

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.

MDOS Meeting

12/17/20 Meetings

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

Okay so Sue since this is the first meeting on this side of the Zoom partition, I will just let you know about five minutes out I ask Cathleen to throw up a slide to screen share a slide which she will put up in just a moment and that is because we like to get the live stream on YouTube set up about five minutes in advance. So that we can circulate the links to the general public, so they are able to view the meeting once it does start. But it means when this slide comes up and you should see it on your screen now you should assume the public can hear you at this point. And once the links are shared, I let Steve know and he can begin when the meeting is set to start. So, we will go ahead and do that now. So just assume that anything you say from this point forward will be heard.

>> Speaking of that can you all hear me?

>> Yes, MC.

>> Good morning.

>> Steve you are set to begin at the top of the hour.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Hey guys sorry I'm running late this morning but I'm here now.

>> Good morning.

>> Good morning as chair of the commission I call the meeting of the Michigan redistricting commission to order.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube for anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at [redistricting mi](http://redistricting.mi). To find the link for either 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 wishing to -- wishing you would like for easier viewing options for the ASL 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 access to 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 for both Spanish and Arabic. Please e-mail us and we will provide you with a unique link and call-in information. This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [redistricting Michigan.org](http://redistricting.Michigan.org) for viewing at a later date. This meeting is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be made available and posted on [redistricting Michigan.org](http://redistricting.Michigan.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 department of state and members of the state should have her contact information. For the purposes of public of

the public watching and the public record I will turn to the department of state staff to take note of the commissions present.

>> Good morning my name is Sally marsh from the Michigan department of state and commissioners please say present and unmute yourself when I call your name Anthony Eid.

>> Present.

>> Brittini Kellom.

>> Present.

>> Cynthia Orton.

>> Present.

>> Doug Clark.

>> Present.

>> Dustin Witjes.

>> Impress in.

>> Erin Wagner.

>> Present.

>> Janice Vallette

>> Present

>> And Juanita Curry.

>> Present.

>> MC Rothhorn.

>> Present.

>> Rebecca Szetela.

>> Present.

>> Rhonda Lange.

>> Present.

>> Richard Weiss and Richard, you may have to press star six to unmute and go to Steve Lett.

>> Present.

>> Richard Weiss.

>> Present.

>> Thanks, Richard all commissioners are present.

>> With everybody being here we have a quorum and business of the commission can be conducted. Next, we will take a look at the agenda and see if there are any additions, corrections or deletions anybody would care to make. Not seeing any, we will all those in favor of approving the agenda as presented raise your hand. The agenda is adopted. If you are watching on a public forum, the agenda is at redistricting Michigan.org. Next, we will take a look at the minutes from the December 10th meeting. Get that an opportunity to review those. I would entertain any corrections, additions or deletions at this time. Not seeing any and we would approve the minutes as presented.

Kindly raise your hand. Thank you they are adopted, approved. It is my understanding that we have a couple of people for public comment. Is that still true, Sally?

>> Sally: Yes.

>> A few notes about the public comment for those of you joining for the first time because this is a virtual meeting members of the public had to sign up in advance to address the commission. Staff at the department of state will unmute each member of the public up to two minutes on a first come first serve basis. This means members of the public will be called on in the order in which they signed up to address the commission. To those members of the public participating in public comment please note you will have no more than two minutes to address the commission this morning. You can also submit your thoughts to the commission and the public by e-mailing redistricting@Michigan.gov, department of state will provide your written thoughts to the commission by indicating in the e-mail that you would like to submit your written comment to as public comment. It will be included in the online meeting archive for the commission. Public comment sign up links are also posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages on Facebook and Twitter at [redistricting mi](https://www.facebook.com/redistrictingmi). Now I would like to recognize Sally marsh from the Michigan department of state director of special projects we will call on members of the public to address the commission. Sally.

>> Sally: Hello, individuals if you have signed up and indicated they would like to participate in live public commentary will now be allowed to do so. For those who are providing live public commentary today after I call your name your screen will change, and you will rejoin the meeting temporarily as a presenter. You will need to turn your sound and video on before you make those live public comments. And if you are using your phone for a microphone, you will need to dial in at the phone number that you provided in your sign up. I'm not sure that we have that issue today. But just a note there. And if you do have audio issues, we will move on to the next person and then try you again once we are done with that individual. So, first in line to provide public comment the Daniel B. Cook.

>> Daniel: Hello. Am I on?

>> Good morning, we can hear you. Go right ahead.

>> Daniel: Great thank you good morning and thanks for having me letting me speak. My name is Daniel cook I'm a resident of Livonia, Michigan and I really wanted to talk today just about district line drawing and when it's done and as you do it, as you go through this process you keep in mind your ultimate goals. You're going to hear lots of ideas about how maps should look simple and have straight lines and this thing and that thing and we all have sort of our instincts about how things should be but there is actually of course been a lot of work done on what the impacts of certain types of map drawing will be, whether they are structural advantages to one party or another because of, you know, drawing compact boundaries or having highly partisan districts where your incumbent basically keeps the spot for long periods of time without possibility of

challenge. One that I think I tend to favor for the State of Michigan is highly competitive districts where we certainly have some districts like in the Detroit area that will always be blue. And northern Michigan that will always be red. And rightly so representing their districts, but then we will have very -- we will have the opportunity in many other parts of the state around Grand Rapids, around Lansing, around the rest of the state that, you know, voters will know that their votes matter when they go to the polls. Because we will, you know, and in years where we have lots of blue support, we will have more blue representation. And where we have lots of red support, we will have more red representation and we will also have independent representation because there won't be you know sort of a strangle hold on districts as it has been in the past.

>> Sally: Please conclude your statement your two minutes is up.

>> Daniel: Thank you very much for your time, please reach out to me if I can be of help to anyone I would love to be. Thank you so much for your time.

>> Steve: Thank you Mr. Cook.

>> Sally: Next and the last participant in live commentary today is Suzanne Smith. Please allow us a moment for the staff to promote and unmute you. Please unmute yourself and you can address the commission.

>> Steve: Looks like you are ready to go-go ahead.

>> Good morning I'm Suzanne Smith vice president for advocacy for the league of women voters for Michigan. The league of women voters is a nonpartisan organization. We do not support or oppose political parties or candidates. We do take positions on public policy issues that we have studied. Redistricting reform in Michigan is one of those issues. After the state legislature approved the current maps in 2011, our member studied redistricting in Michigan and across the country. That study resulted in the league's decision to work for redistricting reform including passing an amendment to the Constitution that would create an independent citizen redistricting commission. We work for the passage of proposal two and we are thrilled when it passed in 2018. Since last September our team of 12 trained league members has been observing and reporting on your commission meetings. As you know communities of interest are an important part of the map drawing process. With 27 local leagues and over 40 counties, across the state including the upper peninsula, we are uniquely equipped to help identify those communities. Locally members will be identifying, educating and supporting communities of interest in preparation for their testifying at the commission's public hearings. We look forward to assisting the commission in its outreach during the coming year. Thank you for this opportunity to address you. I would be glad to try and answer any questions that you might have.

>> Steve: I don't think we have any questions, and we appreciate your comments and look forward from hearing from you in the not-too-distant future.

Thank you very much and have a good day.

>> Thank you.

>> Sally: That concludes our live public commentary this morning.

>> Steve: Thank you Sally. Next on our agenda is an introduction and a welcome to Sue Ann Hammersmith our recently hired executive director. Good morning Sue Ann and do you probably ought to know this by now go by Sue Ann or Sue since I see Sue on your monitor?

>> Sue: Either one is fine and Sue is either.

>> Just don't call you late for dinner.

>> Sue: Exactly.

>> Steve: Good, I'm assuming I can say without doubt that all of us welcome you on board. So, everybody is nodding their head. Anthony is going no but you know he is a little different. The -- give us some introductions of yourself. I'm assuming that maybe there are some people out in the Ether who may not have watched all of our meetings with rapid attention so tell them a little bit about yourself.

>> Sue: Okay, I have 30 years' experience as an executive director. I guess that means I'm kind of old. But I love the work I've done in the nonprofit arena. Most recently since 2004 I have worked both as an executive director for the united way and also the local community foundation where I live in Lenawee County. My county is all a buzz with the news I'm going to serve this commission. They are very excited, so I've heard from many people with congratulations. So I thank this commission for the work you have done to get here and I thank the department of state staff who filled in when you haven't had an executive director and still continued to do so much work for this commission to support its work, so I'm happy to be part of the team and looking forward to adding a couple new team members very soon here so we can all get to work and make sure that fair district lines are drawn for the State of Michigan. So, thank you for this opportunity.

>> Steve: Thank you and we welcome you again on board. Are there any questions from any of the commission members of Sue Ann at this time?

Or anybody wish to express their own personal welcome to her go right ahead.

>> Okay well once again welcome aboard.

>> Sue: Thank you.

>> Steve: Now, old business, we have a report from the department of state. I assume Sally will be doing that.

>> Sally: Good morning you assume correctly, I'll be pretty brief and then kind of have a question for you all and sort of pass it over to Sue on some of these logistics. So, computers that you all voted on have been ordered. They have been expedited. So, I expect within the next couple of weeks we will probably have e-mail communication about how to get those to you. Just as a refresher. It's going to be a little more complicated than just shipping it to your house. You will have to meet up with a state technology representative essentially to ensure that the security on your device is set up properly. And so you will -- there will be more details about that but right now we are figuring out exactly when those computers are going to get to our state offices to get set

up. So, they have been ordered and more to come like I said probably over e-mail between now and the next meeting and I certainly hope by the next meeting I have a substantive timeline update for you all on that piece.

And you all should have seen, but Sue has a state Government e-mail address so I cc' d her on several e-mails, I sent to all of you and wanted to flag that and that is you know happened thankfully very quickly and Sue I believe you should also be getting your phone shortly, so we are starting to get fully underway here. You are all very great. So just a note that when Robin Serber from technology management and budget addressed you all there was a request for additional information about software and some of the stuff that that group had procured over the years. He has recently sent that to me so I will be sending that along with copies of PowerPoints from some of the people we heard from in December and send those to you by the end of the week so you can review them at your leisure and of course the software piece being something I'm sure you will dig in to in January.

And then Kelly services, you all should be set in terms of compensation. Let me know if that is not the case. And the sort of back pay lump sum should be on its way as well to be processed within the next week or so. So do reach out to me if you have any individual questions or concerns. Or certainly reach out to the Kelly services representatives who at this point will probably be better suited to answer some of your questions. But just let me know if there are any questions there. But sort of on this topic two logistical questions were raised but I the legislative counsel and Kelly services about designated approver both for your timesheets so your weekly timesheets who is sort of approving it so you can get that compensation and then similarly reimbursement expenses, who is approving those based on as you all have discussed in the past state guidelines and so you know my recommendation like I said I'll hand it over to Sue for any of her thoughts here would be to for all of you to set Sue as the approver of your timesheets and of those expenses just from an ease and efficiency standpoint so that would be my recommendation but I'll turn it over to Sue if she has any other thoughts on that.

>> Sue: I'm very happy to do this. It's a little uncomfortable to approve my own compensation and expenses. However, I'm certainly very happy to report to the commission on a regular basis. But I would ask how you would like to handle me specifically and then I could actually handle everyone else. I would be happy to do that.

>> Thank you, Sue.

>> Steve: Sue and I had some e-mails back and forth regarding this. I would say back and forth, Sue sent me an e-mail on it with some suggestions and certainly she had suggested that someone on the commission approve her time and expense, keeping in mind that she is on a salary so her time will be entered with Kelly services as I understand it, same way we are doing it and put in an hour every week and get paid on that. So, don't need to review that. If we want to keep track of her actual time, we can

certainly do that. Someone on I believe on the commission should be set to approve any expenses that she would have such as mileage reimbursement et cetera. We can either name somebody, myself or Brittini could do it. Or whatever the commission's pleasure is. Any discussion?

Rhonda.

>> Do all the expenses have to be approved by the entire commission?

Or is this giving somebody the authority to do it on behalf of the commission?

>> Steve: I don't think the commission has to approve everything and I perceive the process being that Sue would approve an employee reimbursements and then report on a monthly basis or something and we get a report that would show here is what is going on and if we have questions, we of course could ask them. Sue, are you seeing that kind of the process that you are suggesting?

>> Sue: Yes, I'm happy to handle staff and also if you would like me to approve any reimbursement for the commissions, I can do that. Or somebody on the commission can do that. I don't think Kelly wants too many point persons, you know, to do this work.

>> Sally: I might just add as a reminder that both in the contract for the ED and also in the commission's previous conversations you know, there are standard state guidelines about what is reimbursable and what is not and how much is reimbursed. And so, you know, not to diminish the role of the approver because obviously that allows money to be dispensed out which is important, but I think it would more be a role and, you know, for Sue or for anyone else who is doing it for her or whatever you all decide and more be a role to make sure that what the standard is, is being met. It won't be about discretion over all of these different potential expenses because there are already guidelines that all of you and any staff would be based on what the commission has said before would be following. So just wanted to put that out there that it would not be like a wide-ranging discretion or it would not have to be.

>> Steve: We are going to follow the guidelines if we ever get them. I know they are online somewhere. I understand that. But.

>> Sally: I can redistribute them.

>> Steve: I'm old school. I got to see paper. Operated a long time as an attorney with a lot of paper Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I would be perfectly fine with Sue handling that portion of it as far as with the commission I have no issue whatsoever. I think that is kind of part of her job description any way in my view so just want -- I'm good with whatever the commission decides.

>> Steve: MC.

>> MC: I would like to offer Sue to give you some helpful supervision and just sort of share power it does seem wise to have Steve and Brittini as vice chair and chair be sort of sort of go to people to help with your own like questions and I want to offer I like the idea of helping us create a structure so that we have more of our commissions so that

we are sharing more power and it's not just the share and vice chair who are sort of always designated. If you can help create or suggest sort of committees or seek out commissioners who want to be involved in say a personnel committee and again I'm not suggesting I know what structure it is but I think I want to try to create more positions that help distribute, yeah, accountability and sort of responsibility among our commissioners so we can each plug in and share the burden so to speak and give you better insights of what we are trying to do, what we are thinking about.

>> Sue: Thank you.

>> Steve: Sooner or later we may have insights, but we will work on that.

Okay, so I think that we are probably at the point to say that Sue will handle the review and approval of staff. And her either myself or Brittini and I'm saying anybody can volunteer, and maybe Brittini doesn't want to volunteer. Just to have two of us either one could approve those so we have myself or Brittini and pick who you want to submit them to so there is always one person around who could do that.

If that would meet with everybody's approval raise your hand. And those opposed say I'll do it. Not hearing anybody saying I'll do it Rhonda.

>> Rhonda has a question.

>> Richard is on the phone so with raising our hands we have not heard anything from Richard so should we get verbal from him.

>> Steve: Richard have you been raising your hand.

>> Richard: Yes, I have but you have not seen me and I'm trying to be quiet here and listen so if you have any questions on what I think I will be more than happy. I'm thinking the computer is getting close here so I may be able to log out of this one and go to the other one shortly, I hope.

>> Steve: In a legal step then you are acknowledging you have raised your hand on all the previous votes we've taken?

>> Richard: Yes.

>> Steve: Okay thank you.

>> Richard: Thank you, Rhonda.

>> Steve: General Council hiring so we are up to discussing what we will hire, and I will turn it over to Brittini to have the discussion of who we are going to hire.

>> Brittini: We have the firsthand and we approached this similarly to the process that we did last time. Of course, we can have decisive discussion, but I will start with Doug. You can share what your thoughts are.

>> Doug: Yeah, I took some time and went back and reviewed our last meeting, which was the interviews of the four individuals. My general opinion is we have four equivalent candidates. And I think anyone of them could probably do the job. So, I took a little more in-depth analysis of each of the individuals and the opinion I came up with on each one let me just review them quickly on Monifa I thought she was qualified. But I also felt that she didn't have the depth of the experience that the others had. So that

was my general impression of her. I think she could do the job. I did not have any doubts about that. But the experience level wasn't up to that of Julianne or Kathryn or Jim in my opinion. I took a look at Jim and I think Jim had some really great experience dealing with Government issues. You know legally. And I thought he knew his way around the Government, understood the Constitution well, Constitution of Michigan. And the voting rights act and so forth. However, during his explanations I think I share the same opinion that I heard Juanita mention the other day when we met is it was hard to follow his explanations. He got too involved into the legal aspects and the legal jargon and didn't really convert that in my mind to something that us non-lawyers or non-attorneys could understand that well.

So, I saw that, and I saw that in Jim. And so, the two people that floated to the top for me was Kathryn and Julianne and Jim and Monifa are excellent candidates. I took a look at Julianne and she had some redistricting experience. However, when I looked at it there was 11 or 12 years ago. Times have changed since then. Although the experience is good. And I'm sure there is a lot of similar things. Times have changed. We are under some different guidelines than she would be. And I saw her experience as a microcosm of what we have to do. Detroit is a lot smaller than the State of Michigan. Okay, however, I mean they did have the different ethnic groups within the city. For the communities of interest and so forth. But I looked at it this way. I thought she communicated well. And I thought she had some extensive experience with other commissions. So, I thought that was good for her.

However, to me, Kathryn floated to the top. And the reason being a number of reasons. One I felt she was very forward thinking. She -- the impression I got from her is she wanted to prepare us legally as we move forward. She wasn't one that would deal with things as they came up necessarily. She will of course. But she is one that would look at it from a more systematic approach. And looking out for our long-term liabilities. And putting programs together or advice for us to put programs together that would protect us from that sort of thing. I think she gave some examples. One is our documentation and how we kept that. And I think those types of things that another one is something MC brought up a few minutes ago was let's spread the work. So that we are not getting ourselves in a legal position where everything is focused all the work is focused maybe towards one individual or so forth. So, I think those forward-thinking ideas are what we are kind of looking for. I think she communicated well. She I thought she had an excellent approach on how she would work with the communications director. Her daily meetings would be executive director and the communications director with general counsel if not daily three times a week or so forth. Her verbal skills I thought were excellent. They were clear. They were concise and they were right to the point. And I was impressed with that. So, in summary, let me ask each of you that don't have Kathryn at the top of your list, to take a little more time this morning and veer her qualifications again. I think she is a top-notch person.

In my opinion she is a top shelf professional. Who I think would integrate extremely well into our team. People like Kathryn are not available that often and we really should take advantage of this opportunity with her and so I'd like to yield back to you, Steve.

>> Brittini: Thank you. So, I'll go with Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Okay, after our last meeting I went over all the resumes again, watched our last meeting online again and I basically narrowed it down to one just to save time who I believe is the top pick and my top pick would be Julianne and the reasons being with her interview and her resume it shows she has got extensive experience with application and interpretation of the Freedom of Information Act, the open meetings act, Roberts rules of order and she does have the redistricting experience. She made a comment about having governmental experience but not political and I believe MC even has mentioned that in some of our meetings that there is a big difference between governmental and political. The voters right act when I looked at the supplemental questions for everybody, she was the only one that it seemed had actual experience with interpretation and application of it. The others stated they had knowledge of it, but it seemed like she was the one that actually applied it. She has experience outside of legal experience which is very beneficial to help Sue in her job. She has worked with commissions and has over ten plus years advising commission and boards which that is what we are looking for somebody to give us legal advice as a general contractor. The fact that she has been following Supreme Court cases executive orders et cetera as it pertains to this commission and the others that she is working for. I think is a good thing. She studied our timeline and she talked briefly about 30, 60, 90 legal plan as it applies to us. She has got experience coordinating with community forums and meetings which I think is beneficial again both to our executive director and beneficial to our communications director. She does have litigation experience. I was also impressed with her community involvement from voter education pro bono expungements to improve access to jobs and education and pro bono representation to victims of domestic violence and I know that does not pertain to the job duties of this job, but I think it speaks volumes to who she is as a person. You get people that can talk about wanting to help the public or improve communities, but it seems like she is actually done it. So, I think her reasonings for wanting to do this is sincere and comfortable in the interview and saw her as someone I can trust which is very important to me. I saw her as somebody who would be easily approachable and easy to communicate with. There is a couple interviewers that I was a little edgy about not sure about. And I said this in other meetings I did not feel that way with her. There were no flags that came up. And I said in other meetings that I always trust my gut. I said that about Sue Ann when I read her resume there was something about it and after I interviewed there was just something about her and that is how I feel about Julianne and it's silly but believe in listening to your gut and intuition. Lastly, I want the commission to know and kind of the public to know how I came up with my decisions. I kind of looked at four aspects in

rating them myself. I looked at experience and if I believed that the person is capable informed enough and able to do the job and duties that are required. I did take into consideration number two public comments because good, bad, wonderful or not, we are working for the public and I said that even with the executive directors and I'm maintaining that.

Third, I looked at how I first personally felt was there anything that I felt that you know flags going out was this somebody I felt I would be able to work with that other commissioners could work with wonderfully. And lastly going back to the public comment I did look a little bit at their political affiliation and if I believed that there was conflict of interest. With Julianne there was no public comments she was very open and honest about her two contributions and why she contributed to them and when she did. And I just felt comfortable with her. And I know Brittini in past meetings has talked about us keeping a consistency with this commission and doing the same for one as we did for others. These were basically the same things I looked at for the executive director position, so these were the same things I looked at for this position and these are the same things I'm going to look at moving forward for our communication and I want to put that out there so there is no question. I ranked highest on experience when I'm looking. I gave a higher percentage to the experience and less so to the last three. And that's it. I get the floor back.

>> Brittini: Thank you Rhonda if anyone doesn't mind, I would like to jump in quickly. And I'm going to keep it short. I think my top two choices were Julianne and Monifa and my choice for Monifa is similar to what Doug shared about Kathryn. I think there is a sound ability there in where maybe there is a little uncertainty about experience. I think the willingness and drive kind of overrides that. I think we have already discussed candidates that maybe weren't high in experience realm but there were other things that we found to be applicable to the role. But, having said that, and following up with Rhonda's comment Julianne edged Monifa out to me in terms of experience and I think when I looked at the candidates as a whole my thoughts of them came in kind of three areas. How do they interview?

Do I view them to be individuals with integrity and their experience?

And out of everyone if we were you know, and I'm also objective so despite my for the public comments that come in I'm always looking for how does the individual present in front of me and what do they choose to share with us, and I agree with what Doug said about Jim and I think Julianne is that great positive opposite of being full of experience. Able to be accessible, not only to us and be personable but there is a transparency there. Even though she is highly intelligent, highly qualified, could easily you know make decisions and make recommendations I can tell from her interview and having reviewed her resume that her goal is to have us understand the type of decisions that we are making. And I think because none of us have served on this type of commission before and as you know our mapping experts to my knowledge, I think that person is more

valuable than someone that can kind of talk at us. And as I have shared before may have the tendency to make decisions based upon having such an intimate relationship with how this commission was formed. My greater point is that I think we need to think seriously again about how we choose candidates. Are we going to do away with public comment?

Or is it something we are just going to fluff off?

Or are we going to deeply consider those things and consider it a conflict of interest when someone has a close tie to high the commission was formed or either is a friend or affiliate or acquaintance to someone on the commission. I think those things do matter and for that reason Julianne is my top choice. There is not conflict there and her resume is I would argue more competitive than Jim's. Yes Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Yeah, so I want to touch on that point about deeply considering public comments because we all know I'm a digger, so I've done some digging the last week because I was really troubled by the comments, I was seeing about Jim Lancaster, so I wanted to do more digging into it. And this is sort of a summary of what I've discovered. So, the very first letter I don't know if you notice we received is from a man called Anthony Tony Daunt is his name and he wrote on letterhead versus everyone else who is e-mail and it was coming from the Michigan freedom fund, so I did a little digging on the Michigan freedom fund and it turns out the Michigan freedom fund is largely funded by the DeVos family and their various foundations. And you know it's a conservative advocacy foundation, mostly associated with republicans and other donations are republicans and however I think the important fact is that the Michigan freedom fund donated over 3 million dollars to protect my vote which was the organization that was opposed to this ballot initiative. So, from the very beginning the Michigan freedom fund has opposed this ballot initiative. There are quotes from Tony Daunt in the paper because he was executive director saying we are committed to defeating proposal two which was the voters not politician's proposal that was ultimately adopted. The Michigan freedom fund challenged the petition language at the board of canvassers review, they lost. The language was approved. And then they fought against and donated significant amount of money to prevent the ballot initiative from being adopted, after the ballot initiative was adopted, he is the Plaintiff in multiple lawsuits against the secretary of state to invalidate the commission. There is one actually that is active right now that he just filed appeal in last week where he is the lead Plaintiff where he is seeking to declare that the commission is unconstitutional and invalid and that the administration and selection of commissioners is a violation of his constitutional rights. This is a person who is actively opposed to what we are doing. He is actively trying to dismantle our commission. He is currently trying to dismantle our commission, and this is the organization that if you look back on Facebook and you look through the social media you can actually see that the Michigan freedom fund is the source of that script that we received from all those people. About Jim Lancaster. So, the organization that is trying

to wipe us out of existence is suggesting to us who we should hire as our attorney. I have a problem with that. I think that is a massive conflict of interest. I think that Jim Lancaster actually touched on it. In his interview he sort of alluded to it which is why I dug deeper. That of course they don't want us to hire Jim Lancaster because Jim Lancaster has wiped the floor with them in every single legal proceeding, they had against him and defeated them at the board of canvassers and defeated them in multiple cases, he defeated them in the district Court and Court of Appeals and of course they don't want us to hire him, so I do think we need to consider public comment. I think we need to consider what people are saying but I don't think we should be taking things at face value. I think we need to realize that there are people who have interests that may not align with our interests and I think particularly when you have an organization that is trying to demolish us, that is saying that our existence is a violation of their constitutional rights and actively trying to prevent what we are doing I think we need to take the comments and any of the script that comes with it with a grain of salt. So taking that away and really digging deep into this and all of this is public commission information as an attorney you can pull lawsuits as an attorney you can pull lawsuits anybody can but you have to pay for it and I pulled one and want to read from one of the lawsuits for you so that you can you know see what I'm saying so this is from one of the lawsuits Daunt has long been an active member of the republican party he works in Michigan to advance consecutive policies and help elect republican candidates and has served among other roles as the field director for the college republican national committee and logistics manager and director for the Michigan republican party. He is currently an officer and a member of the governing body of the Clinton county republican party a member of the governing body of the Michigan republican party committee and executive director of the Michigan freedom fund and then in the lawsuit this is exactly what they are asking for the lead Plaintiffs which is Anthony Daunt and Michigan freedom fund seek to have this Court declare the commission unconstitutional and invalid and the administration and the selection of commissioners of violation of Plaintiffs constitutional rights. So, the comments that we are seeing are coming to M people who are trying to destroy the commission. And with respect to Jim Lancaster, I don't think the comments deserve a lot of merit that being said I did look in political ties and comments and did not see one way or another convinced me he is particularly partisan people are saying he is partisan based on donations but that was it so going back to the principle of who is the most experienced, who has the most knowledge, I don't think there is any comparison between Jim Lancaster and anybody else. I think he is an expert. Everybody else is still learning. So, he would be the one that I would vote for because I think he is the most experienced. And I understand I feel like from my perspective I understood him but I'm a lawyer so to me what he was saying completely resonated and I did not find it confusing and I think if other people are not following him we should have given him the chance like we did with Julie Ann and say I don't

understand what you are talking about Government and the sunshine can you explain it and I have no doubt he does he has to go into Court and make it understandable so if there was a concern maybe he talked too much or maybe speaking over people's heads we need to challenge him on that and say Jim speak like we are sixth graders or bring it down to another level because we are not following you so that is my two cents but I think the board needs to think carefully about who these public comments are coming from and not just take them at face value because I think you know if I was suing my neighbor I would not let my neighbor pick my lawyer and I don't think we should be letting the Michigan freedom fund tell us who we should have as our lawyer particularly when they have every incentive to have us not pick the most qualified person because I guaranty you at the end of the day the person that is going to be suing us when we finally approve our plan is going to be the Michigan freedom fund and Anthony Daunt.

>> Rebecca respectfully from what I've heard so far people are not focused on the public comment and are focused on the way he interviewed, and I think to suggest we should have baited him to have a different response all we have is what how the candidate presents. So, coming into this he knows that not everyone is an attorney and I think it was his responsibility as a perspective candidate to give his best interview. I do not think he gave his best interview. Cynthia and Doug and then Rhonda.

>> Rebecca: If we say we are looking at the experience and that is what I keep hearing from everybody's talk I'm going back to the experience you can't ignore his experience. He has got over 30 years whereas everyone else has less than ten. That is a huge difference. It's a huge difference.

>> I'm not but if he cannot explain the experience it becomes irrelevant.

>> Rebecca: I thought he did very well actually but again I feel like if someone with Juliann Ann was saying I don't understand, no one gave Jim him that opportunity to explain it in a lower level if you were not following. I think it's an inconsistent standard to give someone the chance to clarify and not give someone else a chance to clarify.

>> I have something to say of inconsistent standards and Doug and Rhonda had a hand.

>> Rhonda: Can I have a comment and acknowledge it because it's pointed at me and I feel I need to acknowledge this. I asked about the sunshine laws because in her talkings and in her resume it said something about sunshine laws. I did not know what sunshine laws was. So, for me to ask her that question was for verification for my understanding, so I don't understand how I'm supposed to ask every other person what sunshine laws was not brought up until we interviewed her, and I just want clarification because it has been brought up twice now thank you.

>> Steve: Let's not take everything as a personal attack. This is a discussion.

>> I don't think she said it was a personal attack.

>> Steve: Rebecca had her points. Rhonda you had your points. Let's try to keep it on an even keel. Don't take a front anybody. This is a discussion.

>> Brittini: To make this a safe and brave space I want us all say what we need to say and if we are going to vocalize, we cannot say it's personal and they are our thoughts, so we have to have the discussions here or not contentious or not but have to be respectful. Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: So, I want to thank Rebecca for doing all that legwork for us. I have a few things and found a few things as well but of course not as much as she was able to find so I appreciate that. I do think that we need to read every public comment and take it seriously and, yes, look at where it's coming from if we can find that information.

That being said, I without all the stuff that I can give if you want my top two picks were Julianne and Kathryn. They each edged each other out in different ways but really, I think either one can't go wrong with either one. I think we had a good group of candidates so.

>> Thank you, Cynthia, anyone else that we all have to share our choices?
Yes, Richard.

>> Richard: I would like to make this quick if possible.
I think all the comments by the public, but I noticed a lot of copy cut and paste in their comments which is understandable I guess because you try to get your point across. I've looked at a lot of the comments, they are quite interesting, some of them make a lot of sense. Some of them don't. Obviously as Rebecca has said as usual, she gave me some information that she dug into the importance of Mr. Lancaster's position and his experience. Rhonda, I also like your comments about your stuff, I agree with you 100% perception is everything. The only problem we have here is we have -- we need experience with this. And I guess I want one of you commissioners to please explain to me a man that wrote this proposal is so partisan I don't -- it does not make any sense to me. Why is he such a bad guy?

Because he gives money to the democrats?

All right, I get that. But he's not -- he wrote the proposal. That is why we are all here. So, I need somebody to explain to me. So maybe the solution is to hire two of them. Hire one, hire Mr. Lancaster and another attorney. I don't know how much work there is involved here. Maybe that could be split up as far as wages or whatever. I guess I'm open to some comments. But thank you commissioner, you enlightened me very well with your comments.

>> Thank you, Richard you are a commissioner, too so we are all in this together.
Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I'd like to address Richard's comment about hiring two people. I don't think that is a workable solution for us. I think it would be difficult to separate work among the two people. I think we would get a lot of differing pons and potentially some contention. And I think we are better off with one individual. Now I saw that recommendation come from a comment I believe from Tom McMillian relative to I don't know who is the executive director or the general counsel and he recommended that I

felt that by going that route that we would lose continuity. And that it was not in our best interest to have two individuals for one role. So just wanted to make that comment.

I will make a short comment about Jim Lancaster. When I mentioned before that it was hard to follow his explanations that was my assessment of him. When I assessed him after going back and looking at these previous meeting, I did not take in to account the public comments from him. For him. Only because there is too many. And half of them were pro, half of them were con. We have gone through that before, so I took that variable out of it and assessed him against the other three. And in my opinion, he ended up to be the third of the four candidates so based on that solely. Okay, I yield back to you Brittini.

>> Brittini: Thank you Doug I would have to agree with you honestly. Can I do Juanita and then Cynthia?

>> Juanita: I just want to say I agree too. My assessment was not upon his -- those people talking about him and sitting in their views of him. It was on the fact that I could not really follow him in a way that I thought I should have been able to follow him. So, I still stick to my person that I my first choice who was Julianne Ann.

>> Okay Cynthia thank you Juanita.

>> Cynthia: One comment I forgot to say I did like Rebecca's suggestion last meeting of I don't know if this would work out but if we didn't hire James Lancaster as the general counsel to maybe use him later if he is willing like when we do get into litigation. I thought that was maybe a really good solution.

>> Brittini: Erin, Doug and Anthony.

>> I'm going to go out on a limb here and say like Rebecca I gravitated more towards James Lancaster due to his experience. And his knowledge and then my second pick was Julianne. Two I noticed a lot of that was the typical cut and paste as Richard said. But I think to just dismiss him and his expertise I think we would be cutting off our nose despite our face. I'm curious what Steve, what your opinion was, Steve. And then I guess that's all I have to say.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Erin. Anthony.

>> Anthony: I'm just wondering before I state my comments I'm wondering if our new executive director has any thoughts because they will have to work with this person quite a bit. So, Sue I don't know if you have any thoughts, but if you have any, I'd definitely like to hear them.

>> Sue: Thank you for asking I was waiting to hear the comments from the commissioners before I spoke so if anyone else would like to say anything before I give my comments you are more than welcome to.

>> Brittini: Thank you Sue that is a great consideration MC.

>> MC: I guess I want to acknowledge what Richard said that there is something about the independence of the group that brought us here, the expertise that, yeah, Jim Lancaster brings is no doubt and because we are looking for general counsel. What I'm

thinking about is what Erin raised or Cynthia just brought back up, Rebecca has said we need a litigator. We need to win. We know it's going to be Tony Daunt and the freedom fund and one of the major parties and so I think but as general counsel the interview also did not go that well for me. I want somebody who is like Julianne Ann who can explain at a moment's notice and experience matters and I would not mind Jim being the general counsel but Juliann Ann gave me the feeling she could say it and ethical and civil servant attitude that I feel is going to be really important as we have our counsel because we are looking to set ourselves up for yeah like we need to educate ourselves and the general counsel I think is the person who is going to help us then we need to move into litigation and I don't think Julianne has great experience but certainly Jim as Rebecca stated right has the proven track record and we need to be able to like pull on that if possible. Yeah, if he is willing but I guess I'm for Julianne and I wanted to offer it feels really important and I'm going to stop talking.

>> Brittini: MC you were fine, Erin and Doug and Anthony.

>> I think Jim could probably sidestep any litigation issues we may run into because he has been there. And my next suggestion would be to possibly bring back our top two picks for another interview and maybe they can both plead their cases.

>> Brittini: Thank you Erin. Anthony, I think that was the order.

>> I think Doug was ahead of me.

>> Doug and then Anthony.

>> Go ahead Anthony.

>> Anthony: The first thing I want to say is you know I agree with Brittini in that I think the idea of consistency needs to be discussed further.

So perhaps adding to the agenda for a future meeting a discussion like she was talking about about consistency and how we are going to handle this kind of stuff in the future. Might go a long way. I think individually each of us really has been consistent. But because some of the views may be in opposition it makes us as a whole not consistent even though on an individual level, I think everyone is pretty much holding the same views that I've seen since the beginning. So, I think adding that to the agenda might be a good idea going forward. And I'd also like to thank both Rhonda and Rebecca for their comments even though they are kind of you know different viewpoints I think both of you two really did an up standing job of going through everybody and kind of laying down the pros and cons of each. And I really do value the opinion of both of you. So, thank you. Now for the applicants. I also kind of started from scratch after our last meeting. I went through and you know looked at all the applications again, watched all the interviews again and the list that I came up with as far as preference is James Lancaster then Julianne then Kathryn and then Monifa. I first looked at their resumes and applications and as far as that goes I had Mr. Lancaster followed by Ms. Pestula then Ms. Kirwin and I looked at their area of expertise and I had them in the same order. Then I looked at comfortable ability and it kind of changed a little bit because you know I

agree I don't think James had you know the best interview so for comfortable ability I had actually Kathryn first and then Ms. Pastula then Mr. Lancaster. And then I had after comfort ability I had how I thought they did on their interview and I thought Pastula had the best interview followed by Kirwin then Mr. Lancaster and finally I had I gave this a low percentage as far as my total preference went but I did find Ms. Kirwin to be the least controversial followed by Ms. Pastula and then obviously James Lancaster is the most controversial out of the bunch.

However, you know, I gave the most credence to the area of expertise and the resume portions because I really want the best lawyer for us, and you know I think the best lawyer and the person that is going to defend us the most is James Lancaster.

>> Brittini: Thank you Anthony, Doug did you have something to say?

>> Doug: I just wanted to comment on you know, having a general counsel other than James and then having him join the group later particularly if we have to litigate, I would see that scenario going where the general counsel would come back to the commission with recommendations of attorneys if we ever got in that situation with litigation, which is probably probable. And he may or may not be on that list of recommendations. Based on who she is comfortable with. And my experience with litigation in the past. And in corporations, in large corporations, is that it's not a one man show. It's generally a team of people from a reputable law firm. And we are back, or Steve could comment more on that than I could. But that's been my experience. So, I mean, I'm looking at who I think we can work best with of that group of people and who can communicate the best with us and that is where my focus is. I'll yield back to you, Brittini.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Doug, Janice, let's hear your voice.

>> Janice: I just want to say that I also was lost when Mr. Lancaster spoke. I have no idea what he said. I thought that when he first started out, he kind of like took over the interview.

>> Brittini: Uh-huh.

>> Janice: Rebecca when she talked, she kind of swayed me over and I agree like Erin I would not mind hearing them both again, both Mr. Lancaster and Julianne to see you know what it is. Right now, my choice is Julianne only because I truly did not understand what you guys are talking about his experience so I would not mind hearing him again. That's it.

>> Brittini: Thank you Janice. Oh, Anthony, I'm sorry.

>> Anthony: I just want to say I definitely after watching all of them again I definitely agree with the idea that especially you know at the beginning of the conversation, you know, James Lancaster kind of join took it over and spent a lot of time talking to us, but I also think there was you know a reason for that. He came in with I don't know if you want to call it a handicap, but he had controversy that the other candidates didn't come in with. So, I took it as you know yes it was long winded. Yes, I thought you know like I said earlier I thought you know his interviewing skills were a little worse than the other

candidates, but I do think we should keep in mind the reason for that is he was trying to address you know the things that people said about him. Which I appreciated.

>> Brittini: Anthony I see what you are saying but I also think take it as a Mark of respect. Because there was not even a first question and I think if I think back to our executive director candidate, there was at least a pace to the interview. There was -- she gave space for us to ask the questions and beyond that there was that initial part that there was an explanation I was looking for just kind of a direct answer but then everything after that I felt almost as if we were listening to a panelist or a lecture on redistricting commission. And that made me feel uncomfortable. And I'm sorry if this is in the space where we acknowledge those feelings, but I think we are working with this individual. So, if there is this amount of discomfort already, I think we also need to take that in consideration if I'm choosing him these are 13 people that have to work with this individual and it's not just litigation, there is a whole other aspect to the role of general counsel. And this person also has to be community minded and to a certain degree has to be likable or approachable so if all of this doesn't even matter like I said public comment aside there were other things that noted about him that I think we need to take seriously and then again thinking of continuity if we have someone that is a hot button topic or we become indecisive will we get everybody a chance for a second interview and is that time efficient so that is what I would offer to that discussion. Doug, I know you have something to say go ahead.

>> Doug: I just wanted to say that I agree with you 100%. You know and relative to second interviews I don't think we are going to get much out of it a second time. I think we have heard what we are going to hear from these people. And the impressions we got from them. So, I would suggest we don't. And maybe what we want to do is move on to a straw vote to see where we stand at this point.

>> I yield back Brittini.

>> Brittini: MC has something to say.

>> MC: I'm not sure that Steve has shared yet and I think Sue wanted to sort of give her impressions.

>> Brittini: Steve would you like to say something, and Sue are you ready to give your impression?

>> Steve: My impressions I guess are number one, previously I have talked about the impact of myself having Jim as an acquaintance. And that is all he has been. So, I've said everything I want to say about that. I do agree with Rebecca as to the Michigan P freedom fund. And their canteen of letter writing. Once I looked at, you know, the first hundred e-mails that all say the same thing, I have a pretty good idea of how large their mailing list is. And so, it becomes rather insignificant, not totally insignificant but certainly pretty much insignificant. I also read some of the or I read some of the letters in support of Mr. Lancaster. And there were some people in there that I knew. And I certainly would give credence to their opinions. Having said all that if you look at these

four people Mr. Lancaster has clearly experience in litigation. He has clearly experience in voting rights act and clearly, he was significant had a significant role in getting us on the ballot and approved. So, I think that claiming as Michigan freedom fund does that, he would be too partisan, I agree I don't see it. If he is partisan, then he is partisan in the correct way which is independent selection of districts based upon verifiable information coming to us. Of the others, Kathryn is clearly a litigator. And there is nothing wrong with that. Her experience is in the litigation for the Attorney General. Julianne probably has a little less litigation experience. But has a lot of experience in the city of Detroit and Wayne County and the southeast Michigan area which is going to be important to us in our communities of interest. I would hope though we did not question her on this, that she would have some idea of who is around and about in southeast Michigan which is probably going to be one of our more problematic areas in coming up with balanced districts. So, for those reasons, and especially having taken Rebecca's comments into concern is you know, I don't think at least in my mind that while we have to pay attention to public comment, we can't let public comment make our decision. Because if we did that, you know, they are just going to have a letter writing campaign to us and it's so easy to do nowadays with emails you know you just cut and paste. You don't even have to go to a mimeograph and many of you don't know what that is and roll a bunch of them off and mail them off. So, while I don't necessarily want to extend the process if enough of us think another interview between who I would consider the top two Jim and Julianne would be useful I would not be opposed to it. I'm also not opposed to voting today. I certainly have the people in my mind that I'm going to vote for. I think out of the ladies that probably Julianne rises to the top of the list overall. Doesn't have the litigation experience I don't think, but quite frankly our general counsel is not going to be doing a lot of litigating. We get into litigation we are going to hire a litigating firm that's going to represent us. One person as Doug says. You're going to have a multi person firm and quite frankly the way it works is you are working with whatever the senior partner is and he has got about ten clerks working under him doing all the real work. Right Rebecca? So that's all I got.

>> Brittini: Go ahead thank you Steve I think those were thorough comments.

>> Cynthia: I don't think we heard from Dustin yet.

>> Brittini: I was looking for Dustin and don't see him unless he is by phone.

>> Sally: Dustin had to leave at the last-minute for a personal matter.

>> Okay.

>> Steve: He can't even raise his hand.

>> Brittini: I usually track pretty well, and I don't think he is here, but I was not going to say anything.

>> Steve: We still have a quorum.

>> Brittini: Yes, that is fine. Sue?

>> Sue: Okay, wow, thanks to everybody for all your comments. To Doug and Richard and MC that brought these candidates forward. Very good discussion this morning, I'm not going to repeat anything anybody has said so you're not going to hear much of my comments that I have written and prepared. We do have four good candidates. It's wonderful to have this difficult decision in this challenge to find the best person to serve this commission. I thought Kathryn was very prepared. She had been watching meetings. She is a public servant. She is a litigator and if you go back and look at the job descriptions it is not necessarily litigation job, it's a job to work with this commission to communicate with this commission to help in every area that we as a team will be working from now until the redistricting is finished. So, I thought Jim wasn't the best communicator in his interview. As some have stated. Julianne said her skill set she was specialized in serving public bodies and she mentioned Detroit as a microcosm this is the most difficult area where we will have communities of interest and need to work especially diligently in that area. And she said she would treat staff with collaboration and mutual respect. With great communication, with our common goal to serve the commission. I like that. She does have project management experience. That is going to be pretty important I think in our tight timeline. And I found her to be very respectful of everybody. She is the only thank you I saw after the interview. That to me I mean I have never participated in an interview and by the way this is my first one since 1989 for this job. But I've never participated in an interview and I did not send a thank you afterwards and you know let that body know you know whatever the decision you appreciated their time, and you wish them best. And she did that for us. So, I just felt the strongest connection with her. I thought she communicated very clearly. So, Julianne would be my top choice for those reasons, but you are the commission, and you get to decide. So, I wish you the best in making this very difficult decision.

>> Brittini: It drops us back off in the ocean together, Sue. Okay.

>> Sue: I did.

>> Brittini: No, but thank you. That was appreciated. I can speak for myself but I'm sure the rest of us felt that way and it's good to have that extra perspective. So yes Doug.

>> Doug: I would like to move that we take a vote at this point in time.

>> Brittini: Yes.

>> Doug: And move forward with it.

>> Brittini: Okay.

>> Steve: Let me see if we can get through this and suggest. Is there substantial support to re-interview people?

And if you want to re-interview let's just take a straw poll if you want to re-interview and I hear Julianne and Jim raise your hand. That is three. If you don't want to re-interview raise your hand. No re-interviews.

All right, I'm going to suggest a voting perimeter even though we have theoretically narrowed it down to two I propose that we have everybody vote on who they want as their top pick and we take the top two and have a runoff. Does that sound good? I'll take another straw poll if you are in favor of that method raise your hand. Any opposed tell me what to do. Anthony tell me what to do.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I think it's a good idea. But I think for consistency sake we might want to do the same type of system we did with the executive director position. I think it would create the same outcome as what you just proposed, Steve. If that matters. But that might be something we want to think about for consistency.

>> Steve: Being inconsistent all the time is consistent.

>> Brittini: Let's not be inconsistent though please.

>> Steve: I'm going to take we are going to do everybody will vote for whoever they want and have a runoff on the top two. So, Sally please call the roll.

>> Sally: Hello commissioners all right I will go in alphabetical order by first name Anthony Eid.

>> Lancaster.

>> Sally: Brittini Kellom.

>> Brittini: Julianne.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> Julianne.

>> Doug Clark?

Sorry Doug I think you are muted.

>> Doug: Kathryn.

>> Sally: Dustin is absent Erin Wagner.

>> Erin: James Lancaster.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> Julianne.

>> Juanita Curry.

>> Juanita: Julianne.

>> MC Rothhorn.

>> Julianne.

>> Rebecca Szetela.

>> Lancaster.

>> Rhonda Lange

>> Julianne.

>> Richard Weiss.

>> Mr. Lancaster.

>> And Steve Lett.

>> Steve: Mr. Lancaster.

>> Sally: Okay so I have it did not pass so we will have to do a runoff. And just as a note commissioners you will need seven to officially select this individual and one from each political party as well. So, we will be doing some double checking before we move on just to make sure that everybody is set. So, you would have to vote again.

>> Steve: Correct okay so we now have the candidates narrowed down to James Lancaster and Julianne-Pestula.

>> Brittini: Anthony.

>> Anthony: Since we have a member absent, does that change the numbers at all? Because our quorum now is 12 instead of 13.

>> Steve: You know I went back and looked at that after I misspoke several meetings ago on how many we need. And you need two things number one is a quorum which we have and number two it does not say that the number you need drops when the quorum drops. So, it's my opinion that we still need seven.

>> Sally: At the department of state, we double checked that as well over the past week and that is correct you do need seven.

>> Steve: I'm glad they agree with me. All right, one more time.

>> Sally: Okay this time I will go in reverse alphabetical order. Steve Lett.

>> Jim Lancaster.

>> Richard Weiss.

>> Jim Lancaster.

>> Rhonda Lange.

>> Julianne.

>> Rebecca Szetela.

>> Jim Lancaster.

>> MC Rothhorn.

>> Julianne.

>> Juanita Curry.

>> Julianne.

>> Janice Vallette.

>> Julianne.

>> Erin Wagner.

>> James Lancaster.

>> Doug Clark.

>> Julianne.

>> Cynthia Orton.

>> Julianne.

>> Brittini Kellom.

>> Julianne.

>> Anthony Eid.

>> Lancaster.

>> Let me just confirm. I think we are set but let me just confirm one moment, please. Okay so we have seven votes for Julianne and there is at least one commissioner of each party who voted in favor. So, we the motion passes.

>> Steve: Thank you everybody. I appreciate your comments this morning. And I certainly don't disagree. I don't know of anybody would pay attention whether I did or not quite frankly with Julianne. She is I consider her to be imminently qualified as well. And have no qualms about us having chosen her. I think she will be an excellent choice. Who was on the committee?

Where is my list?

General.

>> Doug: The committee was MC and Richard and myself.

>> Brittini: Outstanding job.

>> Steve: Who is going to contact her from the committee?

>> MC: If I'm not mistaken Richard we would rather have Doug do it is that true?

>> Doug: I would like to spread the work a little. Rhonda and I did it last time as a team so I suggest that we see if there is any volunteers that would step forward and do it this time.

>> MC: I like that good suggestion.

>> Steve: Since there is three of you one of you has to do it twice. If you didn't do it last time so that sounds like it was MC.

>> MC: I would be happy to work with Erin if you are open to that Erin.

>> Steve: I think she said yes. Did you say yes.

>> Erin: I can do that yes.

>> Steve: You guys will get ahold of her and we will have to prepare an employment contract for her. Sally, if you will have you and Mike or whoever is doing that give us another employment contract similar to the one that we just had, I'm sure there will be a few changes to be made but not a lot. And MC and Erin can you tell her that she is on board and will be getting her contract and how did we determine -- how are we going to determine her salary?

Doug?

>> Doug: Yeah, that is a comment I wanted to make. It was a multi-step process last time. Rhonda and I talked to the candidate, Sue, and we negotiated a salary. With her and then we came back to the commission for approval of that. Once we negotiated a salary with Sue there was a document, we put together that we presented to her, she signed, and we brought -- and that had the salary on it. But it was not binding. It was not binding until we brought it back to the commission and the commission approved it. And then we had the letter that you and.

>> Doug: We had the letter that you and Sally had put together and we presented that to Sue for final signature. I've got a short document typed up with the process that we used, and I can share that with MC and Erin.

>> Steve: Okay that same letter that you guys used for Sue as far as the initial.

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Steve: Offer letter that will work, just make the appropriate word changes.

>> Doug: One of the things we did, Steve, was we voted, let me see this real quick.

We voted here in the commission to give the hiring team the authority to make an offer.

>> Steve: Within the range.

>> Doug: But not a binding offer, yeah.

>> Steve: The only caveat was within the salary range as posted.

>> Doug: Correct, so that was -- the hiring team was formed and approved but I the commission. Which we just did. That approval included authorization for the hiring team to discuss compensation on behalf of the commission. And then the initial letter and then that after the candidates sign that letter would that compensation that they had agreed to it came back to the commission for approval.

>> Steve: Right at that meeting we should have the contract in hand because we don't have to reinvent the wheel on that one.

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Steve: If everybody is comfortable with this procedure again raise your hand.

>> MC: Steve I'm thinking whether we should include Sue because we didn't have an executive director last time and I'm just wondering about conferring the just the weight of her position, right, sort of including her in our committee it seems wise but I'm not sure if that is if there is a conflict there or a reason we shouldn't do it but I wanted to make sure that we don't exclude her because we just didn't think about it so I want to offer.

>> Steve: That is okay I just forgot her because she is brand new so I think that she should -- I think she should be included with you and Erin in this hire because she is going to be working with her. So, if you MC and you Erin and Sue would confer on how to make that contact and make that happen, I think that would be the way to go. Having said that, everybody agree?

>> Steve: Okay, anybody disagree?

>> No. Okay, all right, we are up to new business and somebody is calling me on my ICRC phone which I never answer so. January schedule and agenda. Sally.

>> Sally: Hi everybody.

>> Steve: Did everybody get the schedule?

Okay.

I take it Sally that since you put this schedule out you had surveyed everybody, and everybody was available on all these dates.

>> Sally: Yes, everyone who -- a couple people didn't respond like maybe two, one or two but everybody who responded these dates should work for all of you and correct me if I'm wrong. And it also works for department of state staff and like I said Sue and I collaborated to make sure that it was good for her as well. I you know there is a slight

heavier emphasis as you will see on afternoon and evening meetings to try to be extra helpful for those who do have jobs and also sort of tryout an evening meeting and see how that works for everyone. And then also a meeting on a weekend day just in anticipation that once you all hire these staff members that you're going to hire that you might want some extra time to do the work with Sue and others to plan out the rest of the year.

>> Steve: Okay and these certainly are not cast in stone and we can work with Sue to refine anything that is necessary as we go along so after the first of the year, we are certainly going to have to make some efforts to get out into the community and start having these community discussions. And for us skiers we may want to do the UP first while they have snow. Just a thought.

>> Sally: On that note actually I should have mentioned this but it's expected that by the end of the week the legislature will pass an extension on the remote meetings for open meetings act so that in the first part of the year for certainly if the legislation does pass you will be able to still meet remotely at least in January and I think the extension is through the year but we will provide those details once we have -- once the bill is passed but just know right now this is written as if it's all remote meetings for the month of January.

>> Steve: That raises a question, and I don't know that we have to discuss it, but in the amendment, in the Constitution it says that we will use technology extensively, so in my mind that means even if the legislation weren't passed that we continue to meet remotely. I think under the amendment we could choose to continue to meet remotely. Ask Mike Brady that where is he.

>> Sally: There is Mike Brady.

>> Steve: Speak up. Take yourself off mute.

>> Sally: Our computers sometimes take a second. Go for it, Mike.

>> Mike: Can you hear me now?

>> Steve: You make a good commercial go right ahead.

>> Mike: Good morning to you all Steve I don't think you would be without the legislation moving through the that is moving through the legislature right now this commission would be bound by the open meetings act. With a requirement to meet in person. So that is not currently the case because the law has been changed for a temporary period of time that allows you to act virtually you are correct the Constitution does require you to stream the, you know, to have video and to stream the meetings so other people can observe and perhaps even participate but that is separate from the obligation that is under the commissions for the open meetings act. The house did adopt the legislation I believe it would take it out until April 1st and it's now in the Senate and the Senate is expected to pass it and we will certainly keep you apprised of that and update that when that happens. So, two different pieces and meeting the

obligations and the obligation to use media to get word of the proceedings out to the public as a whole. And that exists in the Constitution.

>> Steve: This may be facetious, but the real question is when we go out for these community meetings depending on what you know what is going on and that is going to be a serious question that we are going to have to deal with. And our executive director will be looking at that closely.

>> Sally: Just the only thing I was going to add to what Mike said if you all recall the in person meeting that you had in October during that period of time when the legislature was, you know, taking up this legislation, we did live stream that so that was an example of what you know when you if and when you do have an in person meeting if you will recall we were live streaming making sure the audio worked so all of you could be heard by those watching back home so that is the kind of sort of at a normal open meeting you would not have the obligation to do that because you all have the obligation to do that.

>> Steve: I'm assuming on our shows out in the public meetings that as you said we are going to be live streaming those everywhere.

>> Mike: That's right.

>> Steve: Will it be the same team?

>> Mike: We stand ready to assist and Sally and Sara and I had a few conversations with Sue already just about not that specific question but just ongoing needs that may very well arise for the commission and how the department of state can continue to serve the commission.

>> Steve: When I say that I meant the technical people, are they going to be the ones.

>> Mike: Yes, it might be the same individuals and we have other folks from the communications department so there may be one person swapping out here or there as necessary to make them.

>> Sally: To just add to that and we have already talked to Sue about this, but you know, and we said it to you all before as well but certainly our entire office, our entire team stands here to support you all. You know, as is written in the Constitution but also you know whatever you all need, we want to you know support your success. So, we will be working with Sue to figure out how we best do that especially now you are bringing on, you know, staff of your own and really play that role of secretary without a vote and also furnishings assistance as directed by the commission as much as we can.

>> Steve: Okay Erin.

>> Erin: So currently to reiterate Januarys are still remote meetings not in person meetings?

>> Steve: Correct. We need to schedule communication interviews. How many do we have?

The team, who is the team?

>> Sally: I believe it's six, six that you all voted on at the most recent conversation about this.

>> Juanita: Yes, we have six and I wanted to revisit a resume of Walter Song because.

>> Steve: Sorg.

>> Juanita: Walter Sorg.

>> Steve: Go ahead.

>> Juanita: Did you say something, Steve.

>> Steve: If you want to revisit somebody go ahead.

>> Juanita: Yes, when we arrived at the number that we wanted to bring to you guys, it was -- we were trying to just keep our short list short. And after Steve had said something about how come we didn't choose Walter Sorg on here it's Walter Song I went back and revisited his resume and looked at it real well. I remembered I did write very good on his. And he has a lot of experience. Walter Sorg has a lot of experience and let me get my glasses here. And he created the ballot committees' names, and he became the third word message of the campaign. His responsibilities within voters or not politicians was he developed and implemented media relations strategy, he counseled the communications committee which developed printed and web support materials. He provided media training for the executive director to prepare for her interviews. He did create an initial PowerPoint presentations on gerrymandering to use at town hall meetings and thought he was very informative when it came to town hall meetings and spoke at two dozen town hall meetings on the first month following creation of the ballot committee. He also had primarily liaison with numerous commission political and nonprofit organizations. He had a real good profile and resume. His experience with public affairs, he was assistant executive director for the media of the state bar of Michigan. Primary media spokesperson and staff director for Michigan department of commerce. He had majority communications staff director and press secretary to the speaker of the house representatives, communications consultant for clients including Michigan State University. Multiple state agencies, fortune 100 companies and nonprofit associations. He had broadcasting and journalism experience. He produced and cohosts Michigan policast in 2019 and 2020. He was cofounder of talk Lansing netting company. He was award winning broadcast journalist for radio television stations in Detroit and Lansing including CBS and TV Detroit. He is a producer and has done news media website design development, created and implemented social media marketing campaigns excuse me advertising and marketing and business development and I just thought that he would be a good face for also for us if we chose him. He is very, very knowledgeable in this feel for communications and as a communications director.

>> We should put him on the list for interview.

>> Steve: That would raise us to seven.

>> Juanita: Yes.

>> Steve: Those are scheduled for January 7th from 1:30 to 6:00 which typically means 6:30. So it would be five hours. We may have to hold a couple over to January 12.

>> We are not going with the original selection of the subcommittee.

>> Steve: Juanita was on the subcommittee and she is suggesting to add a person.

>> I'm just adding.

>> Cynthia and then Rhonda.

>> Cynthia: I just think if we are going to interview that many it needs to be on two days because over five it's just hard to still hear everything fresh.

>> Juanita: That probably would be good. I'm sure that would be excellent due to the fact that whoever our communications director is, he will be the face of our organization, so we want to pick a good one. So, I would like to hear Walter Song.

>> Anthony.

>> I thought I was next but okay.

>> Steve: Go ahead Rhonda.

>> Steve: Rhonda Anthony has surrendered his position to you.

>> Rhonda: I just want to make a point that if somebody is going to be added I think we need to vote on it because I know for the executive or not the executive director the general counsel, I made a recommendation, and it was discarded and never voted on. So, I think if we are going to add anybody after the commission subcommittee has already made a recommendation and it's been voted on that we should vote on it.

>> Steve: Is that a motion?

>> Rhonda: That is my motion.

>> Steve: Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> Steve: Motion has been made and seconded that we vote on having I take it 7 people with the addition of Walter Sorg all in favor raise your hand.

>> Anthony: Is this a motion to interview Walter Sorg.

>> Steve: Motion to increase the number from six to seven with the addition of Walter Sorg.

>> Anthony: I don't believe that is what the motion was, I believe the motion was to, you know, to vote to put it on, to increase the limit, not necessarily to -- sorry I can't verbalize what I'm saying Rhonda can you clarify your motion for me, please?

>> Rhonda: They were asking that somebody be added the Walter Sorg be added so since we have already voted on the initial six that we were going to interview, I was saying we should vote on whether or not to include him.

>> Steve: Everybody clear on the motion now?

Okay all in -- you got a comment Doug or are you going to vote?

>> Doug and Cynthia look like they have a comment.

>> Doug: I wanted to make a comment, Steve. Maybe instead of adding one maybe we ought to reconsider the six that we've got and reduce the number, so it gets down to a more manageable amount.

>> Steve: Are you amending the motion?

>> Doug: I am.

>> Steve: So, your motion would be to.

>> Doug: Remain with six people and we will add Walter and eliminate one of the others.

>> Steve: Okay, is there a second?

>> I think Cynthia has a comment.

>> Cynthia: I will second it. So, my comment is Walter is very qualified. The most qualified out of all the applicants that we had so thinking back to our meeting, the reason that he wasn't on my list is because when I looked at political affiliation and social media, we are going to get the same thing that we got with the other people. Although the people against, people for. So, I took that into consideration. And that is why in our discussion he wasn't one of the top six. But if we want to do that, he definitely is qualified. And the other thing, well I seconded the motion I do think we should keep it to six. One person on the list that was well two people on the list that were kind of added at the end that were not on two people's list from our committee so we could take a look at them or if anyone else has other thoughts.

>> Brittni: I agree with what you said Cynthia. That is why I kind of raised the furrow-brow and voter not politician's affiliation should be taken into consideration. Sue and then Anthony.

>> Sue: We -- since at least this decision was made we have received a letter of support from a candidate from the other party. Not his party. Who he actually did media campaign for? So, I think that speaks to his nonpartisanship. And then also if I can assist in any way, you have an executive director now who would normally hire staff that would work under the executive director. If I could assist in any way by doing preinterviews and bringing recommendations to this commission, that might help you, whittle your list down to a more manageable number because six or seven interviews is going to be a grueling process. So, I'll just throw that out there. If you want to take advantage of me doing some of the legwork ahead of you, I'm happy to do that or if the commission as a whole wants to reduce the number that is fine also.

>> Steve: Keep in mind when you get ready to vote that we have previously made a decision not to vote to two days for interviews because second people are going to have the advantage of watching the first people and see what we do. So just a point.

>> Brittni: Cynthia and then Anthony.

>> Cynthia: Well, I just wanted to thank Sue for reminding us of this. We are not used to having an executive director so we should use her to our benefit to the commission's benefit and I don't know how exactly that is, but we do need to take that into consideration.

>> Brittini: Anthony. Thank you, Cynthia, and then Erin I see your hand.

>> Anthony: I'm wondering at our last meeting we already voted to have the you know the six people that we chose at the last meeting come in for an interview so I'm kind of just wondering how did like why didn't this individual come up when we were discussing this previously?

I just worry about like setting a precedent of you know backtracking.

>> Juanita: Can I answer that?

>> Anthony: Please.

>> Juanita: The reason it did not come up prior is because Cynthia and Janice and I we chose the two or three people that we wanted and that is kind of what we came up with when we put our little committee together. And I had three, all of mine and I had three and I think a couple of them, I think Cynthia you had three or two. Did you have two people that you suggested?

>> Cynthia: I think you are thinking of the people we actually presented to the commission.

>> Juanita: That is what I'm talking about.

>> Cynthia: I presented two but that was not my top list necessarily.

>> Juanita: Well, the ones that we came up with is we did not want to go over the amount that we had. We thought we would kind of keep it as short list as we could. And so, but my three were all when -- we had so many applications for this job. We had more than we had for any of the other positions. And we -- I think I went over 50. It took me about eight hours to read every one of the resumes and the people that I selected were I put on there very good, mind you I did do four years of communications at Wayne state University. And in journalism and I did four years as a public relations person. And so, I chose Walter Song. He was one of my first ones and I had so I grabbed the first kind of three I wrote very good on and those are the ones I selected, and Janice and Cynthia chose the ones they wanted to select but I just kind of thought if we picked the ones that had a good, had a lot of experience for this communications job that we would -- it could really get narrowed down quicker or whatever.

>> Thank you, Juanita, Erin then Rebecca.

>> Erin: I think we should take Sue up on her suggestion maybe that she preinterviews the seven if we are going to go with seven and I also wanted to say I don't think we should discredit someone due to their monetary contributions to either the democratic party, the republican party or whatever. I think we really need to take into consideration their expertise of their job and what they are interviewing for.

>> Juanita: That is right, I agree.

>> Rebecca: I was going to second what Erin just said that I think we should take Sue up on her screening ability for the seven, but I did want to comment that Walter Sorg did come up during the last meeting. We specifically discussed him. I thought it was and I may be wrong Steve said what about Walter Sorg and talked about it briefly, so he did come up and I don't recall what the final conclusion on that is, but I certainly think he is worth interviewing especially if Sue is going to do that sort of filtering function for us.

>> At the risk of sounding redundant I know I took off or had to go the last meeting, but I watched it and he did come up and Cynthia said the same thing she said today as her reasoning that is my question why are we revisiting things that we made and seems we made a decision on and I think we have to stop doing that. That could be my personal opinion, but we spend so much time waxing and waning and we entrust the committee to do their job and we need to let them do their job. Otherwise let's scratch that and just make decisions as a whole. I have no problem with Sue offering to screen so that's great. But I think we have the candidates, and we should stick with that and I think even reviewing them we could pair it down even more based upon the qualifications and I respect deeply the decisions and the education and all the work that went into presenting that. And that is where I stand. Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I have to agree with you. And with Rebecca we did discuss it briefly at the last meeting before we voted to confirm who we were going to interview. And now looking at it now I'm wondering how many people of the six that we interviewed have watched this know that they are going to be interviewed and now that the discussion is, we might bring somebody else, I mean doesn't that kind of seem like a conflict to them? Since we as a committee, as a whole voted on the six that we are going to do, I would almost look at it as a slap in the face, now they are going to add more, I don't know, that is just my personal feeling. I could be wrong in my feeling, but I can't help but feel that way for the ones that were chosen, were voted on and now to say, well, I think we want to bring this one on for interview too. It just doesn't seem fair to me but that is my opinion.

>> Juanita: I just think, okay, I just think that because we have not interviewed any one yet that it should not make a difference because who knows Walter Song may not gel with anybody or he may gel, but we are trying to get the best face for our communications person and that is all. I think we should look at every -- look at every good application that we have if we possibly can.

>> Steve: Okay there are a couple of motions on the table, there is also a volunteer by our executive director to do a little of our work. There is a couple of ways that we can go. One is and I think probably I'm guessing that having Sue do a prequalification on the people is kind of what we are leaning towards. So, we can have a substitute motion if someone wants to make it. Or we can vote on the motions that we have now.

Before us. And if we are going to do a substitute motion, the motion would be that instead of the two motions that are current we would substitute, have in the executive director do a prequalification on I'll say the seven names that we have floated. And are talking about and bring back two us her recommendation for who we are going to interview or start interviewing on January 7th. I think that would probably require that be done those recommendations be done through e-mail. So that is my substitute motion. It needs a second. Cynthia you are seconding?
No?

>> Cynthia: I have a question first.

>> Let's get a second then we can discuss it. Erin seconded it. Okay now you have the floor, Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: My question is can we take care of something like that by e-mail?

>> Steve: We are not making a decision by e-mail. We are not hiring by e-mail. We are taking a -- we are having Sue give us recommendations. That's not a hiring decision. That is not -- Mike, you want to chime in on that?

>> Steve: Open meetings guru?

>> Steve: I think he left for lunch.

>> Sally: I think Mike is.

>> Steve: He is coming on.

>> Sally: There he is I think he was trying to get on, hold on a second. Thanks everybody.

>> Mike: Hello. So, as I understood the proposal it's not that Sue would have the authority to act. I don't view this offhand as being a delegation of the commission's authority but rather Sue would be doing a review of the individual candidates that to the committee considered everybody and I think there was a recommendation to the commission, the commission agreed and maybe looked at other candidates and candidate agreed to narrow it to specific candidates. At this point given the number of candidates it is to a sizable number six or seven, Sue you know this commission could ask Sue to meet with or speak with each of these candidates and then come back with a -- with her recommendation and given that it would not be a formal delegation of authority I don't think there would be any concern that Sue would be you know a committee of one or anything like that under the open meetings act. At that point she might come back and say you know actually I think these two or three candidates come as more appropriate perhaps or you know public meeting interviews from the full commission that would be her recommendation. The commission then would still have the ability to decide they wanted to interview you know for somebody or they could not accept basically not accept the executive director's recommendation. Does that make sense?

>> Steve: Yeah, I think the question is can we do that by e-mail?

Can we get her recommendation by e-mail and schedule the interviews?

>> Mike: You could get her recommendations by e-mail. You can't -- the commission cannot act and if the commission is taking a vote to act that decision has to be made at a public meeting. But Sue could certainly write her comments to you in advance of a public meeting.

>> Okay.

>> Mike: You would not want to respond to her.

>> Steve: Okay, Erin.

>> Erin: If we do that will Sue's interviews be subject to the open meetings act?

>> Mike: No, they would not be. Sue is not a public body. And if you delegated the authority to her there is an argument that you could have created a committee of one. Which actually terminology the courts used. But that's not what you are doing, you are not delegating the authority you are asking her to do her own review and come back and advise you all. That is a good question, Erin I hope the answer is clear.

>> Juanita: I think if we go on and interview where everybody can hear it then that is just as much time as we probably would take if when Sue do all hers and come back and tell us.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: As far as the motion goes, I'm not for the motion because it was all kind of wrapped up into one saying the seven people when my original motion was should we not as a commission or I wanted to as a commission vote on if we are going to bring in that seventh person. I'm all for letting Sue do kind of a prelim but don't want it rolled into one motion when I made the motion.

>> Steve: Your motion we are voting on the motion for a substitute and if you don't want that you vote no and there is not a substitute motion. It's the motions of the amended motion and the main motion.

>> Is it combined in with the motion of Sue doing it that is how I was listening to it as the motion for Sue to do the preliminary on the seven so as it rolled all into one because I have no problem with Sue doing it, but I would like to vote on it if we are bringing in a 7th person. The last motion that you just made kind of put everything in one basket.

>> Steve: My motion was a substitute motion she would interview the seven people and bring back her recommendations for whoever it is we want to interview and that is the substitute motion that can be either voted up or voted down.

>> Rhonda: I would like to substitute the substitute motion if possible and put in that we vote on if we are going to have a 7th person since we already voted on the six and then a separate motion saying that Sue can handle the preinterviews.

>> Steve: I'm actually good with that.

>> Anthony.

>> Would Rhonda have to accept the substitution since it was her motion in the first place?

I believe Rhonda's motion was simply to add to go from six to seven and I believe she wants to vote on that and then after we vote on that we can decide if we want our executive director to handle a preinterview process.

>> Steve: Right and I considered that a friendly substitute that we can vote on. I'm withdrawing my motion. We will take hers. I will second hers. So, her motion is we are going to have six or seven. Are we ready to vote?

All who would approve having.

>> Rebecca has something to say.

>> Rebecca: Can we clarify the motion so it's not going with six or seven are we going with seven or are we going with six so it's not confusing what we are voting on?

>> Steve: I was just going to say that. And it will be are you in favor of going with seven people?

"Yes" or "No"?

All in favor of going with seven people raise your hand.

I see 1234567. All opposed?

Raise your hand. 12345. It passes. We are doing seven. Now as I understood everybody's sentiments it was to have the executive director talk with the seven and come back to us with a recommendation on who we interview which we can accept, reject or modify. So that is the motion. Have the executive director preinterview the seven. Is there a question on who the seven are?

It was the original six plus Walter Sorg.

>> I can't see we can keep it the way we have been doing with all the votes.

>> I don't understand you lost me.

>> I'm just saying that if we are voting that we do seven why don't we just go and interview the seven.

>> Then you vote no on this motion.

>> Okay.

>> MC has something to say.

>> Pardon?

>> MC: I wanted to offer Juanita with the preinterviews we might be able to get more information and understand how we can make not have two days of interviews with seven people to let's say full days but have a one day with, yeah, more complete interviews and, yeah, be able to -- the preinterviews I think help us that is why I think we are making this motion Juanita and I see Sue's hand up too.

>> Steve: Sue.

>> Sue: I had trouble with my unmute button. The only thing this will do is kind of upset the schedule that has been made. I want to make sure you're aware of this because the first meeting in January we were going to do interviews and I think Mike is telling us I can't decide who you are going to interview, and you can't decide outside of

a public meeting. So just be aware that if you would have to be, yeah, I'm not sure how that will work with the open meetings.

>> Juanita: Right, right.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I see that Sally has something to say.

>> Sally: Just to add to what Sue just mentioned, if you all were to ask her to do the preinterviews, she could of course tell you over e-mail these are going to be the recommendations that I'm going to tell you about in the next open meeting. You wouldn't be able to discuss it with her over e-mail. That -- you all discussing it with her over e-mail would be a violation of the open meetings act but she can give you just like I will send you things sometimes before meetings or things like that I can do that. Now what I would suggest with the schedule knowing that is that we do the same dates but adjust the time so instead of Thursday January 7th being a very long day it would be a shorter meeting where you would hear the recommendations from Sue, you guys could get to other business items as well. I know there is a lot to dig in to. You have no shortage of things to use meeting time for. And then we would have I'll look at our schedules but either the 12th or the 14th could be when you actually bring people in to interview and we could adjust that timing based on how many people you choose to interview. So, we might for example, on Thursday the 14th, might make it instead of from 9 to 12, 9 to 1, if you need a little extra time but that would basically be swapping some of the key agenda items here and I think it would only put you back timeline wise only slightly. And be a more you know be an efficient use of your time that way.

>> Steve: Everybody understand that you know Sue will make a recommendation, we choose not to accept that recommendation we could choose to interview anybody we wanted. Outside this six or seven. So, I doubt we would do that but that certainly is an option. Are we ready to vote?

Where did Erin go?

Step away.

>> MC: She said she had to step away.

>> Steve: Well then, we need to have her back anybody got anything for the good of the group while we are waiting?

>> MC: Thinking of general counsel and I don't know next meeting Erin and I and Sue the three of us will have done something so that will probably be part of the agenda on the 7th. Okay.

>> Steve: Sure, and by that time we will know whether or not they are going to accept, and they can participate in that meeting.

>> MC: Right.

>> Sally: As Steve had mentioned earlier in this meeting you know; at the department of state, we will work with you and certainly with Sue on both that initial letter and having the draft contract ready to go so there is not the same time between the initial letter and

the contract being signed. I think we can do that pretty quickly since the initial legwork has been done for Sue's position. We have a template.

>> MC: I think we have already as a commission already said that the general counsel will get the same sort of laptop and all that, we have that cleared.

>> Steve: We already have it on order.

>> MC: Great.

>> MC: That is all the stalling I'm doing.

>> Steve: Tell us even today.

>> Juanita: I just want to say that Walter Sorg is not my person yet. But I would like to hear him. I'm not in opinionated with anyone yet but wanted to throw him on there because he had a good resume and wanted to clear that up.

>> Steve: Erin is back and for everybody the vote the motion I seconded is that we will have Sue preinterview the seven people, the six original plus Walter Sorg and come back to us with a recommendation of who we are going to interview which we will then make a decision on. So that is the motion. If you are in favor of that raise your hand. 123456789, 10, 11. 12. That pretty much covers it. All right, Sue you have your marching orders. We did meeting dates. We have outstanding, excuse me, correspondence, everybody should have received something from Gangwar publication, and I've seen on chat that some of you are of the opinion they want to know about me go on Facebook and find out. Others are saying I don't have a problem. I will give them what they want and so you know I guess it's up to us. I mean they are not asking us as a committee to give them any information, but they are asking us as individuals. Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I think Sally was wanting to say something, it might have been.

>> Steve: You are more important Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Sally might want to say something.

>> Sally: It was about the meeting agenda. So, if you want to get to this next item and I will raise my hand again once you are done with this discussion, no problem.

>> Steve: I mean that was just an observation. I mean, you know it certainly appears to me they are not asking us as a commission to give them any information. They are simply asking for information from us that individuals and I see some of us have decided to give it to them and others have said go find it, so the other was a Wayne state what I call the Wayne state study. Is everybody -- does everybody know what I'm talking about when I say that?

Okay, they are wanting to basically do a study on why not just us, but you know 9,000 of our closest friends made an application to be on this commission. Does anybody have any strong feelings one way or another?

Rhonda?

>> Rhonda: Of course, you know I do.

>> Steve: Hey everybody has feelings on this commission, so you're just as entitled as anybody.

>> Rhonda: I went over their letter their proposal and there are a few things that kind of bother me about it. The one is it's saying that it's saying that applicants would be all those who applied plus the commissioners that were chosen and then in the letter it says in addition we respectfully ask the commission for contact information of all applicants. Well, one, if they are grouping applicants as it says in here as everybody that applied, we don't have that. Even if we did even if secretary of state just put it down not our address, not our phone numbers but just the city we are so I think as far as confidentiality of the people that applied that would go against that. It says also that it's not mandatory that the people participate in it, they will send something out but then also says that they will do up to five follow-up contacts to people who do not respond. So, I'm sitting there thinking like that is like telemarketing to me, that would annoy me if there was something I did not want to participate in, and somebody is repeatedly contacting me about it. And then the full knowledge and support of the commission. The letter saying that we fully support it. I for one when we initially talked about it said that I did not want to be part of it. So, I'm not fully in support of it. Personally. I just think that there is better ways than going through this commission. I don't really want to put my name on a research study saying that I'm for it. And when they are asking to give out people's you know information, their contact information which we don't have, and I don't know if there is legalities to that about even getting it but I would not be comfortable doing that since ours on the application were for privacy reasons for not given. So those are pretty much the three things that I kind of have issues with which before I said that when it was first brought up, I personally did not want to partake in it but after reading this, this is my feelings on it.

>> Steve: Sure. Anybody else?

>> Anthony has a hand raised.

>> Anthony: This is Oakland University who want to do the study, not Wayne state University.

>> Steve: I will make that change thank you.

>> Anthony: Wayne state had a different thing; they had a lecture that wanted us to speak but this proposal I believe is coming from the professors out of Oakland. They answered my questions that I asked last time. If you recall I asked what journal academic journals they will submit the results of this study to and they listed that. I'm familiar with some of the journals and they are up standing academic research journals that do things in a scientific manner. Which is how they want to conduct this study. After reading their proposal, I'm more comfortable with it. But I would understand anybody's hesitation to be a part of doing a study. I don't think any of our -- normally when you do a study you have the principal author, and you have secondary authors of the study. And I don't think that any of us unless we want to, but I don't think any of us would have

to put our names under the authorship of the study. To me it's more of a us being the subject of the study. And I think whether or not we want them to do it, I think they can just even if they don't necessarily have our support, they can you know study us in the context of us being a public body as all of our information you know is very transparent and part of the open meetings act. So that is just a few things to keep in mind with this.

>> Brittini: MC.

>> MC: I'm thinking about how education and getting public input is one of the challenges that we are going to have, and we have such a quick you know short timeline to get it all. I think the more education about why people are -- as much as I was surprised, I think we each sort of expressed surprise we were chosen randomly, you know, none of us we each applied with a one statement sort of application. And I think what I'm suggesting is because we are randomly selected, we are not actually chosen because of let's say what we wrote on that line. It feels like the study could help our future commissioners, right, and it certainly is going to get our name out there and the commission and help educate in ways that it seems like you know so many people voted for this.

It feels like it could be something that many people do want to understand. Or frankly the education I don't know if it's media attention or education I don't know how to call it, but it does feel like the more that we are out there engaging with the public and if we have researchers helping us do that it feels like it could give us a positive essentially more informed public where we are ultimately giving us right now information that we need. Because they are aware oh, we want to draw lines fairly and we need committees of interest et cetera, et cetera and if there is over 9,000 people who applied, and I think they may want to give answers.

>> Steve: Mike, question for you. Is this information they are requesting available under FOIA?

>> Mike: Specifically, in terms of addresses?

>> Steve: Sure.

>> Mike: No, I mean the department of state we would redact that. There is exemption for this is FOIA Freedom of Information Act and there is exemption for private information or personal information and so the department of state's position is that you know generally speaking if someone were to submit a FOIA for a personal address as I think Rhonda has already noted the way we put out the proactively put out the applications that you and others have submitted to serve on the commission we redacted you know and we left your city but we redacted Your Street address and your phone number. I think Sallie Mae be able to redact your e-mail address, I think that is how we usually handle that. Or to that, we would not do that and of course you are private individuals and can voluntarily decide to do that but that is different question about if it would have to be disclosed under Freedom of Information Act.

>> Steve: Can they I assume they can FOIA who applied.

>> Mike: They can. And have, in fact, when we received those requests something like 10,000 applications and per the Constitution it was narrowed to what was it Sally? It's been six months. Narrow it down.

>> Steve: About 9300 applications thereabouts.

>> Mike: Yes.

>> Steve: And so those names have been supplied to whomever asked for them under FOIA with the redactions you talked about.

>> Sally: Just want to illustrate a little bit what we are talking about for folks who have never engaged in FOIA things before as I was one of those people a couple of years ago. So, somebody will request, will submit a request for the information, in this case we are talking about who applied to serve on the citizens redistricting commission. And as Mike said, because of sort of legal protections we are able to the best of our ability to redact certain personal contact information. If you recall on the actual application itself, it made note that this was a public document and that the person submitting the application was submitting a public document but that we would do our best to Remove Street address and e-mail and personal contact information. And so that is really what was on the application and said to every person that applied so we are legally obligated to provide the list of people who applied and a lot about their application with the exception of that personal information that we are as Mike said legally able to redact. So, these researchers just to be clear any person in Michigan could request to see that information. But just you know not the personal contact details.

>> Steve: Okay, so let me suggest something that maybe will -- maybe we will consider. I don't think we need to officially recommend this study. I guess my position is if they want to do this study, that's fine with me. But don't ask me to bless the study. I'm not going to stand in the way and whatever they can get through FOIA is fine with me. Because they have a right to get it. And then if they want to contact Rhonda five times, they are not going to get a response. Rhonda is going to block their phone number. And I probably would never respond because if I don't know who you are calling me to start with, I'm not going to answer. At any rate that would be my suggestion. I wouldn't say, yeah, we are going to help you all we can, but we are not going to stand in your way. I'm open for other suggestions.

>> MC: For clarity if I do want to participate what I'm hearing it's okay with you all and the commission in general that I yeah participate. I don't want to do something against the commission. I guess I want to act on behalf of all of us.

>> Steve: I think it's the same as with Gangwar you want to respond to this study that they are doing, that is totally up to you.

>> MC: As an individual but not on behalf of the whole commission that is what I'm hearing.

>> Steve: You are not speaking for the commission. I don't know they will ask you a question about the commission other than how come you applied. So.

>> MC: Very good, thank you.

>> Steve: I don't know if we need Sally, they have kind of again conversing through you. Are they expecting a response from us?

>> Sally: I don't know if they are expecting a formal response. But I'm happy to e-mail them back and I can even direct them if they are not watching right now to this portion of the meeting where you all discuss it and sort of relay that the collective thoughts that you all provided, I'm happy to do that.

>> Steve: I'd be happy to take a vote on this but if we are good for what our discussion is, yeah, Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, Sally, rather than you having to do that, would our executive director be the better person to do that?

>> Sally: I'm happy to loop Sue in and have her do it, sure.

>> Doug: Yeah, this will be outreach to you know outside the state Government.

>> Rebecca: Sue this is Rebecca speaking. I am also like MC where I'm fine with participating if they were to reach out to me. I don't know if you want to let them know maybe that Rhonda is not interested and MC and Rebecca are interested if that might be helpful for the group, so we don't have people being bothered who don't want to be bothered.

>> Steve: I think our position, Sue, is that the commission is not taking an official position. We are not saying we are for it. Or against it. Anybody that wants to participate is totally up to their own personal discretion and you know, we as the commission, we do not have possession of the applications. The department of state has them. But they are not in our possession. And if they wanted to get them -- if they were to come to us and ask us through a FOIA for those documents we would answer we don't have them, and they can go to the secretary of state which they obviously has already done, I think. So, everybody is good with that?

No?

Yes?

Okay, any other business?

That is all I had. All I have. Sue go ahead Sally.

>> Sally: Sorry to interrupt.

>> Steve: You said you were going to jump back in, yes.

>> Sally: I just wanted to clarify the draft schedule given the decision that was made about the communications, so I mentioned this, but I just want to make sure this is okay with all of you. That so Thursday, January 7th we would shorten the timeframe of that meeting. It was made so long estimating out interviews so we will shorten the timeframe of that meeting. And then likely extend the timeframe or sort of plan tentatively on the 14th being the day that you do interviews. I think it's ambitious to think in an evening timeframe we would be able to get through, potentially you could get through the interviews, it depends on how many people but tentatively plan the 12 or the 14th to be

when you do those final interviews, and you can make that decision on the 7th. Does that work for everyone?

>> Steve: Sure.

>> Sally: I just want to make sure.

>> Steve: You will send us a revised schedule, proposed.

>> Sally: I will update the timeframe on Thursday, the 7th.

>> Sally can you clarify what will be happening on the 14th.

>> Sally: So, depending and my thought is depending on how many people you all choose to interview based on Sue's recommendation and how long you want those interviews to be you could either do it on the 12th or the 14th and one of those dates we might just need to extend the time out a little bit, but you could make that decision on the 7th and we would have enough time to alert the people who would be interviewed.

>> Okay.

>> Sally: Does that work for everybody?

>> Steve: I think so.

>> I might have an issue on the 14th because I have to go to Court so we will see. For a client not my personally.

>> Steve: For money.

>> Brittini: Absolutely not Steve not me try again.

>> Steve: We will get you a PR bond. Good luck Brittini.

>> Maybe somebody you know but representing a client.

>> Steve: I don't know anybody in Detroit courts and made a firm decision when I started practice 40 years ago never to go to Detroit.

>> Detroit is a lovely place it's for trauma accuracy and that is what I do.

>> Steve: We are down to my last point which is Sue. After seeing this collegial group do you have questions, comments, observations?

Now is your time.

>> Sue: Thank you and thank you for all your work today. I think this is a great group. I love to see how well you work together. Especially through tough decisions. I really commend this group. I have a kind of short list, but I wanted to let this commission know what I'm thinking, my short-term focus areas should be. And then I would value your input if I'm on course or some things may be more important than another. So, my short list includes a work plan with timelines.

Getting a hold of the budget and addressing, you know, what that budget looks like. How it's playing out and if we have enough money in our budget to do the work that this commission feels it needs to do. The RFP, RFQ process for consultants we are going to have to get on that pretty quickly. I know some draft RFPs have been made so we will look at those and start thinking about who we might get for mapping. Also, maybe to look at what software we want for mapping. So, the public could possibly put their own maps, send their own maps to us versus sending comments which is going to be very

difficult for us to manage. There will be some onboarding of staff fairly quickly. And also continuing education for the commission.

I know there is an interest and a desire to learn and you have learned a lot, but I've listened, and I know that there is more that we as a team can learn there. I have a question about who we might talk about as a media spokesperson is it the communication person, it is the executive director, is it the chair of the board?

So those are some things to think about. I will tell you before I accepted the position, I did three media interviews in my community. Obviously, that is not big news. It's a small community. But you know I was on the radio stations explaining this process and I was surprised to hear the radio people who have been involved in this you know and spreading news that they learned things about the process from me that they didn't know. So, I think it's really, really important and I've heard MC say this more than once that we start that public education. You can tell from the many of the letters that we have received from the public comment that people don't understand the process. So, we've got a big job to do there.

And then just simple procedural thing do you want me to prepare a letter to the executive director candidates for Steve Lett to sign as your chair?

Indicating that I have been selected for the position?

They probably all know. But I think it's a common courtesy that we should extend. And you know I don't think it should come from me personally. It should come from Steve. So that is my short list.

>> Steve: That is a pretty good list. Did we not send out a letter to the other ED candidates already?

Anybody?

No?

Okay, please prepare a letter and I'd be happy to sign it. Anybody else got anything to add to Sue's list?

Rhonda?

>> Rhonda: Does she also do one since we voted today for the general counsel a letter for the general counsel.

>> Steve: Let's get them hired first.

>> Rhonda: That is true I'm sorry I'm jumping ahead.

>> It's okay, it's okay.

>> Doug?

So, I have the same comment for what Rhonda had said.

>> If anybody else has anything we are at the end of our discussion. Ending a little early. And I make a motion to adjourn everybody in favor raise their hand. Everybody opposed stay online. Everybody have a good weekend. Have a great everyone have a great weekend.

>> And happy holiday.

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.

>> Thanks everyone.

>> Celebration however that happens for you and your folks.