

# Individual Regional Advisory Committee Member

## Strategic Implementation Planning and FY 2026 Budget Input

### Region: Equus- Walnut

#### Shared Criteria Discussion

- In addition to the 6 criteria listed on the first page, what additional 2 do you think should be considered when evaluating water investments?
  - Leverage Federal Funds, Measurable Impact on Principle Progress.
  - Environmental Impact, Limited Assistance Elsewhere.
- If you chose “Other”, what is/are your suggestion (s)?
- From the list of 8 criteria (the original 6 plus the 2 you chose), what would be your top 4 from the list? What order would you rank those 4? Why did you choose that ranking of 4?
  - Cost effectiveness, economic impact, stakeholder input, leverage federal funds.
  - 1. Cost Effectiveness- without this, none of the others will follow.
  - 2. Resiliency- programs need to be built to last and provide for future generations.
  - 3. Economic Impact- accounting for + or – impact to community.
  - 4. Stakeholder input- without stakeholder involvement, programs will not be supported.
- Finally, from those 4, what 1 criterion do you wish is always considered when prioritization of state dollar investments is done? Why
  - Cost effectiveness.
  - Cost effectiveness- without this, none of the others will follow
- Do you have any other comments about the shared criteria?
  - The criteria were well thought out and had input from across various stakeholders. I think we are getting somewhere.

#### Budget Discussion: \$140 million Investment Scenario

- What is your reaction to this proposed investment scenario? (To achieve the outcomes listed in the proposed scenario, requires an investment of about \$140 million annually. Does that seem reasonable for what would be achieved with those dollars?)

- Yes, it would be a start.
  - Yes.
- What would you change? If that amount doesn't sound reasonable, what strategies or outcomes would you change?
    - I think increased investment dollars would have a greater impact.
  - Are the proposed levels of funding per area appropriate? If no, what would you proposed otherwise?
    - This would be a good first step. I think more funding is needed, but it is wise to take a smaller step now, look at the progress made, re-evaluate, and increase funding as needed.
  - What activities, programs, or areas are your highest priority including those not listed on the handout?
    - Improving infrastructure and protecting ground water.

### Reasonability Discussion: Is it reasonable for the state to. . . .

- Should an outcome be that all Kansas communities will have 50 years or more water supply for their communities/economic base in 10 years?
  - Yes, an outcome of this program should be that all Kansans/communities have at least two generations of water supply.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the question about communities having at least two generations of water supply?
  - I find that very minimal. We need to supply water all communities going forward, not limited to 50 years.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate if it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region, increasing the resiliency of its water supply? The core of these questions is around cost-effectiveness for state investment and water security for our small towns and communities. There are many communities across the state that are too small to fund and maintain their own public drinking water and wastewater supply systems. Further, long-term water supply planning is the first step to understanding the risks to a community's water supply and building a plan to ensure enough water for both residents and the local economy for

generations to come. However, many small towns don't have the staff/capacity to do the analysis.

- Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning and evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
  - Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about communities or regions seeking state loans?
  - Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state only to provide cost share programs for irrigation efficiency in areas which have adopted conservation measure through a Local Enhanced Management Area (LEMA), Water Conservation Area (WCA), or Intensive Groundwater Use Control Area (IGUCA)? This question is asked because there is research indicating that without a requirement for reduced water use (through LEMA, WCA, etc.), conservation incentives can actually increase water use because more efficient water use without a conservation requirement can simply incentivize increased production. Prioritizing cost-share investments in areas that are taking local action on groundwater depleting helps ensure that state dollars are directing stabilizing aquifer declines. However, some people think efficiency should be encouraged and anyone who wants to participate should be allowed.
  - I'm not sure.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about cost-share programs?
  - I don't have a firm understanding of the conservation programs. I would want to have more information before voicing an opinion.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every 2 years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals? The results would be shared with stakeholders during future local consult process. Programs underperforming would be revamped or discontinued based on stakeholder input and agency expertise/judgement. This approach would provide an assessment on the return for taxpayer dollars, but it can also take a long time for programs to demonstrate progress.
  - No, it is not reasonable.

- Other.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last questions about the evaluation of state investments/programs?
  - Some projects may take longer to implement and see the results
  - Every 2 year may be good, or it may be burdensome to the program. Three to five years might be a more reasonable evaluation period.

### Revenue Source Discussion

- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these existing revenue sources would you support increasing?
  - Economic Development Initiatives Fund Transfer.
  - General Fund Transfer, Economic Development Initiatives Fund Transfer, Existing Fees.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe what other sources should be considered.
- What do you like or dislike about these revenue sources and why?
- Existing Revenue Support – Why would you support increasing?
- For any that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase in those sources?
- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these possible new revenue sources would you support?
  - Bonding, Sales Tax
  - Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee, Sales Tax.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe your proposed revenue source.
- New Revenue Sources – Why would you support those you chose?
  - Water is a necessity for everyone not just certain sectors so a sales tax everyone participates
- For those that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase?

### Other Feedback

- Any other RAC feedback for the Strategic Implementation Team or Kansas Water Authority?
- Did you attend a water local consult meeting?
  - No.
  - Yes
- Please select all local consult meeting you attended in person in September.
  - Colby

# Individual Regional Advisory Committee Member

## Strategic Implementation Planning and FY 2026 Budget Input

### Region: Great Bend Prairie

#### Shared Criteria Discussion

- In addition to the 6 criteria listed on the first page, what additional 2 do you think should be considered when evaluating water investments?
  - Environmental Impact, Geographic Balance.
- If you chose “Other”, what is/are your suggestion (s)?
- From the list of 8 criteria (the original 6 plus the 2 you chose), what would be your top 4 from the list? What order would you rank those 4? Why did you choose that ranking of 4?
  - Resiliency, Stakeholder Input, Geographic Balance, Environmental Impact.
- Finally, from those 4, what 1 criterion do you wish is always considered when prioritization of state dollar investments is done? Why?
  - Resiliency.
- Do you have any other comments about the shared criteria?
  - Have to be careful not to just hit the populated areas, all Kansas deserve quality water and ample water.

#### Budget Discussion: \$140 million Investment Scenario

- What is your reaction to this proposed investment scenario? (To achieve the outcomes listed in the proposed scenario, requires an investment of about \$140 million annually. Does that seem reasonable for what would be achieved with those dollars?)
  - It will be tough but understand the ask. Just have to spread out the source of the income.
- What would you change? If that amount doesn't sound reasonable, what strategies or outcomes would you change?
- Are the proposed levels of funding per area appropriate? If no, what would you proposed otherwise?

- I think reservoir is increased too much. Water quality and quantity need adjusted higher.
- What activities, programs, or areas are your highest priority including those not listed on the handout?
  - First of all, this is way more complicated than the road infrastructure in Kansas. If the KWO wants to control all the criteria as a blanket for the state it will be tough. Keep in mind area criteria and local input is invaluable. I know you are attempting to collect this input however this process with consult meetings is not coming close to capturing this.

### Reasonability Discussion: Is it reasonable for the state to . . .

- Should an outcome be that all Kansas communities will have 50 years or more water supply for their communities/economic base in 10 years?
  - Yes, an outcome of this program should be that all Kansans/communities have at least two generations of water supply.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the question about communities having at least two generations of water supply?
  - It should be everyone's goal however a lot of variables play a role.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate if it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region, increasing the resiliency of its water supply? The core of these questions is around cost-effectiveness for state investment and water security for our small towns and communities. There are many communities across the state that are too small to fund and maintain their own public drinking water and wastewater supply systems. Further, long-term water supply planning is the first step to understanding the risks to a community's water supply and building a plan to ensure enough water for both residents and the local economy for generations to come. However, many small towns don't have the staff/capacity to do the analysis.
  - No, it is not reasonable.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about communities or regions seeking state loans?

- Local communities are not staffed for this. We all know the impacts and benefits.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state only to provide cost share programs for irrigation efficiency in areas which have adopted conservation measure through a Local Enhanced Management Area (LEMA), Water Conservation Area (WCA), or Intensive Groundwater Use Control Area (IGUCA)? This question is asked because there is research indicating that without a requirement for reduced water use (through LEMA, WCA, etc.), conservation incentives can actually increase water use because more efficient water use without a conservation requirement can simply incentivize increased production. Prioritizing cost-share investments in areas that are taking local action on groundwater depleting helps ensure that state dollars are directing stabilizing aquifer declines. However, some people think efficiency should be encouraged and anyone who wants to participate should be allowed.
  - No, it is not reasonable.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about cost-share programs?
  - Irrigators already conserving need consideration for continuing their efforts above and beyond, however we still have to reach irrigators in areas not conserving at all. Those are the problem areas.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every 2 years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals? The results would be shared with stakeholders during future local consult process. Programs underperforming would be revamped or discontinued based on stakeholder input and agency expertise/judgement. This approach would provide an assessment on the return for taxpayer dollars, but it can also take a long time for programs to demonstrate progress.
  - I'm not sure.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last questions about the evaluation of state investments/programs?
  - It depends on who is evaluating and what that person deems criteria.

### Revenue Source Discussion

- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state's water plan, which of these existing revenue sources would you support increasing?



- Other.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe what other sources should be considered.
  - A variety of tax increases, sales tax, user fees, etc.... Not just one.
- What do you like or dislike about these revenue sources and why?
  - Not a fan of general fund transfer, adds to other problems by taking away from those efforts.
- Existing Revenue Support – Why would you support increasing?
  - Across the board yes, money is needed.
- For any that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase in those sources?
- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these possible new revenue sources would you support?
  - Bonding, Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee, Severance Tax Increase, Sales Tax, Other
- If you chose “other” above, please describe your proposed revenue source.
  - Across all.
- New Revenue Sources – Why would you support those you chose?
- For those that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase?

## Other Feedback

- Any other RAC feedback for the Strategic Implementation Team or Kansas Water Authority?
- Did you attend a water local consult meeting?
  - Yes.
- Please select all local consult meeting you attended in person in September.
  - Newton.

# Individual Regional Advisory Committee Member

## Strategic Implementation Planning and FY 2026 Budget Input

### Region: Kansas

#### Shared Criteria Discussion

- In addition to the 6 criteria listed on the first page, what additional 2 do you think should be considered when evaluating water investments?
  - Measurable Impact on Principle Progress, Public-Private Partnership.
  - Environmental Impact, Population Impacted.
  - Environmental Impact, Other.
- If you chose “Other”, what is/are your suggestion (s)?
  - Ecosystem services affected.
- From the list of 8 criteria (the original 6 plus the 2 you chose), what would be your top 4 from the list? What order would you rank those 4? Why did you choose that ranking of 4?
  - Cost-Effectiveness, Resiliency, Measurable Impact on Principle Progress, and Public-Private Partnerships.
  - Resiliency, Cost effectiveness, Environmental impact, Population impacted.
  - Environmental impact, Ecosystem services affected.
- Finally, from those 4, what 1 criterion do you wish is always considered when prioritization of state dollar investments is done? Why?
  - Cost-Effectiveness because of the challenges I foresee with funding and shortfalls of available funds. I'm concerned we will come nowhere near the \$140M goal and the state will have to focus efforts on the projects that are most cost-effective compared to the overall impact the project will provide.
  - Population affected.
  - Ecosystem services affected.
- Do you have any other comments about the shared criteria?
  - Will need weighted and consolidate metrics to evaluate choices.

#### Budget Discussion: \$140 million Investment Scenario

- What is your reaction to this proposed investment scenario? (To achieve the outcomes listed in the proposed scenario, requires an investment of about \$140 million annually. Does that seem reasonable for what would be achieved with those dollars?)

- It seems like a small amount compared to the \$ spent on other state efforts or even what larger KS cities spend annually on capital improvement plans.
  - Good, wouldn't go less. Need to pony up.
  - In general, I strongly support the increased funding scenario. There are some things that I think are a waste of money, but in general far more that are very useful.
- What would you change? If that amount doesn't sound reasonable, what strategies or outcomes would you change?
    - I think there needs to be an education process so the residents of Kansas can fully understand where current funding sources come from, what happens if we are underfunded, and how this level of funding compares to other programs like transportation.
    - Agree with number.
  - Are the proposed levels of funding per area appropriate? If no, what would you proposed otherwise?
    - This is a very difficult question for most people to answer without proper context.
    - Not able to say yet. Needs balance across state and issues.
  - What activities, programs, or areas are your highest priority including those not listed on the handout?
    - Research and master planning of specific problem areas.
    - Reservoir management
    - Silt reduction on ag.
    - Water use optimization in aquifers.
    - Key water quality treatment.
    - Public ed.
    - Working with nature all big.

### Reasonability Discussion: Is it reasonable for the state to. . .

- Should an outcome be that all Kansas communities will have 50 years or more water supply for their communities/economic base in 10 years?
  - Yes, an outcome of this program should be that all Kansans/communities have at least two generations of water supply.
  - Yes, an outcome of this program should be that all Kansans/communities have at least two generations of water supply.
  - No, that should not be an outcome of this program.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the question about communities having at least two generations of water supply?

- Because I want my children and grandchildren to have a sustainable water supply.
  - At least, but that's a really shortsighted goal. that second generation is already born.
  - Not every community deserves to survive. Plus, lead pipes are a permanent threat.
  
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate if it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region, increasing the resiliency of its water supply? The core of these questions is around cost-effectiveness for state investment and water security for our small towns and communities. There are many communities across the state that are too small to fund and maintain their own public drinking water and wastewater supply systems. Further, long-term water supply planning is the first step to understanding the risks to a community's water supply and building a plan to ensure enough water for both residents and the local economy for generations to come. However, many small towns don't have the staff/capacity to do the analysis.
  - Other.
  - Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
  - Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
  
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about communities or regions seeking state loans?
  - I generally say yes if the purpose of the grant or loan is related to the water supply of said community.
  - We all need a stake in this. And financial participation leads to good scrutiny.
  - I favor encouraging cooperation and building scale, not everyone going it alone.
  
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state only to provide cost share programs for irrigation efficiency in areas which have adopted conservation measure through a Local Enhanced Management Area (LEMA), Water Conservation Area (WCA), or Intensive Groundwater Use Control Area (IGUCA)? This question is asked because there is research indicating that without a requirement for reduced water use (through LEMA, WCA, etc.), conservation incentives can actually increase water use because more efficient water use without a conservation requirement can simply incentivize increased

production. Prioritizing cost-share investments in areas that are taking local action on groundwater depleting helps ensure that state dollars are directing stabilizing aquifer declines. However, some people think efficiency should be encouraged and anyone who wants to participate should be allowed.

- Yes, it is reasonable for the state to only provide cost-share programs for irrigation efficiency only in areas which have adopted conservation measures through a LEMA, WCA or IGUCA.
  - Yes, it is reasonable for the state to only provide cost-share programs for irrigation efficiency only in areas which have adopted conservation measures through a LEMA, WCA or IGUCA.
  - Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about cost-share programs?
  - Yes, but needs to come with a big push to make those programs scaled up. In end every region needs help and buy in. So, use the carrot and stick.
  - If they won't help themselves, they should not get state money.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every 2 years based on their ability to a make measurable progress on the state water plan goals? The results would be shared with stakeholders during future local consult process. Programs underperforming would be revamped or discontinued based on stakeholder input and agency expertise/judgement. This approach would provide an assessment on the return for taxpayer dollars, but it can also take a long time for programs to demonstrate progress.
  - Yes, it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every few years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals.
  - Yes, it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every few years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals.
  - Yes, it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every few years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last questions about the evaluation of state investments/programs?
  - Be prepared to do more substantial reviews every 10 years. Two years at a time is actually a short window.
  - We need accountability for the program to be effective.

## Revenue Source Discussion

- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these existing revenue sources would you support increasing?
  - General Fund Transfer. Economic Development Initiatives Fund Transfer. Existing Fees. Other.
  - General Fund Transfer. Economic Development Initiatives Fund Transfer. Existing Fees.
  - General Fund Transfer. Existing Fees.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe what other sources should be considered.
  - A tax on plastic drinking bottles.
  - Need all in.
- What do you like or dislike about these revenue sources and why?
- Existing Revenue Support – Why would you support increasing?
  - To ensure we have adequate water supplies for future generations.
- For any that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase in those sources?
- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these possible new revenue sources would you support?
  - Bonding. Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee. Sales Tax.
  - Bonding, Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee. Severance Tax Increase. Sales Tax.
  - Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee. Severance Tax Increase.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe your proposed revenue source.
  - Yes, all in. Urban and Ag. Everyone needs a stake.
- New Revenue Sources – Why would you support those you chose?
  - Ag uses by far the most water in the state and most of the stuff they grow we don't eat anyway. Yellow dent corn? They should support their production with fees. This will align incentives with conservation instead of exploitation.
- For those that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase?

## Other Feedback

- Any other RAC feedback for the Strategic Implementation Team or Kansas Water Authority?

- Applaud Giver or and KWA/KWO for doing this. Well done.

- Did you attend a water local consult meeting?

- Yes.

- No.

- No.

- Please select all local consult meeting you attended in person in September.

- Topeka.

# Individual Regional Advisory Committee Member

## Strategic Implementation Planning and FY 2026 Budget Input

### Region: Missouri

#### Shared Criteria Discussion

- In addition to the 6 criteria listed on the first page, what additional 2 do you think should be considered when evaluating water investments?
  - Leverage Federal Funds. Population Impacted.
  - Permanence. Effective Life Expectancy.
  - Leverage Federal Funds. Population Impacted.
- If you chose "Other", what is/are your suggestion (s)?
- From the list of 8 criteria (the original 6 plus the 2 you chose), what would be your top 4 from the list? What order would you rank those 4? Why did you choose that ranking of 4?
  - Economic Impact. Population Effected. Cost Effectiveness. Leverage Federal Funds. It's all about the money to accomplish things.
  - Resiliency. Economic Impact. Population Impacted. Cost-Effectiveness.
- Finally, from those 4, what 1 criterion do you wish is always considered when prioritization of state dollar investments is done? Why?
  - Resiliency.
- Do you have any other comments about the shared criteria?
  - Buffer Strips are one of the most effective practices to protect water quality against sedimentation, and water quality protection, as well wildlife habitat and generally cost effective. They can be established quickly and not very expensive, and can have an extended life, but it is my observation that they can be removed quickly and inexpensively when the price of corn, or beans goes up, so often the predicted effective life span is as long as government payments continue. The same is true, to varying extent with no-till practices and cover crops, both of which can be effective but take time for the effectiveness to mature and each have to be reinstated each year, hopefully the operator sees the advantage to these practices but it seems that "economic impact" (right or wrong) can be used to justify ending the practice.



- Riparian Corridors are also very effective for sedimentation control and water quality protection, as well as wildlife corridors and habitat. In the past farmers left the corridors in place because it was expensive to clear and the ground was often difficult to farm, and they may have recognized their value. However, a few years ago when the price of corn was high, acres and acres of riparian corridors were ripped up and planted to corn. The corridors take a long time to establish but can be removed quickly. They generally are generally a cost-effective strategy for water quality protection if there was a mechanism to insure longevity.
- Dredging is another example of strategies that can be effective but short life expectancy.
- There is much emphasis on stakeholders and public input to the planning process. I fully support public participation and input, and understand that to start and complete a project (and the success of the project) is often dependent on public buy-in. I remember as a consulting engineer working with municipalities, much of the time and costs of many projects were spent on public participation and stakeholder meetings, occasionally with one or two individuals with particular resistance. I am reminded that if I am not feeling well, I sometime talk (complain) to friends and family, receiving plenty of advice. But if I am really not feeling well, I get test done and talk to a professional expert (doctor). I may discuss with friends and family afterwards but I primarily rely on the expert advice.

### Budget Discussion: \$140 million Investment Scenario

- What is your reaction to this proposed investment scenario? (To achieve the outcomes listed in the proposed scenario, requires an investment of about \$140 million annually. Does that seem reasonable for what would be achieved with those dollars?)
  - \$140 million is a good start.
  - Reasonable is very subjective - what will actually be achieved. There can be a big difference between the ideal and the achieved.
  - Water problems tend to get bigger and more expensive to solve over time. Problems solved now (and money spent now) reduce the need to fund more expensive solutions in the future.
- What would you change? If that amount doesn't sound reasonable, what strategies or outcomes would you change?
  - Too vague of a question.
- Are the proposed levels of funding per area appropriate? If no, what would you proposed otherwise?
  - HB 2303 Grants could be quadrupled to start having an impact on the problem.

- Get the most bang for the buck, focus on the core mission of resiliency first - then worry about the areas of lesser importance in out years. Don't try to do too much too fast.
- 
- What activities, programs, or areas are your highest priority including those not listed on the handout?
  - Reliability of infrastructure.
  - Reduce future sedimentation rate, dredge to mitigate previous sedimentation - reducing sedimentation will have a positive impact on water quality and water storage - which will improve resiliency in periods of too much and too little precipitation.

### Reasonability Discussion: Is it reasonable for the state to . . .

- Should an outcome be that all Kansas communities will have 50 years or more water supply for their communities/economic base in 10 years?
  - Yes, an outcome of this program should be that all Kansans/communities have at least two generations of water supply.
  - I'm not sure.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the question about communities having at least two generations of water supply?
  - With proper planning by the communities, it is possible (and necessary).
  - I don't like how this question is constructed - being in the Missouri River RAC - we need to be more concerned about the next season - 50-year planning is more aquifer specific.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate if it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region, increasing the resiliency of its water supply? The core of these questions is around cost-effectiveness for state investment and water security for our small towns and communities. There are many communities across the state that are too small to fund and maintain their own public drinking water and wastewater supply systems. Further, long-term water supply planning is the first step to understanding the risks to a community's water supply and building a plan to ensure enough water for both residents and the local economy for generations to come. However, many small towns don't have the staff/capacity to do the analysis.
  - Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.

- Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about communities or regions seeking state loans?
  - As long as the degree of formality of the water supply studies is not too bad, common sense can provide many of the answers.
  - In rural Kansas - there is too much emphasis on 'Kingdom' building/maintaining. We need communities, RWD's, school districts etc. etc. to consolidate/cooperate as much as possible. If there are to be state loans offered - they need to be linked to improving efficiencies!
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state only to provide cost share programs for irrigation efficiency in areas which have adopted conservation measure through a Local Enhanced Management Area (LEMA), Water Conservation Area (WCA), or Intensive Groundwater Use Control Area (IGUCA)? This question is asked because there is research indicating that without a requirement for reduced water use (through LEMA, WCA, etc.), conservation incentives can actually increase water use because more efficient water use without a conservation requirement can simply incentivize increased production. Prioritizing cost-share investments in areas that are taking local action on groundwater depleting helps ensure that state dollars are directing stabilizing aquifer declines. However, some people think efficiency should be encouraged and anyone who wants to participate should be allowed.
  - I'm not sure.
  - Yes, it is reasonable for the state to only provide cost-share programs for irrigation efficiency only in areas which have adopted conservation measures through a LEMA, WCA or IGUCA.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about cost-share programs?
  - As a small business owner who pays a lot in property taxes - at a much higher rate than my brothers and sisters in Ag - contributing at a fair rate is very important to me. If Ag is using the lion's share of the water in the state - they need to contribute at a reasonable rate. I am in favor of user fees more than tapping into the State's general fund.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every 2 years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals? The results would be shared with stakeholders during future local consult process. Programs underperforming would be revamped or discontinued based on stakeholder input and agency expertise/judgement. This approach would provide an

assessment on the return for taxpayer dollars, but it can also take a long time for programs to demonstrate progress.

- Other.
  - Yes, it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every few years based on their ability to make measurable progress on the state water plan goals.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last questions about the evaluation of state investments/programs?
    - Five years would be a better window to re-evaluate in give the time it takes to make an impact.
    - We should always be evaluating the success/failures of programs - 2-years is a reasonable interval.

### Revenue Source Discussion

- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state's water plan, which of these existing revenue sources would you support increasing?
  - Existing Fees.
- If you chose "other" above, please describe what other sources should be considered.
  - You use it you should pay for it!
- What do you like or dislike about these revenue sources and why?
  - General fund transfer - just means my property/income taxes will increase - regardless of how much water I consume. Consumers of water need to pay their 'fair share' - understanding fully determining what is 'fair' will always be a very difficult to quantify.
- Existing Revenue Support – Why would you support increasing?
  - Sure - but only if it is direct user fees.
- For any that you didn't select, why do you not support an increase in those sources?
- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state's water plan, which of these possible new revenue sources would you support?
  - Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee.
  - Agriculture Irrigation Water Use Fee.
- If you chose "other" above, please describe your proposed revenue source.

- Pay per gallon.
- New Revenue Sources – Why would you support those you chose?
  - Agricultural Irrigation is the largest State-wide use of water and does not directly contribute at this time (monetarily) to a solution.
  - The aquifer depletion is largely a result of Ag irrigation - I understand that Ag is currently under tremendous pricing pressure - increased input costs/lower grain price=lower profits. With that in mind, this is a difficult time to introduce the topic of increased Ag fees. On the flip side, if we ignore it today - when there is an up cycle in Ag we will already be going down a path and the legislature will 'forget' to capture revenue in good years. Perhaps there is some way to index an Ag fee to the 'Ag CPI'.
- For those that you didn't select, why do you not support an increase?

### Other Feedback

- Any other RAC feedback for the Strategic Implementation Team or Kansas Water Authority?
  - Perhaps there is some way to index an Ag fee to the 'Ag CPI'.
- Did you attend a water local consult meeting?
  - No.
  - No.
- Please select all local consult meeting you attended in person in September.

Individual Regional Advisory Committee Member  
Strategic Implementation Planning and FY 2026 Budget Input  
Region: Upper Arkansas

Shared Criteria Discussion

- In addition to the 6 criteria listed on the first page, what additional 2 do you think should be considered when evaluating water investments?
  - Other.
  - Environmental Impact, Geographic Balance
- If you chose “Other”, what is/are your suggestion (s)?
  - Large scale interconnected water transfer.
- From the list of 8 criteria (the original 6 plus the 2 you chose), what would be your top 4 from the list? What order would you rank those 4? Why did you choose that ranking of 4?
  - 1) Water Transfer.
  - 2) Economic Impact.
  - 3) Stakeholder Input.
  - 4) Leverage Federal Funds.
- Finally, from those 4, what 1 criterion do you wish is always considered when prioritization of state dollar investments is done? Why?
  - Honor Private Property Rights.
  - Keeping a balance across the state is important.
- Do you have any other comments about the shared criteria?
  - Focus investment on WATER TRANSFER! Interconnect our rivers, lakes, reservoirs, and aquifers! This single investment will provide resilience to underserved communities, secure economic prosperity, motivate to restoration of our Land and Water resources, benefit habitat & wildlife & recreation, provide safe drinking water, solidify Kansas as the bread basket of the world, and give HOPE to all Kansans by providing solutions to our most dire threats facing our AQUIFERS, RESERVOIRS, and WATER QUALITY!

Budget Discussion: \$140 million Investment Scenario

- What is your reaction to this proposed investment scenario? (To achieve the outcomes listed in the proposed scenario, requires an investment of about \$140 million annually. Does that seem reasonable for what would be achieved with those dollars?)
  - Not reasonable! Need \$100 billion investment!
- What would you change? If that amount doesn't sound reasonable, what strategies or outcomes would you change?
  - Invest in Large scale water transfer! Outcome: restores our LAND and WATER resources!
- Are the proposed levels of funding per area appropriate? If no, what would you proposed otherwise?
  - No! The majority of investment needs to focus on areas of highest water usage = the AQUIFER. \$100 billion!
- What activities, programs, or areas are your highest priority including those not listed on the handout?
  - WATER TRANSFER! Seek and secure alternative sources of supply!

### Reasonability Discussion: Is it reasonable for the state to. . . .

- Should an outcome be that all Kansas communities will have 50 years or more water supply for their communities/economic base in 10 years?
  - Other.
  - Yes, an outcome of this program should be that all Kansans/communities have at least two generations of water supply.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the question about communities having at least two generations of water supply?
  - No! 1000 years.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate if it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region, increasing the resiliency of its water supply? The core of these questions is around cost-effectiveness for state investment and water security for our small towns and communities. There are many communities across the state that are too small to fund and maintain their own public drinking water and wastewater supply systems. Further, long-term water supply planning is the first step to understanding the risks to a community's water supply and

building a plan to ensure enough water for both residents and the local economy for generations to come. However, many small towns don't have the staff/capacity to do the analysis.

- Yes, it's reasonable for the state to require a community seeking state grants or loans to undergo some long-term water supply planning AND evaluate whether it's possible to connect its water system to another water system in the region.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about communities or regions seeking state loans?
  - Every community needs a Resource Use Plan.
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state only to provide cost share programs for irrigation efficiency in areas which have adopted conservation measure through a Local Enhanced Management Area (LEMA), Water Conservation Area (WCA), or Intensive Groundwater Use Control Area (IGUCA)? This question is asked because there is research indicating that without a requirement for reduced water use (through LEMA, WCA, etc.), conservation incentives can actually increase water use because more efficient water use without a conservation requirement can simply incentivize increased production. Prioritizing cost-share investments in areas that are taking local action on groundwater depleting helps ensure that state dollars are directing stabilizing aquifer declines. However, some people think efficiency should be encouraged and anyone who wants to participate should be allowed.
  - No, it is not reasonable.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last question about cost-share programs?
  - No! All conservative needs to prioritization! CREP and ALL prior voluntary conservation!
- Do you think it is reasonable for the state to require all programs be evaluated every 2 years based on their ability to a make measurable progress on the state water plan goals? The results would be shared with stakeholders during future local consult process. Programs underperforming would be revamped or discontinued based on stakeholder input and agency expertise/judgement. This approach would provide an assessment on the return for taxpayer dollars, but it can also take a long time for programs to demonstrate progress.
  - Other.
- Why did you answer the way you did to the last questions about the evaluation of state investments/programs?



- 5-7 years.

## Revenue Source Discussion

- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these existing revenue sources would you support increasing?
  - Other.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe what other sources should be considered.
  - Federal Funds/Loans/Grants! Sales taxes and Lottery and Gaming revenues!
- What do you like or dislike about these revenue sources and why?
  - Kansas water is owned by all Kansans! All Kansans need to contribute to the Protection and Restoration of our Land & Water resources!
- Existing Revenue Support – Why would you support increasing?
  - Yes!
- For any that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase in those sources?
  - Leverage all sources.
- If the state was going to secure additional dollars to fund the state’s water plan, which of these possible new revenue sources would you support?
  - Other.
- If you chose “other” above, please describe your proposed revenue source.
  - Federal Funds/Loans/Grants! Sales taxes and Lottery and Gaming revenues.
- New Revenue Sources – Why would you support those you chose?
  - That’s what other states are using!
- For those that you didn’t select, why do you not support an increase?

## Other Feedback

- Any other RAC feedback for the Strategic Implementation Team or Kansas Water Authority?

Secure Alternative Sources of Supply.

• Did you attend a water local consult meeting?

- Yes.
- Yes.

• Please select all local consult meeting you attended in person in September.

- Dodge City.
- Dodge City.