

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

03/30/21 9:30 am Committee Meeting

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

>> Brittini: Good morning. As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:31 a.m.

Can you all hear me?

Okay.

Sorry.

I got a note that it said that I was on mute and now it says, okay.

I'm ready for the next slide though.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed to YouTube. For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at redistricting MI to find the link for either viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning.

Close caption and ASL Spanish and Arabic translation service also are be provided for effective participation in this meeting.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should e-mail [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and/or contact Sarah Reinhardt.

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

This meeting is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be made available and posted on [RedistrictingMichigan.Org](http://RedistrictingMichigan.Org).

Along with written public comment submissions.

Excuse me.

Members of the media who may have questions, before during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods, III, Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission at [WoodsE3@Michigan.gov](mailto:WoodsE3@Michigan.gov). Members of the media should also have his contact information.

For the purposes of the public watching and for public record, I will turn to the Department of State staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> Sally: Good morning, Commissioners.

When I call your name, please unmute yourself and indicate the city or county that you are attending remotely from.

Doug Clark.

>> Doug: Present, and I am remotely attending the meeting from Rochester Hills, Michigan.

- >> Sally: Juanita Curry.
- >> Juanita: Present; and I'm attending the meeting remotely from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Anthony Eid.
- >> Anthony: Present; remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Brittini Kellom.
- >> Brittini: Present attending from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Rhonda Lange.
- >> Rhonda: Present; attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Steve Lett.
- >> Steve: Remotely attending from Lee county, Florida.
- >> Sally: Cynthia Orton.
- >> Cynthia: Present; attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.
- >> Sally: MC Rothhorn.
- >> MC: Present; remotely attending from Lansing, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.
- >> Rebecca: Present; remotely attending from Wayne County, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Janice Vallette.
- >> Janice: Present; attending from Highland. Michigan.
- >> Sally: Erin Wagner.
- >> Erin: Present; attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Richard Weiss?
- >> Richard: Present; remotely attending from Saginaw, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Dustin Witjes?

There are 12 of 13 Commissioners present. There is a quorum.

- >> Rebecca: Thank you, Sally.

Moving on to the adoption of the agenda.

As a reminder to the public watching, you can see the agenda at [RedistrictingMichigan.Org](http://RedistrictingMichigan.Org).

Or assuming we have all had a chance to look at the agenda, I would entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

I have Erin making the motion and Cynthia seconded.

It is moved and seconded that the meeting agenda be approved as given.

All in favor signify with a raised hand.

And all opposed same sign.

Okay, the ayes prevail.

The motion is adopted.

Review and approval of minutes.

Are there any edits to the meeting minutes?

I'm seeing none.

MC is shaking his head.

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.

Okay, thank you.

Let's -- same, I need a motion for the approval of the minutes.

Erin with a motion and Juanita with a second.

All in favor approving the minutes as given.

And all opposed?

Okay, the minutes have been approved.

And public comments moving on to public comments, a few notes about public comment for those of you who are joining the first time if you have public comment today.

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

Staff at the Department of State will unmute each member of the public for up to two minutes on a first come, first serve basis.

This means members of the public will be called on in order in which they signed up to address the Commission.

To those members of the public participating in public comment, please note you will have no more than two minutes to address the Commission this morning.

You can also submit your thoughts to the Commission and public by e-mailing [Redistricting@Michigan.Gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.Gov).

The Department of State will provide your written thoughts to the Commission by indicating in that e-mail you would like to submit your written comment as public comment, it will be included in the online meeting archive for the Commission.

Public comment sign up links are also posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook and Twitter at [RedistrictingMichigan](https://www.facebook.com/RedistrictingMichigan).

Now I would like to call on Ms. Sally Marsh, Michigan Department of State, Director of Special Projects, who will call on members of the public to address the Commission, if we have any today.

>> Sally: We do have one member of the public who signed up to address the Commission today so individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live public commentary will now be allowed to do so.

Just a few brief notes.

After I call your name, our staff will unmute you.

Your screen will change and you will rejoin the meeting as a presenter.

You will want to make sure that you turn your sound and video on before you make those live public comments.

And if you have any technical issues, we will try to trouble shoot. And if not send you instructions on how to participate at the next meeting.

So first in line to provide public comment is Tom Walker.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

Please unmute yourself Mr. Walker and you have two minutes.

>> Mr. Walker: Good morning, Commissioners.

Again my name is Tom Walker.

I am calling from Port Huron. And my concern is about the tenth Congressional district. I know time is short so I'll try to make this as brief as possible.

I strongly urge the committee to consider redrawing the boundaries of the 10th Congressional district.

Before the 2000 census, this was a strong, active, progressive district, that was represented by David Bonior in Congress who was majority whip.

And once the republican majority, state legislature redrew the district, it went from composing St. Claire and Macomb county to expanding north to most of what we know as the thumb.

And Lapeer County.

Not suggesting that their voices are any less important than ours, but essentially quashed the voices of the people in the original district and the district has gone from being extremely influential in Congress to pretty much just a seat that with all due respect republicans have held since 2013, when the district was redrawn, and forced David Bonior to retire from public service, thank you.

>> Sally: Thank you very much for addressing the Commission.

And that concludes public comment this morning.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Sally.

Can we have the Executive Director report?

Sue?

>> Sue: Yes, you can.

And unfortunately, I have a train so hopefully you don't hear the loud noises in the background.

>> Brittini: I don't hear anything.

>> Sue: Well you probably will.

They are switching out cars near our house.

>> Brittini: A little exciting.

>> Sue: Anyway I come to you this morning with lots of gratitude and just want to mean shun a few things special thanks to Commissioners Szetela for Chairing the Voting Rights Act legal counsel committee this morning. You will hear the report. And thanks to Commissioners Clark, Eid and Kellom for serving on this committee with seven proposals. They did some pretty heavy lifting on the reading and the evaluation and we appreciate their work.

And the other Commissioner's work as they reviewed the proposals also.

By I also want to thank General Counsel Pastula and Communication and Outreach Director Woods. I want the Commission to know how hard they are working and are doing a great job so I'm really blessed to be able to work with two wonderful people who are working very, very diligently to support the commission's goals.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the Michigan Department of State, Sally Marsh, Sarah Reinhardt, Mike Brady, and the newest edition Mustafa Rasheed. And appreciate the commitment and support for the MICRC. And also thanks to Matt Grossman from IPSA for public policy and social research for the continuing education as he has assembled a great team of panelists for today to look at the practice maps that the Commissioners have created of Ohio to learn a little bit more about mapping. So we have a very full agenda today. So let's proceed with our ice breaker.

And that question is: What is one important piece of advice you have been given? Anthony, would you like to start this morning?

>> Anthony: Sure.

Piece of advice that was given to me by my father is to always pursue your dreams and don't give up on them.

And that is something I have always appreciated.

>> Sue: Good advice. Thank you.

How about you, MC?

>> MC: I'm not sure who gave it to me but hate the sin, love the sinner is probably the thing that I think of most.

>> Sue: Okay, thank you.

Steve?

>> Steve: Well, it's a common one.

Don't sweat the small stuff and it's all small stuff.

>> Sue: So true so true Cynthia how about you?

>> Cynthia: Live beneath your means.

>> Sue: Good advice.

Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: This is also a common one but when someone shows who they are believe them.

>> Sue: That is true.

How about you Juanita?

>> Juanita: I guess the one that I would choose would be try to be a better listener than a person that is always talking, listen to who you are speaking with.

>> Sue: Okay, thank you.

Doug?

>> Doug: Yes.

Mine really comes from religious training and it's treat others as you want to be treated.

>> Sue: Uh-huh.

Thank you.

How about you, Erin.

>> Erin: It's a shame Doug went before me because that was mine, treat others the way you wish to be treated.

>> Sue: That is okay.

That is okay.

It's good.

Richard, how about you?

>> Richard: The best one is measure twice, cut once.

>> Sue: You would get along with my husband. Janice, how about you.

>> Janice: Never reply when you are angry, never make a promise when you are happy and never make a decision when you are sad.

>> Sue: Good advice. Thank you. Brittini, how about you?

>> Brittini: These are always so hard. I feel like everyone I've been surrounded by or with in my life is just full of advice.

I had one, too.

>> Sue: Want me to come back?

>> Brittini: Yeah, come back.

>> Sue: Okay, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: You got me already.

>> Sue: Okay, maybe you had another one.

People are moving around.

>> Rebecca: I can do another one. Someone told me that children are the true treasure of any family, I thought that was great advice, too.

>> Sue: That is lovely.

Okay. Are you ready Brittini?

>> Brittini: I'm ready.

It's a tie between two. When I was little my grandfather use to always tell like on the way to school, big girl don't take any wooden nickels, so that's one.

And then don't burn your candle at both ends, those are my two pieces of advice.

>> Sue: Okay, Julianne, how about you today?

>> Julianne: Good morning, everyone.

I would say mine is short, pay attention.

>> Sue: Okay, that is good advice and Edward?

>> Edward: Excuses are tools of the incompetent which build monuments of nothingness those who use them master them and seldom accomplish anything at all.

>> Sue: Okay. Good advice.

I remember really early in my career somebody said don't pick a fight with somebody who buys their ink by the barrel and the paper by the truckload.

So that was pretty good advice on how to deal with media.

It has changed a little bit.

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

There is not as much print, but there is other media and you always have to discern if it's worth responding to something that may be incorrect.

So I learned that early on and I've used that a lot.

Thank you.

That concludes my report.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Sue, you made it then the train came to welcome us at the end.

All right, what about a Department of State report?

Sally?

Do you have anything you want to share with us?

>> Sally: Yes, good morning again everyone.

Just wanted to briefly share a few updates from the Department of State, answer any questions you all might have.

We continue to work with the Commission staff of course to support all of you on things behind the scenes like website updates and all of that kind of a thing.

But I wanted to provide a bit more of an update today on the public comment tool that we've been talking about.

And just kind of let you all know what's happening with that and how we are moving forward.

So the Department of State has moved forward in procuring the tool from the MGGG redistricting lab.

For those of you who might not be familiar, it is a nonpartisan research group out of Tufts University that grew out of an informal research collective that was called the metric geometry and gerrymandering group so that is what MGGG stands for.

It's led by Moon Duchin who you will actually be hearing from today in the exercise led by Matt Grossman and others.

The MGGG lab is the sort of creating entity behind [districter.org](http://districter.org) which is the tool that all of you used in the exercises that you have done recently with continuing education. And essentially the lab is going to be -- is in the process right now of building out the public comment tool that we had described in the statement of work shared with you, you know, weeks, months ago, now at this point.

They are building similar or analogous tools for other states across the country as well. So that is, you know, an exciting piece of this.

And though the tool is right now in development it will be ready in time. And before actually your public hearings so that continues to be a priority for us at the Department of State.

And in the coming weeks we certainly hope to be able to demonstrate it for you. But just wanted to kind of remind you all and provide a refresher to you and to the public on really what the functionality is going to be with this tool.

It's a couple of key functions.

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.

Essentially members of the public would be able to go to this one place, this site for several different reasons to create a map either of a community of interest or of a district or of a larger district plan.

To upload or link a map that they might have made on another site or using another platform.

And then also to provide written comment to all of you.

Members of the public and all of you as well will be able to view other submissions, other sub mixes of public comment as a part of this tool, so it's sort of that very open, very transparent portal.

And they will even be able to comment on the plans of others.

And all of this data be preserved and be able to be exported various different ways and be provided to all of you of course but also to EDS and your staff.

So I just wanted to provide that update and a bit of a refresher and I will have more to share with all of you in the weeks ahead, I'm sure.

>> Brittini: Thank you so much, Sally.

We appreciate all the work that you do.

And have done.

It's just tremendous and thank you for letting us know what's going on with the tool.

Does anyone have any questions?

Erin.

>> Erin: Sally, will the public be able to comment on those maps and public comments that other people are putting up on that tool?

>> Sally: Yes.

>> Sally: Thanks for the question, Erin.

>> Brittini: Anyone else, any thoughts any questions for Sally before she fades off again?

>> Sally: Thanks everyone.

>> Brittini: Okay, moving on to unfinished business.

It doesn't look like we have much unfinished business unless there is something last-minute that someone wants to squeeze in

So we will go to new business.

We have Communications and Outreach Director Woods, III coming to us with a public hearings resolution.

>> Edward: Good morning, Commissioners, how are you today?

I hope all is well.

I want you to know I come in peace.

I come in peace.

I repeat, I come in peace with regards to the public hearings.

I think last week you asked for an itinerary and a schedule.



An itinerary and a schedule and I just want to make sure everyone knows I come in peace.

So as we share this itinerary and schedule that we are going to talk about for today, this is a typical itinerary as it relates to the public hearing on the actual day of the public hearing.

What we are going to be doing is we will have radio interviews or newspaper interviews but mainly radio between 7-9.

That's the sweet spot that we want to take to draw people to the public hearings.

Most of these will be able to be done by phone, but some are going to be in studio. And so this is something that would happen with regards to the actual day of the public hearing.

I repeat the day of the public hearing.

At the last Commission meeting the Commission elected to have a meeting from 5-6 and the public hearing from 6-9.

So the time from 10-2 will be used to go to senior citizens centers, we are partnering with the Area Agency on Aging. We are also partnering with Center for Independent Living with regards to people with disabilities, and other populations whose time is better suited between 10:00 a.m. to 2 p.m. for in-person presentations.

And, once again, this would be in the city or in the surrounding area when we are doing public hearings.

That's from 10-2.

4-4:30, this is to hit the 5:00 news, we will need somebody to do a promo or something with regards to the media between 4-4:30.

And then at 5:00 to 9 we have the meeting and this is suggested time and the public hearing will last until the last person speaks but for scheduling purposes at our different locations, we had to provide a time slot. And we are using a half a day and then anything that goes over that we will be covering through the costs.

After the public hearings there is going to be another media avail depending what time we get to catch the 11:00 news.

So once again, this is the itinerary for the day of the public hearing as it relates to the Commission.

In between the public hearings we would like to fan out for those who are available to sites in between where we were Tuesday and where we are going Thursday.

But this is the schedule for the day of the public hearing.

Another question the Commission asked was what would be the actual schedule for the public hearings?

Our chairperson Brittini Kellom would obviously be calling the meeting to order.

We would want welcome and introductions.

We want to have -- give each Commissioner an opportunity to host one of the 16 public hearings.

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

And then for the three extra we would have an extra democrat, an extra independent, and an extra republican for a total of 16 public hearing Commissioners to host.

Suann Hammersmith, our Executive Director, would provide a presentation on why we are here, which addresses and the Constitution of the purposes for the public hearings, which are right there.

Inform the public about the redistricting process, share the purpose and responsibilities of the Commission, and then solicit information from the public about potential redistricting plans.

We will have the public hearing by the residents. I will provide the acknowledgment of the volunteers and those who work behind the scenes to execute the public hearing for us.

And then we would adjourn.

So this is kind of the schedule of what would happen between 6-9. Because as you know you have a Commission meeting between 5-6.

Host Commissioner as relates to what we tried to do is put people close to their sites, knowing where you are so we would ask Commissioner Erin wagon narrow to do Jackson, Commissioner Cynthia Orton to do Kalamazoo, Commissioner Steve Lett to do Marquette and Gaylord.

Commissioner Doug Clark to do Midland and Pontiac.

Commissioner MC Rothhorn to do Lansing.

Commissioner Richard wise to do Flint.

Commissioner Janice Vallette to do Novi.

Commissioner Anthony Eid to do Dearborn.

Commissioner Juanita Curry to do Detroit.

Commissioner Brittini Kellom to do Detroit.

Commissioner Dustin Witjes to do Port Huron.

Commissioner Rebecca Szetela to do Warren.

Commissioner Rhonda Lange to do Muskegon.

And then Commissioner Brittini Kellom to do Grand Rapids.

Last week we shared with the challenge of the state taking over some of the sites as vaccination centers and some challenges with some facilities and so we want to share with you the dates for the public hearing.

Are because of northern Michigan being a vaccination center, we are having to start a week later.

So we want to start May 11 in Jackson at the commonwealth commerce center.

May 13th at Kalamazoo.

We will be either at the Radisson Hotel or the Wings Event Center.

They are both working on a competitive package.

They are owned by the same property, so it really depends on the state guidelines which at that time where we will be.

But it will be one of those locations.

May 18th will be at Marquette at Northern Michigan.

May 20th at Tree Tops in Gaylord.

May 25th the great hall banquet and convention center in Midland.

May 27th the Lansing Center.

June 1 Center Point Marriott in Pontiac.

June 3 the river front Banquet Center in Flint.

June 8 Suburban Collection Show Place. And Dearborn where at this time we are still trying to get the Ford Conference Center. If we are unable to get that we have a backup at the University of Michigan in Dearborn.

June 15th we are looking still looking at the Wayne County Community College Northwest. And then June 17th we are at the TCF Center, formally known as Cobo Hall.

June 22 would be at the Bluewater Convention Center.

June 24th the MRCC Banquet Center.

And then the last week June 29th will be at the Van Dyke Mortgage Convention Center. If that is not open, this is a new facility in Muskegon, we will be at one of the adjacent hotels.

And then on July 1 the DeVos center is looking to give us a spot because they finished their contract with the state as a vaccination site on June 30th. So we are still trying to negotiate through that.

If not, we will have an alternate location.

Right there in Grand Rapids.

Madam Chair, this concludes my presentation.

I can take any questions at this time.

>> Brittini: Any questions for Edward?

Juanita go ahead.

>> Juanita: Yes, good morning, Mr. Woods.

I was just wondering all 13 of us should be at every meeting, right?

Just a question.

>> Edward: That would be the hope.

>> Juanita: Okay, great.

>> Brittini: Richard.

>> Richard: Mr. Woods just one quick question did you send this to us yet or have we recent an e-mail yet.

>> Edward: No, you have not seen it.

>> Richard: If we did, I missed it but thank you.

>> Edward: We are still working on getting these dates.

It's like a maze Commissioner Weiss but I'm happy that we are almost close.

I just want to verify that what we are doing because with the contracts and the vote of the Commission you know we have to be in there at 5:00, with that and the set up and so I just want to reiterate that we are all on the same page.

We will need a motion to approve.

But with regards to the start time, because that impacts the contracts and so if the Commission is going to change their mind with regards to the start time in light of the public comments or what have you, I would need to know that because we are at the point where we are ready to start signing contracts to hold these facilities.

Obviously if there is a surge in COVID, we can reschedule.

Just so we are clear.

But I want to make sure that we are all on the same page.

We understand what's going on.

And we are putting that in there because it's a little bit -- it's easier now to change than it is once you get the contract signed.

>> Brittini: Okay so with that said do we have any thoughts last-minute thoughts about times?

Or any adjustments that need to be made?

Before Edward, before we do the motion and have everything signed, sealed and delivered, any lasting opinions on that?

MC.

>> MC: Just want to acknowledge it's going to be hard and I'm glad we are not volunteering to do this.

And you know that we are actually getting some compensation.

Really appreciate that.

And really appreciate that the wrangling that you are doing, Edward.

Yeah, I know it's not easy and there is a lot of people in play and the executive assistance will be helpful hopefully when that comes around.

So I'm going to move that we adopt it.

I don't know how many options we have frankly and I just feel like this is as good as we are going to get so I move that we adopt the resolution as presented.

>> Anthony: Second.

>> Brittini: I have MC with the motion to approve and Anthony with the second. Juanita or Steve were you all seconding as well or did you have something?

Okay I just want to make sure.

Okay and if we are ready to vote all in favor of the public hearings resolution as presented by Mr. Edward Woods, III signify with a raised hand.

Okay and all opposed same sign.

By my count it has been approved, so Edward, you can with the majority move forward with faith and hope that you know we support you.

>> Edward: First and foremost thank you and we will be meeting to load up your schedules on the day of the public hearing because there is an outcry to make sure that our voices are heard so I greatly appreciate it so now that you have kind of seen the itinerary, I will be sure to e-mail the presentation to you and we will be able to fill it.

A couple of updates I just want to share with you, I will be reaching out if you have not responded to your bio, and I sent your picture, please respond back to me. We are in the process of revamping our website and some other communication materials and it would just be very, very helpful if you haven't had the chance to take a look at it to respond back to me to ensure that the bio is saying what you want it to say. It's a very brief bio, but it would be very helpful if you can do that. And you also got your pictures. So I want to thank the MDOT team of Bill Philips, Sarah Martin, and Tim Burkes for their work and effort in terms of getting us our professional pictures for the Commission and the staff.

Just want you to know that next week we should be receiving our market research report.

Next week we can receive our market research report which will be going in to developing our communication outreach plan so just want you to know it should be available to the Commission within the next week or two.

But they are already out in the field and collecting data and I'm doing that as well. So thank you for your support with that as well.

Last but not least the League of Women Voters is hosting town hall forums and they have 27 sites and they are looking for Commissioners to participate.

So I got the list.

And I'll be sharing that with you to see if you are available.

But it would be providing 5-10 minute remarks where you would probably where you would introduce and last week, we approved our strategic plan so we would talk about our vision, or vision and our goals and elements of the plan, just in a five to ten minute introduction as they share redistricting to their membership across the state.

So really looking forward to that as well.

I want to thank the Commission.

We are almost through the month of March and we have done quite a few local Government presentations.

Just want to say thank you for that.

It's greatly appreciated.

And then you have some more presentations coming up, in April.

And some more panel discussions.

So you're going to see different types of presentations.

More collaborative types of presentations and just really looking forward to those opportunities to showcase the Commission and the outstanding work that you're doing as well.

Julianne Pastula our general counsel did a presentation in Marquette last night and they are like we have to make sure we are heavily, heavily advertising as relates to these upcoming public hearings.

So we will be sharing that with you.

Our advertising schedule with regards to promoting the public hearings on radio and print, on radio and print next week.

So once again that is just the update.

I just want to thank you again for your support.

And this is going to get exciting because people are engaged and this is exactly what we want when it comes to our redistricting efforts.

So thank you once again for being a part of your team.

And to my distinguished colleagues Sue Hammersmith and Julianne Pastula.

That concludes my report Commissioner Chair Kellom thank you.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Edward, we appreciate you.

And Commissioners you can also thank Edward if it moves you but I know that you took the time to thank us and I for one definitely appreciate all of the things that you have to do as MC said earlier.

Okay, well, you know, second meeting in a row we are ahead of schedule.

But I'm thinking that we could jump down and hear from our general counsel, Julianne, if you are ready and willing.

>> Julianne: I am always ready Madam Chair.

>> Brittini: So I'm thinking we will jump down in here from you extension of virtual meetings through April.

>> Julianne: Wonderful.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the body.

Yesterday a memorandum was circulated regarding the continuation of virtual meetings by the Commission.

I know this topic we have been addressing it and touching back on it over the course of this year certainly.

So the current authorization under the Open Meetings Act expires March 31st which is why we have our rescheduled meeting this morning.

There is a Senate bill again that I mentioned in the past.

That was introduced on March 4th and still has not made any progress.

So that bill is still in committee at this time.

However, the Ingham County board of Commissioners has extended and approved the mayors extension of the declaration of emergency for Ingham County through April 30th so should the committee that would allow the committee to meet virtually through April 30th a resolution has been prepared for your consideration.

If you would like to do that.

The other highlights of the memo it again goes through the requirements of the open meetings act for remote meetings and has the resolution from Ingham County attached to it.

So that would conclude my remarks, Madam Chair. I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> Brittini: Any questions?  
Or thoughts?

>> MC: Seems like it's prudent for us to do it mostly because we don't want to have the costs that are associated with switching gears if we are in person or not in person. Is that accurate, Julianne, that this is one of the reasons we are trying to do this before the Senate bill is passed is that accurate?

>> Julianne: Well, I think, Commissioner Rothhorn that is an excellent question. I think really, it's acknowledging that the Ingham County board of Commissioners has indicated that there is still a need in the county to avoid their emergency operation plan is still in effect.

And so that if we are able to meet virtually and that would be an option that we would have with this extended state of emergency in Ingham County.

Now, moving forward, again, the distinction is whether individuals can participate remotely or the body can hold remote meetings.

And because it is Ingham County where the Commission has held its past in person meeting that would allow us to do that.

Moving forward for individuals to attend remotely for our public hearings that Mr. Woods just went through, if one of the public hearings was being held in a community where there was an extended state of emergency or a declared state of emergency, then that person could attend the public hearing remotely.

Hopefully that was clear.

So it's two separate issues of whether individual Commissioners can participate remotely based on living in an affected area or that the committee Commission itself can meet remotely because the meetings are to be held in an affected area.

And I would also like to highlight for the benefit of the public that for in-person meetings of the Commission or for virtual meetings of the Commission will both be particularly in person meetings the distinction needs to be made that they will be live streamed and that the public will be able to participate in public comment virtually.

Thank you.

>> Brittini: Anything else for Julianne?

>> MC: I guess it makes sense to me so I would offer to move the resolution.

>> Brittini: Okay, I have MC with a motion to move.

Cynthia Orton with a second.

Thank you, Cynthia.

All in favor signify with a raised hand.

Okay looks like majority or unless I missed.

All opposed?

>> Dustin: I will also vote yes, it's Dustin.

>> Brittini: Thank you Dustin and welcome.

Okay, so by my count, sorry my screen just did something weird that you all did not see. That was a majority and we are approving general counsel Julianne Pastula's resolution that she presented for the extension of virtual meetings through April, excuse me.

Okay, it is 10:14, technically we are supposed to break at 10:20.

But are we okay with breaking now and coming back at 10:30 for our continuing Ed Map quest project with our lovely Matt Grossman?

So is that okay with everyone?

Great, see you all at 10:30.

[ Recess ]

Brittini: Okay we are just waiting for, oh, two people.

No, one person.

A few more minutes.

I don't want to delay our map practice.

Okay well next on our agenda is our continuing education mapping practice with Ohio maps and we have may mat Grossman, Eric Guthrie and a panel of evaluators.

So I am going to turn it over to Mr. Grossman.

>> Matt: Thank you so much.

And we have some resources available at the link on the IPSR website including all of the practice maps of Ohio and seven different commentaries, including two that won't be with us today, that I just want to draw your attention to some comments from the University of Michigan, faculty and a lab that compares the maps to lots of different possible maps that were drawn all go rhythmically so lots of places to get commentary.

I want to acknowledge that we gave you a hard assignment, that is you were trying to district a state that you don't know that well from with a lot of information to go on. So we really wanted to you to get the sense of how hard it is to meet multiple criteria and even the basic criteria of equal population districts and the kinds of decisions that you have to make.

So we are very thankful for those of you who tried and followed through.

And we are also thankful to the panelists.

We asked them on a very short turn around a few days and a couple days to in Moon's case to do some fairly complicated analysis of the practice maps that you put forward so we are very thankful that they were able to do that on such short terms.

Now let's see who has joined us.

Do we have Moon?

She was going to start us off.

Yes, we do.



All right I'd like to first introduce Moon Duchin, professor of mathematics and society program at Tufts University.

Her redistricting lab developed the districter software that you all got to practice with and they will be working in at least eight states in 2021 to assist Commissions and legislatures and are willing and able to help you so Moon will start us off.

>> Moon: All right, hi everyone I just gave a voting theory exam that ended three minutes ago so I'm still switching mind frames.

Well hello it's a huge pleasure to get to talk to you today.

So as you heard my name is Moon.

My lab is called the MGGG redistricting lab.

And we like to think of ourselves as data science for civil rights.

So we have been the web existed for about five years and for the last three we have been intensely preparing for this year and we hope that we are going to be able to be helpful in Michigan and in a number of other states.

So I prepared a short presentation to just walk through some, you know, basics. And also take a look at some of the maps that you all turned in.

And then after that I'm going to switch over to show you a couple features in districter. So I'm going to keep this part brief but on hand for any and all questions that you have.

All right. Let's see if I can get this started.

So are you seeing that? Is it showing full screen?

>> Brittini: It's a black screen.

>> Moon: All right.

Let me give that another try.

Now are you seeing that?

Okay and let me try full screen again.

Failure.

All right, I think actually the right thing to do is leave the Zoom and come back.

In the past that has worked for me.

So forgive me.

I will be right back.

>> Matt: The last time it worked, the very last time.

>> Moon: Even in full screen mode.

>> Matt: Yes.

>> Moon: Okay let's try again.

>> Brittini: The color was different on mine but it was I could see it.

>> Moon: Do you see this?

>> Matt: Now it's black again.

>> Moon: I will be right back.

>> Matt: Thank you for your patience.

We literally sent some maps to Moon on Sunday to get her involved.

So this is a very quick turn around and we are pleased to have the districter with us.

Now we can see it but you are on mute.

We can see it now but you are on mute.

>> Moon: Not muted.

Okay, and not sharing, is it?

Yeah, okay that is okay.

What I will do is.

>> Matt: It looks good now.

>> Moon: What I will do is just I won't get to show you kind of fancy animations but that is okay.

I think you will be able to see the screen and I apologize for the Zoom woes so I think you can see this now I just want to go into full screen mode does that look like evaluating plans?

Okay great.

All right so your task redistricting Michigan, so it's great news that Michigan has an independent citizens redistricting Commission.

But there is still a whole lot of work to do and obviously you started to see all the complexity that there is in the redistricting problem.

So some of that complexity comes from having a large number of criteria.

In your case you have the advantage of the criteria are stipulated and they are ranked so you have equal population and the Voting Rights Act, congruity, communities of interest, partisan fairness, don't pay attention to incumbency.

Respect county and municipal boundaries which is generally jurisdictional boundaries and then at the bottom this thing called compactness.

I spent a lot of time thinking about these criteria and how to make them precise and how to kind of think about the ways that they interact.

So I'm happy to take questions on kind of any of it, the quantification, what goes wrong when you take quite one of them too literally but generally just to say you are already at an advantage for having your list specified.

When it comes to plan evaluation though there are some challenges.

So one is that the central challenge even is that since you have these multiple criteria that we just talked about on the last slide you have to look for plans that are good in a number of different ways.

So I think the first thing that's really challenging about that is operationalization.

And this is something that I would say is often under appreciated.

So what that means to make something operational is first you have this nice idea so like going back to my last slide, let's say congruity.

That sounds like a nice idea.

But then you have to operationalize it that means you have to say what it means precisely in your context, in you know, on the ground.

And so, for instance, contiguity across water is something you might have to think about what is connected to what across water.

Or the pieces themselves you are building out of if the pieces are disconnected than what counts as a connected assemblage of pieces.

So each of these turns out to be kind of subtle.

And some of them like the Voting Rights Act have, you know, half century of case law around them, right, so figuring out how to make them precise is going to be one of your challenges.

So that's what those of us in math and computer science call operationalizing.

You take English or legal rule and you turn it into something quantitatively precise.

Beyond that going to have to handle tradeoffs and so if you look over here in my plot, I've got just an abstract schematic and maybe this is one thing you are trying to do well on and this is another priority you are trying to do well on.

And what you will find is that there is some sort of frontier where if you do better on one it might make you do worse on the other, you have a tradeoff.

You have two priorities that are kind of intentional.

And so one of your challenges will be to try to get to frontier to make things as good as possible and then your other challenge will be to sort of decide how to accept tradeoffs among those criteria.

So these are the basic challenges.

What how do you make the rules concrete and then once they are concrete how do you handle the tradeoffs?

Okay so one of the things that I wanted to spend a little time on today is partisan fairness metrics so there are many, many, many of these in the literature.

You know I will also mention I won't emphasize this today but this is also true of compactness or the idea that the district shapes should be sort of pleasing to the eye. Compactness has 30 odd definitions in the literature from the last if you low this many years. And partisan metrics, well, maybe it's not quite at 30, but there are a whole lot. There are a lot of competing ways that people have advanced ideas for how to measure whether you are treating the parties in a way that is equitable.

So the most basic one is proportionately so that one doesn't I don't need to attribute that to everyone because it seems to everyone because it seems to be a pretty universal intuition of fairness.

So the proportionality is the idea that the seat share you get should be about like the vote share that you get.

And if you follow popular press coverage of the criteria, or of gerrymandering actually very, very often when people are up in arms about an egregious gerrymander, it's on the basis of a failure proportionately. They might say why did 63% of the vote turn into

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.

75% of the seats? So this is the public intuition of what is wrong with gerrymandering, I would say.

Okay, but then many, many others in the literature have tried to come up with metrics that make kind of an end run around this proportionality idea.

So one big family of examples is called partisan symmetry.

So symmetry just sounds like you know you treat do on to others as you would have do on to you and that is what Gary king and other coauthors of his over the years have had in mind for partisan symmetry.

It's a table turning idea.

It's that if you exchange the roll of the two parties you should exchange their fates, right?

If one party gets 75% with of the seats with 53% of the votes, then the other party should also get 75% of the seats when they get 53% of the votes.

That is the idea of partisan symmetry.

As a -- I can tell you, you know, lots more, if you have any questions, please I can tell you lots more about how it's actually carried out.

But you probably have heard phrases like partisan bias and the mean median score and those all fit in the partisan symmetry family.

I'm just trying to kind of situate the partisan fairness metrics.

Okay so then there is another kind of metric called the efficiency gap and I have another slide I will say a little bit more about efficiency gap.

It was introduced circa 2015 by a law professor and a political scientist.

And the idea of efficiency gap is the idea that when an election is carried out and the winners are tabulated district by district, some votes are wasted.

If you have lots of excess winning votes like maybe you won the district with 90% of the votes, that was wasted votes.

Those are voters supports of yours who could have actually made a difference in neighboring districts but instead they were concentrated into one.

You know and unduly leasing votes are kind of wasted votes because they did not contribute to your representation so the idea behind efficiency gap is one party's wasted votes across the whole state should be about the same as the other party's wasted votes.

This sounds nice.

I'm going to try to argue that it's hard to interpret these in a vacuum.

I'll give you some pictures and some demonstrations but that is the idea.

Let me quickly point out a lot of people think efficiency app sounds like another symmetry metric.

But in the technical sense in the literature it isn't.

Because efficiency gap is not about turning the tables between the two parties.

It's just about checking if they have the same number of wasted votes so those don't always point in the same direction.

There are a lot of others with names, so Greg Warranton proposed something called declination. I think you are going to hear from Professor Idea today about artificial partisan advantage.

And there are a host of others.

If you buy mapping software, for instance, if you buy Maptitude for redistricting, it will have many of these preprogrammed in it to and you can just have item computed for your plan.

I'm going to try to show you by looking at your Ohio maps that sometimes that can give you kind of confusing and contradictory information. And I'm here to help you kind of feel reassured there are reasonable ways to put all that information in context.

Okay, I'm just going to ask if there is any questions at this point because I'm going to be a professor and do that.

Okay, hearing no questions, so let's just look at one example efficiency gap.

All though I promise not to turn this into a big lecture on the metrics.

So efficiency gap is just what I mentioned on the last slide.

It's like taking the wasted votes for two parties and looking at the difference divided by the whole number of votes.

So the idea is that what sounds like fair is equal waste adjust so  $EG = 0$ .

The authors proposed that a plan with more than 8% efficiency gap should be a presumption gerrymander it's probably bad.

It would have to have a really good reason to have such a high gap.

So what was nice about that was that people thought it could just be a litmus test.

You could just take a plan and here is a score and it would tell you pretty much right away just with a single indicator whether this is probably a gerrymander.

What's more because this is done as dem wasted votes minus republican it's a science score so if this comes out the way that I wrote it here if this comes out negative it's because republicans wasted more votes so that is a democratic gerrymander and if it can comes out positive it's because democrats wasted more votes so that is a republican gerrymander.

So the science plus or minus is supposed to tell you which party got advantage from the map.

Okay that sounds really good, that sounds really neat and actually I'm not here to as Nate efficiency gap but here to give you some caveats.

One is that it turns out if you just sort of crunch the numbers this works out to an ideal that the winning party should get a double bonus.

I will show you what I mean by that on the next slide.

So if you actually just do the arithmetic and sort of work out, what efficiency gap does it does something that may be a little surprising that is one kind of reality punch line but

the other one which is you will see when I show you your maps is that efficiency gap 0 might be a nice abstract ideal but it may not even be achievable.

It may not even be possible in the real political geography of an actual state.

Equal waste adjust sounds nice but you may not be able to do it.

Okay so here is a cartoon of the proportionality test, the efficiency gap test, and the symmetry test all on the same slide. And so proportionality, so what I'm showing you here is an access for the votes that were obtained by a party and another access for the seats that were obtained by a party.

So, for instance, if you have a 50/50 election, that would be halfway up the vote scale. And if it gave a 50/50 seats outcome that would be right here in the middle.

We would think that was pretty fair.

But if about a 50/50 election gave a you know a 3-1 advantage to one party that would be pretty fair from middle.

Proportionality tells you the votes and the seats should be equal and should track each other.

Efficiency gap I told you on the last slide turns out if you do the math, that's what I'm here for I guess do the math efficiency gap just turns out to have a different slope. Instead of saying for every additional point of vote support you should get a point of seat support, it says that for every additional point of vote support you should get two points of seats support, so double bonus.

So in a state where a party has 60% support, efficiency gap prefers that it has 70% of the seats.

And that's a little unintuitive, like why should we prefer something with a double bonus.

Symmetry is a little different. And remember symmetry was a table turning thing. And says however well I do with a certain share, you should do that well if the tables had been turned. So what that amounts to is just preferring something that is symmetrical like this S shape.

If I flip it over the center, the top lobe and the bottom lobe agree.

Okay, so that is the comparison of those three.

All right. So how does this play out?

So I'm just going to give you one other vision of what it would mean to put things in context and this is something that my research group has been studying for the last five years.

So the idea that we had following others in this space you know several other teams of researchers have tried to do this as well.

Is that instead of comparing to an ideal we should compare it to the realistic alternatives.

Right and so the notion of how to do that is build lots and lots of different possible districting plans that follow all the rules.

So build lots of plans that are population balanced that a compact that are contiguous, that respect political boundaries, that follow all the rules. And when you build those lots of plans, that gives you a sense of what would be possible.

So quick example I'm just going to show you just for a second how this works out in Michigan.

So in Michigan you know as you heard from Matt, I just got asked to come speak to you in the last few days so yesterday we made a 20,000 step Michigan run.

So we just built an ensemble of 20,000 districting plans for Michigan over dinner yesterday.

Okay and then when we do here is what we see.

If we take the Presidential race in Michigan from 2016, as you all know that was razor thin. And if you just looked at the two party votes it was 50.1% republican.

So for proportionality, out of 14 seats, proportionality says that the ideal outcome is an even split. And efficiency gap also says that the ideal outcome is an even split. Right, and just recall why that is, proportionality inefficiency gap, go through the middle, so does symmetry, all the different standards all say a 50/50 vote should give you a 50/50 seat split.

Right.

You all with me?

Okay, but so the inactive map is 9-5 when you lay it over this voting pattern.

Okay so in other words if you take how people voted between Clinton and Trump, you take the current inactive current play plan in Michigan and lay it over there you get a 9-5 outcome. And an efficiency gap of over 15 percent.

Remember 8% efficiency gap was supposed to be gerrymander. So this sounds like it's saying that the enacted plan is a giant gerrymander. But I want to tell you that that doesn't take into account the world of possibility.

So the world of possibility is 20,000 neutrally made plans that weren't made with any partisan advantage have this split.

There is some with six seats for republicans and 7, 8, 9, 10.

And the enacted plan clocks in here at nine.

It no longer looks like a giant gerrymander when you put it in the context of alternatives of what else would have been possible.

And like wide that efficiency gap of over 15%, that sounds terrible in the abstract. But here is a histogram that shows you the 20,000 neutral plans. And now you can see the enacted map no longer looks that atypical.

It looks as though it was made without any intent, without any kind of recourse to partisan data, right because my comparator ensemble was made without recourse to partisan data.

Okay. So let's see that in your Ohio maps.

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.

All right, so here is what I did hastily in the last couple days, last day or two.

I received from your submissions six different districter plans of Ohio here. They are ABCDEF.

These pictures actually cheat a little bit because many of those plans were incomplete. They had not assigned all of the units in Ohio.

And so I went in by hand and I finished them up as closely as I could just to have complete plans so I could give you an analysis.

So everything I'm about to say take it with that grain of salt I had to go this and complete these plans so they are not exactly as they were submitted but here, they are.

Six plans that you made, you know, asterisk a little boost by me.

All right, so what do we see?

Here I'm showing you efficiency gap and kind of partisan symmetry measure.

And the pale red means that you're flagged as a republican as what the efficiency gap could consider to be a republican gerrymander.

Something important that is going on, on this slide I'm emphasizing that in order to consider whether you're gerrymandered have to consider you against some election data, right?

And so I've used two sets of different election data the Presidential race from 2016 and the Senate race from 2016.

Okay so what do we have? We have of these plans, a few of them look like you know republican gerrymanders and one of them looks like a serious republican gerrymander. And a couple of them have small efficiency gaps so the efficiency gap thinks they are kind of fair.

And that's on the Presidential data.

If I do partisan symmetry on the Presidential data, I'm not going to go into the definitions of that exactly how it's computed unless you want me to. But I'll just say most of these have a fairly high partisan asymmetry, but plan C has kind of a reasonable one.

So if you were just looking at the Presidential race from 2016, if you were just looking at that set of load data, plan C looks pretty good and some of the others look questionable.

But then, you know, here is the daily mall, if you switch to a second election, the Senate race from 2016, that was conducted on the same day, voted on by the same people and present on the same ballot, the picture changes quite dramatically. And now plan C, which used to look like very fair, all the sudden looks like a big republican gerrymander from the point of view of the efficiency gap.

Okay. And so, you know, this might seem a little much to try to reconcile those, which is right, we are just giving you the right story.

For good measure I threw some compactness metrics here at the bottom. So I threw in what is called the poll popular metric kind of asking how plump the districts are. And I



threw in something called the cut edges metric, which is kind of asking how simple is the plan to cut out.

And I marked that, you know, these metrics plan D shows up as looking really good. It's the one that is measured as having the most compact districts.

You know, and then others vary.

So like cut edges, in terms of cut edge is a higher score is a little bit worse. And so this Plan F it's very nicely population balanced.

I did not put that on the slide but that is true.

But its compactness is a little bit worse.

And I hope you see the tradeoff dynamic I was talking before is starting to emerge here. So you can sort of try to get very good on one thing and that might cost you in another.

In this case you might try to get very good on compactness, but over here you are very good on population balance. And you have to start weighing those things against each other.

Any questions about this for now before I try to do the move of putting these in context?

Okay. So now I'm going to argue that if you want to understand these and get a bit of a more coherent picture, you should compare them to what was possible.

So I'll do that on the next two slides.

So here is this Presidential race from 2016 and in Ohio that was a 54.3% republican outcome, and that republican in that race was of course Donald Trump.

And now if I take those plans from before, so I'm going to toggle back and forth just quickly, if I look at the Presidential outcomes, remember, you know, this is what I was seeing before, B and C looked good.

E was really -- looked like a really strong republican gerrymander.

But now that I put them in context, I can see actually all of them are in the reasonable range when you compare them to actual alternatives.

Does that make sense, everybody?

So like, yeah, it can sound like E was a huge efficiency gap number, but if you look at all the different things that were possible, that's what you're seeing in this histogram. And you are saying E looks now fairly normal, putting context of the alternatives.

It's no longer an out liar,

If that makes sense.

Okay. So actually none of the plans that you drew look like gerrymanders, which I guess is good news for you, right?

None of the plans that's you drew look like gerrymanders when you compare them to the world of alternatives.

And that's true whether you just consider the number of seats one, whether you consider the efficiency gap or any of the other metrics.

Okay, questions about that?

So now let me shift.

This is the Presidential race.

It's -- one of the points I would really like to make for you today is that if you change the election that you're using as the background voting pattern, it can change somewhat how the plans perform.

Right?

So now I'm shifting to the Senate race, which that year in Ohio was 61% republican. And that of course elected department and let he she you by the way please notice if you see the red and blue map over here notice these don't look very different from each other, these two maps but they are fairly different. One is 54.3 and the other is 61%. So it's a little bit invisible to the naked eye.

And, of course, you're seeing a characteristic pattern of blue in the cities and red in the more rural areas.

Okay. And then, once again, if you take a look at these plans, look at how they perform with respect to the Senate data.

You see, well, none of them is a gerrymander when compared to the world of alternatives.

Now A and F are kind of interesting.

They have a smaller number of republican seats than the rest of this kind of bell curve. And so you have to ask yourself, and this is a question that I would pose to you as you think about fairness, these have a lot fewer republican seats than what happened if you closed your eyes and drew districts completely at random, which is what my comparator ensemble lets us think about.

But, on the other hand, they are closest to proportionality.

They are the closest to, you know, having the partisan symmetry scores and the efficiency gap scores potentially. They might be all the way over on the side of the bell curve that gives us the best scores.

And so a question for you to think about, and this is not a question anyone else can answer for you, this is a question for you to deliberate and think about, is: What's the highest value for you when it comes to partisan fairness?

Is it to perform as though you were drawing with no partisan data? Or is it to secure the most proportionate outcome you can secure?

Those are not quite the same.

Hopefully that makes some sense.

Same question over here.

How about the efficiency gap?

Well, these are the ones in blue that you can get from these random plans. And you can see all the plans, ABCDE, all perform very much as though made completely at random.

F though is a bit off to the side.

But which side?

It's F is the one that sits right about at efficiency gap 0.

Okay. So this raises the same question, to some that just repeat the question to you again, so that question is: What's the highest value when it comes to partisan fairness? Is it to look as though you were drawing without attempting to get partisan advantage? Or is it to get the most proportional or the most symmetric outcome that you can find? This is a question that can only be answered by democratic deliberation.

Okay, so I'll close this part with some drawing tips. And just say here is what I saw when I looked at your plans.

When it comes to drawing, it takes practice, practice, practice.

You have to make sure you assign all the units. And we do have a feature in districter that lets you see where all your unassigned units are so you can locate and pain them in.

We have a feature where you can turn on county boundaries, so you can use those as a guide while you draw.

You can also turn on district numbers so that you can see how they are numbered while you draw.

If you shoot for a population balance within 1%, this can be tuned to perfect balance later by your mapping consultant. But it should be possible to get within 1% even using the units that are available to you in districter.

And then, finally, there is a VRA dashboard coming to districter soon that will help you think about some of your VRA questions.

Okay, I'd like to show you some of these things in demo form but I think I've been going on a little long. And so maybe I will stop there.

>> Matt: All right. We designed it so Moon would go first and cover the most. So you should see some of these same terms repeated.

I just want to add two reminders. Number one, is that, obviously, what we can develop a metric for does not necessarily mean it's the highest priority.

So you're going to see a lot of partisan metrics today because there is a lot of research in that area.

But, of course, it's lower than some, that it's a lot harder to quantify today in Ohio without the communities of interest present, for example.

So I just don't necessarily want you to think that we have shortchanged that. We just don't have the data on Ohio communities of interest for you.

And then the second is just that when we use terms about partisan bias, we are not necessarily talking about intentionality.

So we are not accusing anyone of making a map that was favorable towards republicans or democrats on purpose.

These are not the measures about their potential effects.

So next I'd like to bring up Ashton Shortridge who is a professor of geography and environment and spatial sciences at Michigan State University. He is also the director of social science data analytics initiative and worked in the geographic information systems industry in the public and private sectors. And has worked for the State of Michigan on policy questions related to spatial distribution of healthcare services.

Ashton, are you ready.

>> Ashton: You bet. So first off thank you. Matt, I appreciate to check out the maps and provide a little bit of feedback. And appreciate the chance to talk to the Commission. And also thanks to Moon and the design team there at districter for a really cool piece of software.

I had not had a chance to play with it before this exercise.

So I have a few slides.

Many of them are somewhat redundant to what you just saw, so I think I can go through that pretty quickly. But I thought I would provide you with a little insight of what I saw as I was looking at the outputs and what some of the take home methods might be for you. So I'm going to go ahead and try to share my screen and see if this works.

Okay, all right. Can you all see my map?

Looks good?

>> Matt: Yes.

>> Ashton: Just wanted to make sure.

Okay, so, again, I am a geographer, so I come at this thinking, I suppose I began thinking about redistricting more from a spatial perspective or geographic perspective. But all the stuff that Moon talked about in her presentation, you know, I'd really liked to echo that.

There is a range of different criteria that you're using here.

There are range of different both quantitative metrics that you can use as well as qualitative or descriptive approaches that you can use for each one of those criteria. And you're going to have to make tradeoff choices between them.

So I thought I would go through each of the criteria very quickly, mention a few of the metrics or a few of the things that strike me as I'm looking at it from my very different perspective than, you know, you guys are ultimately going to be making these decisions, you know, for Michigan, very important role.

Here I'm just kind of taking a look at a few of the plans that you guys have drawn up for Ohio.

I did think the Ohio drawn, that was a wonderful idea.

It's a great chance to start to get a sense of what some of the challenges and tradeoffs really are.

And, of course, it's not Michigan, so it doesn't have some of the locked in issues that we think about a lot being residence of the State of Michigan.

So I'll talk about those criteria and some assessment metrics and some thoughts about them and I will actually provide a table a little bit like what you saw in the last presentation but with some other perspectives there.

Maybe I'll note Ohio is not the same as Michigan but it has some of the same characteristics that are going to be pose challenges for you in your work here in the state.

So number one, I have a nice map of one of the districting plans that you shared with me.

Number one the boundaries of the state are not smooth.

Right, on the north there is like Erie and a couple of islands in the lakes on the lake that people live on.

Michigan has thousands of islands.

And many of which have substantial populations and that is going to come back when you think about congruity questions.

In addition the southern borders the Ohio river is a wiggly boundary just like a lot of the boundaries of the State of Michigan are and those wiggly boundaries will effect some of the spatial metrics that you had to work with unless they are accounted for so that is something to bear in mind is that we are going to get different numbers for Michigan than we would get for some other state.

And so looking at what the population of possible alternatives are for those metrics is a great idea.

Because they are going to be a little different for Michigan than they are for Ohio or for Iowa or Wyoming.

Okay, the other thing to note about Ohio is that it's a state that has multiple pretty large cities, Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati.

And medium and smaller cities.

And it also has lots of areas that are really rural.

Or have lots of small towns.

Michigan is going to be very similar in that there are large Metropolitan areas with high density of people and areas that have much more human population densities than Ohio does, northern Michigan is a lot more wild.

And these kinds of these kind of large variation in the distribution of population is going to pose challenges for the districting effort because we can't just layout pretty equally sized compact looking shapes that cover an equal number of people.

And I'm sure you experience that as you started to mess around with these maps.

Okay so I'm going to go real fast through this and not use too much time up. The top criteria have to do with equal population districts and non-dilution of minority votes.

Those are I think many of the maps that I saw struggled with the number one here which of course means that the output wouldn't be legal, it would not be a valid district

map just because, yes, you do need to get that margin down essentially to zero for Congressional districts.

And not quite that small for other kinds of districts.

And then everyone has to do it in only one district and I'm going to talk a little bit about inclusion in a little bit here.

And, secondly, delineating minority votes may be interpreted in multiple ways either in terms of why should there be majority-minority districts within the state.

Currently Michigan has two.

Ohio has one.

And then there are issues of cracking or breaking minority voters into multiple districts that you might want to think about.

The second criteria is congruity.

Districts have to be physically connected.

And you can see here that some of the plans, this is taken directly from one of the districting plans that I evaluated.

And it shows that we have a community that is in one district that is completely surrounded by another district.

Obviously, there are ways to connect these things up by running really narrow lanes between them.

But and we see that in real world maps but that is certainly something to avoid that particular outcome wouldn't be valid.

In many cases.

Matt mentioned communities of interest.

I think this is a really vital area for the Commission to be involved in.

My understanding is that you're collecting information to think about what that looks like on a statewide level for Michigan.

It's a lot more straightforward in local elections in districting than I think it is at the state level and not one that I have much expertise on.

But it's important.

No party advantage.

I've listed a bunch of the same metrics that Moon talked about.

It's important to note as we just saw in the previous presentation the different metrics will give you different results.

And apply to different electoral results.

Whether it's the 2016 Presidential election, whether it's the Senate election, whether it's the 2012 or the 2020 election right all of these will give somewhat different results because people's voting the decisions change from election to election.

So there is a lot of hidden nuisances and variability in here that is worth looking at.

In general looking at multiple metrics is going to be a good idea.

I'm going to assume that the maps you drew were not in consideration of the actual district boundaries that have been in place in Ohio.

And I assume that wouldn't -- it certainly would not favor incumbents but the favor, disfavor issue is kind of an interesting one to consider.

Also boundaries.

In part you are tasked with considering existing political boundaries meaning city and municipal boundaries including rural governance as well as townships as well as county lines.

Generally we split as little as possible.

Here we have another map an example from one of the outputs where the city of Hamilton Ohio is split pretty much in half by a district.

Many times we have to do these sorts of splitting within cities because of the population equivalence, right, in Ohio we can't just lump everyone in Metro Columbus into one Congressional district because it's way too many people.

Right it has to be split up somehow so that has been one of the tradeoffs that Moon mentioned in her presentation.

So compactness is probably, well, I got started thinking about redistricting and gerrymandering.

Districts should be reasonably compact.

Again, the many, many metrics and all have their pluses and minuses.

Visually it's one of those things that we can all see that it's difficult to come up with a real consistent approach to measuring them so in this case one of you one of your maps had a really nice compact fairly compact district.

It's relatively circled with little bits sticking out around Cleveland.

Here is another district which is extremely elongated and would probably get a pretty poor score on most compactness metrics.

Metric measurements.

So just a few.

Sort of picture as to sort of install some ideas there.

So some notes about how to do a comparison I'm going to look at each of the criteria and try to use some quantitative, some numerically based and some qualitative or descriptive based approaches.

I have to do this very quickly.

This is just a quick exercise.

I think the more you can flush these out in your own comparisons the better that would be.

These kind of comparisons can be use to contrast how different solutions should go.

But there is a lot more to this.

Figuring out where your tradeoffs occur, what you want to weight more or less heavily and how much less or less heavily to weight it.

Thinking about issues like comparing plans to lots of simulations of the population of possible legal districts, that makes a lot of sense to me as well.

I think that is a really good way to do it.

Here is my table.

It's not real pretty.

I should have colored it in with web green just to show that off.

The numbers are going to be a little bit differ than what the previous presentation was in part because the plans will change dynamically even as I was processing through them so numbered have changed and we had to make some decisions about what to do about those under lined or unassigned districts.

But again the top criterion here is just equal population.

And a couple of them fell below that 1%, which I indicated looked like it met those criteria of the other ones but need a little bit more work.

Minority districts there is a lot of ways you can characterize that.

I simply looked at whether or not there was a majority-minority district.

That is a district with a majority of non-flight population within it.

So some of the districts satisfied that and some didn't.

There is again there are other ways to think about dilution of minorities of votes than just looking at minority-majority districts.

Contiguity, most of the plans did have units that were embedded within other districts, but one plan didn't.

Communities of interest, I assume this is something you weren't really able to look at in these plans given that it's Ohio and we don't really know what those communities might be.

Down below I used two partisan measures.

One is the efficiency gap.

And the other one is basically looking at proportionality of the difference in the number of seats between the actual percentage and the Presidential election in 2016 and what the plan would appear to produce for its districts.

So in this case the pluses would indicate more seats for republicans than would be expected given a proportionality decision.

And, again, you can see, what all the plans had, that we will call it a bias, but, again, note that the heterogeneity of where people are located in the state of Ohio and the density of the tendency of rural areas to vote republican may be deriving the difficulty and actually coming up, with something where we can divide the state into 15 zones that produce results that match the statewide numbers so that is going to be a challenge for sure.

And then, finally, boundaries.

I looked at just county splits.



I did not do anything fancier than that for the bound dry check and obviously some counties have to be split in order to satisfy some of the other criteria.

And finally I used poll popular as well, a measure of circularity of districts and the higher number the better.

And you can see that these plans really range across a very wide range of possible polls for popular metrics.

Okay, so that is really all I wanted to share with you.

Hopefully you can see that I was able to look at each of these plans across a range of different criteria.

Identified some things which were absolutely no goes.

The districts would not have been legal.

And other ones where there is going to be some tradeoffs that are necessary and plans might be legally viable but you would need to make some decisions about which things you value more.

I love metrics, I did not use very many metrics here.

I'm very aware of the challenges of metrics and I would encourage you to think about using a range of them for each of the criteria that you have.

And again thanks a lot.

I'm happy to answer questions once we get to the end of this process.

And I'll wrap it up there, thank you.

>> Matt: Thanks so much so we are behind and have a lot of participants but I know a lot of numbers have been coming at you so I want to give you a chance to ask some clarifying questions before we go on.

>> Anthony: I have one can you hear me?

My connection is a little weird today.

>> Matt: I can hear you.

>> Anthony: I went out for a minute and not sure if you went over this, or not; but if we wanted to you know do some of these calculations ourselves, you know, after drawing a map, on the various websites is there a way for us to do that?

>> Ashton: That is a great question.

Just to let you know I've used the data that was within districter for each of the plans. But I did export that to my own stats package to do a lot of the work.

And maybe Moon can explain whether some of that stuff could be calculated within districter or whether you would be using some other platform to get those kinds of metrics.

>> Moon: I will just say we made a design decision when we with were building districter to not make it metrics focused.

So you heard Ashton say he loves metrics I might love metrics too in my personal life as a mathematician. But I think they can be really cacophonous when it comes to trying to

understand your plan so we did not want to turn it into kind of like a score board website.

Having said that, we are able to calculate a lot of these metrics. And if you request that there are particular ones you would like to see, we can build that into districter for you.

>> Anthony: Wonderful. Thank you.

>> Matt: MC.

>> MC: A quick question and has to do with the name. And Cynthia raised this question the last time we were together. It's when we are drawing the maps in Ohio you would click on a district and unctiguous areas would highlight.

Is that called an electoral district?

Or why is that district, yeah, what is the name of that thing is that earlier material district.

>> Moon: Absolutely in Ohio those are precincts and it's absolutely true and I'm sure you noticed especially when you come to the cities those precincts themselves are disconnected.

And this is one of the things that you have an advantage in Michigan.

There is much less of that.

But this is an issue in many states.

In Wisconsin as many as 20% of their precincts are disconnected.

And so if they are trying to, they call them wards if they are trying to build out of wards then there is they get the same confusion that you had when you were probably drawing, which is now do I have to have all those pieces be part of my district?

So, yeah, the building blocks that you're working with sometimes are just given to you by administrative boundaries and that's what you are seeing with those precincts so yes, the pieces are disconnected you read that right.

>> MC: And they are called precincts in Ohio but in Michigan we are not likely going to deal with as many of those and would they also be called precincts; is that the idea?

>> Moon: You do have precincts in Michigan from what I have seen a much less disconnected precincts problem. And it's a question for you to decide whether you want to build from precincts as your atomic units or whether you want to build from census units like bloc groups, right, you can decide what you want the little atoms to be when you color in when you make your map.

Does that make sense?

>> Corps win: Can I just chime that Matt.

This is Corps win from Michigan State and they get redrawn after the map to fit the state legislative and house districts afterwards so the cities will kind of respond to what map you make.

So they try to make the districts the precincts fit the state legislative and house you know the other sort of maps that you guys will be making.

So you shouldn't try to fit their precincts within a city because they are going to try to fit your map afterwards.

I would say in Michigan you have about 1500 separate independent jurisdictions on its own without even looking at precincts, so that is a tough job.

>> Moon: Although I would add one point the past precincts are the ones where you have election results reported and so if you want to know some sort of partisan scoring for your plan, you're going to need to have it so some nice relationship to past precincts.

>> Corwin: That is very true.

>> Matt: MC has raised previously raise sort of ease for election for administrators, so that also might be an issue.

All right. I'd like to turn it over now to John Chamberlain who is a Professor Emeritus of public policy at the Ford school of public policy at the University of Michigan. And has research and ethics in public policy and efforts of election and representation, John.

>> John: Thank you Matt and thank you for the opportunity to be with you today. I got into this rather late.

It was pretty clear to me that a lot of people were taking care of the math heavy stuff. And they were better at it than I would be any way so I just thought not to repeat that.

And I decided to look at it as I might if I were a Commissioner and I walked into a room and there was a table full of maps.

And what am I supposed to do with these?

And starting with the sense that in the new redistricting process the districts are supposed to work for citizens.

Not necessarily for incumbents or parties, supposed to work for citizens.

What does that mean?

Well, the work a lot of the work of that I think is done by the concern for communities of interest.

Which we don't know anything about in Ohio.

And we don't yet know anything about in Michigan.

But you can imagine a map like we were seeing in Ohio a similar one for Michigan and as we start to gather information on communities of interest you know they show up as a little dot on the map.

And they could be color coded for various things like size and what kind of community of interest they are.

And we are going to start to see things like that.

That we don't see in Ohio.

But ought to be important because of the problems given to communities of interest in the Michigan system.

So I thought, you know, what would you look for?  
In that?

And I might note that a good district for constituents can also be a very good district for representative.

If a long strung out district that is 500 miles from one end to the other and the camp seemed to have a district like that a couple decades ago it's hard for the citizens to know anything about the people at the other end of the district.

It's hard for the representative to show up very often and very many parts.

It needs a lot of district offices so there is a coin dense about districts that work for citizens elect representatives for whom the districts make sense and make their job easier.

And I don't know how you measure that.

But I think it's certainly true.

So in looking at maps, I had these maps spent out on the table looking for things that were different and for instance there is a number of is snaky districts in one of the maps. That if you measure compactness by the map, you might be one thing.

But if you look at those districts, they look a lot like the 14th Congressional district in Michigan.

They snake all over the place.

Those raise how could that be a sensible thing for the citizens who live in that district?

You know, maybe there is an explanation.

But you can start to look at districts and say that doesn't look reasonable.

What might be the justification for that.

And long snaky districts seem to me long districts in general that run north, south sometimes the states communities of interest in the way they interact run east, west, might make more sense to have east west and we can't tell that some of the maps have long north south districts and some have long east west districts.

And one questions how does that make sense?

So I got to thinking about well how would you put all this together for communities of interest once you look at a map of Michigan with all these dotted communities of interest.

And the term that came to mind which is not a term of science or even art in this case is coherence.

Coherence in the district, if you ask communities of interest what would your preferred Congressional district look like?

Would communities of interest in part of the state have roughly the same notion and in which case it may give you a notion that is the place to start when designing a district that works for these people in what they tell us and if they tell you something very different you might decide, well, there ought to be two districts there.

So the sense of coherence is does it make sense for the citizens who are in the district to say capture their community of interest but the way they interact with nearby

communities, where they go to work, where do they go to school, where are the medical facilities.

So that is a sense goes beyond just their community of interest and not chopping it in half which most of them don't want.

But one what are the communities of interest they identify that they would like to share a member of Congress with.

And I think that that helps integrate some of the community of interest data with some of the other things which we have got numbers because the sense of it's going to be tough to come up with a metric for communities of interest other than how many of them have you chopped in small pieces when they ask you not to.

So I think that thinking about it from the standpoint of somebody who lives in a district is an important way, very subjective way to do it.

But one that you can look at a map and start to say what looks funny to me?

What would I need to know about that district that runs from lake Erie all the way down to Columbus?

And in what way is that a sensible thing for the citizens involved?

Also some of the maps have a lot of county splits.

Seems to me that they are for the most part not necessary.

And people could have cleaned them up if they wanted to like the population figures after a while mouse click fatigue sets in and I don't care if I find another 135 people, I'm just going to call it quits.

We will hire people who can fine the 135 people and move them in. And I think that is what consultants will do.

So I think the sense of figuring out what you're going to do with a map of Michigan that has communities of interest plugged in to it and what do you need to know, how can you code those?

How are they going to work for you?

And added to that information that communities of interest tell you about what would I like my doctor to look like?

And you could get loads of those and the map will pretty soon get so you can't see what you are looking at.

But that sense of what is the community of interest.

What are its ties to other communities of interest.

Where do people go to work.

Where is the medical center?

And I think that finding a way to both use the data that you've got and the metrics based on those data and a sense of how to get your heed around communities of interest both in terms of where they are and what they are and their desires in terms of districts and if you think it's hard for Congressional districts then it really is as you have learned, imagine what it's like when you do 110 house districts.

The number of possible maps there is probably bigger than any of us could count. So I think that the metrics are going to be very helpful.

The community of interest one counts a lot and it's not clear what the metrics are for that and you're going to have to develop ways to talk about that.

And some vocabulary, some definitions, some ways to tradeoff, think about what matters.

And my sense is starting with you know city boundaries and county boundaries and then if you have to whittle them down later that is appropriate.

But this is in a sense a preview of this is the easy stuff that somebody can already build into software.

As far as I know nobody has got the software that is going to you know juggle the communities of interest for you.

And so I decided I would point out to you the hard work is still to come so thanks.

>> Matt: All right, thanks so much.

I just want to remind everyone that the purpose of this exercise is to give you a sense of what kind of feedback you will receive from the including from the technical analyses but you are not going to be required to do all this ours obviously you have line drawing and VRA consultants who will be with you and so we won't want to expose you to the concepts and methods that you will hear.

Richard did you have a question or an accidental hand raise, accidental hand raise.

So I want to see if we can get to everyone for at least brief comments but I posted all of the written commentaries online.

So Tom Ivacko, are you available?

>> Yes hi Matt.

>> You all know Tom well so thank you.

>> Mr. Ivacko: Hi, Commissioners; and let me see if I can share my screen.

Are you seeing that okay?

Okay, so my approach is somewhat along John's lines since I'm not a mathematician or demographer. I came at this as a lay person.

And so for my own benefit I needed to start by getting kind of a broad overview of what I will call that state down south.

Of course, this is very simplistic effort given our time limits, but I wanted to start by saying who is it that needs representation.

And so I first looked at Ohio's, let's see if I can move this out of the way, I first looked at Ohio's current Congressional district map.

And immediately noticed a bunch of weirdly shaped districts like the Toledo to Cleveland strip and the district connecting Cleveland to Akron.

So I then found that Ohio currently has one Congressional district that is protected by the voter rights act as a majority-minority district.

It's the 11th district, the one that connects Cleveland and Akron. As I see in more detail here on the right, I believe it's minority population is about 61%.

Next, I looked at Ohio's partisan makeup from a variety of sources starting with survey data from Gallop and Pew. While evidence shows Ohio has been trending more republican over time, as of now both Gallop and Pew show pretty similar breakdowns for closely divided states. Gallop estimates that 42% of Ohioans are republicans. About 41 are democrats. And Pew finds very similar results. These are the republicans and democrats.

Then looking at statewide election results we see that Ohio has one republican and one democratic Senator.

In fact, in 2018 brown the democrat won the Senate seat with 53% of the vote. While Mike divine a republican won the gubernatorial race with just barely over 50% of the vote.

In addition, five of the last six Presidential elections, the winner had less than 52%. And in three of those had less than 51%.

So despite trending republican it's no wonder the Gallop lists Ohio generally as a toss-up state.

However, Ohio use current Congressional district maps, again, seen here are heavily gerrymandered in partisan terms, although we saw with Moon's presentation some metrics would say they are not when you consider kind of what is possible.

But these maps have produced 12 republican seats against four democratic seats. So on that kind of proportionality assessment, these look gerrymandered on a partisan basis.

So I then looked at look for previous efforts to see what fairer maps might look like and I found this project from the Cleveland plain dealer the city's main news pap paper. On the right is a map that was designed to achieve compact districts according to regional relationships.

Meet the voter rights act requirements, provide partisan fairness and equal population. Summarized by those who designed it, the benefits of this map, include that there is indeed a district that would meet the Voting Rights Act, majority minority requirement. This has Cleveland with 57% minority population.

In addition, areas of similar characteristics around the state are generally kept together, which might help protect communities of interest as John was just describing.

This generally provides about five republicans and four democratic districts and six that would be fairly competitive.

This map just ten of Ohio's 88 counties are divided. And last and very impressively no cities are split other than a few that cross county lines, or in the case of Columbus as we heard where the city is just too large to fit in a single district.

So there is a lot to like about the map. And thought it would be useful as a comparison.

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.

However, again, I don't know how this would tour on various metrics, we have seen presented earlier and possible it has some significant flaws.

Okay. With that background, I looked at the number of the maps that the Commissioners designed over the weekend.

A few as we've heard had a pretty big populations missing so I skipped over those and will look at just a few of the maps and first in a fairly divided toss up state that is trending republican with 15 districts over all I assumed that fair maps would generally produce about eight GOP seats, to seven for the democrats.

Again, this is basically the proportionality approach that Moon described.

And, of course, it's only one such approach.

And, also, since we don't have actual COI data for Ohio, I'm using regional relationships as a proxy for COIs.

So, with all that said, the thing that stand up to me on this map are, first, a good number of the districts are relatively compact, or at least appear kind of regionally based like in the map from the Cleveland plain dealer.

While population equality is not good enough for actual maps, for this exercise it's not bad with the maximum deviation of just over 2%.

In terms of the Voting Rights Act, this is probably close. But unclear if it's good enough without more analysis of voting patterns.

Here are the 11th districts as 52.7% minority voters.

Again, that's lower than the current maps provide at the little over 61% for that Cleveland to Akron districts.

In terms of partisan fairness using the 2016 Presidential vote, the set produces nine republican districts with six being really quite safe.

These darker shades of orange.

Versus three democratic districts that are pretty safe, the dark shaded blue and three more that lean democratic.

So that may not be quite fair on basic proportionality measures in terms of maybe what is achievable, maybe it's not that far off.

It's not as good as the plain dealer would produce, but it's certainly better than the current maps that produce 12 GOP seats.

In terms of communities of interests and other constituencies, one thing that jumped out on the map is that by splitting Warren and Youngstown over here into separate districts, that probably splits an important relationship in a region that is struggling economically.

For instance, there is a Youngstown, Warren regional Chamber of Commerce, which implies an economic community of interest that's being split across two districts.

On the other hand Toledo and its suburbs are kept together, which is probably good. And Dayton and Cincinnati are pretty whole and so on.

On the other hand, about 26 counties here are split across Congressional districts.



And again that compares to just ten in that map from the Cleveland plain dealer.

On the next map again population is pretty equal just 2% maximum deviation. With the voter rights act again this is probably close but we've seen could be improved. Here are the minority population for the second district is 51, just over 51%.

In person, fairness this produces ten republican and five democratic seats with six of those GOP seats being really safe compared to just three or four for the democrats.

Again, the districts are relatively compact and regionally based.

And in terms of communities of interest and other constituencies, numerous urban areas and their surrounding areas are kept together nicely including Toledo, Canton Youngstown, Warren and Dayton. And for this map only 11 counties are divided, and almost the same as the plain dealer map.

Now, on this map, the first thing that jumps out are the weirdly shaped districts that we have seen already, this green one, kind of snaking through the area. However, you know, you can't judge a book just by its cover and can't judge a map just by its shape. Really good analysis would include all the metric we have seen. And, in fact, after trying to design maps myself this weekend, I immediately when I saw this one thought the designer was trying to achieve equal population along with both parts and fairness and compliance with the Voting Rights Act because when I tried to draw maps with those same goals I ended up with some really weird shapes, too.

So population here is indeed very close, it's almost within that .5% threshold. For the Voting Rights Act again close, maybe good enough maybe not. Here are the first district has just over 51% minority population.

On partisan grounds this produces ten republican and five democratic districts. With eight of those republican districts being very safe compared to just three or four for the democrats so again probably can be improved. But based on what Moon showed us in the realm of what is possible, you know maybe this is not that far off.

And in terms of COIs and other constituencies, given the oddly shaped districts, many cities and counties are divided on this map including Cleveland, Akron, Youngstown, Columbus, Cincinnati, and Dayton.

In addition to about 40 counties are divided, it's almost half of the state's counties. And all of these community divisions and penta torture [sic] districts probably have a greater chance of providing us more COIs or at least dividing up regional relationships.

Then for this final map that I'll look at the first thing that stands out to me is just how similar is it to that map from the Cleveland plain dealer.

In similar ways it seems to be based on large regional groupings although it does split two or three times as many counties as the plain dealer map.

Otherwise looking just at this map the population is remarkably equal below the threshold of 25%, that is quite an achievement for this around of practice. I could not do that myself.

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.

In partisan terms this produces nine republican districts to six for the democrats. Of those republican districts six or seven are really quite safe compared to four for the democrats.

Overall that's probably among the fairest of the maps that we've looked at. Although maybe still not quite as good as the plain dealer map achieved.

However fatal flaw for this map there are no majority minority districts and so this map probably would not pass muster.

So, summing, up across all these maps, I think what I would say is what stands out are that only a few reach even close to majority-minority requirement, none rise to the level of the current map.

None produce real partisan fairness at least in terms of the basic proportionality.

Maybe they do pretty well in terms of what is achievable.

Some do better than others.

None may be quite as good as the plain dealer map.

And my last observation is that as a novice this myself is really quite challenging to balance all of the roles. And as we've heard, this exercise really did not include data on COIs, which is going to add complexity to the task. And so thank goodness you will have a mapping consultant who will be very scaled at those things.

So with that I will conclude and turn it back over.

Thank you.

>> Matt: Thank you.

I do want to clarify that the majority minority districts are not a requirement of the Voting Rights Act.

And the kind of analysis that we are doing very crude analysis today.

I think last time I also gave you, well, this would be 30%, this would be 35% but that is not the way your VRA consultants will or should do it and so I want to turn it back over real quick to Moon to show us a tool that she is developing to mirror the kind of way that Voting Rights Act consultants or lawyer will do it.

>> Moon: Thank you.

Yeah, I just want to agree strongly there is definitely no requirement that you make majority minority districts.

And actually on the contra and I know you have already heard from some wonderful voting rights attorneys, Katz and Justin Lovitt, so what they will tell you is that, on the contrary, aiming to hit a particular demographic target can get you in trouble.

That can be considered racial gerrymandering on its own.

So what's the alternative?

So I want to show you something we are building into districter which we are call agree VRA dashboard.

And so right now you can play with this yourself with [districter.org/VRA](http://districter.org/VRA) and we have two states up, Louisiana and Texas. And be assured Michigan is coming soon.

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 as is Ohio.

Okay so I want to show you what this tool does.

Because the question is if you're not aiming for majority minority districts what are you aiming for?

Well, as you heard from Tom and from several of the speakers what matters is electoral history.

It's voting patterns.

So just want to show you something of what this looks like.

So here I'm in the Dallas area, Dallas, Fort Worth, and I've drawn a number of districts.

And you can see besides the population data and evaluation tabs there is somebody called a VRA tab.

And what that is doing is showing you kind of electoral effectiveness for the major minority groups in Texas which are Black and Latino voters. So these effectiveness scores should be interpreted as some sort of probability of electing the candidacy of choice.

I just want to give you a sense of how that is made.

For instance let's look at district four here and try to understand why it's scoring so poorly.

If you look at the district details, and go to district four and you can see what's the actual electoral history of district four so how did people in district four vote relative to the Black communities candidate of choice?

So this is the candidate of choice for Black voters.

And this is telling you how they did.

So right now this looks pretty good.

The candidate of choice green means they succeeded in the prime election St.

Candidate for Black voters is very much exceeding in the primary.

What you can see if you go to runoffs and then the general election, it's very hard for those candidates of choice to ever be elected.

And that's how these scores are done and this is exactly how your VRA consultant will think about districts and their performance.

It's not the question is not what percentage of Black or Latino voters are there in a district but how effective is that district at nominating and electing candidates of choice for those communities.

What I want to show you here and there is very little time but I hope you will play with this.

I want to show you as you change its live calculating a new score.

So it takes a few seconds to think.

But once it does it gives you the new score and now it's synced to the current map and it updates in just a few seconds with just a few seconds of lag and so you know if you

go to a more effective district like district five, you can view district five in the primaries, in the runoffs and in the generals and you can see why district five received a much higher effectiveness score.

It's not because of the percentage, it's because of the electoral history.

And so this will be a tool that is at your disposal so that when you draw you get a sense of and again this is why having precinct units is pretty useful because we can get a sense of if you just add up the votes in those precincts that you drew are you building something that will be effective for the various minority groups to elect candidates of choice.

So that is all I wanted to say about that and I'll just show you one more quick thing because it's now come up a few times what are we going to do about communities of interest and how do we make that concrete?

So in Ohio so a second thing that districter does besides letting you draw districts is let you draw communities of interest.

So this particular page is where communities of interest are being gathered for the state of Ohio.

And so you can see this is just people turning in maps that show you their communities of interest.

And this is also going to be available to you in Michigan.

You're going to have a sense of what people are telling you matters to them in terms of their communities and neighborhoods.

And when you load in though those what you will see is not only are they drawing areas but they are naming the areas and they are telling you what matters about the areas.

So you will have access to kind of lots of public testimony about what people are saying matters to them in terms of being kept together and some of the reasons why.

I will stop there and see if you have any questions.

>> Matt: All right thanks so much.

So John and Corey sort of exceeded their time but I still want to give them a chance to react to what has been said so far so I would like to introduce John a professor of economics at Michigan State University and developed some of his own measures. And is a new courtesy appointee at the Department of Political Science and affiliate at IPSER, Jon?

>> Jon: Thank you very much to all the Commissioners for your work.

So I would briefly say on the response I think it was MC that questioned about the names of the precincts what are the built in blocks you do your maps with so I think you can map based on whatever you want, it's up to you but there are advantages as Moon said and they are the smallest units that have past election data so you build on anything other than past precincts that you don't know how your districts did in previous elections. And the smaller you want to break some precincts as the census bloc, it's the smallest unit for which you will have demographic data.

So if you use things that do not correspond to census blocs, we don't know very well how much population there is in anything smaller than that.

Then partisan fairness that I work with and talked a lot of and varying I think you can maybe have a different education session for that.

I will not talk about mine together in a few minutes I will talk about the philosophy how to think about fairness before you decide how to measure it.

Because we have a lot of measures.

I think it give as distinction that Moon touched on is some practices have an advantage due to the political geography of the state.

How votes are distributed it's better to have voters even in small majorities in the state rather than having them cluster like it's better to win basketball games by five points many of them and then lose one by 30 than it is to win one by 30 points and then lose by 6.4 so some parties have an advantage to begin with.

And a question that you need to have is when you draw a map do you think that it's fair for the map to just respect the natural advantage and not contribute?

You don't provide additional advantage and you are not adding but you are not fixing what was there already in the political geography or do you think that it's due to fair math to push back, to cancel that geographic advantage of one party and then you would be doing what the Supreme Court has called reverse gerrymandering and tried to do how can I go to compensate to what is proportionality or what some symmetry and as Moon showed that right require active work to push back against it.

So that is the first decision what is your philosophical decision of fairness once you know what you want to achieve then we can think about which measures to measure how you are done.

That is all for me and of course we are always available all of us if you have questions.

>> Matt: Thank you.

And I posted Jon's analysis which is extensive by maps so please take a look.

I will also post Corwin, but I want to give him a chance to respond to what has been said so far.

And Corwin Smith is the Interim Chair of the Department of Political Science at Michigan State University and has done some of his own work on redistricting.

>> Corwin: Thanks, Matt. First, I want to thank the committee.

I've been watching you guys, so this is fun.

And, two, I want to echo that a lot of what Professor Moon put on in her presentation is a very fair summary of the literature and want to just reiterate some of the things she said.

In some cases you want an out liar, if you are trying to achieve an optimality.

So in some cases you don't want to you know in terms of the simulation and what looks typical in some cases you want an optimality and want to be at that edge.

I think also that you just need to recognize that the partisan advantage scores that people are going to give you are very volatile.

And partisanship changes not a lot but it changes enough demographically to make it sort of a hard to predict what will happen ten years later.

In other cases the communities I mean your amendment sets out some priorities.

I think some people are commenting how your maps look kind of snaky.

I kind of like some of them like Appalachia is a snake and it's a recognized community of interest by the state of Ohio and the Federal Government.

It is an along the Ohio river.

Likewise if you are combining Akron and Youngstown and Warren and looks like a snake if you have an argument and have data for back it up that is the priority in the list so I think you have the opportunity there.

And just finally I just want to it rate that yeah, the majority minority district literature it's pretty clear that you can it's what is legal and what is optimal.

And I would not seek to maximize majority-minority districts.

That doesn't fit either the legal or the optimal situation.

At least in terms of the evidence.

Thank you.

>> Matt: All right, I want to open it up for questions now.

Now that we have confused you with lots of different metrics.

How about your drawing experiences, what were you trying to achieve?

What was tough?

Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Oops I think the biggest frustration withdrawing in Ohio was just those little segments of noncontinuous precincts within the Ohio.

I just found it so frustrating because I would be like going along and get to an area where I'm almost at population and I would hit a district and there is another little circle island floating off in to the you know other space so then I would have to redraw things.

So I just found it very frustrating to try to draw that map in Ohio because of all the sort of little island precincts that bounce all over the place.

>> Matt: Okay Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I totally agree with what Rebecca said.

What I started out trying to do was with my limited knowledge with Ohio just trying not to break up county boundaries as you know as much as possible and keep the cities together from, you know, but I -- you could using districter, you can tell population by how much it is shaded so that it was helpful.

But still you don't really know where the city boundary is.

If you're not familiar with it.

So I found that challenging.

And, of course, population wise you have to break up some county boundaries so.

>> Matt: So I hope you got some sense as well as the challenges of just the tradeoffs.

We definitely mentioned a few with trying to keep cities together versus some of the partisan fairness measures, trying to try to respect local Government boundaries versus equal population.

So hopefully some of those came through.

And if you do update your map, please send it to me and I'll send it to the group as well to see if we can get another back and forth and of course they are all available to help as we move into Michigan as well.

Any closing thoughts from the panel that -- last chance?

Well thanks so much for giving us all the opportunity to comment and please let us know if we can help in the future.

MC.

>> MC: I just wanted to say thank you for presenting the complexity we will be dealing with in ways that I feel like I can come back to again and again.

Like it was thank you, thank you, thank you, this was really, really helpful.

>> Matt: .

>> Brittini: Thank you Matt thank you to all the evaluators that poured over the maps that we submitted and helps us to make sense of it.

I also want to highlight again that Matt was gracious enough to include several filings for us to review.

Different analysis, things that we can play with in our own time.

So if we are looking for anything those files are there and I'm sure they will be available, yep, full list of materials at the website that he just gave us okay so let's move on to new business continued, yes Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Do you mind if we take a quick five-minute break before we move into new business.

>> Brittini: Not at all we can take five minutes see you at 12:06.

[ Recess ]

Brittini: All right so now do over after our break.

Let's move on to our new business continued.

So we will have a report from our very own Rebecca Szetela about the VRA legal counsel committee.

>> Rebecca: That so the VRA committee met this morning.

We had received 7 proposals in response to our RFP.

The proposals were initially reviewed by our staff in terms of whether they complied with the RFP requests and they were ranked based on that so the recommendation that was brought to us from the staff was for two bidders one was the Federal compliance consulting which is Bruce Adelson's company and the second was the law office of Brian sells.

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.

Out of those two Federal compliance consulting had a significantly higher vendor score so after some discussion of the group the committee also reviewed all 7 submissions and we came to the conclusion that FCC which is Bruce Adelson's group was the most compliant with our RFP has the best experience has experience in Michigan law. All of which was appealing to us as a committee and we felt that he was the strongest choice in terms of a person to interview.

We did also consider Brian Sells and Dickinson Wright and discussed them pretty much in detail but the feeling was that in terms of comparisons between Federal Compliance Consulting and both Brian Sells and Dickinson Wright that the difference in experience was vast.

And that in terms of Brian Sells the lack of knowledge of Michigan law was in some ways disqualifying so our recommendation is that we proceed with interviews for Federal Compliance Consulting, which is Bruce Adelson's company only.

And that is the person or company that we are presenting to the committee and recommending that we interview.

>> Brittini: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I watched the committee this morning and I really appreciated all the points that were brought up and the deliberation.

And I would move to make that happen.

I don't know how to word it.

Move to vote, to bring that one person forward.

>> Rebecca: I'm sorry can I make a connection I accidentally said Dickinson Wright but Clark Hill was the other law firm we were considering, I'm sorry.

>> MC: I will second Cynthia's motion to bring the one firm forward which is what the committee is recommending.

>> Brittini: So there is a motion on the floor brought to us by Cynthia, seconded by MC.

To accept the resolution or the suggestion of the committee to interview the one candidate.

Are we ready to vote?

I thought Julianne was going to say something but I was assuming.

Are we ready to vote?

All those in favor signify with a hand raised.

All those opposed?

Dustin?

>> Brittini: Okay so it has been unanimously passed excuse me that we will bring in the candidate suggested by the VRA legal counsel committee.

Sorry.

And.

>> Dustin: Can you hear me now?



I vote yes.

>> Brittini: What did you say? Say it again, Dustin.

>> Dustin: I vote yes and I was trying to unmute hitting the speakerphone button but it didn't really work.

>> Brittini: I was making sure that I got you.

Did you say something else?

I'm sorry my sound is doing something weird.

Dustin did you say something else.

>> Dustin: No that's it I just vote yes for that motion.

>> Brittini: Okay, so if there is nothing else for that, let's move on to future meetings and agenda items.

.  
>> Sue: I'm happy to take that if you would like to.

>> Brittini: Yes, I'm sure.

>> Sue: We will bring Federal compliance in for the VRA legal counsel presentation next week if he is available at that time.

Edward had mentioned the market research reports, so if that is available that will also be on our agenda.

Coming up, either next week or the following week I will provide an updated budget.

We will look at an updated -- put an updated timeline would look like if the proposed dates to the Michigan Supreme Court would be granted.

So we will look at what our current dates are compared to what those future ones could be.

I'm expecting a first quarter report from your staff, so you can see a little bit more about what we have been doing.

Maybe a marketing contract or two from Edward's point of view for PR consultant and a videographer and may be a couple coming to the Commission and Julianne is working furiously on different policies and procedures for us to guide everything from group presentations at public hearings to you name it.

I mean there is a lot to consider as we go into the next phases of our work.

So there is plenty to be done in the next couple of weeks and I'm happy that we can meet virtually and not have to cancel.

April 8th we will be meeting next week on Thursday on April 8 virtually so we can do that.

And if there are other agenda items that you would like in the next week or two, please let me know.

Or speak now.

.  
>> Brittini: Rebecca go ahead.

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.

>> Rebecca: Yeah, I know Doug had mentioned last week that he wanted to see some discussion of adding the Pledge of Allegiance before the meeting can we get that added on to a meeting for discussion for him?

>> Brittini: Thank you, Rebecca.

Any other discussion or suggestions for Sue?

Okay, hearing none, we can move on.

I just also wanted to take the time, even though I was on this committee to say thank you to the subcommittee for the VRA legal counsel. I know it's a weird thank you but, you know, just for showing up and doing the work and making it easier for the rest of the Commission to kind of trust us and get the job done.

And thank you, Sue, for keeping us abreast on things that are coming our way.

Are there any other announcements before we depart?

Rebecca is already shaking her head no, announcements for anyone else?

I always try to wait about 30 seconds.

Okay if there are no announcements, we can move to adjourn this meeting.

Is there a motion for adjournment.

>> Cynthia, Dustin is that a second?

I'll take it, is that a second Dustin?

I think he is trying.

>> Dustin: Yes, sorry.

>> Brittini: It's moved and seconded that we and, oh, sorry I did in the last time.

All those in favor of adjourning can we signify with a hand raise?

All those opposed same sign.

And stick around.

The meeting is adjourned at 12:14.

See you all later.