June 14, 2018

Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners  
30 West Pershing Road, Suite 2800  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108

Dear Board of Election Commissioners:

Kansas City Public Schools (KCPS) has conducted an evaluation of the three (3) subdistrict boundary maps proposed by the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners (KCEB). KCPS based its evaluation on traditional districting principles (population, compactness, contiguity, etc.), as well as, the feedback provided by members of the KCPS community (see Attachment A). It was clear that some adjustments to the KCEB proposed maps were needed based on community feedback. After evaluating several alternative scenarios, the KCPS Board of Directors recommends an alternative map – Alternative D. Attached, please find two versions of Alternative D for your review: 1) with precincts; and 2) with KCPS school sites and major roadways. KCPS has uploaded both versions of the Alternative D map and a copy of this letter to our website for our constituents’ review in advance of your June 20, 2018 board meeting.

KCPS has also received feedback from the community regarding the data used throughout this redistricting process. That feedback has pointed to the age of that data, how unreliable it likely is, and the disruption of holding an election in 2019 and again in 2021/2022. KCPS recognizes that the KCEB was instructed to take on this task. However, KCPS feels it important to share the feedback from the community for consideration by KCEB prior to the vote on June 20.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

Melissa Robinson  
Board Chair
**ATTACHMENT A:**

**KCPS Impact Assessment of 3 Maps Proposed by KCEB & KCPS Proposed Alternative D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Start with 6, Remove 1</th>
<th>Alternative 8</th>
<th>Alternative 9</th>
<th>KCPS Alternative D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns with Subdistricts 4 (Green) and 6 (Orange)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns with Subdistrict 6 (Orange)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Communities Together</td>
<td>Concerns with Subdistrict 3 (Pink)</td>
<td>Concerns with Subdistrict 5 (Blue)</td>
<td>Concerns with Subdistrict 5 (Blue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key for Colors and Terms:**

- **Green**: Successfully meets the criteria
- **Yellow**: Somewhat meets the criteria
- **Red**: Does not meet the criteria

**Population Equality**: Subdistrict populations are substantially equal.

**Continuity**: This refers to maintaining subdistricts as previously drawn, to the extent possible. This leads to continuity of representation.

**Contiguity**: All parts of a subdistrict being connected at some point with the rest of the subdistrict.

**Compactness**: Having the minimum distance between all the parts of a constituency (a circle, square or a hexagon is the most compact subdistrict).

**Keeping Communities Together**: Preserves long-standing communities of interest based on social, cultural, ethnic, and economic similarities. Ensures boundaries will not dilute the voting strength of racial or language minority populations. Ensures boundaries will not degrade a voter’s or a group of voters influence on the political process as a whole.