

Approved March 2, 1990  
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The meeting was called to order by Sen. Don Montgomery at  
Chairperson

9:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on March 1, 1990 in room 531-N of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Sen. Gaines - Excused

Committee staff present:

Mike Heim, Legislative Research  
Emalene Correll, Legislative Research  
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes  
Shirley Higgins, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Sen. Jerry Moran  
Sen. Marge Petty  
John Torbert, Kansas Association of Counties  
John Koepke, Kansas Association of School Boards  
Barbara Wood, Bourbon County Clerk  
Alan Alderson, Kansas County Treasurers Association  
Betty McBride, Cherokee County Treasurer  
Mary Ladesic, Kansas County Treasurers Association  
Susie Parmer, Register of Deeds, Leavenworth

The hearing began on SB 697 concerning unpaid property taxes assessed against property owned by the city of Bazine. Sen. Jerry Moran, who had requested the bill, testified in support of it. He explained that the city of Bazine has a population of 350. Prior to 1986, a developer planned a development, however, he did not go through with the plan and deeded the property back to the city of Bazine. The city now owes \$11,000 in real estate taxes. The County Attorney has said that the County Commissioners have no statutory authority to abate the penalty and interest on the taxes. The bill would allow for an abatement of the penalty and interest only, not the taxes. It is limited to the city of Bazine and would expire January 1, 1991.

Next to be considered was SB 739 concerning the consolidation of operations, procedures and functions of municipalities. Sen. Marge Petty, author of the bill, testified with the help of a balloon of the bill with amendments which she felt would satisfy concerns which had been expressed to her. (See Attachments I and II).

Sen. Allen asked Sen. Petty if this concept is being used elsewhere, and Sen. Petty said she knew of no other use and reiterated that it allows the public to be the authority to consider consolidation which is an option the public does not have at the present.

John Torbert, Kansas Association of Counties, testified in opposition to SB 739. (See Attachment III). Sen. Petty asked if the amendments shown on the balloon address his problems with the bill. Mr. Torbert said they do somewhat, but not striking lines 23 through 28 would make the bill more palatable.

John Koepke, Kansas Association of School Boards, expressed his concerns that the bill could be used for the consolidation of school districts. It could result in the forcing of an election on two school districts consolidating and then under Section 3 of the bill, it could be decided that the consolidation was not a good idea after all. Staff informed the committee that under 12-3909, the bill would not apply to school districts. It does not provide for school consolidations or closing of school districts.

Barbara Wood, Bourbon County Clerk, stood to say she concurs with the

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

room 531-N, Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on March 1, 1990

Treasurer's testimony. She also had a pass out which she felt was relevant. (See Attachment IV).

Alan Alderson, Kansas County Treasurer's Association, followed expressing his concerns with the bill. He concurs with Mr. Torbert that the proposed amendments make the bill more palatable. Citizens' right to elect local officials **needs to be protected.**

Betty McBride, Cherokee County Treasurer, followed expressing the treasurers' concern that this bill may allow a bill that passed two years ago to be reopened and erode what was done then. The treasurers feel that their jobs are important and the electorate should make the decision on consolidation. Five percent is not adequate to decide that an office should be eliminated. She fears that this bill could go to the floor of the House or Senate and have other officials amended into it. She would like lines 23 through 28 put back into the bill.

Mary Ladesic, Kansas County Treasurers Association, testified in opposition to SB 739. (See Attachment V). She also expressed the concern of the possibility that the bill could be a vehicle to change the statute back to as it was prior to 1988 although she understands that this was not the intent of Sen. Petty.

Susie Parmer, Register of Deeds from Leavenworth, stood to express her concern with lines 23 through 28 and to ask who would take charge under New Section 2.

Sen. Lee stated that she supports the bill. She has met with the eight counties she represents where the population is dwindling, and all have expressed concern about their increasing tax load. More than once, a favorable consideration was given to consolidation of programs and unification of school districts. The bill is simply an avenue to address the rising costs of local governments. It is not a mandate but an option to voters and would require a written plan. With this, the hearing on SB 739 was concluded. Several phone calls had been received by the Chairman in opposition to SB 739 by the following: Freida Davis, Meade County; Ann Harrison, Seward County; Linda Fincham, Marshall County; Ilene Colbert, Riley County; Mary Ann Gibbs, Hodgeman County; Mary Strunk; Alice Cahoon, Jetmore; Paula Lonnerberg, Jetmore; Mary Ann Pechanec and Gloria Anders, Rush County; Loretta Stoecklein, Ness County; Betty Swayden, Barber County; and Yvonne Kraus.

The Chairman called the committee's attention to SB 649 concerning fire protection which had been previously heard. Staff had copies of the suggested amendment which would allow the opportunity for the purchase of not only land and buildings but also fire fighting equipment. Sen. Daniels made a motion to so amend SB 649 and recommend the bill favorable for passage, Sen. Steineger seconded, and the motion carried. (Attachment VI)

Discussion began on a previously heard bill, SB 727 concerning lease-purchase agreements. Staff had prepared the suggested amendments. (See Attachment VII). Sen. Allen made a motion to recommend SB 727 favorable for passage as amended, Sen. Daniels seconded, and the motion carried.

Attention was returned to SB 697. The Chairman had talked with the Revisor and determined that if the bill is passed, language would be needed to insure that it would not apply to those powers already doing this. Staff said it would be a close call as to whether this would come under home rule. However, it sunsets in 1991 and, therefore, it will not be a gate for other counties. The statutes have exemptions for railroads and certain cities but interest or penalties are not mentioned.

Sen. Burke made a motion to recommend SB 697 favorable for passage, Sen. Allen seconded, and the motion carried.

The minutes of February 28 were approved.

Page 2 of 2

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Date: March 1, 1990

GUEST REGISTER

SENATE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS
Ellie Mae Lewis	Wabasha County	Alma
Ellen Kintz	Riley County Treas	Manhattan
Nancy Wecht	Haskell Co. Treasurer	Sublette
Betty Mae Bude	Cherokee Co. Treasurer	Columbus
Sh. W. J. Joto	Leavenworth Co. Treasurer	Leavenworth
Jim Reber	Harvey Co. Treas	Newton
Barbara Hunter	Jard Co. Treasurer	Dodge City
Nancy Stemann	Wauzeka County Treas.	Lawrence
J. W. Hamilton	" " Deeds " " Registered at	" "
John Hamilton	Osage County Treasurer	Lyndon KS
John J. Massey	Osage County Register of Deeds	Lyndon, Mo.
James Reed	Register of Deeds	Lynn, Mo.
Jessie Palmer	" "	Lynn, Mo.
Rosemary Schmidt	Rice Co. Treasurer	Linn, Mo.
Esther B. Smith	Mayor City of Wayne	Wayne, Mo.
Red Erb	Wayne Council	Wayne, Mo.
Mr. J. P. Johnson	Wayne Co. Treasurer	Wayne, Mo.
John W. Kresch	KASB	Topeka
John Van Dyke	ICAC	" "
LOREN L HIRBS	Sumner County Treasurer	Wellington
Wm. E. O'Brien	JOHNSON COUNTY TREASURER	OLATHE
TOM GROSS	KS Hosp. Assn.	Topeka



SENATE BILL No. 739

By Committee on Local Government

2-21

9 AN ACT concerning municipalities; relating to the consolidation of  
10 operations, procedures and functions; amending K.S.A. 1989  
11 Supp. ~~12-3903 and 12-3904~~ and repealing the existing sections.

12-3904 and repealing the existing section.

13 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:*

14 ~~Section 1. K.S.A. 1989 Supp. 12-3903 is hereby amended to read~~  
15 ~~as follows: 12-3903. Whenever the governing body of any political~~  
16 ~~or taxing subdivision of this state shall determine by resolution de-~~  
17 ~~termine that duplication exists in the operations, procedures or~~  
18 ~~functions of any of the offices or agencies of such subdivision or that~~  
19 ~~the operations, procedures or functions of any of the offices or agen-~~  
20 ~~cies thereof can be more efficiently and effectively exercised or pro-~~  
21 ~~vided as a consolidated activity performed by a single office or~~  
22 ~~agency, or whenever the governing body of any two or more political~~  
23 ~~or taxing subdivisions of this state shall by the passage of identical~~  
24 ~~resolutions determine that duplication exists in the operations, pro-~~  
25 ~~cedures or functions of offices or agencies of such subdivisions or~~  
26 ~~that the operations, procedures or functions of any of the offices or~~  
27 ~~agencies thereof can be more efficiently and effectively exercised or~~  
28 ~~provided as a consolidated activity performed by a single intergov-~~  
29 ~~ernmental office or agency or by a single office or agency of one of~~  
30 ~~the participating political or taxing subdivisions, such governing body~~  
31 ~~or governing bodies are hereby authorized to consolidate any or all~~  
32 ~~of the operations, procedures or functions performed or carried on~~  
33 ~~by such offices or agencies by the passage of a resolution or identical~~  
34 ~~resolutions setting out the time, form and manner of consolidation~~  
35 ~~and designating the surviving office or agency. The elimination of~~  
36 ~~an elective office by consolidation under the provisions of this act~~  
37 ~~shall be subject to the approval of a majority of the electors of the~~  
38 ~~political or taxing subdivision served by such office, voting in the~~  
39 ~~next regular general election of the county in which the office~~  
40 ~~of governor is elected at an election called and held for such~~  
41 ~~purpose, in the manner provided by the general bond law. Any such~~  
42 ~~proposed consolidation which eliminates any such elective office shall~~  
43 ~~provide that the elimination of such office shall become effective~~

Senate Local Gov't  
3-1-90  
Attachment I

I-2

1 ~~upon the date of normal expiration of the term of such office. Any~~  
 2 ~~such proposed consolidation which eliminates any such elective office~~  
 3 ~~shall not be voted on by the governing body of the political or taxing~~  
 4 ~~subdivision until a special public hearing is held within the political~~  
 5 ~~or taxing subdivision. Notice of such special hearing shall be pub-~~  
 6 ~~lished in a newspaper of general circulation in the political or taxing~~  
 7 ~~subdivision once each week for two consecutive weeks prior to the~~  
 8 ~~hearing. The first publication shall not be less than 21 days prior to~~  
 9 ~~such hearing. Any elected officer whose office would be eliminated~~  
 10 ~~in such consolidation and any other interested party shall be given~~  
 11 ~~an opportunity to appear and offer testimony at any of such hearings.~~

Section 1.

12 ~~Sec. 2. K.S.A. 1989 Supp. 12-3904 is hereby amended to read~~  
 13 ~~as follows: 12-3904. Whenever a sufficient petition, signed by not~~  
 14 ~~less than 10% of the qualified electors of any political or taxing~~  
 15 ~~subdivision of this state or any two or more political or taxing~~  
 16 ~~subdivisions of this state, shall be is filed with the governing~~  
 17 ~~body of such a political or taxing subdivision or subdivisions of this~~  
 18 ~~state requesting that a proposition for the consolidation of specified~~  
 19 ~~operations, procedures and functions of designated offices or agencies~~  
 20 ~~of such subdivision or subdivisions be submitted to the electors~~  
 21 ~~thereof, such governing body or governing bodies shall submit such~~  
 22 ~~proposition at an election called and held for such purpose in the~~  
 23 ~~manner provided by the general bond law. If such proposition~~  
 24 ~~eliminates an elective office by consolidation, the governing~~  
 25 ~~body of such subdivision or subdivisions shall provide for the~~  
 26 ~~hearing and submit such proposition at the next regular general~~  
 27 ~~election of the county in which the office of governor is elected~~  
 28 ~~in accordance with K.S.A. 12-3903, and amendments thereto.~~  
 29 ~~Any such petition shall be signed by at least 5% of the qualified~~  
 30 ~~electors of each political or taxing subdivision involved in the pro-~~  
 31 ~~posed consolidation.~~

except if the consolidation proposes to  
 eliminate an elective office, such petition  
 shall be signed by at least 10% of the  
 qualified electors of each political or  
 taxing subdivision involved in the proposed  
 consolidation

32 2) New Sec. 19. Prior to the consolidation of any operations, pro-  
 33 cedures or functions pursuant to K.S.A. 12-3901 *et seq.*, and amend-  
 34 ments thereto, the governing bodies of the political or taxing  
 35 subdivision proposed to be consolidated desiring to be the surviving  
 36 office or agency shall prepare a proposal for the provision of such  
 37 operations, procedures or functions. Such proposal shall include the  
 38 manner in which such operations, procedures or functions would be  
 39 provided and the cost thereof over a three-year period. All such  
 40 proposals shall be submitted to a board composed of one repre-  
 41 sentative from each political or taxing subdivision involved in the  
 42 consolidation. Such board shall review the proposals and shall select  
 43 the proposal which is the most cost-effective. If none of the proposals

I-3

1 submitted would provide for the consolidation of operations, pro-  
2 cedures or functions in a manner which is more cost-effective than  
3 if such operations, procedures or functions were not consolidated,  
4 the board shall reject such proposals and there shall be no  
5 consolidation.

6 ~~3~~ Sec. ~~4~~. K.S.A. 1989 Supp. ~~12-3903~~ and ~~12-3904~~ are hereby 12-3904 is  
7 repealed.

8 ~~4~~ Sec. ~~5~~. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after  
9 its publication in the statute book.

STATE OF KANSAS

MARGE PETTY  
SENATOR, 18TH DISTRICT  
SHAWNEE COUNTY



TOPEKA

SENATE CHAMBER

SENATE BILL 739

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS  
MEMBER: ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE  
RULES AND REGULATIONS  
JUDICIARY  
LABOR, INDUSTRY AND SMALL BUSINESS  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The purpose of SB739 is to provide the public with the opportunity to initiate, by petition, the consolidation of services.

Such petitions, if signed by 5% of the voters in affected political or taxing subdivisions, such as in incorporated and unincorporated areas, could require the question of the consolidation of services to be placed on the ballot. Services such as parks and recreation, purchasing, and law enforcement could be consolidated if supported by a majority of the public.

The procedure following a positive vote is also set out in the bill. Specifications would be set and bids taken for the entity who would provide the most cost effective service. Representatives of governmental units would set criterion and taxing entities may bid against each other for the directing of the service.

The advantage of this bill, as a compromise to a tax lid or a budget roll back provision for local taxing units, is that:

- \* the public exercises the option regarding specific services
- \* the public participates directly in where government cuts expenses
- \* it provides for public initiative

There is not agreement on whether consolidation saves money. If bids do not reflect a cost savings, consolidation would not be required.





"Service to County Government"

212 S.W. 7th Street  
Topeka, Kansas 66603  
(913) 233-2271  
FAX (913) 233-4830

**EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**President**

Gary Hayzlett  
Kearney County Commissioner  
P.O. Box 66  
Lakin, KS 67860  
(316) 355-7060

**Vice-President**

Marjory Scheufler  
Edwards County Commissioner  
R.R. 1, Box 76  
Belpre, KS 67519  
(316) 995-3973

**Past President**

Winifred Kingman  
Shawnee County Commissioner  
(913) 291-4040  
(913) 272-8948

Dixie Rose  
Butler County Register of Deeds  
(316) 321-5750

Gary Post  
Seward County Appraiser  
(316) 624-0211

**DIRECTORS**

Leonard "Bud" Archer  
Phillips County Commissioner  
(913) 689-4685

Marion Cox  
Wabaunsee County Sheriff  
(913) 765-3323

John Delmont  
Cherokee County Commissioner  
(316) 848-3717

Keith Devenney  
Geary County Commissioner  
(913) 238-7894

Berneice "Bonnie" Gilmore  
Wichita County Clerk  
(316) 375-2731

Harry "Skip" Jones III  
Smith County Treasurer  
(913) 282-6838

Roy Patton  
Harvey County Weed Director  
(316) 283-1890

Thomas "Tom" Pickford, P.E.  
Shawnee County Engineer  
(913) 291-4132

**NACo Representative**

Joe McClure  
Wabaunsee County Commissioner  
(913) 499-5284

**Executive Director**

John T. Torbert

March 1, 1990

**TESTIMONY**

To: Senate Local Government Committee

From: John T. Torbert  
Executive Director

Subject: SB 739 (Consolidation of Government Services)

The Kansas Association of Counties is in opposition to SB 739.

I believe that the bill is well intentioned and it is my understanding that it was the intent of the author to simplify the process of consolidating certain governmental functions and services. We are open to ideas or suggestions on how this process might be facilitated. However, this legislation amends the statute which also relates to the combining or elimination of certain elective county officers. We do not wish to see that issue reopened. You may remember that this committee dealt with that issue only two years ago.

We have several problems with the legislation as proposed. First of all, under current law, a vote to eliminate an elective office can only be held at a regular general election at the same time that a gubernatorial election occurs. This legislation would permit such elections to be held "in the manner provided by the general bond law." My understanding is that means that an election could be called at just about any time. This potentially creates all sorts of continuity and transition problems. The reason for the existence of the current statute is so that the elimination of any office would coincide with the conclusion of a normal electoral term.

Senate Local Gov't  
3-1-90  
Attachment III

Secondly, the proposed legislation eliminates a provision (page 2, lines 23-28) which specifies that if a petition is received calling for the elimination of an elective office, the governing board would be required to hold a hearing on such elimination. On an issue as important as removal or consolidation of an elective office, certainly the requirement for a hearing is a good one and should be retained.

We do not see any real benefit to reducing the percentage requirement on petitions from 10% to 5%. Again, the elimination or consolidation of a county-wide elected office is a very serious matter. It should not be an "easy" process for that reason. If there are big advantages to elimination or consolidation of an office, it does not seem that 10% is an onerous requirement.

If it is the intent of the legislation to deal only with the idea of functional consolidation (and it is my understanding that it is) our suggestion would be that a separate bill be crafted on that issue specifically. We would very much prefer that the statutes relating to the consolidation or elimination of elected officers not be reopened. I believe that you have enough battles to fight this year without taking on that one.

TSJOFCON

# Having them around to grab

While the fate of the Free World doesn't hang in the balance, a proposal to eliminate elected positions in Johnson County does defy voter preference.

The League of Women Voters of Johnson County has recommended the offices of county clerk, register of deeds and county treasurer be changed from elected to appointive.

County Treasurer William O'Brien says that the recommendation is "floating against a worldwide tide," and that "people all over the world are fighting, leaving their homes, even dying because they want to elect their government."

Before the League of Women Voters is branded un-American, it should be said the departure of these three offices from the ranks of the elected leaves plenty of choices for voters, and plenty of ballot accountability.

Still, people do like the idea of being able to yank officials by voting them in and out. Sadly, voter turnout is often low and not a lot of attention is paid to jobs like clerk or register of deeds, unless something goes wrong.

It is like that rarely used tool kept in the bowels of the garage. You don't know when you are going to want it, but, by God, it better be there when you do.

We should continue to elect the county clerk, treasurer and register of deeds. A comfort zone for citizens is worth the regular march to the polls.

TO: Senate Committee on Local Government  
FROM: Mary P. Ladesic, on behalf of the Kansas County Treasurers Assn.  
DATE: March 1, 1990

RE: SENATE BILL NO. 739

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to address you today.

My name is Mary Ladesic. For the last nine years I have served as Treasurer of Wyandotte County.

I am here today to speak in opposition to Senate Bill No. 739.

The amendments of K.S.A. 12-3903 and 3904 proposed by Senate Bill 739 repeal the amendments just made by the legislature in 1988 and re-create the flaws in the law that the legislature corrected at that time.

As I understand it, the intention of the amendments is to make it simpler for consolidation of government to occur.

No one disagrees that the original statute embodies the valid principle that voters and taxpayers are entitled to efficient, cost-effective local government.

At the same time, local government, especially statutory, elected offices, operate according to state statute and cannot be re-organized by a simple public referendum without a tremendous expense of public tax dollars.

In Wyandotte County, the offices of Treasurer, County Clerk, Register of Deeds and Sheriff, have been elected, statutory offices since 1861, when Kansas became a state.

Anyone who believes that these offices are going to be changed to become a part of an unelected bureaucracy of county government without a tax increase to pay for the change-over and ultimately cost taxpayers more money in tax dollars, simply isn't living in the real world.

For this reason, this committee should realize that any statute which allows for a consolidation of governmental services, or allows for the elimination of public statutory offices, should properly reflect the practical realities involved in such a tremendous change in governmental philosophy. This committee should also realize the heavy expense in tax dollars that will be involved.

Senate Bill 739 makes two essential changes in the present law:

1. It changes the election requirements from the years in which the governor is elected to an election held according to the general bond law, K.S.A. 10-120;
2. It reduces the referendum petition requirements from 10% of registered voters to 5%.

*Senate Local Gov't  
3-1-90  
Attachment IV*

ch of these proposed changes are wrong in principle and wrong in practice. They should be rejected by this committee and they should be rejected by the legislature.

The general bond law election requirement under K.S.A. 10-120 permits an election on 90 days notice. At any time of the year, in any year. This means that the election could occur at exactly the same time that a county official was running for election. The voter would then be faced with the decision of whether to vote for the consolidation of the public office or the re-election of the office holder. If the majority vote was to abolish the office, who would run it? Who would handle the transition to the new administration? How would all of the statutory requirements of the office be handled? Who would discharge the statutory duties of the office during the transition?

The true answer, the answer that each of you know, is that absolutely no one would. Complete chaos would result.

By leaving the present statutory requirements in place, by not adopting these proposed amendments, you are saying that two years shall elapse in which to make the transition. This is only common sense and it protects the voter and taxpayer in several ways:

1. Extraordinary, unbudgeted tax money will not be spent paying consultants, lawyers or additional personnel to try to create sense out of insanity;
2. The statutory duty of the elected official will not be violated because of a fluke or loophole in the law;
3. The public will be served in the short term and in the long term;

Next: consider the change in the petition percentage requirements:

1. The duty of every public official: you, me, the legislatures as a whole, and the governor, is to provide stable, responsible government. Public opinion can become so inflamed over a single issue that emotions instead of good sense may prevail. For example, in 1986, Kansas voters approved the constitutional amendment to allow reclassification and reappraisal of property. They believed they were right at the time. Now they know they were wrong. And now it is too late.

2. In Wyandotte County, only a few thousand signatures on a petition could force a complete, catastrophic change in government. If the general bond law election requirements were followed, county or city government could literally be upset in less than 120 days. Is this responsible government? Is this responsible legislation? Does this serve the long-term public interest?

I think not.

But I do think that if public tempers are allowed to cool, if time is allowed to pass, the natural good judgment of the voters of Kansas will prevail.

Ten percent of the registered voters to require a public vote on governmental consolidation is a reasonable idea. Having to wait until the next gubernatorial election to allow emotions to again return to common sense is a reasonable idea. And these reasonable ideas are already the law of Kansas. There does not need to be a change in the present law.

In 1988 I supported the amendments that are now the present law. I thought those amendments were right then, and I think the present law is right now. The people of Kansas are entitled to have the kind of government they want.

But emotional times should not result in bad legislation.

The present law protects the public, the voter, the taxpayer. It also protects the long-term stability and common sense of local government.

I say to you sincerely: Do not change the present law under the heat of emotional times. I ask that you reject Senate Bill 739.

MPL:sc  
2-28-90

SENATE BILL No. 649

By Committee on Local Government

2-13

AN ACT concerning fire protection; relating to the issuance of bonds and no-fund warrants.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

Section 1. (a) The governing body of any benefit district created under the provisions of K.S.A. 31-301 et seq., and amendments thereto, may issue general obligation bonds of the district for the purpose of constructing buildings to house fire-fighting equipment. Before any bonds are issued, the governing body shall publish once in a newspaper of general circulation within the district, a notice of its intention to issue such bonds and stating the purpose for which such bonds are to be issued and the amount thereof. If within 60 days after the date of publication of such notice, a petition signed by not less than 5% of the qualified electors residing in such district is filed with the county election officer or in the case of a district within two counties, with the county election officer of each county, no bonds shall be issued until approved by a majority of the qualified electors residing in the district voting at an election called and held therefor. The aggregate amount of outstanding bonds issued under this section shall not exceed 5% of the assessed valuation of taxable tangible property within the district. Such bonds shall be issued and any election thereon shall be called and held in the manner provided by the general bond law.

(1) Acquiring land; (2) purchasing, acquiring, constructing, reconstructing, equipping and furnishing

; and (3) acquiring fire-fighting equipment

(b) The governing body of any such benefit district may issue no-fund warrants in the manner provided in K.S.A. 79-2940, and amendments thereto. All such warrants and interest thereon may be payable in approximately equal installments over a period of not to exceed five years from the first day of July following issuance. The governing body shall make a levy at the first tax levying period after such warrants are issued sufficient to pay such warrants and the interest thereon as may be required during the budget year.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its publication in the statute book.

Senate Local Gov't  
3-1-90  
Attachment VI

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## Proposed Amendment to Senate Bill No. 727

On page 1, in line 36, following the comma, by inserting "excluding debt service,";

On page 2, in line 1, by striking "electors" and inserting "voters"; in line 2, before the period, by inserting "voting at an election thereon"; following line 12, by inserting:

"Sec. 3. K.S.A. 72-8225 is hereby amended to read as follows: 72-8225. The board of education of any school district, as lessee or lessor, may enter into written contracts for the use of real or personal property, except that no board of education shall enter into any contract under authority of this section as lessor of any school bus, as defined in K.S.A. 72-8301, and amendments thereto. The term of any such lease may be for not to exceed 10 years. Such lease may provide for annual or other payment of rent or rental fees and may obligate the school district to payment of maintenance or other expenses. Any contract made under authority of this section shall be subject to change or termination at any time by the legislature. Any assignment of rights in any contract made under this section shall contain a citation of this section and a recitation that the contract and assignment thereof are subject to change or termination by the legislature. The provisions of the ~~cash--basis~~ and budget laws shall not apply to any lease made under authority of this section in such a manner as to prevent the intention of this section from being made effective. The provisions of this section shall be subject to the provisions of K.S.A. 10-1116b, and amendments thereto.";

By renumbering sections accordingly;

On page 2, in line 13, by striking "is" and inserting "and 72-8225 are";

In the title, in line 10, after "10-1116b", by inserting "and 72-8225"; in line 11, by striking "section" and inserting "sections"

Senate Local Gov't  
3-1-90  
Attachment VII