

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

MICRC

10/28/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Michigan, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:12 a.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube on the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel.

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.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning.

Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish, Arabic, and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in the meeting. Please E-mail us at Redistricting@Michigan.Gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting@Michigan.gov.

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for viewing at a later date, and this meeting also is being transcribed and those closed captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on Michigan.gov/MICRC along with the written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC.

This portal can be utilized to post maps and comments which can be viewed by both the Commission and the public.

Members of the media who may have 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 purposes of the public watching and for the public record I will turn to the Department of State staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good morning, Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending today's meeting remotely, please disclose during roll call that you are attending remotely as well as your physical location.

I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present and attending from Wayne County.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present and attending remotely from Eaton County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

As a reminder to the public watching, you can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. I will now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Seconded by Commissioner Lett.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, it is moved and seconded that we adopt the meeting agenda.

All in favor raise your hand and say "Aye."

>> Aye. [in unison]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed raise your hand and say "Nay."

The ayes prevail the motion is adopted.

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

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

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

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

Please step to the microphone when I call your number.

You will have one minute to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

So first in line to provide public comment is number one and you are now invited to address the Commission.

First in line to provide Public Comment is number one and you are now invited to address the Commission.

>> MR. CHRIS ANDREWS: Good morning. I'm Chris Andrews from Haslett.

Last week residents from the Lansing Region asked you to un-pack Democrats to fix unfair House districts.

Part of the solution is to divide Ingham County's largest communities and connect them with the northern portion, the northern portion with Clinton County and the south side with other Ingham Counties.

My map, O-6677, does that.

Partisan fairness is a constitutionally more important, uh, item than county or city boundaries.

I live in Haslett in Ingham County.

Less than a mile in the Bath Township in Clinton.

I shop at the Bath Township Myer.

I can't even tell you where one county begins and the other ends.

Dewitt Township to the west is another growing Lansing suburb in Ingham County.

There has been an effort to create a divide between urban and rural so that Democrats are packed and it creates an unfair advantage.

Please don't let that happen.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

That concludes our in-person comment and we are now going to move to remote Public Comment.

Individuals who signed up and have indicated they would like to provide live remote public commentary will now be allowed to do so.

I will call your name and our staff will unmute you.

If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

If you are on the phone, a voice will say the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute.

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

I will call on you by your name.

Also, please note that if you experience technical or audio issues or if we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail us at Redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you troubleshoot so that you can participate during the Public Comment period or at a later hearing or meeting.

You will have one minute to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide Public Comment is Susan Smith.

>> MS. SUSAN SMITH: Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Susan Smith, Vice President, League of Women Voters of Michigan.

The League of Women Voters supports the Promote the Vote redistricting maps because they adhere to the Michigan Constitution's redistricting criteria and the partisan gerrymandering and ensure fair maps for the next decade.

As you make adjustments to your House maps, we encourage the Commission to look at Promote the Vote House map P-6784.

This map creates 20 VRA districts where there are enough Black voters to elect a candidate of their choice. Also P6784 creates our scores better than any of the Commission's current plans on the measures of partisan fairness used by the Commission.

Thank you for this opportunity to address the Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Gerald Lang.

>> GERALD LANG: Good morning, everyone.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Can you hear me good? I'm going to start my video now.

Anyone hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can hear you.

>> MR. GERALD LANG: Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

My name is Gerald Lang

I live in Lake Orion, Michigan.

I thank everyone for the opportunity to speak.

I have some suggestions and recommendations and one would be for my neighbors in Rochester and Rochester Hills.

They should be put together for equal District representation.

I believe that that, that goes along with the way their demographics are over there of voters.

And I think Oakland Township kind of tips the scales and should not be included with Rochester and Rochester Hills.

Also District 16 with Troy, Clawson, and Western Sterling Heights from Van Dyke West, I believe that's a great opportunity there for fairness.

And once again, without trying to make Oakland Township its own little island there, I don't believe that Oakland Township, it should be included with them as well.

Some concerns that I have and I have heard of are, you know, the numerous amounts of proposals that out there.

I mean, like, 25.

Also, the individual ---

[Timer sounds]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.
Anthony Skinnell.

>> MR. ANTHONY SKINNEL: Good morning, Commission.
I'm interested in your Congressional map.

I think Detroit deserves a much more well thought out two-districts approach for its federal representation.

Some of the only positive comments that I recall, having been received about your Congressional Districts at the TCF hearing were about how they keep the southwest Community of Interest intact.

Well as you see this configuration on the screen behind me, this would also leave the southwest community in interest intact if you drew something like this and I think it would get you better BVAP metrics and I also think it's just a better east/west split for the city.

And I really hope you can go with something like this for Congress.

I think it's very much needed.

So Apple Birch Maple V-1-RAS have all identical, you know, configuration.

It's a copy/paste job and Juniper, it's nearly identical and VR1L the only Congressional map with a different configuration for Congress.

[Timer sounds]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.
Kermit Williams.

>> MR. KERMIT WILLIAMS: Good morning, Commission.
Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can.

>> MR. KERMIT WILLIAMS: Good morning, Commission.

Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> MR. KERMIT WILLIAMS: Thank you so much.
I'm Kermit Williams, City Council President from Pontiac.
I just want to commend the Commission on listening to us with the State Senate maps.
My only concern is in the state representative map.
We have Pontiac listed with some other people instead of Auburn Hills School District.
Also Auburn Hills is the largest contributor to that school district and should have representation there.
We are on I-75 together which is a major corridor coming through.
I think the state representative district should be more like our state Senate map.
I know you guys have tough decisions to make but I think if you can look and make a tweak to the state rep map and make it mirror the state Senate map, it will be very helpful.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.
Emily Clancy.

>> MS. EMILY CLANCY: Good morning, Commission.
Thank you all so much for listening to the public and for this opportunity.
I'm a current homeowner in Grandmont in Detroit but I grew up and Saint Claire County and Macomb County.
I want to talk about all the state House maps.
I see that in each map version and you have separated the Grand Mouton, Rosedale communities.
And North Rosedale Park/Rosedale Park, Grandmont, and Minock Park are all different neighborhoods but operate as one community, and I'm asking you to keep all of the Grand Mouton Rosedale communities together.
We have a community development corporation that provides a number of programs directly to the residents and It is really important that we stay together.
I also want to speak on the State Senate map.
In each of your maps District 7 brings together Harper Woods with DeFrost Point and St. Claire Shores and even parts of Detroit in the Cherry map and extends all the way to Baltimore.
I think that just stretches way too far to include New Baltimore. New Baltimore residents do not have shared interests with Wayne County residents.
As someone who grew up there, I can testify.

[Time]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.
Next in line is Percy Johnson.

>> MR. PERCY JOHNSON: Can you hear me?

>> MR. PERCY JOHNSON: Okay.
Great.

I live in Troy.

And I'm hoping that for District 16: Rochester Hills, Troy, Western Sterling Heights, please keep Troy whole, including all of Clawson, west of Van Dyke and I'm hoping that you don't include Oakland Township at all in the map.

And then I'm also hearing a lot of support from our listeners, where they're supporting the AFL-CIO now and the Promote the Vote map.

So is that – Can, can you give me a reason why you possibly would not want to choose those maps? And, and when can I possibly get an answer on that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Robert Dendoffer.

>> MR. ROBERT DENDOFFER: Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> MR. ROBERT DENDOFFER: Hey, um, so, what -- I guess two things.

First, I appreciate while you guys went into Closed Session to discuss the legal memorandum yesterday, I'd request in the interest of transparency that you all release one or both of the memoranda that you were discussing.

And I ask this because so far everyone in the public has known why, if they've paid attention to the meetings, they've known why you're drawing Districts in a particular way.

And if there are any changes or no changes, I think the public would like the window into the thinking and I make that request.

Second, while I've got 15 seconds left, I ask that you prioritize the testimony of the residents of the areas that are still living there as opposed to residents – uh, former residents.

And I'm talking about the Lake Sinclair area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

That concludes Public Comment for this meeting.

We appreciate everyone who provides Public Comment and we encourage people to continue to share their thoughts, proposed maps and communities of interest in whatever way they choose to do so.

At this point we're going to move to unfinished agenda item carried over from yesterday's agenda.

Without objection the Commission will begin deliberations.

The Mapping Process and Procedures states the following steps.

First, we are supposed to determine the number of proposed maps for each District type that should be posted for Public Comment during the 45-day Public Comment period and then we will review proposed maps.

We are supposed to start with the State Senate maps and then move to the house maps and then move to the congressional maps per our process document.

Okay.

Um, we can take personal notes on our preference for maps and obviously, those are public record and they need to be turned over to counsel to be retained for foyer purposes.

I believe it is -- so we choose our most preferred maps by vote for each draft map, the number preferred map selected by each Commissioner will be equal -- if we have seven and we've agreed we're only going to advance two, then each Commissioner has to pick two and the votes are tallied by the secretary and the maps receiving the greatest vote will proceed with further deliberations and adjustments.

Once we decide what maps we're advancing we're then going to make changes.

So I think I probably said that incorrectly the first time.

We're going to pick the number of maps, redrew the draft proposed maps, decide the ones we're advancing and then make changes to the ones we're advancing.

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I didn't think that type of voting was happening now? I thought that was the second option if we don't come up with an option by just voting. Like, I didn't know that we each choose our two that we want to go forward and then the one with the most votes goes forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's what we have in our process document and we can change it if that's not what we want to do.

Our process document says determine the numbers maps, review the proposed maps and select those to advance and make changes.

If we have 20 total, two Congressional, two Senate, two house we're going inform deliberate and decide what maps to move forward with and make changes to those maps.

That's that our document process says.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like to get EDS's point of view on whether that's the best way to proceed at this point or whether there's other alternatives in front of us.

So if I can the go ahead John's opinion, I would appreciate that and one other question.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: At this point, let's use the State Senate as an example. You have six carried forward and you would consider reviewing all six of those and I believe Commissioner Clark's question would be what would be a good process of reviewing all six of those and it sounds like your document contemplates eliminating maps first before you go forward and I don't know if you want to really eliminate something until you understand what they are.

So I would suggest maybe focusing a little bit more on the review of all the maps first before you just eliminate things.

Because I don't think -- unless you have a really good understanding of what the differences are in these maps, then I think you'll have a hard time just tossing one map

or two maps and then also I think there's some flexibility with the number of maps to take forward.

If you have six Senate plans you might say we're going to advance six for further analysis or you can say we're going to advance three and that number seems to be something you can set at your discretion.

So I suggest putting the review up front as much as possible so you understand the differences and look at combining things that are similar.

Maybe you can eliminate a map by saying these maps are really similar and there's only a difference in two differences and maybe effectively you combine two maps into one.

That's what you're talking about maybe changes to the maps so in the process of eliminating you can do it by consolidating rather than eliminating.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree with John.

I don't want to reject something because every map has good ideas in it so taking the good ideas and consolidating them into one master and then we should select the master I think would be a better approach toward that rather than eliminate something and then all of a sudden, it's gone for good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that's what the process anticipates.

Number one, determine the number of proposed maps.

We could flip that around.

Process is: review all drafted proposed maps.

>> Did you say, "as presented"?

Chairperson and Vice Chair, will did you say facilitation and collaborate maps and then after that we narrow down the maps?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't think we're picking a number and randomly slicing things off.

I think the thought process is we're going to look at the maps and narrow down with what we want to move forward are.

Otherwise we have six to be tinkering with that is inefficient.

Go ahead, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Madame Chair.

I want to add the process laid out also contemplates that you would have gone through debriefing sessions and what potential edits may be made to those maps so it may be beneficial for the Commission to read through the process documents debriefing session that would have occurred during your Public Hearings prior to deliberations.

Thank you.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madame Chair that's on page 13.

Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

That is what I was going to be pointing out.

Debriefing -- not taking place.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The second point I was going to make is I think the first step we need to make is go back and take a look at the five hearings we just had and identify what strategy we want to use for each.

For example, we'll use Flint for the example.

Do we want to make Flint whole or not? Decide as a group.

Do we want Midland together or with the five cities.

Identify but not touch the maps.

When we touch the maps, we know what direction we're headed in.

Five Public Hearings and develop a strategy based on what was heard and move forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have to do that on a map by map basis -- Flint is not a -- different comments don't apply to every map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct what I'm suggesting is we don't do it on a map by map basis.

This is the strategic direction we want to go in Flint.

We want to consolidate Flint or we don't want to consolidate Flint and keep it two Districts.

When we're adjusting maps, we're not doing it two ways.

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Eid.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I didn't have anything.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry.

Mr. Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I wonder if we're -- I think we can do it all.

I feel like we can do it together.

It feels like instead of elimination we're talking about consolidation.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: MC are you speaking into the mic.

Sorry to interrupt you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm not.

Sorry about that.

I think what we're wrestling with is where to start.

I think Mr. Morgan is suggesting we have maps we can try to consolidate and using Commissioner Clark's -- which part of the maps we like that addresses Commissioner Szetela and Orton were addressing -- understanding the ideas on each map and bringing in each Commissioner's memories and thoughts about what was happening at the public hearing.

What have we heard but on a map by map basis and moving forward in what feels like a systemic way.

Move towards one map and I feel like if we can start with either Congressional or Senate because I feel like those are the maps we do have, isn't that right Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

I've done a little extra work on the Senate and I can show you and if you would like the direction of those options, we can have a Member of our team leapfrog and do other ones while I'm working with you on the Senate to prepare them for discussion tomorrow and next week.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we want to use our time today and tomorrow -- we might get stuck tomorrow.

I feel like if we can try something -- using everything everyone said.

We will eliminate maps by simply consolidating them and we will discuss about what we each have heard at the Public Hearings as each map or pieces of a map is considered so it feels like we could move forward with it and that's kind of what I'm -- yeah.

That's what I'm hearing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree.

I think it comes down to what order do we want to do things in so it's organized.

We didn't deliberate after each or sorry -- we didn't do the debriefing session after every public hearing.

So do we want to do that first and go around and listen to what everyone heard and then bring up the maps or do we want to, like Commissioner Rothorn said bring up the maps first and do it that way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm curious if the Commissioners will be able to address why they drew specific Districts the way they did because I think that would be beneficial for the Commission to know why they did things.

Not all of them have been reviewed prior to submission so I think it might be beneficial to know.

Just my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to agree request Commissioner Eid here.

We didn't have any of the debriefing whatsoever and my understanding that was going to be what we were going to be doing before we come back and reconvene.

I think we have to do that first and move forward from there.

We need to decompress what we heard at all the Public Hearings.

If we don't, we're going to be throwing darts at a wall and going in circles and that's where we need to start.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Just to uplift comments here -- another thing to consider is some of the Districts are exactly the same because they're drawn from the same original plan.

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

To Commissioner Lange's point, her plan might be very different but some of the other plans are very similar.

If Commissioner Szetela drew a map it's based on another map and 80% of the Districts are the same and she can say these are the ones that are different and we can look at the map and see what they are and that's one thing.

Second thing just a tip, if the Districts are slightly different but the concepts are the same.

You can say we have a north Grand Rapids seat and a south Grand Rapids seat and the concept is the same, you can move forward without committing to an exact different in that area.

If you understand the differences then you understand the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

So it seems like there is interest in starting with a debrief because we never had a debrief.

So do we want to go session by session? Just in general? We don't want to do Detroit and what stood out from Detroit? Okay.

So I think it's clear we've had sort of discussions generally around Detroit, Flint, and Ottawa County and those are the big three.

Do we want to start with Detroit and talk about observations and move on?

>> That's fine.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madame Chair would it be helpful for me to quickly scribe the debriefing considerations to have in your mind while you're talking about this?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sure.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For debriefing commissions will discuss feedback and themes from Public Hearings, considerations and suggested changes for COIs, additional COIs, suggested changes and input from RPV and VRA line drawing consultants.

If you like while you're making changes, I can document the changes and then we will have a nice list for you all to examine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

Thank you.

Ms. Reinhardt.

So how we want to proceed on Detroit? I think there are two easy ones that came up. Banglatown.

Adding in the two precincts and we all received maps.

Palmer Park, wanting to include that in Ferndale and Oak Park and Huntington Woods because of the LGBTQ community there.

Two simple small changes.

Any thoughts or comments on those? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think there's a third.

One individual talked about a street being split and that was an easy one.

I think that we could handle relatively easy.

It was in Detroit.

There was a street.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: It was the dexter Davis and I think it was Laughlin worth Lynwood, does that sound right?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I'm describing the area. Lynwood is over there.

Yep.

Hold on one second.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't see any reason why we shouldn't take those into account.

Those are neighborhood types of things that I think are appropriate at this point. I think there's the bigger issue that we have to talk about.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The other piece that was maybe easy was the idea that there was a Latino District moving the line west.

I wrote down something like into 17 from 19.

I wasn't able to understand all of it, but the comment was mostly about increasing the effectiveness of the Latino representation in 17 by moving the line west from central, I wrote down, from District 19.

I think these are all house maps, related to house maps and there was something else about Melvindale has a large Yemen that should be included in Arab Districts we've drawn.

If we're talking about moving a line -- the other one that I recognize is that the Cherry map complete the Boston Edison neighborhood.

In general we might want to do a review of all the neighborhoods and I believe people know which neighborhoods are okay to split and which are not okay to split.

Recognizing we want to walk through those neighborhoods.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, and I think that also gets into the broader sort of topic of discussions about how we've divvy up Detroit and relooked at the maps to keep neighborhoods together because they're easy to keep together that way.

Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree with everything that's been said.

I heard a few different things.

Some of which have been mentioned.

Bringing the neighborhoods back together.

The house map, we have specific comments that mentioned the South field area for that.

We've also heard that was already stated on the house maps, the difference in those precincts between District two and District ten.

I also have some notes here from people in Troy wanting to be with Oakland County.

I have some notes about the Arab community wanting Dearborn Heights to remain whole and to be a second District along with Dearborn.

And just generally speaking by my account it seemed like the most preferred maps were maple, pine, and cherry.

And, you know, actually, I heard some good comments from the Spanish and Latino, Latina community about our maps.

That community seemed to have liked what we did by enlarge.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Anthony highlighted what I was going to say and Commissioner -- if you want to take notes of what we were talking about just for clarity -- specifically the gentlemen from the Dexter area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I looked at my maps because I drew a map of what he was saying, Laughton street move from number one to number two and I drew the map. Dexter Lynwood area.

Windemere Park.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: And keeping the Roseville community together and when we go back and mend some of these neighborhoods and that's all I wanted to say and Commissioner Lange I think has her hand up.

I don't know if you saw that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

And in the neighborhood discussion there was a lot about is East English Village, Morningside? Something.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Morningside and Cornerstone.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Cornerstone, yep.

Morningside east English Village.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: This is a little bit more specific.

Someone made a reference to District 21 and wanting horizontal Districts in the wood ward 8-mile area and that's just a configuration suggestion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Okay.

And the last one I would raise up is there were requests for Congressional maps to switch Southfield and Northville.

We're getting a little out of Detroit.

Sorry.

South Lyon and Southfield.

Right now Northville is pushed up and south Lyon is pushed into Wayne County.

You're keeping the communities in their Counties and the other would be the API community in Novi.

There was a precinct or two left out and they want pulled back in.

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

Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Roth owner Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It's not particularly in Detroit but I want to make sure special consideration is given to the (inaudible) community.

I want to make sure we give consideration to them.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was going to say it's loud and kind of hard to hear.

Let's try to be clear so that welcome all hear each other.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because the room is small, when people is having side conversations, it's picking up on the microphones.

>> I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The seat community that was an African immigrant community that was a smaller -- it's not clear that it's a small change because when I was able to try and draw my map, I lost it so I can't actually speak to it at this point but I have a note about this.

Between south feed and north park there was a Jewish community.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Orthodox Jewish.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oak park.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There were maps given and I have not been able to look into it but Commissioner Lange was lifting up these smaller communities that we may have included, somehow recognizes that we can include them and all of these changes that I think I'm addressing I think are house map changes, I think.

Commissioner Szetela lifted up we have Congressional maps.

I would like to offer I would like to look at with Anthony Skinnell drew it and recognize the shift and he's been really clear to us and he has an interest in -- looking at that if we're going to look at Congressional maps and looking at how many Communities of Interest, he has included in that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

Anything else about the general metro Detroit area? Commissioner Clark? We've discussed all the things that keep communities together.

COI types of things and I also heard a major theme in Detroit and that thing was that the citizens of Detroit want to be kept together as a whole.

I think it's something we need to look at and discuss as we go forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I heard that as well but the way I'm analyzing that is saying that they want to be both together and packed together is still illegal.

The fact they say we want to be packed together is a violation of the VRA.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have to comply with the voting act.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Trying to adhere to what the individuals wanted in Detroit, that's a fine line between giving people what they want and giving people what they want that is illegal.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I wouldn't call it illegal but noncompliant.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Your mic is not on.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think we should take a look at it.

I think in fairness for the people who got up and spoke about this -- and there were a lot that got up to talk about this -- in fairness we should look at whether or not we can make adjustments and maybe we can't but it's worth discussion.

I would really like Brittni's and Juanita's upon that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Clark, thank you.

I totally agree.

I think as we all know there can be information gaps between what the public understands and what we've been working with and if we pay attention to Detroit's rich history and the fact that it is predominantly a City of color that has many neighborhoods and folks that have to have this kind of united voice because I heard that as well.

I think we can find a middle ground between the switches that we -- that they would like us to make.

We're kind of honing in on these neighborhoods and I think we'll find we'll have positive outcomes that don't necessarily put into question our map inside general and I think that will be the happy ground.

Because Detroit is a different place, much like Flint.

We heard those folks say it's a unique city and it has to be observed as much and I think my fellow Detroiters did an excellent job representing that.

I heard the concerns as well that we have an obligation to comply.

With it, as well, I think it's our obligation as we're making decisions in Detroit and I would like to say the same thing in Flint, to be very verbal as we're reassessing to explain why.

As a point of education, I think we can do a better job of doing that and using some of the things we've heard from the community so we're not silently drawing and talking the whole time and giving shout outs and nods to the enabled we've heard and I think if we do it bravely and together it will be absolutely fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments from Commissioners?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe one because I think we're trying to also paint a big picture here.

One of my understanding is the public is asking for partisan fairness.

We haven't mentioned it and I feel like that's one of the things we have to balance as we adjust, making sure we're getting increasingly fairer and representational and recognizing that it's right that we have to go in priority.

The other piece I feel like is that I don't know that the public has asked us to get these done right the first time.

That's part of what I want to lift up.

My intention is to get this right the first time.

That's really a major, yeah, theme in my heart that we have to somehow, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, so Ann Arbor is off on the west side but in terms of partisan fairness, all of my individual maps changed what we were doing in Ann Arbor for the purpose of creating better partisan fairness and it drove down the efficiency gap in the mean median by making the change inside Ann Arbor.

A lot of our maps maintain Ann Arbor as a community but if you look at the top ten in the state and what we've done with the rest of them, Ann Arbor is in the middle and the only city we haven't split up.

There's a lot of Public Comments to split up in one way share or form for partisan fairness and to equally split up the community.

I think we need to look for it as well and how we're treating Ann Arbor and not preserve this special status and we have other communities we're dividing up.

Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Lett.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I thought about what Commissioner Clark just said of keeping Detroit together because of what they said and I think that's true and it celebrates the spirit of community there and wanting to continue to build on resources and I challenge us and this is also for Members of the public that are watching and Kim Brace that's his hand up as well in case you can't see, we encourage representation but we also look for ways that we can positively add growth to that community because I think that's a deeper job that we have in the way we are designing and reimagining through redistricting.

That is it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

I did see Kim Brace's hand up but I'm focusing on Commissioner comments right now. Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Lett and then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you Madame Chair.

I want to go back to your comment about Ann Arbor and efficiency gap.

My objective here is to focus more on COIs and the items we heard of what the individuals at the hearings thought would be the best approach.

My objective is not necessarily to continue to decrease the partisan fairness and the efficiency gap in particular.

If it even went up .1% it wouldn't bother me.

I they we're well in scope.

I think what we have to do is look out for the people and what they think is the correct approach and apply that as most appropriately as we can as we move forward.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ann Arbor there are hundreds of comments on the portal and we've received Public Comments as well asking for Ann Arbor to be split up.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's fine but the objective shouldn't be to keep driving down to .1 or zero and that may happen.

That's great.

In my mind is to take into consideration more of the Community of Interest and what the people said they feel is more appropriate than what we have to and focus on that and we have to balance it.

I realize we have to balance it.

The main objective shouldn't be to drive the efficiency gap down.

We should be being looking forward to the people until the neighborhood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't see that as being an either or choice.

I think we can achieve partisan fairness and protect community interest.

It is a Constitution at criteria.

We shouldn't ignore it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not saying we should ignore partisan fairness.

You look at the Constitution, COIs and keeping the neighborhoods together and so forth are higher priority than the partisan fairness so I think that should be our focus as we make the adjustments.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett and then Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: In listening to the comments, while they all use different words, they're really all saying the same thing that we need to look at these and make whatever adjustments we need to make to make them as fair as we can.

Keeping in mind one of my favorite sayings, don't let the perfect get in the way of the good.

And I have to really disagree with Commissioner Rothhorn.

He said we need to get it right the first time.

Well, we're on about the 33rd time on some of these maps so we really need to try to get it right the last time and that's what we're working on and everybody I'm hearing talked to is trying to do that.

And we've had some philosophical comments about what should be and what shouldn't be but I think we need to move forward with debriefing the rest of the five meetings.

We've kind of done Detroit and move on.

And then get down to looking at the maps because that's really what we need to be doing.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mean I think we can do both, respect Communities of Interest and achieve partisan fairness.

In regards to Ann Arbor, Commissioner Szetela, you were speaking about in the Senate configuration for all the maps; is that correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe so and I believe in the house too.
I would have to look at individual maps.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree I think also if we did do that, we heard voices at the Detroit public hearing from the west Bloomfield area that they weren't really happy with being with northern Oakland County and they would rather be with southern Oakland County and that's one of the ways of doing that by changing the configuration of Ann Arbor and you would open more room for that type of configuration. I really like this debriefing session and I think this is good and I agree with Commissioner Lett that this should keep going.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I agree about the keep going but I want to make a point to Doug's point.

In the Constitution it says nothing about the efficiency gap.

We had Dr. Handley give us guidelines that stated if we stayed within a certain range these would be acceptable measures as it says in the Constitution.

So this idea of getting this efficiency gap down to zero, while tearing apart certain areas that have asked to be remained, Communities of Interest, as I've seen, as I've spoken out about, is about acceptable in my opinion and I just wanted to add that on to what Commissioner Clark was saying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I totally disagree with that statement.

We have to take partisan fairness into account.

It doesn't specifically say efficiency gap but it does say we take into account fairness --

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So they definitely fall within the criteria of things we have to consider.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I get legal counsel to comment on that so that I have a clear understanding, then?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel did you follow what was just said?

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

Good morning.

Yes, Commissioner Lange that was an accurate statement that those have been accepted by the courts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you have a follow-up?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That's not my question.

My question is as far as the reading of the Constitution, do we have to get the efficiency gap as close to zero to the Constitution.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to clarify, that's not what I said and I didn't suggest that.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly and that's an excellent question

Commissioner Lange and I'm sorry I didn't answer that first but I did agree with the summary of the Chairperson.

Based on accepted measures of partisan fairness the Commission cannot provide a disproportionate advantage.

There is no language mandating zero political bias.

It is again not to give disproportionate advantage based on those accepted measures of partisan fairness which are expert identified the measures that have been accepted by the courts and offered to the Commission for its use.

And, again, it's disproportionate advantage are the keywords.

Is that helpful, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, it is.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark, did you have a response to that?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do.

The Constitution doesn't use the words efficiency gap but we hired a consultant and asked for her advice and Dr. Handley offered us a number of ways to measure partisan fairness and one of those being the efficiency gap and she explained to us the significance and how it's been used in the courts and how they've looked at it.

I think in my opinion what Dr. Handley has given us is an acceptable number for us to actually measure partisan fairness and I know there's other approaches but she got it down to four of the simplest and ones that have been used in the courts and I think we should accept that and move forward even though verbiage doesn't say specifically efficiency gap or any other criteria she identified for us.

I have the utmost respect for Dr. Handley and her advice to us regarding this matter.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm not sure the thought is still here.

So okay.

After all that was said, Dr. Handley did analyze our collaborative maps and she was impressed that was done without any partisan fairness work at all.

That was what we came up with using the top three criteria and she said there was probably room for a little improvement and we've gotten guidance on that.

We have made improvement.

And I think as we -- I don't know how to say it -- but started chasing that zero efficiency gap, it all kind of got a little imbalanced and we were just chasing that to get that lower when that was kind of Commissioner Lett's saying -- we were chasing the perfect and messing up the good.

I think we need to take all of those measures.

There's the seat vote count and I would say that's the most important, that number.

We take all of those measures into account and not keep chasing the zero and cutting up all the good work that we did in the communities.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

Any additional comments? Okay.

So-so we've sort of dealt with the metro Detroit area.

Do we want to move on to Lansing area? Any thoughts about Lansing? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I heard a few things in Lansing.

Overall they seemed quite happy with our Congressional maps and that included the Tri County maps.

By my account was Birch and Juniper and those both have the arrangement of District five.

So this was probably the most positive feedback I've heard of all of our Public Hearings. As far as the house Districts, I heard a lot of people saying we should unpack the Lansing area.

There was a lot of mention of unpacking Lansing into five Districts instead of the current four that we have.

With you also heard a lot of comment outpost map as in regard total Battle Creek and Albion.

There was a few comments to that and there were a few that wanted Kalamazoo to be with Battle Creek.

That's what I heard.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I heard one other thing and that's dealt Township in the Eaton area that I believe they wanted or expected those to be together.

So I think that's one we should add to the list.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn and then Commissioner Orton.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is where the Native American -- band of Potawatomi were giving us maps and asking us to shift and I have not had a chance to look at those but I have had a chance to look at the five maps and that those were drawn by Chris Andrews and he had given Public Comment here a couple of times. I drew it, I tried to draw it and my computer crashed and my software doesn't preserve it and it's unfortunate.

It does preserve a lot of the Counties.

We have Communities of Interest. Whatever we're doing, there are Counties that are getting quote unquote carved up and it's just real sort of dilemma to make it better and I think we have to decide if it's worth it, so to speak, and then, again, that has to do with

either partisan fairness or VRA but there are Communities of Interest and there are tough choices that we're going to be making so that fifth, splitting up into five and I'll offer that also extends into the Grand Rapids area.

If we do shift it in the Lansing it does allow us to move things in Grand Rapids. Ada and Cascade and there are reasons to do it and it's married and will take a lot of time in the house.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I redrew that map for that area so I have it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Oh, good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I personally think it split up Counties, Counties are low down on our list.

I think it's a different configuration and if it improves the other metrics without cutting up Communities of Interest and I don't think there were that were cut up in that map I think we should make the change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: People of color there was more than one the Hispanic population and people of color, lower percent, like in the teens was the one I wasn't able to evaluate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The Cristo Rey neighborhood? Yes.
Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: This is a question for MC and Steve as well since they're familiar with Lansing.

Do you feel the Native Americans were factored in initially? Reporting that's what I mean.

In their comments they say we receive services and we have to live within that area. That's the part I haven't had the chance to reference and there were multiple maps and I haven't had a chance to look at that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You're still going to look at it? I'll dive into it as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I heard those same comments and I've lived in Lansing longer than MC has and while there are certainly a number of indigenous -- as they prefer to be called -- people in Lansing, my recollection in all of my years was that they weren't -- I don't mean this as downplaying -- but they weren't a cohesive voice. They're becoming a more cohesive voice.

So Lansing doesn't have what Mount Pleasant has and I heard that in one of my Zooms with Ann Arbor, they had a call in from an indigenous person and her comment I thought was very telling.

She said there are a lot of indigenous people in the state but we're spread out all over the place.

And that's what we're dealing with.

The one interesting point and it hasn't come to pass and MC probably knows about it. They're trying to get a casino in Lansing.

They were prying and I don't know if they're still doing it but they were going to transfer some river front property to a tribe to build a casino.

My supposition is that some corporation that's sponsored by the indigenous people are trying to make that happen.

Not necessarily the local indigenous people.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think that's accurate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think the problem is you have a community that's vastly distributed, at large in part because of forced assimilation and historic inequities but that makes it hard to draw a map to accommodate them because they're spread out all over the place. We tried hard where we knew there are Indian reservations to keep the communities together.

I know that group did submit multiple maps.

Promote the vote map as well as other maps but those maps were whole state maps but it makes it hard to identify what areas we need to target and they weren't focused down and I know Members had spoken to the groups asking for them to submit Communities of Interest so it's easier for us to make changes and hopefully they do so. Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree with Steve stair scattered all over in smaller groups and it's hard to look out for their interest when that happens.

One of the other things that I got out of the Lansing hearing and I heard it at other hearings as well -- it deals with student voices being represented.

They felt many colleges were split in different Districts.

Oakland University, Rochester Hills, Auburn Hills.

Those are two different Districts and they want them consolidated into one.

I thought I would bring that up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: While certainly the college students and the ones we heard from voiced that opinion, I didn't hear any of the citizens from east Lansing, full year round residents, backing that up.

My recollection? Hear in this area in east Lansing, when they changed the rules back in the day that college students could register to vote in east Lansing, east Lansing weren't very excited about that because there were 40,000 people here who were going to control the vote.

While we have a legitimate right to be heard there is a counter veiling process from the full-time tax paying residents.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think also particularly with college communities students don't necessarily live on campus and they're spread throughout the community and it's an issue of dispersion and how do you group those people together and frankly another factor to consider is the transient effect of college students.

People rent there for ten years.

They're there for four years and move on.

Maybe eight if they go to graduate school.

It depends.

Go ahead Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I've been a college student for 11 years now.

Just saying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's not something to be proud of Anthony.

>> We're also hoping for you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have 3-degrees and I'm working on a fourth.

I'll take it.

The reason I say that is because while yes most college students and undergrad are at schools for four years, they're also important because the impact especially on a state legislature side that college policies on students last way beyond ten years and you're talking about how much funding colleges get which impacts how much loans a student has to take and the interest rate on those student loans and I think we're well aware of the student debt crisis going on the in the country right now.

Not saying that I agree that the whys of putting east Lansing and Lansing back together is a good idea because I don't agree with that.

I believe the college community is better served with them being split but we shouldn't just forget about the college people's voices because the effects that these policies has on them does last between years.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Don't take my comments that way.

They weren't meant to that way.

The college students provide a significant voting block for whatever District they're in. I personally know of individuals who have been elected by going through all of the dorms on east Lansing campus and working the crowds to get votes and got elected based upon the students' votes for them.

They are definitely a political force and we need to take that into account.

I'm not saying to dismiss it.

But I am saying there's a counter veiling weight out there also that we need to consider.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like some clarification Steve on the comment you made that east Lansing students were required to register and vote in east Lansing. Is that a administrate requirement or just an east Lansing requirement?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Way back in the day students were required -- and I'm going from memory -- to register from their home, where they lived.

That changed.

They could register from their they were in east Lansing or Ann Arbor and vote there and that dynamic changed what went on what went on in college towns.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Were they required to do that?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: They had the option.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Say you were living out of state and say you were from Connecticut and living in Michigan you could not register to vote in Michigan because you were considered not to be a permanent resident because you were there nine months a year and they changed that so that students could register if they were in college to allow them to vote in Michigan and there was a change in law.

Some people nine months, some 11 years.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Some never leave.

>> And still going.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments about the broader Lansing area.

Do you want to go to Grand Rapids or up to Flint Grand Rapids.

Let's go to Grand Rapids.

Senate maps move the line from Fulton to Wealthy.

I think we need to look at that time.

Move Senate map.

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: There was also one that I know that MC might have more detail on and I know he worked on it Ada and Cascade Townships and the airport area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

What do we think about the Kalamazoo/Grand Rapids configuration? I see your hand right up.

I feel like the people from Ottawa County loved it and felt like it was the best fit every and the people of Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo were not fans of it.

Go ahead Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I've heard both.

Both say they don't like it and they do like it.

The portal itself as far as I can -- and taking this on face value of where people click and they try to make a comment but it's basically an equal number in regards to saying they like it or don't like it for the individuals that live in that particular District from Kalamazoo up to Grand Rapids.

My personal opinion if you have 50 saying yes and 50 saying no that's perfect.

Because that creates a competitive District among the people itself.

I like it.

Not just because I drew it.

I took everyone's comment has no account and there's the fact that there's an equal yes or no to me, I mean, it makes sense.

Secondly, the individuals that say that they're not a Community of Interest with a certain area makes no sense to me.

You can't say, a Community of Interest, again, is not where you don't want to be.

We're taking the community, keeping them whole in this particular area and this particular area.

So taking into account and you don't get to say where you don't want to be, I don't think, in my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Um, Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree with your analysis, Rebecca.

But I want to point out that as I recollection Anthony had done a map where he kept Ottawa County and Kent County for most part, as I remember.

But he linked Kent County with Muskegon with that map and there's a different configuration you can use to get Ottawa County whole and I think we should take a good look at doing that and I think Battle Creek and Kalamazoo deserve the right I think to be together more than Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's what I was going to say.

If you put -- Commissioner Orton and then we'll common carrier balk to you Commissioner Witjes.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I heard you but I thought you were calling on Commissioner Orton? So it's my turn?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay I'm just going to agree with the statement that was made about I think I heard more Public Comment both in writing and in person about the Kalamazoo and Battle Creek being combined than the Grand Rapids. I heard a lot of Public Comment about Grand Rapids wanting to stay whole and some with it being split and not going all the way down to Kalamazoo.

If I had a choice, I would keep the ones that combined the Kalamazoo and Battle Creek.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I have a few notes on the Grand Rapids public hearing. In regards to the Congressional configuration that Commissioner Clark was just speaking of, it splits Ottawa County once instead of twice which is the configuration on most of the other maps.

I'm a little torn between the apple configuration that has Grand Rapids with Kalamazoo and some of the other configurations.

Everything Commissioner Witjes said was true.

It felt like we had a lot of people from Ottawa County liking that map solely because it kept the County whole.

That's not what everyone said.

Some people had legitimate comment.

One person said there business runs down that south north highway and I felt that was legitimate too.

More people simply because of Ottawa Township.

They're both Communities of Interest.

They're saying they are and it's going to come down to which one we choose to go with. As far as other things that I heard, it seemed like most people liked the pine house map and the Cherry Senate map.

As you guys already said, we had a lot of comment switching from Fulton street to Wealthy street on the Senate map.

At this meeting we also actually had a lot of support for the lake shore District, District 87.

That's on the house map.

And there was some words about maybe reconfiguring it slightly to take off the south part and go a little more south into Saginaw and that might be something we want to look into.

As was already stated we heard a lot about Kalamazoo and Battle Creek to Believe being together.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I just want to comment that in my humble opinion, I don't think any particular city, County, or Township is a Community of Interest.

I think the Constitutional language is very clear that city, Township, and Counties are number 60 our list.

The fact they're specifically delineated, I agree with a lot of the commenters.

Particularly, Judy Maga made that comment it wouldn't be listed as number six if it was intended to be a Community of Interest.

The fact that Ottawa comes out and said they are a Community of Interest it's going back to the April standards and we are not to be following the April standards.

With respect to Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo I think we have a better configuration of linking them together and make more sense and are more logical and don't foreclose the Battle Creek, Kalamazoo connection which I like.

I like your map --

>> COMMISSIONER EID: To respond that that the Community of Interest I was talking about was the Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo Community of Interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: A couple of things.

I think Dustin is right on when he said a Community of Interest is not who you don't want to be with.

That's true and we have heard a do want to be with or I don't want to be with for lots of different areas.

I think just even though we're saying Townships, Counties, and cities aren't Communities of Interest, it's logical and common sense that an area near each other is

going to be more of a Community of Interest than something far away that we have to reach for so we should keep that in mind, I think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Isn't there 50 miles between Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo? I think people mentioned that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah.

So I also think -- what was my other thought.

Give me a second.

We have three different types of maps with three different population needs.

So we can give people what they want, you know, what we're hearing on one map, something different we're hearing on a different map, different configuration for different areas if we know that there are varying needs.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn? I'm sorry Commissioner Witjes, I was supposed to be coming back to you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Someone refresh my memory I don't have my note inside front of me.

Didn't the grand rapid dollars and Kalamazoo create a need --

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was going to speak to that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Communities of color there was one woman in particular of color who did not like the Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo connection and there was a woman of color specifically said she likes the idea of being represented or having the opportunity of being represented in Washington DC and having the stronger opportunity to elect.

I think that's why we should look at the Battle Creek and Kalamazoo.

If we like at the minority representation, if there was an opportunity to elect -- it was lifted up and I think we should just verify or try to understand it because that seems reasonable.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: On that point, so when we combine Grand Rapids with Kalamazoo and Benton Harbor.

You might be lifting up one but drowning out another.

Kalamazoo with Battle Creek, we in Congressional brings in Ann Arbor and gives that a political voice.

Benton harbor is left with rural areas that are not demographically similar.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There was a Van Buren and Cass and a Native American nation.

Van Buren, Allegan and agricultural and definitely a Native American voice that wanted to recognize there's some connection there and it was map P-6 0754.

Smaller things to look at and our House map.

Byron Center split.

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

There was suggested to add Greenville, something like Byron center was one that was split that we might be able to do a small change.

And then that's yeah Southwest corner.

Allegan and Berrien.

Reduce the number of cuts in Allegan County.

They were spit up in way that's we used or had to split up other Counties -- I'm thinking of Livonia in particular -- recognize we've tried to reduce the number of cuts and that's the only thing I wanted to lift up.

That's it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think if we move the line to wealthy street and Grand Rapids, we can bring in Grandville below Grand Rapids.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that.

In our house District we did redraw the southern District.

We drew it as a coalition District and I haven't had the chance to look to see if they were suggesting keeping that coalition District and where Pine splits the Hispanic community. I haven't looked at that but attacking the pine map adds the Hispanic community or something like that.

Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

All right.

Any other comments? So I do have one more comment about Ottawa County -- we're the fastest growing County and for me that leans in favor of not keeping them together because if they're the fastest growing County why would we want to keep them together.

It didn't make sense to me logically.

So all right.

Anything else about a general Grand Rapids area? So we've done Detroit area, Lansing.

Grand Rapids.

Let's move to Flint.

What were we hearing?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Gaylord.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

Go ahead, Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm going to think about how I'm going to word this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For Gaylord, right?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, but it's going to go back to Midland.

Midland city I believe does not need to be with Midland County as a whole.

It needs to be westbound tri cities and this goes hand in hand with what happened in Flint.

The argument that midland city and midland County should stay together, it seems to me that everyone that is saying that is for political gain and the reason for that is Bill Schuette showing up with his Staffer in my opinion.

The fact that they're all saying that is a state that that is a pure political gain for him and Staffers and all political in the area that were saying that so we need to take that into account.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Orton, I completely disagree.

Midland Township and midland County should stay together with the County to the north and I looked at Bill Schuette coming as a citizen and not a politician and representing the watershed particularly and I think it's a valid concern.

I think it's a serious problem that the County and the town have and I think there's some -- another serious problem with fertilizer runoff in that area as well.

So that's why I would say it should be brought -- but, however, in support of what you said, I heard a lot of people saying that midland should be with the tri cities.

But what I recall was most of those people were from Saginaw and bay city area and not middle city Township and middle city area and that's my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where does the fertilizer run into?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe the river.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Saginaw -- we're hearing comments about the watershed needs to be kept together and if you're saying that it should be the tri cities.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The root cause is up north.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sixty percent of the comments wanted midland city with the tri cities.

If Midland Township wants to be with Midland City, they should be with the tri cities together.

That's honoring and respecting the watershed which flows to Saginaw.

That's my person opinion.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You can accomplish that on a Congressional basis but because of population I don't think you can do it necessarily in a Senator House District but I think the watershed goes to the west and north and I think it's appropriate to take that into consideration as well.

I'm not an expert on the area.

I can only analyze what's been said and make an opinion on that and that's my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

I also think the current Congressional map and current Senate maps puts which had manned city and Township with Michigan and people expressed they don't want the status quo to continue and by doing that we're furthering the status quo.

I thought it was very interesting at our first public hearing we received tremendous Public Comment from people from midland city saying put you go with the tri cities.

To me the flooding issues don't change any of that whatsoever.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton and Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Responding to Dustin's comment, I think we all know that there have been tons of comments from partisan, both partisan sides.

Lots of advocacy groups from both sides have been putting huge pressure on us and trying to make their comments more than the other side for different things.

We know we can't put midland in a tri city house District.

We can give different considerations for each map and we can try to filter out the pressure that we know is coming from the different sides.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right and our current Senate District in most of our Congressional maps do have midland with the tri cities and we have a Senate District in midland with the tri cities right now but the house is a totally different story because there's just not the population.

All right.

Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

I'm going to give my comments on Midland.

First with it being political about the watershed, I don't see it being political with people standing in front of us with tears in their eyes with the basements flooded in sewage because of what was done to the grades of landscape around there and I find it hard to believe that we wouldn't take into consideration that they are recovering from the devastation just like we heard Flint talk about the other day needing water representation.

I agree with Flint and Midland in saying that and I want to point out we have a group giving repeat, repeat, repeat, just as Commissioner Orton has said, we've heard from both sides but we have groups give repeat saying that one side that wants this is political, with when in turn they are saying we lean 40% Democrat and we want to be with this area so our voices are represented.

One thing that the Constitution says about Communities of Interest, why it leads a wide range of things that Communities of Interest it can be -- the one thing that it says it is not is affiliation with any political party.

And I have to honestly say, I did not hear out of all the people -- and it wasn't just about the watershed.

In our very first hearing we had someone from the midland area who said their community of community is the -- they don't see how counties and cities are Communities of Interest. Please tell me when we look at the Constitution which even though it's lower on the levels that we have to follow that it says we will take into consideration municipalities that include Counties Townships and cities, how is it taking

into consideration municipalities when you're talking about taking three cities from three different Counties and putting them together.

It seems like it's a little bit of hypocrisy to say I don't think it should apply for this area that this County should be a Community of Interest but it's okay in this area.

I think we need to show consistency and I think back to the political part of it we had a commenter that said thank you for putting the Tri-Cities together and now we can elect someone with intelligence.

Please put the tri cities together because midland is 40% democrat.

Please put the tri cities again because we relate to each other more politically and we heard that over and over again and when people talk about the watershed and health, safety, economics, I didn't hear them say because we align politically.

I heard them say we're in recovery and we need help and want our representation to be from here and coordinate with the areas affected.

Just like we heard in Flint.

So I'm going to leave it at that.

Because I think you know I can go on and on and on this forever and I have three pages on it but I'll leave it at that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Something I really struggle with what you've touched on and I struggled when I have hearing people's comment outside this as well.

People are taking the position, one, that they have to have representation for recovery which I completely agree with and the same is true for Flint.

I don't see how having two different represents is going -- government failure.

If a dam failed due to government failure and inspections so I struggle with that.

And I struggle even with Flint same thing.

People saying we need to be together because we need representation.

Why is having two representatives instead of one a bad thing? It seems like then you have more representation and I don't buy the argument that having two representatives somehow means your flood recovery is going to be negatively impacted.

It doesn't pass the smell test for logic at all.

It's not going to impair recovery.

Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: A couple of other things I heard in Gaylord.

One talked about lower income and higher income and I think these are related to house maps.

District 102 sort of lower income.

Not yeah District 102 was a lower income and District 103 was higher income and to recognize that and I don't think we've done a comprehensive analysis and I don't think we're going to be able to and lifting that up but Benzie County was coming out of Gaylord.

I think that was the only piece that felt like it was important.

Hoss common Nester Township, 180 voters in glad win and wanting to stay with rate of speed common and don't group them and we could potentially take that little Township out and they were adamant about staying in common if I understood that comment correctly that leaked out at me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have another item to add.

There were a couple of comments coming out of Sheboygan -- they felt they were better represented if we associate them with the west rather than the east.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sheboygan and Emmett?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, and I think we have the opposite we have them associated with the eastern side of the state and that's something we need to take a look at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, it is? Well, you're jumping the gun, Steve.

We're supposed to break at 11:00.

We'll take a break now, five-minutes early.

Without objections we will take a recess for ten minutes.

It's currently 10:55.

Hearing no objections, we will stay in recess until 11:05.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As the Chair of the Commission I recall the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 11:13 p.m. For the purposes of the public record will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending today's meeting remotely, please disclose, your physical location I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We talked about the Gaylord area.

Is there anything else anyone thinks we need to mention that we learned and gleaned from the public comments in the Gaylord area? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I'll just say over all it seemed like the most preferred maps were Pine for the house map, cherry for the Senate map and then both birch and Juniper for the Congressional map.

But there are also quite a few people who liked both the Lange Congressional map and if they liked that one, they also local the oak house map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Going to go a little further north here.

In the UP, one thing I think we do need to revisit are the lines hold on the train is about to derail, the lines where we have, I think it's the house where we are splitting up the Sault, the District we drew that has Sault St. Marie and the where we are going into the County instead of just doing the County line.

I think we need to revisit that for the whole fact of the indigenous comments we received to see if we can make that particular area better.

But we can do that once we are done with everything else, we are working on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Sault St. Marie.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Those comments of the indigenous peoples that came in kind of hit hard to me.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll offer in addition to this it respects the general UP shoreline like the western UP and the superior shoreline then there is the Michigan shoreline so to speak.

I think that lines up with what Commissioner Witjes was talking about.

There is another piece there that I want to lift up to is like we did get comments around Bay and Arenac Counties as part of this Great Lakes Bay region.

I don't think it came at the community hearing.

But in general, just trying to recognize that we may be able to do something if we can, to include Arenac in the when we are looking at that Midland, Bay Area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, any other comments? I'm.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Weiss, pardon me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Erin you have not gone yet, please go first.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you Commissioner Lange.

I just wanted to add my voice to Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Lange's in keeping Midland whole and with Gladwin and Isabella Counties.

I think it's completely ridiculous to this that was politically motivated and as someone who has lost their house like my compassion goes out to them.

We also heard about keeping Ross common, I just lost where that was in my notes.

We heard about keeping Leelanau with Traverse City.

And Ross common and Esther Township including those with the rural Counties as well, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: There was also comments regarding the Traverse City area, some of the I guess they would be considered more rural areas that said they have always associated with Traverse City and they did not feel that it was right they were split off or that the County was split up to accommodate doing a Traverse City you know kind of again splitting off Traverse City from the rest of the County to put with Leelanau.

Then we had comments about Leelanau being agricultural and wanting to be kept together but reviewing the map it looks like they are whole in the house map.

So I'm not sure where that comment came from, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Commissioner Lange.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree with the comments about Grand Traverse County being split up.

But I heard more supporting Leelanau Traverse City combination in the House District that was positive.

And because the population requirements you know we have to split something.

So I thought it was more relevant to keep those two together.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you have another comment Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I wanted to ask opinion to wise we did hear a lot of comment about it for the grapes and the wineries, but it could be argued that any one of those lakeshore areas are agricultural as far as growing and stuff.

And I can't help but wonder because it was specifically put that they wanted to be just with Traverse City if, again, if we are not looking at something that's more political than community of interest.

And I think it's just something we need to keep in our minds, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay anyone else? All right let's move on to the Flint area. Any feedback on the Flint call? Or Flint public hearing? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Three things, Midland of course and I think we've had that discussion to this point.

So I had two other items that I found significant.

One was the Oxford, Addison Lake Orion, Clarkston area.

They didn't like the way it got split up and they felt it should be consolidated and I think we should take a look at that.

And then the second, the other item of significance of course is do we move Flint into a single District or keep it as two districts.

The opinion from the people in Flint was geared more towards they wanted a single District.

And so I think what we have got to do is decide among us which approach we want to take when we get to that point, so thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, I think in Flint they gave us that P7273 which is really helpful because they have a map.

And I think you know we talked about it earlier this morning right that it is about keeping the community whole more than just reputation.

It's bigger than that.

It feels like it's a community of interest.

And to this what Commissioner Clark was raising this Oxford and Addison village Townships it's precinct 3 and 5 I have tried to move and it relates to where Pontiac is so I think we want to like if we do that it's not as simple as I would have liked.

Because it is that longer District that where we are drawing Pontiac with Waterford rather than Pontiac with Auburn Hills and we have the Auburn Hills with Bloomfield.

So it's that what I mean is I think if we are going to look at Oxford and Addison, I want to recognize it's a bigger piece.

Sometimes these are little but sometimes they are not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would also point out for Flint we do have Flint together in the Congressional maps.

And we have it together in the Senate maps so it's really just the house map where we need to make that determination.

As to whether we are going to keep Flint as a whole unit.

Because it could fit into House District by itself.

So we need to evaluate that.

Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So Commissioner Rothhorn I may have missed this if you said it in your comment but beyond the Oxford and Addison Township issue, there was also a comment or two about that in the Oxford Township we just didn't include two precincts within that.

So we might want to take a look at that, see what it looks like.

There was also a comment about that we split Caro from its County.

To me the comment sounded like that was the only piece we took out.

Which might want to look at it.

I have not looked at it yet.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For the two precincts are you talking about Oxford?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Oxford and I'm not sure what maps they were on and not sure what they were referring to.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Precinct 3 and 5 in the house maps and they are Oxford and Addison village Townships.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, when item I forgot to add was it was over in the Caro appendage in the County going out into another District in that County.

The person that owned the majority of the land in that area wanted to get a consolidated back into that other District.

I think we should do that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I thought that comment was interesting.

Because I am not really sure why it would matter if you are a single owner and have a big piece of property.

I just was kind of confused as to why that would be relevant if someone has clarity on that I would love to hear it.

Commissioner Lange you only get to vote once is my point.

The fact your land is split is not going to change the fact you are voting on one side or the other.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: True but we got the gist of what he was concerned about.

And in 90 seconds he can't explain a whole heck of a lot so I thought we should consider that seriously.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My points are separate from the map but I will comment on that.

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

Being a large swath of land and agricultural land I can understand him wanting that land in the same District for the representation for the agricultural issues.

So that may be exactly what he is talking about.

As far as the Flint public hearing rather than not rather than agreeing with everybody else what they said about Flint and the voices that were heard in Flint, definitely something we need to look at.

There were also some voices from the Saginaw area.

I don't write down names but the firefighter.

She also echoed about Flint.

She also echoed about keeping Saginaw and Genesee County together in a Congressional area.

But was adamant that Midland does not belong with that.

There were others that asked as far as State House goes to keep Saginaw whole.

And not split it up.

And additional ones that talked about the Saginaw and Midland and keeping Saginaw and Genesee together but not including.

So I just want to raise that up that people from Saginaw even had comments where they felt like they belonged more with Flint than the other areas.

And as far as Congressional goes that they would like to be included with Flint.

So that the people of color population their voices are heard more and combined with those in Flint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't have anything about the Flint.

Since we are making a list of little things, there is this Holland Macatawa community of interest and spoke to us more than once.

About 230 people so it does not make a big difference.

But it sounds like it will make a big difference in their life to just in the Holland area and western side of the yeah on the west side.

Just below Holland Macatawa adding 230 people.

So just a small little thing we can I think make a big difference in that community of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So a few things.

Some of which have already been said.

I think the number one thing I heard from this public hearing was the wish you know to take the partisan fairness criteria seriously.

Which I think we are.

But you know we heard people that wanted the Tri-Cities with Midland.

Included.

Midland City included.

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

We heard people without it included.

I found it interesting that we had politicians again show up to this meeting and speak to us.

But I wanted to say did anyone look at that map that was given to us? Because the population numbers were off.

So if we are to use that map, we would have to examine that one of the districts where like 10,000 people over.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which map are you talking about?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't have the number written down but it kept being displayed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In Flint?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: In Flint.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 7273 was the one referred to each time.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That was referred to and might want to look at that.

I also have some notes regarding this City of Burton.

And reconfiguring that a little bit.

And then as far as overall what people seem to like best, for what we have so far you heard a lot of support for the Pine map, the cherry map, the birch map, the Juniper map and then we had some support of the Eid Congressional map as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I believe the comments on Burton were to keep Burton and Flint together.

That was the main thing that I had gotten out of that.

But not Grand Blanc.

They felt Grand Blanc should be separate from Flint.

The other comment about the map you referenced in the numbers being off Anthony, some of the maps that got displayed was only used in 2010 census data.

So that may be the reason why those numbers were off.

Yes.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan is nodding to that.

>> MR. MORGAN: The map I saw looked like it was using 2010 census data or estimates so that is probably why it was off.

You can take the concepts from it and put it into the current census data, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was going to comment until Anthony did about the Burton one.

I just want clarification.

I had it written down Burton was split, and that's what the issue was.

And now hearing Commissioner Clark he said they wanted to be with Flint, can anybody just Anthony maybe can you tell me from your notes was it keeping it whole that it split? Does anybody remember?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It is split a little bit now.

There was a wish to keep it whole but I don't have written down where to keep it whole in.

Because you can either go east or west.

So unless someone else knows.

I think there are about three or four comments about Burton so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This isn't going to help necessarily the clarification because I didn't hear specifications either.

But I heard, I remember one woman specifically mentioning the split but when she heard the other public comments about Flint she said if it only like unified.

Showing and wants the changes to be made if it does not interfere with the will of the majority of Flint folks so I remember that specific comment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn did you have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The only other clarification Burton this was towards the end of the night and did not write down the names but person Burton is a City just like Flint or but distinct from Flint and not split up in the Lange map.

So the Lange map did not split up the City.

So that I just wrote down Lange map.

I think that may have been a way so we might just look at that to see how Burton is represented there.

And to sort of put that again I don't have any other thing within the Lange map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark? Commissioner Kellom did you have another comment? Or did you not drop the hand, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I heard a couple comments up in Flint keeping the Birmingham Bloomfield Township area together.

From a few people.

So I think we should note that.

Take another look at that as well.

And I'd also be interested in hearing some of the Commissioners opinions towards Flint in the house maps.

Whether we should or should not consolidate it into one District or keep it as two.

So my opinion is we should consolidate it.

And make one District.

And it's based on their feeling of community interests.

And they seem to be very focused toward that.

And the number of pastors that talked and up in Flint I think reinforced that.

So that's my opinion as we move forward and I'd like to hear some other people's opinions on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I can give you my opinion on that.

I'm on the belief that more representation is not a bad thing.

So having two representatives in the City of Flint in my opinion makes sense.

Because you have two people fighting for the people that live in the City as opposed to just one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think my thoughts were similar to Detroit.

I felt that they said very similar things but maybe in Flint they were almost like better articulated if I can say that.

So I am on the fence.

I would want to tweak the area.

Or I would want us to reexamine and see what we could create with what they have said.

I can't say as of right now should they be kept whole or should we keep it the way that we have it.

I think it just should represent I wrote down a couple comments which I'm looking at specifically we would like to keep a representation we have.

And gladly accept anything that would positively add representation.

So this thought of wholeness is great.

But as Commissioner Witjes said I think if there is a way that we can even amplify that, then that is what we should do within reason of keeping the neighborhoods and communities together as a guide.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would just also echo just a point of concern on we want to keep the representatives we have.

To me that's asking us to draw a map that favors incumbents and I don't know that we can do that.

So that would concern me with respect to that particular comment.

And then again, I sort of echo what Dustin said.

Is that I think more representation is better.

And we worked really hard to get VRA compliant districts in the Flint area.

And I think that's not going to deny them a representative because I think they will still be able to elect who the current representative is in the newly drawn districts and have that but have one more too.

Which I think is better.

I was going to say Commissioner Orton, I saw someone over there with a hand up then Commissioner Lange then Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was going to point out as well we consider VRA and worked really hard in that area I remember.

And maybe when we go back to those maps, we should just look at that and have Mr. Adelson look at it again and see what the numbers are. See what it is, if we do and if we don't.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: As far as Lange, Lange, as far as Flint, I was reading my name on the screen, they were definitely very passionate.

And about their community.

As they should be.

And they spoke of it as a community of interest.

As these are the issues that we face as a community whether it be their healthcare issues, their water issues, they were very passionate.

They had a very big turnout.

And the part I guess that took me is it was not only the residents of Flint.

It was the residents from surrounding areas that were lifts their voices up and supporting the same thing that they say.

So I would be -- if this is what the residents of Flint want, this is their community of interest.

This is what they want, then I think we should give it to them.

As long as we can -- you know still comply.

But I think they did speak about community.

And that's what we are kind of looking for.

And if that's what they want, let's give it to them.

I don't think it's a matter of two representatives.

I think what we were hearing is they just want to know that their issues are going to be taken care of from people that I guess deal with those issues.

I don't think they care who it is as long as it's their issues that are being taken care of.

And the challenges that they face and if we can do that, I think we should.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, I lost my order now.

Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Rothhorn Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I think their biggest concern was that the second District that they didn't have the opportunity to necessarily vote for the candidate of their choice.

So they felt as a community they were better off to consolidate and work together.

And I think that is an Admiral goal.

And I think that is something we should seriously consider as we move forward.

And I agree with what Rhonda said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn then Commissioner Lett.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, the, yes, so I'm going to agree with that. Also that I like the idea of keeping them whole. I respect them as a community of interest. I did hear they wanted to be kept whole and not totally whole. They did want two districts just not the way we have it configured. What I was listening I heard Grand Blanc that was the area that was not necessarily like they had different interests in Grand Blanc than they do in Flint. The two districts we may have to look at, right, it's important to recognize that there is two districts. Just can way we have drawn the two districts may not allow both districts to elect candidates of choice. The Grand Blanc area was lifted up as a place where we could redraw, to keep them whole.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, regardless of what we do with the districts or don't do with the districts, we can't cure all of these problems for one very simple reason. We do not elect the representatives that are going into those districts. The people in the districts regardless of where they end up being are the ones that have to choose the people to represent them. So the comments are we are doing some disservice by putting lines here or lines there because the people that are there now don't represent them, that's not our fault and it won't be our fault in the future. They have to elect the people.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, and I would also add on to that, that you know to the extent they want to keep current representatives we are not blocking the ability of current representatives to run again. In whatever districts we have. And if you know that representative is not happy with the District that's there, they can move. Their choice.

So there is options here. It's not like people are blocked from ever running again. Okay, Commissioner Kellom and then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Just really quickly I understand what you all are saying and this is maybe a little anecdotal we know there are things that present people though it's not our responsibility. And the note I was saying was more so about representation not specific representatives. There are things that prevent people from having access and all of that. So I think it would be a disservice not to take that into consideration.

I understand why we are saying it's not our responsibility but we do know the impact of the decisions that we are making.

If I wanted to highlight that, so that we could have more qualitative discussions if possible.

I know that is not everyone's perspective or view but I will speak for myself as a Commissioner when I think about drawing lines that is what I'm considering is what this will mean ten years from now.

For folks that are already suffering and experiencing different issues no matter what color they are and no matter where they live.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I want everybody to know it's so hard for me after five days of public comment not to say Thank you for addressing the Commission. Every time someone speaks.

I'm trying to hard so if it slips out once, please forgive me.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You can say thank you Rebecca it's fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On a different note I want to say we also heard in regards to the house map once again concerns from the Arab American community. Mainly centered around Dearborn and Dearborn Heights and wanting those to be closer to the prior configuration that we had before.

But at this one we also heard from the Chaldean community which was nice to hear from.

Being a community that is spread out in Oakland and Macomb County.

So just wanted to acknowledge that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, any other comments? Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I wanted to save this until the very end.

But.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, no.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: There is one comment in I believe it was Flint that really irked and wanted to address my opinions on the matter.

Someone stated that partisan fairness is gerrymandering by a different name.

It's the exact opposite.

Of gerrymandering.

And ensuring that districts are fair.

So I wanted to raise that at the public hearing but I bit my tongue.

But I did want to give my opinion on that fact, on the public record.

So hopefully if the individual is watching this, they know how I feel on the matter.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, we did hear a lot of opinions about what gerrymandering was across the board.

You know particular Commissioners accused of having their maps being gerrymandering and you know all sorts of comments about gerrymandering. Go ahead Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I remember that comment up in Flint. But I've also heard it consistently throughout the last year. As we've from different people, different areas of the state. And it may be a miss conception of what gerrymandering is. It may or may not.

But I've heard a lot of comments relative to that. So appreciate it, Dustin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, any additional comments about any of the public hearings? All right so I feel like we've sort of done our debriefing. So at this point do we want to start moving into maps and discussion of maps? Now that we sort of have our talking points? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do we want to do that or do we want to make some decisions based on specific areas? The big topics, not the small ones we are going to take this appendage and move it back and move this thing two streets over or whatever. I would suggest that we do that.

And we decide what we are going to do with Flint. Decide what we are going to do with Grand Rapids and Ottawa County and that way we when we get to the point of adjusting maps, we already know what direction we are headed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I personally would kind of like to see the maps before we make decisions. Because something that is on one map might work on another map and make more sense.

Rather than saying we are definitely going to change this, this and this. I think we need to look at it as a whole and how it affects the areas around it as a whole too.

Just doing due diligence.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree with Commissioner Lange because the reality is we can't definitively say yes, we are going to change this because we know any change, we make has ripple effects on the map.

If we say we definitely change it we could get in the map and think wow we cannot change this because it has other areas that we think need to be preserved.

So I don't think that is going to work very well. Go ahead Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I feel it would work.

That we set the direction.

But we may not be able to accomplish the direction as you state.

So I think we should at least know where we are headed.

At least from a general standpoint on the big issues, there is what only four or five big issues we have to deal with.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well, I still think that even like let's say for example say we voted to or decided we were going to merge Flint, well then when we get to Flint and we do that and we run the metrics and we are like oh, my God these are horrible so now what effect is that decision? I just feel like I feel like we need to be on the maps to make these decisions.

Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I feel we have the maps up and trying to make the changes at that time otherwise we are kind of doing it twice.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I agree.

I need the maps.

I need to see them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are supposed to start with the Senate.

Our process document requires I shouldn't say requires because obviously we can do what we want.

Our process states that we are going to determine the number of maps we are going to present for the 45 day comment period then we move into the maps.

Do we want to make that determination or do we want to look at the maps? I mean because I personally my feeling on that is I'm not so sure I want to say, yes, definitively to for each one.

And then once we look at the maps maybe we want more than two.

Do you know? I feel we should give ourselves maximum flexibility.

Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have to agree.

I want to see them before I say because if there is three that are a good possibility or four or five, I don't want to narrow it down at this particular moment.

Without seeing them and weighing the pros and cons of each.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You're good, you're good.

All right then let's start with the Senate because that is where we are supposed to start according to our process document.

And so for the Senate we have five maps total.

Three, no, wait I'm sorry we have six maps total three that are collaborative, three that are individual.

And I guess my question on that are we only considering the collaborative as a Commission? Are we looking at individual as well in terms of advancing a map? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think our process was we look at the collaborative ones first and then we look at the other.

So we will be looking at all of them.

But I think many of our maps collaborative and personal ones are based off the same map.

So there will be a lot of similarities.

So if we can look at a couple of them together and just see where the differences are and consider those areas maybe.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think this is where we do need to see the individual maps because when we have something different, I think it's the idea.

I think that is what Mr. Morgan was trying to help us.

We are actually recognizing looking at different maps and trying to draw out good ideas. And building one map to sort of like build like and maybe and then talking about those ideas.

Like what is this right, how is the Kalamazoo right area in this map drawn, how is it drawn in another map.

Just seeing how Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Orton we have different maps but they are all going to be like looking at the way that we do it, we have to look at the different maps together and just it's not the maps as a whole.

It's the ideas within the maps.

And how each area is treated.

I see Mr. Morgan's hand too.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I can comment on that.

A tip in the area when you think about the districts see if you can name the constituencies or this is the Grand Rapids south seat. This is the Grand Rapids north seat.

So you will see even though you have six different configurations, you're probably going to have variations on the same concept for those same two seats.

Even though they might be slightly different.

So it's the concept or the constituency you can informally say this is this seat, this is that seat then you can see across the six plans how those two seats are treated.

Are they identical, are they 90% identical.

Or are they very different? And that way you can then quantify your differences and say on five of the six plans they are exactly the same.

On one plan they are different.

And this is the difference.

You can look at your metrics or you can just make your own summaries of what the differences are.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I agree with Commissioner Rothhorn.

I think at this point they are all just plans.

So I don't know if it really matters to distinguish between collaborative versus individual at this point in our process.

Because as Commissioner Orton said, all the collaborative ones are essentially based off of the same thing.

In fact the individual ones are also based off of that by and large.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so do we want to consider looking at metrics as a way to start or do we want to just look at all maps? Some of the maps perform significantly worse than others and do we want to have that factor into our analysis? Just to give an example for Senate.

The Elm was sort of our first dib.

Then we did Spruce then we did cherry so Spruce and cherry are built off of Elm so Elm is the base map and has the worse metrics.

Then Spruce and cherry improve upon that.

Then I think the individual maps at least some of them are built off of Elm as well.

So my question is for Elm do we want to consider that map and look at it or do we want to look at the metrics and say we have two better performing plans and let's go there because they were later maps.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Can we open them and we are arguing about whether to open maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not arguing.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Discussing we are opening maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I think the metrics for all the plans are within scope.

So I don't think I use that as a criteria at this point.

I realize some are better than others.

But I think we just look at them one by one and then maybe go from there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Actually I had a differing opinion of what I was going to say earlier.

I think for efficiency sake and effort to produce put forth like the best maps that we can that we do consider metrics.

Especially since we know that some of them are like our not so favorite starting points.

And then we look to improve and reassess based upon the maps that offer the better metrics.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It would do no good to me to start with something that is already a little deficient.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't think any of the maps were deficient as far as metrics go because we had to meet a certain criteria in order to have them submitted for the public comment.

So if we can start opening them rather than going back and forth.

We all have copies of the metrics that were sent to us prior to them being submitted for public viewing that we can review as we go.

But I say we just throw them up and let's start picking them apart.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right let's start with, Elm because that is ranked at the bottom.

Actually, yeah, let's what did you say? Elm or Lange would be ranked at the bottom for performance so let's start with, Elm.

>> MR. MORGAN: What I did to help I have PDF of all six Senate plans and what I could do is and I have regional sort of pictures of those.

So I could scroll through a single plan's eight different views of the map.

I could also scroll through six plans and what they look like in a particular region.

So I could cut that two different ways.

I've also printed out, sorry printed out I prepared the overview tab from the District data view which could be printed.

So the idea here is all of these PDFs could be printed for you so you could potentially put all six together and look at them at once if you wanted to.

And then I've also got the partisan fairness spreadsheet that is prepared for each of those.

So as far as having metrics available and maps available, I have some way to proceed on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm wondering since John is the professional mapper, I'm wondering if he could just walk us through looking at these things like he would do it if he were making a map.

We can see the information and make our decisions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is your flavor Mr. Morgan what would you like to do?

>> MR. MORGAN: Why don't we set it up so well there is two things.

I don't have your tree titles on the maps that I have.

So we are going to have to do that.

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

But the second step is you could basically prepare a matrix of the six plans and just say, you know, in the UP, the three districts in the UP are exactly the same and five of the six plans.

You just have a check box.

So that might be something you could prepare after as we look through this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Ms. Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

So just from a process standpoint to clarify.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are really quiet.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Just from a process standpoint to clarify you all are going to be reviewing the maps but not making changes at this time.

Or do you plan on making changes to each of the maps?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think what the plan is we are going to look at the maps as a means of reducing the number of maps we are looking at and narrowing it down.

Then at that point we could make potential changes to a map or maps.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think I'm wondering right one of the things we are dealing with is we do have to look at metrics.

We have the fact is that we've got from our analysis, from our Lisa Dr. Lisa Handley said we are 52% democratic state.

Right and that seats-votes ratio feels like an important piece.

What I mean is if we start with it imbalanced the reason we moved in the direction is because I think many of us, I heard it from Commissioner Orton and I really resonate with it I don't need the efficiency gap to be 0.

But I don't want to start backwards if we have something that actually is more representational.

That's the part that is really challenging for me.

I do think there is a metric and maybe we can't agree on it but that is the hard part for me.

I should not say backwards but just like the idea that fairness does we have a metric that helps us understand proportional and we are 52-48.

And that was shared with us.

And so I feel like we should start with something.

Because these districts we are going to have to adjust to get to that representation and if we have already done the work to deny it at this point feels like, yeah.

And yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I think I'm not quite sure if I'm understanding what you're saying.

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

But I think if we are going to go through this exercise where we look at each of the map, we know they are each within you know close to the range we are wanting.

So if we look at each of the maps and then we are trying to kind of consolidate, fix some areas it may change.

Some of the metrics so we will have to look at it again in the new.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think MC's point is why start with something we already did that to.

So like oak map is the base like, Elm map is the base line. We made changes to that map to make it better and so why like particularly I'm just going to pick on the oak map. So the oak map the partisan balance is 54 democratic 56 republican seats with a negative yeah, it's flip-flopped negative partisan bias of democrats with the seats that is a pretty huge imbalance.

Efficiency gap and the margin 3.8 in favor of republicans. Looking at that why would we consider making changes to the map when we can go up to the Peach map or the Pine map and now we've got 55-55 or 56-54.

Either of which are better.

So why would we start with the one that is the most poor performing and hope to change it.

Reality is we already did change it with Peach and Pine.

Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: What I would say it would be pretty simple to just put those in the matrix as well and look District by District and just understand what the differences are. Because if you have two maps maybe when you looked at the and when you say looking at the data you are only talking here about the partisan fairness data.

There is other data as well. But the point is that if you were to look at, say, you know the first two I guess it's Elm and cherry, no, I don't know whatever the two are that you say one is an improvement on another one, at least you can quantify it.

And say well how are they different? So the difference is these Districts are 80% the same and we changed two districts or five districts or whatever it is.

Then you can say okay that's the change.

Then you understand what it is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that.

That is helpful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What you are contemplating is are we doing like shape files or just bringing them up and comparing region by region using PDFs?

>> MR. MORGAN: Do it first by PDFs because that is again something during the break maybe we could contemplate printing those if you think that is a good way to go. And then just the views are not identical, but they are close.

And I think if we can look at the views and you can see what they look like and see if that is a logical way to proceed then you can say, yes, John do more of that.

Or, no, we want something different.

So let me show, you pick the Elm plan first.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: What I'm going to do is to give you an idea what I have ready right now I will show those JPG or the different regions just for that plan.

I can compare two regions or sorry one region over multiple plans as well.

So let me just start with the Elm plan.

Sorry so what I have eight different views.

There is a north which is UP, Central and south which is sort of the larger picture.

So this is the Central not region but this is the Central view let's just call it a view.

And then I've got a separate one for Lansing and Grand Rapids.

So that is two more.

So that is five.

And I've got the thumb as six.

I've got Oakland and Macomb blow up which is 7 then the 8th is Wayne County.

So those are kind of standardized-ish views.

So this Central map you've got again you can kind of see what the districts are in the big picture.

There is in this plan there is a District 34 here, 35 in the middle, 33 down here.

You can see 36, one and 15 and in the thumb it's all there.

I'm just going to cycle through the next one.

So this is focused more on Grand Rapids.

So you've got a District 22.

Which is over in Ottawa County.

You have a north Grand Rapids.

A south Grand Rapids.

And then for this purposes this let's just say this is the Kent north District.

There is some Counties associated with that.

So when I show you this view for another plan, you will see roughly the same four districts, there will be a District here, a District here, here and here.

And so that is the idea you can compare those four districts across multiple plans.

This is the Lansing area.

It's just zoomed in more or less on Lansing.

So you're looking generally at two different seats in the various plans.

This is Oakland County.

And Macomb County.

And it shows you how many districts are roughly in the area so you have 18, 14, 16, you have a 11 that crosses into Wayne.

9 which is primarily Wayne with some of Oakland.

Then you can see the other districts that are coming out of Wayne and then five and 7 are primarily Macomb County districts.

Then here is a southern.

Which you can sort of see the districts so there is 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, 7 in this view essentially.

Just Ann Arbor, I'm including here because it's a better visual.

And then here is the thumb.

And while it does not focus on the thumb, I think we generally know what the outline of the Huron Bay is.

So there is a District here.

Here.

And here.

So you can see those.

And then here is the UP version.

So the UP version there is generally going to be three districts and you will touch a fourth or a fifth here.

Those are the views sort of cutting the state down into bite sized chunks that we can look at.

And then also, again, with each of these plans, all I did was I created a document that would be printable, that is just the matrix for that plan.

So it's the overview tab of the Autobound.

Then I also have got, which is viewable a little harder to print, but we can figure out a way around that, and this is the partisan fairness spreadsheet.

So I have that information for each of the six Senate districts.

And then there is also a way we can overlay them in the redistricting software.

But that gets much more complicated if you're doing more than, say, two or three.

So, again, if you want to look at each plan, sorry, let me just to clarify what I have.

Then here is a version where let's just pick one that is relatively simple.

Here is the UP.

These are all six plans.

With just the view of the UP.

So this one is, let's see, I don't know the tree names are throwing me a little bit, this is 104.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is, Elm.

That is cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, and then here is another one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And that is Spruce.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right, okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There is no changes yet, correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, you are not seeing any.

We could look a little more carefully but generally you have 38, well actually let's be more careful.

So here is your 38 and 37 in the Elm.

So we can look to the interocular test as they say.

All right, so we've got and then this appears to be basically the same.

And if we overlaid them, they would be the same.

And then this is the third plan.

I believe it's also the same for this is the Spruce.

And then this one is a different one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is my individual map.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right, so that is, okay that has got your name on it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's the same.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is the same, right.

And so now this one is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is Rhonda's.

>> MR. MORGAN: Not Senator Senate place Lange, right? So that is different.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So when should we -- what is in your process should we talk about this or just keep going interocular just looking?

>> MR. MORGAN: What I'm trying to do is give you the tools I have handy.

So now you have all six views of just basically those three things.

So if you were doing a matrix, you could say let's look, five of the plans those three districts are exactly the same.

One plan they are different.

How is it different.

You know, is it you could look at the metric and say it's different on the metric or the metrics are basically the same but a different configuration of populations.

You could quantify it with a different name.

You could say, well, in this you know this District how do you quantify what the differences are.

You can use the metrics that is helpful but you can use a quick descriptor to say the real difference is Sault St. Marie is different.

Or it probably is more to do with the District 36.

Or since we have the author of the plan here, we could ask the author of the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so it looks like for the Upper Peninsula region Eid Szetela Pine Spruce and Elm are the same.

Is everybody seeing that the same? The Lange map has some changes to the Upper Peninsula.

Anybody disagree with this assessment?

>> MR. MORGAN: We could focus on the areas where the boundaries are like you can see this boundary line is what you are really looking at here between 37 and 38. Then the outer boundary of 37 and 36.

So again this is you said Elm.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 04 is, Elm.

That is cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: So it looks like it's the same boundary here and here so same. And then this is just.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is Spruce.

>> MR. MORGAN: Spruce is the same with this boundary, right? And looks like it's the same there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: And you know we could look a little more carefully to see if 36 is exactly the same or not.

Okay and then this is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is my individual.

>> MR. MORGAN: Individual, okay.

And that appears to be the same.

Is it? Maybe it's not.

No, it appears to be the same.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I did not make any changes that I remember.

>> MR. MORGAN: As the author you can say I didn't make any changes and now you know it's the same.

Now this is different.

So what is different is from my read on in the numbers are different.

So you know we may consider this might be a good time to renumber things or not.

And it looks like the primary difference is Sault St. Marie is the community, the City, the Township around it, the Sue is in with the rest of the western UP.

And District -- it's numbered District 2 but basically the Traverse City north to the bridge is configured a little differently.

And then this District is you know it's configured differently.

We could describe how it is configured for those three districts.

And this is the Eid map, which is I think if I'm looking at this it's the same boundary in 38 and 37 and presumably 36.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid do you remember making changes? Okay, yep.

Okay.

All right, do you want to move on to another region or does anyone else want to look at this further?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think this is where -- so Commissioner Lange I think earlier you were saying like it might be useful to talk about.

Is this a good time for you to talk about that change or do you want to help us understand why you did it differently or is this not the right time?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That is up to the Commission as a whole.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are here go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't know what you want to know.

Obviously, they are different for the UP.

My maps obviously were not based on any of the collaborative maps.

I did them all based on VRA.

One vote, one person.

Population and communities of interest to the best of my recollection.

The UP split was different because I was trying to remember and mind you, I could not get the thematics or the dots on our mapping thing to work for me at the time.

So I was trying to remember where the bands of the American Indian populations in the UP were.

I know from doing my own research that there was quite a few in the Baraga County.

I also took into consideration community of interest as far as Marquette saying they wanted to be with them.

I tried to split as few as what I could to maintain the population.

As we go south, there was comments about people from certain Counties relating more to the west side of the state.

So I tried to incorporate that.

The District that also looks like steps, those are rural areas.

It also includes my area.

It was population wise taking in consideration how rural they are and trying to get the population correct.

If you went even lower to the -- I don't know how low you want to go.

I mean are we looking at just this portion?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can just stop because we didn't go down that far on the map so you can kind of stop there.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may again, I brought this up in Autobound and overlaid.

Since we have five of the District plans are the same, I used the Elm plan as the base and overlaid the one District plan that is a little bit different.

So if you decided again this is where you would look towards in just a general sense rather than discarding a map you can take an idea from a map and add it in to your maps moving forward.

So if you decided you like Commissioner Lange's map in this area, you could you know, do those three districts in that way.

And you could just put them into your plan.

That's one way to handle it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, Rhonda, it's hard for me to see part of the map but you have Cheboygan going to the west rather than the east on this.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point to Cheboygan here.

I'm bringing up the map myself.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's the same as ours.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's the same as ours.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just in the UP she has the line different and 36.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is what I couldn't see.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I couldn't see it well but I believe it's all the same except like between 36 and 37, the line is on top of each other.

Is that right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, on this boundary that is correct.

So if you think about it this way in the combination of 38 and 37, there are differences. Sorry but the outer edges are the same between 38 and 37 as it gets down here. And then 36 is different here.

With the Elm plan has Arenac, Saranac, Iosco and Ogemaw. And Commissioner Lange's map goes to Osceola and Clare.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I would think our next step we take is either take these two ideas forward since there is only two ideas here or talk about them and see if we want to change anything and incorporate them together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I would agree and seems how we want to move forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to move forward on a Section by Section or map by map basis?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The part that makes me nervous is doing UP down I feel we want to go population centers.

That is the only other thing I would say so yeah, I think we learned right as we did map that we needed to be in the population centers and sort of move out from there to understand all the ripples, right, that is what I mean.

If we are rippling that is the only part.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may if you want to postpone any votes or decision making, you could just make a note and say these are the differences.

So you understand now what the differences are and there are many.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which is what I'm doing.
Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'd like to comment on that population about the ripple effect coming from the more populated areas. That ripple effect, the rural areas still have voices too. And they should be given just as much consideration as the urban areas. So that ripple effect let's concentrate on the urban areas and however it affects the rural areas is not going to fly with me.

I'm sure that is not how you meant it.

It's kind of how it came across.

Because the rural areas do have their own concerns.

And I don't want them discounted because there is more urban areas that might take more time.

But their voice is no less important than anybody else in the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I won't disagree with you but I do recognize too the makeup of the urban and rural is very different.

The racial makeup for me is my concern.

There has been historical legacies of the right the Black population not getting representation early on.

So that is all I'm suggesting is that to recognize that we are doing something historic here.

That we are trying to make a difference with people who have been marginalized for centuries.

That's what I'm recognizing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so John if we can move on to another area, I think everybody has had to take notes about what the differences are here. If we can move to the west side and compare those maps.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will just call that Grand Rapids.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Grand Rapids area.

>> MR. MORGAN: So we will do that and again are you liking this style so far? Just in terms of comparison.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Again at the break, you know, if you like the style then I could have another member of the team try to prep some other maps possibly.

Okay so we will bring up Grand Rapids.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Shall I start and do the all six together? Does that work okay?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at the reference this is so-4 so this is, Elm.

You will see different configurations let's talk about what we have here.

So there is one District here that is primarily Ottawa County.

There is a Grand Rapids north, Grand Rapids south.

And then the fourth District is the treatment of Kent.

I'm trying to de-emphasize in this discussion these two districts because they are primarily in another region.

So this is basically a view that gives you three basically four districts, okay, so this is the Elm plan.

And this is the cherry plan, okay, and they are probably the same.

And, again, you know I don't recall there being substantial changes in this area.

This is another plan.

So this is the Spruce plan, I think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes Spruce.

>> MR. MORGAN: It appears the Districts are the same just for those four districts.

And this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is my individual.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is your individual plan.

So this appears to be the same for those four districts.

So four out of four.

All right, and now this is Commissioner Lange's District.

So, again, even though this is a different configuration, I'm primarily focusing on one District here and the differences you know you can see that this has Muskegon whereas other districts didn't.

And then you have a north and a south Grand Rapids configured differently but still generally north and south.

And then de-emphasizing the southern and really picking the north.

You could go either way.

You could say okay this is the fourth District or this is the fourth District.

I would tend to say it's this number six.

So six, 7, 11 and 12.

And again different configuration.

And then I believe this is the Eid plan and I think this is a little different though.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It has a little drop down there.

>> MR. MORGAN: So there is a difference here so again it's 1, 2, 3, 4 districts and it is a little different.

It does not -- these Townships are not being taken in the south.

So somewhere along the way you know this plan is going to have to rotate that population out of view in some other way.

Okay, so it looks like there is probably three different options that are being looked at in this area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So can we go back to one of the prior collaborative ones and compare it against Anthony's? So he brings down into three that part goes up into 33 instead.

Okay, that is helpful.

>> MR. MORGAN: We have not looked at the specific metrics but you can also do that, isolating these four districts if you wanted to could bring up the metrics for each of these four districts and look at your partisan numbers, your demographic numbers if you wanted to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right any questions Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So how about we start with focusing on the differences between the north Grand Rapids and south Grand Rapids District for all these. Because it looks like there is only one difference.

And from there we can look at other areas.

So to accomplish that it seems that either the you know elm cherry of Spruce would be a base map and I would pick one of those to put down as a base then I can bring up the Eid map on top of it and the Lange map on top of it separately.

Then you could compare them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Don't you have Elm open right now?

>> MR. MORGAN: I do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you just layer on Elm since it's already open?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, no problem.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, I love what John has been doing to help you guys out.

The one thing that I would just be cautious of is when you're talking about the matrixes that have been developed, either the partisan one or the Voting Rights Act one, those tend to look at overall plans, not the individual regions that we're looking at.

So just be cognizant of that.

Don't get confused by bringing up a partisan index for the Grand Rapids area because it's so much impacted by other things around there.

So just be cognizant of potentially keeping those kind of concepts a little bit separated.

>> MR. MORGAN: And to build on what Kim said, we have the data available.

And then if you are looking again with comparison for the four or five districts in the view you could look at the individual numbers if you wanted to.

They are just available.

And I think Kim's point is especially when you're looking at the plan as a whole you wouldn't take the regional approach.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I know John was saying if we wanted to have the same system with the Congress and house, did we decide we wanted to do that? He had to tell people.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think we do.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, all right, so again during the break I will try to confer with Kim and Kent and see if we can move forward and that and I will focus on the Senate today.

This is the Lange version.

You can see it's different.

But it's already here so let's look at that first so that you just understand what the differences are.

And it is different.

So you know in this case you have Ottawa associated with districts to the south most of Ottawa County and this takes Muskegon and I believe Grand Haven and this part of Ottawa.

And then it looks like in this case the Grand Rapids north seat instead of going into Ottawa it stays in Kent County.

And then the Grand Rapids south seat again the red line it's a different boundary.

I don't know whether that is closer to the Wealthy Street boundary or not.

And then it takes a Township over here.

And looks like it takes a little more over in this area.

So again conceptually even though you will see there are differences in metrics, on these seats they are conceptually a Grand Rapids north, Grand Rapids south, and then Ottawa to the Lake.

And then your remainder District again this is where because they are different it's hard to tell what is what.

But the area of the District that has most of Kent County would go up to Newaygo and it looks like it goes, hang on.

I have another plan on.

Let me turn that off.

Right so the District 6 is more similar to the Elm plan District 34 but without Muskegon.

So those are the differences.

I guess if I had to describe it the differences are really the treatment of Muskegon.

Muskegon is in an Ottawa focused District here or in the Elm it's Muskegon plan along the lakeshore.

All right.

Then you want me to bring up the Eid variation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, the Eid version, the Eid creation.

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe while we are there or when we are at each one it would be helpful if the Commissioner who created that could explain the reasoning behind.

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

So we can see if that is something we want to consider or not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay for Grand Rapids obviously, yes, north, south split or however you want to say it.

I tried to include Rockford.

We received public comment Rockford saw themselves as a bedroom suburbs of Grand Rapids.

There are definitely some rural areas out on the outskirts of Kent County.

So I tried to put those with more rural areas.

I tried to make sure that and this map confused me so I'm bringing up my own.

I made sure that Cascade which is where the airport is was included with the City.

And also Ada because we had a lot of comments about Ada so I made sure those were included because there was a lot of back and forth about whether they should or whether they shouldn't agree Cascade should be with Grand Rapids, it holds their airport.

That's pretty much the split for Grand Rapids.

I tried to look on the map to try to expand it and bring it.

The best I could.

I honestly it was almost a straight other than certain districts.

I wanted to try and at least keep voting precincts together.

I tried not to go down to the block level.

When we get into the big City, bigger cities sometimes it's hard.

So that's kind of how some of the you will see I guess little points stick up, but that is the reasoning for that.

I tried to keep whole precincts whole and not split up by blocks is that good enough for Grand Rapids for the Commission?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: What about the Muskegon area?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The Muskegon area was a little harder because there was conflicting about putting it with Grand Rapids and raising the voices.

We also had public comment about it being an agricultural in certain areas plus a lakeshore community.

So trying to take into consideration I knew that at one point you were trying to work the maps over into Grand Rapids.

So this was something different.

It was kind of about options for the public to look at.

And pretty much communities of interest.

I wanted to make sure and keep Muskegon whole.

The City of Muskegon.

Which was very important because that's where the population as far as your communities of colors go.

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

And I also know that Grand Haven well Ottawa County had talked about the diversity they have also with the Hispanic population.

So I was hoping that I could still get a little bit of a grouping in there to maybe lift voices up.

Again, my -- I was not able to get I call them the dots up.

So whether or not I did a good job.

But I figured if it was bad, the public would let me know.

I don't know how else to put it.

I'm just going to be honest.

And again I tried to maintain Township lines the best I could.

I tried to maintain in certain areas the County lines.

If the population allowed for it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, and also if you wanted to, you could bring up the spreadsheets or you know and I take out those four districts and just look at them side by side if you wanted to.

That's another option.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While we are here, yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would like to do that.

We have what 24 and 11, 23 versus 12, oh, boy going to get confused 22 versus 8 and 34 versus what? 34.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is where you really do have a difference.

So in this case I would call six is the one that is you know kind of Kent County focused. But it's almost like 6 and 34 are more congruent because Commissioner Lange's six as far as I can see is basically the same as 34 except for not having Muskegon.

That's a pretty substantial difference.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there anything else?

>> MR. MORGAN: So you want to look at the two plans side by side or do you want to look at Commissioner Eid's version as well?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well I think we want to look at the metrics for this plan versus Elm.

I'm concerned about voting rights population.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, well, all right.

Sorry Commissioner Eid it looks like.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange actually has her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to give one more comment about Muskegon.

And as far as the County goes there was also public comment about Oceana Newaygo and Muskegon being kept together because of the school systems.

The Agriculture and there was a special program and I don't recall off the top of my head that affects the school aged kids there.

It sounded like less we will just say some of the lower income, less fortunate type of school systems.

I don't remember exactly how they put it.

But there was a special program put in place for those three Counties according to public comment.

So I was trying to accommodate that the best I could also with population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> MR. MORGAN: So in this case, this is the Elm the overview tab from the Elm plan and it's the same but saved in an excel file.

And so what I will do is I will do a comparison of these.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are you going to do a comparison or put them side by side?

>> MR. MORGAN: Because of the District numbers I think it will be better for me to pull them out and put them in like side by side.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Something close to that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wasn't sure how you would do comparison with the differing District numbers.

>> MR. MORGAN: They are not going to be exact but you will be close in some of the areas.

So in the base plan the Elm plan we have, sorry, 23, 22, 23, 24 and I guess 33.

We say 11 is closer to 24 and 12 is closer to 23.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, John, this is great.

>> MR. MORGAN: Again for purposes of discussion here we are going to say 7 is close to 22.

Okay so the most congruent districts are 11 and 12 and 23, 24.

So you can look at the metrics across here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think was the Black voting age population is one of the reasons we were looking at a southern and northern Grand Rapids District.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so again the reference here so the northern one is 24.

So and the Elm plan the African/American population on that is 5%.

And then in the Lange it's 8%.

Non-Hispanic African/American population.

Then you also have the total minority percentage so in this case it's 21.7.

And then in the other seat, which is the southern seat, 23 and 12.

So it's 15 percentage African/American in 23 and 12%, 12.2% in 12.

And then again, we are looking at in the District 22 and the Elm configuration it's 1% non-Hispanic Black and in the -- this is where Muskegon is with Grand Haven it's 9% for African/American and Hispanic numbers are here as well.

So this version of 22 has some of the Hispanic population, is higher than in this.

But I do think Commissioner Lange was saying the Hispanic population would have been in the southern part of Ottawa County.

That's my understanding.

And then the districts that are very different are going to be 33 and 6.

And again this doesn't show a lot on those differences.

But again we know that they are very different because Muskegon is in with District 7 here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right, so one of the things we can maybe look at is the southern right where she is including Cascade Township which includes more of the Grand Rapids area, that is southern District, which was 12 on her map, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, it's 12 and it has a different dividing line here but it does include Cascade.

So Cascade is in 12.

And it's not in 23.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right but includes Georgetown also, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: No, I think Georgetown is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In another one.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you. Can you go back to the numbers again, please? And 12 District 12 was I see it now, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Since we are looking at numbers now, if you brought up Commissioner Eid's version, we could add them to the comparison and you would have all three plans in one spreadsheet if you wanted to.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right, okay, that makes sense to me. How do other Commissioners feel? Okay I'm seeing some nodding heads. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So mine doesn't have any Grand Rapids changes. It just has changes to the areas around Grand Rapids.

That is because I didn't want to change the collaborative Grand Rapids configuration that we deliberately made.

We can still look at it if y'all want.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Mr. Morgan was suggesting is then we have -- this is the best -- this is an alternative to it.

That does have the Cascade, Ada in the Senate maps. I think, yeah, they wanted us to make sure we got it right in the house maps also.

Is that your memory, Commissioner Lange? I can't remember if it was in the Senate maps and the house maps that we didn't have it, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It was in both.

And when they said about Ada and Cascade the comments were when you were doing the Grand Rapids 6 or however, they called it, that Cascade and Ada should be included in some of those districts that combined with Grand Rapids.

But it was definitely saying that Cascade and Ada were associated with and a part of Grand Rapids as the City goes.

And the big one was Cascade because of the airport.

>> MR. MORGAN: And, again, I would just say that in this case, you might be able to -- if you like the way Commissioner Lange has dealt with Ada and Cascade you could take those districts only and put them into a version of the collaborative plan if you wanted to.

That would be something that would be relatively easy to do as a module just put that in or not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think it's the read I want to get the Black voting age population and a read or a coalition District or something like that.

It feels like what would be helpful for me.

I'm wondering if Mr. Adelson has a thought?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Rothorn I appreciate you know what you are saying and the thought of a coalition District.

I think for now we are very interested as your process unfolds.

And we can certainly address the issues that you're mentioning as you go forward.

I think that the -- as you said, looking at the minority population the way you mentioned, I think that that is always significant.

As the Commission moves forward with whichever maps and reconfigurations the Commission decides we will be able to talk about that more in the future if that is okay with you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Absolutely.

At this point there is a 39% versus 36% and that is significant.

I'm just going to bookmark that and bring up that question later for a coalition District.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think that is a great point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so are we going to look at Commissioner Eid's Grand Rapids area or not? I feel if there is no changes this probably is not something we need to do.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is the partisan fairness spreadsheet if you wanted to look at those districts on that data as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not particularly interested in looking at like an individual District for partisan fairness.

I feel like it's a whole map analysis.

Personally.

I don't know if anyone -- I don't want to look District by District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we were actually given that very advice we can't look at it so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can't.

Okay, so okay can we move on to another region and try to cover another region before we go to lunch? I'm sorry Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So is this do you think this is the time where we might want to make the change to at least the collaborative version? For that wealthy Fulton Street or should we do that after we are done?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have not picked a map to work off so no so we would have to do it five times.

No, we need to settle on a map first.

Okay so Mr. Morgan, can you bring up another region? I don't know what your next region is.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let's go ahead and do the south because that's not you know, there is six or seven Districts that are kind of in that area.

And I think it's just a bigger picture to look at, at this level.

So in this view again these are the Districts that I would just point out.

So you have a District here that's Benton Harbor.

You have the District that's along the border with Indiana and Ohio.

You have a Kalamazoo focused District.

I don't know again what you would name this District but it's outside of Kalamazoo.

I'm going to skip over the Lansing area.

And then you've got Jackson, if you wanted to include Ann Arbor in this discussion I would just because it's easy to see it in this view.

And then you've got Monroe and Lenawee.

So 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 districts roughly and you will see configurations so focusing on the 7 districts generally.

And this is the Elm map.

So I will move on to the next one.

And this is the cherry map.

So I'm going to go backwards first so we can look back at the Elm map.

And here is the cherry map.

So the configurations are fairly similar for these four.

I don't know if there is any actual differences in them.

So that's one where we probably look side by side and say they are the same in this area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, if I remember correctly some of those changes were made for plan deviation so they are small but they are bringing the plan deviation down below 5%.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the next one.

So this is the Spruce.

So looks like these four districts are the same.

It looks like they are basically the same.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So that is my individual map which splits Ann Arbor.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so the primary difference here, these four Directors are roughly the same.

But there is substantial difference in Ann Arbor so this is Ann Arbor going west.

Ann Arbor north going west.

Including Jackson.

So, again, if I had to describe this, you know, I would say this is Ann Arbor Jackson.

And this is greater Ann Arbor Ypsilanti and then I don't know what this would be called.

And then the Monroe Lenawee combination is similar.

Just a slightly different Township configuration.

And you know those are differences.

And then here is Commissioner Lange's map.

And these are different in these area the Kalamazoo seat is not too far off, different Township configurations.

The border District doesn't go all the way to the Lake.

We are skipping over Lansing.

I'm just going to Zoom in a little bit here.

This has a split of Ann Arbor with Monroe.

And then the balance of Ann Arbor but not including Jackson.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Again if you were doing a grid it looks like four of the plans are basically the same and we have one more.

And this is, did I miss it? Hang on.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think the southwest corner of District 9 in Lange's map is also significantly different.

There is I think it's Allegan and Van Buren that are together there? If I remember correctly, if I remember the Counties names.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is Van Buren and this is Allegan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is Allegan up there.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is let's see that is the Lange version.

And then this is the other version.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm just remembering if I remember that is one of the things we wrote down in our little right that there was a native population and agricultural connection with those two.

That is all I'm trying to remember.

Anyway okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: And here is the Eid version here.

And this is also different.

So in this case you've got Cass here.

Kalamazoo to Battle Creek.

So that is a little different.

You've got Ann Arbor to Jackson.

And then this has Ann Arbor going into the Detroit area.

To Novi.

So in this case you probably have three variations, generally one through four are the same.

Including the Szetela option of yours is different sorry I guess you have four options.

So the collaborative maps are the same and individuals are different.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, my map changes Ann Arbor but that is it.

Then Eid and Lange have many changes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: Exactly.

So I don't know how you know if you would make a chart of those in some way but that would be again just understanding what you have if you are going to discuss and negotiate things.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any comments or thoughts about these? Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I can tell you why I made those changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If that is what y'all would like.

It's pretty simple really.

I was trying to both respect communities of interest and do better on partisan fairness.

And I think a configuration like this does both of those.

Because every District there represents a community of interest.

It may not be a community of interest that I agree with or that we all agree with.

But it is a community of interest.

And the partisan fairness numbers are a heck of a lot better than some of the maps.

As Battle Creek and Kalamazoo we talked about earlier Berrien, St. Joe and Cass together.

It has Hillsdale, Branch, Calhoun and the remainder of Jackson and Kalamazoo Counties together.

And then it has parts of Jackson, the City of Jackson, and the County of Jackson with Washtenaw County.

And you know I think we have heard all of the collaborative maps have that Z configuration for Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti.

And I think one of the avenues we might want to look at is breaking up that area. If you do that it also allows you to maintain other communities of interest for example the Ann Arbor to Novi community of interest.

And then going more into Oakland County the West Bloomfield Farmington Hills Commerce Township community of interest.

Which this does.

Then you can have like Waterford and White Lake be with the other northern Oakland County areas such as independence Township.

So, yeah, that is the gist of it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right so to explain what I did with my map can we go back to mine? Because it really is that Ann area.

Can you Zoom into Ann Arbor a little bit.

Yep so, we received abundant public comment about breaking up Ann Arbor.

And we also received quite a bit of comment about Jackson wanting to be with the west side of Ann Arbor.

So I.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: West side Washtenaw.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No Jackson being with the west side of Ann Arbor, both, so that was why I made this change.

And it dramatically improves the overall performance of the map.

It drops the efficiency gap to .7 and the mean median to .6 then still preserves those communities of interest.

Without having to make other wholesale changes to the map.

So it's just that small change in those two districts dramatically improves the map.

Rhonda did you want to comment on your map?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I did my best to take into consideration communities of interest.

We had a lot of comments about the border Counties, keeping them on the border. We had comments and I'm not exactly sure if I got that right or not.

12th hour mapping.

I kept recalling Michiana. And I may have, I'll admit it, I may have gotten the Counties wrong but the corner Counties there and I don't know if that is what they referred to as Michiana but remember public comment on that.

Some major ones there is debate about Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti.

Keep them together.

They are a community of interest, split them up.

So I decided to split them up and see what happens.

As far as partisan fairness, the maps fell well within the means that were prescribed by Dr. Handley.

They may not be as low as others, but the main thing I looked at like I said were the top three criteria.

And then I made adjustments as needed for partisan fairness.

So that's all I've got.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, well we are just about at our lunch break.

So I think we will just without objection Dustin I saw your hand up at one point do you have a comment or are you good? Okay all right without objection we will recess until 2:00.

It's currently 12:57.

Hearing no objections we are in recess until 2:00.

[Lunch recess]

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hi Juanita.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:07 p.m.

Will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending today's meeting remotely please disclose during roll call you are attending remotely and where you are attending from, I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending from Detroit, Michigan.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Eaton County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We left off and reviewing with Mr. Morgan comparisons of the Senate maps and gone through the UP and Grand Rapids and the south and now we are going to move on to I'm guessing maybe Lansing area.

Is that what is the next one?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, we can do Lansing.

Again there is basically just two districts that are kind of in that area.

Also did you want to look at any of the metrics for the southern Section? Because you did look at the different options for the Grand Rapids area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I mean does anyone particularly want to look at that or do we want to continue comparing the District shapes? Not seeing strong opinions so let's continue doing the shapes.

>> MR. MORGAN: So just focusing on the view that is here this is a view centered on Lansing and some of the other districts you know you can see in the surrounding area but basically, you're looking at two districts that are in and around Lansing.

So this is the Elm map I believe.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

There we go.

Then this is the cherry map.

So they are the same I believe.

Yep, different colors.

All right.

And then this is the map.

And this is Commissioner Szetela's map.

Same in the Lansing area I believe and then this is different.

This is Commissioner Lange's map.

This has Lansing in one District and East Lansing.

And then this is Commissioner Eid's map, which it looks like it's substantially similar in the Lansing area but has a different footprint on the out boundaries.

Yeah, it looks like it's a little different configuration on this side.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That might be because of changes in Ann Arbor, yep.

Commissioner Rothhorn can you facilitate for a few minutes for me so I can take care of something?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, so I think at this point we want to Commissioner Eid did you want to say any more about your changes and Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Lange changes that you or yeah why okay no changes for Commissioner Szetela.

Commissioner Eid, I think.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The Lansing area stayed pretty much the same.

I think two districts is the way to go here.

As I said earlier the Ann Arbor District changed which is south of this.

So changing that for population reasons still having to keep population within the correct amounts to change -- add some Townships here and there to 31.

Yeah, I mean that is the gist of it.

Everything else is pretty much the same.

It's just for population balance, having a few different Townships here or there.

Because of those communities of interest in Ann Arbor and then as you can see in District 10 having Ann Arbor the northeast side of Ann Arbor which has the large Asian American population connected to Novi which also has a large Asian American population.

So once again it respects both communities of interest and brings the partisan fairness numbers down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Naming the community the Asian community in particular is that correct? And Novi Ann Arbor, is that right?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is one of them.

There is also Livingston County wanting to remain as whole as possible.

It does that in 31.

It adds in a little Ingham County.

There is a community of interest between Jackson and Washtenaw, Jackson and Ann Arbor that is also supported in this configuration.

And also the northern Oakland County districts as well.

You can see an 18 over there.

You have Waterford, White Lake, those areas connected to you know Highland rose spring field Orion, Holly.

All of those able to be connected.

While still maintaining the Southfield Pontiac districts that we have further east for that community of interest.

So because when if you recall when we made the original collaborative map, I was not really satisfied with how the suburbs were because we had that wall of Southfield up to Pontiac which this configuration keeps just changes Ann Arbor to make, again, support both communities of interest and partisan fairness numbers.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, Commissioner Lange did you want to speak to your map?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Sure.

It was taken it from a different point of view.

We had public comment about East Lansing saying that Lansing is very much a part of them.

The college communities, the students that live in East Lansing.

So it was giving a different approach to communities of interest to present to the public, something to look at.

And that was pretty much the reason for doing it is to give a view of a different community of interest that was expressed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'll pass for now.

I got to formulate my thought.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we go back to Rhonda's map there.

Is that it here? Okay, I just want to study it for a minute.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While you're studying Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We are looking at Lansing but I just for District 13, in the Grand Rapids, I was curious to the thought process behind what looks to be a key at the top going into District 11.

What is that? For why was that done? I was just curious.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: There was a lot of comment about rural areas and wanting to remain rural when we looked at now, I'm going to blank out, Dustin.

The County name.

There was one particular County that was, oh, goll darn it.

Any way, it was taken into consideration some of the areas that might be a little more rural and putting them together.

Thank you.

It was Barry County had mentioned, wait, that did not include Barry, did it? It did.

Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: It does.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry I got to go back to my map.

Barry County said they would prefer to stay with more rural areas because they are an agricultural and very rural area.

So I tried to take I'm not from Lansing so I don't know but I figured areas more to the west of Lansing in the County would probably be more rural.

I know that when you look to the east in Kent County, that you start getting into a more rural area.

So the thought behind it was again putting rural communities together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right, thank you.

Okay anyone want to see any of the numbers so to speak comparing of numbers in a chart, spreadsheet? I'm not seeing anybody, okay.

I guess I'm interested in the -- because of the Lansing area there were comments.

I would like to see if you know comparison with Lange's map and I guess the other split. Like is there a minority population or what that you know what the, yeah, what the numbers would look like.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so are we in agreement that most of the maps have the same footprint in Lansing?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: So for that purpose I'll just use the Elm map for comparison.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

All right so 30 and 32.

And then 19 is the one that is Lansing focused.

So as a counter point would you pick 13 or 21?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good question.

We are not going to see much.

It just occurred to me, yeah, we're not going to see much.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay the 19 I'll just do that one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do 13 and 19.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: MC I would go the other direction because then you are moving towards Ann Arbor.

It might make a difference compared to the rural region of 13.

I would probably go 21.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do that 19 and 21 then.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let me reverse these.

No, I guess not.

Lansing is in 30 and East Lansing is in 32.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Lansing is in 30 and Lansing is in 19, okay, yep.

So a small uptick in the minority population and not, okay.

That is useful.

Okay, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay do you want to move to another region?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so we've got Central, we've got Oakland Macomb, we have Wayne and we have the thumb.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Whatever order you have been going in I think we just continue.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's fine.

I'll just go ahead and do Central.

Okay so the Central view you can see District 35 is in the visual center of this.

But we got District 34 which is the lakeshore District 35 is Central 36 we have seen on other views now you can see the southern boundary of 36.

So looks like it has two Townships of Bay and there is Arenac so that is 36.

Then we've looked at 33.

We've looked at 32.

Here is 15.

All right so I guess if we are looking in this area it's probably 34, 35, you know maybe one other District.

Okay and then this is the cherry districts.

So it's a little different between 35 and 33.

Here.

Looks like 34 is the same.

36, sorry, is a little different.

Yeah.

It's a little different up here.

But conceptually it's the same.

And now looking at the Spruce map I believe, yep.

So I would say this brings 35 a little more to the south and a little less to the west.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Brings 33 north, uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep.

Okay, and then this is Commissioner Lange's map.

And again her District, her version of what is in other plans District 36 goes a little more to the west.

There is a different configuration as we discussed earlier with Muskegon.

So this District is similar to the other districts 34.

This District 5 is different.

And then this District 4 we can talk about that in the thumb or here.

But this is Bay City or Bay County, generally Midland.

And then this is Commissioner Eid's map.

And it looks like it's the same configuration in 36 and 34.

35 is substantially the same.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Can you go back to the previous one?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, stop me, I guess.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Right there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Are my eyes playing tricks on me District 3 there is a little spike.

>> MR. MORGAN: No that is correct.

This is a little bit of population up here.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That seems unusually odd to me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange do you want to talk to that piece? I think that was your map.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, it's because of the layout.

If you go up there around the Oscoda area, you will see there is almost like a -- it's not quite a peninsula.

But there's what is it called cedar Lake that runs down through it.

And so the area around it that is connected again remember I took into consideration Townships especially in the rural areas Counties, Townships when doing this.

And that just so happens that that is kind of how that comes out and for population wise. It was nothing that was done for any.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I wasn't saying that it was done purposely or not.

I thought it looked weird and wondering if my eyes were playing tricks on me.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No your eyes are not playing tricks on you whatsoever.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I heard you say Oscoda but it's Alcona and Oscoda between those?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Right and actually.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Want to make sure we are talking about the same spike.

Lincoln junction looks like.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: When you look at the Lake do you see where the Lake on the map there can you see where the Lake ends? It goes between the two Counties. It stretches between the two Counties so it's trying to keep that area together in conjunction with that Lake.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so this is the Central region we are looking at.

Thank you, John.

And can you summarize? You do a nice job of summarizing it for us John.

How many changes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so let's go back through them.

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

This is the collaborative map the Elm map and looking at 34, 35 maybe 33 and 36 and then the next version it's a little different between 36 and 34 so this is the whole County version of 34.

And then this version has a little less.

Sorry let me get this.

I guess it's Manistee.

Maybe.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That looks right.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then looks it's different between 35 and 33.

Yeah, there you go 35 and 33 there is a difference here.

And then this version is the Spruce version.

And it looks like that reverts back to the -- this, well maybe is it the same boundary?

Yeah, looks like it's the same boundary as the Elm map.

And then the differences down here is a little different in 35.

And did we say 33 came, yeah, 33 came more northerly up here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, and then this is out of order.

No, that is the Spruce one.

Okay.

Yeah, okay so Elm, cherry, Spruce.

And this is Commissioner Szetela's map which seems to be the same as the cherry in this area.

Okay, so Szetela and cherry are the same in this.

And then Elm and Spruce are the same.

And then in the Lange map again we talked about this District 34 is different without Muskegon so it goes into Kent County here to get population.

And then District 3 goes here and then that's different configuration in the Bay County Midland area.

And Commissioner Eid's keeps the whole County District 34 same configuration on 36 and it looks like on 35.

Yep.

So same configuration 34, 35 and 36 as Elm so three of the plans have the same configuration.

Then we have two are the same.

The Szetela and cherry.

Thank you.

And then Commissioner Lange's is different.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, do we want to see any numbers, folks? Nope.

Okay.

Commissioner Lange?

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

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If you don't mind MC, could I talk a little bit about the difference in mine and why they are the way they are?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, let's start with the Midland.

That will be quick.

We've had testimony both sides of the aisles.

This one I thought was a good compromise.

When we talk about the watershed it was even brought up earlier from Commissioner Szetela that Bay City, Bay County has part of that watershed too.

So I included them actually as a compromise in this map.

When we did another map with Arenac being more northern, I remember the comment they associated more with Bay County so I included Arenac County and included Gladwin County because that's what we heard a lot about.

Is Midland and Gladwin.

And the other two connecting Counties above it population wise.

When we look at Mecosta, Isabella, Montcalm and Gratiot, two sheriffs asked to keep them together because their offices interact with each other and collaborate on cases.

And we also had public comment when we were actually at CMU and I don't remember if it was from the president or a student about possibly is it possible to get Isabella County and Gratiot County together because you have Central Michigan University and Alma college which shares similar interests.

And I believe working together for Federal for funding for the school or something like that.

So I had tried to accommodate them as well.

When you see the little dip though down into Mecosta County that goes up with three pardon me on mine it's three.

But when you see that dip, that's not necessarily something I wanted to do.

But for population deviation it had to be done.

So what I did is I went in and I'm very familiar again this is my area.

That strange charter Township which includes Hawkins which basically consists of a little bar and a wonderful golf course.

The intimidator go.

But my reasoning for adding it in with the other one, wait, no, I'm sorry.

That was on a different map.

That particular area is Paris.

Which is not in the City of big Rapids and closely associated, very rural.

It consists basically of a store, a little pizza place and a lot of rural areas.

So I figured it would fit in good.

I don't like splitting if I don't have to.

I think everybody knows.

But it was necessary for the population deviation.

So that's why that one was there.

And I think that pretty much, I already talked about the others with the Newaygo and Oceana but that kind of explains the whole Central County idea there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Lange.

Commissioner Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I did not say earlier that Midland the watershed drained into Bay.

It drains into Saginaw so I want to clarify that the Tittabawassee runs to Saginaw.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My apologies.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right any other comments or clarifications on maps? Before we move on to the next region? Area? We are heading to the thumb. Here we come.

Yum, yum.

>> MR. MORGAN: So in the thumb area, you know for purposes of discussion we are including Flint in that.

So there is a District here that includes all of Flint, there is a District that is the rest of mostly the rest of Genesee County, this District here.

It's Saginaw outside the City.

And then Genesee County and most of Lapeer.

And then you have District 1 up here which is Midland, Bay City and Saginaw.

So again 1, 2, 3, 4 districts basically we are looking at.

We can also I think we talked about 32 already.

And then this District, this version is similar for 1.

And four but it's different in 15.

And 25.

So this is the cherry version.

And then this is back to the original configuration from Elm and that is in the Spruce version.

So 1, 2, 3, 4 seats.

And then the Szetela version is that's going to be back to the cherry, I think.

Yep.

And then this is the Lange version.

So in this case as Commissioner Lange pointed out, the District 4 is Midland and Bay Counties and then to the north and then you have Saginaw and I believe this is Livingston.

And then you have a different configuration of Flint, but Flint is whole in this area.

And then the balance of Genesee goes south and a District that is basically the thumb without going too far south in St. Clair.

And this is Commissioner Eid's plan.

District 1 is similar to the other plans.

Flint is kept whole with slightly different Township configuration.

And then 15 is a different combination but it does have the balance of Saginaw substantial portion of Genesee and Livingston and the thumb doesn't go far down into St. Clair.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Since we are on the Commissioner Eid map do you want to share anything Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure well I didn't want to change Flint from our collaborative configuration too much.

This is probably one where we want to look at the BVAP for all the different configurations and make sure that they are around where they were on the collaborative map.

The other changes were, again, mainly to account for population deviation.

Because 18 well you can't really see it here but 18 and 2 with a little different.

18 recombines northern Oakland County the Townships I talked about before Waterford independence Holly Orion those Townships.

Because that gets recombined you just have to move around a few different Townships in 25.

But I think doing that also supports their community of interest because you keep pretty much all of the thumb together in a Senate District.

It doesn't change the Bay Area.

That is the same as the configuration.

Then that 15 is basically what's left of Saginaw and Shiawassee Counties.

And, again, this does both, it accounts for the communities of interest in the area.

And it brought the partisan fairness numbers down.

So it does both.

And that's why I like this configuration.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thanks Commissioner Eid.

Commissioner looks like Rhonda or okay you want -- Commissioner Szetela, we are on your map.

Do you want to go next.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For my changes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's the same as cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Same as cherry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I didn't make any changes to it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange do you want to speak to your map?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Keeping the thumb area with the thumb area and the shoreline and the City of Flint basically whole.

And there was a lot of public comment about the residents from Saginaw saying that they would like to be kept whole from our very first Midland hearing and some other hearings on the online portal.

And it seemed like there was comments from the Owosso area saying they wanted to be and I hope I got this right wanted to be separate from Genesee County and being separate we had this conversation, that's not a community of interest.

But the population wise worked out to where that was able to be done too.

So that's just a quick rundown of why I tried.

I don't know if I accomplished it.

But I tried to make sure that I took into account our communities of color in the Flint area.

I hope I did it well.

But I guess you can look at the numbers and determine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right thank you.

John?

>> MR. MORGAN: So did you want to look at the numbers on those? Okay, so we have Elm, and Spruce are the same.

Cherry and Szetela are the same.

So do we want four to look at basically? Okay.

Okay.

So generally we are looking at four districts here.

So there's and it may be a little different with Commissioner Lange's map.

But we have one District that's in the Bay City Saginaw area.

One District between Flint and Saginaw.

One District with Flint and then one District with the thumb.

So generally four districts in this area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed.

Sorry if we need to put background music on or something.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Play by play.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We could use the jeopardy music.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are very good at this John, I really appreciate it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: John you are doing amazing job keeping track of all that.

We don't need music I'm just watching.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are the music, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well there is a singing weatherman maybe there is a singing map drawer too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So District 1 is more or less the Bay.
Flint is.

>> MR. MORGAN: I just need to get the Lange districts in here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right I apologize I jumped.

>> MR. MORGAN: 1, 2, 3, so 1, 2, 3 so basically, it's going to be a little different but it's the same general geographic area.

So this will be 1, this will be equivalent to 15, 4 and 25.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is the main thing we are looking at here the minority population in the Flint District? Or are we looking over all at all of them here?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we are trying to understand the, compare and contrast.

But you're right.

It's probably the Flint District we are looking at primarily.

We do have significant minority populations in other areas that we may want to just try to draw our attention to or understand if we have coalition districts that we are not aware of.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for those descriptions, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So in the Bay we have a significant minority population.

In the first three.

But I think you will notice in Commissioner Lange's in Bay it's just shifted down to the Genesee Saginaw area.

So there is a much higher minority population in that Genesee Saginaw area in Commissioner Lange's map.

And almost you know it's similar to what you know the 23% minority population in the Bay Area.

So that is an interesting, yeah.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Saginaw if you look at it, the other Bay Areas have your Midland Bay City Saginaw.

And mine has Saginaw by itself.

So that's why you're seeing the shift from the others to mine is taking into consideration that it's Saginaw is whole.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right, thank you.

Okay, any other observations, Commissioners? Or Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, the non-Hispanic Black population in Flint for the first three, the first one Elm is 27.95 second cherry is 27.27.

AE is 27.8 is.

And RL is 25.87.

So I know we were talking about looking at the Flint District in particular.

So I think it's important we note that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Uh-huh.

And John I think I guess in your experience how do we I mean when we -- we're going to have to come up with a decision.

We are sort of figuring out how to you know combine maps.

Can you help us walk through.

We are moving on.

And what Commissioner Eid just said is we want to note it.

Have you noted it Commissioner Eid? I'm thinking about we are on you.

We will just replay it on YouTube.

Seeing no other comments let's move on to the next one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, John, yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Next, I will do Oakland and Macomb.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the Elm version of Oakland and Macomb and let's see what districts we are looking at so 1, 2, 3 districts are primarily in Oakland County.

And then to the south there is one that is substantially Oakland so maybe four.

And then there is one two, three, four districts that are coming in from Wayne.

Anyway let me just focus on Oakland first.

So 1, 2, 3 and basically a fourth District and up north you have some smaller Townships that are being associated with other Counties.

And then in Macomb you've got Detroit, Warren, Sterling Heights and District 8 coming out of Wayne as well and District 5 is almost principally in Macomb.

District 7 is Macomb plus a little of St. Clair in this version.

So maybe 8ish districts and then with several down below that are going into Wayne.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we should just probably note at this point that it's the districts that we drew for to the opportunity to elect districts are 14, 13, 8, 6 and 5.

I don't think 9 was one of them.

Oh, it is you are right, yep, you are right, 9 as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We don't fully have 9 represented here but we do have the 14, 13.

Not all not quite all of 8.

Not quite all of 6.

All of five, okay.

And John as you were pointing out to us, we have 8 districts we are looking at total on this, in this view.

Roughly eight districts, I think.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to clarify we are looking at 18 or something like it.
11 or something like it.
So that is two.
14, 16, 3 and 4.
2 is five.
And then 5 and 7.
And then these districts probably I would like towards Wayne County to talk more about them.

They do come up into this area of course.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.
All right.

This is the Elm, no, this is.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the first one so this is Elm and the next one I guess is cherry.

Okay so looks like 18, 14 and 16 are fairly similar.

A little bit of a difference here.

On 18.

And then District 2 it looks like if I'm reading this right District 2 does not go north in the Elm version and does go a little bit north in the cherry version.

And then the other difference is it looks like in the Elm version you've got the Lake areas intact here with the southern portion of St. Clair County.

And in the Spruce version it doesn't take that portion.

Okay and this is the Spruce version.

Sorry, the previous one was cherry.

This has District 7 is roughly the same.

5 is a different configuration on the top end.

And then this is Commissioner Szetela's which has a similar footprint here, here and here.

And it's closer to the cherry version, I guess it's based off of cherry generally.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's based off cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and then the Lange version let's see so this is similar to District 11.

This is similar to 14 and then it is a little different here where you have a different District going into Wayne County.

This is probably similar to the District 16.

This is similar to 7.

And this is definitely a little bit different than 5.

So it might be one of these three districts might be well we will have to look a little more carefully to see.

Here is Commissioner Eid's version.

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

So 18, 11 and then as he mentioned District 10 is coming in from Ann Arbor.
And it's a little different configuration in 16 but looks like 13, 8, 6 are the same.
7 is has got the St. Clair portion.

And five is looks like back to that version, right, same as cherry.
In five and seven, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is it the same as cherry? I thought cherry is the one that didn't have the whole Lake District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Cherry changes District 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah so, I think yours is actually closer to Elm.
With District well District 7 and 5.

Can we just confirm that, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Let's focus on District 5.

This is 5 in the Eid plan.

This is the area that shows visually.

And so that is the Spruce, is that right? Yeah, I think so.

This is Elm, cherry Spruce and District 5 is closer to Spruce it looks like.

And District 7 in Spruce it's the same.

Okay so looks like 5 and 7 are from Spruce.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And Elm so Spruce and Elm have been the same up to this point.

And that is.

>> MR. MORGAN: These two seem to be.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Roughly the same.

Yeah, but that 7 District seems to be one of the major pieces.

Then 2 and 5, okay, yeah.

Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to do numbers on these?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Seems like it should this is where the opportunity to elect districts are.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, so on my Senate plan, the I did not want to touch any of the VRA districts.

That we had previously drawn.

So I tried not to do that.

But aside from Ann Arbor, well it all -- this whole map goes back to Ann Arbor.

It's a different split in Ann Arbor that affects everything else.

Along with that it's the difference in Oakland County.

And I do in this configuration is you know, preferable.

For both community of interest and partisan fairness reasons.

I mean, we are putting -- I like the collaborative Senate map I really do.

The only thing I don't like on it is where Oakland County is.

How it's configured.

And I think this kind of configuration corrects that issue.

Again, you have the northern Oakland County Townships being together.

You have the ones that are closer to Detroit being put together such as West Bloomfield with for most of Farmington Hills, Farmington Hills is put back together and we have Commerce being with it as well and Wixom and Walled Lake which is something we heard over and over again.

And I was able to find a way to do that while keeping that District 14 the same.

And then what that does is it just changes District 2 a little.

So instead of District 2 hanging off going into Oakland County on the west side you get a much more compact District 2.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Szetela or Commissioner Lange would you like to walk us through your maps? Before we go to the numbers?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, so can you go to my map? Thank you and can you go back to the main one because I need to look at it for a second.

Go back to Elm or cherry either one because it's built off of cherry so go to cherry.

Go back again to the other one.

The change here is just that change along 25, which is dividing 7 and 25.

And when I was doing that, I was mostly balancing for population because this map like I said I brought down below 5% other map is close to 9 percent on plan deviation.

So a lot of small little changes made are just for that purpose.

And then.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Population deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Population deviation because there was a high population deviation on the plan.

There is little jigs and jags and it's to bring the population back in specs so nothing major changed here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'll be honest to get beat up by the citizens of Detroit because I don't know Detroit.

I said that over and over again.

I tried to do my best remembering the communities of interest that were spoken about and follow the guidelines that were given to us by our VRA Council.

With doing that, with focusing on the Detroit area where I started, I moved my way up. So honestly some of those are why you get the shapes you get with mine.

There were certain ones that stood out as before the Novi and keep Novi whole.

But with the population and the Asian population in Novi I just basically did my best and it kind of is what it is.

In all honesty I figured if it was something that if Commissioners from the region you know the Detroit area saw something I know they would speak up and say something so I tried to do my best looking at communities of interest and population and VRA.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Lange.

It's good to get the ideas out and understand the ideas on the different maps so yeah. There is different strengths in different maps.

Okay so I don't know that we need to do -- Commissioners I'm thinking about what Commissioner Eid said earlier maybe we don't need all the numbers on the Districts in here or should we ask John to pull out all the districts? That is what I'm asking.

Help me know.

John, are you saying we should get all the numbers?

>> MR. MORGAN: Generally I think we were talking about you know, like up to 8 districts total.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All 8 let's do all 8 is that what you are suggesting?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Take it away music man, John.

And thank you, John.

Your color formatting is appreciated by the way and you called it oak MC look at that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While we are waiting, we are scheduled to go to 8:00 and scheduled for a one hour break between 6-7.

Wondering we took a lunch break at 1:00.

Do we want to take a break? We don't have to make a motion or do anything.

I'm just looking for sort of rough ideas.

Are we planning on working until 7:00 or do we want to go until 8:00? Looks like 7:00.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would rather push through the dinner break or take a 10-15 minute break and push through until 7, 7:15 versus taking an hour and staying until 8:00.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what we have done in the past and trying to use our time well.

I think that is helpful for our Executive Director who has to make the agendas.

So in general we want to just make that change and just make that a change for the rest of our time together until November 5th? Okay seeing nodding heads.

And anyone online have any different thoughts that we just work until 7:00, not all the way until 8:00 with the break? I'm seeing Commissioner Eid and Executive Director Hammersmith.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well actually I'm looking at the agenda.

We don't have another long recess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It what's a typo 6-7 and says 10 minutes.

It's just a typo.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: District Hammersmith did you want to weigh in.

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

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Because we moved to this room and in this room on Tuesday it's our intent to stay in this room.

Given that on Tuesday we could start an hour earlier if you wanted to because we won't be moving into a different room.

Monday I kind of think you might want until 10:00 because people will be traveling in.

But on Tuesday if you want to start at 9:00 to makeup some of the time we lost yesterday you could do that also.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so without objection Commissioners I'm just going to suggest that we take that suggestion from Director Hammersmith that we start Tuesday at 9:00 and that we just end our meetings at 7:00.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just for clarification, the starting next week for 9:00 a.m. would be Tuesday only, right? The 10:00 a.m. would still be 10:00 a.m. for Wednesday? I ask because I have a doctor's appointment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is correct Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioners.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The spreadsheets we are making are they going to be put on our website?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Great question are the spreadsheets we are making will we put them on the website? That is a question, yeah, that is a great question Commissioner Witjes.

Anyone can help us answer that question? These spreadsheets we are making should we put these on the website? The answer is yes.

All right so we will do our best to make sure that happens.

And much appreciated.

Yeah, it does seem like it's an educational tool for us.

It has been an educational tool and for the public also to help see how we are making our decisions and what we are comparing, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you could just help me consolidate these.

So just look at the views and see if something is substantial enough to not include it in the spreadsheet.

If they are similar enough.

I mean okay so this is the Elm version.

All right so that is our starting point.

And then this is the cherry version.

And I think, yeah, it's different in District two.

Okay so we will include the cherry.

This is the Spruce version.

It looks like there is enough differences to probably include it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looking at District 2; is that correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: I guess.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I'm looking at too and does look different enough that we should.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and this is the Szetela version.

Commissioner Szetela, is this substantially similar to another plan such that you wouldn't want to include it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's based off of cherry.

There is cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that is cherry.

So it's the same basically.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, it's got small changes for like I said for trying to get that plan deviation down.

So but I mean functionally it's the same as cherry.

Not worth comparing.

>> MR. MORGAN: For this purpose.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just a minute we may have a technical issue, it came back, okay.

Very good.

Did you get all your questions answered, John in terms of helping you think through which ones we are going to include?

>> MR. MORGAN: I think so collapsing Szetela with cherry.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good.

.

[Playing jeopardy music]

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Michigan trivia while we are waiting what is Michigan State motto?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I thought it was #show up speak up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wasn't there a jeopardy question about which is the biggest Lake and the guy answered based on surface area versus water volume and it ended up being disputed because technically he was right.

It's just like what do you mean by biggest, is it surface area, is it water volume? Is it depth? I don't remember.

[Laughter]

I thought it was Michigan versus superior, superior has bigger volume because it's deeper but Michigan is bigger surface area wise.

[Laughter]

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: What is the only state that has more shoreline than Michigan? Answer was Alaska.

What is the Michigan State bird.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Robin.

Everybody knows that.

Yeah, is the stone Petoskey?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have a state reptile? I was going to say it's a turtle. I was just going to say a turtle.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair, you have to start having conversations ASL is trying to hear those conversations over the music.

Could we maybe lower the music a little bit so she can hear what is going on in the room? Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Lange we are doing Michigan trivia. This one is for you.

The Mackinac Bridge is how many miles in length?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm going to pass.

I'm not playing trivia.

I'm sorry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right Steve you know all the answers what is the answer? The answer is five.

Good job.

>> MR. MORGAN: Almost there.

Port Huron.

Go.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Do the Novi one.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I've got the spread sheer here.

I will lead one more question what is the birthplace of professional hockey, what town is the birthplace of professional hockey in Michigan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Houghton.

Yeah, don't you now.

Unfinish, that's right don't you know.

>> MR. MORGAN: We have five plans we are looking at, and I think 7 districts in there.

Yeah 7 districts so District 2 is generally up on the north side of Oakland and Macomb. In most of the plans.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So let's see if we can get the names here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Oakland Macomb north.

>> MR. MORGAN: North do we have a name or constituency for direction 5? Mount Clemens.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mount Clemens.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's not mount Clemens because that is in 7, call it Clinton Macomb.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Clinton Macomb.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: When you are doing that John when you get to it, it looks like the top pink row should be Rhonda's map because there is no information in there.

>> MR. MORGAN: I did not really find an analog that fit very well. So in this -- in Commissioner Lange's plan, let's see if I can show this. Come on.

So there is not really an equivalent District 2 up here.

You could argue 24 might be.

But I basically said this is the analog to 7, this is the analog to 5, 16, 14, 18 so there is not quite an analog so in the interest of time I just skipped that one.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I see, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Is there another town in the Waterford area?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commerce maybe.

>> MR. MORGAN: Waterford.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: White lack, Commerce, Clarkston.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We should definitely call it Milford though.

Just in honor of our Commissioner.

Highland.

Forgive me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Vallette land.

>> MR. MORGAN: We will just call it the Vallette District, how is that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are all a little slap happy today.

>> MR. MORGAN: Again just the these are just general constituencies.

So Oakland, Macomb north is District 2.

And then we didn't find an easy analog in Commissioner Lange's plan.

Clinton, Macomb is the District 5.

The St. Clair lakeshore District 7.

And 38.

Farmington 11 and District 34.

Pontiac Southfield 14 and 31.

Troy Rochester 16 and 36.

And then Waterford Commerce is 18 and 35.

So which do we want to focus on first?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you have a comment?

>> MR. MORGAN: She waved off.

Okay so I think we were looking at you wanted to look at say the maybe the Pontiac seat.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was just going to suggest looking at the Pontiac seat because that is the.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is the one.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is the elect District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The one that really reaches those levels, I agree.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here are the configurations for the Pontiac Southfield seat.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No applicable difference essentially is what it comes down to Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I do see on Elm the population deviation is out of the allowable amount.

So if we change that it could change the number.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh, yep.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I remember on one of the maps we went through and did a lot of little work.

I think Anthony was it was his turn to bring it in to good population deviation.

But we only did that on one of them.

So whichever ones we choose we will probably have to go through and do that little work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I'll just offer that Commissioner Lange, you know said she didn't really recognize the Detroit area was her strength so I think what we've got is we have got yeah but it does not perform her District does not perform poorly in that the one we have highlighted.

But we should, yeah, unless there is other comments why don't we just keep going.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, the Clinton Macomb one is a little interesting to me. You have minority populations on four of them that are about 10 percent higher. Then I think that's also the case for, okay, what are we showing now.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just getting the map.

It is a slightly different configuration right.

So Commissioner Lange's District 38 goes much more to the north.

So that is the difference.

So they are not quite apples to apples but I see your point there.

Well I mean that explains why it's different.

But, yeah, that is the difference.

Then I think that holds true in the Troy Rochester area as well.

Where it's lower as well.

Yeah, so that is where we have a lot of the Asian American population as well in Troy. So those stick out to me as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we go back to the spreadsheet? Again? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want to thank John for saying that. We are really not doing apples to apples and oranges to oranges on these maps. I'll just say I did my best.

But my maps are not identical to yours.

So I would expect there would be some deviation.

I did look at the Troy area.

I looked at the Novi area for the Asian population.

Again, adjustments could be made and I think my overall plan deviations were good.

So I'm not justifying this area like I said.

I'm just familiar with Detroit.

But I'm seeing I'm just going to say it I'm seeing a real a theme going on right now.

And I don't appreciate it.

That's all I've got.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange.

Just for the record I don't think anyone is trying to beat up on you.

We are just trying to understand what the changes are in the maps.

It's not intended to make you feel like we are persecuting you and I apologize if you feel that way.

All right let's I think we are good with this Section.

Can we move on to another Section?

>> MR. MORGAN: The last Section will be Wayne County.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this is the first version of Wayne.

This is the Elm configuration 10-4 so let's see how many districts we are dealing with.

District 12 is the river communities.

Down River.

District 17 Taylor or Allen Park part of Detroit.

District 19 is Dearborn, Dearborn Heights.

District 10 is Canton.

District 9 is Livonia and Detroit and Redford and then you have let's see what do we still have here? So 7 is most of the Grosse Pointes and going north so we kind of talked about that.

So we have 6 is Detroit.

North.

8 Detroit north 13, Detroit Royal Oak, we talked about 14.

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

So we are looking at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, sorry let me try that again.

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 districts basically.

Okay, so again this is the Elm configuration.

And this is the cherry configuration.

So let's see.

Same.

Little different in 19.

It's different in 17 here with Hamtramck or that Highland Park, sorry.

And then it's a different configuration with the Grosse Pointes in 6 versus 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sarah can we move the Zoom box to the side so we can see the.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hang on let me back up Elm, cherry this is the Spruce version. Looks like the Spruce version is pretty close to the Elm version and cherry is different. This is Commissioner Szetela's.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you back it out a little bit so we can see Ann Arbor or Zoom more in.

It's making it hard without having Ann Arbor.

>> MR. MORGAN: Each one is just a snapshot.

So I can Zoom in a little bit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, no, no that is fine, the one map had Ann Arbor, yeah this does not show Ann Arbor so it's hard to -- it's like difficult to compare.

So can you go back? I'm trying to then go back again. Yeah, that is more helpful.

Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this is 10-8 so that is the Spruce version.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Spruce, yep.

And that is cherry.

And I -- are there differences in this?

>> MR. MORGAN: I don't think that is cherry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that my individual? That is my individual.

>> MR. MORGAN: What was that based on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was based on cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you think it's the same as cherry or there are some differences.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it the same and small differences for population but the Ann Arbor area is different.

But this Detroit area should be the same.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay all right that takes care of that question.

And then here is Commissioner Lange's version in that area.

And Commissioner Eid's version.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: May I ask a question?

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Just wondering John, there is no way you can show any of these maps side by side to kind of see them at one time two of them?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I can do that.

Give me a moment.

I will set something up for that.

Can you give me two maps you want to look at?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Maybe.

>> MR. MORGAN: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Possibly the last one and then this one together, which map was that.

I don't even know who.

Was it Lange's map and then this one.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, what I will do is I will bring these up in a PowerPoint in just a second.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I can compare some of these.

So this is comparing the Elm version to Commissioner Eid's version.

And then I can, you know, replace those so you can compare any two you want to see.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Curry is that helpful? You're on mute Commissioner Curry.

We can't hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm sorry I said it was very helpful, John. Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: This are some side by sides.

We can see what other combinations you would want to look at.

This is the base Elm map with Commissioner Eid's districts.

And Dearborn, Dearborn Heights are similarly configured.

District 17 is pretty similar with the change of a little bit of Taylor is put into 12.

And then it looks like the western Wayne towns are put towards a distribute outside of Wayne.

Commissioner Eid mentioned the Ann Arbor District 10 combination here.

So this has a different configuration with Canton, going in District 29.

With Ypsilanti.

District 9 does not go into Farmington.

14 and 13 are similarly configured.

8 is similarly configured.

6 and 7 are.

19 and 17 are similar.

So the differences are 9, to some extent 12 and 10 and 29.

And then here is Commissioner Lange's plan.

So in this case the Grosse Pointes are with a portion of Detroit.

And then let's see a little bit of Macomb.

And then this 27 is similar to the District 6.

28 is close to District 8.

30 and 13 are similar.

And then 9 and 33.

And here is Commissioner Szetela's map.

And that is the same, no, it's different.

This is based on the cherry.

That is right.

So this also this basically is a stand in for cherry as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Is there any way, John, that say for instance I could look at it later on too? Will I be able to pick this back up?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'm fairly certain we can make arrangements for you to receive a PDF of this or some other document that you can open on your computer.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Very helpful, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So this is I believe this is the region we probably do we want to I think Commissioner Lange has spoken about Detroit.

I think Commissioner Szetela I can't remember if we each sort of had a turn, the individuals so I think we are do we need to look at the numbers? I think John has helped see a side by side here.

What's next Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't -- does anyone want to see numbers? Seems like the Detroit configurations are all pretty similar.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If we look at numbers there is a map, I'm not sure which one it is, it has quite a different Dearborn configuration and we might want to look at that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right I see Commissioner Lange's hand.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would like to compare the ten in Elm and I think it's the same in cherry.

Versus trying to figure out what it is on your map Anthony, 12.

Because of that change of Inkster because Elm has Inkster with Wayne, Westland and Canton versus putting it towards Down River.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What number do you want to look at for that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you mean what number? The Black VAP and overall minority of 10 versus your 12.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't think 10 is a BVAP District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It may be based on the Asian and African/American in both Westland and Inkster that is why I want to compare the two.
Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like to see the numbers on the Detroit area since there is obviously some differences in the configuration of these.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay should we start the music again?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now I lost track of what it was.

Yeah, so it actually is time for us to take a scheduled break.

So hearing no objections, it is 4:00.

We will take a break for I'm going to say 15 minutes because we never get back if I say 10.

But by 15 I do mean 15 not 20.

So.

[Laughter]

So please be back here at 4:15.

Thank you everybody.

[Recess]

Commissioner Lange did you have a comment before we break?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No just forgot to put my hand down I guess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, thank you.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 4:16 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair.

Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending today's meeting remotely, please disclose during roll call you are attending remotely and where you are attending from, I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending from Detroit, Michigan.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

Attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'll return to Erin Wagner?
>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present attending remotely from Eaton County, Michigan.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All Commissioners are present.
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We are continuing with our analysis of the different maps that are out there.
And already John where did we leave off?

>> MR. MORGAN: Finishing touches on the spreadsheets here, just putting them on.
I have the different plans.

Do you want to give them a constituency name as we go through this just roughly? If we do District 6 and I don't know if this is a particular area of Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just east Detroit.
>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.
So eight is in this one it's Hamtramck and.
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just call it Hamtramck that is easy Highland Park.
>> MR. MORGAN: And Hamtramck is common.
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.
>> MR. MORGAN: Someone want to help me with this?
>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is not right.

CK, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No A.
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hamtramck.
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Polish.
>> CHAIR SZETELA: The A was right, it's not the Mack, TRAMCK.
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keep MC together.
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Nice one, Steve.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm learning.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 9 is Livonia, red land and west Detroit, does that work?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which one?

>> MR. MORGAN: 9 is Livonia Redford.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Redford west Detroit, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry.

Do we have a name for 13? Detroit Royal Oak?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That will work.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so.

>> MR. MORGAN: We have 6 generally here.

And also 6 goes north.

So what's our town? Warren?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So this is also Asian population.

Can we turn on the theme, John? Maybe I think that would help us.

No, we have the numbers here.

That is what they are for, yeah.

Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: John that Down River and towns what is towns with Down River, what is it? I'm just curious.

>> MR. MORGAN: Basically the District 12 are most of the Wayne towns that are down river.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Oh, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, that is fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You see the difference that Inkster makes though with 10 versus 12? So look at Canton Westland.

Because it's almost 20% African/American then you add in the almost 10% Asian as well.

To bring it up to 35%.

Just under 35% and should make it majority minority based on coalition voting in Wayne County which is what we were considering when we drew that.

But then if you look underneath, at I think Anthony 12 is the Down River you pull that same population in Down River you end up 18% for Inkster because Inkster is almost entirely African/American and end up with a total of 30% which is below that threshold. Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, so you are comparing 12 into Down River towns.

Anthony is 12.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anthony is 12.

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

It's not the same as our 12 to our 10 because our 10 so the elm cherry Spruce include Inkster with Wayne Westland area and Canton and a little bit of Livonia.

Whereas Anthony's map, I'm not trying to single you out Anthony, pulls Inkster down to Monroe.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the highlight there is that the coalition District may be disrupted because of that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right and that coalition District is pretty close to being a VRA District.

And I wouldn't want to see it disrupted.

So.

>> MR. MORGAN: In the same vain Commissioner Lange's District in that area is similarly configured demographically.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's pretty good.

That is the 32.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Her 32.

>> MR. MORGAN: Inkster, Westland, it does not have Canton.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it has part of Dearborn Heights in it.

Which that might trigger a different issue with the Arab American population because you are pulling out Dearborn Heights out of Dearborn and Dearborn Heights so that might throw off that balance of community of interest we were trying to preserve.

So and again VRA considerations with the Arab American community as well.

So and we can't really tell looking at the numbers because Arab Americans show up at white so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is where we would have to look at, okay, but at this point right so we have to look at the electoral results to figure that out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For that District how it would affect it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are looking at ideas and we are seeing different districts different ideas and different maps to see what we want to combine.

To see if we can actually agree on a couple maps, Senate maps that we want to work on.

John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I think you were contemplating possibly creating one base map and putting possibly certain options into that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We reviewed all of the regions or the areas.

Yeah, all the areas at this point.

So now we have to that is our task.

>> MR. MORGAN: Also this was designed so that if you did want to get print outs of these for your own perusal you could do that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we spent a lot of time looking at all these maps and Senate configurations.

What are everyone's thoughts on them?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: My personal thought is cherry and Spruce incorporate everything that is in Elm so I think we should cross Elm off the list and focus on cherry and Spruce for the collaborative.

Because there's nothing in Elm that is not in cherry or Spruce.

That we've seen.

And if it is a change then it's actually an improvement over what we had.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I have in my notes as well.

Anybody have anything different?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I mean, I think Spruce should be the base that we work off of.

And then I would also because it does incorporate everything that's in Elm.

And cherry is a little different but not that significantly different.

And Spruce was the last one that we actually did collaboratively.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Cherry is a collaborative map too.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The last one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Cherry was the last one.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not according to the dates that were on the maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Maybe you are right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is what I was looking at.

But I also think we should bring forward Rhonda's map because I think she has got some really good ideas in there.

I don't agree with everything in her maps but there are certain areas that I think we could use to incorporate into this Spruce map.

That is my opinion on this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we should go off the cherry map because the cherry map already has less than 5% plan deviation whereas the Spruce is going to require us to make all of those changes to bring down the plan deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Plan deviation is within spec.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No it's not.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What is it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Almost 9%.

8.58%.

It's way off.

Spruce.

Yeah.

Commissioner Orton? Then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, just looking at that bottom, the Dearborn, Dearborn Heights area, Spruce and cherry it looks like Elm and Spruce have if we look at total minority population, voting age population they have 40.81%.

Cherry is 3 points lower than that.

I don't know why that is, I don't know what the change is there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dearborn, Dearborn Heights.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: My memory of that Commissioner Orton was that there was -- do you know what I apologize. Commissioner Kellom wanted to speak.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Well, my opinion is of the same that I had before.

That we should begin with the map that has the best metrics.

And then make the changes, the things I think that folks are suggesting they like about other maps those maybe could take place in the cherry map.

I do not think that we should start with any map that does not measure up after we worked so hard to make it just doesn't even make sense.

Why would you essentially start from scratch when we have maps that we have improved significantly on? So I don't understand that logic.

I don't know if it's in the eye of being inclusive or just to offer up more options.

But we should start off with a map that has the best numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we were doing is we each reviewed the areas to look at the ideas in each map.

So and we do ourselves a service if we can just hold on to the ideas.

And start with one that has a good number but we have to agree on the right, I mean, maybe we just have to sort of agree how do we treat these numbers.

Like it's there is -- when we say numbers, we have to sort of identify it's population deviation and we know how to do that but it takes a lot of time.

I think right we know how to do it but it takes time. Then there is the VRA and we right we are within right, I think we have gotten from our consultant, right, each of these is okay.

Like we are okay, we are within what we should make some changes.

So I think what I think I hear Commissioner Kellom say what feels the least of work to do and with communities of interest and the feedback we got with the numbers we have to do the least amount of work and take ideas from other maps.

We are not taking a map wholeheartedly so to speak and not taking cherry wholeheartedly and taking it and taking some ideas we got from Commissioner Lange or all these different maps so we can just, yeah.

I'm done talking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think for Spruce and cherry there is no need to look at Elm because they were based off of it and improve so why not throw Elm in the dumpster of history especially because its metrics are terrible.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There are ideas I like.
Like there are ideas in there that is what I mean.
Not the whole map we are throwing out that is all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What ideas would you change and if you change to what is in Elm you are going back to that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I apologize not the whole of the map but the idea in the map.

It was a useful exercise.

I don't need to say any more.

It's how we talk about it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

But I mean I think what is the point of looking at metrics if we are not going to look at metrics? I mean what is the point of having them if we are just going to say well let's consider them all because they are clearly Spruce and cherry, I think are comparable in terms of their metrics.

The Lange map and the Elm map are significantly performing at a lower level.

So why would we start working off of.

To me it's like the discussion is at this point Spruce or cherry what are we starting with and go from there.

Not you know not my individual map.

Not Anthony's individual map, Spruce versus cherry.

Which one do we want to go with, what are the differences between those two?

Because they have the most similar metrics and they perform the best.

They both have 2018 seats votes ratio and a .03.

Bias.

They one has 3.1 efficiency gap the other has 3.4.

One has 2.7 mean median the other has 2.2 so one is a little higher in one area and one is a little lower in the other.

One has a lower population deviation in specs the other does not.

That could be a factor but why go to Elm with efficiency gap of 6.2 and mean median of 3.4 and seats vote ratio of 1919.

With a negative 2.3 against democrats when we have two better maps? Like it just doesn't make any sense to me, it's nonsensical.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we get rid of Elm to start with something else or is it too early.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Instead of I don't know if this works but instead of choosing to just get rid of something why don't we choose the one or two we want to work on and those ideas are still out there if we see that we want to incorporate any of those? As we are working on it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Weiss first and then Mr. Morgan.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right, I understand MC's thinking. But I like Rebecca's thinking better. I go by that because I have the map here or not the map but the sheet and that was my top pick why? Because the numbers are better. So my suggestion was going to be this morning let's just start with this map. And see if we could improve on it if it's possible. And maybe take a couple ideas. Of course you might have to go back to the Elm map but it's my impression we started with, ELM and improved it to Spruce and improved it when we went to cherry if that is the case why not start with the cherry map thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We should compare Spruce and cherry what are the differences between those two maps. What do we want to keep. Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was getting back to the idea of a matrix where you are comparing. If you are isolating and want to compare Spruce and cherry then you know you can bring up the different what are the differences.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark? Commissioner Rothorn, Commissioner Eid Clark then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: This question is for Bruce. When you look at the metrics for the Senate here, does any of these plans raise a red flag for you?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark I appreciate the question. Are you asking in which of the categories or all of the categories?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> Livonia Redford west Detroit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Individual districts on the screen are you looking at individual districts or entire plan?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm looking at the entire plan.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: What we have on the screen those are for these metrics of the -- these areas per plan. So just looking at just these it's difficult for me to say whether one is and at this point I would be reluctant to say one is off the table.

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

Because you are just deciding which maps you want to move forward with in order to contemplate adjustments.

And looking at the numbers in isolation is difficult to make a determination.

What I would say though is as you go forward and as you contemplate changes, I would recommend that one of the more challenging metrics to me is the plan deviation.

The plan deviation takes a lot of time.

But I think the important point in that is as you move further from there is no equal requirement.

But as you get closer to 10%, you need to justify more why.

And the justification could include lots of reasons.

But keep in mind that if you have maps that vary in deviation 4.5, 6.5, 7%, that as you go further up, you will need to provide more of an explanation for the record about why you chose a plan with a higher deviation than a plan with a lower one.

So my thought in general is that the deviation tends to be among the more vexing metrics to meet.

Because there are a lot of changes that have to be made.

And I think in addition to that, the changes that you may contemplate have switches this deviation and numbers are going to change we have seen that before.

So being mindful of that and mindful of everything that went into I don't remember what the plan was where you spent a lot of time before you went out to the second round of hearings adjusting the deviation.

It's a slog, it's painstaking.

No question about it.

But I think that as you contemplate where you are going in the next seven days, think about that.

That keep in mind that deviation, to me it's not the most important number.

I'm not suggesting that.

But it can be one of the more challenging numbers to get to.

So I know that that really does not address your -- the question about which one may be appear better or appear more problematic.

But because it's difficult to assess that.

But keep in mind what the deviations are.

I think that can be a good one for now.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anyone else have a question? Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, it's not a question.

It's more of the same discussion we were having earlier.

I mean, you know, we spent a lot of time looking at these maps.

And how I view it, is we should be using either the cherry or Spruce map to make further changes on.

Because let's not forget like we are going to be making changes to this.

And I personally would like to see those changes that we make on the cherry ones be copied to some of the individual plans as well.

Because they are based off the cherry or Spruce one.

I mean, we pretty clearly have like three different tiers of plans.

You know we have two that are within 1%.

We have two that are within 3%.

And then we have two that are around 6%.

That is not a small difference.

That is not the difference between the Congressional maps for example where it's .6 to .7 to .8.

I think those are all well within each other.

I mean we are talking difference between 1% and 6.2%, well that is six times the amount.

So I would support you know making changes to the cherry or Spruce map and then putting those ideas into the other maps like Commissioner Rothhorn was saying and using those individual maps to kind of get ideas to improve.

Because I think those have good ideas too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would also add that we heard a lot about the cherry map.

In our public meetings over and over and over again. People got up and said I like the cherry map I like the cherry map I like the cherry map.

I don't really remember being that much interest in the Spruce map honestly and if it has the lower plan deviation, we can certainly bring it up and then overlay Spruce on top of it and see what the differences are.

And then see what we want to change.

And then that is an easier slog than starting with Spruce and trying to bring it to cherry because the cherry has the lower plan deviation.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I mean I agree what you're saying.

I really respect Bruce's opinion.

And I think bringing the plan deviation down would be very difficult.

We already have it down.

So cherry in my opinion now based on his advice I think is probably the better approach as a base.

And I agree, let's overlay Spruce and see what the differences are.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Just happen to think since we have a drawing expert here, Mr. Morgan, would it be possible to have him give us an opinion or show us maybe a possibility and then if we decide to choose it use it.

Rather than sitting here trying to figure it out, he is an expert at it.

In my book.

I've watched him.

He is good.

Maybe it would help.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you want him to show us I'm not clear what you say.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Bring the deviation down and get it a little closer if that is possible.

I don't know.

That is why I'm saying.

We don't know how to do it that way but he should.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It just takes time to bring it down.

We have seen that.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Do we want to waste time doing that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You don't need to with cherry.

That is the point.

It's already there.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Right that is what I was thinking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We did it in an open meeting and it was a pain in the tucus.

So Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Erin had her hand up first.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The overall plan deviation is right now for cherry?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 4.93.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If we look at plan deviation, I would like to state mine is 2.23%.

Just wanted to throw that out there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Commissioner Curry did you say something? I thought you said someone.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I was looking at Erin's hand has been up for the longest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We cannot see her on the screen and Commissioner Wagner we cannot see you on the screen.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Quite all right I understand.

I was going to chime in and similar to what Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Eid were saying let's start with the one with the best metrics.

And then let's compare them to individual maps because there has been quite a few of Commissioner Lange's that I have liked as well.

So that was just my two cents.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioner Orton did you have your hand up as well?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's do the overlay and see the difference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, John, can you bring up the cherry map and then bring in the shape file for Spruce and overlay it?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You know also Madam Chair, I heard a lot of people say they liked the Pine map too.

So I don't know how you guys want to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Pine is for the house so it's a different District.

Pine birch and cherry people kept saying together, Pine birch and cherry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Great.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There were quite a few who liked apple.

I heard apple a lot and possibly Maple.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you want to go District by District, I could Zoom to each individual District and you could look at it so that it would be centered on an individual District.

So you can see if there are changes between them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: John, the base on this is the cherry map?

>> MR. MORGAN: I believe so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why does it show an 8.96 plan deviation.

It's not the right map.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It --

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It could be the numbers are switched and let's open Spruce and see what that plan deviation is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: I may need to go back to the website to be sure we downloaded the correct one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There are so many plans out there.

It's like confusing as heck.

>> MR. MORGAN: Going back to the State Senate, let's see which one we want to look at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 100721SDRASBK.

So I think it's on the next Page maybe.

At the bottom.

Yes, at the bottom.

There you go.

That one right there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that should be correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 485 comments, Holy cow.

Holy cow.

Actually that is the most commented on Senate plan.

Good and bad.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like it's what you are expecting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so then can we put the Spruce over the top? And the Spruce is, let me look, 100821V1SD.

>> MR. MORGAN: That has the overlay so District 1 appears to be exactly the same.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to start from the UP and come down or where? Probably.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was suggesting there is a function that allows me to Zoom to each individual District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay do that then, that is easy.

Go ahead Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: For what it's worth I like the idea in the Elm map where the Lake St. Clair lakeshore and 25 and if we can because I recognize there was a lot of work done to make this happen and I think you were saying Commissioner Szetela that that may have been important.

But if we can that is one of the ideas I would like to preserve if we can from an older map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I'm just trying to think of like a systematic way to do this.

We all went over the debriefing that we did earlier today.

And with that it seems like the biggest changes that need to be made might be in the Detroit area.

Then if we do decide to make changes there, that's going to affect everything else.

So we might want to look at Detroit first and then start moving up and looking at these other Directors.

I'm just thinking we are looking at two right now but like if we change 5 or if we change 6 then 2 is going to change as well.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we need to look at Grand Rapids because Grand Rapids wanted that change of Fulton to wealthy.

And that is going to also push it.

But I think the broader question is the differences between Spruce and cherry.

So I mean we see some changes here.

Can we look at the rest of the map to see where there is other changes?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay you are going to flag the differences in 2 or just note that there are differences?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm just noting for right now there is differences.

I just want to see where else there is differences, is it kind of only that Metro area or is that elsewhere? Yeah.

Well some of those come out of the change to 7. So.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like there is a slight difference in three.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm going to guess that is population because it's so small. Same thing with that little bit near Kalamazoo.

>> MR. MORGAN: In this case the red outline is the Zoom two District is that is the one that is on the map.

Then the blue line is the overlay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 4 right there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can just keep going.

>> MR. MORGAN: So five here and here.

So yeah, there are definitely differences here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 7 is the one with the major change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks like that is included.

>> MR. MORGAN: As I recall there were reasons you made certain changes so if you go back to those reasons, it might give you an explanation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This had to do with communities of interest and the Black voting age population if I'm not mistaken.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

That's just adjusting for population, just small changes to bring it into spec.

That is no changes.

11 again small change for population.

You know again population.

No changes that I see.

A little change Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Some of these small changes we are seeing they actually do like that one split up Taylor, one of them Taylor was whole, one is split up. We might want to look at some of those and see if we can bring them together or use the two different maps as possibly going forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Do we have someone who has a hand up, Erin? Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you Madam Chair.

I have a question and I know Commissioner Rothorn had said something about it this morning as well.

Is there a way that we can pull up Mr. Skinnell's map and use it as overlay to compare it to our maps at the same time?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There is but his was Congressional.

His District was for the Congressional districts that is why there were only two.

It was not a Senate map.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Okay thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Should we go back to three?

>> MR. MORGAN: 15 had some considerable differences.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: It could be that that relates to the District 7.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it does.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That has the changes for 7.

It's the same.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Could we go back to the Ada north Grand Rapids District? I just wanted to take a look.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it was like 25 maybe 23.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep 24.

So what I'm looking at, what I'm wondering Commissioners because this is Ada and Cascade right here, I think that is true.

That is true and if what is it can we just sort of like I know it's hard but like it's just like instead of going this way which I think is where Ottawa County is right, we just sort of like shift it down this way.

I know it's a lot of work but I'm thinking working with Commissioner Lange and what many of us wanted to do is respect their wishes and put those in.

It feels like we might be able to look at that.

We don't have to do it now but that is if you all see it too that is what I'm thinking about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we can and should and need to adjust that wealthy line which is right there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 33, yeah, and 24, okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Okay so most of the deviations between Spruce and cherry are in the Metro Detroit area.

Right, that seems to be.

And they drive off of this District 7.

Can you scroll up on the active matrix so we can see what the metrics are on 7? Okay and Cynthia you wanted to look down towards Taylor?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just noticed that was one of the pages I noticed to put it altogether or if we want to split one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the 7 and then the 8 including Highland Park. Or not including Highland Park in 8 it's either 17 or 8 and trying to understand that or remembering like this is the improvement, I think.

Right, the -- there is a reason we moved to cherry, there is a reason we moved Highland Park into District 8 out of 17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think 8 was also where we are preserving the Bengali community and 17 if I remember correctly has a lot of the Latin X community.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Where is the LBGT community we wanted to highlight that I think it's the palmer.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Palmer Park.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Further northwest Detroit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that in 8?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right under Oak Park see the diagonal line below 13 I think on this map we have most of it in except that little jut out from 14.

Can you Zoom in a little bit more John and show us.

That is Palmer Park right there.

The diagonal comes down.

And I'm not sure if that little part of 14 is part of Palmer Park or not.

I don't think it is.

I thought it was between the two diagonals.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm sorry 6 mile Woodward area.

So immediately admittedly my strong suit is not looking at a map like this and knowing. I will always have to have neighborhoods so I'm going to say that loud and clear for everyone.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is it possible John, to bring up the neighborhood map on top of this?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Names not just the outline of neighborhoods.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In terms of process we are still trying to understand Spruce and cherry.

And do we feel like there is things -- that maybe what we were talking about. Holding Taylor keeping Taylor whole for example one did, the other didn't and trying to understand it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But I mean I think most of that is just plan deviation trying to bring down the plan deviation and get it down.

Because you know it's almost half of what the other plan is.

And that is because of all those small changes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I guess.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Palmer Park right there, yep, a little to the east.

Yep, right there.

So it's included in this map.

Palmer Woods Palmer Park and Sherwood forest.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe there is a question about plan deviation being low versus communities of interest.

Because we have neighborhoods broken up and things.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which I think is where Mr. Adelson was saying we really have to justify it and be willing to justify it whether it's a higher population, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I mean let's look in the Detroit area.

Like these neighborhoods are together.

So can we Zoom out a little bit, John? And so we have that cornerstone village English village down there where we need to maybe make a correction.

It's hard with the names on it.

>> MR. MORGAN: I can turn the names off for the moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Madison.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would be helpful.

That is split, yeah.

This is so confusing to look at now.

Okay, so does anyone find this confusing to look at as I do? I feel like I can't tell what is where with this on.

Can we take the neighborhood lines off and focus on the differences between Spruce and cherry and see if there is anything we want to incorporate?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is fine with me.

I was saying that for that specific moment.

If you were asking me a question about Detroit, then Commissioner Kellom would like the label of neighborhoods so I can make sure that I'm making number one the right choice and also well, yeah, that's all I want to say, that I'm making the right choice.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel like we are stuck in decision paralysis.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, well, how about we get out of that decision paralysis.

Is everyone okay with continuing to go with cherry as far as the collaborative map moving forward?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I agree we are just looking and looking and looking and not doing anything.

Let's pull up a map, decide that is the one and compare it to the other one and make the changes that we want to make.

We already started the meeting talking about the things that we wanted to look at.

So why don't we just pull up a map, look at those things we talked about earlier today. And start like changing That Street to what was it wealthy.

I mean that is a simple, simple little thing.

There is a ton of simple little things we can change. And look at the bigger picture but we are just sitting here staring at the screen and looking at these maps over and over and over again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's do that and take off the Spruce.

And since we are in Detroit, do we need to change anything for Bangla Town? I think this map incorporates those two precincts does someone have that map in front of them that we received public comment on?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right so we confirmed we have palmer Woods and park in the right place.

So we are going to stay with the cherry map.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We did get confirmation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Make sure we have the right cherry map. You are making a copy.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Point of order.

Cherry map is going to be our base?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

Ms. Reinhardt.

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

Just wanted to confirm if the Commission had reached a decision that you're only moving forward with cherry map or if there will be multiple drafts that will be worked on? I believe the current process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we are using the cherry as our base and there will be changes to it but I do not think we are anticipating having multiple maps is that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think what we are also trying to do is consolidate taking ideas from different maps so none of them have been eliminated we are trying to consolidate and make sure the best ideas from the various maps are in one map and I think what we just decided was that the cherry map is probably the best that serves us the best to take all the ideas and put them into the cherry, a basket full of cherries.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If there was the will of the Commission or a vote to determine it's only the one map that will proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I think we have to get something done.

I'm not saying you know let's throw the other ones out. Let's get one for each type of map that we need and if we have time, we can do another one.

On each one.

But if we don't start finishing something when the time comes, we're not going to have any.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And I know the staff does a really good job of not trying to tell us what to do.

And Sarah I don't mean to speak for you but what I heard her saying is pointing to and I think we are personalizing this.

We all like it's fine we like ideas.

But I think we do need to say hey we really like cherry and we are going to use the ideas from the other map so let's move forward with cherry as the base like I think that is kind of what Sarah was trying to direct us basically saying what Janice is trying to articulate so we are having a more focused discussion on I think we have to let go of this idea of we are not letting go any maps.

We are because we worked hard to produce a strong map that serves as a base.

So I don't think there is anything wrong with the language of saying we are letting go of those other maps and keeping the best ideas of those and moving forward with cherry.

I agree with Janice I cannot stare at another map I'm ready to make changes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You're moving on with one collaborative map.

Or are you saying that to bring forth to the public you're looking at one map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We're not saying that at all.

We are going to work on this map and hopefully come up with a map we can move forward and it's not foreclosing us for potentially moving forward with another map as well.

Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right, Commissioner Lange had stated her deviation is better.

Dustin and I did look it up and checked that it is.

I would like to compare it with all the other things that are on this form here lopsided margin median difference efficiency gap and so where that falls in relation to the cherry map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: John can you do that for us.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have it on the spreadsheet.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I don't have it on can you bring it up on yours.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have the one I downloaded from our website.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: We can compare and see if it is better or not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John can you bring it up too?

>> MR. MORGAN: I have a printed copy of it here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, can I share my screen? Am I allowed to do that? I have it up so.

Hold on.

I have to log into this one.

I was going to say John can do it real quick.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: On the website.

>> MR. MORGAN: Where.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Michigan.gov MICRC.

The maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hold on I'm logging in too.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Let's see if it is better or worse.

I don't know.

I'm pretty good yet.

There you go.

Can you hide everything except for Lange and cherry so that we can kind of compare them? It's just easier when they are right next to each other.

So we can see it on the screen.

So right now the Senate maps are in the blue.

So the cherry has a lopsided margin of 4.5.

The Lange map has a lopsided margin of 5.6.

The cherry map has a mean median of 2.2.

The Lange map has mean median of 4.4.

The cherry has efficiency gap of 3.4.

Lange has efficiency gap of 6.1.

The democratic seats under the cherry are 20 with a democratic bias of .3%.

And the Lange is 19 with a negative democratic bias so bias against democrats of negative 2.3.

Republican seats are 18.

With a negative bias against republicans of negative .3.

And the Lange is 19 with a positive republican balance of 2.3.

Is that helpful?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so the plan deviations are within spec.

Okay so going back I think to the cherry map, which is what I think we want to do, we were in the Detroit area.

And we've confirmed that Palmer Park is with oak you know Ferndale Oak Park Huntington Woods which was requested.

The other things we need to check in this map are the wind mere park area Dexter Lynn wood but that was actually the house map so I don't know if we need to worry about it in this map.

So we will save that for later.

Bangla Town.

There was concern about two precincts and I'm waiting to see if someone has that map.

Someone have that map available to see if that impacts this map or if that is a house map concern.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Does not impact.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we will save that for the house.

Save Dexter and Grandmont gardens are they reserved in this, that is another thing to look at corner side, east English village and we need the neighborhood maps again. So can you bring back up the neighborhood map? Rosedale is north of on the west side north of Dearborn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need the neighborhood names too John.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you scroll to the left Rosedale Park, Westwood, Grandmont, North Rosedale, they are altogether.

Okay, so that is good.

We got those taken care of.

So if we could go to the east side of Detroit scroll in a little bit morning side east and cornerstone village are currently split.

Do we want to put them back together? Cornerstone east village and morning side wanted to be together and we have them split.

Brittini, are you shaking your head?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was shaking my head yes to try that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I would recommend that we try to put those into 6 and then see what we need to change with 7 to account for what we just did.

John is there a quick and easy way to do that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The other way we can put it in 7 too.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think you are probably better off putting it in six because most of them are in six.

So you would just take these portions in and then see what happens to 7 but I think you are contemplating changing 7 any way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Possibly, yeah.

So can you put cornerstone village and the rest of east English village into six?

>> MR. MORGAN: Was there an issue with the Grosse Pointes since we are in this area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will deal with that next because that was my question, we might be able to bring in Grosse Pointe if we do that because that was also a comment that we have the one Grosse Pointe split off from the other five.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to align exactly with the neighborhood boundaries?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think so.

We would put that portion of Yorkshire Woods back.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, and then Ms. Reinhardt?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So similar to our last round of mapping as we are making adjustments, I'll prompt you for justifications for making the adjustment. So Commissioner Szetela could you explain why you moved that area into the other districts?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are not done and need to do cornerstone village too. But before we do that yes.

Because east English village morning side and cornerstone village identified as being a community of interest and wanted to be kept together and we had them separated in this plan so we are putting them back together.

We will evaluate Grosse Pointe because we have a portion of Grosse Pointe that is also split off from the west of Grosse Pointe and see if given what we just did with morning side and east English village and cornerstone if we can now add in the Section of Grosse Pointe back into 7.

Once again Community of Interest.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want me to put the outlines on from the other plan? Because it may have done this already.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, if you want to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Madam Chair.

I don't see which part of Grosse Pointe is not part of it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Gross point park.

It's the most southern.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right there Grosse Pointe park.

So what is the population of Grosse Pointe park? Can't see.

It's being difficult.

11,000, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Which is about what you need.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does anyone have a problem putting Grosse Pointe park into 7?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't I think that is where it should go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Put Grosse Pointe park into 7.

We will kill two birds with one stone.

We made a change Janice.

[Laughter]

Okay so did that damage our demographic balance our voting rights balance in 6 or 7?

I'm thinking no but let's just I don't think so.

What Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John brought it up for us.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Non-Hispanic population in 6 is 38.62.

And 7 is now 16.65%.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We wanted to -- until yeah but we have a coalition potentially.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think we are good.

And deviation is still below 5 so we are good.

Okay, so there was some comment about the Latino community in some area that we had split.

Does anyone know specifically what those comments were addressing in Detroit?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Latino community I believe was 17.

That is mostly where and I think Brittini you and I talked about this maybe Tireman Road was a reference.

And if we move it, yeah, I say it because I'm not sure which District.

I will see if I can find it north to Tireman Road was the small change that was requested at the hearing.

I'm asking you Commissioner Kellom because I'm not familiar enough.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, I do believe that was the suggestion that was made.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Miss Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry go ahead Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know if we are going to move to other areas because I had some thoughts regarding Oak Park Ferndale referencing the comment in that area to go horizontal rather than shoots.

But I don't know how we would like as a Commission to navigate.

It seems like we are shouting out very pointed areas.

So there was some other things I just noticed on our map by looking at it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm actually following a list of what we talked about earlier.

So that is why I'm.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you for the clarity.

Just making sure those things are on the list.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm just going down the list.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay cool.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is Sarah with the Department of State.

I guess I'm the process person today.

So as usual the Commission can conduct its business as you all want.

And edit your process in any way that you see fit. But just pointing to your current process as it is outlined for map adjustments during deliberations it operates in the collaborative way, that previous map adjustments have been performed.

Which is in rotating alphabetical order.

So Commissioner Szetela after your turn concludes it would be Commissioner Vallette's turn.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to do that guys?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: I don't.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I heard comments we did not want to do that.

So we did not want to take turns.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: I do not think we should take turns.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Take too long.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need to have it more than just one person.

I think I'm not disagreeing I just want to make sure that we somehow mix it up.

That's all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is fine I'm literally working off the list that we discussed earlier because I wrote a list.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: As long as you stick to the list that's good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Doug is sitting next to me I'm literally checking things off as we go down the list.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: People will naturally participate because some Commissioners will be more quiet or you know more vocal depending on the area. So I don't think we should force turns.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think that in our process where we have gone around from person to person previously those were appropriate.

But as we got further into the weeds it became less appropriate.

And I think as long as everybody is satisfied with one or two or three people there is no reason that any of us can't speak up.

And I don't think any of us are shy, quiet and unassuming.

And therefore I think the way we are doing it right now is working pretty well.

And I would suggest we continue making progress.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I agree.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So with that we do have -- it's from I was wrong about Tireman Street I apologize.

This moved the Latino with relation to the Latino community, into 17 so we are moving from out of 19 into 17, into District 17 and we are moving the line from Central.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: From Central.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If we can see Central.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that Central right there.

If you Zoom in it looks like that is Central, yep.

So right under St. Stevens Central, no further down underneath right there, that little block is that what they're talking about and they mentioned Lonyo too.

So definitely is a known Hispanic community.

Can we put do we have theme dots we can put on there to make sure we are grabbing the right thing for Hispanic community? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Madam Chair I don't any there is too many near Lonyo.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: There is I'm sorry I don't want to confuse Bethany.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: My mother stayed there at Lonyo and I didn't ever see any.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Isn't 19 the Dearborn District? So would that mess up any of our numbers that we tried to get so you know that we worked on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That area we are looking at is in Detroit.

And there is a mix.

So that is why I want the thematic dots brought up closer south of Michigan avenue on the Dearborn border is more of the Arab American areas.

If you move to Lonyo you get into more of the Hispanic area so I think we may be okay but we definitely need to see the thematic dots and they were specifically talking about Center Street which is pretty far east on that border.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think one of the other comments Melvindale which is currently in 17 has a large Yemeni population that could be included in the Arab District so we may be swapping.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a balance issue there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What is the theme?

>> MR. MORGAN: Voting age Hispanic.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, it's a lot.

>> MR. MORGAN: For reference this is the town line for Dearborn an area you were looking at moving were these two precincts and the number is the population if I click on the bubble, it tells me the percentage.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 73% in that area.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is what it says.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is pretty high.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's suppressed if it's below 10 percentage.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Unless someone disagrees, I would say move that one precinct yeah move it into Detroit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Next is 47.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Middle Eastern and taken out of Dearborn if we did that and prefer with the 1599 unless someone has an objection.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No objection.

>> MR. MORGAN: That precinct okay.

If you wanted a one for one population exchange you can look at the border to the north between 19-17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I remember correctly if we go a little further south John to where 17 and 19 and Melvindale is around there and this is where an Arab

population Yemeni thank you Yemeni population if we move it into Dearborn but this is where right we don't have any theme that can guide us here, do we have anyone that has enough understanding of the area?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I need to see where we are looking at here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There is a COI map that has that and I brought it up before.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: P6764 or P6762 and it's a P and I don't know if it's a COI map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dearborn and all of Melvindale in it.

So when we first drew this, I had brought up including Melvindale with the Dearborn District but I think more people wanted Melvindale with Down River so it depends having part of Melvindale to be with appropriate and it's appropriate to have it with Down River it's whatever we decide for this exercise we are doing now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can always as John suggested go north to the northern border between 17-19 and see what is up there where we might do a 1500 population swap.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm okay with it either way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you Zoom out a little bit so we can see what is north?

>> MR. MORGAN: This is Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would want to put on the neighborhood maps to just make sure we are not breaking up a neighborhood to fix this.

So what about that little, small neighborhood right there.

How many is in that that little block right there? 1700 so pretty close.

Everyone all right with moving that into 19?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I do 19 is our largest deviation and we are 8,000 under so we would get improve plan deviation if we moved more than 1700.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can do both.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I mean, yep.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: See what happens.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That takes all the fun out of it.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That is true.

>> MR. MORGAN: One voting precinct that covered both of those neighborhoods.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So that answered the questions for us right there
Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Should we clean it up because it took some blocks into the other.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we put the four little blocks back into 17?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Before we do that, I think if we take one more because 19 is the largest deviation, yep.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, interestingly 19 still needs about 6,000 more people but when we made that change, we dropped the BVAP of 17 below 35%.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No it's back up now.

It's back up now, yeah.

So we need to be careful then what we are grabbing.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If we go into Melvindale that might not be an issue.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: You were contemplating that 17 was a Hispanic focused District as well?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

16% Hispanic, yeah.

Can we Zoom out so we can see what around Dearborn, where else we might go? Go down to kind of Melvindale area.

I'm wondering too what the population.

Can we go to the southern edge of Dearborn or southern edge of 19, I'm trying to see what is along there.

Yeah, that strip down there is what I'm looking at.

South of Dearborn Heights.

Getting into Taylor.

Who does? Brittini Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: MC, yes, I had my hand up.

This is kind of tearing things apart and just like a brainstorm idea.

Which I mean Commissioner Eid you can definitely throw your shoe at me.

You can do maybe, it's an idea like a Dearborn Allen Park Taylor situation, leaving Melvindale in with the Down River Area? And then maybe do like a Dearborn Heights Garden City Inkster configuration.

Just so you would have a little bit more to work with.

So it's again introducing a nice idea of why than what we have here.

Just my thoughts.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That sounds good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I wouldn't want to redraw the entire Dearborn district though.

I mean it looks like we can just take that little corner of Melvindale that is east of Oakman jutting in Dearborn with not a lot of Hispanic population and not pulling out of 17 Hispanic population.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No Hispanic heritage over there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you Zoom in a little bit, John, not there.

A little further, yeah, see where the 1922 is.

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

>> MR. MORGAN: That is Allen Park.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Allen Park.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to put that in 19?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thoughts? Opinions? All right let's give it a try.

Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The community submitted the map to us of Melvindale not Allen Park.

If we add to this, I think it should be in Melvindale.

Even if it's just a couple precincts in Melvindale for population deviation.

Since it supports the community of interest, I think it is justified.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Then you are breaking up the community of interest of the Hispanic population of Melvindale which also asked to stay with southwest Detroit.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We can try it and see what it does to the Hispanic population how much it changes it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's see what we have right now.

We have Allen Park added.

At this point we are adding an Arab potentially Arab community and want to make sure we are not diluting that voice.

So we want I guess we have to look at election results at this point in order to understand whether we made a choice that's affirming that community.

Is that accurate?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think so.

I mean I don't think adding 2000 people out of 20 is going to make a change whatsoever out of election results.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need another 2000 if we need the population deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As long as it's below 2.5 then we stay below 5% so it's good in terms of population.

Yeah, then you are not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Your words are persuasive Anthony.

I'm struggling here but we have two so you are okay with it?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is pretty good where it is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You said pretty good.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Madam Chair got it right.

I mean I'm right.

I know exactly where that is so that is pretty good so Brittini go ahead before we move out of the Detroit region Brittini there was something you wanted to address with Oak Park area?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: But I just wanted to look at it Oak Park, Ferndale, I don't know.

I'm not opposed to ripping things apart if it means it's better.

But I know my fellow Commissioners don't like doing that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are you looking to make better that is what I'm trying to understand.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, it's fine.

So I was looking at can we Zoom in? I think that is nine and 13 that area.

Like Zoom in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, right there.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can you put if the neighborhood overlay for a few seconds and I know it makes people dizzy but I like to look at it actually.

How far can you tell me does 13 extend so Southfield is together that is fine.

And then all the way to Birmingham, okay, I'll save my thoughts.

Maybe I will just do -- I will wait until we get to the house.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right go ahead Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, one item that I had on my list, I don't think we have gone through is I think we should walk through the neighborhoods and make sure they are not specifically in two different districts.

I'm sorry, walk through the neighborhoods so that they are not split between two districts.

I think we should do a quick scan of that.

That has to be a visual scan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One of them was Boston Edison that was split.

I remember that coming up, earlier.

Hi Kent.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hey Kent how are you, did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You are on mute.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are on mute.

We can't hear you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I saw something a while ago in the maps and curious John could you Zoom in to Highland Park, the northwest corner right there? Of Highland Park? Zoom in on that right there a little up to your left and up turn on your aerial photography that cuts right through houses.

Can you put the layer view on that shows the aerial photography? Now I understand that this is the Township boundary as they had it.

Number two.

That might show it.

Wait number two.

Yeah, if you Zoom in right there Brighton and Geneva Street that line goes through houses and neighborhoods.

And since y'all were in this area, I understand the two Townships may have worked out which houses in which.

But for the sake of drawing house and Senate District maps, when you have a line like that going through a neighborhood there is no physical feature there.

I mean I was just wondering if you could put all of the census blocks on That Street in one District or the other, would that matter to the neighborhood? See it goes all the way down.

See it's cutting through.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is going to be some discussion about which District people are in.

It may not be a big deal.

But it could be if people asking, I'm in this District I'm in that District.

If there was a power line or a road or anything through there you could say, no, it's one District or the other.

Anyway just wanted to bring that to y'all's attention.

It caught my eye a couple weeks ago and I was wondering or would it be easier for the registrars in the local people to have those splits.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you are looking for resolution of that you would probably add the precinct that is outside of the Township into the District with the Township rather than the other way around.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right guys, we've gone about two hours do we want to take a ten minute break so everybody can get up and stretch?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We need longer.

These ten minute breaks are not getting it.

By the time I get up to walk it's time for me to come back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so without objection it's 5:54, we are going to take a ten minute break and we will reconvene at 6:05 p.m.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 6:06 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely, Madam Chair. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending today's meeting remotely, please disclose during roll call you are attending remotely and where you are attending from, I will Start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending from Detroit, Michigan.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

Attending remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Eaton County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

Okay, so we are working through our Detroit area on the cherry as the launching off point.

We covered Bangla Town Dexter we are dealing with the house map and addressed the Latino community and Grandmont, Cornerstone, Morningside and East English village. Another is South Lyon, Northville and affects the Congressional map, so not an issue with this map.

We had a bunch of comments about the Asian Pacific islander community in Novi so I think that should probably be the next place to look and see if there is any concerns with this particular map.

I think those concerns were in the house map but I'm not 100% certain.

So let's take a look at Novi area.

Before we do that, we have a suggestion from Commissioner Clark to put on the neighborhood map in Detroit and take a look at the neighborhoods to try to minimize any neighborhood splits.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And just in the housing split because of Highland Park that we were working on that Mr. Stegall brought our attention to.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want neighborhoods in Detroit or Novi?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Neighborhoods in Detroit.

I guess we can take a peek at Novi really quick because I don't think it affects this map. Any preference? Okay let's bring back up cherry and take a look at Detroit with the Detroit neighborhood overlay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Neighborhoods of Detroit are on the map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are not seeing your screen.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well they are still there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sure they are. I'll take your word for it.

Commissioner Kellom do you want to lead this look and see if there is anything you want to change?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Well you know I'm going to ask for what you all don't like and that is the labels.

Thank you, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you want to do this systematically this District 5 only has a few neighborhoods to consider.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, so, yeah, you could I mean that looks like Mohican some of the neighborhoods in Detroit Detroiters don't always use the neighborhood names.

So are you all wanting to take that small area where it's split and put that into 5? It's such a small little.

>> MR. MORGAN: Or go the other way and put it in six.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is true.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It up to you.

I don't think it hurts to put it into five.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I say put it into five.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I think my understanding is that the reason we put this on our list was because we do understand that neighborhoods are important and we you know so if there is someone who can help us understand right the two right Commissioner Kellom, Commissioner Curry if you can help us understand which ones where there is egregious and they cannot remain divided that is what I think we are trying to do.

If you understand something like hey it's okay, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I got it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom is correct some neighborhoods have a stronger identity than others.

And so for some neighborhoods maybe it is not such a big deal but for others it might be.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So that would be the areas that go ahead John.

>> MR. MORGAN: What I was going to say I brought up the other plan for reference. You know, so in the other plan it looks like that's not in.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't think it would make a huge difference. I have not heard anyone reference that area. They have been more like large scale suggestions as it relates to like the Eastpointe Harper Woods the whole east side so we can kind of scan around go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hold the decision on this for the moment and let's scan and see other options.

Okay so this is maybe, maybe not.

But there is one.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Erin has a hand because I know you all can't see her.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you are talking, we can't hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

I am trying to juggle the phone and the computer.

But for those of you that are familiar with the Grosse Pointe area, did we hear testimony that cornerstone village belongs in with them as well?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: They did not want to be with the points. Cornerstone morning side and east English village wanted to remain together.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, they are all Detroit neighborhoods.

We did.

She is asking if cornerstone wants to go with Grosse Pointe.

Yeah, sorry.

All right keep going Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yep, what I see on my little screen looks good. I don't see anything right now that needs to be shifted.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going along the border.

We see here District 5 now there is a split neighborhood here between 6 and 7.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't think that would make much of a difference outer drive, Hayes, Commissioner Curry do you have any thoughts on that?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, English village is pretty much to their self in Detroit here.

So Hayes is doing their thing over there.

So I don't think it would make that much difference.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to go ahead and put all of this into six or leave it split?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Put it into six.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that puts that neighborhood whole.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

What is that little curious piece?

>> MR. MORGAN: That is following the precinct boundary instead of a block boundary.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here is the downtown by Greektown.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That looks fine to me.

>> MR. MORGAN: So leave it split?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What Street is that?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was going to say Zoom in to The Street before I say

yes.

I.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it's Michigan avenue.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here is Jefferson avenue is here.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is Jefferson avenue.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Down at the bottom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is the gold coast.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You can leave them split because they are more or less split any how you know.

The way they are made.

Because of the large streets down there.

Larn and Michigan Ave and all that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right Brittini, don't you think?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You can call me sister Kellom that is fine. I

appreciate.

[Laughter]

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay there is a split neighborhood between 8 and 17.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm not familiar.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Piety hill don't split that.

>> MR. MORGAN: All into 17? Or this into 8?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is the population.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Put it in 8.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Versus 8.

>> MR. MORGAN: 8 from 17.

Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 17 is 2000 over so yeah definitely put it to eight.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Put it in eight.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Boston Edison and I'm pretty sure we heard comment about that.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is following a major roadway though if that makes a difference.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Is that Woodward?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is Woodward.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Edison extends on either side of Woodward so that is why that is the boundary.

Does that make sense to you all what I just said?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, it does.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay I like participatory back.

Okay, how are populations?

>> MR. MORGAN: That was fine after that change.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You can keep Oakman separate from Dexter and Finkle.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so Oakman is in 17 and Dexter Finkle is in 13.

There is just a little difference here if you want to adjust that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think I would keep Oakman separate from Dexter and Finkle as far as the District, the house rather.

What is in the Senate?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The Senate.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to take that little bit of Dexter Finkle that is blue and Pilgrim village and put those in 13 and maybe take Oakman that is currently in 13 and put it into 17.

>> MR. MORGAN: After we do this, I promise I'm going to save the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a good choice on your part.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And for my beloved Sarah Reinhardt's benefit we are doing this to reunify communities and that existed forever.

And communities and cultures that are sacred to the City of Detroit.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You're welcome.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well said.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I have a train.

I will mute for a minute.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay as I'm going through here the census blocks are on two sides.

Well, you know, the census blocks are split by the neighborhoods.

So you have to decide which way you want to go.

Do you want to go back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you show houses, are there houses in that triangle there? Because I'm just.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, if there is houses near Dexter and Finkle you can kind of keep them together.

I think Oakman is more of a Chaldean neighborhood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Come on sister Brittini.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You would not be able to hear me over the train.

I didn't have anything to say.

I realize when we were at the bus it was the lodge and I don't think that was Woodward.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is not Woodward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we Zoom in? I feel that is not houses.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hospital.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lynn wood something supply.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Probably Lynn wood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lynn wood something.

>> MR. MORGAN: Pipe and supply it's a business.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So those are businesses and then Robinson academy.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is a school.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a school.

So is that okay to have them into 17? Because they are not houses? Or do we want to put them back the other way?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What do you think put the businesses in 17 or the which ones?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think what he is doing is good.

So put.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: North of oak man Boulevard.

North of Oakman Boulevard.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there a little triangle we have left out right now? Right there, what is that?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What is that? Anthony, you would probably know. What is that?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: He filled it in.

She was not asking what is it, let's fix it I think that is what Chair Szetela was saying.

>> MR. MORGAN: A median between two highways.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, yeah, can we go back to the non-satellite map? And can we grab that last area.

Well it's part of Dexter Finkle so I would say leave it where it is.

All right, so Zoom back out again.

Yeah. That is part of Dexter Finkle so I say leave it.

All right anything else in that area? We got a little bit where are we?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Davidson Schoolcraft and Littlefield community.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: They are pretty good together the Davidson and Littlefield is good, everything else looks pretty good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Davidson is 13 and Schoolcraft and Littlefield is in 17.

So they are not necessarily together.

So what do you think? But they are okay the way they are?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: They are okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yep.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I know, happy homes.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: And northwest community.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is that little strip? Never mind.

I think we already fixed that.

That little line that was by Dexter, Finkle, Davidson, Schoolcraft where it looks like 17 kind of bleeds in the area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, that was part of the same precinct, yep.

Do you want to fix that part just below where it says David son Schoolcraft where it's part of Oakman yeah though three little precincts, do we want to move those into 17?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I would like to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Along with the blurb going in Littlefield.

John, can we put those into 17? Okay and just fix Littlefield put Littlefield together with that line and I think that will be good.

Because there is houses there.

All right, yeah, we are saving.

Dude.

Why did you say that, Steve? It won't happen.

Right, okay, all right anything else?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No I don't see anything blaring there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Brightmoore together.

Commissioner Clark has a question.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Juanita after we went past Boston Edison you said that was not Woodward that road we are looking at.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Boston Edison goes up to Woodward.

Boston Edison is a very pretty nice.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I know where it is.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, so it runs into Woodward but, no, it is not.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I said it was the lodge that curvature I was describing that I saw and said it was Woodward it was not, in fact, Woodward.

Even though there are pieces of Boston Edison on both sides of Woodward that particular strip was the lodge is what I was correcting myself.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I thought your comment was that was not Woodward, that road so okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is another split neighborhood if you want to adjust this or not.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is Plymouth and what?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And Hubble.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't know how would we adjust that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Put it into 19.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You could assign it to 19 is what he is asking.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay that will be good Szetela se how many people are in there though?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is what I was going to say.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 19 is 5,000 under so it's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That would help it, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: You have pride area split.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What is pride area?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is what I was explaining.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's a new name and I'm not familiar with that name.

The streets around there, what streets are around there?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does Commissioner Wagner have her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think she just left it up but you can check.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner did you have a comment or question?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No I left my hand up, sorry about that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think pride area is an area they built into you know the new Meijer's. I think that is over near pride area.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Close to Brightmoore.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is that new little area they are building up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Fullerton maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is it, yeah.

The other side of Grand River or somewhere.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know if that is that area.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, there is grand river, that is it, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay all right Commissioner Curry, all right, all right.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: If I don't know anything else.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You know that area.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I know Detroit period.

I've been here all my life.

All over Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So do you want to grab the rest of that triangle and put it in the pride area community? Do we want to put that triangle into 17? I think it probably makes sense.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think so, yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So grab that triangle cutoff triangle and put it into 17.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is a trapezoid.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a what? Geometric shape.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What if we actually put 13 so 13 is under and 17 is over.

Maybe it doesn't make that much difference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 13 is under and 17 is over.

We will see.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I would keep some of 13 with Grand River and 96 area because when you get to that new little place what we just talked about, what was that? The little place they built in.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Pride area community.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is more of a business area where they put new little businesses in.

There is not that many houses right there on that particular triangle.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anywhere else?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: They want to keep grand Mont and what else was that together, keep grand Mont.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And we checked that, they are together Grandmont, Rosedale Park, Westwood, Fremont in one and North Rosedale and Minock Park and they are altogether so we are good there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Neighborhood split in three districts here.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is the Brightmoore area.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 19 is under.

Is that Brightmoore neighborhood? Can we Zoom all the way in.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: A lot of houses over there.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Brightmoore is over here.

>> MR. MORGAN: In 9 and Schoolcraft Southfield if we follow the line this is the entire neighborhood and it's in three different districts, 1, 2, 3.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Would probably be okay, yeah Brittini?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know that is okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay I did not hear anybody complaining about it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can we Zoom so I can see the names of the street?

And it's split into how many different, four pieces?

>> MR. MORGAN: Three different districts the pink portion is in District 9.

This is District 19.

And this is District 13 over here.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM:

>> MR. MORGAN: Here is the Interstate.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Could we at least put that little area of 19 into 9 but I'm not looking -- that could be too much population, I'm not sure.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's going to be too much.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's relatively small population probably.

These are census blocks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's right off the freeway so it does tend to have a lot of businesses along there.

Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I say put it into 9.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Add that to 9 and see what it does.

Hopefully we will still be within specs.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What is that? What is that, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: These are just areas that I didn't get with the clicks.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You what?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 19 is our largest deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

Thank you for saving as always.

>> MR. MORGAN: Now it's split just between two districts.

Over here you have Holcomb community and Berg-Lasher is split.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I have not heard anyone really complaining about the splits over there.

I know that there are a lot of businesses kind of around that area.

So maybe that probably why they are split because of the businesses out there.

I have a strong opinion about that.

I mean it looks funky because it looks like a stair step but what is happening in 14? Is it under.

>> MR. MORGAN: Take some of this in 14 or you could.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let's try to even it out a little bit.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Keep both of the Berg and Evergreen, Lasher.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What did you say Commissioner Curry what was your suggestion?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Looking at Berg and Lasher and Evergreen and Lasher so work with that a little bit or whatever.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: John are you going to assign the other little.

>> MR. MORGAN: Like that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Like that John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to put the Holcomb community in nine?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I would but I want Commissioner Curry to say.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It would like a little more neater what happened to that? He just pulled his tooth out.

What are the streets there John?

>> MR. MORGAN: It's by Lasher it's the burg neighborhood is mostly single family houses.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I know where that is but I'm talking about where the thing looked like a tooth that was being pulled that line.

What streets are those? I can't see the streets.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep, just a moment.

Sorry.

>> MR. MORGAN: 7-Mile and this is a shopping center Renaissance village apartments and Apollo market.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I would not worry about that.

Those are all businesses.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and this little portion of the neighborhood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to ask about that are we moving that too into 14.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Those are houses what you think Britini?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Chippewa and those are mostly houses over there aren't they?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: All of that is.

Can you move that into 14?

>> MR. MORGAN: I bike through the neighborhood and this is kind of like the back end is wilderness.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Nothing past that because then it would not make sense.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Start to get in park River Rouge runs through. It's the wild lands.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I like River Rouge.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Before we leave this area too much that is 19 is our largest deviation and 17 has extra.

Meaning 17, 19 we are under populated by 6,000.

And 17 is over.

So I just and because we are working on neighborhoods what I'm hoping you might be able to help us do is between 17 and 19 because they do touch, I think further north John.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Aviation 19 we need in 19.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need to reduce it.

Excuse me we need to add to 19.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Can you put Delray in spring wells?

>> MR. MORGAN: Delray and spring wells are in the same District.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: See that Aviation sub right there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Put that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Put it into 19.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Aviation, it's a neighborhood.

Has a particular style of houses.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, that is where Brittini it kind of changed the looks of some of the houses over there and building up that neighborhood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There is Oakman Boulevard by the way.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: One area is a totally different culture than another area so where are we at on that? I can't hardly read this.

I need my glasses on.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's small.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I understand this is a plurality District but we are still and I think these are all good changes we have made but just want to be aware we are dropping the BVAP quite a bit.

We almost dropped it below 34% but it went back up with the last change.

So we should just be careful making sure we have that number in mind too.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, that is true.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What area is this in?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In 17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anybody else we see along here we need to adjust?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm through when you get that far up.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Curry you better sit back up in your Chair no way.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I may not know that area but and all the different neighborhoods have made a great change in the past couple of years. So I'm not too familiar with what is going on but I know where they are but when you get up more towards the north, I'm not too familiar with what is happening in that particular neighborhood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Last area I think John is trying to get our focus on is far well and we've got a little Pershing do we want to change anything here Davidson, do you want to move any of these lines around?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I didn't hear anybody talking about it and I probably would.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: How come I see District 17 at the bottom?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, that is weird.

It says districts in view but it's not showing us districts in view.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is not going to help me make any decisions.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe move the two or three blocks in Pershing.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Homes over there so maybe they are satisfied.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are moving them into 6 or 8?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Into 8.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Sorry thank you, thank you, thank you.

The wrong way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want to put that in the cube? And is that neighborhood divided, is that Krainz Woods? I'm not familiar with that at all? Do we want to put that into six? Do we want to put that in six.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We should be careful because these are new neighborhoods that have popped up where Duggan planted a whole lot of nice new homes there so the neighborhoods.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You are asking if Krainz Woods goes in 6.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are below population there and could balance it out if we put the whole community in.

That is what I was thinking.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Including Krainz Park?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not sure how much population or leave it.

>> MR. MORGAN: You have the Mohegan region you can put it in six.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I would say put it in six.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is the population of five? I'm not seeing five, okay, but five is more under so would we want to take away from five but no I'm thinking not I would say just leave it.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is a District you might change on the north end any way.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I really wanted five to come down lower into Hamtramck but that is an out loud confession.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: More southwest?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we add to five in the Mohegan region? Are you against taking that sliver and adding it to five and taking it out of six and into five so Mohegan region is complete all in different five?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I knew what you meant.
It can be totally complete.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm not familiar with the name Mohegan region and.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is it okay because of the population?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead and add those blocks in just into we are adding into five, right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ones that are currently in six and that yeah add those blocks in.

>> MR. MORGAN: 6 is 2%.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 2% what.

>> MR. MORGAN: Under now do you want to add the Krainz Woods to six?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would think so.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We probably need to see the streets so we can tell the names.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think it's fine to add it to six.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It probably is fine.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm stepping back you guys.

>> MR. MORGAN: Trying to save the plan and I think the computer may be protesting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just give it a second.

Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We got 12 more minutes then we can go home.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Curry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry you are home.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm not comfortable.

Just sitting in a Chair all day like you guys.

I feel just like I feel like.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Our hearts are bleeding.

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

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You feel trapped.

Do you want to stand, stand.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm good it's just time to go home.

It's time for us to close.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Curry I'm going to mute your mic.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are close and ten minutes away and we are making good progress and we will be back at 9:00 tomorrow, I know I see your face Commissioner Curry.

It won't be quite as long a day and we will start early and getting as much done as we can.

With computers willing.

>> MR. MORGAN: Computer says no.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: At least it's not saying unresponsive so that is a positive.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: This is what map, the Bruce map?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This is cherry we are in the Senate.

This is kind of like a going back question.

Can we review why we chose Melvindale over Allen Park for the switch up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hispanic population is greater in Melvindale and trying not to pull it off the District we created for the Hispanic population and grabbed from Allen Park where it was not as Hispanic and trying not to break up that Community of Interest.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: There may be an opinion on that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's a big opinion because I'm two blocks from Melvindale and trying to see where you are seeing all this at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Everybody is leaving us.

>> MR. MORGAN: After this change I'm going to close the program.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is a wise choice.

Wait.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: There is one area in regent park southeast end and looks like it's unassigned.

There is a little square down there.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Lincoln Park.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Regent park.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Total unassigned 0 so I think we are all right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so are you just waiting on it?

>> MR. MORGAN: I think so.

I don't know.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You what?

>> MR. MORGAN: I think I'm waiting.

I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If we could just assign that area, if you can, if not.

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

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm trying to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right then.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Machine is tired.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: At least you got to save it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: My Zoom is tired, I'm losing buttons.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to close it at this point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right while in light of that let me take a quick gander at our agenda.

We don't have any minutes to approve we don't have any staff reports.

Department of State do you have any updates for us? No updates correspondence received in advance of the meeting as provided to Commissioners in our meeting materials.

Future agenda items do we have any? Announcements? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So just to prepare for tomorrow, where do we see us starting with and going to as far as this map and the next group of maps? Do we have any idea what is going to be happening.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's continue to follow the list of what we talked about earlier and just go down it and address everything we brought up and then I think at that point evaluate the map and then at that point we can decide whether we want to do more with it.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Only thing you can do.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Are we going to what I meant is after we are done with the Senate map, do we go to the Congressional or the house map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Congressional.

Yes, the plan is even though our process document calls us for us to go to the house next, we decided there was suggestion that it would be more efficient to go to the Congressional maps because it's 13 districts and it's easier to compare and that will give our vendors some additional time to prepare

The PDF and accommodate the additional time to prepare house maps for the districts we have.

The plan is once we are completed with Senate, we will move on to Congress.

All right, now so we had a motion by Commissioner Lett seconded by Commissioner Witjes to adjourn any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

For the record because MC is off camera you can see him in the camera, he said aye with his hand up all opposed raise your and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the meeting is adjourned at 6:54 thank you everybody.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.