

Approved Ivan Sand 3/19/85  
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The meeting was called to order by REPRESENTATIVE IVAN SAND at  
Chairperson

2:00 ~~am~~/p.m. on MARCH 6, 1985 in room 521-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Dorothy Nichols, excused

Committee staff present: Mike Heim, Legislative Research Dept.  
Mary Hack, Revisor of Statutes Office  
Gloria Leonhard, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Mr. Bill Curtis, Asst. Exec. Dir., Kansas Assn. of School Boards--HB 2481  
Mr. Jerry Marlatt, Kansas Firefighters--HB 2481  
Mr. Ernest Mosher, League of Kansas Municipalities--HB 2481  
Mr. Dennis Shockley, City of Kansas City, Kansas--HB 2481  
Rep. Kenneth Francisco--HB 2481  
Mr. Glenn Cogswell, North Topeka Drainage District--HB 2483  
Mr. Larry Winn, III, Attorney, Johnson County--HB 2484  
Mr. Dan Busby, Chm., Fire District and C.P.A.--HB 2484

Chairman Ivan Sand called for hearings on the following bills:

HB 2481, concerning municipalities; relating to residency requirements for employees thereof.

Ms. Mary Hack, Staff, presented an overview of the bill. (See Attachment I.)

Mr. Bill Curtis, Asst. Exec. Director, Kansas Association of School Boards, appeared in support of HB 2481.

Mr. Jerry Marlatt, representing Kansas Firefighters, explained that there is a need for the bill; that residency requirements have caused employees to move prior to retirement at a substantial cost.

Mr. Ernest A. Mosher, League of Kansas Municipalities, testified in opposition to HB 2481. (See Attachment II.)

Mr. Dennis Shockley, City of Kansas City, Kansas, testified in opposition to HB 2481. (See Attachment III.) When questioned, Mr. Shockley stated that Kansas City contractors are considered temporary employees and are covered by a special exemption.

Rep. Kenneth Francisco explained that he had requested the legislation because it is needed by the people; that the proposed legislation requires a city to grandfather in employees who have worked for that city prior to the establishment of the residency requirement.

The hearing on HB 2481 was closed.

HB 2483, concerning drainage districts; relating to the petition for enlargement of the boundaries of such districts.

An overview of the bill was provided by Staff. (See Attachment IV.)

Mr. Glenn Cogswell, representing the North Topeka Drainage District, appeared to give background and intent of the bill. Mr. Cogswell explained that the original legislation was passed in 1905; that at the present time, a district in North Topeka pays for but does not receive benefits of a district. Mr. Cogswell urged the Committee to support the bill.

The hearing on HB 2483 was closed.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT,  
room 521-S, Statehouse, at 2:00 ~~xxx~~ a.m./p.m. on MARCH 6, 1985

HB 2484, concerning fire districts; relating to tax levies therefor.

Mr. Mike Heim, Staff, presented an overview of the bill. (See Attachment V.)

Mr. Larry Winn, III, attorney, Johnson County, testified in support of the bill. Mr. Winn explained that the increased mill levy is needed to take care of salaries; that the increase should be sufficient into the 1990's.

Mr. Winn introduced Mr. Dan Busby, Chairman of the fire district and a C.P.A. who indicated his support of HB 2484.

A committee member asked if the levy increase is limited to Johnson County. Mr. Heim, Staff, referred to K.S.A. 19-3613, passed in 1955, which applies to counties of over 90,000 population and noted that Johnson is the only County applicable. Mr. Heim said that Johnson County could be specified in the bill.

The hearing on HB 2484 was closed.

Chairman Sand called for action on the following bills:

HB 2481, concerning municipalities; relating to residency requirements for employees thereof.

Rep. Kenneth Francisco made a conceptual motion to amend HB 2481 to insure that it will not be retroactive and that the bill be passed as amended. Rep. Clinton C. Acheson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Rep. Arthur W. Douville made a motion to reconsider action on HB 2481. Rep. Phil Kline seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Rep. Arthur W. Douville made a motion that HB 2481 be amended to disallow any governing body of a municipality from making residency a condition of employment, unless there is a bonifide need for such a requirement. Rep. Phil Kline seconded the motion.

Committee discussion followed. It was the general consensus that the proposed amendment, although well intended, might jeopardize the passage of the bill. Therefore, Rep. Douville withdrew his motion to amend. Rep. Phil Kline withdrew his second.

Rep. Kenneth Francisco made a motion that HB 2481 be amended, as originally stated, and that the bill be passed as amended. Rep. Clinton C. Acheson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

HB 2483, concerning drainage districts; relating to the petition for enlargement of the boundaries of such districts.

Rep. Robert D. Miller made a motion that HB 2483 be passed. Rep. Phil Kline seconded the motion. The motion carried.

HB 2484, concerning fire districts; relating to tax levies therefor.

Rep. Samuel Sifers made a motion that HB 2484 be passed. Rep. Phil Kline seconded the motion. The motion carried.

HB 2275, concerning zoning; relating to group homes.

Rep. Robert D. Miller, Chairman of Sub-Committee on HB 2275, reported on Sub-Committee meeting on March 4, 1985.

Committee discussion followed. It was suggested that the bill might be clarified by making the act not applicable to any home in effect at this time. A question was raised about areas zoned other than for single family, e.g. Faith Village, which needs two more cottages. It was suggested to take out "3/4" in Line 59.

Rep. Elizabeth Baker made a motion to remove HB 2275 from the table. Rep. LeRoy Fry seconded the motion. The motion carried Page 2 of 3 with 10 voting in favor of the motion.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT,  
room 521-S, Statehouse, at 2:00 ~~am.~~ p.m. on MARCH 6, 1985

Rep. Elizabeth Baker made a motion that HB 2275 be amended as provided for in balloon bill furnished by Staff. Rep. Mary Jane Johnson seconded the motion.

Rep. Kenneth Francisco made a substitute motion that "3/4" be stricken in Line 59 and the language be changed to indicate "majority" and that the other amendments set out in balloon bill be accepted. Rep. George Dean seconded the motion. The motion carried with 11 voting in favor.

Rep. Ivan Sand proposed that the bill be further amended by removing "mentally ill" from Lines 20 and 29 and wherever applicable. Rep. Robert D. Miller made a motion that "mentally ill" be removed from Lines 20 and 29 of HB 2275 and wherever applicable. Rep. Arthur W. Douville seconded the motion. The motion carried with 11 voting in favor.

The Chairman informed the Committee that HB 2275 would be further discussed and acted upon at the March 7, 1985 Committee meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 P. M.



MEMORANDUM

March 5, 1985

TO: House Local Government Chairman  
FROM: Kansas Legislative Research Department  
RE: H.B. 2481

H.B. 2481 requires municipalities which adopt a residency requirement as a condition of employment to exempt current employees from that provision.

(ATTACHMENT I)

3/6/85

MH/pk

Attachment 1



# League of Kansas Municipalities

(ATTACHMENT II)

3/6/85

PUBLISHERS OF KANSAS GOVERNMENT JOURNAL/112 WEST SEVENTH ST., TOPEKA, KANSAS 66603/AREA 913-354-9565

TO: Members of House Local Government Committee  
FROM: Jim Kaup, Staff Attorney  
DATE: March 6, 1985  
RE: HB 2481; Residency Requirements for Municipal Employees

The League opposes HB 2481 as a matter of principle, in that it amounts to the State's encroachment upon the authority of local governments by legislating on a matter of purely local concern. HB 2481 is also directly at odds with the League's convention-adopted "Statement of Municipal Policy" which provides: "The governing bodies of cities should have full authority to establish comprehensive personnel programs, including authority to determine hours of work, compensation, overtime, leave policy, residency requirements, insurance, promotion, firing and all other terms, conditions and qualifications of city employment." Accordingly the League asks this committee to oppose the bill.

While there are some practical problems with the wording of HB 2481 (and those specific issues will be addressed later in this memo) the League's primary concern with the bill is the fact that it is contrary to the above-stated principle of local decision making on matters of local concern. Before dealing in some detail with the subject of residency requirements for municipal employees, it should be noted that if there are in fact problems in communities in this state arising from municipal employee residency ordinances, the proper recourse for those citizens who oppose residency requirements is to act to change the local law. Such has been done, and can be done, through petitioning the local government, participating in local elections, and so on. From our standpoint, such local activity is a much more desirable course of action than running to the state legislature seeking a state-mandated prohibition against any municipality imposing any residency requirement upon any municipal employees.

Residency requirements fall generally into two categories, durational and continuous. A **durational residency requirement** states that before a person may be hired he or she must have been a resident of the area for a certain period of time. Durational residency requirements are frequently struck down by the courts as violating constitutional equal protection rights and the right to travel. These requirements are judged by the "strict scrutiny" equal protection constitutional standard, and such a requirement will be upheld only if there is a compelling governmental interest which justifies the requirement. Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618 (1969). The League is not aware of the existence of any durational residential requirements at the municipal level anywhere in Kansas. **Continuous residency requirements** require that an employee maintain his or her residence in the appropriate area while employed by the governmental entity. The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld a continuous residency requirement as recently as 1976. McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission, 425 U.S. 645. The U.S. Supreme Court found no constitutional right to be employed by a city while the employee is living elsewhere. Cases handed down since the McCarthy decision indicate that a continuous residency requirement is to be judged by the more relaxed "minimum scrutiny" equal protection constitutional standard--that there be a rational relationship between the end sought to be accomplished and the means used to achieve that end--that is, the restriction must have a rational basis and be reasonably related to the goals which it is intends to accomplish. The Kansas Supreme Court, in the 1978 case of Lines v. City of Topeka, 223 Kan. 772, upheld a continuous residency requirement and thereby adopted the "minimum scrutiny" analysis.

Some of the goals or reasons for residency requirements which have been recognized by the courts as a legitimate basis for imposing a continuous residency requirement are as follows:

- (1.) Enhancement of the quality of employee performance by greater personal knowledge of the city's conditions and by a feeling of greater personal stake in the city's progress.
- (2.) Reducing absenteeism and tardiness among municipal employees.
- (3.) Ready availability of trained personnel in emergency situations (this is particularly important in the instances of firefighters, law enforcement officers and emergency medical personnel).
- (4.) General economic benefits flowing from local expenditure of employee salaries.
- (5.) An incentive to halt or reverse the flight from central cities.

The 1978 Kansas Supreme Court case referred to above concerned a Topeka residency requirement that only applied to specified managerial employees (city attorney, city clerk, city treasurer, public works director, fire chief and police chief). The Kansas Supreme Court held that if the "emergency availability" and "salary expenditure" criteria (items 3 and 4 above) were all that the city of Topeka was relying upon as the basis for the residency ordinance, the city's failure to extend the requirement to all municipal employees might deny equal protection to those falling under the requirement, since the goals would cover all employees, not just those affected. However, the court felt that the city "was justified in requiring major officeholders to have a commitment and involvement with the city, its taxpayers and its activities in order to hold such an office." 233 Kan. 779.

While the League believes that the policy issue of local control over matters of local concern is the prevailing, and winning, argument against HB 2481, there are some additional, more practical, problems with the wording of the bill. A few of those problems are set out below:

(1) The bill appears to be drafted for prospective application only. That is, municipalities would not be allowed to subject current employees to the requirement of residency, but could require such of employees hired after adoption of the requirement. To make it perfectly clear that the bill is not meant to affect residency requirements which are already in place, lines 19:20 could be amended by inserting the word "hereafter" as follows: "...municipality which hereafter adopts an ordinance,..."

(2) Does the term "person employed" (line 23) cover all categories of persons in an employment relationship with a municipality? If so this would include not only part-time and full-time employees, but may also apply to contractors and agents for the municipality.

(3) The Legislature should recognize that the passage of HB 2481 could raise questions as to implicit amendments to statutes such as K.S.A. 15-209 which mandate that appointive officers be residents of the city at the time of their appointment and during their tenure of office. The question which arises is who is an employee and who is an officer?

(4) A difficult question is raised by the term "residency" in HB 2481. In the absence of local ordinances which establish what constitutes "residency", the rules of statutory construction found at K.S.A. 77-201 will be applicable. K.S.A. 77-201 (23) states that the term "residence" shall be construed to mean "the place adopted by a person as such person's

place of habitation, and to which, whenever such person is absent, such person has the intent of returning. When a person eats at one place and sleeps at another, the place where such person sleeps shall be deemed such person's residence." In the Lines case referred to above, the Kansas Supreme Court noted that "although the term domicile and residence may have different legal meanings, residence is defined in the statute as substantially the equivalent of domicile--the adoption of a place of habitation with the intent to return thereto." Neither residence nor domicile has one fixed definition, although residence is a looser term, and basically means having a fixed place of abode in a particular area and requiring mere physical presence. Domicile basically means a residence which is intended to be permanent rather than temporary--the place where a person is most intimately connected. It is a question of fact and the intent of the person may be shown from a number of factors.

(5) The bill may cause a special problem for those cities which have employee unions. Labor law comentators indicate when a residency requirement is the subject of mandatory collective bargaining: "... when its enforcement will or could result in termination or other adverse treatment of any incumbent bargaining unit employee. This is so because the action prompted by the rule's enforcement would adversely effect the job security of a bargaining unit of an employee." (29 Labor Law Journal 353 (1978)). What this means in effect is that the subject of residency may be an already-negotiated point in the bargaining process between a city's management and its employee unions. Such a negotiated settlement, if in fact any do exist in Kansas on the point of residency, would be essentially wiped out by passage of this law.

In summary, the League raises policy arguments and questions of application to this Committee on the subject of HB 2481 and urges Committee members to defeat this bill.



**OBJECTIVE #15:**

(ATTACHMENT III)

3/6/85

Oppose legislation to alter the City's inherent home rule authority and specifically in regard to establishing residency requirements.

**OVERVIEW:**

A robust and responsible local government is in the best tradition of democracy so the governing of public affairs is as close to the people as possible. Kansas City, Kansas and other cities in Kansas must guard against encroachment by the State on the home rule powers we currently enjoy under the State Constitution and Statutes. Just as the League of Kansas Municipalities in its Policy Statement, Kansas City, Kansas must oppose "any direct or indirect attempt to limit or restrict the constitutionally granted home rule authority of cities, or any bills which merely declare the existence of legal authority which cities have under the Constitution."

Specifically, City Ordinance #64504 established a residency requirement for City employees of Kansas City, Kansas. It was passed by the City Council on July 21, 1983, and took effect on July 29, 1983. This ordinance was a re-definition of an already existing residency ordinance. The new ordinance requires that all City employees reside within the corporate limits of the City, except police and fire officers who are allowed to continue to reside outside of the City limits but within Wyandotte County if they were residents of Wyandotte County prior to the adoption of the ordinance, as provided in their union contract.

Such residency requirements have been upheld consistently in the federal courts. State action, however, could supercede Kansas City, Kansas' ordinance. We are opposed to that as a blatant attack on our home rule authority. We feel employees who work for the City should live in, pay taxes in and have a commitment to the City.

**COMMENTS:**

Oppose any attempt to restrict Governing Body home rule powers.

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT  
IN KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

The July 21, 1983, enactment by the City Council of Kansas City, Kansas, of Ordinance No. 64504 (attached) requiring all employees of the City to be bona fide residents represents a continuation of previous ordinances affecting employees of said governmental unit. As a condition of employment, residency within the City has been required for certain classes of employees under civil service rules and regulations since 1950. As to all other employees the residency requirement has officially existed since enactment 1969 of Ordinance No. 47589 codified at Section 2-33.1 of the Code of Ordinances (attached). The refinement of these two ordinances to comport with existing law as determined by the United States Supreme Court in various decisions resulted in the 1983 enactment. This latest enactment only represents a continuation of prior express policy.

On January 4, 1950, the former City Commission of Kansas City, Kansas, enacted and created a Civil Service Commission with application basically to firefighters and police officers. Section 9 of the original act provided in 1950 that all applicants for covered positions within the fire or police departments were required to have been residents of Kansas City, Kansas, for three years prior the date of the competitive examination. Subsequent amendments to that ordinance reduced the number of years to two years preceding the date of the examination. At the time the present City Council enacted the 1983 version the ordinance itself did not alter the requirements imposed upon firefighters and police officers. In numerous subsequent amendments to the 1950 Rules and Regulations, the residency requirement has specifically remained unchanged. All covered employees were required to maintain a bona fide residence within Kansas City, Kansas, during all times while employed. Although both firefighters and police officers were staunch in their opposition to the 1983 ordinance, the fact remains undisputed that such requirement had always existed for them to maintain their employment positions.

As residency pertains to other city employees, Ordinance No. 47589, codified as Section 2-33.1, was enacted on January 9, 1969, and required that all employees be bonafide residents at the time of their appointment except for certain expert employees deemed necessary by the City Commission. Until the 1983 update, the language of this ordinance was neither changed nor challenged.

The question may arise as to the historical analysis of enforcement. Each of these ordinances imposed specific requirements upon the employees affected. No accurate records exist as to the extent either of these ordinances were enforced against those classes of employees affected. An analysis of the enforcement would vary depending upon the department. While some departments were lax in maintaining rigid enforcement of this ordinance, others refused to employ persons who did not meet the requirement. Thus, prospective employees were required to move to Kansas City, Kansas, in order to obtain the employment. The records of the Kansas City, Kansas, Civil Service Commission do not reflect actions taken against firefighters or police officers who were not in compliance with the rule. At the time of their employment, the very nature of the civil services rules necessitated that the applicant be a resident of Kansas City, Kansas, to be eligible. However, these same employees then without consent or authorization removed their residence from the City after being employed. The supervisory personnel of the fire and police department took varying action depending upon the administration in office. Thus, fire and police personnel affected by the 1983 passage of the current residency ordinance had in fact changed their residence after acquiring employment despite their awareness at the outset that their employment required continuing residency.

In summary, an analysis of the current residency ordinance reveals that it merely clarifies the language of pre-existing ordinances into compliance with interpretations of similar laws by the Kansas Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court. This ordinance imposed no additional requirement upon City employees that did not in fact exist prior to the date of its enactment. In fact, the only difference between the earlier versions and the present requirement of residency is that the policy of the governing body appears to that strict enforcement will be a priority.

ORDINANCE NO. 64504

AN ORDINANCE relating to the establishment of residency requirements for employees of the City of Kansas City, Kansas; requiring employees of the City of Kansas City, Kansas to establish permanent residence within boundaries established by the governing body of the City of Kansas City, Kansas; providing for employees presently residing outside the established boundaries; providing for newly hired employees; and providing for penalties for violation of the provisions of this ordinance; repealing original Section 2-33.1 of said Code; and repealing original Section 9(3) of the Civil Service Rules and Regulations, Appendix B to the Code of Ordinances, City of Kansas City, Kansas.

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to promote an interest in, and a loyalty to, the City of Kansas City, Kansas, among all of its employees; and

WHEREAS, the City Council deems it necessary to establish certain boundaries within which employees of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, must establish permanent residence in order to promote said interest and loyalty, improve relationship of city citizens and city employees, enhance the quality of employees' performance by greater personal knowledge of the city's condition and by a feeling of greater personal stake in the city's progress, diminish absenteeism and tardiness, promote ready availability of trained manpower in emergency situations, help general economic conditions by local spending of employees' salaries, help reverse the population decline of the City, and help abate decline of city tax base.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KANSAS CITY, KANSAS:

Section 1. All employees of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, shall establish and maintain their permanent residence within the corporate limits of Kansas City, Kansas, throughout the period of city employment.

Section 2. Those employees who have legally established a permanent residence in Wyandotte County outside the corporate limits of Kansas City, Kansas, under Section 9(3) of the Civil Service Rules and Regulations, Appendix B of the Code of Ordinances,

Kansas City, Kansas, and who are currently maintaining such permanent residence in the county outside the city, shall be exempt from the provisions of this ordinance. Provided, however, that if at any time any such employee changes his or her place of permanent residence, such employee's exemption shall cease and the employee shall be required to establish and maintain permanent residency in Kansas City, Kansas.

Section 3. Employees of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, excepting those who are exempt under Section 2 of this ordinance, who do not now have a permanent residence in the corporate limits of Kansas City, Kansas, have fifteen (15) months from the effective date of this ordinance in which to establish such a permanent residence.

Section 4. Employees who are not already permanent residents of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, at the inception of their employment shall have a period of four (4) months after such employment begins within which to establish said permanent residence, after the end of which four (4) month period their exemption from the requirement of this ordinance shall terminate.

Section 5. For purposes of this ordinance, "permanent residence" means "domicile," that is, a residence which is intended to be permanent rather than temporary, and which is the place where a city employee is most intimately connected. Tests for determining permanent residence include an employee's driver's license address, auto registration address, voter's registration address, addresses of bank accounts and credit cards, and the phone number and address at which an off-duty employee can be routinely reached at 3:00 a.m. in case of an emergency.

Section 6. For purposes of this ordinance, "employee" shall mean any person employed by the City of Kansas City, Kansas, under the jurisdiction of the City Administrator or the Mayor.

Section 7. Any employee violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be subject to discharge from employment with the City of Kansas City, Kansas.

Section 8. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of

the remaining portions hereof.

Section 9. That original Section 2-33.1 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Kansas City, Kansas, be and the same is hereby repealed . . .

Section 10. That original Section 9(3) of the Civil Service Rules and Regulations, Appendix B to the Code of Ordinances, City of Kansas City, Kansas, be and the same is hereby repealed . . .

Section 11. This ordinance shall be in full force and take effect from and after its passage, approval and publication in The Kansan.

Passed by the City Council of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, this 21st day of July, 1983.

APPROVED:

/s/ John E. Reardon - Mayor

Attest:

/s/ David T. Isabell  
City Clerk.

Section 2-33.1 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Kansas  
City, Kansas:

Sec. 2-33.1. Appointive officers to be  
residents of city; exception.

No person, including urban renewal and public housing authority employees, shall be eligible to any appointive office unless he or she shall be a bona fide resident of the city prior to his or her appointment, except that the city may hire non-resident expert employees when deemed necessary by the board of commissioners.

Section 9(3) of the Civil Services Rules and Regulations,  
Appendix B of the Code of Ordinances, City of Kansas City, Kansas:

Sec. 9. Applicants.

(3) Other requirements. Applicant, except applicants for the position of patrolman or firefighter, must be a citizen of the United States and a bona fide resident of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, for two years next preceding the examination; applicants for position of patrolman or firefighter must be citizens of the United States and a bona fide resident of Wyandotte County, Kansas; all applicants shall be able to read and write the English language; provided, that each applicant for a position in the civil service of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, shall furnish and attach to his application a certified copy of his birth certificate; provided further, that the commission may allow experts who are non-residents of Kansas City, Kansas, or Wyandotte County, Kansas, to apply when the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, deems it necessary; provided further, that each applicant who is appointed to a position in the civil service shall maintain a bona fide residence and actual domicile within the limits of Wyandotte County, Kansas, so long as he is an employee of said city.



MEMORANDUM

March 5, 1985

TO: House Local Government Chairman  
FROM: Kansas Legislative Research Department  
RE: H.B. 2483

H.B. 2483 permits the board of directors of a drainage district incorporated under K.S.A. 24-458 to put the issue of annexing added territory before the board of county commissioners who must decide the issue. Under current law, the question of annexing territory by such a drainage district can only be brought before the board of county commissioners by petition of 2/5 of the taxpayers within the area to be annexed and the original drainage district. Petition by 2/5 of the taxpayers in the drainage district is not required if more than 2/5 of the taxpayers in the area proposed to be annexed request it.

(ATTACHMENT IV)

3/6/85

MH/pk

MEMORANDUM

March 5, 1985

TO: House Local Government Chairman  
FROM: Kansas Legislative Research Department  
RE: H.B. 2484

H.B. 2484 permits fire districts in Johnson County to raise their mill levy from 8.5 mills not to exceed 11.5 mills subject to a five percent protest petition election procedure.

(ATTACHMENT V)

3/6/85

MH/pk

Attachment 5