

SESSION OF 2002

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON
SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 378**

As Recommended by Senate Committee on
Reapportionment

Brief*

Sub. for SB 378 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 *Kansas Day Revision*. 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 *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.

Districts were built using election precincts (VTDs) and counties. In the plan, six counties would be in more than one district: Bourbon and Leavenworth counties would be in both the 2nd and 3rd districts; Coffey, Jackson, and Marshal counties in both the 1st and 2nd districts; and Marion county in the 1st and 4th districts.

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>

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

*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/>

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 1st and 2nd districts are 34,435 and 30,718 less than the ideal, respectively. The current 4th and 1st districts are too populous by 3,650 and 61,501 people, respectively.

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.