Approved _	April	25,	1986	
PP		D	ata :	

MINUTES OF THE HOU	SE COMMITTEE ON _	LEGISLATIVE,	JUDICIAL		
The meeting was called to	order byRepresentation	tive Keith Roe		APPORT	IONMENT
The meeting was caned to	order byRepresentati	Chairperson Chairperson	1		at
_2:00xxx/p.m. on _	March 3	, 1980	5 in room _52	6-S of the C	Capitol.

All members were present except:

Rep. Aylward - E

Rep. King

Rep. Roper

Rep. Bunten

Rep. Grotewiel

Committee staff present:

Russ Mills, Legislative Research Bob Coldsnow, Legislative Counsel Sue Pettet, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Rep. Spaniol
George Collins
Randy Martin, Olathe Chamber of Commerce
Bill Ramsey, City of Olathe
Mary Koenig, League of Women Voters - Johnson County

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Roe.

Representative Vincent Snowbarger was first on agenda to give his testimony on HCR 5039 AND HB 2952. (see attachment)

HCR 5039 has three basic provisions. First, it requires redistricting in 1987. This plan would be in effect for the 1988 elections. Second, it provides that redistricting may be done at any time when two-thirds of the legislature agrees to its necessity. This is meant to uncomplicate the current procedure which requires constitutional amendment. Finally, because of the difficulty in agreement, it requires redistricting at least once every ten years.

HB 2952 provides for reinstitution of a state census. It is similar to a bill that has been introduced in the Senate. The bill would require a census in July, 1986, January, 1987, and each January thereafter.

In the 1983 case of <u>Bacon</u> vs. <u>Carlin</u>, the court indicated there were two clear principles upon which our legislative decisions on redistricting in Kansas must be based. First, we are required to redistrict in 1989. Second, the court said, "...if the Kansas legislature attempts to implement its constitutional provision requiring reapportionment by reliance upon 1980 federal census figures or those figures updates by estimates, constitutional problems will arise."

There were several questions asked by Representatives Reardon, Adam, Miller, Braden, and Knopp.

George Collins, private citizen of Olathe, Ks., and Randy Martin, of Olathe Chamber of Commerce each gave their testimony on state and federal census. Bill Ramsey of the City of Olathe, and Mary Koenig of League of Women Voters of Johnson County testified also.

No motion was made for further action on  $\underline{HB\ 2952}$  or  $\underline{HCR\ 5039}$ . Meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

JOHNSON COUNTY 1955 SHERIDAN BRIDGE QLATHE, KANSAS 66061 19131764 0457

ROOM 250-W. CAPITOL BLDG TOPEKA KANSAS 66612 19131 286 7640



TOPEKA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES March 3, 1986

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

MEMBER JUDICIARY LAHOR AND INDUSTRY LEGISLATIVE JUDICIAL AND

CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT TRANSPORTATION

Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to present legislation on redistricting and census to you this afternoon. realize that these are sensitive issues. However, I am trying to approach this based on the "one man, one vote" principle. The argument I am making for these proposals is basically one of fairness.

In the 1983 court decision in the case of Bacon v. Carlin, the court indicated there were two clear principles upon which our legislative decisions in regard to redistricting in Kansas must be based. First, we are required to redistrict in 1989. Second, the court said, "... if the Kansas legislature attempts implement its constitutional provision requiring reapportionment by reliance upon 1980 federal census figures or those updated by estimates, constitutional problems arise." There are also federal court decisions that indicate that reapportionment schemes that exceed every ten years are suspect.

These factors leave us with few alternatives. We must redistrict in 1989. To do so we will have to introduce a state census

attach ment

REAPPORTION

& CONG.

HCR 5039 has three basic provisions. First, it requires redistricting in 1987. This plan would be in effect for the 1988 elections. Second, it provides that redistricting may be done at any time when two-thirds of the legislature agrees to its necessity. This is meant to uncomplicate the current procedure which requires constitutional amendment. I am not so naive as to believe that this will result in frequent changes, however. We all know how difficult it is to get two-thirds of us to agree on anything. Finally, because of this difficulty in agreement, it requires redistricting at least once every 10 years.

HB 2952 provides for reinstitution of a state census. It is similar to a bill that has been introduced in the Senate. The bill would require a census in July, 1986, January, 1987, and each January thereafter. For my purposes, the first census is all that is required. It is my understanding that this census scheme tracks the old "ag census".

Having explained the situation and the proposed approach, I would like to indicate why we are suggesting that the process be started earlier.

First, overpopulated districts are not being given their fair representation in our "representative" system. (Our local newspaper refers to this situation as being underrepresented. My ego prefers to describe this status as being overpopulated.) I think some examples may give you a better idea of the critical nature the problem. There is a reason why Representative Spaniol and I have sponsored this legislation together. Whereas there are no census figures available for the whole state, we have

reason to believe that we represent the two largest districts in the state.

The Election Commissioner of Johnson County has provided me with population statistics for the Representative and Senate districts for Johnson. The population figures are from the County Appraiser's office, and have been matched to precinct lines to give an accurate picture of the district's population. (See attachment 1.) Note that there are 5 Representative and 2 Senate seats where the population exceeds the ideal by at least 16%. Note my district exceeds the ideal by 47%. Note also that there will be shifts within the county. This is not necessarily a shift from rural to urban.

Because population figures are not available state-wide, we have to look for other indications of imbalances. Although imperfect for determining exact population, voter registration statistics are to some degree a reflection of population. (See attachment 2.) Note Representative Spaniol's district has a voter registration that is more than 70% above the average. The average for Representative districts is 9,503. There are 31 districts which exceed this average by 10% or more. The average for Senate districts is 29,696. There are 8 districts that exceed this average.

The fairness and necessity of earlier redistricting to overpopulated districts is evident. There are also advantages to the less populated districts. Whenever we redistrict, there will be shifts in district lines and representation. That is difficult for each of us to deal with. However, it is

inevitable. The sooner the redistricting is done, the less dramatic the changes will be. In Olathe, city officials tell me that approximately 3 people per day are moving into the city. There is no indication that is going to change. I also suspect that the same is true in all of the districts that currently have high populations.

The second positive feature to the program we are proposing is the reinstitution of the "ag cansus" which I have been led to believe is more advantageous to less populated areas. In fact, there may be disadvantages to my district to using this census approach. However, the greater injustice to my district is any delay in redistricting. My census proposal was made as a compromise in the whole process to hopefully speed the process.

Finally, there has been some talk of postponing the census until after the 1990 census to take advantage of the Block Boundary Suggestion Program that we heard about in our last committee session. Those figures would not be available until at least 1991. As I mentioned earlier, reapportionment plans which go beyond 10 years in redistricting are suspect. Therefore, if we are to use these figures in the early '90's when they are "fresh", we should redistrict as soon as possible to maximize the time between reapportionment plans.

I appreciate the committee's attention, and I will be happy to try to answer any questions.

## (VITACULIENT T)

## JOHNSON COUNTY POPULATION BY LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT

DISTRICT	REPRESENTATIVE	POPULATION	<u>%*</u>
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 43	Louis Kline Douville Fox Mayfield Blumenthal Hoy Sifers Snowbarger Brown Patrick Vancrum Cloud D. Miller	21,137 18,277 16,582 16,414 20,672 19,752 18,130 17,428 28,724 27,200 22,719 25,919 24,537 **11,289	108 94 85 84 106 101 93 89 147 139 116 133 126
7 8 9 10 11	SENATORS  Langworthy Walker Burke Bogina Allen	55,558 56,399 88,415 70,727 **17,681	91 92 145 116

## JOHNSON COUNTY TOTALS

288,780

District population in relation to an ideal district calculated by total Kansas population divided by number of seats.

House - (2,429,245 / 125 = 19,434)
Senate - (2,429,245 / 40 = 60,731)

<sup>\*\*</sup> These are multi-county districts. Figures are for Johnson County only.

tri ist v			
CONTRACT	nergiates en en e	Republican	Democrat
1	₹8,709	12,997	en en en la calanta de la c
•	27,886	10,451	7,254
j	22,279	7,354	7,042
4	22,153	2,968	6,891
• ;	31, 381	6,065	13,719
O	26,413	5,463	16,971
+ /	38,482	19,158	12,540
+8	34,587	15,550	7,348
<b>4</b> 3	48,972	22,870	6,497
+10	39,051	14,663	6,962
1.1	32,162	14,367	7,838
1 2	<b>∠8,748</b>	11,874	8,920
13	29,968	7,766	9,626
14	28,146	9,657	10,351
15.	27,477	13,905	8,839
16	29,373	10,844	6,426
17	26,643	11,868	8,629
1.8	24,868	10,353	6,681
19	20,878	6,580	8,116
20	29,094	13,666	7,990
21	29,476	13,446	7,629
22	21,477	9,075	7,954
23	28,269	15,439	5,665
+ 24	32,974	14,022	5,392
∡*t,	29,473	13,191	8,935
26	31,451	9,986	6,503
+ 27	39,282	14,650	10,498
. 8	28,070	7,207	11,633
_**4	25,247	5,032	10,681
+ 10	38,125	16,084	12,575
-4- 11	33,347	12,536	10,463
2 &	28,260	10,905	11,062
10	29,748	12,547	10,164
54	, 23,971	9,076	7,706
. ( )	27,833	12,577	7,286
⊬b	t8E,0t	16,136	7,783
. 7	32,196	10,244	6,658
18 ·	.7,570	10,871	10,470
39	22,911	9,269	8,123
41,	29,923	13,476	5,736
		43,470	7,349
To take	1,187,856	464,188	348,905
Ave	24,696		,,,,,,,,

16 18 m			
est i i e t	hogistered	Republican	Democrat
1	8,764	2,246	2,912
až.	8,914	3,138	2,917
3	8,600	2,256	2,541
-4	10,436	2,787	3,994
ي	9,130	3,315	2,118
ρ	8,282	2,329	2,226
7	8,066	2,943	3,640
8	8,002	4,333	1,668
9	8,435	4,295	1,844
10	8,188	3,968	2,355
11	9,090	3,635	
12	10,012	4,345	3,401
13	9,586	4,144	3,099
14	10,229	5,232	2,859
15	8,674	2,775	3,327
16	8,121	3,585	3,048
17	7,415	3,102	1,933
+ 18	11,913	4,362	2,060
+ 19	11,114	5,199	2,820
<u>-</u> 20	11,593		1,927
<del></del> 21	11,094	6,042	1,793
- <del>/</del> 22	11,376	5,515	2,143
<b>4</b> 23	11,472	4,743	2,271
T 24	12,247	4,176	2,427
-r- 25		5,403	2,621
<del>-/-</del> 26	12,179	6,430	2,232
+ 27	14,449	5,867	2,399
+ 28	13,507	5,581	2,286
<del>/-</del> 29	14,814	8,221	2,004
<del>/-</del> 30	14,833	6,844	1,999
31	13,738	5,777	2,083
	7,373	1,318	3,715
32	5,787	1,266	2,667
33	7,292	862	4,829
34	7,588	751	5,287
<b>3</b> 5	8,560	876	5,403
36	9,198	1,566	5,020
37	9,049	2,014	4,752
38	10,182	2,393	5,102
39	8,227	1,505	3,954
40	9 <b>,7</b> 03	2,944	3,367
41	5,779	1,732	2,021
42	6,246	1,961	2,277
43	9,445	3,691	2,245
44	10,273	4,145	2,315
45	8,194	3,371	1,985
46	8,099	2,441	2,342
47	9,967	3,583	2,256
4.8	8,038	2,832	3,150
49	8,968	4,595	1,594
(31)	9,898	4,005	2,744
· 1	10,278	4,662	2,651
		.,002	7,001

no. de			
PARTI, I	Reglatered	Kepublican	Democrat
2	4,436	4,583	and the same of th
5 j	5,545	1,717	2,550
<b>5</b> ,4\$	8,318	4,011	2,170
<b>5</b> (v	8,232	3,772	2,092
56 ( )	7,925	3,622	2,503
57	5,422	1,326	2,427
58	5,244	1,478	2,479
59	8,749	3,238	2,260
60	9,516	5,003	2,811
61	9,828	4,993	2,410
62	9,896	4,044	1,837
63	9,742	5,449	3,234
64	8,345	4,778	1,807
65	5,474	2,136	1,645
66	8,378	4,003	2,043
67	7,075	2,836	1,715
68	9,002	5,135	1,656
69	8,982		1,737
70	9,542	3,352	2,505
71	10,086	4,775	1,908
7∠	10,028	4,403	2,535
73	9,076	4,289	2,671
74	10,912	4,245	1,924
75	9,092	4,512	2,744
76	10,069	3,303	3,184
71	9,469	5,158	2,570
78	9,990	2,745	2,734
79	8,869	4,382	3,078
80	8,983	3,133	3,586
+ 61	10,476	3,405	3,437
+62	10,611	2,984	3,624
<del>1</del> 83	12,544	3,624	3,145
84	8,975	5,093	4,027
+ 35	14,349	2,456	4,012
<b>ა</b> მხ	10,682	5,968	3,591
+8/	12,830	4,926	2,910
<b>ಶ</b> ಚ	10,051	4,882	3,803
89	8,010	3,575	3,535
+ 40	10,658	879	4,982
+ #1	12,104	3,652	3,572
+ 32	10,644	4,665	3,888
+ 73	10,705	4,530	3,785
+ 44	16,555	3,435	3,900
95		6,521	3,993
<b>†</b> 16	8,890 10,989	2,159	3,634
57		2,828	3,965
10	9,824	2,649	3,771
1 1	8,245	2,117	3,338
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	9,168	3,852	1,692
	9,239	3,940	2,105
	1, 195	1,170	2,134
- ·	$a_{i,j}$	1,549	

1. 1. 38			
olio" ( . c t	neglatered	Republican	Democrat
1	7,656	•	
1.504	9,759	1,132	2,142
$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{i})$	10,273	4,201	2,649
100	9,534	4,544	3,189
102	9,553	4,761	2,650
108	10,191	4,045	2,211
+ 109	10,650	4,487	2,733
+ 110	10,488	5,673	2,257
+111	10,585	4,082	3,507
112	8,972	2,790	4,004
113	7,312	3,984	2,547
+114	10,611	2,909	2,166
115	8,966	4,154	2,982
116	9,017	3,568	2,618
117	7,651	3,245	2,826
118	10,079	3,035	1,828
114	10,026	4,298	2,451
+ 120	10,506	5,491	1,928
121	9,771	4,497	2,628
122	8,570	4,574	2,787
123	7,582	3,853	1,780
124	8,789	2,721	1,705
125	8,078	3,716	2,391
(2.0 m)		3,351	2,274
TOTAL 1,	187,856	464,492	240 0==
Ave.	9,503	1,134	348,955