

Approved UKS

Date 4-29-89

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT

The meeting was called to order by Representative Vince Snowbarger at
Chairperson

12:05 ~~am~~/p.m. on January 24, 1989 in room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Representatives Buntin, Miller, and Shore who were excused.

Committee staff present:

Fred Carmen, Revisor of Statutes
Robert Coldsnow, Legislative Counsel
Mary Galligan, Legislative Research
Marian Holeman, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Ruth Wilkin, League of Women Voters of Kansas
Mark Stafford, Asst. Attorney General
Brad Bryant, Director of Census Division, Secretary of State
Brent Anderson, Deputy Asst. Secretary of State - Legal Counsel

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Snowbarger at 12:05 p.m.

Ruth Wilkin spoke on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Kansas on redistricting the House of Representatives. (Attachment 1)

Common Cause was originally scheduled to appear today, but they have requested to be placed on tomorrow's agenda.

Chairman Snowbarger commented that the Committee, as well as the Legislature, is governed by a constitutional provision which provides that we are to use the census that has been certified by the Secretary of State. Lawsuits have been filed against the Secretary of State concerning the census. Therefore, there are some constraints on the types of requests for information or questions to which the Secretary of State's office is able to respond. They appeared at their request to try to be helpful to the Committee in understanding how they carried out their census responsibilities.

Because of the pending lawsuits and the legal ramifications involved, the first person to make a statement for the Secretary of State's office was Mark Stafford, an Assistant Attorney General who is working on the cases. (Attachment 2)

Brad Bryant made the presentation for the Secretary of State's Office. (Attachment 3)

In response to a question about adoption of rules and regulations, Brent Anderson explained that the census law contained the necessary provisions to enable the Secretary of State to carry out what needed to be done. After consulting with the Attorney General's office, they decided not to promulgate rules and regulations.

The presentation of the Secretary of State's office was continued until the January 25, 1989 meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: HOUSE LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT DATE 1/24/89

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Sharon Schwartz	5145 S. Sycamore	Bunton Office
Burdett Loomis	701 LA. Lawrence	KANU
Diane Silver		Eagle-Beacon
Sheila Hochhauser	Manhattan	Legislature
P. Lamp	Topoka	Staff
Christy Young	Topoka	Topoka Chamber of Comm
Pat J... ..	"	KPCA
Myrna Stringer	Platte KS	League of Women Voters KS
Earl Nehring	Lawrence KS	Common Cause / Kansans
Mary Holmgren	Topoka KS	Topoka City Council
James Hays	Topoka	KS. ASSN. OF SCHOOL BDS.
Chris Graves	Topoka	ASK
Ellen Johnson	Lawrence	Am Assoc Univ. Prof.
Dolores A. Jay	Topoka, KS	State Legist. Comm State Dem Women
Ann Hebbiger	Overland Park	League of Women Voters of KS.
Jay L. Hoden	Topoka	KS Democratic Party
George Bony	Topoka	Louis.
Celso V. Ramirez	Topoka	KS Advisory Committee On Hispanic Affairs
Jim Mc... ..	Topoka	of
Doug Marto	Topoka	SHAWNEE CTY
Mark W... ..	Topoka	A/G. Secty of ST
Brad Bryant	Topoka	Sec. of State's office
Brent Anderson	Wichita	Sec. of State's office
Rex Pullin	Kansas City, MO	Consultant Div. of Census, Sec. of State
Jim Kauf	Topoka	League of Municipalities

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF KANSAS
919½ Kansas Avenue
Topeka, Kansas

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Ruth Wilkin, and I am speaking today for the League of Women Voters of Kansas. We appreciate the opportunity to testify on this very important issue of redistricting of the House of Representatives.

The League of Women Voters has been closely associated with reapportionment and redistricting since the early 1960's. At that time the League was one of the leaders of the movement to guarantee "one person, one vote." Today Leagues continue to supply leadership for organizations working to carry out that guarantee.

I became involved in the redistricting issue in 1970 when the federal court took control of redistricting the Senate of Kansas after failure of the legislature and the governor to agree upon a plan. The League of Women Voters brought 12 to 15 women to Topeka from across the state, and, armed with plain old adding machines, we worked day and night for a long week end, using maps and census figures supplied by the Legislative Research Department. We redistricted the state in accordance with the basic principles we supported: population with as little deviation as possible, compact and contiguous districts, and observance of political boundaries. We also sought to keep ethnic and cultural groups from being divided and diluted. We opposed the multi-member districts that had been in existence. The Court drew its own plan that year, but for Johnson County it adopted the League plan completely.

In 1973 the League of Women Voters entered another suit involving the House of Representatives, and again we reapportioned the House and submitted our plan to the Court. As I was at that time a member of the House, I did not participate. We used the plan approved by the legislature and attempted to improve upon it. We think we did, but the only question before the Court was: "Was the plan approved by legislature constitutional?" --and not "which was the better plan?" At any rate, the Court approved the plan passed by the legislature.

In 1983 the League of Women Voters entered an amicus brief in a court case requesting
L, J+C Apportionment
1-24-89
Attachment 1

a new redistricting following issuance of the 1980 federal census figures. Our position has always been that federal figures should be used rather than a state census. The Court did not mandate a redistricting at that time.

We simply want you to know that the League of Women Voters has much experience in redistricting and has not hesitated to present our differences with legislative plans to the courts.

Court cases in the past 20 years have firmed up some guidelines for redistricting which you have been briefed on. We hope you will adhere as strictly as possible to those guidelines. We would oppose any redistricting that appeared to be done to purposely eliminate any incumbent or to dilute the effectiveness of any ethnic or minority group.

Having actually reapportioned ourselves, we are aware of the problems that arise with trying to get equal districts and observe political boundaries. Sometimes it is not possible, but usually some good and fair way can be found.

In the late 1960's and early 70's several redistrictings were done. I remember people complaining that they had been in three separate legislative districts in six years. We would call your attention to the fact that when you redistrict again in 1992, following the 1990 federal census, you may have people in one district in 1988, another in 1990, and yet another in 1992. I assure you the public resents this. Therefore, there is some rationale for looking at existing districts as you make your plan. We hope you will not disturb any more voters than necessary, but we recognize the shifts in population will require many people to be placed in different districts.

Having been in the legislature in 1979 when the existing plan was drawn, I know the problems you will face. Districts will have to be consolidated in some cases, and incumbents placed in the same district. They will consider this a personal attack upon them. We hope you can prove it is not. Partisan politics is inevitably involved, but, again, we hope its influence is minimal. Political gerrymandering is as abhorrent to the courts as is geographical gerrymandering.

We have attached a few newspaper clippings from former years that may be of interest.

I will be happy to answer any questions that I can.

EDITORIALS

THE PARSONS SUN

Friday, April 13, 1973

Page 6

Somebody Up There

There's one thing to be said about the new House apportionment bill approved by the 1973 Kansas Legislature. It's a beaut.

Something else, too. Somebody up there in Topeka doesn't like southeast Kansas!

Present apportionment of the lower house was thrown out by a three-judge federal court. One of the basic faults it found was the division of too many counties into too many parts, particularly in southeast Kansas.

Crawford County, as we recall, won the prize. The judges cited it as being split among four counties for purposes of apportionment, and blew the whistle.

So what does the House do this time around? It divides Labette County into three representative districts. Ditto for Neosho County. Erie, the Neosho County seat, is to be represented by a fellow way up in Iola.

Labette's representatives will be in districts which slice through Cherokee County to the Missouri line on the east and reach the Oklahoma line on the south.

Reapportionment is necessary. The court says so. But this is ridiculous. The bill embracing the latest monstrosity is on Gov. Robert Docking's desk, awaiting his decision on whether to sign or veto. He should veto, of course, and not be a party to this legislative nonsense.

Parsons Sun

Attachment 3A

PARSONS SUN

NEW STATUS
TO BIKES: P. 9

INSAS 67357, THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1973

14 PAGE

House Remap Plan Slices County

By NILA WALKER
OF The Sun Staff

A Kansas House reapportionment bill on the desk of Gov. Robert B. Docking for possible signature places Parsons in a T-shaped 6th district including townships in Labette and Cherokee counties.

Labette County will be divided into districts represented by three different legislators, according to a reapportionment plan drawn by the 1973 legislature in response to a directive from a three-judge federal court.

State Reps. David L. Miller, D-Parsons, Richard Overman,

R-Oswego and Fred M. Harris, R-Chanute, all voted against the plan.

"It didn't make much sense to me," Miller said today, "to split Labette County into three districts. I think the governor probably will veto it and we'll have to reapportion again because I don't think there will be enough votes to override."

Legislators return Monday to Topeka to consider any vetoes made by the governor.

The plan for the 6th district as approved by the legislature including Parsons would eliminate three Neosho County townships now in the district

and Osage, Walton and Mound Valley townships in Labette County.

The district would extend south to the Oklahoma border and east in Cherokee County almost to the Missouri line, Labette Township would be the western border.

Included in the new district would be Labette, North, Liberty, Neosho and Montana townships in Labette County plus Sheridan, Ross, Mineral, Lola, Neosho and Cherokee townships in Cherokee County.

The new district would include parts of school districts in Parsons, Altamont, Oswego, Cherokee and Columbus.

The 2nd district represented by Overman would lose one township in Cherokee County and add Mound Valley township in Labette County.

Harris' district would gain three Neosho County townships formerly represented by Miller plus Osage and Walton townships in Labette County. Walton Township borders Parsons on the west. The Neosho townships are Shiloh, Ladore and Lincoln.

Erie, the Neosho County seat, would be in the same district with Iola although Harris would represent most of Neosho County.

One of the principal reasons the federal court threw out the previous House reapportion-

ment plan was because numerous counties were divided among an excessive number of representative particularly in southeast Kansas.

The reapportionment effort attempted by the House would appear to repeat the same error. Labette County was divided between two representatives in the plan voided by the federal judge although one of its districts extended into Cherokee and Montgomery counties and the second included the three Neosho townships.

Under the reapportionment plan, the sixth district including Parsons will have a population of 17,751 persons. The second district represented by Overman will have 18,608 residents and the fifth district represented by Harris includes 17,999 persons.

Miller said the court ordered a variance of three to five percent among representative districts. Populations, he said, range from about 17,000 to about 19,000.

Parsons 4/20/73 House Remap Test to Be Filed

The Parsons Sun April 20, 1973

By NILA WALKER
of The Sun Staff

State Rep. David L. Miller, D-Parsons, said today he would join a Wichita representative in filing a suit against a House reapportionment recently completed by the Kansas Legislature.

Miller said he and Frank McMasters, a Wichita Republican, currently were attempting to enlist other citizens as plaintiffs in the suit which he said probably would be filed in U.S. District Court against Robert B. Docking, governor, as representative of the state. The filing date is uncertain, he said.

Miller said other legislators probably would be involved in the case. He said William A. Dearth of Parsons, former state senator, and Richard C. Dearth, also of Parsons and former Labette County attorney, had agreed to be named with those filing the suit. Other individuals

will be contacted, he said.

Docking permitted the reapportionment bill to become law this week without signing it.

"We think the reapportionment bill," Miller said, "is unconstitutional according to previous court decisions. Labette County is divided into three districts and isn't large enough to be divided into more than two."

A decision by a three-member U.S. District Court panel in February labeled reapportionment completed by the 1972 legislature as unconstitutional because of disregard

for county lines and deviation in population among districts.

If the legislature has not reapportioned itself by Feb. 16, 1974, the court said it would proceed with judicial reapportionment.

Miller said Labette County's division compared with previous 1972 division of Cherokee County's population of 21,594 into three separate districts. Labette County has a population of about 24,000 and is included with legislative districts reaching east almost to the Missouri line and south to

the Oklahoma border.

The plan for the 6th District including Parsons eliminates three Neosho County townships in the district and Osage, Walton and Mound Vall townships in Labette County.

Walton Township, which borders Parsons on the west and Osage would be in a Neosho County district represented by Fred Harris, R-Chanute.

Included in the new district would be Labette, North, Liberty, Neosho and Montana townships in Labette County plus Sheridan, Fox

Continued on page 12.

House Remap

Continued from page 1.

Mineral, Lola, Neosho and Cherokee townships in Cherokee County.

The division of Neosho County, which places the Erie county seat in a district with most of Allen County, is similar to the 1972 apportionment placing Girard, the Crawford County seat, with a district comprised primarily of Bourbon County, he said.

"The court ruled," Miller said, "that reapportionment is not supposed to split county lines if it could be avoided. The population deviance in this current plan is about 11 per cent and it's supposed to be between three and seven per cent.

"There's always an attempt made by legislators to protect incumbents. It happens in every legislature, and causes this type of reapportionment."

Citizens would be asked to join in the suit, he said, to show a broad representation of dissatisfaction with the plan.



STATE OF KANSAS

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

2ND FLOOR, KANSAS JUDICIAL CENTER, TOPEKA 66612-1597

ROBERT T. STEPHAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MAIN PHONE: (913) 296-2215
CONSUMER PROTECTION: 296-3751
TELECOPIER: 296-6296

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: The Honorable Vincent K. Snowbarger, Chairman
House Legislative, Judicial and Congressional
Apportionment Committee

FROM: Mark W. Stafford, Assistant Attorney General

DATE: January 24, 1989

RE: Testimony by the Office of the Secretary of State

On behalf of Secretary of State Bill Graves and members of his office, I appear before this committee, seeking your assistance and cooperation regarding questions about the 1988 state census.

As you know, there are lawsuits concerning the 1988 state census pending in the United States District Court in Topeka and in the Shawnee County District Court. The issues involve the statutes which directed the 1988 state census, as well as the implementation of those statutes. Daniel P. Kolditz, Assistant Attorney General, and I represent Secretary Graves and other members of his office in the above-mentioned litigation. I will not discuss the merits of the lawsuits before this committee. Neither is it my purpose or the Secretary of State's

*L., J. & C. Apportionment
1-24-89
Attachment 2*

purpose to interfere with, frustrate or delay the legislative task of apportionment.

The Secretary of State is anxious to answer questions from this committee. However, due to the pending litigation, I respectfully request your indulgence in allowing me to counsel the census staff regarding questions directed to them. The Secretary of State certainly wants to answer any questions which do not concern the lawsuits. Nonetheless, if a question touches, or may touch, on an issue which might be litigated, then I respectfully request that such question be submitted to the Secretary of State in writing. You can be assured that any question submitted in written form will be promptly reviewed and answered to the extent appropriate. If a question directly involves an issue in the lawsuits, we must respectfully decline to discuss the matter.

Since some of the members of this committee are attorneys, they should have a special understanding for the reasonableness of our request. Our request seems even more reasonable since one of the opposing parties in the lawsuits is a member of this committee. Since I am not permitted to have contact with that party, I will address only the committee chairman. The Secretary of State greatly wishes to cooperate with this committee. The 1987 Legislature directed an important task to

be carried out by his office and he is certainly eager to discuss the results of the census with this committee.

MWS:bas

Bill Graves
Secretary of State



2nd Floor, State Capitol
Topeka, KS 66612-1594
(913) 296-2236

STATE OF KANSAS

HOUSE APPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE

January 24, 1989

Testimony of

Brad Bryant, Census Director

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

My name is Brad Bryant, and I am director of the state census. I'm sure you detected some reluctance on the part of our legal counsel about our appearance, but we are pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you today. Pleased because we are proud of the result of nearly two years of work. We believe that the 1988 Kansas Census represents the most accurate count of the state population ever. It represents the diligence and hard work of more than 1,500 Kansans who successfully carried out your directives in conducting the census.

In compiling these figures we used methods and procedures that have been tried and tested by the U.S. Bureau of Census. Specifically, the Kansas Census was designed based on procedures used by the federal census bureau in conducting special censuses. Through newspapers, television, radio and literally hundreds of personal appearances, we launched a massive informational campaign to alert Kansans to the census. We adopted quality control methods patterned after the federal census bureau's quality control programs, including an extensive local review program in which we worked with local governmental officials to assure that all enumerations met reasonable standards of quality.

In addition to all this, we were able to secure the services of Mr. Rex Pullin as census consultant. Mr. Pullin worked for the U.S. Bureau of Census for 25 years. He was regional director of the Bureau of Census in Kansas City from 1973 to 1979 and

*L., J. & C. Apportionment
1-24-89
Attachment 3*

from 1979 to 1981 he worked in Washington, D.C., as national director for field operations. Because Mr. Pullin happens to live in Kansas City, we were able to secure his extensive expertise in the planning and carrying out of this important project. And we are fortunate that Mr. Pullin could be present today. He recently returned from Pakistan where he was serving as an adviser to the United Nations in its preparations for a census of that country.

The techniques used in the conduct of the census were designed to efficiently implement state law. The state was divided into five regions, roughly corresponding to congressional districts. A regional office was established in a centrally located city in each region. These regional offices were responsible for recruiting, hiring and training their local employees.

Initial data for the census were gathered through a mailing to each household in the state. Following this mailing, trained canvassers were sent into the field to create a listing of all housing units and to interview households that had not returned cards.

The mailing was coordinated with an intensive public relations campaign designed to increase the response to the mailing. The card itself was revised extensively based on the advice and recommendations of the Census Advisory Committee, a group of 18 citizens from across Kansas who gave of their time and energy to advise the Secretary of State on the census project. A 67 percent rate of return was achieved. This high rate of return allowed us to spend more time and money on quality control measures to assure the accuracy of our final figures.

About 1,200 canvassers were hired and trained to conduct the field work in the state's 2,986 precincts. On the average, each canvasser was responsible for 2 and 1/2 precincts. The canvasser's job was to travel through the precinct in a

prescribed and systematic manner, listing the address of each housing unit he encountered. As he listed each unit in the Address Register, he checked the returned cards to see if the occupants had returned their card. If they had, the canvassers enumerated the residents according to the information they provided. The card was retained as a permanent record. If the occupants had not returned their card, the canvasser contacted them personally to obtain the necessary information. If no respondent was available at the home, the canvasser attempted to reach them by telephone or made a call back to the household.

Quality control measures were extensive. In November 1987, we conducted a test run to discover how well the basic census procedures would work in a field test. All of the procedures tested worked well. Some technical problems were identified and corrected for the actual census.

When the census field work was completed for each county, all the precincts in that county were subjected to two separate quality control checks.

One, the listing and matching program, was designed to independently check a sampling of addresses in each precinct against the results submitted by the canvasser.

Then, when the preliminary housing unit and population totals were assembled for each county, the local review process was initiated. A local review form was completed for each county - showing the housing unit and population totals for each precinct as well as totals for the county. The county totals from the 1979 Kansas Department of Agriculture Census, the 1980 U.S. Census and 1986 U.S. Census estimates also were included for comparison. Also provided, when available, were the housing unit and population totals for cities in the county.

This information was sent to the county clerk and to the mayor of those cities for which separate totals were available. The local officials were asked to review the totals, sign the forms and return them if they found the totals to be reasonably accurate. If they suspected errors or inaccuracies, they were asked to call or write to specify where additional checks were needed.

More than 90 percent of the county clerks and 77 percent of all city officials signed and returned the local review forms.

A third quality control measure -- the Population Count Evaluation Program (PCE) -- was used in Johnson, Sedgwick and Wyandotte counties. Central office personnel obtained all census books from the three counties and drew a random sample for re-interview. The sample was every 205th housing unit in the county, with an additional listing of the next five units in the canvasser's path of travel.

Because there are about 144,000 college students in Kansas, counting them at the correct addresses was the most difficult aspect of the 1988 census. Instructions were carefully written and clearly indicated on the census card mailings to encourage respondents to correctly count their college-student dependents. Also, canvassers were trained to ask each respondent if they had such dependents who should be included. Canvassers in college towns were given special instructions to help them account for all households properly. Specially prepared brochures were passed out during January enrollment on all large campuses in the state.

As a further check on the college student count, computer printouts of spring semester enrollees were obtained from each college and university in the state. These lists were distributed among the regional census offices, where clerks checked the names against the completed census books to see that all were included in the correct precincts.

The Division of Census undertook a survey of on-campus residence halls at the regents' institutions. During the planning phase of the census project, a decision had been made to exclude on-campus residence halls from the original census card mailing and the subsequent canvassing. This decision was reached because residence halls were considered to be temporary residences, and the law required that all citizens be counted at their permanent residences. Married student housing and all types of off-campus housing were included in the mailing and canvassing.

At the request of local leaders in the affected areas, the Secretary of State instructed the Division of Census to survey the students in the residence halls to determine how many of them considered those halls to be their permanent residences. The election precincts containing the residence halls were then credited with the appropriate number of students.

In Wyandotte County, corrections were made to population totals submitted November 1. These corrections were made following an extensive local review program in which state employees worked in coordination with officials in Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County. The result of this extensive review in Wyandotte County was to lend further confidence to the accuracy and reliability of the state census project.

With me today are Mr. Pullin and former census director Brent Anderson, the current legal counsel in the Secretary of State's office. To the extent our legal counsel advises, we are prepared to answer any questions that you might have.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Bryant
Census Director

Census Facts

Submitted to: House Apportionment Committee

January 24, 1989

By: Census Division, Secretary of State's Office

Introduction

The information contained in this report is submitted in conjunction with the written testimony of Brad Bryant, census director, to the House Apportionment Committee

The 1988 Kansas Census reports the population of permanent residents, as

defined by K.S.A. 11-201 et seq., as 2,293,445. As to House and Senate districts, this total results in target district sizes as follows:

House District Target Size
18,348

Senate District Target Size
57,336

Contrasts: State and federal

One of the more difficult aspects of the census project is communicating to both the public and government officials the contrast in methodology between the 1988 Kansas Census and that used by the federal bureau of census.

The Kansas Census total population of 2,293,445 does not and is not intended to reflect the population of the state of Kansas as defined by federal standards. Because K.S.A. 11-204 directs the census division to count only U.S. citizens who are permanent residents of Kansas, groups such as aliens, non-resident college students and non-resident military personnel are not included in the

population total. However, special efforts were made to make certain that those persons who consider themselves Kansas residents were included in the state census.

For example, the census division contacted the commanding officer at each military installation in the state and, working through the chain of command, provided for the distribution of census cards to all soldiers living on-base who claimed Kansas as their place of permanent residence. Military personnel living off base or living on base in single family units were included in the original mailing and canvassing.

State agriculture census

Until 1979, state law directed the county assessor to enumerate persons residing within the county boundaries as of January 1 of each year, and report this information to the State Board of Agriculture.

The instructions pertaining to the county of Kansas inhabitants, provided by the State Board of Agriculture, required county assessors to "list all persons who have established a permanent residence in the county, including those who are temporarily absent therefrom." The board of agriculture did not provide county assessors with a clear, non-contradictory definition of legal residency. In practice, many definitions of legal residency exist. Some counties used the federal definition of residency, while others required evidence of intent to be a resident, such as registered to vote or the purchase of an automobile license, before counting that person as a county resident.

Depending upon which definition of legal residence a particular county adopted, it is evident that not all counties adopted the same procedure, thus leading to discrepancies in the enumeration.

Lack of standard enumeration procedures governing the census-taking process was the major complaint against the

board of agriculture census. Most decisions regarding residency and all other areas of the process were made by the 105 county assessors acting independently. Even the basic decision on method of enumeration was left to the county assessors.

The enumeration was conducted, literally, 105 different ways. Some counties used tax rolls, some counties went door to door, other counties sent out questionnaires and some counties used various combinations of these approaches. Quality control procedures were rarely used. Because of this, some counties would significantly over- or under-count its population.

Other problems with the agriculture census include the fact that the state required local officials to conduct this enumeration at local expense, within a limited time and with little or no guidance or assistance.

The county assessors also had clear economic incentives to portray a less than accurate population count. Because the state of Kansas used the annual agricultural census data as a basis for distributing some state taxes to local governments, counties could increase their share by inflating their census counts.

There is some evidence that the inflating of population

figures may have been wide-spread. In 1960, 83 of the 105 counties reported populations that were greater than the U.S.

census figures, a result that on a pure probability basis would occur about once in every 100,000 trials.

Population Count Evaluation Program

The Population Count Evaluation (PCE) Program of the 1988 Kansas Census was a quality control procedure used in the three most populated counties in Kansas — Johnson, Sedgwick and Wyandotte. The program was designed to take a random sample of housing units within each of the three counties and re-interview them to determine the accuracy of the census data obtained by the canvassers during the initial count. Each structure in which people live or could live is defined as a housing unit (HU). The random sample, equal to 0.5 percent of the total housing units, was taken from the lists of housing units in the census books from the target county.

In addition to the interviews conducted at the selected housing units, checks were done on the next five housing units in the canvasser's path of travel. These checks were made in order to test the completeness of the canvasser's original address listing.

Several statistics that resulted from the re-interviews at the sample housing units indicate the quality and

reliability of the original canvass. In Johnson County, the 0.5 percent sample consisted of 654 housing units, resulting in a net population change of +5, which equals +0.32 percent of the sample. In Sedgwick County, the sample consisted of interviews at 773 housing units and results in a net population change of +22, which equals +1.23 percent of the sample. In Wyandotte County, the sample was 333 housing units, which results in a net population change of +17, which equals +2.29 percent of the sample. The PCE results tended to confirm the local review generated changes requested by Wyandotte County.

In sum, 1,760 interviews were conducted, resulting in a net population change of +44, which represents a 1.07 percent increase in the population of the three counties. Those changes then were included in precinct totals.

In addition to the corrections summarized above, the PCE Program resulted in other improvements in the initial canvassing of the counties involved. When the findings from the re-interviews or the

additional address listings warranted them, further field checks were conducted in specified areas. These checks sometimes led to further corrections in the totals, but sometimes they merely served to satisfy the regional office that the original county was accurate.

The value of the PCE Program in analyzing the census project as a whole was

that it indicated that the original canvassing had produced data with an error rate entirely acceptable to experts on census taking. Furthermore, the PCE Program was conducted in the three counties which contained some of the most difficult areas to accurately enumerate. The error rate of the original canvass in other counties can be expected to be lower.

Local Review Program

The Local Review Program, which is patterned after an identical procedure carried out by the U.S. Bureau of Census during its decennial and special censuses, was initiated when census field work was completed for a given county.

As preliminary county population and housing unit figures were completed, they were sent to the county clerks in each county and to the mayors of the 168 cities for which separate population totals were obtainable. Population totals were not obtainable for those third-class cities that do not comprise precincts distinct from the surrounding townships.

Pursuant to the Local Review Program, local officials were asked to evaluate the preliminary census figures. A number of questions were received from local officials regarding the figures, the

naming of precincts and the geography of the census.

Among the 105 counties, 90 percent of the county clerks returned the forms signed, indicating approval of the figures. Also, the four election commissioners, who serve in Johnson, Sedgwick, Wyandotte and Shawnee counties, signed and returned the local review forms. Some city forms were signed by mayors, some by city planners, some by city managers and some by city clerks.

Among the 168 cities, 77 percent of the forms were returned and signed.

As part of its records, the census division compiled the oral and written responses to the local review process by city and county and by the nature of the local review inquiry, as well as by the response from the census division.

Whenever requested by

local officials, representatives from the census division and the secretary of state's office met personally with the officials to respond to any questions or concerns raised. Often the concerns of local officials were directed to housing units, as opposed to population totals, based on their information about utility hookups, building permits, postal delivery information and federal census estimates.

However, many of the questions about the census were resolved when local

officials were made aware of the methodology contained in the census statute and its provision that no state census information would be used for funding purposes.

The most extensive local review occurred in Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County, where as a result of information provided by local officials the census division undertook a comprehensive review of its initial canvass. The results of that process are discussed elsewhere in this report.

Wyandotte County Review

A review was conducted of all precincts in Wyandotte County during the months of October, November and December of 1988, as a result of the local review. This review was structured into four phases that are described below.

Phase 1 was carried out by census personnel, the results of which were included in the November 1 report. Forty-six (46) precincts were chosen at random, and when plotted on a map of the county they represented all geographic areas of the county. The method used to conduct this portion of the review was a normal census procedure, Address Listing Checks (ALCs). This procedure required census personnel to verify each house in the

completed census book by driving each street in the chosen precinct. When a housing unit was not verified, the census personnel canvassed such unit for inclusion in the census book.

Phase 2 and 3 were similarly conducted, the difference being the City of Kansas City chose not to participate after phase 2 because of the amount of staff time involved. All fifty-five (55) precincts reviewed were selected at random, with the City of Kansas City research staff selecting the precincts in phase 2. Quarter-section maps, utility hookup information, building permit and demolition records, and the census books were used in the review. Teams of city employees and census personnel

(teams in the phase 3 were composed only of census personnel) reviewed addresses and utility hookups in comparison to the census books. Possible misses were cited, to be later verified visually by the teams. The person/housing unit average and the occupancy rate for each precinct were then applied to the verified missed housing units.

A statistical correction was used for phase 4. The population corrections for the preceding phases were averaged, then such average was applied to each of the remaining precincts.

Figures from phases 2, 3 and 4 were then included in the January 12, 1989 addendum to the November 1, 1988 final census report.

Counting college students

The Legislature chose to continue the prior policy of counting college students in their home towns unless they affirmatively adopted their college towns as their permanent residences. Since the federal census counts students wherever they are found, special procedures were adopted to accurately count students using the Kansas methodology.

Relying upon the recommendation of the census advisory committee, the census card made special reference to college students. The cards were sent at a time when college campuses were closed and students would likely be home.

When the students returned to school, special information sheets were distributed at enrollment and advertisements appeared in

local newspapers. Students who lived off-campus or in married student housing actually received cards and were canvassed by specially trained canvassers.

Because dormitories were closed on census day and second semester assignments were not made, dormitories were not considered permanent residences and were not canvassed. However, in response to local review complaints, a survey was done of dormitories on Regent campuses. Only 9.9 percent of the dormitory residents indicated that they had abandoned their former place of residence.

The average results of the survey were multiplied by the dormitory residents at all colleges and universities in Kansas and the number added to the appropriate precincts.