

Approved March 26, 1991
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 21, 1991 in room 531-N of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

MIke Heim, Legislative Research
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes
Shirley Higgins, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

John Torbert, Kansas Association of Counties
Ernie Mosher, League of Kansas Municipalities
Walt Cole, The Kansas Municipal Security Dealers Association

HB 2172 - Concerning the Kansas development finance authority; relating to financing municipal lease-purchase equipment.

John Torbert, Kansas Association of Counties, testified in support of the bill. (Attachment 1).

Ernie Mosher, League of Kansas Municipalities, testified in support (Attachment 2) and distributed a handout from the Municipal Accounting Section as an aide in his testimony (Attachment 3). Mr. Mosher also had testimony given by Allen Bell, previous President of the Kansas Development Finance Authority (KDFA), before the House committee. (Attachment 4).

Marty Bloomquist, Program Manager with KDFA, stood at the Chairman's request to answer questions. The Chairman had several questions regarding how KDFA accesses its money and the process involved in establishing financing agreements. Sen. Steineger began a discussion regarding the lending limits of banks in this regard and how the KDFA functions.

Walt Cole, Kansas Municipal Security Dealers Association, testified in opposition to HB 2172. (Attachment 5). A short discussion followed regarding a list of recent Kansas tax-exempt lease financings which was attached to his written testimony. This concluded the hearing, and the bill was taken under advisement.

The minutes of March 20 were approved.

Copies of testimony regarding SB 317 concerning EMS services, which had been heard yesterday, submitted by Jerree Forbes of Hutchinson Community College, had been distributed to committee members. (Attachment 6).

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 a.m.



"Service to County Government"

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

EXECUTIVE BOARD

President

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

Vice-President

Marion Cox
Wabaunsee County Sheriff
Wabaunsee County Courthouse
Alma, KS 66401
(913) 765-3303

Past President

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

Thomas "Tom" Pickford, P.E.
Shawnee County Engineer
(913) 266-0192

Murray Nolle
Johnson County Commissioner
(913) 791-5501

DIRECTORS

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

George Burrows
Stevens County Commissioner
(316) 593-4534

John Delmont
Cherokee County Commissioner
(316) 848-3717

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

Betty McBride
Cherokee County Treasurer
(316) 429-3848

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

Gary Post
Seward County Appraiser
(316) 624-0211

Nancy Prawl
Brown County Register of Deeds
(913) 742-3741

Vernon Wendelken
Clay County Commissioner
(913) 461-5694

NACo Representative

Keith Devenney
Geary County Commissioner
(913) 238-7894

Executive Director

John T. Torbert

March 21, 1991

TESTIMONY

To: Senate Local Government Committee

From: John T. Torbert
Executive Director

Subject: HB 2172- K DFA Financing of Lease Purchase Agreements

The Kansas Association of Counties appears today in support of HB 2172. Cities and counties, as this committee is aware, use lease purchase authority to a large degree. It is a recognized and accepted form of financing various types of machinery and equipment acquisitions.

According to information obtained from the state municipal accounting office, most existing lease purchase agreements have interest rates of at least 12%. Most of the rates are higher. The ability to "package" these agreements into a statewide equipment lease program using tax exempt debt instruments is attractive. Such a program has the potential to reduce interest rates to around six percent and could save local governments \$3 million per year. The legislation separates the question of equipment purchase from the financing arrangements- something we think is desirable.

K DFA has proven that these kind of programs can work and we think that extending this concept to local governments makes good sense. We urge your favorable consideration of HB 2172.

tsjleapr

Senate L.G.
3-21-91
Attachment 1



**League
of Kansas
Municipalities**

**Municipa
Legislative
Testimony**

PUBLISHERS OF KANSAS GOVERNMENT JOURNAL 112 W. 7TH TOPEKA, KS 66603 (913) 354-9565 FAX (913) 354-4186

TO: Senate Committee on Local Government
 FROM: E.A. Mosher, Executive Director, League of Kansas Municipalities
 RE: HB 2172--K DFA Financing of Municipal Lease-Purchase Equipment
 DATE: March 21, 1991

On behalf of the League and its member cities, I appear in support of HB 2172 which is recommended by a provision in our convention-adopted Statement of Municipal Policy.

While HB 2172 is written broad enough to permit K DFA to enter into agreements with a single municipality for the purpose of financing the lease-purchase acquisition of one or more pieces of equipment, we think this is unlikely to occur because the advantages of scale does not occur unless a larger bond issue is involved. Instead, a pooling arrangement would most likely occur when several municipalities are involved, and the collective total of a number of the lease-purchase agreements equals a significant amount. For example, if 20 municipalities are involved with lease-purchases averaging \$50,000 each, K DFA could issue bonds totaling \$1,000,000 and acquire the financial paper for the various equipment items under lease-purchase agreements. Thus, there would be a single bond issue, rather than 20 separate efforts by 20 municipalities to finance equipment acquisition. The efficiency of scale, with the elimination of some of the overhead costs otherwise needed for each separate financial program, could result in significant savings to the public and taxpayers. In addition, the financial market tends to be more competitive for one larger debt issue than when several small issues are at sale.

We want to call to your special attention that the bill is limited to the acquisition of equipment. It would not apply to buildings and public improvements normally financed by the issuance of general obligation bonds or revenue bonds.

I would also note that the authority of a municipality to enter into the lease-purchase agreements for the acquisition of equipment is subject to the provisions of K.S.A. Supp. 10-1116c. As a result, the agreement must be approved by a majority vote of all members of the governing body. Further, the agreement must specify the amount or capital costs required to purchase the item if paid for by cash, the annual average effective interest cost, and the amount included in the payments for service, maintenance or other charges exclusive of the capital cost and interest cost. In addition, a valid lease-purchase agreement must include a provision that the municipality is obligated only to make payments from funds budgeted and appropriated for that purpose during each current budget year.

*Senate L.G.
3-21-91*

President: Frances J. Garcia, Commissioner, Hutchinson * **Vice President: Robert G. Knight**, Mayor, Wichita * **Past President: Irene B. French**, Mayor, Merriam * **Directors: Michael A. Conduff**, City Manager, Manhattan * **Ed Ellert**, Mayor, Overland Park * **Harry L. Felker**, Mayor, Topeka * **Greg Ferris**, Councilmember, Wichita * **Idella Frickey**, Mayor, Oberlin * **William J. Goering**, City Clerk/Administrator, McPherson * **Judith C. Hollinsworth**, Mayor, Humboldt * **Jesse Jackson**, Commissioner, Chanute * **Stan Martin**, City Attorney, Abilene * **Mark Mingenback**, Councilmember, Great Bend * **Joseph E. Steineger, Jr.**, Mayor, Kansas City * **Bonnie Talley**, Commissioner, Garden City * **Executive Director: E. A. Mosher**

Attachment 2

We support HB 2172 since the involvement of KDFA in equipment acquisition can result in some significant savings to the public. As a practical matter, we think the authority will be used primarily by smaller municipalities, since larger jurisdictions, like Wichita, now effectively consolidate their lease-purchasing into periodic larger certificate of participation agreements, somewhat similar to what KDFA now does for various state agencies. We have a number of municipal bond firms and other companies active in Kansas which have generally well served the debt financing needs of local governments. However, handling the financing of equipment lease-purchasing, normally in limited amounts and for short terms, is generally not profitable to such companies in comparison to larger tax-exempt issues. We are convinced that the cost savings possible from KDFA pooled financing would be of significant benefit to the public, and will not jeopardize the continued involvement of private businesses providing municipal capital financing.

Finally, we would note that the availability of KDFA financing could provide a yardstick which municipalities can use even if they don't elect to use the KDFA program. If it is found that KDFA can finance municipal equipment acquisition at an average annual cost of 7%, for example, we think it is unlikely that municipalities will enter into lease-purchase agreements with vendors or other private companies where the interest cost is significantly higher. The availability of KDFA pooling experience will help assure that non-KDFA financing will be competitive.

HOUSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

BARBARA BUTTS, TRAINING SUPERVISOR, MUNICIPAL ACCOUNTING SECTION

FEBRUARY 19, 1991

On September 6, 1988, Bill Ervin, Chief of the Municipal Accounting Section, was a conferee at the Special Committee on Local Government hearing concerning lease-purchase authority for municipalities. In its summary report, the Committee recommended that we change the municipal budget forms to include a schedule for reporting lease-purchase agreements. We initiated this change to the budget forms that we distributed to the county clerks in mid-May 1989, see attachment.

We have gathered the lease-purchase information from the schedules included with 1990 budgets. Attached is a summary of the information we compiled. We did not verify/correct the data except where it appeared to be clearly erroneous. We can provide any details to support this summary that you may want to see.

Providing the financing for the lease-purchase payments has a major impact on tax levies, tax lids, and budgets of municipalities. These payments must be made from an operating fund, such as the General Fund, which is usually subject to the tax lid. There is no authority to make these payments from the bond and interest fund (which is exempt from the tax lid).

Lease-purchase agreements do not require voter approval as do most bond issues. Thus, some view lease-purchase agreements as loopholes because, while the long term obligations they create are similar to those of bond issues, the lease-purchase agreements can be used without voter approval.

I would be happy to respond to questions from the Committee.

Attachments

Senate L.G.
3-21-91
Attachment 3

SUMMARY OF LEASE-PURCHASE TRANSACTIONS
AS REPORTED IN THE 1990 BUDGETS

Equipment

Number of Transactions	Range of Contract Amounts	Interest Rate	Term	Total Contract Amount	Budgeted Payment
742	\$ 412- 99,999	3.3-20.4	8 mo-7 yrs	\$21,700,019	\$ 4,988,577
81	100,000-999,999	3.3-27.4	3-21 yrs	21,142,702	3,799,874
4	over \$1,000,000	6.24-8	5-7 yrs	<u>8,681,238</u>	<u>1,353,431</u>
<u>827</u>	Total Equipment			<u>\$51,523,959</u>	<u>\$10,141,882</u>

Buildings

60	\$1,600-52,505,000	5.5-11.5	3-21 yrs	92,372,093	\$ 4,909,795
----	--------------------	----------	----------	------------	--------------

Land

7	\$12,500-2,380,000	7.49-9.28	5-25 yrs	3,807,432	\$ 487,620
---	--------------------	-----------	----------	-----------	------------

Other

Certificate of Participation	4.75-7.875	239 mo	3,000,000		
2-Maintenance Contracts	10	5 yrs	30,144		
Water Purchase Rights		40 yrs	843,600		
Phone Project Data	6.37	6 yrs	651,749		
Energy Maintenance System		7 yrs	152,566		
TV Agreement		10 yrs	85,685		
Debt Refinancing	7.1-7.5	10 yrs	2,440,000		
Distribution System		40 yrs	<u>730,680</u>		
<u>9</u>	Total Other			<u>\$ 7,934,424</u>	<u>\$ 746,025</u>
<u>903</u>	Grand Total			<u>\$155,637,908</u>	<u>\$16,285,37</u>

2172

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
H. EDWARD FLENTJE, CHAIRMAN
LAURA NICHOLL
CHRISTOPHER MCKENZIE
DENNIS MCKINNEY
HARRY WIGNER

Suite 10
Capitol Tower
400 S.W. 8th
Topeka, KS 66603

(913) 296-6747
FAX (913) 296-6810



K DFA
KANSAS
DEVELOPMENT FINANCE
AUTHORITY

MARTY BLOOMQUIST, PROGRAM MANAGER

ALLEN BELL, PRESIDENT

February 18, 1991

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: House Committee on Local Government
FROM: Allen Bell, President *Allen Bell*
Kansas Development Finance Authority
SUBJECT: Testimony on House Bill No. 2172

If enacted, House Bill 2172 will permit the Kansas Development Finance Authority to use its statewide tax-exempt financing authority to significantly reduce the equipment leasing costs of local government. As indicated by the statistics collected by the Municipal Accounting Office, municipalities are substantial users of lease-purchase contracts for the acquisition of equipment, at relatively high interest rates. Through the enactment last year of 1990 House Bill 3109, this committee and the Legislature have tacitly approved the continued unregulated use of this financing arrangement. K DFA would like to fashion and administer a statewide equipment lease purchase program for municipalities, similar to the state agency program that we administer for the Department of Administration.

As a general proposition, state law does not allow the state finance authority to issue bonds, or other evidence of indebtedness, to finance projects or activities of political subdivisions of the state. This prohibition against involvement in local government finance was incorporated into K DFA's enabling legislation at the request of local municipal bond dealers at the time of its enactment in 1987. Their concern was that a state finance authority with such powers might become a municipal bond bank which would package local bond issues into very large statewide issues and sell the bonds out-of-state into the national bond market.

While I don't agree that the bonds would always be sold out-of-state, I agree with the underwriters that the state does not need a municipal bond bank at the present time. There are occasions, however, when a specific exception to the general local government finance prohibition is warranted, in fact needed. The 1988 Legislature foresaw this and amended the K DFA statutes to provide for the making of such exceptions on a case-by-case basis. Since then,

Senate L.G.
3-21-91
Attachment 4

exceptions to the prohibition have been made five times: for the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Program, the Partnership Program and the Community Provider Pooled Loan Program, for local water supply projects, and for the Labette County Correctional Conservation Camp Project.

The area of equipment lease purchase financing is one in which involvement by a central statewide tax-exempt bond issuer can save millions of dollars in a short period of time. Municipalities currently lease equipment primarily through equipment dealers or manufacturers at interest rates that do not appear to take into account the fact that the interest income realized by the lessors is exempt from federal income tax. To a limited extent, equipment is also leased through third-party finance companies who recognize the value of tax-exempt income, but whose rates are still considerably higher than tax-exempt bond rates.

As the Municipal Accounting Office statistics show, in the 1990 budget year municipalities reported over \$50 million in currently outstanding lease purchase contracts for equipment, with annual installment payments in excess of \$10 million. Without having analyzed the data, my guess is that the average interest rate on these outstanding contracts is in the neighborhood of 12 percent and the average term is five years. Current tax-exempt bond rates for a similar term are around six percent. If the aggregate principal balance of outstanding lease purchase contracts remained at \$50 million, municipalities could save as much as \$3 million per year on a statewide basis if a statewide municipal equipment leasing program was in place.

Municipal bond underwriters would not be cheated out of business by this arrangement because equipment finance is not an area in which they have had much involvement due to the relatively small transaction sizes. In fact, there is a good chance that they could become involved through a statewide program since the relatively small individual equipment purchases would be bundled together into relatively large aggregate financings. The first step in establishing this program would be to refinance most of the municipalities' outstanding lease purchase contracts through the issuance of certificates of participation, which would be sold to individual and institutional investors, most likely through Kansas bond dealers.

To make this kind of program work effectively, a statewide issuing authority with equipment finance experience is needed. KDFA is ready to put such a program together and make it work. I urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

POLICY STATEMENT

PRESENTED TO

**THE
SENATE COMMITTEE
ON
LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

**THE HONORABLE
DON MONTGOMERY, CHAIRMAN**

ON BEHALF OF

**THE
KANSAS MUNICIPAL SECURITY
DEALERS ASSOCIATION**

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1991

RE: HOUSE BILL 2172

*Senate L.G.
3-21-91
Attachment*

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate having this opportunity to appear before you this morning on behalf of the Kansas Municipal Securities Dealers Association regarding House Bill 2172.

This measure expands the authority of the Kansas Development Finance Authority (K DFA) by allowing it to "pool" local government municipal leases into larger K DFA bond issues.

This measure represents a dramatic departure from K DFA's original enacting legislation and the policies adopted when K DFA was established.

As you may well remember, the Legislature specifically limited K DFA powers to those functions which are not available to local units of governments and municipalities.

Authority currently exists under state statutes for units of government to put together "pooled" bond issues. The Hospital Association and a group of Kansas independent colleges have made use of these laws in the recent past.

It should also be pointed out that due to the competitive environment of municipal financing, local units of government have been able to obtain very competitive rates for lease purchase financing. Attached to this testimony is a list of some recent lease purchase financing done by Kansas Municipalities. This list serves to illustrate the fact that the current marketplace is taking care of municipal leasing needs at very competitive rates.

In instances where higher rates of financing have occurred, these were done through vendor-associated finance services and not through the Kansas tax-exempt market.

The problem, if any exists, is in local government taking advantage of the financing opportunities that currently exist with tax-exempt bonds rather than settling for vendor financing.

The issues of "cost" is another concern we have with this proposal. The Kansas Development Finance Authority traditionally charges one-half of one percent of the principal amount of the transaction. This surcharge creates an additional, unnecessary cost for the ultimate borrower.

In closing, this proposal puts that state in direct competition with the private sector, allowing KDFA to become involved in a financing arena that is competitive and is presently working.

For these reasons, we urge you to reject this proposal.

We appreciate your attention and consideration of our opposition to this measure and would be pleased to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

RECENT KANSAS TAX-EXEMPT LEASE FINANCINGS

<u>ISSUER</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>INTEREST RATE</u>
Brown Co., Kansas U.S.D. #415	\$ 450,000.00	03-01-87	5.85%
Newton, Kansas	93,199.65	04-29-87	8.50%
Hutchison Community College	3,000,000.00	05-01-87	7.60%
Labette Co. Community College	1,385,000.00	05-01-87	4.50/6.00%
Dodge City, Kansas	500,000.00	06-01-87	7.07%
Nemaha Co., Kansas U.S.D. #441	46,827.22	06-01-87	7.80%
Pratt Community College	1,800,000.00	06-01-87	5.50/8.50%
Nemaha Co., Kansas U.S.D. #441	37,560.00	06-15-87	9.00%
Newton, Kansas	141,737.88	07-01-87	8.50%
Johnson Co., Kansas	840,000.00	07-15-87	7.973%
Wyandotte Co., Kansas U.S.D. #204	58,082.00	08-15-87	7.80%
Sedgwick County, Kansas U.S.D. #259	537,000.00	10-15-87	6.34%
State of Kansas	16,280,000.00	12-01-87	6.60%
Newton, Kansas	80,000.00	01-28-88	8.50%
Leawood, Kansas	70,000.00	04-01-88	6.25%
McPherson Co., Kansas	140,000.00	06-01-88	6.75%
McPherson Co., Kansas	37,500.00	06-01-88	7.00%

<u>ISSUER</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>INTEREST RATE</u>
Jefferson Co., Kansas U.S.D. #340	\$ 14,303.78	06-30-88	12.70%
Sedgwick Co., Kansas U.S.D. #259	908,500.00	07-01-88	6.00%
Labette Co., Kansas	60,500.00	09-22-88	7.50%
Eureka, Kansas	1,500,000.00	10-01-88	7.99%
Winfield, Kansas	600,000.00	12-15-88	7.00%
McPherson, Kansas	44,000.00	02-01-89	6.50%
Bonner Springs, Kansas	130,000.00	02-13-89	7.00%
Ford Co., Kansas	2,000,000.00	04-01-89	7.24%
Johnson Co. Community College	6,330,000.00	04-01-89	7.265%
Lindsborg, Kansas	62,500.00	05-01-89	8.20%
Ellinwood, Kansas	100,000.00	06-01-89	6.77%
Dodge City, Kansas	500,000.00	06-29-87	7.49%
Melvern, Kansas	155,000.00	07-20-89	7.75%
Oswego, Kansas	275,000.00	08-01-89	7.25%
Bonner Springs, Kansas	525,000.00	08-15-89	6.737%
Derby, Kansas	860,900.00	09-28-89	6.00/6.20%
Brown Co., Kansas	235,000.00	10-15-89	7.50%
Butler Co., Kansas U.S.D. #394	650,000.00	11-01-89	6.25%
Franklin Co., Kansas	355,000.00	11-01-89	7.10%
Leavenworth, Kansas	320,000.00	11-01-89	6.437%

<u>ISSUER</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>INTEREST RATE</u>
Park City, Kansas	\$ 48,100.00	11-17-89	7.20%
Butler Co. Community College	2,275,000.00	12-20-89	6.20/7.25%
Blue Valley Recreation Commission	4,880,000.00	01-01-90	7.319%
Bonner Springs, Kansas	130,000.00	01-01-90	6.567%
Marion, Kansas	915,000.00	01-01-90	7.10%
Pomona, Kansas	125,000.00	03-15-90	10.00%
Franklin Co., Kansas	3,500,000.00	05-01-90	7.223%
Winfield, Kansas	75,000.00	05-10-90	6.35%
Johnson Co., Kansas	13,200,000.00	09-01-90	7.450%
El Dorado, Kansas	83,000.00	09-28-90	6.75%
Lawrence, Kansas	400,000.00	10-01-90	6.553%
Dodge City, Kansas	500,000.00	11-01-90	6.50/8.00%
Leawood, Kansas	405,000.00	12-01-90	6.1969%

**Testimony in Support
of Senate Bill No. 317**

Jerree Forbes

The funding provided for the Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services in Senate Bill No. 317 is vital if prehospital care in Kansas is to continue to meet the diverse and substantial demands of the citizens across the state. At no time in history has there been a higher expectation of emergency medical care. Those who work and live in Kansas appreciate the benefits of high quality prehospital care and attempt to support it through local funding of ambulance services and through participating in the system as volunteers and in other capacities.

A Region Council system exists in which physicians, nurses, and EMS personnel work together in accomplishing significant headway in prehospital services. The Regional concept has existed in Kansas since 1980 and provides a mechanism whereby services are rendered at low or no cost to the EMS system. These services involve the training of technicians, the planning of EMS system enhancement, the development of 911, the continuing education of technicians, the training of EMS managers, the dissemination of information, and the coordination of communication plans and other services relative to EMS. The services of the Regions could not be obtained outside of the current system. The investment made

Senate L. G.
3-21-91
Attachment 6

by hundreds of people throughout the state would be lost or reduced if the Region's were not present to provide the opportunity and mechanism for participation. The savings to the state of Kansas is significant and not likely to be discoverable through any means other than the Regional Councils.

Their missions are clear and proven to be of value. I have attached a copy of the Region III EMS Council Mission Statement as an example. The Regions are effective and efficient in meeting their goals and in fulfilling their mission. In Region III, over 2500 participants were trained through Regional activities last year and over 1500 EMS technicians were trained in initial training or continuing education programs. Nurses, physicians, and others also attended EMS training sessions. New Instructor Coordinators were assisted in obtaining their instructor status through the Board of EMS, automatic external defibrillator programs were supported, increased training levels were supported resulting in increased levels of services and instructors participated in workshops directed at their skills. Water rescue and other specialized EMS seminars were offered which in turn were presented by participants in their local service areas. This "ripple effect" in training means that many more than the 2500 participants benefited from the training sessions supported by Region III and other Regional Councils.

The activities currently being undertaken by the Regional

Councils are not activities which could be assumed elsewhere with the same results given the current funding level. The support of the Regional Councils allows resources to be utilized which would otherwise be lost or limited. The funding for the Regional Councils is a cornerstone to the delivery of quality prehospital care.

As injuries and serious illnesses are studied, it is clear that prehospital care is essential if a given group of citizens is to survive and recover from their injury or illness. The Board of EMS is a vital part of the prehospital system. The regulatory and support functions it serves relative to prehospital care are absolutes if organization, quality, and evaluation are important in prehospital care.

This bill would provide for the stability needed to meet the many demands facing Kansas EMS. EMS is being challenged to provide the care necessary for Kansans to live. EMS is being challenged to ensure that Kansans are not disabled for life. The survivability and reduction in disability is a major cost saving factor in this state. In addition, Kansas' most important resource is best preserved and maintained by keeping people alive and productive - people who contribute to society as a whole.

Funding the Board ensures that the prehospital care delivered meets the national standard and that a standard of quality set out by the Board is maintained. This quality is protected

through the Board's involvement in certifying new technicians, approving education programs and hundreds of other functions. Kansas EMS and indeed the Board of EMS are expected to perform to a high standard in the delivery of their services. Kansans expect the prehospital care they receive to be of life saving and life sustaining quality. But a barrier is attempting to rise which would prevent those needing prehospital care from receiving what they expect and what they need. The lack of stable financial support does not allow for long term planning or for essential services to be continued even at the current level. Considering the increased number of Kansans calling on emergency medical services (over 130,000 last year) and the increased levels of service desired, EMS must grow in stability if it is to even maintain its current position. A threat to the stability of EMS in Kansas is most appreciated in any budget reductions. It is evident that EMS will suffer if there is not an increase in stability through appropriate funding measures.

I believe this bill and the funding it produces is a necessity for Kansas and that it is in a palatable form which is acceptable to Kansans since it will help to deliver what they are expecting - high quality prehospital care.

**KANSAS EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES REGION III
ADVISORY COUNCIL, INC.
MISSION STATEMENT**

Region III EMS Council provides support services to local EMS organizations within the thirty-two counties in the southeastern quadrant of the state, designated by the Governor of Kansas as Region III. These EMS organizations include ambulance services, hospitals, educational institutions, training programs, and public safety agencies. The purpose of these activities is to enhance the ability of EMS systems in providing patient care and in administering EMS operations. This support is recognized as an essential part of the EMS system and is specifically designed to facilitate education and communications between the Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services and the functioning local components of the pre-hospital care system.

The goal of Region III is to support the emergency medical service systems in meeting the present and future needs of the environs of the Region in a coordinated and efficient manner, in accordance with the adopted systems design, addressing each of the fifteen components which were originally mandated in P.L. 93-154, and that provide for interrelationships with other Emergency Medical Service systems outside of Region III.

The objectives of Region III are:

1. To facilitate initial courses of instruction, continuing education programs, and supplemental workshops.
2. To coordinate the distribution and maintenance of an audio-visual library, training and multi-media equipment, and adjunct supplies.
3. To enhance local, regional and state-wide communications by disseminating information between the pre-hospital consortium consisting of the medical community, public safety agencies, and governing bodies.