

SESSION OF 2002

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON  
SENATE SUBSTITUTE FOR  
SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 3012**

As Amended by Senate Committee of the Whole

**Brief\***

Senate Substitute for Sub. for HB 3012, as amended by the Senate Committee of the Whole, would create new districts from which Kansas' four members of the U.S. House of Representatives are elected. The redistricting plan described by the bill is named *Feb Copper Modified I*. The August, 2002 primary election will be the first time the new districts would be used.

The redistricting plan is based on 2000 U.S. Census results as required by KSA 11-321. Based on those population figures, the ideal congressional district population is 672,105. The district population range from smallest to largest district in *Feb Copper Modified I* is 672,104 to 672,105. The plan's overall deviation from the ideal congressional district population is 1 person or 0.00 percent.

Districts were built using Census blocks, election precincts (VTDs), and counties. In the plan, three counties would be in more than one district: Comanche County would be in both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> districts; Leavenworth County would be in both the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> districts; and Lyon County would be in both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> districts. Two VTDs in Comanche County and one each in Leavenworth and Lyon counties would be split in the plan.

Maps and reports that describe the plan can be viewed on the Kansas Legislative Research Department's Internet site:

<http://skyways.lib.ks.us/ksleg/KLRD/Redistrict/CongressPlans.htm>

---

\*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.accesskansas.org/legislature/>

Paper maps displaying districts that would be created by the bill can be obtained from the Kansas Legislative Research Department.

## **Background**

During the regular 2002 Legislative Session, new state House, Senate, Board of Education, and congressional districts are to be enacted by the Legislature. The goal of redistricting is to equalize population among districts. Congressional districts were last drawn in 1992. The 2000 Census showed significant growth during the decade in two districts and population decline in two districts. Currently, populations of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> districts are 34,435 and 30,718 less than the ideal, respectively. The current 4<sup>th</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> districts are too populous by 3,650 and 61,501 people, respectively.

The bill, as recommended by the Senate Reapportionment Committee, would have enacted a plan named *Kansas Day Revision*. That redistricting plan also was embodied in Sub. SB 378, as recommended by the Senate Committee. The district population range from smallest to largest district in *Kansas Day Revision* is 672,087 to 672,124. The plan's overall deviation from the ideal congressional district population is 37 people or 0.01 percent.

The bill as passed by the House would have enacted a congressional district plan named *HR Congress 4*. The district population range in that plan from smallest to largest district is 672,088 to 672,130. The House plan's overall deviation from the ideal congressional district population is 42 people or 0.01 percent.

Other bills that contain proposed congressional redistricting plans are Sub. for SB 378, SB 381, HB 3012, Sub. HB 3012, and HB 2696.

The fiscal note on the introduced version of the bill states that the Secretary of State's office may incur additional expenses that result from working with each county election officer to ensure that all registered voters are reassigned to the correct representative district; redesigning various computer spreadsheets, tables, maps, directories, and other publications to account for each of the state's precincts in the correct district; rewriting the computer program that tallies results on election night; and redesigning official election abstracts which are provided to county election officers for their use in certifying election

results. The fiscal note states that the Secretary of State's office indicated that expenses related to these tasks could be financed within current resources and staffing levels, provided that the redistricting bill is enacted reasonably early in the 2002 Legislative Session. If redistricting legislation is not passed until April or May, the agency notes that additional temporary employees and outside computer programming assistance will be needed to complete the required tasks before the primary election. The agency cannot estimate the potential cost at this time.

The fiscal note also includes an observation of the Secretary of State's office that there is a fiscal impact on counties, because each county election officer would carry out some of the required tasks. Some counties would incur costs for new software and additional computer programming to reassign the registered voters in their counties to the proper district. Counties also would redesign spreadsheets and rewrite computer programs to match precincts to the correct legislative district and tabulate vote totals to be certified to the Secretary of State's office. The Secretary of State's office is unable to estimate potential costs to counties. The Kansas Association of Counties indicates there would be a fiscal impact associated with the introduced version of the bill, especially with the software upgrades, but the Association was unable to estimate any such costs. Any potential fiscal effect would be in addition to amounts provided for redistricting in the Legislative Research Department and Secretary of State's budgets, as presented in the *FY 2003 Governor's Budget Report*.

The substitute bill does not contain any provision that would alter the assessment of the fiscal impact on either the Secretary of State's office or counties.