

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Arlen Siegfroid at 1:30 P.M. on February 15, 2007 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Representative Ted Powers- excused

Committee staff present:

Kathie Sparks, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Dennis Hodgins, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Mike Heim, Revisor of Statutes Office
Carol Doel, Committee Assistant

Conferees:

Representative Lance Kinzer
Bruce Ney - Attorney
Bill Dun - Concerned Citizen
Steve Macalli - Business Owner
Deb Taylor - Concerned Citizen
Pedro Irigonegaray - Attorney Kansas Equality Coalition
Thomas Witt - Chair, Kansas Equality Coalition

Others attending:

See attached list

Chairman Siegfroid opened the meeting for bill introductions and recognized Representative Mah who requested a bill creating the Kansas Vocational and Technical College Commission within the Board of Regents. The Chairman moved the bill, seconded by Representative Peterson. With no objections this bill is accepted.

Attention was directed to the written testimony from Representative Steve Brunk regarding **HB 2241**- Grandparents have the right to intervene in child custody or visitation litigation to request visitation based upon statutory parameters - which was heard on February 14th. (Attachment 1)

The Chairman opened the floor for hearing on **HB 2299** - Concerning cities and counties; prohibiting the enactment of certain ordinances or resolution and recognized Representative Lance Kinzer as a proponent of the bill. Representative Kinzer stated that it has not traditionally been the practice in Kansas to allow local governments to develop their own ordinances and resolution in such matters as to define marriage, and govern matters such as divorce and child custody. Recently the Lawrence City Council discussed the potential establishment of a domestic partnership registry which would represent a departure from the traditional practice of state-wide standards. The Representative related that in light of the clearly expressed will of the people on this issue he believes it is incumbent upon the Legislature to act at this time to preserve our prerogative over domestic relations law, as well as to protect the marriage amendment by preempting domestic partnership laws at the local level. (Attachment 2)

There were no other proponents to **HB 2299** and the Chairman opened the floor for opponents.

Maggie Childs, Chair, Kansas Equality Coalition of Lawrence/Douglas County provided testimony in opposition to **HB 2299**. The Coalition has been urging the City of Lawrence to create a Domestic Partnership Ordinance primarily for the convenience of both straight and gay couples whose lives are emotionally and economically entwined, but who are not, or cannot be, legally married. Ms. Child further stated that this would allow domestic partners the benefits offered by employers. (Attachment 3) Ms. Childs also included a copy of the proposed ordinance for the City of Lawrence. (Attachment 4) as well as a list of employers that offer domestic partner health benefits (Attachment 5)

Bruce Ney, Senior Counsel for AT&T appeared on his own behalf to testify in opposition to **HB 2299**. Mr. Ney stated that his company offers benefits to its employees in domestic partnerships regardless of the employee's sexual orientation. He expressed the opinion that the establishment of a domestic partner registry

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House Federal and State Affairs Committee at 1:30 P.M. on February 15, 2007 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

- at any level of government in Kansas - is of critical importance, as it will provide more than the symbolic recognition of a relationship. (Attachment 6) Also included for committee benefit, was a copy of *Legally Recognized Partner Eligibility Rules*. (Attachment 7)

Bill Dunn and his partner have been together for sixteen years. As a result of his partner's employer offering domestic partner benefits, he was able to be a full-time foster parent to their three sons as well as care for his parents who were faced with declining health. Mr. Dunn requests a no vote on **HB 2299** which would allow them to protect their families without legislative interference. (Attachment 8)

Stephen Macalli owns a catering business in Lawrence, Kansas and as a business owner, he would like to make sure his full-time employees, and their loved ones have access to health insurance. He would like the Legislature to vote no on **HB 2299** which would interfere with companies' rights to compensate their employees as they see fit. (Attachment 9)

Deb Taylor of Lawrence, Kansas has a domestic partner and they are in opposition to **HB 2299**. They feel that a domestic registry tells people that she and her partner rely on each other for emotional, financial and physical support. Ms. Taylor stated that she believes that laws should be made to protect people. (Attachment 10)

Attorney, Pedro Irigonegaray, an attorney is in opposition to **HB 2299** because it specifically targets our Kansas Gay and Lesbian population for disparate treatment. Mr. Irigonegaray also opined that the bill weakens the authority of Kansas cities and counties by interfering with their home-rule authority. He also related that it is a direct attack on K.E. C. (Kansas Equality Coalition) efforts to pass a domestic partner ordinance. (Attachment 11)

Thomas Witt, State Chair for the Kansas Equality Coalition, is in opposition to **HB 2299** stating that the bill will unfairly keep some Kansans from qualifying for the benefits their employers wish to give grant. The elected representative of the people of Lawrence are trying to provide a mechanism that facilitates private companies in providing certain benefits to their employees. (Attachment 12) Mr. Witt also included a copy of a printed article regarding the benefits to gay employees' partners. (Attachment 13)

With no other person wishing to speak to **HB 2299**, Chairman Siegfried closed the public hearing and called the committees' attention to written testimony in opposition to the bill from Janis McMillen, League of Women Voters of Kansas (Attachment 14) and from David L. Corliss, City Manager, Lawrence, Kansas. (Attachment 15)

The Chairman entertained a motion on **HB 2202** - Concerning alcoholic liquors; relating to farm wineries.

Representative Peterson made a motion to pass HB 2202 favorable for passage and place it on the consent calendar with a second from Representative Ruiz. Motion passed.

The Chairman requested a motion on **SB 13** - Native American tribal law enforcement jurisdiction; liability insurance coverage, proof of; repealing sunset.

Representative Knox made a motion to pass SB 13 favorable for passage with a second by Representative Loganbill. Motion passed.

With no other business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.

STATE OF KANSAS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STEVEN R. BRUNK
CHAIRMAN, COMMERCE & LABOR
REPRESENTATIVE, 85TH DISTRICT
4430 JANESVILLE
BEL AIRE, KANSAS 67220
(316) 744-2409

STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 143-N
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612
(785) 296-7645
brunk@house.state.ks.us



TOPEKA

TESTIMONY

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
CHAIRMAN, COMMERCE & LABOR
MEMBER: ELECTIONS & GOVERNMENTAL
ORGANIZATION
FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
STATE BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION

TO: The Honorable Arlen Siegfried, Chair
And Members of the House Federal and State Affairs Committee

RE: HB 2241 - Grandparents have the right to intervene in child custody
or visitation litigation to request visitation based upon statutory
parameters.

DATE: February 14, 2007

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. This bill helps keep the family unit intact by allowing the grandparents to request visitation rights. This gives the judge an opportunity to consider the best interests of the child when a substantial relationship already exists.

With the societal degeneration of the family unit, this gives some consideration to a restoration of the extended family, but with respect to the best interest of the child.

Line 38 on page one makes it clear that the "best interest" of the child is at stake. This bill, as I understand it, does not mandate grandparent's visitation rights, but allows grandparents the right to request visitation.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steven R. Brunk". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Representative Steven R. Brunk
District # 85

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 1

Date 2-15-07

STATE OF KANSAS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12549 S. BROUGHAM DR.
OLATHE, KS 66062
(913) 461-1227

STATE CAPITOL
(785) 296-7692
kinzer@house.state.ks.us



TOPEKA

LANCE KINZER
REPRESENTATIVE, 14TH DISTRICT

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
TAXATION
JUDICIARY
FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS

TESTIMONY REGARDING HB 2299

Domestic relations is an area of the law traditionally reserved to the States. State laws define marriage, and govern matters such as divorce and child custody. It has not traditionally been the practice in Kansas to allow local governments to develop their own ordinances and resolutions in these areas. Indeed, the entirety of Chapter 23 of the Kansas Statutes is dedicated to setting forth uniform laws for the governance of domestic relations in Kansas.

For example, K.S.A. 23-101 sets forth a State wide standard for the definition of marriage:

23-101. Nature of marriage relation.

(a) The marriage contract is to be considered in law as a civil contract between two parties who are of opposite sex. All other marriages are declared to be contrary to the public policy of this state and are void. The consent of the parties is essential. The marriage ceremony may be regarded either as a civil ceremony or as a religious sacrament, but the marriage relation shall only be entered into, maintained or abrogated as provided by law.

(b) The state of Kansas shall not recognize a common-law marriage contract if either party to the marriage contract is under 18 years of age.

Furthermore, Article 15, § 16 of the Kansas Constitution provides as follows:

(a) The marriage contract is to be considered in law as a civil contract. Marriage shall be constituted by one man and one woman only. All other marriages are declared to be contrary to the public policy of this state and are void.

(b) No relationship, other than a marriage, shall be recognized by the state as entitling the parties to the rights or incidents of marriage.

The recent discussion by the Lawrence City Council regarding the potential establishment of a domestic partnership registry would represent a departure from the traditional practice of state-wide standards regarding domestic relations. The extent to

Federal and State Affairs
Attachment 2
Date 2-15-07

which a domestic partnership registry may be prohibited by existing State law would of course depend upon the exact language of the ordinance or resolution in question.

In the case of the proposed Lawrence ordinance the question is not clear cut. In an October 30, 2006 Legal Memorandum, Toni Ramirez Wheeler, the City's Interim Director of Legal Services indicated that the purpose of domestic registries are often:

"[a means] by which unmarried couples in a mutual support, caring and commitment may document their relationship", recognizing the cultural changes in our society that have resulted in "diverse living arrangements and the development of nontraditional family compositions or familial units", and seeking **equal treatment for domestic partners**. Although the ordinances collected from other communities are varied, and operate under different constitutional and statutory provisions, they contained many common elements or features." (Emphasis mine).

Whether the proposed Lawrence ordinance fits these parameters is a bit difficult to discern. What the Lawrence ordinance clearly would do is define the term domestic partner to mean:

"two individuals who have reached the age of majority and live together in a relationship of indefinite duration, with an exclusive mutual commitment in which the partners share the necessities of life and are financially interdependent. Also, domestic partners are not married to anyone else, do not have another domestic partner and are not related by blood more closely than would bar their marriage in this state."

As I read Ms. Ramirez Wheeler's memorandum the ordinance as proposed in October of 2006 did three things with this definition: 1) Adds the term "domestic partner" to definitions in the City Code; 2) Amends the definition of family that appears in the Human Relations portion of City Code. This change may have the effect of changing the definition of "employee" in the City Code, since the term "immediate family" is used in the definition of employee; 3) Amends the definition of "family" for purposes of the City Zoning Code. Without going into great detail I believe that depending upon application an ordinance of this breadth might well be preempted by existing State law.¹

That having been said, in a February 1, 2007 Attorney General Opinion Request the City appears to present a more limited version of the draft amendment. Under this version it is not clear that either the Human Relations portion of the City Code or the City Zoning code would be affected. Furthermore, the revised proposal includes a specific section specifically stating that the ordinance "creates no legal rights, other than the right to have the registered domestic partnership included in the City's Domestic Partner Registry."

¹ The October draft arguably gives domestic partners equality with spouses in the general city code definition of family, as well as in zoning regs. This would mean that every single city ordinance pertaining to families would include domestic partners and would thus convey legal rights that are traditionally incident to marriage.

The apparent narrowing of the resolution from the time of the October Legal Memorandum to the time of the February Attorney General's Opinion Request is itself evidence of a potential recognition by the City that it is treading on tenuous legal ground. And as an aside I might add that the recent draft's explicit disclaimer of the conference of any substantive legal rights should make it apparent that in passing HB 2299 we would not be denying any substantive right to anyone. Simply put, the preemption of an ordinance that conveys no rights can not in any way itself be construed as a denial of any rights.

The point then is that, regardless of the exact language used by the City of Lawrence, the very concept of Domestic Partnership by local ordinance is an invitation to legal wrangling, and ultimately to the development of this area of the law via judicial rather than legislative action. This alone in my view is reason enough why local units of government should not be allowed to establish their own domestic relations law on an ad-hoc basis.

There is certainly no reason that a domestic partnership registry is necessary to make zoning ordinances more fair and equitable as Cohabiting couples are already permitted to live together even under existing restrictive single-family zoning laws, if they function as a single-house keeping unit.

Furthermore, couples already have the perfect right to govern virtually every area of life via legally recognized contracts and other legal devices. To the extent a private company requires a formalized domestic partnership for extension of insurance or other benefits that is quite frankly the private company's problem. Nothing in current law requires any company to adopt such a requirement.

A further problem with domestic partnership legislation is its fuzzy relationship to any legitimate public policy aim. First of all it is important to realize that at least in the Lawrence context the proposed domestic partnership ordinance would apply to opposite sex couples who are not blood relatives. This raises several issues. First, all possible legal rights are already available to these couples via marriage. What possible public policy objective is achieved by allowing governmental recognition of some sort of ill defined sub-marital relationship between cohabitating opposite sex couples. This questions gains even greater force when one considers the no blood relatives requirement that invariably seem to be a part of domestic registry laws. Why, as a matter of public policy, does it make sense to grant this special legal recognition to two 18 year olds who met last month, but not to a brother and sister who have lived together for 50 years? In a similar vein, but this time in the same sex context, what public policy goal is advanced by conveying this special status to certain same sex couples who live together, but denying it to two spinster sisters?

I think an honest assessment of these types of questions leads to the conclusion that domestic partnership registries can have only two purposes. First, they can serve as mechanisms to convey legal rights approximating marriage. To the extent they do so, at least in Kansas, they run contrary to the clearly established will of the people embedded in our Constitution. Second, they can serve as pure political statements designed to allow a particular community to stake out its position in a broader cultural dispute. While it can be argued that this is not all bad, any possible benefit must be weighed against the dangers attendant to setting a precedent in favor of local development of domestic relations law. Again, this is a recipe for our law in this area to develop via judicial decree rather than via the legislative process. The net result may well be an erosion or hollowing out of the marriage amendment. Indeed, I do not think it at all unlikely that this is exactly what some proponents of the Lawrence ordinance have in mind.

In light of the clearly expressed will of the people on this issue less than 2 years ago I believe it is incumbent upon the Legislature to act at this time to preserve our prerogative over domestic relations law, as well as to protect the marriage amendment by preempting domestic partnership laws at the local level.



www.KansasEqualityCoalition.org • 6505 E. Central #219 • Wichita, KS 67206 • (316) 260-4863 • fax (316) 858-7196

Testimony in Opposition to HB2299
Maggie Childs, Chair
Kansas Equality Coalition of Lawrence/Douglas County
Kansas House Federal and State Affairs Committee
February 15, 2007

Good afternoon Chairman Siegfried and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

The Kansas Equality Coalition strenuously opposes HB 2299.

The Lawrence/Douglas County chapter of the Kansas Equality Coalition has been urging the city of Lawrence to create a Domestic Partnership Ordinance primarily for the convenience of both straight and gay couples whose lives are emotionally and economically entwined, but who are not, or cannot be, legally married. There are many private companies that offer employee benefits to the domestic partners of their employees and it would be a convenience to those employees to be able to use a city registry to document their living arrangements to gain health insurance, family leave, and other protections.

Banning registries violates basic standards of fairness by keeping some Kansas families from taking advantage of protections their employers already offer. Walgreens, Target, Sprint, Home Depot, AT&T and many other companies doing business in Kansas offer domestic partner protections to both heterosexual and same-sex couples.

Depending on each company's rules, though, those protections may only be provided to couples that can prove they are domestic partners. Often the standard of proof is registration. If couples are banned from registering anywhere in this state, they will be put in an impossible Catch-22 situation. In effect, these citizens will be legally barred from receiving the benefits their employers want to give them.

Health insurance can be a matter of life and death. Sylvia Stone was an artist who had two part time jobs, and no health insurance. She got sick, but delayed going to the doctor because she didn't have health insurance. When she did seek medical help, her respiratory infection had worsened to the point of no return. Her partner's employer did not offer health insurance to their employees' domestic partners, but if it had, Sylvia would have been covered, and would still be living and painting among us today. While some companies are dropping health insurance coverage altogether, the number of companies offering health insurance to domestic partners of employees is growing. We want people in Lawrence to be able to access those health insurance policies easily.

The proposed registry has the support of a majority of the Lawrence City Commission. Three of Lawrence's commissioners have said publicly that they support this registry. They are our elected representatives, and any attempt by lawmakers from other cities to ban the registry makes a mockery of our constitutional right to home rule, and of our right to elect people who represent us.

We are also interested in having a Domestic Partnership Registry because it will reflect the fact that Lawrence welcomes diversity. The passage of the constitutional amendment banning marriage rights for gay couples in 2005 makes something as minimal as a Registry an important demonstration of tolerance.

I urge you to vote no on HB2299. Thank you for your time.

Federal and State Affairs
Attachment 3
Date 2-15-06

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, KANSAS ESTABLISHING A DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP REGISTRY; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO DEVELOP PROCEDURES FOR THE REGISTRY

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, KANSAS:

Section 1. Chapter 10, Article 2, of the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2006 Edition, and amendments thereto, is hereby enacted to read as follows:

10-201 DOMESTIC PARTNER DEFINED.

Whenever used in this Article, "domestic partner" shall be construed to mean two individuals who have reached 18 years of age, who have the mental capacity to contract, and who live together in a relationship of indefinite duration, with a mutual commitment in which the partners share the necessities of life and are financially interdependent. Domestic partners are not married to another person, do not have another domestic partner and are not related by blood more closely than would bar their marriage in this state.

10-202 CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING A DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP.

The following criteria must be met for two individuals to be considered domestic partners for the purposes of registering the partnership with the City of Lawrence:

- (A) Both individuals share a common permanent residence. It is not necessary that the legal right to possess the common residence be in both of the individual's names;
- (B) Both individuals agree to be in a relationship of mutual interdependence;
- (C) Both individuals contribute to the maintenance and support of the household. The individuals are not required to contribute equally to the household.
- (D) Neither individual is married to a third individual or a member of a domestic partnership with a third individual;
- (E) Each individual is 18 years of age or older;
- (F) Each individual has the mental capacity to contract;
- (G) The two individuals are not related by blood in a way that would prevent them from being married to another in this State; and
- (H) Both individuals agree to file a Declaration of Domestic Partnership with the City pursuant to this article.

10-203 REGISTRATION.

- (A) Two persons seeking to register as domestic partners may complete and file a Declaration of Domestic Partnership with an office of the City designated by the City Manager.

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 4

Date 2-15-07

- (B) No individual who has previously filed a Declaration of Domestic Partnership in this City may file a new Declaration of Domestic Partnership until at least ninety (90) days after the date that a Request for Removal from the Domestic Partnership Registry was filed with the City under this article. This prohibition does not apply if the previous domestic partnership ended because one of the partners died.

10-204 REMOVAL FROM REGISTRY.

A domestic partnership registered with the City shall be removed from the registry in accordance with this Section:

- (A) Reasons for removal from registry:
- (1) One of the partners dies and the City is notified thereof; or
 - (2) A Request for Removal from the Domestic Partner Registry has been filed by one or both of the individuals registered as domestic partners with the City.
- (B) Procedure for removal from registry:
- (1) Within ninety (90) days of the dissolution of the domestic partnership, at least one former partner shall file a Request for Removal from the Domestic Partner Registry with an office of the City designated by the City Manager pursuant to procedures adopted by the City Manager. Upon receipt, the City shall provide the domestic partner who filed the Request for Removal from the Domestic Partner Registry with two copies of the Request marked "filed." Unless the partners jointly file the Request, the partner filing the Request, shall within five days send a copy of the filed Request to the other partner's last known address. This notice requirement does not apply if the removal request is due to a death of one of the domestic partners.
 - (2) The request shall be effective upon filing the Request for Removal from the Domestic Partner Registry with the City by one or both partners or on the date of the death of one.
 - (3) A former domestic partner who has given a copy of the Declaration of Domestic Partnership to any third party to qualify for any benefit or right and whose receipt of that benefit or enjoyment of that right has not otherwise terminated, shall notify the third party in writing of the Request for Removal from the Domestic Partner Registry, at the last known address of the third party.
 - (4) Failure to provide third-party notice required in subsection (B)(3) shall not delay or prevent the removal of the domestic partnership from the registry. The City shall have no duty to provide notice required by subsection (B)(3) to third parties.

10-205 REGISTRATION.

- (A) The City Manager shall develop procedures and standard forms for the "Registration of Domestic Partnership" and "Notice of Removal from the Domestic Partnership Registry."

- (B) The City Manager, or his or her designee, shall determine a reasonable fee based upon the cost of processing the forms and the City shall charge these fees to the persons filing a Declaration of Domestic Partnership. No fee shall be charged for filing a Request for Removal from the Domestic Partnership Registry.
- (C) The City shall maintain the registry based upon the information provided by the individuals filing the Declaration of Domestic Partnership. The City shall have no duty to independently verify the information provided by the individuals filing the Declaration of Domestic Partnership.

10-206 LEGAL EFFECT.
 Registration pursuant to this Article creates no legal rights, other than the right to have the registered domestic partnership included in the City's Domestic Partner Registry pursuant to this Article. No parties are prohibited from extending rights or benefits to persons listed in the Domestic Partner Registry.

10-207 OTHER APPLICABLE LAWS.
 This Article shall not be interpreted nor construed to permit the recognition of a relationship that is otherwise prohibited by State law.

10-208 SEVERABILITY.
 If any provision, clause, sentence or paragraph of this Article or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this Article which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Article are declared to be severable.

Section 2. Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10-102.32 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2006 Edition, and amendments thereto is hereby enacted to read as follows:

Section 3. This ordinance shall be effective as of the ___ day of _____, 2007.

Passed by the governing body this ____ day of _____, 2007.

 Mike Amyx, Mayor

ATTEST:

 Frank S. Reeb, City Clerk

Approved as to form and legality:

 Toni Ramirez Wheeler, Interim Director of
 Legal Services



HUMAN
RIGHTS
CAMPAIGN
FOUNDATION

1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
phone 202 628 4160
fax 202 347 5323

Human Rights Campaign

Date: 02/08/2007

Employers that offer domestic partner health benefits
Business Ranking: Fortune 1000

Number of Results: 359

| | CEI RATING | FORTUNE RANK | ORGANIZATION | CITY | STATE |
|----|------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|
| 1 | 100 | 3 | General Motors Corp. | Detroit | MI |
| 2 | 100 | 4 | Chevron Corp. | San Ramon | CA |
| 3 | 100 | 5 | Ford Motor Co. | Dearborn | MI |
| 4 | 78 | 6 | ConocoPhillips | Houston | TX |
| 5 | 75 | 7 | General Electric Co. | Fairfield | CT |
| 6 | 100 | 8 | Citigroup Inc. | New York | NY |
| 7 | 30 | 9 | American International Group Inc. | New York | NY |
| 8 | 100 | 10 | International Business Machines Corp. | Armonk | NY |
| 9 | 100 | 11 | Hewlett-Packard Co. | Palo Alto | CA |
| 10 | 100 | 12 | Bank of America Corp. | Charlotte | NC |
| 11 | 85 | 14 | Home Depot, Inc. | Atlanta | GA |
| 12 | | 16 | McKesson Corp. | San Francisco | CA |
| 13 | 100 | 17 | J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. | New York | NY |
| 14 | 85 | 18 | Verizon Communications Inc. | New York | NY |
| 15 | | 19 | Cardinal Health | Dublin | OH |
| 16 | 71 | 20 | Altria Group, Inc. | New York | NY |
| 17 | 65 | 24 | Procter & Gamble Co. | Cincinnati | OH |
| 18 | 100 | 25 | Dell Inc. | Round Rock | TX |
| 19 | 100 | 26 | Boeing Co. | Chicago | IL |
| 20 | | 27 | AmerisourceBergen Corp. | Chesterbrook | PA |
| 21 | 93 | 28 | Costco Wholesale Corp. | Issaquah | WA |
| 22 | 80 | 29 | Target Corp. | Minneapolis | MN |
| 23 | 100 | 30 | Morgan Stanley | New York | NY |
| 24 | 100 | 31 | Pfizer Inc. | New York | NY |
| 25 | 100 | 32 | Johnson & Johnson | New Brunswick | NJ |
| 26 | 100 | 33 | Sears Holdings Corporation | Hoffman Estates | IL |
| 27 | 100 | 34 | Merrill Lynch & Co. | New York | NY |
| 28 | 100 | 35 | MetLife, Inc. | New York | NY |
| 29 | 100 | 36 | Dow Chemical Co. | Midland | MI |
| 30 | | 37 | UnitedHealth Group Incorporated | Minnetonka | MN |
| 31 | 80 | 38 | WellPoint Inc. | Indianapolis | IN |
| 32 | 100 | 39 | AT&T Inc. | San Antonio | TX |
| 33 | 85 | 40 | Time Warner Inc. | New York | NY |
| 34 | 100 | 41 | Goldman Sachs Group Inc., The | New York | NY |
| 35 | | 42 | Lowe's Companies, Inc. | Mooresville | NC |

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 5

Date 2-15-07

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|---|--------------------|----|
| 36 | 80 | 44 | United Parcel Service, Inc. | Atlanta | |
| 37 | 100 | 45 | Walgreens Co. | Deerfield | IL |
| 38 | 100 | 46 | Wells Fargo & Co. | San Francisco | CA |
| 39 | 85 | 47 | Albertson's Inc. | Boise | ID |
| 40 | 100 | 48 | Microsoft Corp. | Redmond | WA |
| 41 | 100 | 49 | Intel Corp. | Santa Clara | CA |
| 42 | | 51 | Medco Health Solutions | Franklin Lakes | NJ |
| 43 | 80 | 52 | Lockheed Martin Corp. | Bethesda | MD |
| 44 | | 53 | CVS | Woonsocket | RI |
| 45 | 100 | 54 | Motorola Inc. | Schaumburg | IL |
| 46 | 100 | 57 | Wachovia Corp. | Charlotte | NC |
| 47 | 85 | 58 | Allstate Corp., The | Northbrook | IL |
| 48 | 100 | 59 | Sprint Nextel Corp | Reston | VA |
| 49 | 55 | 60 | Caremark RX | Nashville | TN |
| 50 | 100 | 61 | PepsiCo Inc. | Purchase | NY |
| 51 | 100 | 62 | Lehman Brothers Holdings | New York | NY |
| 52 | 100 | 63 | Walt Disney Co. | Burbank | CA |
| 53 | 100 | 64 | Prudential Financial Inc. | Newark | NJ |
| 54 | 100 | 67 | Northrop Grumman Corp. | Los Angeles | CA |
| 55 | 100 | 69 | American Express Co. | New York | NY |
| 56 | 100 | 71 | Honeywell International Inc. | Morristown | NJ |
| 57 | 100 | 73 | DuPont (E. I. du Pont de Nemours) | Wilmington | DE |
| 58 | 78 | 74 | New York Life Insurance Co. | New York | NY |
| 59 | | 75 | Johnson Controls Inc. | Milwaukee | WI |
| 60 | 100 | 76 | Best Buy Co. Inc. | Richfield | MN |
| 61 | 60 | 77 | Delphi Corp. | Troy | MI |
| 62 | 75 | 78 | Hartford Financial Services Co. | Hartford | CT |
| 63 | | 81 | Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association - College Retirement Equities Fund | New York | NY |
| 64 | 85 | 82 | International Paper Co. | Stamford | CT |
| 65 | 100 | 83 | Cisco Systems Inc. | San Jose | CA |
| 66 | | 84 | HCA - Hospital Corporation of America | Nashville | TN |
| 67 | 65 | 85 | St. Paul Travelers Companies, Inc. | St. Paul | MN |
| 68 | | 86 | News Corp. | New York | NY |
| 69 | 80 | 87 | Federated Department Stores | Cincinnati | OH |
| 70 | 100 | 89 | Coca-Cola Company | Atlanta | GA |
| 71 | 60 | 90 | Weyerhaeuser Co. | Federal Way | WA |
| 72 | 100 | 91 | Aetna Inc. | Hartford | CT |
| 73 | 93 | 92 | Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company | Springfield | MA |
| 74 | 50 | 93 | Abbott Laboratories | Abbott Park | IL |
| 75 | 85 | 94 | Comcast Corp. | Philadelphia | PA |
| 76 | 100 | 95 | Merck & Co. Inc. | Whitehouse Station | NJ |
| 77 | 100 | 97 | Raytheon Co. | Waltham | MA |
| 78 | 100 | 98 | Nationwide | Columbus | OH |
| 79 | 90 | 99 | Washington Mutual, Inc. | Seattle | WA |
| 80 | 85 | 101 | 3M Company | St. Paul | MN |
| 81 | | 102 | Liberty Mutual Group | Boston | MA |
| 82 | 100 | 105 | AMR Corp (American Airlines) | Fort Worth | TX |
| 83 | 100 | 106 | BellSouth Corp. | Atlanta | GA |
| 84 | 100 | 107 | Tech Data Corp. | Clearwater | FL |
| 85 | 70 | 108 | Electronic Data Systems Corp. | Plano | TX |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|---|--------------------|----|
| 86 | 35 | 109 | McDonald's Corp. | Oak Brook | IL |
| 87 | 100 | 110 | Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. | New York | NY |
| 88 | 70 | 111 | Sara Lee Corp. | Chicago | IL |
| 89 | 85 | 113 | Supervalu Inc. | Eden Prairie | MN |
| 90 | 75 | 114 | Cendant Corp. | New York | NY |
| 91 | | 116 | Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance | Milwaukee | WI |
| 92 | 50 | 118 | J. C. Penney Company, Inc. | Plano | TX |
| 93 | 65 | 119 | Wyeth | Madison | NJ |
| 94 | 65 | 120 | Coca-Cola Enterprises | Atlanta | GA |
| 95 | 80 | 122 | Countrywide Financial Corp. | Calabasas | CA |
| 96 | 95 | 123 | Dominion Resources, Inc. | Richmond | VA |
| 97 | 73 | 124 | UAL Corp. (United Airlines) | Elk Grove Township | IL |
| 98 | | 125 | Constellation Energy Group, Inc. | Baltimore | MD |
| 99 | 95 | 128 | Visteon Corp. | Van Buren Township | MI |
| 100 | 70 | 129 | Rite Aid Corp. | Camp Hill | PA |
| 101 | 100 | 130 | CIGNA Corp. | Philadelphia | PA |
| 102 | 85 | 131 | U.S. Bancorp | Minneapolis | MN |
| 103 | | 134 | Express Scripts Inc. | Maryland Heights | MO |
| 104 | 85 | 135 | Delta Air Lines Inc. | Atlanta | GA |
| 105 | 93 | 137 | Staples Inc. | Framingham | MA |
| 106 | 100 | 139 | Gap Inc. | San Francisco | CA |
| 107 | 85 | 140 | Kimberly-Clark Corporation | Irving | TX |
| 108 | 100 | 142 | Xerox Corp. | Stamford | CT |
| 109 | 80 | 144 | Exelon Corp. | Chicago | IL |
| 110 | | 145 | Loews Corp. | New York | NY |
| 111 | 100 | 146 | Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc. | St. Louis | MO |
| 112 | 100 | 148 | Eli Lilly & Co. | Indianapolis | IN |
| 113 | 100 | 152 | Whirlpool Corp. | Benton Harbor | MI |
| 114 | 50 | 153 | Progressive Corp., The | Mayfield Village | OH |
| 115 | 60 | 154 | Office Depot Inc. | Delray Beach | FL |
| 116 | 100 | 155 | Eastman Kodak Co. | Rochester | NY |
| 117 | 100 | 156 | Chubb Corp. | Warren | NJ |
| 118 | 100 | 159 | Apple Inc. | Cupertino | CA |
| 119 | 70 | 160 | Qwest Communications International Inc. | Denver | CO |
| 120 | 100 | 163 | Nike Inc. | Beaverton | OR |
| 121 | 58 | 164 | Union Pacific Corporation | Omaha | NE |
| 122 | 80 | 167 | Texas Instruments Inc. | Dallas | TX |
| 123 | 85 | 170 | Waste Management Inc. | Houston | TX |
| 124 | | 178 | Public Service Enterprise Group | Newark | NJ |
| 125 | | 179 | TRW Automotive Holdings Corp. | Livonia | MI |
| 126 | 85 | 181 | Amgen Inc. | Thousand Oaks | CA |
| 127 | 65 | 182 | Northwest Airlines Corp. | Eagan | MN |
| 128 | 30 | 186 | Marsh & McLennan Companies, Inc. | New York | NY |
| 129 | 100 | 187 | Capital One Financial Corp. | McLean | VA |
| 130 | | 190 | Textron Inc. | Providence | RI |
| 131 | 93 | 191 | Health Net Inc. | Woodland Hills | CA |
| 132 | | 192 | Pepsi Bottling Group Inc., The | Somers | NY |
| 133 | 35 | 194 | Edison International | Rosemead | CA |
| 134 | 80 | 196 | Oracle Corp. | San Mateo | CA |
| 135 | 100 | 197 | Sempra Energy | San Diego | CA |
| 136 | 100 | 199 | Consolidated Edison Co. | New York | NY |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|--|---------------|----|
| 135 | 100 | 200 | PG&E Corp. | San Francisco | |
| 138 | | 202 | Bear Stearns Companies Inc., The | New York | NY |
| 139 | 75 | 203 | Marriott International | Bethesda | MD |
| 140 | 78 | 204 | Colgate-Palmolive Co. | New York | NY |
| 141 | 100 | 206 | General Mills Inc. | Minneapolis | MN |
| 142 | 75 | 207 | Continental Airlines | Houston | TX |
| 143 | | 210 | Eaton Corp. | Cleveland | OH |
| 144 | 100 | 211 | Sun Microsystems Inc. | Santa Clara | CA |
| 145 | 30 | 212 | Avnet Inc. | Phoenix | AZ |
| 146 | 80 | 215 | Aramark Corp. | Philadelphia | PA |
| 147 | 73 | 216 | Dean Foods Co. | Dallas | TX |
| 148 | 100 | 217 | SunTrust Banks Inc. | Atlanta | GA |
| 149 | 53 | 222 | Progress Energy Inc. | Raleigh | NC |
| 150 | 30 | 225 | Omnicom Group | New York | NY |
| 151 | 55 | 226 | Circuit City Stores, Inc. | Richmond | VA |
| 152 | 78 | 229 | UnumProvident Corp. | Chattanooga | TN |
| 153 | 75 | 235 | Medtronic Inc. | Minneapolis | MN |
| 154 | | 236 | Tenet Healthcare | Dallas | TX |
| 155 | 95 | 237 | Aon Corp. | Chicago | IL |
| 156 | 100 | 238 | Cummins Inc. | Columbus | IN |
| 157 | | 239 | Ashland Inc. | Covington | KY |
| 158 | 73 | 240 | Baxter International Inc. | Deerfield | IL |
| 159 | 100 | 241 | Viacom Inc. | New York | NY |
| 160 | 70 | 246 | Limited Brands Inc. | Columbus | OH |
| 161 | 75 | 247 | Xcel Energy | Minneapolis | MN |
| 162 | 45 | 249 | EMC Corp. | Hopkinton | MA |
| 163 | 100 | 250 | Schering-Plough Corp. | Kenilworth | NJ |
| 164 | 100 | 252 | Clear Channel Communications, Inc. | San Antonio | TX |
| 165 | 100 | 255 | Lucent Technologies Inc. | Murray Hill | NJ |
| 166 | 80 | 259 | DTE Energy Co. | Detroit | MI |
| 167 | 85 | 261 | Principal Financial Group | Des Moines | IA |
| 168 | 30 | 271 | Automatic Data Processing, Inc. | Roseland | NJ |
| 169 | 65 | 272 | Amazon.com, Inc. | Seattle | WA |
| 170 | | 274 | Smurfit-Stone Container Corp. | Chicago | IL |
| 171 | 63 | 275 | Calpine Corp. | San Jose | CA |
| 172 | 85 | 278 | Bank of New York Co. | New York | NY |
| 173 | 90 | 280 | Reynolds American Inc. | Winston-Salem | NC |
| 174 | 30 | 281 | Avon Products | New York | NY |
| 175 | | 285 | Science Applications International Corp. | San Diego | CA |
| 176 | 73 | 290 | PNC Financial Services Group Inc. | Pittsburgh | PA |
| 177 | 95 | 291 | ITT Industries Inc. | White Plains | NY |
| 178 | 100 | 293 | Nordstrom Inc. | Seattle | WA |
| 179 | 100 | 295 | Keyspan Corp | Brooklyn | NY |
| 180 | 80 | 296 | Gannett Co. Inc. | McLean | VA |
| 181 | 83 | 300 | Southwest Airlines Co. | Dallas | TX |
| 182 | 53 | 301 | Land O'Lakes | Arden Hills | MN |
| 183 | 80 | 302 | Campbell Soup Co. | Camden | NJ |
| 184 | 80 | 304 | Northeast Utilities System | Berlin | CT |
| 185 | 100 | 307 | State Street Corp. | Boston | MA |
| 186 | 95 | 309 | Harrah's Entertainment Inc. | Las Vegas | NV |
| 187 | | 313 | InterActiveCorp | New York | NY |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|------------------|----|
| 18 | 95 | 316 | Cox Communications Inc. | Atlanta | |
| 189 | 73 | 317 | Applied Materials Inc. | Santa Clara | CA |
| 190 | 100 | 319 | Agilent Technologies Inc. | Palo Alto | CA |
| 191 | 80 | 322 | MeadWestvaco Corp. | Stamford | CT |
| 192 | 75 | 323 | American Family Insurance Group | Madison | WI |
| 193 | 75 | 325 | KeyCorp | Cleveland | OH |
| 194 | 40 | 326 | Golden West Financial Corp. | Oakland | CA |
| 195 | 65 | 327 | Mohawk Industries, Inc. | Calhoun | GA |
| 196 | 75 | 331 | SLM Corp. | Reston | VA |
| 197 | 55 | 332 | Newell Rubbermaid Inc. | Atlanta | GA |
| 198 | 85 | 334 | MGM Mirage | Las Vegas | NV |
| 199 | | 336 | Monsanto Co. | St. Louis | MO |
| 200 | 85 | 338 | Starbucks Corp. | Seattle | WA |
| 201 | 75 | 339 | SAFECO Corp. | Seattle | WA |
| 202 | 100 | 340 | Estee Lauder Companies | New York | NY |
| 203 | 100 | 341 | Owens Corning | Toledo | OH |
| 204 | 57 | 343 | CDW Corporation | Vernon Hills | IL |
| 205 | | 346 | Boston Scientific | Natick | MA |
| 206 | 75 | 348 | Interpublic Group of Companies Inc. | New York | NY |
| 207 | 100 | 353 | Google Inc. | Mountain View | CA |
| 208 | 100 | 357 | NCR Corp. | Dayton | OH |
| 209 | 75 | 359 | McGraw-Hill Companies Inc., The | New York | NY |
| 210 | 100 | 360 | Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide | White Plains | NY |
| 211 | | 362 | Saks Incorporated | Birmingham | AL |
| 212 | 60 | 365 | Dole Food Co. Inc. | Westlake Village | CA |
| 213 | 60 | 366 | Blockbuster Inc. | Dallas | TX |
| 214 | 80 | 367 | Advanced Micro Devices | Sunnyvale | CA |
| 215 | 100 | 368 | Freescale Semiconductor Inc. | Austin | TX |
| 216 | 90 | 372 | Unisys Corp. | Blue Bell | PA |
| 217 | 100 | 373 | Coors Brewing Company | Denver | CO |
| 218 | 57 | 374 | Ball Corporation | Broomfield | CO |
| 219 | 93 | 375 | Ryder System Inc. | Miami | FL |
| 220 | 100 | 377 | Mellon Financial Corp. | Pittsburgh | PA |
| 221 | | 380 | Harley-Davidson Inc. | Milwaukee | WI |
| 222 | 95 | 381 | QUALCOMM Inc. | San Diego | CA |
| 223 | | 386 | Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. | Pasadena | CA |
| 224 | | 388 | Tribune Co. | Chicago | IL |
| 225 | 40 | 389 | Fisher Scientific International | Hampton | NH |
| 226 | 80 | 392 | Quest Diagnostics Incorporated | Lyndhurst | NJ |
| 227 | 93 | 394 | Pitney Bowes Inc. | Stamford | CT |
| 228 | 95 | 396 | Lincoln National Corp. | Philadelphia | PA |
| 229 | | 402 | Goodrich Corp. | Charlotte | NC |
| 230 | 80 | 409 | Darden Restaurants | Orlando | FL |
| 231 | | 411 | Carmax, Inc. | Richmond | VA |
| 232 | 90 | 412 | Yahoo! Inc. | Sunnyvale | CA |
| 233 | | 414 | Cablevision Systems Corp. | Bethpage | NY |
| 234 | 100 | 415 | Lexmark International Inc. | Lexington | KY |
| 235 | 88 | 416 | Mattel Inc. | El Segundo | CA |
| 236 | 100 | 418 | Charles Schwab Corp., The | San Francisco | CA |
| 237 | | 421 | Erie Insurance Group | Erie | PA |
| 238 | 60 | 422 | Barnes & Noble Inc. | New York | NY |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----|
| 239 | 40 | 423 | RadioShack Corp. | Fort Worth | |
| 240 | 100 | 424 | US Airways Group, Inc. | Tempe | AZ |
| 241 | | 425 | Jones Apparel Group, Inc. | Bristol | PA |
| 242 | 100 | 434 | Avaya Inc. | Basking Ridge | NJ |
| 243 | | 436 | UGI Corporation | King of Prussia | PA |
| 244 | 100 | 440 | Liz Claiborne Inc. | New York | NY |
| 245 | 70 | 443 | Owens & Minor | Mechanicsville | VA |
| 246 | | 448 | EMCOR Group Inc | Norwalk | CT |
| 247 | 95 | 449 | Whole Foods Market Inc. | Austin | TX |
| 248 | | 455 | El Paso Corp | Houston | TX |
| 249 | 100 | 456 | Corning Inc. | Corning | NY |
| 250 | | 458 | eBay Inc. | San Jose | CA |
| 251 | | 459 | Ecolab Inc. | St. Paul | MN |
| 252 | 100 | 460 | Clorox Company | Oakland | CA |
| 253 | 95 | 464 | Hilton Hotels Corp. | Beverly Hills | CA |
| 254 | | 467 | H&R Block | Kansas City | MO |
| 255 | | 469 | IKON Office Solutions | Malvern | PA |
| 256 | 75 | 471 | Affiliated Computer Services | Dallas | TX |
| 257 | | 472 | Conseco Inc. | Carmel | IN |
| 258 | | 476 | Graybar Electric Company, Inc. | St. Louis | MO |
| 259 | 45 | 479 | Mirant Corporation | Atlanta | GA |
| 260 | | 482 | Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. | Chicago | IL |
| 261 | 100 | 484 | Levi Strauss & Co. | San Francisco | CA |
| 262 | 95 | 490 | Borders Group Inc. | Ann Arbor | MI |
| 263 | 75 | 491 | Mutual of Omaha Insurance | Omaha | NE |
| 264 | | 495 | SunGard Data Systems Inc. | Wayne | PA |
| 265 | | 500 | LandAmerica Financial Group Inc. | Richmond | VA |
| 266 | 45 | 502 | Host Hotels & Resorts | Bethesda | MD |
| 267 | | 503 | URS Corp. | San Francisco | CA |
| 268 | 100 | 504 | Brinker International Inc. | Dallas | TX |
| 269 | 65 | 508 | Gateway Inc. | Irvine | CA |
| 270 | | 509 | Anixter International Inc. | Glenview | IL |
| 271 | | 512 | Neiman Marcus Group, Inc. | Dallas | TX |
| 272 | | 518 | PetSmart Inc. | Phoenix | AZ |
| 273 | | 519 | M&T Bank Corp. | Buffalo | NY |
| 274 | | 520 | PepsiAmericas Inc. | Minneapolis | MN |
| 275 | | 521 | Level 3 Communications Inc. | Broomfield | CO |
| 276 | | 523 | Laidlaw International | Naperville | IL |
| 277 | 80 | 524 | Comerica Inc. | Detroit | MI |
| 278 | | 527 | Health Management Associates | Naples | FL |
| 279 | | 531 | Sovereign Bancorp Inc. | Philadelphia | PA |
| 280 | 95 | 533 | Northern Trust Corp. | Chicago | IL |
| 281 | | 534 | Washington Post Co. | Washington | DC |
| 282 | 80 | 535 | Guidant Corp. | Indianapolis | IN |
| 283 | | 537 | Williams-Sonoma Inc. | San Francisco | CA |
| 284 | | 539 | Computer Associates International | Islandia | NY |
| 285 | 60 | 549 | Alliant Energy Corp. | Madison | WI |
| 286 | 78 | 550 | Rockwell Collins Inc. | Cedar Rapids | IA |
| 287 | 100 | 557 | New York Times Co. | New York | NY |
| 288 | | 562 | Robert Half International Inc. | Menlo Park | CA |
| 289 | | 567 | Polo Ralph Lauren Corp. | New York | NY |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------|----|
| 290 | | 571 | Vulcan Materials Company | Birmingham | AL |
| 291 | 50 | 572 | Allegheny Energy | Greensburg | PA |
| 292 | | 588 | Forest Laboratories Inc. | New York | NY |
| 293 | | 590 | Factory Mutual Insurance Company | Johnston | RI |
| 294 | 80 | 591 | CH2M HILL Companies, Ltd. | Englewood | CO |
| 295 | 88 | 594 | Electronic Arts Inc. | Redwood City | CA |
| 296 | 63 | 601 | GameStop Corp. | Grapevine | TX |
| 297 | 65 | 602 | Hasbro Inc. | Pawtucket | RI |
| 298 | | 605 | DaVita Inc. | El Segundo | CA |
| 299 | | 621 | Alaska Air Group Inc. | Seattle | WA |
| 300 | 80 | 627 | MasterCard Inc. | Purchase | NY |
| 301 | | 630 | CB Richard Ellis Group Inc. | El Segundo | CA |
| 302 | 100 | 633 | Hewitt Associates | Lincolnshire | IL |
| 303 | 65 | 638 | Alliant Techsystems | Edina | MN |
| 304 | 100 | 639 | Abercrombie & Fitch Co. | New Albany | OH |
| 305 | | 642 | Louisiana-Pacific Corp | Nashville | TN |
| 306 | | 643 | Genzyme Corp. | Cambridge | MA |
| 307 | 65 | 644 | CUNA Mutual Insurance Group | Madison | WI |
| 308 | | 647 | AGL Resources Inc. | Atlanta | GA |
| 309 | | 657 | Granite Construction Inc. | Watsonville | CA |
| 310 | | 658 | Thermo Electron Corp. | Waltham | MA |
| 311 | 100 | 660 | Hospira Inc. | Lake Forest | IL |
| 312 | 85 | 665 | A.G. Edwards, Inc. | St. Louis | MO |
| 313 | | 666 | Phoenix Companies, Inc. | Hartford | CT |
| 314 | | 672 | Symantec Corp. | Cupertino | CA |
| 315 | | 673 | Convergys Corp. | Cincinnati | OH |
| 316 | 73 | 679 | E*TRADE Financial Corporation | New York | NY |
| 317 | | 683 | Sabre Holdings Inc. | Southlake | TX |
| 318 | | 689 | E. W. Scripps Co., The | Cincinnati | OH |
| 319 | | 695 | Legg Mason, Inc. | Baltimore | MD |
| 320 | | 709 | Airgas Inc. | Radnor | PA |
| 321 | | 720 | Snap-on Inc. | Kenosha | WI |
| 322 | | 734 | Allergan Inc. | Irvine | CA |
| 323 | | 736 | American Eagle Outfitters Inc. | Warrendale | PA |
| 324 | | 741 | Brown Shoe Company, Inc. | St. Louis | MO |
| 325 | | 742 | MBIA Inc. | Armonk | NY |
| 326 | | 775 | Commerce Bancorp, Inc. | Cherry Hill | NJ |
| 327 | 100 | 779 | Intuit Inc. | Mountain View | CA |
| 328 | 73 | 780 | KLA-Tencor | San Jose | CA |
| 329 | 50 | 782 | Scholastic Corp. | New York | NY |
| 330 | | 786 | Ann Taylor Stores | New York | NY |
| 331 | | 789 | Juniper Networks, Inc. | Sunnyvale | CA |
| 332 | | 793 | Equity Residential | Chicago | IL |
| 333 | | 801 | Gilead Sciences Inc | Foster City | CA |
| 334 | | 813 | Spherion Corp. | Fort Lauderdale | FL |
| 335 | 58 | 815 | American Power Conversion Corp | West Kingston | RI |
| 336 | 100 | 817 | Adobe Systems Inc. | San Jose | CA |
| 337 | | 821 | Univision Communications | Los Angeles | CA |
| 338 | | 828 | Chiron Corp. | Emeryville | CA |
| 339 | | 829 | LSI Logic Corp. | Milpitas | CA |
| 340 | | 852 | Applera Corp. | Norwalk | CT |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------|---------------|----|
| 341 | | 855 | Magellan Health Services Inc. | Avon | |
| 342 | 30 | 867 | Dow Jones & Co. Inc. | New York | NY |
| 343 | | 869 | IndyMac Bancorp Inc. | Pasadena | CA |
| 344 | 60 | 873 | Deluxe Corp. | Shoreview | MN |
| 345 | | 881 | Church & Dwight Co. Inc. | Princeton | NJ |
| 346 | | 885 | Moody's Corporation | New York | NY |
| 347 | 35 | 887 | Men's Wearhouse Inc., The | Houston | TX |
| 348 | | 896 | JetBlue Airways Corp. | Forest Hills | NY |
| 349 | | 897 | Perkin-Elmer Corp. | Wellesley | MA |
| 350 | 100 | 904 | Agere Systems Inc. | Allentown | PA |
| 351 | 35 | 926 | Vertis Inc. | Baltimore | MD |
| 352 | | 941 | Timberland Co. | Stratham | NH |
| 353 | | 954 | Hub Group, Inc. | Downers Grove | IL |
| 354 | | 960 | Autodesk Inc. | San Rafael | CA |
| 355 | | 962 | Belo Corp. | Dallas | TX |
| 356 | | 963 | T. Rowe Price Associates Inc. | Baltimore | MD |
| 357 | | 984 | BMC Software Inc. | Houston | TX |
| 358 | | 986 | Ceridian Corp. | Minneapolis | MN |
| 359 | | 998 | XO Communications Inc. | Reston | VA |

These data represent the best efforts of the Human Rights Campaign Foundation to track laws and policies that relate to sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination, and workplace same-sex benefits. Because of the proprietary nature of human resource information and because there is no centralized place where laws and policies must be reported, some entities that have inclusive policies for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Americans may not appear. Also, while every effort is made to confirm the existence of these laws and policies, some may have been included in error. The information offered here is intended for educational purposes only. It does not constitute, and should not in any cases be regarded as or relied upon as, legal, or professional advice. If you require individualized legal advice, the Human Rights Campaign Foundation highly recommends that you consult an attorney.

We encourage readers with additions, corrections, questions or comments to contact: HRC WorkNet at:
HRCWorkNet@hrc.org.

TESTIMONY OF BRUCE A. NEY
BEFORE THE FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OF THE KANSAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2007
HB 2299

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. My name is Bruce Ney, I am a life-long Kansan, I grew up in Russell and now live in Lawrence. I am also an attorney licensed to practice law in the state of Kansas and am Senior Counsel for AT&T Kansas here in Topeka. I appear before you today on my own behalf and in my capacity as a concerned Kansan opposed to House Bill 2299.

My employer, AT&T Kansas, like the nearly one-half of the Fortune 500 and nearly 78 percent of Fortune 100 companies in the United States, offers domestic partner benefits.¹ Those benefits are available to any unmarried AT&T Kansas employee and his or her opposite sex or same sex domestic partner. Of those companies like AT&T Kansas that provide domestic partner benefits, 90 percent cover a domestic partner's dependent children; 60 percent extend adoption assistance to the domestic partner; and, 72 percent also allow employees to take extended family leave to care for a domestic partner or their dependents.² My employer offers all of these benefits, among others, to its employees in domestic partnerships regardless of the employee's sexual orientation.

The establishment of a domestic partner registry – at any level of government in Kansas – is of critical importance, as it will provide more than the symbolic recognition of a relationship for people like me. In my case, as is the case in most employer offered benefit situations, in order for me to claim domestic partner benefits from my employer, I must be able to register my domestic partnership with a governmental body pursuant to state or local law authorizing such registration.³ I am opposed to HB2299 because it will, if passed, prohibit the establishment of domestic partner registries at the municipal or county level, including a proposed registry being considered by the City of Lawrence – my home. This prohibition, and the corresponding failure to establish a statewide registry, will effectively prevent me, and other AT&T Kansas employees like me, from being able to claim the tangible and valuable health and other insurance benefits offered by my employer for our domestic partners. Thus, the proposed Lawrence ordinance, unlike this legislation, is extremely helpful and important to Kansans like me.

Public registries provide employers with demonstrable and tangible evidence of the parties' commitment, as well as serving to prevent potential benefit abuse, such as the unfettered changing of partners simply to gain needed insurance benefits for someone who is not a registered partner or the dependent of a registered partner. In either case,

¹ *Luther*, Domestic Partner Benefits, Employer Trends and Benefits Equivalency for the GLBT Family, March 2006, www.HRC.org/workplace/dpbsearch.

² **GAY PARENTS CHEER A BENEFIT REVOLUTION**, Stephanie Armour, USA Today, Jan. 10, 2005.

³ AT&T Inc., Legally Recognized Partner Eligibility Rules.

Benefits Manual

Your Favorites

[Overview](#)

[Health, Insurance...](#)

[Benefits Overview](#) > [Health and Life Plans](#) > [Dependents You Can Cover](#) > [Legally Recognized Partner Eligibility Rules](#)

[+ Add to Your Favorites](#)

Legally Recognized Partner Eligibility Rules

Select a topic to jump to that section on this page.

- [Definition of an Eligible Legally Recognized Partner](#)
- [Available Coverage](#)
- [Enrolling Your Partner for Coverage](#)

Learn More

[Child Eligibility Rules](#)

[Employees Within the Same Family](#)

[When Eligibility Ends](#)

Definition of an Eligible Legally Recognized Partner

If you're eligible for coverage, you can enroll your same-sex or opposite-sex legally recognized partner for coverage under the company's plans.

If your legally recognized partner is also an eligible company employee or retiree, [special rules apply](#).

To be eligible as a legally recognized partner (LRP), the individual must be registered as a legally recognized partner with a government body pursuant to state or local law authorizing such registration.

For specific information about LRP eligibility, contact the AT&T Health Benefits Enrollment Center.

If your dependent isn't eligible as an LRP and doesn't meet other AT&T dependent eligibility requirements, he or she cannot be enrolled in coverage.

Available Coverage

You can enroll your legally recognized partner for coverage under these plans:

- [Medical Plan](#)
- [CarePlus Plan](#)
- [Dental Plan](#)
- [Vision Plan](#)
- [Spouse Life Insurance](#)
- [Child Life Insurance](#) (dependent of LRP)

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 7

Date 2-15-07

- Spouse Accidental Loss Insurance
- Child Accidental Loss Insurance (dependent of LRP)

You pay contributions for your LRP and dependents on the same pretax or posttax basis as your coverage.

Depending on your state's regulations and benefit plan administrator or insurer, you may not be able to cover your legally recognized partner under some plans.

Enrolling Your Partner for Coverage

You should enroll your legally recognized partner for coverage within 31 days of the date he or she becomes eligible for coverage.

If you don't enroll your partner within 31 days, you can enroll him or her on a prospective basis (with a posttax contribution) or if you have a qualified change in status.

You may be subject to taxes on imputed income for the coverage you choose for your legally recognized partner and his or her children.

[▲ Top](#)

Testimony of Bill Dunn in Opposition to HB2299
Kansas House Federal and State Affairs Committee
February 15, 2007

Good afternoon Chairman Siegrfreid and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

My name is Bill Dunn. My partner, Shaun Morse and I have been together for sixteen years. We are both native Kansans but in 1993, education opportunities took us to California. While in California, we registered as domestic partners, first at the municipal level and once available, with the Secretary of State. Shaun became employed by Pacific Bell and because the company offered domestic partner benefits, I was able to become a full-time foster parent for our county. By 2004, we had adopted our three sons.

In 2004, the declining health of our parents back in Wichita alarmed us and we decided that it was time to move our newly expanded family back home to help with their care. By this time, Pacific Bell had been purchased by SBC which later merged with AT&T. Our move back to Wichita was only possible because Shaun was able to transfer within the company to Wichita. More importantly, he retained our health insurance through SBC.

AT&T requires annual proof of our domestic partnership in order to maintain my company sponsored health insurance. We are able to do this only because we are still registered with the California Secretary of State. Without this insurance, I would be unable to stay at home and care for our sons and assist in the care of my partner's ailing father. All three of our boys began their lives at risk due to their birth parents' abuse and neglect. They have made progress because of my ability to dedicate so much time and energy to their special needs. This progress would be severely curtailed if I was unable to acquire health insurance through Shaun's employer.

I am saddened that our friends here in Kansas in similar situations do not have this same blanket of protection for their families. Without any local municipal partnership registries, they are unable to confirm their relationship in order to receive domestic partnership benefits for their partner or children. Their families are put at risk and there are few options available in which they can alleviate their situation. The mere possibility of some local partnership registries at least gives these families a glimmer of hope.

Two years ago, I stood before this committee during the marriage amendment debate. Most of us opposed to the amendment were concerned that it might put our domestic partnership programs with our employers at risk. We were consistently and adamantly assured that the legislature had no intention of meddling with the employer/employee relationship. I stand here today to ask you to honor that assurance. Municipal partnership registries simply provide a way for employers to verify their employees' relationships for the purpose of benefits. Banning these registries serves no purpose other than to offer further proof of an animus against same-sex couples.

I am here today to urge you to reject this latest attack on same-sex couples in Kansas. Allow us to protect our families without legislative interference. Please vote no on HB2299.

Federal and State Affairs
Attachment 8
Date 2-15-07

Testimony of Steve Maceli in Opposition to to HB2299
Kansas House Federal and State Affairs Committee
February 15, 2007

Good afternoon Chairman Siegrfreid and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

My name is Stephen Maceli and I have a catering business in Lawrence.

I employ 12 full-time and 35 part-time workers.
Our gross sales for 2006 were 1.27 million dollars.
This year we hope to surpass 1.5 million.
My business collected \$60,000 in sales tax for the state, county and city during 2006.
Our payroll expenses for the year were \$492,018.45.

I have come a long way since I started my business 12 years ago as a poor KU grad student. As my business has grown I have been able to increase the salaries and benefits of my employees. A year ago I began offering health insurance to my full-time employees. This benefit cost my business approx. \$12,000 in 2006.

In an economic climate where many companies are decreasing benefits, Maceli's, Inc. wants to increase them. If I do not treat my employees like the valuable assets they are, I will lose them. The cost of retraining employees and producing an inconsistent product is much higher than paying my employees a living wage. Call me old fashioned but I would like to have the kind of business where my employees work for me for 20 years.

As a businessperson I am not trying to recreate the wheel. I take many clues from the well-established business community. I try to learn from their mistakes and benefit from their successes. When my Director of Human Resources started to create an employee manual, we called Tom and Marilyn Dobski, who own 17 McDonald's Restaurants, to borrow their employee manual. After reading their manual, we were able to create our own.

Many national corporations offer health care access to domestic partners of employees. US Bank, Home Depot, Southwest Airlines to name a few. These corporations have Kansas affiliates. Whether we want to acknowledge it or not, this is a growing trend. Health Care is a critical benefit, because one illness or accident could bankrupt a family.

My friend Sheila works as a pharmacist at Walgreens in Lawrence. Her partner, Suzanne is employed by the family business, which does not offer health insurance. Fortunately, Suzanne is covered by Walgreen's health care umbrella. Sheila went on line and filled out a form in which she declared that they were domestic partners and had been in a committed relationship for at least 1 year.

While Walgreens requires simply in-house paperwork, other corporations, such as ATT, require that couples be officially registered. Consequently, employees working in states without such registries are prevented from taking advantage of this benefit.

Federal and State Affairs
Attachment 9
Date 2-15-07

If a registry existed, I would require my employees to publicly register as domestic partners. This process would put an official stamp on the relationship, further legitimizing it in the eyes of employers and health care companies.

A public registry is also a more efficient way to go. If a couple wants to take advantage of various benefits, it makes more sense to provide a copy of a domestic partnership registration than constantly having to sign affidavits with various companies or organizations.

Page 2 of US Bank's Policies and Programs Employee Handbook highlights a note about terminology, "Throughout this handbook, the term 'spouse/partner' refers to a domestic partnership which is defined as an ongoing and committed spouse-like relationship between adults of the same or opposite gender." Benefits for domestic partners, whether heterosexual or homosexual exist today and their availability will continue to increase in the future.

As a business owner, I would like to make sure my full-time employees, and their loved ones have access to health insurance. Within my own organization, there are two long-time heterosexual couples who could benefit from such coverage. Health care security for loved ones is just common sense. This is a trend we should all be part of.

I would urge the legislature to vote **No** on HB 2299 which would interfere with companies' rights to compensate their employees as they see fit.

Testimony of Deb Taylor in Opposition to HB2299
Kansas House Federal and State Affairs Committee
February 15, 2007

Good afternoon Chairman Siegrfreid and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

My name is Deb Taylor and I live in Lawrence, Kansas. My domestic partner is Jennifer Kopp, and she is with me today. Jennifer and I are well-educated from Kansas universities. We are very financially stable and we are aggressively saving for retirement. We are healthy and health-conscious. Barring a serious lapse in judgment, we will never be in trouble with the law. We are good to our families. We're good neighbors and hard-working employees. We intend to spend the rest of our lives in Kansas.

To me, it seems like we are the type of people that lawmakers and City leaders want in Kansas because we're intelligent, self-sufficient, and healthy. Put bluntly, I cannot think of any government-paid program of which my partner and I take advantage. Barring a debilitating illness, I have serious doubts that we will ever need government assistance. In our case, we definitely give much more than we take. And we ask for even less.

Jennifer and I don't spend a lot of time broadcasting our relationship to people outside of our family and friends. You would probably never know of our relationship except that we feel a need to let you know that we are against the bill to ban all possible domestic partner registries in Kansas, mainly because it goes against ensuring that the decisions that Jennifer and I have made in private will be honored by those in authority **if and when the need arises**.

Ideally, for Jennifer and me, a domestic partner registry tells people **who might need to know** that she and I rely on each other for emotional, financial, and physical support.

Right now, for example, Jennifer and I carry our own insurance at our own jobs. If Jennifer ever loses her job for whatever reason, she is able to join my health insurance plan (as opposed to needing State aid) because my employer recognizes domestic partnerships. In this case, I can easily and immediately add her to my insurance (and even outside of the open enrollment period), IF I have established with my employer—Motorola—that Jennifer and I are in a domestic partner relationship. This process is made tremendously easier when I can show them paperwork asserting that Jennifer and I have registered as domestic partners.

Jennifer and I believe that laws should be made to protect people. We do not know who this law will protect, or how it will make our lives better. At the same time, I do not see how my desire to provide for Jennifer (and her for me) is a detriment to any citizen in Kansas to the point that domestic partner registries should be forever banned. As model Kansas citizens, we ask that you not make us feel like second class citizens. Please realize that—for people such as Jennifer and me—what matters is making sure that the decisions we have made for each other are honored and that we are treated with fairness and respect.

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 10

Date 2-15-07

February 15, 2007

Chairman Arlen Siegfried

Re: HB 2299

Mr. Chairman:

My name is Pedro L. Irigonegaray. I am a practicing attorney here in Topeka. I am a member of the Kansas Equality Coalition (K.E.C.) and serve on its Board of Directors as Chairman of the Legal Committee.

I am here in opposition to HB 2299 because it specifically targets our Kansas Gay and Lesbian population for disparate treatment for no other reason than their sexual orientation.

Our gay and lesbian population represents our mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters. They are our family, our friends, our neighbors--they are one of us.

HB 2299 weakens the authority of Kansas cities and counties by interfering with their home-rule authority. Article 12, Section 5 of the Kansas Constitution empowers municipalities to determine their own local affairs. HB 2299 is intended to override home-rule authority and in doing so sets a policy and pattern allowing state government to interfere in what should be local affairs. Pursuant to Article 12, Section 5 of the Kansas Constitution, home-rule powers granted to cities should be liberally construed for the purpose of giving cities the largest measure of self-government.

HB 2299 is a direct attack on K.E.C. Lawrence Chapter's efforts to pass a domestic partner ordinance.

The proposed Lawrence Ordinance creates no legal rights, other than the right to have the registered domestic partnership included in the City's Domestic Partner Registry (10-206). The proposed Lawrence Ordinance shall not be interpreted nor construed to permit the recognition of a relationship that is otherwise prohibited by State Law. Nothing in the proposed ordinance shall be construed to explicitly or implicitly create a marital relationship or entitlement to the rights or incidents of marriage (10-207).

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 11

Date 2-15-07

Chairman Arlen Siegfried
Page 2
February 15, 2007

I respectfully urge each of you to ask yourselves: what is the benefit to Kansas from HB 2299? A fair answer is that there is none. In fact, the bill hurts Kansas and its people, both heterosexuals and homosexuals.

Please vote "NO" on HB 2299.

Respectfully submitted,

Pedro L. Irigonegaray

PLI:MSW



Testimony in Opposition to HB2299
Thomas Witt, Chair, Kansas Equality Coalition
House Federal and State Affairs Committee
February 15, 2007

www.KansasEqualityCoalition.org • 6505 E. Central #219 • Wichita, KS 67206 • (316) 260-4863 • fax (316) 858-7196

Good afternoon Chairman Siegrfreid and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

My name is Thomas Witt, state chair of the Kansas Equality Coalition. We have seven chapters across Kansas, and well over 500 members.

We all appreciate the chance to tell you why the people of Lawrence believe they should create a domestic partnership registry. You've heard from business people who want to offer benefits to their employees, the need for a common registry, and the desire of many Lawrence residents to provide for their families. You've heard that the most successful businesses in America offer these benefits to their employees, and that many of those businesses have a presence here in Kansas.

You've heard that HB2299 will unfairly keep some Kansans from qualifying for the benefits their employers wish to give them. You've heard that this bill will interfere with the home rule authority granted Kansas cities in Article 12, Section 5 of our state's constitution.

Two years ago, many of us here today stood before many of you to speak out against the marriage amendment. One of our chief arguments against that amendment was that "Part B" would be used to interfere with the ability of Kansans to receive private benefits from private employers. We were repeatedly assured this was not the case.

Then-Attorney General Phill Kline is on record as saying the amendment would not prevent local or state government agencies from extending benefits to employees' domestic partners. On April 29, 2005, he told the Associated Press that, quote, "It's my belief that they could, and we would defend them in that choice."

These statements by General Kline directly contradict the assertions of the chief proponent of this bill. Representative Kinzer told the Lawrence Journal-World earlier this month that Lawrence's proposed registry would somehow "run afoul" of the 2005 amendment. Quite frankly, we believe General Kline's assessment of the amendment can be trusted to be the correct one.

The elected representatives of the people of Lawrence are now trying to do exactly what General Kline invited them to do – provide a mechanism that facilitates private companies in providing certain benefits to their employees. HB2299's proponents assert that this action by the people of Lawrence will lead to "inconsistent domestic partnership laws across the state." If that is the indeed the finding of this committee, then we ask that you immediately address these inconsistencies by amending HB2299 to create a domestic partner registry statewide. This simple act of fairness would satisfy this bill's proponent's concern that the Lawrence ordinance will somehow lead to conflict and litigation. If that's truly the concern here, then it can be addressed in a way that is consistent with all provisions of the Kansas constitution, and that results in fair treatment of your fellow Kansans.

Thank you very much for your time and attention. I stand ready to answer any questions.

Kline: Marriage amendment wouldn't prohibit partner benefits

By JOHN HANNA

Associated Press Writer

April 29, 2005

TOPEKA, Kan. (AP) _ The state constitution's ban on same-sex marriage and civil unions doesn't prevent local or state government agencies from extending benefits to gay employees' partners, Attorney General **Phill Kline** said Friday.

"It's my belief that they could, and we would defend them in that choice," Kline told reporters.

Kline's statements contrast with a legal opinion issued in March by Michigan Attorney General Mike Cox, who said a similar amendment to that state's constitution prevents governmental entities from offering domestic partner benefits.

Critics of the Kansas amendment had argued it is broad enough to prevent government agencies from offering benefits to employees' unmarried partners, gay or straight, and perhaps could prevent even private companies from doing so. Supporters said such fears were unfounded.

Asked about the Michigan opinion, Kline said: "I'm not the guy in Michigan."

The Kansas amendment, approved by 70 percent of the state's voters on April 5, reaffirms the state's long-standing policy of recognizing only marriages between one man and one woman.

It also declares that only such unions are entitled to "the rights or incidents" of marriage, something Kline said prevents the state from setting up a marriage-like institution for gay couples.

But he added, "The scope is relatively narrow."

Kline made his comments after he, Secretary of State Ron Thornburgh, and Matt All, chief counsel for Gov. Kathleen

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 13

Date 2-15-07

Sebelius, certified the results of the election. The amendment took effect when their meeting ended.

Kansas is the 18th state to add a gay marriage ban to its constitution. Michigan approved its ban last year.

Matt Foreman, executive director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, said he's encouraged by Kline's remarks and hope they will encourage local and state government agencies to begin offering domestic partner benefits.

"Only time will tell if the attorney general's opinion will stand up in a court of law," Foreman said.

David Buckel, director of marriage-related activities for the New York-based gay rights group Lambda Legal, said: "This attorney general interprets this language to be less harmful. Does that mean no harm? No."

Some critics of the Kansas amendment had suggested it's likely to face a legal challenge in federal court because it discriminates against gays and lesbians and restricts their right to seek policy changes from the state.

Kline said: "Do I anticipate litigation? Unfortunately, it's the game of the day. I wouldn't be surprised."

But Buckel said Kline's opinion about the amendment's scope might make a legal challenge less likely than a challenge in state like Michigan.

"That decision always starts with the families in the state who have to confront the challenges," Buckel said.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS® OF KANSAS

President
Janis McMillen
Overland Park

February 15, 2007

1st Vice President
Sharon Ailsieger
Wichita

Honorable Arlen Siegfroid, Chair
Federal and State Affairs Committee
The Kansas House of Representatives

2nd Vice President
Cathy Hoy
Emporia

Chairman Siegfroid and members of the committee:

The League of Women Voters of Kansas opposes HB 2299 for the following reasons:

Secretary
Carol Snyder
Overland Park

✓ Home rule authority is conferred on city and county governments, allowing them to pass ordinances and resolutions that reflect the norms and wishes of their respective communities.

Treasurer
Leonore Rowe
Overland Park

✓ A registry of domestic partners is nothing more than a collection of data documenting the existence of a partnership between any two unmarried persons.

Directors

Gwen Elliott
Topeka

✓ Some businesses, non-profit organizations and other entities offer benefits to unmarried couples, providing there is documentation from a government entity verifying the existence of the partnership.

Ellen Estes
Wichita

✓ To reward all employees in a fair and just manner is a "best practice" goal of many companies. By acknowledging the existence of domestic partnerships, it allows businesses or other entities to provide benefits to these unmarried couples. In the case of unmarried couples with children, inclusive benefits enhance the well-being of the children, such as providing equal access to housing, health insurance and other benefits which can provide a more productive and stable life.

Linda Johnson
Manhattan

✓ A domestic partner registry poses no threat or harm to married couples or to any other citizens.

Bob Kruh
Manhattan

Janice Norlin
Salina

This is a local governmental issue, and we ask that the committee keep the legislature out of local governmental activities by not advancing this proposed legislation.

Nona Ponder
Wichita

Janis McMillen

Webmaster
Carol Yoho
Topeka

Federal and State Affairs

Attachment 14

Date 2-15-07



DAVID L. CORLISS
CITY MANAGER

City of Lawrence KANSAS

City Offices
Box 708 66044-0708
TDD 785-832-3205
www.lawrenceks.org

6 East 6th
785-832-3000
FAX 785-832-3405

CITY COMMISSION

MAYOR
MIKE AMYX

COMMISSIONERS
SUE HACK
DAVID M. SCHAUNER
MIKE RUNDLE
DENNIS "BOOG" HIGHBERGER

February 14, 2007

The Hon. Representative Arlen H. Siegfried
Chairman, Federal and State Affairs Committee
Room 136-North, State Capitol Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Re: HB 2299 – Concerning cities and counties; prohibiting the enactment of ordinances or resolutions which create a domestic partner registry

Dear Hon. Chairman Siegfried and Committee Members:

On behalf of the governing body of the City of Lawrence, I am writing in opposition to HB 2299. Cities have broad Home Rule powers to determine their local affairs and government by ordinance. HB 2299 unnecessarily restricts cities' powers to govern local affairs.

The City Commission is considering passing an ordinance establishing a domestic partnership registry. Before proceeding to adopt an ordinance, we requested an opinion from the Kansas Attorney General regarding the lawfulness of such an ordinance under the existing laws of the State of Kansas. We are awaiting the Attorney General's opinion.

The City Commission is considering passing such an ordinance because we heard from Lawrence residents that some private employers may voluntarily extend employee benefits to an employee's domestic partner if the partnership is documented with a local unit of government. We also heard from some of our constituents that such an ordinance would create an inclusive environment for many committed couples and their families living in Lawrence. Whether the City Commission decides to pursue such an ordinance, is a matter best left to local elected officials.



We are committed to providing excellent city services that enhance the quality of

Federal and State Affairs
Attachment 15

Date 2-15-07

Hon. Rep. Siegfried
Feb. 14, 2007
Page 2

We respectfully request the Committee not recommend HB 2299 for passage.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mike Amyx".

Mike Amyx
Mayor

cc: City Commission
David L. Corliss, City Manager