ELECTION DAY
November 3, 2026
VOTER GUIDE

Editor's note: Within this year's 2026 Voter Guide, you will find information on each of the candidates running for local office in Derby. Among races for Sedgwick County Commission, Kansas House of Representatives and even the U.S. House of Representatives, there are a total of nine candidates seeking to represent their local constituents and serve their community.

Each candidate was presented with a questionnaire seeking some basic information of those running for office (years in the community, family, job, etc.), as well as a few questions regarding their qualifications and where they stand on current issues.

On top of the Voter Guide, The Informer will also be providing online election night coverage on Nov. 3 as results are received. Readers can expect to get updated results throughout the night at derbyinformer.com and through the Informer's social media channels. A breakdown of the winning candidates will be posted online once the races are called.

We at The Informer would like to thank all of the candidates for taking the time to participate in our election coverage and submitting their information and responses. It takes a special commitment to be willing to serve your community in this capacity, and these candidates have shown that investment and dedication. We are grateful for their willingness to run and represent the people of Derby.

Reading through this special election section, we at The Informer hope you gain a clearer understanding of who each candidate is in order to help you – the voter – make an informed decision on Election Day.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES – DISTRICT 4

Name: Drew Cranmer **Party:** Libertarian
Age: 40 **City:** Wichita
Spouse: Abby **Children:** 1
Education: Bachelor's of General Studies with a Minor in Political Science, Wichita State University
Current Employment: Reyes Holdings, 1 year
Previous Employment: TEC Systems Group/Cornerstone Data, 2 years; InfoSync Services; 7 years
Service History: N/A



Q: What, ideally, do you think could be done to provide more property tax relief for Kansas residents?

A: Property tax relief is mostly a state and local job. Congress shouldn't pretend otherwise, and I won't promise what a U.S. Representative can't deliver. But I have a clear view of what ideal relief looks like.

Property taxes hit hardest because they ignore your ability to pay. A retiree on a fixed income or a young family can watch their bill climb simply because the market did, even though they earned nothing more. Owning your home shouldn't feel like renting it from the county.

Ideally, Kansas would:

1. Cap how fast assessments can rise on a primary residence, so a bill can't jump because a neighbor sold high.

2. Make local governments earn every increase. Require a public vote, not a quiet budget hearing, before taxing above the revenue-neutral rate.

3. Stop subsidizing winners with abatements and TIF deals. When officials hand some businesses a break, everyone else's bill covers it.

4. Cut spending first. Real relief means government doing less. Tax cuts that come with new fees are just a shell game.

The federal government's part is to stop making it worse. Federal mandates push costs onto states and cities, and endless deficit spending drives up inflation, which inflates home values and assessments. Restoring Tenth Amendment limits and balancing the budget would leave Kansas communities more room to decide for themselves.

If elected, I'd use my seat to push back on unfunded mandates and back efforts that return decisions to Kansans. Those closestp to the problem are best placed to fix it.

Q: Do you believe the potential economic benefits of data centers outweigh the public's interest in further analyzing community impacts? What, if any, regulations do you think should be put in place regarding data center development?

A: No. Although there are potential economic benefits, they don't outrank the public's right to ask questions, especially when the public is asked to help pay for the project.

As a data engineer, I know what goes on inside these buildings: heavy demand for electricity and water, and relatively few permanent jobs once construction ends. That doesn't make data centers bad. It means the promised benefits should be verified, not taken on a developer's word.

My starting point is property rights. A landowner should be free to build on his own land, and I don't want government blocking private projects just because it dislikes them. But rights run both ways. Your neighbors' water supply, noise levels and electric bills are their property, too, and the old common-law principle applies: you can't push your costs onto others without their consent.

So instead of a thick rulebook, I'd support a few principles, mostly at the state and local level:

1. No taxpayer subsidies. No abatements, giveaways or public financing. A good project can stand on its own.

2. Ratepayers don't foot the bill. Data centers should pay the full cost of the power and water infrastructure they require, so households aren't left covering it.

3. No secret deals. Officials shouldn't sign NDAs that keep residents from learning what their community is agreeing to. Water, power and noise impacts should be public before approval.

4. Local decisions. Counties and cities should decide, not Washington.

Congress's role is small: stop federal dollars from subsidizing these projects, and otherwise stay out of the way. The best regulation is transparency, accountability and a real voice for our neighbors.

Q: Following on the heels of legislative action to ban cellphones in schools, do you think there needs to be more regulations on overall screen time with laptops, Chromebooks, etc.? Why or why not?

A: I'd lean toward no new statewide rules. I do think schools and parents should be asking harder questions.

I'm a data engineer, so I'm not anti-technology. I'm also a father, and I understand the concern. Kids spend a lot of hours on screens, and a school-issued laptop or Chromebook is different from a personal phone. A phone is a distraction a family chooses to provide. A school laptop is a tool the school chooses to require, and that puts a heavier burden on the school to show it works.

Here is where I draw the line between my own values and what government should enforce. I'd personally like to see kids writing by hand, reading real books, and spending less time in front of a screen. But a law written in Topeka can't know whether a rural kindergarten, a Derby high school and a Wichita special ed classroom need the same thing. Devices can be a lifeline for a student with a disability or for a family that can't buy a computer. A blanket cap would hurt them.

So I'd push for these instead:

1. Transparency. Schools should tell parents how much screen time is expected each day, what software is used, and what data is collected on their children.

2. Parental choice. Families should be able to opt for paper or lower-tech alternatives whenever practical.

3. Local accountability. School boards should justify device spending with evidence of results, not trends.

The phone ban was easier to defend because the problem was narrower. Laptops are a much broader question, and the people closest to the classroom should answer it.

See **CRANMER** / *Page 3B*



Name: Katy Tyndall **Party:** Democrat
Age: 44 **City:** Wichita
Spouse: Shawn **Children:** 3
Education: Bacherlor's of Arts tin Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity, Stanford University; Juris Doctor, University of Maryland
Current Employment: Manager of Tallgrass Management LLC, 13-plus years
Previous Employment: Staff attorney, National Congress of American Indians, 4 years
Service History: NAACP; Moms Demand Action; Leading Kansas; Chair of the Sedgwick County Fire District 1 steering council

Katy Tyndall elected not to respond to questions on current issues.

Q: What, ideally, do you think could be done to provide more property tax relief for Kansas residents?

A: The property tax relief is really a local and state issue (not federal), but several things have been explored such as property tax caps, exemptions for seniors, consolidation of city and county services where there is a lot of duplication of effort, and fewer property tax abatements.

Q: Do you believe the potential economic benefits of data centers outweigh the public's interest in further analyzing community impacts? What, if any, regulations do you think should be put in place regarding data center development?

A: The economic impact of data centers has both positive and negative effects. They provide planning and construction jobs in the building phase and increased property tax revenue once constructed. However, careful attention must be paid to the amount of water and energy consumed, particularly in areas where water is a precious and dwindling resource. Farmers, especially in western Kansas and everywhere during drought conditions like we have recently experienced, find it challenging to irrigate their crops.

I don't support a federal mandate on data centers. I believe that the local communities in Kansas that want to pursue a data center should have that ability and that local communities that don't want a data center should be able to say no. I support President Trump's Ratepayer Protection Plan and voted for it when the House of Representatives passed it last month. This will require data centers to pay for their own electricity, and it protects Kansas residents from increased electricity bills.

Q: Following on the heels of legislative action to ban cellphones in schools, do you think there needs to be more regulations on overall screen time with laptops, Chromebooks, etc.? Why or why not?

A: Excessive screen time can be damaging to young brains. Parents and teachers are the primary influencers on children and students. I think this should be a decision made by parents and teachers to ensure what is best for their children.

Q: Regarding ALPR cameras used by law enforcement around Kansas, do you believe that equipment is more helpful or hurtful to local communities? How would you hope to see their usage addressed in the future?

A: A free society is not compatible with a constant surveillance environment. These cameras do provide law enforcement with useful tools to catch criminals, but they are also constantly surveilling and recording law abiding citizens without their consent. If law enforcement wants to use this tool to assist in preventing crime, there must be a high standard of guardrails that protect everyday Kansans' privacy, and they should only be accessed with clear and transparent methods that ensure everyone in the community benefits from the safety they can provide.

Name: Ron Estes **Party:** Republican
Age: 70 **City:** Wichita
Spouse: Susan **Children:** 3
Education: Bacherlor's of Science in Civil Engineering and Master's of Business Administration, Tennessee Tech University
Current Employment: U.S. House of Representatives, 9 years
Previous Employment: Bombardier Learjet, 4 years; Koch Oil, 5 years
Service History: Sedgwick County treasurer, 6 years; Kansas State treasurer, 6 years; former Airport Authority board member



Q: Do you believe the use of ALPR cameras is a violation of Fourth Amendment rights? Why or why not?

A: This is a matter still being debated in the courts. On one side is the objection to surveillance without cause or consent, and on the other side is the public installation of the cameras where there is no expectation of privacy. Ultimately, there's no easy way for the public to decline consent.

Q: Shortly after the 2026 primary election, a push began to try and get a new Kansas constitutional amendment on the ballot to declare life begins at conception? Would you be in support of such an amendment or against it?

A: I believe that life begins at conception and that every life is precious and should be protected.

Q: If you were to receive a $50 million grant for your governing body, what would you use it for and why?

A: Grants are best executed and dispersed on the local level rather than by the federal government. There are many fine service organizations that could benefit from portions of a $50 million grant including those who serve veterans, pro-life organizations, mental health and substance abuse treatment, and outreach to those who are homeless.

Q: Why are you the best candidate for the job?

A: As a fifth-generation Kansan who grew up on the family farm where my mother still lives today, I understand and share our Kansas common sense values. My previous experience in the manufacturing and aviation sectors adds to my knowledge and support for those key industries in our state. As a former county and state treasurer, I have a unique set of experiences to evaluate and manage fiscal issues and tax policies so important to our national economy. Finally, as a Christian, my faith guides my respect for the sanctity of life from conception to natural death. I would be honored to have the privilege to continue to serve as your congressman.