Approved: April 12, 2002
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Michael R. O'Neal at 6:00 p.m. on January 22, 2002 in Room 313--S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Representative Carl Krehbiel - Excused

Committee staff present:
Mary Galligan, Department of Legislative Research
Kathie Sparks, Department of Revisor of Statutes
Cindy O'Neal, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Dr. Joe Aistrup, Fort Hays State University
Leslie Kaufman, Farm Bureau
Steve Pickman, President of the Atchinson Chamber of Commerce
Alan Revies, Atchinson
John Kujawa, Atchinson Casing Corporation
Lynda Wilkinson, Southeast Kansas Inc.
Billy McCray, Wichita
Rob Lessen, Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce
Reverend Wanda McDaniels

Information provided by staff for the committee:

- Press Release for the public hearing (Attachment 1)
- Set of State House 4 maps (Attachment 2)
- Technical Report on State House 4 (Attachment 3)
- House & Senate calendars (Attachment 4)
- Committee Guidelines (Attachment 5)
- Set of maps showing the deviation from ideal district population (Attachment 6)

Dr. Joe Aistrup, Fort Hays State University, express his concerns about the map eliminating rural districts and splitting communities of interest. He requested that the map be redrawn to maximize the five percent variance guideline, so that rural districts would have a population of 20,400 and urban districts would have a 22, 400 population. He was opposed to the splitting of the City of Hays, especially when other communities were not split. (Attachment 7)

Leslie Kaufman, Farm Bureau, stated that they would not endorse any map but would prefer one that would keep as many rural legislators as possible. She raised concerns that are important to rural Kansans. Each Representative would have a larger geographic area and therefore would have further to travel. (Attachment 8)

Steve Pickman, President of the Atchinson Chamber of Commerce, stated that he was concerned with placing the first precinct in the City of Atchinson with the Citys of Leavenworth and Lansing because it would split up neighborhoods and drive a wedge into the industrial base. (Attachment 9)

Alan Revies, Atchinson, expressed his concern about not getting the representation they would need since Leavenworth & Lansing would be a "bigger" part of the district than the first precinct in Atchinson. (Attachment 10)

John Kujawa, Atchinson Casing Corporation, believes that the courts would prefer that counties, cities and precincts not be divided except when absolutely necessary. (Attachment 11)

Lynda Wilkinson, Southeast Kansas Inc., commented on the concerns with making sure that they receive good representation due to the new highway program and the possibility of there being cuts. They are trying to encourage population growth and employment and don't believe that it is time to be reducing their representation. (Attachment 12)

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE at 3:30 p.m. on January 22, 2002 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

Billy McCray, Wichita, suggested extending the 89th District east of Hillside toward Olive & Woodlawn streets and make 53rd Street at Hydraulic the Northwest boundary of the district, because the current map could violate the 1965 Voting Rights Act. (Attachment 13)

Rob Lessen, Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, read Brian Jones testimony, which opposed the map because it would disenfranchise the city of Pittsburg and residents would lose their stake in state government. (Attachment 14)

Reverend Wanda McDaniels, was upset with the proposed map because it dilutes the voting power of minority representation in Kansas.

The additional attachments were distributed at the meeting:

- E-mails (Attachment 15)
- Resolutions from the Cities of Arma & Cherokee; and Crawford County (Attachment 16)
- Pawnee County Economic Development Commission (Attachment 17)
- Ellis County Clerk/Election Office (Attachment 18)
- Unified School Districts -Crawford-Neosho Counties (Attachment 19)
- Fort Hays State University (Attachment 20)
- City of Coffeyville (Attachment 21)
- The Pelican Press, Larned (Attachment 22)
- City of Hays (Attachment 23)
- Midwest Grain Products, Inc. (Attachment 24)
- Nemaha County Commissioners (Attachment 25)
- Atchinson Casting (Attachment 26)
- Ronald Thomas, Baxter Springs (Attachment 27)
- Allen Reavis, Atchinson (Attachment 28)
- Susie Crockett-Spoon, Wichita (Attachment 29)
- Norman Maier, Edwardsville (Attachment 30)
- John Peters, Edwardsville (Attachment 31)
- John Sower, Edwardsville (Attachment 32)
- Senator Barone (Attachment 33)

The committee meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

HOUSE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE
GUEST LIST
January 22, 2002

NAME	REPRESENTING
Jennifer Kiehl	Atchison Chamber of Commerce
John R. Kujawa	Atchison Steel Casting & Machining
Steve Pickman	ATCHISON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
Allen Reavis	ATCHISON - Planning Commission / Republican Party
Stan Ahlerich	Kansas Farm Bureau
Rev. Wanda M. McDaniel	Wichita Branch NAACP
Rev. Charles Mayey	Wichita KS. 67213
Sue Storm	KS House #22
Megan Chalfant	Democratic Party
[illegible]	Ks. House District #1
Rob Lessen	Pittsburg Area Chamber
Tom Collinsay	Pittsburg Industrial Development Co
STEVE WARD	Pittsburg AREA CHAMBER
Mike Brasser	KS Secretary of State
Martin Hawver	Hawver's Capitol Report
Trista Beadles	Governor's Office
Garry Boston	KS HOUSE DIST 72
Ryan Wright	Speaker's Office
Dennis Pyle	KS House Dist 49
Joshua Akers	Associated Press

STATE OF KANSAS

BEN F. BARRETT
DIRECTOR
WILLIAM G. WOLFF
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
ALAN D. CONROY
CHIEF FISCAL ANALYST

STAFF
LEGISLATIVE COORDINATING COUNCIL
INTERIM COMMITTEES
STANDING COMMITTEES
LEGISLATIVE INQUIRIES

THE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
300 W. TENTH — ROOM 545 N — TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1504
PHONE 785 296-3181 FAX 785 296-3824
E-MAIL: kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us INTERNET: http://skyways.lib.ks.us/ksleg/KLRD/klrd.html

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Kathie Sparks
Kansas Legislative Research Department
(785) 296-3181
(785) 296-3824 (fax)
E-mail: kathies@klrd.state.ks.us

The House Committee on Redistricting has scheduled a public hearing on the proposed House redistricting plan (HB 2625). The hearing will be January 22, 2002 in the Old Supreme Court Room (313-S) in the Statehouse beginning at 6:00 p.m. The purpose of the public hearing is to gather input with regard to the House redistricting plan known as *State House 4*. A copy of the plan and related statistical information can be seen on the Kansas Legislative Research Department's website at http://skyways.lib.ks.us/ksleg/KLRD/Redistrct/Plans/StateHouse4/statehouse4.html.

Persons who wish to present a formal statement at the meeting are asked to contact the Legislative Research Department at (785)296-3181 or via e-mail at kathies@klrd.state.ks.us prior to the meeting. Persons who are unable to attend the meeting are welcome to submit written testimony to Kathie Sparks, Redistricting Staff, Kansas Legislative Research Department, 300 SW 10th, Room 545-N Statehouse, Topeka, KS 66612. Persons who will make a formal presentation are requested to bring 50 copies of their statement for distribution to the Committee; however, if making this number of copies presents a hardship, conferees are asked to provide one copy to staff at the meeting.

House Redistricting
Attachment 1
1-22-02

Background

The *Kansas Constitution* requires legislative districts to be redrawn every ten years. The House Redistricting Committee has developed proposed new districts and this redistricting plan is currently under consideration by the 2002 Legislature. The Legislature faces a very tight schedule for enactment of a legislative redistricting plan because of the constitutional requirement that the State Supreme Court approve plans for the state House and Senate before they can take effect. The time available for developing new districts is limited by the fact that 2002 is an election year. The candidate filing deadline for the August primary election is in June 2002, barring any delays resulting from redistricting. Therefore, districts need to be finalized early enough to give sufficient planning time to potential candidates.

Since 1990, Kansas' population considered for legislative redistricting increased 9.3 percent to 2,672,257 as of April 1, 2000. The current population is 226,877 more than the 1990 population of 2,445,380. The 2000 Census results reflect a continued trend toward concentration of people in urban areas in the state and a declining population in predominately rural areas. Six of Kansas' 105 counties now account for 52 percent of the state's population. Those counties are: Sedgwick, Johnson, Shawnee, Wyandotte, Douglas, and Leavenworth. In 1990, those counties accounted for 49 percent of Kansas' total population. Those six counties accounted for nearly 82 percent of the state's total population increase during the 1990s. In contrast, 57 of the state's 105 counties lost population since 1990.

Another significant trend is the increased number of Hispanics in the state. In 1990, Hispanics constituted 3.6 percent of the Kansas population, whereas in 2000, they represent 7.0 percent of the population. Hispanics now constitute the largest racial/ethnic minority group in the state.

New legislative districts must be drawn to be nearly equal in population. The current House districts range from a low of 15,310 to a high of 60,943 people. The acceptable range of population for a district is 20,309 to 22,447. The ideal district size is 21,378. The proposed House redistricting plan is composed of districts that range in population from 20,338 to 22,441.

M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR
Map Layers
Voting District
County
Interstate Highway
Districts

0 20 40 60
Miles
Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

NOTE: In urban areas, VTD boundaries and highways have been hidden so that other information can be displayed. Detailed maps of urban areas follow this statewide map.



W= Wichita districts 83-89, 91,92, 94-98, 100, 103, 105

T= Topeka districts 52, 55-58

E=Wyandotte and Johnson Co. districts 14-26, 30-35, 28, 29,37,48,49

M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

Voting District

County

Cities class 1 or 2

House Incumbent

Interstate Highways

0 10 20 30

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Western Kansas



M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

Voting District

County

Cities class 1 or 2

House Incumbent

Interstate Highways

0 10 20 30

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Central Kansas

Note: urban incumbents not shown on this map will be shown on subsequent detail maps.



M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

Voting District

Cities class 1 or 2

House Incumbent

Interstate Highway

County

0 10 20 30

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

NOTE: Urban incumbents not shown on this map will be shown on subsequent detail maps.

State House 4

Eastern Kansas







State House 4

Garden City and Dodge City







State House 4

Salina, Hays and Hutchinson









M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers
- Voting District
- County
- Cities class 1 or 2
- House Incumbent
- Interstate Highways

0 2 4 6
Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Sedgewick County





M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

- Voting District
- County
- Cities class 1 or 2
- House Incumbent
- Interstate Highways

0 1 2 3

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Northwest Wichita





M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers
- Voting District
- County
- Cities class 1 or 2
- House Incumbent
- Interstate Highways

0 1 2 3
Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Northeast Wichita





M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

- Voting District
- County
- Cities class 1 or 2
- House Incumbent
- Interstate Highways

0 1 2 3

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Southeast Wichita



State House 4

Topeka area

M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

- County
- Voting District
- Cities class 1 or 2
- House Incumbent
- Interstate Highway

0 1 2 3

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01



M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

- County
- Voting District
- Cities class 1 or 2
- House Incumbent
- Interstate Highway

0 .8 1.6 2.4

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Lawrence area



State House 4

Atchison and Leavenworth areas





M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

Map Layers

Voting District

Cities class 1 or 2

House Incumbent

County

0 1 2 3

Miles

Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

State House 4

Wyandotte County



M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR
Map Layers
Voting District
Cities class 1 or 2
House Incumbent
Interstate Highway
County
0 1 2 3
Miles
Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01



State House 4

Johnson County

Northeast corner






M2_State House 4 for KLRD TR
Map Layers
Voting District
Cities class 1 or 2
House Incumbent
Interstate Highway
County
0 .6 1.2 1.8
Miles
Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01
State House 4
Johnson County
Central east
page 16 of 19
Prairie Village
Lenexa
Overland Park
Olathe
Leawood
Ray
Owens
DiVita
Huff
Lightner
Patterson
W 87TH STREET PKY
W 87TH ST
W 91ST ST
W 95TH ST
W 99TH ST
W 99TH TER
W 103RD ST
W 111TH ST
W 119TH ST
W 123RD RD
W 127TH ST
W 131ST ST
W 133RD ST
W 135TH ST
W 143RD ST
W 151ST ST
W 159TH ST
LENEXA DR
GODDARD ST
FARLEY ST
HAYES DR
CARTER ST
OLIVIA RD
ROSEHILL RD
OVERLAND PKY
GILLETTE ST
I 435
MISSION RD
EL MONTE ST
METCALF AVE
LEE BLVD
STATE LINE RD
STATE LINE
SWITZER RD
QUIVIRA RD
ANTIOCH RD
US HWY 69
PFLUMM RD
NALL AVE
KENNETH RD
17
21
30
16
19
20
14
29
49
48
28
27


M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR
Map Layers
Voting District
Cities class 1 or 2
House Incumbent
Interstate Highway
County
0 .8 1.6 2.4
Miles
Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01
State House 4
Johnson County
Central
page 17 of 19
Lenexa
Olathe
Overland Park
Campbell
Toplikar
Williams, D.
Huff
DiVita
Lightner
Owens
Storm
W 79TH ST
W 83RD ST
W 87TH STREET PKY
W 87TH ST
W 91ST ST
W 99TH ST
W 99TH TER
W 103RD ST
W 111TH ST
W 115TH TER
W 119TH ST
W 123RD RD
W 127TH ST
W 135TH ST
W 143RD ST
W 151ST ST
W 159TH ST
W 175TH ST
STATE HWY 10
STATE HWY 7
N 7 HWY
E HAROLD ST
E KANSAS CITY RD
E SANTA FE ST
W SANTA FE ST
W ELM ST
S RIDGEVIEW RD
S WOODLAND ST
S LAKESHORE DR
S MONTCLAIRE DR
S PARKER ST
S LONE ELM RD
S CLARE RD
S BLACK BOB RD
S MUR LEN RD
S WILLOW DR
ROGERS RD
PFLUMM RD
S LACKMAN RD
RENNER BLVD
MAURER RD
LENEXA DR
GOODARD ST
SWITZER ST
QUIVIRA RD
ROSEHILL RD
OVERLAND PKY
I435
I35
SWITZER RD
ANTIOCH RD
US HWY 69
FARLEY ST
HAYES DR
CARTER ST
22
17
38
30
16
19
14
29
15
49
48
43
27
26

2-17

State House 4

Emporia and Pittsburg









State House 4

M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR
Map Layers
County
District
0 20 40 60
Miles
Kansas Legislative Research Dept. 12/21/01

NOTE: In urban areas, VTD boundaries and highways have been hidden so that other information can be displayed. Color etailed maps of urban areas preceed this statewide map.



W= Wichita districts 83-89, 91,92, 94-98, 100, 103, 105

T= Topeka districts 52, 55-57

E=Wyandotte and Johnson Co. districts 14-27, 30-36, 29,37,48,49

M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR

t	Population	Deviation	%Devation	Dist	Population	Deviation	%Devation	Dist	Population	Deviation	%Devation
	21,495	117	.55 %	43	22,046	668	3.12 %	85	21,843	465	2.18 %
2	22,431	1,053	4.93 %	44	22,234	856	4.00 %	86	21,787	409	1.91 %
3	21,870	492	2.30 %	45	21,714	336	1.57 %	87	22,153	775	3.63 %
4	21,796	418	1.96 %	46	21,816	438	2.05 %	88	21,145	-233	-1.09 %
5	21,020	-358	-1.67 %	47	20,338	-1,040	-4.86 %	89	20,740	-638	-2.98 %
6	20,669	-709	-3.32 %	48	21,814	436	2.04 %	90	21,567	189	.88 %
7	21,801	423	1.98 %	49	22,141	763	3.57 %	91	21,217	-161	-.75 %
8	22,320	942	4.41 %	50	20,415	-963	-4.50 %	92	20,624	-754	-3.53 %
9	21,019	-359	-1.68 %	51	20,888	-490	-2.29 %	93	21,662	284	1.33 %
10	21,103	-275	-1.29 %	52	20,615	-763	-3.57 %	94	20,528	-850	-3.98 %
11	20,397	-981	-4.59 %	53	20,729	-649	-3.04 %	95	21,466	88	.41 %
12	21,857	479	2.24 %	54	20,746	-632	-2.96 %	96	22,063	685	3.20 %
13	20,989	-389	-1.82 %	55	21,473	95	.44 %	97	20,942	-436	-2.04 %
14	22,177	799	3.74 %	56	21,104	-274	-1.28 %	98	21,133	-245	-1.15 %
15	21,615	237	1.11 %	57	20,482	-896	-4.19 %	99	21,929	551	2.58 %
16	20,352	-1,026	-4.80 %	58	20,901	-477	-2.23 %	100	22,197	819	3.83 %
17	21,718	340	1.59 %	59	21,646	268	1.25 %	101	20,794	-584	-2.73 %
18	20,434	-944	-4.42 %	60	21,530	152	.71 %	102	20,681	-697	-3.26 %
19	21,380	2	.01 %	61	21,829	451	2.11 %	103	21,330	-48	-.22 %
20	22,289	911	4.26 %	62	22,318	940	4.40 %	104	21,046	-332	-1.55 %
21	21,689	311	1.45 %	63	22,328	950	4.44 %	105	20,567	-811	-3.79 %
22	21,257	-121	-.57 %	64	20,927	-451	-2.11 %	106	21,012	-366	-1.71 %
23	20,937	-441	-2.06 %	65	20,903	-475	-2.22 %	107	21,082	-296	-1.38 %
24	21,761	383	1.79 %	66	21,500	122	.57 %	108	21,094	-284	-1.33 %
25	20,860	-518	-2.42 %	67	21,201	-177	-.83 %	109	21,419	41	.19 %
26	22,059	681	3.19 %	68	20,400	-978	-4.57 %	110	20,433	-945	-4.42 %
27	22,101	723	3.38 %	69	21,955	577	2.70 %	111	21,851	473	2.21 %
28	22,255	877	4.10 %	70	20,585	-793	-3.71 %	112	20,692	-686	-3.21 %
29	20,639	-739	-3.46 %	71	20,338	-1,040	-4.86 %	113	20,447	-931	-4.35 %
30	22,018	640	2.99 %	72	20,737	-641	-3.00 %	114	22,411	1,033	4.83 %
31	21,292	-86	-.40 %	73	20,552	-826	-3.86 %	115	22,310	932	4.36 %
32	20,398	-980	-4.58 %	74	20,499	-879	-4.11 %	116	22,432	1,054	4.93 %
33	22,285	907	4.24 %	75	21,313	-65	-.30 %	117	22,127	749	3.50 %
34	22,210	832	3.89 %	76	21,662	284	1.33 %	118	21,302	-76	-.36 %
35	21,823	445	2.08 %	77	21,432	54	.25 %	119	22,419	1,041	4.87 %
36	21,055	-323	-1.51 %	78	22,098	720	3.37 %	120	21,937	559	2.61 %
37	22,157	779	3.64 %	79	22,429	1,051	4.92 %	121	20,588	-790	-3.70 %
38	21,936	558	2.61 %	80	22,441	1,063	4.97 %	122	21,239	-139	-.65 %
39	21,414	36	.17 %	81	21,921	543	2.54 %	123	20,957	-421	-1.97 %
40	20,609	-769	-3.60 %	82	21,096	-282	-1.32 %	124	21,706	328	1.53 %
41	20,475	-903	-4.22 %	83	21,173	-205	-.96 %	125	22,148	770	3.60 %
	20,596	-782	-3.66 %	84	20,410	-968	-4.53 %				

2-20

Plan: M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR
Plan Type: House
Administrator: Duane Simpson
User: KLRD

Population Summary Report

DISTRICT	K_Population	DEVIATION	% DEVN.
1	21,495	117	0.55
2	22,431	1,053	4.93
3	21,870	492	2.30
4	21,796	418	1.96
5	21,020	-358	-1.67
6	20,669	-709	-3.32
7	21,801	423	1.98
8	22,320	942	4.41
9	21,019	-359	-1.68
10	21,103	-275	-1.29
11	20,397	-981	-4.59
12	21,857	479	2.24
13	20,989	-389	-1.82
14	22,177	799	3.74
15	21,615	237	1.11
16	20,352	-1,026	-4.80
17	21,718	340	1.59
18	20,434	-944	-4.42
19	21,380	2	0.01
20	22,289	911	4.26
21	21,689	311	1.45
22	21,257	-121	-0.57
23	20,937	-441	-2.06
24	21,761	383	1.79
25	20,860	-518	-2.42
26	22,059	681	3.19
27	22,101	723	3.38
28	22,255	877	4.10
29	20,639	-739	-3.46
30	22,018	640	2.99
31	21,292	-86	-0.40
32	20,398	-980	-4.58
33	22,285	907	4.24
34	22,210	832	3.89
35	21,823	445	2.08
36	21,055	-323	-1.51
37	22,157	779	3.64
38	21,936	558	2.61
39	21,414	36	0.17
40	20,609	-769	-3.60
41	20,475	-903	-4.22

DISTRICT	K_Population	DEVIATION	% DEVN.
42	20,596	-782	-3.66
43	22,046	668	3.12
44	22,234	856	4.00
45	21,714	336	1.57
46	21,816	438	2.05
47	20,338	-1,040	-4.86
48	21,814	436	2.04
49	22,141	763	3.57
50	20,415	-963	-4.50
51	20,888	-490	-2.29
52	20,615	-763	-3.57
53	20,729	-649	-3.04
54	20,746	-632	-2.96
55	21,473	95	0.44
56	21,104	-274	-1.28
57	20,482	-896	-4.19
58	20,901	-477	-2.23
59	21,646	268	1.25
60	21,530	152	0.71
61	21,829	451	2.11
62	22,318	940	4.40
63	22,328	950	4.44
64	20,927	-451	-2.11
65	20,903	-475	-2.22
66	21,500	122	0.57
67	21,201	-177	-0.83
68	20,400	-978	-4.57
69	21,955	577	2.70
70	20,585	-793	-3.71
71	20,338	-1,040	-4.86
72	20,737	-641	-3.00
73	20,552	-826	-3.86
74	20,499	-879	-4.11
75	21,313	-65	-0.30
76	21,662	284	1.33
77	21,432	54	0.25
78	22,098	720	3.37
79	22,429	1,051	4.92
80	22,441	1,063	4.97
81	21,921	543	2.54
82	21,096	-282	-1.32
83	21,173	-205	-0.96
84	20,410	-968	-4.53
85	21,843	465	2.18
86	21,787	409	1.91
87	22,153	775	3.63
88	21,145	-233	-1.09

DISTRICT	K_Population	DEVIATION	% DEVN.
89	20,740	-638	-2.98
90	21,567	189	0.88
91	21,217	-161	-0.75
92	20,624	-754	-3.53
93	21,662	284	1.33
94	20,528	-850	-3.98
95	21,466	88	0.41
96	22,063	685	3.20
97	20,942	-436	-2.04
98	21,133	-245	-1.15
99	21,929	551	2.58
100	22,197	819	3.83
101	20,794	-584	-2.73
102	20,681	-697	-3.26
103	21,330	-48	-0.22
104	21,046	-332	-1.55
105	20,567	-811	-3.79
106	21,012	-366	-1.71
107	21,082	-296	-1.38
108	21,094	-284	-1.33
109	21,419	41	0.19
110	20,433	-945	-4.42
111	21,851	473	2.21
112	20,692	-686	-3.21
113	20,447	-931	-4.35
114	22,411	1,033	4.83
115	22,310	932	4.36
116	22,432	1,054	4.93
117	22,127	749	3.50
118	21,302	-76	-0.36
119	22,419	1,041	4.87
120	21,937	559	2.61
121	20,588	-790	-3.70
122	21,239	-139	-0.65
123	20,957	-421	-1.97
124	21,706	328	1.53
125	22,148	770	3.60

Total Population: 2,672,257
Ideal District Population: 21,378

Summary Statistics

Population Range: 20,338 to 22,441
Ratio Range: 1.10
Absolute Range: -1,040 to 1,063
Absolute Overall Range: 2,103.00
Relative Range: -4.86% to 4.97%
Relative Overall Range: 9.84%
Absolute Mean Deviation: 566.30

Plan:	M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR	Administrator:	Duane Simpson
Type:	House	User:	KLRD

Relative Mean Deviation:	2.65%
Standard Deviation:	645.27

KANSAS LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
Rm. 545N-Statehouse, 300 SW 10th Ave.
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504
(785) 296-3181 ◆ FAX (785) 296-3824
kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us
http://skyways.lib.ks.us/ksleg/KLRD/klrd.html

January 22, 2002

To: House Select Committee on Redistricting

From: Mary Galligan, Principal Analyst

Re: Technical Report on *State House 4*

I have been asked to distribute the attached report prepared as part of the technical review for *State House 4*. The report displays an analysis of the component districts of each proposed new district in the plan. This analysis is based on the population, not the geographic extent, of new and existing districts.

For example, the report shows that district 1 in *State House 4* is composed of population from existing districts 1, 2, 3, and 4. One can also see that 56.6 percent of proposed district 1's population currently resides in House district 1; 34.3 percent of the new district's population is from current district 2; and so on.

For each proposed district, one can identify the primary source district, that is, the district from which the largest block of population comes. That primary source district may not always have the same district number as the existing district. As the report shows, 62.3 percent of the population in new district 2 is from existing district 11, and nearly 84 percent of new district 4's population is from existing district 3. In both cases, a large portion of an existing district's population remains in a single district, but the district number changes in the new plan.

The table below displays a summary of the primary source districts for the proposed districts in *State House 4*:

District #	%
2	<= 50%
58	51% - 80%
15	81% - 85%
31	86% - 95%
19*	96% - 100%

* Eight districts contain 100% of a previous district's population.

From the summary table above, one knows that for two of the proposed districts the primary source district provided less than 50 percent of the total population. Further, 58

House Redistricting
Attachment 3
1-22-02

proposed districts draw 51 percent to 80 percent of their population from a primary source district. As the table shows, for 50 (40 percent) of the districts in *State House 4*, the primary source district provided more than 85 percent of the new district's population.

In addition to displaying sources of the total population of a new district, the report displays information about sources of the proposed district's Hispanic and Black populations. So, looking again at proposed district 1, one sees that the district's population is composed of 283 (1.3 percent) people of Hispanic origin and that nearly all of the Hispanic population in the proposed district currently lives in House district 1. Likewise, most of the Black population in the proposed district currently lives in House district 1. The percentages displayed in the Black and Hispanic columns are percent of total district population.

I also have included a report that displays the same information for the voting age population. Those data also may be useful as you evaluate redistricting plans.

If you have questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 1 is composed of:				
12,154 (56.5 %), from district 1 in 1992 House	186	.9 %	93	.4 %
7,368 (34.3 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	75	.3 %	42	.2 %
1,420 (6.6 %), from district 3 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	14	.1 %
553 (2.6 %), from district 4 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	4	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 1 Total is 21,495	283	1.3 %	153	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 2 is composed of:				
6,459 (28.8 %), from district 1 in 1992 House	76	.3 %	71	.3 %
1,991 (8.9 %), from district 7 in 1992 House	22	.1 %	34	.2 %
13,981 (62.3 %), from district 11 in 1992 House	479	2.1 %	1,323	5.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 2 Total is 22,431	577	2.6 %	1,428	6.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 3 is composed of:				
3,612 (16.5 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	23	.1 %	14	.1 %
18,258 (83.5 %), from district 3 in 1992 House	708	3.2 %	650	3.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 3 Total is 21,870	731	3.3 %	664	3.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 4 is composed of:				
19,484 (89.4 %), from district 4 in 1992 House	233	1.1 %	502	2.3 %
2,312 (10.6 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	17	.1 %	20	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 4 Total is 21,796	250	1.1 %	522	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 5 is composed of:				
15,549 (74.0 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	183	.9 %	64	.3 %
5,471 (26.0 %), from district 6 in 1992 House	123	.6 %	217	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 5 Total is 21,020	306	1.5 %	281	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 6 is composed of:				
1,360 (6.6 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	7	.0 %	0	.0 %
19,309 (93.4 %), from district 6 in 1992 House	289	1.4 %	289	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 6 Total is 20,669	296	1.4 %	289	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 7 is composed of:				
912 (4.2 %), from district 1 in 1992 House	10	.0 %	1	.0 %
1,897 (8.7 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	26	.1 %	5	.0 %
16,665 (76.4 %), from district 7 in 1992 House	627	2.9 %	1,135	5.2 %
968 (4.4 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	23	.1 %	5	.0 %
1,359 (6.2 %), from district 11 in 1992 House	8	.0 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 7 Total is 21,801	694	3.2 %	1,148	5.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 8 is composed of:				
7,333 (32.9 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	49	.2 %	48	.2 %
1,436 (6.4 %), from district 3 in 1992 House	32	.1 %	23	.1 %
13,551 (60.7 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	416	1.9 %	149	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 8 Total is 22,320	497	2.2 %	220	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 9 is composed of:				
896 (4.3 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	7	.0 %	10	.0 %
2,796 (13.3 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	118	.6 %	42	.2 %
14,944 (71.1 %), from district 9 in 1992 House	190	.9 %	231	1.1 %
2,383 (11.3 %), from district 13 in 1992 House	20	.1 %	14	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 9 Total is 21,019	335	1.6 %	297	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 10 is composed of:				
5,272 (25.0 %), from district 10 in 1992 House	57	.3 %	30	.1 %
2,960 (14.0 %), from district 44 in 1992 House	104	.5 %	130	.6 %
11,074 (52.5 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	305	1.4 %	463	2.2 %
1,797 (8.5 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	44	.2 %	72	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 10 Total is 21,103	510	2.4 %	695	3.3 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 11 is composed of:				
2,707 (13.3 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	40	.2 %	4	.0 %
17,690 (86.7 %), from district 10 in 1992 House	549	2.7 %	299	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 11 **Total is** 20,397	589	2.9 %	303	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 12 is composed of:				
709 (3.2 %), from district 7 in 1992 House	12	.1 %	0	.0 %
2,418 (11.1 %), from district 11 in 1992 House	39	.2 %	22	.1 %
18,730 (85.7 %), from district 12 in 1992 House	547	2.5 %	828	3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 12 **Total is** 21,857	598	2.7 %	850	3.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 13 is composed of:				
1,197 (5.7 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	35	.2 %	0	.0 %
16,501 (78.6 %), from district 13 in 1992 House	293	1.4 %	79	.4 %
3,291 (15.7 %), from district 76 in 1992 House	73	.3 %	7	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 13 **Total is** 20,989	401	1.9 %	86	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 14 is composed of:				
21,539 (97.1 %), from district 14 in 1992 House	889	4.0 %	979	4.4 %
0 (.0 %), from district 30 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
638 (2.9 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	1	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 14 **Total is** 22,177	892	4.0 %	980	4.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 15 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 14 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
20,884 (96.6 %), from district 15 in 1992 House	2,406	11.1 %	1,141	5.3 %
0 (.0 %), from district 26 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
597 (2.8 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	6	.0 %	14	.1 %
134 (.6 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 15 **Total is** 21,615	2,412	11.2 %	1,157	5.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 16 is composed of:				
12,067 (59.3 %), from district 16 in 1992 House	420	2.1 %	284	1.4 %
2,102 (10.3 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	67	.3 %	46	.2 %
6,183 (30.4 %), from district 29 in 1992 House	150	.7 %	239	1.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 16 **Total is** 20,352	637	3.1 %	569	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 17 is composed of:				
19,845 (91.4 %), from district 17 in 1992 House	639	2.9 %	619	2.9 %
1,873 (8.6 %), from district 30 in 1992 House	36	.2 %	61	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 17 **Total is** 21,718	675	3.1 %	680	3.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 18 is composed of:				
2,656 (13.0 %), from district 17 in 1992 House	86	.4 %	215	1.1 %
17,778 (87.0 %), from district 18 in 1992 House	634	3.1 %	406	2.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 18 **Total is** 20,434	720	3.5 %	621	3.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 19 is composed of:				
16,881 (79.0 %), from district 19 in 1992 House	901	4.2 %	442	2.1 %
3,830 (17.9 %), from district 20 in 1992 House	87	.4 %	86	.4 %
669 (3.1 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	21	.1 %	4	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 19 **Total is** 21,380	1,009	4.7 %	532	2.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 20 is composed of:				
2,490 (11.2 %), from district 19 in 1992 House	324	1.5 %	97	.4 %
17,241 (77.4 %), from district 20 in 1992 House	298	1.3 %	261	1.2 %
1,344 (6.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	22	.1 %	8	.0 %
1,214 (5.4 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 20 **Total is** 22,289	646	2.9 %	369	1.7 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *	Non-Hispanic Black DOJ
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 21 is composed of:		
13,118 (60.5 %), from district 21 in 1992 House	397 1.8 %	147 .7 %
3,664 (16.9 %), from district 22 in 1992 House	54 .2 %	14 .1 %
4,907 (22.6 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	62 .3 %	9 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 21 **Total is** 21,689	513 2.4 %	170 .8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 22 is composed of:		
6,367 (30.0 %), from district 16 in 1992 House	348 1.6 %	410 1.9 %
14,890 (70.0 %), from district 22 in 1992 House	959 4.5 %	437 2.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 22 **Total is** 21,257	1,307 6.1 %	847 4.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 23 is composed of:		
2,191 (10.5 %), from district 18 in 1992 House	228 1.1 %	186 .9 %
0 (.0 %), from district 21 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
18,746 (89.5 %), from district 23 in 1992 House	1,177 5.6 %	860 4.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 23 **Total is** 20,937	1,405 6.7 %	1,046 5.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 24 is composed of:		
4,300 (19.8 %), from district 21 in 1992 House	157 .7 %	42 .2 %
17,461 (80.2 %), from district 24 in 1992 House	1,042 4.8 %	715 3.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 24 **Total is** 21,761	1,199 5.5 %	757 3.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 25 is composed of:		
1,544 (7.4 %), from district 24 in 1992 House	104 .5 %	62 .3 %
19,316 (92.6 %), from district 25 in 1992 House	595 2.9 %	143 .7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 25 **Total is** 20,860	699 3.4 %	205 1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 26 is composed of:		
19,449 (88.2 %), from district 26 in 1992 House	456 2.1 %	579 2.6 %
2,610 (11.8 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	90 .4 %	65 .3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 26 **Total is** 22,059	546 2.5 %	644 2.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 27 is composed of:		
22,101 (100.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	456 2.1 %	313 1.4 %
0 (.0 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 27 **Total is** 22,101	456 2.1 %	313 1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 28 is composed of:		
0 (.0 %), from district 20 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
430 (1.9 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	4 .0 %	5 .0 %
21,825 (98.1 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	296 1.3 %	431 1.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 28 **Total is** 22,255	300 1.3 %	436 2.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 29 is composed of:		
6,613 (32.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	94 .5 %	173 .8 %
14,026 (68.0 %), from district 29 in 1992 House	515 2.5 %	460 2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 29 **Total is** 20,639	609 3.0 %	633 3.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 30 is composed of:		
0 (.0 %), from district 16 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
22,018 (100.0 %), from district 30 in 1992 House	1,078 4.9 %	836 3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 30 **Total is** 22,018	1,078 4.9 %	836 3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 31 is composed of:		
20,013 (94.0 %), from district 31 in 1992 House	4,767 22.4 %	1,896 8.9 %
1,279 (6.0 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	144 .7 %	12 .1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 31 **Total is** 21,292	4,911 23.1 %	1,908 9.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 32 is composed of:		
495 (2.4 %), from district 31 in 1992 House	90 .4 %	9 .0 %
18,464 (90.5 %), from district 32 in 1992 House	6,099 29.9 %	2,308 11.3 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 32 is composed of:				
1,439 (7.1 %), from district 37 in 1992 House	607	3.0 %	109	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 32 **Total is** 20,398	6,796	33.3 %	2,426	11.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 33 is composed of:				
17,348 (77.8 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	1,376	6.2 %	3,177	14.3 %
3,188 (14.3 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	222	1.0 %	1,761	7.9 %
1,749 (7.8 %), from district 38 in 1992 House	79	.4 %	621	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 33 **Total is** 22,285	1,677	7.5 %	5,559	24.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 34 is composed of:				
13,993 (63.0 %), from district 34 in 1992 House	1,409	6.3 %	9,267	41.7 %
5 (.0 %), from district 35 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	5	.0 %
8,212 (37.0 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	389	1.8 %	4,476	20.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 34 **Total is** 22,210	1,798	8.1 %	13,748	61.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 35 is composed of:				
2,832 (13.0 %), from district 34 in 1992 House	86	.4 %	2,648	12.1 %
15,305 (70.1 %), from district 35 in 1992 House	812	3.7 %	9,981	45.7 %
3,686 (16.9 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	151	.7 %	1,177	5.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 35 **Total is** 21,823	1,049	4.8 %	13,806	63.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 36 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,424 (6.8 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	56	.3 %	235	1.1 %
19,556 (92.9 %), from district 38 in 1992 House	766	3.6 %	3,348	15.9 %
75 (.4 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	6	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 36 **Total is** 21,055	828	3.9 %	3,583	17.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 37 is composed of:				
1,124 (5.1 %), from district 32 in 1992 House	589	2.7 %	32	.1 %
0 (.0 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,778 (8.0 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	116	.5 %	587	2.6 %
19,255 (86.9 %), from district 37 in 1992 House	7,084	32.0 %	3,303	14.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 37 **Total is** 22,157	7,789	35.2 %	3,922	17.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 38 is composed of:				
7,940 (36.2 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	167	.8 %	85	.4 %
5,912 (27.0 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	332	1.5 %	25	.1 %
2,119 (9.7 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	63	.3 %	150	.7 %
5,965 (27.2 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	144	.7 %	80	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 38 **Total is** 21,936	706	3.2 %	340	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 39 is composed of:				
24 (.1 %), from district 17 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
890 (4.2 %), from district 18 in 1992 House	18	.1 %	8	.0 %
18,820 (87.9 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	787	3.7 %	493	2.3 %
1,680 (7.8 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	30	.1 %	5	.0 %
0 (.0 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 39 **Total is** 21,414	835	3.9 %	506	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 40 is composed of:				
13,265 (64.4 %), from district 40 in 1992 House	719	3.5 %	2,617	12.7 %
1,770 (8.6 %), from district 41 in 1992 House	78	.4 %	168	.8 %
4,240 (20.6 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	61	.3 %	92	.4 %
1,334 (6.5 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	53	.3 %	102	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 40 **Total is** 20,609	911	4.4 %	2,979	14.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 41 is composed of:				
2,676 (13.1 %), from district 40 in 1992 House	225	1.1 %	512	2.5 %
16,737 (81.7 %), from district 41 in 1992 House	804	3.9 %	2,838	13.9 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 41 is composed of:				
1,062 (5.2 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	33	.2 %	89	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 41 **Total is** 20,475	1,062	5.2 %	3,439	16.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 42 is composed of:				
2,390 (11.6 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	63	.3 %	7	.0 %
636 (3.1 %), from district 40 in 1992 House	37	.2 %	186	.9 %
1,812 (8.8 %), from district 41 in 1992 House	35	.2 %	165	.8 %
15,758 (76.5 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	332	1.6 %	391	1.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 42 **Total is** 20,596	467	2.3 %	749	3.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 43 is composed of:				
1,717 (7.8 %), from district 15 in 1992 House	132	.6 %	67	.3 %
6 (.0 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
20,323 (92.2 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	604	2.7 %	290	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 43 **Total is** 22,046	736	3.3 %	357	1.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 44 is composed of:				
14,016 (63.0 %), from district 44 in 1992 House	389	1.7 %	659	3.0 %
8,218 (37.0 %), from district 46 in 1992 House	429	1.9 %	633	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 44 **Total is** 22,234	818	3.7 %	1,292	5.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 45 is composed of:				
11,579 (53.3 %), from district 44 in 1992 House	301	1.4 %	449	2.1 %
10,135 (46.7 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	308	1.4 %	496	2.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 45 **Total is** 21,714	609	2.8 %	945	4.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 46 is composed of:				
3,761 (17.2 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	146	.7 %	222	1.0 %
18,055 (82.8 %), from district 46 in 1992 House	800	3.7 %	1,221	5.6 %
0 (.0 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 46 **Total is** 21,816	946	4.3 %	1,443	6.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 47 is composed of:				
1,149 (5.6 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	23	.1 %	25	.1 %
256 (1.3 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	2	.0 %
16,868 (82.9 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	225	1.1 %	90	.4 %
2,065 (10.2 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	10	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 47 **Total is** 20,338	269	1.3 %	127	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 48 is composed of:				
21,814 (100.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	463	2.1 %	529	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 48 **Total is** 21,814	463	2.1 %	529	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 49 is composed of:				
11,842 (53.5 %), from district 14 in 1992 House	402	1.8 %	453	2.0 %
4,429 (20.0 %), from district 26 in 1992 House	375	1.7 %	236	1.1 %
5,870 (26.5 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	156	.7 %	141	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 49 **Total is** 22,141	933	4.2 %	830	3.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 50 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
16,595 (81.3 %), from district 50 in 1992 House	308	1.5 %	97	.5 %
3,820 (18.7 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	122	.6 %	29	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 50 **Total is** 20,415	430	2.1 %	126	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 51 is composed of:				
3,853 (18.4 %), from district 50 in 1992 House	77	.4 %	26	.1 %
10,571 (50.6 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	264	1.3 %	313	1.5 %
1,580 (7.6 %), from district 57 in 1992 House	31	.1 %	11	.1 %
4,884 (23.4 %), from district 61 in 1992 House	90	.4 %	24	.1 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *	Non-Hispanic Black DOJ
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 51 is composed of:		
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 51 **Total is** 20,888	462 2.2 %	374 1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 52 is composed of:		
9,433 (45.8 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	321 1.6 %	410 2.0 %
11,182 (54.2 %), from district 52 in 1992 House	451 2.2 %	564 2.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 52 **Total is** 20,615	772 3.7 %	974 4.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 53 is composed of:		
16,410 (79.2 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	955 4.6 %	1,029 5.0 %
2,333 (11.3 %), from district 54 in 1992 House	146 .7 %	129 .6 %
1,986 (9.6 %), from district 58 in 1992 House	100 .5 %	154 .7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 53 **Total is** 20,729	1,201 5.8 %	1,312 6.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 54 is composed of:		
5,170 (24.9 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	120 .6 %	64 .3 %
3,463 (16.7 %), from district 52 in 1992 House	141 .7 %	277 1.3 %
208 (1.0 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	7 .0 %	2 .0 %
10,828 (52.2 %), from district 54 in 1992 House	458 2.2 %	795 3.8 %
1,077 (5.2 %), from district 55 in 1992 House	52 .3 %	76 .4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 54 **Total is** 20,746	778 3.8 %	1,214 5.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 55 is composed of:		
14,143 (65.9 %), from district 55 in 1992 House	1,187 5.5 %	2,440 11.4 %
7,330 (34.1 %), from district 56 in 1992 House	701 3.3 %	1,381 6.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 55 **Total is** 21,473	1,888 8.8 %	3,821 17.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 56 is composed of:		
0 (.0 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
6,924 (32.8 %), from district 52 in 1992 House	264 1.3 %	264 1.3 %
3,425 (16.2 %), from district 55 in 1992 House	97 .5 %	92 .4 %
10,755 (51.0 %), from district 56 in 1992 House	446 2.1 %	471 2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 56 **Total is** 21,104	807 3.8 %	827 3.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 57 is composed of:		
788 (3.8 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	25 .1 %	2 .0 %
18,199 (88.9 %), from district 57 in 1992 House	3,564 17.4 %	1,455 7.1 %
1,495 (7.3 %), from district 58 in 1992 House	135 .7 %	441 2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 57 **Total is** 20,482	3,724 18.2 %	1,898 9.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 58 is composed of:		
5,809 (27.8 %), from district 54 in 1992 House	495 2.4 %	1,454 7.0 %
15,092 (72.2 %), from district 58 in 1992 House	2,089 10.0 %	4,075 19.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 58 **Total is** 20,901	2,584 12.4 %	5,529 26.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 59 is composed of:		
21,052 (97.3 %), from district 59 in 1992 House	894 4.1 %	145 .7 %
594 (2.7 %), from district 68 in 1992 House	12 .1 %	1 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 59 **Total is** 21,646	906 4.2 %	146 .7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 60 is composed of:		
0 (.0 %), from district 59 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
21,530 (100.0 %), from district 60 in 1992 House	4,620 21.5 %	682 3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 60 **Total is** 21,530	4,620 21.5 %	682 3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 61 is composed of:		
2,827 (13.0 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	118 .5 %	26 .1 %
16,738 (76.7 %), from district 61 in 1992 House	320 1.5 %	141 .6 %
2,264 (10.4 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	36 .2 %	10 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 61 **Total is** 21,829	474 2.2 %	177 .8 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 62 is composed of:				
18,959 (84.9 %), from district 49 in 1992 House	342	1.5 %	365	1.6 %
3,359 (15.1 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	35	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 62 **Total is** 22,318	361	1.6 %	400	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 63 is composed of:				
15,077 (67.5 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	245	1.1 %	841	3.8 %
895 (4.0 %), from district 50 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	9	.0 %
6,356 (28.5 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	41	.2 %	29	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 63 **Total is** 22,328	289	1.3 %	879	3.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 64 is composed of:				
12,523 (59.8 %), from district 64 in 1992 House	835	4.0 %	1,316	6.3 %
4,620 (22.1 %), from district 65 in 1992 House	432	2.1 %	2,042	9.8 %
2,062 (9.9 %), from district 106 in 1992 House	204	1.0 %	424	2.0 %
1,722 (8.2 %), from district 107 in 1992 House	12	.1 %	10	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 64 **Total is** 20,927	1,483	7.1 %	3,792	18.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 65 is composed of:				
18,789 (89.9 %), from district 62 in 1992 House	561	2.7 %	908	4.3 %
2,114 (10.1 %), from district 66 in 1992 House	152	.7 %	333	1.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 65 **Total is** 20,903	713	3.4 %	1,241	5.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 66 is composed of:				
4,273 (19.9 %), from district 62 in 1992 House	181	.8 %	234	1.1 %
17,227 (80.1 %), from district 66 in 1992 House	704	3.3 %	1,002	4.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 66 **Total is** 21,500	885	4.1 %	1,236	5.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 67 is composed of:				
17,585 (82.9 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	512	2.4 %	324	1.5 %
3,616 (17.1 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	45	.2 %	15	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 67 **Total is** 21,201	557	2.6 %	339	1.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 68 is composed of:				
1,831 (9.0 %), from district 64 in 1992 House	20	.1 %	6	.0 %
604 (3.0 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	2	.0 %
17,965 (88.1 %), from district 68 in 1992 House	467	2.3 %	131	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 68 **Total is** 20,400	492	2.4 %	139	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 69 is composed of:				
2,551 (11.6 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	136	.6 %	149	.7 %
19,404 (88.4 %), from district 69 in 1992 House	1,935	8.8 %	863	3.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 69 **Total is** 21,955	2,071	9.4 %	1,012	4.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 70 is composed of:				
19,813 (96.2 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	409	2.0 %	500	2.4 %
772 (3.8 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	30	.1 %	9	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 70 **Total is** 20,585	439	2.1 %	509	2.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 71 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
20,338 (100.0 %), from district 71 in 1992 House	856	4.2 %	807	4.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 71 **Total is** 20,338	856	4.2 %	807	4.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 72 is composed of:				
20,128 (97.1 %), from district 72 in 1992 House	2,284	11.0 %	500	2.4 %
609 (2.9 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	13	.1 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 72 **Total is** 20,737	2,297	11.1 %	502	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 73 is composed of:				
311 (1.5 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	0	.0 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 73 is composed of:				
20,241 (98.5 %), from district 73 in 1992 House	423	2.1 %	219	1.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 73 **Total is** 20,552	428	2.1 %	219	1.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 74 is composed of:				
782 (3.8 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	1	.0 %
728 (3.6 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
538 (2.6 %), from district 73 in 1992 House	4	.0 %	4	.0 %
17,337 (84.6 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	393	1.9 %	122	.6 %
1,114 (5.4 %), from district 113 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	12	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 74 **Total is** 20,499	402	2.0 %	139	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 75 is composed of:				
2,304 (10.8 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	26	.1 %	2	.0 %
19,009 (89.2 %), from district 75 in 1992 House	444	2.1 %	321	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 75 **Total is** 21,313	470	2.2 %	323	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 76 is composed of:				
5,794 (26.7 %), from district 9 in 1992 House	107	.5 %	15	.1 %
998 (4.6 %), from district 59 in 1992 House	25	.1 %	6	.0 %
2,014 (9.3 %), from district 68 in 1992 House	37	.2 %	13	.1 %
909 (4.2 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	80	.4 %	1	.0 %
11,947 (55.2 %), from district 76 in 1992 House	695	3.2 %	41	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 76 **Total is** 21,662	944	4.4 %	76	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 77 is composed of:				
20,072 (93.7 %), from district 77 in 1992 House	439	2.0 %	96	.4 %
1,360 (6.3 %), from district 78 in 1992 House	26	.1 %	8	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 77 **Total is** 21,432	465	2.2 %	104	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 78 is composed of:				
1,807 (8.2 %), from district 77 in 1992 House	47	.2 %	14	.1 %
18,732 (84.8 %), from district 78 in 1992 House	641	2.9 %	457	2.1 %
1,559 (7.1 %), from district 79 in 1992 House	21	.1 %	13	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 78 **Total is** 22,098	709	3.2 %	484	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 79 is composed of:				
4,385 (19.6 %), from district 76 in 1992 House	59	.3 %	17	.1 %
567 (2.5 %), from district 78 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	2	.0 %
16,204 (72.2 %), from district 79 in 1992 House	636	2.8 %	603	2.7 %
1,273 (5.7 %), from district 80 in 1992 House	20	.1 %	16	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 79 **Total is** 22,429	720	3.2 %	638	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 80 is composed of:				
15,540 (69.2 %), from district 80 in 1992 House	755	3.4 %	171	.8 %
6,901 (30.8 %), from district 105 in 1992 House	90	.4 %	24	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 80 **Total is** 22,441	845	3.8 %	195	.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 81 is composed of:				
3,544 (16.2 %), from district 80 in 1992 House	75	.3 %	7	.0 %
11,539 (52.6 %), from district 81 in 1992 House	303	1.4 %	48	.2 %
2,931 (13.4 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	30	.1 %	7	.0 %
3,907 (17.8 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	87	.4 %	87	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 81 **Total is** 21,921	495	2.3 %	149	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 82 is composed of:				
19,986 (94.7 %), from district 82 in 1992 House	715	3.4 %	428	2.0 %
1,110 (5.3 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	15	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 82 **Total is** 21,096	734	3.5 %	443	2.1 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 83 is composed of:				
14,969 (70.7 %), from district 83 in 1992 House	346	1.6 %	676	3.2 %
2,726 (12.9 %), from district 84 in 1992 House	64	.3 %	69	.3 %
30 (.1 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	5	.0 %
2,564 (12.1 %), from district 86 in 1992 House	110	.5 %	49	.2 %
884 (4.2 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	13	.1 %	111	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 83 **Total is** 21,173	533	2.5 %	910	4.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 84 is composed of:				
14,985 (73.4 %), from district 84 in 1992 House	745	3.7 %	9,323	45.7 %
3,128 (15.3 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	120	.6 %	1,806	8.8 %
2,297 (11.3 %), from district 103 in 1992 House	537	2.6 %	643	3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 84 **Total is** 20,410	1,402	6.9 %	11,772	57.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 85 is composed of:				
6,791 (31.1 %), from district 83 in 1992 House	174	.8 %	427	2.0 %
14,259 (65.3 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	476	2.2 %	1,138	5.2 %
349 (1.6 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	9	.0 %	34	.2 %
444 (2.0 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	13	.1 %	20	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 85 **Total is** 21,843	672	3.1 %	1,619	7.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 86 is composed of:				
14,399 (66.1 %), from district 86 in 1992 House	1,778	8.2 %	1,247	5.7 %
4,041 (18.5 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	254	1.2 %	359	1.6 %
1,253 (5.8 %), from district 88 in 1992 House	133	.6 %	139	.6 %
2,094 (9.6 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	330	1.5 %	171	.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 86 **Total is** 21,787	2,495	11.5 %	1,916	8.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 87 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 83 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
7,054 (31.8 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	360	1.6 %	378	1.7 %
7,271 (32.8 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	323	1.5 %	982	4.4 %
7,828 (35.3 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	457	2.1 %	1,067	4.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 87 **Total is** 22,153	1,140	5.1 %	2,427	11.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 88 is composed of:				
14 (.1 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	6	.0 %
5,401 (25.5 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	904	4.3 %	921	4.4 %
15,730 (74.4 %), from district 88 in 1992 House	1,968	9.3 %	2,204	10.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 88 **Total is** 21,145	2,872	13.6 %	3,131	14.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 89 is composed of:				
5,841 (28.2 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	331	1.6 %	158	.8 %
14,546 (70.1 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	643	3.1 %	8,954	43.2 %
268 (1.3 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	10	.0 %	9	.0 %
85 (.4 %), from district 103 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	17	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 89 **Total is** 20,740	984	4.7 %	9,138	44.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 90 is composed of:				
185 (.9 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	3	.0 %
18,348 (85.1 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	405	1.9 %	144	.7 %
3,034 (14.1 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	68	.3 %	8	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 90 **Total is** 21,567	478	2.2 %	155	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 91 is composed of:				
2,861 (13.5 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	169	.8 %	60	.3 %
18,356 (86.5 %), from district 91 in 1992 House	1,566	7.4 %	581	2.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 91 **Total is** 21,217	1,735	8.2 %	641	3.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 92 is composed of:				
19,765 (95.8 %), from district 92 in 1992 House	3,697	17.9 %	902	4.4 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 92 is composed of:				
859 (4.2 %), from district 95 in 1992 House	56	.3 %	35	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 92 **Total is** 20,624	3,753	18.2 %	937	4.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 93 is composed of:				
8,511 (39.3 %), from district 81 in 1992 House	272	1.3 %	58	.3 %
10,927 (50.4 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	168	.8 %	58	.3 %
882 (4.1 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	30	.1 %	2	.0 %
1,342 (6.2 %), from district 108 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 93 **Total is** 21,662	475	2.2 %	120	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 94 is composed of:				
84 (.4 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	6	.0 %	5	.0 %
3,256 (15.9 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	91	.4 %	43	.2 %
17,188 (83.7 %), from district 94 in 1992 House	675	3.3 %	330	1.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 94 **Total is** 20,528	772	3.8 %	378	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 95 is composed of:				
1,919 (8.9 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	56	.3 %	16	.1 %
2,526 (11.8 %), from district 94 in 1992 House	242	1.1 %	220	1.0 %
17,021 (79.3 %), from district 95 in 1992 House	1,720	8.0 %	747	3.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 95 **Total is** 21,466	2,018	9.4 %	983	4.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 96 is composed of:				
2,114 (9.6 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	74	.3 %	18	.1 %
18,274 (82.8 %), from district 96 in 1992 House	1,092	4.9 %	681	3.1 %
1,675 (7.6 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	45	.2 %	7	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 96 **Total is** 22,063	1,211	5.5 %	706	3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 97 is composed of:				
253 (1.2 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	9	.0 %	1	.0 %
1,730 (8.3 %), from district 96 in 1992 House	136	.6 %	64	.3 %
18,959 (90.5 %), from district 97 in 1992 House	1,668	8.0 %	1,352	6.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 97 **Total is** 20,942	1,813	8.7 %	1,417	6.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 98 is composed of:				
2,352 (11.1 %), from district 82 in 1992 House	243	1.1 %	198	.9 %
3,057 (14.5 %), from district 88 in 1992 House	1,234	5.8 %	160	.8 %
15,724 (74.4 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	1,370	6.5 %	1,832	8.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 98 **Total is** 21,133	2,847	13.5 %	2,190	10.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 99 is composed of:				
3,697 (16.9 %), from district 75 in 1992 House	48	.2 %	30	.1 %
4 (.0 %), from district 77 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
0 (.0 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
2,624 (12.0 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	83	.4 %	248	1.1 %
15,604 (71.2 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	352	1.6 %	291	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 99 **Total is** 21,929	483	2.2 %	569	2.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 100 is composed of:				
1,504 (6.8 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	33	.1 %	18	.1 %
20,693 (93.2 %), from district 100 in 1992 House	718	3.2 %	316	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 100 **Total is** 22,197	751	3.4 %	334	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 101 is composed of:				
20,134 (96.8 %), from district 101 in 1992 House	511	2.5 %	185	.9 %
0 (.0 %), from district 102 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
660 (3.2 %), from district 104 in 1992 House	20	.1 %	18	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 101 **Total is** 20,794	531	2.6 %	203	1.0 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *	Non-Hispanic Black DOJ
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 102 is composed of:		
0 (.0 %), from district 101 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
20,681 (100.0 %), from district 102 in 1992 House	2,447 11.8 %	1,505 7.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 102 **Total is** 20,681	2,447 11.8 %	1,505 7.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 103 is composed of:		
1,736 (8.1 %), from district 86 in 1992 House	293 1.4 %	150 .7 %
19,594 (91.9 %), from district 103 in 1992 House	7,829 36.7 %	2,201 10.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 103 **Total is** 21,330	8,122 38.1 %	2,351 11.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 104 is composed of:		
21,046 (100.0 %), from district 104 in 1992 House	633 3.0 %	295 1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 104 **Total is** 21,046	633 3.0 %	295 1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 105 is composed of:		
1,207 (5.9 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	23 .1 %	7 .0 %
6,380 (31.0 %), from district 94 in 1992 House	297 1.4 %	208 1.0 %
12,980 (63.1 %), from district 100 in 1992 House	519 2.5 %	272 1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 105 **Total is** 20,567	839 4.1 %	487 2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 106 is composed of:		
7,952 (37.8 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	65 .3 %	23 .1 %
13,060 (62.2 %), from district 106 in 1992 House	118 .6 %	38 .2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 106 **Total is** 21,012	183 .9 %	61 .3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 107 is composed of:		
17,419 (82.6 %), from district 107 in 1992 House	141 .7 %	80 .4 %
3,663 (17.4 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	37 .2 %	5 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 107 **Total is** 21,082	178 .8 %	85 .4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 108 is composed of:		
5,046 (23.9 %), from district 64 in 1992 House	190 .9 %	209 1.0 %
15,656 (74.2 %), from district 65 in 1992 House	1,138 5.4 %	3,007 14.3 %
392 (1.9 %), from district 107 in 1992 House	8 .0 %	1 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 108 **Total is** 21,094	1,336 6.3 %	3,217 15.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 109 is composed of:		
3,411 (15.9 %), from district 106 in 1992 House	31 .1 %	17 .1 %
11,092 (51.8 %), from district 109 in 1992 House	86 .4 %	14 .1 %
6,916 (32.3 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	59 .3 %	40 .2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 109 **Total is** 21,419	176 .8 %	71 .3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 110 is composed of:		
14,517 (71.0 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	155 .8 %	104 .5 %
4,346 (21.3 %), from district 111 in 1992 House	192 .9 %	83 .4 %
1,528 (7.5 %), from district 118 in 1992 House	7 .0 %	12 .1 %
42 (.2 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	0 .0 %	0 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 110 **Total is** 20,433	354 1.7 %	199 1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 111 is composed of:		
1,393 (6.4 %), from district 109 in 1992 House	6 .0 %	0 .0 %
1,403 (6.4 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	12 .1 %	1 .0 %
15,802 (72.3 %), from district 111 in 1992 House	348 1.6 %	139 .6 %
3,253 (14.9 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	14 .1 %	7 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 111 **Total is** 21,851	380 1.7 %	147 .7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 112 is composed of:		
937 (4.5 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	10 .0 %	8 .0 %
19,295 (93.2 %), from district 112 in 1992 House	2,154 10.4 %	264 1.3 %
460 (2.2 %), from district 113 in 1992 House	2 .0 %	0 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 112 **Total is** 20,692	2,166 10.5 %	272 1.3 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *		Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 113 is composed of:				
18,205 (89.0 %), from district 113 in 1992 House	772	3.8 %	197	1.0 %
2,242 (11.0 %), from district 114 in 1992 House	54	.3 %	9	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 113 **Total is** 20,447	826	4.0 %	206	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 114 is composed of:				
9,581 (42.8 %), from district 108 in 1992 House	291	1.3 %	91	.4 %
12,830 (57.2 %), from district 114 in 1992 House	737	3.3 %	397	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 114 **Total is** 22,411	1,028	4.6 %	488	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 115 is composed of:				
15,655 (70.2 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	1,886	8.5 %	70	.3 %
5,226 (23.4 %), from district 116 in 1992 House	2,579	11.6 %	63	.3 %
1,429 (6.4 %), from district 125 in 1992 House	323	1.4 %	6	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 115 **Total is** 22,310	4,788	21.5 %	139	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 116 is composed of:				
12,268 (54.7 %), from district 105 in 1992 House	206	.9 %	51	.2 %
9,255 (41.3 %), from district 108 in 1992 House	157	.7 %	14	.1 %
909 (4.1 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	33	.1 %	8	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 116 **Total is** 22,432	396	1.8 %	73	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 117 is composed of:				
2,996 (13.5 %), from district 114 in 1992 House	169	.8 %	12	.1 %
17,007 (76.9 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	7,344	33.2 %	107	.5 %
2,124 (9.6 %), from district 122 in 1992 House	1,232	5.6 %	11	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 117 **Total is** 22,127	8,745	39.5 %	130	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 118 is composed of:				
2,440 (11.5 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	24	.1 %	12	.1 %
4,835 (22.7 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	58	.3 %	5	.0 %
13,042 (61.2 %), from district 118 in 1992 House	507	2.4 %	56	.3 %
985 (4.6 %), from district 122 in 1992 House	165	.8 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 118 **Total is** 21,302	754	3.5 %	75	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 119 is composed of:				
2,632 (11.7 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	136	.6 %	14	.1 %
19,787 (88.3 %), from district 116 in 1992 House	8,453	37.7 %	385	1.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 119 **Total is** 22,419	8,589	38.3 %	399	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 120 is composed of:				
4,516 (20.6 %), from district 109 in 1992 House	34	.2 %	14	.1 %
17,421 (79.4 %), from district 120 in 1992 House	292	1.3 %	281	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 120 **Total is** 21,937	326	1.5 %	295	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 121 is composed of:				
2,665 (12.9 %), from district 118 in 1992 House	23	.1 %	98	.5 %
17,923 (87.1 %), from district 121 in 1992 House	753	3.7 %	62	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 121 **Total is** 20,588	776	3.8 %	160	.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 122 is composed of:				
2,532 (11.9 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	457	2.2 %	2	.0 %
1,583 (7.5 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	511	2.4 %	11	.1 %
17,124 (80.6 %), from district 122 in 1992 House	2,891	13.6 %	97	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 122 **Total is** 21,239	3,859	18.2 %	110	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 123 is composed of:				
672 (3.2 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	197	.9 %	7	.0 %
20,285 (96.8 %), from district 123 in 1992 House	7,741	36.9 %	267	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 123 **Total is** 20,957	7,938	37.9 %	274	1.3 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

	Hispanic *	Non-Hispanic Black DOJ
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 124 is composed of:		
21,343 (98.3 %), from district 124 in 1992 House	5,583 25.7 %	95 .4 %
363 (1.7 %), from district 125 in 1992 House	82 .4 %	0 .0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 124 **Total is** 21,706	5,665 26.1 %	95 .4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR District 125 is composed of:		
22,148 (100.0 %), from district 125 in 1992 House	9,402 42.5 %	839 3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD TR New District 125 **Total is** 22,148	9,402 42.5 %	839 3.8 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
3:31:48 PM, 12/21/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 1 is composed of:				
8,964 (56.4 %), from district 1 in 1992 House	95	.6 %	37	.2 %
5,496 (34.6 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	46	.3 %	28	.2 %
1,041 (6.5 %), from district 3 in 1992 House	13	.1 %	5	.0 %
404 (2.5 %), from district 4 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 1 **Total is** 15,905	156	1.0 %	73	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 2 is composed of:				
4,757 (28.2 %), from district 1 in 1992 House	39	.2 %	46	.3 %
1,530 (9.1 %), from district 7 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	28	.2 %
10,569 (62.7 %), from district 11 in 1992 House	255	1.5 %	842	5.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 2 **Total is** 16,856	308	1.8 %	916	5.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 3 is composed of:				
2,751 (16.1 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	15	.1 %	11	.1 %
14,303 (83.9 %), from district 3 in 1992 House	455	2.7 %	404	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 3 **Total is** 17,054	470	2.8 %	415	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 4 is composed of:				
14,475 (89.3 %), from district 4 in 1992 House	127	.8 %	325	2.0 %
1,743 (10.7 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	11	.1 %	7	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 4 **Total is** 16,218	138	.9 %	332	2.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 5 is composed of:				
11,449 (74.1 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	97	.6 %	34	.2 %
3,994 (25.9 %), from district 6 in 1992 House	79	.5 %	160	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 5 **Total is** 15,443	176	1.1 %	194	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 6 is composed of:				
996 (6.7 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	0	.0 %
13,897 (93.3 %), from district 6 in 1992 House	166	1.1 %	170	1.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 6 **Total is** 14,893	171	1.1 %	170	1.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 7 is composed of:				
690 (4.3 %), from district 1 in 1992 House	7	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,384 (8.6 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	18	.1 %	2	.0 %
12,387 (76.8 %), from district 7 in 1992 House	395	2.4 %	724	4.5 %
708 (4.4 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	10	.1 %	3	.0 %
970 (6.0 %), from district 11 in 1992 House	4	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 7 **Total is** 16,139	434	2.7 %	729	4.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 8 is composed of:				
5,467 (32.8 %), from district 2 in 1992 House	30	.2 %	24	.1 %
1,029 (6.2 %), from district 3 in 1992 House	17	.1 %	14	.1 %
10,174 (61.0 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	279	1.7 %	99	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 8 **Total is** 16,670	326	2.0 %	137	.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 9 is composed of:				
653 (4.2 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	4	.0 %
2,146 (13.7 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	83	.5 %	31	.2 %
11,074 (70.8 %), from district 9 in 1992 House	102	.7 %	139	.9 %
1,764 (11.3 %), from district 13 in 1992 House	13	.1 %	7	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 9 **Total is** 15,637	201	1.3 %	181	1.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 10 is composed of:				
3,765 (24.0 %), from district 10 in 1992 House	36	.2 %	17	.1 %
2,211 (14.1 %), from district 44 in 1992 House	64	.4 %	81	.5 %
8,484 (54.0 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	208	1.3 %	290	1.8 %
1,257 (8.0 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	27	.2 %	34	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 10 **Total is** 15,717	335	2.1 %	422	2.7 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.

Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 11 is composed of:				
1,956 (13.2 %), from district 5 in 1992 House	25	.2 %	1	.0 %
12,853 (86.8 %), from district 10 in 1992 House	333	2.2 %	178	1.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 11 **Total is** 14,809	358	2.4 %	179	1.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 12 is composed of:				
532 (3.3 %), from district 7 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,837 (11.3 %), from district 11 in 1992 House	22	.1 %	12	.1 %
13,913 (85.5 %), from district 12 in 1992 House	329	2.0 %	524	3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 12 **Total is** 16,282	356	2.2 %	536	3.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 13 is composed of:				
832 (5.3 %), from district 8 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	0	.0 %
12,452 (78.6 %), from district 13 in 1992 House	170	1.1 %	52	.3 %
2,557 (16.1 %), from district 76 in 1992 House	44	.3 %	7	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 13 **Total is** 15,841	228	1.4 %	59	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 14 is composed of:				
15,038 (97.1 %), from district 14 in 1992 House	561	3.6 %	594	3.8 %
0 (.0 %), from district 30 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
451 (2.9 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	1	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 14 **Total is** 15,489	563	3.6 %	595	3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 15 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 14 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
14,916 (96.4 %), from district 15 in 1992 House	1,707	11.0 %	679	4.4 %
0 (.0 %), from district 26 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
424 (2.7 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	11	.1 %
134 (.9 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 15 **Total is** 15,474	1,710	11.1 %	692	4.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 16 is composed of:				
9,150 (58.5 %), from district 16 in 1992 House	283	1.8 %	174	1.1 %
1,447 (9.3 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	41	.3 %	25	.2 %
5,033 (32.2 %), from district 29 in 1992 House	114	.7 %	168	1.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 16 **Total is** 15,630	438	2.8 %	367	2.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 17 is composed of:				
14,409 (91.6 %), from district 17 in 1992 House	423	2.7 %	392	2.5 %
1,324 (8.4 %), from district 30 in 1992 House	28	.2 %	44	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 17 **Total is** 15,733	451	2.9 %	436	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 18 is composed of:				
1,852 (12.2 %), from district 17 in 1992 House	53	.3 %	133	.9 %
13,291 (87.8 %), from district 18 in 1992 House	419	2.8 %	256	1.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 18 **Total is** 15,143	472	3.1 %	389	2.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 19 is composed of:				
13,315 (79.9 %), from district 19 in 1992 House	683	4.1 %	280	1.7 %
2,915 (17.5 %), from district 20 in 1992 House	61	.4 %	56	.3 %
432 (2.6 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	10	.1 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 19 **Total is** 16,662	754	4.5 %	339	2.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 20 is composed of:				
2,121 (12.1 %), from district 19 in 1992 House	236	1.4 %	71	.4 %
13,557 (77.6 %), from district 20 in 1992 House	197	1.1 %	195	1.1 %
886 (5.1 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	15	.1 %	4	.0 %
903 (5.2 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 20 **Total is** 17,467	450	2.6 %	273	1.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 21 is composed of:				
10,289 (60.9 %), from district 21 in 1992 House				

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Data Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 21 is composed of:				
10,289 (60.9 %), from district 21 in 1992 House	265	1.6 %	80	.5 %
2,826 (16.7 %), from district 22 in 1992 House	47	.3 %	8	.0 %
3,788 (22.4 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	41	.2 %	6	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 21 **Total is** 16,903	353	2.1 %	94	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 22 is composed of:				
4,995 (30.0 %), from district 16 in 1992 House	253	1.5 %	246	1.5 %
11,664 (70.0 %), from district 22 in 1992 House	643	3.9 %	281	1.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 22 **Total is** 16,659	896	5.4 %	527	3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 23 is composed of:				
1,721 (10.4 %), from district 18 in 1992 House	141	.9 %	125	.8 %
0 (.0 %), from district 21 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
14,816 (89.6 %), from district 23 in 1992 House	833	5.0 %	562	3.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 23 **Total is** 16,537	974	5.9 %	687	4.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 24 is composed of:				
3,341 (19.0 %), from district 21 in 1992 House	99	.6 %	25	.1 %
14,198 (81.0 %), from district 24 in 1992 House	702	4.0 %	459	2.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 24 **Total is** 17,539	801	4.6 %	484	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 25 is composed of:				
1,225 (7.7 %), from district 24 in 1992 House	71	.4 %	41	.3 %
14,754 (92.3 %), from district 25 in 1992 House	424	2.7 %	88	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 25 **Total is** 15,979	495	3.1 %	129	.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 26 is composed of:				
13,064 (87.6 %), from district 26 in 1992 House	274	1.8 %	356	2.4 %
1,844 (12.4 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	58	.4 %	38	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 26 **Total is** 14,908	332	2.2 %	394	2.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 27 is composed of:				
14,809 (100.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	265	1.8 %	185	1.2 %
0 (.0 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 27 **Total is** 14,809	265	1.8 %	185	1.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 28 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 20 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
249 (1.6 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	3	.0 %
14,900 (98.4 %), from district 28 in 1992 House	177	1.2 %	264	1.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 28 **Total is** 15,149	179	1.2 %	267	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 29 is composed of:				
4,432 (29.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	66	.4 %	116	.8 %
10,828 (71.0 %), from district 29 in 1992 House	357	2.3 %	285	1.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 29 **Total is** 15,260	423	2.8 %	401	2.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 30 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 16 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
16,551 (100.0 %), from district 30 in 1992 House	758	4.6 %	564	3.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 30 **Total is** 16,551	758	4.6 %	564	3.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 31 is composed of:				
14,026 (94.1 %), from district 31 in 1992 House	2,956	19.8 %	923	6.2 %
872 (5.9 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	79	.5 %	5	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 31 **Total is** 14,898	3,035	20.4 %	928	6.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 32 is composed of:				
348 (2.3 %), from district 31 in 1992 House	53	.4 %	3	.0 %
13,535 (90.6 %), from district 32 in 1992 House	3,909	26.2 %	1,418	9.5 %
1,064 (7.1 %), from district 37 in 1992 House	422	2.8 %	58	.4 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 32 is composed of:				
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 32 **Total is** 14,947	4,384	29.3 %	1,479	9.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 33 is composed of:				
12,583 (76.9 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	834	5.1 %	1,975	12.1 %
2,356 (14.4 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	142	.9 %	1,163	7.1 %
1,427 (8.7 %), from district 38 in 1992 House	51	.3 %	458	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 33 **Total is** 16,366	1,027	6.3 %	3,596	22.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 34 is composed of:				
9,684 (62.5 %), from district 34 in 1992 House	870	5.6 %	6,233	40.2 %
1 (.0 %), from district 35 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	1	.0 %
5,804 (37.5 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	229	1.5 %	2,894	18.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 34 **Total is** 15,489	1,099	7.1 %	9,128	58.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 35 is composed of:				
1,914 (12.4 %), from district 34 in 1992 House	44	.3 %	1,806	11.7 %
10,838 (70.1 %), from district 35 in 1992 House	519	3.4 %	6,831	44.2 %
2,705 (17.5 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	105	.7 %	762	4.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 35 **Total is** 15,457	668	4.3 %	9,399	60.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 36 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,030 (6.6 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	33	.2 %	145	.9 %
14,424 (93.0 %), from district 38 in 1992 House	465	3.0 %	2,252	14.5 %
62 (.4 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	4	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 36 **Total is** 15,516	502	3.2 %	2,397	15.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 37 is composed of:				
701 (4.5 %), from district 32 in 1992 House	336	2.2 %	15	.1 %
0 (.0 %), from district 33 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,267 (8.2 %), from district 36 in 1992 House	75	.5 %	365	2.4 %
13,539 (87.3 %), from district 37 in 1992 House	4,465	28.8 %	2,164	14.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 37 **Total is** 15,507	4,876	31.4 %	2,544	16.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 38 is composed of:				
5,774 (36.6 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	104	.7 %	61	.4 %
4,136 (26.3 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	193	1.2 %	9	.1 %
1,621 (10.3 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	42	.3 %	99	.6 %
4,224 (26.8 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	83	.5 %	55	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 38 **Total is** 15,755	422	2.7 %	224	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 39 is composed of:				
20 (.1 %), from district 17 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
724 (4.7 %), from district 18 in 1992 House	12	.1 %	5	.0 %
13,252 (86.9 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	464	3.0 %	320	2.1 %
1,250 (8.2 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	18	.1 %	5	.0 %
0 (.0 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 39 **Total is** 15,246	494	3.2 %	330	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 40 is composed of:				
9,465 (64.2 %), from district 40 in 1992 House	507	3.4 %	1,909	13.0 %
1,265 (8.6 %), from district 41 in 1992 House	46	.3 %	103	.7 %
3,056 (20.7 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	28	.2 %	62	.4 %
946 (6.4 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	36	.2 %	64	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 40 **Total is** 14,732	617	4.2 %	2,138	14.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 41 is composed of:				
1,542 (10.2 %), from district 40 in 1992 House	111	.7 %	286	1.9 %
12,751 (84.6 %), from district 41 in 1992 House	550	3.6 %	2,187	14.5 %
778 (5.2 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	49	.3 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 41 is composed of:				
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 41 **Total is** 15,071	680	4.5 %	2,522	16.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 42 is composed of:				
1,767 (11.7 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	41	.3 %	3	.0 %
627 (4.1 %), from district 40 in 1992 House	37	.2 %	186	1.2 %
1,364 (9.0 %), from district 41 in 1992 House	20	.1 %	121	.8 %
11,387 (75.2 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	217	1.4 %	259	1.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 42 **Total is** 15,145	315	2.1 %	569	3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 43 is composed of:				
1,236 (8.1 %), from district 15 in 1992 House	88	.6 %	39	.3 %
6 (.0 %), from district 39 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
14,084 (91.9 %), from district 43 in 1992 House	369	2.4 %	175	1.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 43 **Total is** 15,326	457	3.0 %	214	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 44 is composed of:				
11,854 (61.0 %), from district 44 in 1992 House	317	1.6 %	441	2.3 %
7,581 (39.0 %), from district 46 in 1992 House	379	2.0 %	555	2.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 44 **Total is** 19,435	696	3.6 %	996	5.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 45 is composed of:				
8,486 (53.1 %), from district 44 in 1992 House	185	1.2 %	281	1.8 %
7,482 (46.9 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	188	1.2 %	313	2.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 45 **Total is** 15,968	373	2.3 %	594	3.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 46 is composed of:				
3,042 (17.1 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	115	.6 %	163	.9 %
14,730 (82.9 %), from district 46 in 1992 House	565	3.2 %	717	4.0 %
0 (.0 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 46 **Total is** 17,772	680	3.8 %	880	5.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 47 is composed of:				
853 (5.7 %), from district 42 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	18	.1 %
206 (1.4 %), from district 45 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	2	.0 %
12,304 (82.9 %), from district 47 in 1992 House	147	1.0 %	57	.4 %
1,483 (10.0 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	11	.1 %	10	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 47 **Total is** 14,846	174	1.2 %	87	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 48 is composed of:				
13,601 (100.0 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	267	2.0 %	323	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 48 **Total is** 13,601	267	2.0 %	323	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 49 is composed of:				
7,899 (52.5 %), from district 14 in 1992 House	255	1.7 %	304	2.0 %
3,066 (20.4 %), from district 26 in 1992 House	267	1.8 %	135	.9 %
4,074 (27.1 %), from district 27 in 1992 House	102	.7 %	87	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 49 **Total is** 15,039	624	4.1 %	526	3.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 50 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
11,988 (80.8 %), from district 50 in 1992 House	186	1.3 %	56	.4 %
2,840 (19.2 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	69	.5 %	20	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 50 **Total is** 14,828	255	1.7 %	76	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 51 is composed of:				
2,786 (18.2 %), from district 50 in 1992 House	53	.3 %	17	.1 %
7,715 (50.3 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	146	1.0 %	261	1.7 %
1,176 (7.7 %), from district 57 in 1992 House	21	.1 %	9	.1 %
3,650 (23.8 %), from district 61 in 1992 House	54	.4 %	11	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 51 **Total is** 15,327	274	1.8 %	298	1.9 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 52 is composed of:				
6,823 (43.8 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	196	1.3 %	259	1.7 %
8,748 (56.2 %), from district 52 in 1992 House	273	1.8 %	348	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 52 **Total is** 15,571	469	3.0 %	607	3.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 53 is composed of:				
11,698 (77.5 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	578	3.8 %	634	4.2 %
1,911 (12.7 %), from district 54 in 1992 House	96	.6 %	98	.6 %
1,482 (9.8 %), from district 58 in 1992 House	67	.4 %	108	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 53 **Total is** 15,091	741	4.9 %	840	5.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 54 is composed of:				
3,725 (23.3 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	65	.4 %	38	.2 %
2,703 (16.9 %), from district 52 in 1992 House	85	.5 %	186	1.2 %
155 (1.0 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	4	.0 %	1	.0 %
8,484 (53.0 %), from district 54 in 1992 House	308	1.9 %	494	3.1 %
929 (5.8 %), from district 55 in 1992 House	37	.2 %	61	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 54 **Total is** 15,996	499	3.1 %	780	4.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 55 is composed of:				
10,779 (66.6 %), from district 55 in 1992 House	745	4.6 %	1,625	10.0 %
5,415 (33.4 %), from district 56 in 1992 House	427	2.6 %	880	5.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 55 **Total is** 16,194	1,172	7.2 %	2,505	15.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 56 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
5,573 (33.1 %), from district 52 in 1992 House	164	1.0 %	196	1.2 %
2,649 (15.7 %), from district 55 in 1992 House	54	.3 %	66	.4 %
8,639 (51.2 %), from district 56 in 1992 House	271	1.6 %	309	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 56 **Total is** 16,861	489	2.9 %	571	3.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 57 is composed of:				
603 (4.0 %), from district 53 in 1992 House	17	.1 %	2	.0 %
13,339 (88.8 %), from district 57 in 1992 House	2,247	15.0 %	938	6.2 %
1,086 (7.2 %), from district 58 in 1992 House	87	.6 %	296	2.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 57 **Total is** 15,028	2,351	15.6 %	1,236	8.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 58 is composed of:				
3,995 (26.8 %), from district 54 in 1992 House	261	1.8 %	836	5.6 %
10,905 (73.2 %), from district 58 in 1992 House	1,268	8.5 %	2,676	18.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 58 **Total is** 14,900	1,529	10.3 %	3,512	23.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 59 is composed of:				
15,364 (97.3 %), from district 59 in 1992 House	523	3.3 %	85	.5 %
425 (2.7 %), from district 68 in 1992 House	8	.1 %	1	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 59 **Total is** 15,789	531	3.4 %	86	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 60 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 59 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
15,831 (100.0 %), from district 60 in 1992 House	2,734	17.3 %	441	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 60 **Total is** 15,831	2,734	17.3 %	441	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 61 is composed of:				
1,815 (11.7 %), from district 51 in 1992 House	63	.4 %	8	.1 %
12,001 (77.5 %), from district 61 in 1992 House	197	1.3 %	60	.4 %
1,678 (10.8 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	21	.1 %	4	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 61 **Total is** 15,494	281	1.8 %	72	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 62 is composed of:				
14,055 (84.8 %), from district 49 in 1992 House	200	1.2 %	238	1.4 %
2,515 (15.2 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	11	.1 %	23	.1 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 62 is composed of:				
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 62 **Total is** 16,570	211	1.3 %	261	1.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 63 is composed of:				
10,997 (68.1 %), from district 48 in 1992 House	123	.8 %	506	3.1 %
650 (4.0 %), from district 50 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	7	.0 %
4,494 (27.8 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	26	.2 %	12	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 63 **Total is** 16,141	152	.9 %	525	3.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 64 is composed of:				
7,735 (56.5 %), from district 64 in 1992 House	353	2.6 %	470	3.4 %
3,142 (23.0 %), from district 65 in 1992 House	261	1.9 %	1,274	9.3 %
1,530 (11.2 %), from district 106 in 1992 House	116	.8 %	310	2.3 %
1,273 (9.3 %), from district 107 in 1992 House	7	.1 %	4	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 64 **Total is** 13,680	737	5.4 %	2,058	15.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 65 is composed of:				
14,096 (89.6 %), from district 62 in 1992 House	388	2.5 %	551	3.5 %
1,633 (10.4 %), from district 66 in 1992 House	108	.7 %	231	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 65 **Total is** 15,729	496	3.2 %	782	5.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 66 is composed of:				
3,393 (19.2 %), from district 62 in 1992 House	117	.7 %	163	.9 %
14,254 (80.8 %), from district 66 in 1992 House	509	2.9 %	708	4.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 66 **Total is** 17,647	626	3.5 %	871	4.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 67 is composed of:				
13,043 (82.3 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	316	2.0 %	264	1.7 %
2,810 (17.7 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	9	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 67 **Total is** 15,853	335	2.1 %	273	1.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 68 is composed of:				
1,322 (8.6 %), from district 64 in 1992 House	12	.1 %	1	.0 %
429 (2.8 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	4	.0 %	0	.0 %
13,558 (88.6 %), from district 68 in 1992 House	289	1.9 %	82	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 68 **Total is** 15,309	305	2.0 %	83	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 69 is composed of:				
1,848 (11.7 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	78	.5 %	87	.5 %
13,990 (88.3 %), from district 69 in 1992 House	1,152	7.3 %	479	3.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 69 **Total is** 15,838	1,230	7.8 %	566	3.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 70 is composed of:				
15,076 (96.7 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	255	1.6 %	438	2.8 %
507 (3.3 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	8	.1 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 70 **Total is** 15,583	263	1.7 %	438	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 71 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
15,568 (100.0 %), from district 71 in 1992 House	503	3.2 %	510	3.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 71 **Total is** 15,568	503	3.2 %	510	3.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 72 is composed of:				
15,045 (97.2 %), from district 72 in 1992 House	1,421	9.2 %	334	2.2 %
434 (2.8 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	11	.1 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 72 **Total is** 15,479	1,432	9.3 %	336	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 73 is composed of:				
240 (1.6 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	1	.0 %	0	.0 %
15,030 (98.4 %), from district 73 in 1992 House	253	1.7 %	113	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 73 **Total is** 15,270	254	1.7 %	113	.7 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 74 is composed of:				
598 (4.0 %), from district 67 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	0	.0 %
528 (3.5 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
404 (2.7 %), from district 73 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	1	.0 %
12,655 (84.5 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	220	1.5 %	63	.4 %
800 (5.3 %), from district 113 in 1992 House	1	.0 %	4	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 74 **Total is** 14,985	225	1.5 %	68	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 75 is composed of:				
1,632 (10.4 %), from district 74 in 1992 House	12	.1 %	1	.0 %
14,018 (89.6 %), from district 75 in 1992 House	286	1.8 %	214	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 75 **Total is** 15,650	298	1.9 %	215	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 76 is composed of:				
4,235 (26.3 %), from district 9 in 1992 House	56	.3 %	10	.1 %
725 (4.5 %), from district 59 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	4	.0 %
1,456 (9.1 %), from district 68 in 1992 House	22	.1 %	7	.0 %
692 (4.3 %), from district 70 in 1992 House	46	.3 %	0	.0 %
8,975 (55.8 %), from district 76 in 1992 House	402	2.5 %	18	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 76 **Total is** 16,083	540	3.4 %	39	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 77 is composed of:				
14,177 (94.3 %), from district 77 in 1992 House	245	1.6 %	46	.3 %
852 (5.7 %), from district 78 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	4	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 77 **Total is** 15,029	259	1.7 %	50	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 78 is composed of:				
1,274 (7.9 %), from district 77 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	5	.0 %
13,727 (85.2 %), from district 78 in 1992 House	382	2.4 %	364	2.3 %
1,109 (6.9 %), from district 79 in 1992 House	12	.1 %	7	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 78 **Total is** 16,110	408	2.5 %	376	2.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 79 is composed of:				
3,365 (20.1 %), from district 76 in 1992 House	30	.2 %	9	.1 %
413 (2.5 %), from district 78 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	2	.0 %
12,034 (72.0 %), from district 79 in 1992 House	406	2.4 %	384	2.3 %
905 (5.4 %), from district 80 in 1992 House	9	.1 %	8	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 79 **Total is** 16,717	447	2.7 %	403	2.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 80 is composed of:				
11,339 (69.7 %), from district 80 in 1992 House	442	2.7 %	110	.7 %
4,919 (30.3 %), from district 105 in 1992 House	58	.4 %	8	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 80 **Total is** 16,258	500	3.1 %	118	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 81 is composed of:				
2,502 (16.1 %), from district 80 in 1992 House	41	.3 %	0	.0 %
8,176 (52.8 %), from district 81 in 1992 House	165	1.1 %	25	.2 %
2,012 (13.0 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	16	.1 %	4	.0 %
2,808 (18.1 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	51	.3 %	66	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 81 **Total is** 15,498	273	1.8 %	95	.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 82 is composed of:				
13,606 (94.8 %), from district 82 in 1992 House	396	2.8 %	211	1.5 %
753 (5.2 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	10	.1 %	5	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 82 **Total is** 14,359	406	2.8 %	216	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 83 is composed of:				
11,706 (71.9 %), from district 83 in 1992 House	236	1.4 %	465	2.9 %
1,927 (11.8 %), from district 84 in 1992 House	38	.2 %	42	.3 %
27 (.2 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	2	.0 %
1,930 (11.8 %), from district 86 in 1992 House	60	.4 %	31	.2 %
699 (4.3 %), from district 89 in 1992 House				

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 83 is composed of:				
	5	.0 %	74	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 83 **Total is** 16,289	339	2.1 %	614	3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 84 is composed of:				
10,343 (74.7 %), from district 84 in 1992 House	443	3.2 %	5,996	43.3 %
1,962 (14.2 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	61	.4 %	968	7.0 %
1,537 (11.1 %), from district 103 in 1992 House	331	2.4 %	387	2.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 84 **Total is** 13,842	835	6.0 %	7,351	53.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 85 is composed of:				
5,358 (33.8 %), from district 83 in 1992 House	122	.8 %	307	1.9 %
9,874 (62.2 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	276	1.7 %	723	4.6 %
263 (1.7 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	7	.0 %	24	.2 %
377 (2.4 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	8	.1 %	16	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 85 **Total is** 15,872	413	2.6 %	1,070	6.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 86 is composed of:				
10,451 (64.5 %), from district 86 in 1992 House	1,023	6.3 %	667	4.1 %
3,159 (19.5 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	168	1.0 %	217	1.3 %
974 (6.0 %), from district 88 in 1992 House	89	.5 %	74	.5 %
1,622 (10.0 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	202	1.2 %	117	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 86 **Total is** 16,206	1,482	9.1 %	1,075	6.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 87 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 83 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
5,027 (31.7 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	208	1.3 %	216	1.4 %
5,603 (35.4 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	226	1.4 %	643	4.1 %
5,220 (32.9 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	261	1.6 %	629	4.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 87 **Total is** 15,850	695	4.4 %	1,488	9.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 88 is composed of:				
11 (.1 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	4	.0 %
4,004 (25.2 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	562	3.5 %	552	3.5 %
11,877 (74.7 %), from district 88 in 1992 House	1,196	7.5 %	1,401	8.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 88 **Total is** 15,892	1,758	11.1 %	1,957	12.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 89 is composed of:				
3,974 (26.9 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	166	1.1 %	94	.6 %
10,522 (71.2 %), from district 89 in 1992 House	380	2.6 %	6,109	41.3 %
203 (1.4 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	4	.0 %	6	.0 %
76 (.5 %), from district 103 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	17	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 89 **Total is** 14,775	550	3.7 %	6,226	42.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 90 is composed of:				
123 (.8 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	3	.0 %
12,794 (85.7 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	215	1.4 %	71	.5 %
2,011 (13.5 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	27	.2 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 90 **Total is** 14,928	245	1.6 %	76	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 91 is composed of:				
2,191 (13.3 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	94	.6 %	38	.2 %
14,296 (86.7 %), from district 91 in 1992 House	935	5.7 %	369	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 91 **Total is** 16,487	1,029	6.2 %	407	2.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 92 is composed of:				
14,951 (95.9 %), from district 92 in 1992 House	2,145	13.8 %	565	3.6 %
638 (4.1 %), from district 95 in 1992 House	33	.2 %	26	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 92 **Total is** 15,589	2,178	14.0 %	591	3.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 93 is composed of:				
5,899 (39.9 %), from district 81 in 1992 House	142	1.0 %	26	.2 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 93 is composed of:				
7,283 (49.2 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	85	.6 %	17	.1 %
669 (4.5 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	18	.1 %	1	.0 %
951 (6.4 %), from district 108 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	1	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 93 **Total is** 14,802	247	1.7 %	45	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 94 is composed of:				
67 (.5 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	3	.0 %
2,174 (15.2 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	51	.4 %	20	.1 %
12,060 (84.3 %), from district 94 in 1992 House	391	2.7 %	183	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 94 **Total is** 14,301	445	3.1 %	206	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 95 is composed of:				
1,285 (8.1 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	32	.2 %	8	.1 %
1,857 (11.7 %), from district 94 in 1992 House	129	.8 %	106	.7 %
12,687 (80.2 %), from district 95 in 1992 House	1,003	6.3 %	392	2.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 95 **Total is** 15,829	1,164	7.4 %	506	3.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 96 is composed of:				
1,526 (9.6 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	43	.3 %	14	.1 %
13,151 (82.8 %), from district 96 in 1992 House	619	3.9 %	391	2.5 %
1,212 (7.6 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	23	.1 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 96 **Total is** 15,889	685	4.3 %	408	2.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 97 is composed of:				
195 (1.3 %), from district 93 in 1992 House	8	.1 %	0	.0 %
1,220 (8.1 %), from district 96 in 1992 House	72	.5 %	28	.2 %
13,666 (90.6 %), from district 97 in 1992 House	962	6.4 %	669	4.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 97 **Total is** 15,081	1,042	6.9 %	697	4.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 98 is composed of:				
1,564 (10.9 %), from district 82 in 1992 House	137	1.0 %	82	.6 %
1,881 (13.1 %), from district 88 in 1992 House	713	5.0 %	80	.6 %
10,932 (76.0 %), from district 98 in 1992 House	744	5.2 %	934	6.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 98 **Total is** 14,377	1,594	11.1 %	1,096	7.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 99 is composed of:				
2,584 (16.7 %), from district 75 in 1992 House	30	.2 %	15	.1 %
4 (.0 %), from district 77 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
0 (.0 %), from district 85 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
2,106 (13.6 %), from district 87 in 1992 House	62	.4 %	173	1.1 %
10,755 (69.6 %), from district 99 in 1992 House	200	1.3 %	155	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 99 **Total is** 15,449	292	1.9 %	343	2.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 100 is composed of:				
977 (6.7 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	15	.1 %	11	.1 %
13,689 (93.3 %), from district 100 in 1992 House	396	2.7 %	196	1.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 100 **Total is** 14,666	411	2.8 %	207	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 101 is composed of:				
14,882 (96.8 %), from district 101 in 1992 House	286	1.9 %	91	.6 %
0 (.0 %), from district 102 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
492 (3.2 %), from district 104 in 1992 House	14	.1 %	9	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 101 **Total is** 15,374	300	2.0 %	100	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 102 is composed of:				
0 (.0 %), from district 101 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
15,714 (100.0 %), from district 102 in 1992 House	1,553	9.9 %	1,162	7.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 102 **Total is** 15,714	1,553	9.9 %	1,162	7.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 103 is composed of:				
1,245 (7.9 %), from district 86 in 1992 House				

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 103 is composed of:				
	164	1.0 %	78	.5 %
14,433 (92.1 %), from district 103 in 1992 House	4,726	30.1 %	1,657	10.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 103 **Total is** 15,678	4,890	31.2 %	1,735	11.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 104 is composed of:				
16,168 (100.0 %), from district 104 in 1992 House	369	2.3 %	166	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 104 **Total is** 16,168	369	2.3 %	166	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 105 is composed of:				
834 (5.5 %), from district 90 in 1992 House	17	.1 %	4	.0 %
5,042 (33.4 %), from district 94 in 1992 House	206	1.4 %	133	.9 %
9,237 (61.1 %), from district 100 in 1992 House	276	1.8 %	156	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 105 **Total is** 15,113	499	3.3 %	293	1.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 106 is composed of:				
6,038 (38.0 %), from district 63 in 1992 House	43	.3 %	9	.1 %
9,852 (62.0 %), from district 106 in 1992 House	74	.5 %	18	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 106 **Total is** 15,890	117	.7 %	27	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 107 is composed of:				
13,273 (82.5 %), from district 107 in 1992 House	92	.6 %	48	.3 %
2,822 (17.5 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	19	.1 %	1	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 107 **Total is** 16,095	111	.7 %	49	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 108 is composed of:				
3,775 (24.6 %), from district 64 in 1992 House	116	.8 %	140	.9 %
11,285 (73.4 %), from district 65 in 1992 House	696	4.5 %	1,838	12.0 %
308 (2.0 %), from district 107 in 1992 House	3	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 108 **Total is** 15,368	815	5.3 %	1,978	12.9 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 109 is composed of:				
2,754 (16.6 %), from district 106 in 1992 House	21	.1 %	7	.0 %
8,626 (52.0 %), from district 109 in 1992 House	50	.3 %	6	.0 %
5,220 (31.4 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	30	.2 %	17	.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 109 **Total is** 16,600	101	.6 %	30	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 110 is composed of:				
11,116 (71.3 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	99	.6 %	78	.5 %
3,313 (21.2 %), from district 111 in 1992 House	121	.8 %	45	.3 %
1,136 (7.3 %), from district 118 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	5	.0 %
34 (.2 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	0	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 110 **Total is** 15,599	222	1.4 %	128	.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 111 is composed of:				
1,077 (6.5 %), from district 109 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	0	.0 %
1,085 (6.5 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	9	.1 %	0	.0 %
12,022 (72.1 %), from district 111 in 1992 House	222	1.3 %	68	.4 %
2,487 (14.9 %), from district 119 in 1992 House	8	.0 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 111 **Total is** 16,671	244	1.5 %	71	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 112 is composed of:				
686 (4.5 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	5	.0 %	1	.0 %
14,329 (93.4 %), from district 112 in 1992 House	1,202	7.8 %	146	1.0 %
327 (2.1 %), from district 113 in 1992 House	2	.0 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 112 **Total is** 15,342	1,209	7.9 %	147	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 113 is composed of:				
13,575 (89.0 %), from district 113 in 1992 House	435	2.9 %	106	.7 %
1,678 (11.0 %), from district 114 in 1992 House	33	.2 %	3	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 113 **Total is** 15,253	468	3.1 %	109	.7 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

	18+ Hispanic*		18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ	
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 114 is composed of:				
7,218 (42.8 %), from district 108 in 1992 House	177	1.0 %	57	.3 %
9,644 (57.2 %), from district 114 in 1992 House	432	2.6 %	296	1.8 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 114 **Total is** 16,862	609	3.6 %	353	2.1 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 115 is composed of:				
10,972 (71.2 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	993	6.4 %	24	.2 %
3,507 (22.8 %), from district 116 in 1992 House	1,466	9.5 %	39	.3 %
932 (6.0 %), from district 125 in 1992 House	171	1.1 %	1	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 115 **Total is** 15,411	2,630	17.1 %	64	.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 116 is composed of:				
9,312 (55.3 %), from district 105 in 1992 House	118	.7 %	25	.1 %
6,855 (40.7 %), from district 108 in 1992 House	88	.5 %	8	.0 %
663 (3.9 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	16	.1 %	2	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 116 **Total is** 16,830	222	1.3 %	35	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 117 is composed of:				
2,294 (15.4 %), from district 114 in 1992 House	107	.7 %	7	.0 %
11,297 (75.8 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	4,136	27.8 %	59	.4 %
1,312 (8.8 %), from district 122 in 1992 House	669	4.5 %	6	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 117 **Total is** 14,903	4,912	33.0 %	72	.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 118 is composed of:				
1,908 (11.9 %), from district 110 in 1992 House	18	.1 %	4	.0 %
3,698 (23.1 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	34	.2 %	1	.0 %
9,701 (60.5 %), from district 118 in 1992 House	291	1.8 %	24	.1 %
718 (4.5 %), from district 122 in 1992 House	102	.6 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 118 **Total is** 16,025	445	2.8 %	29	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 119 is composed of:				
1,922 (12.3 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	70	.4 %	4	.0 %
13,683 (87.7 %), from district 116 in 1992 House	5,158	33.1 %	213	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 119 **Total is** 15,605	5,228	33.5 %	217	1.4 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 120 is composed of:				
3,414 (20.2 %), from district 109 in 1992 House	21	.1 %	9	.1 %
13,450 (79.8 %), from district 120 in 1992 House	213	1.3 %	251	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 120 **Total is** 16,864	234	1.4 %	260	1.5 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 121 is composed of:				
2,076 (13.5 %), from district 118 in 1992 House	16	.1 %	78	.5 %
13,301 (86.5 %), from district 121 in 1992 House	431	2.8 %	30	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 121 **Total is** 15,377	447	2.9 %	108	.7 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 122 is composed of:				
1,721 (11.8 %), from district 115 in 1992 House	247	1.7 %	2	.0 %
1,011 (7.0 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	269	1.9 %	5	.0 %
11,804 (81.2 %), from district 122 in 1992 House	1,590	10.9 %	35	.2 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 122 **Total is** 14,536	2,106	14.5 %	42	.3 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 123 is composed of:				
368 (2.6 %), from district 117 in 1992 House	77	.5 %	3	.0 %
13,927 (97.4 %), from district 123 in 1992 House	4,513	31.6 %	140	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 123 **Total is** 14,295	4,590	32.1 %	143	1.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 124 is composed of:				
14,671 (98.4 %), from district 124 in 1992 House	3,200	21.5 %	50	.3 %
232 (1.6 %), from district 125 in 1992 House	45	.3 %	0	.0 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 124 **Total is** 14,903	3,245	21.8 %	50	.3 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

Plan Comparison with Recalculated Population and Race (Voting Age Population)

	18+ Hispanic*	18+ Non-Hispanic Black DOJ
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD District 125 is composed of:		
15,072 (100.0 %), from district 125 in 1992 House	5,487 36.4 %	545 3.6 %
M2_HR State House 4 for KLRD New District 125 **Total is** 15,072	5,487 36.4 %	545 3.6 %

***The Hispanic column includes persons of Hispanic Origin of all races.**

Percentages are a percent of total Population.
Source: Secretary of State

KLRD
House
12:42:15 PM, 12/31/01

House Redistricting
Attachment 4
1-22-02

January 2002

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Senate Committee activities House Committee activities	1	2	3	4
7	8	9	10	11
14	15 (3:15 PM) House Committee Meeting (313-S)	16	17	18
21 (8:00 AM) Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday	22 (6:00 PM) House Committee Evening Public Hearing (Rm 313-S, Statehouse, Topeka)	23	24 (5:00 PM) Deadline for submitting to KLRD proposed House Committee amendments (Rm 545 N, Statehouse, Topeka)	25
28	29 (6:00 PM) Senate Committee Evening Public Hearing (Rm 313-S, Statehouse, Topeka)	30 (4:00 PM) House Committee Meeting (Rm 313-S, Statehouse) (5:00 PM) Deadline for submission to KLRD of proposed Senate Committee amendments (Rm 545-N, Statehouse)	31 (4:00 PM) House Committee Meeting (Rm-313-S, Statehouse)	

February 2002

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Senate Committee activities House Committee activities				1
4 (Upon Adjournment) Senate Cmte. (Rm 531-S, Statehouse, Topeka)	5 (Upon Adjournment) Senate Cmte. (Rm. 531-S, Statehouse, Topeka)	6 (5:00 PM) Deadline for submission to KLRD of proposed House floor amendments (Rm 545-N, Statehouse, Topeka)	7	8
11	12	13 (11:00 AM) House Committee of the Whole Action on House Redistricting Bill (House Chamber)	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	

Kansas Legislative Research Department

April 26, 2001
Updated July 31, 2001

GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR 2002 KANSAS CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING

Adopted by the House Select Committee on Redistricting April 25, 2001
Adopted by the Senate Committee on Reapportionment April 26, 2001

Legislative Redistricting

1. The basis for legislative redistricting is the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census as recalculated by the Kansas Secretary of State pursuant to Article 10, Section 1 of the *Constitution of the State of Kansas* and KSA 11-301 *et seq.*

2. Districts should be numerically as equal in population as practical within the limitations of Census geography and application of guidelines set out below. Deviations should not exceed plus or minus 5 percent of the ideal population of 21,378 for each House district and 66,806 for each Senate district, except in unusual circumstances. (The range of deviation for House districts could be plus or minus 1,069 persons, for districts that could range in population from 20,309 to 22,447. The overall deviation for House districts could be 2,138 persons. The range of deviation for Senate districts could be plus or minus 3,340 persons, for districts that could range in population from 63,466 to 70,147. The overall deviation for Senate districts could be 6,681 persons.)

3. Redistricting plans will have neither the purpose nor the effect of diluting minority voting strength.

4. Subject to the requirement of guideline No. 2:

   a. The "building blocks" to be used for drawing district boundaries shall be voting districts (VTDs) as described on official 2000 Redistricting U.S. Census maps.

   b. Districts should be as compact as possible and contiguous.

   c. The integrity and priority of existing political subdivisions should be preserved to the extent possible.

   d. There should be recognition of similarities of interest. Social, cultural, racial, ethnic, and economic interests common to the population of the area, which are probable subjects of legislation (generally termed "communities of interest"), should be considered. While some communities of interest lend themselves more readily than others to being embodied in legislative districts, the Committee will attempt to accommodate interests articulated by residents.

   e. Contests between incumbent members of the Legislature or the State Board of Education will be avoided whenever possible.

   f. Districts should be easily identifiable and understandable by voters.

Congressional Redistricting

1. The basis for congressional redistricting is the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census as published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. The "building blocks" to be used for drawing district boundaries shall be Kansas counties and voting districts (VTDs) as their population is reported in the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census.

2. Districts are to be as nearly equal to 672,105 population as practicable.

3. Redistricting plans will have neither the purpose nor the effect of diluting minority voting strength.

4. Districts should attempt to recognize "community of interests" when that can be done in compliance with the requirement of guideline No. 2.

   a. Social, cultural, racial, ethnic, and economic interests common to the population of the area, which are probable subjects of legislation (generally termed "communities of interest"), should be considered.

   b. If possible, preserving the core of the existing districts should be undertaken when considering the "community of interests" in establishing districts.

   c. Whole counties should be in the same congressional district to the extent possible while achieving population equality among districts. County lines are meaningful in Kansas and Kansas counties have historically been significant political units. Many officials are elected on a countywide basis, and political parties have been organized in county units. Election of the Kansas members of Congress is a political process requiring political organizations which in Kansas are developed in county units. To a considerable degree most counties in Kansas are economic, social, and cultural units, or parts of a larger socioeconomic unit. These interests common to the population of the area, generally termed "community of interests" should be considered during the creation of congressional districts.

5. Districts should be as compact as possible and contiguous, subject to the requirement of guideline No. 2.

1992 Kansas House Districts

Deviation From Ideal District Population -- 2000 Recalculated Population



Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State,
Adjustment to the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census,
July 31, 2001

Legislative Districts that are within + or- 5 percent of the ideal district population are generally permitted under redistricting case law.

Map Layers
- Districts
- County (Tiger)
- House Incumbent

Numeric Deviation
- -28.4 to -5.0
- -5.0 to 5.0
- 5.0 to 185.1

0 20 40 60
Miles



1992 House Districts and Deviation from Ideal: Wichita area

Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State,
Adjustment to the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census, July 31, 2001

1992 House Districts and Deviation from Ideal: Manhattan and Topeka areas



Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State, Adjustment to the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census, July 31, 2001

enlargement of Topeka House Districts

1992 House Districts and Deviation from Ideal: Douglas and Johnson Counties

Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State,
Adjustment to the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census,
July 31, 2001



closeup of northeast portion of Johnson County

1992 House Districts and Deviation from Ideal: Wyandotte County



Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State, Adjustment to the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census, July 31, 2001

1992 House Districts and Deviation from Ideal: Southeast Kansas



Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State,
Adjustment to the 2000 U.S.Decennial Census,
July 31, 2001

Kansas Legislative Research Department
August 28, 2001

House Districts that have small areas, various locations throughout the state



Hays



Leavenworth
Wyandotte
Johnson cos.





Garden City

Emporia





Salina



Dodge City

Newton
Harvey Co.



Hutchinson
Reno Co.



Great Bend
Barton Co.



Map Layers
- Districts
- County (Tiger)

Numeric Deviation
- -28.4 to -5.0
- -5.0 to 5.0
- 5.0 to 185.1

Data Source: Kansas Secretary of State,
Adjustment to the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census,
July 31, 2001

Kansas Legislative Research Department
August 28, 2001

Plan: 1992 House Districts
Plan Type: House
Administrator: KLRD
User: KLRD

Population Summary Report

Wednesday September 26, 2001 6:22 PM

DISTRICT	K_Population	DEVIATION	% DEVN.
1	19,525	-1,853	-8.67
2	20,210	-1,168	-5.46
3	21,114	-264	-1.23
4	20,037	-1,341	-6.27
5	22,824	1,446	6.76
6	24,780	3,402	15.91
7	19,365	-2,013	-9.42
8	18,512	-2,866	-13.41
9	20,738	-640	-2.99
10	22,962	1,584	7.41
11	17,758	-3,620	-16.93
12	18,730	-2,648	-12.39
13	18,884	-2,494	-11.67
14	33,381	12,003	56.15
15	22,601	1,223	5.72
16	18,434	-2,944	-13.77
17	22,525	1,147	5.37
18	20,859	-519	-2.43
19	19,371	-2,007	-9.39
20	21,071	-307	-1.44
21	17,418	-3,960	-18.52
22	18,554	-2,824	-13.21
23	18,746	-2,632	-12.31
24	19,005	-2,373	-11.10
25	19,316	-2,062	-9.65
26	23,878	2,500	11.69
27	60,943	39,565	185.07
28	27,946	6,568	30.72
29	20,209	-1,169	-5.47
30	23,891	2,513	11.76
31	20,508	-870	-4.07
32	19,588	-1,790	-8.37
33	18,627	-2,751	-12.87
34	16,825	-4,553	-21.30
35	15,310	-6,068	-28.38
36	18,288	-3,090	-14.45
37	20,694	-684	-3.20
38	21,305	-73	-0.34
39	30,466	9,088	42.51
40	16,577	-4,801	-22.46

Plan: 1992 House Districts
Type: House

Administrator: KLRD
User: KLRD

DISTRICT	K_Population	DEVIATION	% DEVN.
41	20,319	-1,059	-4.95
42	23,889	2,511	11.75
43	28,979	7,601	35.56
44	28,555	7,177	33.57
45	27,345	5,967	27.91
46	26,273	4,895	22.90
47	24,630	3,252	15.21
48	18,476	-2,902	-13.57
49	18,959	-2,419	-11.32
50	21,343	-35	-0.16
51	28,001	6,623	30.98
52	21,569	191	0.89
53	21,226	-152	-0.71
54	18,970	-2,408	-11.26
55	18,645	-2,733	-12.78
56	18,085	-3,293	-15.40
57	19,779	-1,599	-7.48
58	18,573	-2,805	-13.12
59	22,050	672	3.14
60	21,530	152	0.71
61	21,622	244	1.14
62	23,062	1,684	7.88
63	19,931	-1,447	-6.77
64	19,400	-1,978	-9.25
65	20,276	-1,102	-5.15
66	19,341	-2,037	-9.53
67	21,522	144	0.67
68	20,573	-805	-3.77
69	19,404	-1,974	-9.23
70	21,761	383	1.79
71	20,338	-1,040	-4.86
72	20,128	-1,250	-5.85
73	20,779	-599	-2.80
74	21,022	-356	-1.67
75	22,706	1,328	6.21
76	19,623	-1,755	-8.21
77	21,883	505	2.36
78	20,659	-719	-3.36
79	17,763	-3,615	-16.91
80	20,357	-1,021	-4.78
81	20,050	-1,328	-6.21
82	22,338	960	4.49
83	21,760	382	1.79
84	17,711	-3,667	-17.15
85	27,383	6,005	28.09
86	18,699	-2,679	-12.53
87	19,337	-2,041	-9.55

Plan: 1992 House Districts
Type: House

Administrator: KLRD
User: KLRD

DISTRICT	K_Population	DEVIATION	% DEVN.
88	20,040	-1,338	-6.26
89	18,907	-2,471	-11.56
90	24,272	2,894	13.54
91	18,356	-3,022	-14.14
92	19,765	-1,613	-7.55
93	24,434	3,056	14.30
94	26,094	4,716	22.06
95	17,880	-3,498	-16.36
96	20,004	-1,374	-6.43
97	18,959	-2,419	-11.32
98	20,375	-1,003	-4.69
99	28,893	7,515	35.15
100	33,673	12,295	57.51
101	20,134	-1,244	-5.82
102	20,681	-697	-3.26
103	21,976	598	2.80
104	21,706	328	1.53
105	19,169	-2,209	-10.33
106	18,533	-2,845	-13.31
107	19,533	-1,845	-8.63
108	20,178	-1,200	-5.61
109	17,001	-4,377	-20.47
110	19,297	-2,081	-9.73
111	20,148	-1,230	-5.75
112	19,295	-2,083	-9.74
113	19,779	-1,599	-7.48
114	18,068	-3,310	-15.48
115	21,728	350	1.64
116	25,013	3,635	17.00
117	24,097	2,719	12.72
118	17,235	-4,143	-19.38
119	17,490	-3,888	-18.19
120	17,421	-3,957	-18.51
121	17,923	-3,455	-16.16
122	20,233	-1,145	-5.36
123	20,285	-1,093	-5.11
124	21,343	-35	-0.16
125	23,940	2,562	11.98

Total Population: 2,672,257
Ideal District Population: 21,378

Summary Statistics

Population Range: 15,310 to 60,943
Ratio Range: 3.98
Absolute Range: -6,068 to 39,565
Absolute Overall Range: 45,633.00
Relative Range: -28.38% to 185.07%
Relative Overall Range: 213.46%

Plan:	1992 House Districts	Administrator:	KLRD
Type:	House	User:	KLRD

Absolute Mean Deviation:	2,758.07
Relative Mean Deviation:	12.90%
Standard Deviation:	4,832.76

Testimony to House Committee on Redistricting: Proposed House Redistricting Plan (HB 2625) Statehouse 313-S

Dr. Joseph A. Aistrup, Professor, Department of Political Science, Fort Hays State University

January 22, 2002

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for giving me this opportunity to provide my comments regarding the House redistricting plan known as *State House 4* (HB 2625). I come to you today as a citizen of the City of Hays to voice my concerns about the proposal to split Hays between the 110th and the 111th state house districts (see map B). I also come to you today as a representative for rural areas of Kansas to ask the committee to reconsider eliminating rural Kansas districts.

B



The guidelines for redistricting adopted by this committee on April 25, 2001 ("Guidelines and Criteria for 2002: Kansas Congressional and Legislative Redistricting) explicitly recognize the importance of taking into account "similarities of interest" generally termed "communities of interest." (4.d.). Most who are involved with redistricting recognize that cities represent communities of interest because citizens of cities voluntarily choose to live within the boundaries of cities.[1] In the case of Hays, the communities of interest span social, cultural, and economic interests. Hays is known for being a Volga-German community. Much to the chagrin of those who don't appreciate alcohol consumption, we do celebrate Octoberfest. Hays is home to Fort Hays State University, Thomas-

[1]It is significant to note that the plan generally respects the boundaries of most mid-sized communities in Kansas (See: Garden City, Liberal, McPherson, Great Bend, Emporia, El Dorado, Winfield, Ark City, Augusta, Junction City, Pittsburg, Coffeville, and Independence). Aside from Hays, the only other instances of dividing clearly defined communities of interest in mid-sized communities are Atchison (Districts 63 and 40) and Dodge City (115 and 119).

More Prep Marian High School, and Hays High School. Hays is bound together economically through the Hays Medical Center, Fort Hays State University, the industries located in its industrial park on the east side of Hays (For example: Sykes Enterprises Inc. and A-1 Plank) its retail shopping on Main and Vine Streets, its banking and financial services located throughout the city, and tourist attractions like The Sternberg Museum located on the northeast side of town, and old Fort Hays located on the southwest side of town. Hays is a shining example of the definition of "communities of interest" because its interests are sewn into the fabric of the community.

Moreover, Hays has a population of about 20,000 individuals. It would be a relatively simple task to add a few voting districts contiguous to Hays to create a house district of about 21,378 people, which is the ideal size for a house district.

But the *State House 4* plan splits Hays between the 110th and 111th districts, and in so doing, divides Hays' communities of interest. Fort Hays State University, old Fort Hays, and the bulk of the city's industrial employers would be placed in the 110th district, which pivots around Hays to encompass the City of Russell on the East and spreads North of Hays to include all of Rooks County. While the rest of the City of Hays would be placed in the 111th district, which flows northeast of Hays to engulf the northwest corner of Russell County and all of Osborne County. Even though residents of Hays share some economic and cultural interests with the good people of Russell, Rooks, and Osborne counties, these interests pale in comparison to the interests that are shared within Hays' boundaries.

In addition to similarities of interest, the proposal to divide Hays is at odds with another of the committee's guidelines, preserving the "integrity and priority of existing political subdivisions" (4.c.). The *State House 4* plan violates this guideline in two basic ways. First, by dividing the City of Hays into two districts. Second, by needlessly extending the boundaries of the 111th district to cross the Ellis County line into Russell County and on up into Osborne County. The 110th and 111th districts could be easily redrawn so that the 111th district keeps the City of Hays within one district contained within Ellis County. While the 110th district could be redrawn to include all of Rooks and Osborne counties with parts of Russell and Ellis counties. Under this type of district configuration, the 110th district would include the cities of Russell, Osborne, Plainville, and Stockton. These cities are similar in size and socio-economic conditions. This would facilitate more effective representation for these cities and the rural communities that surround them.

Finally, *State House 4's* plan to divide the City of Hays does not coincide with the committee's guidelines that districts "should be easily identifiable and understandable to voters." It is very difficult to provide a rational reason to an average voter in City of Hays as to why he/she is in the same state house district with someone from Osborne County given that the current population of Hays and the population of an ideal state house district are close to equivalent.

I recognize that redistricting plans may split communities of interest if this serves some other "valid" or "rational" state interests. The guidelines the committee adopted provides a list of the state's rational interests as they apply to the redistricting process. While other types of considerations may also play a legitimate role in the redistricting process–like partisan interests–the guidelines take precedent because they define legislative intent and provide a summary of court precedents that define the state's valid or rational interests. For each of the guidelines that may provide a rational basis for dividing Hays between two districts, I apply a test to assess the extent to which this plan meets these defined rational state interests.

Test 1: Does dividing Hays serve a rational state interest regarding protecting minority voting rights (3.) ? The percentage of minority interests in and around Hays is less than 10%. Answer: No, dividing Hays would not facilitate the creation of a majority-minority district.

Test 2: Does dividing Hays create districts that are more contiguous (4.b.)? Contiguous refers to the idea that all parts of the district are linked geographically.[2] The proposed *State House 4* plan and a plan that would keep the City of Hays united in one district would both satisfy the criteria of being contiguous. However, under the *State House 4* plan, the geography between City of Hays and City of Osborne is sparsely populated in the 111th district. Indeed, there are no major state roads directly linking City of Hays and the City of Osborne. Answer: No, dividing Hays does not create a district configuration that is more contiguous.

Test 3: Does dividing Hays create districts that are more compact (4.b.)? Compactness refers to the ratio between the geographic scope of the district and the perimeter of the district.[3] Districts that are irregular in shape, jutting in and out of geographic areas, reflecting fairy tale creatures versus neatly shaped, simple, geographic figures, are generally thought to violate the criteria of compactness. The 110th and 111th districts under the proposed *State House 4* plan are unusually shaped, especially when juxtaposed to a redrawn map with the 111th district being composed primarily of Hays and the 110th district being composed of the remaining area that surrounds the 111th district. Answer: No, dividing Hays does not create districts that are more compact, it creates districts that are less compact.

Significantly, Representative Dan Johnson (110th District), in his statement of support

---

[2] See: "The South Carolina Senate Judiciary Committee's Redistricting Subcommittee's Guidelines for Legislative and Congressional Redistricting." Adopted May 1, 2001. www.lpitr.state.sc.us/redist/senate/gline.htm.

[3] See: Polsby, Daniel D. and Popper, Robert D. May/June 2001. "Partisan Gerrymandering: Harms and a New Solution." *Intellectual Ammunition*. www.heartland.org/ia/mayjun01/excerpt.htm.

for the *State House 4* plan, addressed the issue of fairness regarding the geographic scope of the 110th and 111th districts. He noted that if the 110th district excludes parts of Hays, it will mean that his district (the 110th district) will be much larger in scope than the 111th district. While Representative Johnson is correct, the guidelines of the committee do not address this issue (compactness and geographic scope are not the same issue). In addition, I am unaware of any case law giving precedents to limiting the geographic scope of a representational district over the other criteria for redistricting (noted in the guidelines).

Test 4: Does dividing Hays serve a rational state interest regarding avoiding contests between incumbents "whenever possible" (4.e.)? This is the most difficult aspect of this or any plan. Because of population decline, there are only two state house districts where there used to be three. Except for the possibility of remapping the districts to maximize the 5% variance in population (2.) to leave the same number of rural districts in tact (see my comments later), there appears to be no way to avoid placing two incumbents together in one district. The question is which two incumbents? In answering this question, the courts have indicated that the answer should be based primarily on the guidelines set by the committee and legislature. Under these guidelines, the districts should –to the extent possible– be compact, be contiguous, maintain the existing political subdivisions, maintain communities of interests, and be clearly understandable by voters.

Unfortunately, in deciding which two incumbents will be placed in the same district, the *State House 4* plan appears to run counter to each of these valid state interests, opting to divide Hays between the 110th and 111th districts and combining two incumbent Democrats into the same district (Rep. Phelps from Hays and Rep. McClure from Osborne). While partisanship has a legitimate role to play in the redistricting process, it does not take precedent over valid state interests as defined in the guidelines.

Thus, given that there is no apparent way to avoid placing two incumbents in a district, this does not mean that the *State House 4* plan can neglect the state's rational interests in order to avoid creating a district that combines a Republican incumbent with one of these Democratic incumbents. It is significant to note that the *State House 4's* plan to divide Atchison between the 40th and 63rd districts appears to be at odds with the state's rational interests in the same manner as the district configuration that divides Hays.

This brings me to my last point. As a citizen of rural Kansas, I implore you to avoid this type of conundrum completely by maximizing the 5% variance guideline (2.) so that rural districts are redrawn to have an average population of about 20,400, while more urban districts are redrawn to have an average population of 22,400. This would allow the present district configuration to be largely maintained, thus avoiding placing incumbents in the same district. It also would maximize the number of rural districts, thus assuring that rural interests will have a justified voice in the state legislature as rural communities are making strides toward redevelopment in the next decade.

Kansas Farm Bureau
2627 KFB Plaza, Manhattan, Kansas 66503-8508 • 785.587.6000 • Fax 785.587.6914 • www.kfb.org
800 S.W. Jackson, Suite 817, Topeka, Kansas 66612 • 785.234.4535 • Fax 785.234.0278

PUBLIC POLICY STATEMENT

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

RE: Redistricting – House Plan 4

January 22, 2002
Topeka, Kansas

Presented by:
Leslie Kaufman, Associate Director
Public Policy Division
Kansas Farm Bureau

Chairman Adkins, Chairman O'Neal and members of the Special Committee on Redistricting, thank you for the opportunity to appear today and comment on the redistricting process. I am Leslie Kaufman, and I serve Kansas Farm Bureau as the Associate Director of Public Policy.

Farm Bureau appreciates the effort this committee has invested in developing a plan for redrawing the House of Representative districts in Kansas. We know there are many factors that go into positioning these boundaries, compounding the difficulties of the process.

Kansas Farm Bureau is a voice for agriculture in this state. It is our policy to speak out for farmers and ranchers at every opportunity, giving voice to the concerns of agricultural producers.

As you are well aware, population shifts during the last ten years are impacting legislative representation across the state. For many portions of the state, this means rural legislative districts that are growing in size, geographically. The results can include:

- Legislators representing larger geographic areas;

- For many Kansans, increasing distances between their home and that of their legislator;
- Greater traveling time for legislators to attend in-district events and for campaigning; and
- Fewer "rural" representatives.

These issues all carry concerns for those in rural communities, including the potential for a decrease in access to their legislator and a diminishing voice for rural concerns in the legislature.

Farm Bureau policy has long supported the time-tested and successful pattern of representation on a state basis in the U.S. Senate and on a population basis in the U.S. House of Representatives, largely in part, because it provides a workable system of checks and balances which assures a truly representative government with consideration for minority and area interests. We have supported these sound and desirable principals being authorized for use in Kansas, as well.

Obviously, the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives are both organized into districts based on population, and the issues of one chamber's districts being tied to a fixed number, as with the U.S. Senate, is not an issue here. But, this policy is illustrative and reflective of our members desire to see that representation is fair, balanced, and that all types of minority interests, including those of agriculture and rural communities, are afforded equal access to government.

At this time, Farm Bureau is not endorsing any particular redistricting plan. We would respectfully request, as any redistricting plan works its way through the legislative process, this committee and the legislature continue to identify ways to ensure rural representation is not unduly, unreasonably or prejudicially diminished.

Thank you.

Comments from Steve Pickman
Kansas House Redistricting Committee Hearing
Old Supreme Court Room, Kansas Statehouse
January 22, 2002

Good evening. My name is Steve Pickman. I am a lifelong resident of Atchison County, current Chairman of the Board of the Atchison Area Chamber of Commerce and an officer of Midwest Grain Products, Inc., a fixture in the Atchison business community for more than six decades.

I am grateful for this opportunity to offer input regarding a House redistricting proposal that would place the First Precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut Precinct in Atchison County in a legislative district that would include the cities of Leavenworth and Lansing. While I certainly hold nothing against these two latter communities and I understand our State's constitutional obligation as it pertains to redistricting, I must ask whether this particular proposal effectively satisfies that obligation? Common sense and practicality would say "no, it does not."

Recognizing that the City of Atchison is inhabited by slightly more than 10,300 residents and all of Atchison County by a little over 16,000, it seems neither logical nor warranted on even a pure numerical basis to split our population into separate legislative arenas. To do so would be to establish a new and unnecessary legislative tug-of-war-zone with the dividing line drawn over what is a relatively small and concentrated group of citizens—citizens with a general sense of common interests and concerns. This proposal would dice up neighborhoods and drive a wedge into Atchison's industrial base. It would, at least for a time, create confusion among Atchison County voters, and would weaken Atchison County's voice in State matters indefinitely. It would cause inefficiencies in dealing with city and county issues that might require legislative involvement or intervention at the state level. In such instances, the efforts of voters and our City and County officials would conceivably have to be channeled through not one, but two representatives, thereby further compounding the process and fostering an environment for increased political wranglings and bureaucratic impediments. This would give way to a waste of time and resources, a situation that would be totally out of place in these times of budgetary belt-tightenings.

Lastly, I fear that this proposal would have the potential to greatly slow or even prohibit progress and new development in our County. This obviously is not in the best interest of our County's citizenry, nor is it supportive of growth in our State. In closing, I ask that if you take nothing else from my comments here this evening, please remember the words "common sense." Common sense dictates that the aforementioned redistricting proposal be rejected and that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain in a single legislative district. Thank you.

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capitol Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the city of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be removed from Atchison and included in the legislative district that will include the cities of Leavenworth and Lansing.

As we are the current chair of each major political party, we have come together in bipartisan opposition to this plan. We feel it is important to lay aside any partisan opinion and look at what's best for our community. It is apparent to us that both the city and county of Atchison remain cohesive and it be considered a "community of interest" remaining in one legislative district.

Allen Reavis, Chairman
Atchison County Republican Cmte

Linda Lykins, Chairman
Atchison County Democratic Cmte

House Redistricting
Attachment 10
1-22-02

ATCHISON
CASTING

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I request that Atchison County and Atchison remain as a "community of interest" and the entire county remain in one house legislative district.

I am President of Atchison Steel Casting & Machining located in Atchison, Kansas since 1872 which is the largest steel foundry west of the Mississippi employing approximately 675 employees with annual sales of approximately $70-$80M. As a primary business manager and citizen of Atchison County I believe this request is viable and necessary for our company and community to continue to receive acceptable representation in the state of Kansas.

Sincerely,

John Kujawa
President

ATCHISON
CASTING

AFM CSF PAC LPM

JOHN R. KUJAWA
GROUP VICE PRESIDENT

LARGE STEEL & MACHINING GROUP
OF ATCHISON CASTING CORPORATION
400 SOUTH FOURTH STREET • P.O. BOX 188
ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002-0188
(913) 367-2121 • FAX (913) 367-2130
HOME (913) 367-4807 • jkujawa@atchcast.com

Southeast Kansas, Inc.
Providing Leadership and Resources for Regional Development
1002 South College, Pittsburg, Kansas 66762-5606
Phone: (620)232-1605 Fax: (620)232-1628
Email wilkinsek@kscable.com

Testimony on House Redistricting Plan (HB 2625) State Plan 4
January 22, 2002
Provided by Southeast Kansas, Inc.

I am here today representing a regional development organization called Southeast Kansas, Inc. As the name implies, our association provides leadership and resources for 12 counties in Southeast Kansas. Our area has a long history of working together to promote economic development. Starting in 1957, Mid-America Inc., was the voice and driving force to align our cooperative efforts to strengthen the economic climate and retain and create jobs in our region. Today this cooperative determination continues under Southeast Kansas, Inc. We are proud to represent the counties of: Allen, Anderson, Bourbon, Cherokee, Coffey, Crawford, Labette, Linn, Montgomery, Neosho, Wilson and Woodson.

Community leaders and constituents in our region share many of the same goals and concerns. As you collect information on State Plan 4, I encourage you to consider the following issues which affect our area of the state and deserve fair representation.

- Expansion of our transportation/highway programs including an aggressive maintenance program has been a regional priority for years. Our region is scheduled to see the construction of US Highway 69 from Kansas City to the Oklahoma line in 2003. This construction will allow for expanded commerce in the region as well as more visitors and tourists. Other improvements along 169 and the improvements already made to 400 from Wichita to southeast Kansas are beginning to draw a picture of economic growth for the region. Soon, the highways passing through southeastern Kansas will become a natural shipping route for Kansas, and for northern companies to move their products to the southeastern United States.

- Our regional high education institutions provide many opportunities to learn for the entire state and have a good working relationship. The Technology Center at Pittsburg State University is a great asset to our region. We have a common goal of combining the assets and talents of Pittsburg State University, Allen County Community College, Fort Scott Community College, Labette County Community College, Independence Community College, Coffeyville Community College, and Neosho County Community College for the purpose of facilitating regional development and have seen some significant successes.

- Watco, a Pittsburg based rail company has recently acquired rail customers in Western Kansans and are bringing millions of tons of grain and other products

through southeast Kansas. The grain will be on its way to the Port of Catoosa and will pass directly through many of our communities. By doing so, there is potential for jobs, which add value to the rail products as it moves down the line.

- The majority of the counties in our region are beginning to see modest population growth and an increase in employment opportunities. The addition of Cessna, Amazon.com, American Insulated Wire and many others located throughout southeast Kansas, coupled with the expansion of the Farmland Refinery in Coffeyville, are just a few of the companies who have increased the average wages in our region and are building a younger workforce. Just when our area of the state is beginning to take a positive turn, why reduce our united voice?

- And there are major issues and trends we are still trying to overcome in our region. Such as, the need for affordable modern housing. It is a priority for our entire region.

- Our regional employers are in need of qualified and well trained employees. It is difficult to fill their vacancies.

At a time on our history, when our spirit of cooperation of working together is seeing some results, is not the time to reduce our voice in the legislature. The redistricting decision will affect public policy and will impact future decision on education, economic development, highways and taxation. These are all important issues to southeast Kansas as a region and we deserve to be heard as a united voice. We recognize that we are not a major metropolitan area, and therefore you may be inclined to think that our opinions are different from county to county. However, our community and business leaders have developed a strong working relationship and do recognize that what is good for one county is generally good for the entire region. Therefore, we strongly oppose State Plan 4 because it will reduce the number of legislators in our region and thus reducing our voice here in Topeka.

January 22, 2002

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Reapportionment Committee:

My name is Billy McCray. I live in Wichita, Kansas and was a former resident of the 89th House District.

I appear before you this evening in opposition of the Sedgwick County portion of the statewide reapportionment map.

The latest proposal which I have viewed includes the Shadybrook and North Hillside neighborhoods with the City of Park City, Wichita Heights, and the new Wyandham Creek Estates all in the proposed 89th District.

It appears that this could violate the spirit and possibly the letter of the law as contained in the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

In order to make the district more contiguous and discourage dilution of neighborhood populations, it would seem more appropriate to extend the 89th District east of Hillside toward Oliver and Woodlawn Streets and make 53rd Street at Hydraulic the Northwest boundary of the district. This would require minor adjustments of all districts as you go east toward Butler County.

Respectfully,

Billy Q. McCray

PITTSBURG AREA Chamber of Commerce

CRAWFORD COUNTY convention & visitors bureau

January 22, 2002

Representative Michael O'Neal, Chair
2001 House Redistricting Committee
Capitol Building - Room 170-W
300 S. W. Tenth Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representative O'Neal:

As Chairman of the Pittsburg Area Chamber of Commerce Government Review Council, I am writing this letter to voice our concern with current plans for redistricting. While we realize that some sacrifices are necessary as redistricting occurs, it is our understanding that current proposals may ask our area to contribute more than our share.

Historically, our area has been somewhat divided in our goals and visions for the region. However, over the past several years, considerable progress has occurred and today the Pittsburg area is much more unified and working toward common goals that are beneficial for the entire region. Current redistricting proposals would appear to fracture our representation and could result in loss of much of our progress.

Under our current level of representation, the regions that our representatives cover have the same community of interest. Issues that affect the school districts are common within the local representative districts and allow better representation. Under the proposals, USD 250 for example, could end up with three different representatives with regions that cover over 70 miles north to south or east to west, and many different communities of interest. Balancing not just education issues, but all issues over such a diverse region will make effective representation an impossibility.

Redistricting is derived from census information and representation should be based along the lines of approximately 20,000 residents per representative. According to current census numbers, Pittsburg and Crawford County should have approximately 1.75 representatives. This is our current level of representation. Under the proposals, our representation would decrease to approximately 1.25. Future highway expansion, increasing enrollment at Pittsburg State University and a growing population base, according to the latest census numbers, would indicate that we will continue to grow. Based on the proposals, we would be underrepresented after redistricting and our position would only continue to worsen over time.

Finally, we oppose any proposal or amendments which would split Pittsburg into more than one representative district. With our current population level, Pittsburg deserves its own representative. All of the forgoing issues such as community of interest are especially important to Pittsburg and any split of the city would undo years of progress. How can a divided city work together on issues that could be of little consequence to a non-resident. Pittsburg must have a local representative. Disenfranchised cities and residents lose their stake in state government and become weak partners at the state level.

Thank you for your time. This issue is critical to our city and region. We would be willing to visit with any committee member at any time regarding our concerns.

Respectfully,

Brian K. Jones

Brian K. Jones
Chairman of Government Review Council

ACCREDITED CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

316-231-1000 • 316-231-1212
P.O. Box 1115 • 117 West 4th Street • Pittsburg, Kansas • 66762

House Redistricting
Attachment 14
1-22-02

From: Mary Ellen Otto <maryellen@ckt.net>
To: "Kansas Legislature" <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/21/02 10:03AM
Subject: redistricting

The proposal reported in The Morning Sun (Sunday, January 20, 2002) to deprive southeast Kansas of a seat in the legislature is simply putting a new face on a very old political practice called gerrymandering. Means simply taking from the needy to give to the greedy by redrawing lines on a map. It is not considered a "nice" word and noone wishes to be accused of it because under most circumstances it is not right and in some it is not legal. In this case it is not necessary.
Mary Ellen Otto

House Redistricting
Attachment 15
1-22-02

From: "clem" <cds@ckt.net>
To: <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/21/02 11:21AM
Subject: house seat

I protest the plan to take a State House seat away from southeast Kansas. I don't think Crawford County should be split into 2 Senate districts. Thank you. Clementine Stafford, PO Box 725, Arma, Ks. 66712.

From: "Lee Queal" <lqueal@prattusa.com>
To: "Kansas Legislative Research" <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/18/02 5:59AM
Subject: House Redistricting - HB 2625

Kathie Sparks
Kansas Legislative Research Department
200 SW 10th, Room 545
Statehouse
Topeka, KS 66612

Subject: House Redistricting

I am extremely displeased with the current proposal in HB 2625 regarding the boundary lines for changing current house Dirsticts. I am particularly disturbed by the exclusion of Pratt County from the District represented by Rep. Dennis McKinney (Currently #108). I will be unable to attend the public hearing on this bill scheduled for Tuesday evening, January 22. Please make this letter part of the public record.

The current District (#108) includes Kiowa and Pratt counties and the majority of Kingman County. This is a natural alignment because the bulk of the economic and travel ties for these areas are in an east-west direction. Highway U.S. 54 is a major travel artery tying all three counties together.

U.S. 54 is currently the subject of a major revovation and there are many unsettled considerations in this regard. Continuity is essential. Representative McKinney has done an excellent job of helping to keep this project on tract by getting the various local entities to keep a focus on the overall good.

By having Kingman and Kiowa counties represented in new District 116 and Pratt county in District 114, the opportunity for consistent dialog between the various local parties will be compromised. Regardless of other minor boundary changes that may be necessary due to population shifts, I believe that the majority of the area in Kiowa, Pratt and the west half of Kingman counties should remain in the same House District.

I have been a Republican throught my 34 year residency in Kansas, but I am disappointed in the extreme partisanship that has been shown in the current redistricting proposals. When one focuses on the efforts to pit Democratic incumbants against one another, while giving Republican Representatives a free ride in this regard makes me embarrassed to say I am a Republican.

The two party system has served Kansas well over the years. It provides the basis for complete debate over issues that may have a broad spectrum of conflicting views. The current effort by Republicans to make the House a one-party institution can not bode well for the people of Kansas.

Respectfully,

Leland M. (Lee) Queal
1004 West Ninth
Pratt, KS 67124

620-672-6100

lqueal@prattusa.com

From: Robert Grant <grantbnl@ckt.net>
To: <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/20/02 8:02PM
Subject: redistricting

January 20, 2002

Kansas Legislative Research Department

c/o Kathie Sparks

300 SW 10th Room 545N

Statehouse

Topeka, KS 66612

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to protest the legislative redistricting plan that is currently under consideration by the redistricting committee. There is no reason for Southeast Kansas to lose a legislative seat. Southeast Kansas was reduced in representation the last time districts were redrawn and I don't feel we deserve that again.

The present plan calls for the first district to extend from Galena in the very southeast corner of the state all the way through Crawford County to the Bourbon County line. The second district would run from the southern edge of Crawford County up to and including Chanute. Then the eleventh district reaches over from Montgomery County all the way to Baxter Springs. There is not much rhyme and a lot less reason for these districts to change that drastically.

At the present time the representation of Southeast Kansas in both the Senate and the House reflects shared interests and common bonds. Under the current proposal and others that have been presented, Southeast Kansas would lose all cohesiveness.

The redistricting proposals that have been made have all seemed to reduce the representation of the rural areas, not only in the southeast corner, but all across the state and I don't feel that is right. Like it or not, Kansas is still an agricultural state and our rural residents are as entitled to be well represented as the urban areas.

While I understand the need for redistricting due to population shifts, I do not accept the proposals that are aimed not a fair representation but merely for partisan power.

Lynn Grant

Cherokee, KS

From: "B. Bradrick" <bbradrick@pitton.com>
To: <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>, "R.J. Wilson" <rjwilson@ksdp.org>, Robert Grant <grantbnl@ckt.net>, Jim Barone <sjbarone@swbell.net>
Date: 1/21/02 8:07AM
Subject: Loss of legislative seat in SEK

Kathie: This e-mail is being sent to you on behalf of the following citizens of Southeast Kansas:
William Bradrick, 412 West First Pittsburg
Beth Bradrick, 412 West First, Pittsburg
Joe Beauchamp 414 Webster, Pittsburg
Reta Beauchamp 414 West Kansas, Pittsburg
We, the above, wish to take this opportunity to protest the possible loss of a legislator from Southeast Kansas as a result of the redistricting plan. We have taken a hit during the last two redistricting activities of the State and it is grossly unfair that this should occur again. Such a plan leaves this important sector of the State with little representation. While we recognize that SEK may be losing population that is not true of Crawford County, notably the Pittsburg area.
This document is being sent on behalf of two of the individuals, namely the Beauchamps, because both are retired individuals who do not own computers and because there is not time to send a proper letter regarding our concerns. Yes, the addresses are correct even though they may look a bit peculiar as listed.
We also want to acknowledge that it is not fair to notify the public just two days before the public hearing on this issue that our input is being solicited. This is something we heartily protest.
Feel free to contact any of us as to the authenticity of this document.

From: "Bill Linde" <blinde@kscable.com>
To: <KathieS@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/19/02 9:14PM
Subject: Redistricting

January 19, 2002

Ladies and Gentlemen:

After reviewing the proposed redistricting plan for the Kansas House Districts 9 and 13, the Woodson County Board of Commissioners strongly oppose any and all attempts to divide our county's unified voice in state government.

The latest map proposal shows the separation of Yates Center, our county seat, from the remainder of the county. Woodson County, home to 2,600 voters is a struggling agricultural community which ranks as Kansas's fourth poorest county.

To an outside observer, district boundaries appear as merely lines on a piece of paper. To some, these lines may suit a particular political agenda. To the citizens, and elected officials of Woodson County, the potential impact of these dividing lines are both significant and detrimental to our future.

Dividing the voice of our representation would have a negative impact on the future efforts to attract new economic development to our rural county. What has been a unified attempt by city and county officials to improve our local sagging economic status, would loose support to competing districts and larger constituencies. In addition, the proposed changes would create additional burdens in funding and administering services for our local citizens. Good government begins and ends with good representation of its citizenry. We fail to see how this division equals good government.

The division of our representation would have a negative impact on the future of our local school district. As the boundary lines for U.S.D. # 366 almost mirrors the boundary lines of Woodson County, maintaining this unified voice is imperative. Over half of the 560 students attending the Yates Center schools live outside the proposed lines within their school district. Possible future attempts to reconsolidate Kansas school districts would leave local school patrons with conflicting representation created by competing surrounding interests. Our local school district also plays a vital role in the economic future of Woodson County. It supports the largest payroll in the county, and contributes to our ability to attract new residents and businesses.

The citizens of Woodson County proudly live, work and learn together. We wish to be represented together as one community of interest. Help us, help ourselves. Keep our district in tact.

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Linde
Woodson County Commissioner
2nd District

Chief Petty Officer
United States Navy Retired

Woodson County
Silverhaired Legislator

Southeast Kansas County Commissioner Director
Kansas Association of Counties

From: "Pam Henderson" <pamclutter@hotmail.com>
To: <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/22/02 11:44AM
Subject: Redistricting

I would like to see the redistricting plans go through as they stand now. As a Republican in Crawford County, I would like a Senator/Representative that shared my thoughts and views instead of everything being Democrat controlled. Southeast Kansas Republicans would honor the opportunity for Sen. Dwayne Umbarger to represent us along with Sen. Jim Barone. Thanks for your time!

From: "Sandra Arnett" <trand@pratt.net>
To: "Kansas" <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/22/02 12:22PM
Subject: Redistricting Pratt County

We will be unable to attend the public hearing this evening but would like to express our sentiments regarding moving our County from under the leadership of Dennis McKinney to that of Melvin Minor of Stafford. We are against making this change. The citizens of our county helped to elect Dennis McKinney, not Melvin Minor. Therefore, we should remain represented by Mr. McKinney.

We have come to know Dennis and have developed a high respect for his values and the way he has represented our district. But it is much more than just having knowledge of Dennis and a comfort level with his leadership. He has developed a strong connection with us personally and with the members of our community. This connection has allowed him insight into our district which someone new would not have.

He has committed his time to us and we have commited our time and our vote to him. We have done so despite that fact that we both have strong Republican ties. That mutual give and take is not something which should be denied.

We do not even know Mr. Minor, or anything about him. Since we do not know him, and did not take part in his election, we do not feel it is fair that he represent us. Our State Representative is obviously the closest connection we have to anyone at the state level. Therefore, it is very important to us and to our community that we be a part of him and he a part of us. We respectfully ask that you not deny us this connection to Kansas, our State where we were both born and have remained committed to.

Terry and Sandra Arnett
800-451-7215

From: "Donna Raskin" <donnaraskin@kc.rr.com>
To: <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/17/02 12:21AM
Subject: Reapportionment of the state house - CONCERNED CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL....Oh, Really?

I hear from our capital that the battle over reapportionment of the state house has gone from unfair to mean spirited. The rule is one person, one vote, not one Republican, one vote. In Johnson County alone we have 67 Thousand Democrats.

Don't the Republicans realize this behavior is not going to survive the automatic court scrutiny and will end up costing our state money it doesn't have in legal battles. This is irresponsible.

Not only are the Republicans attempting to draw out 6 democratic districts across the state, they are doing it violation of their own policies. Their policy going into the redrawing was that they would not pit an incumbent against another incumbent. Well, they have tossed that to the wind and, even though the Democrats did no such thing 10 years ago, Republicans are violating their own incumbent contest rule.

The latest tactic of only offering one public hearing in Topeka
over the latest map on a Tuesday before the Friday vote
is absurd and sleazy politics.
This completely cuts out the public.
They should hear from us on this issue!

This behavior is irresponsible and the map is so bad it is bound to draw court criticism, spending more of our tax dollars in court proceedings instead of doing the right thing in the first place. Do they not understand we have a huge budget problem and the tax payers don't want to pay legal fees? I urge you to speak up and bring attention to this problem as soon as possible.

We want and deserve an opportunity to make sure the citizens of Kansas understand what is going on in the state house, before a vote on this issue of this magnitude takes place. I do not see this as an option, more of a demand from a tax paying, registered voter of the Democratic Party who is NOT asleep at the wheel.

Please let the Republicans know that The People, put them in their office...We'll take them out!" Their are a lot of Split-voters in this state, and this is a powerful issue.

Keep this e-mail going, add your name, forward it to mailto:kathies@klrd.state.ks.us and to 10 of your friends who truly care about justice in the Kansas political system. WE ARE THE CHECKS AND BALANCE SYSTEM. Please weigh in on this issue before we loose another pound of flesh, much less another Democratic District.

We need your help and we need it NOW.

Donna K. Raskin

CC: "Gavin Young" <GavinY@senate.state.ks.us>, "Larry Tenopir" <lltks@aol.com>, "jan k stewart" <houndzaboundz@yahoo.com>, "Kansas Democratic Party" <kdp@ksdp.org>, "Bob Raskin" <niksar2@JUNO.COM>

From: "Dave and Diane Robbins" <drobbins@wichitausa.com>
To: <kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: Monday, January 21, 2002 09:46:48 PM
Subject: Proposed change to the 85th District House seat Boundaries.

1/21/02

To: Chairman, House Redistricting Committee

From: President David J. Robbins, Park City Council
2412 Gary
Park City, Ks 67219

Dear Chairman:

I would like to apologize for not attending your public meeting. We are holding a regularly scheduled Council meeting in the Council Chambers in Park City as you speak. Our meeting has started at 7:00 PM and will last till 11:00 PM.

The City of Park City has a common history with northern Sedgwick County. The city of Bel Aire and Park City were created at nearly the same time. We have small cities and rural issues, that are not inner city problems and are issues that need to be addressed to the legislature. I feel the proposal to split Park City down Hydraulic and place 1/2 in the 90th and 1/2 in the 85th would provide Park City a better representation in the Legislature based on its economic and rural environment.

The placing of Park City in the 89th District will disfranchise about 1/2 of the District because of the difference in educational, economic, and living experiences.

We are prepared to accept whatever your ruling, and appreciate this opportunity to provide public comment. These views are mine only as we were not given sufficient time to poll our citizens.
Thank You.

Sincerely

David J. Robbins

From: "Jeanette Siemens" <jeans@sctelcom.net>
To: <kathies@klrd.state.ks.us>
Date: 1/22/02 11:15AM
Subject: Redistricting

THis e-mail is to express my disagreement with the removal of Pratt County from the 108th District which is served by Dennis McKinney. Dennis was elected by the citizens of Pratt County, a predominately republican County, by a majority. He has great support in this area as he has served us well. He understands our issues and concerns, which is why he was ELECTED. There is also a concern about issues involving Highway 54 and Highway 50 under the same legislative jurisdiction.

I urge this be reconsidered and Pratt County remain in the 108th District.

Thank you.

Jeanette Siemens
Executive Director
Pratt Area Chamber of Commerce

CC: "Dennis McKinney" <McKinney@house.state.ks.us>

Bette[illegible]n
City [illegible]k
Carolyn Girard
Asst. City Clerk

City Office Number
620-347-4125
Fax Number 620-347-4492

CITY of ARMA

701 E. Washington, P.O. Box 829

ARMA, KANSAS 66712

Arma City Council
Crawford County, Kansas

RESOLUTION – 2002-001

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, the Kansas Legislature is in the process of redrawing House and Senate districts which will be effective beginning in 2002 and will remain for the next ten years; and

WHEREAS, information provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department shows that the ideal Senate district should contain 21,378; and

WHEREAS, Crawford County is now the largest County with regards to population in southeast Kansas with a population of 38,242, which lends itself ideally to no more than two House districts and one Senate district; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of Arma believes very strongly that carving up Crawford County into four House districts and two or three Senate districts dilutes Crawford County citizens' voice in the State Legislature.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas:

Section 1: The Arma City Council of Arma Kansas, Crawford County, hereby expresses its support for a redistricting plan that keeps Crawford County in one Senate district and with no more than two House districts.

Section 2: That the City Clerk of Arma, Kansas is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Governor and State legislators as appropriate.

ADOPTED, APPROVED AND GIVEN, by the Arma City Council of Arma, Kansas Crawford County, under our hands at the City Council meeting this 21st day of January, 2002.

Rock Anderson, Mayor

House Redistricting
Attachment 16
1-22-02

MAYOR AND COUNCIL
CITY OF CHEROKEE, KANSAS

RESOLUTION 2002-1

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, the Kansas Legislature is in the process of redrawing House and Senate districts which will be effective beginning in 2002 and will remain for the next ten years; and

WHEREAS, information provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department shows that the ideal Senate district should contain 66,806 and the ideal House district should contain 21,378; and

WHEREAS, Crawford County is now the largest County with regards to population in southeast Kansas with a population of 38,242, which lends itself ideally to no more than two House districts and one Senate district; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council believe very strongly that carving up Crawford County into four House districts and two or three Senate districts dilutes Crawford County citizens' voice in the State Legislature.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the City of Cherokee, Kansas:

Section 1: The Mayor and Council of Cherokee, Kansas, hereby expresses its support for a redistricting plan that keeps Crawford County in one Senate district and with no more than two House districts.

Section 2: That the City Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Governor and State legislators as appropriate.

ADOPTED, APPROVED AND GIVEN, by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Cherokee, Kansas, under our hands at the City Hall in Cherokee, Crawford County, Kansas this 18th day of January 2002.

Noel Rakestraw, Mayor

John Lovell, Council

Vernon Brooks, Council

ATTEST:

Lynn Grant, Council

Ken Omeck, Council

Sari A. Pouch, City Clerk

Chester Osborn, Council

16-2

Resolution No. 928

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, the Kansas Legislature is in the process of redrawing House and Senate districts which will be effective beginning in 2002 and will remain for the next ten years; and

WHEREAS, information provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department shows that the ideal Senate district should contain 66,806 and the ideal House district should contain 21,378; and

WHEREAS, Crawford County is now the largest County with regards to population in southeast Kansas with a population of 38,242, which lends itself ideally to no more than two House districts and one Senate district; and

WHEREAS, Pittsburg, the largest city in southeast Kansas, is experiencing significant growth, and should not be divided into two districts under any circumstances; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Commissioners of Pittsburg, Kansas, believe very strongly that carving up Crawford County into four House districts and two or three Senate districts dilutes Crawford County citizens' voice in the State Legislature.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF PITTSBURG, KANSAS, that the Mayor and City Commissioners of Pittsburg, Kansas, hereby express their support for a redistricting plan that keeps Crawford County in one Senate district and with no more than two House districts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Governor and State legislators as appropriate.

Passed and approved by the Governing Body of the City of Pittsburg, Kansas, this 22nd day of January, 2002.

Garry W. Lassman, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tammy Nagel, City Clerk

CITY OF PITTSBURG CITY CLERK CRAWFORD COUNTY KANSAS

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
CRAWFORD COUNTY COURTHOUSE
GIRARD, KANSAS

RESOLUTION 2002-104

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, the Kansas Legislature is in the process of redrawing House and Senate districts which will be effective beginning in 2002 and will remain for the next ten years; and

WHEREAS, information provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department shows that the ideal Senate district should contain 66,806 and the ideal House district should contain 21,378; and

WHEREAS, Crawford County is now the largest County with regards to population in southeast Kansas with a population of 38,242, which lends itself ideally to no more than two House districts and one Senate district; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners believes very strongly that carving up Crawford County into four House districts and two or three Senate districts dilutes Crawford County citizens' voice in the State Legislature .

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas:

Section 1: The Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas hereby expresses its support for a redistricting plan that keeps Crawford County in one Senate district and with no more than two House districts.

Section 2: That the County Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Governor and State legislators as appropriate.

ADOPTED, APPROVED AND GIVEN, by the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas under our hands at the

Courthouse in Girard, Crawford County, Kansas this 18th day of January, 2002.

Anthony Pichler, Chairman

Bob Kmiec

Tom Moody

ATTEST:

Kevin Anselmi, County Clerk

PAWNEE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
LARNED, KANSAS

January 21,2002

Written testimony for The House Committee on Redistricting

Dear House Committee on Redistricting,

We are writing today to express our opposition to House Bill 2625. Currently all of Pawnee County is a part of the 114th House District. When one looks at the plan there doesn't seem any rhyme to reason why Counties like ours are being carved out and put in new Districts. Public opinion here in Pawnee County is that we want all of the County in one House District and that should be the 114th. On January 10,2002 the Pawnee County Economic Development Commission passed by unanimous vote a resolution to work with the Legislature to keep all of the County in the 114th District. Under House Bill 2625 the following townships: Shiley, Lincoln, Browns Grove which includes the City of Burdett, Grant which includes the City of Rozel, Sawmill and Keysville will be in the 117th District. These 6 townships have a total population of 679 of which a great many have for multi-generations been life long residents of Pawnee County and the 114th House District. They also represent a large part of one County Commissioner District here in Pawnee County. Dividing the County will also place undue burden on the two school districts, as they will be in both the 114th and 117th Districts. Has the Legislature considered the election costs that will be placed on the Counties to develop and print ballots for a multi House district County? When you consider representation one must look at common interests, needs and desires of the people you represent. The six townships have more in common with the people of the 114th than they will have in the 117th. For many years they have actively worked hard to protect and promote the quality of life here in the 114th and in our great State. During the reforming of new Districts and changed Districts can any one assure that their voice will not be lost for several years because of the already formed alliances and time and money and effort will have to be spent to re-organize everyone for representation. Elections will be more expensive in the first few years as new territory will have to be canvassed to help the Voters know who is seeking election. In closing we want to leave you with this thought to the best of our knowledge we have presented to you the feelings and concerns of the 7,233 people who live in Pawnee County. We understand that these 679 people would place us out of the quote "number for equal representation" but we feel that we have equal representation under the law under the current House of Representatives structure. We believe that the way we are represented presently with all of Pawnee County being a part of one House District is how we want to stay. Thank you for your time and consideration of our request.

Cordially your,

Kim Alan Barnes
Vice-President PCEDC
620 -285-6916
P.O. Box 240
Larned, Kansas 67550-0240

House Redistricting
Attachment 17
1-22-02



OFFICE OF PAWNEE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Phone (316) 285-3721
715 BROADWAY
LARNED, KANSAS 67550-3098
Fax (316) 285-3802

RESOLUTION NO. 2002-1

A RESOLUTION to express opposition to House Bill No. 2625.

WHEREAS, House Bill No. 2625 would split Pawnee County into Two House Districts No. 114 and No. 117; and

WHEREAS, Pawnee County now is all in One House District; and

WHEREAS, Representation must look at common interests, needs and desires of each District; and

WHEREAS, the six townships in Pawnee County, namely, Brown's Grove, Grant, Keysville, Lincoln, Sawmill and Shiley, have more in common with ALL of Pawnee County; and

WHEREAS, the Costs of Managing and Administering Policies and Procedures with Divided House of Representative Districts is Not Cost Effective and Prohibitive;

NOW, THEREFORE, by the Board of Commissioners of the County of Pawnee, Declare Opposition to House Bill No. 2625.

Signed and Sealed this 21st day of January, 2002.

Attest:

Ruth M. Searight
County Clerk

Kathy Bowman
Kathy Bowman, Chair

Arlis A. Atteberry

I, RUTH M. SEARIGHT, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL, AS FILED IN THIS OFFICE. SIGNED AND SEALED THIS 22nd DAY OF January 2002

PAWNEE COUNTY CLERK, LARNED, KANSAS

1204 Fo PO Box 720
Hays, KS 67601

Phone 78- -9410
Fax 785-628-9413

Office of Alberta Klaus
Ellis County Clerk/Election Officer

January 21, 2002

Kathie Sparks
Redistricting Staff
Kansas Legislative Research Department
300 W 10th St, Room 545-N
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Re: Election Officer Concerns with Redistricting

Thank you for allowing me to address the Special Committee on Redistricting regarding concerns of Election Officers.

The number one concern is that precincts should not be split.

Therefore, I've briefly identified a few tasks that would have to be done to make changes for registered voters affected by redistricting.

Splitting districts would cause County Election Officers to update voter files. There are many steps involved in this process. (i.e. scan voter precinct lists manually to identify voters in both old and new districts, remark the registration cards, scan the new information into our imaging system, file updated registration cards, update the computer election program.

In addition, voters would have to be notified of a new polling place, old precincts would have to be combined together because they would be to small. Finding polling places in rural areas is not easy.

In Ellis County, one of our third class cities is split between two townships and if the City would be a different district than both townships, that could be a difficult situation to address. If a split would occur along precinct lines, it would not pose much of an issue.

I've calculated the time, materials and other expenses that redistricting would cost Ellis County and that would be a minimum of $2.00 per voter affected by such a split.

Hopefully, the redistricting will not be a burden to the taxpayers nor cause confusion for the voters.

Sincerely,

Alberta Klaus

Alberta Klaus
Ellis County Clerk/Election Officer

House Redistricting
Attachment 18
1-22-02

Crawford-Neosho Counties

Unified School Districts

Northeast-Arma USD 246: Marvin Bualle, Supt.
Southeast-Cherokee USD 247: Larry Coltrane, Supt.
Girard USD 248: Gary Snawder, Supt.
Frontenac USD 249: Greg Hafner, Supt.
Pittsburg USD 250: Gary Price, Supt.
Erie-St. Paul CUSD 101: Randy Corns, Supt.
SEK ESC 609: David DeMoss, Director

January 21, 2002

The Honorable Mike O'Neal and Members of the House Committee on Redistricting
c/o Kathie Sparks
300 SW 10th, Room 545-N Statehouse
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Chairman O'Neal and Members:

We are writing to express our opposition to the redistricting plan as proposed under HB 2625. The plan, as proposed, does not provide the representation that is necessary to effectively make our voice heard in the legislature. For example, the same state representative now represents four of the five county school districts and this gives us a common platform from which to represent our issues.

Crawford County, which is the largest county in the region, is on the upswing in terms of growth. Our school districts serve over 6,000 children and our responsibility is to ensure the children in our districts have the representation they deserve. This plan takes away another rural representative, compounding our loss during the last redistricting period, and significantly reduces our ability to be heard in Topeka.

We are aware that there is another plan that gives us the representation that our schools deserve, supports rural Kansas, and is in our community interest. We support the plan that keeps Crawford County in one Senate district and no more than two House districts. We encourage you to revisit this proposal and make a decision in the best interest of all Kansans.

Marvin Bualle, Superintendent USD 246 Northeast - Arma

Larry Coltrane, Superintendent USD 247 Southeast-Cherokee

Gary Snawder, Superintendent USD 248 Girard

Greg Hafner, Superintendent USD 249 Frontenac

Gary Price, Superintendent USD 250 Pittsburg

Randy Corns, Superintendent CUSD 101 Erie-St Paul

David DeMoss, Executive Director, Southeast Kansas Education Service Center

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY

1902 2002

January 18, 2002

Ms. Kathie Sparks
Kansas Legislative Research Department
300 S.W. 10th, Room 545 N.
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Ms. Sparks:

The purpose of this letter is to submit to you my concerns in writing instead of testifying at the public hearing on January 22, 2002. Due to a prior commitment on the Fort Hays State University campus that requires my attendance, I will not be able to attend the hearing.

As I am sure you are aware, a number of citizens of Hays are very concerned about the current geographical makeup of the House Districts that impact our city. I am aware that we are required by law to redraw the districts every ten years to account for the shifts in population. However, I strongly urge the committee to consider the common interests and the linkage that exists between the City of Hays and Fort Hays State University. The future of both our community and university are inseparable. The success of one depends upon the other and the relationship between the two is critical.

It is for that this reason that I wholeheartedly agree with comments made at the public hearing in Hays last May, that "if possible, the committee not split communities and where possible not split counties." Since Fort Hays State University is inside the city limits of Hays, we would hope that the city and the university could be in the same district.

The first map published in *The Hays Daily News* split our community and Ellis County three ways. The latest map only splits our community into two districts. The question I would propose is why can't the city of Hays, including Fort Hays

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT • 600 PARK STREET • HAYS, KS 67601-4099 • (785) 628-4231 • FAX (7

House Redistricting
Attachment 20
1-22-02

State University, given its common interests and relationships, make up a single district. This strategy is implemented in a great number of places throughout the state and I believe could be implemented in our case given the population requirements of districts.

Thank you for your willingness to accept this testimony. I hope it is helpful.

Sincerely yours,

Edward H. Hammond

Edward H. Hammond
President

Coffeyville KANSAS

7th & Walnut • P.O. Box 1629 • (620) 252-6163
Coffeyville, Kansas 67337-0949

January 22, 2002

Honorable Representative Michael O'Neal
Chairman of House Redistricting Committee
House of Representatives
State Capitol
Topeka, KS 66612

Honorable Representative O'Neal:

Southeast Kansas has been very fortunate in the last few years to have made significant strides in upgrading the public infrastructure and enhancing our area's economic climate. The working relationship between local and state government is a key element to the long-term stability and growth of Southeast Kansas. It is critical to the future of our part of the state that Southeast Kansas keep strong representation in the state Senate and the state House of Representatives. We encourage you to not again reduce the level of representation for our area.

During the last two redistricting efforts, Southeast Kansas lost a representative in each round. We feel we have sacrificed in the past and have earned at least some consideration that we not lose representation this time. We have strong advocates currently serving in the Kansas Legislature and we need to keep their numbers at the same level.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our comments on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Leroy D. Alsup

Leroy D. Alsup
City Manager
lalsup@coffeyville.com

CC: Representative Jim Garner

House Redistricting
Attachment 21
1-22-02

Kathie Sparks, Redistricting Staff
Kansas Legislative Research Dept.
Room 545N, Statehouse
300 SW 10th
Topeka, KS 66612

January 22, 2002

The Legislature Is Wrong!

I was absolutely appalled at the plan for redistricting on both the House and Senate side. It is unconscionable and appears to be self-serving for those in power at the state legislature, and it is simply wrong.

First of all, they have split most of the counties in southwest Kansas. We have enough problems trying to work together for the common good without further dividing our small counties.

Secondly, you have increased greatly the election expense faced by the counties that have to have split ballots. Naturally, the legislature won't have a reimbursement plan for the added expense.

The removal of an entire Senate District from Northwest Kansas is ludicrous. The population shift within the state could easily be solved by expanding existing districts by small amounts. There is absolutely no reason for dismantling entire districts other than to serve those who want even more power. It appears there's some sort of "get even" policy for those who may not have voted "right" in the past.

Finally, in addition to splitting counties, you have split those areas that have like economic interests and like areas of concern. For instance, Pawnee county will be split between Hays on our eastern side and Finney /Hodgemen on the western side. And since you have penciled out Melvin Minor, we are left with no representation that has a concern for our interests.

Many of us in Pawnee county have worked closely with Melvin Minor, and our well remembered past senator Jerry Moran, for the improvements at Larned State Hospital and the Larned Correctional Mental Health facility, which has been an economic plus for all the surrounding counties. We have been well served by those representatives. Now, it appears we will have very little representation, and I have to ask, "Is Rep. O'Neal's goal to totally disenfranchise southwest Kansas for his own political gain, or can he truly be that dumb? In either case, his plan for redistricting is wrong and doesn't serve the state he supposedly is representing.

Sincerely,
Carl Immenschuh, *The Pelican Press*
RR 1 Box 49 B
Larned, Kansas 67550-9783
620.923.4202

CITY OF HAYS
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Testimony on H.B. 2625:
Proposed Restricting of House District 111

Submitted to:
Select Committee on Redistricting

Submitted by:
Henry Schwaller, IV
Mayor, City of Hays

Kansas State Capitol – Room 313S
January 22, 2002

My name is Henry Schwaller, IV and I currently serve as the Mayor of Hays. I would like to thank the chairman and members of the Select Committee on Redistricting for allowing me to submit my testimony on H.B. 2625.

In its current form, H.B. 2625 proposes to divide the City of Hays into three separate Kansas House of Representative districts and in the process, create unusual representational boundaries within the City of Hays.

I am opposed to this plan, as well as any plan that relies on "fractional" representation for the citizens of Hays.

After the 2001 Legislative session, I attended the redistricting public forum held in Hays and was impressed with the testimony and discussion during the hearing. At the end of the forum, I believed that the interim committee would recommend to the Legislature that current boundaries for Kansas House District 111 remain relatively unchanged, with minor modifications to District 110.

Our community is in a unique position – both geographically and economically – in Northwest Kansas. We survived the economic devastation of the 1980s and began rebuilding our community throughout the last decade. As we look ahead to future economic and demographic challenges, we understand that our future depends on strong representation in the Kansas Legislature. Single person representation – with appropriate district boundaries – has been instrumental in our community building partnerships in the Legislature and state agencies.

I strongly believe that fractional representation would dilute the voice of our community in the legislative process and serve as a barrier to addressing several critical issues:

1. Water. Hays continues to seek and develop a viable long-term source of water for our community and enjoys a good relationship with the Kansas Water Office and the Division of Water Resources.

2. Transportation. Working with the Kansas Department of Transportation, Hays will continue to apply for construction grants to enhance transportation infrastructure with direct linkages to the state highway system. Hays also plans to continue its dual-hub air service and seek other assistance for transportation projects.
3. Economic Development. While our community has created a large number of jobs in the last decade, our community lags behind the state and the nation in the creation of high skill, high wage jobs. Support from the Kansas Department of Commerce and Housing, as well as the Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation, will be critical in providing technical assistance to our community in the incubation/creation of new firms, retention/expansion of existing businesses, and recruitment of advanced, sustainable firms.
4. Social Services. Changes in demographics have had a dramatic impact on our community. Providing reliable, community based care to seniors, disabled persons, and people with mental health issues has become one of our community's top priorities.
5. Housing. The housing needs of our population has changed dramatically over the past ten years and the need for additional low to moderate income housing must be addressed in a partnership with the state.

In sum, I feel that the current redistricting proposal hinders our ability to remain an economically viable rural community. While I understand the difficulty of your task, I ask you to reconsider the current boundary and maintain our current representation.

Once again, thank you for allowing me to submit my testimony on this issue.

MIDWEST GRAIN PRODUCTS, INC.
P. O. BOX 130
ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002

LADD M. SEABERG
PRESIDENT & CEO

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representatives:

It has come to my attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a business owner and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district. It would be impossible for a representative to support both communities fairly when many issues of communities of this size are competitive in nature.

Sincerely,

Ladd Seaberg

Ladd M. Seaberg

ATCHISON CASTING

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

I have been informed that a proposal has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In this proposal, the committee has supposedly selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district with the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

It is my opinion that Atchison County and Atchison should remain as a "community of interest" and the entire county remains in one house legislative district.

Atchison Steel Casting & Machining is located in Atchison has been operating in Kansas since 1872. It is the largest steel foundry west of the Mississippi employing approximately 675 employees with annual sales of approximately $70-$80M. As Vice President of Atchison Casting, and as a citizen of Atchison County, I believe this request is important and necessary for our company and community in order to continue to receive acceptable representation in the state of Kansas.

Sincerely,

John DeRossi
Vice President - Materials

ATCHISON/ST. JOE DIVISION
ATCHISON CASTING CORPORATION
400 SOUTH FOURTH STREET • P.O. BOX 188 • ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002-0188 • (913) 367-2121 • FAX (913) 367-2130

ATCHISON
CASTING

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I request that Atchison County and Atchison remain as a "community of interest" and the entire county remain in one house legislative district.

I am President of Atchison Steel Casting & Machining located in Atchison, Kansas since 1872 which is the largest steel foundry west of the Mississippi employing approximately 675 employees with annual sales of approximately $70-$80M. As a primary business manager and citizen of Atchison County I believe this request is viable and necessary for our company and community to continue to receive acceptable representation in the state of Kansas.

Sincerely,

John Kujawa
President

ATCHISON
CASTING

JOHN R. KUJAWA
GROUP VICE PRESIDENT

LARGE STEEL & MACHINING GROUP
OF ATCHISON CASTING CORPORATION
400 SOUTH FOURTH STREET • P.O. BOX 188
ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002-0188
(913) 367-2121 • FAX (913) 367-2130
HOME (913) 367-4807 • jkujawa@atchcast.com

Preserving our past, working for our future

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a leader in the Atchison Community and as a resident of Atchison County, that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remains in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

David W. Butler
Mayor
City of Atchison, Kansas

24-4

Tel (913) 367-5500 Fax (913) 367-3654 • 515 Kansas Avenue Atchison, KS 66002

ATCHISON AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Historic Santa Fe Depot
200 South 10th / P.O. Box 126
Atchison, Kansas 66002
PH (913) 367-2427 FAX (913) 367-2485

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear House Committee on Redistricting:

As an organization representing local businesses, we have concerns about the proposal submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. If approved, the redistricting would divide our city by removing the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County from the existing 48th District and placing those precincts in the 42nd District, which includes the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

Placing the southern portion of Atchison (including our largest employer) in a district dominated by a city 25 miles away does not seem to provide adequate representation. This concept might be appropriate for populations comparable to the metro cities, but we believe it would not be advantageous for Atchison, with a population under 11,000.

As a representative of the business community, I would like to respectfully request that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that our county remain undivided in one legislative district of the House.

Respectfully,

Glenda Purkis

Glenda Purkis
President/CEO

24-5



January 22, 2002

Representative Jerry Henry
State Legislature
Topeka, Kansas

Dear Representative Henry:

I am writing to request that the boundaries for redistricting the south part of Atchison not be changed. It is not in the best interest of any town or city to be divided into two districts. Please reconsider this proposal and do not change the boundaries within Atchison.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rose Marie Stallbaumer OSB

Rose Marie Stallbaumer, OSB
Business Manager

Benedictine Sisters • Mount St. Scholastica
801 South 8th Street • Atchison, KS 66002 • 913.360.6200 • Fax 913.360.6190
www.mountosb.org

24-6

January 18, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a business owner and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a it community of interest and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Mike Kentzler

Mike Kentzler
816- 233- 1377 Ext 111
AAA Auto Club of Missouri

Urban Lawncare

1728 CHESTNUT • ATCHISON, KS 66002 • 913-367-4478

January 18, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a business owner and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a it community of interest and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Ron & Michelle Urban

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison county that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Michelle L. Drimmel

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Kerry L. Navinskey



KANSAS TECHNICAL COLLEGE

"Our Technologies Launch Careers"

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as an educational institution of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Shirley M. Antes

Shirley Antes
President

1501 WEST RILEY STREET ■ ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002 ■ (913) 367-6204 ■ Fax (913) 367-3107 ■ 800-567-4890

Dave Hundley

Tuesday, January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct n Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

Would request that as a business owner and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

David B. Hundley
Owner

david hundley's
FARMOWNER
PROTECTION
PROGRAM

Hundley Insurance Services
1401 Main Street
Atchison, KS 66002-2605

913/367-2196 Office
888/232-8098 Toll Free
913/367-2230 Fax

dave@hundleyinsurance.com
hundleyinsurance.com

Charter COMMUNICATIONS
A WIRED WORLD COMPANY

Tuesday, January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in City of Atchison and Walnut Precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a business owner and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Sanders
Charter Communications

625 Commercial Street, Suite 4, P.O. Box 395 • Atchison, Kansas • 66002
www.chartercom.com • tel: 913.367.2251 • fax: 913.367.0230 • 800.445.0980

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

I have been informed that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen in the effected area of the City of Atchison that the City and County of Atchison remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kiehl
431 S. 7th
Atchison, KS 66002

24-14

Rea D. Laflin, CPCU, CLU
Auto-Life-Health-Home and Business
E-mail: Rea@realaflin.com
101 South 5th St.
Atchison, KS 66002
Office: 913-367-4856 Home: 913-367-9169 Fax: 913-367-3766

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: REDISTRICTING

As a businessman in the city of Atchison, I believe strongly that we should keep Atchison County together as one district in the Kansas State House of Representatives. This will continue to provide appropriate representation for our community.

Thank you for you consideration.

Sincerely,

Rea D. Laflin, CPCU, CLU

MOUNT ACADEMY ATCHISON, KANSAS

MOUNT ST. SCHOLASTICA ACADEMY

810 R Street - Atchison, KS 66002 - (913) 367-1334 FAX (913) 367-5108

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a preposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a school administrator and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Sister Bridget Dickason, OSB

Sister Bridget Dickason, OSB
Principal of Mount St. Scholastica Academy

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Lisa Henderson

Lisa Henderson

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

James R. Wietharn

James R. Wietharn

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Karen Persinger

Karen Persinger

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Mohler

Carolyn Mohler

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Ashley Blodig

Ashley Blodig

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Jonnie Wolters

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1 st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as is and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Sarah Scherer
Sarah Scherer

Jennifer Kiehl

From: "Pat Cairney"
To: <edassistant@atchisonkansas.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2002 12:16 PM
Subject: letter of support

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to my attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a community of interest and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Patrick Cairney
President
Maur Hill Prep School

Jennifer Kiehl

From: "Larry J Buessing" <lbuessing@MetLife.com>
To: <edassistant@atchisonkansas.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2002 9:17 AM
Subject: Re: Redistricting

DEAR SIR,
Please be advised of my opposition to splitting this town into 2 districts. I believe it would be a real problem in having the town as small as Atchison divided.
Suggest take Southwest portion of the district instead.
Sincerely,
Larry J Buessing

24-25
1/22/02

ROBERT & JANICE DENNEY 913-367-3696

January 18, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a business owner and a citizen of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Janice & Robert Denney

24-26

BENEDICTINE COLLEGE

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to our attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as President of a liberal arts college that has served all of Atchison County that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district. It simply does not make sense to divide our community in this fashion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Carey, Ph.D.
President

Office of the President
1020 North 2nd St., Atchison, KS 66002 • Phone: (913) 367-5340 ext. 2400 • Fax: (913) 367-6566
Email: bcpres@benedictine.edu • http://www.benedictine.edu

24-27

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

I have been informed that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In the proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I would request that as a citizen and property owner in the effected area of the City of Atchison that the City and County of Atchison remain as a "community of interest" and that the entire county remain in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Bennea Blaski

Bennea Blaski
1019 S. 4th
Atchison, KS 66002

Northwest Pipe Company

January 21, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

It has come to my attention that a proposal on redistricting has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In this proposal, the committee has selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district that will include the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

I, as Operations Manager of Northwest Pipe Company and having several employees who are citizens of Atchison County would like to request that the City of Atchison, Atchison County, and the entire county remain as a "community of interest" in one House legislative district.

Sincerely,

Matthew W. Geiger

Matthew W. Geiger
Operations Manager
Northwest Pipe Company

24-29

8154 INDUSTRIAL PARK LANE • P.O. BOX 610 • ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002-0610 • TELEPHONE 913 / 874-4011 • FAX 913 / 874-2801

The Mount Community Center

751 South 8th Street Atchison, Kansas 66002-2784 Telephone (913)360-6151

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representative:

Recently, it has come to my attention that the House Committee on Redistricting has submitted a proposal to place the lst precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County in a legislative district with the cities of Leavenworth and Lansing.

As a citizen of Atchison and director of a business, I request that the City of Atchison and Atchison County remain in one House legislative district. Why divide a "community of interest?"

Sincerely yours,

Laura Haug OSB

Laura Haug, OSB
Director of The Mount Community Center

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital
Topeka, KS 66606

22 January 2002

Dear Mr. / Madam Chairman:

It is axiomatic that political decisions are willful, but they should not be openly spiteful. I object, strenuously, to the proposed redistricting of Representative Jerry Henry's district with the obvious intention of reducing the number of Democrats in the Kansas House of Representatives by pitting him against a party colleague from Leavenworth County.

It is telling, indeed, that the Republican party, whose supermajority in the House of Representatives you seek to increase through this chicanery, did not or could not find a suitable opponent to field against Representative Henry in the last election. Now, through redistricting, you seek to accomplish what you could not in a fair election.

Representative Henry does a fine job, as measured by his diligence in representing the residents of his district and the larger interests of all Kansans. He should not be cast in the role as "an expendable Democrat". If you succeed in displacing him by drawing lines on maps, then you will have reduced the overall competence of the House of Representatives by one very large measure.

There is no defensible logical justification, except for the political purposes I have outlined, to split the small city of Atchison, except to dilute its representative voice in Kansas government. This state and this city were both born of the strife of border wars in the 19th century. I would have hoped that (Republican majority) men and women would not create 21st century border wars using census data, computer programs and harsh political retribution as weapons against the law abiding citizens of Northeast Kansas.

Please relent, consider another proposal that is less politically willful, less spiteful in its partisan intent and more fair overall. Or, if this be your will, be sure to redistrict Speaker Glasscock into an election fight with a fellow Republican incumbent from a neighboring district.

Sincerely yours,

John F. Settich

John F. Settich

324 Santa Fe Street
Atchison, KS 66002

NEMAHA COUNTY
607 NEMAHA
SENECA, KANSAS 66538
FAX: 785-336-3373 • E-MAIL: nmclerk@nvcs.com

The Nemaha County Commissioners, meeting in regular session this Tuesday, January 22, 2002, object to the redistricting of Kansas as is currently being considered. The current boundary lines that we have been informed will be adopted will fragment the County between three districts. Nemaha County is not large nor heavily populated, therefore our representation in each district will be insignificant within that district. We feel certain we will not have basic representation. Please reconsider this action. A portion of our County will be in a District with the City of Atchison. The representative chosen for this District will undoubtedly be selected from the urban areas. The same will hold for those two Townships being included the the balance of Northeast Kansas which includes Hiawatha.

NEMAHA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Nemaha County Chairman

Mildred Brownlee
Commissioner Mildred Brownlee

House Redistricting
Attachment 25
1-22-02

ATCHISON CASTING

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capital Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representatives,

I have been informed that a proposal has been submitted by the House Committee on Redistricting. In this proposal, the committee has supposedly selected the 1st precinct in the City of Atchison and Walnut precinct in Atchison County to be placed in a legislative district with the City of Leavenworth and the City of Lansing.

It is my opinion that Atchison County and Atchison should remain as a "community of interest" and the entire county remains in one house legislative district.

Atchison Steel Casting & Machining is located in Atchison has been operating in Kansas since 1872. It is the largest steel foundry west of the Mississippi employing approximately 675 employees with annual sales of approximately $70-$80M. As Vice President of Atchison Casting, and as a citizen of Atchison County, I believe this request is important and necessary for our company and community in order to continue to receive acceptable representation in the state of Kansas.

Sincerely,

John DeRossi

John DeRossi
Vice President - Materials

ATCHISON/ST. JOE DIVISION
ATCHISON CASTING CORPORATION
400 SOUTH FOURTH STREET • P.O. BOX 188 • ATCHISON, KANSAS 66002-0188 • (913) 367-2121 •

House Redistricting
Attachment 26
1-22-02

Jan. 16,2002

75th Anniversary
Historic Route 66
1926 - 2001

Rep. Doug Gatewood
State Capitol Suite 273-W
Topeka,KS 66612-1504

Re-districting

It has come to my attention,and indeed alarm, that there are proposals afoot to split up the 1st Dist. and,inter alia, break off Baxter for positioning somehow with the likes of Coffeyville. Nothing could be less in the best interests of all concerned.

Baxter has nothing in common with Coffeyville,etc As indicated by the mute testimony of this notepaper alone, Galena and Baxter share the rich history of Route 66,now increasingly celebrated internationally. My parents were raised in and around Baxter and Columbus(mid-1890's-early 1920's) living in Baxter but retaining family members and friends in Columbus,frequently travelling to Columbus for visits. Baxter residents deal with the County govt. in numerous ways,continuing the ties between those communities.

No one need "fix" something that isn't "broke"! Leave this matter as it now is...in favor of sound government.

Thank you,sincerely,

Ronald O. Thomas

RONALD O. THOMAS
2848 Gaineswood Ave.
Baxter Spgs, KS 66713

KANSAS US 66

House Redistricting
Attachment 27
1-22-02

January 22, 2002

House Committee on Redistricting
State Capitol Building
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Representatives,

I come before you today as one of several representatives of Atchison, not only the city of Atchison, but the county as well. The consideration currently underway to redistrict and remove part of our community is of a deep concern for all of us.

For years Atchison wasn't unified, had many problems, and was in need of both vision and leadership. Over the last few years there has been a transformation in Atchison and the changes have been substantial. There's more to come and the community leaders are working hard to improve both the city, the county and thereby the state.

The entire county has improved both in quality of life and in confidence for the future. The "community of interest" here is the full City and County. Any change to the concept of keeping the county whole would be disruptive to our progress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Allen B. Reavis, D.D.S.
Business Owner
Member of Economic Development Council
Planning Commission Chairman

JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING
ATTN: Honorable Mike O'Neal, Chairman
State Representative, 104th District

Dear Sir:

The following is testimony concerning legislation regarding the creation of new legislative districts, in particular the Wichita metro area. Please find at the bottom of this testimony my contact information. If you should have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Please submit my testimony as follows:

A central characteristic of Wichita and Sedgwick County is organized and active neighborhood associations. The Eastridge Neighborhood Association covers our area. The proposed redistricting would split our neighborhood association area between the 87th and 88th districts. Our association covers the area from Harry to Kellogg and Woodlawn to Rock Road. Splitting the neighborhood in this fashion makes it more difficult for neighborhood residents to relate to state legislation that affects them.

Eastridge Neighborhood Association has existed for five years, and has been a positive force in helping to create neighborhood improvements. The goal of a neighborhood association is to bring neighbors together to share fellowship, share information, and learn about issues that affect the neighborhood. An important result is increased civic involvement, especially at an early stage, rather than approaching everything from a reactive mode.

It is our hope that our association could be one place where we could learn about pending state legislation and provide relevant input. This process would be greatly facilitated by having our entire neighborhood in one representative district. We believe our neighborhood constitutes a unified "community of interest."

It is my understanding that there are other instances in Sedgwick County where neighborhoods are similarly split, such as in Oaklawn and Planeview, both with active neighborhood associations. We ask that you consider these cohesive "communities of interest" groups as you work on the redistricting plan. The valuable work that many neighborhood leaders and residents have expended on organization, communication, and many, many intensive improvement projects would be rewarded by making it easier for them to relate to their state representatives.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Susie Crockett-Spoon

1004 S. Governeour
Wichita, Kansas 67207
(316) 684-0526

Honorable Doug Mays
Topeka, Kansas

Dear Sir,

Please consider establishing a legislative district which would incorporate Bonner Springs and Edwardsville in the same district. We have more in common with Bonner Springs than the Unified government. This would be a good district for the citizens of Western Wyandotte County.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

Sincerely,

Norman Maier

Norman Maier
161 Haines
Edwardsville, Kansas

Honorable Doug Mays
House Minority Leader
Topeka, Kansas

Dear Sir,

I read the newspaper and saw where you are going to re-draw legislative districts for the whole state. Now is a good time to look at alternatives to insure better representation for the people of our community. I have been active in Wyandotte County all of my life.

I hope you consider establishing a legislative district which would merge Bonner Springs and Edwardsville. As you know we have more in common with Bonner Springs as a city and we share the same school district and many of the same services. This would be a good district for the citizens of Western Wyandotte County and give them a stronger voice in Topeka

Thank you for your considering my position on this matter.

Sincerely,

John Peters
1020 Edwardsville Drive
Edwardsville, Kansas

House Redistricting
Attachment 31
1-22-02

Honorable Doug Mays
Topeka, Kansas

Dear Sir,

I hope you will consider establishing a legislative district which would incorporate Bonner Springs and Edwardsville in the same district. As you know we have more in common with Bonner Springs as a city and we share the same school district. This would be a good district for the citizens of Western Wyandotte County and give them truer representation in Topeka

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

John Sower

John Sower
603 High Street
Edwardsville, Kansas

KANSAS LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
kslegres@klrd.state.ks.us
Rm. 545N–Statehouse, 300 SW 10th Ave.
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504
(785) 296-3181 ◆ FAX (785) 296-3824
http://skyways.lib.ks.us/ksleg/KLRD/klrd.html

January 22, 2002

To: House Committee on Redistricting

From: Kathie Sparks, Principal Analyst

Re: Public Hearing on HB 2625

The attached information was submitted for the Committee's consideration by Senator Barone.

House Redistricting
Attachment 33
1-22-02

Web posted **Sunday, January 20, 2002**

Fairness in redistricting

The process of redistricting the Kansas Senate and House seats this Legislative session looks like it could get hairy -- and local residents could be the losers.

It looks like proposed redistricting plans could harm southeast Kansas. Some proposals may rob lawmakers from rural communities, thus giving residents in less populated areas less of a voice in Topeka while providing densely populated areas such as Johnson County with even more representation.

Also, under proposed plans released by the redistricting committee recently, Crawford County could be split into two Senate districts and Rep. Bob Grant, D-Cherokee, and Rep. Jerry Williams, D-Chanute, would be placed in the same district, meaning a Democrat-against-Democrat election for one seat.

It appears some Republican lawmakers may be acting with partisanship, trying to use the redistricting process to make some areas more Republican and solidify the GOP's stronghold on both the House and Senate.

That could mean a dim outlook for some parts of our area which traditionally have elected Democratic representatives, who would be left with little or no power.

By all appearances, politicians are looking out for themselves during the redistricting process rather than looking out for the state's citizens and which plans would best serve constituents.

In some states, officials rely upon independent committees and computers, not politicians, to carve out legislative districts. Perhaps such a process would be both fair and unpartisan and maybe the time has come for Kansas to look at such as process for redistricting.

Many lawmakers are getting their first look at the redistricting proposals during these early days of the 2002 Legislative session, and the outcry could be resounding as rural lawmakers realize their communities could loose out to larger districts such as those in Johnson, Sedgwick and Shawnee counties.

Current redistricting plans appear to be somewhat self-serving. The redistricting process must be fair, providing sound representation both for rural citizens and for those districts which have historically sent Democrats to Topeka.

Anything less would be unfair to us all, serving only lawmakers and not the citizens they were elected to represent.

33-2

RESOLUTION 2002-003

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANSAS

WHEREAS, the Kansas Legislature is in the process of redrawing House and Senate districts which will be effective beginning in 2002 and will remain for the next ten years; and

WHEREAS, information provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department shows that the ideal Senate district should contain 66,806 and the ideal House district should contain 21,378; and

WHEREAS, Crawford County is now the largest County with regards to population in southeast Kansas with a population of 38, 242, which lends itself ideally to no more than two House districts and one Senate district; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of Frontenac, Crawford County, Kansas, believes strongly that dividing up Crawford County into four House districts and two or three Senate districts dilutes Crawford County citizens' voice in the State Legislature.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Body of the City of Frontenac, Crawford County, Kansas:

Section 1. The City Council of Frontenac, Crawford County, Kansas hereby expresses its support for a redistricting plan that places Crawford County in one Senate district with no more than two House districts.

Section 2. That the City Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Governor and State legislators as appropriate.

ADOPTED, APPROVED AND GIVEN, by the Governing Body of the City of Frontenac, Crawford County, Kansas under our hands at the City Hall in Frontenac, Crawford County, Kansas this 21st day of January, 2002.

James Kennedy, Mayor

ATTEST:

Richard Cicero, City Clerk

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
CRAWFORD COUNTY COURTHOUSE
GIRARD, KANSAS

RESOLUTION 2002-104

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, the Kansas Legislature is in the process of redrawing House and Senate districts which will be effective beginning in 2002 and will remain for the next ten years; and

WHEREAS, information provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department shows that the ideal Senate district should contain 66,806 and the ideal House district should contain 21,378; and

WHEREAS, Crawford County is now the largest County with regards to population in southeast Kansas with a population of 38,242, which lends itself ideally to no more than two House districts and one Senate district; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners believes very strongly that carving up Crawford County into four House districts and two or three Senate districts dilutes Crawford County citizens' voice in the State Legislature .

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas:

Section 1: The Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas hereby expresses its support for a redistricting plan that keeps Crawford County in one Senate district and with no more than two House districts.

Section 2: That the County Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Governor and State legislators as appropriate.

ADOPTED, APPROVED AND GIVEN, by the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kansas under our hands at the

Courthouse in Girard, Crawford County, Kansas this 18th day of January, 2002.

Anthony Pichler, Chairman

Bob Kmiec

Tom Moody

ATTEST:

Kevin Anselmi, County Clerk