

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

10/05/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As Vice Chair of the Commission, we will bring the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:03 a.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube at Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube site.

For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at Redistricting MI to find the link for viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this 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 or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at 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, our 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 now 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 the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present from Farmington Hills, Michigan

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present 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?
- >> 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: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. You can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved. Motion made by Commissioner Lett. Seconded by Weiss.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Seeing none we will now vote all in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed please raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and 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 the public comment pertaining to agenda topics.

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 nearest microphone when I call your number. 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 Sarah Howard.

>> Sarah Howard here on behalf of the fair map project. And your current maps are still unconstitutional. You drew a Senate map yesterday giving republicans a clear advantage on all four partisan measures. Democrats would have to win 52% of the vote

just to win half the districts. You've also used Presidential year election data to measure partisanship of the Senate districts. But the State Senate never runs in Presidential years. Partisan fairness measured by efficiency gap at or near 0 is a constitutional requirement, not just a goal.

Anyone who tells you otherwise is wrong.

No disproportionate advantage has a plain language -- it does not mean being largely out of proportion.

Your current efficiency gaps will not pass constitutional muster.

We encourage you again to borrow from the AFLCIO maps or others on the portal that draw districts fair to each party and respecting communities of interest.

The rest of what I need to say today is being submitted on your portal for your consideration. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Ms. Howard. Do we have a number two? We do not, okay, at this time we will now move on to remote live public commentary to the Commission.

I will call on 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 that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call on you by your name. Or the last four digits of your phone number.

If you experience technical or audio issues and 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 redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate during the next public comment period 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 James Gallant.

>> Hello. This is James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. And where is the second public comment at, please, the period? And it appears on Robert's Rules of Order.com, there is a question-and-answer forum on there. And it seems to be the consensus that motion to discuss is absurd and out of order, and that discussion has been going on for the last ten years.

And you moved the minutes to deny the public due process to address your minutes to talk to the minutes before you approve them.

That's a first amendment issue.

And although it's highly improbable, I think that Secretary Benson may have randomly selected 13 cheaters out of 10,000 applications. You know Jordan Peterson talks about this. You need discipline not to take the temptation of the, you know, the Dutches

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.

Witjes and people that want to just make it easy so for you, you don't have to follow the rules.

Please do your due diligence and gets the reports and hire a parliamentarian. And all due respect to your attorney, but that is her world view. That is her own personal opinion. And where did this come from?

No, you did not ask again.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission, Mr. Gallant.

Next in line to speak is Anthony S. You will have one minute to address the Commission.

Please wait for our staff to unmute you.

>> Good morning, Commission. Thank you so much for the one minute. I guess one minute is better than none, not as good as two though. But I'm commenting to mention today my community of interest, which is Down River. I'm not too happy with the way it looks in one of your maps, which is Congressional. Looks good in State House and looks good in State Senate, no problem there. But in Congress it's split three ways between three different districts. And in District one you have part of Down River including Allen Park, Melvindale, River Rouge, Ecorse, and Lincoln Park. And it's in with cities in Macomb County. It doesn't seem like -- it seems an odd grouping to me in the collaborative Congressional map.

And then in District 7 you have the rest of Down River except for Taylor. And those are with cities, which include, you know, Washtenaw, fine, but part of Jackson County, too.

It's just such a stretch to me.

I don't understand these Congressional districts for Down River.

My comments are backed up by the steel worker for me course if you remember her and the lady from Trenton on the Zoom the other night.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Mr. S.

And next in line to address the Commission is Dr. Stan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not currently present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Ashley Prew, you will have one minute to address the Commission.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Hello. Thank you. My name is Ashley Prew. I'm a resident of the city of Fenton, Michigan in Genesee County. I would like to speak directly to the State House map and State Senate map as it pertains to Genesee County, specifically the State House map, very clearly chops Genesee County into eight different districts.

I am in the proposed District 56.

And as I look at the proposed District 56, 59, 57, 58 and 53, for residents of Genesee County it seems highly unlikely the representative will actually live in the County they reside, and think it violates the community of interest standard.

In addition the State Senate map for the northern part of Genesee County cuts way into Lapeer County and I do not believe that is appropriate.

Also did notice the maps do disproportionately lean to republican favor for the State House and the state or State House and State Senate specifically. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. .

Next in line to address the Commission is Loida Tapia.

>> Hi. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Loida-Tapia. I'm a resident of Detroit. And calling to bring your attention to some concerns from residents. We think that it is deeply needed to have a second public hearing in Detroit. Even your communications and Outreach Director, Edward Woods, has requested this as well. With 40% of the population in Detroit, I think it's highly necessary to have a second period especially when you moved public comment from two minutes to one with just a rule change.

These were changes you made last week.

Please reconsider as organizations and people are really trying to get to the public comments to provide you feedback on your maps especially in Detroit as you are struggling with. And it's necessary for us to provide as much time for residents of Detroit to be able to provide those public comments.

Please consider adding the second day as it was recommended by your communication and Outreach Director.

There is a reason why he is recommending this is because he is also hearing from community.

When 40% of the population votes in this area, it's necessary to hear from them as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Ghana-Goodwin-Dye.

>> I'm Ghana Goodwin Dye from Southfield, Michigan. I would like to say thank you to the Commission for the changes they made for Pontiac residents.

Second, the Commission was tasked with drawing maps under the political gerrymandering.

Currently the Senate map favors republicans by 7%.

The State House map favors republicans by 9%.

And the Congressional map favors republicans by 2%.

The maps need to be significantly adjusted across the state to be considered fair for everyone.

So I'm hoping that the Commission will take that into consideration.

And make those adjustments so that we will not be in this position that we are now.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line to address the Commission is Susan Smith.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For the public watching, Susan Smith is number 7.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Susan Smith, vice president for advocacy for the League of Women Voters of Michigan.

The League of Women Voters urges the Commission to reconsider the decision to limit the length of public comments at public hearings to one minute.

As a practical matter it won't be possible for communities of interest to follow the direction given to them by the Commission.

COIs have been told to provide the ID number of maps they have submitted in the portal when they sign in at the public hearing.

This will enable EDS to show their map on the screen while the COI is making their public comment to the Commission.

One minute is not long enough for this process to occur.

Please reinstate the two minute time limit for public comments at the public hearings.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Paul McAdams.

>> Good morning. My name is Paul McAdams, St. Clair Shores Michigan.

I am -- would like to speak about partisan fairness and communities of interest beginning with the Congressional District that was drawn.

I think that we have far more here in the Congressional District in common with fellows in Oakland County and in Warren. And we would like to see the District drawn to include more of that.

The State Senate District that you have drawn, it favors -- that you have drawn overall, it favors republicans by 7%.

We think that the State Senate District in...that encompass St. Clair Shores should come further south down to Harrison Township.

I think we have a lot in common with the people in Grosse Pointe Woods and Grosse Pointe Shores. And if we could include Eastpointe, I think that would be more significant as far as communities of interest go.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Next in line is number nine.

Brandon Snyder.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. Thank you all for allowing me to speak.

My name is Brandon Snyder, the co-Executive Director of Detroit action.

We are a grass roots member led community organization building for the working class Black and Brown voters and non-voters here in the City of Detroit.

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'm a resident in the City of Detroit. And like so many Black and Brown folks here in the state of Michigan, my family moved here, up from the south for the promise of good jobs, neighborhoods, and good schools and the American dream.

Thank you all so much for fixing Pontiac's Senate District.

We appreciate that.

And it helps ensure that both Black and Brown voters will be able to have their voices heard.

However, Harper Woods is still disenfranchised by being part of a lakeshore District that stretches all the way to new Baltimore.

Communities like of interest like Eastpointe are needed to reflect accuracy and make sure that their voices are heard.

Last, we need to make sure more fair maps are across the board. And we have improved fairness metrics in each map and that there is no regression VRA, from the VRA.

Thank you all so much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number ten Mark Payne.

>> Hello, Commission.

Good morning. My name is Mark Payne. I'm a resident of Detroit and a democracy for the Court with Michigan league conservation of voters education fund.

Reducing the number of hearings especially in Metro Detroit that makes up over 40% of the state's population and having the length of individual testimony from two to one minutes will negatively impact the public input provided to you.

Furthermore, I ask you to be transparent and open and posting maps drawn by the day at the end of the day or next morning at the latest.

Last, please use all of the tools available such as voting patterns, voter participation, State House and State Senate primaries. And examine and use these tools to examine the surrounding districts for mapping Detroit and Detroit Metro area.

Thank you.

Have a great meeting.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Next in line is number 11.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Secretary of State.

Joyce Smith, number 12, please.

>> Hello, Joyce, we can hear you if you can hear us.

>> Yes, I can.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Muskegon is a lakeshore community.

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 the efforts to try and draw Muskegon and Grand Rapids together in the same Congressional District divides us into three communities with no natural connection. Simply put this is considered more gerrymandering.

Muskegon belongs with the lakeshore communities such as Holland, Grand Haven and Ottawa community, Muskegon and Ottawa Counties should remain whole in the lakeshore District.

The lakeshore community of interest, Muskegon, Ottawa, Allegan, Counties with Van Buren and Barry Counties represent a lakeshore Congressional District.

Thank you very much for putting those together.

Grand Rapids should be kept with the surrounding Metro communities.

And Township in Kent County.

Your task is not an easy one.

And we hope that you can keep the lakeshore by putting Muskegon and Ottawa Counties together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 13 Amanda Price.

>> Good morning.

My name is Amanda Price.

I'm the -- my name is Amanda Price. I'm the Ottawa County treasurer, former state representative for the 89th district and current chair of the Ottawa County apportionment Commission.

I want to commend the Redistricting Commission for the recently drawn map number 187, which specifically draws Muskegon, Ottawa, Allegan, Van Buren and Berrien Counties into District 9.

Recently drawn District 9 shares similar concerns we have similar agricultural products and manufacturing basis and concern for the Great Lakes shipping and water quality and our tourism efforts.

I urge you to retain map 187 District 9 in its current form.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Next in line is number 14, Adele Mozip.

>> Good morning, distinguished Commissioners.

My name is Adel-Mozip. I'm a resident of Dearborn. And for full disclosure I'm a Dearborn school board member.

First of all, the one minute limitation is very limited. And I hope that can be reconsidered as urged by the League of Women Voters as this suppresses people's voices.

When Michigan voters overwhelmingly approved this Commission back in 2018, the purpose was to have districts that are not gerrymandered.

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.

What the current map currently shows especially in Southeast Michigan and specifically the area of Hamtramck, Michigan is gerrymandering at its best.

Hamtramck is a City rich in many cultures that live in harmony. And they need to be kept in one State House District, not three.

Please keep Hamtramck as one District.

And add adjacent area of the airport south which clearly aligns with the City of Hamtramck, being a community of interest. The Wayne state area and midtown have no common interests.

Please keep Hamtramck.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number 15, Rick Catherman.

>> Good morning my name is Rick Catherman. I reside in South Haven, Michigan in Southwest Michigan. I'm going to echo the previous comments except for Southwest Michigan and address partisan fairness.

Michigan citizens established your Commission to end partisan gerrymandering.

Overall, Michigan is a slightly democratic leaning state. However, reports on your initial maps show your proposed lines favor republicans.

Yesterday your edited Senate maps resulted in a republican plus five analysis.

This is not acceptable.

I'm sure the republicans were satisfied. But the democrats and independents must speak up, step up and insist that the Commission do better.

Your task is enormous, but your responsibility is even greater.

This is hard work.

The citizens of Michigan are counting on you to end partisan gerrymandering.

Get it done with fair maps. Thank you very much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Next in line is number 16, Janessa-Smit.

>> Good morning. I live on the west side of the state in Hudsonville Michigan.

My husband and I chose to live and raise our family in Hudsonville because of its economic and cultural ties to Ottawa County.

Hudsonville associates with Zeeland and the neighboring communities of Jamestown and Georgetown with whom we share services and even schools with.

We are not Grand Rapids.

We are not Kent County.

We are Ottawa County. And there is a distinct difference.

I appreciate the Commission acknowledging that map 187 keeps Ottawa County as a community of interest.

Thank you for your work.

I know it's not easy. And the final map I ask you please keep Ottawa County whole.

Thank you.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next is 17 Abraham.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not currently present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Secretary of State. Number 18, Jill Adams.

>> Hi, can you see me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can.

>> Okay. First, I'd like to thank all the Commissioners for what I assume has been endless hours on this very large task.

My name again is Jill Adams. I live in Lenawee County. And I know that the people here or in the area down in southern Michigan are very pleased with the Congressional map you've drawn to include the border Counties that are along the Ohio border, and also including Jackson and Calhoun Counties.

Those of us near the border face very unique challenges in the state.

I know that you've received comments from both sides and knowing that you used feedback from both sides is greatly appreciated.

I know I don't speak for everybody on this panel this morning, but I think you have done a great job.

Trying to make all the communities equal 50/50 is never going to happen.

I think it's most important to keep the Counties.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. And our final speaker today is number 19, Chris Andrews.

>> Can you hear me now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can.

>> Okay. Hi. I'm Chris Andrews from Haslett.

Please don't settle for less unfair maps.

Right now your Senate plan is 100 yard dash or one party start five steps ahead.

Your consultant inadvertently created a false picture yesterday when he agreed that there was a democratic advantage on some of the metrics.

Don't let that color your view.

Every single metric provides a disproportionate bias towards republicans.

Your Voting Rights Act work did not move us towards fairness.

Some of the discussion yesterday seemed to suggest that a 50/50 seat outcome was amazing.

It is not amazing when it takes 52.3% democratic vote to achieve it.

In a close election republicans will probably control the Senate with your map even though even when most voters vote democratic.

The party with the most votes should win the majority.

Otherwise it under mines the will of the people.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Andrews.

That concludes our public comment for the day but I would like to say all comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting and Commissioners review the public comment portal on our www.Michigan.gov/MICRC website on a regular basis.

We appreciate everyone who provides public comment in whatever way you choose.

And invite you to keep sharing your thoughts communities of interest and maps.

And our Chair has arrived, I'm going to hand it back over, welcome Chair Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Unfinished business agenda 5A and without objection we will return to continuing the assessment for draft maps for compliance and adjustments.

Yesterday we were working on the Congressional districts and we will start with the compliance process for collaborative Congressional maps with Commission I believe Eid is he here? He is online Commissioner Eid instructing the line drawer.

So Anthony if you want to go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, so what we were doing we were looking at Congressional map, the collaborative Congressional map.

Since I'm virtual today I will be okay with skipping my turn and coming back to it later if someone else wants to take over on making these two VRA districts about the same non-Hispanic Black voting age population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much Commissioner Eid. Commissioner Orton I believe you are next in line.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, am I on? I am not familiar with the area really. So I'll need to have the theme dots up I think to help.

And to reorient myself we are trying to, well, they are about even right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They are about even.

>> MR. MORGAN: Since the computer crashed at the end, I can show you where you were at the last-minute Commissioner Eid was trying to equalize the population between two and one and you can see they are within 6800, 6500. So potentially precinct or two would rectify this.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay and it looks like the non-Hispanic Black voting age population has equaled out and that's about where we want it. So, okay, so let's see.

We are going from one to two.

So would you I guess just keep going up that line, that next precinct.

>> MR. MORGAN: To the south here?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Down that line or up that line.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton what we tried to acknowledge there are neighborhoods that may need to stay intact.

You are not so sure but want to acknowledge that Chair Szetela you probably are our best help here.

Do you need anything else to help guide Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So that is a community right there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a neighborhood.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is where we stopped before.

I just put those two in.

You said go down the line.

You want to change that?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well Commissioners that are familiar with that area should we take something else instead of breaking up that community? Neighborhood?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we also have Commissioner Curry.

But that's the border of Dearborn.

So I think honestly it could go either way because you have a pretty decent Arab American population in that too.

So I think putting that neighborhood either way would work.

So if you want to continue to put it into two, I think that is acceptable.

Commissioner Curry, do you have any comment?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I totally agree.

It would work if we could put it in, yeah, it's fine you're going to do it as far as I'm concerned, yep.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you.

Will you do that then, John?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was thinking about these the neighborhoods in the Detroit area over the weekend.

And this is something to think about and I don't know if there is going to be ament but when it comes to the neighborhoods a lot of them tend to break up precincts.

So would it be appropriate in that particular case to assign on the block level and stick to neighborhoods or would that be too extreme? Precincts should neighborhoods remain whole over precincts? Or should precincts remain whole over neighborhoods?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, my thought on that is neighborhoods are I would say fall under communities of interest.

So that's number three.

However, we will have to go down to the block level on the Congressional map to get the deviation.

The population deviation close to 0.

So kind of both.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just something to think about.

I noticed that over the weekend when I was working in the area.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A lot of the precincts in Detroit do cross over neighborhood lines.

So definitely something to consider.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We are breaking up this neighborhood but we are doing this for we started out doing this for VRA compliance.

So, okay, 1376, yeah, that little corner, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it's going to go down and see.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Oh, it probably is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what Dustin is talking about a lot of them span but that's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay why don't we undo that one so we don't break into that whole new area.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, I'm undoing the last one.

And did you want this portion? Or do you want to look at others?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's not do the block level right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Cynthia I'm just looking and John can you scroll up a little bit, please? Are we right up in here, right, yeah, right there, there is two right there, yes, is that a neighborhood and that is split into one District? Could we put that back into two from one?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Who are you asking?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Whoever wants to comment.

To me it looks like it's split up right now if you are looking at a neighborhood.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's hard to tell if that is a neighborhood line.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it is but it's hard to tell if that is just the line from line one breaking it up.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That picks you up a few right there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would actually equal you out there.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: And accomplishes trying to keep the neighborhood together.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Good catch Commissioner Weiss.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is a neighborhood and that would be a different neighborhood.

Going across the street there.

It's hard to see but, yeah, it is a different neighborhood.

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 ORTON: It is, I see the line.

Well we can still take the whole neighborhood, take both of those John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and then if you want, we can look at what was done down here.

So this is where you are.

They are within 914 and 448 at the moment.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, since it's Congressional and we need to get close, can you I don't know if your computer does this but if you select that little triangle, yeah, that one, down just right there, yeah, can you tell how much population is in that, in those blocks?

>> MR. MORGAN: Just under 400.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, that would help so why don't we do that, assign those blocks.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 2 is within 28 people and District 1 is 494.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so now is it Commissioners do we think it's a good time to try and go down to the deviation we are trying to reach or is this good for now and we will go around again to get it perfect?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: My understanding that is also part of our first compliance criteria.

Especially for this map.

It seems like now is the time to do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, I mean technically we are the deviation is within limits so we are complying with it.

So my thought would be to continue working to get everything as close as possible and then go back to it.

It would be easier to make minute adjustments later on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel can you weigh in for Congressional how close do we need to be? We have districts that are .06 with 400 over.

Obviously the 3800's a different story.

But for districts where you have like 494 and negative 28, is there a need to balance those out further down?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Good morning to the Commission.

Five days left for compliance analysis work.

Very exciting.

So every day, five days, I'll get my sign up, I forgot my tape, I need my sign.

So going back to the serious question of total population and deviation, so I think that going down through the districts now we are seeing District 3 is significantly over for Congressional standards.

But the final you will have another opportunity to make those final tweaks when.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right what I'm asking is Cynthia was looking at one and two is there a need for further adjustment there or is that close enough?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Not on one and two and I recommend you go down the list and District 4 would not need to be modified, but definitely District 3 so yes definitely continue down the list at this time and see what adjustments you can make.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so I think with those adjustments we made we actually brought up District two to now 42% instead of 41 point something does that still seem okay or?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson? We brought down District 1 and 2 and 41.49. And 42.10.

Is that compliant for VRA purposes?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Madam Chair I think they look good.

And congratulations to all the Commissioners who weighed in on balancing these districts the way they have.

And I also have to echo my colleagues comments.

One and two please don't touch the deviations because I have not seen any District that you have a 0 literally percent deviation in two so those are great.

And really are well within the range they need to be.

Going back to the Voting Rights Act, yes, I think the adjustments do look good.

And again, congratulations on everyone who for everybody who worked on this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I just wanted to offer because we know what Commissioner Szetela said there are districts excuse me that District number 2 east of Dearborn and the western edge of one right if we were to add right there so the what I'm thinking about is that blip in the northeast corner of two that is just over that one neighborhood that we added in the northern side instead to add it further south and we would add potentially Arab community.

I can't prove that.

I don't know that.

I don't know how we can see it.

But that's the only thought I had.

Is that instead of that one blip on the northeast just bring it and do it in the southeast area.

That's all I have.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That does make sense to me Rebecca and Anthony what do you think?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Repeat, I was not quite following.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John can you sort of the blip on the right there that neighborhood there, will you put that back in one.

And the numbers matter keeping the neighborhood whole that is one of the reasons we did it up there.

Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we can try it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is fine and are keeping more of the triangular Midwest neighborhood together.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So, John, do you know where he is talking about? Will you add those back into one, those two.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: And then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can do the 86424 and 14 and that should be about 3,000 is that right?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Will you do those three, John? And try the 574 would be switching one over one under but okay there is not a significant difference but Mr. Adelson, is that does that look good?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Deviation is good and under .10.

I mean the Supreme Court in the last round of redistricting in a case out of West Virginia confirmed a .8 deviation on a Congressional map is constitutional.

So I think that General Counsel Pastula and I are that is one of the things we are watching as the maps change and certainly if there were a range or a situation where you were getting into potentially problematic territory we would speak out.

But these deviations are good.

The districts look good.

The election results showed out yesterday so I think we are good.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I do have a question here.

We did this for non-Hispanic Black population for VRA but we know that we also have the large Arab American population and I'm not exactly sure.

I just know Dearborn and Dearborn Heights.

So are we breaking that up at all? Is that I don't know how to balance those two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are you breaking up the Arab American population is that what you are asking.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No most are in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights.

There are some in the neighborhoods around but they are in the clay town neighborhood just south of the District you added.

If you were venturing in there, I mean there is let me put it to you this way you can pick that neighborhood instead of what you picked that would be furthering the Arab American community by adding more Arabs in two verse the one you did pick.

But the other primary area is north of Dearborn which you already have in District 2.

Does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so if nobody sees any way, we can improve it then I'm good with it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may just at this point since you are I want to point out a process to this.

So if you notice how everything in District to outside of Detroit you have the whole Townships and a split in Detroit so what you might do if you were looking at lower deviations which you heard we don't have to do you might keep District two as is and make adjustment in Detroit and then District one you might make adjustment where you already have other splits.

When you are talking about balancing at very small levels that is just a way you can kind of do that and you do it one District at a time.

And again I'm not saying you have to do that.

We have heard comment you don't have to do that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioner Orton did you want to make any more changes or are you satisfied with your turn? So John can we look down the list a little bit just to see if there is anything else that needs changing? I don't think there was.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There isn't.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We don't have the population anywhere else for VRA districts, correct? Otherwise our deviations are good.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is discussion about deviation on three.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just the population is what we are going for.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: VRA I don't think we have anything else, does anyone disagree with that? Population we could adjust three a bit.

And so six is actually under by almost a thousand and we could probably move some of three into six.

What else? And ten, is also under.

So ten and six would be good areas to potentially shift some of three to.

To balance those out a little more especially ten, we can put 2000 in and what was the other one I said six.

Between six and ten we could balance out three.

Do you want to do that Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm wondering if we could Zoom out a little bit to see where 8 and 12 are because the numbers could balance.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Jackson 8 and 12.

Is kind of, yeah, a little out of order but.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 8 and 11 sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 11 is Saginaw.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would also consider moving some of three into seven.

That I mean there is a half of a Township there we may be able to use.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is Plymouth that is not half a Township that is Plymouth and Plymouth City that are their own divisions right now so it's not cut in half, no.

Commissioner Orton did you want to tackle this or do you want to pass it off to MC?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please tackle it Commissioner Orton.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Tackle away.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Because I see that speaking of split Townships, we do have Commerce Township, so why don't we move I don't know how much we can do. Can you Zoom in a little bit more so we can see population? We can move some of it in ten and balance those out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid I heard you have your hand up. I'm sorry I can't see you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I would just add that eastern part of Commerce Township from three into ten.

Those two eastern precincts that were almost at if you pan up a little bit. Yeah.

Those eastern precincts I would just add them to three.

And I think that would get the job done.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We need to take from three into ten.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay then I would do the opposite.

I would take the western Townships and put them into ten.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So, John, can you Zoom out just a little bit so I can see the border.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is border of Wixom, this is Commerce Township and this is Walled Lake.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That middle part of Commerce Township can we see? Okay.

Which piece? I can do the two middle ones right there or that one, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well if you are looking at the average this is right in between your positive 3800 and your negative 2800.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's do that one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent choice.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

Great they are both good now.

Okay I yield back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You could potentially put a little of three into six too if you wanted to balance or was it three and six? Three and six if you wanted to balance those a little closer.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm looking at the largest is 11 on our screen excuse me 8 and 11.

So I'm trying to understand -- I think we are trying to I think our process and I'm trying to be methodical because what is called to do doing compliance and with the largest deviation is 8 and 11 so I'm going to look at those two.

They don't touch each other.

So 8 and 7, right? So that looks like a place to balance or eight and nine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can also step up so take a little from.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 8 and 5.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 8 and put it in 7 and take a little from 7 and put it into 5 and then take a little from 5 and put it into 11.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Like you said we could skip a step and just go 8, 5, 11.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would work too yes.

Must faster.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I'm going to try to do.

So looks like we are so 8 if we are beginning at 8 in the south, we are -- so I'm adding five to eight.

So we've got whole Counties more or less in five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Other why you are adding 8 to 5 because you are over on 8.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Want to remove sed Szetela remove from eight and put it into five.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sorry my language is we are saying the same thing. I'm not translating it.

So which so I want to increase the area in five right removing a Section of eight and I'm guessing it's mostly rural areas.

So I'm going to and I feel like we that I think it's so the west earn that is Kalamazoo County.

Sort of on that northwestern County there.

That is a nine, that is Kalamazoo sorry that is Calhoun, yeah, I want Calhoun County and look at the northeastern block.

What do you think Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have one comment Jackson County from what I can tell is already kind of split so maybe if you took from there, we would not be breaking up a County.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

I appreciate that.

So yeah, let's look at that.

In the northeast I'm trying to move into five John so a little bit north so that what is that population? Uh-huh, that one there.

Pleasant Lake so 2600 or yeah looks like just 2600, 2800, 1949.

1903 or 1055 but I think we are in Calhoun now already.

I want to stay in the Jackson County.

So that northwest corner what is that? Go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That was just a thought but it's not that big of a deal I don't think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can always split down to blocks if you can't take a whole precinct so keep that in mind as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or like some of those.

>> Did someone just open the Zoom meeting? If you have a Zoom meeting on your laptop that your microphone is off.

See I'm muted on my laptop but somebody is unmuted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you split the precincts because the upper Townships were more than you needed and have two precincts in the upper southeast corner ones you could potentially split in half or the block level on the other two Townships on the western edge, Northwest edge of Jackson County.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was just going to say you know I think it's fine as is. I understand we are trying to make the population closer to 0. But we are already pretty close.

And I don't know like where we would decide to stop if it means splitting up an extra Township or an extra County.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Eid I appreciate that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Then I have a question for Bruce here.

If we have total deviation for 11 out of the 13 districts on the Congressional under a thousand deviation and then we have two districts that are over a thousand by, what, well one is 1749 and one is 1133 could that potentially bring up a legal challenge?

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

I think that the challenge with the Congressional is as you know you have little or no room.

If there is a deviation and let's just say it's .4% across the map, you have to explain why. So that's not something that I'm suggesting be done now.

But getting the deviation as low as possible, low meaning I would shoot for to get under .20.

And that is just a random figure.

But if you at the end the whole plan scores out as .5, .6, .4 you have to explain why you didn't get the deviation lower.

And that is a bridge we can deal with later on.

But unlike the legislative, there is no room for maneuver and West Virginia had a justification the Supreme Court accepted.

Our advice would be not to go there and try to get the deviations as low as possible.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay and so after that I'm not sure that we I think we are on map 180 for the Congressional and have not run a partisan fairness analysis.

We have run it? I remember 187 did we do 180.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Lisa did 180 when she was here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We did not do this configuration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We made changes since so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So what I'm thinking about in terms of just helping us proceed is I'm thinking about okay I'll get it lower.

Because we do have, we are over a .2% here so I will work on moving 8 into 5 but feels like we should have a pathway or like get the analysis somehow and understand how we will do the next step in our compliance, getting the data that we need to achieve compliance.

Work towards compliance.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well it looks like that our plan deviation is .37.

We have, what, two districts as Dustin said that are a little over two.

And now we are talking about taking what are not relatively they are very contiguous well run maps and making little tweaks here and there which we've heard people come in and say how come you got this tooth sticking up into my County.

You know, I think they look pretty good.

The ones we needed to change we appear to have changed appropriately.

I think unless Bruce is going to say these absolutely will get us kicked out of Court, then I think that we ought to seriously consider moving on to the next step, which would be partisan fairness.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes Mr. Adelson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Commissioner Lett and no I'm not going to say that.

I think that the deviations across the board, the Commissioner already remedied deviations that were higher than this.

What I'd like to know what the composite deviation score.

But I don't see this as a significant issue as it stands.

If you wanted to make tweaks to adjust the particular District to below .2, I think that that's fine.

But nothing is jumping out.

I think in either of those.

That the numbers are too high, raise a significant problem.

Just again to keep in mind the getting the population as low as possible.

So while I understand wanting to move on, I think you have resolved many of the issues.

So there may still be some room to go.

As you know I tend to be pretty cautious.

So but you have already remedied the larger deviation.

So I think that that is definitely a point in your favor.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes Mr. Chairman just to point out if you look at the top right hand side you will see the overall deviation of .37.

So that is the overall plan deviation and it's based upon districts 11 and 8.

So that upper right hand side of the whole screen, see where that is Bruce?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: He is circling it.

>> KIM BRACE: Yep, that's the place to look at, to see the overall plan.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Kim.

The Zoom certainly does a lot of things sometimes.

That is helpful.

I would suggest that deviation is that's almost .4%.

So if you left that deviation you have to explain why what would the justification be under Federal and state law? Not being able to address the supreme deviation lower makes it less likely to provide justification.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looking at compactness that is probably the that is our 7th criteria.

And that's what we would be wrestling with here right is like adding something to balance it but then I think you know as Commissioner Lett said that would be a tooth. And that is compactness score, correct?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And compactness score may help the deviation it's really difficult to speculate on that.

But just as you saw with one and two with what Commissioner Orton was doing.

You saw the deviations drop.

And more to where they are now.

.01 and .07 which are good.

So there are and this is frankly also part of redistricting is you are moving forward to your draft map and public hearings.

Just doing these little seemingly little tweaks.

But it almost for a .4% you will have to justify that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you I see Commissioner Eid's hand but want to go to Commissioner Orton first.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I couldn't see them on the screen before, but 13 is also the next one that is out of alignment.

So looks like we could move enough from 8 up through 5 to go to 11 and 13 and solve all those problems at one time.

I think Commissioner Weiss had an idea though.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Just a quick thought here, I'm looking at District 8 right at the Jackson area and right down to the right there, there is that little Section that butts up yes John right there into 7.

8 down and 7 open.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Help us, try to do that and if you would help us move and adjust all the districts, I would appreciate it.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Just to try to fix this. John if you go over to the right there, under Jackson.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I will move over there. You are looking at 8 and 7.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Right below your cursor right there that little Section how much is the population there versus taking that and putting it into 7, if that is possible?

>> MR. MORGAN: So again the split areas are already...are here between 8 and 7 and also a split between 8 and 9. And then 9 is adjacent to 13 as well.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yeah, so what would be if we moved Northville into 7.

>> MR. MORGAN: That would change 1290.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Let's try that to see what it does.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While that is happening did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I feel this is a good endeavor, but to me it makes more sense to run the partisan fairness values first because if they are off, then we may need to make more wholesale changes and then come back to doing this after making those.

So just a thought.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes. I hear that thought what we are trying to do is be methodical and are helping us adjusting when we are in District 1 and fixing and moving towards compliance in that methodical way and we will move after the adjustments towards the partisan fairness measures next.

Commissioner Weiss please continue.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Looked like we raised up 7 to .15. 8 to .06.

Brought our plan deviation down to .29%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keep going Commissioner Weiss please.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: After that I'm not sure I need a little help Cynthia help me out please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is great.

Did you have something Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: What were you talking about by switching and moving I did not quite.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: You took care of some of that.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, but you wanted to take.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The direction that MC was going just moved a little in five and moving that up to 11 will take care of some of that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Well I think you should handle that and I will watch.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Why you picking on me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are good at little details.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I got that little bit done.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are detail oriented.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton, no, I'm seeing and I will it's my turn so I will continue so we are looking at 11 and 13 I believe.

And yeah, we only have 13 districts so and 7 so 7 is .1.

Okay, but and so we just did that so I'm going to focus on 11 and 13.

11 is Flint Saginaw Midland area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 13 is above that and they are both under.

They are both under.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You are over in 7, you could move some of 7 into 5 and then you can move some of 5 into 11.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so let's try that.

I'm going to take away from 7 because it's overpopulated.

This is where I have to go -- should I just add like so that is Lansing area what do you think Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I would not go into the eastern portion because that is Brighton.

So I would avoid that.

I would aim more towards the western edge of 7.

Commissioner Witjes do you agree with that?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, I would say the western edge of 7 but I would also go into Ingham County.

That furthest west and straight.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John, Jackson County the green area is that where you're seeing Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, and straight north just above that into five.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will try gosh I have we have to do it at the block level, don't we? Right because the Township or is the precinct the Township and the precinct are the same; is that correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: That's correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You could go a little over under Pickney.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Moving east.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You see that little precinct under Pickney.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's try that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wondering what the population is there so 1359 right versus having to break something up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Try precinct 1359 Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Before you do that the road from, yeah, there can I just see what the blocks would be there potentially? In regards to population? I'm just curious if that could get close maybe.

Probably not but.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John could you select the area above the road he was looking at to see the population.

>> MR. MORGAN: The short answer is not quite my computer doesn't have that functionality.

So I can add it and then take it back out.

That's probably the fastest way to do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want to try that Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was just curious to see that the numbers.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like they are all pretty small and looking at a thousand and you probably won't get there with just the road.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's it, that is all I needed to see.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so let's try that precinct just under Pickney I think it was 1300 maybe.

So we will add it to five, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did we go the wrong way?

>> MR. MORGAN: No, because it was 7 that you were trying to adjust.

I'm sorry, no, no, no, there is something else that happened.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I thought we were like a thousand over or 1300 over.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm not sure what happened.

Just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I see what happened.

Oh, no, maybe not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good choice John, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: If this does something we don't expect I will probably rebuild the plan.

There is something up with the geography here because it's not assigning the right amount.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we will take a little pause for you to rebuild the plan, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to take a ten-minute recess? Hearing no objections, it is currently 10:15 let's recess for 10 minutes until 10:25 so we can rebuild the plan.

[Recess]

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Test one two, test one, two.

MC, could I get a test from you.

>> Test three, four.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I recall this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 10:27 a.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 the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present. I'm remotely attending from Farmington Hills.

Brittini Kellom?

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 Rothorn?

>> 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.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. We will continue with unfinished business 5A. So, Mr. Morgan, did the computer start cooperating?

>> MR. MORGAN: Not quite.

What appears to be happening there appears to be a different population assigned to the precinct than what we see on the screen possibly so I was not able to resolve it right away so we are still working on it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to try a different precinct perhaps?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's try a different precinct.

We are not seeing it on the screen yet.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I'll bring this back up on the screen.

I think what was happening is even though I was assigning by precinct it was moving the population from the whole Township so on the visual it assigned the precinct but for whatever reason it assigned the whole population of the Township.

So what I have and I'll show you on the screen.

Okay, so the population of this Township that's coming up, here and I'll put it on the other screen.

The population of the whole Township is 6696.

But when I put just that precinct in even though it looked like it only assigned the precinct it actually assigned the population for the whole Township.

So this is probably one of the areas where the geography is just a little off.

And so when you click on the mouse it doesn't quite do what you expect so we can look at another area or you know if we really want to do this area then we will need more time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Changing it to block level may resolve it or would that make it more difficult?

>> MR. MORGAN: We can try it but I did try at the block level and had the same thing I moved a block of a hundred people and it moved 6,000 in the population totals.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Richard is giving him his eraser.

So let's look at the one next at the you're on it.

Let's see what the population is there in that precinct.

2000.

So I'm noticing that just west of where we were if you go just further west so that is 2052.

That whole Township further west, no, I guess it's 26.

So that is a good 6,000 more.

So it's not a good idea.

We want to get in sort of the 1300 range.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can try to split that one Township too and maybe it would work over there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This one here he was circling on?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A little over to the west but still within I think Washtenaw County.

Linden center.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, yeah, and that is where Commissioner Witjes was exploring earlier is that right Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think it was over one more to the west but that should be fine too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so let's do this looks like it has more population than the farm country that was in the western one.

No, farms still, lakes.

And let's stop there, John, after you cleanup.

Okay so our overall plan deviation is .24 and we have reduced so we worked on five and seven and we are trying to move towards 11 and 13.

>> MR. MORGAN: It brings the deviation down closer to 0.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Follow that road and take everything north.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And see what happens okay we have altered our overall deviation with that and it looks like a more complete geographical area.

All right so I think at this point we are moving, yeah, north of five into 11.

And we are going to try to move 11 and 13 districts.

So we will take from five, right? Into 11.

Is that right? Yes.

Okay.

And where should we do that? Any suggestions Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would suggest north of Owosso right there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we change the color on 11 to maybe it stand out a little more? It's just kind of hard to see.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So seven is still you know in the positive.

And five isn't that much over.

You might need to take a little bit more just because there is not very much to move up into those other 11 ap.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we want to be closer to a thousand do you think? Have five be closer to a thousand over? Is that your range and where you are thinking?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I guess so, yeah, because we have, we are down 2000 in those other two districts.

So we got to take it from somewhere.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right okay we want to be as methodical as possible any thoughts Commissioner Witjes do we move in the next Township over.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Where is 13 and 12 is UP.

>> MR. MORGAN: 9 and 13 here, 9 is slightly over and then 13 is adjacent to 9 so you could do that.

If you wanted to.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Or you can go into, yeah, through five as well. Hum.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think Commissioner Rothorn was suggesting taking or Commissioner Orton was taking a little more of seven in the same area, I think.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, let's do that.

Let's just follow the road from Linden center southeast.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson, did you have a comment?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, in looking at the continued positive direction in the overall deviation I'm looking at the population and 11 for example, that's under by over a thousand.

And I think that to me would be an area to look at because the numbers just going right down the list could you John could you go down a little bit to see what 13 is what the deviation is please? Thank you.

Those are the only two districts that have over a thousand people under.

Those would be areas that I would recommend if there is something you can do to lower them, I think that that would be a very positive step.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Adelson.

We are doing that population circle thing, trying to figure out where to take from yeah. So Commissioner Witjes do you want to help continue directing Mr. Morgan?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, he is going down the road I suggested which would be fine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are close to a thousand here.

Let's fill that in, John.

Fantastic that little corner in the Township southeast.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's grab that area too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are a little bit over a thousand.

Right the next step I heard you suggesting Commissioner Witjes was the right to move District 11 into 5, correct, and grabbing from those areas; is that right?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Hold on.

Yeah, that would make the most sense.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed so let's grab those two Townships excuse me we only want one of them.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Grab 1218.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 1218, okay. Do we want to grab both because we want to have a thousand over to get right 13 more in balance.

Do we want to grab -- if we grab instead of 1218 why don't we grab the 2000.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's do that and switch it.

I did not think that far ahead.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Same with me.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: New haven back in five and that should go in 13.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keep directing Commissioner Witjes if you like.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So where to put it in 13.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we want to go above and north of District 11 to find 13.

Yep.

Oh, 13 is right there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You have that little divot above the Bay right there.

I don't know what the population there is.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will see how much do we need 11693 that would be 400 we would be over.

See if there is anything close south.

Let's look at the border going towards Livingston County what about 1842?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think it's the hand in front of the mouth.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's on my chin.

[Laughter]

Got to be comfortable, you know.

1693.

Let's just grab that.

1693.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I think you need to go the other direction.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are going the other way and taking from 11 into 13.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you looked at the difference between these two you could go into 11 with this and then out into 13 with that and the difference between these two are going to be closer to what you need.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's true.

Let's do that.

There we go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Looks good.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I believe our compliance is as low as it's been .22.

Plan deviation I said compliance but plan deviation that is one of the pieces to get our data in compliance, more in compliance.

So I think we just sort of methodically checked this part off.

We feel pretty good about this.

Commissioner Orton do you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just for clarification, Mr. Adelson, I think you said below .2 would be great.

Should we try further or is this good?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Orton thank you.

It would be great but I think this is good too.

Because if you look at -- just look a step by step.

You had a few districts that you had over a thousand deviation.

You don't have that anymore.

The plan deviation has come down from .37 I believe to .22.

So I think that that's something we can provide more information about in the record about your approach and what you achieved but I think a .22 deviation at the moment I think that that's I think that's good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to suggest we may want to look at District 6 and 3 because that is a negative and 3 is a positive 751, we could probably get that a little bit better.

I don't know where I will leave up to you folks so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I guess it's technically still my turn Commissioner Orton do you want to help me out with this.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: He said this is good but if we got below 2.0 it would be great.

We want to be great, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That fix is going to do that.

But that adjustment will probably fix it so let's just move a little from 3 into 6.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss has an idea is that true?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I think so.

District ten is over by almost 300.

And District 10 butts right up to six.

Maybe we could swap a little bit there to bring six up a little and take ten down a little.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do you want to direct Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No, Cynthia, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we should look at three.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Three is higher.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 350 over.

>> MR. MORGAN: In the plan deviation to the right it shows the highest which is six and the lowest and it happened to be adjacent.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You okay with that Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Maybe we take a little from each.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sounds like a plan.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I'll give you my eraser, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So what are we doing here MC?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so I will try to direct and John where you are is exactly where we want to be.

That is right so we are adding three, we will start with three and we may be at the block level do we know? Can we do precinct? Looks like block instead of precinct.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would consider going down to Clawson, which is in three which is south of Troy and moving something from Clawson up into Troy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It might also be helpful to add the Asian American dots because there might be some population in those neighborhoods.

And we did try to do that in six.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent can we try that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: They tried to get their school districts together.

That didn't work out.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think what you are reminding us of Chair Szetela when we drew three the Asian population was in our mind so to remove it from three so let's have the Asian American theme, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not anything there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's take that suggestion and go in 2532 area and yeah take from at the block level Commissioner Weiss?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: There is a nice road not really a road from 68 that is in north the curve line down.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: North-south.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is the one you got it.

But I don't know which side you want, is up who whomever is doing it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's look at the theme and see if it will help us.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 193.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We want to keep that in District 6 because of the other dots or do we want to -- can we Zoom out to see how many like where our most Asian American population is? If it is in six or in three?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's in six.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's in six so we do want to take the eastern edge as Commissioner Witjes was suggesting right where that, yeah.

Yes, please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That way we accomplish two objectives the same.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, that is great, John.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now our plan deviation is .18.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which is under 2 which is great.

Okay so I think my turn is done.

I think we are also trying to figure out what we do next to achieve more better compliance.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So before we move to the next, it seemed that we were when we were in -- can we move up to Midland City because it looks like dis-continuities and not sure because it was zoomed out.

Look at the top, there, and some of the top.

Can we fix those?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that part of our compliance that we run to run a dis-contiguity check.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Since it's here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We do want to, that is part of our compliance so let's do that.

Since this is the map we decided to, yeah.

Do you want to walk us through that Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sure so five so what is it recommending for that little area?

Recommending to assign it to five.

Is that an area of four sitting in there? Yeah, can you just assign that to five.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I know in the past the Commission has elected to let EDS during the meeting if it's surrounded by a District to just make those changes automatically.

And raise and highlight and receive guidance on a dis-contiguity that would be on a border between two districts to see what the Commission would like to do.

So I would recommend that the Commission might want to consider doing the same thing here today with the Congressional.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think these are all the ones in Midland, yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Correct these are all Midland I'm just cycling through them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you could just put them all into in if they are surrounded by Midland put them into Midland, I would appreciate that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep, and it will affect the population slightly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is why I wanted to do it now before we did anything else.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioners wondering while we are waiting are you okay with working not through lunch but what I mean is I would I'd like to consider sort of breaking at 1:00 rather than at Noon because it's a little bit later and I'm wondering how you all feel? It's not even 11:00 yet but what while we have this break and while we have this time, I'm asking you to consider that we because we are going to work until 8:00 potentially.

To have a later lunch.

And this was, yeah, we got some great thinkers over there we are considering that so if you all think about that we can, yeah, try to work through the Noon hour and just take a break at 1 or 1:30 and just see how we are doing.

I'm not seeing any objection so I'm not saying we are going to do that, I wanted to make sure we did not anticipate and sometimes anticipation sometimes is what helps us.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry it's taking a little time.

We need a sports announcer to cover all these changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now we have District 11 population that needs to be assigned.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Where is Andy Harwell, the spirit is in Chair Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: All these zeros.

That's what we are cleaning up.

Those must be Yankee precincts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keep the baseball metaphor going.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We know that's true.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just preparing you for tonight's game, Bruce.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We have action about tonight's game we are locked in a definite major rival.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is Detroit New York.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: The Yankees and the Red Sox.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Got it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have no dis-contiguities.

Did you check for unassigned areas, if you didn't could you.

That looks good.

Please save.

All right so we've Commissioner Weiss did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Why did our plan deviation jump?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Probably because there was assignment of a Township when we took a block.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, hold on.

Let me look back here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Eagle eye Weiss.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

All right so let's working on the dis-contiguities, Commissioner Witjes? Did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That happened while the -- we were assigning the dis-contiguities in Midland.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So is there any place else that is over by that amount?

Because.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to try to rebuild the plan Szetela se that seems way off.

Okay so what happened here some of these have become unassigned as we were doing that.

So I have to go in and assign those Townships.

That is what the issue is.

That's why it looks off because these Townships were unassigned during this process.

So if I reassign them, it will get closer to what we want to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you go ahead and reassign them to 13 please.

>> MR. MORGAN: I may and it may cause dis-contiguities again but we will get there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay the Commission directed me to assign these Townships to District 13.

And that's what I'm doing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, thank you.

Would it help to lock District 11 before you do that so it can't change back?

>> MR. MORGAN: I did that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

You are so smart.

Who knew Midland was going to be such a pickle for everybody.

I mean I feel like that is contiguous so just leave it, you know? Yeah.

It's weird.

But, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Who do we have online Commissioner Curry and Commissioner Eid and Erin.

I just want to make sure.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

Go ahead.

Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry for the delay but I just ran the checks on this.

And there is no dis-contiguities and all the territory is unassigned now you can look at the plan deviations with the correct totals.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are back to .18.

So that looks good.

So we looked at VRA.

We balanced out equal population.

We accommodated communities of interest in drawing this map.

So do we want to now do the partisan fairness analysis? All right so let's go ahead and run that partisan fairness analysis.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm giving up my turn so whoever is in the next rotation and I think that is you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is me although technically I could say why I just was asked to cleanup Midland so we can go on to someone else and it's on to Janice. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm curious what was the conversation about Midland? Because we had no audio and it came on with you saying who knew Midland was going to be such a pickle so I was just kind of curious what the conversation was we were not able to hear.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for bringing it to our attention there were 13 or 14 dis-contiguities within Midland so I directed John to fix that and in the process of fixing that it reassigned a bunch of population like 5,000 people in District 13.

So we had to go back to fix that.

So that is all we did there was fix the dis-contiguities and correct what got reassigned and there were a lot of them so it took him probably a good ten minutes to fix all that so it's back to the plan as drawn with the dis-contiguities fixed and no unassigned areas.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may before we run the partisan fairness, we took this plan that was originally 180 and then you made revisions yesterday and you made revisions today.

Would you like to rename this as a plan so when we run the information you have a new, fresh plan number for it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I will save this with a new name reflecting today's date.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much while Mr. Morgan is assisting the Commission and running those, I wanted to circle back on this partisan fairness issue. Again the goal for the Commission is to achieve scores that are low as possible without sacrificing other criteria.

The constitutional language is very clear that competitiveness and proportionality are not criteria.

Accepted partisan fairness the Commission is about to look at what the Constitution provides there shall not be a disproportionate advantage.

I know that there has been very passionate public comment about the goal is 0%.

What the Constitution speaks to is again disproportionate advantage.

So that 0% threshold.

Remember the Federal Court has found a Federal Court found our current maps in Michigan were heavily partisan gerrymandered.

And they used both political and election data to achieve that result.

Again the goal is to have that as low as possible but without sacrificing the other criteria.

And I'm sorry please excuse the delay.

The other thing I know that Dr. Handley highlighted when she was with us last week, and I wanted to up lift again is that the data that is in the active matrix we are looking at with the draft plans that the Commission is currently working on, these are projected election results.

So in the League of Women Voters versus Benson case I was highlighting the other day, those results and those fairness measures were based off of actual elections that the Plaintiffs used to prove partisan gerrymandering.

So I wanted to make sure and make that distinction once again.

But the Commission again is adhering to the constitutional criteria as written and will continue to do so.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel, could you clarify for me what kind of the bumpers are we are looking for? I don't believe lopsided margin was one of the ones considered by the League of Women Voters and is there a range we should be looking for you can direct us on what is legally permissible I thought it was negative six up to five for mean median but what is the range for efficiency gap and if there is anything for lopsided margins as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: While they are discussing that for a moment, I wanted to point out I saved the plan with today's date version one CD so that is what we will be running these on and at the end of the day or whenever you choose to, we will upload this to the website.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you and if you want to go ahead and run that report while she is responding and we are sorting this out that would be helpful.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair.

So Dr. Handley gave some feedback and we've been in contact with her about some additional guidelines that would assist the Commission.

But the bless you -- and again the goal is to get the scores as low as possible without sacrificing the higher criteria.

What the Commission is -- will see and continue to see is that the function of keeping communities together whether it be by through communities of interest, the third criteria or the Voting Rights Act, the first criteria, or diverse populations in the third criteria is that that tends to sub merge party votes on a certain side.

So a lot of what the numbers are demonstrating bear that.

So again we will receive additional feedback from Dr. Handley and also note she raised last week that she was very surprised at the UP, the Upper Peninsula.

Some of the data that was demonstrated for the Upper Peninsula.

So that could also be an opportunity for the Commission to look at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

All right can we see the numbers, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this is the partisan fairness report.

And it's on today's plan date version 1CD.

And then these are the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, can we see the mean median? All right can we see the efficiency gap? .7.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The Zoom is a little bit in the way.

Can we move that down a little bit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Department of State can we move the Zoom to the bottom?

Thank you.

All right and can we see the seats per vote? Okay, all right, thoughts? So I have a suggestion if anyone is interested in hearing it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's your turn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It is my turn.

So Commissioner Witjes did have an alternative arrangement for Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo and with his map the numbers go down a lot.

Do we want to create a clone map with his configuration for Grand Rapids and run a report and compare it?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Is this the 0 deviation I was working on?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A couple that show Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together so just that, yeah, we could work off your 0 deviations.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You can go off that one because it has the same configuration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A couple configuration but some food for thought maybe create a clone.

But even though it's my turn I would ask you to direct that because you know your map.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay I'll try.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are we taking making a clone of this one and then making the changes?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, because we have already fixed everything else on this map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is what I wanted to know is having to go back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If we can create a clone of the map and grab the shape file from Dustin 0 deviation map and put it on top and guide us to redistrict.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That was submitted so we can actually pull that up as an alternative.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But it doesn't have all the changes we just made for VRA.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Good point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is why I was thinking we had to do that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid? Yeah, you guys, I couldn't hear what just happened after we suggested making a clone and putting up Commissioner Witjes' configuration for Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was pretty much it.

Is we discussed the process for doing that, that would be most efficient so we are going to make a clone of this map and then pull in the shape file from Dustin's map, put it on top and that way we are working with all the work we already did this morning and making the changes in the Grand Rapids Kalamazoo area.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We also had the map that I submitted, that was based off of this map originally with some configurations that had Grand Rapids with Muskegon and then Kalamazoo with Battle Creek.

And that scored a little better.

I think it's a little closer to this map that it's a little closer to the collaborative map shape wise.

We can look at both of them and I would be totally okay with that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can do that but let's work on getting Dustin's Grand Rapids variation up first.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sounds good.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just the shape files you said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So if you create a clone of this map and pull your shape file from the website, he should be able to put the shape file over as a layer then you can see very easily where your districts were and draw from there and it's a lot faster.

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 WITJES: Perfect.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Like I said it's preserving what we did earlier today where we balanced everything else.

So.

>> MR. MORGAN: I made the copy and opened the copy so it has a name version one from today's date with DW.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: And then I'm going to open the shape file here okay are you able to see this on the Zoom for the Commissioners that are not present? Here?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see Juanita shaking or nodding her head I should say.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so the outlines in red are the boundaries of Commissioner Witjes' plan.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay so work on the coast and move in land?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the whole thing and make the changes you have and we will rerun it and see what we come up with.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So District 9 let's start there.

I guess just follow the red line at the south.

Now since I did get these down to near 0 population, blocks are going to have to be used.

So we will see how if I remember where they all are.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: I would suggest making the big moves first and then seeing if you want to and at the smaller level.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is fine.

So let's go ahead and fill in the Counties here so I believe those red lines on the outside of Grand Rapids and north of Lansing are all District 13 if my memory is correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry we need our sports announcer back.

Maybe we can get Harry-Cary.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That would be B5.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Dustin can I ask a question the next red line between 11 and 13, is that adding to 11 just south of Midland? Is that adding to 11?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I want to say yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm just wondering if you are willing to go north to Arenac.

If we are doing it Arenac and Bay Counties really associate with each other, that is my thought there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Your map does not have Midland City in with Saginaw.

And I would prefer to leave that.

So we might have to make some other adjustments to what you have.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Fine by me.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may what I was trying to do primarily is get 4, 9, 13, 5 and 8 and we have not adjusted any of these.

So these are still the same as the map you just had.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Good point.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you just focus on as it stands then it's 8 and 13 you know you would potentially have to look at passing population between 8, 9 and 13 and then I think you're good on the deviations.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want to go ahead and direct that, Dustin? So we will pass population from 8 because we are 2000 over on 8 to 5 up to 13.

>> MR. MORGAN: Or 9, 5 or 9 whichever way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Maybe 9.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's do nine.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay down here I took this one Township that you had maybe the next Township up would be a good idea.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is fine.

>> MR. MORGAN: Howard is fairly large.

It's possibly you could split it or look at another portion of another Township or you could look at the difference again where let's say we are trying to take out.

So if you took this in, then you would be 5,000 up and then you would have to take out something else.

So that probably doesn't work.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I see that part of Niles is split so maybe we could at least take some of that area.

So that all of Niles would be together.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's fine.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay let me see if it selects as a separate Township but before I do that I'm going to save.

Okay so that did not affect a lot of people but that does unite Niles.

Now if you follow with the same idea, you would probably take some area around that or in the southern part of Howard maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That works for me.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, what Section would you like to take into nine?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will take the north end of M60 following the road up, right where your mouse is.

Let's see where we get.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right here.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

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: Okay, and we are looking at probably somewhere a little more than 1500.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Want me to continue up around this Lake or go a different direction?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thoughts? Szetela se worried if you go around the Lake you will get more population in splitting the Lake so maybe going up around the airport.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Good point, let's keep heading north.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Slightly over 1500 so let's stop there and we have to pass that through District 13, correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I'm saving this and then before we do that, I was going to run the dis-contiguity to see if something changed if I may.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, you may.

Do you want to move the rest through? No errors.

Yeah, that is easy.

All right so please continue Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are those blocks?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry these are Townships.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Those are the population of the whole Township.

It looks like you are looking to move somewhere close to 1600, so this would be one or this single one there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What about that 1627 right there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's fine, I did not see that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: What is that, that we are cutting up?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wastewater treatment facility is what it says.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My brother would have something different to say but.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right that looks good.

So can we save this and run the partisan analysis on this plan and see what we come up with?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Plan deviation is .12 so I think it's even lower.

I did not record what we had.

Did you record? Was it .18, right, was our other one.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: .18.

>> MR. MORGAN: I have a different plan name for this so I will run the scores.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we had a 7 and we are down to four for lopsided do you want to direct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Last map was 7% also favoring republicans.

Let's look at the mean median.

Mean median is 2.4%.

Republican that's down from 3.5%.

Let's look at the efficiency gap.

1.3%.

Down from 8.7%.

That's a huge drop.

And then let's look at the seats votes.

So we now have a 1.5% negative for republican, positive for democrat.

So the balance has switched so this is now a 7-6 democratic map.

Versus the other one was a 6-7 so the proportionality bias was negative sign was reversed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I remember correctly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The other one was negative 6.5 or 6.2 so quite a drop there too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I may Chair Szetela one of the things I heard excuse me that Lisa Handley said the state is democratic.

So majority of the voters elect the majority of the seats in that one.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, to build on what Vice Chair Rothorn is stating yes, the key is that the party with the majority of the votes wins the majority of seats. So what happened in the previous plan, the first Congressional map that was run the mean median at 3.5 was acceptable but the other three measures were either significantly high or in seats to votes that was flipped.

That the seats to vote to ratio was not demonstrating or reflecting the majority of votes in the state.

The current plan that I had stepped out but I heard% tables so I popped back in as fast as I could all measures have improved and significantly the seats to votes ratio accurately flecks the majority of votes with the majority of seats in the State of Michigan. But all three of the other measures there was even an improvement on the mean median score.

So this plan scores very well across all the measures.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan and then Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Eid.

>> MR. MORGAN: I just want to point out again I've said this before but just to go back to it again the vote share here does not change for each plan so while Commissioner Rothhorn was talking about individual elections what we are really talking about is this come piss it index.

That is not going to change.

All right so that is all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I've got a number of comments.

Yeah, let's stay with the map here.

The numbers came down.

And I would not want to argue that.

But to make that happen we did a number of things that I'm concerned about.

One is and I know what we are trying to do today.

But with this map we've taken Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo and combined them.

And I don't think they belong together at all.

I'd like to get some comments from some others based on that.

Then what we have also done is taken what we call the lakeshore and moved it inland.

And that's not what we are hearing from the public either.

And so I was concerned about those two things.

I was -- I'm anxious to look at what Anthony has done as well as a third alternative.

But I personally would rather live with the first map and the higher numbers than this for the reasons that I think we've hacked up the west side of the state.

And I don't think that is appropriate.

I don't think that is what the people want over there so that's my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, you know, this configuration to me is certainly much better than the previous one we were looking at just on virtue of the numbers being so much closer to 0.

I mean the numbers are good.

You know the numbers look really good.

I agree with Commissioner Clark but I don't think Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo go together very well.

It's kind of a long District but if that's what it takes to get the numbers then I'm okay with it.

We can examine a third alternative when we get to that point that has Kalamazoo and Battle Creek.

I think that's a little bit more appropriate.

But overall I mean the numbers don't lie.

This map is much more fair than the other one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I agree with Commissioner Clark that the west side of the state has expressed their opinion regarding who they want to be with and whom. While also everybody has basically said they want fair maps and this certainly is one iteration of a more fair map than what our first one was.

But certainly we need to take a look at Anthony's and see what that looks like.

But I think undoubtedly, we can improve on our numbers somehow, some way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just hope we remember to follow the right criteria.

I keep hearing the numbers, the numbers, the numbers.

But if there is community of interest that are being separated to get these numbers down, then I will not vote yes for it.

I'm going to follow the rank of the constitutional amendment that says communities of interest rank higher than the political fairness.

I'm fine with political fairness.

And this is a good start.

Don't get me wrong but if we are jeopardizing or throwing out communities of interest to make those numbers happen that is not going to sit well with me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think I said this before I'm not too sure but with communities of interest for example, okay so Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids two very different cities, sure.

I can agree with you but other community of interest standpoint we can say we are keeping the Kalamazoo community of interest together.

We are keeping portions of the communities of interest in Grand Rapids together.

So there are communities of interest that are staying whole and I'm assuming there is a community of interest in the middle too that is also staying whole.

So, yeah, communities of interest are there, a community of interest is not where you don't want to be but a group of individuals living together and by doing this we are, in fact, taking communities of interest into account in my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I do think these are great numbers and great we got the plan deviation down.

Personally living in the Kalamazoo area I don't think I don't like this configuration.

But the numbers are good.

I think Commissioner Lange's point is good that communities of interest rank above partisan fairness and we all want fair maps but not really thinking about Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids together.

What I see is I don't know about the Grand Rapids area but Kalamazoo those few Townships to the right of Portage and Kalamazoo really are a community of interest with Portage and Kalamazoo so we have to make it so skinny to get those two cities together we are breaking up communities of interest I believe.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Department of State can you put the Zoom down to the bottom so that we can sort of see? Or either that John or can you move the map over so we can see that? Thank you so much.

So I have a couple thoughts on this.

One of the communities of interest we consistently heard about was Grand Rapids and keeping Grand Rapids and the Metro six together.

This map does that.

Another community that we heard repeatedly about wanting to stay together was Ottawa County.

This map does that.

We have the shoreline kept together.

Yes, we carry it out all the way to the County but I don't think that is necessarily a bad thing because all of those supporting communities and Townships on the inside do typically rely on a shoreline as well.

They are connected.

In terms of Kalamazoo we've heard all sorts of comments about Kalamazoo with respect to Battle Creek.

I don't know that we have ever heard any comments from Kalamazoo about not wanting to be with Grand Rapids.

And of course that is natural because Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo aren't currently together on a map.

So I feel like there is an area for public comment there.

In terms of what does the public want, what do the communities think and I particularly like to hear from people in Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo are they okay with this configuration particularly in light of the fact that it creates a more fair and equitable map which is number four on our criteria.

But I don't see a lot of dividing of other communities of interest that are happening on this map.

I'll be honest I don't love this configuration.

It's not my dearest, fondest desire.

I like our other map better in terms of appearance but we do have to meet the goal of partisan fairness and this configuration gets us much closer to that goal than the other map that we did.

So and then my last point is with respect to the Latino community which is scattered up and down the coastline this map performs well in terms of keeping Hispanic community together 6.86% with this configuration because that community is dispersed up and

down the coastline so I think that is yet again another community of interest we are keeping together.

And John if you could pull the map down a little bit more.

I just want to see the upper boundaries of District 9.

So once again we have Muskegon County where we received a lot of feedback about Muskegon not wanting to be cut up.

This for the most part preserves that County except one Township that is brought up.

I don't think we are throwing communities of interest to the wayside with this.

I think we have most of them considered in the way we have understood.

It's just I would want to hear from the public specifically about people who live there, not people like me who don't live there have an opinion about it.

I want people from Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo to weigh in on that concept which is why I think presenting bringing two maps to the public hearings might be a good idea so people could weigh in on that.

General Counsel and then Commissioner Eid I believe has his hand up then we will go to Commissioner Clark.

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

What I would like to highlight is that this is a perfect illustration of since the beginning of the Commission certainly before and I said it numerous times since I've been here and this is a perfect illustration of the tension between criteria.

That the Commission has always expected from the very beginning and it's manifesting today and the differences between these two maps.

I just wanted to highlight that because I know when we are giving our presentations, going through the criteria and we kept saying there will be conflict between the criteria there will be conflict sometimes within the criteria such as the communities of interest. And the advocacy efforts around those.

But, again, both plans would be acceptable to put forward to the Commission or excuse me to the public and both plans are stronger for different reasons.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid I believe you had your hand up and then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just wanted to second what Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Witjes said.

I mean, I already said I don't love the Grand Rapids Kalamazoo configuration but as far as communities of interest go, it does support communities of interest.

It's just a matter of which communities of interest.

Which is you know the hard thing and it's something I struggle with because it's subjective.

We have comments that advocate for all sorts of different configurations all over our state.

So I'm sure if we look, we could find some that have Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together.

Now probably not as much as you know some other configurations but as you guys already said about all of the other communities of interest that are intact on here, I would agree with that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Eid.
Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I agree.
This map should be brought to the hearings that we have.
And I'm going to be particularly interested when we are in Grand Rapids and when we are in Kalamazoo what the comments are.

Because if we get a lot of negative comments, I'm not going to support this.
And I still may not support it.

But I would like to see Anthony's map as well.
And yeah, I'd like to see Anthony's map as well because we may want to bring three.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is a fine idea.
So we are going to try to go to 1:00 is that correct.
Do we want to take a quick ten-minute break and we can save this, we have it saved and put it on the website Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Once you reach the lunch break that might be a good time for me to upload the plans so if Commissioners want to look at them during the lunch break, they can.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would be fantastic Commissioner Orton?
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: What is the number or name of this plan?
>> MR. MORGAN: Right now it's 10521 version one CD which is the descriptor and DW and it will get a number designation when I upload it so you can refer to the number after I upload it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The first map doesn't have the DW at the end; is that correct?
>> MR. MORGAN: I think that is correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 180 on this one and run the compactness score to sort of check that off because I think that is our last measure for compliance.

>> MR. MORGAN: And if I may I don't believe we have run the compactness score on any Congressional plan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Suggesting both before the lunch hour before we put them up because then we would have a Senate one that has had all of that and then we would have two Congressional that would have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So can you go ahead and run that on this right now.
>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did we want to take a break for ten minutes? If we are fine, we can press through because I know this is supposed to be our lunch hour.

All right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are not on a break.

>> MR. MORGAN: Running compactness report there is only 13 districts so not as much to look at and I'll open this in the PDF format.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is version DW we are looking at, correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right thank you.

Sorry I didn't get to see those numbers.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is okay I'm going to blow them up, I'm going to enlarge them on the PDF.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for not blowing them up.

>> KIM BRACE: I was going to say.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at this again Polsby Popper is the measure we are looking at and as we discussed yesterday it's a range of 0-1 and comparing the areas of circles. The most compact here is District 9.

And the least compact is District 1.

In this configuration.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Detroit area and District 9 was the one we just drew on the west coast.

All right.

Which is interesting because yeah, the Senate District right that was District 34 and that was also a 50/50.

That was unusual.

>> MR. MORGAN: So one of the things that's a little odd here is it has to do with the territorial boundary of Michigan.

So if you were to just follow the coastline this would not score as compact but because it has the water, the 12 mile water limit it's increasing the compactness.

So I don't know how you would describe that.

But that's what is happening.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right, thank you Mr. Morgan for that.

All right so we've got and just I want to record this.

I guess we are not recording an overall score.

We are just recognizing which ones are the least compact and the most compact.

And it's our final criteria and we will acknowledge this and let's run the first version.

Which is I think map 180 I'll say version one, whatever we started with this morning please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right we adjusted it and the new name is 10521 version 1 and we will get a number designation when I upload it at the lunch break.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm just confirming this is not the Grand Rapids to Kalamazoo and then you can see the changes that we made.

So this was a change between five and seven.

And then this is the Township swap up here and just confirming that the tinkering that we did this morning is correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then I will run the compactness report.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

I guess we are running the Polsby Popper on this one and then we will have two Congressional Districts that have completed our compliance review I suppose and then we will upload those and then we will move on to the next thing.

>> MR. MORGAN: So in reviewing this you have the same District 1 so it is showing the least compact and in this case the least compact is District 5.

Which is here.

It fills the circle.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Aren't those the same numbers the high and low?

Most compact.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mean most compact with District nine in the first one but the same number is that your question.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It was .55 wasn't it and then .24.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

You are exactly right.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is right what happened is the configuration that has the Lansing area following the County boundaries is a little more compact than the one that takes a few Townships away from that as the Witjes adjustment did.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so Mr. Morgan I think what we wanted to do is make sure we can save those and upload those to the website and thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so shall I pause here and work on that?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No at the lunch hour, please.

And I think where we are at is ready to move on to the next thing.

Commissioners Commissioner Eid? So let's see where are we? I think it was so that was Commissioner Szetela's turn so we finished with her.

Help me remember the alphabet, no.

Shall we do Commissioner Eid's plan? So it would be Commissioner Vallette so I guess what I'm asking Commissioner Vallette will you help Commissioner Eid run his plan or how should we do this, Commissioner Witjes do you have a thought?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For clarification are we doing the same methodology we just did with bringing an overlay and changing keeping VRA districts as we just did or taking a look at Anthony's plan?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Stay consistent.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What does that mean Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Overlay exactly what Dustin said.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It depends on how much Anthony how different his is from this.

And what his goal is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right if I remember correctly Commissioner Eid you were saying you were not quite sure you wanted to do that because you are remote today am I correct or did I miss it?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I can do it.

I think if we set it as an overlay for this first collaborative plan it's actually pretty close. So I think we could do it.

There are some changes in Metro Detroit.

But it achieves about the same levels of BVAP we were looking at.

So I think let's set it as an overlay and I will talk us through it.

Let's make sure there is a copy of this because I don't want to you know and I believe there is so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So if there are substantial -- what I'm hearing you say Commissioner Witjes there may be substantial changes not just an overlay is that -- do we want to --

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't think the changes are substantial.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So maybe what we need to do is put it as an overlay and the Commission can understand if it is substantial or not, we can talk about that, does that sound reasonable?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure, yeah, there is a the one that I submitted yesterday to get more VRA fairness.

And that was posted on our website.

So if we could use that, that would be great.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay Commissioner excuse me Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: So this might be a good question for Commissioner Eid.

Would it be better to use the Witjes' version with the Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids together? Or to go back to the previous one that didn't have that configuration?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I think the first one that we were looking at today would be a good base and put the overlay over it.

Just like same methodology as the first one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay then just to try to keep us sort of you know in a cycle here, again it is we would be normally going to Commissioner Vallette. Yeah, I'm wondering how to proceed.

I recognize go ahead Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I know Commissioner Clark you want to see it but our goal this week was to review collaborative maps and this is not a collaborative map and we discussed that yesterday with respect to my map which I said I didn't want to bring up that it was not collaborative so we were not going to review it.

So I think we should you know, we will have time on Friday to look at this.

And it should be brought as an individual map but none of us have collaborated on this map so I have concerns about -- I certainly don't think it should be presented as a collaborative map.

And added to our cue of collaborative maps.

Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: There is no difference with what Anthony is doing than what Dustin did.

His was not collaborative.

He did it at home and then brought it in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's not what we did.

We took our collaborative map and I asked him to add a District to it.

Not have Dustin bring his whole map.

Go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me finish.

One of the alternatives we did collaboratively previously was and I think this is the direction Anthony is headed was to bring it out to Muskegon.

District Four.

So we have done that portion of it collaboratively.

All right I yield.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I kind of tend to agree.

We had a collaborative map that had Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids together.

That's a true statement.

I don't see a difference in Anthony putting or Commissioner Eid or putting his overlay on the map and changing that Grand Rapids particular area or Muskegon area much like I did.

I would say if we were to go make changes in the Metro Detroit area at that point it's no longer a collaborative effort because those changes were made on his own.

But if he wants to bring in his map and we can change around the west coast of the state by all means that seems good to me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My question is, is that what Commissioner Vallette wants? Since it's her turn, I would hate to skip over her so somebody else can bring their map.

I just want to make sure that is okay with her, that that's what she wants to do on her turn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette do you have an opinion?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yeah, I actually would like to see Anthony's map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

So you are opening up that map Commissioner Clark go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I'd like to see it but as Dustin said not the changes in Metro Detroit.

Just the western part of the state because I think that is what we are focused on at this point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I'm trying to understand.

You want it opened as a shape file on top of our existing map or.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct but only deal with the western part of the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think Mr. Morgan's question was which of our collaborative maps did you want it overlaid on, the one with the Witjes changes?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The first one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Original one so 1052021 version 1CD.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct because that is more consistent with what Anthony has done and it will be easier for him to make the changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I can ask Mr. Eid through the Chair what is the plan number for the plan he wants-to-bring forward?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't believe I did not see it uploaded to my Districtr, but it's uploaded to the MICRC website.

>> MR. MORGAN: I don't have access to that at the moment so I would have to arrange to get that shape file and make sure that it's been processed by the Secretary of State, I think.

Okay so this is a different plan that I may have received separately but it's not uploaded to the website yet so it does not have a designator.

So do you want me to find that plan from e-mail?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Whatever works for you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could you help him with the title?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, just a moment.

Commissioner Eid in my e-mail I see something that says Eid Congress plan V8A and V.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is the one.

>> MR. MORGAN: V8A or V8B.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They are pretty much the same one has Midland with the Tri-Cities and one without and I would prefer to look at VA at the point because it's closer to the collaborative map we were just working on.

>> MR. MORGAN: It will take a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel has a comment on this John if you could please hold.

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

The posting to the public and that I know during when we were at Oakland University Commissioner Szetela had a plan that she designed with some proposed changes that she wanted to display and the mapping procedures as well as the intent and the will of the Commission at that time was that it be posted first.

And then it was looked at a subsequent meeting.

So I just wanted to highlight that if the Commission decides to upload this map in this fashion to address it, it again does not follow the adopted mapping procedures which requires it to be posted to the public with the plan number and then pulled up in the meeting.

So I just wanted to highlight that for the Commission.

And let them know what they have done in the past when this exact situation has arises.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It is posted to the MICRC website.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought it was not on the web.

Which one is this, Anthony? What is the plan name Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought he said it was not posted is this a different plan.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On the website under mapping data it's the first one Eid alternative Congressional draft plan 105 and it says MICRC Eid Congress plan V8A.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't see that.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's not on the second Page.

I do not believe it has been uploaded to mydistricting.com site.

In that sense I would have to upload it into my computer from his e-mail which was sent to me by the Executive Director then I could bring it in to Autobound and then I would upload it to the my Districting site.

So that is the process that I would generally follow at this point.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If you want to look at the west side of the state, we could use version two, the difference between version two and three was simply VRA stuff so if we don't want to look at that, that's fine.

We can look at the other version too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So are you talking about 92921 you have a 2A and a 2D is that what you're talking about one of those?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, if that is easier, we can use 2A.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So 2A.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think 2A is 188 on the website if anyone is looking at that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes 188.

Ms. Reinhardt, I see you have your hand up over there.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, thank you I just wanted to clarify.

Individual Commissioner maps may be uploaded in two places.

The shape file is uploaded for the record that the secretary keeps in this location.

It's the mapping data Page under mapping process on the website.

I mean as you can see Commissioner Eid's plan is posted here and members of the public may also view this particular or individual Commissioner plans on my Districting without having to download the individual shape file.

While Commissioner Eid's plan has not been uploaded yet to my Districting, it is publicly available for download at this Page.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: With that distinction if it was posts to the website even though it has not been incorporated in my Districting which is the easier way for the public to interact with the data the initial comment was that it was not posted with a period after posted.

So thank you for the additional clarification, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John ran from the room.

So I'm not really sure where we are at right now.

He is like running from the room.

So Mr. Brace, can you jump in and help us out?

>> KIM BRACE: Sure but I just came in so I wasn't sure where you guys are.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where are we at General Counsel? Are we authorized to open up the shape file that is on the one site but not the other?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you for that question.

It's an excellent question Madam Chair.

So when the mapping process was adopted but I the Commission my Districting site was not active so there was only one site where and that was where the shape files were posted and the public would need to download those shape files into GIS software in order for it to be meaningful.

What happened since the mapping process document was approved is that the my Districting site where it has gone live so people can comment on the maps individually. So, yes, it would be appropriate for the map that is currently on the MICRC website to be uploaded into the my Districting site so that the Commission can move forward in the manner it wanted.

I believe they expressed that they wanted to see the overlay of it on to the plan that is categorized as coming from the Commissioner Witjes is what my understanding is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe it was to be overlaid on the plan we completed yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right, well.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I apologize for the interruption and did want to extend my apologies for Commissioner Eid.

When it was first stated it was not posted, period.

So it was my understanding it was not on either site.

So I'm very happy it's on the MICRC website.

And I'm sure Mr. Morgan has rejoined us and he can take the necessary steps so the Commission and the public can interact with the map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are done Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I can get it straight in my head what it is we are doing. We are taking the collaborative map that we worked on today that we made the VRA changes to and population changes to, overlaying Anthony's map and then working on the west side of the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know we are working on anything but we are looking at it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Looking sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's ultimately Janice's turn and if she wants to change anything she can.

We are working off 10521 version CD we will bring in the overlay that Commissioner Eid has posted on the second Page.

And put it.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that is 8.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's not it is not in the my Districting.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right but he is referring to it as 8A or 8B?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Eid you need to specify.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's use 8A because it's out there for the collaborative.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I will bring that up.

Just a moment.

Okay so I'm bringing this up as a shape layer.

Okay Commissioner Eid can you see the screen in the Zoom?

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: I can, I can so the blue lines are the shape file that just got overlaid.

You know I don't know why we are saying this is not like -- I understand I made changes at home on my own.

But I did use the original collaborative map we made on our first day of mapping in the Congress to do this.

You can see District 5 is essentially exactly the same.

If you scroll up District 1 is almost exactly the same.

If you scroll down the border districts is almost exactly the same.

District 8 being there.

It just extends out.

But so what changes do we want to focus on? We said possibly looking at the west side of the state.

And I think we see those changes there in District 9.

It splits Ottawa County which is unfortunate and one of the communities of interest this map is not able to accommodate.

But it doesn't accommodate what we tried to do as a group last week and including Grand Rapids with Muskegon.

And it does it without it looking like a robot arm which I think was the term used last week.

It also has Barry County there included with districts 13.

That is something that I heard Commissioner Lange advocate for.

Saying that Barry County in particular wants to be more with those counties north of it.

And to do that District 8 just goes all the way across to the border and those are really the only differences.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ms. Reinhardt did you have a comment over there?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I do apologies.

I don't want to impede the progress of the Commission but I do just want to clarify quickly to Commissioner Eid's point of the difference of a collaborative and an individual Commissioner submission.

So I think something that will help clarify is to think about it in a way that the collaborative map what we would consider a collaborative map is a map where all mapping decisions are made in public.

So if a Commissioner takes the collaborative map and while not in a public meeting makes individual edits to that it would no longer be a collaborative map.

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

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm not sure that makes sense to me.

If you guys want to look at Metro Detroit the only thing it really does is it takes Warren out of District 1 that you have there.

And then instead includes the airport with that District.

So it's just one Township more on top of Taylor.

Then it includes Southfield.

With District 2 and Dearborn.

And because you do that, you're able to include Troy with the rest of Oakland County. And as you can see if you look at the, well, you can't see it now but if you look at VRA numbers, they are pretty much exactly the same as what we just made earlier today on the collaborative map.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John can you scroll up on the active matrix for us so we can see higher up? Just so we can see districts like 1, 2, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: To be clear this is not Commissioner Eid's map.

This is the current map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's right and it's not going to show that I'm sorry.

Thank you for reminding me of that.

Can you Zoom in a little bit to the Detroit District for me, 1, 2, 3 what he has got there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So 1 takes out the part of Warren above 8 mile and just includes Romulus which is where the airport is.

And to makeup that population on two it goes into Southfield.

You can see Oakland County District has most of the Townships in southern Oakland County including Troy.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid one of the things that so the District 2 one of the ways I've been trying to conceptualize for myself we talked about the Arab American community in District 2 primarily.

As in District 1 I think we had a number of communities including the Bengali community and the Yemeni community sort of in the Warren Sterling Heights so that is now in 6 and I heard you say you added oh, no, the airport does not include the Yemeni.

That is the airport suburban never mind.

I think I just walked myself through it.

Sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I think you got it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you mean it does not include the Yemeni community? I'm lost.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sorry one of the things that the Bengali Yemeni community around Hamtramck was asking for was there is a Detroit neighborhood that is sort of the that is east of Hamtramck that is I think the airport.

There is Coleman airport.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Coleman young.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was confused because Anthony said he added the airport but that is actually down west of Taylor, right, in District 2 is that true?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, not at all.

So the airport in Romulus which he does have, that's Metro airport.

Coleman young is next to Hamtramck.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are saying the same thing.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They are both in here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But you also cut out the part of the Bengali community and the Yemeni community that is in Macomb County.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is true and that is unfortunate.

I think that looking at a Congressional District the percent of Bengali or Yemeni people in a Congressional District isn't really going to matter.

I did not look at any sort of election results but if you want to pull it up and look at election results, I think that is what you would find.

To me it seems like the Bengali and Yemeni are also advocating for a House District than a Congressional District because they know their population isn't sufficient to matter you know in this case much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, with all due respect Anthony, why are we revisiting something we did this morning? Why wasn't this brought up this morning when we were making all the adjustments? They were painful adjustments to figure out.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I believe I did bring it up but we decided we wanted a few different choices to systematically go through which I agree with.

This is just a choice.

You know and we have two choices that are in compliance.

I believe this is a third choice that can be in compliance.

And yeah, that's not that's just getting how the meeting went.

I don't know how to answer that question.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The second choice that was in compliance or it is...was Dustin's and we kept Detroit the same in that one.

We didn't touch it.

We made a decision earlier this morning that I'm not sure it was a decision but collaboratively we decided that a certain configuration for Detroit.

Then I think we should stay with that.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If I can interject briefly and we talked about this before but I would just recommend broadly that until the attorneys as we did with the earlier plan, vet issues I would caution against referring to something as compliant or in compliance.

So with the first two I completely agree we went through them.

You all made a lot of changes and adjustments.

But I think that beyond that I would be cautious about using saying something is in compliance or compliant.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I just also I'm wondering because you said you didn't and maybe I just misunderstood you, you did not look at election results. But my understanding was from this map what you previously indicated is you did look at election results and tried to make this as close to what you're referring to as 0 on the partisan fairness as possible.

So I'm just wondering.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There is a difference between election results and putting the map into plans for it to generate the numbers of partisan fairness which I did do in order because we didn't have the tool yet.

But what I looked at there was efficiency gap, mean median difference.

They did not have lopsided margins test on that website.

That is the website our you know Dr. Handley told us we could use.

If we wanted to run the plan using our tool now that we have it, I'd be in support of it.

But I did not look at any election results in the fashion for example like how Mr. Adelson looked at election results when we were configuring the VRA districts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have Secretary of State then Commissioner Weiss.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

So per your rules of your mapping procedure, I believe that you all are currently still in step one of deliberations.

Which is making adjustments to collaborative maps to ensure compliance.

Step two or I should just say later steps would involve the presentation of individual Commissioner maps that Commissioners want to propose are carried forth into public hearings.

So as the -- for the presentation of Commissioner Eid's map, should you wish to carry this forth into public hearings for consideration of the public, that would be the appropriate time to present those figures.

Or conversely if the Commission collectively chooses to incorporate features of Commissioner Eid's map into your collaborative map, now would be the appropriate time to do that.

But regarding presentation of this map to the Commission, I would suggest waiting until later phases of deliberation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just have a quick question about that process.

Let's say I intend to take this to the next phase just as an option you know to be looked at, not saying it's what we are going to choose but an option, when would be the appropriate time to figure out if it's compliant in the same fashion that we just did for Dustin's map? I feel like we did exactly the same thing for that configuration.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I would encourage you to contact the consultants to coordinate with them for, examination of your proposed plans and General Counsel has more to say on this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: If it's not appreciate time, I need something clarified. What I noted, what Commissioner Eid said and I don't want to miss interpret or miss hear or misstate, so I need the clarification from Commissioner Eid. I heard you did look at election results but you didn't put it into plan score. And I just needed clarification on that statement.

If I captured -- can you clarify that Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What I said was I did not look at election results but I did put it in plan score before we had our own internal tools available to look only at the measures of partisan fairness that we are using now. Just to get an idea of if it was you know okay or not.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Eid. Thank you so much.

I again I just needed that clarification.

So the plan score and I know we have talked about this before, and this doesn't address the issue of alternative maps or that but plan score is only based off the 2020 Presidential results.

That's the only election data in that predictive model.

And the as Dr. Handley had indicated that you never want to use just one election result unless you have to or have good reason.

So the partisan fairness measures and the software from your consultant has that composite score of 13 weighted elections so it's far superior to plan score.

Thank you.

And thank you for the clarification, Commissioner Eid.

I very much appreciate it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I suggest that because of the large number of changes that have been made outside this group that this be moved off to a category of an individual map that's presented at the public hearings and that it's not a collaborative map out of this group.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark. I agree with assessment.

And just to be clear, I just want to clarify that what happened with Dustin this morning was it was my turn and we had worked on the map and made attempt to make it compliant or try to reach compliance.

I'm not saying it's compliant but we worked on VRA and population balances then it was my turn and ran the partisan fairness on it and there were some concerns there.

So my suggestion was having previously viewed the map that was drafted by Commissioner Witjes in one of our collaborative sessions by the way to suggest to redraw the map and create an alternate that included the configuration of Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together during our meeting, on the public record in front of everybody. So at that point that map is a collaborative map because we are working off our collaborative map and I'm just incorporating ideas which I asked Commissioner Witjes to lead.

It was not Commissioner Witjes working on his own honestly with the Grand Rapids Kalamazoo District because he drew it in one of the public meetings and I asked to incorporate our map to reevaluate partisan fairness.

So it was not an individual map and that is the distinction here.

This is an individual map that Commissioner Eid worked on and I have as well and I have several maps I submitted but we are at the point we are dealing with collaborative maps and that is the point right now.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't disagree with that but quite frankly we invited Anthony to present this map to us today.

Commissioner Vallette was asked directly what do you want to do? And she said I want to see Anthony's map.

And that's what we did.

Now, if we want to move on and say Anthony you can submit this as your own map, that's fine.

But I get -- I guess I'm feeling we are kind of dissing Anthony when we ask him to present this.

And that's not fair.

That's not what we did with Dustin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: In fairness we did discourage it.

So because it doesn't follow our process.

But as a nod to Commissioner Clark who wanted to look at it, we did allow it to proceed but it's not our process so if Commissioner Clark is now saying he has to have it brought and followed by Janice we want to move on then it's time to move on Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I feel we need to move on.

I feel there are too many changes here because we were focusing on in western Michigan standpoint.

And I know Anthony had looked at bringing Muskegon in with Grand Rapids only. I mean previously.

We had done that a couple times, I think Cynthia originated it and Anthony put a different flavor on it.

At some point in time.

But this got too complex particularly in the changes in the Detroit region.

Too complex and not done collaboratively.

We had previously talked as a group about Muskegon.

And we had previously gotten Bruce's opinions on using Muskegon.

So I would like to have this brought in as an individual map into the public hearings.

And unfortunately it got too complex for me from what I saw from as far as changes that took place.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, I mean I think it would still be appropriate for us to fill in the at least west side of the state.

Let's not make any change -- put pretend that the Detroit area, the thumb and north doesn't exist for a couple seconds and we are just dealing with the west side of this particular state.

We can make the changes following the blue lines that are west of Lansing at least make changes to the west, bring 13 down, change Grand Rapids, change 9 and then maybe tweak something in 8.

And then we have a collaborative map with his particular changes only on the west side. But I do not want to see Detroit changed here.

That is why too complicated.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree with you Commissioner Witjes and we can do that and create a third version which would be AE, I think.

I'm using our notations.

Actually it looks like you did do that already Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is what you were contemplating was to make changes to this before this discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Vallette if you would like to use your turn to do that you are welcome to do that and focus on the left side, we can certainly do that and as Commissioner Witjes rightly points out it would be a collaborative map.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Anthony has his hand up let's hear from him.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't take any of this personally so don't worry about my feelings or anything and none of it is personal.

I mean I could you know I could submit this as an individual map.

I don't really think it matters, a map is a map.

I just wanted to make sure at some point I'm able to review if it is compliant or not with our experts.

You know especially for those VRA reasons and I just want to say thank you General Counsel I agree.

The tool we now have available is much better.

And Dr. Handley ran that on Friday for this.

And I do agree it's a much better result because it takes ten whole years of election rather than just what plan score uses.

I just used that in the meantime because we did not yet have that tool available to us.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Eid I would encourage you to contact the consultants and coordinate review of the compliance of your map with them.

As I mentioned during the presentation of the deliberation process, it is appropriate for individual Commissioners to do that.

And to coordinate that outside the public meeting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm probably going to have an unpopular opinion but that is okay.

I'm just curious we keep saying collaborative, collaborative.

So if a Commissioner that has not submitted a set of maps yet submits a set of maps tonight that has perhaps some districts on here that are the same as what has been drawn already are we going to consider those collaborative and go through every single one and to present? Or should we just leave them at an individual's maps that can be submitted? I feel like right now we are wasting a lot of time and not getting through the maps that we need to, the collaborative that everybody drew together.

I just feel like we are going to run ourselves out of time again.

Just my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree with you.

So Commissioner Weiss then I think we will go back to Ms. Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Mr. Eid the discussion of your map I'm curious what was your plan deviation on your map?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It was -- I did not go -- let me look it up.

Hold on.

I believe it was 0.57.

However, I didn't painstakingly try to make it 0 like you guys did this morning on some of the maps yet.

Just the base of 0.57.

It could easily be made closer to 0 just as y'all did this morning.

If we did overlay it, I was hoping Dustin could help with that because he seems to be very good at it.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette are you interested in redrawing the west?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I would like to do what Dustin suggests and let's look at the west side of this map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan I believe you have already created an alternate version so can you following the west side of Lansing start reassigning those areas following the shape file from Mr. Eid's map?

>> MR. MORGAN: So in order to do that we are looking primarily at District 4 and Grand Rapids District 9 and then it also looks like it will affect 8 and 5 and 13.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, and in the interest of efficiency because it's 12:34 can you just do that without us telling you each individual Township? Can you just move it along? We are all watching you do it so we know what you are doing. We don't need to tell you every single Township.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Lange I just want to be responsive to your question that as you posed regarding whether an individual Commissioner who edited a collaborative map outside of a public meeting then brought that map back to the Commission if that would be considered a collaborative map and the answer is, no. Any map that is edited by an individual Commissioner outside of the public meeting would be considered an individual map, not a collaborative map. Is that responsive?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That's fine, yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid is your hand up to make a comment?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so at this point I'm focusing on four and nine first and the surrounding districts 8, 13 and 5 will be affected in some way and what I would like to say is you probably would it probably would be a good idea to direct me to stop after I have adjusted four and nine primarily.

Because the changes in the other areas may be substantial because Commissioner Eid's configurations are a little different than what you have there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you put that in 8 the area of nine?

>> MR. MORGAN: I wanted to get four and nine closer.

Going into the District with a District 9 with Kalamazoo and Holland and Benton Harbor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this is where I'm going to undo that last move because in order to put this, you're affecting so many districts here.

Let me just try to get four and nine close to where they are and then bring it back to you for reevaluation.

So for example District 8 is already overpopulated before we put those Townships in. And that has to do with something related to the Detroit Metro area.

I see also up here.

This may fix that.

Just one moment.

Now I'll do the move down in District 8 here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That would go in 13.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so at this point primarily focusing on four and nine, four is within 4600 and 9 is over as drawn and Districts 5 and 13 are something between that would reconcile close to 0, they are off by 52 and 40,000 at this point.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There is a little part of the area in between four and nine. Like right where you were.

Right there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The line goes off a little bit.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will make that adjustment between four and nine.

Okay and that brings four to 1200 under and 9 to 2100 under. And it basically follows the configurations and just point out five and 13, 13 is overpopulated so it might give to 5 directly to resolve that.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I'm really not certain.

Does anybody have any comments on this?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I see them.

So can you Zoom in to the area between three and five? I'm just trying to understand where the lines are there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Moving towards Metro Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just right there so, okay, all right, okay Zoom back out.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I mean I said you wanted to see the western part of the state.

That's how it looked with Barry with Ionia and Montcalm and Gratiot and like I said earlier you have the City of Grand Rapids proper with part of Ottawa, part of Muskegon which is what we were trying to do last week but not make it look like a robot arm and I think that achieves this.

And then basically instead of Commissioner Witjes' configuration which again was a very good configuration and I like that configuration.

This is just a different one.

Just has Kalamazoo with Battle Creek instead.

And also includes the rest of the lakeshore as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay so I thought about potential changes between five and 13 here.

My suggestion would be either to take, well, a few Counties from Barry but I don't know what Barry is state in regards to where they believe they should belong.

One other place that you can do and it's already cut up just for now to see where we go is the little part of north of Shiawassee.

What looks like a birthday cake I suppose.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are proposing just taking from 13.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Taking from 13 and put it into five for now.

Or parts of Barry.

I mean, I see the Barry wanting to associate with north.

However, Barry County stretching that far north seems a little bit of a stretch to me.

Eaton County Clinton Ingham are all rural as well for the most part.

Minus Lansing naturally so adding it into directly into District 5 where majority of Barry into District 5 seems like it would be a fairway to go about doing that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Adding which.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Barry part of it or almost all of it or the bottom half into

Barry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Direct him to do so and we can run analysis once it's better balanced unless you don't want to do that.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: What are we doing?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: District 5 is 40,000 under and District 13 is 52000 over and proposing a quick fix to balance those two so it will be closer so we can run partisan analysis.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: He can do that then I have a comment after.

>> MR. MORGAN: I took all of Barry so you might look at either taking some of that back or looking at Clinton which is on the border as well.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's take the top couple right there and put that back into 13.

>> MR. MORGAN: You have 8 and 9 are collectively 11,000 under and 5 which is here is over, so again 8 and 9 are under and 5 is over.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't know where to change the population.

Anthony you might have a better idea.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Vallette you had a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yeah, it was my intention just to look at this for the west side of the state.

It's my understanding that we are not going to use this because we do not consider it a collaborative map; is that correct? Okay, so well, I think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: At this point it's becoming collaborative but it has not gone through the rest of the analysis that we did this morning.

So we can continue to and it or you know we are almost at lunch we can run partisan analysis which was the point for an alternative and see if we want to continue working on it.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, that's a good suggestion. Run the partisan fairness and compactness tests here right now. Because changes that we are going to make are not going to really change the configuration all that much if we are working with population. It might add or remove a Township or a precinct but that's about it. It's not like we will be deviating from the actual plan here very much. So I think it would be appropriate to run the analysis on the compactness and also the political fairness at this particular point if everyone agrees.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay let's do that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Mr. Morgan Commissioner Vallette is instructing you so.

>> MR. MORGAN: So save this plan as is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, all right are we ready to go? See what we got here.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It froze again.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's the windows at the moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

There we go.

>> MR. MORGAN: These are the numbers Szetela se okay so lopsided margin 6.9. Can we see the mean median? 2.8.

Republican leaning.

Can we see the efficiency gap? We can't see it with the Zoom bar.

Department of State? Yep.

Efficiency gap is 8.5%.

And then the seat votes ratio.

Is six dem, 7 republican, the bias of 6.2 negative for dem, positive for republican.

Okay, all right, all right and what are the District numbers we just changed? Can you tell me really quick John, I thought it was 9, 4.

>> MR. MORGAN: Change primarily in 4 and 9 and 13 and 8 was affected.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we go back to seats votes or lopsided either one? So five which is Lansing is now 50.1 democratic.

Four is now 50.1 republican so those are swings.

Eight is 59.2.

And then 9, 44, 13, 60, okay.

All right. So just for comparison purposes, because I wrote this down for everybody else, the very first map we worked on without Dustin Witjes' changes was lopsided ratio of 7.0 leaning republican. The second map is 4.0 also leaning republican.

This map is 6.9.

So on those standards the best performing maps was the Witjes map.

Mean median.

The original map was 3.5 leaning republican.

The Witjes map was 2.4 leaning republican.

This map is 2.8 leaning republican.

So a little better than our original map but not performing as well as the Witjes map.

Efficiency gap the first map was 8.7% republican.

The Witjes map is 1.3 republican.

This map is 8.5 republican.

So again a slight improvement over the first map but not as much as the Witjes map.

And then the last one is the seat vote ratio.

The original map was 6 democrats to 7 republicans with a bias of negative 6.2.

Against democrats positive 6.2 for republicans.

The Witjes map was a balance of 6dems, 7 republicans so it flipped the balance.

With a positive 1.5 for dems and negative 1.5 for republicans.

And Eid's map is exactly the same as our other map.

It's the negative 6.2.

6 democratic seats 7 republican seats.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, you know so this is a little surprising because when Lisa did the analysis sorry when Dr. Handley ran the whole map with all of the changes not just the ones on the west side the numbers were significantly better.

I don't know if anyone has them on hand.

I do.

If you need them.

The efficiency gap was 0.5.

The partisan the seat vote ratio was 7-6.

Much like Commissioner Witjes' map.

The mean median difference was 2.3.

Much like Commissioner Witjes' map and the lopsided margin test is 4% which is actually the same as Commissioner Witjes' map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought Lisa Handley ran a different map.

Isn't this map a new map you had just submitted? I'm a little confused.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The only difference between the one that Lisa Handley ran on Friday and this one, well so are you talking about the overlay or talking about this actual map that is being looked at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No I'm talking about the numbers you read off for a map that Lisa Handley ran last week but my understanding is you created this map and it's not posted yet and it's a new map.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You guys didn't make all the changes.

You just made some of the changes on the west side of the state sed Szetela right but I'm just saying comparing it to what Dr. Handley said those numbers may not be accurate because she didn't run this -- your shape file map, right? Is that accurate.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: She ran the whole shape file map that you have overlaid on top of this map.

If you were to open that map and run that, then you would get different numbers. These numbers are different because we only reconciled some of the overlaid districts into what we were doing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ms. Reinhardt and then Mr. Morgan and then I think Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Witjes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Commissioner Eid I appreciate what you are saying about the differences between your map and the scores versus the collaborative map.

But I would again remind you and the Commission that presentation of individual maps including scores of partisan fairness and other considerations are scheduled for later this week.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan and then Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Witjes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I think Dr. Handley while she was here, we did run another plan.

It might have been Commissioner Eid's 2A or 2B.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I thought.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's not 8B we received.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's not the same map and I don't know what those changes are Commissioner Eid.

But it was just a different map.

So Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to get away from the numbers for a second and ask Mr. Adelson we looked at Muskegon and Grand Rapids attached before and but it was a much narrower type of path to Muskegon.

Now it's much wider.

And it gives a different perception.

Do you feel that's more acceptable? Or this one is acceptable?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Well Commissioner Clark let me address that with the point about the robot arm for want of a better term.

If you are reaching out from a proposed District or area to another area with a rather thin geographic reach and the predominant reason is for based on race, that as you are trying to capture a community that is majority or minority or plurality minority then, yeah, I would be concerned about that so yes you are right this does look different.

But the whole issue of the explanation justification of you know what is the reason for doing that, if the reason is to capture excuse me substantial minority community, then that would concern me.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay it doesn't matter how wide or we are reaching out, I know we are reaching out.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point I think the Districting plans that the Court have rejected going back quite a few decades all have these really weird, shaped lines. And often the weirder the line the narrower the line is to gerrymander whether it's partisan or racial.

So that is something that I was schooled with by the Attorney General of the United States a long time ago.

That those are the things that jump right off the Page and present concern.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Given what you just said, I mean, I find this then unacceptable because we are just going to get ourselves in a legal bind.

The way we dealt with Grand Rapids and Muskegon unacceptable.

So I don't support this either because of what Mr. Adelson said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Witjes did you still have a comment or can we go on to Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Go on.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Adelson can look at this but looking at the numbers and we originally tried to put Muskegon with Grand Rapids thinking of the minority community.

But the minority numbers aren't high enough to have an impact it seems.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Orton that is a good point and often and looking at the map it looks like Muskegon is split and that may be a reason.

There may be parts of the District that have dilutive potential but what stands out is the City of Muskegon seems to be split and as we talked about often when you are splitting a community that has a plurality or substantial minority community if you cut it in half and you have you're splitting, cracking, reducing, the minority community and potentially reducing minority voting strength, that could be one explanation for why the District presents as it does in population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I just wanted to say I wanted to look at the west side of the state to see if we had better options.

Frankly I don't think they are.

We looked at the shoreline on Dustin's and we thought it was too wide and this is way wider than that.

I just unless someone disagrees with me, I think that we should just move on.

And I think Anthony should tweak his map and submit it on his own.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I concur with that.

Seeing lots of nods around the room, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: For the sake of completeness you did ask me to run compactness do you want me to run it or are you moving on?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not at this time it's 1:00 and I think we will break for lunch without objections and take a recess for 60 minutes Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I was asked to upload two plans at this point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> MR. MORGAN: The collaborative plan and the collaborative plan with Commissioner Witjes' changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, please Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we should run the compactness.

It's only going to take a couple minutes then we will have run all the things to see.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Fire away.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

Generated the report and just need to save it in PDF form and again this is going to be the base map with AE in the west.

Okay and here are the numbers so District 1 is the least compact at .24 on Polsby Popper and District 2 is the most compact at .53.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So that is basically the same number.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, all right, so now without objection no, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Two maps not three.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Two maps.

Mr. Or without objections we are going to take a recess for 60 minutes.

It's currently 1:03 p.m.

Hearing no objections we will recess to 2:05 p.m. thank you everybody.

[Lunch recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I recall this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:03 p.m. call the meeting back to order at 2:05 p.m. Will the secretary please take the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present and attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

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: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you at this point we will continue with what we have been working on 5A compliance assessment of Senate Congressional and house maps. It's my understanding that we have a request to move back to that first Congressional map and rebalance Districts to make sure they are as close as possible is that accurate? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you want to go back to the first plan and adjust the districts to eliminate any discrepancies in population? I was told by someone you wanted to do that so that is not accurate that is fine.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: It was with me.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: All right who drew that? I don't know that I want to do anything with the populations.

I think we can examine it to see if we can get the partisan fairness more closer, in other words, as Dr. Handley has said lower is better and we had some of that might be considered a little higher.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So you want to go back to the first Congressional plan and see if we can adjust for partisan fairness.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So all right John I'm sorry General Counsel?

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. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, Madam Chair relative to that it's my understanding that Dr. Handley is available later on today to speak to the Commission. On partisan fairness.

And so the Commission might want to wait until after that presentation and that additional information is given to move forward with Congressional or any partisan fairness work on the maps already looked at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So in light of that Commissioner Lett do you want to proceed or do you want to wait until after Dr. Handley has a chance to speak to us?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: My preference would be to proceed but I will defer to our esteemed General Counsel and I said that with a sneer.

So having done that unless somebody wants to stick with Congressional, we might as well move on to the house.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Wondering if we wait to talk about that isn't that the next step for all of them? So what would we be moving on to yet?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have not done the house maps yet.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: What are we doing on the house maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Start again with population, VRA and move on down the line. So we will move on to the house map at this point so I believe we only have one unless I am misunderstanding.

So John if we can bring up the last house map, we worked on which is 194 and we can rename it and start making revisions from there.

>> MR. MORGAN: From the website it's 194.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Then I believe Commissioner Wagner is going to pass today so we are going to move on to you Commissioner Weiss.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm just bringing the time across time for the sports commentator again.

And we will rename this with today's date is that the procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, just use the naming convention that we used.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just confirming this seems to be the plan you want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it's the last one.

So are we just going to follow the same process we did before going District by District looking at VRA? So Commissioner Weiss I will hand it over to you.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Thank you Madam Chair.

Looks like our first one could be an issue.

Well number one looks good 37.46 that is not so bad but I see number two is a little high and John could you scroll in one and two? Looks like we maybe can swap some stuff out here maybe.

Maybe bring up some population totals and maybe take the matrix down a little bit.

Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to add the population on for the voting precincts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss what I remember District 1 was that there was a relatively high Hispanic population and also another community of interest that was that identified 48217.

I don't think there is a -- I don't think there is a theme there in that one but I think number one is drawn the way it was.

So I guess if you're looking for the dots the Hispanic theme maybe the right one to look at when you're adjusting.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: John could you do that please?

>> MR. MORGAN: You want the Hispanic population?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

This is the Hispanic theme.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Okay, thank you.

Can you bring up some population totals, I guess? I'm looking at maybe up in the upper corner there of two.

Where it goes just above one.

But I don't know if there is too many in there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It looks like you are pretty safe to take off the northern part of that District 1.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm just wondering you are trying to bring down the Monday Hispanic Black age population a little bit to get it in good balance so maybe the African/American dots would help to see if there is anywhere to pull from.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: John, can you do that?

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the African/American age voting population.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Cynthia, do you have any thoughts?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It all seems pretty much the same.

Equal.

Could be tricky Richard.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That is why I'm asking you for help.

You want my eraser?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Four is overpopulated so further south towards the river one and four touch and that Detroit area.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And downtown Detroit area.

I'm looking at 1588.

No, I just didn't see the dot.

So I'm looking right where one and four meet.

But yeah, I think that dot there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to be clear you're trying to increase the African/American population in one and reduce it in two is that what I'm understanding you're trying to do?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes at least that is what I'm thinking.

Any suggestions Chairperson?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So can you take two up above where one is right where Richard was originally?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I'm wondering, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are the percentages in 1065, 91% so go ahead Commissioner Rothorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I want a read on Mr. Adelson because I think we have a significant Hispanic population here that is within sort of the threshold of 35 to 40% so I'm wondering if there is reason to sort of say we can justify number one as it is specifically because of the high Hispanic population.

I guess or do we need to focus on the non-Hispanic Black in this situation?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point Commissioner Rothorn the Hispanic population both overall and VAP are 40ish.

But remember we don't have Dr. Handley's analysis did not cover the Hispanic population.

So we are still awaiting the voting pattern analysis.

So I think that the as I recall we will be checking this as well.

The election results are good in this District.

But because our racially polarized voting analysis did not focus on Hispanic population, I'm reluctant to make changes that might negatively affect that just because we don't have data on voting patterns and cohesion morning different groups.

So my advice for now is to leave the Hispanic population as it is.

And the, I think diversification of numbers in this District appears to be good.

As I said the election results as I recall are also good.

And we will be checking them.

I think that moving to District 2 and making some adjustments there I think that that would be my recommendation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Richard being familiar with this area of Detroit if you take population from two up at the top and put it into one, you're adding more African/American into one.

And if you go down where there is the junction of one, two and four, those few precincts right along there are kind of the downtown area and they tend to have a predominately white population.

So that might enable you to balance it if you try to take up top and then take at the bottom.

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 WEISS: All right I like some suggestions from you since it's kind of your area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would try 1323, 1464 and 1065 and put them into one.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want the neighborhoods on or not yet?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No we are looking at VRA so no.

Okay thank you.

Scroll up a little so we can see at the junction so I would say 1191, 616 and 167 should bring the numbers the opposite way.

That worked a little bit so now we are 39.9 and 43.9.

Is that a little better?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I also want to make a comment about the plan deviation, remember this is a legislative map so you have a little more leeway.

The deviation over 9.1 is something that we should also aspire to, to bring down.

But it's not the same as the Congressional where you have virtually no margin for error and the Supreme Court has approved legislative plans with deviations in this area.

But I still recommend bringing it lower as we progress through the house.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want to do more than that or are you satisfied with that?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: It's better than it was and as long as it looks okay, I would say yes, I would be finished.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You sure you don't want to do another District? You did such a good job with that one.

I think the next one to focus on is District 4 and Commissioner Witjes we will put that to you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We will follow the same logic then just kidding because downtown is already in District 4.

I would imagine we would have to go north, correct? We got to take away some too.

We could expand District ten into District 4 and move District 4 to include more of the points I suppose.

Any thoughts on that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So expand District 10 to go where?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Bring the diagonal line of District 10 if we expand that to go further towards Canada I guess if you want to describe that.

Yep.

That would take some of the non-Hispanic Black population out and if we were to expand north in the points, we should be able to get non-Hispanic Black population down so let's try that.

Do 1029.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into District 10.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: 635 and 1177.

Let's grab 805 as well just for some good measure.

And now let's go north towards the points.

What District is that? Correct let's put that into four for now.

>> MR. MORGAN: The entire Township?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sure.

That was quite a bit of people.

Would it be more beneficial to remove back from the points area? Or move ten down into four at this point?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think you have the right idea goes into Grosse Pointe, Grosse Pointe Woods.

I think that might be too much population but I don't know.

I think that's the right way to go.

I think you probably need to chip off further and bring ten more in.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Expand ten in the direction I was going.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that will help.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's do that.

But where scroll north, that particular area where you just clicked on the dots, right there.

So exactly. So add those into ten. 799, 1079, 1311, and 1242.

And bring it back 834, 1457, 654, 633 and 1001.

So 5,000 over.

Let's do it right there.

189, 981, 866 and 1241.

Then you should be pretty close to being in compliance I think that is fine for now 39.37 non-Hispanic Black.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which one are you reading.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Looking at District Four.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Brought it down quite a bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 53.2.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm not positive what the numbers were before but three districts are high and feel we are going in the wrong District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I have the numbers recorded for District 4 and it was non-Hispanic Black was 53.34.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It seems like 6, 9 and 10 are all now really high.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That happened because of how we are adjusting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: With ten and six we have room to go north so I think it's okay.

And some of them were high to begin with.

So I think we have room to go north with the rest of those because they kind of lead out of Detroit whereas four and to and one are really squarely in Detroit.

So it's definitely an improvement.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Where was District six at?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Six was 48 point.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: On the map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Next to it, I think it's that green one.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well let's add and try to fix the population and add the 709, 1495, 657 and 1410 into six.

It's going to skew the so now six needs to expand north.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Or into the Grosse Pointes or east.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The Grosse Pointes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would undo.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Undo District Four.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, it would I apologize.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is an option.

As District Four is below 40%.

And 40% sweet spot still apply?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: As we talked about yesterday, I think providing some leeway, a little cushion here I think that is important.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay so let's try to increase District Four on non-Hispanic Black side by adding some of the Grosse Pointes back into District six. I will do that on the block level I would imagine.

Or 2202 let's add that in to six.

2396 and 2800 let's do both of those.

That is going to be undoing four.

Undo what we just did.

I don't like the way that looks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Down at the bottom of ten we I think added into four, John, could you scroll down near the bottom of the ten District right there, that little blip area right there.

Would that help if we put that back into four?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Where.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: From ten into four right there where John has his cursor.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sure, give it a shot, 1177?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, sir.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into four?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sure.

Magic eraser have any other suggestions there, Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Let me think.

Can I see where ten butts up into District 6?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does it go further north and westerly?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It does but I'm trying to adjust ten because ten has too many at this particular point and six is under populated.

So, yes, grab 981, 866, 1241 and 777 and put that in District six for right now, please.

And 1079 that strip.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want the 981?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, please.

And we will grab 333, 999, 502, 1242.

>> MR. MORGAN: 333.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: As we are going in this direction, District six is now up to 61%.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I need to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: As you take from ten and add to six it keeps going up.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct yes but now I have more room to go up and add more into six on the north side.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So let's go do that.

Looks like it's going to have to go in District 34.

And I suppose we are just going to have to keep adding, going north.

So those let's try those two at the bottom 2736, 3119, so I have to go back and shift District ten again any way so let's add the next three St. Clair shores 11 -- 3359, that line, got it.

And we will go back down to District ten in a second.

And we have to take population away.

>> MR. MORGAN: 3201 is these two pieces.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay let's add 1242 in just to square that off.

All right then we have to go back down to Detroit.

So ten is good on population.

11 is we can add more to 11.

So let's take 1279, 777 and over to District ten and add it to 11.

1242 put that into 11.

1241, 866 into 11.

We will take the ones in the southern area there 1495 and 981 into 11.

1410, 657, 1389 into 11.

Zoom in a little bit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Zoom in where?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Zoom in slightly the thematic layer is in the way for me.

There we go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Other than what we did with one and two it looks like we are going in a circle one reduces and the other goes way up high.

I feel we are better off where we started from.

And try to justify the numbers.

And I know one of them was like 57%, Bruce, you know, and I don't know how that would fly.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark that is a good point.

As we are seeing the adjustments among the districts, that number is come down. So that is more I believe it's come down more in a range that I think is justifiable.

But I agree with you, that initially that justification would have been different if that number had stayed the way it was.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would it be acceptable to keep it that way.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: 58% Black voting age population.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Given the community.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Looking at the law says and what Dr. Handley analyzed and Dr. Handley's analysis is in Wayne County BVAP and Black voters can elect candidates of choice at 35%.

So if you make a District a majority minority District when that additional population goes beyond the ability to elect that is where you get into more involved attempts at justification.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: But you can't change the places where these people are living.

I mean it's so concentrated.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It is.

Like we had talked about before getting into things in such detail there may be areas and there are some limitations about what you can do.

But having a population that is more than 20 points above what Dr. Handley analyzed is raises my eyebrow.

So to the extent it can be done absolutely.

And if it's impossible or unreasonably then that is justification have to deal with but until that point, I think making reasonable efforts at what the Voting Rights Act and the courts say and what Dr. Handley analyzed I think that that's important.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Dustin is juggling what I think this requires extreme patience and trusting somehow that it's going to require 17 balls in the air kind of thing.

Like and what I mean to say is like I really appreciate that Dustin is trying it. Right and Dustin if you are willing to continue like I do think that, yeah, how are you feeling about it?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, I mean what I'm doing is I'm slowly shifting the districts up.

So I do have to keep going back and forth between where I started and where the District starts to where it's going to end.

And yeah, it's going to look like we are going in circles but we are making progress on the voting age population for non-Hispanic Black population is going down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So keep going.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: But I'm running out of room.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is the point in answering Commissioner Clark that there may be because the population, the river, and other realities of downtown Detroit, there may be a limit.

I don't know what that limit is.

I don't know if the limit exists.

But I think to Commissioner Witjes' point clearly the adjustments are having an ameliorative effect so I think as we have seen in other areas but in different ways you know, with if there is, if it just isn't going to work then it's not going to work.

And that's a justification different saying than we just kept the population because we kept the population.

And that's the eyebrow raising attempt.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: What we are doing now will have a ripple effect throughout all the Detroit districts.

So no matter where we go, 11 is going to affect 12, 12 is going to affect 10 and ten will affect 8 and so on and so forth until we get to the rural areas.

So but I would at this particular point I would say to continue working on six which was my main goal.

47%.

I can continue to shift up north if you want me to try to do so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I would six we started 48%.

So it's not too much of a difference so if you are willing to continue I would.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It was District Four I started on and went over in six because six got all sorts of messed up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 53% so that one is a huge difference, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's take another slice off the southern portion of six.

We will put it into 11 for now.

It's going to throw that a little more out of whack then we will increase District six in the north and expand it further north.

So let's take, okay, there is a line, okay 1954, 1440 I want that to be the base.

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 will take 7009, 1380, 1300 and move up until we get somewhat of a straight line and then we will go back north and add some in.

1322, 1212 and 1145.

See if I can make an arrow here maybe.

And 1692.

6 is under by 7,000 so let's go north and continue to add from District 34.

Let's take the two bottom pieces of District 34 and put them into District 6.

All right now District 6 is at 40%.

And then we are in a total population deviation.

So that is four and six done.

11 and 34 are going to need work but their population deviation is pretty much equal.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right what I'm looking at is a Township in 34 and looks like Roseville maybe that is the population line, is that a simple switch to add to 11?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Which one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 2083 just add that to 11 is that a population?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I can't tell.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are over in 11.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm going to leave my turn here at this particular point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I know I was doing really well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You were doing really well and balanced a bunch of districts.

This is hard.

This is hard to rebalance.

Okay so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Should we review? Look at what districts we do want like I think we did 1234.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: 1-6.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is 5 let's good? That was my question?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't think we touched five because five is over there so 16.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Five is on the other side.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: 1234 and 6 let's look at those for a quick analysis I suppose.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: When you say quick analysis in terms of voting rights?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What sort of analysis?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Election results.

1234 and 6.

>> MR. MORGAN: [Off mic]

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Election results.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think you may have balanced 8 it was 53.9 and brought it down with 8.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Accidentally.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

But let's do 134 and 6.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 1 is for the election results as configured now 87 for Biden, 13 for Trump.

91 for Clinton, 9 for Trump.

Obama 94 Romney 6.

Peters is 87.

James is 13.

Stabenow is 90.

And James is ten in 2018.

Peters 2014 is 94.

Land is 6.

Stabenow is 95, Hoekstra is 5.

Whitmer is 91.

Schuetz is 9.

For Governor.

In 2018.

For 2014 Governor 89 Snyder, 11 Snyder.

Attorney General is 91 Nessel 9 Leonard.

Attorney General 14 is 89totten and 11 Schuetz.

Secretary of State is 91 Benson and 9 Lange.

Secretary of State 2014, 89 Dillard and 11 Johnson.

For the Governor primary El-Sayed is 29.

Thanedar is 36.

And Whitmer is 35.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Election results are all uniform and play out and indicate this is a distribute that performs where minority candidates of choice can be elected but going back a little bit to my discussion with Commissioner Clark.

Here this is a District where the margins are very strong.

So rhetorically if you were going to add additional minority population here, wouldn't that be packing? That's not necessary to elect candidates of choice.

That's the key metric.

So the margins were close like 50.1 to 49.9, yeah, I think that that would make sense.

But when you have margins like this, the difficulty is in justifying it why did you do that?

What would be the constitutional rationale? If you will so that is part of seeing in real

time since the election results all play out strongly, that's the Voting Rights Act metric, ability to elect.

Should we look at two?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sure, we can.

I have a feeling that it's going to be roughly the same.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Well what we could do is why don't we look at I think there are four bellwether elections.

Are those still separated out into its own tab? Okay let's just look at the bellwether elections.

And if they suggest any problem then we can look at others.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: While he is analyzing it's also nice to note on this Detroit side and we are not dealing with communities of interest at this point but Grosse Pointe of the five are still somewhat together for all the points.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: For what it's worth Commissioner Witjes we want districts 1234 and 6 so we will look at minority -- bellwether elections for 234 and 6. Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So for this limited sample it's Biden 92, Trump 8. Obama is 96.

Romney is 4.

For U.S. Senate Peters is 92 and James is 8.

Stabenow is 93 and James is 7.

For Governor Whitmer is 94.

Schuette is 6.

For Secretary of State 2014, 90 Dillard and ten for Johnson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Three please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Biden 89 and Trump is 11.

Clinton 95, Romney 5.

Peters is 91, James is 9.

Stabenow is 92 and James is 8.

Whitmer is 93 and Schuette is 7.

In Governor.

Secretary of State 2014 is 88 for Dillard and 12 for Johnson.

Do you want District Four? Direction four 69 Biden and 31 for Trump.

Obama is 66 and Romney is 33.

Peters is 65 and James is 34.

Sorry 66, 34.

Stabenow is 61 and James is 39.

For Whitmer it's 64 and Schuette 36.

For Dillard is 52 and Johnson is 48.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And six please.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 6 is 66 for Biden, 34 for Trump.

69 for Obama 31 for Romney.

Peters is 66 and James is 34.

Stabenow is 66 and James is 34.

Governor is Whitmer 68 and Schuette 32.

Secretary of State is Dillard 58 and Johnson 42 or 59, 41.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

So in all the elections across 1234 and 6 they all performed, the margins vary four and six the margins are one and a half or two to one, for example, for most of the elections compared to the other districts we looked at.

But without exception the bellwether elections play out the other elections that I notice when we were going through play outs these districts do appear to offer the ability to lock candidates of choice.

They do perform and the description voting rights description so I think that for now I think from that only that metric Voting Rights Act metric I think they look good.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I will note that District 8 I wasn't sure if it was right but I did record when we started, we were at 53.9.

Non-Hispanic voting age bloc population now we are 35.71.

So I think you did something there too Dustin.

Yes, you can take a nap, thank you.

So what I think what we have identified is five and seven are sort of the next places we want to work on.

Is that accurate? Okay, I'll turn it over to you Chair Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So at this point we will go to Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Dustin.

So we are looking at five and seven? Can we get District five up on the screen? Okay, I see where we are at.

Five is 45.37.

And 7 is 10.91.

Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Question for you, Bruce.

The fact that we have a District that where we were working that has you know about 38% so District 4, 38%, District 5 being 45%, I guess that particular -- never mind. I thought they were next to each other.

I was going to say if they were next to each other could you make the argument that curb sun is in both areas one way to the next?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good point my first thought in looking at them they were adjacent you may be able to do the swapping we have done before. Because I had the same thought that they could be next to each other.

But they are not.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's over, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: District 5 is in a different County.

So the numbers should be different, right the threshold?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is true it's Oakland County so it would be 42 to 43% and are we within range there with District 5.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought it was 40-45.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Oakland County I think Farmington Hills.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 40 to 45 versus 35-40 wasn't that the range.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is where I think our General Counsel said the official legal term was ish, is that right General Counsel? Did I write that down correctly?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That was certainly accurate, Mr. Vice Chair and I believe that we obtained those ranges from both Dr. Handley's presentation and VRA counsel Mr. Adelson and again the ranges I think for Saginaw County and Oakland County, the 40-45 range. But that 42-43 really was what was pinpointed by your experts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay. So we are two percent above.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON:

For 5, 45.37% that is right there.

My thought is THAT there may be, whether it's looking at 8 from a performance metric or nine potentially 45.37 is just in that 40-45% range.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There was significant changes made to District 5 so I think we can justify it, I feel comfortable and what I'm hearing you say it may be okay to say this is okay because it's in Oakland County we've got a decent and it's not only in Oakland County.

It is also like a tip is in Detroit, right?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, and I think that I'm I don't have the raised eyebrow of a .37% difference within the range we are talking with Dr. Handley's analysis so whether it's District 17 for example it's about 51%.

And District 9 about the same.

I think that those are perhaps more of an immediate concern as we are going down the list.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm helping us keep on track and we have done 1-4 so we will say 5 is okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Five is okay, six is also okay and we looked at that. And seven and eight are also.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Seven we are not seeing on the screen right now because it's out of view and he has the view so it goes from 6-8.

So Mr. Morgan can you pull 7 on the screen?

>> MR. MORGAN: 7 is in a different area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: South, the other way.

I think it's south.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think a simple change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There you go.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think a simple change may bring five down some, small change.

Taking some out of nine and moving it to five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think Mr. Adelson's point it's so close we have bigger fish to fry like the ones and maybe we will end up taking from there but.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So I'm looking at 7 and 8.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 7 is good it's 10.91, which it's off the screen and 8 is 35.7 which is also good.

So 9 would be the next one because that is 50.97.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 9.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right along five so.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If I could I don't think we looked at the election results for eight.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And that is eight only in Wayne County?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's both Wayne and Oakland.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That gives us an additional leeway because remember it's 35-40% in Wayne County. 40-45% in Oakland.

So that I think that should be looked at as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we want to look at eight? Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 8 and 9.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes 8 and 9, but they are not contiguous so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's start with nine.

Let's take a look.

I think the approach on nine, let me look at it for a second.

It would be to take.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sarah Reinhardt can I ask you to pull the Zoom to the lower right so it's a little easier for us to see? Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to take some of the Black population out and move it and if I move it to five, it will help with the population, but I think it's going to increase the percentage if I do that.

So if I move it to 110, can we see what 110 is at? So 110, okay it's real low. Let's move some of five.

Can we bring it up so I can see five again.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, so adjacent to nine you have 110, 24, 16 and 5.

I don't know if you looked at 16.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 16 is.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me see what 16 is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because your African/American population in nine is in the Southfield area so it's all the way to the east.

So if you are trying to pull that out, you're going to have to go somewhere along the east.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I could go if I went into, wait, hold on.

Nine into 16, I could take some of the Black population out of nine.

Bring it to 16.

16 will still be I think it will help a little and bring it up a spec and bring nine down so that is what I think I want to do.

Let's look at the numbers on the east end of Southfield.

Okay so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If you take anything off the east you will divide it.

You don't have much of a bridge there it's so narrow.

>> MR. MORGAN: Putting 9 into 16.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 9 into 16.

Let's start with the small number 1814 and see what impact that has.

It didn't reduce nine enough so let's take let's go can we go up north a little? Let's take 2713 and move it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: John can we have the demographic overlay?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That did not change it much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because that is Beverly hills.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we reverse that out and let's go down south a little.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There was a request for the theme the African/American theme.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay let's go down.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Clark do you want the theme put on?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, please.

Let's go down to the bottom of nine, okay, what percentage is that? Can you tell? Oh, good let's move that one.

Really didn't impact nine a whole lot.

And 16 is now over.

Boy so let's back that out.

16 is way over by doing that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well when you add African/American population in you have to take some off somewhere else.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I could do it that way too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would suggest adding those in and taking off white population elsewhere.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's go up to the top of nine again and let's.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want me to add back in add that back into 16, or no?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, not yet so let's take a look at hold on see both 24 and 16 are over in population.

So if I take some from there and move it into nine, boy what communities are that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like Bloomfield Township.

Nine is already into it right here.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's move those two into nine and see what happens. And so then they would have to go to 16.

I don't like going that far north and I definitely don't want to start splitting up West Bloomfield either.

So back that off, John.

16 is high.

Let's take let's take just on the north part of nine so I want to increase with white population.

So let's go, yeah, let's go to Beverly hills area and Bingham Farms and start right there where you are at, yep.

Move that from 16 because 16 is overpopulated any way.

Yeah, that one there, yes.

Okay so now we are 49-3 and let's take the next one over.

48, 7, let's take the one that says Beverly hills with the small one and see where we are at.

So that is nine, 16 we got the population down.

That is 40.57.

Which is not in the 42-43ish range.

So let's look at 24.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: May I suggest something?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you pull off the eastern edge of Southfield and put it into 16 you are then shifting the African/American population from 9 to 16 and it should take it in conjunction with what you did up there, that should adjust your balance a bit.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's do that one right there, John.

2713.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would just do that whole strip all the way down.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go another one I was going to do them one at a time and see how this thing rolled out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Every time you do that is balancing out and you are down to 48 now 47.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't want to take more population out of 16.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can always add more further north too.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Keep going north.

>> MR. MORGAN: 16 is overpopulated right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's over.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: By 5,000.

Yeah, but nine is see that is or nine is, well, 37.5.

Five is under populated so we really can't take from there.

What is 24? Let's look at that, John.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Do you want this one to go into 9?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct, I'm sorry.

46.6.

And what did that do? We took that one from 24, that's nothing significant there.

Yeah, let's do that one.

Move that to nine that is 45 almost 45 and what did it do? 24.

Okay population wise fine, okay.

Would that be acceptable, Bruce?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark, I think your adjustments have really made a lot of -- have a lot of positive effect so I think that that's Commissioner Rothhorn and I were talking about a .37 difference or a .5 difference.

Isn't the same as a full five to ten percent.

So difference.

So that's just marginal I think that changes are positive and the -- having a .89 overage with the 40-45% range I think that's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's leave that one and let's go to eight.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So did you want to possibly take a little more population from 16 to bring that because it's above deviation right now it's 5.8.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I see what you're saying, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Beverly hills or in that area of West Bloomfield or Bloomfield Hills.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, Beverly hills area, yeah, keep it consistent as much as we can.

And that will help nine's numbers two and yes now we are down to 45.24 now and six we still have an over population in 16.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now it's in nine.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What was that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Your outside deviation on nine now.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: By doing that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Didn't you add that edge didn't you take the edge from 24 into 9.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Want to move it back?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's move it back.

Up on the tooth as Steve would say, yeah on the west side let's move that back, no, no, go up further, up above Franklin, let's take that and move it back to 2424 is under populated too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is better.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah so, we are 45.92, 24 is fine.

Yeah, let's leave that at this point.

According to Bruce the 4592 is going to be okay.

Let's go to eight.

I hate messing with eight.

Okay so it's under populated.

And so what we want to do 8 can I see the active matrix on eight? So we want to add population and we want to add Black population.

So eight is another this is going to be Wayne County and Macomb County I believe yeah so what are we focusing towards here? Wayne, we said 35 to 40% Macomb we had nothing we are currently at 35.71 so if we raised it to 40, I think we will be okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark and particularly if you are moving population from Wayne County areas, I think that is the zone to look for plus as you said earlier this District is under populated so there is some room to grow here.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay so ten is overpopulated so let's take a look at border of 8 and 10 to Detroit in the Detroit area and let's see if we can move some Black population.

We may impact ten by doing that percentage wise.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ten is the upper range of that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we put the Black population on the screen, the dots, yeah, so I mean we are not going to we really can't take any out of eight because we will reduce the population so we will have to add into from ten into eight.

Yeah, that is the only area but it will impact ten negatively when we do that, if we move that.

Let's see what happens.

Move the 1873 and let's see what happens from 10 to 8.

Yeah, that area let's just see what is going to happen so ten goes to -- eight goes up, ten goes down that is good and not what I expected to see so let's get trying to see where else there is if you go down on the bottom of ten and in eight where that see now, we are in the Hamtramck area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson where we have these districts that are kind of bordering Wayne and Washtenaw because we have different percentages should we aid to the higher or is like right around 40 good? We have half of Wayne County? Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: District nine was entirely in Oakland and now these are split between the Counties.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Wayne and Macomb.

>> MR. MORGAN: Wayne and Oakland and ten is Macomb.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 8 with 37.98 and we have ten with 42.53 so I mean we could try to balance them more but they are still both going to be about 40 is that acceptable?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Are they mainly in Wayne County?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They cover both I think.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: About half and half.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ten I would say is more in Wayne County.

Eight I would say is more in Oakland County.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Eight goes a little further north than Oakland and Wayne is more spread out in Macomb.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Eight does come all the way down so yeah, I would say they are 50/50.

I mean.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Bruce we can see if there are some additional judgments to make with the aim of hitting Dr. Handley's marks and then we can look at the elections.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You're suggesting a little more.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If eight, I understand that is in Oakland and Wayne County so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go to the top and Madison Heights move some from eight to ten.

And okay and that will bring non-Black population into ten which should reduce it a little and it should increase the population in eight.

Let's take a look at Madison Heights and we are going to move from eight to ten.

So the upper corner there, right next to your cursor, take the top, yep, that one and move it over to ten and see what happens.

There may be too many people that is the problem.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are 39.05 and 41.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It does help the numbers but it's too many people so reverse that off and.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Take the bottom to those two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The Directors are so skinny if we take them, it makes them.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I know.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Dis-contiguous or at least almost.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, that may be true but there really may not be anything else we can do in that situation.

If you look at maps currently now it doesn't matter what state you look in, in heavily populated areas there are districts drawn that are maybe blocks wide just to do something.

So, yeah, ideally do we want it to be skinny, no, but I think we just don't have a choice.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't think you have a choice either er.

Can we get the map back up?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'm just saving it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Good idea.

So we will back off the last change and look at some other precincts but that did have an impact on the percentages to the direction we want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Definitely.

So did you I did not see it before it crashed did you move the next two precincts over?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, they are the ones below the funny looking one.

If that is too high, we will use one of them and see what happens.

>> MR. MORGAN: Bringing this back we put Madison Heights back into eight.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So those two that were just below where we took off let's add those from eight to ten.

Yeah, those where your cursor is, those two, correct, let's see what happens and if not then we will just move one of them.

Let's go with both at the beginning.

Okay let's take eight let's take 2598 one and see what happens.

8 at 39% and 250 deviation on the population then ten.

Ten is below 3% and it's at 41.

You think that is acceptable?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I'm sorry which districts are we talking.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Eight and ten.

The only changes I would make from here is down at the block level.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yeah, my only thought about ten is that arm reaching out.

I'm not suggesting that is being done for a nefarious purpose but I think the percentages there has been some positive movement in the with the percentages but that is my only offhand thought.

We could -- are there other adjustments that you're looking to make for eight and/or ten?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I mean I can.

Would you recommend one of the percentage changes?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Well I think eight is at 39%.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: How about this why don't we for now look at the bellwether election results and just have a metric to measure these again.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Good idea.

>> MR. MORGAN: Which District? So District 8 as drawn is 72 Biden, 28 Trump. And 77 Obama and 23 Romney.

For U.S. Senate it's 72 Peters and, sorry, 28 for James.

And then Stabenow is 71, James 29.

For Governor 74 Whitmer 26 Schuette. Secretary of State 67 Dillard and 33 for Johnson.

District 10, 71 Biden and 29 Trump, 79 for Obama, 21 Romney.

73 Peters and 27 for James.

72 for Stabenow, 28 for James.

For Governor it's 74 for Whitmer and 26 for Schuette. And then Secretary of State is Dillard 71 and Johnson is 29.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark the bellwether election results prove out the margins are about 3-1 approximately so this District does appear to perform both districts and to offer the ability to elect candidates of choice I think for now they look okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me take a look at one other thing can we go back up to that last change, John? And look at the I want to look at the populations. Should I switch 2598 and 3759 that is what is in my mind.

>> MR. MORGAN: That would give you more population in ten.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That more non-Black and should bring 41% down a little and 8 it should bring, it should bring, well, it may impact negatively. It would not, it would help that one too.

Can we just see what would happen if we switched 2598 and 3759? You would have to get rid of this part over here at about the 206, yeah, so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think it's better like you said.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What's that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 39.

Sorry.

Never mind.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just want to see what would happen if we switched the to.

Makes it a little better.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It does seem to make it a little better.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So let's stay with that.

I'm good with that.

So that is two direction -- districts I was responsible for.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry I saw you on earlier.

Are you still there? You're on mute.

You're on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I said I would like to pass if I may and let Doug take over for me, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want another turn, Doug?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: He is doing such a great job.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We understand the districts and 23,756 I would like Dustin to do that one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We got Anthony next on deck.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Give Anthony a turn, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We need someone who has got a lot of energy.

He is not on.

Okay, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: So yes, definitely District 11 is out of population alignment and so is 34 but you also might want to look at District 12 which might not impact those too much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so who is taking a turn here? We can move on if Commissioner Curry wants to pass that is fine.

We can move on to Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Why do I end up with this.

I think there are Commissioners from the Detroit area, I will stress this again, when we are getting down to these blocks and voter precincts, I really don't want to make a move that will affect Detroit negatively.

So I am going to pass it to what about you Commissioner Szetela? You seem to know quite a bit about Detroit.

Do you want to take my turn? I just feel more comfortable if somebody that knows the area does it so nothing is messed up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'll be honest with you at this point we are just moving blocks back and forth.

So I don't know that you need to know the area to do it.

I'm happy you know if you want to pass, I'm happy to let it go to Commissioner Lett.

It will get around to me eventually so.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Tag you're it Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Zoom out and let me see what we are looking at.

>> MR. MORGAN: 11 is overpopulated 34 is under populated.

They are joining here.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Let's see if we can do something with those.

Are they joining at the top? No.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes 11 and 34 are joined at the top.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: St. Clair.

>> MR. MORGAN: 34 is under populated.

I think if you were to take this area you would probably affect the African/American population percentages in 11 and not the direction you're potentially looking at going.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 11 is over, puts population up there and let's see what we look like.

>> MR. MORGAN: From our previous work in this area it has a strong concentration of African/American population here.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go back north on -- I know you want to go south, I want to go north.

>> MR. MORGAN: No problem, I'm just following the boundary of the District.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I want to take the top three districts and add them to 34.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

I'll take the next four.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: What appeared to 34? That is 34.

I suppose Bruce you think 61 is a little high.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, sir.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: All right, second question, 34, considering where it is, I don't know that that is low.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: 61.65%.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 34 is 14.43.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: 34 as I recall is one of those interesting districts where performance of the elections was somewhat of a surprise in that it seemed to be I don't remember how much opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

But clearly, you're right the population is much different so taking population from 34 to 11 to or is that what you're suggesting or am I just getting the directions mixed up.

Are you suggesting going from 11 into 34 or?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You took it out, 34 my question is that and my assumption is without really knowing it but heading north up the lakeshore is not it's very African/American put the theme up and see what it looks like.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is my recollection too.
That when we were doing the lakeshore District that I noticed the same thing.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Scroll up north.
Scroll out and let's see what we take a look at and take the themes off so I can see the districts.

Scroll out or Zoom out.

What is 12? What is 12? The very southern tip? What do we have for population down in that area? Okay, let's take just to see what happened let's take 486, 498 and 754 and put them in 11.

I went the wrong way.

You didn't tell me I was going to wrong way.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I did not give a verbal indication.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want to undo and look at taking from 11 into 12?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, I do and you can do next door.

Do 312, 1418 and probably 105.

So we are low on 11.

Head back north on 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so don't take any more at this point.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Not at this point.

I want to see if I can put some of the north back in to 11 and see if that will dilute it.

Yeah, take those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you have at the top of 11 up by 34?

>> MR. MORGAN: He just took in four precincts into 11.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you Zoom out a little bit more?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: For what it's worth we did start the Black voting age population at 11 we started with 51.58 and went up to 61 so we are back down again and with 12 we started 45.27.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I'm wondering if.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We can add some into 6 out of 11.

So let's take the southern, the southeast precincts of 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into 6?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Four is under populated and may work in your favor as well.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Let's do the bother southern into four.

123 southern.

And then where did I end up with four? Numbers okay do the three.

>> MR. MORGAN: These two into four as well?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I was going to put those into six.

>> MR. MORGAN: I thought you put this into six.

I thought you were going to put this into six.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, number wise four works pretty good and it's 40%.

So let's put them into six.

See what happens.

Take some more of the southeast of 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into which District 10, 12, 6 or 4?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Take that tooth, put it into four.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Weiss has a pencil and eraser and you have a tooth extractor.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So we took those from six into four so now six is a little under populated.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The only thing I'm trying to do right now is get the percentage down on 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And you're making progress.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

So yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I'm thinking if you just add a little bit more into six since it is under a little bit under populated, that's taking African/American population out.

So that will help the number in 11, I think.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, that's true.

And I was contemplating that.

And what I didn't want to do is then increase six or percentage but we can try that give me 1145, 13 and 1380.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: How much does six go into Macomb County? Because that might be one of the districts where we can tolerate more because it not Wayne County entirely.

I think you have more wiggle room in six than you are thinking.

Yeah.

So.

>> MR. MORGAN: You have both 11 and 6, yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Between 40 and 45 is what we are aiming for so that is good to add a little more to six.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Those take 1380 and 13 into 6.

How far -- what is in 12? Does it about even out? 12 goes up there too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We can put some in 12.

Let's put let's go north a little.

We could do down there where you were 333 and 972 into 12.

And 502 into 12.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You might benefit on 11 going up on and take some of Roseville which if it's not heavily African/American and move that into 11.

And.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is the third time I did that.

I just wore it out.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I know.

Yeah, before we know it.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What about taking a little bit of St. Clair shores that western edge in 6.

Isn't that primarily white along there? Add a little more white to bring down your African/American?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is the concept move more white into 11 to adjust the percentage population in 11.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sure.

Try that and give that the top three precincts western, northwest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 45%, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Where are we at number wise? We are a little high on population on 11.

Okay give me that northwest precinct of 11.

Put that up in Roseville.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to take something.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Northwest.

>> MR. MORGAN: Take that into 34.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into the pink District, 34?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah.

Now we got 34 is under populated.

Can I see 11 on the matrix, please? So six.

Not bad and 11 is not bad.

And you are saying what? Okay and then north of 11 right next to the northwest we just did.

Let's take those, let's see, hold on a second, from a thousand.

Take do the 3534 and put that into 34.

24 and 48.

Under well within five percentage.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, on the.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm going to leave it right where it is.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: On the southern Roseville districts I would think of taking those U off and getting maybe the three eastern most.

Because that is the shoreline concept we talked about.

Yeah.

See that runs up all along the shoreline.

So as the numbers work, that would be a wash.

On that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Everything is under.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, the two southern most purple, yeah, precincts.

What, yeah, what I'm saying is take those two off, if the numbers work you got to look at the numbers and get the three eastern most precincts.

See those numbers might not work.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at the numbers if you are contemplating that that is 32, 40, 60, 72 and if you took those out that is 72 so they would be about even on the numbers although we would have to look and see how it ended up it's an equal population trade and if the demographics are similar, you won't affect the demographics of the District.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm tired and retire.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson what do you think about those percentages we are a hair high for 11, 6 and 12.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: From a voting rights perspective the numbers did also go in a positive direction.

We can look at the bellwether election results to confirm but the adjustments dealt with what was a relatively high number and adjusted it positively so if you like we can look at the election results for 11, would it be 11 that you would want to look at?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 11, yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay sure.

Let's look at the bellwether, please.

And that will tell us where we are.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so District 11 as configured.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Do me a favor and start with Johnson.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is a challenge.

Okay so Secretary of State 14 is Johnson 31, Dillard is 69.

Schuette is 25 for Attorney General.

And Whitmer sorry for Governor Schuette is 25, Whitmer is 75.

For U.S. Senate 27 for James and 23 for Stabenow.

And then for Senate 2020 is James 27 and Peters 73.

And for president in 2012 Romney 22, Obama 78.

And then for 2020 it's 28 for Trump and 72 for Biden.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: The bellwether elections all prove out.

This District does appear to perform and offer the ability to elect.

Margins are two to three times electoral margins.

That is the gap.

So the from an elections results, election results perspective this District has an ability to elect districts with strong electoral margins.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm good.

Boy am I good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Commissioner Witjes? Do we have any other districts that are super high? Didn't we how do I put this do we address the VRA while we are putting this particular map together?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We got to look at the list but I don't think and I think a lot of them are going into Oakland County where we have a higher percentage too.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: 17 is the only one I saw.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that in Wayne County?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Absolutely I was going to suggest that.

Hearing no objections, we will recess for ten minutes.

It is currently 4:10 please be back at 4:20.

Thank you.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 4:23 p.m.

Secretary could you please take the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Madam Chair.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

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?

>> 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; attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: In appearance.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 10 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are continuing with unfinished business 5A. And I believe we moved to Commissioner Orton and let's take a look at our map and see what we need to work on.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm waiting for the map.

Okay I thought there was just one District left that was a bit too high.

I think it's number 17.

Where is that? Oh, I see.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's the yellow one right there.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay and that is Wayne County?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So the non-Hispanic Black voting age population we are shooting for 35-40.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So John I'm going to need the African/American theme.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I'll bring that up.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So it is adjacent to 14.

And 14 is currently as high as it can be.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Actually they both need to come down a little but okay so where is 35? Zoom out just a little bit.

So this is in Livonia.

Okay.

Well I'm just thinking through this.

If we move west, which seems like the logical area to go, then we have to take something off in the east and where can we put that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is 1? Can you Zoom down or scroll down to 19 that is part of Wayne Westland.

Yeah, I'll be honest with you Cynthia I think this is going to be really, really challenging. Because all of your African population is east.

And going west, I mean, all right, like one solution I could see you doing is bringing 35 in across the centerline of those two and pulling out some of the African/American population.

But I mean that is about the only realistic thing I can see here.

I just think this is going to be particularly challenging.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: A third sort of strip with 13 and 17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you take 35 and go like slice it you might be able to balance those two but I feel it's going to look really weird.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I'm not mistaken one reason, we moved toward this configuration is Livonia and Redford were split three times and trying to minimal the number of splits.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Split five times.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You could make 14 skinnier and flatter, 35 stretch out in between and then 17 skinnier and flatter and it might get you there.

But even that I'm not 100% sure if that is going to work.

But that is kind of the best suggestion I have in that area unless you just want to redo other things.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I would like to ask if this is okay unless somebody tells me no, I would like to ask John since you can look at things and see where the possibilities are, could you spot a possibility that I might not be seeing?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure adjacent to 15 with is an African/American minority system you can put some of the F a can't American population in 7 keeping in mind you would want to carefully look at what you might exchange.

But if you did that 15 could take from 17 or 14 and then 17 could take more of Livonia.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

So MC, my brain is not calculating it very well today.

Could you help me on this?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sure I will do my best.

So I think 7 is our Dearborn Arab American Middle Eastern north African population. So as we and 7 is under populated at the moment or where is the population? I suppose.

>> MR. MORGAN: 7 is under populated with a small portion of Detroit on the north side, Dearborn is split into three and 7 and Dearborn Heights is in I think 7 and 15.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So where would I Commissioner Szetela where would you suggest? You see it's just one or two neighborhoods, right? Just a couple blocks that I'm going to try to add to 7 from 15.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well, I think you would just be going up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just go up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And try to pull as much from 15 as you can and readjust 15 and 14.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So it does create a skinnier you know because I think we are still also trying to understand how we are we want to make sure we are not reaching.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm tempting to you know add to 7 in the Dearborn Heights area. Instead of going north.

You see what I mean because it creates a skinny line there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you mean Dearborn Heights area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Western edge of 7 where John is circling and further west in the 15 area to add to 7.

Again because yeah just trying to keep a skinny.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: My only thought on that, that is not where the concentration of African/American population is so if that is what we are trying to do we should focus where it's more concentrated.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Take just above 7 there in that corner there, John, 2287.

And it's going to put us over population but we are 2287, please.

Yeah, let's do both.

Well, we will see.

Okay and the numbers with 7 we were at, okay, yeah 7 doesn't have a, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: 15 is under populated so you could take something into that and then that would allow 14 or 17 to go more into Livonia.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we want to take a little bit more, that is what I'm thinking about maybe one more voting precinct.

Yes, and do we want to go to 2896 or 1822? What is your instinct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 2896.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay let's try that.

Okay now we will go north.

>> MR. MORGAN: You may have to adjust 7 and might look to do that over here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

So now we will add to.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to turn off the dots so you can see.

Here you have a piece of 16 that comes into there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Goodness.

>> MR. MORGAN: And this is all Detroit up to here is Redford.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are going to have to add a little more to 14, more African/American population of 14 and move to 17.

>> MR. MORGAN: You would take from 14 and putting into 15 potentially.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Taking from 14, yes.

Yep.

So let's go into that, yes, that area right there, please, John.

All right I'm thinking on the diagonal there along Grand River the ten 22, 727, 1839 let's take those.

Add them into 15.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's just stay there.

So now 14 is cutoff.

So we can add that into yeah that area you are circling John what is that?

>> MR. MORGAN: You would do this to make your connectivity.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Those three precincts are okay?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we have to, uh-huh.

And our goal is still to move to add enough population.

>> MR. MORGAN: 17 and 14 are both under populated now and then 7 is slightly overpopulated but we knew that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right and 7, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: 14 and 17 have room to take more of Livonia potentially.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so let's do that.

14 so where should we start? 17 or 14? 17 is under by 4,000.

So let's head west into Livonia please and 17 and those precincts there 2680, 1976 and 1388.

Okay so 17 just for the moment we moved it from 50.89 to 45.72 at the moment and we can add some more so for 17 let's do one more John to see how much further toward 40% we can get.

Yeah, I guess we would have to go in the lower, yep, let's go 2140 and 1782 we are going to be over but I want to, wow, 35 is 10,000 under.

Okay and so that is too much.

What do you think Rebecca? Should we.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Take off the lower precinct you just added.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And maybe the upper.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Take off the 1782 please back into 35.

Now we are 44 so we are under 45 so we reduced it by about 5%.

We are going to record that.

Now we will work on 14.

Let's go west there John and we with 14 we are look let's do those two, please.

So that is 14, 49 to 45 or almost 46.

Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Now you have to adjust 35 and you have some surplus population way over in 7.

So depending on what you do you might have to go through 1, 20 or another way.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

And please yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm wondering if you could put more into 15 and push it through 14 because that strip that comes down is actually Dearborn Heights.

And comes along the bottom.

And that way you are keeping that community together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Will you help direct John.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or put more of Dearborn I mean.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do you want to help direct John or do you want me to try?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead and try.

>> MR. MORGAN: Taking out of 7 potentially.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, that little strip down there and Commissioner Orton did you have a thought?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I like the idea of keeping Dearborn Heights together. You know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah so, the blue sort of keeps so Dearborn Heights wouldn't be split.

We would actually be adding from 15.

Take away the part of Dearborn that is currently in 15; is that correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: 7 is over at the moment so you would be looking to take a little out of 7 and potentially pass some of it to 35 although you could look for other places where 35 could get population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we are adding to 15 from 7.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will continue into Dearborn and not disrupt Dearborn Heights and adding to the population in Dearborn Heights or do you want to go into that right that strip that was taken from Inkster way back when do you want to add it to Dearborn Heights?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is Dearborn Heights.

>> MR. MORGAN: Take that one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keep it together.

>> MR. MORGAN: One to 15.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I'm thinking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You might as well.

That will take down Dearborn a bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what you were suggesting Commissioner Orton keeping Dearborn Heights together? Okay, and then even further south in District 7, yeah, that is also Dearborn Heights.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you wanted to you could look at these to or some other combination.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's try that, please.

We are following the municipal lines here but it's awfully.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what the community looks like.

It wraps around Dearborn so.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that was too much for having both of those.

I don't know if you did that you would have to exchange another precinct out of this area or undo both of those.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's undo both of them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh, yeah, we are not going to be able to keep Dearborn Heights together so back it up and take a little more of Dearborn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Too much population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, dear Lord.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We froze on the Zoom too.

There we go.

>> MR. MORGAN: So at the moment back on screen we did not take the Dearborn Heights here.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think that is okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So looking at a little bit more of Dearborn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The northern, that north.

>> MR. MORGAN: So just a little bit there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please and we are taking we are looking for a thousand or less.

So looking to take and move this through.

>> MR. MORGAN: 315 to 35.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we want to move about 5,000.

Is that accurate? Trying to adjust.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well I think it's going to be a little more than that.

35 is down by 12000.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: And to be clear about 5,000 is your max deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm shooting for ten.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, there may be ways to gather a little bit more.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Along the way.

>> MR. MORGAN: From other places but for right now you would take some out of 7 again you could go out here or you could go here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: With the math do I want to go all the way to or grab 10,000 at this point in 7?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, within reason.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you Zoom in a little bit more and center that? I want to see the Dearborn where we will split Dearborn.

My recommendation would be the 1541, can you Zoom out a little bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John please accept direction from Rebecca.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Back it out.

So 1541, 16 no we will leave Dearborn Heights alone 1541, yes and 1392, 1601, the 2352 and if we have room the 1347 but I'm not sure where we are at room wise.

Do we have room for those two? All right do 13 and the 16.

That should keep neighborhoods together.

>> MR. MORGAN: Now you are on the extreme end on 7 being underpopulated. So you could look at taking another precinct here from 15 or take one back from what you just took in 15.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think what we want to do is keep the integrity of the Mena population together, right?

So will you help?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah. So what do we have up in the Detroit area.

Pull up a little bit.

Can you Zoom in a bit I'm thinking 1688 but I want to see what that neighborhood is.

Yeah, I think that would be we are taking out, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at maybe we took too much out of 7.

You could leave it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So add that 1688.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry did you want to go here and back in 7 or something else into 7 or something else?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, the 1688 that is currently in 15 we will put in 7 is that what we are doing?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just west, John.

Yes, you found it.

>> MR. MORGAN: When you say 7 you mean 7 not 15.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right, right.

Exactly.

So I think that is better, right?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes and.

>> MR. MORGAN: That may be Dearborn Heights but you are okay with that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keeping the Arab American population in 7, also pretty balanced with 15 also.

I think we had two districts.

Before we, yeah, so looking at VRA what I'm tempted to look at the Arab American election results El-Sayed would that help Chair Szetela? I'm thinking about it for you to also just sort of make sure you feel like you got.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do that.

And just the gubernatorial please.

>> MR. MORGAN: For District 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 7 and 15.

>> MR. MORGAN: The gubernatorial primary is El-Sayed 49, Thanedar 14 and Whitmer is 36.5.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: You said 15.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I believe yep that was the other potential.

>> MR. MORGAN: El-Sayed is 40 Thanedar is 23 and Whitmer is 37.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so well done.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We need to address 15 with the goal of moving to 14 moving to 35 that's right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, and it needs to go towards 35 in some way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 14 is currently a little high on African/American population, right? So ideally, we don't want to be putting more of the concentrated African/American part 15 in so I'd say focus on the western edge of Dearborn Heights. Into.

>> MR. MORGAN: 14 or 19.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would go in 14, I think 19 is good the way it is right now, isn't it? It's pretty good.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, and then that way we can bring down the percentage in 14 a little bit strategically including the Dearborn Heights area into it, that is my thought because 14 is currently 45%, right? Am I reading that right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are and I feel you have a handle on it and want to offer to keep driving.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I would take the upper four precincts how much are we adding here? 7,000.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so the upper up here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I'd do the 22, 2226, 2039 and 2179 and put those in to 14.

So now 15 is where it should be and brought it down to 42 which I think we are moving closer to what we want to do and let's go look over at the border of 35 or do you think we should take off more? Take off more? So let's do the 2069.

Should we do a little more or is that good.

>> MR. MORGAN: To be clear you're looking at the difference between 14 and 35 is now if you add them both up positive 11, negative 13 so between the two of them you're 2.5% under populated which is fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so now we're going to take from 14 into 35.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's do that but I'm worried what it will do to 14 but we will see.

>> MR. MORGAN: It may have a little bit of an impact that is why but you did take areas in here that were not African/American.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

So let's take in like those two rows across so 2143, 2183, see where we are at. And then just keep going across.

So 1873, 2594, 2594.

All right can we see that number? I want to see 14.

14 where are you? So 14 still is a little high.

So and 17.

So I feel we did not improve 14 very much but Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't know if the population is there, but where you were just adding, what if you were to take the that area the one you just added last put that back into 14 then add the 2248 into 1882 below it to 35? So put those into 35 and the one above it into 14.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead and try that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm curious, probably not going to change much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You never know, maybe it will.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We had 47.12 with the 2594 added.

>> MR. MORGAN: Can't win them all.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's worth trying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Worth trying.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm sorry I took one up there.

Did you want to keep that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go back to what the configuration so 1873, 2594 in 35 and then put the other two back into 14.

Is that how we had it before?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So let's just pause because the numbers are better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought you said it was worse.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It was but when we took the other two above it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It made it better.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It made it better 47.03 instead of 47.12.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think 14 can I mean 15 can take a little bit more African/American.

So what about that corner? At least the bubble seems large maybe we can click on it and see what the percentage is.

Yeah, down south right there 1996.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 1996 let's go ahead and put that into 15 and that should bring down 14 a touch.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So 15 was at 42.63 now it's 44.5.

And 14 definitely has improved from 49 where we started.

14 and 17 only so I'm not seeing 14 on the screen anymore.

1446.

So definitely improvement.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And then 17 was at 50 wasn't it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes 47.3.

So I think 15 I'm just going to adjust my numbers here is 44.51.

Okay.

We are in balance so to speak and done our best and that was a wonderful turn Commissioner Orton.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, thanks.

You guys did good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Mr. Adelson, do you want to look at what we just did? We made adjustments to 7, 14, 15, 17.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I've been looking at what you did and the changes are going in a positive direction.

I would suggest looking at the bellwether election results for 14, 15 and 17.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 14, 15 and 17, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 14 as drawn is 72 for Biden and 28 for Trump. 73 for Obama and 27 for Romney.

Peters is 73 and 27 for James Stabenow in 18 is 72, James 28.

For Governor Whitmer 75 and Schuette is 25.

Secretary of State is 65 for Dillard and 35 for Johnson.

You wanted 15? 1579 Biden 21 for Trump 79 for Obama 21 for Romney, 80 Peters and 20 for James.

78 for Stabenow and 22 for James.

For Governor it's 79 Whitmer and 21 Schuette.

Secretary of State is 69 Dillard, 31 Johnson.

And then 17.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: 71 Biden 29 Trump.

And 71 Obama 29 Romney.

72 Peters, 28 for James.

Stabenow 68.

James 32.

Whitmer is 69 and Schuette is 31 and for Secretary of State Dillard 61 and Johnson is 39.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good the bellwether elections all prove out.

So these districts based on the bellwether results have the ability to elect candidates of choice.

The only other suggestion I would make is with the tweaks to 15 do you want -- why don't we look at the El-Sayed election.

Were there any other among 14, 15 and 17 were there any others 14, 15 and 17 were there any other communities within those districts that we might want to look at for El-Sayed?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We good with -- let's look at 15 for El-Sayed and then I think that, that probably answers the question.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay 15 is 40 El-Sayed and 24 for Thanedar and 37 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So the districts still elects based on our inferences about the Arab American population.

So all the districts, all the elections prove out for these districts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Fantastic.

So are we -- does that complete our VRA due diligence? Do we have enough data? Have we walked through methodically enough to understand or do we have more districts we want to identify?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: As far as the greater Detroit area I believe we've touched all the districts.

I think that it may be a good idea at this point to get a broader view overall and just look down the numbers and see if there are any Districts that stand out.

Because I remember, I don't remember if the Flint and Saginaw well they can't be in the same House District.

But looking there, looking at the Grand Rapids area I think there were a couple districts out there.

So I would that is where or what I would suggest.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent we will say we are moving from the Detroit area.

So and Commissioner Orton finished her turn.

Is that me next?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Executive director Hammersmith, I understood that there might be the possibility that Dr. Handley wanted to join by Zoom and weigh in.

Is she available?

>> KIM BRACE: Funny you mention that I was trying to send Sue a text. She just got off the phone.

But she has sent me a text message.

She has her PowerPoint set.

So I was going to send Sarah an e-mail to say send Lisa an invite to come on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can I just offer maybe what I will do is I will just confirm we satisfied the Detroit area for now and the next time we meet or the next time we do this we will be looking at the I guess it will be my turn and go to I'm going to suggest we go to Saginaw area and try to complete our VRA.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Depending on the length of Dr. Handley's presentation you can do it later tonight so I mean I don't think she will be here for two hours.

So because we do not currently have that on our agenda if we want to, I mean my understanding is Dr. Handley has done some additional analysis on partisan fairness and she would desire to bring it before us.

We would need a motion to amend our agenda to add that on to allow it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Make our motion to allow Dr. Handley to speak.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Lett is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All right hearing none we have a motion to amend the meeting agenda to allow additional presentation by Dr. Handley to continue her analysis of partisan fairness.

All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

So we will just give her a second to get logged on and we will get started with her additional analysis and data.

Good evening, Dr. Handley please proceed when you are ready.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Can I share my screen?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

Okay your legal staff asked for some direction in terms of what are acceptable scores. And as I mentioned to you when I was there, there are no bright line acceptable scores. But I quickly went through the Court cases and the literature today.

And I thought I would try and give you some sort of idea, mostly about the scores that courts considered high enough to reject the plans.

And determined that they were a partisan gerrymander at least in part on these scores. And that will give you an idea of at least what is too high.

Almost going to point to a couple things in the literature what the developers of these scores have said these things are too high.

If that is amenable.

There is only six slides I think it will take me ten minutes I know you all are tired but does that sound like a plan?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That sounds fantastic.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay let me do this, there are four cases in which I can clearly identify some of the partisan measures that we have been talking about. So there was a challenge to the 2011 Congressional plan in Ohio and this is the site for the case of Ohio and full of Randolph institute versus householder and these are the scores that the Court case, the opinion itself identify.

So I don't have access to the actual expert reports presented to the Court by the expert witnesses.

So this is a little spotty.

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 these are the efficiency gap scores for the Congressional plan and the mean median scores for the Congressional plan when they cited them.

As you know the core as I think I mentioned the Court determined that this plan, the Congressional plan was a partisan gerrymander.

Now, let me add a caveat to this.

And this is an existing plan.

So these are -- this was an existing plan when it was challenged it was 2018, they had Congressional elections to look at.

So this is not the composite score that we are dealing with because we are dealing with plans in the future, predicting what could happen.

But these are actual Congressional election scores.

And this is what the Court determined was too high.

Of course I'm going to leave you with the PowerPoint so you have reference to the scores but here are some scores they thought were too high.

Here is a Pennsylvania challenge.

And this was also a challenge to Congressional plans.

This is the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania and these are some of the scores I found in the Court case.

We have seats votes, so for example in 2012, in terms of the Congressional elections 50.8% of the votes went to democratic candidates and they garnered 27.8% of the seats.

In 2014, it was 44.5% of the vote.

27.8% of the seats.

2016, 45.9%.

Also getting 27.8%.

The mean median over the entire period this was challenged between 2016 and 2018 which I don't have 2018 scores.

You can see it's 5.9.

And you can see that the efficiency scores range from 15 to 24.

So these were considered too high by the Court and they did find that this Congressional plan was an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander.

Now, as the -- as your lawyers will explain to you, of course all of this is irrelevant with the more recent Supreme Court case.

But this is when the Court is considering these kinds of measures as relevant to partisan gerrymandering.

Okay, let's see if I can figure out how to Page down.

Here is the Wisconsin challenge to the state assembly plan.

You can see the seats votes ratios 51.4% of the vote got them 39.4% of the seats.

You can see the efficiency gaps, 13.3 and 10 points.

The Wisconsin Court held this was an unconstitutional gerrymander.

So returned and again this was challenged apparently before they were in 2016 contests.

So these would be scores that are on the high side.

Okay, now here is the Michigan case.

And these I gathered from the case itself.

This was a challenge to all three plans.

The Congressional plan, the State Senate and the State House plan.

And these are the scores that were recorded in the opinion.

So you can see you got a seats votes ratio where I did this very quickly.

I might have copied that over and that might be from a slide earlier.

Yeah, it is.

Okay the seats votes ratio there is incorrect.

It's maybe it's not.

Any way so there are your efficiency gap scores and the mean median scores and again all three plans were declared to be partisan gerrymanders.

So these are the kinds of scores that got the plans in trouble.

Now this again looks at the actual election results but for comparison sake I took the existing or current plan and I analyzed them using the composite score index that we are using.

And this is what I found, so the current plan would yield the following seats with the ratio you can see it's 52, no, again this is the statewide vote.

I think that John and I talked to you about this, it's a composite score and the same across the state 52.3 in Congress that produced 35.7% of the seats in the State Senate 44.7.

In the State House, the picture is blocking it, oops, 45 something.

Let's see.

45.5%.

Efficiency gap, 21.2 in Congress 10.9 in State Senate, 11.6 in the State House.

The mean median difference 5.5, 5.1, 6.1, I should say all of these are in favor of the republicans.

In fact, every score that I've given you so far has been in favor of the republicans.

So I didn't put pluses and minuses.

It just meant the difference favored the republicans.

The lopsided margins are 13.1 Congress.

8.6 in State Senate.

And 10.1 in the house.

And then I just have one more slide where I'm going to talk about what some of the authors of or developers of these scores have said.

So Stephanopoulos and efficiency gap argued that any that 8% threshold and said any efficiency gap, 8% or above should be considered presumptively unconstitutional.

Now, I don't believe that the Wisconsin Court with this was argued accepted this argument.

But that's what they argued.

Simon Jackman, an expert who does these kind of cases, and, in fact, showed up in all of the cases that I just described to you argued that 7% should be considered legally significant.

And the reason was that his research showed him he started out the decade with 7%. You would control all of the seats no matter what happened in terms of the votes for the rest of the decade that is how he came up with 7.

So this is what I just pulled together very, very quickly.

But I wanted to give you some idea of what might be typical because I did not do that when I was there before and I guess you might be struggling with that.

And so if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them if I could.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right let me look around the room here thank you Dr. Handley.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I just really appreciate this information. It does help know what we're looking at when we are trying to figure out where we should be.

So I can't remember the exact numbers of our plans that we went over, but they are better than this.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, for the benefit of Dr. Handley who I know is engaged in other meetings today, first thank you for your time. And the information and the clarifications.

But also to let Dr. Handley know that none of the plans that the MICRC has put through have come close to those numbers whether they were Benson numbers that we had in the state or the out state numbers that provide additional clarity so that is very good news for the Commission indeed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments? Questions, Commissioner Eid, can you also identify where you are dialing in remote from?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, hello I've returned I'm remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead with your question Mr. Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This is kind of a legal question or more about interpretation of the law question.

And please let me know if it's hard to hear me my mouth is a little numbed up right now so if it is let me know.

Did any of these states where these cases happened have like a rule on the book that says there should be a disproportionate advantage like how we do here now in Michigan?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Several of them do now but Ohio did not at the time.

I know that part.

Wisconsin did not.

They use the state Constitution but they used grounds like equal protection.

And I think the lawyers are going to have to expand on that.

But I don't believe that any of them had anything akin to what you have now.

But I think that at least one of them and maybe two of them now do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So first of all I agree with Dr. Handley.

I don't recall either that, I know Ohio for sure now does as well.

But I don't believe even the disproportionate advantage language, what the numbers that are being presented demonstrate.

They are demonstrating what is considered a partisan gerrymander.

And again we've had Supreme Court cases since that time that again indicate that the Federal courts will not entertain these types of cases but I think that these numbers are still extremely useful benchmarks for the Commission.

And really the disproportionate advantage speaks more to in contrast with the competitive criteria or proportionality criteria of how the balance is evaluated.

And so I think what we are looking at here speaks a little bit differently to those.

I'm not sure if one of the states had the disproportionate advantage that based on the way the cases would be brought, we would use the information any differently.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Lisa, I'm thinking about the lopsided margins.

I don't think we got any sort of numbers for lopsided and that is okay I just want to make sure there is no sort of target area in particular for lopsided.

We just have for if mean median efficiency gap and the seats votes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

The issue came up indirectly.

And in at least two of the cases but they didn't actually produce a different score.

They didn't look at the difference in the winning margins.

But didn't produce an actual score.

So it is something that is considered relevant by the courts but I'm afraid I could not give you any measures.

And it's a little bit complicated because of the need if voting is polarized as it is in many places in Michigan to draw districts that will provide minorities with an opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

Those tend to be heavier democratic districts than might otherwise be the case.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you so should we also just consider primarily the mean median efficiency and seats votes? Is that also what I'm hearing you say?

Because we have a target area, we should focus on those? Or can you help us understand if we should use the lopsided margin.

I know why we have it in our mix.

I'm just wondering if you can help us sort of understand how we might continue to use it or potentially just have it lesser of the priority so to speak.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: The lopsided margin is half of the efficiency gap, right, so the efficiency gap looks at how many wasted votes there are, that is how many votes in surplus of what it takes to win and how many votes you lose by.

So it's essentially half of the efficiency gap.

And it helps you identify areas where you have packed democrats.

And, again, to me it's an easy place to start.

But there is always the caveat of the minority opportunity districts.

But the reason that I suggested we put it in there is number one the cases did all at least two of them did refer to them just in a different sort of way.

And it's an easy place to start.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

That's helpful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange or Commissioner Wagner have any comments because I can't see them just want to make sure they are good.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm good thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are there any additional questions for Dr. Handley? All right if not thank you very much for this presentation, Dr. Handley.

I would very much appreciate it if you could send it to our Executive Director so she can circulate it out to everybody so we have it.

I know we are all frantically scribbling while you are talking but helpful to have a hard copy.

Thank you very much for taking the time and popping in.

I know you are very busy they and appreciate you working on this for us.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Very good. Good-bye.

Have a good night.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so at this point I think we are going to go back to the mapping that we were doing and we left off with.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We left out with Commissioner Orton and now we are going to MC.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right and I think we were trying to figure out I think we are going to go with look at the maps and we are staying with the V RA compliance and we are looking and north of Detroit area in the Saginaw area right where you landed us, thank you, John.

So Flint area, 2726.

Let's look at the Black voting age population in those two.

So this is sag thank you so we want to be 40-45% Black voting age population so we are low.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I seem to remember when we were working on this, we tried really hard even down to the block level to get the percentages as high as possible.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That's my memory too.

So what I'm looking for with this compliance review at this point is saying okay you've got to scrap it because it can't be that low.

Because there is no opportunity to elect or, yes, it's possible and somehow we will figure.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I would take the latter and take the expansive view that things are possible.

I think one of the things we talked about in Flint having lived in Flint and having had occasion to return to Flint many times over the years this is true not just for Flint but for other cities is look at the suburbs, look at the Townships outside of the downtown area or the north side of Flint.

Because there may be a dilutive effect.

I don't know that without getting into it.

But I think that that often happens in communities where the population is not 2, 3, 400,000 so it's more in the 100,000, 50-100,000 range that it's easier for that population to be diluted potentially okay by surrounding communities.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John can you put up the African/American theme, please? And then I'm going to try to under populate at this point because I do as Commissioner Orton suggested we did do a pretty good job.

So I'm going to -- what I'm going to try to do is add to 51.

I know that is actually overpopulated so 2047 and the bottom right or the sorry Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Before you do this, I thought you wanted to look at election results if I heard that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can.

Yes, okay let's do that.

I feel like we have done that and run the initial analysis and feel it's okay but we have to right because it's just too low percentage.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Rothorn I agree.

My recollection is that the election results here were good.

But just as we discussed in the Detroit area the population is below Dr. Handley's recommendation.

So I'm certainly more comfortable in meeting her benchmark, meeting her threshold.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What was the threshold again for this area Genesee.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Genesee or Saginaw.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 35-40%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To give you numbers to consider population of Flint by itself is 56% African/American if you take the whole City so we definitely have population there to create at least one VRA District we just have to rebalance things a little bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right now we are 27, we are 26, so do we want to look at the election results? Mr. Adelson? What I heard you say is we want to look at the VRA.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I would suggest that since it seems that there will be some adjustments here, why don't we hold off on that for Flint until we see where you go.

But my recollection is that there weren't election results that were immediately problematic.

So my suggestion is let's wait and see what the adjustments bring.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so District 26 we are at 34.9% and 27 we are 36.95.

So I want to say 26 is excuse me 27 is good so I'm going to try to under populate 26 a little bit so I'm going to work on 26 and I'm going to look for yeah areas where we can add to 51 and I think I see in the southern Grand Blanc area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So just to clarify I'm sorry 26 is good and 27 is high or was.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 27 is good 26 is low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 26 is a little low.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

So I want to add to 51 so if you take that District there, John, 51 and just put that into 51.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: May I make an observation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: As I recall in when we looked at this before, I think that maybe places to look to the north, the north side of Flint or more into the downtown that will give greater population that will have a clearer and ameliorative benefits.

Many of the suburbs and I remember John explaining the size of the dots.

The size of the dots is John could you click on the dot in Grand Blanc.

>> MR. MORGAN: This dot means less than 10% this is a predominately white voting District.

This one is, oops just a moment, I was not on the pointer.

So if it has no dot, it means it's less than 10%.

For example this one is less than 10% African/American.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Could you go to the right 1929 just below the words grant blank and just click on what the percentage is there?

>> MR. MORGAN: 16.5.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: My suggestion is go to the north. Population concentration is different.

And I think that that's where you can find.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let me take this out and I'm trying to take out the white population from 26.

To increase the Black voting age population so let me just try this.

All right so now we are on it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Moving one brought you up to 35.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I think we are done.

Can we just call it good?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: One move.

He has good skills.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we are good 26 and 27 are within the range all be it a lower threshold but.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Could you go up please? I'm not seeing 26.

Okay yes so, the Genesee County range as was discussed is 35-40%.

I think the Saginaw County range is 40-45.

So I think that to get to the sweet spot for Flint, so I would recommend again going north and adding some Black population particularly in these are historic part of Flint and the Black community has longstanding ties to this area.

So I would go north a little bit where you don't need that much change.

But I think that you're likely.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: To get closer to 40% is that what you're saying?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Close to 40% Genesee and not talking about Saginaw County.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so what we will do within 26 I would like you to Zoom in John and we will start adding and taking adding to 26 from 27, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So that one precinct right there 1104 right on the top.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Pretty close to 90% African/American.

If you want to grab there that would be a great spot to grab.

Yeah 95%, yeah.

And the one next to it 1189 is pretty darn close to that too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay let's do that, please, John.

So now we push down 27 that is the tradeoff.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What Mr. Adelson is suggesting we will find more population north, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm not sure Mr. Adelson the theme is not showing that.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: In -- Saginaw is north.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are in Genesee County, Flint.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So with grabbing that population and also looking at the Townships to the east and the west where there is the minority population is not as large.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Minority population is not as large.

We are over 35% to push 40% is going to be a real challenge with either of those districts so that is what I mean Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we spent a lot of time on this before and I think we decided in order to get 40% we would have to have one and then the other one is going to be a lot lower so we kind of discussed is it better to have two right just under or one higher and one lower.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would take off the second one I had you add because they are both closer to 36.

So a little higher.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, thank you John, we will just back it up one.

Mr. Adelson, I think our choice here is to say we can't have it this low.

So we will just have one District that is 40% or we have to districts that are at the lower of the threshold.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point I think that may be the explanation/justification.

Why don't we look at the election results.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay let's go there.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's start with the bellwether, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so District 26 is 72 for Biden 28 for Trump.

For Clinton it's 73, Trump 27.

Obama 79 Romney 21.

Peters is 73, James 27.

Stabenow is 75, James is 25.

Peters 82, Land 18.

Stabenow is, sorry, I was going the whole range.

83, Hoekstra is 17, Whitmer is 77.

Schuetz is 23.

Shower is 77.

Snyder is 23.

Nessel is 73, Leonard is 27. Totten is 73 and Schuette is 26. Benson 77, Lange 23.
Dillard 75, Johnson 25.
El-Sayed 25.
Thanedar 28.
Whitmer 46.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: That was District 26.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I'm sorry, so District 27 is just for the truncated races 68
Biden 32 Trump.

It's 78 Obama, 22 Romney. 70 Peters, 30 for James.

For U.S. Senate in 2018 is 72 and 28 for James. Whitmer is 74, Schuette 26.

Dillard 74 and Johnson 25 or 26.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So bellwether elections prove out two to three times the
margin.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's worth the risk to try it in two districts is that what
I'm hearing?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I would take out the word risk.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's remove the word risk.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I would say it's worth an educated try and shot because
the election results prove out and that is the metric in addition to population.

So I think that those two for now they look okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I can't -- can you scroll up just a little bit on the active
matrix John so we can see 27 as we.

I think they are both right around the right population.

Oh, 27 is a little under but we could under populate 26 and perhaps 27 just slightly more
if we want to.

I think that is the only way to help.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I agree John.

>> MR. MORGAN: I thought that is what you were originally doing but stopped doing
that because it looked like it was the way you wanted it to be.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes so, I think what we can do is under populate in
26.

Now we will stay in the northwest area around flushing.

We will just take out one District there and add to 52 because 52 is under so let's go to
the northeast I say northwest because 52 is under populated let's go to that is Genesee,
yeah, right there add it to 52, please, yep.

And 51 is over already, yeah, so let's add it to 52.

So 27 got a bump.

And 36 is still better.

So we can under populate 27.

I don't know if we can do the same thing with 26.

Was there sort of a natural place to remove from 26? 51 is pretty overpopulated already.

55 is also, 56 has room.

Let's try that.

Can you see what the, yeah, the African/American population? Is that a, that is 21%.

Let's try that.

Yeah, sorry John you hovered over 31, 3014 also.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, that is a little lower but it's also higher.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Not contiguous.

Let's do 1301 please let's try that and we are adding it to 56 we said, I think.

Yeah.

Okay so 56 is in population deviation.

And 26 got a little bump.

Did it? I can't tell John I'm sorry.

26 left, there it is.

So it's 36.5.

Okay, and they are both slightly under populated.

That may be yeah so, we are at 37% instead of 35 and 36.

Okay we got some improvement.

All right, so I think so voting rights so where should we go next Mr. Adelson? Trying to be methodical and systematic and finished the Detroit and Genesee let's go to Saginaw.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yeah, let's do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so yeah what do we remember from this one?

Richard another Commissioners? Anybody remember how we drew this one Commissioner Orton do you have a memory?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we chose the precincts with the highest African/American population and we couldn't seem to get any higher.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are at 32%, which is well below the 40%, which was sort of required for -- to elect a candidate of choice.

Yeah.

And we are still and we are under populated also.

So, yeah, and the election results? Let's try the election results and see.

Yeah, that is probably the best we can do.

John, will you pull that up.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 30 on the truncated election results 68 Biden 32 Trump. 71 for Obama 29 for Romney.

Peters 68, James 32.

Stabenow 68 James 32.

Whitmer 70, Schuette 30.

Dillard 66, Johnson 34.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: They are electing double still it might work.

But.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It might.

And I think that one thing that may be clarifying when we get in the voting pattern analysis because there is 11% Hispanic VAP here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So if we infer that Hispanics and Black voters cohere and coalesce may be part of an explanation but that is supposition for now.

When we get the analysis that may be particularly helpful here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We are getting late in the process when are we getting the voting pattern analysis and how do we get that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I perked right up.

It's my understanding that the voting pattern analysis would be something that you would not have Commissioner Orton before the second round of public hearings.

This is something that would be provided or let me reword that not in time to be considered for the published maps for the second round of public hearing.

It's something with the additional data you will be receiving from the public comment from the hearings, from the portal, there will be additional data from Dr. Handley including the voting pattern analysis, voting pattern analysis.

Mr. Adelson will have additional information for the Commission based on the second round of public hearings.

So again, it's the continuum of information and the building of information that the Commission will have.

And if you had something to add to that.

Okay, is that are responsive Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, but I don't really understand.

It seems like it seems like we should have all the information before we get the maps the way we think they should be for the second round of public hearings.

So I just don't understand.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To that point, and one of the things that we are able to do is able to make some informed inferences based on experience in redistricting and based on general knowledge of voting pattern.

The inference here for example that Hispanic voters maybe...may have cohesive with Black is reasonable for now.

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.

By the time the Commission is at the final deliberation stage after the second public hearings and we have additional information, then the additional analysis will be particularly helpful because the final maps are of course the final maps.

We do have a little leeway here.

I also will mention that in Arizona for example we made significant changes between the second round of public hearings and the final maps based on additional analysis and additional public comments.

The deviation went up almost 4 percentage points but that was in response for comments.

And additional analysis.

So I think that the what we are seeing now with the voting rights analysis is all good.

All election results are proving out and no warning signs.

There will be more information later which will be as General Counsel Pastula indicated very important before a decision is made on final maps.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right then I think we are, yeah, we have done the best we can.

I think we have successfully completed Detroit, the Genesee County and the Saginaw County now.

And we are ready to move to the Western District or Mr. Adelson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I was going to say exactly right that is what I would suggest.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And was it the Grand Rapids? Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Grand Rapids and Kentwood.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Mr. Morgan. So, Commissioner Vallette, I'm just aware that my turn I think is nearing an end or is done.

Are you ready to take over?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: If you don't mind I would rather you kept on.

You are doing such a good job.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I did not think so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I won't get off the hook I will continue then thank you for the permission.

Mr. Adelson 78, 25 and we are in an area that was not we did not have VRA, right, analysis from Dr. Handley.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Right, Commissioner Rothorn, let me provide a little context.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: This area is a great example of the population changes reflected in the census.

These were areas when we began months ago when Dr. Handley when we first talked to Dr. Handley there was really no thought that there might be some VRA implications here.

Because historically the population has not been as high as it seems to be now.

So one of the -- that is in large part why there was no analysis done here.

But we are looking to have additional analysis that focuses on this area.

Now, one of the points if I may make about with District 78, so the this is a majority minority District as written.

59% minority.

This is a coalition District.

There is no one single minority that makes up a majority.

So you have primarily Black population and Hispanic population.

As you know we don't yet have voting cohesion analysis.

So I'm reluctant for purposes of now to make significant changes but one of the things that I would mention that is really not related to this District again but it's similar to other things we talked about.

When you have concentrated population minority population, and that's combined with areas where the population is different, that may have a dilutive impact.

I'm not suggesting that is happening here.

Because of the high minority voting age population.

And also the lack of analysis to guide us.

What might be instructive here I don't recall that we did this.

If we looked at the bellwether election results here.

I just don't remember if we did that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So 78 let's look at the bellwether elections, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 77 for Biden, 23 for Trump.

70 for Obama.

30 for Romney.

Peters 73.

James 27.

72 for Stabenow.

28 for James.

Whitmer is 75.

And Schuette is 25.

And Dillard is 57 and Johnson is 43.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: What is interesting the election results have varying and different than the other side of the state but the bellwether prove out candidates who have been identified as candidates of choice prevail.

So this District based on the information we have now seems to be a newly created ability to elect District.

I don't recall if whether it's a neighboring District or it would have to be I guess a neighboring District.

If there is another District in this area with plurality minority population, I just don't remember that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I also don't remember but just recognizing that John is highlighting a relatively large African/American population in that yep where you were John.

And it looks like 86 can stand to lose some.

And 78 could stand to, yeah, so if we could add 78 and just see what that does to our -- the black voting age population and the increase and we are still within range so I wanted to acknowledge that may be a good choice for the moment and back to you Mr. Adelson what you were suggesting.

You were asking whether we knew of any other on the western edge and we do know there is a large Hispanic population on the western shore Lake Michigan shore and understand it's pretty dispersed and do we just want to get the Hispanic population.

>> MR. MORGAN: In this area you are asking the areas around Grand Rapids so the districts on the screen are 75, 76, 78 and 79 and here are the demographics so 75 is 7% African/American.

76 is 6% African/American.

We looked at 78 which is Grand Rapids and Kentwood and then 79 is 7% African/American.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So could you make the argument then that the African/American population is packed into one District? Around Grand Rapids? Shouldn't it be more of an even split?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think that given the size of the House Districts that may not I mean that may not be possible.

I wouldn't say necessarily that they are packed since they do form the core of 78. So whether or not there is -- whether it's in adjoining District or not, whether there is a possibility of having a minority influence or opportunity to elect District, it's hard to know just from these from the dots because this new District in 78 where we are lie on Hispanic population in part, we just don't have the same polarized voting analysis that we did to the east.

So we have it would be very speculative.

I don't know if there is enough population in 76 or just looking at the numbers.

The only District among 75, 76, 79, 79 is the only District that as it stands a sizable minority District.

So if there were some opportunity to create an additional District by taking population whether it's from the northwestern part of 96.

The -- is that area John where the cursor is that is 78, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: That's it's 78 and then a little bit is 86.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: 86 is the lighter color.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That may answer your question Commissioner Witjes, there may be population in on that western edge of 86 that could be joined with 79. Is 79 is the only current District that has other than 78 that has a sizable minority population unless and I don't think I'm missing.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let me acknowledge that minority right because we do have a significant, I shouldn't say significant but there is 18 almost 19% Hispanic right where John is right in 78, 79 and 82.

We don't see 82 on the screen.

Oh, yes, we do.

It's that lighter color under 77.

Yep, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is going towards the lakeshore.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: When you say minority it's the Black and Hispanic and Asian right when you say minority is that accurate?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Right and I would think from what you had said before Commissioner Rothorn the minority population is not either compact enough or sizable enough if you went west to easily create a District.

Because remember the issue of compactness when you're looking at minority populations is more salient than just compactness in general.

That is the whole robot arm argument.

But here below 78 that part of District 86 and the eastern part of 79, that is a generally compact area of minority population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, all right, and this is the area that we are aware of.

This is the western part of the state where we are familiar with maybe potential VRA District.

And again thinking of our sort of checklist we are through with looking at the VRA compliance and looking at the data that we have to establish that we are more in compliant.

Is that accurate?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: From a VRA standpoint and I would leave this thought in as far as what the justification explanation would be.

Going forward a little bit from what Commissioner Witjes said if the Commission seeing where the minority population is in 79 and in 86, if the Commission attempts to create

an additional coalition District or if the Commission does not, then either way there would need to be some type of justification for that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we are going to put make a note here, between.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: The election results? Sure we can definitely do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the offer was let's look at the election results for District 79, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: 51 Biden, 49 for Trump.
44 for Obama, 56 for Romney.

It's 49 for Peters, 51 James.

Stabenow 48, 52 James. It's 50 for Whitmer and 50 for Schuette.

And it's 33 for Dillard and 67 for Johnson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Clearly the results are mixed.

Now, that could mean there is racially polarized voting which Dr. Handley establishes is true statewide that could be that there is some dilutive impact.

Could be the minority population is not large enough.

So the all of those factors may be in play here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right so what I'm going to offer and what I'm hearing is it's worth, do you need us? [Laughter]

Sorry, so what I'm thinking about Mr. Adelson is to sort of to try, it sounds like we have to it's worth trying and since we are at that point, yeah, so Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Now I disagree.

Looking at the voting results if you take 78 has the ability and the record to elect their candidates of choice.

If you take them out of there and put them in 79 which clearly is moving towards the what I would call normal Grand Rapids election results.

You're going to decrease 78's ability to elect a candidate of choice.

I think that is a wrong move.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And I agree.

I think since we don't have voting pattern analysis I agree.

Taking population out of 79 is something I would not recommend.

But I do recommend looking at bringing population from I'm sorry John can you put up the demographic dots again please?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I think Commissioner Lett it was actually 79 and 86 not touching 78.

It was 79 or and 86 trying to figure out is there a way to shift it, not touching 78.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Not touching 78.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay and then looks like 96 is also the same color as 86.

So that might be useful to just sort of help us see the border between 96 and 86 are on seeing where the dots are.

This is the area of concentration and the minority population is packed in this area unlike other parts of the west inside and it may not be possible and if it doesn't work out as we have seen elsewhere it's a good justification.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's 6 and it's Tuesday and 6:00 that yeah so what I'm thinking about is you know it's worth trying for me any way I'll try to just play with it at home and see if I can come up with something because I think that maybe where we, yeah, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Trying to get where you are trying to go with all that. But I would want to potentially see the partisan fairness measures on this before we leave.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If we can now agree that there is a place we have as the VRA like there is one last little thing to sort of check off before we complete a VRA let's say compliance analysis, that's so we will come back to that tomorrow. And let's move on to partisan is it partisan fairness is that the next one? Let's see if we can continue with that, run the report on this and we are in the house map, right.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: One other point is keeping the note about the VRA and partisan fairness and adding to that the population deviation is 9.43 so that is wills something to look at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Population deviation is 9.43.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Across the plan on the upper right Roth Randy Travis we have time tomorrow and we are doing well and on Tuesday and on the house plans already so we are doing all right.

But yeah so, I think partisan fairness is next, right? That's what we are looking at? John, can you help us run the partisan fairness scores please.

>> MR. MORGAN: So this is 10521 version one so today's house plan and we carried the information from previous house plans with adjustments today.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that review.

Okay so yeah let's thank you.

We have the lopsided margin so scroll down sorry because we have a number of districts so we are looking at lopsided margins and looking for the number of is that what we needed? Okay, so let's move on to the mean median, please.

We are still in favor of republicans for .8.

Efficiency gap.

10.7.

We can do better.

And seats votes.

Ratio is 50-60.

Also leaning republican.

Okay, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You know something that I think would sort of help these numbers there is already an overlay of it and I think it's something we might want to look at.

We can look at it today or tomorrow but I'm quite confident that you know it would probably help these numbers based on the public comment that we got in Benton Harbor was that lakeshore districts that I originally had added into this collaborative process but was scrapped at some point.

Also it would not mess with VRA it really messes with the southwest corner of the state. So I wanted to put that out there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Can you -- it's 6:00.

Can you identify for us the number or that tomorrow when we come in, we just have that for us so we can upload the overlay?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, John has it.

I don't know which collaborative version it was.

But it was this between like 81 and 87 here.

And we can certainly look at it tomorrow.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you.

So the last one is do we need to do the compactness? That is also a quick and easy one run the compactness score for this house map?

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm running the compactness score and I will just save it as a PDF.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: 110 districts so each District will have a score.

So out of 110 districts, again, this is the Polsby Popper so the most compact District is .74.

The least compact is .12 which is District 8.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you.

So Commissioners at this point I know we are tired.

We do have to finish up just I think one set of minutes and want to look at our I think we have some scheduling to look at for next week.

Excuse me for the remainder of this week.

Sorry Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I just want to point out I think of all the plans you looked at this is the low score of 3, 5 or 6 plans you looked at .12.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I feel like I have to be careful how I word this.

The compactness scores on the house I have a feeling could potentially be lower, not by us doing it purposely just because how skinny they are and how we have to reach for things and it's not as big of a land mass.

So I think we should keep that in the back of our minds and try not to chase a poltergeist we probably won't be able to fix so my thought.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, thank you Commissioner Witjes. Commissioner Eid you had your hand but brought it down are you okay?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was just going to say the same thing. I think that is because of what we have for VRA reasons in Metro Detroit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent thanks y'all. So we have some a little bit of work to do on this house map when we get back tomorrow but for the moment let's wrap up our unfinished business which is mapping and move on to approval of minutes which I believe is item 7 on our agenda. So without objection we will proceed to the approval of minutes from September 22. Are there any proposed edits to the draft minutes that have been provided? Seeing none, may I have a motion to approve the minutes of the Commission meeting held in East Lansing on September 22.

Commissioner Witjes thank you. Commissioner Eid is the second.

All in favor of -- any debate? Hearing none all in favor of approving the Commission minutes for September 22, 2021, signify raising your hand and saying aye.

All opposed raise your hand and saying nay. The ayes prevail the motion is adopted.

There are no staff reports at this time.

Without objection I will ask Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State if she has a report hearing no objection, please proceed Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I do have a report actually.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please proceed.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi everyone I thought it might be helpful for me to share my screen really briefly.

And just go over one more time the deliberation process.

So this is part of the mapping process that is posted on our website.

So step one research and review.

Step two additional oops sorry when we are here.

Okay so step one is mapping adjustments.

And it may not surprise you all that is exactly where you are all at right now.

Going through and adjusting your maps to make sure they are in compliance based on feedback from your consultants.

So the next step in the process once you all are done adjusting your maps is to determine the number of collaborative draft proposed maps you want to take through to the hearings.

So as we experienced you have a couple different ones. You can take them all.

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.

You can limit it.

It's totally up to you guys.

Then step three is that piece that I was alluding to earlier today which is where all of the drafts are presented.

So your Chair and Vice Chair will present the collaborative maps.

And any Commissioner who has an individual map that they would like to submit for public hearings can present it at that time.

And then if you all did decide to limit the number of collaborative maps, we would proceed to voting for which maps would make it through to the public hearings.

But we don't have to vote if you just decide to put them all through to the public hearings which is also acceptable.

So one more thing that I really wanted to share is this document that your staff and I have collaborated on briefly.

Which is compliance analysis tracking.

And I believe this all was previously shared with you.

So if you are a Commissioner who is working on your own independent map, your alternate draft you would like to submit for public hearings, you will need this document. Your maps as you all know you voted on are due to be submitted prior to Monday's meeting.

So you can send it in Monday morning or Sunday night or send it in now if you wanted. But we did ask your General Counsel in an e-mail sent to you ask that you complete this form for your alternate draft.

And that does mean that you will have to reach out to your consultants to get scores on various things, prior to submitting it Monday morning.

So you can see here you can fill in your information on your partisan fairness scores compactness scores, different considerations.

And then down here there is a table for filling in information on each District.

Don't worry if you don't want to fill in every single thing on this table.

You can just print off attachments that run the scores and send it in as an attachment in the e-mail.

But if you do want to fill in the table that is fine too.

Some people like excel.

So that is it.

If you have not already started working on your independent draft if you do plan on submitting one, I would encourage you to start on that and reach out to consultants as soon as possible to make sure that you want to make or that you're able to make all the changes that you want to make, to have the most awesome draft that you can prior to submitting it Monday morning.

So that's all I have.

Any questions on that?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The maps we are taking on the road with us for a second round of public hearings are they going to be professionally printed? Or is it just going to be a displayed on a wall somewhere on a projector? That could potentially limit how many we want to bring.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That's a great question.

That is one I would defer to your staff on.

I know that your staff are currently considering what options are available.

So I'll defer to your Executive Director Sue Hammersmith on that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Ms. Reinhardt I think we have two more questions Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Eid. Commissioner Lange please proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to know with what our schedule currently is for doing our collaborative maps I know a lot of people planned on working on these this weekend when we actually had time to do so.

How are we supposed to get these, this sheet done by our consultants if our maps are not done until the weekend?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So I would encourage Commissioners to reach out to your consultants to try to coordinate scheduling for that.

And again if you have all the information on the sheet and other documents and it's easier for you to just attach that to an e-mail and send it along, you don't need to fill out every individual table as long as the information is there for your presentations.

And I see that your General Counsel had her speaker light on too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel did you have a response for Commissioner Lange?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I did thank you for the question, Commissioner Lange. I can only speak for your legal team we work through the whole weekend.

I would not be presumptive and speak for the map drawing team.

I don't know if Executive Director Hammersmith is laughing and nodding her head yes as well as the mappers that are here.

So your entire team works through the whole weekend and are available to the Commissioners, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: But if there is not time to get this completed you are telling me this is now a requirement in order to have the public look at our maps? I guess that's pretty much my question.

Because now I'm being told by staff that this is a requirement.

Obviously, we would try to get them as close to compliance as possible.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much. Commissioner Lange it's not a requirement from staff.

What the tracking sheet is tracks the constitutional criteria.

If Ms. Reinhardt can scroll down a little bit the only question on the form that is not related to the constitutional criteria is consideration number three was this draft proposed map formally considered for publication? If yes vote the vote be end results. So what this form does is it helps the Commissioners as well as the full Commission have an at a glance view at the data that would speak to the constitutional criteria and as Ms. Reinhardt stated much of this can be generated and saved as a PDF from the EDS software.

So think of it as a tool to assist you in your drawing work and in your drawing whether you need to make adjustments like we've seen throughout the day today where it's good and the Commission through its work made it better.

That that is how it would be presented.

And staff is available to assist.

The consultants are available to assist, whatever the Commissioners need individually or as a full body.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes do you have a response to Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If this helps you Commissioner Lange, all the numbers that the form is asking for are able to be printed with two or three mouse clicks within the actual software itself.

That doesn't really need to I don't think we really need to e-mail our vendors or staff to get the information as long as we know how to potentially do it.

You can run the reports for compactness with two or three mouse clicks and run the reports for partisan fairness with two or three mouse clicks and a slew of other reports if you want to potentially go that far and see what the software can do.

But everything that I see on this particular screen for this particular form those reports we can get ourselves out of the software when we are working.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And Commissioner Lange just to reiterate what your General Counsel said, I wouldn't consider this necessarily a requirement for you to submit your own individual plan but more like a helpful tool or resource guide for Commissioners who are creating their own plan.

To make sure that you have considered all of the compliance and criteria.

But also for those who will be viewing the plan during presentations to just have it in a consistent way from plan to plan.

But certainly not a written in stone requirement but more just a useful guideline tool.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange? Okay Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just wanted to say thanks to staff and Ms. Reinhardt for putting this together.

I think it's actually quite helpful as a tool to keep us organized.

I think we should probably use it for the collaborative maps too when we you know put those to publication for the public hearings kind of to make it easy to you know look at them side by side.

But I think this is really helpful thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You are a mind reader Commissioner Eid.

These are actually planned to be used for collaborative maps as well.

So that way members of the public and members of the Commission are able to at a glance see the various scores and criteria from map to map in a consistent and organized way.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt and Commissioner Eid your hand is still raised do you have something else? Okay so thank you miss Reinhardt anything else.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No that is it thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Fantastic thank you.

I do have no reports from the...our staff, but did want to recognize we did have a second Page on our agenda that did have some significant part to our for future Commission meetings so make it's just sort of a heads up maybe it's not something we need to highlight with the staff or do you want to address that Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I'm only a director.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: This is actually the second Page for tomorrow's agenda that has all of the future dates on it.

So I just want everyone to be aware that we will be at MSU union hall the rest of this week and Monday and Tuesday next week.

And then after the public hearings we also have this facility booked and the reason we are booked here is because we can stay later if we need to stay later.

The only day we cannot have here is election day that is November 2nd and we will be at the graduate in one of their conference rooms that day.

So that will work out well for us.

And then we will start the first deliberation day at 1:00 p.m. because we are coming from Flint so there will be some travel time in the morning there for everybody to come this way.

We are also proposing biweekly meetings during the 45 days of public comment.

We felt there may be some Commission business that we would want to attend to.

We can gather and talk also about the types of comments we are getting.

Look at those.

But mostly I think it's just to stay in contact with each other.

And to plan and be ready for the final vote that will take place on December 30th or should the timeline become earlier along the way, a few days, it could happen a couple days earlier too.

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: Thank you Director Hammersmith.

Any questions, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: As I look at the schedule next week Wednesday, Thursday and Friday we are not meeting.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: At the present time we do not plan to meet. That is the time needed for CSS and EDS to get everything ready and published to be part of the public hearings.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Any other questions, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Moving a little ahead after the public hearings so starting on the would it be the 25th-November 5th where we would deliberate on the maps at the public hearings?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: On the schedule Commissioner Eid it says Wednesday October 27-Friday October 29th is the beginning of deliberations and into the following Monday through Friday November 1-5.

Does that help?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair that's perfect.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, all right then correspondence, we have received correspondence in advance of our meeting today and provided along with written public comment to the Commission in meeting materials it's my understanding there are no future agenda items to share at this time are there any announcements? As the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business a motion to adjourn is in order may have a motion to adjourn.

I have a first.

I have a second from Commissioner Weiss.

First from Commissioner Witjes all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed say nay.

The ayes prevail the meeting is adjourned nice work y'all and it is 6:22.