

# City of Wichita Commission of Electors

## Meeting Notes

Wednesday, August 17, 2022

5:30 P.M.

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



### Welcome

#### **Attendance**

<b>Members Present:</b> Marcy Gregory – In Person, John Whitmer – In Person, Javen Gonzalez – In Person, Lamont Anderson – In Person, Janet Johnson – In Person, Patrick Penn – In Person, Joseph Dozier – Online
<b>Members Absent:</b> None
<b>City Staff:</b> Sharon Dickgrafe, Scott Wadle, Mike Kollmeyer, Dan Cramer, Naomi Shapiro, Kathy Sexton, Megan Lovely, Jim Jonas
<b>Public Attendance:</b> Vice Mayor Tuttle, Council Member Frye, David Babich, Faith Martin

### Previous Meeting Notes

Meeting notes from August 10, 2022, to be tabled until the next meeting.

### Simple Process Overview

Scott Wadle to present a brief overview.

- Target Date: August 31<sup>st</sup> to provide a recommendation.
- Reminder of Redistricting Process and deadlines to be met.
- (2) more regularly scheduled meetings of the Commission of Electors.

### Public Input Opportunities

Members of the public to address the board

1. **Faith Martin – 608 South Jury. On the district 2 advisory board and represents Eastridge Neighborhood Association.**
  - Comments that most of the maps presented “eviscerate” the Eastridge neighborhood association. The Association was unaware of what was occurring. Has encourage for the association to reach out to staff and city council person.
  - Comments from the Association:
    - Any map that breaks up the association is undesirable.
    - Form in 1992 by choice, not an HOA.
    - Rejects the maps that target the neighborhood and would prefer to stay together.
    - They are a Large, diverse, proud neighborhood.
    - Socioeconomic, racial, age and ethnic diversity.
    - Would prefers staff map 2 and 5.
    - The community does not want to report or have representation in 2 different districts.

Johnson comments: If the neighborhood association fell into 2 districts it does not impact the association. The association would have 2 council members and CSR to contact. It does not split the association; it would remain intact.

- The association already has multiple representatives, and they are having trouble getting representation as it is. The association would still prefer not to be split up. The community has been together longer than some of the committee members being alive. Would like for there to be other choices to pick from as far as to move a few hundred people around.
- Verified Location: Rock Road to Woodlawn and Kellogg to Harry. The area that would be split off would be the lower socioeconomic status, a lot of renters and the association. The Support that is offered in their community provides an anchor in their community. Splitting such parts of the community and placing on the tail end of another district would not offer a lot of support, so it is preferred to keep them in the association. This way support can be provided. The community is very active and are pulling together for a neighborhood cleanup.

Dozier comments: Clarifies no ill intent. A lot of those maps are drafted to offer balance of the population equivalency demand of redistricting. The reality is that precinct 207 located in the Southern part of the Eastridge neighborhood association extends down to about 3000 with more residents southeast. This is part of the difficulty for some of these maps that were viewed. States in favor of secondary task in the population equivalency is keeping associations intact. Association feedback is very important. For the association, there are updates to scenario 2a which is 2b onward. All those scenarios keep Eastridge intact. The challenge for most of those maps and why they are splitting it up is district 3 has such a population at negative deviation that it has to more than likely move east. If it does not gain precincts south of Kellogg in district one.

Penn Questions: Parameters of the Eastridge area and the two maps favored by the conferees?

- Maps: Staff maps 5 & 2 (Kellogg to Harry & Rock to Woodlawn.)

Dozier comments: Precincts for Eastridge include fully 205, 235,248 and the northwest portion of 207.

Whitmer comments: There will be a fix in 2b due to a problem with 4 and 8 so that was all fixed. The problem is the deviation in 5 and 2. The deviations are 4.29 in 2 and a 3.7, that fixes the issue in a b and 2c and in some of the other maps which does not break up with association.

Faith Martin comments: Is more concerned with looking into how to keep the association together not how it affected the entire city. Looking to best represent her neighborhood association.

Gregory comments: Explains that the committee and staff are not in favor of splitting up anybody that is a group that has come together for the betterment of the community.

No Further Discussion

### Updates on public input

- **Naomi: Forum Updates**
  - Packet provided with updated materials
  - More robust engagement, a lot of public input.
  - Naomi to emphasize the word troll feedback was not referring to a specific resident. The meaning was in terms of the kind of feedback that derails conversation.
  - Dalton Glasscock comment noted to be reviews as well as several other comments that are specific about which districts would be affected and their thoughts on moving things for the least disruption for neighborhoods.
  - As the number of the maps are reduced the public is getting more involved if it affects their area in Wichita.
- **Megan: Forum Updates:**
  - \_Public feedback packet provided.
  - In terms of creating another touch point: A brief broadcast to be conducted to offer a brief update on the status of where the commission is and what is to be recommended to the council. Something to consider.

- **Mike Kolmeyer: GIS Team**

- The summaries that were received in the packets are now available on the redistricting page.
- Staff scenario 6 was incorrectly listed as having 10 neighborhood associations that were impacted there are only 4 and that has been corrected.
- **Whitmer comments:** Concerned about adding more maps. Another map was not submitted. The map was already submitted. The neighborhood association had to be modified. 6A map is correct.
- Blue spreadsheet - District representation in downtown.
- 2010 boundary utilized in 2010 for Project downtown.
- [Downtownwichita.org](http://Downtownwichita.org)
- That boundary is available on the dashboard.
- Maps and charts will show a brand-new layer called Wichita project downtown.
- In account: Downtown area & cow town, keeper & river park stadium for the analysis.
- Changes & updates can be made if needed as well as updating this to the Smith boundary and the other corrected boundary.
- The list itself tells you how many districts are represented within that boundary as well as the districts that are listed on there and none of them more or less than two and the majority of them at four that are represented through that.
- Citizen Request: Interested in the total amount of population impacted by the scenarios so that population was calculated bases on the election districts only that were impacted and moved with each of the scenarios. The ranking would be from minimum to the maximum.

#### **Item 5 Concept Map Review**

- 7 scenarios to cover
- Update to staff scenario 2a

**Whitmer request:** For the committee to review the scenarios and then ask questions if needed rather than going over all the scenarios. – Board was all in agreement to this request.

- Commission is to provide comment on their scenarios

Janet Johnson on Staff scenario 2a

- Election on precinct 212 by Eastborough
- Moved 1 precinct in each map to balance and to make the deviation better.

**Penn question for legal for clarification:** The standard deviation has to fall within plus or minus five percent? And is this based off of the current census information or is this a projection of growth or declination and growth would be in the future? How is that view by legal?

- The abs deviation is five and it is appropriate that is considered growth. Doesn't necessarily mean that a map that has 4.97 should be discarded. Looking at areas that will grow and reduce is an appropriate consideration.

**Whitmer Comments:** Staff scenario 2a, 2, and 4 is not at 5. 6a,6 and 7 this will apply.

Received comment from a former commissioner of redistricting sent comments about Precincts 325 and 326 are part of a Southwest neighborhood association that were drawn into district 3. The association would prefer to be drawn back to be drawn back into district 4. Contention has been created amongst the association. Maps 2b, 2c and one other are placed back into 4.

- Received copies of maps from 10 years ago. (Josh Blick)

Staff Scenario 6a

- Johnson to comment: Moved 355 back into 3
- Dozier notes that 6a splits Eastridge
- No more questions

#### Committee Scenario 2b

- Dozier updates that 2 and 2c are all connected and pivoting on what could be decided with Delano.
- 2a has some neighborhood associations split up.
- Unless d3 and d1 have substantial shifts there's a lot of population growth areas, that can be viewed with the staff overlay on the east and northwest side of town that are not encapsulated.
- Mindful of d1 and d3 have a negative population deviation in the scenario. D2 has a really high positive population deviation that Dozier is trying to correct.
- 2b is the first scenario with Delano uniting going into d6. D1 and D3 having a slight positive deviation.
- Coming to terms in rankings with population deviation and not moving too much to split up associations.
- Received feedback from DAB and council member Johnson that have a strong agreement and desire to keep precinct 103 (downtown precinct including century 2 in district 1).
- This will be a vote issue for Dozier representing district one.
- United associations: Longview, Fairfax, East Ridge and most of them the uniting on the southeast.
- Explains concepts and considerations in moving districts by pivoting on Delano depending on where public feedback goes and where the committee stands on it. Trying to get as close to population equivalency across the board while giving buffer to d1 and d3. Also, keeping D2 and providing a buffer for growth.

**Gonzalez comments:** Concern with maps 2B, 2C and 2E. All 3 maps split a major community of interest in half which involves the historic north end. precinct 617 (district 6 to district 1). Extends to 633, 617, 619 and 615. Public comments state the same information. "Gerrymandering comments of the Latino community".

**Dozier comments:** To explain his map concepts and considerations. When the maps were created Dozier was not aware of the demographic breakdowns and precinct because of population equivalency and secondarily was neighborhood associations. Willing to rework to include 633 but there would still be an issue with splitting up 615 plus adding additional residents. There are limited precincts to work with when trying to find an ideal compromise map.

**Whitmer comments:** Precinct 617 has no neighborhood associations and racial factors cannot be considered.

**Gonzalez comments:** Clarifies that it is a cultural demographic community of interest. The North end is going through a revitalization.

**Penn comments:** The legal side of what can and cannot be considered during the redistricting process.

**Legal comments:** You can consider a community of interest. This is broadly defined, and ethnic or racial issues or concerns cannot be used.

**Gonzalez comments:** The North end going through revitalization effort with power evergreen, putting lots of resources into it, it is united in a house district as well as a senate district. It's a community of interest that the public comment would like together.

**Dozier comments:** Happy to re-work the map to where there's only one other precinct there 633 just west of that wouldn't put us in that secondary territory of missing with associations. That would change the population numbers in D6.

**Gonzalez comments:** There are 17 other maps that keep the level of deviation that would be a better suited.

**Dozier comments:** To clarify his intent of adjusting the districts/precincts that involve the assumption of gerrymandering from the public was not the intention.

Whitmer comments: This can be fixed by taking precinct 603 and 621. There are ways to fix this.

Whitmer Motions to eliminate staff scenario 3, committee scenario 4, committee scenario 5, press scenario 1, step scenario 4 and staff scenario 5 basically from the initial map rankings (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) The bottom half. The least favorable on the ranking sheet. Seconded by Johnson.

Gonzalez comments: To add 2B, 2C, and 2E. (Whitmer – Opposes the amendment.)

Clarification of motion:

- Deleting staff maps: 3,4,5, and 7 committee maps
- Press map 1
- Keeping the extra maps that were made from the initial rankings and all the subsequent revisions and everything else for now.

6 Approve & 1 Oppose (Gonzalez)

Whitmer clarifies: Staff scenario 1, 2, committee scenario 2, 2a and the other 2a variations, committee scenario 3, staff scenario 6.

Anderson comments: To have in writing what is now in and out.

Gonzalez motions that 2B, 2C and 2 E be eliminated, seconded by Johnson. Approved 4 - 3 Opposed (Dozier, Penn, and Whitmer)

Whitmer motions to eliminated staff scenario 6A, Seconded by Gonzalez. Approved 7-0

Whitmer motions to eliminate staff scenario 2A – Motion withdrew by Whitmer.

Penn motions to eliminate staff scenario 2A, seconded by Whitmer. (9 maps remaining)

Dozier with an amended motion to also include committee scenario 2 with the 2A request. Seconded by Penn.

Clarification: staff scenario 2a to strike and Dozier with an amendment to include staff scenario 2 on the motion.

4 Approved - 3 Opposed (Gonzalez, Gregory, Johnson) - Now down to 7 maps

#### Summary of maps:

- Committee scenario 2A
- Committee scenario 2D2
- Committee scenario 2D
- Committee scenario 2
- Committee scenario 3
- Staff scenario 1
- Staff scenario 6

*Whitmer to open discussion on the number of maps recommended to city council. Involving 2 additional alternate maps. Top 3 maps to submit to city council. Next week to come with your top 3 maps to the next meeting.*

Note: Dozier to revise and rework his maps to provide.

Faith Martin comments: Concerned that certain comments were not reviewed by commission before maps were removed. Map 2A should be kept. Would encourage the commission to pay more attention to what the Wichitans are saying. Concerned that the feedback was not considered.

Dozier comments: There will be motions to make amends to the current maps. This will be in open discussion.

Committee sets the goal to narrow down more maps and to come up with a recommendation for city council. The next meeting will be August 24, 2022 at 5:30 PM.

Mike Kolmeyer comments: An updated ranking form for those 7 can be sent out. Also, for rankings to be completed by Sunday for staff to collect the rankings and send out the ranking results on Monday via email.

**Note: Request for staff to send out an update on the maps under consideration.**

Motion to Adjourn by Gregory, seconded by Gonzalez. Approved (7-0)