

Administrative Services

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administrative Services program within KDA houses all of the support functions of the agency, as well as the Office of the Secretary. Without these integral functions, such as Fiscal, Human Resources, Information Technology (IT), Legal, and Communication, the agency would cease to function. Proper guidance and oversight for the entire agency is provided at this level and communicated to employees, stakeholders, and interested parties. Should this program not be funded, these duties would statutorily be required to be assumed by other state agencies or state employees. A large degree of synergism, education, and experience would be lost, as well as goodwill with the agricultural industry as a whole. The agency would jeopardize their ability to compete and receive top federal grant awards, causing further negative consequences to the agency.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA Chapter 74 Article 5 KSA 74-569 - Organization of the Department of Agriculture KSA 74-576 - Powers and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture	Discretionary	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Provide timely, accurate, and efficient fiscal services (accounts payable and accounts receivable)
- B. Provide comprehensive Human Resources services to KDA employees and future KDA employees
- C. Assist programs in the modernization of legacy IT services and continue to improve existing services
- D. Provide timely, accurate, and efficient legal services (process administrative enforcement orders and settlement agreements)
- E. Provide open records to the public in a timely manner
- F. Advocate for agriculture and KDA programs through traditional and other media

Program History

The Kansas Department of Agriculture (KDA) is the nation's first department of agriculture, devoted to the total support of agriculture in Kansas. Crafted from the roots of the Kansas Agriculture Society and Kansas State Agricultural Society, dating back to 1855 and 1862, respectively, the State Board of Agriculture was officially created by the Kansas Legislature in 1872. It was not until 1994 that the Board was officially renamed the Kansas Department of Agriculture. In 2014, a majority of the department was relocated from Topeka to the current headquarters' location in Manhattan.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Number of vouchers per staff member	A	1,132	1,035	1,097	1,088	1,125	1,125
2. Percent of full-time employees retained	B	90.84%	89.54%	81.85%	87.41%	86.00%	88.50%
3. Number of orders issued by Legal for all	D	1,054	908	409	790	700	900
4. Average number of processing days for orders in Legal	D	27	40	29	32	35	35
5. IT user satisfaction rating	C	N/A	95.4%	94.3%	94.9%	95.0%	96.0%

Output Measures

6. Number of vouchers processed in SMART	A	5,095	4,659	4,388	4,714	4,500	4,500
7. Number of IT Service Desk requests	C	N/A	2,678	2,751	2,715	2,800	2,800
8. Number of news releases	F	85	89	78	84	80	80
9. Number of open record requests	E	706	1,019	1,092	939	950	950
10. Number of settlement conferences held	D	215	98	67	127	150	150

Funding

<i>Funding Source (in Millions)</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 0.5	\$ 0.9	\$ 1.0	\$ 1.0	\$ 0.6	\$ 0.6
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 4.7	\$ 4.9	\$ 4.6	\$ 3.6	\$ 5.2	\$ 5.2
Federal Funds	\$ 1.0	\$ 0.4	\$ 0.3	\$ 0.1	\$ 0.2	\$ 0.1
Total	\$ 6.2	\$ 6.2	\$ 5.9	\$ 4.7	\$ 6.0	\$ 5.9

Dairy & Feed Safety

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Inspections and sampling would not be performed, increasing risk of milk product and commercial feed contamination, and/or adulteration putting public health and animal health at risk. Illness and death could result. Kansas milk and dairy products could not be shipped or sold in interstate commerce. Kansas feed manufacturers would not comply with FSMA requirements and could not export feed stuffs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Dairy Law KSA 65-771 through 65-791 - licensing, inspection, and regulation of dairies and milk. Commercial Feeding Stuffs (1923) KSA 2-1001 et. seq. - require regulation and analysis of feed stuffs.	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Provide a fair-minded regulatory environment for the Kansas dairy and commercial feed industry which results in safe, clean, unadulterated milk, dairy, and commercial feed products for both animal and human feed consumers
- B. Achieve and maintain compliance with FDA guidelines and National standards
- C. Grain program efficiencies by continuing to automate and streamline inspection, sampling, and record-keeping processes

Program History

The Dairy division within the old Board of Agriculture was established in 1925 within that same year the dairy law was transferred to the State Board of Agriculture. The Dairy Inspection program protects consumers in Kansas and other states. Inspectors regulate the dairy industry starting at the farm and continuing as the milk and milk products are transported, process, distributed and sold. The Feed Inspection program safeguards both human and animal health by inspecting feed manufacturers, transporters, distributors/retailers and animal production facilities to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Percentage of passing dairy farm raw milk samples compared to total amount of samples analyzed each fiscal year	A	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
2. Percentage of passing feed samples vs. deficient samples each fiscal year	B	84%	84%	82%	83%	84%	84%
3. Percentage of FDA required dairy state surveys completed each fiscal year	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Output Measures

4. Total amount of state inspections (evaluations, tanker inspections, feed sample inspections, sampler evaluations) completed by both dairy and feed programs each fiscal year	A	1,762	1,927	1,856	1,848	1,850	1,850
5. Total FDA-related inspections completed, as specified in Goal B	B	205	198	203	202	200	200

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 27,701	\$ 18,200	\$ 18,328	\$ 18,416	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1,011,400	\$ 1,017,493	\$ 1,032,188	\$ 980,707	\$ 1,210,586	\$ 1,228,580
Federal Funds	\$ 245,125	\$ 220,590	\$ 246,731	\$ 325,726	\$ 388,940	\$ 400,460
Total	\$ 1,284,226	\$ 1,256,283	\$ 1,297,247	\$ 1,324,849	\$ 1,599,526	\$ 1,629,040

Food Safety & Lodging

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Providing uniform food safety inspections in food establishments and food processing plants ensures a safe food supply to Kansas consumers. Failure to provide these inspections and regulate these food and lodging facilities under standard federal guidelines would significantly increase the risk of the consuming public and be detrimental to public health including possible death due to unsanitary food preparation conditions.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific Transfer from KDHE to KDA (2004) KSA 74-581 Transfer from KDHE to KDA (2008) 74-5, 104 Food (1927) KSA 65-643 et seq. - licensing and inspecting food establishments and food processing plants. Lodging (1975) KSA 36-501 et seq. - licensing and inspection of lodging facilities ensuring minimum standards for safe and sanitary operation	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Provide uniform, effective, and efficient food safety inspections in order to protect public health and maintain the public's confidence in Kansas establishments
- B. Professional development of Food Safety & Lodging program staff
- C. Maintain outreach to customers through training and educational meetings

Program History

Food inspection regulation dates back to the early 1900s and traditionally under KDHE. In 2003, the Legislative Division of Post Audit studied Kansas' food inspections and as a result, food inspection was moved to the Department of Agriculture in 2004 with lodging inspections following in 2008. This was done to place all food regulation under Department of Agriculture which was already doing meat, poultry, dairy, and egg inspections. A number of efficiencies were gained and continues to present.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Percentage of inspections performed at interval required by statute	A	97.5%	98.0%	98.0%	97.8%	98.0%	98.0%
2. Number of individual employees completing training plans, yearly	B	64	64	64	64	64	64
3. Percentage of inspections where education and training is provided to food establishments	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Output Measures

4. Number of Food and Lodging inspections performed	A	21,232	15,836	18,058	18,375	20,500	20,500
5. Number of <i>Focus on Food Safety</i> classes given	C	66	93	39	66	55	55

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 3,476,600	\$ 3,584,650	\$ 3,696,047	\$ 3,612,775	\$ 4,044,756	\$ 4,018,003
Federal Funds	\$ 465,740	\$ 561,787	\$ 773,521	\$ 857,210	\$ 774,365	\$ 789,626
Total	\$ 3,942,340	\$ 4,146,437	\$ 4,469,568	\$ 4,469,985	\$ 4,819,121	\$ 4,807,629

Grain Warehouse

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Defunding the Grain Warehouse program will have a significant negative effect on the Kansas economy by not ensuring that Kansas grain producers have safe, solvent warehouses where they may store their commodities as required by state statute.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Public Warehouses (1907) KSA 31-101 et seq. - supervision and regulation of all public warehouses storing grain. Grain Warehouse Law (2007) KSA 21-3711, 21-3736, 21-3737 - criminal acts relating to grain warehouses.	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Protect grain depositors by performing subsequent exams of all licensed public grain warehouses once a year to ensure there are no losses due to fraud or mismanagement of records and grain quality is kept to the standards set forth by the State of Kansas.
- B. Provide a high level of customer service by completing special examinations when requested and measuring new facilities to add to licensed storage space or approve conditional storage space
- C. Accelerated examinations for noncompliance to maintain a system that ensures zero loss to depositors by identifying and deterring fraud in the grain warehouse industry
- D. Professional Development

Program History

In 1907, Kansas enacted its first warehousing laws. The early farmers recognized the need for government to regulate the grain industry much in the same way it regulated banks. The primary goal for the program has not changed in more than 100 years. The Grain Warehouse Inspection program administers and enforces the Kansas Public Warehouse Law relating to grain storage. It requires that any entity that stores grain for the public be licensed by either the state or federal government. It ensures that Kansas grain producers have safe, solvent warehouses where they may store their commodities. To achieve this, the program examines state-licensed facilities at least once each year. More examinations are made on licensed facilities that meet only the minimum financial requirements. A licensed elevator, with the approval of the Grain Warehouse Inspection program, may move open stored grain to another licensed, bonded terminal elevator. This allows smaller facilities to free up bin space for the next harvest. Also, with approval from the program, licensed facilities may use emergency or conditional storage space during harvest when storage space is in short supply. This allows the elevator to better serve Kansas crop producers. Examinations help eliminate fraud in the grain industry, ensure the quantity of stored commodities in Kansas licensed warehouses, maintain the percentage of loss to producers at zero.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Number of grain warehouse	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Number of licensee complaints	B	0	0	1	0.33	0	0
<i>Output Measures</i>							
3. Percent of annual examinations	A	99%	92%	78%	90%	85%	100%
4. Bushels of licensed storage	A	528,154,196	547,640,983	557,040,000	544,278,393	560,000,000	570,000,000
5. Number of accelerated	C	0	0	1	0.33	1	0

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 140,200	\$ 142,101	\$ 142,012	\$ 134,124	\$ 201,847	\$ 141,845
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 304,212	\$ 328,135	\$ 368,446	\$ 264,563	\$ 253,070	\$ 383,734
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 444,412	\$ 470,236	\$ 510,458	\$ 398,687	\$ 454,917	\$ 525,579

Laboratory

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Agricultural products and commodities that pose a public health/safety hazard would likely result in foodborne or feedborne illness. Lack of fairness in commerce from inaccurate weighing and measuring devices or improperly labeled feeds, fertilizers, and pesticides.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Weights and Measures Law (1947) KSA 83-201-224 - metrology lab and services Commercial Feeding Stuffs (1923) KSA 2-1001 et seq. Fertilizer Law (1907) KSA 2-1201 et seq. Soil Amendment Act (1975) KSA 2-2801 et seq. Agriculture Liming Materials Act (1976) KSA 2-2901 et seq. Pesticide Law (1976) KSA 2-2438a et seq. Meat and Poultry Inspection Act (1969) KSA 65-6a18 et seq. Dairy Inspection KSA 65-771 through 791	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Protect consumer and animal health through multiple chemical and microbiological analyses of various food products sold in Kansas
- B. Evaluate ongoing technical competency of analysts through completion of proficiency testing
- C. Professional development of laboratory staff

Program History

Started 1953 to ensure quality of fertilizers, seeds (former), animal feeds, dairy products, livestock remedies (former), pesticides; Metrology lab was established in 1971; Added: meat and poultry, metrology, industrial hemp; Relocated lab during pandemic from Topeka to Manhattan in March 2020.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Report test results within established times (percentage of quarters on track or completed)	A	90	58	89	79	90	90
2. Analysts complete proficiency testing for analytes on scope of accreditation (percentage of quarters on track or completed)	B	83	94	88	88	90	90
3. Attend conferences and complete trainings remain current with issues of regulatory testing (percentage of quarters on track or completed)	C	100%	78%	74%	84%	90%	90%

Output Measures

4. Number of ISO-accredited and NIST-certified test methods	A	47	66	63	59	66	66
5. Lab trainings completed in Qualtrax	C	353	275	163	264	225	250

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 162,401	\$ 196,201	\$ 198,437	\$ 190,531	\$ 26,885	\$ 26,919
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1,204,593	\$ 1,215,155	\$ 1,637,056	\$ 1,276,169	\$ 1,726,109	\$ 1,593,245
Federal Funds	\$ 279,583	\$ 257,295	\$ 204,131	\$ 546,675	\$ 505,643	\$ 504,427
Total	\$ 1,646,577	\$ 1,668,651	\$ 2,039,624	\$ 2,013,375	\$ 2,258,637	\$ 2,124,591

Meat & Poultry

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansas would be non-compliant with Federal law for meat inspection and we would lose federal funding. Either USDA would have to provide inspection services or meat processing could not continue. In the absence of inspection, meat and poultry products that pose a food safety hazard may enter the human food supply. Product adulteration and the incidence of economic fraud would have to be reported and investigated by another agency or not addressed.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
<p>Specific Meat and Poultry Inspection Act (1969) KSA 65-6a18 et seq. - ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections, regulatory oversight of meat and poultry processing, individual slaughter allowance.</p> <p>Food and Advertising Sales Practices (1984) KSA 50-901 et seq. - inspection, produce and price representation.</p>	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

- A. Provide a fair-minded regulatory environment to the Kansas meat and poultry inspection industry to ensure our "equal to" status with FSIS
- B. Ensure that required sampling is done during the calendar year
- C. Facilitate growth education to new and existing businesses

Program History

Kansas Meat and Poultry Inspection Program started in 1969 under the Kansas Department of Agriculture when the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act was created.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Fairly regulate Kansas meat processing facilities (number of slaughter, processing and custom plants)	A	86	86	103	92	126	140
2. Regulatory sampling in accordance with Federal and State requirements	B	98%	99.4%	100%	99%	100%	100%
3. Provide education materials and guidance to facilitate Industry growth (slaughter numbers)	C	48,961	51,991	62,371	54,441	76,230	84,700

<i>Output Measures</i>	A	B	C
4. Inspections performed (slaughter, compliance, patrols)	9,473	9,554	9,968
5. Required samples collected	889	796	766
6. Total businesses licensed by M&P including processing, slaughter, wholesalers, animal food, broker and warehouses.	397	404	526

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 1,433,889	\$ 1,519,683	\$ 1,513,493	\$ 1,347,316	\$ 1,476,434	\$ 1,478,056
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 21,491	\$ 31,669	\$ 17,927	\$ 171,623	\$ 52,901	\$ 61,816
Federal Funds	\$ 1,319,800	\$ 1,369,159	\$ 1,325,159	\$ 1,318,123	\$ 1,394,480	\$ 1,394,480
Total	\$ 2,775,180	\$ 2,920,511	\$ 2,856,579	\$ 2,837,062	\$ 2,923,815	\$ 2,934,352

Pesticide & Fertilizer

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Pesticide and Fertilizer Program needs funding to ensure it meets its statutory and regulatory duties. If the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program is not funded and the statutory and regulatory duties are not met, it is likely that pesticide misuse complaints would increase and such complaints would not be investigated; consumers would not know if a product was properly registered in Kansas; and there would be no oversight of chemigation process which may result in an increased likelihood of groundwater contamination. Additionally, not adequately funding the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program may result in Kansas losing primacy under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) which would likely increase the presence of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the state, including additional federal enforcement actions being pursued against Kansas businesses.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
<p>Specific</p> <p>Fertilizer Law (1907) KSA 2-1201 et seq., ensures that fertilizer products are properly labeled and safely stored; governs the storage and transport of anhydrous ammonia and licensure of individuals who blend fertilizer products.</p> <p>Agricultural Chemical Act (1947) KSA 2-2201 et seq., governs the registration of pesticide products that will be distributed, sold, delivered, and transported in the state.</p> <p>Soil Amendment Act (1975) KSA 2-2801 et seq., requires registration and proof of efficacy for any substance which is intended to improve physical, chemical or other characteristics of the soil, or improve crop production.</p> <p>Pesticide Law (1976) KSA 2-2438 et seq., governs pesticide use in Kansas, provides for licensure of pesticide businesses and dealers, and provides for training and certification of pesticide applicators in the state.</p> <p>Chemigation Safety Law (1985) KSA 2-3301 et seq., requires registration of all water points of diversion that will be used in the chemigation process.</p>	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Efficiently apply state resources to provide an equitable and balanced regulatory environment
- B. Maintain Kansas primacy under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to facilitate Kansas agriculture and restrict federal enforcement for noncompliance by Kansas pesticide business
- C. Grain program efficiencies by continuing to develop and streamline the Agriculture Information Management System (AIMS) to provide online opportunities for licensure and product registration

Program History

The Pesticide and Fertilizer Program works to ensure compliance with Kansas statutes and regulations governing products that are used to control pests or to enhance plant growth. The Program strives to achieve its mission through compliance assistance and outreach education; complaint investigation; and monitoring inspections. The Kansas Department of Agriculture has been responsible for pesticide and fertilizer regulation since the implementation of the various of the statutes identified above. In approximately 1999, the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program was integrated after the fertilizer section was transferred from the Agricultural Commodity Assurance Program.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Promptly investigate pesticide misuse complaints in an attempt to determine a single source of the misuse by completing 90% of the investigations within 30 days	A	97%	93%	100%	97%	100%	100%
2. Provide opportunities for individuals to obtain and/or renew commercial applicator certification by proctoring at least 50 pesticide applicator certification examination sessions	B	59	52	70	60	50	50

3. Monitor at least 30% of the recertification training programs occurring in Kansas so EPA requirements are met and quality recertification training programs are provided to commercial applicators	B	36%	50%	71%	52%	50%	50%
---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Output Measures

4. Total number of pesticide misuse complaint investigations completed by the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program	A	118	99	85	101	100	100
5. Total number of certification exams taken in Kansas	B	3,325	2,152	2,502	2,660	2,500	2,500

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1,110,015	\$ 1,268,294	\$ 1,321,441	\$ 1,074,000	\$ 1,113,930	\$ 1,111,298
Federal Funds	\$ 500,527	\$ 515,584	\$ 504,543	\$ 654,820	\$ 618,698	\$ 618,698
Total	\$ 1,610,542	\$ 1,783,878	\$ 1,825,984	\$ 1,728,820	\$ 1,732,628	\$ 1,729,996

Plant Protection & Weed Control

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Defunding the Plant Protection and Weed Control program will have a significant negative effect on the Kansas economy. Important plant safeguarding, export certification, consumer protection, and industrial hemp licensing activities will not be completed as require by state statute.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Seed (1925) KSA 2-1415 et seq. - ensure seeds are tested and labeled accurately. Plant Pest Act (1965) KSA 2-2112 et seq. - licensing and inspection of plant dealers, certification of Kansas commodities, plant pests and diseases, and quarantine authority Barberry Eradication Act (1951) KSA 2-2712 et seq. - black stem rust and common barberry nuisances. Noxious Weed Act (1943) KSA 2-1314 et seq. - control of noxious weeds. Commercial Industrial Hemp Act (2019) KSA 2-3901 et seq. - cultivation of industrial hemp in a research and future commercial program.	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

- A. Safeguarding: Provide a system to safeguard Kansas' native and cultivated resources by excluding and/or early detection of high-profile exotic pests of regulatory significance which also allow the continued export of Kansas-produced plants and plant products.
- B. Export Commodity Assurance: Provide export commodity assurance for Kansas-produced commodities so that the pest freedom requirements by other states and foreign countries are maintained to allow expeditious movement of those commodities in foreign and domestic trade.
- C. Pest Management: Manage, control, or eradicate select pest of regulatory significance that are established in the state and provide technical expertise to program cooperators involved in pest control.
- D. Ensure that seed offered for sale meets label guarantees and contains no noxious weeds or restricted weed seed exceeding allowed quantities.
- E. Industrial Hemp Program: Enabling Kansans to take advantage of the new alternative crop in Kansas.
- F. Staff Training: Professional development and internal training

Program History

The purpose of the Plant Protection and Weed Control program is to: protect the state's native and cultivated plants from the introduction and outbreak of harmful plant pests, including insects, plant diseases, weeds and other organisms; provide inspection and certification services to ensure compliance with statutes and quarantines and to facilitate movement of plants and plant products to other states and countries; manage pests of regulatory significance within the state; ensure that plants, plant products, and seed offered for sale in Kansas meet the requirements of the Plant Pest and Agricultural Commodity Act, the Kansas Seed Law, the Kansas Noxious Weed Law, and the Commercial Industrial Hemp Act.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3-yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Number of quarantines for harmful plant	A	7	6	6	6	6	6
2. Number of complaints from clients	B	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Acres of compliant industrial hemp harvested (harvest occurs during the next FY after a license is issued)	E	0	1,831	761	864	400	400
<i>Output Measures</i>							
4. Number of live plant and seed dealer	A, D	1,137	575	702	805	900	900
5. Number of export certificates issued	B	9,615	8,082	7,788	8,495	8,000	8,000
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>							
6. Sites surveyed for harmful plant pests	A	7,251	2,890	3,179	4,440	6,000	6,000
7. Number of licensed industrial hemp	E	213	218	81	171	80	80

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 430,799	\$ 447,200	\$ 442,078	\$ 416,499	\$ 441,176	\$ 441,603
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 456,907	\$ 686,527	\$ 832,065	\$ 658,912	\$ 884,371	\$ 886,938
Federal Funds	\$ 166,288	\$ 181,909	\$ 104,684	\$ 150,340	\$ 210,236	\$ 161,450
Total	\$ 1,053,994	\$ 1,315,636	\$ 1,378,827	\$ 1,225,751	\$ 1,535,783	\$ 1,489,991

Weights & Measures

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Weights and Measures provides traceability for Kansas Weighing and Measuring Devices to the National System of Weights and Measures Standards and Performance Testing. This ensures equity in the marketplace for Kansans and facilitates trade locally, nationally and internationally. Failure to maintain accurate weighing and measuring devices harms Kansans, both purchasers and sellers. This harm is economic and results in many millions of dollars in lost revenue annually for Kansans. If trust in the weighing and measuring system is lost it could also result in lost trade and/or the requirement for traded items to be weighed elsewhere which would add additional cost for businesses. As an example there are some scales in Kansas over which several billion dollars of beef are traded annually. For a single scale trading 3 billion dollars of beef, a 0.1% error would result in 3 million dollars of lost revenue to either the beef producers selling beef or to the packing plant buying it. While we don't have the data to determine the value of all products sold annually in Kansas, it is easy to see how very small errors can have significant revenue impacts for Kansans irregardless of the product, beef, grain, oil, fuel, steel, gravel, cement, milk, chemicals, etc.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
<p>Specific</p> <p>Weights and Measures Law (1947) KSA 83-201-224 - metrology lab and services, monitoring and testing of scales, packages, and scanners.</p> <p>Device Inspection (1985) KSA 83-301-311 - annual testing of commercial weighing devices by licensed service companies.</p> <p>Petroleum Products Inspection Law (1935) KSA 55-422-427, 55-429, 55-433-447 - inspection of fuel dispensers.</p> <p>Liquefied Petroleum Gas (1952) KSA 83-143-149 - inspection of weighing and measuring devices, sale tickets.</p>	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Utilize available resources efficiently
- B. Improve compliance education
- C. Improve program coverage

Program History

KDA inspects all retail fuel devices every 18 months, these devices have a compliance rate around 90%. Other commercial devices such as scales, non-fuel meters, propane meters, moisture meters etc. are required to be inspected annually by a licensed service company, these devices have a compliance rate around 50%. KDA inspects a small portion of all non fuel devices on an annual basis. Do to the reliance on private service companies KDA no longer has the equipment or staffing to perform inspections of all device types and has not kept pace with new technology entering the market place such as Mass Flow Meters, Electric Vehicle Charging stations, Grain Moisture Meters, etc.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Percent of failed price verification (PV) inspections	A	58%	55%	51%	55%	50%	50%
2. Total number of complaints	A, B, C	115	89	97	100	100	100
<i>Output Measures</i>							
3. Total number of fuel inspections	A	31,527	24,401	25,233	27,054	28,000	28,000
4. Total number of scale inspections	A	16,534	17,533	18,661	17,576	17,000	17,000
5. Number of educational events / price verification trainings	B	21	13	42	25	40	35
6. Total number of price verification (PV) inspections	A	920	361	588	623	500	500
7. Number of airport devices inspected	C	48	67	190	102	130	130

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 750,299	\$ 717,396	\$ 710,498	\$ 556,820	\$ 662,113	\$ 662,782
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 812,838	\$ 944,286	\$ 686,643	\$ 795,150	\$ 1,006,859	\$ 995,567
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,563,137	\$ 1,661,682	\$ 1,397,141	\$ 1,351,970	\$ 1,668,972	\$ 1,658,349

Ag Marketing

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Consequences of not funding this program include: failure to meet statutory obligations as outlined below; loss of a voice for and support staff hired and trained to validate, promote and mentor/grow/expand Kansas agriculture (farmers, ranchers and agribusinesses/Ag Growth Strategy) domestically and internationally while also serving a supply chain network associated with the direct, indirect and induced effects of the industry; loss of management oversight for the current KDA/Kansas Value Added Foods & Meat Laboratory partnerships designed to provide discounted services to Kansas food, beverage and meat processing/value add entities; dissolution of the state trademark program - From the Land of Kansas - and marketing initiatives/benefits (including eCommerce) offered through the program for farmers' markets and small/mid-sized food and agriculture entities; loss of securing and administering Federal funding associated with USDA AMS grants and USDA FAS market access/market development (International/federal cooperator partnerships); loss of agency economics and statistics validating the Kansas agriculture industry and data collection by statisticians contributing to feeder cattle indexes and hay/sunflower market pricing reports published by USDA AMS; loss of state/domestic agricultural advocacy initiatives including support for and engagement with secondary and post-secondary classrooms/audiences.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific ERO #40 (2011) KSA 74-5, 112-5, 118 - establishing agriculture marketing and promotions within KDA. Agriculture products (1996) KSA 74-50, 156-50, 163 - product development, value added center, trademark registration, contract fulfillment. Farmers' Market (2013) KSA 2-3801-3804 - farmers' market definition, registration, liability protection. Fostering Development and Economic Welfare of Agriculture Industry KSA 74-576 KSA 74-504	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Serve all Kansans through innovate programming and delivering solutions designed to create an environment that facilitates growth and expansion in agriculture while increasing pride in and awareness of the state's largest industry - agriculture
- B. Increase the awareness of making Kansas a potential state for the relocation or expansion of agriculture business
- C. Increase and enhance export opportunities for Kansas farmers, ranchers, and agribusinesses

Program History

The Division of Agriculture Marketing, Advocacy and Outreach was originally created in the Board of Agriculture but was transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1995. In 2011, the division was transferred into the Department of Agriculture. The Division is organized into the following programs: Agriculture Workforce Development, Domestic Market Development, Compliance Education and Agency Outreach/Advocacy, Economist and Statistics, International Market Development and From the Land of Kansas/Affiliated Programs (local foods and farmers' markets). Additionally, the division has a 12-member Agriculture Marketing, Promotions and Advisory Board that meets quarterly and serves as a citizen sounding board for program activities.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Implan / State & County Contributions, in billions of dollars	A	\$46.4	\$49.2	\$47.3	\$15.7	\$47.5	\$48.5
2. International Market Development / Total Agricultural Trade Value in billions of dollars	C	\$3.8	\$3.8	\$4.0	\$2.6	\$4.1	\$4.1
<i>Output Measures</i>							
3. From the Land of Kansas Membership	A	301	349	333	328	350	360
4. Total Sales Generated from FLOK E-Commerce Member Marketing Initiatives	A	\$55,079	\$62,309	\$70,633	\$62,674	\$71,000	\$72,500
5. Strategic Growth Initiative (SGI) Community Facilitations	B	7	2	1	3	3	4

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 722,700	\$ 725,904	\$ 725,801	\$ 694,801	\$ 415,034	\$ 415,034
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1,219,470	\$ 1,468,180	\$ 1,250,749	\$ 1,433,410	\$ 1,574,248	\$ 1,539,067
Federal Funds	\$ 482,623	\$ 385,343	\$ 249,768	\$ 296,649	\$ 200,870	\$ 200,869
Total	\$ 2,424,793	\$ 2,579,427	\$ 2,226,318	\$ 2,424,860	\$ 2,190,152	\$ 2,154,970

Animal Health

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Funding sources are a combination of SGF, license and registration fees, USDA APHIS cooperative agreements, NADPRP farm bill funding, special program grants. Both farm bill funds and special program grants are project specific and provide opportunities for additional initiatives.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Animal Health KSA 47-104 through 47-2306 Stock running at large, strays, marks and brands, protection of domestic animals, registration of veterinarians, public livestock markets, deliveries in motor vehicles, disposal of dead animals, garbage restrictions, feedlots, pet animals, aquaculture, domesticated deer	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Support division responsibilities, including disease investigation and response and maintain interaction with regulated industries and stakeholders
 B. Enhance internal communication and professional development
 C. Enhance animal disease emergency response capabilities

Program History

Kansas Department of Animal Health became a stand alone agency in 1969 by combining the Livestock Sanitary Commission and the State Brand Commission. Via a Governor's reorganization order, the Kansas Animal Health Department became a division of the Kansas Department of Agriculture in July 1, 2011. It is now known as the Kansas Division of Animal Health. Currently there are three programs that make up the Division - Animal Disease Control, Animal Facilities Inspection, Brands Program - all of which work to ensure the health and welfare of Kansas livestock and domestic animals.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Respond to Foreign Animal Disease (FAD) FAD investigation requests within a four-hour timeframe of report	A, C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Conduct routine inspections of licensed facilities as outlined in statutes, regulations and internal policies, as well as conduct pet animal complaint inspections within 3 days (72-hours)	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Conduct and develop at least one emergency management exercise and participate in one non-KDA sponsored exercise or tabletop event per year	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Utilize all available funds that are provided from USDA and DHS in a responsible and effective manner, in line with approved workplan	A, C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Output Measures

5. Number of Foreign Animal Disease (FAD) investigations	A, C	17	99	229	115	50	50
6. Number of Certificate of Veterinary Inspections (CVI)	A, C	50,653	51,614	51,110	51,126	52,000	52,000
7. Number of Official Calhooed vaccinations	A	166,000	169,000	175,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
8. Number of Avian Influenza tests by state staff	A	2,022	1,707	3,490	2,406	3,400	3,400
9. Number of facility inspections	A	1,588	1,531	1,610	1,576	1,600	1,600

10. Number of facility licenses managed	A	166,000	169,000	175,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
---	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 615,600	\$ 703,301	\$ 696,426	\$ 699,055	\$ 697,776	\$ 697,785
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1,508,112	\$ 1,689,442	\$ 1,573,345	\$ 1,814,260	\$ 1,982,082	\$ 1,897,276
Federal Funds	\$ 472,935	\$ 422,330	\$ 501,934	\$ 485,947	\$ 613,662	\$ 492,428
Total	\$ 2,596,647	\$ 2,815,073	\$ 2,771,705	\$ 2,999,262	\$ 3,293,520	\$ 3,087,489

Conservation

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of funding for Division of Conservation programs would lead to greater soil erosion and loss of agricultural production which negatively impacts the Kansas economy, greater sediment and nutrient loading to streams and lakes which increases water treatment costs for municipalities and reduces water storage capacity, greater damage to crops, roads and structures caused by increased flooding, and the loss of 100+ full time positions with Conservation District staff across Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Conservation Districts Law - 1937 KSA 2-1901 to 2-1918 Conservation of soil and water, prevention of soil erosion, flood control, preservation of wildlife, protection of public lands	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

A. Provide support for conservation districts
 B. Increase in efficiency and effectiveness of State Water Plan program implementation / administration
 C. Implement the State Water Plan and 50-Year Water Vision by addressing priority resource concerns through increase local technical assistance and targeted conservation practices with special initiatives and partnerships / cooperative grants / agreements

Program History

The Division of Conservation, working with 105 local Conservation Districts, 75 organized Watershed Districts, other special-purpose districts, as well as state and federal entities administer programs to improve water quality, reduce soil erosion, conserve water, reduce flood potential and provide local water supply. The DOC has the responsibility to administer the Conservation Districts Law, the Watershed District Act and other statutes authorizing various programs.

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Conserve and Extend the High Plains Aquifer by retiring water rights with CREP and WaterTAP Programs (irrigated acres retired)	C	345	0	275	207	1,288	1,144
2. Secure, Protect and Restore our Kansas Reservoirs by implementing Streambank Stabilization Projects to reduce Reservoir Sedimentation (tons of soil reduced)	B	N/A	35,969	50,539	43,254	45,000	45,000
3. Improve the State's Water Quality by targeting conservation efforts to high priority areas (acres protected in high priority areas)	C	32,339	43,156	33,313	36,269	35,000	40,000
4. Reduce our Vulnerability to Extreme Events by improving soil health through providing education and information (number of producers attending soil health workshops)	C	2,216	927	1,260	1,468	2,500	3,000
5. Effectively provide technical assistance to implement conservation practices on private land by completing agreements to sponsor Conservation Technical Assistance contracts with Conservation Districts (number of contracts)	B	36	36	40	37	40	36
6. Effectively implement conservation practices on private lands by offering cost-share for agricultural best management practices statewide (tons of soil saved)	C	51,286	113,575	82,410	82,424	115,000	120,000

Output Measures

7. Conserve and Extend the High Plains Aquifer by retiring water rights (dollars spent on CREP and WaterTAP Programs)	B	\$ 36,927	\$ -	\$ 24,861	\$ 20,596	\$ 446,593	\$ 396,593
---	---	-----------	------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------

8. Secure, Protect and Restore our Kansas Reservoirs by implementing Streambank Stabilization Projects to reduce Reservoir Sedimentation (dollars spent on Streambank Stabilization)	B	N/A	\$ 521,841	\$ 1,112,829	\$ 817,335	\$ 794,264	\$ 750,000
9. Improve the State's Water Quality by targeting conservation efforts to high priority areas (dollars spent in high priority areas)	C	\$ 1,491,092	\$1,730,080	\$ 1,161,121	\$ 1,460,764	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,900,000
10. Reduce our Vulnerability to Extreme Events by improving soil health through providing education and information (dollars spent on soil health)	B	\$ 65,581	\$ 54,509	\$ 110,044	\$ 76,711	\$ 200,000	\$ 300,000
11. Effectively provide technical assistance to implement conservation practices on private land by completing agreements to sponsor Conservation Technical Assistance contracts with Conservation Districts (federal funding leveraged)	A	\$ 501,165	\$1,017,120	\$ 1,366,281	\$ 961,522	\$ 1,622,858	\$ 1,207,194
12. Effectively implement conservation practices on private lands by offering cost-share for agricultural best management practices statewide (dollars spent in Water Resources and Non-Point Source programs)	B	\$ 3,307,671	\$3,639,427	\$ 2,938,031	\$ 3,295,043	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,700,000

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 480,800	\$ 482,999	\$ 482,468	\$ 436,384	\$ 482,980	\$ 483,602
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 5,208,473	\$7,163,356	\$ 8,361,468	\$10,598,937	\$ 10,744,876	\$ 8,337,534
Federal Funds	\$ 527,815	\$ 501,165	\$ 1,017,120	\$ 1,366,281	\$ 1,622,858	\$ 1,207,194
Total	\$ 6,217,088	\$8,147,520	\$ 9,861,056	\$12,401,602	\$ 12,850,714	\$10,028,330

Water Appropriations

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Certificates, permits, changes to water rights, would not be processed and issued. Water use reporting data would not be collected. Private property rights would not be protected. The state's economy would be hurt by not allowing water to be put to a beneficial use. Some water users would take advantage of their neighbors by using more water than authorized.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 42-701-730 (irrigation districts) KSA 68-2201-2215 (junkyards and salvage control) KSA 74-506a-506d, 74-510 - (Division of Water Resources) KSA 74-509 (irrigation plants) KSA 74-2610, 2622 (Kansas Water Authority and Kansas Water Office) KSA 82a-601-647 (rural water) KSA 82a-701-737, 740, 42-303, 313 (water appropriation) KSA 82a-954 (water protection) KSA 82a-1020-1040 (groundwater management districts) KSA 82a-1301-1320 (water plan storage) KSA 82a-1330-1348 (water assurance)	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Process applications to appropriate water and changes to existing water rights in Kansas
- B. Ensure water rights and the resources are protected
- C. Conduct field work, public outreach, and transparent rule development

Program History

We administer the Water Appropriation Act which allocates water to our citizens with terms, conditions, and limitations that provides a framework of first in time is first in right to the water. This allocation method maximizes the use of water for the best economic benefit and protects private property

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Percent of water use data received online	B	88.31%	90.01%	91.18%	89.83%	95.00%	95.00%
2. Amount of water conserved, in acre-feet	B, C	11,844	11,876	11,951	11,890	12,000	12,000
<i>Output Measures</i>							
3. Water use reports processed	B	12,053	12,121	12,153	12,109	12,110	12,100
4. Number of Water Conservation Areas (WCAs)	B, C	45	50	53	49	50	50

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 2,494,022	\$ 2,449,411	\$ 2,550,263	\$ 2,341,914	\$ 2,316,018	\$ 2,322,064
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1,100,587	\$ 1,006,388	\$ 1,298,525	\$ 1,234,915	\$ 1,865,843	\$ 1,489,963
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 3,594,609	\$ 3,455,799	\$ 3,848,788	\$ 3,576,829	\$ 4,181,861	\$ 3,812,027

Water Management

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Not funding this program would severely jeopardize Kansas's ability to secure its water supply from Colorado on the Arkansas River, and from Colorado and Nebraska on the Republican River. Not funding this program would also eliminate the agency's ability to use state of the art hydrologic modeling and analysis tools to develop, implement, and evaluate water management tools and strategies leading to poor management of water resources and economic harm to local and regional economies.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 2-1915, 1919, 1930 (conservation measures) KSA 12-635-638, 12-1616b, 12-766 (flood control/mapping) KSA 24-105, 126 (levees) KSA 24-656-668 (drainage districts) KSA 24-1201-1237 (watershed districts) KSA 42-701-730 (irrigation districts) KSA 68-2201-2215 (junkyards and salvage control) KSA 74-506a-506d, 74-510 - (Division of Water Resources) KSA 74-509 (irrigation plants) KSA 74-2610, 2622 (Kansas Water Authority and Kansas Water Office) KSA 79-201g, 82a-405-410 (water storage) KSA Chapter 82 (Waters and Watercourses)	Mandatory	No	1

Program Goals

- A. Protect Kansas water supplies through administering the KS-CO Arkansas River Compact
- B. Protect Kansas water supplies through administering the KS-CO-NE Republican River Compact
- C. Continue to encourage the development and use of sound science to inform water management decisions

Program History

The water management services program is responsible to administer the state's four interstate river compacts, provide technical assistance to the water appropriation program, evaluate complex hydrologic scenarios to enhance water management, investigate groundwater impairment claims, and maintain and enhance the official water rights information database.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Protect Kansas entitlement under Ark River Compact (acre-feet of water)	A	166,592	147,189	98,174	137,318	150,000	150,000
2. Protect Kansas entitlement under Republican River Compact (acre-feet of water)	B	179,780	333,300	247,750	253,610	250,000	250,000
3. Provide technical support to facilitate Enhanced water management (requests)	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
4. Acres of Colorado inspected for compact compliance	A	22,300	21,500	22,300	22,033	22,300	22,300
5. Meetings with CO & NE leadership on compact issues	B	24	18	21	21	22	22
6. Hydrologic evaluations to facilitate LEMAs, WCAs and management strategies (staff hours)	C	5,720	5,408	5,500	5,543	5,600	5,800

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 746,398	\$ 817,651	\$ 862,279	\$ 809,613	\$ 874,055	\$ 874,575
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 672,656	\$ 657,415	\$ 603,155	\$ 629,602	\$ 1,032,220	\$ 739,189
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,419,054	\$ 1,475,066	\$ 1,465,434	\$ 1,439,215	\$ 1,906,275	\$ 1,613,764

Water Structures

Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Severe private and public property damage or loss of life could occur due to failure of aging dams and other water structures, inappropriate floodplain development or poor construction of water structures. Private property rights could be infringed upon by neighbors constructing dams or other structures that are not properly designed. The citizens of Kansas would not be able to participate in the NFIP to help cover loss costs associated with disasters. Perspective property buyers and current owners would not have accurate data on flooding risks.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 82a-301-328 (stream obstruction) KSA 24-105, 126 (levees) KSA 12-635-638, 12-1616b, 12-766 (flood control/mapping) KSA 82a-325-327 (environmental coordination) KSA 24-1201-1237 (watershed districts) KSA-82a-1601-1609 (small lakes)	Mandatory	Yes	1

Program Goals

- A. Regulate dams, stream modifications, levee and floodplain fills for the protection of life, property, and public safety
 B. Ensure effective community engagement and risk communication
 C. Increase public awareness of floodplain management, stream obstructions, and channel changes

Program History

The Water Structures Program reviews projects that involve dams, stream modifications, levees, floodplain fills and provides technical assistance and coordination for local communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program for the protection of property and public safety. These duties were authorized starting in 1929 with the passage of the Obstructions in Streams Act and Levee Law.

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. No loss of life and property damage due to water structure failures. Outcome based on number of lives lost.	A, C	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Community interaction to produce accurate floodplain maps. Outcome based on number of effective maps per year.	B, C	3	1	5	3	5	5
3. Reduce NFIP claims through regulation, community engagement and public awareness (net total NFIP claims)	A, B, C	\$ 10,934,021	\$ 99,580	\$ 730,021	\$ 3,921,207	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
<i>Output Measures</i>							
4. Processing time for stream obstruction, channel change, floodplain fill and levee permits (days)	A, C	41	42	33	39	35	35
5. Processing times for dam permits (days)	A, C	85	112	221	139	120	120
6. Processing time for general permits (days)	A, C	15	14	11	13	14	14
7. Conduct RiskMAP public meetings (number of meetings)	B, C	61	84	92	79	75	75

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 710,010	\$ 746,301	\$ 713,810	\$ 739,395	\$ 750,582	\$ 750,600
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 235,050	\$ 241,081	\$ 225,660	\$ 194,498	\$ 195,519	\$ 198,017
Federal Funds	\$ 6,532,488	\$ 9,478,614	\$8,956,325	\$ 5,771,413	\$ 6,796,954	\$ 6,796,958
Total	\$ 7,477,548	\$10,465,996	\$9,895,795	\$ 6,705,306	\$ 7,743,055	\$ 7,745,575