

Approved 4-29-92
Date

MINUTES OF THE Special COMMITTEE ON Apportionment

The meeting was called to order by Representative Joan Adam at
Chairperson

5:07 a.m./p.m. on Tuesday, March 17, 1992 in room 529-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

Mary Galligan, Legislative Research Department
Raney Gilliland, Legislative Research Department
Mary Torrence, Revisor of Statutes' Office
Bob Coldsnow, Revisor of Statutes' Office
Ellie Luthye, Committee Secretary
Conferees appearing before the committee:

The Special Committee on Apportionment met on Tuesday, March 17th, 1992 in Room 529-S. Representative Joan Adam, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

Representative Adam opened the meeting with a statement concerning the press activity over the past few days regarding the reapportionment process. She stated this raised a question as to what the Task Force would be doing in the next week and asked what direction the rest of the committee saw the Task Force going as a group.

Senator Vidricksen responded they had announced a week before the Senate was going to introduce a map on their own. He stated the map they introduced in the Senate entitled Republican Congressional (Attachment 1) was very close to the map that had previously been presented by the Chair. He also showed a map entitled Plan G showing the Johnson County district extending all the way to the Oklahoma border (Attachment 2). He stated they had used Plan G map as a plan they thought perhaps the group could support by taking some counties off the long stretch from Johnson County to the Oklahoma border and put in some more of SE Kansas.

Representative Adam stated she did have a problem with maps being introduced into the Senate and House if they had not been agreed to by the Task Force committee as a whole.

Representative Reardon remarked that he did feel the map that was presented at the last meeting, Reardon Cong, (Attachment 3) and the Republican Congressional the Senate introduced were very close and had lots of similarities. He suggested they take the two maps and try to come up with a map that was agreeable and one that was bi-partisan.

Senator Karr reviewed the areas that were of concern: 1) whether Douglas would stay in the 2nd; 2) whether SE Kansas would stay in a block; 3) whether Reno would stay in the 4th and 4) whether Riley and Geary counties would stay in the 2nd. He stated the Douglas County people and their Commission wanted to be in the 2nd, the SE Kansas people wanted to stay in a block as much as possible, there was good concensus of the Reno County people they wanted to stay in the 4th and Riley and Geary counties wanted to stay in the 2nd.

The Chair agreed this summary was correct and reflected the areas that were left to be addressed.

Representative Reardon stated the map Senator Vidricksen drew for the 4th district originally kept more of the current counties in the 4th district than the map that had been introduced.

Senator Vidricksen called the committee's attention to the map entitled Vidricksen Original (Attachment 4). Representative Snowbarger stated it was compact around Sedgewick, compact around Johnson and Wyandotte and about a 50/50 split on combining the 2nd and 5th districts.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Special COMMITTEE ON Apportionment,
room 529-S, Statehouse, at 5:07 a.m./p.m. on Tuesday, March 17, 1992

Representative Adam presented a map entitled Congressional 2/26/92 as the map the Democrats were proposing and stated it was very close to the one they had presented previously, Reardon Cong. Senator Karr stated this map came the closest to maintaining county integrity, maintaining the districts and keeping a low deviation of 0.35 and it was his feeling the map addressed the four areas he mentioned before. (Attachment 5)

Following discussion on the maps regarding community of interest, deviation, etc. Senator Karr asked Representative Snowbarger to explain what he felt was an acceptable compromise.

Representative Snowbarger answered he felt Riley and Geary counties should be in the 1st district. He did not care about Reno, SE Kansas should remain whole and Douglas County preferable in the 3rd, stating he felt there was more of a community of interest with Kansas City with the KU Med Center, KU West Campus and with Johnson and Wyandotte counties going toward the Lawrence area and all three counties running along Highway K-10.

Representative Snowbarger suggested that if the group wanted to focus on Reno County perhaps each group could bring back a map that put Reno in the 1st and also in the 4th.

Representative Reardon countered that he thought they had narrowed it to 2 maps but apparently the Republicans were not in agreement on the map that had been introduced in the Senate.

There was committee discussion as to the deviation of the various maps. Representative Snowbarger stated if the committee was going to maintain county integrity then it should work toward getting the map with the lowest deviation but not necessarily the lowest. If low deviation was the first priority then county line integrity would have to be forgotten.

Following this discussion Representative Adam asked the committee if they were clear on their assignment that the Republicans would return with a map at the next meeting. She adjourned the meeting at 6:10 p.m. until Thursday, March 19th.


REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL

KLRD2
 March 10, 1992
 mkg

42.372185 N 0 100 200 300 MI 43.382185 N 102.71515 W

LEGEND

- County Boundary
- Dist. Boundary (CONG)
- 19 County



Overall deviation .57%

42.372185 N 0 100 200 300 MI 43.382185 N 102.71515 W

Special Committee on Apportionment
 March 17, 1992
 Attachment 1

DB: KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics

Date: 3/10/92

Time: 1:48 p.m.

Plan: REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL

Page: 1

Plan type: 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TYPE

District Name	Number Members	Total Population	Ideal Population	District Variance	% District Variance
District 1	1	617,806	619,394	-1,588	-0.26%
District 2	1	617,701	619,394	-1,693	-0.27%
District 3	1	621,228	619,394	1,834	0.30%
District 4	1	620,839	619,394	1,445	0.23%
Total	4	2,477,574	2,477,576	-2	0.00%

PLANWIDE STATISTICS:

Range of populations: 617,701 to 621,228
Ratio range: 1.0057

Absolute range: -1,693 to 1,834
Absolute overall range: 3,527

Relative range: -0.27 to 0.30%
Relative overall range: 0.57%

Absolute mean deviation: 1640.00
Relative mean deviation: 0.26%


Standard deviation: 1646.1754

PLAN NAME: PLAN G

KLRD2
November 16, 1991
mkg

LEGEND

- - - - County Boundary
- ▬▬▬▬▬▬ Dist. Plan (COMG)
- 10 County



PLAN PRESENTED AT CONGRESSIONAL
WORKGROUP MEETING 11/12/91

Special Committee on Apportionment
 March 17, 1992
 ATTACHMENT 2

DB: KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics
Total Populations, All Ages
Plan: Plan "G"

Date: 11/15/90
Time: 3:12 p.m.
Page:

Plan type: 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TYPE

District Name	Number Members	Total Population	Ideal Population	District Variance	% District Variance
District 1	1	618,083	619,394	-1,311	-0.21%
District 2	1	619,379	619,394	-15	0.00%
District 3	1	620,675	619,394	1,281	0.21%
District 4	1	619,437	619,394	43	0.01%
Total	4	2,477,574	2,477,576	-2	0.00%

PLANWIDE STATISTICS:

Range of populations: 618,083 to 620,675
Ratio range: 1.0042

Absolute range: -1,311 to 1,281
Absolute overall range: 2,592

Relative range: -0.21 to 0.21%
Relative overall range: 0.42%

Absolute mean deviation: 662.50
Relative mean deviation: 0.11%


Standard deviation: 916.7546

PLAN NAME: REARDON CONG

KLRD2


February 15, 1992

mkg



LEGEND

- - - - County Boundary
- Dist. Boundary (CONG)
- 10 County



Special Committee on Apportionment
 March 17, 1992
 Attachment 3

PRESENTED TO WORKGROUP
2/12/92



KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics
Total Populations, All Ages
Plan: REARDON CONG

Date: 2/14/92
Time: 4:35 p.m.
Page: 1

type: 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TYPE

District Name	Number Members	Total Population	Ideal Population	District Variance	% District Variance
District 1	1	618,681	619,394	-713	-0.12%
District 2	1	619,397	619,394	3	0.00%
District 3	1	620,789	619,394	1,395	0.23%
District 4	1	618,707	619,394	-687	-0.11%
1	4	2,477,574	2,477,576	-2	0.00%

WIDE STATISTICS:

range of populations: 618,681 to 620,789
ratio range: 1.0034

absolute range: -713 to 1,395
absolute overall range: 2,108

relative range: -0.12 to 0.23%
relative overall range: 0.34%

absolute mean deviation: 699.50
relative mean deviation: 0.11%


standard deviation: 855.3321

PLAN NAME: VIDRICKSEN ORIGINAL

KLRD2
November 15, 1991
mkg

LEGEND

- - - - County Boundary
- Dist. Plan (CONS)
- 10 County



PLAN PRESENTED AT CONGRESSIONAL
WORKGROUP MEETING 11/12/91

DB: KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics
Total Populations, All Ages
Plan: Vidricksen Original

Date: 11/2
Time: 8:33 a.
Page:

Plan type: 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TYPE

District Name	Number Members	Total Population	Ideal Population	District Variance	% District Variance
District 1	1	618,876	619,394	-518	-0.08%
District 2	1	617,680	619,394	-1,714	-0.28%
District 3	1	622,311	619,394	2,917	0.47%
District 4	1	618,707	619,394	-687	-0.11%
Total	4	2,477,574	2,477,576	-2	0.00%

PLANWIDE STATISTICS:

Range of populations: 617,680 to 622,311
Ratio range: 1.0075

Absolute range: -1,714 to 2,917
Absolute overall range: 4,631

Relative range: -0.28 to 0.47%
Relative overall range: 0.75%


Absolute mean deviation: 1459.00
Relative mean deviation: 0.24%

Standard deviation: 1745.4926

CONGRESS 2/26/92

RILEY/GEARY IN 2ND/RENO IN 4TH


42 247108 N
102 715164 W



42 247108 N
93 784843 W


LEGEND

- County Boundary
- Dist. Boundary (CONG)
- 10 County



Special Committee on Apportionment
March 17, 1992
Attachment 5

34 752892 N
102 715164 W



34 752892 N
93 784843 W

Variance. 35

DB: KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics
Total Populations, All Ages
Plan: CONGRESS 2/26

Date: 2/26/92
Time: 3:55 p.m.
Page: 1

Plan type: 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TYPE

District Name	Number Members	Total Population	Ideal Population	District Variance	% District Variance
District 1	1	618,621	619,394	-773	-0.12%
District 2	1	619,457	619,394	63	0.01%
District 3	1	620,789	619,394	1,395	0.23%
District 4	1	618,707	619,394	-687	-0.11%
Total	4	2,477,574	2,477,576	-2	0.00%

PLANWIDE STATISTICS:

Range of populations: 618,621 to 620,789
Ratio range: 1.0035

Absolute range: -773 to 1,395
Absolute overall range: 2,168

Relative range: -0.12 to 0.23%
Relative overall range: 0.35%

Absolute mean deviation: 729.50
Relative mean deviation: 0.12%

Standard deviation: 868.8343