

City of Wichita Commission of Electors

Meeting Notes

Wednesday, July 27, 2022

5:30 P.M.

455 N. Main Street
Council Board Room
Wichita, Kansas 67202



Attendance

Members Present: Marcy Gregory – In Person, John Whitmer – In Person, Javen Gonzalez – In Person, Lamont Anderson – In Person, Janet Johnson – Online, Joseph Dozier – Online, Patrick Penn – Online
Members Absent: None
City Staff: Sharon Dickgrafe, Scott Wadle, Stephen Banks, Mike Kollmeyer, Dan Cramer, Naomi Shapiro
Public Attendance: Vice Mayor Tuttle, Council Member Frye,

1. Previous Meeting Notes

- Motion to accept the minutes as presented.
- Motion: Whitmer, seconded Gonzalez

2. Process Overview

- Scott Wadle, Planning Director provided an overview of the redistricting effort process to-date.
- Working on the different concepts, the process of refinement and the recommendation to City Council
- August 31st Commission of Electors will make final recommendation to the council.
- December 31st the city council adopts recommendation and passes ordinance.
- Meeting Scheduling and upcoming dates

3. Public Input Opportunities

• Naomi Shapiro, Communication Specialist, will provide a review of public input opportunities for the redistricting process.

- City of Wichita webpage: Wichita.gov/redistricting
- Forum Public engagement platform: forum.wichita.gov/en/projects/redistricting-Wichita
- City of Wichita social media platforms: [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) & [Nextdoor](#)
- The website provides an overview/explanation to provide a better understanding of redistricting is.
- Links and question links are provided on the website for the public.
- Videos of the meetings will be archived as well on the page.
- Explains the Phases located on the website.
- Additional Outreach: Press releases/media alerts, district advisory board newsletters, live stream Q & A.
- Mike Kollmeyer, Application Analyst will review public input opportunities through the GIS redistricting dashboard.
- The public will have time to weigh in on redistricting with questions or comments.
- Developing a dashboard to navigate different scenarios.
- Developed a feedback page option with the dashboard that allows selecting a scenario and to comment.
- For the public who do not have access to a computer, attending the meetings to provide public comment would be the best way to weigh in with public discussion and questions.

- Public opinion & input is important for transparency.
- The forum platform will be able to show the most recent contributions.

4. Census Data – presented by Stephen Banks

- *2020 Census initial report received information for the following:* total population, race, and ethnicity, voting age population which cannot be considered here, total housing units vacant or occupied and group porters' population.
- The rest of the census day for renter and owner occupancy data, sex and age data, family size, household types and sizes expected to arrive maybe in March of 2023.
- Overall population total 15,000 population increase or 4% increase.
- 2010 – 2020 population data are revealed to show city growth and density in certain areas.
- Census PowerPoint can be found on the website.
- Greater number of New Homes was built east of Webb Road in the city council district 2 and the second highest number of new homes was in district 5.
- Wichita had a small decline in the number of vacant housing units, but overall percentage of vacant units stayed the same in Wichita.
- Wichita maintained a high housing occupancy. The Race data obtained (2010 – 2020) shows the following:
- 6% decrease in white non-Hispanic population, 3% increase in Hispanic Latino population.
- Hispanic Latino population grew to 18% and non-Hispanic white population decreased to 59% Black, Asian, and Native American and other race categories of the population stayed the same within the tenth of percent change in the decade.
- Population of 2 or more races increased from 3% to 6% (2010 – 2020) so a doubling of those 2 or more races.

5. Concept Maps Review - Presenter Scott Wadle

- Introductions
- Maps developed by staff will be provided with an overview of the analyses in terms of population, neighborhood associations and precepts.
- For maps developed by commission members a high-level overview will be provided with the commission member to explain concepts behind the map. This is to give the opportunity to view the information.
- There will be an opportunity to vote in terms of identifying which ones can be prioritized to be headed in the right direction.
- This is an opportunity to go through maps and better understand the data provided.

Staff Scenario #1

- With 3 election districts impacted. (Southeast portion of town) 205,235, and 248. The only area impacted by this was the Eastridge Neighborhood association. If approved, there will be a split between districts two and three. No homeowner associations in this area are noted, so only one neighborhood association is impacted.
- Highest percentage variation was 1.3% for District 5. Everything else is below that and all within the 5 percent plus or minus.
- District 216 was moved from District 2 to District 1. No neighborhood associations but quite a few homeowner associations: Waterford Sycamore Village and Applegate Garden homes.
- Eastridge district that split in precincts 205,235 and 248 for clarifications.

Staff Scenario #2 – Is more geographic based.

- District 3 (northern boundary is along Kellogg) and the eastern boundaries which is Woodlawn have been cleaned up.
- Northern part of 29th street is the cutoff point between district 2 and district 1.

- 129, 130 and 101 have quite a few neighborhood associations in the area and were in district 1 and now in district 3.
- Variance located in district 3 with 4.29%, yet growth for those areas is not very high. District 1 has a negative 3.44% but has growth potentially up toward north 29th Steet.
- The northern part of it has no neighborhood associations but a lot of homeowner associations so all those neighborhood associations would move from district 2 to district 1.

Staff Scenarios # 3,4, and 5

- Scenario 3 – Precinct 207 (smaller precincts) The problem: does split the evergreen association in half (Eastridge). Trying to find a way to increase district 3 in population by bringing in more precincts.
- Scenario 4 – Trade-off with two precincts numbers 331 & 306 going into district 1. This will do a couple of good things; one it brings district one’s population up and gets it 3.87% over the average number. It also brings district 2 down to a little over 4 percent below the target number allowing for future growth, but it brings district 3 very closer to the target number.
- Using the roads in this case to create a southern boundary for district 2 giving potential growth in district 3.
- Also, in Scenario 4 for District 6 move precinct 511 on east side of Hoover. Using Hoover as a dividing line. To add more of the future growth area to district 6.
- Scenario 5 – has a different approach that involves moving district 3 over into precinct 425 (district 4), and swapping precincts 336 & 325 going into district 4. There is a domino effect moving precincts 614 and 504 to District 4 and precinct 218 to District 1 in order to even out the numbers with consideration for growth.

Staff Scenario # 6 & 7

- Scenario 6 – Thought process focuses on population and trying to keep the numbers as tight as possible while giving and taking different districts, precincts and maintaining some geographic boundaries.
- Maintaining Willowbend preserving that to district 2.
- Waterford, Sycamore, and Applewood into District #1
- Splitting up Eastridge is an option that can be up for discussion on give and take.
- Scenario 7 – Delano is moved to district four and that may be the further point of discussion.
- Number of situations where we lose being contiguous due to island annexations and so forth. A decision must be made on which districts apply to areas coming into Wichita. Northwest water treatment plant & Bomb range are examples.
- Dividing lines must be established by precincts and other geographic boundaries.

Commission Members

- GIS Staff provided an overview on how they turned out in terms of population and precincts that moved.

Commission Scenario #1

- No analysis beyond the population was performed and the commissioners who submitted it requested it be removed.
- The challenge is inherent in the process and that it doesn’t always work out in terms of population alone.
- Each scenario is a work in progress.

Commission Scenario # 2

- 4 election districts impacted by the southern part (election 331, district 331) which moved from 1 to 3 and that splits up some neighborhood associations. Moves Linwood Schweiter east from 1 into 3.
- One area does split the neighborhood associations that are now represented by two council members. So, Longview and Fairfax both split in that area.

- 213 & 212 moved from district 2 into district 1. No neighborhoods associations impacted by this but there are homeowner associations impacted.
- Committee member to provide comment: Taking district 1 east and conceding some parts of district 1 to distribute that's already kind of embedded in the south. Not a lot of movement but some shake up within the redistricting process.
- Populations is tight with everything under 1% in plus or minus both directions.
- Feedback from HOA's is recommended.

Commission Scenario # 3

- Less is more concept. One election precinct is moved. District 3 is the highest at plus 2.52% and 1 in the lowest at negative 2.92% and the east ridge association that is now split and represented in both 3 & 2.
- Heavy movement should require robust communication with the community.
- Not a big shake up in terms of the redistricting progress. Maps submitted by Lamont Anderson were based upon making sure that the numbers were within the tolerance that is needed and that there was not an aggressive amount of movement to where it was really going to shake up peoples lives without having the proper time to do those type of scenarios and assessments.

Commission Scenario # 4

- Delano got moved from district 4 into district 6. Election district 405 got moved to the north. Noted that all Delano neighborhood association would all be in one district. Southern portion of it include 301, 320, and 420 were modified and moved so 320 was moved to district 3 into district 1.
- 320 & 301 move from 3 over to district 4 which impacted the south-central neighborhoods associations and the south-central improvement alliance. alliance instead of previously those neighborhood associations were in district 3 now they are represented by three different council members so they will be in both district three district one as well as district four.
- Southeast area this is a common theme in case of 207 moving from uh council district two into council district three that will split east ridge to the north here though Eastridge would have two representations both three and two which is the other half of that one is it 209 and its 246 and 245.
- On the poor on the lower portion of it there is actually 208 209 and it's 246 245.
- The other changes are out in the northwest portion of it
- So, in the case of 621 that one only impacts edge water neighbor dissociation or homeowner association.
- Per Whitmer: The goal with this one was geographic and communities of interest until its pointed out the issue with that neighborhood association in 301. It has to be tweaked. The Delano one was brought to me from an email from someone who lived there and it pointed out to me that Delano has been split in representation in half and so yeah because half of Delano is south and half of Delano is north so my problem that I had was somehow moving 3000 people into six which was not easy which is why I did that bit up in the northwest so that's why I moved Delano into six so that the Delano neighborhood association could have one representation instead of two. I'm going to try and fix the issue with 301 and see what I can do there and I'll try and do the same thing that everybody else has had at 207. I don't know what we're going to do there.
- Speaking of the numbers the numbers, all are within the tolerance of the five percent and that's the one area the only one that I had significant growth in was two. That has a significant deviation but that's okay because two is our largest population growth area so it's okay to have a deviation there if you look at the numbers. 3.34% for district five. They have an area of growth that's

available to them but two is at negative 4.2% so has a lot of space to go as well, and six is at 3.44% on the positive side. Are there any questions on committee scenario 4.

Commission Scenario # 5

- Gonzalez: A brief overview of committee scenario five you can see it's a little different than some of the other ones. Main differences between one and two taking a lot two putting it in one. The numbers are within tolerance, but they are getting tight especially on district one we are negative four point eight three percent which is uh pretty close and then also giving two positive growth of 3.25.
- That's something to take into consideration losing about three thirty-two hundred and one gaining twenty one hundred and two overall as you can see the numbers are still there but getting close some other highlights of this scenario are so know is all in four and then some other changes here with college hill in two. The whole northeast part has changed quite a bit and also between five and six so the numbers work.
- Seeing the numbers there's some adjustments that would need to be made especially to district one to bring those the population up a little bit. My main goal on this was to get the districts as tight as possible while also paying attention to communities of interest and geography so Kellogg for the most part is kind of a straight shot through as to what's north and what south I took college hill and put it in district 2. The other big change like John's was Delano. Delano making it all in one district was important, and then also I thought making district 6 a little tighter taking off the northern and western edges and combining that with more communities of interest in district five.
- A dozen scenarios have been submitted.
- Motion by Gonzalez, seconded by Whitmer: To set the deadline for additional maps for next Monday which is August 1st and to set up public comment between now and then to start viewing the maps.
- Substituted motion by: Dozier and seconded by Gregory. to strike the deadline for final map submission.
- 5 Affirmative and 2 opposed. – Motion will carry.

6. Commission Procedures

- Dozier suggested to adopt Roberts rules of order to provide a framework for better discussion and debate during the redistricting process.
- Patrick Penn Motioned to set rules that could be official. Discussion.
- Penn withdrew motion. The motion was tabled until each member has had time to read through the material and voted on at the beginning of the next meeting.

7. Public Comments

- Providing options for those who do not have electronic devices to participate in comments online.
- Including a public comment on future agendas for members of the public to speak with time limitation.
- Motion by Gonzales and second by Gregory to publish the maps on the website for the public to view, and this does not deal with a forum of collecting public input. *5 Affirmative, 2 opposed – Motion will carry*
- Motion by Gonzales and second by Gregory to allow public comment on those maps on the online forum survey and allow public comment to be added on the next agenda for future meetings.
- Comments about platform being hyperlinked and more prominent for the public.
- There is a field for the individual to state their current city council district. Staff to present options at the next meeting. – N Shapiro.
- Substitute Motion by Dozier seconded by Whitmer - Recommendation of the commission is to have a single organized portal for online feedback like the forum or something similar for the public to use and not to have that additional comment section that would be separated on the GIS platform. To clarify – Instead to have a link to the forum platform.

- Request to add a description page when you go to the portal with the maps and charts with a direct link to the feedback portal. Not to have the GIS feedback platform, but to have a feedback platform online in which commissioners are able to see in real time.
- All feedback can be embedded into the forum system for the online comments.
- 6 Affirmative, 1 absent – Motion carries.

8. Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 3rd @ 5:30 PM

- Motion to adjourn by acclamation
- Meeting concludes