

# 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



NOTE: Because the Commission of Electors meetings were concluded on August 24, 2022, the following meeting notes were compiled and sent to the Commission of Electors for review by email. They were given an opportunity for corrections and feedback before being posted.

### Welcome & Roll Call

#### **Attendance**

<b>Members Present:</b> Marcy Gregory – In Person, John Whitmer – In Person, Javen Gonzalez – In Person, Lamont Anderson – In Person, Janet Johnson – Online, Patrick Penn – In Person, Joseph Dozier – In Person
<b>Members Absent:</b> None
<b>City Staff:</b> Sharon Dickgrafe, Scott Wadle, Mike Kollmeyer, Dan Cramer, Naomi Shapiro, Stephen Banks
<b>Public Attendance:</b> Faith Martin, Paul Bradley

Note: No corrections to the agenda

Gonzalez to motion for the acceptance of the agenda, seconded by Gregory (Approved 6-0)

Note: Meeting notes received from the following meeting(s): August 10, 2022 & August 17, 2022.  
No changes or corrections with no further discussion.

Gregory motions to accept the previous notes as they stand seconded by Gonzalez.

### Item 5: Process Status Review

- Process Review
- August 31, 2022 – Recommendation to City Council

Sharon comments: The process and the task at hand.

- Dividing Wichita into 6 pieces following the Charter ordinance in which states that those should be equal to the greatest extent feasible.
- Expressed concern (memo) in percentages in deviations.
- In 2012 the highest deviation was district 6 (positive 2.98) and the lowest in district 4 (negative 1.93).
- City council will make the final decision and changes.
- Mindfulness of violations concerning meetings
- Concerns that public feedback was not considered during August 17, 2022, meeting.
- Making sure that everyone is on the same page.

Note: No Questions or open discussion

#### Johnson comments:

- Concerned about not considering public comment.
- Staff map 2A was eliminated:

#### Reasons

- 1. Council member Johnson and DAB 1 wanted to keep century 2 in District 1.
- 2. Willowbend not wanting to be in district 1.
- Noted a previous discussion to not seek input from the electives
- Public amenity should dictate the maps. To consider that District 1 already has WSU, Old Town, the best neighborhood center, the best REC centers, swimming pool, golf course, park, Cargill, etc. District 3 has Watson Park.
- Century 2 has not fared well in District 1.
- Concerned with no members from Willowbend.
- Recommends that staff map 2A be reinstated for consideration.

**Dozier comments:** District 1 was questioned due to the information being inaccurate. The request from district 1 members was to not make unnecessary changes and not move many precincts around to try to correct the problem of population equivalency without huge shifts of folks receiving different representation. The preferences for precinct 103 to stay in district 1. The issue with staff scenario 2A is the 4.93% deviation. There has been growth on the east side. The point of staff scenario 2A was to bring on 216 and to use Rock Road as the border to provide the same representation. Century 2 was not the focus.

Note: Precinct 216 – 121, 213-111 and 212-102 are the same neighborhoods and are divided.

**Gregory comments:** To reinstate 2A to accommodate the public in those areas.

**Penn comments:** Requests a pause in making a motion to view other maps that might have already addressed the stated concerns. Whitmer to agree and notes not supporting a map with a 4.93 deviation.

**Gregory comments:** Concerns with having input from the council members who appointed the committee members. Concerned with the approval from Council member Johnson on Dozier maps.

**Dozier comments:** Clarifies that he did not confer with anyone. It was after he drafted certain scenario that he went to the DAB and cc'd council member Johnson to share with him. Dozier disclosed this information. Priority is with the DAB and keeping them in the loop. Council Johnson was in the loop on briefing the DAB and looking for feedback.

**Penn comments:** That council members have been present at meetings and are aware of the maps and the issues. Provides examples of members present.

**Whitmer comments:** The mayor has even had influence in conversation or organization. Declared candidates have influence the process.

**Gregory comments:** The action of going to council members puts a blemish on the process.

Notes: Conversation takes place in reference to the issues in the interpretation Dozier's actions in terms of his submitted maps.

**Anderson comments:** Contacted all council members for input and not for approval.

**Penn comments:** Not agreeing to the terminology of Gregory. And vouches for Dozier's character.

**Gonzalez comments:** Concern with the dismissive comments and having a conversation.

## **Item 6: Public Input Opportunities/Review**

Naomi comment: Not a lot of public engagement. Provides insight to some of the feedback submitted.

Johnson motions to reconsidering map 2A seconded by Gregory. (Approve 3 & 4 Opposed) Motion fails.

Note: No further discussion

Gregory motions for the following format:

- Motions and a second
- 3 minutes for public comment
- Back to commission for discussion
- Commission Vote

Seconded by Gonzalez. (Approved 7-0)

Discussion: Public Comment

- To have staff introduce maps and for the public to comment.

## **Item 7: Review of Ranking Survey**

Dan Cramer: The public dashboard will now include a status field. You can select all active and eliminated maps.

Notes: No questions or discussion

### **Survey Results:**

- Committee scenario 2 had the highest ranking, followed by:
- Staff scenario 1
- Committee scenario 3
- Committee scenario 2A
- Committee scenario 2D
- Committee scenario 2D2
- Staff scenario 6

Note: Does not include the 4 new maps introduced.

No Questions or Discussion

## **Item 8: Concept Map Ranking/Prioritization Process and Public Comments**

### 1. Committee scenario 3A – submitted by Anderson

- A hybrid combination of scenario 3, staff scenario 1, and committee scenario 2.
- Map addressed the concerns from the Eastridge neighborhood association and the desire to not be split apart.
- Protects all neighborhood associations and allows for no splits.
- Adds population into District 4 & reduces the population in District 5 to account for potential growth.
- Reduction in District 2 for potential growth and adds population to the areas of 1 & 3 in terms of growth ability.
- Encompasses a lot of the concerns that were addressed by the public.

Dozier comments: Discussion on District 3 being a south-central Wichita district. Most of these scenarios have either traded back certain precincts between District 1. Requesting that Anderson speaks to the additions to District 1 from District 3 (south of Kellogg).

Anderson comments: It was a trade off from where map 2 originally dropped a precinct from district 1 into District 3. States that there was just an alignment to get the numbers to where they were needed and to not create a huge

disruption (messy map). It was an inverse with map 2 and there was a given from district 1 into district 3 and vice versa.

Dozier comments: Moving precincts the same way and that the public had an issue.

No further questions or discussions

## 2. Committee Scenario 2F – submitted by Dozier

- 2F & 2H are basically the same maps except for one precinct.
- All the discussion except for one precinct overlaps with both of them and 2G is an answer to a problem during this that will be brought up in discussion.
- For 2F and 2H the hope is a compromise and improvement on the weeks of discussions that have taken place that where there have been concerns from commissioners.
- Considering public feedback from neighborhood association like Eastridge.
- 2F and 2H build on some of the prudent precinct decisions that Mr. Anderson made in committee map 2 & commissioner Whitmer made in committee map 2A and taking some of staff scenario 2A. This includes giving District 3 further south-central representation while not breaking up any new neighborhood associations and continuing to add precincts to district 1 west of Rock Road in addition to the neighborhood associations and precincts that has from district 2 to compensate for D2's growth like the city did 10 years ago.
- Communities can be connected as well as neighbors who were divided mid-block or street.
- Corrects the population deviation discrepancy between District 2.

## 2F & 2H Remedies: Dozier comments

- remedy numerous new neighborhood association splits. Committee map 2 and committee map 2A and other maps that split up the Long View and Fairfax neighborhood associations these don't do that with precinct 331 in which creates in the break in representation between owners. Also remedy staff 6, staff 1, committee 3 and all the other maps that split up Eastridge.
- Noting the domino effect amending such on those scenarios that would remain would wreck the deviation
- Remedy staff 2, staff 2A and my committee 2D by trying to give D3 further representation south of Kellogg. This splits up both the high neighborhood association and Sunnyside neighborhood association.
- Remedy staff 6 and staff 6A splitting south central neighborhood association from District 3
- Remedies stripping all projected growth areas from D6's current map as in committee 2A by returning the Northwest corridor growth opportunities around West 45<sup>th</sup> Street and Hoover Road back to districts that maintain current lines.
- Remedies all further neighborhood association splits that remain in the remaining scenarios including scenarios that split sunflowers South area, South Central and finally 2F2H builds on weeks of analysis and input from other to avoid these new splits while ensuring the most equitable representation of our city council of all remaining scenarios. Does not create new splits for neighborhood associations.
- This compromise protects one person one vote and achieves our primary tasking.
- Only changes representation for residents in 6 precincts city-wide and one of those precincts has 36 residents and it has a combined deviation from the target population of all districts together of only 3.55% in which substantially outdoes the deviations in every remaining scenario except committee 2D and staff 6 (both with a split in neighborhood associations that would have to be amended.
- Staff 6 breaks up Eastridge, so it outperforms all the maps in terms of deviation.
- District 2 in the negative population D deviation to account for no growth without having bother of either of D1 or D3 below 66,000 which occurs in many of these scenarios that remain.
- Avoids substantial deviations of almost 5 percent like staff scenario 2A and press scenario 1 and committee 2A

- The main difference between 2F and 2G if you overlay with the projected population growth it provides district 1 with a population growth on its East Side in which did not exist before. And precinct 216 connection to 121 so that explains 2H.
3. 2G – was an attempt to solve a concern from commissioner Johnson around precincts 336 and 325. The deviations are a little more varied with a few additional changes.

#### Questions and comments

**Penn comments:** Concern about Eastridge and how your scenarios hold for Eastridge and Sycamore area.

**Dozier comments:** Reviews the changes and addresses concerns.

**Penn comments:** Requested to hear feedback and input from Ms. Johnson for the scenarios in District 4.

**Whitmer comments:** Thoughts on 2F and 2H from Johnson.

**Johnson comments:** Favors maps submitted by Anderson, but could live with 2H

**Gonzalez comments:** Agrees with Johnson. Mr. Anderson's committee 2 map is a great map. A lot of variations are considered off the likes and dislikes of the commissioners. Ranking was high and the deviations are all under 1%, lines are compact and neighborhood associations are happy.

**Whitmer comments:** Committee map 2 has 5 neighborhood associations impacted and 2H has 3.

**Gonzalez comments:** The public has not responded negatively to committee scenario 2.

**Dozier comments:** Map 2H is an evolved map trying to address the concerns and the public comment through this. Map 2H leaves Delano currently leaves most of the current lines intact. Looking towards the future in terms of having District 3 and District 1 with 1 precinct south of Kellogg. This would lead to District 2 to compensate for its positive deviation, to have those precincts between Woodlawn and Rock that connect mid street to the neighborhoods associations and precinct's that already represents.

**Notes:** Public comments referenced on Delano.

**Whitmer comments:** Suggests for Dozier to unite Delano on map 2H.

**Dozier comments:** Cautions to be careful of the domino effect.

**Penn comments:** Question for Anderson on the reasoning on District 2 having a deviation percent negative 2.63.

**Anderson comments:** Close in terms of deviation numbers. It was east to draw from district 2 because of the anticipated growth. District 2 has tremendous opportunities.

**Whitmer comments:** Issue with 3A moves part of East Ridge from District 2 to District 3.

**Dozier comments:** Concerned with district 1 continuing further down south of Kellogg. States that D1 could give to D3 a better flow to maintain those communities of interests and the compactness from District 3 south of Kellogg versus spreading District 3 east into East Ridge.

**Anderson comments:** 3A became a hybrid it was those districts that shifted from 2 into 3 was a continuation of what was presented on staff scenario 1 and that map received a lot of positive feedback. Gives the community a variation variety of several maps and then combining those maps into one map.

#### Public Comment

##### **Paul Bradley (president of Eastridge Neighborhood Association)**

- Oldest association in Wichita established in 93 or 94 by Pat Winters.
- Preferred maps start with 2A as the first choice, 2 as second choice and 2H being the third choice.

- Best attended in the city and very engaged.
- Dislike maps 3, 1, and 6 because the maps split up the association in half along Lincoln Street into North and South halves.
- Concerns with consternation amongst the residents.

**Faith Martin (Eastridge Neighborhood Association Representative)**

- Appreciation on public comment and the importance of understanding what they are there to do.
- The feeling I that everyone is defending what they brought and not listening to what the public is saying.
- Also, to consider those that are not presents.
- To not add more maps.
- To get to the ones that really matter.
- Reiterates to be a little more respectful when the public is watching.

Whitmer motions to eliminate maps 3, 3A, 1, 6, 2D and 2D2. Lower ranked on the survey. Seconded by Gonzalez.

Open for discussion

**Gonzalez comments:** Based on the survey and discussion Map 2 or variation map 2 is the direction the commission is headed.

**Penn comments:** Asks Anderson why he ranked staff scenario 1 the way he did.

**Anderson comments:** Impressed by the deviation and it was supported the most by the public. Did not make very much movement. But it does separate a neighborhood association. Staff scenario 1 and staff scenario 2 became hybrid to ensure that it did not separate any neighborhood association. Notes being okay with the direction and if they protect 1 association, they need to be protecting them all.

**Whitmer comments:** In favor of map 2H because it impacts the fewest of the neighborhood associations then some of the other maps.

**Dozier comments:** Likes staff 1 for the deviations.

Motion passes (Approved 7-0)

Update of maps after motion passes:

1. Committee scenario 2
2. Committee scenario 2H
3. 2F
4. Committee scenario 2G
5. Committee scenario 2F

Dozier to amend motion to eliminate committee scenario 2G as well, seconded (Gonzalez & Whitmer) agree with the amendment to the motion.

Clarification on maps to be eliminated in the motion: 3, 3A, 1, 6, 2D, 2D2 and 2G.

No further discussion

7-0 (Approved)

Update on current maps

2, 2H, and 2F for maps remaining.

**Dozier & Whitmer comments:** Preference of 2H over 2F.

Dozier comment: 2H over 2. The difference between committee scenario 2 and committee scenario 2H is connecting precinct 216 to precinct 121. Longview and Fairfax are not split up.

#### Update on current maps

2, 2A, 2F, 2H

Dozier motions to accept as a recommended map committee scenario 2H, seconded by Whitmer.

(APPROVED 7-0)

Gonzalez comments: to amend motion to add committee scenario 2 to be submitted as a recommendation. (Not accepted)

Dozier comments: Committee scenario 2 takes from District 3 precinct 331 and puts it into district 1 in which splits Fairfax and Longview neighborhood associations. 2H is not changing the current map line, it is an improvement.

Gonzalez motions that the committee recommends committee scenario 2 and to edit moving precinct 331 to District 3 seconded by Anderson

- Changes 500 in population and leaves within the deviation.
- Dozier: with concern for District 1 and 3 being below 66,000 by moving 331 back into 3. District 1 would be brought down to a low 65,000.
- Gonzalez notes that deviation would be under 1% deviation.
- Whitmer suggests allowing staff to prepare this and to provide the deviations.
- Dozier: Explains concern with population deviations in 2H and 2. And recommending that map to city council. Dozier comments to be mindful of the next 10 years and possible growth within districts 1, 2, and 3.
- Discussion to take place on recommendations and editing of maps for before submitting to city council.

Dozier comments: 3% deviation difference between H and 2. And does not want to support a map that keeps district 1 and 3 below 66,000. Committee scenario 2 has district 2 and a positive deviation of 0.53. Committee scenario 2H has a negative deviation of 2.48 that which is a 3% difference in deviation. And worries that 3 and 1 will not have expected population growth areas.

Note: The commission is down to 4 remaining maps. Map 2H is going forward for recommendation. Map 2, 2F, and 2 A are still on the table for discussion.

Gonzalez states previous motion to recommend committee scenario 2 to the council with the only edit being moving 331 (precinct 331) back into district 3 seconded by Anderson

Approved (4) Opposed (3) – Motions Passes

Whitmer motions to eliminate map 2F and 2A seconded by Penn

Approved (7) Opposed (0) – Motions Passes

Dozier motions for the vote rankings to be shared on any recommended maps that are passed with the council as part of the recommendation seconded by Anderson.

Approved (5) Opposed (2)

- No further meetings are needed and so the task has concluded.

Penn motions to have staff generate what the culmination of your work has been as chair of this committee into a report no later than the 30<sup>th</sup> and to have it sent over to the city council no later than 5PM with the recommendations included as a package. Penn withdraws motion

#### **Item 9: Process Review**

Sharon comments on the next steps

Information is put on an agenda report, Placed on a city council agenda. The date is determined with input from the city council as well as the city manager. From that the agenda reports in this case talked about it going out to the DABS. Unknown to have it go to the DABS before it goes to city council, that directions would come from the city manager as to whether it is placed on a city agenda in September which may result in going back out to the dabs or whether they want to do the dabs first.

Scott Wadle comments: (Prior practice) Goes to city council and then city council sends it out to the dabs.

Sharon comments: In terms of process the report would be put into an agenda and then placed on an agenda in September because of the deadline.

Gregory comments: For any further closing remarks.

No further discussion

Dozier/Gregory motions to adjourn and a thank you. Meeting concludes.