

Approved RLH

Date 2-26-87

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections

The meeting was called to order by Representative Richard L. Harper at
Chairperson

9:00 a.m./p.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 1987 in room 521-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Jenkins, excused; Representative Littlejohn, excused; Representative Helgerson, excused; and, Representative Johnson, excused.

Committee staff present: Myrta Anderson, Legislative Research Department
Ron Thornburgh, Secretary of State's Office
Jill Wolters, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Dottie Musselman, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Representative Spaniol
Earl Nehring, Common/Cause
Ron Thornburg, Secretary of State's Office
Janet Williams, Public Disclosure Commission
Carol Williams, Public Disclosure Commission
Dr. Richard Funk, Kansas Association of School Boards
Jim Kaup, League of Kansas Municipalities
Representative Baker
Belva Ott, Appeared before the committee as a member
of the Public Disclosure Commission

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order. The Chair recognized Representative Spaniol, author of HB 2340. HB 2340 is an act relating to governmental ethics; application to certain public officers and employees.

Representative Spaniol gave the committee a briefing of the intent of HB 2340. He told the committee this bill would provide that local candidates for city commission, county commission and school board elections would have to comply with the same campaign reporting requirements as state officials. The Representative also told the committee he had given a great deal of thought to the cost of implementing this legislation, and realizing the limited ability to fund new programs, ask the committee to amend the bill to require local candidates to make their filing at a local level, rather than with the Public Disclosure Commission. At this time, Representative Spaniol told the committee he did not know what the fiscal note would be on this legislation. (Attachment 1).

The Chair next recognized Earl Nehring, Common/Cause. Mr. Nehring came before the committee in support of HB 2340.

Janet Williams, Public Disclosure Commission, was recognized by the Chair. Ms. Williams told the committee that the commission has no opinion on HB 2340 as a commission, but as individuals they do have concerns. A concern being that the bill would not require the filing at a local level, and not be accessible to the local people. Ms. Williams told the committee, Carol Williams has been working on the fiscal note, and it seems it would be around \$200,000.

The Chair recognized Ron Thornburgh, Secretary of State's Office. Ron came before the committee to give them an idea of the impact HB 2340 would have on their office. Basically, this bill is going to double the number of filings their office would be taking during the next year in this form. This means the hiring of possibly another part-time staff addition, and the fiscal impact possibly would be about \$10,000, which would be for staff, storage, micro-filming of the material, and copies.

Dr. Richard Funk, Kansas Association of School Boards, came before the committee telling them the association didn't feel it was necessary at this time, to amend the statutes.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections,

room 521-S, Statehouse, at 9:00 am a.m./p.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 1987.

Jim Kaup, League of Kansas Municipalities, was recognized by the Chair. Mr. Kaup came before the committee telling them there was still some confusion on their part about this bill. Mr. Kaup appeared before the committee in opposition to this legislation.

The Chair next called on Belva Ott. Ms. Ott appeared before the committee as a member of the Public Disclosure Commission. The committee was told by Ms. Ott that she believes strongly that this is what is needed on the local level.

Rep. Spaniol arose to tell the committee that it was never his intent to take anything away from the Public Disclosure law that is now in the bill.

Following a discussion period the Chair asked Representative Spaniol to have drafted appropriate amendments to HB 2340, and bring them back to committee for further study and consideration at a later date.

The Chair now asked the committee for discussion and possible final action on HB 2133. This bill allows the county or district attorney to determine the sufficiency of the grounds for recall, rather than the county clerk.

Representative Flottman moved to report HB 2133 favorable for passage. Seconded by Representative Shallenburger. Motion carried.

HB 2267 was next up for discussion and possible final action. At this time Representative Shallenburger offered an amendment, and a copy was now handed to members of the committee. (Attachment 2).

Representative Shallenburger made a motion that the balloon amendment to HB 2267 be accepted, and that HB 2267 be amended as such. Seconded by Representative Amos. Motion carried.

Representative Roy made a motion to report HB 2267 favorably, as amended, and be passed from committee. Seconded by Representative Amos. Motion carried.

Chairperson Harper recognized Representative Baker. Representative Baker came before the committee to give them a briefing on HB 2353. This is an act relating to the campaign finance act; providing for reports from publicly funded organizations. This bill provides that any publicly funded organization that expends funds for political purposes must comply with the campaign finance act. Representative Baker told the committee that many small organizations look to their associations to provide leadership and expertise on the broad issues of state. A copy of testimony, together with an attachment labeled "Attachment A" was passed to members for their study. The attachment was material which was put out by the League of Kansas Municipalities (Attachment 3)

Carol Williams, Public Disclosure, was recognized at this time. She came before the committee telling them that the commission really does not have a position on HB 2353, and that at this point, it is very hard to put out a fiscal note on same.

Dr. Richard Funk, Kansas Association of School Boards, arose to tell the committee of his objection to the inclusion of the Kansas Association of School Boards in HB 2353. Dr. Funk told the committee there were a number of reasons to his objection. Dr. Funk said the Kansas Association of School Boards does not involve themselves in the election process, nor in voting records of candidates. However, they have worked with a organization that is registered as a political action group called CARE Board. Membership is made up of individual school board members, school superintendents and anyone who is interested in education. The money is solicited from individual contributions.

Jim Kaup, League of Kansas Municipalities, appeared before the committee in defense of the League. Mr. Kaup briefed the committee about the attachment which had been handed out early in the meeting.

At this time the hearing was closed on HB 2353.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections,
room 521-S, Statehouse, at 9:00 am a.m./p.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 1987

The Chair now called attention to HB 2268, relating to absentee voting. Discussion followed on this bill.

Representative Roy moved to favorably pass HB 2268 out of committee. Seconded by Representative Amos.

As there was a question in mind on the above motion, the Chair requested a show-of-hands vote. The motion carried, with a count of 6 in favor, and 4 members being opposed.

Representative Amos made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 19, 1987, meeting. Seconded by Representative Shallenburger. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

DENNIS SPANIOL
REPRESENTATIVE NINETY-FOURTH DISTRICT
SEDGWICK COUNTY
438 S SOCORA
WICHITA, KANSAS 67209



TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
VICE CHAIRMAN ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
MEMBER TAXATION
TRANSPORTATION

February 24, 1987

Testimony on HB 2340
House Elections Committee

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. HB 2340 would provide that local candidates for city commission, county commission and school board elections would have to comply with the same campaign reporting requirements as state officials.

We have a situation in many of the larger cities in the state where the local city commission, county commission and school board races are far more costly than an average State Representatives race. It seems logical that the voter should be entitled to the same contributors information as is required for a state race.

Since the introduction of the bill I have given a great deal of thought to the cost of implementing this legislation. Realizing our limited ability to fund new programs, I would ask the committee to amend the bill to require local candidates to make their filing at a local level, rather than with the Public Disclosure Commission.

I ask for your favorable support on this measure. I will try to answer any questions that you might have.

*attn #1
House Elections
2-24-87*

HOUSE BILL No. 2267

By Representative Helgerson

2-10

0017 AN ACT relating to elections; providing for the copies of regis-
0018 tration records; amending K.S.A. 25-2320 and repealing the
0019 existing section.

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

0021 Section 1. K.S.A. 25-2320 is hereby amended to read as fol-
0022 lows: 25-2320. The county election officer shall allow access to
0023 any person at any time during regular business hours, under
0024 supervision of the county election officer for the purpose of
0025 examining the voter registration books. Any person may make a
0026 written request for a copy of the registration books at any time
0027 except ~~during the twenty (20) days immediately preceeding on~~
0028 any election *day*. The election officer is hereby directed to
0029 provide one or more copies which are accurate insofar as practi-
0030 cable of such books to the person so requesting. The election
0031 officer shall provide such copies to the person within ~~ten (10)~~ 10
0032 days following the request if so requested. The expense of
0033 making such copies shall be paid by the person requesting them.
0034 The cost of copies shall be established by the county election
0035 officer ~~and shall be set uniformly in order that the price therefor~~
0036 shall be the same for all persons requesting identical copies.

0037 Sec. 2. K.S.A. 25-2320 is hereby repealed.

0038 Sec. 3. This act shall take effect and be in force from and
0039 after its publication in the statute book.

at a price which is not more than the
actual cost

attachment 2
House Elections
2-24-87

ELIZABETH BAKER
REPRESENTATIVE, EIGHTY-SECOND DISTRICT
SEDGWICK COUNTY
1025 REDWOOD RD.
DERBY, KANSAS 67037



TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
VICE CHAIRMAN: ELECTIONS
MEMBER: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

February 24, 1987

TO: House Committee on Elections
FROM: Representative Elizabeth Baker
RE: HB ~~2340~~ 2353
2353

HB 2340 relates to the campaign finance act. It provides that any publicly funded organization that expends funds for political purposes must comply with the campaign finance act.

The rationale for HB 2340 is readily apparent in Attachment A. Many small organizations look to their associations to provide leadership and expertise on the broad issues of state. For associations who have been given statutory authority to be funded by taxpayers dollars and then to use those hard-earned dollars in an attempt to influence the outcome of partisan elections is offensive to fundamental principles of fairness. I urge your careful consideration of this matter and the ultimate passage of HB 2340.

/bs

Attachment 3
House Elections
2-24-87



League of Kansas Municipalities

ATTACHMENT A

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

TO: League Voting Delegates and Other City Officials
FROM: Mayor John L. Carder, Iola, President, League of Kansas
Municipalities
RE: Annexation
DATE: October 7, 1986

Unfortunately, it appears certain that much of our lobbying efforts during the upcoming 1987 Legislative Session will focus on opposition to annexation bills which are contrary to the interest of cities and the League's Convention-adopted Statement of Municipal Policy.

The motivation and strategies employed by our opponents on the annexation issue have been discussed with the Convention Delegates, as has been the strategy used by the League in previous years in response to our opponents.

At the direction of the League Governing Body, at its meeting on October 5, 1986, I am asking for your active involvement in our annexation lobbying efforts for 1987, beginning now. The strategy is based on the Governing Body's assumption that the League's fundamental position in opposition to anti-annexation legislation will be continued by the 1986 Voting Delegates.

We will only be able to survive another forray into the annexation wars by exerting greater pressure upon our local Senate and House members. The following attached materials are intended to serve that purpose:

- (1) City Resolution. Use this resolution as a form for your own. Send copies to your local Senator, Representative and general election opponent (if any), to the local news media, and to the League office.
- (2) Letters to Legislators. Use the form letters only as a guide to educating your legislators, and legislative candidates, of the importance we place upon retaining the current annexation law. These letters are also designed to put legislators on the record, in writing, as to whether they support or oppose Kansas cities on annexation.

These letters are critical to our success-- not only because they show grass-roots concerns for the issue, but also because the responses will be used for measuring our support going into the 1987 session. They will also be used to ensure that favorable positions taken by legislators in October do not turn against us during the Legislative session.

Please send out the letters as soon as possible. Attach the City's Resolution and the League Policy Statement to these letters. Strongly request written responses to your letters, even if you know how the legislator will respond. Remember to send a copy of each legislator's response to the League office.

- (3) Voting Records on Annexation. Note the attached record of roll-call votes on annexation. Educate yourselves, your local news media and the city's voters, as to how your local delegation voted on HB 2117--the bill strongly opposed by the League in 1985 and 1986.

Simply put, we--the City Voting Delegates--have mutually decided our course on this issue. Our position is the right one. Now we must work to see it successful. Whether you annex or not, annexation authority is of great importance to the ability of all our cities to survive and to grow. We must all work together if we are to win this battle--for the future of Kansas cities.

Resolution No. _____

A Resolution urging the Kansas Legislature not to enact any legislation further restricting the authority of cities to annex territory pursuant to K.S.A. 12-519 et seq.; and supporting the Policy Statement on Annexation adopted by the League of Kansas Municipalities on October 7, 1986.

Be It Resolved by the Governing Body of the City of _____:

Section 1. We support the retention of the Kansas annexation law, K.S.A. 12-519 et seq., in its present form and oppose any legislative efforts to amend that law in any way which will further restrict the basic power of cities to annex adjacent territory that is urbanized or urbanizing.

Section 2. It is the finding of this Governing Body that any additional legislative restriction on the authority of cities to annex is contrary to the interests of the people of the City of _____. Further restrictions upon this City's ability to define its own boundaries will hamper our ability to provide for the planned orderly development of this community, will obstruct our ability to promote economic development both within and without the city, will result in substandard urban fringe development, and is contrary to the home rule concept of local decision-making and local government control over matters of local affairs and government.

Section 3. We further find that the present unilateral annexation authority of K.S.A. 12-520 is necessary to our ability to remove the tax unfairness which results from subsidization by city taxpayers of non-city fringe dwellers who use the city's streets, facilities, programs and services on a daily basis, but who are not required to contribute towards the costs of such streets, facilities, programs and services.

Section 4. Finally, we strongly support the position on annexation adopted by the Voting Delegates to the League of Kansas Municipalities Annual City Conference on October 7, 1986.

Section 5. The City Clerk is hereby directed to mail a copy of this resolution to State Senator _____, Representative _____ and to _____, candidate for State Representative.

ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the City of _____, Kansas this ____ day of October, 1986.

_____, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____, City Clerk

October __, 1986

Dear Representative _____ and
Candidate _____:

This letter is to advise you that the City of _____, by Resolution of its Governing Body, has requested that the Kansas Legislature not pass any laws at the 1987 Session which would place additional restrictions upon the legal authority of the City of _____, and other cities in Kansas, to annex territory. The Resolution further specifically endorses the Policy Statement on Annexation adopted by the Delegates to the League of Kansas Municipalities Annual City Conference on October 7, 1986. Copies of the City's Resolution and the League-adopted Policy Statement are attached.

Retention of the present annexation law is of vital importance to the future of our city. It is an effective and workable law based on fairness to individuals and to the public at-large. It allows cities to grow and develop by adding urbanizing territory, but is also protective of the rights of property owners. Not only is it a fair law on paper, it is one we use fairly. We do not indiscriminately annex land, nor do we use expansion of the city's tax base as the basis for approving an annexation.

Over the past few legislative sessions, with all the very real and critical problems facing Kansas, too much time and emotion has been unwisely spent in failed efforts to amend a law that does not need to be amended. Legislators who advocate greater restrictions to the present annexation law are actually proposing that cities be stripped of an important tool for economic development. Those legislators are apparently willing to sacrifice annexation in order to quell the clamor of some property owners who oppose annexation for personal economic reasons--they want to live near a city, and enjoy its benefits, but don't want to pay any of the costs associated with those benefits. In short, these people now enjoy a subsidization by city taxpayers, and they sometimes object to the prospect of losing that subsidy. Their opposition to annexation is predictable, as it is based on their financial self-interest and not the public interest of the entire community.

It is only when cities such as ours are provided with an effective annexation law like our current one that we are able to plan for growth and encourage development. Just as the citizens of Kansas are demanding that the Legislature work to promote new and expanded business and job opportunities, so too are the citizens of _____ demanding of us, their locally-elected representatives, that we do all we can to expand the local economy. The simple fact is that we can much better meet that demand with the present annexation law than we can without it.

We ask both of you for your support of this City's position on annexation.

Both as representatives of your constituency in the City and as locally-elected officials who must live with the laws you pass, we ask for you to advise us as to your position on annexation and for your response to the position we have taken. If you favor changes to the present law, would you advise us as to what you find objectionable in the law, and what you will propose, or support, in the way of amendments to it?

Please assist us in our effort to keep the annexation law as it is. Certainly your attention will be needed for more real and pressing concerns facing the Kansas Senate.

Thank you for your attention to our request.

Sincerely,

_____, Mayor

_____, (Councilmember or
Commissioner)

October __, 1986

Dear Senator _____:

This letter is to advise you that the City of _____, by Resolution of its Governing Body, has requested that the Kansas Legislature not pass any laws at the 1987 Session which would place additional restrictions upon the legal authority of the City of _____, and other cities in Kansas, to annex territory. The Resolution further specifically endorses the Policy Statement on Annexation adopted by the Delegates to the League of Kansas Municipalities Annual City Conference on October 7, 1986. Copies of the City's Resolution and the League-adopted Policy Statement are attached.

Retention of the present annexation law is of vital importance to the future of our city. It is an effective and workable law based on fairness to individuals and to the public at-large. It allows cities to grow and develop by adding urbanizing territory, but is also protective of the rights of property owners. Not only is it a fair law on paper, it is one we use fairly. We do not indiscriminately annex land, nor do we use expansion of the city's tax base as the basis for approving an annexation.

Over the past few legislative sessions, with all the very real and critical problems facing Kansas, too much time and emotion has been unwisely spent in failed efforts to amend a law that does not need to be amended. Legislators who advocate greater restrictions to the present annexation law are actually proposing that cities be stripped of an important tool for economic development. Those legislators are apparently willing to sacrifice annexation in order to quell the clamor of some property owners who oppose annexation for personal economic reasons--they want to live near a city, and enjoy its benefits, but don't want to pay any of the costs associated with those benefits. In short, these people now enjoy a subsidization by city taxpayers, and they sometimes object to the prospect of losing that subsidy. Their opposition to annexation is predictable, as it is based on their financial self-interest and not the public interest of the entire community.

It is only when cities such as ours are provided with an effective annexation law like our current one that we are able to plan for growth and encourage development. Just as the citizens of Kansas are demanding that the Legislature work to promote new and expanded business and job opportunities, so too are the citizens of _____ demanding of us, their locally-elected representatives, that we do all we can to expand the local economy. The simple fact is that we can much better meet that demand with the present annexation law than we can without it.

We are aware of your votes on HB 2117, the anti-annexation bill opposed by Kansas cities during the 1986 Session. As you know, that bill was passed, but was vetoed by Governor Carlin. We ask you for your support of this City's position on annexation.

Both as representatives of your constituency in the City and as locally-elected officials who must live with the laws you pass, we ask for you to advise us as to your position on annexation and for your response to the position we have taken. If you favor changes to the present law, would you advise us as to what you find objectionable in the law, and what you will propose, or support, in the way of amendments to it?

Please assist us in our effort to keep the annexation law as it is. Certainly the attention of those who are elected will be needed for more real and pressing concerns facing the Kansas House of Representatives.

Thank you for your attention to our request.

Sincerely,

_____, Mayor

_____, (Councilmember or
Commissioner)

POLICY STATEMENT ON ANNEXATION

The following statement on annexation was adopted by the City Voting Delegates of the League of Kansas Municipalities on October 7, 1986

ANNEXATION

(1) Cities are of vital importance to the state and to the general public, both city residents and non-residents. Cities are where three-fourths of all Kansans live. Cities provide people with a sense of place or community. Cities are where most jobs now are, and where most jobs will be in the future. Cities, through their taxpaying residents, contribute the large bulk of the taxable income and retail sales which support the state general fund. It is contrary to the public interest, to the future economic development of Kansas, and to the long-term interest of state government itself, to bring about the gradual destruction of cities as viable places to live and work by denying cities adequate power to annex and grow--to make that which is part of the urban community a part of the legal corporate municipality.

(2) If Kansas is to meet the governmental and public service needs of people, property and businesses in urbanized areas, there are only two alternatives to annexation -- either the continued growth and proliferation of special districts, or the expansion of county government as a municipal service agency. We believe either alternative is undesirable and unacceptable. The number of special purpose districts required as a substitute to city growth through annexation would result in a quagmire of our already complex local government structure; an increase in the number of general improvement districts would simply result in the creation of a confusing jungle of pseudo-cities, under a different name. Perhaps, in the distant future, counties may legally replace cities. We believe this would simply shift certain problems to a different arena. There is also the very practical reality that, in all but Wyandotte County, the urban portion of counties is but a fraction of the whole county, and farmland should not be taxed to provide services of exclusive benefit to non-farm fringe areas, any more than property within cities should be taxed to provide services of exclusive benefit to non-city areas.

(3) For the past two decades, Kansas has benefited from effective and workable general annexation laws. These laws have been used responsibly, by locally elected governing bodies, to achieve the long-term public interest of the entire community. We recognize that conflicts often result from annexation, since the private interest of the individual landowners and the long-term public interest are not always compatible. Cities do understand the financial, tax advantages of property owners being located in the "community city" but outside the "legal city." Cities also understand that annexation is often not the politically popular thing to do, even though the landowners may have created the situation by making residence and development decisions with the intent to obtain the benefits, services and amenities of a city, but not the responsibilities. It may be more appropriate to criticize cities for past failures of annexing too little, too late, rather than too much. Such criticism may be especially valid where governing bodies have failed to undertake timely annexations because of a lack of concern about the long-term future of the city, or simply out of fear of provoking the wrath of non-city property owners.

(4) We believe that state laws should favor the annexation of land into existing, functioning cities as the preferred avenue for providing municipal services to unincorporated areas now urbanized or which are becoming urbanized. We believe it imperative that the legislature retain for cities adequate and workable annexation authority, which will secure the long-term public interest and total community needs.

(5) We believe that the owners or residents of land adjoining a city should not be granted a statutory right to vote on or consent to annexation. It is essential that the long-term public interest of the whole community be given priority in municipal growth, in the same manner that other, over-all community needs in our society occasionally require the sacrifice of some private goals and interests in order to achieve the greatest social utility of the area and benefits to the many. It is untenable to us that the owners of land within the

fringe area, whose location has benefits and value primarily in relation to the existence of the city, should be given veto power over the geographic, economic and governmental destiny of the whole community.

(6) We oppose any legislation which further restricts the basic power of cities to annex adjacent territory that is now urbanized or is becoming urbanized. However, we are supportive of actions to assure by law greater political due process for the owners of land subject to annexation, which still maintains workable and effective annexation authority, as follows:

- (a) requiring planning commission review of proposed annexations;
- (b) providing for notice of intent to annex to other governmental units;
- (c) mandating public hearings in areas under consideration for annexation;
- (d) specifically authorizing service extension agreements, conditioned on possible future annexation; and
- (e) establishing a procedure for deannexation upon the failure of a city to timely provide major municipal services, as specified in the city's service delivery plan.

(8) Cities should have full authority to control who provides utility services to areas annexed to the city. The existing electric territorial act should not be changed except to provide for reasonable compensation for existing facilities when the city or another supplier assumes jurisdiction as a result of an annexation.

(9) We request an interim legislative study of the adequacy of the planning and development regulations applicable to the fringe areas of cities. We believe that cities should have more control or influence over adjacent developments which may become a part of the city in the future, or other assurance that urbanized development in the fringe area will meet urban standards.

REPRESENTATIVES

Legislators Voting Consistently with League on Annexation Bills*

| | | |
|-----|------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Acheson | Topeka |
| 2. | Adam | Atchison |
| 3. | Barkis | Louisburg |
| 4. | Blumenthal | Merriam |
| 5. | Brady | Parsons |
| 6. | Branson | Lawrence |
| 7. | Buehler | Claflin |
| 8. | Bunten | Topeka |
| 9. | Dean | Wichita |
| 10. | Dillon | Kansas City |
| 11. | Douville | Overland Park |
| 12. | Dyck | Hesston |
| 13. | Fox | Prairie Village |
| 14. | Fry | Little River |
| 15. | Fuller | Wichita |
| 16. | Gjerstad | Wichita |
| 17. | Grotewiel | Wichita |
| 18. | Harder | Buhler |
| 19. | Heinemann | Garden City |
| 20. | Helgerson | Wichita |
| 21. | Holmes | Plains |
| 22. | Jarchow | Wichita |
| 23. | Justice | Kansas City |
| 24. | Kline | Overland Park |
| 25. | Knopp | Manhattan |
| 26. | Louis | Shawnee |
| 27. | Lowther | Emporia |
| 28. | Luzzati | Wichita |
| 29. | Mainey | Topeka |
| 30. | Mayfield | Overland Park |
| 31. | Nichols | Ottawa |
| 32. | O'Neal | Hutchinson |
| 33. | Ott,B. | Salina |
| 34. | Patrick | Leawood |
| 35. | Patterson | Independence |
| 36. | Pottorff | Wichita |
| 37. | Reardon | Kansas City |
| 38. | Roy | Topeka |
| 39. | Runnels | Topeka |
| 40. | Snowbarger | Olathe |
| 41. | Sughrue | Dodge City |
| 42. | Turnquist | Salina |
| 43. | Vancrum | Overland Park |
| 44. | Wagnon | Topeka |
| 45. | Walker | Newton |
| 46. | Webb | Wichita |
| 47. | Whiteman | Hutchinson |

Legislators with "Mixed" Voting Records on Annexation Bills*

| | | |
|-----|-------------|----------------|
| 1. | Campbell,K. | Miltonvale |
| 2. | Charlton | Lawrence |
| 3. | Cloud | Lenexa |
| 4. | Cribbs | Wichita |
| 5. | Duncan | Wichita |
| 6. | Flottman | Winfield |
| 7. | Foster | Wichita |
| 8. | Friedeman | Great Bend |
| 9. | Hensley | Topeka |
| 10. | Hoy | Fairway |
| 11. | Love | Kansas City |
| 12. | Peterson | Kansas City |
| 13. | Ramirez | Bonner Springs |
| 14. | Schmidt | Hays |
| 15. | Shriver | Arkansas City |
| 16. | Solbach | Lawrence |
| 17. | Sprague | McPherson |
| 18. | Sutter | Kansas City |
| 19. | Wilbert | Pittsburg |

Legislators Voting Consistently Against League on Annexation Bills*

| | | |
|-----|-------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Apt | Iola |
| 2. | Aylward | Salina |
| 3. | Baker | Derby |
| 4. | Barr | Auburn |
| 5. | Bideau | Chanute |
| 6. | Bowden | Goddard |
| 7. | Braden | Clay Center |
| 8. | Brown | Stanley |
| 9. | Bryant | Washington |
| 10. | Campbell,C. | Beloit |
| 11. | Chronister | Neodesha |
| 12. | Crowell | Longton |
| 13. | Crumbaker | Brewster |
| 14. | DeBaun | Osage City |
| 15. | Eckert | Wetmore |
| 16. | Erne | Coffeyville |
| 17. | Francisco | Maize |
| 18. | Freeman | Burlington |
| 19. | Goossen | Goessel |
| 20. | Graeber | Leavenworth |
| 21. | Green | El Dorado |
| 22. | Guldner | Syracuse |
| 23. | Hamm | Pratt |
| 24. | Harper | Fort Scott |
| 25. | Hassler | Abilene |
| 26. | Hayden | Atwood |
| 27. | Jenkins | Leavenworth |
| 28. | Johnson | Kansas City |
| 29. | King | Leon |
| 30. | Lacey | Oswego |
| 31. | Laird | Topeka |
| 32. | Leach | Linwood |
| 33. | Littlejohn | Phillipsburg |
| 34. | Long | Harper |
| 35. | Miller,D. | Eudora |
| 36. | Miller,R.D. | Russell |
| 37. | Miller,R.H. | Wellington |
| 38. | Mollenkamp | Russell Springs |
| 39. | Moomaw | Dighton |
| 40. | Neufeld | Ingalls |
| 41. | Ott,K. | Mulvane |
| 42. | Polson | Vermillion |
| 43. | Rezac | Onaga |
| 44. | Roe | Mankato |
| 45. | Roebaugh | Lewis |
| 46. | Rolfs | Junction City |
| 47. | Roper | Girard |

continued

REPRESENTATIVES (Cont.)

| Legislators Voting Consistently with League on <u>Annexation Bills*</u> | | | Legislators with "Mixed" Voting Records <u>Annexation Bills*</u> | | | Legislators Voting Consistently Against League on <u>Annexation Bills*</u> | | |
|---|----------|-------------|--|--|--|--|-----------|----------------|
| 48. | Williams | Wichita | | | | 48. | Rosenau | Kansas City |
| 49. | Wisdom | Kansas City | | | | 49. | Sallee | Troy |
| | | | | | | 50. | Sand | Riley |
| | | | | | | 51. | Shore | Johnson |
| | | | | | | 52. | Sifers | Mission Hills |
| | | | | | | 53. | Smith | Topeka |
| | | | | | | 54. | Spaniol | Wichita |
| | | | | | | 55. | Teagarden | LaCygne |
| | | | | | | 56. | Weaver | Baxter Springs |
| | | | | | | 57. | Wunsch | Kingman |

*Two House votes on HB 2117 were used to compile the above -- a vote of 63-61 to pass HB 2117 on final action on 3/7/85 and a vote of 68 to adopt the conference committee report on HB 2117 on 4/3/86.

SENATORS

| Legislators Voting Consistently with League on <u>Annexation Bills*</u> | | | Legislators with "Mixed" Voting Records on <u>Annexation Bills*</u> | | | Legislators Voting Consistently Against League on <u>Annexation Bills*</u> | | |
|---|------------|-----------------|---|--------|-------------|--|------------|---------------|
| 1. | Anderson | Wichita | 1. | Burke | Leawood | 1. | Allen | Ottawa |
| 2. | Frey | Liberal | 2. | Harder | Moundridge | 2. | Arasmith | Phillipsburg |
| 3. | Gaines | Augusta | 3. | Karr | Emporia | 3. | Bogina | Lenexa |
| 4. | Hoferer | Topeka | 4. | Morris | Wichita | 4. | Daniels | Valley Center |
| 5. | Johnston | Parsons | 5. | Reilly | Leavenworth | 5. | Doyen | Concordia |
| 6. | Langworthy | Prairie Village | | | | 6. | Ehrlich | Hoisington |
| 7. | Martin | Pittsburg | | | | 7. | Feleciano | Wichita |
| 8. | Mulich | Kansas City | | | | 8. | Francisco | Mulvane |
| 9. | Steiniger | Kansas City | | | | 9. | Gannon | Goodland |
| 10. | Strick | Kansas City | | | | 10. | Gordon | Highland |
| 11. | Vidricksen | Salina | | | | 11. | Hayden | Satanta |
| 12. | Walker | Overland Park | | | | 12. | Kerr, D. | Hutchinson |
| 13. | Winter | Lawrence | | | | 13. | Kerr, F. | Pratt |
| 14. | Yost | Wichita | | | | 14. | Montgomery | Sabetha |
| | | | | | | 15. | Norvell | Hays |
| | | | | | | 16. | Parrish | Topeka |
| | | | | | | 17. | Salisbury | Topeka |
| | | | | | | 18. | Talkington | Iola |
| | | | | | | 19. | Thiessen | Independence |
| | | | | | | 20. | Warren | Maple City |
| | | | | | | 21. | Werts | Junction City |

*Three Senate votes on HB 2117 were used to compile the above -- a vote of 23-16 to pass HB 2117 as amended by the Senate on 2/20/86; a vote of 24-15 to adopt the first conference committee report on 3/31/86; and a vote of 22-18 to adopt the second conference committee report on 4/3/86.