Approved 4-29-92
Date

MINUTES OF THE Special COMMITTEE ON Apportionment.

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

5:10 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on Thursday, March 19, 1992 in room 529-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:
Mary Galligan, Kansas 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 Thursday, March 19th, 1992 in Room 529-S. The meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m. by Representative Joan Adam, Chair.

Representative Adam stated she had been asked by several members of the House as to how the Senate was progressing with their map and the status of the House map that was currently in the Senate. Senator Vidricksen stated he hoped by the first of the week (March 23rd) they would have some concensus on a Senate redistricting plan.

The Chair stated the topic of the meeting was consideration of the map from the Republican side which would be their base map and their response to what the Democrats had presented previously.

Representative Snowbarger stated it was his understanding that he would return to the meeting with 2 maps. The first map he presented entitled Congressional Republican 1(Attachment 1) was similar to a map presented very early in the process. He remarked that if it became necessary to go into court it was a map he would feel very comfortable with.

The second map he presented entitled Congressional - Republican 2 (Attachment 2) was a version of the map introduced in the Senate which addressed some of the concerns he had about that map, particularly in SE Kansas. In this map Reno would go into the 1st district, Geary County in the 1st and it unified the 6 counties in SE Kansas. The deviation on this map is 0.41.

Representative Adam stated she liked the 4th district on the first map presented as it was quite similar, if not matching, the one presented by the Democrats, however she felt this map maximized the SE corner of the state but was a disadvantage to Riley and Geary counties.

Representative Snowbarger stated that if Riley and Geary counties remain in the 2nd district then SE Kansas has to be reshaped and split up.

Representative Reardon stated the map the Democrats had presented, the one the Senate introduced and Congressional Republican 2 presented by Representative Snowbarger all had similar characteristics in that all of the counties in SE Kasnas were not in the same district.

Representative Snowbarger remarked that the problem was a definition of SE Kansas. Representative Adam stated it was not clear even from the people in SE Kansas exactly what SE Kansas is.

Representative Adam stated she had thought today Republicans would present one map that all agreed upon and she was confused because she did not feel they were here to negotiate with each of them on different maps which they each preferred.

Representative Reardon stated it was very difficult to begin negotiations without an agreed starting point. He further stated the Democrats had a starting point with the

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

one map which they introduced and all agreed upon and it was necessary for the Republicans to come up with a map which they agreed on.

Senator Vidricksen questioned whether the map the Democrats had proposed met the guidelines that the committee had decided upon.

Representative Reardon countered he felt it met all of the guidelines, low deviation, reflects the community of interest, maintains the guideline that was voted on to keep the existing districts as possible to what they are now.

Senator Bond stated the map the Democrats presented was not compact as far as District 1 was concerned.

Representative Adam handed out maps from other states to see what kinds of districts they were presenting in their maps. (Attachment 3) She wanted to show that other states did have wrap arounds and this was necessary to keep community of interest together.

Representative Adam asked the Republicans if they could have a single map by Monday. They responded they felt they could have a map by Tuesday, March 24th.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m. with the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 24th at 5:00 p.m. in Room 529-S.

KLRDHR

CONGRESS – REPUBLICAN 1

March 18, 1992

42.247108 N 102.715157 W — 0 — 100 — 200 — 300 MI — 42.247108 N 93.784843 W



34.752895 N 102.715157 W — 0 — 100 — 200 — 300 MI — 34.752895 N 93.784843 W

LEGEND

- County Boundary
- Dist. Boundary (CONG)
- District 1
- District 2
- District 3
- District 4
- 19 County

DEVIATION – .34
RENO IN 4TH
DOUGLAS IN 3RD
SOUTHEAST WHOLE

Special Committee on Apportionment
March 19, 1992
Attachment 1

2-1

DB: KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics
Total Populations, All Ages
Plan: CONGRESSIONAL - HOUSE REP.

Date: 3/18/92
Time: 1:47 p.m.

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	619,152	619,394	-242	-0.04%
District 3	1	620,839	619,394	1,445	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:	618,707 to 620,839
Ratio range:	1.0034
Absolute range:	-687 to 1,445
Absolute overall range:	2,132
Relative range:	-0.11 to 0.23%
Relative overall range:	0.34%
Absolute mean deviation:	723.00
Relative mean deviation:	0.12%
Standard deviation:	849.5413

KLRDHF

CONGRESS – REPUBLICAN 2

March 18, 1992

42.247108 N
102.715157 W

0 100 200 300 MI

42.247108 N
93.784843 W



LEGEND

- County Boundary
- Dist. Boundary (CONG)
- District 1
- District 2
- District 3
- District 4
- 19 County

DEVIATION – .41
RENO IN 1ST
DOUGLAS IN 3RD
SOUTHEAST WHOLE
RILEY IN 2ND

34.752895 N
102.715157 W

0 100 200 300 MI

34.752895 N
93.784843 W

Special Committee on Apportionment
March 19, 1992
Attachment 2

DB: KANSAS

Congressional District Statistics
Total Populations, All Ages
Plan: CONGRESSIONAL - HOUSE REP.

Date: 3/18/92
Time: 8:57 a.m.

Plan type: 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TYPE

District Name	Number Members	Total Population	Ideal Population	District Variance	% District Variance
District 1	1	618,315	619,394	-1,079	-0.17%
District 2	1	618,584	619,394	-810	-0.13%
District 3	1	620,839	619,394	1,445	0.23%
District 4	1	619,836	619,394	442	0.07%
Total	4	2,477,574	2,477,576	-2	0.00%

PLANWIDE STATISTICS:

Range of populations:	618,315 to 620,839
Ratio range:	1.0041
Absolute range:	-1,079 to 1,445
Absolute overall range:	2,524
Relative range:	-0.17 to 0.23%
Relative overall range:	0.41%
Absolute mean deviation:	944.00
Relative mean deviation:	0.15%
Standard deviation:	1012.8833

MAR 18 '92 14:45 SENT FROM THE DEM. NAT'L COMM.

Attachment 3
March 19, 1992
Special Committee on Apportionment

OKLAHOMA CONGRESSIONAL PLAN
(BASED ON 1990 CENSUS)

J



IMPAC 2000

State of Oklahoma

Draft

Congressional Plan - SF 1597

January 9, 1992 Federal Plan Minnesota

Seven County Metro Area



-9-

02-26-92 17:40 SENATE COUNSEL/RESEARCH ID=612 296 7747 P.04

IMPAC 2000

VIRGINIA
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS '92



Tidewater Area



Congressional District Plan
Governor's Amendments
12/2/91

-10-

Richmond and Petersburg Area



Northern Virginia Area



Texas Plan

-11-

HOUSTON AREA →