

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gary Hayzlett at 1:30 p.m. on January 29, 2009, in Room 783 of the Docking State Office Building.

All members were present.

Committee staff present:

Bruce Kinzie, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Hank Avila, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Jill Shelley, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Betty Boaz, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Deann Williams, Bureau Chief, Motor Carrier Services, Div. of Vehicles, Dept. of Revenue
Kevin Gregg, Director of Industry Relations, KS Motor Carriers Association

Others attending:

See attached list.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2009.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The Chairman opened the meeting by calling for bill introductions.

Mike Hutfles requested the Committee introduce a bill concerning dealer-hauler full-privilege trailer license plates. A motion to accept the bill was made by Representative Ballard, seconded by Representative Wetta and the motion carried.

There were no other bill introductions.

Chairman Hayzlett opened hearings on **HB 2023****HB 2023 - Motor carriers, enforcement of state corporation commission orders.**

The Chairman recognized Deann Williams, Motor Carrier Services, Department of Revenue. According to Ms. Williams this bill addresses a loophole that allows carriers to request that the local county treasurer issue registration to vehicles that have been placed out of service by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for serious safety violations. (Attachment #1) Ms. Williams said once the carrier comes into compliance they will receive reinstatement papers and tags can be reissued. She said they had worked with the Kansas Corporation Commission, Kansas Highway Patrol and the Kansas Motor Carriers Association to develop language of this bill. Ms. Williams asked the Committee to favorably pass this bill as it would help keep unsafe motor carriers off the road. She stood for questions.

Chairman Hayzlett then recognized Kevin Gregg, with the Motor Carriers Association. According to Mr. Gregg, the Motor Carriers Association fully supports this bill and feel it is one more tool to help keep unsafe vehicles off the roadways. (Attachment #2) He said HB 2023 would permit the Dept. of Revenue to notify the county office of the tag revocation to prevent the re-registration of a vehicle that has been placed out of service, until such time as the carrier can prove that the vehicle has been brought back into compliance.

There were no other proponents and no opponents to HB 2023. After all the Committee Members' questions had been answered the Chairman closed the hearing on HB 2023.

Staff from Legislative Research had prepared and presented a "Report of the Special Committee on A New Comprehensive Transportation Plan to the 2009 Kansas Legislature." (Attachment #3) Staff provided a summary of oral and written testimony on policy considerations for a new plan and summarized specific improvements for which conferees sought funding.

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

TO: House Transportation Committee

FROM: Deann Williams, Bureau Chief
Motor Carrier Services Bureau

DATE: January 29, 2009

SUBJECT: House Bill 2023

Mr. Chairman and member of the House Transportation Committee:

My name is Deann Williams, Bureau Chief, Motor Carrier Services, Division of Vehicles, Kansas Department of Revenue. I appear here today in support of House Bill 2023.

During the 2006 legislative session the passage of SB 373 required Kansas to implement PRISM (Performance Registration Information Systems Management). PRISM is a federally funded program that requires states to tie registration and safety together. Below is a brief program overview... a motor carrier may be placed out of service by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) for serious safety violations, such as failure to pay fines, failure to comply with findings of a safety investigation, imminent hazard declaration, etc. This is not something that happens overnight, the process may take six months or longer. The motor carrier has been given ample opportunity to comply with FMCSA, but for some reason the carrier does not to comply and an out of service order is issued. Once the out of service order is issued, my office is notified and we issue a "tag pick up order" to the Kansas Highway Patrol. The Patrol then picks up all listed apportioned IRP (or International Registration Program) tags and cab cards and returns them to my office. Once the motor carrier has come into compliance with the Federal out of Service Order, a reinstatement letter is issued, and the motor carrier can then apply to have their apportioned tags reissued.

The language in HB 2023 is very simple and addresses a loophole that we have witnessed. If the apportioned tag office revokes registration, some carriers will request their local county treasurer to issue registration to the same vehicles that have been placed out of service by FMCSA. We have also placed language in this bill that would prohibit a carrier from operating intrastate if a carrier's authority has been cancelled, or if a KCC order has been generated ordering the carrier to cease intrastate operations. KDOR would notify the county treasurers' office of the order and they would issue a "tag pick up" order requesting local law enforcement to pick up the county tags and return them to their office. The loss of the registration plate will make the carrier a target to law enforcement and contribute to voluntary carrier compliance. We have observed successes in compliance from the IRP revocations through PRISM. Once again, when compliance has been achieved, the motor carrier will receive reinstatement papers and tags can be reissued. We believe this will enhance the states' ability to keep the unsafe motor carriers off the road.

The Kansas Corporation Commission, Kansas Highway Patrol and the Kansas Motor Carriers Association have worked together on the language of this bill.

This concludes my testimony; I would be please to respond to questions at the appropriate time.



Kansas Motor Carriers Association

Trucking Solutions Since 1936

Michael Topp
TT&T Salvage & Towing, Inc.
President

Mike Miller
Miller Trucking, LTD
Chairman of the Board

Larry Dinkel
Mitten Trucking, Inc.
First Vice President

Jason Hammes
Frito Lay Service &
Distribution
Second Vice President

Larry "Doc" Criqui
Kansas Van & Storage
Criqui Corp.
Corporate Secretary

Ken Leicht
Rawhide Trucking, Inc.
ATA State Vice President

Calvin Koehn
Circle K Transport, Inc.
ATA Alternate State VP

Jeff Robertson
JMJ Projects, Inc.
Public Relations Chairman

Mike Ross
Ross Truck Line of Salina, Inc.
ProTruck PAC Chairman

Tony Gaston
Rawhide Trucking
Foundation Chairman

Bill Johnston
Northcutt, Inc.
Allied Industries Chairman

Tom Whitaker
Executive Director

LEGISLATIVE TESTIMONY

By the

Kansas Motor Carriers Association

Before the

House Transportation Committee

Representative Gary Hayzlett, Chairman

Thursday, January 29, 2009

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE:

I am Kevin Gregg, Director of Industry Relations for the Kansas Motor Carriers Association. I appear before you today in support of HB 2023, a bill which will serve the trucking industry and the motoring public by adding one more tool for enforcement officials to use in getting unsafe carriers off the road.

The PRISM (Performance Registration Information Systems Management) program is a national initiative that couples a carrier's registration privilege with the safe operation of their vehicles. PRISM allows the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) to revoke the tags from the vehicles of unsafe carriers. However, the prior legislation does not prevent that same carrier from going to their county office after the Kansas Highway Patrol has removed the carriers tags, registering the vehicles at the county level and continuing to operate. HB 2023 would permit KDOR to notify the county office of the tag revocation to prevent the re-registration of a vehicle that has been placed out of service, until such time as the carrier can prove that the vehicle has been brought back into compliance with FMCSA (Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration) and Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) guidelines.

HB 2023, very simply, will help keep unsafe vehicles off of our roadways by facilitating communication between the Federal, State and county regulatory authorities.

Thank you for your consideration, and I would be pleased to respond to any questions from the Committee.

respond to any
Date: 1-29-09
Attachment # 2

**Report of the
Special Committee on A New
Comprehensive Transportation Plan
to the
2009 Kansas Legislature**

CHAIRPERSON: Senator Les Donovan (through December 17, 2008)
Senator Dwayne Umbarger

VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Representative Gary Hayzlett

RANKING MINORITY MEMBER: Representative Margaret Long

OTHER MEMBERS: Senators Karin Brownlee, Laura Kelly, Janis Lee, Derek Schmidt, Ruth Teichman, and John Vratil; and Representatives Elaine Bowers, Mike Burgess, Terrie Huntington, Julie Menghini, Don Myers, Jene Vickrey, and Vince Wetta

STUDY TOPIC

- Study the need for a new comprehensive transportation plan. Review the status of the current transportation system in Kansas. Study possible funding sources for a new transportation plan. Review the potential of federal funding for a new comprehensive transportation plan. Review the status of the current comprehensive transportation plan, including federal funding. Review the use of roads using tolls.

House Transportation
Date 1-29-09
Attachment # 3

Special Committee on A New Comprehensive Transportation Plan

REPORT

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends that the standing Senate Transportation Committee and the House Transportation Committee develop a new comprehensive transportation plan and present that plan to the Kansas House and Senate. Such a plan should provide for implementation as soon as funds are available.

The Committee further requests that such a plan include these two types of provisions:

- Provisions to ensure equity between rural and urban areas for transportation projects chosen for economic development reasons, and
- A process by which a legislatively appointed body including the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) Secretary could choose additional or special transportation projects when the Legislature is not in session.

The Committee urges both the Governor and the Legislature to review and recommend natural resource development policy designed to streamline access to permitted reserves of rock, sand, and gravel, because of the potential for reducing construction costs.

The Committee endorses KDOT's efforts to identify projects for which improvements that may not meet federal design standards but nonetheless meet the specific needs of the project.

(The full text of the conclusions and recommendations is provided at the end of this report.)

Proposed Legislation: None.

BACKGROUND

The Special Committee on a New Comprehensive Transportation Plan was directed by the Legislative Coordinating Council (LCC) to “[s]tudy the need for a new comprehensive transportation plan. Review the status of the current transportation system in Kansas. Study possible funding sources for a new transportation plan. Review the status of

the current comprehensive transportation plan, including federal funding. Review the use of roads using tolls.”

The LCC also directed the Special Committee to conduct hearings on the topic in the state's four congressional districts. Accordingly, the Committee held hearings in Topeka, Wichita, Johnson County, Garden City, and Pittsburg. The Committee concluded its hearings in Topeka

on January 8, 2009, where it also made its recommendations to the 2009 Legislature.

All but the first meeting were primarily devoted to hearing from stakeholders on the state's transportation policies and needs. Because the Committee heard from more than 140 stakeholders, only a summary of that testimony is provided in this report.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Initial Topeka Hearing

The Committee began its deliberations in Topeka on November 12, 2008. This hearing was devoted primarily to hearing testimony from Secretary of Transportation Deb Miller and her staff. Secretary Miller presented testimony that included information on the following topics: a history of the previous comprehensive transportation plans, local consult meeting highlights, a discussion of economic analysis, a highway system update, discussion of new business models, revenue and financing approaches, and an update on the Transportation-Leveraging Investments in Kansas (T-LINK) task force. The Secretary also said that due to the lack of funds, certain projects scheduled to have been let in December 2008 and January 2009 would not be let. The Secretary said that for December 2008, only 27 of 70 projects would be let. She added that for January 2009, only 34 of 86 projects would be let.

In addition to the Secretary, Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) staff summarized the T-LINK Financial Overview document. This document contained:

- Information about exempt real property appraised value;
- A listing of potential revenue generated by removal of selected exemptions;

- Using gaming revenues to pay off debt;
- Post Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) payments for CTP projects;
- State Highway Fund service restructure;
- Railroad diesel use in Kansas; and
- Short line railroad rehabilitation project history.

KDOT also provided information on funding options for an additional \$1 billion over ten years plus information about tax increment financing; transportation development districts; and a summary of credit agencies' views of the state debt burden.

Other Hearings

At its remaining meetings, in November 2008, December 2008, and January 2009, the Committee heard testimony from representatives of local governments, economic development agencies, civic organizations, local businesses, and other groups plus several citizens presenting their individual views. More than 140 conferees presented oral or written testimony or both. Those meetings were held November 24, 2008, in Wichita; December 5, 2008, in Overland Park; December 15, 2008, in Garden City; December 18, 2008, in Pittsburg; and January 8, 2009, in Topeka.

The following section summarizes the testimony heard at those hearings. A longer summary that includes specific comments and identifies conferees is available from the Legislative Research Department and will be posted on the website with other Committee documents.

The testimony generally fell into two categories – policy and requested improvements – and comments have been summarized by topic within those categories. Testimony on

policy considerations for a new plan fell into six subcategories:

- Broad Transportation Policy, including comments on the need for a comprehensive plan, regional solutions, and preservation of the current infrastructure.
- Beyond Roads, including comments on intermodal and multimodal planning, transit, aviation, rail, and pedestrian and bike trails.
- Economic Considerations, including comments on whether infrastructure improvements are good for the economy, economic considerations in choosing projects, competitiveness, flexibility, and affordable solutions.
- General Policies on Funding, including comments on current local government spending on transportation and related topics.
- Ways a Program Should Be Funded, including comments on funding transportation infrastructure primarily from taxes and fees on users and comments on specific revenue streams, including fuel taxes, tolls, sales tax, and other suggestions.
- State Funding for Cities, Counties, and Local Transit Providers, including comments urging continuation of programs that send moneys to local governments and increases needed for specific programs.

In the following summary, numbers in parentheses indicate the number of comments.

Broad Transportation Policy. Many conferees offered opinions on policy considerations to be included in a new plan, with these types of comments:

- Some sort of comprehensive transportation plan should be enacted in 2009. (25 + 54

city and county resolutions) Conferees said that having a plan is important for the State's present and future, and several also said that localities need a state plan so that their local planning can proceed. Several said economic development depends on such a plan and urged flexibility in the plan to meet economic development opportunities. One conferee urged a one-year plan and a comprehensive plan next year, because state finances are in disarray and no new federal plan is in place. The Committee received resolutions from 36 cities and 18 counties urging adoption of a comprehensive plan.

- Planning should provide for regional, broad transportation solutions. (18) Conferees pointed out that the cities and counties are economically interconnected – a transportation project in one locality may help the economy of another – and that workers commute within their regions. They also said that transportation modes must work together to maximize efficiency.
- Complete the current plan. (4) Two projects were mentioned specifically: K-61 in the Hutchinson area and US-69 in the Kansas City metro area.
- Preserve and maintain the current infrastructure. (11) Infrastructure such as bridges, city streets used as transportation arteries, and airport pavements is costly and must be maintained.
- Base a new plan on planning that has already been done, such as a Kansas City regional plan and those created by local governments. (3)
- Address congestion and air quality in a new transportation plan. (1)
- Keep all current state roads in the state system. (1)

Beyond Roads. Conferees urged legislators to think “transportation,” not “roads,” in these types of comments:

- Encourage intermodal and multimodal planning in a new comprehensive plan. (11) Conferees urged legislators to help ensure a new plan integrates all modes of transportation, to efficiently move goods, workers, and other people needing transportation from one area to another. Some said the shift is essential for economic development and economic viability of localities.
- Increase the role of transit in the state plan. (11) Conferees said that ridership increased substantially over the past year and did not decline with reductions in fuel prices. They said that many riders, especially those of limited means, have no other way to get to jobs and health care, so transit is important to economic development and quality of life. They also said that many areas of the state are underserved, including that ten percent of the state’s counties are without any form of public transportation.
- Retain and increase aviation transportation funding. (11) Conferees said that continued support for aviation is important to rural areas for growth and sustainability. Several said that current airport infrastructure should be upgraded both because 52 counties have no all-weather access (which limits air ambulance service) and for economic development purposes.
- Support rail. (12) Conferees said that some economic development opportunities hinge on access to railroads, and that some opportunities have been lost due to inadequate rail infrastructure. Some said that railroads are an efficient transportation mode and reduce costs for road maintenance because fewer heavy trucks move on those

roads.

- Support transportation systems that include pedestrian and bike alternatives. (5) Conferees from smaller cities urged legislators to include funding for these options, for economic development, quality of life, safety, and environmental reasons.
- Tie transportation investment to local land use and environmental objectives. (1)

Economic Considerations. Conferees generally agreed that spending on infrastructure is good for the state’s economy and that economic considerations should have a bearing on chosen projects. They made the following types of comments:

- Improvements to the state’s transportation infrastructure will be good for the state’s economy. (13) Conferees said that improvements are vital for economic development both locally and for the state as a whole. Several said that near-term investment is important to retaining jobs and employers. One conferee testified that spending on transportation infrastructure does not lead to economic growth within a state.
- Economic opportunities should be considered in choosing state-funded transportation projects. (7) Conferees urged support for a selection of policies, not projects, and placing priority on projects that enable economic expansion as well as maintenance. Several testified that their localities are at a disadvantage when businesses that are considering locating to the area ask about access to a four-lane road, because no four-lane roads are available in their areas.
- Think about national and global competitiveness when determining priorities under a new comprehensive transportation

plan. (7) Conferees said that Kansas' strength is its location and that the state depends on being able to get the goods and services it produces to other parts of the country and world in a timely manner. Localities need a good transportation system to compete with localities in other states, and employers need to draw good employees.

- Keep flexibility in the plan to allow communities and the State to be in a better position to take advantage of economic development opportunities. (8) This flexibility should include multimodal choices and emergency maintenance, conferees said.
- Seek affordable solutions. (6) Conferees said that modifying or reducing certain standards for low-volume roads and bridges would allow more "good" projects to be built as opposed to a few "perfect" projects. A conferee also requested that assistance not be reduced for counties that reduce their maintenance needs.

General Policies on Funding. In their general statements about funding, conferees asked legislators to remember current local spending on transportation infrastructure. Their comments are summarized below.

- Local governments already spend significant amounts on transportation and cannot handle all of the increasing expenditures for needed projects. (10) Conferees gave examples of amounts localities already pay, such as \$21,000 a year for bridge inspections in Great Bend and \$50 million a year from Johnson County and its cities for infrastructure construction and maintenance. They said localities already have taken many steps to reduce expenditures, such as closing certain bridges, and that decisions made by the state may mean increased traffic on locally maintained infrastructure, which increases

costs to the localities.

- Delaying a program could significantly increase costs, for building materials and for rights of way. (3) One suggested reducing regulation on gravel and sand extraction would decrease construction costs.
- Explore ways to capture the state revenues generated from economic development projects to assist with local transportation needs, in addition to transportation development districts. (2)
- Do not impose a two-mile grid on counties, as has been tried in some areas. (2)
- Consider developing regional funding streams to use for regional projects. (1)

Ways a Program Should Be Funded.

Several conferees said that, in general, the State should continue to fund transportation primarily from taxes and fees on users. (4) Conferees also suggested the following specific funding streams:

- Fuel taxes and other current user fees. (9) Several conferees suggested an increase in fuel taxes, saying that the tax should be updated to reflect current prices. Some included that any increase should be split with the localities. Among the comments was that plans should be made to replace the fuel tax with a system by which motorists pay per mile.
- Tolls. (8) These conferees supported tolls in general, to take advantage of Kansas' position as a pass-through state, and on certain projects, such as new roads or major bridges and a four-lane route through southwest Kansas. A comment in opposition to tolling said that tolls push traffic onto county roads, thereby adding maintenance costs to the counties.

- Sales tax. (7) Conferees suggested a dedicated sales tax at the local or regional level, the state level, or both. Two specified that a sales tax should be added to fuel.
- Local fuel tax. (2) Conferees suggested making such a tax a local option.
- Tax increment financing (TIF) bonds and transportation development districts (TDDs). (1)
- A dedicated income tax, because of the link between transportation and the economy. (1)
- An aviation fuel tax. (1) Shift the tax on aviation fuel from a sales tax to a per gallon tax, with the moneys directed to transportation.
- Introduce a “severance” tax on wind energy. (1)
- Press Congress to strengthen federal transportation funding and give Kansas its fair share. (1)
- Plan a major state bond issue for road, bridge, and other transportation needs. (1)
- Consider repeal of property tax exemptions for industries that adversely affect roads. (1)

State Funding for Cities, Counties, and Local Transit Providers. Conferees said that state funding for cities, counties, and local transit providers is extremely important. (24) Many testified that localities could not afford infrastructure projects without KDOT’s KLINK, geometric improvement, and other programs that send state-collected dollars to localities. Among the specific points mentioned were that discontinuing these programs would mean significant local property tax increases and that

certain needed projects may cost more than a locality’s entire annual budget. Two conferees also asked that the state/local matching funds program be a priority.

Conferees asked for increases in the amounts available for specific programs:

- City Connecting Links. (6) Among the points made was that the amount a locality receives has not increased since 2000, but maintenance costs have risen dramatically.
- Transit. (4) Conferees said that transit providers have shared the same amount, \$6 million, since 2001, but that member agencies of the Kansas Public Transit Association estimate need at \$16 million to \$23 million a year, indexed to inflation.
- KLINK resurfacing, geometric improvement, economic development, revolving loan, and system enhancement programs. (3) The funding limits for these programs should be increased, conferees said.

Conferees also asked the state to implement a state/locality cost-share program to adequately maintain other streets and roads, including former state highways transferred to the localities (4); continue with the statewide county five-year construction program (1); and restore the demand transfer dollars withheld in 2002 (1).

Specific projects. Conferees stressed projects important to their localities or constituencies. The listing below shows only those routes or types of projects brought to Committee attention and the number of conferees testifying on each. (Additional detail is provided in the extended summary.)

US Routes:

- US-24 (3)
- US-36 (4)

- US-40 (3)
- US-50 (8)
- US-54 (10)
- US-56 (4)
- US-56/K-96/K-14 in and near Lyons (1)
- US-69 (15)
- US-75 (10)
- US-77 Corridor, south central Kansas (1)
- US-83 (7)
- US-169/K-7 in southern Johnson County and in Miami County (2)
- US-169, other counties (4)
- US-183, Pawnee County (1)
- US-281, Russell County (2)
- US-400 (13)

Interstate Route:

- I-70, Topeka (1)

K Routes:

- K-5, Leavenworth County, connection from K-7 to I-435 via McIntyre Road (2)
- K-7 (7)
- K-10, Douglas and Johnson counties (3)
- K-18, Riley County (1, a joint request from the Greater Fort Riley Communities)
- K-16, Jackson County (1)

- K-23, Gove and Sheridan counties (2)
- K-25, Rawlins County (1)
- K-27, Wallace County (1)
- K-31, Anderson and Coffey counties (1)
- K-47, Wilson and Neosho counties (4)
- K-59, Atchison County (1)
- K-61 (3)
- K-64, Pratt County (1)
- K-68, Miami and Franklin counties (3)
- K-96 (9)
- K-156, Pawnee and Hodgeman counties (1)
- K-232, Russell County (1)
- K-360, Winfield Bypass (1)

Area Projects:

- Kansas City area projects: 16 requested (21)
- Projects related to the Gardner intermodal facility: 4 requested (4)
- Lawrence projects: 9 intersections (1)
- Leavenworth County bypass (1)
- Centennial Bridge, Leavenworth County (1)
- Manhattan/Junction City area projects: various intersections with US-77 plus 6 additional projects (1, a joint request from the Greater Fort Riley Communities)
- I-135 and Mohawk Road Interchange,

McPherson County (1)

- Northwest Passage, Wichita to Hays (3)
- Ottawa local projects: 3 requested (1)
- Salina/Saline County projects: various road-related projects (1)
- Topeka area projects: 6 requested (1)
- Wichita area projects: 5 requested (2)
- Turning lanes at rural intersections (4)
- Studies needed; 5 requested (3)

Non-Road Improvements:

- Airports – projects requested for airports at Atchison, Hutchinson, Independence, Lawrence, Leavenworth County, Manhattan, Miami County, Oberlin, Osage City, Pratt, Russell, and Salina (13)
- Rail – projects requested were for the Cimmaron Valley Railroad, the Heartland Flyer Initiative, a Lawrence-Kansas City route, and a spur in Salina (7)
- Transit – projects requested were in these areas: Kansas City, Lawrence, Manhattan/Fort Riley, Miami County, Salina, and Topeka (10)
- Other improvements requested included a grade separation in Paola (1), regional multi-modal bike/pedestrian infrastructure (4), changes in signage policies (2), and overnight truck parking facilities (1)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends that the standing Senate Transportation Committee and the House Transportation Committee develop

a new comprehensive transportation plan and present that plan to the Kansas House and Senate. Such a plan should provide for implementation as soon as funds are available.

While funding a future transportation plan is critical, keeping future costs at a reasonable level is important as well. During the course of its investigations, the Committee was concerned to learn that the cost of basic construction materials such as rock, sand and gravel has risen by an average of 154.6 percent from 1996 to 2006, while production has risen only 23.7 percent during the same period. More than 90 percent of asphalt and more than 75 percent of concrete produced contain these materials. This appears to be caused by a noticeable decline in the amount of permitted reserves in our state. The Committee urges both the Governor and the Legislature to review and recommend natural resource development policy designed to streamline access to permitted reserves. An updated policy providing for the safe and sustainable extraction of natural resources will save over \$480 million in construction costs over the next ten years.

The Committee endorses the Kansas Department of Transportation's (KDOT's) efforts to identify projects for which improvements that may not meet federal design standards make sense, such as shoulders three feet wide rather than eight or ten feet wide on infrequently traveled roads on which complete redesign would be cost prohibitive. The Committee requests that KDOT consult with the project area's local governments when these "practical improvements" are being considered.

The Committee requests that the standing Transportation Committees include, in any comprehensive transportation plans passed by those Committees, provisions to ensure equity between rural and urban areas for transportation projects chosen for economic development reasons.

The Committee encourages the standing Transportation Committees to include, in any comprehensive transportation plans passed by those Committees, a process by which a legislatively appointed body including the KDOT Secretary could choose additional or special transportation projects when the Legislature is not in session. The Committee suggests the State Finance Council could be used as a model.