



Sedgwick County... *working for you*

Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee

Board of County Commissioners Meeting Room

November 23, 2021

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members in Attendance: Patrick Penn, Melody Miller, Vail Fruechting, Leann Moore, Joseph Dozier, Keith Dater, Martha Pint, Naquela Pack, Kelly Schodorf, Con Howerton, Casey Yingling, Levi Henry, Randal Rathbun, Lamont Anderson, Elizabeth Stanton

County staff present: Tania Cole, Assistant County Manager; Mike Fessinger, Assistant County Counselor; Jack Joseph, GIS Director; Corinthian Kelly, Christian Lamielle, Paul Leeker, Management Interns

- Tania Cole introduced the meeting with the swearing in of members
- Kelly Arnold took the oath from members

Introductions

- Patrick Penn, the Chair, thanked the Committee Members, Tania Cole, and the County Clerk. Penn expressed appreciation for the work that will be done and stressed the importance of redistricting.
- Melody Miller, Vice Chair, introduced herself. She is a former Sedgwick County Commissioner and former state representative.
- Vail Fruechting
 - SW Kansas native
 - Family of 3
 - 11 grandkids
- Leann Moore
 - Retired military
 - From Derby
 - Moved to Wichita
- Joseph Dozier
 - Wagonmaster
- Elizabeth Stanton

- From Derby
 - 4 children and a husband
 - Keith Dater
 - Worked for Mike Pompeo
 - Martha Pint
 - Works at Federal Court House
 - League of Women's Voter
 - NaQuela Pack
 - Born and raised in Wichita
 - DAB 1 advisory Board
 - Works at WSU
 - Kelly Schodorf
 - Attorney
 - Lifelong Wichitan
 - Con Howerton
 - Pastor Temple Baptist Church
 - From Oklahoma
 - 4 daughters
 - 3 grandkids
 - Excited to help people
 - Casey Yingling
 - Has COVID and cannot be there in person
 - Lifelong Wichitan
 - Lawyer
 - Levi Henry
 - Works in elections office
 - Excited to serve
 - Lamont Anderson
 - Lifelong Wichitan
 - Small business owner
 - Formerly served on Citizens Advisory Board District 3
 - Current member of DAB City Council District 5
-
- Penn wanted the County staff to introduce themselves. Tania Cole introduced herself as an Assistant County Manager, Mike Fessinger introduced himself as Assistant County Counselor, Jack Joseph introduced himself as Director of GIS, Paul Leeker introduced himself as Management Intern.
 - Penn requested Tania Cole read the resolution establishing the Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee into the record. She did so.
 - Penn asked if there any questions about the resolution. Miller asked if the terms "compactness" and "equal" were defined.
 - Penn wanted to seek more clarification from the counselor's office on definitions.

- Fessinger answered that the terms are not defined in the resolution, but that he would more clarity in his presentation.
- Penn made a few remarks on the process
 - Next week the committee will vote on rules governing their actions
 - Today's meeting is informational
 - The committee will be following Robert's Rules of Order
- Penn wanted to encourage members to attend the meetings in person in order to be as involved as possible.

County Staff Presentations

- **Mike Fessinger (Assistant County Counselor) presentation:**
 - Thanked the Committee for their time
 - Assistant County Counselor
 - One of the staff members who will be providing assistance
 - Wants to go over a few things
 - The role of the committee, the redistricting process, and a brief examination of the maps
 - You are aware of your directive and the time to fulfil this directive
 - These meetings are subject to KOMA
 - This committee is subject to KOMA
 - 8 or more members make a quorum
 - Cannot gather in a group of 8
 - ancillary considerations can be made in email
 - General considerations
 - Redistricting is the process by which districts are established
 - Equal
 - Compact
 - Comport with County, Federal, State Law
 - Done every 10 years in accord with Census
 - State law establishes that the BOCC adopts the districts via resolution
 - BOCC in control of the process
 - Compactness relates to geographic boundaries of the 5 districts
 - "territory that is closely united"
 - It is important, but it can be subordinate to population
 - Districts in lower density areas tend to be larger
 - Population equivalence is important because larger populations mean less representation
 - 500 in one district vs. 1000 in another as an example
 - A variance of up to 5% is generally acceptable in state law
 - Staff's goal is less than 1%
 - Directed attention to census results
 - Population data from 2010
 - Population data from 2020
 - District 1,3,5 grew at roughly the same rate

- Ranging from 4.5 to 6%
- District 2 grew by 1.3%
- District 4 grew by 8.2%
 - This is the disparity that needs to be corrected to get us back into acceptable variance
- Staff set about the process and created maps
 - Were acceptable from population and compactness
 - All maps were in compliance with federal and state law
- Shot for districts that were generally representative of the county
 - Wanted continuity
 - Respected communities
 - Wanted to ensure that commissioners stayed in their districts
 - Maintained voting precincts
 - Looked at city boundaries
 - It is permissible to split cities
 - Thought about voters placed on 2 year and 6 year voting terms
 - Not illegal, but wanted to avoid this where possible
 - Explanation of current districts and the 11 plans
 - **Plan 1**
 - A number of major changes
 - Maize goes from 4 to 3
 - WSU moves from 4 to 1
 - **Plan 2**
 - Less changes
 - WSU goes from 4 to 1
 - **Plan 3**
 - Riverside and Indian Hills from 4 to 2
 - **Plan 4**
 - Similar to Plan 3
 - **Plan 5**
 - Major redraw
 - Attempt at absolute population equivalency
 - More of a donut effect
 - 4 and 2 would encompass Wichita
 - 1,3,5 would be more rural
 - **Plan 6**
 - This creates the closest population equivalency
 - Less than ¼% off
 - **Plan 7**
 - Similar to other plans
 - Riverside and Indian Hills from 4 to 2
 - (repetition is due to population disparity—some answers are easy)
 - **Plan 8**

- Similar to many
 - Indian Hills moves from 4 to 2
 - Hyde moves from 1 to 4
 - 3 would gain newer housing editions
 - **Plan 9**
 - Proposed by Commissioner Cruse
 - Riverside remains in 4
 - Other neighborhoods would be shifted to 2
 - Sunnyvale would go to 1
 - **Plan 10**
 - Proposed by Commissioner Howell
 - More transformative
 - 2,3,4 trade a lot of territory
 - 2 and 4 extend further to the west
 - **Plan 11**
 - Proposed by Commissioner Howell
 - Goddard would go from 3 to 2
 - 3 would pick up urban area
 - Colwich and Bentley would go from 3 to 4
- Kelly asked if the maps could be shown at the precinct level
 - Fessinger answered in the affirmative
- **Jack Joseph's (GIS Director) presentation:**
 - Wanted to go through dashboard on website
 - (Penn directed members to screen)
 - Johnson showed where to get to dashboard
 - The front page is a FAQ/overview
 - Not as detailed as Fessinger's presentation
 - Maps/charts are available
 - Quick overview
 - White lines are current boundaries
 - Can be turned on/off
 - Precincts can be seen by zooming in
 - Includes population data
 - The top left shows population and population deviation for each plan
 - To view all 11 proposed plans there is a drop-down menu in the top-right corner of the screen
 - Shows census data
 - Every plan falls within 1% population deviation
 - As you select the plans the stats on the left automatically update
 - Plan 6 is the closest plan to equivalence
 - 09% deviation
 - Plan 3 had the highest deviation
 - But, the minimum amount of change

- .77% population deviation
- There is other data that we wanted to provide to the members
- Two different spreadsheets were created
 - One has every precinct with population and whether it was moved
 - Proposed square miles and the target population
 - Precincts with delayed voting
 - Precincts and population
 - Precincts with 'advanced voting'
 - Moving ahead in the election cycle
 - Pint asked for clarification
 - Joseph answered that they were moving ahead in the election cycle
 - Penn requested members what for recognition before asking question
 - The other spreadsheet demographic information
 - Current boundaries with 2010 census data
 - Current boundaries with 2020 census data
 - The spreadsheets contain demographic data from the United States Census
 - Naquela asked about how areas of common interest were determined
 - Joseph answered there were 2 approaches
 - Trying to hit population with little impact
 - Trying to get population deviation as close to zero as possible
 - Population was the driving factor
 - With the smallest change possible
 - Miller asked if population was the overriding factor when considering factors
 - Joseph answered yes
 - Fessinger answered that compactness and population equality were required by law
 - The other factors aren't
 - Howerton asked if the fewer precincts were moved that would lead to fewer people disenfranchised?
 - Not necessarily, it all depends on the size of the precinct
 - If a district moved to Districts 2 or 3 they would have a delay
 - If they were moved from Districts 2 or 3 they would have advanced voting
 - Penn asked if the lines were drawn for least impact and not considering gender/race but the law considers only population and compactness (2:00 p.m.)
 - Penn asked if there were issues with the members messing up the spreadsheets
 - Joseph answered no issues
 - Pint asked what "generally representative of the county refer to"

- Fessinger answered that this was subjective
 - Delano district was the example
 - You could consider not splitting that
 - It is a subjective consideration
- Dozier asked if staff had any recommendation about state law defining areas of common interest
 - Fessinger answered that there was not much clarity from the state
- Penn thanked Joseph
- Asked if there were any questions from the Zoom

Future Meeting Times

- Penn requested members look at their calendars
 - We have to have the project by no later than 11:59 on December 10
 - Wanted to backward plan
 - Wanted to have staff have 2 days to prepare the report
 - Wanted input on the meeting schedule
 - Weekends/weekdays?
 - What is the pleasure of the body?
 - Miller wanted to hear from the committee
 - Pack asked if there was a time limit on the meetings
 - Penn wanted the meetings to last 1 to 1.5 hour
 - No limit on the Zoom
 - Will post for 1.5 hours, with flexibility
 - Pack wanted to know the number of meetings
 - 3 total
 - Howerton asked if it would be easier for the staff if it was during the day?
 - Cole answered we can meet anytime
 - Dozier mentioned that Monday presented issues with DABs
 - Miller asked the committee members if meeting during the day challenged anyone?
 - Is it preferable to meet after hours?
 - Rathburn's preference would be for evening hours
 - But, he didn't want to set the schedule for one member
 - Penn wanted to do this during the weekdays
 - Penn wanted them in the evenings on Tuesdays
 - Unless anyone really wanted to serve during lunch
 - Food attracts people
 - Penn planned on the next 2 Tuesday evenings
 - Nov. 30 and Dec. 7
 - Howerton asked how does parking work in the evening

- Cole answered that getting into the parking garage would not be problem
- Dozier had a conflict, but would be able to clear his calendar for the meeting
- Leann asked what time
 - Penn answered after 5 p.m.
 - 5:30 or 6:0 start time
- On Dec. 8/9 the time would be set aside for the staff to generate the final product
- 9 a.m. on the 10th the chair and vice chair would get it to the BOCC
- Nov. 30 would be downselecting maps
- Kelly noted that there would be two additional conflicts on the 7th
- Kelly asked if the 6th would work?
- If we push it to the 8th, would that effect staff's ability to prepare a report
 - Joseph answered that that would be plenty of time
- Howerton mentioned that he could the 8th, but he has to leave by 6:40
- Kelly noted that the 8th works for Casey, Levi, and Rathburn, Vail
- The only conflict on the 8th is Howerton at 6:40
 - Would an early start help?
- Final meeting on December 8th at 5:00 p.m.
- Keith Dater has a conflict on the 8th that can't be missed
- Penn asked what the turnaround time for the 10th
- Are people available on the 9th?
 - Would that give Joseph the time
 - Joseph answered that, if needed, it can be done
- The 9th is out
- The best date is the 8th
- Fruechting asked if a Tuesday lunch would work?
- Penn entertained any time on any days?
- Kelly answered that she had 2 out for the 7th
 - Penn confirmed that the 7th was stricken
- The 8th was fine, if it was lunch
- The meeting on December 8 will be lunch (noon)
- November 30 at 6:00 p.m.
- December 8 at noon
- Penn wanted as many people as possible to attend in person
 - Find someone in your stead if you cannot attend
 - Keep him informed
- 23rd was the intro meeting
- 30th downselect to 5 maps
- (Penn had a thought he wanted to submit to the body—he asked Anderson if there was any value to have CAB chairs present. He didn't feel he was in a position to answer. Anderson stated that is was not his intent to perhaps pursue a path in which the Commissioner's had maybe discussed with their chairs prior to appointments and went in other directions. He expressed some hesitation if all CAB chairs could not be present. However, adding voices to the process is always a positive outcome.)
 - Penn agreed

- Miller felt it was good to hear from them
- Penn wanted to invite CAB chairs to allow them to make comments
- 8th lunch will be a downselect to 3
- Wants to deliver a decision brief that allows for 3 course of action
- Will be presented to BOCC
- The final brief meeting will be between the chair and vice chair at 10 on the 9th
- Fessinger clarified that the resolution charges the committee to come up with a map
- Penn clarified
 - One map and two recommendations
- Miller wanted clarification about Dec. 8 meeting
 - Penn answered the body will pick one map and then make 2 recommendations if the body feels strongly
- Leann More asked about the time for Nov. 30
 - 5:30 p.m. on the 30th
 - Noon on the 8th
- Cole asked the members to check roster to make sure it was accurate and to find her about validating parking
- Penn reminded the committee to obey KOMA
- Penn asked about repository for public comment
- Cole answered that we have a link for the public to make comment
 - We are receiving public comment there until the 15th of December
- Pint wanted to clarification if the public comment could be the form of a map
 - Cole thought the capability was just for comment
 - We can look into making the comment section available for accepting body
 - Penn felt that the committee should be the one preparing the maps
 - Not the public
- Pint was wondering because the League of Women Voters were requested by Commissioner Cruse to represent a map
 - Penn answered that they could bring forward a map
- Any member can bring forward a map from an organization they represent
- Penn's intent for this body is to make the maps, not to pass on maps
- Pack asked if there will be a community input section?
 - Cole answered that the comments can be provided to the committee at the next meeting
- Miller asked if the public will be making a decision making a based on the 10 maps
 - Cole answered that the public can review any of the maps
 - Cole answered that we will accept any public comment
 - Cole confirmed that the public won't be making maps
- Pint had another question about groups making maps
- Penn wanted to make sure if he was acting within the confines of the resolution as far as public comment/expected output/etc.
- Does it entail maps being generated from the outside?

- Fessinger answered that the directive was for members of this committee to study materials provided and if necessary to generate maps. Can take public input, but there was no directive for the general public to generate maps for this committee.
- Pint wanted clarification about who analyze the maps
 - Fessinger answered that the bailiwick of the committee is to reach consensus on a map (2:34)
- Miller asked about the appropriateness of having a group present a map through a member of the body.
 - Penn answered that any map brought forward would be under consideration
 - The main task of this committee is to present a map
- Last call for questions. Any issues?
- This meeting is adjourned at 2:36. The committee will reconvene at 5:30 on the 30th.