have what is called a short line of products, with little diversity," he says. "Fuller has a long line."

Of the company's 2,000-odd offerings, more than 20 different cleaning and household products are produced by the chemical division alone. The company produces gardening products, cotton mops and dusters, brooms, personal-care items, sponges for stainless steel and other household goods. It's all manufactured in awesome amounts. Annually, the plant produces enough floor finish to cover 6,500 football fields and uses enough cotton in mops to go around the world four times.

Fuller additionally has an industrial line of janitorial and sanitary supplies, and does contract work for other industries such as Boeing.

"Huge amounts of air flows through a jet engine," says Dunlap, "and some engines use a special form of brush as an air strainer. We make these."

Among the other companies Fuller contracts with are International Business Machines, Pratt Whitney and McDonald Douglas, in addition to the federal government.



Fuller Brush Co. plant, Great Bend

One of the most active departments is plastics. On-line seven days a week, 24 hours a day, this department produces containers and parts for Fuller goods—including 1.5 million bottles and 300,000 hair brush blocks a year. Making its own plastics, explains Senior Vice President Russ Imler, who is in charge of the Great Bend Plant, allows the company to control inventory and quality.

The plastics department also does contract work, producing display racks and port lights for yachts. The primary contract, however, involves the production of 118 million L'eggs plastic pantyhose eggs each year—enough to cover Fuller's eleven-acre facility should anyone care to place them end to end.

The hosiery eggs are contracted by a sister company. Fuller remained a family-owned concern until 1968 when it was purchased by Consolidated Foods. The same company still owns Fuller, but took the name of a subsidiary, Sara Lee, a few years ago to achieve better name recognition. Sara Lee also owns Hanes Hosiery, which produces L'eggs.

Imler says the three-year-old L'eggs contract helped raise Fuller's employment from the 373 it was when he took charge in 1981. "Getting the contract for L'eggs," he says, "was a very competitive situation. There was a question whether we could compete." He smiles. "We are now the driving force in this market and I give credit to our employees. They're producing a better product at lower cost."

Fuller's productivity, Imler believes, will allow it to compete in even more market areas. "Productivity is the thing I am most proud of here. In the past five years, it has gone up more than 20 percent."

High productivity and product diversification, agree Imler and Dunlap, have the direct benefit of keeping employees working. "Since Fuller has been in Great Bend, we've had one layoff for about two weeks," says Dunlap. "I wish it hadn't happened. Since then we have been able to keep employment fairly stable. There is some seasonality, and we do some short-term hiring. We have to go to a four-day week once in a while.

Western Kansas

But, if possible, we think it is fair to our permanent employees to provide a regular paycheck so they can pay the mortgage."

Fuller's Great Bend payroll runs \$6.5 million a year, and, says Imler, wages have gone up each year he has been there. "Last year we gave lump-sum raises instead of percentages, but we haven't missed an increase in six years. We could do it because each raise was offset by cost decreases in the plant, while quality went up. The way you achieve success is through your people."

Although Fuller has foreign operations (Canada and Mexico), plus plans to open another plant in Spain, Great Bend has the only U.S. plant. Great Bend also houses Fuller's primary U.S. warehouse.

Transportation, in fact, is the one thing Fuller would like to see improved. "The Great Bend location is central to all points in the U.S.," says Dunlap, "but Great Bend is a little off the main transportation routes. We serve the entire United States from there and almost all shipping is done by truck."

"This state has to deal with the highway situation if it wants to attract industry," says Imler, adding that more companies would find Kansas ideal for shipping if roads could support the traffic.

With wide-scale operations and many products, Fuller has not been hurt by the slumps in agriculture and oil in Western Kansas. In fact, Dunlap says that although he of course doesn't welcome problems in another industry,

there may have been an indirect benefit to Fuller.

"Every situation has a golden side for someone," he says. "One problem we had in Great Bend was competing for good workers while oil companies guaranteed 50-hour weeks, top salaries and heavy overtime pay. Fuller has a 40-hour work week; we'd have people falling into the machinery if we did more. We could not compete with oil in the past, but today a steady paycheck and 40 hours a week looks good in Great Bend."

...wages have gone up each year he has been there.

Imler agrees that high oilfield wages caused some hiring problems for Fuller.

"Almost all our jobs have a three-year training period," he explains. "In oil, people could be trained sooner and were quickly earning as much money as it takes our people time to work up to."

Imler works out of the Great Bend plant. Dunlap and about 150 other executives, sales people and staff members—people who travel a lot—do not. When Fuller left Connecticut, the plant was moved directly to Great Bend. The administrative offices were first located in Illinois, then moved to Great Bend where they remained until seven years ago. They were then moved to North

Kansas City, Mo., and a new move has just been made to Winston-Salem, N.C., where Fuller's new mail order operations are based.

The moves of the administrative branch, says Dunlap, are totally unrelated to the plant. "There have been rumors—for years—that we are about to move the plant from Great Bend. It's not true. There is far too much money invested."

Fuller's new venture, catalog sales, won't interfere with door-to-door sales, says Dunlap.

"Our direct sales do not reach all people in the United States," he says. "Half the women in the U.S. work today and are not at home to answer the door. That number will continue to grow." Nor could Fuller's 13,000 representatives canvass the more than 40 million households in America. Dunlap says he thinks the catalogs will help find those who wish to be called on. "Each catalog is stamped with the name and address of an area representative. Some customers prefer the personal service offered by a Fuller Brush man."

The Fuller Brush man, from Alfred Fuller on, has traditionally emphasized personal service. Fuller brushes have been delivered by dog sled in Alaska, muleback in Central America and river boat in Brazil. One story is told of a salesman who scrubbed seven children with a bath brush one Saturday night to prove its worth to the lady of the house. Fuller Brush men have pulled teeth, delivered babies, plucked chickens and repaired leaky faucets, all in the pursuit of sales.

Before the company moved its manufacturing operation to Great Bend, Fuller brush men provided service there, too. But now, with the plant containing an employee store, Great Bend is one of the few places where Fuller salesmen seldom ring doorbells. Imler says there are three representatives in the area, but admits they are spread too thin.


Imler says his personal goal this year is raising employment to 600. ♦

KANSAS OXYGEN, INC.

"Serving Kansas Since 1946"


Company Stores In:

HUTCHINSON 1200 N. Grand 316-665-5551	WICHITA 1311 S. Mclean Blvd. 316-265-1535
DODGE CITY 606 S. Second 316-225-0002	GARDEN CITY Boots Road 316-276-2861



MEDICAL & INDUSTRIAL GASES, PLUS COMPLETE WELDING SUPPLIES

- Lincoln Welders
- Tweco
- Flamex
- Milwaukee
- Stellite
- Victor Equipment
- Piranha Iron Worker
- Plasma Equipment
- Sellstrom
- Hobart
- Black & Decker
- Stoodly
- Harper



**A-C TRUCK SERVICE, INC.
A-C TRACTOR SERVICE**

316-792-5333 P. O. Box 622
GREAT BEND, KANSAS 67530

JUNE 1, 1987

Leroy Lyon
Economic Development Commission
2015 Lakin
Great Bend, Kansas 67530

DEAR MR. LYON:

WE HAVE A SMALL TRANSPORTATION COMPANY WITH THE HOME OFFICE IN GREAT BEND AND SATELLITE TERMINAL IN GARDEN CITY, KANSAS. WITH DEREGULATION NOW IN FULL EFFECT, TO STAY IN BUSINESS AND PROSPER IN THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY, AND KEEP YOUR RATES COMPETITIVE, YOU HAVE TO CUT COSTS. IF YOU HAVE A STREAMLINED OPERATION THE ONLY MAJOR WAY TO CUT COSTS IS TO CUT MILEAGE BY DRIVING THE SHORTEST ROUTES. TO UNDERSTAND MY POINT, YOU SHOULD OPEN AN ATLAS AND LOOK AT THE STATE OF KANSAS AS WHOLE, NOT JUST THE CENTRAL PART OF THE UNITED STATES. THE STATE OF KANSAS NEEDS TO REMEMBER THAT THEY ARE THE CENTER OF THE U.S., AND WITH A FEW MINOR ROAD CHANGES THEY COULD BE THE HUB OF THE U.S.

IN ONE OF KANSAS MAJOR INDUSTRIES, THE MEAT BUSINESS, SEVERAL HUNDRED TRUCKS LOAD EACH MONTH IN GARDEN CITY, LIBERAL AND DODGE CITY WITH MEAT PRODUCTS TO FEED THE EAST COAST AND OTHER PARTS OF THE NATION. IF A TRUCK LOADS AT GARDEN CITY TO GO TO CHICAGO, DETROIT OR NEW YORK, THE CLOSEST ROUTE WOULD BE 156 HIGHWAY. WITH THE BAD CONDITION OF HIGHWAY 156, A SPEED LIMIT OF 55 M.P.H. THE TRUCK TAKES HIGHWAY 183 NORTH TO I-70. THAT TRUCK JUST WENT APPROXIMATELY 61 MILES OUT OF ROUTE. WITH OPERATIONAL COSTS OF 70 CENTS PER MILE, THAT'S AN ADDED EXPENSE OF \$42.70 TO THE TRUCK. THIS MONEY COULD HAVE BEEN USED FOR MAINTENANCE, DRIVER BENEFITS OR FOR OPERATING CAPITAL TO USE FOR UPDATING EQUIPMENT.

THAT FIGURE DOES NOT SEEM LIKE MUCH FOR ONE TRIP, BUT MULTIPLY THAT BY SEVERAL TRIPS, SEVERAL TRUCKS AND YOU COME UP WITH DOLLARS THAT ARE TOO ASTRONOMICAL TO WORK WITH. THEN ALSO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE REVENUE LOST BY THE TOWNS ON HIGHWAY 156 BECAUSE OF LOST TRAFFIC, MEALS, FUEL, GASOLINE AND MAINTENANCE, ETC. THIS IS ON A LOCAL SCALE.

If You Got it . . . A Truck Brought It

PAGE 2


NOW LETS GET ON A BIGGER SCALE AND GO NATIONWIDE. WE WILL LOAD A TRUCK AT JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA, GOING TO SALT LAKE CITY, DENVER, PORTLAND OR SEATTLE. THE SHORTEST ROUTE WOULD BE I-10 TO 27-842-231 TO I-20 TO DALLAS, 81 TO WICHITA FALLS, 287 TO AMARILLO, 87 TO RATON, 25 TO DENVER, THEN 80 TO SALT LAKE. BUT TELL ME WHO IS GOING TO DRIVE 55 M.P.H. AND 2-LANE ROADS WHEN HIS SALARY DEPENDS ON MILES HE DRIVES AND TRIPS HE MAKES. OUR DRIVERS WOULD TAKE I-10 TO HOUSTON, I-45 NORTH TO 35 AND I-70 FOR DENVER, OR I-80 TO SALT LAKE. THERE ISN'T ANY ROUTE YOU CAN TAKE ACROSS TEXAS OR OKLAHOMA TO I-25 THAT IS ALL FOUR LANE OR A SUPER 2 ON WHICH YOU CAN MAKE TIME UNDER SAFE HIGHWAY CONDITIONS.

IF THE STATE OF KANSAS WOULD PUT A MAJOR HIGHWAY FROM WICHITA TO HAYS THERE WOULD BE A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT OUTLOOK AT MOST TERMINALS WHERE TRUCKS ARE DISPATCHED AND AT ALL TRUCKSTOPS WHERE THE DRIVERS ARE LOOKING AT ROAD MAPS TO FIND THE BEST ROUTE.

IT MIGHT SURPRISE THE POLITICIANS IN TOPEKA TO KNOW HOW MANY INDUSTRIES AND BIG TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES WOULD SET UP TERMINALS IN THE CENTER OF THE UNITED STATES IF THEY COULD TRANSPORT COMMODITIES BOTH WAYS TO THE MAJOR COAST AREAS. COASTAL INDUSTRIES AND PEOPLE NEED A CONSTANT SUPPLY OF RAW AND FINISHED PRODUCTS AND A NEVER ENDING FOOD SOURCE TO FUEL A GROWING POPULATION. IT MIGHT ALSO BE SURPRISING TO DISCOVER HOW MANY INDUSTRIES WOULD TAKE A LOOK AT KANSAS AS A WHOLE TO SET UP FACTORIES BECAUSE OF TRANSPORTATION ADVANTAGES AND LOWER LABOR COSTS. BOTH ARE IMPORTANT IF ANY INDUSTRY WANTS TO SUPPLY A MORE COMPETITIVELY PRICED PRODUCT IN TODAY'S MARKET PLACE.

KANSAS COULD VERY WELL BE THE GATEWAY TO THE NATION!

IF YOU GOT IT A TRUCK BROUGHT IT,


ALAN R. NOKES
PRESIDENT OF
A-C TRUCK SERVICE, INC.

PREFACE

The Mid-Kansas Economic Development Commission retained the services of Mr. Edward H. Minges to conduct an economic analysis of the proposed Northwest Passage highway.

Mid-Kansas Economic Development Commission is an entity of the Barton County Board of County Commissioners and the city governments of Great Bend, Claflin, Ellinwood and Hoisington.

Mr. Minges is an Instructor of Economics at Barton County Community College. He was previously a consultant with Foreman Econometrics, Wichita, and a professional site selector with Robertson Investment Company, McLean, Virginia.

I. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THE HIGHWAY PLAN

Our position is that the adoption of the highway plan is critical to Kansas' future. Nothing in this paper should be construed as calling for abandonment or delay of all or any part of the plan. But during the forthcoming special session, the legislature may find it necessary to decide whether to eliminate some portions of the plan proposed by the Task Force, and the tests by which two sections of road are compared are presently somewhat subjective.

Fortunately, a few simple tests can give the legislator a base from which to begin consideration. Within the scope of our limited resources, we have been able to conduct a few of these, and have outlined some of the others. The numbers generated by no means tell the whole story, but can be compared to a baseball player's stats: knowing that one player has a .305 batting average and a .997 fielding average and another has a .225 batting average and an .850 fielding average may not tell you all you need to know about the two men (it doesn't even tell you they're men), and in fact the batting and fielding averages are only two of many stats kept on ball players. But there would be little hesitation on most of our parts in placing a \$20 bet on which of the two players gets a better contract this year.

The basic idea is that some of the benefits provided by new construction can be quantified with surprising precision, and some cannot. Safety benefits, time and distance savings, and short-run benefits from construction spending can be easily quantified, while long-run economic development benefits are more difficult to compute accurately.

Once annual benefits have been computed, they can be divided into the cost of proposed construction to give the number of years to payout. The value of a simple bridge repair can then be compared directly to the value of a massive interstate project. We can't substitute numbers for good judgment, of course, but we can say this: if it's necessary to choose either Project A or Project B, and Project B, for example, provides faster payouts on the basis of time and distance savings and safety and short-run construction spending benefits, then the question becomes simply whether the long-run economic development benefits from Project A can be shown by themselves to outweigh all the benefits from Project B.

We discuss time and distance savings and safety benefits below. A Technical Appendix is provided which gives the rationale, assumptions, methods, calculations, and results of the time and distance savings in greater detail, for those interested.

We also briefly discuss several other topics of interest at the end of the paper.

1. TIME AND DISTANCE BENEFITS

Perhaps the first benefit of building or upgrading roads that comes to mind is simply saving time and shortening the distance between two points. And calculating time and distance savings is relatively simple. It should be noted that best practice is to try to keep estimates conservative, wherever possible.

Calculation of Benefits

First, we find the distances in each speed zone along the route, divide those distances by the posted speed limit, and multiply by sixty to give the driving time in minutes. The summation of all the different times gives the fastest legal passage. A small time penalty is added for each stop light and stop sign. Since on most routes there are slight differences in east and west speed zone postings, we average the two.

The average fastest legal passage is then compared to the estimated passage on proposed routes. The difference between the two yields the time savings in minutes, and if the new route is shorter the distance savings can be found as well. [In our study, distances from point to point were measured directly on present routes and distances on proposed routes were taken from the Howard, Needles feasibility study.]

Number of Persons Receiving Benefits

Once the benefits per vehicle are figured, we must know how many vehicles are involved. Vehicle counts may be taken from KDOT Traffic Flow Maps and from KDOT County Federal Aid Secondary Roads maps (Maps 1 and 2). Of course, vehicles don't receive benefits; people do. We use an estimate of 1.25 occupants per vehicle, or one passenger for every four vehicles (versus the Federal government's national average of 1.6). The traffic counts used in calculation are a simple numerical average of the rural counts along the routes in question. To keep the estimates conservative, no attempt has been made to estimate additional usage and benefits in urban areas.

Valuation of Time Saved

Standard practice in cost-benefit analyses, particularly in transportation studies, is to value time at 50 to 100% of the prevailing wage rate, per person receiving benefits. In 1986 the average industrial worker in Kansas received \$17886 in annual wages, or about \$8.60 an hour. 75% of this (in other words, the average of 50 and 100%) is about \$6.45 an hour. Since we assumed 1.25 occupants per vehicle, we get a value for time of about \$8.00 per hour per vehicle.


Valuation of Distance Saving

ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY VOLUMES
ON



COUNTY FEDERAL AID SECONDARY ROADS
DISTRICT 5
Source: KDOT

MAP 2



For heavy commercial vehicles calculation of distance saving can be done directly, using a low-end operating cost estimate of \$1.00 per mile. Since this includes the driver's wages, we will not calculate an additional value for time saving. Valuation of non-heavy commercial vehicles' distance saving is made at \$.06 per mile, based on actual operating costs and ignoring depreciation, insurance, tax and license fees, etc.

Annual Savings and Payout

Time and distance savings per vehicle are multiplied by daily traffic counts and then again by 365 to get the total annual savings for each route from proposed construction. The proposed cost of each section of the route was divided by the calculated savings per year to give the number of years that it would take for the proposed improvement to pay for itself ON THE BASIS OF TIME AND DISTANCE SAVINGS ALONE.

2. EXAMPLES OF TIME AND DISTANCE BENEFIT ANALYSIS

We have computed time and distance savings and payouts for the Northwest Passage, broken into three sections: Hutchinson to Wichita, Great Bend to Hutchinson, and Hays to Great Bend.

Wichita to Hutchinson

The Wichita metro area and Hutchinson form the biggest population center in the state. K-96, the only link between the two cities, carries over 4000 vehicles per day. Yet for much of its length K-96 is a narrow two-lane, with neither shoulders nor passing lanes. It is obviously long overdue for improvements, but on what basis?

Present -

Total distance:	45	miles
Total time(avg.):	49.2	minutes
Avg. legal speed:	54.9	MPH

Proposed -

Prop. distance:	45	miles
Proposed constr.:	31	miles
Total time:	49.2	minutes
Distance saved:	0	miles per vehicle
Time saved:	0	minutes per vehicle

Unless K-96 were rebuilt to interstate standards permitting 65 MPH travel, time and distance savings would be negligible. The primary justifications for this proposed construction must be safety and economic development.

Hutchinson to Great Bend

Great Bend is a natural distribution center for western Kansas, a six-way intersection of U.S. and state highways. But

the most heavily travelled arm of the 'star', with rural traffic counts averaging over 3300 vehicles per day, one of the three most heavily travelled two-lane roads in the western half of the state, is also the worst. K-96 to Hutchinson is so congested that for one ten-mile stretch half the traffic diverts to county roads. The average speed that can be maintained over the whole route is only 46 MPH.

Present -

Total distance: 68.1 miles
Total time(avg.): 88.83 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 45.99 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 54.00 miles
Total time: 58.90 minutes
Distance saved: 14.10 miles per vehicle
Time saved: 29.93 minutes per vehicle

Value of time and distance savings:

\$ 6.4 million per year
Proposed cost:\$ 85.9 million
Years to payout: 13.4

This section of road can be justified on the basis of time and distance savings alone. A 13-year payout on any public works project is unusually fast. That this payout comes before we add safety or economic development benefits is little short of startling.

Great Bend to Hays

Great Bend to Hays is the second most heavily travelled arm of the 'star'. It should be the last link of a fast, through route between Wichita and the west. Instead, it's three rural two-lanes wandering through post rock country. Between Hays and Hutchinson a truck can make better time going 25 miles further to McPherson on I-70 and I-135 and then doubling back to Hutchinson, than he can going 'directly' on U.S. 183 and K-96.

This is the most problematic section of the Northwest Passage. There are several possible routes with no clear-cut winner (Map 3). Here we can use time and distance savings to at least get a handle on the problem:

a. U.S. 281 to I-70, via Russell



Present -

Total distance: 64.00 miles
Total time(avg.): 72.18 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 53.20 MPH





Proposed -

Distance: 64.00 miles
Total time: 65.54 minutes

MAP 3



PRESENT AND PROPOSED ROUTES, HAYS TO GREAT BEND



Time saved: 6.64 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 0 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance savings:

\$.5 million per year
Proposed cost: \$ 29.0 million
Years to payout: 58.0

b. K-96/K-4 to U.S. 183, via LaCrosse

Present -

Total distance: 61.83 miles
Total time(avg.): 76.86 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 48.24 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 61.83 miles
Total time: 67.45 minutes
Time saved: 9.41 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 0 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - existing traffic:

\$.9 million
Proposed cost: \$ 33.0 million
Years to payout: 36.6

c. Full diagonal

Present -

U.S. 281 via Russell

Total distance: 64.00 miles
Total time(avg.): 72.18 minutes

U.S. 183 via Rush Center and LaCrosse

Total distance: 61.83 miles
Total time(avg.): 76.86 min.
Average distance: 62.90 miles
Average time: 74.50 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 50.66 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 48.00 miles
Total time: 52.36 minutes
Time saved: 22.14 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 14.90 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - diverted traffic:

\$ 4.4 million per year
Proposed cost: \$ 93.4 million
Years to payout: 21.2

d. Partial Diagonal

[This is a proposed route incorporating a new diagonal from

K-96 west of Albert to U.S. 183 at the Ellis/Rush County line.]

Present -

U.S. 281 via Russell

Total distance: 64.00 miles

Total time(avg.): 72.18 minutes

U.S. 183 via Rush Center and LaCrosse

Total distance: 61.83 miles

Total time(avg.): 76.86 min.

Average distance: 62.90 miles

Average time: 74.50 minutes

Avg. legal speed: 50.66 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 53.5 miles

Total time: 58.4 min.

Time saved: 16.1 minutes per vehicle

Distance saved: 9.4 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - diverted traffic:

\$ 3.4 million per year

Proposed cost:\$ 60.0 million

Years to payout: 17.6

4. INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS -

The Task Force-recommended route, via Russell, shows up with the worst payout time of the four routes. All this indicates is that if that route is taken, some other justification must be shown for the choice other than time and distance savings. For instance, the Russell route enjoys the lowest absolute cost of any of the proposals, and utilizes 25 miles of existing interstate, permitting 65 MPH travel, which would be expected to be an important consideration for through trucks.

5. SAFETY BENEFITS

Theoretically, since all the necessary statistics are compiled, calculating safety benefits should be easy:

$$\frac{\text{Total cost of present accidents} \\ - \text{Total cost of accidents on proposed road type}}{\text{Total savings from proposed road}}$$

We would then take the savings, add them to the time and distance savings, and again compute the payout by dividing the total into the total cost of the proposed improvement.

But accident rates are to some degree site-specific. To compute benefits from average accident rates, we must be given the variances as well. We cannot assume that the average accident

rate for a road of the type we're investigating times the number of miles in the road times the annual vehicle count will give us a the number of accidents on that road at present. Accident data must be compiled from police reports for each section of road. To the best of our knowledge this has not been done.

Another problem is that of small samples. For instance, to compare the safety benefits on K-96 between Hutchinson and Wichita for four-lane expressway versus four-lane interstate, we find the following figures in Table I:

Lane Class	Type	Access Control	Loc.	Number of Miles	Accidents	100 Million Veh.Miles	Acc. Rate
4 Lane	Divided	None	Rural	44.656	6	5.42	1.108
4 Lane	Divided	Partial	Rural	120.306	34	14.10	2.411
4 Lane	Divided	Full	Rural	825.072	106	106.49	.995

First, the figures as given hardly support one KDOT staff member's charge that the last-minute decision to switch from interstate to expressway on K-96 "is going to kill a lot of people out there." Given a 4000-vehicle daily traffic count on the 31 miles of new construction, going from full to no access control would yield five additional fatalities every decade.

But how could more access control double the fatality rate? We could sidestep the question, and say that the change in accident rates between no and partial access control only yields one potential additional fatality a year on K-96. But we must look further, at the number of miles and accidents in the sample. 44 miles and six accidents, or 120 miles and 34 accidents, over five years isn't enough. One two-car accident in five years could raise the accident rate 133% and 25%, respectively. And all 44 miles of 4 Lane, Divided, Partial Access, Rural road in the state could be on a single stretch of highway.

Total accidents, injury accidents, and fatal accidents should have been compiled from police records on each proposed section. These could have been compared to accident rates on similar highways not only in Kansas but in neighboring states to give us a sufficiently large sample, and the value of lives and property saved computed.

[If this seems like excessive effort, compare this to the amount of paperwork required of one small businessman annually, and weigh this against the magnitude of the two enterprises.]

II. USE OF TRAFFIC COUNTS

In determining which roads have first claim on improvement, care must be taken when using traffic count maps. KDOT has said that the 'hole' in the traffic counts between Sterling and Nickerson on K-96 (Map 1), with traffic going from 2500 vehicles north of Sterling to 1145 vehicles just west of Nickerson to

TABLE 1.

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Date - 06/01/87

State Highway System and City Connecting Links Plus the Kansas Turnpike

 Statewide FATAL Accident Rates

Period - 01/01/1982 to 12/31/1986

Lane Class	Type	Access Control	Location	*** Number of Miles	*** Acc's	100 Million Veh.Miles	Acc. Rate
2 Lane		None	Rural	8130.883	547	185.72	2.945
2 Lane		None	City	314.950	43	19.02	2.261
2 Lane		Partial	Rural	636.046	89	24.19	3.680
2 Lane		Partial	City	22.690	11	2.64	4.160
2 Lane		Full	Rural	70.006	6	3.13	1.916
2 Lane		Full	City	1.206	0	0.06	0.000
4 Lane	Undivided	None	Rural	11.799	0	0.52	0.000
4 Lane	Undivided	None	City	192.273	59	29.65	1.990
4 Lane	Undivided	Partial	Rural	4.583	0	0.44	0.000
4 Lane	Undivided	Partial	City	17.254	3	3.38	0.888
4 Lane	Divided	None	Rural	44.656	6	5.42	1.108
4 Lane	Divided	None	City	27.502	12	8.69	1.381
4 Lane	Divided	Partial	Rural	120.306	34	14.10	2.411
4 Lane	Divided	Partial	City	94.512	52	26.03	1.997
4 Lane	Divided	Full	Rural	825.072	106	106.49	0.995
4 Lane	Divided	Full	City	118.536	60	43.28	1.386
6 Lane	Undivided	None	City	1.745	0	0.61	0.000
6 Lane	Undivided	Partial	City	0.136	0	0.01	0.000
6 Lane	Divided	Partial	City	4.740	2	2.66	0.752
6 Lane	Divided	Full	Rural	2.802	0	0.47	0.000
6 Lane	Divided	Full	City	53.720	32	33.34	0.960
2 Lane	Divided	None	Rural	0.794	0	0.03	0.000
2 Lane	Divided	Partial	City	0.498	0	0.12	0.000
***** STATEWIDE TOTALS *****				10696.709	1062	510.01	2.082
Undivided.....				9403.571	758	269.39	2.814
Divided.....				1293.138	304	240.62	1.263
None.....				8724.602	667	249.66	2.672
Partial.....				900.765	191	73.58	2.596
Full.....				1071.342	204	186.77	1.092
Rural..				9846.947	788	340.50	2.314
City...				849.762	274	169.50	1.616

5 Years

triple that just east of Nickerson, demonstrates that most of the traffic on K-96 is local. The sparse traffic between Sterling and Nickerson indicates just how light through traffic really is, thus justifying a lower priority for improvements on this road.

This offers an excellent example of why care must be taken when interpreting traffic count data. Here, KDOT's "County Federal Aid Secondary Roads" survey for District 5 (Map 2) shows clearly where the 'lost' vehicles are going. Hundreds of vehicles per day are diverting around Sterling, Nickerson and (presumably) Lyons on county roads; on the five mile square north and west of Nickerson the county roads are carrying more traffic than the state highway (Map 4).

Moreover, hundreds more vehicles per day avoid K-96 by taking Fourth St. Extended (Map 5). On the County Road map, counts never drop below 530 vehicles per day, although the land surrounding Fourth St. averages fewer than one farmhouse per mile. Since county roads in this area carry typically fewer than 200 vehicles per day, this would suggest that at least 300 vehicles per day are through traffic.


And there are several other alternate Great Bend to Hutchinson routes on county roads that would presumably divert all or most of their traffic to a new diagonal, but whose traffic does not show up on the KDOT Highway map (Map 6). [Each of the routes shown was offered by respondents in an informal survey taken at the college and in the CoC survey.] The counties, of course, are now paying for the additional maintenance costs caused by this diverted traffic.

The conclusion is that a quick glance at the KDOT Highway Traffic Count map is not necessarily sufficient to determine the true potential traffic on a proposed route. County road traffic flows must be carefully studied as well. A low traffic count on a state highway may indicate that there's little traffic in the area, or it may indicate that the state highway is such a loser that everyone in the region diverts around it. An extended discussion of this problem may be found in the Technical Appendix.


III. INDEXATION

Indexation is the only sensible way to proceed on fuel taxes and registration, and should have been approximately as controversial as the announcement of National Buttermilk Week. In addition to the governor's example of the \$5.00 Big Mac, we would like to point out some additional comparisons.

The fuel tax may well be \$.60 in 2014 and registration of a grain truck may well be \$1900. But the inflation necessary to get us to that point would also give us:




TRAFFIC FLOW, LYONS TO HUTCHINSON



TRAFFIC FLOW
Annual Average 24-Hour Traffic
Fourth Street Extended

RICE

HUTC



\$4.25 a gallon gas
\$225,000 grain trucks
\$35 an hour average industrial wages in Kansas, and
\$80,000 new Buicks.

Moreover, to believe that indexation is going to ruin our economy you would also have to believe that under those conditions, Missouri, Colorado, Nebraska, and Oklahoma will still have \$.15 a gallon fuel taxes and \$25 registration fees!

IV. ELASTICITY OF DEMAND FOR GASOLINE

A frequently asked question has been whether the benefits from the highway plan will be offset by a slowdown in business resulting from higher gas taxes. A quick reply is that we recently saw the price of gas increase \$.25 retail, and received no reports of massive unemployment, so it's difficult to see \$.05 a gallon bringing us to our knees.

We should also look at the elasticity of demand for gasoline: that simply means the percentage change in the quantity of gasoline purchased divided by the percentage change in the price. What's being proposed is roughly a 5% increase in price. In the short run, the elasticity of demand for gasoline is about $-.2$; that means that a 5% increase in price leads to only a 1% reduction in sales. In the long run, elasticity of demand is about -1.0 ; 5% price increase, 5% demand decrease.

What's interesting is that in the short run, half that one percent drop is due to fewer miles being driven, and half due to people tuning their cars and buying more fuel-efficient cars. In the long run, NINETY PERCENT of the reduced gas consumption is due to people buying more fuel-efficient cars and tuning them up more often.

In other words, any money the gas stations lose, the car dealer gets.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

TIME AND DISTANCE SAVING

The dollar value of distance saved can be measured by figuring the amount of fuel, tires, etc. that are saved with a shorter route. Savings for heavy commercial traffic can be figured directly, since this type of traffic commonly charges by the mile.

The dollar value of time saved is just as 'real' as distance savings, though it might not be as obvious. If time were valueless, we wouldn't need roads at all: we could stroll everywhere we needed to go. Fortunately, techniques for the valuation of time in cost-benefit analyses, especially in transportation studies, are well-established. Figuring the benefits per vehicle times the number of vehicles using a road gives us an annual benefit that can be compared to the cost of providing it.

Regional Efficiency

Sometimes people are led to believe that this accounting of benefits is all "smoke and mirrors". The answer to this lies in the idea of regional efficiency. 'Efficiency' in economics means getting the most output from the least input. Regional efficiency means getting the highest value output from a region's given resources, and Kansas' two most valuable resources today are our location and our human capital.

In the past, we made our money from agriculture, cattle, and oil; now there are too many competitors willing to meet or beat our price for us to do anything more than break even in the long run. Location is a different matter. No matter how valuable location becomes, Montana or West Virginia can't pick up and move to the center of the United States. We can't build a mountain range in Kansas, we can't dredge a seaport, we can't sink a gold mine, but we've got the location, and to make the most efficient use of this resource we can build roads.

Here is where the accounting of time and distance savings comes in. A manufacturer can't afford to saddle every unit shipped by truck with an 'inefficiency tax'. This is important to the site locator for a corporation considering moving to Kansas, and it's doubly important to a small, locally-owned business just starting up. A savings in time and distance is as real in hard cash terms to the producer as a reduction in his utility rates.

In terms of our human capital, a doctor, a machinist, or a schoolteacher can't produce value while sitting in their cars, going from here to there (or at least not as efficiently). And, unfortunately, our human capital can also be taken away from us. An antiquated transportation system means no new industry means no new jobs means our best and our brightest leave the state every year.

The bottom line is that our undeniable advantage as 'Midway, USA' is worthless without an efficient highway system.

CALCULATION OF TIME AND DISTANCE SAVING

Method

The fastest legal passage on each route was calculated by finding the distances in each speed zone along the route, dividing those distances by the posted speed limit, then multiplying by sixty to give the driving time in minutes. Fifteen seconds was added for each stoplight and stop sign. On each of the present routes there were slight differences in east and west driving times, since speed zone postings are not always identical in each direction; these were averaged.

The summation of all the different times gives the fastest legal passage. The estimates overstate the actual times to the extent that drivers exceed the posted limit. They understate actual driving times to the extent that drivers encounter slower traffic on the open road, congestion in towns and cities, and occupied railroad crossings, and to the extent that drivers themselves travel at less than the posted limit.

Distances from point to point were measured on present routes. Estimates of distances on proposed routes were taken from the Howard, Needles feasibility study.

Number of Persons Receiving Benefits

Vehicle counts were taken from the KDOT 1984 Traffic Flow Map and from the KDOT 1984 County Federal Aid Secondary Roads map. But we also know that vehicles don't receive benefits; people do. Instead of developing a separate estimate of the average number of occupants per vehicle, we account for the fact that the average number of occupants per vehicle is greater than one in the valuation of time (below).

The traffic counts we used are a simple numerical the average of the rural counts on the map. To keep the estimates conservative, no attempt was made to estimate additional usage and benefits in urban areas.

It should be noted that, since the traffic counts given by KDOT are 24-hour year-round averages, it is not necessary to distinguish through from local traffic. One driver travelling sixty miles on an improved route receives approximately the same benefits as ten drivers travelling six miles each.

Valuation of Time Saved

Time was valued at \$8.00 per hour. Standard practice in cost-benefit analyses, particularly in transportation studies, is to value time at 50 to 100% of the prevailing wage rate. This standard has been arrived at both theoretically and empirically - in other words, by asking people, "What would you pay to save an hour of time?" [Interestingly, this range has been observed not only in this country but overseas as well.]

In 1986 the average industrial worker in Kansas received \$17886 in annual wages, or about \$8.60 an hour. This does not include wages paid to railroad workers, professionals, government workers, or the self-employed, and thus gives a relatively conservative estimate of the prevailing wage. A value for time halfway between the high and low values of this low-end estimate

of the prevailing wage would be \$6.45 an hour (in other words, halfway between \$8.60 an hour and 50% of \$8.60 an hour, or \$4.30 an hour).

However, we still must account for the fact that the average number of adults per vehicle in our traffic counts is greater than one. An estimate of time of \$8.00 an hour is about 25% greater than the middle-of-the-road estimate of \$6.45. Using this as our overall estimate per vehicle would permit us to say that there is an adult passenger in every fourth vehicle on the road - in other words, there are five adults in every four vehicles in the traffic counts receiving the benefits of time and distance savings. (Or to put it another way, five adults' time at \$6.45 an hour each is worth a total of about \$32 an hour. If these adults are in four cars, that would be the same as saying that each vehicle was worth \$8 an hour.)

Valuation of Distance Saving

Valuation of heavy commercial vehicles' distance saving can be done directly. Heavy commercial vehicles are defined by KDOT for the purposes of the road survey as having more than two axles or more than four wheels. A low-end estimate of the operating cost for this class of vehicle is about \$1.00 per mile.

Valuation of non-heavy commercial vehicles' distance saving was made at \$.06 per mile. This is derived from a simple model of actual operating costs, based on the following:

20 MPG
\$.90 per gallon for fuel
40,000 miles per set of tires
\$250 cost per set of tires
\$150 annual maintenance costs
15,000 miles per year

Estimates of Total Savings

The total time and distance savings from proposed construction was calculated by multiplying the time saved by each non-heavy commercial vehicle by the value of time per hour by the number of non-heavy commercial vehicles per day. Next, the average cost per mile to operate a non-heavy commercial vehicle was multiplied by the distance saved per vehicle, and by the number of vehicles per day. Then distance saved per heavy commercial vehicle was multiplied by the average cost per mile per heavy commercial vehicle and the number of heavy commercial vehicles per day. To obtain an annual savings figure, the three totals were added and multiplied by 365.

No separate value of time savings was calculated for the heavy commercial vehicle traffic; the value of time was assumed to be largely captured in the cost per mile figure. Again, this gives a conservative bias to the figures.

Finally, the proposed cost of each section of the route was divided by the calculated savings per year to give the number of years that it would take for the proposed improvement to pay for itself ON THE BASIS OF TIME AND DISTANCE SAVINGS ALONE.

DIVIDING THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE INTO THREE PARTS

The three segments of the Northwest Passage present three distinct sets of problems and solutions.

Wichita to Hutchinson

Distances are figured from the intersection of I-135 and U.S. 54 in Wichita to the intersection of K-96 and K-17 south of Hutchinson.

Present -

Total distance: 45 miles
Total time(avg.): 49.2 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 54.9 MPH

Proposed -

Prop. distance: 45 miles
Proposed constr.: 31 miles
Total time: 49.2 minutes
Time saved: 0 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 0 miles per vehicle

Unless K-96 were rebuilt to interstate standards permitting 65 MPH travel, time and distance savings would be negligible. The primary justification for proposed construction is safety.

Hutchinson to Great Bend

Estimating precisely the additions and subtractions to traffic counts due specifically to travel between the endpoints of the diagonal is difficult. The town and city population served directly by K-96 from Great Bend to South Hutchinson is 70117. The town and city population served directly by the proposed diagonal would be 65576, or 93.5% of the present population. It would thus seem logical that the preponderance of traffic in the area, particularly heavy commercial, would divert to the diagonal.

A diagonal could also be expected to divert considerable traffic away from Fourth St. Extended. The 30 square miles surrounding the western portion of Fourth St.(in other words, a mile north and a mile south of the last 15 miles of road) average fewer than one farmhouse per mile, yet traffic never drops below 530 vehicles per day. Since county roads in this area carry typically fewer than 200 vehicles per day, this would suggest that at least 300 vehicles per day are through traffic.

Some of the present traffic on K-96 would be expected to continue to use part of the old route after construction of a diagonal, specifically traffic travelling between Ellinwood and Lyons and Sterling and Lyons. On the other hand, two relatively small towns, Raymond and Alden, lie directly on the proposed route, with traffic in and out of the two towns averaging 300 - 400 vehicles per day. It would be expected that the bulk of this traffic would divert to the more direct diagonal.

Finally, there are several other alternate Great Bend to Hutchinson routes on county roads that would presumably divert

all or most of their traffic to a new diagonal.

For the above reasons, we estimate that at minimum traffic counts on the proposed diagonal would be 90% of the current counts without diversion of "super-through" traffic from I-135. In particular, we would argue that heavy commercial traffic would be expected to run in excess of 100% of the current counts on K-96. To keep estimates conservative, we will use the following counts to figure benefits: 2500 non-heavy commercial vehicles per day and 400 heavy commercial vehicles per day.

Present -

Total distance: 68.1 miles
Total time(avg.): 88.83 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 45.99 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 54.00 miles
Total time: 58.90 minutes
Time saved: 29.93 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 14.10 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance:

2500 X \$8.00 X 29.93/60 X 365 = \$ 3.6 million
2500 X \$0.06 X 14.10 X 365 = .8 million
400 X \$1.00 X 14.10 X 365 = 2.0 million

\$ 6.4 million per year

Proposed cost \$85.9 million

Years to payout 13.4

Great Bend to Hays

There are at least four proposed routes.

a. U.S. 281 to I-70, via Russell

The ten miles of this route between Great Bend and Hoisington are used by an average of over 4600 vehicles a day, over 780 of which are heavy commercial. Past Hoisington, however, traffic drops off to one third of this. Assuming we get a bypass at Hoisington, the particular advantage of this route is that not only are there no other towns along the way but also that U.S. 281 connects directly to I-70 before entering Russell, obviating the need for any improvements. Moreover, the last 25 miles to Hays are on I-70, permitting legal passage at 65 MPH.

It should be kept in mind that not only the 1984 but also the 1986 traffic counts, currently being readied for release, do not take into account the increased speed limit on I-70. As it is, in the current traffic counts U.S. 281 beyond Hoisington only carries 68% as much traffic as U.S. 183 between LaCrosse and Hays, but has 91% as much the heavy commercial traffic. This would suggest that before the speed limit increase truckers were

responding favorably to the faster access to I-70; after the increase, we would expect to see additional diversion of heavy commercial traffic to U.S. 183 even without improvements.

The time and distance benefits of improvement to this route would go almost entirely to those vehicles going past Hoisington, and would be largely limited to savings generated by the Hoisington bypass. In the long run, it would be expected that the slightly longer distance but definite time saving of this route would divert most of the through traffic to Hays away from K-4, K-96, and U.S. 183; the question is, what proportion of the 2200-2500 vehicles a day currently using those routes is through traffic, particularly the non-heavy commercial traffic?

Here we simply have to guess. We will assume that all the 1250 non-heavy commercial and 280 heavy commercial vehicles presently in the traffic count will use the improved route north of Hoisington, and that about 25%, or 500 non-heavy commercial vehicles a day will divert. We will also assume that a somewhat larger proportion of heavy commercial vehicles have already diverted or will divert, about 120 per day.

Present -

Total distance: 64.00 miles
 Total time(avg.): 72.18 minutes
 Avg. legal speed: 53.20 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 64.00 miles
 Total time: 65.54 minutes
 Time saved: 6.64 minutes per vehicle
 Distance saved: 0 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - existing traffic:

1250 X \$8.00 X 6.64/60 X 365 = \$.4 million
 1250 X \$0.06 X 0 X 365 = .0 million
 280 X \$1.00 X 0 X 365 = .0 million

\$.4 million per year

Proposed cost \$29.0 million

Years to payout 72.5

Diverted traffic: 500 vehicles nhc from U.S. 183
 120 vehicles hc

Time saved: 11.32 minutes
 Distance saved: -2.17 miles

Value of time and distance - diverted traffic:

500 X \$8.00 X 11.32/60 X 365 = \$.3 million
 500 X \$0.06 X -2.17 X 365 = - .1 million
 120 X \$1.00 X 0 X 365 = - .1 million

.1 million per year

Years to payout 58.0 (combined)

b. K-96/K-4 to U.S. 183, via LaCrosse

The advantages of this route are that it starts out slightly shorter (2.5 miles) than the U.S. 281 route, primarily due to a 14-mile diagonal section between Great Bend and Albert; cost of improvement is also relatively low, since U.S. 183 in Ellis County is already close to the Super-2 standard. In the past, the advantage of the diagonal (and the local traffic generated by LaCrosse/Rush Center) apparently offset most of the advantage of the section of I-70 incorporated in the other principal route, but the raising of the speed limit on I-70 would be expected to tilt the balance the other way in the long run. K-4 is occasionally used as a way around the Rush Center corner and to avoid driving through the middle of LaCrosse.

Current traffic counts on the 'through' (northern) portion of U.S. 183 are about 1950 non-heavy commercial and 310 heavy commercial vehicles per day. Again, we will assume that this is the proper number of vehicles against which to compare vehicles receiving benefits in the future as a result of improvements. Given bypasses around LaCrosse and Rush Center, we will estimate, as above, that about 25% of the traffic on U.S. 281 will divert to the new route. We would also argue, however, that even with the faster route little heavy commercial traffic will divert, given the preference shown for 281 even before the increased speed limit on I-70. We will thus figure benefits on the basis of 200 non-heavy commercial vehicles diverted per day and 15 heavy commercial.

Present -

Total distance: 61.83 miles
Total time(avg.): 76.86 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 48.24 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 61.83 miles
Total time: 67.45 minutes
Time saved: 9.41 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 0 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - existing traffic:

1950 X \$8.00 X 9.41/60 X 365 = \$.9 million
1950 X \$0.06 X 0 X 365 = .0 million
310 X \$1.00 X 0 X 365 = .0 million

\$.9 million per year

Proposed cost \$33.0 million

Years to payout 36.6

Diverted traffic: 200 vehicles nhc
 15 vehicles hc
 Time saved: 4.73 minutes per vehicle
 Distance saved: 2.17 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - diverted traffic:

200 X \$8.00 X 4.73/60 X 365 = \$.05 million
 200 X \$0.06 X 0 X 365 = .0 million
 400 X \$1.00 X 0 X 365 = .0 million

(negligible)

Years to payout 36.6 (combined)

c. Full diagonal

A full diagonal has been proposed from Great Bend to Hays. The advantages for through traffic are obvious: the distance between the two cities is reduced from 65 miles to 48 in one stroke. On a grander scale, the diagonal looks good on a regional map: a trucker in Tulsa, for example, would observe that a precious 60 miles had been lopped off the trip to Denver. Wichita to Hays and back would no longer be a days' effort, but a long morning.

The difficulty with the route is simple and essential: as opposed to the Great Bend - Hutchinson diagonal, which uses the existing railroad right-of-way, the Hays - Great Bend diagonal would have to be started from scratch, beginning with the purchase of all new right-of-way. The marginal cost over the improvement of U.S. 281 or 183 is enormous, as much as \$100,000,000. Even with the most optimistic scenarios of traffic diverted from all over the mid-West, payout on such a project would still be years in the future. To offer a comparison to the preceding two projects, we will figure benefits on a diagonal route, assuming diversion of half of the present traffic north of Hoisington on both 183 and 281 and two-thirds of the heavy commercial, or 1600 non-heavy commercial and 400 heavy commercial.

Present -

U.S. 281 via Russell

Total distance: 64.00 miles
 Total time(avg.): 72.18 minutes
 Traffic volume: 1250 vehicles nhc
 280 vehicles hc

U.S. 183 via Rush Center and LaCrosse

Total distance: 61.83 miles
 Total time(avg.): 76.86 min.
 Traffic volume: 1950 vehicles nhc
 310 vehicles hc

Average distance: 62.90 miles
 Average time: 74.50 minutes

Avg. legal speed: 50.66 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 48.00 miles
Total time: 52.36 minutes
Time saved: 22.14 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 14.90 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - diverted traffic:

1600 X \$8.00 X 22.14/60 X 365 = \$ 1.7 million
1600 X \$0.06 X 14.90 X 365 = .5 million
400 X \$1.00 X 14.90 X 365 = 2.2 million

\$ 4.4 million per year

Proposed cost \$ 93.4 million

Years to payout 21.2

d. Partial Diagonal

A fourth possibility would be to attempt to capture some of the benefits of the full diagonal at some fraction of the cost. One possibility would be to construct a diagonal route from just west of Albert to the Ellis/Rush County line. Twelve miles would be cut from the Hays - Great Bend trip and both the section of U.S. 183 near Super-2 standards in Ellis County and the existing diagonal from Albert to Great Bend would be fully utilized. No formal construction estimate has been prepared for such a route; extrapolating from per mile figures for proposed construction, such a route would cost approximately \$60 million.

This route gets closer to the population centers of Rush County, so we assume a higher diversion from present routes, two-thirds of all present traffic north of Hoisington, or 2100 non-heavy commercial and 400 heavy commercial.

Present -

U.S. 281 via Russell

Total distance: 64.00 miles
Total time(avg.): 72.18 minutes
Traffic volume: 1250 vehicles nhc
280 vehicles hc

U.S. 183 via Rush Center and LaCrosse

Total distance: 61.83 miles
Total time(avg.): 76.86 min.
Traffic volume: 1950 vehicles nhc
310 vehicles hc

Average distance: 62.90 miles
Average time: 74.50 minutes
Avg. legal speed: 50.66 MPH

Proposed -

Distance: 53.5 miles

Total time: 58.4 min.
Time saved: 16.1 minutes per vehicle
Distance saved: 9.4 miles per vehicle

Value of time and distance - diverted traffic:

2100 X \$8.00 X 16.1/60 X 365 = \$ 1.6 million
2100 X \$0.06 X 9.40 X 365 = .4 million
400 X \$1.00 X 9.40 X 365 = 1.4 million

\$ 3.4 million per year

Proposed cost \$ 60.0 million

Years to payout 17.6



MANHATTAN
CHAMBER
OF
COMMERCE
505 POYNTZ
P.O. BOX 988
MANHATTAN
KANSAS 66502
913-776-8829

18 August 1987

The Honorable Bill Morris
The Honorable Rex Crowell
Chairmen Senate and House Transportation Committees
State Capitol
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Chairman Morris, Chairman Crowell and committee members:


I am Wendy Schiappa, Director of Public Affairs for the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce, a business organization representing over 750 business members and over 1,000 individuals. Our organization supports Governor Hayden's comprehensive highway plan.

It is a privilege to testify before you today when leaders of our state are considering an innovative plan to enhance the economic growth and wealth of the state of Kansas, improve the safety of our roads and reduce the accidental death of our citizens. Our chamber supports the comprehensive plan because we believe it represents a sincere attempt to apply the management skills of private industry to the transportation needs of Kansas.

There can be no doubt that the infrastructure needs of Kansas far exceeds our capacity. Estimates for the next 5-10 years alone estimate the need at \$8 to \$13.5 billion. In this respect, this proposal cannot be considered excessive. Rather, it is a well conceived plan to meet as many needs as possible in the most equitable way possible, via user fees.

The new construction initiatives in the plan are certainly the most popular aspect of the program, and Manhattan is most grateful for the projects in Riley County that are included. However, we support the plan because it is comprehensive and provides for the maintenance needs, department of transportation needs, and local governmental needs while building new roads to meet the economic and safety needs of the state.

We urge you to think beyond the short range, beyond the 1988 election, beyond the needs of any particular district or constituency, and consider how best to create economic wealth in Kansas, to consider how best to ensure future economic growth, to consider that adequate transportation is the key missing element in many parts of the state that have been popular potential sites, but not final sites for industrial growth.



Att 30

RUSSELL HIGHWAY TASKFORCE

We in Russell would like to commend the Governor and Legislature for their foresight in recognizing the transportation needs of our State. Kansas' need for Economic Development hinges on transportation.

The proposal put together by the Blue Ribbon Committee represents millions of dollars in funding for badly needed maintenance and improvements to our existing road system. We applaud this portion of the proposal and look for it's implementation.

The Northwest Passage serves as an Economic Lifeline to Northwest Kansas and more specifically to the community of Russell. The major industries of our portion of Kansas have been ravaged by low prices in the oil and agricultural sectors. In order to diversify our struggling economy we ask for your support in making the dream of the Northwest Passage become a reality.

Robert I. McCurdy
Chairman

Att. 30

SENATOR AND CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE, BILL 1 ^{1.} IS,
CHAIRMAN REX CROWELL,

By
Dick Nichols
McPherson

Distinguished Members of the Committee:

It's a special pleasure for me to appear before
this ~~distinguished~~ committee here today and discuss
~~viewpoints on~~ the program of the Highway Task Force.
~~presented for your review and consideration.~~ In my
appearance today, ^(I'm wearing) ~~I'm appearing~~ I suppose with two
hats -- one as Kansas Cavalry Commanding General --
another as a private citizen very much concerned
about the future of the state of Kansas.

The Kansas Cavalry has a membership of about
250 cavalry members at the present time. We make
from 7 to 10 out-of-state missions per year.

In these missions we call on businesses and industries that have expressed an interest, or are considered likely prospects for expansion into the state. You can readily see in selling the state of Kansas how important it is that we can talk about an improved highway system that is gearing for the 21st Century. As immediate past president of the Kansas Bankers Association, I have come to appreciate fully the importance of economic development in these troubled times.

~~By way of background, I might mention that both~~
my wife and I are Kansas born and educated and have spent all of our working lives in Kansas.

3. 3.
~~We did receive some measure of notoriety for the state
from our experience aboard the Staten Island Ferry
last summer. That's the reason I've chosen to talk
about highways here today, rather than waterways.~~

Another side note I might add is that this is the second time I've appeared to testify before a committee in connection with the Highway Bill. The first time was before the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation which was reviewing the Southeast Kansas feasibility study. I was the only person out of the immediate area being affected to testify and many found it unusual that a person coming from a town on a four-lane highway would appear in support for a project that didn't benefit them directly.

My viewpoint is that these projects benefit all of us directly. The future of Kansas is tied indelibly to its transportation system and now is the time to move forward.

Excited about Highway 81 - I had to Nebraska -

About a month and a half ago ~~I~~ ^I was ~~at~~

~~privilege for me to be~~ in Akron, Ohio, on a mission of the Kansas Cavalry. We were in the World Headquarters Building of Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company and Bill Martin, Economic Development Advisor for the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce and I were privileged to be given over an hour's visit with the International President of Goodyear, ~~Tire and Rubber~~, Mr. Tom Barrett. Tom Barrett is a native Kansan coming from Dover, just south of here, and we discussed many facets of Goodyear's worldwide operations.

5.

As we toured a mammoth room, looking at scale models of some of the 97 plants they had worldwide, I talked to him about transportation and the importance of that in plant location.

Said Mr. Barrett, "You have to have the transportation to get to market. You head for the four-lane highway system in plant location". His Director of Facilities Planning, who makes the first recommendations for new plant locations, also said it in another way. Said Art Stube, "When we look at new site potential, we look at highways and transportation first of all. You want accessibility".

Much has been said recently about the topic of infrastructure. This word covers the gamut of a community's capital facilities and outlay, including public utilities, water distribution systems, waste water treatment plants and especially highways and bridges. The (maintenance) problem has been recognized across the nation. Without huge infusions of new dollars to maintain and repair the infrastructure and to build for the future, the economy will suffer, quality of life will be eroded and our standard of living will decline.

Kansas is no stranger to this problem. Federal statistics on pavement conditions, based on a 1981 sampling, indicate that Kansas' most heavily traveled roads were among the worst in the country.

Statistics from 1983 indicate that pavement conditions have deteriorated even more. Sorry to say, Kansas ranks third among states for the greatest number of structurally deficient or functionally obsolete bridges.

Side by side with the issue of infrastructure is the issue of economic development. We now live in a super competitive world of states vying against each other for industry, population growth, and items like -- yes, even super-colliders. And we'd like to think Kansas has a chance!

Kansas, traditionally relying on farming and agricultural related industries, oil and energy, and the aircraft manufacturing, has discovered that it is no longer recession-proof.

Although these industries have served us well in the past, we need to gear for the future with a much broader base.

Study after study has shown the significance of transportation in the development of a state's economy. The combined economic impact study of Southeast Kansas, for example, carried on by four state universities, concluded that during road construction between 1300 and 2300 jobs would be created, depending on whether the road was a Super-Two or a four-lane. That alone would reduce area unemployment between 6/10ths of 1% and 1%. There would also be an income increase between \$560 million and \$940 million in the region.

~~More important even than that the report said, more~~

Significant long term benefits would be felt during the first 20 years of the road's existence. Other benefits ... the region's population would increase, in this case between 7,000 and 13,100 ... employment would increase between 4.9% and 8.3%. Between 6,600 and 10,700 new jobs would be created. Retail sales would also find corresponding increase along with the increases in personal income.

Jobs often seem intangible, with the effects difficult to measure. A study by KU shows what the ripple effect created by 100 new jobs would mean:

nine new retail shops, eight new service businesses, \$3 million additional in bank deposits and, over five years, a total of 458 new jobs created. Over 10 years, \$66 million of new personal income infused into the local economy, with an additional \$1.76 million in property taxes generated for local government.

We know more and more the benefits of an improved highway system for the state but let's consider for a minute the price that we pay if we don't have the improved highway system. As one person said, "We're going to pay for it one way or another".

If we don't have it, we still pay. How do we pay? We pay by wear and tear on a car, for every chuckhole, for every damaged tire, for every injury, for every fatality. We pay in terms of driver discomfort, in terms of fatigue, which leads to accidents ... in terms of property damage. We pay in terms of economic stagnation, ~~over an area and we're beginning to see that in Kansas.~~ The standard of living slowly declines and the quality of life so important, especially in Kansas, slowly erodes. ~~Unemployment -- is another big price -- and you all know the results of unemployment.~~

And so, oddly enough, there is a price to inaction, as much as there is a price to action. Inaction ultimately may prove as costly, or more costly, to the public.

I think it's important to realize that in this fiercely competitive environment, even with an improved highway system there is no guarantee that we will get economic development. The other side of it, though, is that without it, it's almost a certainty that we won't.

And so, I would pose these questions: When, if not now? Is it ever going to get any cheaper?

The proposal is broad. The proposal is bold. The proposal is controversial.

But isn't all progress? Aren't we at a stage when leadership is needed -- not on the part of a few, but on the part of many? This program that would pump new economic life into the state. This program would generate more tax revenue that would be used for education and better schools ... more adequate prison facilities, and other pressing state needs. A new vitality would come forth to Kansas. A new image and a new attitude. As these things in turn come about, the exact opposite of the price ~~of~~^{for} poor highways becomes evident. We would have the economic development we need, the higher employment, the better standard of living, the expanded business, the safety factors, and the quality of life that we all richly deserve.

As a financial investment, a comprehensive highway ~~system~~ ^{program} is what the state of Kansas needs. The time is now.

Thank you very much.

~~We need this program for ourselves and for our children and our children's children.~~
Thank you

Leband Flint 32

FLINT SALES & SERVICE, INC.

AMERICAN MOTORS / JEEP

519 SOUTH MAIN
PRATT, KANSAS 67124
PHONE (316) 672-2641

THE CITY OF PRATT, THE PRATT BUSINESS COMMUNITY, AND THE CITIZENS OF PRATT HEARTILY ENDORSE A SUBSTANTIAL HIGHWAY INITIATIVE BY THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE.

A BALANCED STATEWIDE PROGRAM OF NEW CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION CAN BE THE BASIS OF AN ECONOMIC REVIVAL AND A STEP FORWARD FOR KANSAS. OUR HIGHWAY SYSTEM IS INADEQUATE TO HANDLE THE PRESENT TRAFFIC. THE HEAVY AUTOMOBILE AND TRUCK TRAFFIC ON HIGHWAY 54 WEST OF PRATT REQUIRES A FOUR LANE HIGHWAY. A FOUR LANE HIGHWAY 54 WOULD STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMIC POSSIBILITIES FOR PRATT, LIBERAL, DODGE CITY, GARDEN CITY, AND ALL THE SMALLER CITIES IN SOUTHWESTERN KANSAS. THIS IS DESPERTELY NEEDED TO OFFSET THE SLOW TIMES FOR AGRICULTURE AND ENERGY.

THE BEEF INDUSTRY HAS DEVELOPED IN SOUTHWEST KANSAS IN SPITE OF THE UNDERDEVELOPED HIGHWAY SYSTEM. THE TRANS CONTINENTAL TRUCK TRAFFIC ON HIGHWAY 54 IS VERY HEAVY DUE TO THE 120 MILES SAVED OVER THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM. THE COMPETITION BETWEEN AUTO AND TRUCK TRAFFIC ~~XX~~ MAKES THIS TWO LANE HIGHWAY VERY CONGESTED AND DANGEROUS. ON HEAVILY TRAVELLED SECTIONS OF HIGHWAY 54 IN SOUTHWESTERN KANSAS, IT WOULD BE MORE BENEFICIAL TO UTILIZE THE PRESENT TWO LANE ROAD AND CONCENTRATE ~~THE~~ SPENDING ON A PARALLEL SET OF LANES TO ~~R~~CREATE A 4 LANE EXPRESSWAY. SOUTHWEST KANSAS HAS THE TRAFFIC, BUT REQUIRES AN EXPRESSWAY FOR SAFETY, ECONOMIC ENCHANTMENT AND TOURISM. FOUR LANE IS LESS EXPENSIVE TO BUILD IN SOUTHWEST KANSAS, ~~AND~~ WOULD ADD TO THE ECONOMIC POTENTIAL OF THE STATE. LET'S UTILIZE WHAT IS IN PLACE AND BUILD A SUPER 2 BESIDE IT.

Att. 32

RESOLUTION NO. 81887-D

WHEREAS, Governor Hayden created a Highway Task Force to make a comprehensive study of the state's highway system including the need for new construction and maintenance; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force has recommended such a plan along with a means for funding and the Governor has called the Legislature into special session to consider authorizing its implementation; and

WHEREAS, the plan includes three projects in the vicinity of Manhattan which will greatly benefit the economic development of our region as well as improving access to the interstate highway system for all our citizens.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN, KANSAS, that the Legislature be encouraged to consider the many benefits of improved highways to the citizens and residents of Kansas and to take the necessary steps to begin the many improvements outlined by the plan and put into effect the funding mechanisms required to support the program.

Adopted this 18th day of August, 1987.



E. A. Klingler
E. A. Klingler, M.D., Mayor

SEAL:

Heide Clark
Heide Clark, City Clerk



CITY OF OSWEGO

703 5TH STREET P. O. BOX 210
OSWEGO, KS 67356
316-795-4433

Sherwood
34

August 18, 1987

Senate Transportation Committee
Capital Building - 2nd Floor
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Re: The Kansas Highway Project.

Dear Sirs:

Greetings from the Mayor, Council and citizens of Oswego, Kansas.

Thirty years ago Kansas was known for its excellent highways. Kansas was very progressive in building and maintaining their highway system. They had a nation wide reputation for good highways. It is time to regain that lost reputation.

Over the last thirty years the reputation for good highways has slipped. Due to economic conditions, neglect on the part of State officials and political football on the part of the legislative and executive branches, the highway system of Kansas has deteriorated.

The highway situation is critical in Southeast Kansas. There has not been a major highway construction project in Southeast Kansas since 1961.

Southeast Kansas has been, for the last twenty-five years, the most economically depressed area of the State, with the highest unemployment, highest welfare recipients per capita, and the lowest per capita income of any area. During this period of time, the bulk of new construction of State highways has occurred in the "major metropolitan areas". The 175,000 people of Southeast Kansas have helped pay for this construction from their gas tax dollars, but they have not received any direct benefit therefrom.

Gentlemen, the time has come to rectify the Southeast Kansas highway situation. The people of Southeast Kansas deserve a break from the legislature of the State of Kansas.

GS.HWY.2

more/

Att. 34

From the Task Force Report of January 1987 published by Emporia State University, University of Kansas, Pittsburg State University and Wichita State University, the economic benefits to Southeast Kansas by the construction of new highways would be as follows:


- Personal Income - A \$1,000 to \$2,300 gain per year for every man, woman and child.
- Retail Sales - An increase of up to \$1.34 BILLION over 20 years.
- Population - An increase of up to 34,600 people.
- Employment - Up to 19,300 new jobs.
- Life Loss And Safety - A savings of an estimated \$80 million.

The Task Force Report does not take into consideration the increase in assessed valuation for each county, created by new construction of homes and businesses. Gentlemen, the citizens of Southeast Kansas must have these benefits in order to survive!

Southeast Kansas has beautiful State parks, lakes and recreational areas, but they need the highways in order for people to enjoy them.

Therefore, please recommend the necessary State highway construction project that will provide the much needed and deserved highways to Southeast Kansas.

Thank You!



John D. Sherwood,
Special Delegate for the
City of Oswego

Testimony in Support of
Southeast Kansas Turnpike/Freeway

W. M. Wyckoff
President
Labette County State Bank
Altamont, Kansas

August 18, 1987

Much has been written and spoken about the economic impact of the proposed Southeast Kansas Turnpike/Freeway. Many, both in and outside the Legislature, have taken positions for and against. We feel the future of our children depend on the rebuilding of our regions economy. One vital link toward economic revitalization is the development of an East/West highway system linking Wichita to the Missouri line.

In an effort to gage the economic impact and benefits of a highway corridor between Wichita, Kansas to Joplin, Missouri a private not-for-profit committee, Highways for Progress, contracted with some of our sister educational institutions to review the impact of a four-lane expressway through Southeast Kansas.

Short range impact of the study cite increased jobs, increased personal income and an improvement in the rate of unemployment.

Long term impact forecasts a turnabout of outmigration in the region, increased employment, and significant increases in personal income and retail sales.

The study focuses on the route projected by Howard, Needles, Tammen, and Bergendoff which was funded by the 1986 Legislature.

We applaud and support the results of the study as properly and scientifically prepared.

Economic expansion greatly depends on the ability of the industrial community to ship and receive material and product. Construction of a modern highway system will greatly aid in economic opportunities.

Many companies seeking to relocate or expand into our area cite the lack of a modern highway system as a negative factor in their decision process.

We in Southeast Kansas have waited patiently for our turn to receive improved highways. Other regions have significantly benefitted from federal and state highway funds. We have been told your time will come.

We feel our time is now!

Note As of this date, none of the governing bodies in Cowley County ^{Ted Barkley} have had a chance to review the Governor's Proposal *per se*, since it was only made available yesterday, however, there is overwhelming official support for the recommendations of the Task Force, which are very similar. F 081887

I represent today many citizens of Cowley County, which includes the City of Arkansas City, the City of Winfield, and their respective Chambers of Commerce.

You have each received printed material regarding our collective position on a comprehensive highway plan. I thank you for the opportunity to express our interest and concerns in person here today.

That the Highway plan will benefit all of Kansas, is, in our view, beyond question. We supported, and were well represented, through "Highways for Progress" and have long held that good highways are essential to the current well being, and future of Cowley County and the entire state.

We believe that the inclusion of the Highway 166 project is integral to any truly comprehensive plan. Why?

. . . . From Ark City east to K-99, according to supporting data in the Governor's proposal, 166 is "geometrically inadequate in all respects." It has a sufficiency rating of only 40%!

. . . . This is a highway over which local industries ship over 5,300 tons of materials and goods on an average DAY (documented).

. . . . This is a highway that has claimed 3 lives in three separate accidents in the last 90 days.

. . . . This is a southeastern access route to a county where economic development is more than just a speculative promise -- it is an unfolding reality, with three firms adding a total of nearly 800 jobs, and two firms undertaking multi-million dollar plant and capital improvement programs in the past 24 months, for a total of nearly \$30 million dollars invested.

. . . . This is a highway that serves an area with at least one industry that cannot profitably market its product -- manufactured housing -- to the southeast, because it cannot move its product on 166. Imagine that -- a U.S. highway that is inadequate to move a mobile home.

The Governor's Comprehensive Highway Program is, I believe, ^{at least in terms of project selection} reasonable as it stands. Perhaps it is a minimum. It is expensive, to be sure, and as Senator Frey suggested yesterday, many will look at the program with an eye toward "paring down". He suggested that there might be (at least) two criteria for evaluating the projects as they stand: demonstrated need, and potential economic development.

The U.S. 166 project measures up very well in both respects, with a low sufficiency rating, existing industry that cannot use it, and a poor safety record on one hand -- and demonstrated economic growth, and potential for even greater growth (despite its condition) on the other.

Further, it is consistent with the recommendations of the Howard Needles report.

There is wide-spread support in Cowley County for ^a the Governor's Comprehensive Highway Program, and enthusiasm for the new market access that it will make available for much of Kansas, of which we, and Highway 166, are an integral part.

I encourage you to move ahead with this proposed program, and sincerely appreciate the challenge that lies ahead of you to get it into its final form. And we urge you to keep the 166 project part of it.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Barkley, Assistant to the City Manager
Arkansas City
For and on behalf of Cowley County

37

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
LABETTE COUNTY
OSWEGO, KANSAS 67356
316/795-4522

J. D. BAUMGARDNER
611 S. 32nd
Parsons, Kansas 67357
421-6110

WOODROW BURNETT
Box 70
Edna, Kansas 67342
922-3432

LONIE R. ADDIS
640 Iowa
Oswego, Kansas 67356
795-2826

August 18, 1987

Senator Bil Morris, Chairman
Senate Transportation & Utilities Committee

Rep. Rex Crowell, Chairman
House Transportation Committee

Gentleman:

As the immediate past President of the Southeast Kansas Regional Planning Commission we urge your support for a modern, efficient highway for Kansas, because we believe it is essential for economic development.


The economic well being of the State of Kansas depends on the continued growth and expansion of the economy. Southeast Kansas has long been denied its share of potential growth because of the lack of major highway transportation facilities. Only when all areas of the state are adequately served by modern transportation systems can all area of the state contribute equally to the welfare of all citizens.

We as area leaders are here today to express our continued support for a comprehensive highway plan. We further express our support for the four lane expressway concept from Wichita to the Missouri border.


Southeast Kansas Regional Planning Commission is not advocating any specific highway plan or funding mechanism at this time. But we do want the State to do something to get us moving forward again. We will support whatever plan the Legislature ultimately develops, as long as it is a comprehensive, statewide plan that helps promote economic development and makes our roads more safe and efficient.

As Kansans, we are not naive as to the political process and constraints for effective legislative action on matters of this magnitude. Nevertheless, current negative economic trends require bold initiatives for Kansas to address our changing economic structure. We firmly believe your action in the coming special session is a crucial factor to reach the long range economic recovery, stability and growth of Kansas.

Sincerely,


J. D. Baumgardner

A 77. 37



PARSONS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

P.O. BOX 737 PARSONS, KANSAS 67357, (316) 421-6500

Joint Meeting
Senate and House Transportation Committee
August 18, 1987

Dear Senators and Representatives:

The Parsons Chamber of Commerce urges your support for a comprehensive, statewide highway program that is adequately funded.

Highway transportation is a basic fundamental requirement of economic growth. Kansas, in many areas, lacks adequate highways to develop strong growth patterns and a comprehensive, statewide highway program will strengthen our weak Kansas economy and be a key part in our long range economic health.

The Parsons Chamber of Commerce joins all areas of Kansas, in solidarity to obtain the support of the joint Senate and House Transportation Committees for a comprehensive, statewide highway program that is adequately funded.

Sincerely,

Calvin Thomas, President
Parsons Chamber of Commerce

CT/tf

TESTIMONY BEFORE
JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1987

PROPOSED STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

I appreciate this opportunity to express the support of the Boeing Military Airplane Company for a comprehensive state highway program. BMAC has more than 22,400 employees working at its facilities in Sedgwick County. Our employees come from all of Southcentral Kansas, residing in more than 60 cities and towns in 13 senatorial districts and 32 house districts.

Boeing, our employees, our suppliers and subcontractors are heavy users of the state and local highway network. Collectively, we have a vested interest in the quality and the cost of any highway program.

We are also vitally interested in future economic growth and job development in Kansas. Strengthening our existing economic foundations and providing opportunities to diversify our economy should be high priorities for the state. We believe a comprehensive plan for upgrading, maintaining and expanding our state highway system is essential to reaching this goal.

There are several ingredients that should be contained in any highway program you support:

- 1) The plan should be comprehensive; it should address maintenance, upgrades, bottlenecks, increase state assistance to local government units, as well as build new roads where needed.
- 2) The plan should describe the highway improvements to be made. As an act of good faith to the public and to secure political support it seems essential to let everyone know exactly what improvements are intended.
- 3) The funding component must be adequate to finance the entire project. We believe user fees that don't compete with programs funded by the state general fund are most appropriate for this purpose.

Passage of a comprehensive state highway program does not by itself guarantee long term prosperity in Kansas. We must continue to implement the other components of the economic development package the legislation has approved the last two years as well. But a statewide highway program is essential to realizing the full benefits of all those other initiatives. We urge your favorable consideration of a comprehensive state highway plan. The risk is not in doing too much, the real risk is in doing too little.

PRESENTATION

to

JOINT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

by

BRENDA M. MANSKE
Executive Director
SOUTHEAST KANSAS TOURISM REGION, INC.

August 18, 1987

Att. 40

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee:

Quality highways are a vital component in the future economic development of Southeast Kansas.

Improved roadways and other public infrastructure are necessary for attracting internal and external business investment to the region through development and expansion of the state's existing, traditional core industries.


Improved roadways carry increased traffic, which will provide the opportunity for stimulation of travel and tourism, a diverse existing industry that expands the state's economic base on at least six different levels--conventions and trade shows, sport hunting and fishing, sporting events, attractions, entertainment and the film industry.

Travel-related expenditures in Southeast Kansas amounted to more than \$58 million in 1985. In that same year, travel and tourism created 1,305 jobs for the region, with a payroll of \$10 million. By comparison, travelers spent \$1.9 billion across the state in 1985, generated 42,000 jobs and \$374 million in payroll.

At a time when the state's traditional core industries--agriculture, energy and aviation--are depressed, travel and tourism grew by 9.7 percent in Kansas from 1984-85, outpacing the national growth rate of 7 percent for that same period of time. These statistics indicate that travel and tourism is a dynamic, growth-oriented industry--an industry that is predicted to continue growing for the next 10 years.

This kind of economic impact is important to the entire state, but it is absolutely vital to the economic future of Southeast Kansas, where most of these travel and tourism dollars are reaching us through our highways. The increased traffic that will be created by improved highways in our region can only enhance tourism programs by giving us the opportunity to serve greater numbers of visitors.

Highway improvement is the best possible investment to make in the future economic vitality of Southeast Kansas.



OFFICE OF
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WYANDOTTE COUNTY COURT HOUSE
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101
PHONE 573-2827



41
JOE L. WILHM
COMMISSIONER 1ST DISTRICT
CLYDE A. TOWNSEND
COMMISSIONER 2ND DISTRICT
PATRICK L. SCHERZER
COMMISSIONER 3RD DISTRICT

August 18, 1987

House & Senate Transportation Committee
Statehouse, 3rd Floor
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Members of the House and Senate Transportation Committee:

I have asked to appear before this Committee to express our support for the Bill regarding the Mass Transit System. The direct economic impact to the City of Kansas City, Kansas would be 9 million dollars, and an additional $\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars to Wyandotte County.

We have experienced growth, in Wyandotte County, as a result of highway fund expenditures such as I-435, I-635, I-70 and the soon to be completed I-670. These road systems have not only given our citizens access to major airports and recreational facilities, but has created a transportation hub that has benefited our community in an expanded tax base. Because of the increased access, thousands of acres of previously undeveloped land becomes ripe for industrial and commercial development. This development will lead to reduction of residential taxes and increased sales tax receipts for the State of Kansas and the citizens of Wyandotte County.

I thank you for your time and attention to this most important matter.

Sincerely,

Clyde A. Townsend
County Commissioner
Wyandotte County, Kansas

CAT:jm

Att. 41

Kansas Association of Counties

*Direct
Next # 10-*

Serving Kansas Counties

212 S.W. Seventh Street, Topeka, Kansas 66603

Phone (913) 233-2271

August 18, 1987

House Transportation Committee
State Capitol Building
Topeka, KS 66612

The Governing Board of this Association has studied the highway improvement proposal and has agreed to generally support it. However, the Board also unanimously agreed that there is a desperate need to increase the amount to be shared with local governments.

The roads (and bridges) that access into the state road system are in a deteriorated condition equal to or greater than the state highway system. We feel that it is inappropriate at this time to increase property taxes for this purpose due to the depressed condition of agri-business and the rest of our economy and urge your serious consideration of these factors as you deliberate on this measure.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Fred D. Allen
Executive Secretary

FDA/dm

cc: Governor Mike Hayden

cc: Senate Transportation Committee

Att 42



Kansas Engineering Society, Inc.

627 S. Topeka, P.O. Box 477
Topeka, Kansas 66601 (913) 233-1867

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President
Kenny E. Hill, P.E.
Wichita

President-Elect
Michael A. Conduff, P.E.
Manhattan

First Vice President
Larry L. Thompson, P.E.
Ellinwood

Second Vice President
T. Michael Garrison, P.E.
Leawood

Secretary/Treasurer
Robert J. Johnson, P.E.
Garden City

Past President
Larry W. Emig, P.E.
Topeka

STATE DIRECTORS

Eastern
Thomas M. Stephens, P.E.
Prairie Village

Golden Belt
Marion E. Shelor, P.E.
Great Bend

Hutchinson
Terry M. Berland, P.E.
Buhler

Northwest
Donald C. Drickey, P.E.
Norton

Smoky Valley
John W. Reh, P.E.
Salina

Southeast
Lorey M. Caldwell, P.E.
Pittsburg

Southwest
Neil K. Norman, P.E.
Scott City

Topeka
Mike K. Dunnaway, P.E.
Topeka

Tri Valley
Ed H. Kittner, P.E.
Blue Rapids

Wichita
Jon M. Callen, P.E.
Wichita

PRACTICE SECTION CHAIRMEN

Construction
Robert K. Van Sickle, EIT
Topeka

Education
Richard B. Hayter, P.E.
Manhattan

Government
Dan R. Harden, P.E.
Manhattan

Industry
Steve T. Smart, P.E.
Hutchinson

Consulting Engineers
C.M. "Mike" Butler, P.E.
Manhattan

NATIONAL DIRECTOR

William M. Lackey, P.E.
Topeka

William M. Henry, J.D.
Executive Vice President

Senate and House Transportation Committee Testimony, August 18, 1987

Mr. Chairman, members of the Transportation Committees, I appear before you today on behalf of the 1000 member Kansas Engineering Society in support of several of the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Highways.

The Society voices its support for these segments of the task force report, based upon the need for improvements in the system. Specifically, the Kansas Engineering Society endorses:

* The task force recommendation on substantial maintenance, including the increases for the pavement management system, bridge repair, bridge painting and safety set asides totaling \$12.5 million. These increases affect virtually all areas of the state and are essential in preserving our current system's useability.

* There is similar support by the Society for the major modification and improvements recommended by the task force. These projects for geometric improvements, pavement reconstruction, and bridge improvements on the state highway system are highly important because of the improvements in service it would bring to the state's current system. The work proposed in this area, totaling \$125 million, conforms with ASHTO standards and utilizes available federal funds as well. Equally important in the area of bridge work is the \$103.7 million recommended for replacement or improvement of more than 102 bridges in the state.

* In the area of state operations the Society finds itself in complete agreement with the task force on the need for salary adjustments for the professional staff of the State Department of Transportation. Due to legislative action two years ago many of the top professional engineering staff of KDOT were sealed off from advancement in salary by a compression of the salary ranges. Currently an adjustment and analysis is planned for fiscal year 1991 to see if some correction can be made in this action. Frankly, we hope there will be the same qualified engineering staff that exists today that will benefit in 1991 from this analysis. When you consider that a significant percentage of the KDOT engineers who began work with the agency in the 1950's are retiring in the next three years you will find that the agency is being whip sawed at a critical time for the state's transportation system.

* KES also favors the increase in state payments to local government for maintaining city connecting links from \$1,250.00 to \$1,750.00 per link mile. This recommendation by the task force is well warranted.

Att. 43

* KES concurs with the realization that unless some major sources of revenue are made available to the Department of Transportation, we will be unable to match federal aid dollars by fiscal year 1989. To give up Kansas' share of what is paid to the federal government in the form of fuel taxes is unthinkable and the Society feels strongly that action should be taken by this special session to guarantee that we can meet this match both in the near future and further down the road.

If there is a reservation that the Society has with the excellent work product of the highway task it is in the area of the so-called new construction program where a recommendation was made to utilize expressway in certain areas of the state. Expressways, particularly in suburban and urban areas do aid traffic flow and aid in traffic decongestion. However, inherent in the design for such roadways is the potential for high impact crashes at intersections. Professionally the engineering society would be remiss if it did not remind the legislature that although this type of roadway is less expensive than freeways, it creates a potential for accidents that cannot be ignored.

The members of the engineering society agree that a major highway program is something that must be looked at carefully and analyzed based upon cost as well as performance. However, the Society's members believe that this is an optimum time to make this analysis and if at all possible make steps forward in the state transportation system that will not only benefit our state's citizens this year and in 1993 but in years down the line.

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Henry
Executive Vice President
Kansas Engineering Society

WMH/mg