

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.

MICRC

07/01/21 1:00 pm Meeting

Captioned by Q&A Reporting, Inc., [www.qacaptions.com](http://www.qacaptions.com)

>> CHAIR KELLUM: As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 1:03 p.m.

This meeting is being live streamed at 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 to find the link for viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Bengali and Arabic translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting.

Please E-mail us at [Redistricting@Michigan.Gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.Gov) for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at [Michigan.gov](http://Michigan.gov).

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed, and those transcriptions will be made available and posted at [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) along with the written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC). This portal can be utilized to post maps and comments which can be viewed by both the Commission and the public.

Members of the media who may have additional questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, our Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission.

He can be reached at [WoodsE3@Michigan.gov](mailto:WoodsE3@Michigan.gov).

For the purpose of the public watching and the public record, I will now turn the Department state Staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hello Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please announce during roll call that you are attending the meeting remotely. And unless your absence is due to military duty, announce please your physical location by stating the county, city, township or village and the state from which you are attending the meeting remotely.

I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.  
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?  
>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?  
>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?  
>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?  
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?  
>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?  
>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette.  
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?  
>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?  
>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you MDOS we will now move to adoption of the agenda and as a reminder you can view the agenda at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC).

I will now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Dustin Witjes.

Second made by Commissioner Orton is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none it is moved and seconded that we approve the meeting agenda all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it.

And the motion carries.

We will now move to the review and approval of minutes, and at this time there are no minutes to approve.

So we will go ahead and move to the public comments correspondence and remarks.

Without objection we will now begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics only portion of the meeting.

Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with the public comment portion pertaining to agenda topics.

For in person public comment individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so.

You will step to the nearest microphone when I call your number and you will have two minutes to address the Commission.

You will conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

Please do not extend much beyond the timer, what I mean by that is whatever sentence that you are saying we would like you to finish your sentence but don't past that to honor time.

Our first in person public comment pertaining to agenda topics only is number one.

>> Hello.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Hello.

>> All right. My name is James Gallant. I'm with the Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. And I signed up for two public comments today. And I've been denied those several times. And I ask for consideration to those that I missed. And the transcripts you post online are not transcripts. It is posted right on there, it says this is not a transcript, so please get transcripts on there.

And I would like to encourage you, Commissioners, to reconsider your decision that you made yesterday, on June 30, 2021, which you have the motion to reconsider at the next meeting.

And Roberts rules to approve Mr. Clark's proposal to a flow chart that includes the virtually unrecognizable process of collaborative, facilitated, dialog type, consensus building type, decision making processes.

In a policy, and you did not amend the Bylaws. You did not amend the rules. Those are voting. This is about voting and you should be amending the rules, right? It appears that those, that flow chart was created in closed sessions with your staff and with your vendors, Mr. Brace.

Mr. Clark testified he was in closed session with these vendors outside of meetings. He was never voted -- you never voted to him to allow to do that. You did not charge him and say you go talk to the vendors and you go work this out. He just sprung it on you during the discussion that was there with no pending motion or second. This is how it works. This is the bully with the gavel, is Ms. Kellom. She is the bully with the gavel. She allowed the discussion. She assigned the floor for discussion without a motion. That's overstepping the authority.

That's what I mean by bullying, that is overstepping your authority, somebody's rights are being violated. And this happens all day long. And this is why it doesn't feel real

good when you are doing this. And encourage Commissioner Lange, your colleague, to not compromise on this. She seems to have compromised on this. And hearing no objections is it now a decision? No, that is not voting, that is in lieu of voting. And remember Mr. Brace told you he had to go to Court, one of his plans in his states that he did. And they threw that out because their process was determined to circumvent the law. They said you just did this because the law said not do it. You did a work around. And you did a work around, and that's in direct contradiction and inconsistent with the State of Michigan.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for providing in-person commentary to the Commission.

We will now move to -- we had one remote public comment, but this that person is not present.

So we will move along in our agenda or we will move -- please don't interrupt me because you don't know what I was going to say. We are going to move along to those who asked to speak a second time.

We will move along to the second, those who requested to speak a second time will now be allowed to do so.

Keeping in mind that we must remain calm as this is a public meeting and we are all here in good faith to do good work.

At this time all those who have signed up for a second time to provide in-person public comment will be allowed to do so.

In-person public comment, second time speaker, number one, you may now address the Commission.

>> Well, thank you, Madam Chair. James Gallant again. I think I should get this concurrent because there were no others and you just interrupted all of my probably trying to just get me and my thoughts changed up here. But guess what? You just said good faith.

I mean, I'm sorry folks but and to this Commission, your Chair just made what she called good faith statements. And it was not in good faith because she is not following the rules the whole time. And this is a matter of the fundamental rules of parliamentary law in America. And this is where it's going to come back down to. And, Commissioner Clark, your colleague stated, well, you can't really document discussion.

Well, yeah, that is what Roberts rules does. And I think that is why this process, and, you know, I wrote on my second page of my notes during the meeting, that was my Ah-ha moment, and I said, My God, they are doing straw polls as they discussed. That is what they are doing one. Because one member said, hey, I agreed with Sarah. And then they went on. And she said wait a minute, did you get that? I agreed with Sarah. Sarah is not a member first of all. And did not get deliberation. And Secretary of State is supposed to be here at the meetings. And then the Chair said oh, yeah, I got that.

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.

Does that mean you are write, pencilling straw polls as you go? Because Commissioner Rothhorn described this consensus building process that you approved as straw polling.

There is only one sentence in the rules book that you have now, Roberts rules, it says straw polling is out of order. And it's truly not right. And yet you just approved that. This is what Mr. Brace told you, they went to Court and it got reversed, why? Unprocessed.

If Mr. Clark to talked to members outside of the meeting, so he only talked to the vendors and the staff, no Commissioners.

If he talked to any of you Commissioners, that is a collective quorum violation of Open Meetings Act outside the meeting, is a collective quorum. But maybe he would like to go in a deposition and say, no, I didn't talk to any Commissioners on purpose so we didn't have to do an open meeting.

So that is the part in Court when they say, yeah, you just did that, directly to circumvent the Constitution again.

So please start from page one of Robert's Rules of Order and start this over. And my prediction is that some people are going to be removed and some people will be disbarred here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: At this time that concludes our public comment for this afternoon.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a point of order.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Mr. Gallant has been at a number of these in person and in virtual and we have explained to him on a number of occasions that his public comment at these meetings are for agenda items only.

And so far in my recollection I have never heard him address an agenda item.

Therefore I think we should consider in moving forward, of course this is the last meeting so we are a little late in this, but if he signs up for public comment tonight it should deal with whatever the topic is.

So I would love that Mr. Gallant if he is making public comment that is outside of the suggested process that he be barred from making that comment and if I have a second I would speak to it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'll second that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I have a motion made by Commissioner Lett and a second made by Commissioner Weiss is there any debate or discussion on the actual motion? Hearing none, it's moved and seconded that if Mr. Gallant chooses to speak outside of agenda topics for tonight's public hearing and if he has signed up to speak for public hearing time as a public commenter that he would be prohibited to do so if I'm stating it correctly.

Thank you Commissioner Lett.

At this time all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All opposed please raise your hand and say nay? The nay was recorded by Commissioner Eid just in cause that wasn't audible.

The ayes have it.

The motion carries.

At this time we are going to move to unfinished business.

Without objection executive director Hammersmith will present a MICRC timeline and roadmap.

Hearing none, Sue Hammersmith you have the floor.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

One of the things we talked about in our last meeting was future agenda items and your staff MDOS staff and our consultant working on timelines so we can make sure that the process moves smoothly going forward.

So before you today is a timeline and a roadmap so you can have a sense of where we feel that as a whole we should be going.

Obviously this is up to you to decide, but these would be initial, an initial draft coming to you.

So it starts with the redistricting process committee meetings that were just held and that full Commission meeting yesterday to adopt the redistricting process.

Starting next week we are going to work on resolving issues with DTMB regarding installing the software on your laptops.

EDS will be testing and installing software and working on building their database.

They will process and incorporate the American community survey draft data set.

And they will obtain the SRI2021 population estimates.

The latest version is not yet out, but it should be out any day.

And with that they will build the first version of the database.

Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question.

To install that on our computers, is that something that is done in person? Or like are we going to Lansing for that?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I don't know at this time.

The process that will be for installing it on the computers.

Right now we are trying to work through the process with DTMB so the software can actually even be approved to be installed on computers.

And then we will work with Fred but we can ask him that next week.

How that typically is installed.



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.

He will be here on the 8th which is the next agenda item, although I skipped the RFP is going to be post for litigation counsel on July 6th.

So next week when we meet on July 8th we have a pretty full agenda.

City Gate is going to provide some initial information so Commissioners will have a good foundation from which to determine if you want the software installed on your computer or if you wish to use the Internet version.

So you can use either.

And he will explain the differences, the different capabilities and that way Commissioners can make the best decision as to what will work best for them.

If we have time we will do some region mapping exercises.

Create, start working on creating regions in the state and explore how to work and draw together through this process.

We are going to talk about some alternative data sets that can be used as temporary place holders in the process.

Bruce Adelson will do a presentation on implicit bias.

And, again, we will continue to work.

This is not the Commission work but we will continue to work to make sure that the data from the public comment portal tool can be transferred over to our EDS to make sure that's a smooth process.

This is a lot for a one day meeting.

And in chatting with Sarah about that, she said we could try to add July 9th.

They checked, the same facility is available.

So with the permission of the Commission, if you decide you want to do this we will add a July 9th.

And on that meeting we would do the two continuing education pieces that you talked about yesterday.

So that's Bruce Adelson with his two hour conversation about the U.S. Constitution, the Michigan Constitution, case law, et cetera, and then Dr. Lisa Handley on the partisan fairness measures.

So those are two topics if Commissioners have other topics they would like us to address on that day we could also do that.

July 13 would be the deadline for bidders to submit their questions about the litigation counsel RFP so when we meet on July 15th we will approve the answers to the bidder questions, we will look at those and work on them.

Bruce Adelson was not available on the 15th for his discussion.

So depending on Dr. Handley's availability we will get her in either the 9th or the 15th.

By July 16 then the bidder questions for litigation counsel will be posted back on the website.

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.

July 18th we are going to confirm EDS has their database built out with the SRI data, the ACS election data everything that they can get possible to start the work and then the week of July 19th we want to begin mapping with the alternative data sets.

Initially draw and confirm the regions as a group and then go into some exercises looking at the data that is available while we are waiting on census data.

Kim informed me this morning that he is not available until July 23rd so he is out the 19th-22nd.

That first week.

So we may have to look a little bit at an alternative schedule that week.

So July 29th would be our deadline for responses to the litigation counsel.

And we will go through our normal process with we have with all the RFPs where MDOS and CICRC staff review and score. And then we move that information and all the proposals along to the litigation counsel committee to meet between August 4-9 to review those and they will come back to the Commission and make recommendations on which individuals or firms to make presentations to the Commission at its next meeting.

Just as a placeholder, August 1st is the date that we requested the Supreme Court ruling.

While we, I would say Julianne has requested.

And the MDOS staff.

But that's the day that a response has been requested.

We may or may not receive it by then.

August 3rd is election day and a Tuesday we would not have staff available, I know Kim Brace will not be available that day also.

August 16th we will be receiving the legacy format data we hope.

And EDS is going to begin processing that immediately and begin sending data and tables to this Commission.

So they will be sending you tables and maps and until they can get it processed it will be homework for the Commissioners to do on their own time, to start looking at all the data that will be coming.

We expect to have the process data available August 23rd-26th during that week. EDS will work to rebuild version two of the database adding this data.

And then that will be posted to our website for public use.

And at this point Dr. Handley and Bruce Adelson can begin flagging areas where census data and the racially polarized voting patterns indicate that some particular attention should be paid consistent with the Voting Rights Act.

August 15th we are going to be meeting in Traverse City.

And the week of August 30 we will begin drawing maps with the 2020 legacy data format and the preliminary 2020 election data.



So during August 30-September 30, plan on a lot of time, a lot of hours per week and remember also we are going to college campuses during that month for 5-8 p.m. meetings on the days that are listed.

By September 10, we expect the litigation counsel contract to begin.

September 17th as you know is a constitutional deadline for the map publication to allow for 45 days of public comment and September 30th we hope to receive the official 2020 PL94171 census data, so EDS can then begin building the third version of the database for mapping that will be the data that again to make sure that the legacy data and the 2020 census data are the same.

So between September 30 and October 6 they are going to be working on processing that data.

And by October 4th we hope to have some draft maps available to begin sharing with the eight communities where this Commission approved to go for public hearings in the second round.

We are looking at either three weeks with two days, three days and three days per week.

Or we could go four days two, two and two, two, two, two and two like we did this last round so that is a decision point for the Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: How soon do we need to make that decision of like when we want to do those, that second round?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: In an ideal world that would be made pretty quickly so Edward can begin scheduling the venues and the AV. Although we are going back to places we have already been, so it should be a little easier lift for him at this point in time.

So by October 22nd we hope to have the second round of public hearings complete. As you know November 1st is the constitutional deadline for approval of the final maps. November 2 is election day, so we will not be able to meet on that day.

And then October 25th-November 12 we will be intensive revision of draft maps based on the public comment we received.

And after November 16th or earlier, if the work is completed, the 45 day for public comment will begin.

The 45 day period.

So the proposed deadline for adoption of final plans would be 45 days after these proposed maps are released.

Which would be December 31st on this calendar.

And then within a month we would do a final draft report.

Or work on drafting the report with a final draft due on January 30th.

On March 1st, the maps would become law on this timeline and on April 19th would be the deadline for candidate filings.

So and also the Bureau of election would have to get the qualified voter file updated in the time between the maps are final and the filing deadline.

So that is a vision for how the Commission could move forward.

I would certainly entertain questions, comments, thoughts, input about adding July 9th meeting and also input about public hearings, those I'm assuming are going to be better attended.

So we will probably have to build more time in.

Maybe look at full days for those or you know with breaks in between.

So I would welcome feedback at this point on this draft regarding any thoughts you might have.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: First thank you so much, Sue, for doing all that work and collaborating with all the necessary people to provide what I will call a really good sketch of how we could begin moving forward and it looks like Commissioner Rothhorn has maybe a question, point or some perspective.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yeah and a lot of gratitude thank you Sue. This is excellent.

And I'm looking at the what I'm thinking about is how many days we can meet to have as many Commissioners as possible on the days that we meet.

And I think I guess I'm just thinking that we have a Tuesday, Thursday we had a Tuesday Thursday kind of schedule and it seems like I guess I'm just I don't know if it's a question but I just want to acknowledge that I'd like to try to see if we can get as many Commissioners together at that time.

And I know that we have a number of hours that you have listed there.

So if we are going to do a what there is weeks where we have 8-12 hours of meetings so 6 hours between two days isn't bad but when we are getting up to 24 hours a week with the estimation I'm just I'm hoping that we can sort of try to figure out the best ways with those who have the most limitations that we can work on that as we move forward.

The second piece that I'm thinking about is the I guess the idea of the unfinished business right for July 9th in particular, that community of interest conversation.

And I'm assuming that you've got it on your radar but it just seems like it's such an important piece to try to wrestle with and so that is just another reason to have July 9th in there, they are already both so packed so I just want to say thank you for trying to make that work.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I would also mention that, you know, from this point forward all meetings have to be in person unless, you know, you're in the mill -- military or have health issues so having Tuesday and Thursday meetings may not be as practical for travel and overnight and that's why adding the 9th on to the 8th made sense if we are already in Lansing.

We could stay there and not be traveling back and forth and have all the mileage.  
So I mean that's another consideration that we need to think about.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I would also just like to add Commissioners that this is a roadmap so we don't have to feel like we have to necessarily vote today.

If, just putting that in our minds because it seems to but I can tell that we are percolating and thinking as we are looking at this.

And it looks like Sarah also has a hand.

I think Vice Chair Szetela has a hand as well.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Madam Chair.

I wanted to address a few points that were brought up by Commissioner Rothhorn.

I also circulated addition to the timeline that Sue circulated a calendar that was created for those who are more visual learners like I am.

That puts most of these dates that are in the timeline on an actual calendar.

And you will note that on the 9th if the Commission so chooses to meet at that day it's ear marked for the communities of interest discussion that the Commissioner requested to engage in.

Second, regarding your comments about what days to meet during the week, so the as you may recall a few meetings ago we made a request of the Department of State and your staff made a request of the Commission that while thinking about what you want your future schedule to look like it might help to think of it more instead of what days do you want to meet, thinking of it as how many hours per week do you want to meet.

And when we receive that information from you, we are happy to compile some scheduling options for you.

And bring it back to you.

Keeping in mind what works scheduling wise for most Commissioners.

So in regards to what you were saying Commissioner Rothhorn it is certainly something we would try to maximize the attendance of all Commissioners and any proposals we would provide.

And finally I just wanted to add that the recommendations on hours that were listed there I believe and Sue perhaps you can confirm that those were provided by Kim Brace as estimates for how much time would be required for mapping sessions during those time periods.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sarah.

Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So it sounds like it would be helpful for us at this point to as Commissioners sort of look at our own schedules and calendars and take into account that we now have to travel for these meetings for each meeting that we are having and maybe I don't know if this needs to go to our Executive Director or to Sarah or to both but it seems like maybe that should be the next step is that we need to all

look at our calendars and come up with a schedule that works for us with a list of okay good days, bad days so that can be compiled and come up with a reasonable schedule keeping in mind there are going to be weeks where 24-30 hours is what's expected.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: That would be very helpful so if you can never meet on Mondays we need to know that or if certain days of the week you know work or don't work for certain Commissioners that would be helpful but especially as we get into the long weeks.

There is not going to be a whole lot of option there.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: For the meetings in person are we anticipating except the ones on college campuses they will be in Lansing?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: They could possibly be in Lansing.  
Maybe also Detroit area.

One thing that is really limiting for Kim Brace is where he flies in from.

It takes him if he comes to a Wednesday meeting he has to fly in on Tuesday and leave on Thursday because he has a very short window on any given day with the flights.

So we may want to consider more in the Detroit area when he is coming in for mapping. I see big smiles from Brittini.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes.  
Commissioner Clark? I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I fully support what Commissioners Szetela just said.

And I would also want to add that we lock in Friday the 9th as one of the days that we are absolutely going to meet.

And I think that makes sense because we are going to be in Lansing on Thursday the 8th as well.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you Commissioner Clark.  
Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just agree with both of those things.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Good it sounds like we are all in agreement of the schedule and that makes me happy.

So thank you again, Sue.

But so Executive Director, Sue, maybe give us some action items moving forward that would I know we talked about them but give us quick hits of what we need to do moving forward to make the schedule set in stone.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Could we also have a motion on the 9th because we need to get that scheduled and assuming it's okay with Edward for the tech.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes I would accept a motion for securing the July 9th date to meet.

Motion made by Commissioner Clark.

Second made by Commissioner Rothhorn but duly supported by Commissioner Lett.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none all those in favor of securing the July 9th date for an additional meeting time for our communities of interest conversation please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Aye.

All those opposed please raise your hand and say they?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm going to abstain on that vote because I was conferring with counsel and did not hear what the motion was.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay the ayes have it the motion carries and we will move forward with securing the July 9th date for our meeting.

Okay it looks like we are finished with our unfinished business and we are going to move on to.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair my apologies before we move on sorry this is Sarah.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Did you see me looking at you?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Before we move on, one additional request I would have from the Commissioner is to determine number of hours that they would want to have scheduled as we move forward so we may provide scheduling recommendations as soon as we receive information from each Commissioner about what days work best for them.

As you know the coming meetings are fast approaching and in order for us to secure space and for your staff to enter into the logistics that are required to facilitate these meetings we do need some advanced notice so if the Commissioner is able to provide a recommendation for the number of hours they would like to meet today, at least for the near future that would be great.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Sarah.

Is there a discussion or some thought on the number of hours needed for meeting and taking care of business? Let's open the floor for those thoughts.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I think we should follow what our experts have recommended, but that's probably just for the mapping part.

So maybe we need an hour or two more than that if we have other business that we are going to have to take care of.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Any other thoughts? Does that mean that we are leaving it to Sue to kind of -- to meet with our resources and our consultants? And Sue is shaking her head.

So.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yeah, I'm happy if these estimates that are listed are reasonable to you, these are what Kim Brace and I discussed about the times that

are going to be needed to do the mapping work and I agree with Cynthia as we build out other things we may have to have an hour or two hours added on to a meeting somewhere for other Commission business.

So if you trust me to do that going forward, that's my job and I'll make sure it happens and we will but please get me within the next few days any special times or days of the week that just will not work for you and we will try to accommodate the wishes of the Commission.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay thank you and Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: With the Chair and Vice Chair that is a good representation with staff to put those pieces together.

I think that would be wonderful and help us because I think we are each sort of at a loss, right? We have a sense of what our own schedule is and what we can do and what it's going to take for all of us to do it, I think yeah thank you for helping us and leading us in that direction, the three of you, yeah.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All right Executive Director it looks like we are on board with the recommendations that you have.

And but as well we will be flexible and continue to kind of snowball our time or unsnowball it as needed, okay? Michigan Department of State staff AKA Sarah Reinhardt, does that sound good to you?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That sounds great Madam Chair, thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much.

Now we will move to new business.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I object.

I want to do a point of order and do a discussion about the motion that was made earlier in regards to James Gallant.

I want to make a motion that we don't take any action against James Gallant in any particular way shape or form unless he is unruly in the meetings with a public because I feel it's a violation of his first amendment rights he is allowed to say what he wants when he wants to do so and if I can get a second that would be fantastic and we can talk about it.

>> Second.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay hold on Commissioners I got a second but let's allow General Counsel to speak at this moment.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much.

So while I understand certainly the frustration given the confrontational nature and repetitive nature of comments before us it would be problematic not only under the Open Meetings Act but also the rules and potentially the first amendment.

So what I hear Commissioner Witjes wanting is a motion to reconsider the previous vote.



>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That would be correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I just wanted that point of clarification before you moved further so again that would be my strong recommendation.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And then I would also request a roll call vote as well on that one.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Did Commissioner Witjes vote on the winning side.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm sorry?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes he did Commissioner Lett.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Commissioners we have a motion to reconsider on the floor that has been seconded by a motion was made by Commissioner Witjes, a second was made by Vice Chair Szetela.

So it's been moved and seconded that we reconsider the previous motion that was made.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I just wanted to add one thing I know I voted in the positive earlier.

But I was really thinking about it.

And I got into the point where this is actually a public body and we can't really censor anybody.

If this was a come IE like Facebook then we could but unfortunately we can't.

So I was thinking about it and I had a really hard time so that is why I put the motion to reconsider forward.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Witjes.

General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, just to clarify, again, I appreciate Commissioner Witjes' sentiments and it's a very nuanced discussion so I think the best path forward is just to consider what's on the table.

Currently is only the motion to reconsider.

That has been moved and seconded.

And I believe a roll call was requested as well.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I'm sorry Michigan Department of State staff, can you provide a roll call vote? For the motion.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Commissioners please indicate your support for the motion to reconsider with a yes or a no.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange? Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?  
>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?  
>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?  
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?  
>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?  
>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?  
>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?  
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I want to say no, but I'm going to stand mute on that.  
I just think that everybody ought to be considerate of calling people names.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Can you provide a yes or a no Commissioner Curry?  
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I really don't want to.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:  
>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I apologize Commissioner Curry the motion on the table is strictly a motion to reconsider the previous vote taken in regard to Mr. James Gallant and public comment.  
That is the only motion on the table.  
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What was the question again? Repeat the question.  
>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Whether you would like to revote the vote taken on the previous motion in regard to Mr. Gallant and public comment.  
This is just a question of whether you would like to take a revote of that motion.  
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?  
>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 7-4 the motion passes.  
>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, Commissioners it looks like we are at a revote.  
So I would entertain a motion.  
>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair the motion would be a restatement of the motion previously brought.  
And you would need a maker and a second as well.  
>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel can you restate the motion? I apologize.  
>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The motion that would need to be moved is that a motion that of Mr. Gallant chooses to speak outside of the agenda topics at a MICRC meeting that he is prohibited from doing so.  
>> So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion has been moved and seconded.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Commissioner Eid? Thank you all because I can't see all the hands all the time.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so you know, I voted I was the only one that voted no on the original one.

On the original motion.

But then I also voted no on the vote to reconsider because it was so one sided.

So I guess I'm wondering what is the rationale to take on this vote again when it was I believe 9-1?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Witjes and then Vice Chair Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't think we have authority to take someone's right to speak away based on the first amendment of the United States.

So I feel like no matter if he I know what we are supposed to be discussing when we go over the public comment on meetings, that's just pertaining to agenda topics and although he doesn't do that, he is not really being all that unruly.

He is just stating his opinions of the fact.

So he should be allowed to do that.

And especially I could consider these particular public comments to be appropriate inside of public hearings as well because it is pertaining to our business and he is entitled to his actual right to speak and his opinions.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I'm going to let General Counsel squeeze in and then Vice Chair Szetela.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Again, just for the benefit of the group that the issue would be under the Open Meetings Act and the Commissions rules of procedure again any first amendment implications are far more nuisanced and this is a limited public forum.

So you do not enjoy limitless first amendment rights.

That's why I would prefer the discussion to center on the Open Meetings Act and the rules because, again, there hasn't been any action taken under the previous vote.

So my strong recommendation would be that the prior vote be rescinded and then again every public speaker has the opportunity to provide two minutes of comment to the Commission by which the Commission can discern that comment in the manner taken.

And again I would like to acknowledge the consistent miss information not only about Roberts rules but also the Commission's rules and the priority of the Constitution over the Michigan Constitution and the Federal Constitution over the Commission's work.

So while I appreciate and those frustrations, again, that the previous motion voted on would be out of order and I would recommend that it be rescinded.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, General Counsel.

Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, my concern is just with our rules and our rules of procedure.

I do want to make sure we are following them.

While I certainly find Mr. Gallant's comments unnecessary, tedious irrelevant to what we're actually trying to do which is redistricting, and we sit through them every meeting, sometimes two times.

At the end of the day he's not at this point being disruptive.

He has sometimes bordered on being disruptive but has not reached the point of being disruptive our rules say remove and silence people being disruptive and we don't feel he has met that threshold so I think the initial decision on my part was an error and I'm happy to reconsider it and I'm glad Commissioner Witjes brought the motion so we can sort of pause, look at this rationally and impartially and make sure we are following our process which is that people who are disruptive can be prohibited from speaking and you know again although I find his comments tedious and not relevant to the point they are not disruptive so I will personally be reversing my vote on this issue.

>> Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I call the question we have now spent entirely too much time talking about Mr. Gallant which was not my goal.

I think we have gotten it across as to how this Commission feels regarding him.

Therefore I call the question.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: To be consistent with the way that we voted, may I have Michigan Department of State staff prepare for a roll call vote? All those in favor of reconsidering or rescinding the initial vote, please prohibiting or restricting Mr. Gallant's speaking privileges for this evening's public hearing please raise your hand and say aye.

I did all that just.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair would you like me to restate the motion?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The motion before the body is a motion that if Mr. Gallant chooses to speak outside of agenda topics at MICRC meetings that he be prohibited from doing so.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Michigan Department of State staff we are ready for a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Madam Chair Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No" I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Since we are restating this motion, I think we need to be sure that what a yes is and what a no is.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Commissioner Lett.  
That is a point well taken.

The motion before the body, again, the motion is that if Mr. Gallant chooses to speak outside the agenda topics at MICRC meetings he be prohibited from doing so.

In voting yes, you would be voting to adopt the motion.

And prohibit that activity.

In voting, no, you would be rejecting the prohibition and supporting the ability of Mr. Gallant to speak.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: With 11 nos the motion does not carry.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Michigan Department of State staff.

Moving on to new business agenda item 7A, without objection I would like to ask our communications and Outreach Director Edward Woods III to provide an update.

Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Madam Chair.

We have two videos that we would like to debut with the Commission.

I want to thank you so much for participating and we will go with video number one.

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.

And then we will go with video number two.

Promoting Michigan's new redistricting efforts and I want to thank MDOS for setting this up so that we can play them at this time.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Can we get this monitor down here on?

>> Go green.

Go white.

Go coop.

Wayne state proud.

Go University of Michigan baseball.

I love Detroit.

I love Michigan's diversity.

While the Michigan independent citizens redistricting Commissioners root for our favorites we are all on the same team when it comes to fair and transparent maps.

Send your ideas to Michigan.gov/MICRC or attend an up coming meeting near you.

I'm a do it yourselfer.

Take me to the lake.

Detroit is the greatest City in the world.

This City rocks.

Up north it's where I want to be.

While the Michigan independent citizens redistricting Commissioners root for our favorites we are all on the same team when it comes to fair and transparent maps.

Send your ideas to Michigan.gov/MICRC.

Or attend an upcoming meeting near you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I really want to thank you.

Go ahead and give yourselves a round of applause. You did it. Doug, don't cheat yourself, Commissioner Clark.

There we go. As you all know, communication and outreach is a team effort and people really want to hear from the Commission so I really want to thank you for laboring with me.

Taking my texts, my chats, my phone calls and the e-mail, we will let you know there is more to come.

We still have the glass and some other opportunities.

We also want to talk about a documentary with regards to the Commission's work in this historic effort that you are a part of.

So just want you to know more things to come.

But thank you for this initial start.

And it's good to see each and every one of you participating in this process and it means a lot.

But please, please, please know communication and outreach is a part of the job and I just greatly appreciate your work and efforts in doing so.



So thank you again and for those that participated this morning we had a really busy schedule.

If you have not seen it Commissioner Szetela has been promoted on wood TV. She did an interview yesterday, they are promoting that, Commissioner Lett was on Wood Radio.

Commissioner Rothhorn, Eid and Orton were with Mlive, then we had a Facebook live press conference event for -- with our Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Curry, Commissioner Lett, and who else? And Commissioner Szetela and then our Executive Director Sue Hammersmith.

So it has been a busy day.

And we look forward to people coming out today on to this last public tour for the first round.

But still note we have more work to do, more promotions to do and just don't want you to think it's over yet but thank you so much for your support.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Edward, we thank you so much for continuing to do the hard work and thank you fellow Commissioners for bringing awareness in education. It's really exciting to not only have our meetings and public hearings but to do all those interviews and to get to speak highly of what we are looking forward to. So from the bottom of my heart I think that's really cool thing.

Do we have any questions? I can't imagine so or any other accolades or praises for Mr. Woods, III? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, Edward I think you may have a career in voice acting after this.

Very good narration work.

I especially like the second of the two videos.

I think it was cut up a little better.

But you know I think they both get the job done so thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM:

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We have time let's watch it again.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett is in to it clearly.

Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think they were both great and want to thank Edward getting us where we need to be organizing all of this, coordinating everything, I know you make it seem effort less but I know it's so much work and takes so much effort on your part and I appreciate the work you are doing and Sue and Julianne and general Julianne Pastula and Mustafa and are appreciative of your efforts and thank you for putting up with us and our inconsistencies.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'll just say second to that.

I agree.

>> I agree doing a great job.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Point of order Commissioners.

I am glad we are happy and to Edward and we appreciate you.

It does not look like we have anything more for Edward for his and great job. And we look forward to seeing maybe both of those videos, play with both of them, put them both out and see what happens.

They are already out he says.

They will be out after this stay tuned.

Perfect.

Moving on to new business items, 7B, without objection, we will ask Bruce Adelson who we see looking at us is ready to provide an update on the Supreme Court of the U.S. VRA case.

Hearing no objection, Bruce Adelson take it away.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Madam Chair good afternoon it's a pleasure to be with all of you and I have to add those videos were fantastic.

Congratulations.

And they really set things up quite nicely so what I wanted to do is give you a brief overview of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision today in the Brnovich versus the democratic national committee case and I will summarize some of the more important parts of the decision and happy to take any questions if there is time, if not since I understand I'll be with you next week, I would be delighted to discuss this more.

In this case the democratic national committee challenged two laws in Arizona. Claiming they were discriminatory under Section Two of the Voting Rights Act.

Those laws prohibited election officials from receiving out of precinct ballots and also restricting the people who can return absentee ballots to election officials.

By a vote of 6-3 the Supreme Court this morning overturned a Court of Appeals decision and decided that these laws did not violate Section Two.

Now I'm going to highlight some important aspects of the Court decision.

One of the unusual things about this case is the Biden administration in February sent an unusual letter to the Supreme Court that said essentially that it agreed with the prior administration.

That these laws did not violate Section Two.

The Biden administration said however that it disagreed about how the prior administration was advocating for the application of the law.

So it is somewhat unusual for a new administration to send a letter like this.

Rather than a new brief or legal documents.

But what the Supreme Court essentially did in this case is say that states interests in election administration is very significant.

And must not be ignored absent compelling circumstances.

The Court also decided that for a state law to be violative of Section Two was a denial of the right to vote.

That is different from the vote dilution part of Section Two that applies to redistricting.

The Court said essentially that for there to be a burden for something to be discriminatory it has to be discriminatory significantly.

And I'm going to read a portion of the opinions so you get a flavor of that.

The Court said that the racial disparity in the burdens that were claimed in this case is small according to the Court in absolute terms.

The Court cited evidence that only 3% of minority voters 1% Hispanic voters 1% African/American voters 1% of Native American voters would be disadvantageously impacted by this law.

The Court went on to say that for a Federal Court for the Supreme Court to overturn a state law, the disparity, potential discrimination has to be greater than the amount in this case.

The Court also stressed that voting is an I don't want to say a burden but a voting involves and may involve convenience, may involve all kinds of personal accommodations.

The fact that something is inconvenient or makes voting perhaps more inconvenient is not necessarily illegal under Section Two and is not necessarily discriminatory.

The Court also and I was surprised about this went back to when the Voting Rights Act was amended in 1982 to say that what procedures were allowed then are relevant to what may be allowed today.

The reason I was surprised about that is 1982 is a lot different than 2021.

I don't know that the Court had to reach that point in making its decision.

But I think that that's an important aspect as well.

So I wanted to really focus on the strength of the state interest that is really a Federalism point.

The Court said that the strength of the state interests served by a challenge voting rule is an important factor that must be taken into account.

As noted in every voting rule imposes a burden of some sort and therefore in determining in the totality of the circumstances whether a rule goes too far in its burdens, it is important to consider the reason for the rule.

And rules that are supported by a strong state interest according to the Court are less likely to violate Section Two.

The Court did not find discrimination here.

The Court in its evaluation of whether or not there was discrimination relied on some seminal prior cases of the Court like one called the Arlington Heights versus Metropolitan Housing Corporation, which is one of the primary Supreme Court decisions to determining what factors to evaluate in deciding whether something is discriminatory or not.

So in short, the Court agreed that the Arizona statutes were not violative of Section Two.

Whether or not there may be constitutional issue is not something that is part of this case.

The Court also in an important part reaffirmed the vote dilution as specific of Section Two.

Reaffirmed the continued on going validity and viability of the seminal case of Thornburg versus Gingles which we have talked about and will talk about more.

So I think in sum this case is I think we had initially talked about back in perhaps in April, really doesn't have much application to redistricting.

It does as I said reaffirm the vote dilution line of cases that the Supreme Court has set down for the last 40 years or so.

But I think it is an important marker in understanding that state interests are very significant in evaluating whether a law is illegal or unconstitutional and the proposition that voting involved inconvenience for all voters, whether or not inconvenience rises to the level of illegal discrimination depends on many different factors and if you are claiming that something is discriminatory to minority voters, the amount of discrimination has to be larger than in this case.

So that's about it for my summary.

I tried to keep that as brief and nonlegaleese as possible. Please let me know if you have any questions and thank you for the opportunity to join today.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Bruce, thank you so much for that good information.

Commissioners, do you have any thoughts or questions while we have him?

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you, Madam Chair.

You know you kind of went over this a little bit.

But besides the ramifications of this ruling and how it relates to Section Two of the VRA, how is it going to affect our job here with redistricting?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It won't really affect it that much.

I mean as you know we've talked about before I'm always very interested and concerned about indica of discrimination and discrimination over all.

The fact that the Court found that the burden on minority voters only reached the level of 3% of minority voters does not that is not something that is a consideration of redistricting.

I did think it was significant that the Court did say basically our vote dilution line of cases remains valid, viable, applicable.

So the vote dilution part of Section Two has nothing to do with this case.

The -- there are I think there are larger ramifications for state legislatures for example. And election administration generally.

Than how this case impacts redistricting.

Does that help?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, thank you.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: You are welcome.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Mr. Adelson, any other final questions or thoughts?

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Bruce, what do you think the impact of this decision will be on the justice department's case with Georgia and obviously there are a number of other states who are going down this same path, Michigan included.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That's a great question.

That is one of the many things I thought about when I was reading the opinion and we will talk about the justice department in general next week.

But the justice department's new case in Georgia focuses on intentional discrimination. This case involved desperate treatment of minority voters are treated or effected differently desperately than nonminority voters.

I think they made a cleaver and strategic decision focusing on intent and I presume in their moving forward with that case they are going to bring forward evidence that the Georgia legislature showed intent to discriminate and what is interesting along that line the Supreme Court today talked about in deciding whether a legislature intentionally discriminates, they looked at whether the legislature in Arizona deviated from standard normal legislative practices in passing these laws.

I recall that in the Georgia case one of justice's allegations is that the Georgia legislature did deviate from normal procedures.

So in a way justice may have even anticipated what the Supreme Court would be focusing on here.

Deviation from procedures is a rather standard tool to use in evaluating whether or not something is intentionally discriminatory or nonconstitutional so that part of the decision I suspect will become a big focus of the Georgia case.

Because from what I understand justice is not alleging desperate treatment like in the Brnovich case. Instead they are focusing on intent.

Intent is by its nature sometimes difficult to prove.

But if you have a state entity that deviates from what it usually does, that's typically a significant indicator that well do you know what? Maybe there is discriminatory intent here.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much for that complete response.

It doesn't look like we have any further Commissioner questions or thoughts so we will see you next week, Bruce and thank you again.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Great thank you looking forward to it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: If you can't see it folks are waving to you.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you good-bye look forward to seeing you next week good-bye thank you.

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.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Moving on Commissioners to future agenda items and Executive Director Sue Hammersmith has already provided information on future meetings and agenda items so unless Commissioners you have more to add for the agenda, which Sue is listening we will move on to the next order of business.  
Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, my thought is just that if we could have as much practice as possible when we get the ability to do that I think that would be helpful.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Orton.  
Any other thoughts? All right, and we will move on to announcements.  
Are there any announcements? No announcements, no jokes, no birthdays, nothing.  
Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Tomorrow is my birthday.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Tomorrow is your birthday.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Tomorrow is my birthday.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I want to be sympathetic and sing happy birthday but I know we have accessibility services and we need to be professional in the meeting but happy birthday commercial Rothhorn.

Any other announcements.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Belgium plays tomorrow at 3:00 p.m. and I hope you root for Belgium.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Commissioners we are definitely excited this is one of our last times and our first round being together, I can tell.

So it doesn't look like we have any announcements.

And we will we don't have any further items on the agenda.

And there is no further business of the Commission.

So we can move to adjournment if there is a motion.

And no objections to adjournment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there a second? Second made by Commissioner Lett.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor of adjournment please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All those opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it, the motion carries, and the meeting is adjourned at 2:17 p.m.

[ Meeting concludes ]