

City of Wichita Commission of Electors

Meeting Notes

Wednesday, August 10, 2022

5:30 P.M.

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



Attendance

Members Present: Marcey Gregory – Online, John Whitmer – In Person, Javen Gonzalez – In Person, Lamont Anderson – In Person, Janet Johnson – In Person, Patrick Penn – In Person, Joseph Dozier – Online

Members Absent: None

City Staff: Sharon Dickgrafe, Scott Wadle, Stephen Banks, Mike Kollmeyer, Dan Cramer, Naomi Shapiro, Kathy Sexton, Megan Lovely
--

Public Attendance: None

1. Welcome

- Marcey Gregory opened the meeting
- Stephen Banks completed the Attendance

2. Meeting Notes

- Gregory made a motion to accept the meeting minutes as presented, Gonzalez seconded. (6-0 Approved)

3. Process Overview

- (14) scenarios with (2) withdrawn by submitters.
- Developing the website further and looking into more ways to gain public input.

4. Public Input Opportunities

Naomi: Website & Current Feedback

- Public input on the scenarios will increase more as maps are narrowed down. The more things defined the better the comments, questions and understanding will be.
- There is an increase on the forum with more comments from the public. The public is weighing on the scenarios.
- Comments are provided through social media. This includes Facebook, Next-door post, and the forum. (Information provided in media packet provided) An overview of the redistricting process is available.

Megan Lovely (COW Communications manager): Possible Townhall Scenarios

- Two Options, edits, and flexibility can be provided for either format.
 - 1. Tradition public feedback forum

PROS:

- Allows the public to come up and speak to the board to be heard. Example: the COW budget forum.
 - Brief presentation from staff to explain what redistricting is and to provide the goal of what is to be achieved.
 - Boards to be provided outside the chambers for the public. Handouts to be provided that would include narrowed down maps.
 - 5 minutes for the public to share their feedback.
 - Minutes to be created and provided to Commission members.
- 2. Walk-around forum (sticky forum)

PROS:

- Very nuanced approach so the public can write down what they like, things they might change and then drop it in a box for staff to compile before the next meeting.
- Begins with a presentation on redistricting and the goals.
- Maps would be located around the room and staff members would be standing around to answer questions as well as the commission of electors.
- Every attendee to receive a pad of sticky notes and a pen to write feedback.

PROPOSAL & GOAL: To use one of the formats next Wednesday @ 5:30 PM – TBD for if meeting should follow afterwards or to have this forum in lieu of the regular meeting. The goal today is to decide which forum to use and to push that information out to the public. Keep in mind, traditional forums like this may not have a ton of attendees in forums but there tends to be robust engagement.

Open Discussion & Thoughts

Whitmer: 2nd format to be more conducive than the first. Offers an option promote to the public through radio station.

Gregory: Agrees that the 2nd format would be more user friendly for the people attending, the staff and the board of electors. Votes for option 2.

Gonzalez: When maps are printed on the foam boards. Maps with withdrawn scenarios are not to be placed on boards. This will also save time and money. Agrees with the library option.

Johnson: Whittling down some maps tonight. Concern with the 5:30 time to the public that have children and new school routines. Also, the library would be a preferred friendly location.

- 6:00 PM or 6:30PM are new proposed times for the meeting to take place at the library.
- Forum on Tuesday at 6:00 PM at the Advanced Learning Library (August 16, 2022) if available

Anderson: No cutoff date for submission of maps. Focused on utilizing time. Getting to the point and being officiant. To have a discussion and to finalize. Public opinion very important but to not extend the process. Edits can be made when maps are narrowed down. To have a general foundation then to have public feedback in terms of process.

Dozier: To prioritize and to have the maps really narrowed down. To serve up the best options for the public.

To be clearly stated: Maps are likely to change (draft)

Penn: Looking into the distribution totals and suggesting that they cut off at the top five votes getters, due to distribution going south (6 to 13). To have a start point and to run edits off those top fives to keep things

moving forward. Rankings of the scenarios on the tool last week. (1 down to 13) and totals go 27 down to the 68 area. To have a cut off at the 38 line (map 5) and to include maps two alpha two staff's scenarios.

Motion by Whitmer to approve format two with a start time at (Tuesday, August 16th at 6:00 PM at the library (if Available) with the change of not using any withdrawn scenarios. To only go with the maps that are in current process. Seconded by Johnson. (Number of maps will not be mentioned, just the number that are withdrawn tonight).

(5) approve – (2) Oppose

Dozier: Motion to expect any commission member within to notify neighborhood associations within their district of any changes to uniting or dividing them going to maps that might be passed. Seconded by Johnson.

(6) approve – (1) Oppose

Gregory: With concern of getting rid of maps without public comment.

Gonzalez: Agrees with Gregory opposed to eliminating maps before public comment. Elimination of maps should be done after public has a chance to comment. Concerned with not having enough public input. No maps are not out of the deviation range. Would like for all public comment to be considered.

Penn: What was the purpose of the map rankings?

- The overabundance of maps that must be delivered.
- Look at how the committee feel in terms of getting rid of some of the maps
- Influence the decision on what is it that the city wants to do with this town hall.
- Market that these are withdrawn and still allow public comment but also to get a sense of where this is all going for completion.
- By popular demand, if the public wants to have (staff scenario five) placed back on the board off the withdrawn status then that would be a problem.

Noted: There is no ordinance that requires that only one map goes. This was discussed at the first meeting.

Stephen Banks: Another motion needs to be made to show all maps or something of that sort.

Penn motions to table to discussion on the town hall until they have the concept maps review seconded by N/A

Whitmer: motions to eliminate the bottom four maps (10,11,12 and 13)

Gonzalez: (substitute motion) to have a cut off next Monday with no more maps submitted. They will still view all the maps at public comment next week.

Anderson: concerned with public comment on the maps. States that a cut off time has not been provided. Next Wednesday for cut off maps submitted and to do the forum following that time.

Stephen Banks – Modifications can be made to maps. Discussions need to be had to discussed how the maps were ranked. Modifications can be done with a live session. The scenarios and rankings should be discussed.

Whitmer: The deadline is the 30th cannot be pushed any further. The forum would have to be next week. The public has had weeks to view, give feedback and submit maps.

Gregory: Begs to differ on the public being notified.

Penn: A forum having not had the opportunity to hear the submitters of these 13 maps the pros and cons as to why they created them. Why we ranked them the way that we did as I asked the question before what the purpose of the ranking was to take time to do that. I thought that the purpose of the ranking was for us to put them in rank order so that we could start the attrition process so that we could go to the public who has had multiple weeks to watch these videos, to watch the meetings to engage in the process through the multiple venues and apparatus that the staff has created to engage in the process. We are moving toward a date that we must have something done as we agreed on our first meeting it was to be and is to be the single map of a recommendation to the city council. If you wanted to have other recommendations off as a second and third order for that is fine but that is what we voted upon. As far as determining who it is that that we cut maps out for, and do we have a cut-off date and things of that nature again as stated previously, I would be comfortable with us talking about what these maps are treating whatever bubble line we decide and any that are left over those you can do as staff has just said you can do a variant of.

Anderson: In spirit of transparency all maps should be on the rankings. Should not be any eliminations unless all pieces of the puzzles are shown together. That is an unintended consequence of not having a cut off. Now we there are new scenarios introduced in the situation and in terms of moving forward cannot happen due to all those maps have not been viewed and they are not a part of this ranking process. If any member has any further maps they will need to be added, ranked, and presented like the rest. Will help the process move forward.

Dozier: Feedback on what feedback on what we have right now can still be productive like the reason I was coming up with a new scenario to 2a was because it was not until I did the rankings. Until I sat down and really looked through it I said maybe there's a way to improve this deviation or something like that that's the situation we're in there it could still be beneficial for our conversation and for public engagement to get feedback on what where what we have and what we ultimately might have at the end of this meeting if there are any maps that the majority of the commission wants to pull away a reject.

** Mr. Dozier's scenarios have been received and staff will have to work through those. There will be three of those but those are variants off scenario committee scenario 2a. Also, Janet Johnson has submitted to two as well which those were slight variants on staff scenario 2 and stop standard six so they do fall within the variance of existing scenario that are already presented.

Whitmer motions to strike the bottom four maps seconded by N/A - Motion fails for lack of a second.

Gonzalez motions to move make the cutoff for new maps next Wednesday the 17th of their next meeting and then we would keep all the current maps that are not withdrawn by the committee members who submitted them available until the public forum. Motion fails for lack of a second.

Johnson: Requests to table the motions and to have a discussion on the rankings.

Anderson: motions that all maps that we have been that have been presented by staff that have been presented to staff from this commission that we are no longer making any deviations of movements those maps are the maps. All maps that are that are current in existence all maps that are submitted by commission members as of right now are all presented and put together and will be worked out and combined and put forth to be presented at the public forum next Tuesday with, we are leaving the public forum date as is.

Gonzalez: For clarification we would still be able to make edits to the current maps like precincts moving here or there but just no new maps or new variants. – Correct.

Anderson: Motions no commission members to come next Wednesday with any different variants. What we have up on that board what we have been submitted by Mrs. Johnson and what has been submitted by Mr. Dozier that is for staff to work out. Those are the submissions. All those submissions roll into the public forum for next week public has the opportunity to make those comments and we have full transparency, and everybody's map has been represented. Seconded by Gonzalez.

Motion recapped:

- Tonight, would represent the cutoff for no more new maps. – Confirmed
- Dozier to make submit changes to the precincts. (Allowed)
- Forum to take place on the 08/16/2022

(Approved 7-0)

5. Concept Maps Review

Staff has viewed the rankings. Comments to explain the WHY behind the ranking:

- **Gonzalez:** Request that staff to do an additional ranking due to submission of Dozier and Johnsons variants.
- **Penn:** Guides population variants and compactness of lines. (Legal muster) for ranking in order
- **Whitmer:** Like Penn and keeping neighborhoods and communities of interest together.
- **Dozier:** Addressing the current deviations issues but also looking at the future population growth. Weary of maps that put precinct 2 & 5 at high positive deviation while putting precinct 2 with precinct 3 and precinct 1 at negative low deviations. Unless there are drastic changes to district 3 in going more east to get the high population areas as part of it, both 3 and 1 are going to face that disproportional development over the next decade as 5 and 2 & 5 and 2 subs grow. With population equivalency looking at having a slight negative deviation if not par for district 2 and maybe somewhat for district 5 so that they have enough buffer over the next decade to keep to the one person one vote and the same mindset of we cannot be negative deviation with district 3.
- **Johnson:** Ditto
- No further discussions

Map Review

- **Johnson:** Would like to go through maps to view the deviation.
- **Penn:** Suggest looking at the bottom vote getters as well and understand why there is such a consensus on ranking those maps as low as they do the high ones. This could give members a little more comfort with vetting some of the maps out. So that when they present to the public that can be further understanding on what is going into the map and why they have the stance that they have.

- Staff to pull up top 4: Ranking 1,2,3, and 4 staff scenarios to be presented.
- Handouts given for impacts on each of those scenarios.
- **Johnson:** Shares concern with 2a – The two district that are the largest and grow faster are over and the two districts that grow the slowest are under. Districts are starting out with a disadvantage. Also, district 1 is short 487 and district 3 is short 613. District 1 will have more of a chance to grow and district 3 is not going to grow and district 2 is going to grow by leaps and bounds.
- **Whitmer:** District 2 is 7.31, so district 2 at a plus 7.31 down to a 0.53. This is a variation off map 2. The major change was trying to reunite Delano. Delano was split into 2 city council districts.
- **Dozier:** Like the fact that you see unity with the Eastridge neighborhood association but when reviewing. Logic applies that we should unite the Delano neighborhood association which balances off of Kellogg then that same logic would apply to the precinct directly east because downtown neighborhood association is split as well it's the same situation. Looking at the maps and putting together a variance that would have Delano and downtown both united under district six and then also would then on most of the variations of things playing with would take district one and cut it at Kellogg as the southern border. Some of my rankings were in large part downranking maps that really started driving district one even further south on Kellogg beyond even the current lines. Personally, in favor if we can work it providing those southern district one precincts to district three um south of Kellogg and then kind of going, we've got highways basically as geographic dividers and so when looking at 2a and we see kind of that downtown corridor you're going to see that district precinct 103 right there on the left where watermen. That's the southern half of the downtown neighborhood association that association is split and so when I'm thinking about that and what John has presented I was I was trying to say well if we're reuniting Eastridge and we think it's a priority to reunite Delano um and under district six then I also feel there's an argument that you should unite downtown uh as well and I think that scenario should be considered too. Similarly the reason I downloaded some of the other maps were the ones that took the Delano neighborhood association or downtown and stripped the entire both precincts and put them into district four because I do not think most Delano residents and they can correct me if I'm wrong particularly those who live north of Kellogg who view themselves as maybe best represented by a council district that is primarily composed of southwest Wichita and so that was kind of when you when you're trying to do a balancing act of if you unite it where do you put it? or is there an argument that we keep it separate if united? I think we also have to be followed logic and unite the downtown neighborhood association as well with the same council member.
- **Stephen Banks:** The way the current council districts are divided kind of around downtown was actually on purpose by the previous council because they wanted to make the point that downtown is everybody's neighborhood, and they were less concerned about dividing the downtown association than they were about getting more council people with a stake in downtown.
- **Dozier:** Appreciates the context. Going off of our tasking, plus I do feel if that was the priority of the last redistricting process yeah, I just feel like there was a better way to give most of the districts a

touch of downtown this this this layout doesn't do it and so I feel like we're kind of committed unless the neighbor associations like to be split. I think my greatest concern though is if you see a downtown neighborhood association essentially going to a district like district 4 in whole including the north of Kellogg Park that doesn't touch downtown hardly at all. I think that would not be right for that neighborhood association and it seems out of steps for the cohesion communities of interest within so I know that also applies to some of the other scenarios but since it's relevant to this discussion I figured I'd bring it up and that might influence our discussion with some of those other maps. On 2a, I think we have to be also mindful of district 6 losing out on some of its population growth areas and so where my head was as well and especially difficult to get district six as southern precinct of Delano, I'm I want to work it where they're not going to lose out particularly north of the loop 90 was that 96 that that's precinct six 21 that's a projected growth area. That's north of the highway there that is one of my concerns of maybe making an improvement if 621 then correspondingly 629 620 could work with six because if you lose that and then if six also loses out on 632 and 603 just directly south then six has lost out on most of his projected population growth areas and it's gone a hundred percent to five uh for the west side of town and I think that could put us in a when thinking about doing the right thing and setting this up for success for the next decade that could put us in a tough spot just like getting too many population we're being mindful of population growth on the east.

- **Whitmer:** I was just trying to keep that deviation down because right now as the map sits right now it's at a 2.4 and if you put that precinct back in it pops it up again. That is why it was moved.
- **Dozier:** I was curious if anyone had any thoughts about where I was giving feedback on district one precinct south of Kellogg going to district three. If it is workable with deviation? If that is something that makes sense to y'all? I was feeling like especially when you see 331 if that goes up to district one right, we have split that neighborhood association as well. I was trying to think if there is a way to work it where we can have a clean cut south of Kellogg for district three, give some additional precincts to district three, plus you do have some flexibility between one and two on the east border to trade off some precincts maybe with rock road is a natural barrier to offset that population loss in district one in reference to thinking about improvements.
- **Whitmer:** Moving more precincts into three is always good because I mean as Janet pointed out three is got growth problems so that was one of the areas that I struggled with when I did this map, was trying to preserve three. So, I do not see a problem moving it into three.
- **Dozier:** I feel like we have some play room with districts one and two depending on the scenario that there's obviously was a concerted attempt in the past to do the best you could with rock road web road over there to try to create an actual boundary line between the districts that makes sense even though the precinct some go more east of Rock and some don't I feel there's like there's a avenue there that makes sense to if we needed to then add population to district one, really within the footprint that district one already has. I also think to have this discussion be productive and think about other scenarios in this section of town the other reason I rank down some of the maps and I still have concerns even about some in the middle was when we see that area on rock road between one and two some of those scenarios if y'all recall bring in district 218 in the northeast instead up and like toss some of the rock road Woodlawn precincts from district 1 to allow that 4500 voters to come in or residents to come in. I am less likely to support maps that do that I feel that that precinct should be

better represented especially with this geographic location and distance from some of the other precincts of district one and the communities in district one and someone who lives in district one I feel that would make more sense for district one to gain precincts along that rock road corridor than in that northeast taking it away from district two. So, there are a number of maps I believe there's like five seven or something like that where they do that and so I just bring it up as we discuss this section and when looking at 2a right you could add 216. you could even add potentially 211. Probably the one that you can add is going to be so many is 215 because it also goes out to web, but I think we have some flexibility if there's support to take some of the southern district 1 precincts to district 3. That we have some flexibility there around the east of east borough and around rock road um and so I will not support any map that would try to get a map change that instead of building precincts there for district one to make the population work instead starts building precinct one out for these two eights.

- **Dozier:** well and it was because of some of the variances that I voted the way I did on some of these other maps because you had maps that were point fives point sevens point you know they were just so cattywampus that you know major moves they were just way off which is why I ranked them the way I did there was one that I remember was already so close to being out of whack that it was a four nine or something I can't remember which map it was.
- **Dozier:** is the commission open to um a madam chairwoman is this do you feel like we're in the point of business that I know there was I think a motion earlier to do a review of like the lowest rankings but if we're going to be discussing these individually if there's anyone that would it be appropriate there's anyone that has a strong feeling on one of these just to bring it up for discussion or for culling now because of glaring issues that the other commission members may agree with.
- Motion was to not pull any of the maps tonight.
- **Dozier:** I do not want to see press scenario number one in the mix at all it's not even worthy of public comment. It's worth important to share as a part of the discussion as well as including if the public members the public are watching this I was a little confused when I saw this map pop up because it's like one of these full meets once will be twice now been pulled three times we got three rewrites from Mr. Lefler where his first recommendation didn't even pull precinct from the correct district and now his second recommendation provides one of the worst solutions that would put us out almost outside of population deviation allowance pretty quickly and it's the worst thing that I'm looking at which is district 3 being at a negative deviation while district 2 is at a positive deviation. Moreover, I was a little confused looking through the minutes about you know I feel like Mr. Lefler delegitimized his own experience based on the comments he has written. I would think someone with so much experience with redistricting would have some understanding that the city charter actually exists for a reason and in large part it is there so that we can have this opportunity and phase for public input for DAB input or to go to the council instead of the council just nearly one week having an up or down vote on what one of the council members wants or what the mayor wants, for all we know that that could have been quite a messy situation based on some of the comments of kind of rushed maybe expanding the council um uh without any public feedback so that I know that's a bit of a editorializing on my part but I was just a little frustrated to see I deal with this information all the time abroad I understand this is probably no intense and it's just sad to see in the public misinformation that has no respect for the city charter and for the process that we are taxed to do and then the solution that is recommended as a

part of that misinformation is something that then puts us in jeopardy for our one person one vote rule what we're trying to do post senses. So, if there was a willingness to take the motion, I think a map like this that puts district 3 at such a disadvantage with lack of growth and district 2 at such a precarious position with 0.03 isn't even worthy to be in the mix.

- **Gonzalez:** If this is open for discussion I would just like to say that regardless of I mean there are several maps that are ranked low and high that I personally don't care for as you can see by my rankings but I want to know what the public has to say um with the press map I'm not super indifferent to it but I'm like why don't we see what the public has to say I just don't understand I feel like some members of this committee are allowing a personal vendetta against a single person to let us weed out the maps and not take public comment in. There are lots of people I do not agree with but if they submit a map or they submitted a map I would like to hear what the public has to say about their map.
- **Penn:** No personal vendetta over here I just think that if we have a map that says that it received the bottom most ranking of 13th place by one commissioner two commissioners three commissioners four commissioners, I think that that particular map doesn't deserve to be in here and they had a 10 by one other commissioner madam chair I move that we delete or strike off from our consideration press scenario one.
- **Gonzalez:** I am just going to reiterate that I am opposed to removing any maps before the public has comment we discussed this earlier we voted on it we agree. So no, they do not know the pieces that she has asked for a second, seconded by Whitmer.
- **Gregory:** okay it has been moved and seconded any further discussion.
- (5) Approve (2) opposed
- **Penn:** the motion that that passed was from Mr. Anderson saying that we would put a lock on the submission of more maps the discussion that we've had since that point has been a consideration of the sufficiency of press number one and other maps as we talk about them in that press number one is right up against the bubble on 4.97 is the deviation percentage on one district two and it's at a negative three point one eight for district number three and a negative two point nine two these particular variances that you have here puts it in direct opposition to what we're trying to achieve on this particular panel and it's not that this the motion that was made was said that we weren't going to delete any of these maps what we were trying to do is get to a situation that we could go out to the public and present all of them to them receive their feedback as Mr. Gonzalez has asked for but if it's the will of the body through the votes to actually streamline this process I'm all for that. I do not believe that was the will of the body I think it was four to three.
- **Anderson:** I would say that in the will of the body of transparency, we have the 13 maps to let them well whatever number. We have to allow all of the maps to be presented in unison because at the end of the day again public feedback is important right but we were appointed in this position to ultimately make a decision on recommendation so even if press scenario number one ascends to the highest of

the high in terms of public input we still have our duty that we are charged to execute as electors to execute within the charter of what we were designated to, so and to the spirit of transparency I believe that is important to what we originally agreed upon to leave all maps there when we go to the forum and then after that point we begin to make elimination to the process thank you.

- **Dozier:** We discussed any of these maps I am very weary of anything with a high population of d2 and low in d3 and we got to be mindful of that system.
- **Gregory:** I think the consensus is that yes, we to be maximally efficient for our time that we need to start weeding but we all I think are in agreement that that will happen after next week's public forum.

6. Public Comments

- No one was present to make public comments

7. Next Meeting

- **Gregory:** Okay, item seven is our next meeting and that is the forum will be August 16th Tuesday at the public library (new learning library). Regular board meeting will be Wednesday August 17th.
- Motion to adjourn Penn and Whitmer seconds. (7-0 Approved).