(Date)

MINUTES OF THE SENATE REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 12:00 P.M. on February 22, 2012, in Room 159-S of the Capitol.

All members were present, except Senator Vratil, who was excused

Committee staff present:

Corey Carnahan, Kansas Legislative Research Department Craig Callahan, Kansas Legislative Research Department Jason Long, Office of Revisor of Statutes Theresa Kiernan, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the Committee:

David Kensinger, Governor's Office, Chief of Staff

Others Attending:

See Attached List

The Chairperson opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

David Kensinger offered Census data in Leavenworth County and stated that the population of the County is greater than the ideal population of a Senatorial Distrct. Mr. Kensinger suggested that the Committee consider creating a Senate District comprised of the entirety of Leavenworth County rather than splitting the County between districts as it currently is split. He suggested that the residents of Leavenworth County are effectively disenfranchised.

Senator Hensley noted that the residents of Leavenworth County have been well-represented in the Senate by former Senators Reilly, Tillotson and Biggs and currently are well-represented by Senators Holland and Kultala.

The Chairperson closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

The Chairperson asked if members of the Committee had maps they desired to present.

Senator McGinn offered a map designated as Amelia Earhart and information relating to that map (<u>Attachment 1</u>). She stated the map was based on Senator Ostmeyer's proposal with changes to address Senate District 31 as her main concern. The District would include all of Harvey county and portions of Sedgwick County including Bently and Mount Hope among other smaller cities outside Wichita.

Senator Teichman suggested there could be an easy fix to avoid spliting Pawnee County.

Senator Steineger offered a map designated as Mona Lisa and information relating to that map (<u>Attachment 2</u>). He stated he had considered Senator Ostmeyer's proposal. Under his proposal, Pawnee

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

Page 1

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Reapportionment Committee at 12:00 P.M. on February 22, 2012, in Room 159-S of the Capitol.

County is not split between Districts, but Barton County is split. He focused on geographical features such as rivers, railroad lines, highways and arterials in urban areas when drawing boundaries. He said he did not consider the residence of members of the House of Representatives or candidates, but encumbent Senators remain in their current Districts. He considered voter-performance data solely in his Senate District.

In response to a question by Senator Haley, Senator Steineger stated that the major differences between Mona Lisa and Senator Ostmeyer's proposal are in the urban areas in Johnson County. He added that a new Senate Distict is not entirely located in Johnson County.

In response to a question by Senator Wagle, the Chairman stated it is unlikely that he would support a map that did not provide a new Senate District in Johnson County. He added that any proposal which does not address the growth in the area of the 3rd Congressional District probably would lose the support of the Johnson County delegation.

Senator Ostmeyer asked the Chairperson to draw a map in which an existing district is collapsed. The Chairperson responded that before such a map is drawn, the Committee should address these issues:

- Should a district be collapsed?
- In what area of the state should the district be collapsed?
- How should the district be collapsed?
- Where should the new district be added in Johnson county?

Senator Ostmeyer moved, Senator Kelsey seconded, that no existing Senate District be collapsed.

The Chairperson stated that he wanted the full committee to be present to vote on the motion. The Chairperson stated that a vote on the motion would be the first item of consideration at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 P.M. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday February 29, 2012.