

Board members in attendance:

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

CAB Chairs or designees in attendance:

Fred Pinaire, Nalini Fraser, Levi Craig

Staff in attendance:

Tania Cole, Mike Fessinger, Jack Joseph, Christian Lamielle, Corinthian Kelly, Paul Leeker

Call Meeting to Order:

Patrick Penn called the meeting to order at 5:35

Consideration of Minutes:

Schodorf moved to approve the minutes. Howerton seconded.

Amendments to minutes: Lamont Anderson was present. Include update info from email. Wanted to clarify his comments. Wanted to provide clarity about CAB chair issue. Wants to have all voices present. Wanted to not be in a position to say whether the CABS should or should not be here. He didn't want to step on the toes of the commissioners. He wanted this clarified. If the Commissioners wanted to deviate he felt it was a conversation that should be had with the Commissioners. He wanted to make sure that all of the chairs were here and the invitation was extended with charity. Strongly noted that he loves the Chair. He was not trying to be exclusionary in any type of way. A process where everyone could be involved.

Elizabeth Stanton was in attendance.

Passed unanimously. 5:41 minutes adopted as amended.

Public Agenda:

Tania Cole presented the public comment. There are six comments for review. At the next meeting we will take the comments from 4:00 this afternoon up to the day of the next meeting.

Penn asked if anyone had any issues. Miller had no issues. She had a question—what, as a committee, will we be doing with these comments. For direction's sake.

Penn answered that public comment was important to allow public voice. This will allow the committee to take their views into consideration in the selection process. Will color and flavor our discussion. It is the work of the committee to make the decision. It is the work of the committee to make the decision—just want to hear all voices.

Yingling had a question for staff. She asked about U. Is that for unknown?

Cole affirmed that.

Yingling asked if it was possible to verify address. To ensure that they are in the district they are commenting on

Cole answered we can add a field and make it a mandatory field to submit a request.

Miller had more comments. Communities of interest were addressed in the public comment. She remembers asking Jack Joseph about communities of interest. The answer she got back involved population. She wanted to discuss other factors. She is seeing comments about not splitting community interests and diluting community of interests. Comments about maintaining racial balance. Ensuring that minority populations are not splintered. The community has shown they care about this.

Schodorf felt that we constitutionally had to discuss this. Is this a matter of a common story about a neighborhood? Is this quantitative? Race, religion, common purpose, common theme—such as Delano—are all definitions of communities of interest. We need to explore all definitions of “communities of interest”. We don’t want these groups to be splintered into 4 different districts that will take the voice from these communities of interest. We don’t want to split neighborhoods. Taking into consideration groups based on race or ideology; if they are to be split they should be divided in a way to maximize their voices rather than dilute them. This is a must. We have to consider this. Population and compactness are important. Communities of interest have to be considered. It might be good to determine guiding principles for communities of interest.

Penn interjected that there are housekeeping actions that need to be taken care of.

Schodorf wrapped it up in one sentence. We constitutionally must consider communities of interest.

Penn asked how often these are checked

Cole answered they can be submitted at any time. Will be presented at the next meeting

Old Business:

New Business:

A. Rules of Redistricting Committee

- a. Presented by: Michael Fessinger, Assistant County Counselor
 - i. Talking through proposed rules drafted with Penn and Miller
 - ii. Based largely on Roberts Rules of Order
 - iii. Lots of guardrails
 1. Make suggestions about too much/not enough structure
 - iv. Has corrections to make
 - v. During an agenda item this committee will consider what it will do
 1. To do this there must be a motion
 - vi. A member must achieve recognition from Chair and make a motion.
 - vii. Must get a second.
 - viii. The motion will fail for lack of a second.
 - ix. If there is a second, the Chair will announce the motion.
 - x. The motion maker will speak first.

- xi. The Chair will recognize speakers
- xii. 10 minutes of open date
 - 1. Further speaking periods can be limited to 2 minutes
- xiii. Debate must be germane to motion
- xiv. During debate committee members may move to amend motion
 - 1. Remove, insert words, etc.
- xv. Chair moves for a vote
- xvi. Motions can be withdrawn
- xvii. You can move to end debate. A second is required. There is no debate on this. No amendment on this.
 - 1. It says a majority vote is required. Fessinger recommends that it should be a 2/3's majority to end debate.
 - 2. This ensures that debate is not unreasonably stymied
- xxviii. A motion can be tabled without a vote
 - 1. A second would be required. No debate. No amendments.
 - 2. Tabled motions can be moved again.
- xix. Recess can be taken
 - 1. No debate/no vote
 - 2. Call for it and Chair approves
- xx. Adjournment done at the prescribed time by Chair Penn
- xxi. Current speaker can be interrupted and the nature of the issue can be resolved by the Chair
- xxii. Points of issue, order, etc. can be made to the Chair
- xxiii. These rules provide the requirement that you be physically present to vote
 - 1. If you wish to resign you have to have a written resignation
 - 2. Your replacement needs to be selected and sworn in before they vote
 - 3. If the rules, as amended are approved, he will make this modifications
- xxiv. Anything here can be discussed and changed
- xxv. Penn is going to lean on Miller to determine who is next in speaking and she will record votes
- xxvi. Rathbun wanted to know where it was different from Robert's Rules and why
 - 1. Roberts' Rules allows for a majority vote in number 11
 - a. This is moved to 2/3s to ensure streamlining
 - 2. Fessinger took the liberty to remove items that did not apply and where to "crunchy" for this committee
- xxvii. Yingling is ending debate to take one vote on ending debate and then another vote on the motion at hand.
 - 1. Fessinger confirmed this.
- xxviii. Penn sought more comments. There were none.
- xxix. Penn moved to adopt the rules as amended. Dozier seconded. Passed Unanimously.

- xxx. Roll Call Vote
- xxxi. **Passed unanimously.**
- xxxii. Howerton asked if microphones were necessary.
 - 1. Penn answered that they were required.

B. Down selection of Redistricting Maps

a. Presented by: Patrick Penn

- i. This is the business that we are here
- ii. He approached the Pro Tem offline and wanted to have 11 maps
- iii. Relayed what he said over email
- iv. The BOCC is looking for a bipartisan map
- v. Our charge is recommend a map
- vi. We are going to take a liberty and had any recommendation that we feel necessary
- vii. He feels we can add two maps
- viii. To get to a map they would dismiss out of hand any particularly partisan map
- ix. Penn's ideal, and hope, is that we can come together and agree with maps that aren't going to make the cut and streamline down to maps that we think can work
- x. Would love to have thoughts about this concept in order to make our limited time as productive as possible
- xi. Yielded time to Miller
 - 1. She agreed with preferences
 - 2. She asked, via email, if there is an additional map that comes from the public; i.e. the League of Women Voters as an example, is there an opportunity for us to consider any additional map outside of the 11? Is that something the body should discuss?
- xii. Penn answered that his feeling was that this body would not take up a map from the League of Women voters, but rather the data behind the map.
- xiii. Not generally opposed to hearing maps from outside this body
 - 1. He feels that this body's work is to look at the maps generated so far
- xiv. Fessinger stated that item D would be appropriate time to bring up a new map
- xv. Speaking of guiding principles: communities of interest are important to her and she would like to open the floor to discuss communities of interest as a framework to consider when culling maps
- xvi. Penn does not have a guiding set of principles motivating him
- xvii. If there is a map of the 11 that is automatically going to receive an 8 to 7 vote those should be the one that we get rid of
 - 1. These maps would hurt bi-partisanship
- xviii. Penn is sensitive to people's time
- xix. Dozier had a question, as long as we follow the rules, can a member amend a map that is down selected at the next meeting.

- xx. Miller asked if it was possible to amend motions passed tonight?
 - 1. Dozier wanted to find out if a heavily amended map could be voted on next week.
- xxi. Miller is amenable to this. She noted that we are under a time constraint. We are going to cull it to 5 tonight. It's just time that we are working against.
- xxii. Fessinger interjected that the agenda item is just for down selecting maps. He recommends that we proceed to down voting.
- xxiii. Yingling wanted to hear from CABS first. She wants to eliminate maps drawn by Commissioners if we are going to limit the maps submitted.
- xxiv. Levi Henry mentioned that Miller stated that it would 2/3s of a vote to amend a map.
 - 1. Fessinger confirmed that it would take just a majority vote
- xxv. Miller asked what actions required 2/3s vote
 - 1. To end debate early
 - 2. To overrule the Chair's determination on issue within his purview
- xxvi. Penn answered that down selection would help guide CAB chair conversation.
- xxvii. Let's hear discussion.
- xxviii. Penn recognized Naquela.
 - 1. Maps 1 and Maps 5 have the most change
 - 2. The disenfranchisement rate is the largest in those maps
 - 3. If we are looking at population and compactness she would recommend taking 1 and 5 out of consideration
- xxix. Pack so moved. Howerton seconded. Open for discussion.
- xxx. Yingling was going to wait. She wanted to bring up that point 11 on the slide from last week makes a flawed assumption. Moving voters can lead to enfranchisement. She does not agree that voters are disenfranchised in maps 1 and 5. Many are moved from governor to presidential year and more voters turn out. This would increase their voting rights. There have been issues with how maps have been drawn in the past.
- xxxi. Schodorf appreciates that argument. Voter turnout is higher in presidential years that could benefit the district. Comments about Map 1. IT keeps 40% of the black vote in one district. Right now it is split between 3 districts. This is a benefit she sees in Map 1. District 1 and 4 changes would line with State Senate districts. It unifies Delano. Map 5 is the most compact map. This is the most equivalent map we have. It also creates diversity in commissioners. Two city cores. Southside and Southeast Wichita. This is a lot of aircraft community. Would have a rural commissioners. This map provides max compactness and max population diversity. She actually found these maps to be beneficial.
- xxxii. Dater noted that 11% of the population would be disenfranchised. The next closest is 5.5% of the population in Map 1. There is a huge gap with these two raise concerns with him.

- xxxiii. Schodorf spoke that disenfranchisement is one consideration. When considering which maps to take out there are important differences to consider. There are statistics supporting published in the Eagle supporting this. They do split communities of interest. Riverside is furious about this. There are maps that split Indian Hills, Riverside, etc. in the north end. She has heard from those residents that they don't want to be split up.
- xxxiv. Pack wanted to comment about Yingling and Schodorf. When she is looking at Map 5 it has some of the highest impoverished minority populations being moved to District 1 that has some of the highest income areas of the County.
- xxxv. Dater mentioned that we have 11 maps and we can hopefully find more maps that address these issues.
- xxxvi. Miller would like for the committee to consider discussing all the maps at one time than one at a time.
- xxxvii. Pack would be willing to withdraw the motion. Schodorf seconded the motion.
- xxxviii. Penn noted that we have a withdrawal.
- xxxix. Penn wants to vote on the motion on the floor. And he wanted to comment on Schodorf's comment. Penn noted that there was no such thing as the black vote. Schodorf responded that she was using statistics. Schodorf asked him not to do that. Penn noted that if you have put all the black voters in one district that leaves 4 districts for white voters. If we are going to do this in a way that brings people together we must not have government sanctioned segregation.
 - xl. Schodorf found Penn's comment offensive to staff.
 - xli. Putting populations in 2 districts gives them strong presence in 2 districts gives them strength. She finds his comments highly offensive.
 - xl.ii. Penn noted that one of the maps split Maize.
 - 1. The residents were happy about this
 - xl.iii. Schodorf asked Penn to not misrepresent her views.
 - xl.iiii. Fessinger clarified that there is no debate. They must vote to end the debate. By a vote of 10 to 5 the motion carries.
 - xl.v. Dater wanted clarification about whether we were voting for down selecting 1 and 5.
 - xl.vi. Vote of 11 to 4. Motion carries.
 - xl.vii. Yingling moved to remove Commissioner Maps. Seconded by Henry
 - xl.viii. Yingling stated that she felt that plan 1 was the most bipartisan map. The easiest way to get consensus is to remove the maps drawn by Commissioners. There was no way around the fact that they were made in their self-interest.
 - xl.ix. Miller agreed and would like to amend the motion. Would like to consider removing 2 additional maps. 7 and 8.
 - I. Miller moved. Schodorf seconded.
 - li. Penn asked if there were any questions.

- lii. Howerton asked if we were talking about removing 5 maps, or just remove 7 and 8.
- liii. Penn confirmed.
- liv. Pint wanted to hear the thoughts about 7 and 8.
- lv. Miller answered that they separate communities of interest. She is definitely supportive of remaining cohesiveness of communities.
- lvi. Schodorf also noted that 7 and 8 dilute city center voice. Cheney, Garden Plain and Andale would dilute city core. 7 and 8 disrupt a number of communities of interest. It splits Viola and Clearwater.
- lvii. Penn asked if there were any questions about the amendment.
- lviii. Vail wanted to know the legality of how we are defining communities of interest. Cutting Maize in half is a community of interest.
 - 1. Fessinger answered that there was no legal definition of community of interest are. It is up to the committee to determine what a community of interest is.
- lix. Vail wanted to emphasize that he rejected communities of interest by being classified as types of people
- lx. Miller responded that when you are looking at communities from a different perspective. Communities of interest can be flexible, but it is going to involve people and what it is they center their lives around. This involves people. Miller duly noted that Vail disagreed with this. But, she disagreed with his assessment.
- lxi. Yingling wanted to address that 7 and 8 split up neighborhood associations in the area
- lxii. Pint wanted to put it out that the reality is that it is not up to us to define communities of interest. This process does not allow enough time for that.
- lxiii. Rathburn would be interested in hearing from a proponent of Map 7 and 8 and why they feel that way.
- lxiv. Penn asked if there were proponents of maps 7 and 8 while we are discussing the friendly amendment to Yingling's original motion about maps 9, 10, and 11
- lxv. Howerton was not a proponent of 7 and 8. He felt that the BOCC had shifted their responsibility to this committee without much time and without much support.
- lxvi. Dozier noted that there are other maps that are equivalent populations that don't have the problems of 7 and 8.
- lxvii. Penn called the questions. Tended to agree with Dozier and these maps fit within the confines of the law. There has been a lot of talk about communities of interest. Things that are incumbent on us are population and compactness. Those are needed. Communities of interest are nice to have.
- lxviii. Penn recognized Jack Joseph
 - 1. Communities of interest are hard to define
 - 2. It takes data into account that he doesn't have

3. He agreed that communities of interest are best self-defined
- lxix. Penn recognized Pack and she mentioned that Kansas City allows communities of interest to define themselves.
- lxx. Penn sought further comments about the friendly motion
- lxxi. Schodorf said that we must weigh all of these factors
- lxxii. Penn called the questions. Seconded by Howerton. Passed 14 to 1.
- lxxiii. Back to the original motion. Debate can continue.
- lxxiv. Vail spoke in favor of Plan 11. Felt that it was good for equalizing demographic factors.
- lxxv. Yingling spoke that we have removed the most compact and the most egalitarian map so far. We have to consider more obscure factors now. Plan 11 mixes up a ton of communities. Doesn't consider what kind of folks who live in those e communities. Goddard, Haysville, and Delano are very different. A single commissioner would be hard pressed to represent the district. Map 11 would make the races for county commissioner very expensive.
- lxxvi. Schodorf thought that Plan 11 was wild. The homeless population in Wichita would be in the same district as Bentley. It would move City Center way out west. Would move a lot of election days. Would dilute city center vote. Dilutes it by bringing in rural communities in each one of these districts. This maps has the highest number of disenfranchised voters.
- lxxvii. Henry called the question.
- lxxviii. Howerton asked if we vote yay on this we are done to 4 maps. This would be better than we had hoped.
- lxxix. Howerton called the question.
- lxxx. Before this, Miller wanted to backtrack. The maps that have been removed have been considered the most compact and the most egalitarian. She would question the definitions used. If you look at the urban core, Map 5 consolidates it. Miller is concerned with moving WSU out to district 1. Looking at moving Maize out of district 4 would be problematic.
- lxxxi. Henry moved to end debate. Dater seconded them option.
- lxxxii. Henry withdrew motion to end debate.
- lxxxiii. The amended motion is to remove Plans, 7,8,9,10,11
- lxxxiv. 12 to 3 passed.
- lxxxv. 1,5, 7,8,9,10,11 down selected
- lxxxvi. 6,3,4,2 remain.

C. Discussion by Commissioner Citizens Advisory Board Chairs

- a. Presented by District 1 Chair or designee –Levi
 - i. These meetings have occurred in the interim between meetings
 - ii. Would like to highlight:
 1. First, we prioritized what we thought were important
 2. One of the members liked that split hospitals into 2 districts

3. Jabara master plan has come up. Bel Aire and any regulations that might have to be adapted. Wanted to keep Bel Aire connected to this.
 4. Concerned with Map 5. Was not popular.
 5. Map 3 was liked for minimal impact. Hated for splitting Riverside.
 6. Map 2 had a common area of interest where Mead is currently split. It would shift between 1 and 5. This could reunify a split community. They would vote in the same election.
- b. Presented by District 2 Chair or designee
 - c. Presented by District 3 Chair or designee
 - d. Presented by District 4 Chair or designee-Nalini Fraser
 - i. Not much discussion at the CAB
 - ii. Questions from Board
 1. Why is this being rushed?
 2. Who set the date?
 3. Continuity of representation.
 - a. People will have commissioners they didn't vote for
 4. Want to keep communities of interest together
 - a. Race
 - b. Economic factors
 5. Is it better for a community of interest to be retained in one district, or spread out across district to expand their voice
 - e. Presented by District 5 Chair or designee-Fred Pinaire
 - i. Forgot his notes
 - ii. Most of comments were relegated to maps that had been voted out
 - iii. Wanted to raise questions about communities of interest
 - iv. Wanted to think of Sedgwick County as a community of interest
 - v. If you want to look at partisan, racial, ethnic distinctions you miss Sedgwick County.
 - vi. The only community of interest is where you live.
 - vii. Felt that the committee was overthinking the concept of communities of interest. Someone will come out on the short side now, but they will come out on the long side next time.
 - viii. The least number of people effected should be determinative. The committee is overthinking this process and there is a time constraint.
- D. Discussion of Redistricting Maps
- a. Presented by: Representative Patrick Penn
 - i. We have maps 6,3,4 and 2 for consideration over the next week.
 - ii. This will be the piece we deal with next time.
 - iii. At this time he would like to seek comments about the maps.
 - iv. Miller had no additional comments. Looked forward to making comments.
 - v. Vail wanted to go on record as the redefinition of disenfranchised. In any redistricting process people will have their votes accelerated and people will have their votes delayed.

- vi. Pack asked if the committee is able to create a 5th map since we are down to 4 maps. Pack wanted to see if Joseph could create another.
- vii. Penn answered that the trend should be towards reduction, but he is willing to follow the will of the committee.
- viii. Schodorf sought clarification about the goal of the committee.
 - 1. Penn answered it was to get down to one map
- ix. Pin wanted to ensure that the county get the message out about public comment. She felt it was disheartening to see so little public comment.
- x. Howerton appreciated that we have all gathered to help our community. The number of comments reflects the engagement of the community. He felt that 50% of the community had no idea who their commissioner was. He thought it would be great to have more insight in where the commenters are from. He appreciates the input.
- xi. Henry agrees with Pint. We need more comment from the community. He feels that more needs to be done to share the link. It is not all on the County to do this. It is on us to share with out people
- xii. Yingling wanted to comment on Naquella's point that the rules allow for amendment to the maps.
 - 1. Fessinger clarified this point. It is possible. Jack Joseph has the capacity to generate maps.
- xiii. Yingling also was disappointed that people messaged her, but they didn't submit public comment. She requested that they take the time to fill out the public comment and list your neighborhood to give us more perspective.
- b. Penn wanted to thank the members for their work. He wanted to end by stating how impressed he was. This debate and discussion has been interesting. He extended his praise to Schodorf for her diligence. Penn wanted the committee members to look at the other maps to have that level of detailed discussion. We receive information from our communities. Bring that in. We want to hear all of their voices to shape our views. For the Wichita citizens.

Adjourn:

Penn adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.