Approved Man Sand 3/5/85

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE	COMMITTEE ON		
The meeting was called to order by			REPRESENTATIVE IVAN SAND at Chairperson
1:30 ×xxx/p.m. on	FEBRUARY	26	, 1985 in room 521-S of the Capitol.
All members were present except:		Rep.	George Dean, excused Don Rezac, excused Rick Bowden, excused LeRoy F. Fry, excused
XHASAKK MASIK KASHKAKAX		Rep.	L. V. Roper, excused Mary Jane Johnson, excused Pat Weaver, excused Samuel Sifers, excused

Committee staff present:

Mike Heim, Legislative Research Dept. Mary Hack, Revisor of Statutes Office Gloria Leonhard, Secy. to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Rep. Michael Peterson -- HB 2383

Dr. Carlos Cooper, Wyandotte County Commission -- HB 2383 Commissioner Patrick Scherzer, Wyandotte County Commission -- HB 2383 Mr. Chris McKenzie, League of Kansas Municipalities -- HB 2383

Chairman Ivan Sand called for committee discussion on the following bill:

HB 2117, concerning municipalities; relating to annexation.

A balloon bill showing proposed amendments was furnished by Staff. (See Attachment I.)

Rep. Elizabeth Baker explained the proposed bill amendments.

Rep. Ginger Barr, a sponsor of the bill, endorsed the proposed amendments as "a compromise".

The possibility of lowering the proposed 75% requirement to 51% was discussed. It was pointed out that 75% of the property owners would not necessarily be the owners of 75% of the property.

Rep. Elizabeth Baker made a conceptual motion to require not less than 51% of the property and not less than 51% of the owners of the property on a petition requesting denial of annexation.

Rep. Dorothy Nichols seconded the motion. The motion carried with Rep. Carl Holmes being recorded as voting "no."

Rep. Elizabeth Baker made a motion that notice of hearing shall be sent by certified mail to the city proposing annexation, the township, and to the property owners at least five days prior to the publication of the notice of hearing. Rep. Clyde Graeber seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Rep. Elizabeth Baker made a motion that HB 2117 be amended as proposed.

Rep. Clyde Graeber seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Rep. Elizabeth Baker made a motion that HB 2117 be passed as amended. Rep. Clyde Graeber seconded the motion. The motion carried with Rep. Dorothy Nichols, Rep. Phil Kline, and Rep. Clinton Acheson being recorded as voting "no."

The discussion on HB 2117 was closed.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE	HOUSE (COMMITTEE ON	LOCAL GOVEF	RNMENT
room 521-S Statehous	se at 1:30	××× /n.m. on	FEBRUARY 26	5 ₁₉ 85

HB 2376, concerning municipalities; relating to the issuance of revenue bonds.

Mr. Mike Heim, Staff, gave an overview of the bill.

It was suggested that the word, "commercial," be removed from the bill.

Chairman Sand informed the Committee that the sponsor of the bill, Rep. David Heinemann, could not be present but that he has indicated that certain problems exist in connection with the bill.

The hearing on HB 2376 was closed.

HB 2383, relating to revenue bonds for economic development; concerning issuance of such bonds by counties.

Rep. Michael Peterson, sponsor of the bill, appeared to give background and intent of the bill. Mr. Peterson urged the Committee to support the bill and asked that as a last resort it be limited to Wyandotte County.

It was suggested that the word "commercial" be removed from Line 28 of the bill.

Dr. Carlos Cooper, representing the Board of County Commissioners of Wyandotte County, introduced Commissioner Patrick Scherzer who asked that counties and cities that are working together to attract new industry not be stopped in the middle of a transaction to get funds; that the Committee support the bill. Dr. Carlos Cooper noted that HB 2383 is totally positive; that it may be a key in property development.

Rep. Sand asked if localizing the bill to Wyandotte County would make the entire economic development bond law subject to home rule by cities. Mr Mike Heim, Staff, suggested requesting an opinion from the Attorney General regarding the question.

Mr. Chris McKenzie, representing the League of Kansas Municipalities, pointed out that cities have limitations and the same limitations are being requested for counties.

It was the general concensus that an Attorney General's opinion should be requested on HB 2383 and that a later request be formed.

The hearing on HB 2383 was closed.

Chairman Sand called for action on $\underline{SB\ 12}$, concerning the limitation of bonded indebtedness. Rep. Robert D. Miller made a motion that $SB\ 12$ be passed and placed on the Consent Calendar. Rep. Elizabeth Baker seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The minutes of the meeting of February 21, 1985, were approved as presented. The meeting was adjourned.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

DATE 2-26-85

NAME	ADDRESS	REPRESENTING
Phil Anderwon		BUDGET DIV-
SANNIS SHOCKLE	y 1112 N-49 France	KCK 7 CITYOF KCK
Ton Groneman	6900 Parallel	K. C. (C.
Jany Devlon	5417 Setton	XCX WY.Co.
Fred Allen	Topeka	A.A.C
Parks In Vieles	7 C. PAN	Wy ot Compossion
Path I febru	400, 90 20h. k.c.k	M. Co. Com-
Day Mih Peter	Cantel	Wy le Bonn
Don Dracia, Se	Kaiman, Board of	nission
Rc Deney 00	WICHITA	SERWICK CO.
almeda Edwards	Ottawa	Fr Co Farm Burenes
Stry Ray	6 lattre	Jo Co Commune
fylin S. Quens	Lawrence	City of Lowrence
Heinnes Zucharis	Couverne	Eitz of Lewrence
Hawld Shoaf	Toppe	KEC
Beu BRADLEY	LAURENCE	KS Assoc, Counties
Dane Toplikar	Calialuil	Jaurence Journal- World
Ed Remert	Topeka	SelfU
Luz Ban	his - Queles	
Hand Brown	Reg. WIRL DIST.	
Chris mc Kungie	Topelsa	League of Ks. Municipalities
WARREN PORTER	EMPORIA	League of Ks. Maniepalities City of Emporior

HOUSE BILL No. 2117

By Representatives Barr, Brown, Laird, Littlejohn, D. Miller and Smith

1-30

0018 AN ACT concerning municipalities; relating to annexation; 0019 amending K.S.A. 12-520 and repealing the existing section.

0020 Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

Section 1. K.S.A. 12-520 is hereby amended to read as fol-0022 lows: 12-520. (a) Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, the 0023 governing body of any city may by ordinance may annex land to 0024 such city if any one or more of the following conditions exist: 0025 (a) (1) The land is platted, and some part of such the land 0026 adjoins the city.

0027 (b) (2) The land is owned by or held in trust for the city or 0028 any agency thereof.

(e) (3) The land adjoins the city and is owned by or held in trust for any governmental unit other than another city, except that no city may annex land owned by a county which has primary use as a county-owned and operated airport, or other aviation related activity, without the express permission of the board of county commissioners of such the county.

0035 (d) (4) The land lies within or mainly within the city and has 0036 a common perimeter with the city boundary line of more than 0037 fifty percent (50%) 50%.

(e) (5) The land if annexed will make the city boundary line possible straight or harmonious and some part thereof adjoins the city, except no land in excess of twenty (20) 20 acres shall be annexed the for this purpose.

(f) (6) The tract is so situated that two thirds (2/3) 2/3 of any 0043 boundary line adjoins the city, except no tract in excess of twenty 0044 (20) 20 acres shall be annexed under this condition.

(g) (7) The land adjoins the city and a written petition for or

(ATTACHMENT 3/26/85

Î

0046 consent to annexation is filed with the city by the owner.

No unplatted tract of land of fifty-five (55) 55 acres or more 0048 which is used only for agricultural purposes shall be annexed by 0049 any city under the authority of this section without the written 0050 consent of the owner thereof. In order to prevent piece-meal 0051 annexation, no city shall annex any portion of such agricultural 0052 land without the written consent of the owner thereof.

Whenever any city shall annex annexes any land under the 0054 authority of subsection (b) of this section paragraph (2) of this 0055 subsection which does not adjoin the city, tracts of land adjoining 0056 the land so annexed shall not be deemed to be adjoining the city 0057 for the purpose of annexation under the authority of this section 0058 until such the adjoining land or the land so annexed adjoins the 0059 remainder of the city by reason of the annexation of the inter-0060 vening territory.

No city shall be authorized to annex the right-of-way of any 0062 highway under the authority of this section unless at the time of 6063 such the annexation the abutting property upon one or both sides 0064 thereof is already within the city or is annexed to the city in the 0065 same proceeding.

The governing body of any city may by one ordinance may 0066 0067 annex one or more separate tracts or lands each of which con-0068 forms to any one or more of the foregoing conditions. The 0069 invalidity of the annexation of any tract or land in one ordinance 0070 shall not affect the validity of the remaining tracts or lands which 0071 are annexed by such the ordinance and which conform to any 0072 one or more of the foregoing conditions.

Any owner of land annexed by a city under the authority of this 6074 section may subsection, within thirty (30) 30 days next following 0075 the publication of the ordinance annexing such the land, may 0076 maintain an action in the district court of the county in which 6077 such the land is located challenging the authority of the city to 0078 annex such lands the land and the regularity of the proceedings 0079 had in connection therewith.

(b) If, within 60 days after the last publication of an annex-0081 ation ordinance, a petition signed by at least 5% of the qualified 0082 voters residing within the area proposed to be annexed is filed

-"the owners of not less than 75% of the property within the area proposed to be annexed/is filed with the county clerk that the petition contains the names of not shall certify less than 75% of the property owners in the area to be annexed. The petition shall: (1) Be addressed to the board of county commissioners in which the land sought to be annexed is located; contain the names of property owners within the area sought to be annexed, including a general description of the boundaries their property; (3) request that the board of county commissioners deny the petition for annexation.

Upon certification of the petition by the county clerk, the board of county commissioners shall fix a date and give notice of a public hearing to be held thereon. The date fixed for such public hearing shall be not less than 30 days following the date of the certification of the petition requesting denial of the annexation. Notice of the time and place of the hearing, together with a legal description of the land sought to be annexed and the names of the owners thereof, shall be published in the official county newspaper or any other newspaper of general circulation in the county, not less than one week and not more than two weeks preceding the date for such hearing. hearing shall be held at the county courthouse in the county where the petition is filed.

Notice of receipt of the petition requesting denial of annexation shall be sent by certified mail to the city proposing annexation upon certification of such petition. Notice of the date of the hearing shall be mailed to the city at least five days prior to publication of the notice of the hearing. of such hearing also shall be mailed to the township in whose boundaries the territory proposed to be annexed lies and to the

property owners in the area proposed to be annexed.

The hearing shall be conducted in a judicious manner, presided over by the chairman of the board of The hearing may be adjourned from time to time. commissioners. Time shall be set aside for the proponents of the proposed annexation to be heard and to present documentary evidence and briefs supporting the contention that the annexation should be allowed. Following the time set aside for proponents, time shall be set aside for the opponents of the proposed legislation to be heard and to present documentary evidence and briefs supporting the contention that the annexation should be denied. All those wishing to be heard and to present documentary evidence or briefs shall be allowed to do so.

As a guide in determining the advisability of the proposed annexation, the board of county commissioners shall consider the following factors among others:

(continued on page 3)

with the county election officer, the land shall not be annexed until the proposal has been submitted for approval at an election by the qualified voters residing within the area proposed to to be annexed. Except as provided herein, the election shall be held at the next school district or county primary or general election. Notice of the election shall be given in the manner provided by the general election law. If there is no school district or county primary or general election within 60 days after the petition is not filed, then the question shall be submitted by a mail ballot election in the manner provided by K.S.A. 25-431 et seq., and amendments thereto. A 51% majority vote against the proposal could shall be required to defeat the proposal.

Any suit, action or other proceeding, judicial or administra-0096 tive, relating to the power and authority of cities to annex 0097 unincorporated territory which is pending prior to the effective 0098 date of this act shall be subject to the provisions of this act. 0099 Notwithstanding any provision of this subsection, a city shall 0100 be authorized to annex land which adjoins the city and for 0101 which a written petition for or consent to annexation is filed 0102 with such city by the owner.

0103 Sec. 2. K.S.A. 12-520 is hereby repealed.

O101 Sec. 3. This act shall take effect and be in force from and O105 after its publication in the statute book.

(1) Population and population density of the area proposed to be annexed;

(2) area of platted land relative to unplatted and assessed value of platted land relative to assessed value of unplatted areas:

(3) likelihood of significant growth in the area and in

adjacent areas during the next five years;

(4) the present cost and adequacy of governmental services

and controls in the area;

(continued from page 2)

(5) the proposed cost, extent and necessity of governmental services to be provided by the city proposing annexation and the estimated length of time to extend 100% of such services;

(6) present level of direct reliance of the area upon

services provided by the city proposing annexation;

(7) past growth of the area in terms of population and the

extent of business, commercial and industrial development;

(8) effect of the proposed annexation on adjacent areas, including other cities, improvement districts or industrial districts: and

(9) topography, natural boundaries, drainage basins, transportation links, or any other physical characteristics which may be an indication of the existence or absence of common

interest of the city and the area proposed to be annexed.

within seven days after the hearing has been adjourned sine die. If a majority of the board of county commissioners conclude that the annexation should be allowed, they shall grant the annexation by resolution and the city may proceed to annex the land by ordinance. Orders of the board of county commissioners denying petitions for annexation shall require a majority vote of the members of the board. When an order denying a petition for annexation is issued, it shall be by resolution, which shall be sent by certified mail to the city proposing the annexation. Such city may not submit a subsequent petition for annexation of any portion of the land sought to be annexed for a period of five years following the date of receipt of the resolution denying the petition for annexation."