

SESSION OF 2005

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON SENATE BILL NO. 219

As Recommended by Senate Committee on
Agriculture

Brief*

SB 219 would enact the Pest Control Compact which is a multi-state effort to allow individual states to obtain financial support to control plant pests in a cooperative manner. The Compact language recognizes an insurance fund which member states may call upon to address plant pest situations in member states. The Compact administration is elected by the governing board of which every participating state is a member. Other provisions of the Compact address such items as assistance and reimbursement; finance; entry into and withdrawal from the Compact; relations with nonparty jurisdictions; advisory and technical committees; and compact and insurance fund administration.

Background

This bill was introduced at the request of a spokesperson from the Kansas Department of Agriculture. At the hearing on the bill the only conferee was from the agency. The conferee indicated that the State of Kansas already was a member of the Compact and that language which had authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into the Compact was inadvertently repealed in 2002. The conferee stated that it was necessary to adopt the language of the Compact to retain membership. Upon questioning, a spokesperson from the agency indicated that the State of Kansas already has paid its membership in an amount of approximately \$28,000. The conferee indicated that the bill was necessary in order for the state to retain its voting rights. The Committee also was told that the Compact bridges jurisdictional gaps between member states by providing financial and other assistance to prevent pests from spreading from the state where they are first detected to other states.

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org>

The fiscal note on the bill states there would be no fiscal effect on the Department of Agriculture.