

SESSION OF 2012

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE  
BILL NO. 2166**

As Recommended by House Committee on  
Local Government

**Brief\***

Sub. for HB 2166 would allow cities to publish summaries of ordinances on the city website provided that the publication is identified as a summary, notice is provided of where the complete text is available, the city attorney has certified that the summary is accurate and sufficient, and the summary is available for a minimum of one week after publication in the newspaper. If the ordinance is subject to a protest petition, the summary must contain notice of such.

The bill also would correct non-uniform language in the city ordinance statutes.

**Background**

This bill, both in its original and revised form, had hearings during both the 2011 and 2012 sessions. During the 2011 session, several concerns were expressed concerning the original language of the bill. During the interim, an agreement was reached regarding amendments to the bill.

At the 2012 hearing, a representative of the League of Kansas Municipalities appeared as a proponent to the bill. The City of Wichita, Kansas Press Association, Unified Government and City of Overland Park all submitted supporting testimony. There was no opponent testimony.

---

\*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.kslegislature.org>

The League representative testified that the agreement to amend the bill would provide better notice for citizens while also saving taxpayer dollars.

The House Committee on Local Government struck amendments made during the 2011 session and recommended the substitute bill be passed.

According to the fiscal note prepared by the Division of Budget, the Kansas Association of Counties and the League of Kansas Municipalities state that counties and cities could see substantial savings from the passage of the original bill. Large counties could save \$120,000 - \$160,000, medium-sized counties could save \$20,000 and small counties could save \$800 if the county does not have an existing website, and \$2,000 if the county does have an existing website. Passage of the original bill would have no effect on the state budget.