MICRC
06/25/21 9:00 am Committee Meeting
Captioned by Q&A Reporting, Inc., www.qacaptions.com

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Good morning everybody as Chair of the redistricting process committee, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:00 a.m.

This webinar 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. We have ASL interpretation, Redistricting@Michigan.Gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services 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 www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed, and those transcriptions will be made available along with the public comment.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov. Or 517-331-6309.

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. Sally is not here anymore. Sarah, if you could please call the role.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioners.
Please say present when I call your name. Please announce during roll call that you are attending the meeting remotely.
I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present, attending remotely from Rochester Hills, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present, attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I am present. And I am attending from Warren, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid? Three Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right and look favorably on a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

   >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll put the motion forward, Dustin.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, can I get a second?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, I second.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, okay. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, all in favor please raise your right hand and say aye.

   >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe Rhonda had her hand up for something.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All opposed raise your hand.

All right. Meeting agenda is approved.

   Okay, we will now move on to public comment. A few notes about public comment for those of you joining us for the first time.

Because this is a virtual meeting members of the public have to sign up in advance to dress the Commission.

Staff at the Department of State will unmute each member of the public for up to two minutes on a first come first serve basis and means the public will be called on in order they signed up to address the Commission.

   For those members of the public participating in the 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-mails www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for written public comment will be included in the online meeting archive for the Commission, public sign up links are also posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages and on Facebook and Twitter at redistricting MI.

   Now I would like to recognize Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State what will call on members of the public to address the Commission.

   >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Chair.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

   >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Excuse the interruption. Please, prior to that you may, I would recommend you note for the record you have been joined by Commission Eid.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Oh, there he is. I see him.

   >> COMMISSIONER EID: Hi, guys. I had issues getting Zoom up but we are here now.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, hi Anthony, good morning.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right. Thank you, Commissioners. And thank you Mr. Chairperson.

Our first public comment participant is a Mr. James Gallant, if you could give me a moment to unmute you.

   >> Can you hear me now?

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, we can hear you. You can proceed.

   >> Mr. Chair can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I sure can. Go ahead.

>> Thank you very much.

My name is James Gallant with the Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. My community of interest are people that acknowledge Robert's Rules of Order as being required by this Commission and the fundamental principles of parliamentary law in America. And fairness and equity in the United States of America is measured by your adhering to the approved rules of procedure, which is Robert's Rules of Order. So please start doing so.

I did sign up for a second public comment today.

Please consider making a community of the whole committee, of the whole process commonplace at this Commission instead of the two or three on the committee like you are doing right now.

A Harvard business study showed that 90% of value added business collaborative efforts are made by three to five percent of the employees.

This is a problem in the United States of America.

And the problem with you folks that divide and conquer that was implemented by this Commission, and that is what you are trying to do is divide and conquer, trying to conquer something. And Commissioner Rothhorn's application and that he -- I cannot verify that he is an actual member of the democratic party.

Now, democratic party, I would ask you members that are party affiliated to show, to tell the community, so we don't have to go to Court, to find out if you are actually affiliated members of that party, you know, democratic party to be a voting member for $10 a year.

So please start doing that.

And the department of -- the definition of consensus is established by the national quality forum and it's a national consensus building organization. And their definition is consensus is not less than a 60% vote.

So you folks are trying to say that you can just by hearing no objections reach consensus, that is incompatible with the Constitution of the United States and consensus building process in the United States of America.

Thank you very much.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you our next participant is Gary Morehead. Please allow us one moment to unmute you.

>> Am I unmuted?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, you may proceed.

>> Okay, thank you.

I wanted to get to the Warren meeting last night and wasn't able to but my comment is process oriented mostly at this point any way.

And I hope I'm coming through, there I go.

I wanted to mention that the Colorado Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission was in the news yesterday and for publishing their first Congressional maps and I thought wow this is great, they are really moving forward.

Then I realized they were only appointed last in March. And gee they don't have any data for these maps.

How are they doing this? It didn't make a lot of sense.

And as I read the coverage the coverage didn't say this but I began to realize it seems like in Colorado the staff is at the head of the parade, the Commissioners, the citizen Commissioners are on the floats on the following further behind waving to the crowd.

And there actually isn't much of a crowd.

It's mostly if anything people watching on TV, I suppose would be the equivalent analogy.

Very little public comment period.

And that compressed timeframe.

Obviously.

And the staff drew the maps.

And I have to say that I have more faith in this Commission than that.

And the reason I do is because of your unique what do you want to call it membership, I guess.

I did a little research there is nine Independent Citizens Redistricting Commissions in the country, so 41 states are still in the legislatures backfilled rooms mode, 9 have at least moved forward from that and the only one where the membership of the Commission is appointed by the is essentially a random selection without a lot of involvement by legislatures or judges is this one.

So I'm really optimistic that you guys will keep the citizen Commissioners on top, the staff and experts on tap and I know you have been getting lots of public comment so I'm really pleased with the way this Commission is working.

And I just ask one thing if you do ask staff to draw you maps based on value judgments that you guys make rather than apparently the Colorado Commission asking for just one map from the staff, ask for a range of maps that satisfy the value judgments that you do because we all know there is many maps.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I apologize your time has elapsed.
You can finish your statement if you like.

   >> Thank you, I'm done.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thanks for addressing the Commission, Gary.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We have one additional public comment participant who has requested to speak for a second time, that is a Mr. James Gallant. If you could give me just one moment to unmute you.

   >> Well, Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I sure can.

>> All right. Thank you. I'm James Gallant with the Marquette Suicide Prevention Coalition. And I'd like to say that I think that it's unreasonable that people are requested to have an Internet connection to request public comment by telephone.

And then you have to have an Internet connection to get an e-mail confirmation an hour before the meeting. So we are in rural areas, you know. And it's pretty sketchy on the Internet so should be a process where people can get a text message or even on the telephone, hey, can I sign up for this and please try that.

And, you know, I agree with the part or the comment, the previous comment here where you know, this is a hopeful Commission. But, you know, the fundamental principles of parliamentary law in America are not being followed here. And I believe that Commissioner Clark was put on this committee at the last-minute because he seems to be one that is making a map.

And he is like asking all the questions. And on the action items at your business meeting, there is discussion and conversation. You had Kim and you had your other contracted providers doing that stuff, the presentation. But opened right up into debate. And I think you folks are actually making the decisions without objection right on the floor with no motion and no second pending, which is not and behind the scenes thing. This is all happening behind the scenes. Look at these decisions. We are so great, look how fast we are moving and it completely contradicts the fundamental principles of parliamentary law in America. And I believe you folks are trying to make this more what you want it to be. But when you got here the Secretary of State had a preceding to the rules of procedure, which is not codified here. And it has not been followed at all right from the beginning.

So I think this is just a sham of a, you know, sham of a committee.

You're just going to fly this through. I think you guys have it already done and you're just trying to go through the motion and rubber stamp everything. And I think it's a disgrace and I think it's -- I think the forefathers of this country would be rolling over in their graves in a few minutes when you start this meeting and you start violating the fundamental principles they put in place back in the day.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Gallant, your time has expired.

>> Well, can I finish my comment?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, please finish your comment.

>> Mr. Chair, can I finish my comment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Go ahead.

>> Okay, please follow the rules of procedure that has been approved here for use during this Commission meeting and not be every next Chair makeup what facilitating dialog consensus building caca they want to put forth. Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That concludes our public comment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right. Thanks, Sarah, appreciate it.

Okay, so I guess without objection we will move on to the next item on our agenda which is new business.

And we will move on to Section 5A which is questions and factfinding with Election Data Services.

So Doug, I see you put your hand up go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, if you don't mind, can I summarize the purpose of this subcommittee and what our intent is today?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You sure can.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The subcommittee was formed to provide recommendations.

Not to make decisions for the Commission.

So as we develop those recommendations, which I think will get pretty involved as we move forward, we will bring those back to the Commission for approval and further discussion if necessary.

So the way the meeting has been structured is we've gone out and asked the Commissioners for questions, which we are going to present to EDS this morning.

And from then we are going to start developing a process and we divided that into two aspects.

One is what we would call the one time types of things we need to do.

Such as decisions on not decisions but recommendations on do we start from scratch or do we not start from scratch? How do we start with the Congressional, should we start with Congressional districts or the state districts or whatever.

So one-time things.

After we have determined all those one-time things then we are going to move into the repetitive process and that is actually how we are going to operate and we are going to have a recommendation on how that is going to be done as well.

And that will go back to the Commission for review and approval at some point in time.

But we've asked that our vendors be involved in this and provide input as well.

So as we go through that, I just wanted to make that comment, Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you.

All right, so bear with me two things I can't figure out why my video feed keeps going dark and coming back up.

I can't quite figure that one out.

Okay, so I guess we can just move on to questions for Election Data Services.

I don't know who wants to start.

But we do have a pretty comprehensive list at this particular point.

Do we want to start at this particular point? Sorry Sue, I see you have your hand up.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes, we tried to set one meeting and we had to break it into two.

So I just want to let people know in this meeting we are focusing with Election Data Services and Fred Hejazi about the mapping process, so maybe we would only use the mapping questions today from the list.

And then on Monday we will have EDS, we will have Pilson from Federal Compliance and we will have Dr. Lisa Handley our racially polarized voting analyst so all three consultants will be with us and at that point we can talk about the things that all of us will collaborate, the Commissioners and the consultants will collaborate on and those questions then would be probably more appropriate on Monday as we go through the process so just a brief clarification on that and maybe Kim has more.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it so the main questions here are just the regarding the mapping questions that we have at this point?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes, that would make sense for today.
I think.
Because those are the two consultants and experts that we have with us to share.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it and the ones regarding the process we can wait until Monday.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Correct, thank you Witjes got it Rhonda, I saw you had your hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If we are going to be talking about process, I think some of these questions regarding the process and how we interact with EDS would be in line to be asked today, that is my opinion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No, that is fine.
Because these are just like I guess I'd like to say steppingstones at this particular point.
If anything were to you know pop in any one's head please state, you know, bring that up and any questions that you have, that's what we are here for.
So, okay, well, I guess I'll just go ahead and start at this particular point.
Actual through Kim go ahead you had something.

>> KIM BRACE: If I can start and do a couple different things and let you know kind of what we have talked about in terms of how this time period of 90 minutes can be organized on our side.
Let me say first off, I'm Kim Brace.
You see in the list of participants there is three of us on here with the same name so I apologize.
I sent Sarah's invite to several other members of our team and they are signed on as me also.
So it's me here with the picture up on the top.
That's this Kim Brace on that side.
What we have talked about is wanting to bring to you a look at, sorry about that, a look at what the software looks like.

What are you guys looking at conceivably working with and how we can go about doing that sort of thing.

So we wanted to give you more of an in depth but not totally in depth look at and look and feel at two elements of the software because part of the questions that you've raised and some of your procedures and that sort of thing have to do with the software.

What would you see? And so we want to show the Autobound edge software but we also want to show you the website software.

It's two different softwares with two different intents.

The Autobound edge is a desktop software that is more sophisticated and does a lot more things and that's what we will be using here.

We are looking at being able to put that on each of your computers at least for those that are interested in drawing.

On that side too but we also have a webbed based software.

And so we want to show you that, which is more designed for the public and more designed for some elementary capabilities in terms of map drawing.

Some of you may want to work with that and work on the web with your browser.

Others may want to look at the more extensive stuff with Autobound edge.

Fred will get more in to detail on that, but basically Autobound, the web-based piece of things is basically kind of a dumped down version of Autobound edge.

It's designed for working over the Internet where you don't have capabilities of passing back and forth massive data sets.

That's what you do with Autobound edge sitting on your computer.

Because the database is there on your computer.

   The web-based one is looking at kind of a more reduced set of data so that it's easier to work with on the web.

And it may have restrictions in terms of the different geographic layers that may be usable on the web just because of the Internet factor itself.

   Those are kind of the overarching distinctions between the two but we want to show you both of them.

So that you get a feel for how people could interface with each of those.

And then what we want to do is give you these kind of presentations and then get into some answers of all those questions that Sue has sent to me.

I do have those in front of me.

I have sent them to all members of my staff so that we can all look at and answering and I've asked each of our team to come online so that they can give their perspectives and their insights also.

I think it's it would be useful for you to see all the different dimensions that are there.

That's part of the team that we have put together so that you get all the views.

You know, D versus R and conservative versus liberal and any which way that you want to.

So that you can get a bunch of different viewpoint in helping your decision making process go forward.

So that's kind of an overview of what we hope to accomplish today.

I want to be freewheeling and let people ask questions at any point in time.

You know, I don't understand this piece or what does this do or that sort of thing.

So by all means interject.

I've told members of my team that if they have got a thought or a comment, interject.

By all means, you know, let things come forward so that you've got the best information that is doable and possible.

So that's kind of our goal today.

So let me turn it over to one of the other Kim braces that are on the call.

Fred, I think you are there.

You said you were there on my text that I sent to you, so why don't you come on, Fred, and talk a little bit and then we can share screen with you and you can start showing some of the software capabilities.

>> FRED HEJAZI: Sorry about that, I did not realize that, I come up as Kim.

Good morning everyone.

My name is Fred Hejazi. I'm with City Gate and we are on EDS' team and my area of responsibility is essentially going to be the technology side so this will be my third cycle of redistricting.

We did provide redistricting software in 2000 and 2010.

Of course we are doing it again this cycle.

And incidentally the last two cycles we did provide software to the State of Michigan as well.

And I'm actually from Michigan.

So that is it in the way of a background.

Basically what Kim said as far as how the software is configured was accurate.

We have a desktop application where the professional work happens.

And then we developed a number of web applications that were designed to support different aspects of public engagement.

So it varies on how far of a public engagement you guys are looking to do.

Our product is commercially available, so different states have different requirements.

So the software is designed to accommodate different levels of participation from the public, from nothing all the way to a lot.

So I'll cover the basic sort of four components of it.

The first one is giving the ability to members of the public to create accounts and draw and submit their own plans.

And we will go over the application that does that.

The second one is the ability for members of the public to view plans and place comments on them.

So you can actually bring up a plan, whether you drew it yourself as a member of the public or it's a plan that the Commission decides to put out for public comment.

They will be able to view the plan and then place comments on specific parts of the plan that they are either happy or unhappy with.

Those comments then show up on the during their redistricting process in -- on the desktop so I can see what comments people had and whether they were happy or not and then what the specific comments were.

We can also run reports that display that in more detail, so I will know who placed the comment.

Each comment incidentally is verified through e-mail.

So when somebody places a comment, they will get an e-mail that says, you know, you requested a comment on this map.

You know, is this from you? So the comments have to be verified so we don't have one person putting a lot of comments on the map without us sort of being able to track that down.

>> KIM BRACE: Fred, if I can let me interject one thing at that point.

These comments that Fred is talking about is what auto bound is doing and utilizing.

These are different than the comments and the plans that come from Moon Duchin's configuration and software.

So I want just want you to understand there is a distinction between what Moon talked to you yesterday and what we are talking to you today.

We have been in discussions with Moon in terms of getting some of her things in and that's what we are working with in terms of her so that you will be able to see those too.

But what Fred is talking about is really within his software package what is there.

So I just want to make that distinction.

Doug, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, can you give me an example of the differences between what we currently have and what this provides?

>> KIM BRACE: Go ahead, Fred, go ahead.

>> FRED: So there is a bit of an overlap between what you guys have gotten from Moon's group and what we have.

When we sell a solution to state, they are looking for essentially end to end solution.

So one thing that's different with ours and her's is that ours is all integrated.

So at any point in time I can click one button, put a plan out for comment, and then immediately see what the comments are, that people have placed.

That's one sort of big difference.

The second one is as far as I can tell, the commenting that you guys are receiving is not location based and means people are not putting specific comments on a specific location on the map.

They are just providing general text comments about a particular plan.

And for us I have done Commission redistricting before in 2010.

I actually did the first citizen Redistricting Commission in Austin so I went through all the process of collecting, going to public hearings, listening to people talk about their issues and concerns.

So I've been through this process with Commissions before.

And Austin as you may know is a very -- has a very active public participation process for their plan I think we hold something like ten hearings which is just a City so we went to every neighborhood and held hearings.

And in each one we had dozens of people testifying.

It wasn't like three or four, it was dozens.

It was surprising to me how much participation we had.

At any rate, so the tools that we designed were built around those types of experiences.

And the ability to immediately interact with the information that we're getting either as comments or as communities of interest was important.

Because if we can if somebody puts in a comment right before they come to a hearing and then we can't bring that up because we haven't sort of synced the two systems together, that is an issue.

So for us everything is fully integrated so if you place a comment, I can see it immediately.

If you draw a community of interest, I can act on it immediately.

Whether you did it two minutes before you came to the hearing or whether you did it a month before, it's always sort of it's always out there.

   The other side of it is the ability of course to put plans for comment during a session.

So, for example, if I'm drawing a plan, and I want, and I'll show all this stuff in the overview, if I want to put a plan out and immediately get comments at a hearing, I can actually do that.

And the software puts up a little QR code so that everybody in the hearing can hold their phones up to it and then be able to see it and be able we can collect comments right then and there.

And that also applies to a situation like we are in right now.

If you are drawing over Zoom and I want you guys to provide comments, then this provides an easy way for us to do that.

So those are some of the differences between what you guys already have and what we have in the tools that we have.

   >> KIM BRACE: So as I've said, you know, we are talking with Moon in terms of getting through an API from her or whatever.

But that is still a work in progress.

We haven't seen you know what we can get from her.

She showed yesterday, you know, her community of interest meshing together of all the communities of interest map that she showed.

From my perspective, I'd like to see each and every community individually, not all meshed together on top of each other.

I could have that capability of meshing it on top, but I want to be able to at least see individually what somebody said when they are trying to describe the neighborhood and this guy says it should go down Main Street and the next guy says it should go down Elm Street.

I want to be able to see some of those differences and distinctions.

Because they can be important to you as you look towards how you want to draw that area in that regard.

So we are looking at it from the practicality of District drawing from that standpoint while Moon is basically coming from an academic background.

So there's that significant difference between the two.

But we just wanted to let you know and I'm going to interject periodically so you can see some of these differences so that you're aware of those in your deliberations.

So, Fred, go ahead with.

>> FRED HEJAZI: That issue of the API and being able to directly communicate with our system is actually kind of a big thing for us.

The public comments that you at least one of the ones that I just listened to is not unusual.

The members of the public are very suspicious about this process.

They already think the decisions are already made.

And if you -- if they submit either a comment or a community of interest and then they come to a hearing and we don't have it or have the ability to show it, they are going to think that we are intentionally not showing it.

Because somehow, we think that their input is -- we want to avoid showing their particular input, which it isn't.

It's just a simple connecting of technologies.

So this is some of the reasoning why we decided to kind of make an end to end system where everything connects to everything.

And you don't have gaps in you know I got to move files from here to here and have some sort of a timing gap between the two where did you download it from this and upload it into this other system? So this is the API issue that Kim mentioned that we need to work out with Moon so that hopefully that gap can be resolved.

So as far as the desktop software I guess we can just get in to unless you guys have any questions, I can get into showing what it looks like and what the process is.

Then once you guys have it kind of an understanding of how everything is laid out, we can customize it to something that works for everybody because as I said this is a commercial application.

We built it so that it can be applied to any number of states.

And depending on the requirements, we can make modifications to accommodate specific workflows.

    >> KIM BRACE: Part of what I will end up showing you in conjunction with what Fred is showing you is we have developed some spreadsheets that you would see at the bottom in the desktop version that are slightly different than what Fred would show to you right now, but I'll show you what we have done in a couple other jurisdictions so that you can see the variety of different things that we could end up being shown on the screen as you draw.

    >> FRED-HEJAZI: I assume you can see my screen.

    >> KIM BRACE: Yes.

    >> FRED: I know I have too many icons I have been told that before.

    So I do have Michigan data, but I didn't have political data for Michigan.

So I picked the state for which I did have political data, which is Washington state.

They are using our system and they do have the online tools as well, so it kind of made it easier for me to do the presentation today.

So I'm just going to use the state of Washington as my example.

    So when you log in, you let me kind of minimize this Zoom, all right.

When you start sort of the presented with a map that looks like this.

In the case of Washington, they have the county boundaries which is shown in these sort of dot, dashed lines and then they have the precincts which are shown in the orange color.

And then as you Zoom in you start to see the blocks which then show up in green.

And then as you go in further you can actually see the streets and the building foot prints so we have the street names and then the building foot prints.

This is one of 11 different types and this is national.

So it kind of doesn't make any difference where I look.

The same data, the same data is available everywhere.

So this is downtown Detroit.

And you can see kind of a similar looking map.

    So actually I'll leave it here for a second.

And look at some of the different map types that we have.

    So there is about 11 different map types, but one of them is imagery so we can actually see imagery as while we are working on a particular plan.

There is also some other ones that show transportation features, it will look better.

We have others that kind of focus on topography so that if you have an area, Michigan is not the best example of that, but if you have a lot of hills, you can actually show that topography of the area if it affects District boundaries, we have the ability to show that.

Most of the times we work in this simpler map which is the white background.

.

    So this is the basic map.

On top we have a scale bar that shows how far an area is.

So for example, this length is 100 miles so that kind of tells me as I Zoom in you can see it changes.

And then I have a search feature, so if I'm looking for, if I'm looking at a map and I want to search for a location, it can be an address or if any location, so it is kind of like Google if you type in an address, it will find the location for you.

And then I can display that on the map.

On the right side we have all of our menus.

I'm going to start out by opening up a plan so we can kind of look like we can look at what a plan looks like.

So I go to my plan manager.

These are all the plans that I have.

The software doesn't limit how many plans I can create.

You can see I have a lot of them.

And the left column there is an icon that shows what the plan was worked on in the last two weeks.

Or the last two months.

Or if it's older than two months, which it shows up in red.

It puts for me a little icon of what the plan looked like when I closed it.

What type of a plan is it.

And then the name, if I gave it a tag, how many districts it has, when was it last accessed by whom, who was the owner and when was it created.

I can sort and filter, so if I'm looking just for Congressional maps, I can come in and say just show me the Congressional maps.

Or I can say show me just the State Senate maps.

There is a little plus button here that shows me more information.

It will tell me how percent complete on this plan.

There is a plan timeline that shows which days I worked on this plan.

These were this is just more information for me from trying to go back to a particular plan and try to figure out when I did work on it.

And if I'm happy with this plan I can go ahead and open it.

So this is a Congressional plan for the state of Washington.

So kind of look at the map quickly and figure out how it's structured.

The districts are colored so you can kind of see the color of the districts.

The number is in the middle.

And it will have one of three different icons next to it.

You can have a check box, which means the plan is within deviation set for this particular plan.

If it has a down arrow, it means that this particular District needs to reduce in population.

It means it's overpopulated.

And on this plan, I don't have any that are over but if they were over the arrow would point up.

So down here at the bottom we have all of the different demographic information about this particular plan.

So this is actually an excel spreadsheet.

So if any of you have used excel before, if you double click here, you can see the formulas.

And this particular deviation is also a formula, so it's basically the population subtracted by the target divided by the target.

So that is what the formula is.

And it has been formatted to display like this.

So if I go to the formatting, this is just the excel formatting and it's red if it's greater than 5% and it's green if it's within 5% so if I want to change these formattings, if you have any familiarity with excel, you would be able to do this pretty readily.

So this first tab and there is multiple tabs here, this first tab shows the summary of all the information that we typically display.

And this particular plan we did show the ACS population.

So this is the ACS, 2019 population so we are displaying that.

We are also showing next to it the 2010 population.

So for them, their District, their population has increased so the District sizes have gone from 672 to 740.

That is the net population increase for each of these districts.

The software does have the ability to also display the location of incumbents in their particular case they elected not to show that information.

Before I get off from on this spreadsheets, so this shows the summary of all the information.

The detailed information are on the secondary tabs.

So where here I have the demographics as percentages and sorry, I screwed up the Black population, I didn't put it in.

But this is the summary information.

And the details are here.

So here I can actually see the total population itself.

And same for the 2010 and then we have the voting age information.

And then Kim mentioned that he has created spreadsheets that have other types of information.

Those spreadsheets would go here and then the information would be displayed.

So looking at the edit tools, so the District that we are assigning to shows up over here so that is District ten so whatever I assign right now goes to District ten.

The select layer is the layer of geography that I'm selecting from and putting into District ten.

So that's what the select layer is.

I have two boxes here.

One of them says plan deviation.

That's the overall plan deviation.

The District with the highest deviation subtracted from the District from the lowest deviation.

And that is six and seven so in this case I can see on the spreadsheet that six is four and seven is five and that is why those are the two districts that are creating my deviation of 9.74.

So if I want to reduce the overall plan deviation, I need to focus on these two districts that are above where they need to be.

If I am curious about any particular piece of geography, I can select this information tool.

And you can see as you move the mouse over it will tell you what the button does.

So I get a list here and then now if I click into anything it will actually show for me the information.

So in this case I have this is 511 is my total population.

And I also in this particular data set do have some political information.

So I have Obama versus McCain.

So if I were to select those two things, now what happens is when I click, I will get a little chart here that kind of tells me in a very quick way what that demographic looked like for these particular precincts.

And I'm downtown Seattle so you can see the democrat vote was higher than the republican vote.

So this is just a very quick way for me to see information on the map.

>> KIM BRACE: I think from Michigan's standpoint, you know, you're looking less at the political data, that's more for someone like Lisa Handley to use.

It will be there for information purposes and the fairness argument, that sort of thing.

But, you know, we may be looking more at racial composition and you can do the same thing that Fred is showing you with the race data as being part of the calculations of the circular areas, that sort of thing.

>> FRED-HEJAZI: So I'm going to show a very basic couple of steps for making some adjustments here.

So I'm looking at this spreadsheet.

I see that District seven is overpopulated which kind of makes sense, this is downtown Seattle so it's District seven so I'm going to kind of look at what District seven looks like and if I double click on it, it will actually highlight the boundary for me.

So this is District seven and it includes a good chunk of downtown Seattle and it looks like that's an area where the population has really grown so this District needs to shrink.
So one of the things I can do in my spreadsheet I can say if I'm looking at District seven show just the current District and adjacent.
So now I'm looking at districts that are adjacent to District seven.
And here I can see that these other ones are pretty good, but maybe a good candidate would be District six.
So District 6 needs to grow by quite a bit.
Around 32000.
And District 7 needs to go down by 39,000.
So if I expand District 6 into 7, then that might be a good way for me to correct this issue.
   So the way that I do that is I go in here and I pick District 6.
Then I click my assign button.
And let's say I decide to pick up this chunk because it's already on the other side of the water, so it may be a good Section to assign to District 6.
And I just start clicking.
And you can see these numbers are kind of beginning to change.
And once they get into my target zone, it actually turns green.
So you can see now that red has changed and so at its very core that's how we do adjustments.
And this is essentially the simplest part of the process.
Of course I would want to get more information about who I'm an assigning and if I'm looking at certain racial demographics, I may want to display that information.
But that's the simplest way to do these assignments.
Now before I move on to more stuff to show, do you guys have any questions? All right somebody has got questions.
   >> COMMISSIONER EID: You know, I think this is very, very valuable information.
And information that the whole Commission needs to see because you know it's more than just the four of us that want to be involved in the mapping.
But I also am I don't know if right now is the appropriate time to be going over this software stuff.
You know, I thought that the point of today was to go do more of like a question-and-answer about you know the process issues so we know when we do know how to use this software it can be more streamlined.
So I guess I'm a little just confused on where we are going with this.
   >> KIM BRACE: Good question, Anthony.
And a valid point from that side.
We are planning to have, I've talked with Sue about it, to have Fred do a more in depth training of the software for the whole Commission.

He is out next week doing training elsewhere.

But Sue and I have looked at July 8th at your meeting on July 8th, which would be total consumption of this is how the software works and this is the things that can be done on that side.

What we wanted to do for you today is kind of give you a preliminary look at some things so that you kind of get a feel for how it looks and operates.

So that in your deliberations in terms of direction, you at least have that background.

Our goal is not to give a total training of the software to you today.

There's a lot more that is in the software.

But we wanted to kind of give you an overview of what the potentials are that you could be looking at and seeing as you start thinking about your deliberations and the questions that we're going to get to.

We will get to those today.

But I wanted to at least let you see kind of what is there as an overview kind of thing.

It may be good at this point, I know, Fred, you've got a whole bunch more stuff that are in here, but it may be good to flip over to see the web-based one so that they can get kind of an overview of the web-based capabilities that the general public could use and utilize, but also some of the Commissioners may want to use that as an application to look at and see things.

So, again, this is just kind of an overview so that you can get a look and feel, you know, that's got the map there, it's got the spreadsheet.

The kind of things I was trying to describe to Doug, you know, at earlier this week's meetings.

So that you can kind of get this kind of overview of what processing is possible.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rhonda go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you for that, Mr. Brace.

I do need to echo Anthony's concerns though, can you kind of give us an idea of time wise? Because there is going to be quite a bit of questions and I'm sure follow-up questions to questions that we will want to.

I know you know how the Commission has a whole, we are very inquisitive and a lot of additional questions.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, for a long time I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And we have to meetings set aside to get the work that the subcommittee needs to get done accomplished.

So I'm kind of on board with Anthony, and I mean no disrespect whatsoever.

This is very useful information but I'm just wondering for the allotted time that we have what are we looking at for discussion and then what are we looking at for the presentation part?

>> KIM BRACE: Right, so what I would suggest, Fred, if you can move to the browser one for like five minutes so that people can just see the difference between those and then we can start getting into some of the questions that are on the list from Sue.
That was what my thought was and my plan was.
Again, I didn't want to get too deep in the woods in terms of one particular aspect.
But just kind of give you an overview.

>> FRED-HEJAZI: Yes, so there is a couple of different parts of the online stuff, I will kind of cover them quickly.
And then we can see if there is any questions.
So for them the one part was this community of interest thing, issue.
And these are the ones that have been submitted in Washington.
And they list here on the so I'm on the website so these are the community of interest links that show up.
And if you click it, click the open it will bring up the map.
But on my desktop, it kind of looks like this.
So if I go into this data exchange and I go to communities of interest, I can download as an overlay and once they are here then I can kind of see what the community of interest request was.
And whether like here, you know, there are some community of interest lines that I'm -- that I need to look at.
So that's kind of the integration with the community of interest.
Then we kind of have the comments.
So these are the comments that have been placed on the map.
And I'll just kind of show how the commenting part works.
So this is essentially the same map that was there.
And normally we don't have all the comments visible.
Means that if you place a comment and you can't see everybody else's comment, so the software can be set up so that comments are visible to everybody or comments are sort of semi visible meaning you can see the comment was placed but you can't see what the comment was or we can set it up so you can only see your own comments.
Here I set it up so all the comments are actually visible.
So the way you do a comment, you just go in here and have the map up and you can see obviously the districts and the deviations then you can say, you know, something so you get this form and then I can put in my information and I think this is very good.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have a quick question.

>> KIM BRACE: Sure Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Based on the web comment that you just tried to put in are most of those fields optional?

>> FRED: Most except for the e-mail.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Perfect thank you.

>> FRED: We need to validate and basically what happens is we will get I'll get an e-mail.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Right, to confirm that it was, in fact, you that made the comment makes sense.

>> FRED: I just validated the comment through my e-mail and now that comment is there, there it is.

And from the desktop I can go in here and look for this particular plan.

And I can look at all the comments that have been placed on any and all plans.

But I can add that in here.

And now as I'm working, those comments are there.

So I can look and see, okay, what was that comment that was placed.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it, oh, yes there it is perfect.

>> FRED: This is what I talked about the tight integration between the systems.

That's sort of what really allows me to get prepared for public hearing by actually having seen what everybody is doing.

So looking at go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rhonda had something too.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you one quick question when you were on overlay, I know another Commissioner had a question about this and it seems like the perfect time to ask.

We have seven criteria we have to look at.

When you have the overlay say like a communities of interest, can the other six also be incorporated into that where they can be like layered on top of each other based off from the rank they have for what we have to do? Do you understand what I'm saying there?

>> FRED: As long as they are geographically displayable.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: That is the key that I've also said many of times in my presentations to you of just making sure that people if they are going to put comments, tell us where, not necessarily their address because I know you have taken a vote on that already, but tell us where so that we know, you know, and I've tried to impress upon all of you in terms of that.

Knowing you're concerned about school districts doesn't help if I don't know what school District you're in for example.

Or other kinds of information to help me put it on a map so that I can see it.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> FRED: This was an issue, this was a big issue when we were dealing with the Commission in Austin.

People would come to the hearing and they would want their community explained but they would just say I'm south of This Street, north of That Street, and we would just sort of get this very vague idea of what they were talking about.

So having the ability to place a dot on a map or draw it on the map really kind of helps out in the process.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Julianne, I see your hand up.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just really briefly, to contrast for Rhonda's question and the other Commissioner's questions that she is relaying so some of the criteria like the Voting Rights Act and things like that that would be the analysis that is supported, that would come through or some of Dr. Handley's work was in statistical analysis and also displayed not just geographically so you would have the corresponding numbers for that.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you.

>> FRED: So this is the desktop store the web-based redistricting.

And when you log in there is a message board where you can communicate with the administrator.

Because I'm an administrator I can see everybody that is on the system.

So if anybody wants to communicate with me, they will send a message and I can respond back to them.

I can go to my plan manager and here is where I have all the plans that I've created online.

This is the one I just uploaded incidentally.

So the one I uploaded for comment now shows up over here.

And if I want to edit it, I can go ahead and click open.

Before I do that, there is also tools here for validating the plan before I submit it.

And a submission button so once I submit the plan then it can go to the Commission for consideration.

So if I'm a member of the public and I want to submit a plan this is how I do that.

So this is the interface to the web-based version.

And you essentially kind of Zoom in.

And select geographies that you want to assign.

So if I want to assign to District 10, I can just pick this and then select District 10.

And then click assign.

So you can see it's a much simpler way of working.

There is only very limited set of tools here.

And essentially, I can see what the population value is as I move the mouse over it.

But my demographics are somewhat limited here as far as what is displayed.

And once I'm happy with my plan, I can validate it.

And then the software will run a bunch of checks and then it will say this plan is ready for submission.

And then I can submit it from the other screen.

So that's it as far as the web-based tools go.

   >> KIM BRACE: All right, good, so I just wanted all of you to kind of see the differences between the two because it is a distinction for you as Commissioners to recognize and feel comfortable on how you want to work.

As I mentioned before, we are going to be as map drawers working in the more extensive edge desktop software.

But we will have just like what Fred is showing, access to anything that came in, off of the web based software also.

   So there is a wide variety and interfaces and as I mentioned before we just have got to work with Moon in terms of what is doable in terms of stuff coming from her.

>> FRED: The one thing that I did, it's probably worth showing is in addition is the fact that you can work on the online version if you choose to do that.

And then have us be able to look at the plans and edits that you make.

The commenting that I showed earlier is also not necessarily can be shared with the public.

So if it's an internal comment, if you make an adjustment and I want to show it internally to just you guys we can just limit it to a subset of people before it sort of rolls out online.

So there is a variety of ways to configure this.

It's probably worth knowing that so that you guys can decide how you want to do that.

   >> KIM BRACE: Yep.

   >> FRED: I just added the plan that I just edited online so now it's showing up over here.

And I can you know do a comparison to see what edits were made online.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Doug you have your hand up.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, it's good to understand this.

I think, and we are going to get to this in one of the questions later on, but I think what we need to do is at some point make a decision on whether we want to use the web-based at all.

I mean my big concern there is we have already got a repository of comments coming in from the public.

And now we are going to go tell the public to do it a different way.

And I mean that is for discussion later on when we get to this point.

But I think we want to be careful on what we use and how we use it but we need to determine that and come back with a recommendation.

So but we will handle that as we go through the process here.

Thanks.

   >> KIM BRACE: I think you are right, Doug.

My purpose today was just to kind of give you some overviews as well as some thought process on, you know, if we are going to end up using the comments that have come in from Moon, that's still a work in progress and how we can get those in on that side.

So just wanted to show you the differences and distinctions on that regard.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, what I don't want to do is tell the public oh, we have a different way of putting your comments in.

Start over.

   >> KIM BRACE: Right, no, I can understand that.

I agree.

   >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah so, I think that is part of a discussion later on as we get into the subjects.

Okay thanks.

   >> KIM BRACE: Indeed.

   >> FRED: I'm done as far as showing the software so if you guys want to move to questions, this just shows the edit I made online so I can if somebody makes an online edit, we can compare it to what we have done on the desktop and then make the adjustments.

   >> KIM BRACE: Okay, Fred, if you want to unshare your screen because I want to share the active matrix that we have put together that shows kind of the more extensive capabilities so that you can see that and then we can get into some of these questions on that regard.

   So let me show you quickly what the more extensive active matrix.

This is like what Fred has already shown you, the different capability we set up and an overview but we are showing the individual populations, both what's coming from the ACS data from the Census Bureau as well as the Esry's data set and that's what we are looking at in terms of getting for Michigan.

We also have the different racial demographics shown a different way.

We have pulled in the citizenship voting age, which is coming from the ACS and of course we end up having some of the political data.

And this is some of the stuff that Lisa will end up using where we do have in these instances each year, we've got the individual election results.

This is in the City of Virginia Beach.

But this is what she uses for the purposes of the racial bloc voting.

And seeing the effectiveness on that side.

So I wanted to show this capability on that side too.

   And so as any of the map drawing takes place, all of these numbers change and that's where then they can be fed back to Lisa in terms of the effectiveness of the plan.

   So let me get out of the share on that one.

And bounce back.

I need to run real quickly to answer the door.

So could we have a minute to let me go answer the door? And then I will be right back and we can move on to the questions.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If we really needed to, we can take five real quick. That's up to us three or four I suppose.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Return at 10:20 is that what you are saying.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is fine just come back at 10:20 if everyone is okay with that, if you want to stand in recess for five minutes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Should we vote on it?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I will move to recess until 10:20.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I second it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right I will see you, sorry, hold on, any objections raise your hand and say nay? Seeing none, all right we will stand in recess until 10:20.

 [Recess]

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right as Chair of the subcommittee for the redistricting process, I call this meeting back to order, if I could have the Secretary of State staff or Department of State staff, please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sarah?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: My Commissioners my apologies I was experiencing some technical difficulties, Commissioners please say present when I call your name. And please disclose your physical location that you are attending the meeting from by stating the county, City, Township or village and the state from which you are attending the meeting remotely I will start with Doug Clark.

 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present and I'm at tending the meeting from Rochester Hills Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present attending this meeting from Detroit Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present from Reed City Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present attending from Warren Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All Commissioners are present.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right since we are all back, I suppose we can get on to the questions if that is okay.
Does anyone want to start? Go ahead, Rhonda.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You are muted.
Doug? Doug, you are muted.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I apologize.

Can I suggest that as we just before we start the questions, we determine that who is going to keep track of any recommendations that we may have? And my opinion is we probably should have a recommendation on each of the items as we move forward.

So that needs to be determined as we move forward.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sue? Your thoughts?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I am happy to record the conversation and keep track of the recommendations.

I've started a spreadsheet that we can add to, edit, delete, whatever this group wants to do.

But I'm happy to record what's happening here, so it can be reported out to the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's fine by me.

Rhonda, are you okay at this point?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm here now I apologize.

I would not let me unmute then it kind of kicked me out, can you repeat whatever was said real quick rundown for me so I can be caught up.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Go ahead, Sue.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I just indicated that I would record the conversation and your decisions, your recommendations, so I will provide a report at the end after the meeting for your use.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, all right, so moving on to the actual questions here.

I guess I'll start because this is one that I saw on there and it's also been something that has been brought up in a lot of our meetings and so I'm sure you're probably aware of where I'm going to be going.

But my question is: Is it feasible to start from absolute scratch when it comes to the redrawing of the maps themselves? Or is it a better idea to use existing data from ten years ago where the current District maps and make adjustments? I'm personally on the fence.

I like both ideas.

However, I'm leaning towards starting from scratch based off of the public comment that we have received.

>> KIM BRACE: That's a good, a valid question, Dustin.

And let me give you some experience from that side, but also some thoughts and comments in that regard.

You guys are unique.

We have already talked about that.

And know that per se.

Experience wise what normally takes place is that most of the redistricting starts with the existing districts.

And makes adjustments to those, to deal with the populations, maybe dealing with the minority populations, maybe dealing with the politics, all of those kind of factors that come into play.

And in the normal redistricting particularly when there is it's the legislature, what we did see in 19 or in 2000 is that there was a whole new set of people with their hands on the mouse.

Previously democrats would control a state, would draw the districts a certain way, basically democratic ways of drawing was to do coalition districts.

Little African/Americans here and Hispanics and liberal whites over there and you create a democrat seat.

Republicans would tend to create what I would call more polarizing districts to where they are looking at putting as many democrats in the smallest number of seats.

You got to be careful going that way because it could be a discrimination thing.

And so there has been some of the cases since 2010 that have brought back some of those kind of District drawings.

But you've got the two dynamics in play on that side.

By starting with the existing districts, you're embedding some of that dynamic already in that regard.

And so starting from scratch kind of gives you a clean slate, more possibilities in that regard.

But also part of the thing that you will get as soon as we get the data is we're going to take a look at the existing plan.

And show you what are the deviations under the existing plan.

So you know that, you know, all these districts up in the thumb area have got to add population.

So or whatever the case may be.

Similar to what we were trying to show you with some of the estimates that we have as a way of experimenting and showing that sort of thing.

But as soon as we get the new data and the PL data, we will end up running that on the existing districts as at least the first cut of this is what some of the data is showing.

   Now, having said that, at that point in time certainly you could start with a clean slate.

And one of the nice things about the software is you can do it both ways.

You can end up creating plans with a starting point of a clean slate.

You can do it as a starting point with, you know, existing districts and how they can get manipulated.

You could do it with and what I've done in a number of different states is show what happens when you start at the bottom of the state.

And move north.

Or starting at UP and coming south.

Because what you'll find in doing that is that there's different dynamics that come into play.

Certainly some of those public comments you've been getting and all of that.

But what is nice about the software is that you can experiment.

And you can see what the impact is.

From an experience standpoint let me tell you that back in 1980 we were creating in the legislative session probably about ten plans for the entire legislative session.

In 1990 we had PCs for the first time.

And all of a sudden, we could create 100 plans as in during the legislative session.

When we got to faster computers and more capabilities, we could create a thousand plans.

Well, now, you know, we've got academics that are sitting there creating a million plans on that side.

Yes, you can end up creating all sorts of different possibilities.

But, you know, the nice things about computers these days is that you can do a bunch of varieties.

And you can see what the impact is.

That's the nice thing about the computers.

Is you get to see what the impact is and then you could vote on it, you can vote going this way, you can vote going that way.

But clearly the best thing is to experiment.

And so, you know, my favorite would be to move in a variety of different directions.

I am interested in this region possibility and one of the things that might be a way of thinking in terms of for the Commission and I think for you guys to also think about does it make sense to divide the Commission into different regions of the state? Have some people draw the northern part of the state, have other people draw the Metro area.

Have and see what could be done.

That way you could end up dealing more concentrated on what the public comments are for that region, for that area on that side.

Trying to take on everything is a monumental task but doing it by regions you can kind of get some specialties that you now know this area more extensively and you can end up reflecting some of the comments that have come back to you.

    That then also raises the question that you also had here is that what should you be drawing first? Congressional districts? State House? State Senate? That is a valid question and a valid choice.

Experience again from my side is that you end up having Congressional would probably be easier to start with.

Certainly.

You've got less districts to draw.

But doing State House, you are getting into the weeds right away.

And looking at what could be done in this particular area.

If you think in terms of regions, then you're really probably looking at letting the regional people think in terms of how State House and State Senate districts and then the group coming together over all and looking at Congressional.

You know, that's one way to play it.

I will tell you that from an experience of an election administrator, which is the other hat that I wear, and your county clerks and your town clerks, for their purposes of conducting elections, the more lines that coincide together, the better it is from their standpoint.

And clearly, forcing one set of house lines and one set of Senate lines and they don't interface between each other causes havoc for county and town clerks in terms of the precincts that they ultimately have to be made, the ballot styles that have to be done.

So I'm always thinking in terms of that also.

My experience in looking at and doing work in Iowa for example, they have a unique system.

They are the only state in the country where they have truly nested all three layers.

Congressional, State Senate, State House.

And they do that by going high to low.

They create their Congressional districts.

Being as equally populated as possible.

Using larger geographies, but at least they create Congressionals and that then becomes in their map drawing process kind of a constraint.

Then within each Congressional District they are creating the State Senate districts within that Congressional District.

So they're not having overlaps.

Now, of course it depends on how many districts there are and whether or not things divide of course.

But they are then creating the State Senate districts.

And once they get those pretty well set in terms of equal population, then they end up dividing the State Senate districts into the State House districts.

But staying within the State Senate District boundaries.

So it is a true nested circumstance.

It works well for them.

It helps election administrators, but it does impose all sorts of constraints on things.

You know, if you are suddenly constraints then how you are going to draw the State House districts by that State Senate District that was created first, that may be a constraint that is too much.

But it does give you the capabilities of seeing what potential choices there are on that regard.

    >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mr. Morgan I saw you have something to add.

    >> JOHN MORGAN: And Commissioner Lange has something too. And I will be brief, and two points. And your central question is can you start from scratch as you say or should you use the existing maps?

At the very least it would be useful to look at the existing maps and perform some analysis just to look at them and say, okay, these districts are out of a population alignment by this much.

The reason you do that is it really does help you see where the population shifts are.

If you then say we are no longer going to look at these districts, at the very least you get the information, it's a quick way to understand the population shifts.

    In addition, there is another advantage which is that there may be some configurations in the existing plan that, you know, make sense going forward.

And I'll give you an example in the UP.

You know, you may read or shuffle the counties up there but there is only so far you can go where the District is going to be really, really similar to what it is now.

You know, just because of the way the population stands.

So that's one that is kind of my one point is at the very least it's useful to have that information that is out there.

You don't have to commit to saying we are only going to use the existing plan.

But it's a useful reference.

    And the other issue that was brought up as part of the discussion is nesting.

It sounds good and it may be possible to some extent, but the numbers are difficult here because you have 38 State Senate districts and if you were to put three State House districts in each of the Senate districts, you would have 114 House Districts.

So you would have to do some interesting gymnastics to make it work where you basically have three districts in most of the Senate plans and then you have these additional four districts that you wouldn't really have.

So it would be very complicated and I don't even know what that would look like.

I will just take this time and say one thing because it was also brought up, the idea of where to start.

Again if you start from scratch, you can look at the population and say well there is about this many seats in this area.

That's helpful as we have talked about and I have talked about.

    I might recommend that you start with the State Senate because it's a mid-point.

It's not as complex as the State House.

A lot of the State Senate Districts are composed of whole counties and it will give you an idea moving some of this around it might be a good place to start.

The Congressional has another issue where you're going to have to go all the way down to zero population.

Although you could test the Congressional getting close and you know that's also fewer districts but that is just a thought so I will stop there so you can get to other questions.

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: General Julianne Pastula you get to cut the line.

  >> KIM BRACE: You get to listen to her.

  >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: You have no idea how much I appreciate that Mr. Chair.

So I just wanted to make two really quick observations one is we don't have nesting as a criteria.

So I think that to constraint ourselves in a manner that is not provided for in our constitutional guidance would be inadvisable.

And the other thing I would like to highlight is that I know in the past I mentioned that length the League of Women Voters versus Benson case again the interplay with the common cause v Rusho, Supreme Court case. Holding that courts can't decide partisan gerrymanders. I think it would be beneficial for the Commission to have a memo outlining those districts that were held by the three Court Federal panel as partisan gerrymanders in Michigan. And I think that is driving a lot of the public comment.

I would speculate that that drives a lot of the public comment about starting fresh.

And, certainly, a lot of those things would be up lifted during the statistical analysis that Mr. Morgan indicated.

  But I just wanted to highlight those two really minute, but yet critical clarifications that directly impact the current discussion on how to proceed.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You're welcome.

Mr. Stigall, you had your hand up and Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Eid. Rhonda, did you still have something or are you okay?

  >> MR. STIGALL: I wanted to add in I have created a lot of plans over the decades and republican, democrat plans came from universities, plans came from individuals and one huge issue that we had any time somebody brought a plan in that had districts numbered differently or just one through 100 or one through ten that immediately stopped everything because it was like, okay, this District number one, if a University or a college says I was not worried about District numbers, that is fine.

But immediately when the public sees that plan, they don't, you know, they are up in arms.

Because they don't know where District ten is.

They don't know if even the region of the state, what is 20? So by starting from scratch when you have a District one and you put in a southern Michigan and ten years ago it was in Northern Michigan, it's going to cause a lot of confusion from plan to plan it will be hard to compare them other than geographically.

So I guess even if you started with the current districts and immediately shrunk them down to their core area so that you're not, I mean you are almost starting from scratch but at least the public and other Commission members know the general location of District X even if you cut it down to one-third of the ideal deviation and then went from there.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I mean I suppose you could just ignore numbers altogether and just draw and superimpose where the rough districts are and put them on the map after the fact and we have the lines drawn.

I mean, that's just technology.

>> KIM BRACE: The software does let you renumber districts once you have them drawn.

So, you know, yeah, you might start with District one down in Detroit, but you could end up after you've got a good feel for how you wanted it, then you could readjust the numbers to reflect well it's always been in Grand Rapids or whatever the case may be.

>> KEN STIGALL: General area.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Before we break up, Mr. Stigall had another comment he wanted to make.

Can we afford him the opportunity for his thought?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, sorry, I apologize.

>> KEN STIGALL: I lost my train of thought on this, but it had to do is it a concern if you start from scratch, none of the districts are numbered.

With the level of concern about having four or five delegates or Senators or representatives in one District and four or five districts surrounding that area with none.

You know, are we going to run into, we draw a great plan and then we are concerned because half the districts don't have numbers in it, don't have any current representation.

And other districts are highly competitive with each other.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> KEN STIGALL: Yes, that is mine.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: One of the main reasons this Commission is put together is to get the public comment and then utilize the public comment.

And I have heard consistently in every meeting from a number of people that they want us to start from scratch.

Which is what my thoughts are.

However, I'd like what John said.

To do the -- take the current districts and map those and within the population and then use that as a reference point or comparison as we move forward.

I think that makes a lot of sense.

Not that we need to use it.

But I think we need to start from scratch personally, but it's great reference point.

And might teach us a lot of things as we move forward.

And the nesting, I think we should just put aside.

I think mathematically it's just too difficult.

I think that is kind of my opinion on how we should move forward as a recommendation.

But I definitely want to hear from Rhonda and Anthony and you Dustin.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

   >> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so a few things that we just learned, which I'm glad we learned.

We learned it is possible you know with the software to start from scratch.

And you know I agree that that is my preference that we start from scratch.

I mean, I think that is the number one thing that we have heard so far.

   As far as the numbering goes, I agree with what you said, Dustin.

I mean we can just you know after we draw what we are going to draw we can just you know approximate the geographical locations of where they are at and you know put a number on it.

So if you know whatever we draw for the UP could be District one because that is what currently is District one, we can do that and start from scratch.

So I think that's the first decision point that we have to make here.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I wasn't sure if we were going to start talking about those or go through all the other questions, that is why my hand has been up and down.

My thought on starting from scratch, I've got several, so when we went into these hearings, we were told to use discernment for a lot of the public comment because you just never know.

I am finding some of the public comment repetitive.

That doesn't mean it's not less important.

But some of it does seem a little coached in my opinion.

This is just my opinion.

And, again, I'm not saying anybody's opinion or comment is any more important than others.

There have been groups that have come out and said that they want us to start with fresh maps, organized groups.

So my thought process is in trying to be fair with everybody that's giving us comments because there is also people that have multiple people that have given us comments that they did not want us to start from scratch, that actually they like their areas, their communities of interests and I will use for example one that stands out is the Sanford.

The groups that came from Sanford that experience the flood.

And how they said that, you know, they are working hand in hand with the Government to help get back on their feet and help rebuild.

And it's very imperative to them they would like to keep the representation, and I'm not making this political that they have, but I can kind of understand where they are coming from in that aspect.

And then I'm looking at it from a constitutional point too.

There is a question that came up in my head about this starting from scratch and not starting from scratch and I think it may playoff from Ken's comment a little bit, one of our criteria is not getting a favor or disfavor into you know into any current incumbent.

If we draw the maps completely from scratch, completely and those areas are no longer even similarly in the areas which these people are currently representing, would that be giving them an unfair advantage then? I guess I don't know how the political process works.

You know, as far as that goes, I imagine that they have to live within the District that they represent.

So if we start from scratch, are we automatically going against one of even though it's a lower constitutional criteria, are we automatically going against one of those which is going to bring up Court cases right off the bat? So my opinion on starting from fresh and not, I'm on the fence.

I do like the idea of looking at the existing once we get the data.

I like the idea of a definitely adjusting heavily gerrymandered areas and seeing what that looks like and then if we have to start from scratch, then I would be.

But I do want to look at all options.

And that's all I've got.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I got that too when I was thinking about the constitutionality of the other things that we have to deal with, not disfavoring or favoring any current incumbent, but I have a feeling that that litigation is going to come any way because there is going to be an argument saying that if we change the actual District by just one person we are now disfavoring or favoring them in any particular manner.

Like those challenges are going to come no matter how we do it.

And that is just the thought that I had months ago in my opinion.

But, again, that is speculative.

And I don't really know if that is going to you know stand.

But I see your point, Rhonda.

Like you have a very good point where if you do start from scratch then technically and move everything further than it would be normally, then you could be disfavoring or favoring.

But you have a very good point in my opinion, so and let's see, General Counsel Pastula you get to cut the line again.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, again Mr. Chair.

Again, I know we consistently talk about you know the Commission and adhering to the constitutional criteria and doing its work and all of that.

So we are always focusing on that.

The litigation will unfold however it unfolds.

The constitutional criteria in that you show your work and you have the statistical data to back up the districts that you're drawing and the recommendations that you're making is always at the forefront.

So and I think this conversation that's happening regarding starting fresh or adjusting like many of the discussions have pros and cons on both side which makes it so difficult to make these kinds of firm decisions without that data in front of you.

But, again, the process should be driven by the Commission's consistent and desire to do the right thing and follow the Constitution and I just wanted to highlight that that again should be the focus.

The litigation, the lawyers will worry about that.

We will worry about you guys focusing on the actual duties that were entrusted to you under the Constitution.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, yes.

I'd like to put a motion forward that we recommend to the Commission that we do start from scratch, however, that we also use on-Morgan's approach of taking what could be the existing data as well for a reference point.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That would be as a comparison right Doug?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct as a comparison.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Is there a second?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I will second that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, so the motion has been seconded on starting fresh, but use the comparison of the data that we already have.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I think it's too quick to make that decision.

That's my only discussion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: My opinion on that is we've got a lot of decisions to make. And given the input we are getting from our consultants and what we have learned so far from the public that we should just move forward with some recommendations.

I mean they will get discussed again at the full Commission.

But if we start delaying things we are never going to get done.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: We don't even have the full context of the questions that we need to ask.

I think if we are truly doing our due diligence, we should gather all of the information.

Look at it collectively because something in this information might affect some process with this information.

So all I'm saying is we have two days of meetings to come up with our process.

And to make those decisions.

I think we should collectively gather all information that's needed before we make quick decisions.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: This is part of the process.

And so I think we need to handle these things one by one.

I mean we are going to be here for more than two meetings if we go collect all the data and come back and revisit each one of these.

Just make the best of the data that we got and the advice we've got from our consultants at this point.

And the only thing I did not address on my motion was the numbering, but I don't know how you want to handle that.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Any other further discussion on the motion? Hearing none we will make a vote.

All in favor of the motion to start fresh but utilize the data that's currently available and the existing maps for comparison purposes, if you agree please raise your right hand and say aye.

   >> Aye.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Aye.

If you disagree, please raise your hand and say nay.

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Three to one motion carries.

Then Sue?

   >> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Just briefly for clarification, I don't think this body can approve that kind of recommendation, that kind of vote.

I think this is a recommendation to the Commission.

I just want to clarify that the maps be started from scratch, so Julianne.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You make a very good point as soon as I saw your hand come up, I had that exact same thought.

Like we can't make motions as far as I'm concerned in regards to the things like this.

However, I would say that we could potentially make a motion to make that a particular recommendation that we bring to the entire Commission and then vote on it.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, and I think that is how I phrased the original motion that it was a recommendation.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Right, correct.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

Everything coming out of this subcommittee should be a recommendation.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay yeah, we are not making any decisions at all. We are saying these are the things that we recommend.

So are motions really required for that?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The committee can, the committee was tasked with bringing back recommendations.

So, yes, the votes would be appropriate for those recommendations that you want to move forward.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The first recommendation to be sent to the full Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And I think Commissioner Lange's point was have the fuller discussion of all of the questions prior to making the decisions in the committee. That's how I understood that comment was that it was not to get the data or external information, it was to that the committee excuse me hear the answers to all of the questions in the event they are interrelated.

But, yes, the vote was appreciate as a recommendation.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And the Commission is expecting recommendations or even options.

If the committee wishes to put options on a topic, that that would also be appropriate.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

Do I need to restate it and vote again? Or is this good enough just by talking about it right now?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The motion that I had was for the recommendation was to start from scratch but take a look at the existing data as well as for comparison.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So we can certainly restate, yes, it's best practice to restate it prior to the vote.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it, I tried my best.

So, okay, so recommendation one done.

I guess we can move on to the next question whoever wants to start that feel free.

And there is a tie so whoever wants to flip a coin I suppose we will go with Commissioner Lange first.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Anthony, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Are you sure Rhonda.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you hear me, hello? Hello?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You can hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My Internet is being a little wonky.

I was going to say the other thing we heard about just now was you know the order of doing the districts.

So you know are we going to do Congressional first? State House? State Senate?

You know, so what are we going to do there to make you know this job the most you know efficient process? Now, as our General Counsel said, the I don't know it's called the layering of you know one seat within another seat within another seat.

That's not a constitutional requirement.

But just because it's not a constitutional requirement doesn't mean we can't keep it in mind.

But I do think it would be a premature decision to you know make that policy as you know creating more roadblocks for us probably isn't a good thing.

So I guess my question to our experts would be: Out of these three maps, which are the easiest to draw? I would think it would be the Congressional districts.

I mean they are bigger.

They have more people.

I think all of us are more familiar with the Congressional districts.

So those are the easiest to draw, maybe we ought to do those first and work our way down.

>> KIM BRACE: You are correct Anthony they would be the easier one to draw.

But let me raise another equally important discussion point for you guys.

Do we think of drawing in regions of the state? Because that is probably a larger factor than starting with Congressional, going down or starting with house going up.

It really is how do you guys want to organize yourself in the drawing process? You know, that to me would be a more important thing to first do because it may be that in the UP you know, you don't have to worry about Congressional because you got to come across the bridge any way.

Or that sort of thing.

So thinking in terms of regions and how you would want to organize yourself, I think is an important characteristic for you guys to think about and debate on that side.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mr. Morgan?

>> JOHN MORGAN: Yes, so again you have three different districts you are tasked withdrawing.

And I made the reference yesterday in my presentation to the Sistine chapel and planning and it did not happen from start to finish.

Essentially the artist there Michael Angelo got better by drawing something first and he learned and his process later was better.

So I would suggest that you have a -- you give yourselves a little bit of flexibility to work on something to a point and then maybe not all the way to the end.

Maybe, for example, I suggest the State Senate districts because it's got some complexity, it's not as complex as the house, but my experience the Congressional districts while they are fewer in number, they have a lot of other issues that make them complex as well.

So I think the State Senate might be a good I don't want to say practice but it may be a good practice.

A lot of the districts are being comprised of whole counties to a point.

And you will get some experience with that.

And, again, I'd say give yourself the flexibility to say start with one of the three types of maps and go part of the way down but not commit yourselves to completing it.

In the initial stage.

Get a good ways down the line and then maybe switch.

And then to Kim's point about regions, I think that's a good idea as well.

You don't have to restrict yourselves to specific bounded regions and say we are only going to work with this.

Create your regions, customized to the type of map you're doing.

Like for example, I pointed out there were seven Senate districts populations in Wayne County.

This time around the population loss it's 6.6 approximately.

So you have to add another county's portion of the population probably to that mix.

But that's a good way to define yourself and say well we are going to have approximately seven Districts in this area but you are not committing to the individual districts up front.

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

  >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I mean this is a tough question because we could start with any of the three, but I -- here is the problem with regionizing or setting up districts and working with them in my mind.

If we do it as a Commission, I think it's more efficient than doing it as subcommittees or special groups for each area because so what drives is are the administrative issue, we have here in Michigan is everything has to be Open Meetings Act so if we had seven regions that is seven different meetings to go through this stuff.

And then we got to get together and talk about it as a whole.

So that's going to drive our timing and one of our biggest constraints is time right now.

So I would -- I'm not against that regional concept.

And working small like John suggests.

And doing the piece here and so forth.

But I do suggest that we do it as a Commission and not separate committees.

I don't know, do you have a comment on that John from your experience?

>> JOHN MORGAN: Sure I agree with what you're saying as the time.

One of the reasons that you would separate into groups is you could work simultaneously.

But what you are basically telling me is that if you do it in subcommittees you don't necessarily have the staff to staff the individual subcommittees and act independently.

You would basically have, you know, one subcommittee and then you take time for another subcommittee.

So there is sequential rather than parallel like in you know circuitry.

The second point on that is the regionality gives you an opportunity to take a break.

So even if you as a whole Commission or even as one subcommittee were to work on a region for a while, you can say, okay, we have worked on this for two days or a day or you know 20 hours or something like that.

You can say okay we've gotten probably 75%, 85% of where we want to go.

We are exhausted let's set that as side and look at another region.

Some approach like that will help you to Commissioner Lange's point to get more information and you know to solidified your thinking a little bit before perhaps finishing something.

So I'm saying switching between regions I think is a good strategy and again your point is from the committee's structure it's unwieldy to create subcommittees.

And I don't know that Kim Brace was saying you had to do this in the form of subcommittees.

But the regional approach to some extent is efficient because you will focus on a region at a time.

And one more thing that Kim said and Ken Stigall picked this up as well when you start at one part of the state and go to the other part it will be different from the central part of the state and work out.

As you do more redistricting you will gain experience on that and you will learn and I have experience on that too.

You know, when you start when you have a different starting point, your approach is just effected a little bit as you go through it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

I'll give my thoughts in a minute.

I don't know who to go to either at this particular point.

General Counsel Pastula.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Chair, if Ms. Reinhardt could go first because I have a feeling we are going to say the same thing but I may want to add to it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, just to add a little bit of additional detail regarding the thought behind hosting simultaneous subcommittee meetings.

As I pointed out at one of our previous meetings regarding staff resources and time, as you all know the Constitution requires that members of the public are able to view meetings virtually and participate.

And unfortunately our resources that we have currently and our staff that we have currently would not be able to facilitate such a process of simultaneous subcommittee meetings.

I'd also add that serving as secretary of the Commission on behalf of Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson there is only one of me.

Who would not be able to present in multiple meetings at the same time so I just wanted to provide that additional detail.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, and to build on what Ms. Reinhardt said, it again and I think Mr. Morgan made an important clarification that the regional approach is not necessarily tied to a committee-based approach.

And as the consultants I know they have been watching the Commission's meetings for many months now, the full Commission is definitely expressed a strong interest in working its way collectively through the State of Michigan.

It has been staff's impression.

So I would divest those two, if the committee was going to make recommendations on those, I would separate those two into two separate recommendations for the full Commission to consider would be my suggestion.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That was my thought as well.

I mean, this was my understanding like once we actually start drawing the maps especially now that we are going to have to start meeting in person, it basically starts the meeting much like we are doing our public hearings and just put a microphone up in the middle of the room and then if we break off into a subsection, we break off into a subsection but we can all work together basically in the same room anyway.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct and again that facilitated discussion and mapping certainly the volume of the public record if you were voting on every single line rather than having that collaborative discussion and then you know the timing I think of when things are formalized is also important thing to consider.

But I don't want to get ahead of the process discussion on that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: I think you do have a couple of different options in this regard.

I wasn't really suggesting having simultaneous meetings.

I recognize Sarah's sanctity in life trying to deal with these animals all over the place.

Certainly on our side too on that record.

But it's, you know, you could end up doing, you know, this region has from 8-10, we take a half hour break and next region has from 10:30 to 12:30 or whatever, however you wanted to design it, divide it, but you do let you know some of the expertise then come into play on that front.

You know, you're not -- you don't necessarily have to have everybody working at the same time.

And later on, you know, then you can come back in to, all right, we got some ideas on these four regions, let's get everybody together to kind of review and look and see how they could fit, not fit, whatever the case may be.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's my understanding, I mean this is just my thought, I mean, I have a feeling that when we start the meetings those particular things are just going to be decided right then and there of how we want to tackle a particular day.

Because as long as you know there is a microphone in the room, they can hear what we are talking about, you know, you could say you know well they decided to go do this for this such and such amount of time or these Commissioners wanted to go do this, these Commissioners wanted to go get coffee et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So but, no, I see the point.

Breaking things up might be good.

And then coming back at a -- you know with the whole group and then saying, you know, this is what we came up with.

Does anybody else want to take a look before we vote on this and so on and so forth.

Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I think what we are talking about is multiple layers of work. And if we have small groups of people that are going off and doing things or an individual specializes in a region or possibly a Commissioner lives in a certain part of the state and they know that region really well, and they have an interest, they have listened to the public comment and they get what everybody is saying, if they can bring that to the table.

But if you have separate meetings to discuss this versus as a whole Commission, then you're just creating another layer of work.

Why don't we put the information on the table for everybody to see at once as one Commission.

If you have a specialty in that area, great, you can bring it to the table.

But we as a Commission, we, sorry, I keep, you know, adding myself in.

I'm staff.

I can't vote.

But the Commission as a whole is going to make the decisions. So if everybody comes with the same information, at the same time despite the process, so whether we are going to say today we are going to work in the UP area.

Today we are going to work in Southwest or Southeast Michigan or Central Michigan, whatever that process is, we as a whole hear all the conversation and then can make decisions collectively.

And I think that is just really important rather than separating people up and into groups.

Not to mention that they can't bring their specialties to the table, and there will be discussions by region, and I will shut up and let John speak.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: One other thing, and I could be completely wrong here.

But my vision is, again, microphone in the middle of the room, we start, I don't think like a Chairperson is going to be there and calling on every single person individually to say what are your thoughts on this and so on and so forth.

We can just be talking back and forth with each other because if you start to do that, then that's going to be incredibly inefficient and it's just going to take longer and longer and longer to do anything.

We can say okay we are going to work at this particular area of the state.

And then you know set the microphone up in the room and then we just talk amongst ourselves, meeting wise like I don't think we will need to be calling on individuals to say it's your turn to talk now.

I don't think an argument is going to breakout in any particular point in time.

But one -- that was one of my questions is what is the most efficient way to go about doing this.

And I thoroughly believe if we you know just start, we vote on or and start working on one particular area of the state so business of the day and then we just say, okay, this is what we are doing and turn the microphone on and go.

My opinion.

I feel like that is going to be the most efficient to have group think.

   Mr. Morgan and Commissioner Eid and General Counsel Pastula.

   >> JOHN MORGAN: On the issue of efficiency, imaging what you're saying about getting a room and go.

But the word go in that circumstance when you're talking about drawing maps, one of the things I would suggest, and I think this is part of the discussion maybe ahead of where we are now, just a little bit, I would suggest that you want to have the ability to have a draft or a working plan in not a plan but just a concept.

And that you can create, if you have to create a distinction, you know, to call something a draft so that you are clear that what you are working on is not, you know, necessarily a final map, it's a proposal.

In the same way that in your committee hearings you have discussion.

And you know you will have discussion for a little ways and then in the discussion maybe withdraw your concern or you know you learn some more information.

So for example, if you are working in an area and you say, well, can you show us what it would look like a single District if you added that Township or that County? And I would say that in this context you would say, okay, we are in a draft situation, we are just looking at some options.

And you designate that type of activity.

So that it's not, you know, you are not necessarily committing yourself to we are voting on every single click of the mouse.

Maybe you have to do that.

I don't know.

But if you establish some language or the ability to have discussion, that may be a way to handle it whereas some of these maps are considered discussion and then you can look at the product of your discussion and you know consider that as a motion or you know a vote or something like that.

I'm just suggesting at least at this stage that you allow yourself to have experiments or concepts.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I didn't have my hand up, Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm sorry General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you again Mr. Chair.

And, yes, Mr. Morgan just touched on what I commented on earlier was that the workflow in the collaborative meeting shouldn't be interrupted by what would result in the tone of votes on drafts or very dynamic situation.

You move one line, it has a corresponding reaction in another area.

But what I really wanted to touch on, again, is this notion that separating those two ideas of working in different regions of the state as the full Commission versus the Commission separating into committees for regional work or that suggestion.

Again, building on Ms. Reinhardt's comment about capacity and staffing issues on Executive Director Hammersmith's comments, again the Constitution contemplates the Commission drawing the lines.

So in addition to the deadlines that we have, that we are up against really from a work process standpoint to have things happening in committees to be recommended back up to the full Commission and then having the full Commission having to have that backed understanding that background understanding of the committee's work really in my estimation does not make sense in this situation.

Again, given the deadlines that the full Commission is up against and the work that is the responsibility under the Commission or under the Constitution it's the responsibility of the full Commission, so I would strongly recommend again against that approach for not only capacity and timing issues but the language of the Constitution as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let Kim go before me, please.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Okay, I have really no problem in having the full Commission doing a meeting, but focusing on a given region.

That would satisfy that kind of work process.

You don't want to try to build the whole state at one point in time.

You really do want to work in different regions.

You want to do that as a whole committee.

I don't have a problem with that, in that regard.

We don't have to divide out the Commission into individual areas from that regard.

But I think the other point that John has made is that redistricting is really an ongoing stepping process that you're not finalizing a map until the very tail end.

You are looking at what possibilities there could be.

You could, you know, let's see what happens if we do this and that can be plan A, tentatively.

We could then go and look at it from another direction and that can be plan B tentatively.

Things need to be tentative because you're going to see that you're going to need to make changes all the time in that regard.

That's the one benefit of having a software because you can do that and experiment, that is it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I mean, I agree a lot about what John and Kim have said.

So I'd like to put the motion forward for us to recommend to the Commission that we take a regional approach and work towards that objective.

And as part of that, that we start with the State Senate per John's recommendation.

I think that is a -- because there is more complexities in the Congressional one, I think that's problem a smaller one to start with.

And understand things.

But I'd like to add that to the motion that we start with the State Senate and do it from a regional perspective.

And I'll put that on the table.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Is there a second?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sue has her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Just a question, I didn't know if Doug wanted to or did not want to add as a whole Commission to that.

Just so we also address that and what you have been talking about.

But just a question.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I definitely do.

Thank you for that.

Yeah, I don't want to split it up in small subsets but as a whole Commission, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So daughter you're saying when you say as a whole Commission, what do you mean exactly? So are we -- I feel like what we have said already is not going with like Commissioners breaking it down like someone does one area, someone does another one.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right, correct, so the mapping process will be a function of all 13 of us in the room at the same time.

Not three of us coming back with recommendations.

That's what I mean to it, Anthony.

>> KIM BRACE: But I think Doug what you can do is you can, I'm sorry Julianne?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I'm sorry we have a motion that is waiting for a second and I think the motion has been revised, recommendation to the Commission that the full Commission take a regional approach and work towards that objective and start with the Senate.

So we have to keep the votes crisp and the discussion on the motion.

We don't even have a second for this motion yet so we are not even sure, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will second that and we can start the discussion right away if that makes more sense at that particular point.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Perfect and again the motion that is on the floor that's that I have for the record made by Commissioner Clark and seconded by Commissioner Witjes is to recommend to the Commission that the full Commission take a regional approach and work towards that objective starting with the Senate.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's my understanding too.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Okay thank you sorry for the interruption.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is fine I was about to say the same thing.

Okay so now we can go into the discussion before we vote.

So Mr. Brace, feel free to continue.

>> KIM BRACE: I partly lost my train of thought but let me just say that you know you can end up implementing what Commissioner Clark was talking about and you could do it in the pattern of, okay, this morning we are going to deal with this area of the state.

We will talk about that.

We will discuss it.

And you could end up having experts within your Commission because each of you come from a different area of the state, you could have them you know, kind of take control or take the first shot at these are what I have heard from my neighbors and all of that kind of stuff.

To get some of that into the discussion for everybody's sake.

So that kind of helps out the process in that regard.

>> JOHN MORGAN: I would say part of the discussion if anyone has questions that is helpful for your decision making let me know.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say I don't see the harm in taking a regional approach by saying hey we are going to look at this particular like start with the Senate maps per recommendation of Election Data Services and then take a regional approach of each state working together as 13 of us that seems like a relatively good idea to me.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I guess that's kind of the big question, isn't it? Like what is the approach? Like how are the 13 of us actually going to sit down and you know, do it in a conducive manner? You know, there has to be some sort of a we mentioned like you know flow charts here and there, we mentioned like step wise processes that has happened because what I'm worried about is you know the repeatability of any process that we undertake.

Because you know we want to balance of something we can repeat so we can show our work, show our decision making process.

But also, we don't want it to be, you know, so defined that you can't get creative at all.

Because we do have communities of interest that are a big part of this.

And we may need to get a little creative here or there in different areas.

So I guess you know that is where I'm kind of hung up on.

Like how do we actually do that?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to respond to Anthony's point.

I think that's another part of the discussion, how do we run those meetings rather than where do we start and how do we, you know, do this thing regionally and so forth.

Or whether we do it regionally or not.

So I would suggest that maybe that is the next topic we talk about or before the end of the day at least talk about it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm just going to reiterate what I said earlier.

I feel like we should have all of the information before we start making decisions.

We are 2.5 hours in and we've had two questions.

I think it will be a lot easier for us to make these decisions when we have all of the information combined because what I'm hearing is a question is being asked and then there is a motion and then we are adding on to the motion and then clarification on the motion, I just feel we should be collecting all of the information which the first 90 minutes of this meeting was supposed to be assigned to that.

And then start making the motions and the recommendations.

I think we are working in a very inefficient way right now.

And I just had to say that, but that's just my opinion.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Any further discussion on the motion? Feel free to weigh in Mr. Morgan, Commissioner Eid, I'm sorry.

   >> COMMISSIONER EID: So what Rhonda do you have any like specific questions for EDS that could kind of help us, you know, do that? Like what is the like what is the information that you know that you're seeking right now? So we can address it.
Because you wanted it addressed, we should address it.
You know.

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm saying I'm looking at two pages plus of questions that were asked that are going in order and we are kind of skipping all over the place which is fine.
But for me personally I'm a very ABCDE person.
So to be skipping all over in the conversations seem to be going all over, I'm trying to keep up with what everybody is saying, but I just feel like putting the information together all at once and evaluating it as a whole and then making recommendations just seems so much better.
EDS' time is very valuable.
And are we even going to get through what we need to get through at the rate we are going? I feel like we should have ask the questions and got the answers and then went into the further discussions.
It's not just a matter of one thing.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My understanding is that since Election Data Services was the only vendor here at this particular point in time, the only questions that we were really working on are the ones that start under the headline regarding mapping and we basically have gone through a couple of those at this particular time.
Go ahead.

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Mr. Chair, I have to disagree because there are processed questions that relate to EDS too.
That I think we should discuss and that was my understanding that we would be discussing those also, which kind of go hand in hand with the mapping.
So that's what I'm saying.
We have regarding process of how we work with EDS and then that evolves into the mapping, okay, we know how we are going to work hand in hand with them now let's go into the mapping aspect of it.
That's what I'm saying, to collaborate all of that information together I think is a better way to make decisions well informed decisions, but that is just my opinion.
But you guys know me, if I think it, I'm going to say it.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You and me both.
All right I mean there is definitely some merit to what you're saying, Commissioner Lange for sure.

So I know Mr. Morgan wanted to do a quick weigh in and I think at that point we will take a motion of the vote on the floor and we can just continue on at this particular point.

And then Commissioner Lange if you have any particular question that you want to ask at that point, please feel free to do so.

>> JOHN MORGAN: I just wanted to get the concept across.

If you do pick regions, I just want to go back to when I showed Washtenaw County, I showed the fact there were about four House Districts there and I just showed the population.

There may be an opportunity to either do a practice round of redistricting, you know, like a training session where you would pick a County or a place with of just a little bit of data so you can get used to seeing what you're going to do.

I just think that may be a good approach.

So you know whether it's actual, full redistricting for an actual region or just a practice round, that may benefit you.

So you can get some idea how to do this rather than jumping into something that is very complicated maybe we can start with something that is simple relatively speaking or we think it's simple and lets you work on that.

And then you know you can come up with some ideas or concepts based on that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Just really quickly Julianne and I have been discussing on July 8th besides the mapping training that we are going to ask Fred to do, to actually do something like that.

So, John I would look to you possibly to maybe pick a region for us that we could use. And I just got a yes from one of the other Commissioners that is watching just for the record.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, so the motion on the table is as far as I can remember is working, making a recommendation to the full Commission to start working in regions and starting the work in the map for the Senate.

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

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Please.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so the recommendation to the Commission is that the full Commission take a regional approach and work towards that objective starting with the Senate.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All opposed? Please raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Three to one motion carries for the recommendation.

All right Commissioner Lange, is there any particular question that you would like to have or ask at this particular time on our list in regards to process? I feel like.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I need to ask a question on process, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Please do.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: One of the ones that stuck out to me on our process list was number nine.

Everybody got a copy of it.

And it's saying understanding that the Executive Director is the EDS contract program manager staff contact with the consultant should all questions and requests from Commissioners go through the Executive Director? My question for EDS, and it's kind of a two-part.

I know we've got very inquisitive Commissioners.

I know I myself am.

And sometimes when I ask questions it brings up repeat questions, our legal counsel can attest to that.

So my question is twofold.

From your you know your aspect of things, would it be more efficient to go through our Executive Director for one? And then the second I'll give you both parts of my questions just to kind of keep it rolling.

And my second part, because I'm always talking about our budget, so if a Commissioner had a question and say they contacted a member of the staff directly, how is that billed? Because I want to make sure that we are being, you know, if going through our Executive Director is more efficient for us and more cost efficient for us obviously that is what I want to do but I want to know kind of what the process is for that and what you charge.

I don't know how else to put it.

What you charge and is it better to go through one person for all of the questions or with there being 13 Commissioners, you know, do 13 Commissioners have access? And obviously this is outside of our regular meetings that you would be at.

>> KIM BRACE: Good question, Commissioner.

Let me say from our side, my first gut reaction is that this is ultimately your choice.

That from our side and our standpoint, we are willing to work any which way that you want to.

So we are -- we keep track of our time.

We do that so that we see where we are within the budget.

So we are, you know, right now, I've told all the staff that's on this call, this is in essence billable time or you know, recordable time on that side.

So that we make sure that people are covered for spending the time.

But it's really your guys' call on how you want to work.

We can work by having a bunch of different people.

We think we can cover any kind of timetable you might have, any kind of process that you might have.

And, you know, sometimes it helps to have Sue intermediary but other times you may have a more, I don't know, precise question that you want to ask of me or John or whomever.

We can accommodate both of those in that regard.

So I don't want to restrict you by any which way and we are trying to be as freewheeling as we can to answer your particular needs.

It may very well be that, you know, at one point in time you're playing with the software and you've got a question.

Give me a call.

I don't care what time it is.

I may say that I'm on another conference call right now, like I just told somebody else that called me.

But, you know, we will be able to get back to you momentarily in that regard.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That was my -- that's my understanding too.

Like I see both, Commissioner Lange, I see both things.

Like you know if we have let's say we are doing work in one particular day and we come up with X amount of questions, it would be more efficient to have one particular person submit all those questions for a response within the allotted timeframe for example.

But let's say I have a question that I could just be like all right, in your expertise "Yes" or "No" would you do X and Y? Getting that particular answer from someone directly from election data services may be more efficient at that particular point but the more complicated questions as far as I'm concerned it should be submitted by one particular person, compiled on the list for answering.

I don't know if that's what you were trying to get at or not.

But I guess it all depends.

Like the harder questions at one point send everything over by one person particular, if it's a quick "Yes" or "No" send a chat message saying can you answer this real fast for my own personal gain and I can share that with the rest of the group.

Go ahead, Commissioner Lange.

And then after that director Hammersmith it will be you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, so, Mr. Brace, if we hypothetically like Dustin just said shot you a text we are billed for that text, correct?

>> KIM BRACE: If it takes two seconds to answer, I'm probably not logging that in on that regard.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, and then to members of the subcommittee, my thought on that also is if we have questions for them that we don't send through Sue also, we need a system set up so Sue can adjust our budget also if we are being billed for additional questions, that's why I asked this question because there is a process in the system in itself.

Because we have our budget, which she is responsible for the tracking and paying of things also.

So that's where I'm kind of going with the whole question too.

What's the best process for us.

And whatever we decide there is probably going to be an additional process that we are going to need to do.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And we probably don't want the same question being asked by 19 different people, 13 different people in a slightly different way.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I mean that was my thought, if you have a question probably other Commissioners have the same question, so if you know six of 13 Commissioners are asking the same question, that's not an efficient way to do business.

And if all the questions have a shared information base, then everybody knows the answers to those.

Also I am expected to manage this contract.

Kim is going to send me bills.

And he is going to log all the time that he spent and it will be my responsibility for managing the contract, holding his feet to the fire with the things he said he was going to do and paying him for all the hours that he and his team are giving to us.

If you have a software issue, there is a software support line.

And I don't -- I certainly would not expect you to get me in the middle of that.

But I think for questions and for billable hours, it's more important to go through one point to make the process the most efficient.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Ms. Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioner Lange's question regarding hourly rates, that information was disclosed in our finalized contract with EDS and I do have that table pulled up if you would like me to screen share or show you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have that one in front of me Sarah.

I don't know if the other Commissioners need it or not.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have it somewhere on my computer.

But, again, like if I for example like if I have a quick "Yes" or "No" like say for example is this possible "Yes" or "No"? Sent text to Mr. Brace or Mr. Morgan or Mr. Stigall and it's a short "Yes" or "No" I can get a response and say yes that is possible and we can continue working at that particular point.

If it takes, I would say if it takes any more than, you know, a minute or two for a response, at that point it may be a more complicated question that should be written down and submitted at the end of the day's business to Election Data Services for a proper response.

And that's just my opinion.

I mean, if I -- let's say if Mr. Brace and me were switched at this particular point and someone said a quick yes-or-no question, I would say yes and then call or no and say okay that was you know your freebie for the day for example.

But again that's just me.

So but I mean, I do definitely agree that if we have a giant list of questions it should go through one particular individual, just for efficiency purposes.

Ms. Pastula?

  >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well I appreciate the generosity of spirit in which Kim and his team are relaying the answer.

I would recommend that my clients understand that communications with our consultants will result in billing between 75 an hour and 350 an hour.

And as they share our passion for redistricting, it is going to be highly unlikely you're going to send them a yes-or-no question.

So I just wanted to, well, and with all due respect to, again, with Kim and I know he is very generous with his time and answers and his expertise and we certainly appreciate it.

From a practical standpoint the assumption should be that lit be being billed.

And again the example given there is a separate software support line.

That was included as part of the contract.

So hopefully that added something to the conversation.

Thank you.

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, anything else in relation to this particular question? All right, next question.

Anybody? Commissioner Lange.

  >> COMMISSIONER EID: We have that list of questions, do we just want to go.

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, go ahead.

Whoever wants to ask it, I'm just facilitating at this particular point.

Commissioner Lange?

  >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Anthony were you recommending that we just go down the list? Or I was just getting ready to ask another one on there because they are there.

  >> COMMISSIONER EID: Perfect you go ahead Rhonda.

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All you.

  >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, so gentleman from EDS, since you have such experience in the redistricting process, and since we do not in your experience of doing redistricting, what should we anticipate as far as like a timeline? I know it's going to depend on how quickly we agree and things, but kind of looking towards the future for our meetings that we need to have to actually do the mapping, if you were to give us approximate hours based on a we are going to give you a real big handicap because,

you know, you done have history with doing redistricting, what would we be looking at as far as timeframe to expect for us to get 161 districts strong?

   >> KIM BRACE: Okay, that's a good question.

From an experience standpoint, part of it depends on how many people you have in the room at any point in time.

The more people that are in the room, and all likelihood they are arguing over this point or That Street or this neighborhood or whatever.

So getting through put is more efficient with the less number of people that you have in the room.

That's just a general rule from a redistricting standpoint.

   Working with the Commission, I think you guys work well together.

So I don't see that really as an impediment.

I've had many more impediments with incumbent legislatures and that sort of things in the room at any point in time.

And really fighting for that one last census block because somebody lives there or that sort of thing.

That's not the case in your guys' instance.

It will partly depend on where we are drawing.

Rural areas are going to be probably easier to draw.

Than urban areas.

It will depend upon the racial bloc voting and the racial configurations that are there.

Having Lisa involved in some of those discussions.

That will make, you know, the Detroit Metro area a little bit more complicated to do.

Because we have to take into considerations a bunch of different things than just making districts that are the same number of people.

So all of those things kind of multiply together.

And form some of the timetable standpoints.

But I do think that you know, with the software you can work relatively quickly.

But you're going to find that you've got different ideas and different concepts.

So by all means don't think like what John said don't think that you have got to get all the districts down to X percentage points today for example.

Play around with stuff.

Look at different options, difficult possibilities, look for a larger global basis to think in terms of that, without getting it all drawn down to within the ten% range for example.

It may be that you want to look at different parts and areas or whatever the case may be.

But I would be flexible because it will change as you go through the process and as you start drawing as John said you will get better as you go along.

So it will be a little bit slower at the beginning.

But that's understandable.

That's the way the process ends up working.

But we are here to help you and you know guide you as much as we can.

But you have to make the decisions in that regard.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I follow-up a little bit on that?

>> KIM BRACE: Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The point you made at the beginning depending on how many people.

There has been different recommendations about having the public interact and actually as we are drawing the maps actively contributing to it as we are drawing the maps.

So can you tell me, is this a pro or is this a con? Part of that I can see as a con because the time stamp that you said.

If we get 100 people that all want to say no, move this line, move this line it could hinder the work of the Commission.

But I would like your opinion on that aspect because I know in other readings that I did it's been recommended before.

So I wanted to kind of know your point of view as the map maker or drawer.

>> KIM BRACE: It is a valid point.

I tend to look at the public has as a right to voice an opinion on what was being created.

Not necessarily to say well you have to draw along Elm avenue there is no if, and/or but about it this is our neighborhood.

That's going to end up slowing down the process.

What you need to have is the latitude to make more global decisions.

And then throw it out to the public to say, okay, what do you think and we may get back, well, you didn't go down Elm avenue, that was a violation of my neighborhood.

Okay, that's something that then you can take into account.

And we can maybe tweak the lines here or there.

That sort of thing.

But certainly from the standpoint as you know having 13 people in the room is manageable.

Can be done.

Having 113 people in the room creates chaos I think is what my reaction would be on that side.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, relative to that last point I think that's the intent of the last eight public hearing is we are going to bring the maps that we put together and let the public comment on those.

And from there we can make adjustments.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that is how our whole process is set up today.

I yield back.

>> KIM BRACE: And you do, you know, we are not having 100 people making statements all within the room.

They are looking out there.

You know, they are having their computers on or whatever the case may be because we are doing it in an open process.

So they can say, well, at 12:35 you said this and it should have been down Elm avenue or whatever.

That's fine.

But I think from the standpoint of moving things forward, you know, let's work from the 13 members team working with us to try to get something crafted, preliminary, not set in stone, not you know this is our plan today because it will change tomorrow.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I guess what I'm hearing is that you're recommending we be a little bit more fluid than what I may have been expecting coming into this.

>> KIM BRACE: I think our experience is that it always is fluid.

Many times it's the last vote that ends up deciding, you know, do we use Elm avenue or not? But you need to hear the various comments.

And don't -- just like when you are painting a floor you want to paint so that you have an exit.

Because if you are painting into a corner you are going to be sitting there for a long time until that paint dries.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mr. Stigall, do you have something to add? Probably not.

Okay, so anyone else have any other questions here on this particular list at this point? With only EDS here.

Okay next go ahead, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I expected a few other Commissioners to ask some of these questions too.

I don't want to seem like I'm a question hoarder here.

I want to ask about process again, too.

We got Dr. Is it Handley.

>> KIM BRACE: Handley.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And we have Bruce Adelson, so at what point in the process of drawing the maps do our VRA counsel get involved? And I would assume Dr. Handley would be right away because she's doing the block aspect of it.

But at what point do we incorporate the VRA? I mean, should that be right from the get-go, too?

>> KIM BRACE: Well, Dr. Handley's role is throughout the whole process.

But it is dictated by having the data.

And, unfortunately, we are at a stage right now where we don't have the data.

You know, we have been talking with the other people within the state in terms of getting the election results which is what Lisa needs on that side.

We also don't have the racial data to do the other part of that scatter plot she was seeing to you yesterday.

So what we are trying to do with her is look towards the 2012, 2014 elections and let her analyze that because in all likelihood that's more analyzed with 2010 census data.

You know, and getting the first part of the decade looked at, letting her analyze because it's off of old data.

Then when PL data comes out on August 16th, starting to look at and feeding to her the data so that the 2014 and 2016 and/or the 2016 and 2018 and 2020 elections can be analyzed with the 2020 census.

So it means that she is kind of working on a flow basis as we get along.

Now she is going to end up saying, okay, based on this set of elections and these years, I think you've got a problem on racial bloc voting over in this part of the state.

And as a result my recommendation is that you need to think in terms of drawing a minority seat with at least 59% of the vote or the voting age population in that minority group over in this part of the state.

So that is a guidance to you in how you want to potentially craft a District over there, in that instance.

It's not a firm number necessarily.

But it's a guidance to say, hey, you know, you don't want to get correct in having the plan challenged because they told you that it would elect a minority candidate of choice.

But it needs at least 53% of the vote and you're drawing them at 48%.

Well, you know, you have been told by the expert that in order to do this part of the state it needs 53%.

Now, it may be that as we draw, we can't draw 53%.

And so that is something that we interchange back and forth between everybody so that you've got a record that says, yes, the recommendation is that we need X percent because turn out and registration is low or whatever.

But it's not possible to draw that.

Now, you know, what do you do then? Well, do you draw it as high as you could? Or do you ignore the area that, you know, there is perils legally as Julianne would tell you which she has already raised her hand on, you know, there is things you need to be careful of on that side.

So but I will let her remind you of those facts, Julianne?

  >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA:

  >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Julianne, go ahead.

  >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So Commissioner Lange, Mr. Adelson has already been working on the Commission's work.

He has already met with Dr. Handley and as the Voting Rights Act legal counsel will be conducting the legal analysis and providing that legal analysis on those, again, I think Kim is giving maybe some examples of things that could happen.

But your General Counsel and your VRA legal Counsel are on lock step providing the Commission the necessary analysis based off of Dr. Handley's RBV analysis.

So again, it's a two-part answer.

Mr. Adelson is already working for the Commission in his role doing actively working in his role as I know Dr. Handley is as well and we had a very productive data meeting the other day about getting your consultants the data that's necessary so things are moving forward on that end but again it's impossible to speculate what the analysis would look like at this time without the relevant under lying data and we would not make any legal recommendations absent the under lying data.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you for that, Julianne.

I guess kind of what I was asking, not saying that he is not working already, but obviously when we draw lines, that's when we really need the analysis too for the lines that we draw, so I guess I was just curious does that analysis come in with each Section of lines we draw? Is this -- which do you know what? Disregard.

I will ask him next week.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That was going to be my suggestion.

That was going to be my suggestion, Commissioner Lange because he and I have had extensive discussions about that and I think you will be very encouraged and impressed with his responses as well.

>> KIM BRACE: I do think in just letting me add one piece to that, we are setting up the spreadsheet so that as you draw, you will have those important election results.

So like what Lisa talked about yesterday of being able to see with these significant elections where we know there was a minority candidate, we know from our racial bloc voting analysis it's of concern.

Having those results on the screen as you're drawing will help you in terms of determining, well, you know, if I draw it this way, is it going to be more effective or if I draw it that way is it going to be more effective because you're going to see those particular election results fluctuating with each drawing effort that you do.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I have some comments, but not on this subject.

So whenever we are finished with this subject, I got another subject I want to bring up.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You want me to proceed?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay fine I want to talk about documentation.
I mean it's been suggested to us to document everything.
Throughout the process what do you document and what do you suggest that we document as we move through it? And how do we do that?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have a follow-up question to that actually because he made a good point and this may be just a quick "Yes" or "No," every iteration of maps that we draw is archived I would imagine on your side.
I'm going off of memory from when we had you know you present your software months ago but.

>> KIM BRACE: Right, and Fred would tell you that every really every move is recorded in the system.
So.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there a reason for that move recorded as well?

>> KIM BRACE: No.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think if you got in a legal situation that would be the important point.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.
So it's there each little move.
Now, we can always, you know, go back to that particular thing if you say well, we made this decision yesterday afternoon at 3:00.
Let's bring up that saved point.
We can do that and then we can move on from there, for example, as Fred would say.
Or we can record and document and know that at this point in time this fact was determined and so therefore we will end up recording that a little bit differently.
The save aspect will still be there.
But it let us then if you want to say, well, at 3:22 we made this decision, that this Township gets split apart.
We can show what it was before it was split, what it was after or whatever the case may be.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: But not the reason why, which I think I want to ask Julianne, I mean do we need that type of level of detail on documentation or not?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA:

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We may not have Julianne at the moment.
From your experience, Kim, when they get into the lawsuits, do they need that level of documentation?

>> KIM BRACE: Usually not to that degree of level of documentation.
It does become an impediment in many instances.
It can be utilized to challenge the plan, but it could also be used to help defend the plan.
It really depends on what is being done.

I mean if somebody comes in and says draw me a District that makes sure that minorities are not going to be able to reflect their candidates of choice, I mean we could draw that District, but that is ultimately somewhere along the line is going to come out with a headline or whatever the case may be that somebody tried to do this or that kind of thing.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So your recommendation other than what Lisa does and Bruce does is that what we do with your system self-documents and we don't need to do anything?

>> KIM BRACE: I think the issue is, and Sue can speak on this one, but how you want to ultimately kind of this is the process we went through or this is the today we move and decided X decision point.

That really is your call on how you want to document that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We have to build that into our process on how we are going to do it and where the repository is going to be and all that if we take that approach.

>> KIM BRACE: Right that's correct, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, okay I yield to Sue.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes, my thought on this is they have the documentation for the what, what's being done and how it's being done.

What we need to document is the why.

Why we made that change.

We made that change to comply with, you know, this law or we made that change because based on our public comment this is what we heard from people.

So I think we have to make sure that we have in our process some way to document that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do too.

I would want Julianne's opinion on whether that is going to be a hindrance or not if we go to Court.

But not only the why, Sue, but the when.

We have to date stamp these changes or these decisions.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'll share my thought and question after General Counsel Pastula goes ahead.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My observation and the information I wanted to relay is the two sections of the Constitution because I'm just going to keep going back to the Constitution you guys.

So subsection 9 it is publishing the proposed plans and any data and supporting materials used to develop the plans that is for the public to give the feedback and the five additional eight excuse me additional public hearings.

And then after the plan is adopted, it's not only the data and supporting materials but it's the pragmatic used to test the plans so again the Commission will be required under the

Constitution to provide even with its proposed plans all the data and supporting materials that can demonstrate how this plan comports with the constitutional criteria set forth in ranked order in subsection 13.

So I think the documentation issue is a critical one.

And it will again either help us or hurt us in our subsequent litigation.

But I am confident that no one, none of my Commissioners are going to ask you to draw or suggest that a noncompliant District be drawn.

So we can definitely jump over that hurdle before we put pen to paper.

So thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KIM BRACE: I would agree with you, yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, one other comment then.

I think as we get into putting our process together, Dustin, that we need to incorporate that within it, identify how we are going to document it and identify where the repository for that documentation is going to be.

So I think that should be part of it.

I'm not putting that forward as a motion but just as something we need to keep in mind as we move forward.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Here is my thought, so let's say so are you suggesting that we document every single move in the software for example? Because.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, because they build on each other.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I know that but like are you or just major decisions?

So for example let's say I'm in the software right and looking at the maps and I'm like you know what does it look like if I add this particular voting block here and I'm going back and forth between the two to get different data sets do I need to log every single one of those moves just because I'm looking at how it would affect something? Or is it okay that looks good.

I did my little analysis that I want to do.

Do I want to just put the last thing that I did and compare it to the original in the documentation piece? Or do I need to do every single one of those clicks? Because I feel if that is the case it would be incredibly inefficient.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't know.

I think it probably would be too.

I think your suggestion and maybe when we do a recommendation to the Commission that is how we are going to do it, yes then we have to determine who is going to do it too.

But we will get to that once we start putting the process together.

But we need to consider those items so that we cover ourselves.

Wouldn't you agree, Kim?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay so I just wanted to bring that point up.

>> KIM BRACE: Sue has her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH:

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I have a few other questions, I don't know if Doug had anything more to add.

But if not.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I didn't have anything else to add.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sorry Commissioner Eid I had a logical question I had it going to 12:10 how long are we here for today out of curiosity?

>> KIM BRACE: We are here at your pleasure.

On that side.

But I know, Sue was I think hoping to get out of here by you know 12:30, quarter to 1:00 kind of a thing so.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It was mostly in regards to the state Department of State's resources.

Ms. Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Their, thank you the meeting today is noticed until 2:00 p.m.

And all of our translators and support staff supporting this meeting virtually are also available until 2:00 p.m.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Excellent perfect thank you.

Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH:

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We have lost her or her hand may be stuck? Limbo.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I apologize I forgot to lower it, sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, no problem.

Commissioner Eid go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was going to ask to things, one of them I think are pretty easy to address.

The other one not so easy and might be more appropriate for Monday when we have the full team.

But the first was about you know, we have heard quite a bit from a few different communities to look at school districts as a community of interest.

So I was wondering you know as far as the overlays on the software goes, is that something that, you know, we can do?

>> KIM BRACE: I know that in talking with Moon earlier in the week, she showed how she has brought in school districts as a layer.

We can get that layer also.

The thing that you need to be cognizant on school districts is if you like straight lines, that's not school districts.

You know, it is notorious that school Districts are built on the basis of the loudest voice.

I don't want my kids going to this school.

I want them to go to that school.

And so you end up seeing little cut cutouts along the street kind of thing.

They may not be the case totally in terms of Michigan but that's been always my experience in looking at school districts.

And looking at just the overlay that Moon put up that she had.

You could see that kind of impact.

You know, it may be on a larger level that people are talking about in terms of school districts.

Okay, but you know, getting an overlay and having that, yes, that's doable.

But be just cognizant of you know don't expect to use that as a cookie cutter and take all the blocks underneath it because then you're creating all sorts of funny looking districts.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: In a more general sense we can see where you know.

>> KIM BRACE: Right now could.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The schools in the area.

>> KIM BRACE: Right, yep, now sometimes you know it depends on the state.

Sometimes school districts are a larger entity that governs both secondary and elementary and all that sort of stuff while in other states there are school districts that are just for elementary schools or just for high schools or that sort of thing.

So it partly depends on what there is.

I think what Moon had pulled in were school districts that were in the Census Bureau's Tiger file.

Those are a set point in time and so right now we probably do have some degree of that in even in the 2020 Tiger.

But I don't know how good those are.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would imagine that school districts also cross county lines so all the individuals.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Keep counties whole if we go off of a school District that is no longer something we can do.

>> KIM BRACE: That's right.

What you're seeing is firsthand what you will continually see.

There is conflicts with each little layer that you're going to deal with.

And where you want to follow a county boundary here, you want to follow a school District there, it's going to vary.

You know, the goal of the GIS software is that you can see all those things and make your determination on what do you want to follow along 8 mile run or whatever the case may be.

>> JOHN MORGAN: To follow-up on what Kim is saying let's say you have a school District that breaks the county line and you are going to have to take a Township from the neighboring county perhaps that would inform your decision.

You could say, well, the school District already crosses the county lion and we recognize that as a community of interest.

So let's take this Township into this otherwise you know it's like a whole county and we need one more Township for population, let's take that one instead of another one.

So it can inform your decision.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I agree.

I think that is a useful just another useful data point to make decisions on you know in the future.

Not necessarily we will use them or not but it's good the option is there.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My second question that might be better for when the whole group is available you know, probably we have heard some pretty consistent things throughout this whole process on the public hearing tour, you know, fresh maps, keep counties whole, try to keep things as compact as possible.

While you know following the constitutional amendments.

But probably the fourth biggest thing that we've heard after that is this whole prison gerrymandering thing that we have in Michigan.

You know, I know that is more of a Federal thing.

But what are the capabilities on that front? Is it possible to do something about it?

Because I mean, it is pretty unfair that some counties get 50,000 extra people just because they are in prisoned there.

So is there a way to I don't know figure out where those people lived before and put them there as far as population?

>> KIM BRACE: Valid question.

But it's probably being asked a year and a half too late.

In order to do that and implement this sort of thing, you end up needing to work with the corrections facilities to get that list.

And to make sure that it's good and the addresses that they have are good.

And I've worked in a bunch of different states where sometimes it's not good.

It may be, well, my house is in Detroit.

Well, that doesn't help me put you back someplace, yes, maybe in Detroit but where in Detroit because it's going to determine the State House District, or the State House Senate, all of that kind of thing.

It really depends on what the data points are and what's available.

And but you got to have that list of the inmates to correspond closely to the census date.

And you know that was a year ago on that side.

So, yes, it's a good and worthwhile cause, but it's something that really needs to be planned out well ahead of the process.

You know, they implemented in Illinois to implement the prison gerrymandering concept, but the implementation date isn't until the year ending in five.

It's not now.

But it's so that they can get ready for the 2030 of getting the people working on the right set of data.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Mr. Chair and yes Mr. Brace and I have had discussions on this topic in the past.

I have a memo owing to the Commission on the prison gerrymandering issue.

There is some state legislation pending.

There are -- lit be a comprehensive memo.

Addressing other issues then the census data redistribution that I think Kim just summarized very accurately one of the Commission's challenges is when that decision needs to be made this Commission under the Michigan Constitution has not been formed yet.

So again the state legislation would take wear of that, that is pending and I look forward to submitting that memo to the Commission on the fullness of this topic.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You're welcome.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thanks Julianne, I look forward to reading that memo.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can I change to a different topic if we are done with this one?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, this is all informal any way at this particular point because there is no motion so.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: One of the items that Kim discussed and I believe his first meeting with us was Jurgs.

And I still don't fully understand the significance of it.

But my thoughts relative to it was that the Commission does not deal with Jurgs at all but we have EDS utilize them and give us recommendations based on what they see in those Jurgs so that is my thoughts to this and I know it will get up in the full Commission how it will be applied but I don't think we have enough knowledge individually to be able to apply those and we should rely on the recommendations from the vendor.

So I'd like to get some comments on that.

>> KIM BRACE: Good question.

Commissioner.

As I think I have stated when I first introduced the Jurg concept they are very tentative.

They are subject to how you want them ultimately drawn.

Usually they are drawn starting off with County level because that gives you a larger data set, you can deal with.

And so regions of the state can be done with counties.

For example in Illinois, one Jurg is Chicago City.

Another Jurg is Suburban cook County.

Another Jurg is the inner suburbs and another Jurg is the outer suburbs and in Illinois there is the down state that is divided between northern down state and southern down state.

That is kind of how they think about the regions of the state in Illinois.

How you think in terms of Michigan, that's what I'd like to be able to capture.

Jurgs was the first attempt.

We've already talked this morning about you know thinking in terms of drawing in regions.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Uh-huh.

>> KIM BRACE: Those are Jurgs from my standpoint.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: How you want to design those regions, hey, you're the expert on your state.

You know, mine were just a first cut on some information I know about the state.

But you're the expert, so you know give us your ideas in terms of that and we can work with that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll give you my thoughts.

If we are going to do things regionally and I think we need them.

Because it will also define how we are going to do things originally.

And give us some data to compare at that point.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that is good.

>> KIM BRACE: But keep in mind don't use them as absolute barriers.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> KIM BRACE: You're going to have Districts that are going to cross yes, that is possible.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Conceptual regions that we use.

>> KIM BRACE: That is right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So I think Dustin as a subcommittee we need to provide a recommendation to what those regions should be.

But I also feel that we need to heavily rely on EDS to give us guidance on the data and how the data is to be used as we move forward.

That is kind of my thoughts on that whole thing.

Now I see a little value in it since we are going to do things regionally.

Because we can say, okay, we are going to start with Jurg-A then the next meeting we are halfway through the meeting Jurg-F.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Depending how many we have.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that is what they are designed to kind of guide a little bit on that side.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Then I see more value in it.

How many Jurgs do you think are appropriate?

>> KIM BRACE: It really depends on the state.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to make it manageable though.

>> KIM BRACE: The original concept behind them is that you divide the state into four pieces.

Each state originally was divided into four pieces.

Now, I think there is more than that in Michigan.

Original the Jurg for Illinois was four pieces then we kind of looked more closely in terms of inner suburb outer suburb that sort of stuff and so they have grown a little bit in their usefulness.

But when you know if I was doing Nevada, you know, Clark County is one Jurg and the rest of the state is the other Jurg.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Nothing in the rest of the state.

>> KIM BRACE: That is right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So anyway that is what I would recommend Dustin that maybe I don't know how the others on the subcommittee feel, but we utilize it in that manner and we do the definition of the regions and recommend those to the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Are you putting forth a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Julianne, you had a comment?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I did Mr. Chair really briefly just with the Constitutional prohibition of drawing until after July 1st which is your last scheduled first round of public hearing, I would suggest framing it as a motion to establish the Jurgs in the future, that the Commission would be doing that, in the wording of the motion would be my suggestion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The Commission would be doing it?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The Commission would make the determination on the Jurgs what maybe if EDS had options or things like that, that it would be that the motion would be to consider Jurgs in their future work.

>> KIM BRACE: I think Julianne and I have talked about this many of times because.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: My initial thought is I can sit down with Doug and we can draw Jurgs given his input and that sort of thing and she is saying no we have July 1 so don't give him that idea yet.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: July one and all of the Commission, this drawing work so that would be my suggestion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What you are suggesting is that we don't define the Jurgs and recommend them to the committee, the Commission but rather have the Commission decide what that regional break up would be.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct I think appropriate recommendation would be that the Commission work with Jurgs as to be determined during that process.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I see Sue also wants to weigh in as well Dustin not to jump ahead of you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: She is next.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay good.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I think we already covered this and we had a recommendation to work by regions so we can start with that and then after we get to July 1st, we can help define those regions and if we choose to use Jurgs as the regions then you know I think it's interchangeable.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Conceptually the Jurgs are an EDS creation, correct? So they can be changed on a whim.
The way I'm seeing it like an and little tool to breakdown the state into a different, easier, manageable section.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: But not necessarily bound by what the regions for a District would potentially be.

>> KIM BRACE: Correct, yep.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So help me with this, Dustin or Anthony or Rhonda, how should we phrase this going back to the Commission? That we recommend we use Jurgs and also recommend that it becomes regions that we do our work from?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would say we should recommend that we use -- utilize Jurgs as a tool but definition of Jurgs of the state are to be determined at a later date just to make the state be in a more manageable chunk I suppose.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That sounds reasonable to me, is that a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Will someone make the motion? I don't think I can.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I will make the motion then.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't know if it's really needed, we make a motion on this.

I mean they are arbitrary and like Sue just said we will work with regions.

So we are just calling these whoever and call these regions Jurgs and just go from there and I don't know if we necessarily need to codify that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I feel regions are a much larger concept than these Jurgs would be.

Unless you cut the state in four but it's a good way to get an idea of like you know the UP, Lake Michigan side, lake Huron side, metropolitan Detroit, other cities.

It's just a way that we can potentially break down the state into a more manageable item.

Now, yes, we are recommending that we work in regions of the state.

But it's a good way to break down the state into more of a manageable chunk because I mean you could have, I guess my definition of region and Jurg is different.

But the way I see it is you can have multiple Jurgs in one particular region I suppose a region is like the northwest or the southeast.

But you can have different areas, let's say like the greater Down River Area for example could be part of southeast Michigan so on and so forth.

>> KIM BRACE: I guess if I could add a comment.

Don't get hung up on the word Jurgs.

To me Jurgs and regions are basically the same thing.

So don't think that they are distinctive and different.

I look at it as just a word to use to help define regions in that regard.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So going back to our previous motion where we had said we are going to work with regions, maybe that should be modified to say that the regions will be defined by the Commission.

I don't know.

Or do we not even need that?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

No, that would not be necessary.

The regions would be determined in consultation with your consultants but the final decision would be a Commission decision.

And if we are -- I think the vote with the regions kind of accomplishes what the Commission was seeking to accomplish with a correlating Jurg so I think it would be appropriate to move on, that the decision is always already been made to use regions, the full Commission, the recommendation is the full Commission to use regions and those would be set by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay sounds good.

I don't think there is a need for a motion then.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Moving on we were done with that one, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, seems like it.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm going to combine two questions and I kind of I think I would like a perspective from everybody from EDS that joined us because I think that's probably the best way.

Everybody has their own opinions and experiences so let's hear them.

There has been discussion on the committee how we make our decisions during the map drawing process on whether we come to a consensus on whether we vote how we have to vote at the very end where it's so many from each affiliation.

My question the two part question is you worked on other commissions and drawn maps for many years do you see either of those being a pro or a con? And can you give us recommendations on how we could work through this process to be the most efficient and the most effective and if you need clarification let me know because these were other questions that Commissioners had, so I'm just trying to word them how I think they mean them.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, could I get a clarification? You said either or as a two part. What is your definition of the two parts?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Well the two part is do you see us doing consensus or us voting for the steps in the map process as being a pro or a con? And the second part would be do you have recommendations that you can give us as a committee on how we can make this process the most effective and efficient for us?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just while you think of that answer, I got a couple messages saying that a couple people need a quick break so do you mind if we take about five minutes or so and then construct your answer to Commissioner Lange's questions and then we can reconvene here in five minutes? Can I get a motion to stand in recess? For five minutes? All right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a motion to take a break, five minutes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'll second it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All in favor please raise your right hand and say yea.

>> Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All opposed same sign? All right we will be in recess for five minutes.

[Recess]

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think we are all back, as the Chair of the subcommittee for redistricting process with Election Data Services I call us back to order, Secretary of State staff, please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hello Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name and indicate where you are attending the meeting remotely from by stating the county, City Township or Village from which with you are attending the meeting I will start with Doug.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Doug Clark, present. I'm attending the meeting remotely from Rochester Hills, Michigan.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

   >> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm present, remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present, attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All Commissioners are present.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And you can answer Ms. Lange's question.

   >> KIM BRACE: On new behalf and others on the team can voice their thoughts too as far as consensus, that's the ultimate goal.

I've always said that I know that I've done a good job if everyone is just a little bit mad at me because there is consensus then and so that is really the ultimate goal of redistricting is crafting something that everybody can buy in to, they are not totally happy with one little line or that little line there or whatever.

But they can start looking at the overall consensus of it.

So that is usually the overarching goal in terms of drawing districts.

    For efficiency wise I do think that you know the regions will help you be efficient.

I would echo John's comment don't get yourself caught by structuring it so you create something and you can't change it.

You will end up changing things throughout the process and it's many times useful to create a bunch of different ideas.

What I usually do when I'm in a partisan situation just to give you an example I create a map that is the most republican I can draw and then I create another map that's the most democratic that I can draw.

By doing that, it gives me that perimeter.

What's those border areas, what is that boundary, okay, I can create, you know, between 28 and 56 districts that way and looking at some extremes that you know you won't be able to draw it any way but that at the very least.

So looking at what might be extreme areas is one mechanism.

So that you can see what extent you could create and still create a plan that could be you know passed but only with you know five votes instead of eight votes or whatever the case may be.

So that's kind of a one mechanism that I've always used to try to see what kind of extremes there might be in the plan from that side.

I'm not necessarily suggesting you do that for the House Districts and then the Senate districts and the Congressional, but more from an overarching of a way of looking at the state.

And that may be, you know, what's the most number of minority seats you can create.

Or what is something that is you know not the most kind of thing.

It can be any kind of criteria that you want to utilize.

But it does let you get kind of a perimeter of what the outer boundaries might be.

So other people? On our team? John?

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Before Mr. Morgan before you go ahead, I do need to correct the record the meeting was called back to order at 12:43 p.m.

Mr. Morgan, go ahead.

   >> JOHN MORGAN: So getting to the idea of actually drawing when you are if a room drawing and you are trying to figure out are you going to do this by consensus or are you going to vote on it, what I would say is I think you want to allow for the creation of multiple options before you have truly tried to force a decision on them.

And in that sense, I have two suggestions.

One is in the same way you could ask someone on the staff to draft a motion for you to make or you can come up with motions for this on the fly.

You could have multiple motions that have been drafted and you're not necessarily voting on them but you need to draft them so you can actually look at them and consider them.

And then the second point is you may want to come up with differ levels of concepts, so for example, right now there are maps that people have drawn that you have received, at least through the public portal.

There is portions of maps, there is communities of interest groupings.

You can look at that and say well we are going to enter that into the software system and analyze it.

The same way you could take the, you know, portions of the existing plan for the house, the Senate or Congress and just enter it as it's just another map we received, we are going to take a look at it and analyze it.

Then you may sort of bump something up and say well you know we have looked at these and you know, based on our discussion we think this is a concept we want to pursue more.

So you, you know, in the same way you might let's not say make it a recommendation but you say well I want to explore this more so you could treat some of those ideas of the group in the same way rather than force it to a conclusion prematurely.

You know, to getting to Commissioner Lange's point you know having more discussion and information.

So hypothetically let's say you got Washtenaw again and you know there is about four districts there and as a group you draw five plans to draw those four districts, rather

than say well this is the best one and that is the end of it, you know, let those five plans be drawn.

And you know rather than say we are not going to proceed with this, we are going to stop on this plan, let those five be drawn, consider it and then maybe say well between these five plans let's vote on two of them to consider later.

I mean that is what I'm saying.

A progression to the process.

As far as the process goes.

To Kim's point about, you know, what do you want to do when you get towards the endpoint? That is a little different.

I mean that is where you are trying to build a consensus.

That is where you know you may try to address your Commissioners directly and say, well, you know, Commissioner, what are your concerns? What do you think would cause you to support this plan? Or if we took, you know, a concept from this plan and combined it with this plan, do you think that would work.

So you are trying to build those consensus with people.

I think that is later in the process how you handle some of those things.

And ultimately you may have to vote on things.

You know, when you can't come to an obvious consensus.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, to build on definitely on what Mr. Morgan is saying that is also the process that the Constitution contemplates.

So under first as to the plans then I will shift over to the voting really briefly and then let the discussion flow.

So for subsection nine is publishing proposed plans and you have the five hearings to get feedback from the public.

So certainly, again, using Mr. Morgan's example of the four Districts in Washtenaw County, that there would be five proposed plans that the public could give the Commission the feedback on and the Commission could decide again in that process moving forward that next step process of how to adjust those proposals based on the feedback from the public that subsection 14B, those plan, the plans that are published there are the plans that are being put forward for a vote, the final vote for the adoption that starts the 45 days.

So, again, that the plans in subsection 9 complaint revision, complaint the back and forth and iterative process between the Commissioners and the public.

For the voting, there is also two relevant sections unsurprisingly subsection 12 sets forth that for hiring and firing staff and consultants it's 1, 1 and 1 from each of the affiliating selection pools.

And subsection 14C is 2, 2 and 2 and that is only for voting on the final adopted maps.

Other than those two categories of votes, everything is by simple majority vote of the Commission so I just wanted to highlight that distinction.

Again and how both the timing and the voting fit together hand and glove due to the responsibilities for the Commission on those two very distinct portions of the process and the cycle that you'll be going through.

Thank you.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I have a follow-up real quick Dustin?

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You sure can.

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Because it's on the same Julianne just for clarification then I'm talking in reference to the mapping process, getting to those maps that we are going to submit to the public for their input.

The process of getting there is kind of what I'm referring to so are you saying that on those maps we've got to options.

We've got majority vote or consensus that we could not change how getting to those maps that are presented to the public are completed? I just want clarification on that.

   >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Right, well Commissioner Lange I would never recommend that the Commission restrict its ability to or the dynamic nature in which it could function.

So I don't think you would want to superimpose any higher requirements and I say preliminary because you will be creating the proposed maps.

So it wouldn't benefit the Commission in any manner to further restrict their activities or how they can function at that stage when the goal is to have multiple proposals and I believe Mr. Morgan and Mr. Brace both highlighted that, that during that process.

So it wouldn't be necessary to have a majority vote on all of that when you're having a collective discussion or how does this look or how does that look? Or that iterative process between the Commission themselves, right? Because it's not only iterative with the public.

But it's also iterative amongst your colleagues.

So I would strongly recommend not to restrict the Commission in that manner because I think, again, from a timing perspective, from a work product perspective you want to have that free dialog and see what the options look like.

And all of this is going to happen in open meetings.

So the public will be viewing and have the ability to comment on those discussions as well.

Is that responsive, Commissioner Lange?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Kind of and I'm sorry to beat a dead horse you guys because sometimes I have a hard time, it doesn't sink in perfectly sometimes so one last thing.

So when we -- the consensus then would it be a consensus that is used for the maps that we're going to present to the public? Or is there -- is that when there is a vote? I'm just trying to make sure that I have this exact in my brain.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And I think that's what you're discussing right now Commissioner Lange.

Again the distinction I wanted to make is the 1, 1 and 1 is reserved for again retention or dismissal of staff and consult analyzes and the 2, 2 and 2 is not and for clarity for the public the viewing public it's two Commissioners from the democratic affiliating selection pool, two of our republican affiliated Commissioners and two of our independent Commissioners would be required to adopt the final plans, again, that is under subsection 14C in the Constitution.

Other than those two specific distinctions and the Constitution everything else would be a majority would require a majority, the formal vote would just be simple majority.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, from a couple of questions or comments.

Going back to the Commission.

I think we should make that point understood.

We should document it so and make sure we don't recommend it.

I mean it's just the way it's going to be.

And I think it's more efficient that way.

With simple consensus from each drafts.

Now, let me come back to where you said.

You are recommending that we have multiple drafts for a given area or District or whatever you used Washtenaw as the example.

And so we could have anywhere from 2-5 drafts or, therefore.

And that gets presented to the public.

That's the concept that you talked about?

>> John: I don't know that you necessarily present that to the public but what I'm trying to say is maybe you have different levels of consideration or you have different, you know, holding places where you can hold these ideas.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> JOHN MORGAN: Rather than saying we are never going back because it has been shut down.

With Washtenaw you don't have to propose that just Washtenaw piece to the public but in your own deliberations you can say we looked at different plans and put one or two of the options into a plan that you do share officially with the public.

I'm just trying to get the concept that you know, have a place like a draft resolution or a draft motion where you can have that flexibility to change and revisit it without the formality of having decided it.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, so really what you want to get to is providing one map to the public and then coming back and having some alternatives that we could come back to at some point.

>> JOHN MORGAN: Well it sounded like the General Counsel is saying you either are required to have a certain number of maps or that it's expected that you will have a certain number of maps for the public.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are we required Julianne or expected?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So the -- there are no set number.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Of either put in the Constitution.

The point that I was trying to make was that the more proposals the Commission puts in front of the public to react to, I believe the members of the public will have specific recommendations and specific reactions to these proposed maps.

Again, so far listening tour is on communities and people have been sharing their thoughts on gerrymandering.

But when the proposed maps, even if they are not the proposed maps will enable people to give the Commission more specific feedback.

And so the more options and the more proposals that the public is able to react to, the better sense the Commission will get of the sense of what the public's feelings are.

And so there are -- but to specifically answer your question, no, there are no set number of proposed plans required.

Aside or final plans aside from the one for each District.

But, again, timing wise the Commission would be constraining itself if it had to go back through these cycles again to be reacting to the public input.

Is that helpful?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, my feeling is let's say we put on two different plans.

And we are going to get 50% of the people say I like plan A, 50% I like B, or whatever.

And then how do you handle it from that point? Rather than just putting out one and getting suggestions how it should be changed? I mean I know you don't have the answer, Julianne.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: But my pause is what part of the cycle are you in? Are you under subsection nine with proposed plans.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Or are we talking about the voting? For proposed plans there is and I defer to the experts on the benefit of having one plan for people to react to as opposed to, again, creating that well, here is proposed, you know, C1 for Congressional districts, the first iteration.

Here is C2, here is C3 and the public would have more information and more options to react to so that any proposed changes could be made to what will become your final proposed maps for.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

   >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: For adoption because you lose the ability to make those changes during the second cycle, the 45 days would restart under the language of the statute or the excuse me under the language of the Constitution if modifications were attempted to be made at that time.

So again the Commission might be restricting itself if it holds itself to just one set of proposals.

But again I defer to EDS for the pros and cons of multiple proposals versus singular.

Thank you.

   >> KIM BRACE: I guess I would add many times it is useful to present multiple possibilities where you could have, you know, in this part of the state we think this may be one way of doing it or people would say I like this over here but I like from plan B over there.

And so you end up starting to once you kind of have some concepts, again, multiple plans, it is kind of hopefully a pick and choose of different regions of how they are laid out differently in the four or five options you create or something like that.

That I found has been useful to get people to react to on that side, from the public.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Once you start making changes to a given plan it cascades in the District.

   >> KIM BRACE: You have to be careful on that.

And just like in John's example in terms of four districts within Washtenaw County, well, that's fine when you have got the blinders on, on just that County but it may be that, you know, the counties all to the south have to end up in order to create a District pick up part of it.

And so you know you're not getting a four full seats within there.

You need flexible enough that, you know, it's fine for this little region but maybe other regions are forcing you to go in a different direction.

   COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay thanks.

Dustin, I almost think we need a recommendation coming back to the Commission relative to whether we can submit one plan or multiple plans out to the public.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

I think we got off topic a little bit.

So my question is: Are there any other recommendations that you can make to help us make our work efficient and effective? Other than what you have given me, we have regions would help, possible looking at extremes, multiple options, different levels of

concept, are there any other things that we can look at from your experience to make the process effective for us? Mr. Morgan, I see your hand.

   >> JOHN MORGAN: One quick point on that you could get to a situation where you have a good concept you like and drawn ten District in an area but not quite in population balance.

Like one is 6% over and the others are pretty close.

You could direct you know, one of you know your consultants to fix that and come back with you if they plan that is within the deviation.

So in the sense that might be something where you have your concept, your direction is clear, and you're asking us to do some mechanical function on it and come back with you or back to you with a solution so you don't have to spend your time in full committee on something that would take us very little time to do but might take you as a committee longer to process that.

   >> KIM BRACE: Right and I would agree with what John just said.

The only other thing I would also say is as you are drawing it may be that you can in a given area satisfy one concern being expressed for one geographic level of districts where you can't do it for the other geographic level.

So you could keep the neighborhood whole here in the House Districts but it may be split by the Senate or you know, other possibilities.

Just keep in mind that you've got a three-level Chess board that you are playing with.

And it may be that, you know, different components can help satisfy some desires on that side.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Next question anyone? Or let me rephrase, any other questions where we don't need or need our VRA counsel here at this particular point?

   >> COMMISSIONER EID: Looks like we have gone over, at least discussed everything on the agenda.

And we came to two decisions.

Is there anything else or do we want to save the rest for when we got the whole group together?

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Lange?

   >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think there is one subject that either Anthony or you brought up before about when we go back to the Commission how are those meetings going to be run.

You know.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You're talking about when we are actually drawing the maps and working on the maps?

   >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct, correct, yep, I think we need a recommendation for that.

And at least we need to discuss it with the subcommittee.

I mean I would see it being run one person leading it.

Not necessarily the Chair.

And I don't think it should be opened up.

I think it's got to Robert's Rules of Order just because we are required to do that.

But any way I think we need if we have time later before we end let's talk about that a little bit.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm going to ask one more quick question because then it may be something that the whole Commission needs to decide on.

We have to use the communities of interest and I know you have been talking to Dr. Duchin about how to incorporate the things that have been put on the tool that she has for our communities of interest.

My question is since we are not privy to those conversations, can you tell me if there has been any discussion about the public comment that we've received in person about communities of interest? If there has been any discussion with her on how those will be incorporated? Or is that right now something that as a Commission we need to figure out how to do?

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Ms. Reinhardt?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes Sarah.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I didn't know if you wanted to respond to that or if you would like me for go ahead, Kim.

   >> KIM BRACE: Go ahead, Sarah, yes.

   >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So an excellent question Commissioner Lange.

As you know the public comment portal was designed to record written public comment and maps submissions.

The purpose of the public comment as contracted with MGGG and Moon Duchin is not designed to record live public comments.

But as you all know repeatedly during public hearings the Chairperson and members of the Commission encourage all individuals who provide live public comment during the hearing to go visit the portal and put their information into the public comment portal.

   So certainly, the Commission and your staff are making best efforts to capture those public comments within the public comment portal.

One more thing that I might add is that individuals who submit written public comment into the portal regarding their communities of interest who elect not to draw a map but rather describe it within the written public comment, I think Moon alluded to this during yesterday's meeting, if I remember correctly, that we also have plans to reach back out to those individuals and encourage them to not only submit their written public comment describing their community of interest in words but to also utilize the Districter software to actually draw the public comment so that it's more useful to you all.

And one last thing that I will add is during the public comment or during the public hearings that you all are hosting some individuals as they are signing in to provide

public comment optionally provide their e-mail address to us and we are reaching back out to those individuals to also encourage them to submit public comment and draw their communities of interest.

So through those measures we are hopeful to capture the information or most of the information that is provided during these hearings.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you Sarah can I follow-up real quick with you on that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Digital divide, not everybody has Internet to submit those public comment on there and I imagine probably some of them that even attended the public hearings didn't.

So that's why I'm asking does the Commission need to come up with a way to incorporate the public comment that was -- I mean they have done a wonderful job about stressing you know using the tool that for those that can't or we have even advertised if you do not have, you know, you can write us or you can call or whatever.

Are we going to have a way to incorporate those? Because I read all of the public comment on this tool.

And I know not everybody especially from the very first hearings that gave public testimony are not on there.

So that's why I ask that because we may have this digital divide.

And I'm wondering is that something then on the part of the state or is this something as a Commission where we need to go back and see those to incorporate it?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That is an excellent question.

So the first thing I will say is for every participant who arrives at a public hearing we provide them with some postcards that you may have seen floating around at some of the hearings.

That provide information not only about the public comment portal but additionally provide information about how to submit a hand drawn map and our PO box for mailing that in case they don't have access to the Internet.

I know that your staff are making every effort to reach communities where there is like a technological divide to encourage those individuals to submit maps.

Currently those maps are posted that we receive via mail are posted at Michigan.gov/MICRC and included in PDF format attached to additional public comments we received via e-mail or in the mail or papers that are handed physically handed to the Commission during public comment hearings.

So those are always available for your review at that location.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So my question is how are those getting incorporated?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Great question.

So currently there are not any plans for us to upload those into the public comment portal.

However, I don't know if your mapping consultant, Kim Brace, has any suggestions how to incorporate those hand drawn maps into communities of interest as they are reflected in your mapping process.

   >> KIM BRACE: Good question, Sarah.

The issue always becomes is this digital divide? And I agree with you, that's the log jam.

We've tried to create as much public access with whatever kind of portal is possible.

But some people aren't able to accommodate that.

And I don't know that there is necessarily an easy answer other than like what you have done already is send us a poster, a postcard or sent us a drawing on a map.

You know, from my standpoint, I need to see things geographically.

I need to understand what you're talking about so that you know, if need but I could translate it on to a map.

But I need to have as much detail as you can provide so that I can see it on a map.

Then it becomes something that can be drawn, the community of interest, or whatever the case may be.

But you know a general statement of keep this part of the state together, that gets a little bit hard to deal with sometimes in terms of a map per se from that side.

I've been encouraging Sue and everybody on the Commission side every time I've talked to somebody is, you know, let's get as much geographically we can define as possible.

So don't take general answers.

Get specifics is what I've always sought.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Did that answer your question, Rhonda?

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: A little.

So for the ones that we are receiving, that we are receiving by mail, are you able to incorporate those then? If you have an actual drawn one you are able to incorporate it within your program?

   >> KIM BRACE: We could draw it.

Again, it depends on how detailed it is.

Or you know, it may be that it's a drawing that just has two counties on it or something like that.

That is pretty easy from that side.

So it really depends on the kind of specificity that they might provide.

   >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Eid?

   >> COMMISSIONER EID: Alternatively, I mean, we could take it and add it to the public comment tool ourselves and then that way it would be included in you know in the API stats that Ms. Duchin sent over.

>> KIM BRACE: No, that is entirely possible and where have always envision you guys would have some input also be it however you want to graphically depict something be it a plan or a community of interest or what you have heard, you know, on that side.

So I know, you know, Anthony, you tend to be looking at meetings and looking at your computer an awful lot during the meetings, you know.

Having the tool up as somebody is making a comment and just quickly drawing it, you know, that hey that is an idea.

You know, once you get comfortable with software or the portal or whatever the case may be, yeah, you have got your computer up at a meeting and hear somebody saying something, draw it out.

>> JOHN MORGAN: Let me amplify about what Kim said about drawing stuff on the fly like that.

It's not directly related to Commissioner Lange's question, yes, we can draw maps.

But doing it on the fly like that you know I've been fairly successful doing that because what you are basically doing is you are taking somebody's verbal testimony and you are putting it into the map.

And that is possible.

It takes a little effort but it's definitely possible.

And as far as taking whatever somebody has done, we can probably click it into a map.

Kim pointed out that if there is not specificity then we have to make some assumptions.

I don't know, you have to say, well, they have you know 65% of the District that really encapsulates their idea, here is the additional 35% that could work.

In other words, we could take whatever they exactly have and then fill in the rest of the District if you want.

It's not exactly what they want.

But it does complete the painting.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Julianne, this is a question for you.

I would imagine that to air on the side of caution we wouldn't be able to draw maps in Districter and submit them until after our public hearings because couldn't that be construed as us drawing maps at that particular point?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, it would.

And the other issue with again, Commissioners will either be drawing the lines, they will be reacting to the conversations with the consultants in the meetings.

So really having Commissioners logging in for lack of a better way to phrase it, the public testimony and I think we had discuss that previously.

I defer to the Executive Director on that, but certainly, bless you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly, yes, the Commissioners are prohibited under the Constitution from drawing until after the first round of public hearings.

So that would start the last public hearing is July 1st so that prohibition would be lifted July 2nd.

But again the next question to be asked is: Is it appropriate for the Commissioners to be interpreting that data or is that a function of the or what should be put in the portal and by whom and EDS and but I whom? And I think that was what where the conversation was headed.

Does that help, Mr. Chair?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It does because I was under the impression that, well, I was strongly advised against us not doing anything on the public comment portal at all whatsoever.

Just because of the optics of that piece.

Because if we are interpreting anything, then everything is open to another level of interpretation at that particular point.

So I don't know if it would be necessarily appropriate for any of us or any of our vendors or any of our staff to put that into Districter or the comment portal or do anything with it because of how that could be construed.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That's consistent with our previous conversations on this topic.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it perfect thank you.

That does answer my question.

>> KIM BRACE: But I think, Dustin, from the standpoint of you know, we usually, if we are trying to interpret what somebody is saying and put it in to a portal, we want to send that drawing to that person and say is this what you're really talking about? So that, you know, they say, well, you shouldn't have gone down Main Street.

You should have done Elm Street.

Okay we can make modifications from that degree but trying to make sure that what may have been captured gets verified from that side.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And I think something to keep in mind too none of the public comments that we have got in have been so specific that it goes down to The Street level.

You know, they have been a little bit more general than that.

You know for example yesterday we had a whole lot of people that thought Warren should be with the Hamtramck and Sterling Heights for example.

But the only like roadways that we heard were like north of 8 Mile Road or in between I-94 and M59.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It did not get down to the specific level Like Street level of oh, Elm Street starts here, let's put it to wherever.

You know, so I don't think we should get too bogged down in such, you know, detailed parts of this when discussing just the public comment.

Because it has not been that specific as of yet.

>> KIM BRACE: Okay, great.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I think I got my answer on that whole one.

Thank you everybody.

Everybody's input thank you.

Dustin, since you're the tekkie guru, I think number two should be addressed while we still got them here since it's all about EDS and give an idea.

I know we have other Commissioners that are listening in that would probably be interested in the software part of it as far as uploading that, it was number to on the processed questions uploading the software and.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let me see here, hold on, I lost it.

Where did the questions go?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that is actually a question that we have too.

And because we want to find out from the Commission, Commissioners how would they like to operate.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: Do they want on your machines that you have at home, do you want to use the browser software? Do you want to use the more detailed software? The auto bound edge? We can put them on whichever machine you want to have.

We have been talking with the state and some of the technical considerations on that side.

And Dustin, you know, I want to coordinate with you too.

But it's partly a question in terms of machine and capability and our drive wise and everything else.

But it's also a question of how do you want to operate? How do you want to set up? Do you want to draw once we get passed July 1, or do you want us to draw and you direct?

You want to take your hand on stuff? It does get into the question and I've dealt with Julianne with that on a couple of instances of, you know, how open and public is what you may draw on your machine at your house? On that side? And that's a difficult question.

But it's something that you guys need to think about and face.

Again, we can configure it whichever way.

We may need to have access via the Internet to support you and your computer at home.

And that is some of the discussions we've had with the tekkies and the state in terms of how open is that, that Internet connection that you have on that machine and that sort of thing that is one of the technical sides of things we need to work out.

But from a global standpoint I think the question is how would you like to work?

Because we've got different tools that can answer and handle any which way you want to work but we need your thoughts and ideas and you know, maybe these four Commissioners want the full scale software on those, this six Commissioners want you know to just use the browser.

And these two don't want to deal with it at all, you know, we will leave it up to the consultants.

Those kinds of determinations we need to know and move in the direction of providing what is necessary on your machine.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rhonda to further your question I know that the, who is it, Sue was going around yesterday asking who wants the software on their actual state machines and who doesn't.

I know I'm one of the ones that does.

However, it also becomes an issue of DTMB getting the approval to install the actual software.

Now I did have epiphany moment last night that will get shot down quick by Julianne and that is if for example DTMB is taking forever to get approval to get the software installed on our software, I have my own personal computer I can potentially put it on.

Now do I want to open up my personal laptop to scrutiny in case you know FOIA requests and all that come through? The answer to that would be, no, I don't.

But at a you know, a logistical level I could potentially put it on my personal machine as well and I guaranty you that is going to be much faster and better than the ones we have from the state with this particular one.

But.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: You went to no Mr. Chair and you circled back to a yes.

I would highly recommend.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Not to do that.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That you use your personal computer for personal use.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And your business computer for business use.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Unless you want me to have your personal computer for some unknown amount of time you should definitely segregate.

I cannot recommend it any more strongly that you maintain that divide.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is my position as well but I guess how would we work with DTMB to get this put in to not just the expressed lane but into light warp speed mode to get the stuff installed on our machines?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe the Executive Director has been having the conversations with DTMB.

EDS as part of our contract negotiation went through security protocols needed on both sides.

And that was all ironed out so really it is just a question of facilitating and having it happen.

So again I would refer to Executive Director Hammersmith on the timing for that to happen.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And I know she dropped off because she was having Internet issues but I would imagine we can circle back to that on Monday, so, okay, perfect.

>> KIM BRACE: Keep in mind also from the standpoint of software and the database.

The database is going to be an ongoing creature that gets updated.

You know, we have the census data from 2010 right now on several of the machines that we have with our staff.

We will be expanding that to have additional data, the ACS data that sort of thing, that is kind of another phase then starting to add election results as we start getting that stuff from the state is kind of another phase of the database, you know, another version of the database, all of those are doable and they can be done on your machines too depending upon, you know, connections in terms of getting the database updated on to your machine or that sort of stuff.

And how we do it, that is part of the question that we have been raising.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark.

>> KIM BRACE: Dustin, I heard you want a new computer anyway and were going to contribute your personal one do Julianne's safe or something.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Question for you, Kim.

Is on the laptop version, is the data on the laptop as well or is it like a client server type of op operation where it goes against the data from your machine?

>> KIM BRACE: On the laptop our recommendation is if you have a laptop make it a beefy laptop so that it's all there.

I mean, if you've got a real slow laptop that is real thin kind of thing then it's probably not going to fit on that kind of a laptop.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So if the data is on the laptop as well, like you were saying that has to get updated every time you do an update.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, and so the question is how to connect the laptop through the Internet so that we can download that sort of thing.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For my own personal knowledge R, how big is the actual database itself out of curiosity?

>> KIM BRACE: It starts getting big.

I'd have to go and take a look like what did we install in Illinois or something like that, that and I'll send you the specs on what that database is.

I don't have that in front of me.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: One of the comments made by Kim we have to decide how we are going to operate.

I almost think we should recommend that coming out of this subcommittee.

On how we do that.

And maybe a hybrid some people may have a laptop version, some people may have the web version.

But if you just ask them that they don't understand the difference.

We heard the difference early this morning.

>> KIM BRACE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And don't know the limitation of the web version compared to the laptop version.

>> KIM BRACE: That is why on July 8 when Fred is going to do the full scale demo of software and showing all the pieces.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> KIM BRACE: That would be the time we are going to show you both pieces like what you guys saw, go more in depth on that side but that would be the time that, you know, okay now given all of this knowledge that we've just imparted on you what kind of system do you want on your machine?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, so maybe we don't need a recommendation because it's going to happen anyway.

>> KIM BRACE: Yeah.

And it's a question of giving them the information so that then they can make that call but it may be something that you could say hey this is a decision point that we all individually need to think about and you know we will show you some varieties, but you know be cognizant that you know once we get finished with the 8th, you're going to need to decide what you want to do on your machine kind of thing.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Regardless of whether Commissioners have the software on their machine or if they are using the web based version my understanding is the database is pretty much centralized and gets updated regardless of what it is we are all doing I would imagine, correct?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that's correct, that's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I vaguely remember that being brought up two or three months ago when we were going over the actual RFP and all that.

>> KIM BRACE: Right now on the web-based thing, as Fred was saying, you know, you may not have access to all of the data that we are putting in the big data but it really is, it's the same database, it's just on the web you're only being pointed to, you know, these 16 characters as opposed to on your desktop you got all 595 characters, you know, columns or whatever.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So just another question then, I would imagine the database gets updated in real time when you are on the using the web-based version so.

>> KIM BRACE: When we do an update to the database, so we look at it as.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: Version one of the database is this, version two is that. You know, it's not a 2A or a 2B kind of thing. It's looking at what major components can we get collected, get put in, get analyzed, make sure it's running properly, okay, now we are ready to unleash version three.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Understood and then the software on the desktops will be updated too.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> KIM BRACE: What usually happens it's both the database that gets updated and what's called the active matrix. That is that spreadsheet on the bottom. We will redefine that active matrix so that oh, now I can see more tabs or more columns of data or different mix or whatever the case may be. So we will end up feeding several different components into your system when we would be doing an update.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sometimes do you freeze the database and don't do updates?

>> KIM BRACE: Yeah, I mean, but it may be parts of the database that is frozen. Clearly when the PL file comes out, that's pretty set. You know, that's not going to change. That is going to be in essence frozen. We may add other election results for example. We may go back to, okay, well let's we replaced it now with PL but let's keep on the background the ACS data that we have or you know, those kind of things, but those are discussion points that we would seek to work with you and say, okay, here is the new one, this is what we've got, this is what we can do, you know, how would you like, would you want all of it, whatever the case may be and that can help guide you know how the active matrix looks to you.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, because at some point in time when we get down to the final maps, we will want to freeze everything because it becomes our historical data set.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, no, that is correct.

That is correct.

So, yeah, by all means.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm going to call on Commissioner Lange but I do want to point out that we are under 20 minutes to our drop dead time here so.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you for that Mr. Chair because that is what I was just going to say.

I know this and when we get talking about tech stuff it can kind of go on and on and on.

My question is you will be here EDS will be here Monday also, correct?

>> KIM BRACE: Oh, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you then I would like to make a recommendation that we kind of wrap up the portion with EDS and maybe the last 20 minutes us in the subcommittee talk about potential questions or processes that we want to come up with for next week to put it together, what are the goals that we need to meet for next week? If nobody is against doing that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's fine by me and I think, well, that is new business part B I believe.

So I guess without objection we can move on to that particular piece.

So hearing none, thanks for being here and feel free to stick around and listen to us, but, yeah, let's do that.

Let's just continue on.

>> KIM BRACE: I will continue to monitor and if you have questions, I will be happy to answer.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Excellent.

All right so let's go over that and I'll start with Rhonda since you brought it up do you want to go first? I'm sorry?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Why don't one of you gentleman go first because mine usually comes up after listening to everybody so whoever wants to go first.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, a good place to start would probably be these other questions like what we have for the VRA for legal counsel at the bottom of this document that we all got.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Clark, I did see you had your hand up as well.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me pass right at the moment, and address what Anthony just said.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It I'll pull this back up because I don't know what happened to it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which document are you referring to Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Questions from the MICRC to the consultants PDF Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: VRA.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I make a suggestion too? Obviously, that will be the beginning business for our next meeting are those questions for the VRA. Can we appoint somebody to ask those questions right off the bat so we keep things going in a very productive, concise manner so we don't jump all over? Like Mr. Chair, if you want to do it or Doug or Anthony, I don't care who but just there is only four questions on that part of it, so I don't think it will be very but just have somebody designated I think to make the process run smoothly.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well as I'm going to be calling on people when we start going over the questions for additional comment, I would refrain from doing that. So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I can do it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If anyone wants to read through the questions when the VRA legal counsel is there, that would be fine by me. I don't think we all need to do one that kind of seems excessive so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I'll do it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Anthony will go and read and ask the four questions at the bottom of the page right off the bat and then if there is any discussion on each one, I will just facilitate that discussion. I think those are the only four that are really targeted to the VRA counsel any way, there are ones we can go back to, to revisit to get both sides input on how things should be handled I would imagine.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a question then too obviously I want to know what you guys are thinking as far as the process you voted on things and let me ask this question, it's a whole Commission thing but this question has been brought up and I had stuff that said something to me about it, about the communities of interest. And I think that is something that we the subcommittee obviously can't decide this is something that the whole committee needs to decide but because it includes the process something that we should have a discussion on how do we rank the communities of interest, how do we let me give an example. We had wonderful turn out last night from the Bengali, I hope I say that right community. And very good participation. They had many speakers.

My question when it comes to the communities of interest, is it going to be weighted somehow where if there is a community that only had one person representing that community compared to like 40 or 50, is it weighted somehow especially if you get overlapping communities of interest? We've heard public comment where people have said, well, my community of interest is this.

And I think we should be with this community or this County even but then we've had other people that have said this is my community of interest and I think we should remain with this County so I think the discussion needs to be had on how we handle those types of issues and maybe that should be something a discussion just to bring forth to the whole Commission to get it on the agenda to discuss as a whole because that is going to be part of our process too.

We are going to have to and a concern that I have with the communities of interest, if one people or one person, pardon me, speaks and especially if it's not narrowed down and it's very broad, well there could be a thousand people in that same area that don't know about us or feel very differently.

So that's my concern especially with it being such a high criteria on the criteria that we have to follow being number three on it, that's something I want for make sure we get right.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, I agree with you.

But I would personally feel more comfortable that that particular piece since it is such a high level on the criteria that we need to pay attention to, that should be decided by all of us at the same time.

Not a recommendation, well, I mean that is up to us at this point but I would feel strongly that, that should be a 30 minute, let's face it, an hour conversation with the -- all the Commissioners present because I would want to hear everybody's take on that.

I mean I try to weigh everything equal but when things start to get repeated at what particular point do I cut it off? Or at what particular point would you cut it off? Or Brittini or Steve for example, they all have their own methodology of how they want to rank these things and I mean I feel like I said I feel like that would be more appropriate with all of us in the whole to discuss, which would but I suppose a recommendation that we could bring forward is to recommend that we all talk about it or put it on the actual agenda.

   >> KIM BRACE: If I could add a comment for your benefit on this subject.

   >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Please do.

   >> KIM BRACE: Cognizant that you are dealing with different kinds of groupings and particularly I'm thinking in terms of data, you have groupings of Voting Rights Act concerns and so we've got as Lisa mentioned yesterday the different racial groups that are in the PL, that's one category.

But we also have capabilities and what one of the things I'm going to show you on Monday is looking at some of the other ACS data to look at where is the Arab

community, where is as Rhonda just said what is the Bengali community and we get data to help show us and guide you of what would be kind of a community of interest on that side.

So we will be looking for those kind of circumstances.

And it may be beyond the PL, it may be other kinds of data sets, but that can help you a little bit.

But some of them are not possible.

You know, we can't find a left-handed Lithuanians, my favorite expression, on that data set; but we will try to accommodate that kind of thing too.

    >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay so given all of that, I mean, hopefully someone could say so moved here in a second, but I would I mean what I'm thinking is to since we have a meeting on the 28th, we have a meeting on the 29th where we are bringing all of our recommendations to the full Commission itself, to add to the agenda that on or on the meeting that we have on Thursday and that particular point we can say hey actually let's think how we are going to rank it so people can think about it on Tuesday and Wednesday to really you know hammer it home in their head of how they personally feel things should be ranked on their own so we can come up with a process and actually discuss it on Thursday beforehand.

The other option would be to do it the week after however I don't think that will make much of a difference because it's our last hearing any way or public hearing any way.

So I guess I can try and rephrase that.

So if I could…I look favorably on a motion to add to the agenda on Thursday, March, July 1 that we add the discussion on how to rank communities of interest as a group.

    >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Do we have to have a motion for that or is that something we can reach out to Sue and say can you add this, Julianne? Or Sarah?

    >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I guess that is true.

    >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Sarah popped up too.

    >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. Just a point of clarification I believe that the schedule for discussing your recommendations with the full Commission was set for our final virtual only meeting this coming Wednesday.

    >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

    >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: June 30th is that correct Sarah?

    >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Correct.

    >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That meeting is how long?

    >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe that meeting is scheduled and noticed currently from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

    >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So it might be more productive for us to discuss it at that time when we have more time since it's all about recommendations and it will be recommendations and discussion, can I get the others' input your thoughts on that.

    >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I agree with you.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: To answer Commissioner Lange's question about needing a motion, no, just notify the Executive Director that that's the will to have that placed on the agenda is sufficient.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For Wednesday.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The 30th.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will do that later on and tell her we want to discuss how we rank the COIs I can do that, okay.
Anything else? All right, well I think we can go ahead and General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Rather than categorizing it as ranking COIs which tends to imply that there is different weight, I would say just a discussion about communities of interest and their incorporations into the process or their integration or something of that nature.
Because again we have communities of interest within the same category across different categories.
They might have regional importance.
That varies so again just the broadest categorization possible to start that conversation off would be my recommendation.
Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'll think about how to word it and send it to her.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And I'm always available.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is right that is what you're here for.
All right perfect okay so if there is nothing else at this particular point in time, at this point since we are getting close to our drop dead time anyway, I would entertain a motion to adjourn until Monday the 28th.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Second.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right motion has been moved and seconded.
Any discussion on the motion to adjourn? Seeing none all in favor please raise your right hand and say yeah.

>> Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All opposed same sign and signal? All right motion carries we stand adjourned until Monday the 28th and we are adjourned at 1:55 p.m.
 Have a good one everybody and a good and safe weekend.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Good talks everyone nice seeing you.

>> KIM BRACE: By all means.

 [Meeting concludes]