

ICRC

11/10/20 Meeting

Captioned by Q&A Reporting, Inc., www.qacaptions.com

>> Anthony Eid: Okay, well let's get started then. Good morning everybody. As chair of the advisory committee for review of executive director applications I now call this meeting to order. Today we are live streaming this Zoom we are live streaming over Zoom and it's being live streamed to Facebook and YouTube. To anyone in the public who is watching and would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using please visit our social media at redistricting mi to find the link for viewing on YouTube. Our live stream today includes closed captioning. We have ASL interpretation available for this meeting. If you are a member of the public who would like easier viewing options for the ALS interpreter on your screen, please e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will provide you with additional viewing options. Similarly members of the public who would like to access translation services during the webinar can e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov for details on how to access language translation services available for this meeting. Translation services are available in both Spanish and Arabic. Please e-mail us and we will provide you with a unique link and call in information to access those services. This meeting is being recorded and will be available at redistricting.Michigan.org for viewing at a later date. It is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be on redistricting.org along with written public comment submissions.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Tracy Wimer media relations director at the department of state. Members of the media should already have her contact information. Now for the purpose of the public watching and for public record I will turn to the department of state to take note of the commissioners present.

>> Good morning, I will do a brief roll call. Sally Marsh and Anthony Eid.

>> Present.

>> Dustin Witjes.

>> Present.

>> Rhonda Lange.

>> Present.

>> All advisories of the committee are present.

>> Wonderful. Thank you everyone for being here this morning. It's definitely been a long week and I hope we can get the work on our agenda done today. And thank you to the Michigan department of state for setting up this Zoom meeting. We all very much

appreciate it. The other day I sent out an agenda. Is there a motion to adopt said agenda?

>> I have a question.

>> Yes.

>> On the agenda it said I'm sorry I don't have it in front of me because it's an e-mail. Reviewing the numbers, right?

Is that I apologize that I don't have it in front of me. Okay, now I do, thank you so much. Compile application Rankings, what exactly are we doing as far as that goes so I know?

>> Oh, I believe the plan we laid out last meeting was to combine the numbers that the three of us made to then generate a list of the top applicants.

>> Okay, I just wanted to make sure I understood what we were doing on that particular one.

>> I move to proceed.

>> Okay, is there a second?

>> Yes.

>> Okay.

>> I second.

>> The agenda is then adopted. Are there any public comments today?

>> No, there are not.

>> Wonderful. I'd also like to actually now that I'm looking at this, I'd like to motion to add adoption of the minutes that were sent out to the agenda. Is there a second for that motion?

>> Second.

>> Okay all those in favor say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Wonderful. Okay, so we were sent out meeting minutes from our last -- from our last advisory committee meeting. Are there any comments on those meeting minutes?

>> Okay, I will say under adjournment it says there being no further business Chairman Lett called for a motion to adjourn, I think that is just a typo instead of Chairman, Chair Lett, it should be myself. Besides that I have no other comments. With that said is there a motion to adopt these minutes?

>> So moved.

>> Thank you, Dustin.

>> Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> Wonderful. Okay, the meeting minutes are approved. Moving on to our next course of business, we will compile our application Rankings for our applicants. Do you all want to e-mail these to me?

Go ahead Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I'm not going to be able to e-mail them to you because I don't have the scanner in front of me. But I need to fully disclose on this. I did do the ranking system. However, I don't feel that the ranking system worked well for me because I had already reviewed them. So I understand that the whole purpose of this was to go over everybody's applications as if we had not seen them before. And rank them. With me having already read them, there were some that I you know as I'm reading through them again there are some that I already know that were better in my opinion. So I think the ranking system didn't quite work for me. So I was going to make a suggestion that maybe I still did rank mine but I don't know how truly -- I'm not saying biased, but as far as I had already read them, so I'm not saying that I was biased in my ranking but because I had already read all of the resumes beforehand before we came up with this ranking system I'm wondering if it affected my numbers. Just in full disclosure. So I was going to recommend maybe we still just go off your guys' Rankings and maybe take turns rotating our top picks because I still do have top picks on mine. But rotate it so that way we don't show bias like you said with each other. Where our opinions go for each other. I just wanted full disclosure on that that I did have a hard time doing the ranking because I had read all of them prior to, if you are good with that.

>> Anthony: I'm fine to proceed any way that we decide to proceed. I think the Rankings make it a little bit more organized. So I mean we could go either way here. Do you think that the Rankings you came up with would you say they are indicative of how you feel about each candidate?

>> Rhonda: Well, what I would say is my initial Rankings, I've gone through the resumes probably four or five times now. The initial day we came up with the ranking I went through and did my Rankings. I went through them again which changed, you know, because sometimes when you look at things a second, third time and I also went through them again yesterday. To prepare for today just to make sure if they changed a little bit again. So is my ranking sheet accurate in my opinion to my true feelings, no. Just because I reviewed and rereviewed resumes. I did, however, write down names of people after reviewing them again that I felt would be good candidates for the interview process. And why I felt they would be good so that is why I thought maybe if we took turns rotating it each one of us present say our top pick, we discuss them, we note on them. The next person will do their top pick, we could kind of keep it rolling that way. If you both would agree to that.

>> Anthony: I'm cool with that what do you think Dustin?

>> That is fine with me.

>> Rhonda why don't you start us off then.

>> I have one more quick question before we get started. Are we going to have a cutoff point when we reach a certain percentage?

Obviously, time allotted there are 40 of them. Are we going to go through all 40?

Or are we just looking for a top percent of ones to interview because we won't interview everybody who sent a resume. If we are looking at a cutoff point, I would like to recommend 20% of the resumes which would be eight and then that still leaves it open for our main commission meeting if they want to add somebody, they can still add somebody without it being overwhelming.

>> Dustin: I like that idea. That will work.

>> Anthony: I had come up with a list of ten preferred candidates. So I'm okay with eight.

>> Rhonda: Okay.

>> Dustin: I'm going to run to my car real quick. I had to leave work relatively quick yesterday and grab my folder. My aunt passed away in Europe yesterday so I will be right back.

>> Rhonda: Can you speak up so the interpreter can hear you?

>> Dustin: Me, I'm just going to run and grab my folder from my car. I left work in a real big hurry so give me one second.

>> Anthony: Okay, so while we wait for Dustin to return, just pull up my applications. Dustin: Okay.

>> Anthony: Wonderful so let's start then we can take turns on who we want to talk about. .

>> Rhonda: Do you want with me to start?

>> Anthony: Take us away.

>> Rhonda: My first applicant that I would recommend for interview is Suann Courtright Smith. I'll give you a moment to find her. .

>> Dustin: I had her in my top two.

>> Rhonda: I believe the reason we should consider her, she has a very good resume. She has experience. She does not have any Government office affiliation. She has some glowing letters of recommendation. Her supplemental questions were great. And she does have like I said extensive executive director experience. .

>> Anthony: Ms. Suann Hammersmith she was also in that list of top eight that I came up with. And so it's good that all three of us are in agreement about that. I agree she does have a great resume and has been an executive director before and has also had many other similar rolls. I also noted her education. She had both a bachelor's degree and a master's degree. And other graduate education studies as well. One thing a little not really a critique but I appreciated the people who specifically put in their cover letter or personal statement why they wanted this job in particular. And I did not see that in this one. But I still agree with this recommendation.

>> Rhonda: Actually she did send one. .

>> Anthony: I know she sent one. I'm saying the contents of it.

>> Rhonda: I apologize. .

>> Anthony: Wonderful, so that is one that we can recommend. Dustin, do you want to do the next one?

>> Rhonda: I have a quick question.

>> Dustin: Yes.

>> Rhonda: Are we voting -- do we have to vote then on which ones or are we just in agreement since she was on all of our list?

>> Anthony: I think we are in agreement now. After we talk about everybody, we can kind of finalize who we are going to recommend.

>> Rhonda: Okay.

>> Anthony: Dustin, are you ready or should I go next?

>> Dustin: I'm pulling up again different computer, I'm pulling up all the resumes here to look at with my notes that I had. So give me one second. I know the name. I'm just trying to figure out who and my reasoning for why. But it was Vickie Devould. I liked her GPA. Her education background.

>> Rhonda: I apologize Dustin I did not hear the name.

>> Anthony: I did not either.

>> Dustin: Vickie Devould.

>> Can you hear me?

>> I have a bunch of pop-ups coming up, everywhere for Adobe. Things that stuck out to me were education, financial management background. Those were the two biggest things. And they also did not have very much like governmental background, so one of the reasons why they stuck out to me.

>> Anthony: I had this individual relatively high on my list. But not to the level of one of my top choices. She is qualified. However, in my opinion I think some of our other candidates are even more qualified having more experience directly being executive directors or in similar positions. .

>> Rhonda: I'm having a little bit of trouble pulling her up at the moment however I do remember from our initial meeting that I did have her on my list. So I would be open to considering her. I'm just having a little issue opening her resume again at the moment.

>> Dustin: Her cover letter also stood out to me quite a bit as well.

>> Rhonda: I did have her ranked too fairly high on mine when I did my initial ranking. And she wasn't one that I had excluded when I went through again. So as I said, I would be open to considering her.

>> Anthony: Okay, wonderful. I'll go next. So I had let's see I had four candidates who I scored higher than everyone else. And the first of that was Janet Phillips, I hope I'm saying her name correctly if not I apologize. I was pretty blown away by pretty much everything in this resume. Where are my notes here?

Not only -- so she has amazing resume. She has been in executive director before. She also was a, sorry, technical difficulties, she also took a lot of time in her

questionnaire questions and really went in detail about what she specifically thought she could bring to the table in this position. And, yeah, I think she would be a great fit.

>> Rhonda: Okay, I also had her on my list. She was actually my number two. So I would agree with you there. She definitely has an abundance of experience. The only thing that I found she doesn't have like a lot of governmental experience, but that's not a bad thing. So I would agree with you that she would be a good candidate for interview.

>> Dustin: She was my number one pick Anthony.

>> Anthony: Wonderful, wonderful. I'm glad we are in agreement on most of these so far. So it's a good sign. Rhonda, who do you got next?

>> Rhonda: Okay, my number three pick would have been Amna Siebold. I know there may be -- because she did in her resume it shows that she did serve as a mayor for two terms. However, I did look it up and she was unaffiliated. So I think that's a good thing when looking at that. She has been directors of different departments, so she does have the experience as far as being in a director role. I liked her cover letter, you know. She explains her years of experience. And she stresses that she has been a nonpartisan leader and that she has appointed from all, you know, independent republican, democrat. And I think you know we discussed last time that is really something we need to watch too is our public perception when we do the hiring because we will be under a microscope. With that being said she's got over 40 years of experience with different areas both financial like I said director experience, so I think that she would be a good choice for interview.

>> Anthony: Yes, she was in the top four for me who got that perfect score. And noted her resume, very detailed. Lots of former experience that can help us. She was a former nonpartisan mayor. And I don't believe that Government work necessarily precludes someone from having this position. I think it could just as easily help. I also noted her education. She got a master's degree from U of M. So that's a good sign for me. And, yeah, I definitely think we should bring her in for an interview.

>> Dustin: Was in my top four, so, yeah. I also think that you know mayor of a small town may be good and nonpartisan is also not a bad thing to think about. So that would be some experience for sure.

>> Anthony: Wonderful, wonderful. Okay Dustin, who do you got next?

>> Dustin: I have a tie between two. Brandon Brice. And James Lancaster. And hold on I'm trying to pull them up again real fast. Sorry, technical difficulties. He was chief legal counsel for voters, not politicians. That is something that stood out to me. Because it sounds like he is definitely able to put citizens first over politicians in my mind. Legal background is also not necessarily a bad thing to have. More the merrier and can go for questions would be fantastic in my opinion. He also had some experience. I will scroll back up and I will probably mute myself again here. And experience managing staff was between five and nine years. I think that would qualify him in my opinion. Did you have anyone have a chance to look at him by any chance?

>> Rhonda: I did and this is one we discussed at the last meeting and I just don't feel with him having -- I understand the voters not politicians. But I feel like he was too involved in the process that got us to where we are today. If we truly want to stay independent without influence, I think it would be in our best interest to look outside. Not that having an attorney that wrote the language wouldn't be great. But I just think for public opinion, for public view and for us as a commission maybe we should not consider somebody that was involved so much with the initial proposal.

>> Dustin: Wouldn't this writing the language for the actual constitutional amendment, that's not necessarily a bad thing. I mean he just wrote and wanted to make sure that we are picking people in a fair manner and drawing districts in a fair manner and not what's the word I'm looking for?

Not necessarily ignoring but not having the current legislature do it. If he wrote the language for it, he is clearly an advocate for this whole process the way that it is now. That's just my opinion on it. But I mean you do raise a very good point. So.

>> Rhonda: I completely understand your opinion. And, you know, I keep thinking about public perception. Public perception, how are we going to do this with the most transparency. Everything we do is open. And I just can't help but wonder if he was hired and retained and worked in a lawyer position and the process that got us to where we are today but he did work for them. So if we are staying truly independent should we try and do it as an independent citizens they got us to where we needed to be today. But now is it upon us to take us to where we need to go?

I guess that is what I'm saying.

>> Dustin: That is a very good point so yes.

>> Rhonda: Okay Anthony?

>> Anthony: So very good discussion we are having here. I think both of you bring up you know very valid points. I had James Lancaster in the top four who got my top scores. Just based on his credentials. So I would recommend that we bring him in for an interview at least. And kind of see what the rest of the commission thinks about, you know, any potential conflicts of interest that may occur like you're talking about, Rhonda. I definitely think that as a point we should consider, but I still think based on his credentials that I would like to interview him. And you know see how he does when we get to that phase. Some things I noted on his application were that you know, he is a went to a top law school. Was a former city Council member and mayor pro tem and because he wrote the language on voters and politics, he is familiar with it. Like you said, that might be a good thing or a bad thing. I don't know yet. I'd love to ask him that question. And see what he says. I also have here that he actually might be better -- he might possibly be better suited for the general counsel position that we currently have up as well. But either way I think that an interview should be warranted.

>> Are there any more comments on him?

>> Anthony: Okay, let's see, I believe Dustin, didn't you say you had a second person as well?

>> Dustin: .

>> Anthony: We can't hear you.

>> Dustin: How about now, better?

Yeah, we will come back to me, I don't want to steal anyone else's thunder.

>> Rhonda: I'm okay with you going to your second one, Dustin, because I initially had him down too so if you want to proceed.

>> Anthony: I did as well.

>> Dustin: Well, let's see here, hold on, I'm pulling it back up. Top schools for education. I think he went to Howard and Rutgers if I remember right. What I have written down. Again I'm trying to do this from some kind of memory here as well. Broad range of leadership and a whole bunch of different fields, boy Scouts, wrestling. Just a whole bunch of different leadership positions stood out to me. And I feel that his cover letter was extremely well written. .

>> Anthony: Yes, I agree. I had Brandon Brice in my top eight as well. I noted pretty much the same things that you noted. I also noted that this one in particular it just seemed more personable, like this person might be a little somehow easier to work with. That's hard to say without meeting him first. But I definitely would love to meet him.

>> Rhonda: I got that same read on his resume. I don't know what it was, but it just he seems like he would be very personable like you said and easy to talk to. Just based off from his resume. I don't know why. I would think the same thing but I did get that same read.

>> Dustin: I felt he was in the room talking to me while I was reading it so, yeah.

>> Anthony: Wonderful, wonderful. Okay, Rhonda, who do you have next?

>> Rhonda: I'm going to let you go next Anthony if you don't mind.

>> Anthony: I do not mind. So we've gone over three of the people that I gave perfect scores to. I will go with the fourth. I had Sheryl Mitchell as quite high. She has had a lot of Government work. Like we said earlier that could be good or bad. But I think she has the credentials to warrant an interview. She had great academic credentials. She had a doctorate degree in business administration. And she has done this type of work before. I also thought her cover letter/personal statement was very well written.

It had why she wanted this job. And not some other job. And I can tell she took the time for her questionnaire to really think about the questions and have sufficient answers to those questions.

>> Dustin: I would agree. She was in my top ten as well. And even though here is my take on the Government positions. If you worked in a like a city center for example, like a mayor or a city planner or city manager so on and so forth, in my mind those individuals, they really have never had any kind of responsibility in regards to

redistricting as well. But they have a lot of experience in managing at that point. So that's -- if someone said you know I was a state legislature so on and so forth then that is a red flag. But mayor of a small town or Sheryl Mitchell here, Dr. Sheryl Mitchell in my opinion her leadership skills she would have attained working in some sort of Government fashion would not necessarily be a bad thing. So same with Amna as well for the same reasons is why I would have scored her so high and Dr. Sheryl Mitchell as well.

>> Rhonda: I initially had her when I first did your scoring system, I did have her as one of my top four so I would not object at all to including her in the interviews.

>> Anthony: Okay, cool, moving on. .

>> Rhonda: Okay if I'm next here is where mine get kind of all over the place as I went through and redid, and redid. One when I was reviewing yesterday that I initially -- she initially got a fairly good score from me but not as high as others. But when I went back and reread hers yesterday, I thought she might make a good candidate is Rochelle Collins. She has worked as a director. She does have some experience if you look on her resume she worked for the office of the mayor as director of Government relations. So as far as going out into the public and interacting with the public, I think that might be a good quality and experience to have. She has been an executive project manager. There is something else on here. I apologize. I have to look. .

>> Anthony: Okay, take your time.

>> Rhonda: In her cover letter she talks how she has more than 25 years' experience in Government relations, management and human resources et cetera. So I do think that could be helpful in our situation. She is familiar with open meetings act. I like that she says that you know she has got the ability to listen. Learn, develop. You know, I just think that she would be a good one to interview. I'm sorry, I'm kind of blanking out here. But I did move her a little higher up yesterday so.

>> Anthony: So I had Ms. Collins pretty high on my applications but as I started to read some of the other ones and go through it and really put in the time to try to find the most qualified person I kind of moved her down a little bit. That is not to say I don't think she would make a good candidate. She is kind of like in the middle of my Rankings here. But, yeah, she would be in the middle of mine.

>> Rhonda: That is kind of where she was on mine. Not anywhere near the lowest because she was up there fairly high and like I said I don't know what it was. I was reviewing all of them again yesterday and she stuck out more so I put her on my list but I'm open to your guys suggestions and we reviewed 7 of them so far so obviously we can't vote on every single person so your opinions whatever you feel I'm good with.

>> Dustin: This is where I say I don't remember looking at this resume, I must have skipped over it. Because it doesn't even ring a remote bell. So give me a few minutes and I will take a look and see something.

>> Anthony: While Dustin is doing that, I also had Andrew Cline pretty far up my list. He was after -- pretty much after the people we have already talked about. He had a very good resume. We also talked about him at the last meeting and the issue that we brought up was that he has been away from Michigan for quite some time but I think this might be a good chance to maybe get a talented person back over here in our state. But he had a great resume. But you know he has been in Maryland for the past number of years. But you know it looks like he has done a very good job in Maryland serving in roles that will give him a lot of experience to sit in a role like this one.

>> Dustin: I do remember talking about Andrew in the last meeting as well my question would be would he be willing to relocate is the question.

>> Rhonda: That would be my question also and would he be willing to relocate just for a year. I'm not ruling him out. It -- you guys agree you would like to interview him and that could be asked in the interview process, I'm fine with that. We did talk about him and he did have you know good experience and everything. I think all of our main concern was the fact that he was in another state and with things being so up in the air right now with COVID and what have you we may not be doing Zoom come January. So that would be something in order to make a good, informed decision we would need to know is does he plan on relocating here?

Or is he trying to do it from Maryland?

Because as we have seen things can change at the drop of a dime. So I think that is kind of why we are leaning towards somebody that was in state.

>> Going back to Rochelle Collins?

I would not rule her out as a potential interviewee. I like her resume and cover letter as well. So especially with working in nonprofit and grant writing is also pretty decent thing to have, so I like it.

>> Anthony: To talk where we are at right now before moving to the next candidate, based on the discussion that we've talked about I have six people that we all pretty much agreed we should definitely interview. That is Janet Phillips, Amna Siebold, Brandon Brice. Sheryl Mitchell. Suann or is it Suann or Suann Hammersmith and James Lancaster. That's 123456. And then kind of in the next I don't want to say like tier of people of the people there was a little bit of disagreement on we have Vickie Devould, Andrew Cline and Rachel Collins so I think we said eight originally and now we have six and then the makes for the three that I just stated. Does anyone have anybody else that they feel strongly about that we might want to consider for those two more interview spots that we have?

>> I think the ones we have discussed so far in my opinion stood out and scored the highest on my list with the two point system they were either 29 or 30. So I'm happy with these people to bring forward in my opinion as our top suggestions.

>> Rhonda: There is one more I want to bring up and I want to bring up her resume real quick because I had her written down so I kind of want to see review again why I

had her written down, okay, one more that I would like to be considered for interview is Shanelle-Manis and I may not say her last name correct. She is an attorney which could prove helpful. She worked as an HR specialist for the city of Detroit. She does have three years of experience with the open meetings act. She has experience in developing and executing budgets for businesses. And with public reporting including managing the full life cycle of FY aid request so Freedom of Information Act she is familiar with which will be very useful with our commission. She was one that initially on mine she was one initially kind of middle of the road for me and after reviewing a second time I thought that she might be a good candidate. She might not have as much experience as some of the other ones. Sometimes experience is a good thing, sometimes it's not. You get somebody that might not have as much experience. They might not be set in their ways I guess so I don't want to rule out another potential one because she might not have as many years of experience when she has got other qualities that I think would be beneficial to the committee. So that is my opinion on her.

>> Anthony: So I originally on my first review had this person actually towards the bottom of my list. But then as I did subsequent reviews, she did move up each time which I think is notable. I think you kind of said the same thing, Rhonda. And, yeah, the only thing that really would concern me here is that she hasn't really had any like directorship experiences. But like you said it could be a good or a bad thing. .

>> Rhonda: I think with her HR experience you know being an HR specialist and an attorney a public relations assistant, I think there is other little things that might make up for it. Like I said I would hate to rule anybody out because they may not have as much experience if I see things that might benefit the commission. And I just think with her resume I keep going back to the lawyer thing. You know, just like we said with the other gentleman being a lawyer and writing language, that may be beneficial for us too even as an executive director. But as I said I'll take your guys' opinions also and whatever we as a team decide. Anthony: It's definitely a team effort here. Is there anyone else that anyone felt particularly strong about?

>> Anthony: I have, let me pull him up real quick. There was one candidate who stuck out to me, but I also think there might be some conflicts of interest. So it wasn't quite as high on my list as some of the others we have talked about. But he was still quite high within the top eight. It's Daniel Charon. Looking at his resume very well qualified person like Mr. Lancaster there is a possibility he may be better suited for the general Council job. But as far as his experience goes, he has a ton of experience. He was a communications director for the city of Detroit and an independent relations strategist for a rather large company when I looked it up. The conflict may come in is that he was a Federal lobbyist from what it seems like. That may or may not cause some issues. He did disclose in his cover letter that he identifies as a democrat. Which I appreciate the honesty in putting that. This is one that stuck out to me. Rhonda: On some of mine when it came to that the lobbying on some of the ones, I made decisions

on if I was kind of on the fence on how much is too much Government, how much isn't, you know, is it a good thing, is it a bad thing, I went back to our Constitution that was written regarding the Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. And although there is no, you know, writing in there about who we hire, I kind of looked at it and how it said that neither nobody on the commission within six years could hold public office or be a lobby -- be associated with lobbying. So what I kind of did if there were some I was on the fence on and I wasn't quite sure, I went back to that and I kind of applied those same standards to who I was looking at for the executive director. I mean is it a prerequisite?

No, but that's kind of what I did to help me decide to do I want to move forward with this or not. Or how much you know some of them did have local experience but then I saw some that had a lot of Government experience working for a lot of Government officials. So I kind of went back on that as how many years has it been and that kind of helped me get over that hump of you know could there be political biases or not. And just throwing that out there that that kind of helped me make some of my decisions when I was on the fence.

>> Anthony: That is definitely a good point. Well, I think let's see I just had one more person that I think we might want to talk about. Then I will be good and that is Gregory Hicks. His application was rather long. He included some materials we did not ask for in it like his abstract. But by reading it I kind of got to learn more about him and what he does. He has served as executive director previously for the Detroit charter revisions commission. In Detroit. So that definitely stuck out to me. He also served as secretary of the board of the Detroit police commission. And we just had a lot of work like that if you want to pull up his resume. Also has a Ph.D., very well educated. And also two master's degrees actually, so that stuck out to me as well. But yeah, this is the last guy on my list, that kind of stood out.

>> He was the political director for the Michigan democratic party but that has been a while ago but again I'm trying to get it not saying that anybody would be but trying to look at it in terms of what's going to appear to be the least biased or what is going to be the least biased, most impartial, I don't know. When I initially went through all of his on your grading scale, your grading scale I'm sorry your numbers scale, I had him kind of middle of the road. There were some that were lower but I had a lot more people that were higher just based on different criteria and looking at things like that. I would be on the fence with him. It's not one I personally would recommend, but again this is a team effort so.

>> Dustin: I'm on the same page as you, Rhonda.

>> Anthony: Rhonda, I do appreciate you know how often you are bringing up the point that this is an independent commission and we have to act independently as citizens. And you know part of that is looking out for any you know different interests that may or may not be there. Okay, so that's -- those are all the candidates I have to

talk about. If no one else has any others they would like to highlight, then like I said earlier we have the six that we are in agreements with. Agreement with. And then we have two more spots and out of those two spots we kind of have four candidates that we've talked about. So we can narrow those four extra ones down to two. To make our recommendation. That is what we have to do out of four we have Vickie Devould, Andrew Cline, Collins and Shanelle-Manis. Does anyone feel strongly about either of those four?

We need two of them.

>> Rhonda: When we were going through initially, I thought we were all pretty much in agreement on Vickie Devould when we first started. She was the second one that was brought up and I thought we were in agreement with her that all three of us said she would be good. Am I mistaken?

I have her written down as number two.

>> Dustin: That's what I thought too. I had her written down.

>> Anthony: You are correct, I just put her in the wrong column.

>> So that gives us seven.

>> Rhonda: I'm still on the fence about Mr. Lancaster I'm going to be honest, I will go with what the group decides but I'm on the fence with him because of that. And I'm sorry but I just I don't know call it my gut. So if you both decide like I said I will be fine but I just want it to be known that I am on the fence about that because of the participation in the movement. Anthony: I hear what you are saying but that is something I would really like to ask him and I think the commission can ask him and I think you can ask him when he comes in and I think we should brilliant him on it actually and try to ask tough questions and hopefully see if we get good responses and if there is going to be a conflict there. But I do really want at least to meet him and give him an interview just because of I think his credentials are one of the best that we have here.

>> What do you think, Dustin?

>> Dustin: Same. I mean, he is a great candidate for interviewing in my opinion and we will just have to or someone since I've really never interviewed people before coming up with some tough questions to see if that gut feeling would be there after we have a chance to speak with him as a whole, with all of us. .

>> Rhonda: We are just recommending to the commission, right?

So we can discuss in our committee meeting following this we can discuss our concerns with them. We are not making the final decision, correct?

We are all in agreement?

Okay.

>> Anthony: Yes.

>> Rhonda: Okay, then I say move forward with them. That is fine.

>> Anthony: We all have our notes here too on the candidates that we are going to bring forward to the commission. The rest of the commission too and I'm sure you know

they might have a couple people they want to talk about that maybe we didn't but like you said we are making you know the recommendation to you know streamline the process and make it a little easier because we did have you know 43 complete applicants, which is quite a bit.

>> Rhonda: Did he have any -- I did not bring it, I don't have him up in front of me real quick so I have one more question on him does he have any executive director experience?

Or is all of his experience as an attorney?

I'm trying to find his resume again just so I can look one last time.

>> Anthony: He didn't have any executive director experience, but he was a city Council member for the city of Dewitt. And it looks like he served from 1992-2004. And then from 2016-2015 and it looks like in that gap he was the mayor pro tem of the city. And he also served on the planning commission for that city during that time as well. So no executive director experience. But I would say definitely you know civil engagement experience.

>> I definitely think that is something and that should be noted compared to some of the other applicants.

>> Rhonda: How do you recommend we proceed with the final three that we are kind of a maybe on what do you recommend that we do as far as deciding which one should move forward?

Are we going by total points?

Or.

>> Anthony: I'm glad the points brought us here and helped us narrow it down to these people. That was kind of the whole point of it to try to do it in an objective and unbiased fashion. And I think it achieved that goal. I think we have a pretty you know diverse list right here. Which definitely is a good sign. I would ask you know out of those three does anyone -- do any of you feel strongly out of any of them?

>> Rhonda: I think they all have some sort of potential. I also believe our highest pick based on experience and what we have a gut feeling about already on our list. So we could move to lead the 8th spot open and if our full committee would like to add somebody then we are still not overwhelming it if it's okay with you. I just don't know how we would decide between the last three unless we did by the numbers because what would determine if nobody feels super strongly about any of the last three then I guess I would move to the leave the 8th position open in case the full committee has somebody they feel very strongly about.

>> Anthony: You know I was actually right before you said that I was thinking the exact same thing. If we want -- if we all feel pretty strongly about these seven that we have and if we think these seven are the most qualified, then I mean that is who we think is the most qualified which is what our job is to come up with so I'm totally okay

with leaving it at seven and that way like you said it leaves us some room if the rest of the commission wants to consider anyone else.

>> Dustin: Remember also like the first four we all were in comply agreement with already, so I am quite happy with this list leaving one open to say, hey, if you have anyone that you would like to discuss you can. But keep in mind they have a chance to review all 40 applications as well so.

>> Rhonda: Agreed.

>> Anthony: So I'm just going to make a motion real quick to recommend the following applicants to move on to the interview process. It's not a definite you are moving forward because we have to speak to the rest of the commission but it is this advisory committee's recommendation. And that's Janet Phillips, Amna Siebold, James Lancaster, Brandon Brice, Sheryl Mitchell, Suann Courtright Hammersmith and Vickie Devould.

>> Is there a second?

>> Dustin: Second.

>> All those in favor please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Anthony: Wonderful. Okay well that is the recommendation we will bring to the commission. And I think that completes our agenda. Let me pull it up to make sure. Sally I see your hand.

>> Hi everyone just wanted to jump in and say you know with the remaining time you have left, you're scheduled until 11:00 you might consider discussing how you want to present your recommendations to the commission. You have time at the full commission meeting, so if there is sort of an order or an explanation or you know how you want to present the recommendation of the group that might be something to discuss before you end today.

>> Anthony: We probably should discuss that. I also think something we might want to discuss since we have some extra time is if we want to send out any you know rejection letters or letters that say you know you're not going to be considered to go on further once we talk to the whole commission. But are there any comments on how we want to present this to the rest of the commission?

>> Rhonda: I say we recommend or I recommend that we do it based on which ones did all of us agree on the top?

Who was our top?

You know kind of rank them from top down as far as how we had them on here so this might be where your numbers could come into effect too. You know, based on your total numbers that you gave which nobody got a perfect score on mine. Just so you guys know. But that might be one way to rank them. We could add together all of ours and as we present them be like this is our top pick. Here is why. Here is our next topic, here is why and rate them like that. Just a suggestion.

>> Dustin: Why not just explain what we did individually and how we came up with our ranking system on the cover letter, the question and the resume and score one through ten for composite score between 0-30. And then we just we went over that list today with all of us and these first four people they were all on our list pretty high. And then just explain it the way that you know how Anthony how you came up with the whole process for picking these people to potentially move forward the applicants to move forward. It will be beneficial in my opinion.

>> Rhonda: I get you there Dustin. The only issue is the ranking system didn't work so well for me as I first said.

>> Dustin: Right.

>> Rhonda: To say it was based solely on that ranking system I kind of did it how I've done interviews before because I've interviewed, hired, fired before. So a lot of that came from that. So my ranking system I did it based off from my first view, I guess. And like I said when I started going through the second time did people get less of a rank from me because I had already knew there were more qualified, yes, honestly, they did. And so but I get what you're saying. We can do it that way. I mean, I guess we don't have to present any of the ones that we have chosen in any particular order to say top, bottom or what because it's going to be the commission's as a whole. Their final decision, I mean they may not want some of these people anyway. They may have some they say we think this is better qualified person and let's vote on it. So I say we just give them the list. We can tell them how we came up with it like you said. But I guess we don't rank them. I'll withdraw that idea of not ranking them based off from their scores.

>> Dustin: That makes sense. We can say we did that as a steppingstone to get started, but I mean halfway through I was just reading them and basically saying this one is good, this one is good, this one is good, this one is not so good and so on and so forth and I was doing my own kind of thing but steppingstone is a good way to put it. Something or basically to say this is what you need to hone in on and eventually you get in your own groove so.

>> Rhonda: Agreed.

>> Anthony: No, I definitely agree with what you two are saying. The whole point of the ranking system was just to narrow it down to who we thought were the most qualified because we had such a large amount of applicants and you know I think it served that purpose for sure. And I think that's evident by the fact that most of the people that all three of us came up with was the same people so I think we can just give them you know this list of names. We can briefly go over how we came up with the list. And I think what is most important is you know we tell them why we chose these people and that you know we feel strongly if there is any that we feel out of this list of seven that we feel strongly about so I would be okay with kind of going over it one by one. And kind of taking turns like how we just did. Hopefully maybe a little faster since there

will be less deliberation. And why we chose these people. And then letting the commission take it from there.

>> Rhonda: Sounds good to me.

>> Anthony: Okay do you guys mind if I lead that discussion?

And I will be sure to give you the time you need to discuss as well.

>> Dustin: Take it away champ.

>> Rhonda: You are the chair so it would make sense to lead the discussion and we can put in our objections or for and why throughout the discussion. But I do think with you being the chair that obviously you should present each person and then we will just open it up for discussion.

>> Anthony: Wonderful, I'm glad we are all in agreement. All things considered this has been pretty smooth so I'm quite happy about that. Okay.

>> Rhonda: Definitely better than our last one.

>> Anthony: Time does help. Does anyone have anything else to say?

Or any other comments to make?

How about our friends at the department of state?

>> All good.

>> Anthony: Okay with that said I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

>> Rhonda: I have a quick question for Sally. Sorry. And we are being recorded, but for our next commission meeting, do we use that other link that we were e-mailed or do we stay logged in to this one?

>> Sally: Yes, it's a separate meeting so it's a separate log in and for the members of the public who are watching all of that information on how you can view has already been posted on social media. And will be posted again. So the next meeting the full commission meeting starts at 11:30 a.m. So look to our social media redistricting MI and then again you can see that later again today at 11:30 we will post again.

>> Rhonda: Thank you, Sally.

>> Anthony: Questions for comments from anybody?

Announcements?

>> Dustin: I will second your motion.

>> Rhonda: Did we have a motion yet?

>> Dustin: I think so. I was supposed to say so moved, right, there we go.

>> Anthony: Okay is there a second?

>> Rhonda: Second.

>> Anthony: Okay, all those in favor to adjourn this meeting at 10:23 a.m. say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any opposed?

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

All right we will be seeing you guys in a little bit. Thanks for coming everybody. See you.

>> Good-bye.

[Meeting concludes]