

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

03/04/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> Steve: Good morning.

As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order.

This Zoom Commission 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 viewing on other platforms.

Our live stream today included closed captioning.

We have ASL interpretation available for this meeting.

If you would like easier viewing options for ASL interpreter on your screen, please e-mail us at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we will provide you with additional viewing options.

Similarly if you would like access to translation services during the meeting, please e-mail us at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) for details on how to access language translation services available for this meeting.

Translation services are available for both Spanish and Arabic.

Please e-mail us and we will provide you with a unique link and call-in information.

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [redistricting.Michigan.org](http://redistricting.Michigan.org).  
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 [redistricting.Michigan.org](http://redistricting.Michigan.org) along with written public comment submissions.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to the communications and outreach director, Edward Woods the third at [Woods E3@Michigan.gov](mailto:Woods E3@Michigan.gov).

For purposes of the public record and for members of the public watching I will now request the Department of State staff to take note of the members of the Commission present.

Sally, would you please call the roll?

>> Sally: Good morning, yes, Commissioners, when I call your name, if you could unmute yourself and say the city or county that you are attending remotely from, that would be great.

Doug Clark.

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

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Juanita: Present; and I'm remotely joining the meeting from Detroit, Michigan.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Anthony: Present and I'm remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> Sally: Brittini Kellom.

Rhonda Lange.

>> Rhonda: Present, attending remotely from Reed City.

>> Sally: Steve Lett.

>> Steve: Present and I am attending from Lee County, Florida.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> Cynthia: Present, attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn.

>> MC: Present, attending remotely from Lansing, Michigan.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.

>> Rebecca: Present; attending from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> Janice: Present and attending from Highland, Michigan.

>> Erin Wagner.

>> Erin: Present; attending from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> Sally: Richard Weiss.

>> Richard: Present; attending remotely from Saginaw, Michigan.

>> Sally: Dustin Witjes.

>> Dustin: Present; attending remotely from Ann Arbor, Michigan.

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

>> Steve: Thank you, Sally.

For those -- I guess a question, well, we approve the agenda.

Has everybody received a copy of the agenda?

And if so, are there any additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda at this time?

Seeing none, I would entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as presented.

>> Erin: So moved.

>> Seconded.

>> Steve: And all in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

The agenda is adopted.

The next we will review the minutes from the February 25th, 2021 meeting.

If everybody has had an opportunity to review those, are there any corrections that need to be made?

Or additions or deletions?

Hearing none I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

>> Cynthia: So moved.

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: Seconded.

>> Steve: All in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

They are approved.

>> Julianne: Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Julianne: Could I please get clarity who the second for the motion was?

>> Rebecca Szetela.

>> Julianne: Thank you.

>> Steve: Is there any public comment today?

Sally?

>> Sally: One person signed up, but they don't appear to be here.

So I think you can move on to the next item on your agenda, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Thank you.

Normally at this time for those out in the Ether we would have public comment for people who would like to address us personally on this Zoom meeting.

For those of you who have not joined us previously, I will have a few comments on how you could participate in public comment at these virtual meetings.

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

If you sign up you will have two minutes to address us.

Public comment sign-up links are posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook and Twitter at [redistrictingMI](http://redistrictingMI.com).

And you can e-mail our office at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov). If you would like to submit your thoughts or comments to the Commission, you may also do that by e-mail to [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and they will be provided to the Commission.

I can assure you that those are, in fact, provided to us and we do look at them.

Are there any comments by any of the Commissioners or staff regarding any e-mails or comments we may have received in the last -- since the last meeting?

Seeing no hands raised or people unmuted, we will move on.

I will note for the record, however, that we did receive a number of comments regarding where we are going to hold meetings, how to redistrict, et cetera.

And we have taken those into consideration.

Thank you.

New business, line drawing and technical services presentations.

Sue, are you introducing these folks?

>> Sue: I certainly can.

I'm going to start by introducing Kim Brace. He would be the lead for election data services.

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

And I will let him introduce his team as he wishes to have them speak if they are all on board. We are about seven minutes early, so we can roll right along.

>> Steve: We are just efficient that is all.

>> Sue: Yes very, thank you.

>> Kim: Commissioners, and members of the public, welcome my name is Kim Brace.

I'm with Election Data Services and let me share my screen.

Am I in cohost mode?

>> Sally: You should be able to share your screen. If not, we can promote you.

>> Kim: All right, let me see here.

Can you see my PowerPoint?

At this point in time?

Yes, good, okay.

Let me do it from the start then.

Thank you, members of the Commission and Commissioners.

I feel like I partly know you because I've been watching you for the last month and a half to two months.

It's a pleasure to be able to present to you and talk to you about some of what we have and what we can do.

But let me start off.

I am head of a company called election data services.

And we have put together a great team to provide support and line drawing assistance to the Commission.

What is our team all about?

We are a tri partisan team of democrats, and republicans, and independents.

We have been uniquely brought together to help provide the best of all levels of services to the Michigan Commission.

We have deep experience in redistricting spanning the past 45 years.

We have worked for redistricting Commissions, both past and present.

We have compiled massive databases that are important for the process and we will talk about that.

We have drawn thousands of plans around the nation and all the work that we have done and members of our team have done.

We have modern technology really designed for the next decade to help you as well as us in our options.

We provide multiple options for public viewing and input by the web, which is I know important for all of you.

You have said over time.

We will be providing Commissioners with immediate online access to all view all plans, edit and comment on them.

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

And have the software available to you should you desire to draw plans on that side.

Our software is really built so that you will have full access to everything.

We have been implementing it already in multiple states including supporting the state of Virginia's Commission that they have brought up and are playing with.

And we have vested our nearest rival software in numerous RFPs that have been in the process this year.

So we think that we put together a great team of everything that you need.

The members of our team, the overall project lead and the prime for the contract is myself and my company election data services as well as our database specialist Ryan Taylor.

We are also members of the team that include city gate GIS with President Fred Hejazi and his team of programmers to build and have access and support all the technology that we will be providing to you.

We have brought on board the retired technical director for Virginia legislative services Ken Stigall as a line drawer and map drawer.

Ken is key because he has worked with Fred and city gate GIS for the last two decades as have we on that side.

We have also brought in on the republican side applied research coordinates with President John Morgan, who has been heavily involved with on the republican side of things.

So we are providing a lot of different expertise and we have added at Sue's recommendation we have done -- we have added on a racial bloc voting expert.

We know that that was what you were looking at originally through your legal framework but when you didn't get legal stuff, we decided that we would offer a person that we have worked closely with.

In fact, a former employee of ours who is the lead expert in racial bloc voting support and testimony around the country.

So this is the members of our team on that side.

Election data services.

We since 1979 have been involved in more than half the nation in helping states in the redistricting process.

We compile extensive database of election results and census demographics for use in redistricting over the past four reapportionment processes and redistricting processes.

So we are very extensive in our experiences in dealing with data and dealing with issues on that side.

I started election data services back in 1977.

We developed the first redistricting efforts in the 1980 round of redistricting and these included providing software and databases to the Michigan legislature and the state democratic party, along with several other states.

We helped develop the first PC based redistricting software for 1990.

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

It was used in 12 states and numerous local jurisdictions around the country.

We have developed software for census Bureau programs dealing with precincts and traffic analysis zones.

And that was put into play and made use by a number of jurisdictions around the country.

We have also provided staffing and directing, direction for Rhode Island's redistricting Commission.

They set up a Commission in 1990.

We staffed that Commission.

And we provided direction.

In 1990, in 2000 and 2010.

And we will do it again for 2020.

So we have long experience in terms of helping people on the redistricting side.

And we have been heavily involved with organizing and testifying in each public hearing around the state in Rhode Island.

So we are long experienced with showing people what is happening.

Which is part of the key.

In terms of myself, I was a member of the census advisory committee back in 2010. That advised the commerce secretary on how well the census Bureau was being conducted and issues on that front.

I have been speaker and faculty on the national conference of state legislature, redistricting training University for every decade since 1982.

So I'm long experienced in helping people and teaching them in terms of the various realms of redistricting.

And we are here to help you on that front also.

I have served as an expert witness myself in more than 75 different Court cases around the country.

Majority of which were redistricting related Court cases.

And I have been heavily involved in election administration around the country.

So working with secretaries of state and county clerks, all around the country and dealing with issues on election administration from the types of voting equipment that are used, I was Al-Gore's expert witness in Florida in 2000 but we work closely with local Governments in helping them deal with some of the crazy lines that get created during the redistricting process.

And so we are very much concerned with the impact of line drawing and how that impacts what local Governments have to do.

So from our side in terms of election data services we are also heavily -- we have been involved with creating posters and maps of election results after each election since 1986.

That are on the walls of Congress and the White House and a lot of places around DC but we sell it around the country.

And we just released the 2020 election result poster.

We have also we are producing a reapportionment study each year.

We have since 1990 to look at the reapportionment that is the allocation of seats to states for Congressional districts.

And our last estimate in December of last year showed that indeed the State of Michigan would be losing a Congressional seat.

We have seen that for the last several years.

But we have closely tracked that and we will be extremely busy in analyzing the data when it comes out of the census Bureau at the end of April in terms of looking at the avenue of reapportionment for all the states.

We have experience in Michigan.

As I mentioned, with Election Data Services in 1980 and 1990.

City gate GIS provided the auto bound for use of state efforts in redistricting in 2000 and 2010.

So we are experienced in dealing with that.

John Morgan worked on the republican side with map drawing expertise for the last several decades in the State of Michigan.

And Lisa Handley has been involved in Court cases in Michigan.

So we are very experienced when it comes to Michigan per se on that side.

In terms of the redistricting process, the redistricting process starts with a properly built database.

And that is our specialty.

At database I've always defined as a redistricting data cue, has elements from the census and from political side of things.

But it has elements that are tabular numbers and also spatial dealing with maps.

The key of building a database is being able to put this altogether and together over time because that is also relevant to understand what is going on in the state.

It is relevant for racial bloc voting and it's relevant for analysis of what's happening in terms of the plan drawing.

So it's not only just the PL file from the census Bureau with the demographics.

But it's also combining other things including the spatial side of things.

And the census Bureau just released, sorry, the top of this, their Tiger files the geography files for the State of Michigan.

And we have gone and taken a look and analyzed that so far.

What we end up seeing, of course, no changes to counties.

And not like Colorado that ended up adding a county back in the 1990s.

But what we are seeing in the last line there in terms of census blocks, it's important to realize what's going on in your state.

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.

The census Bureau has eliminated 75,000 census blocks in the State of Michigan.  
From 2010.

Now a lot of those has to be admitted were really small, little, tiny pieces that were kind of leftovers.

They were splinters.

They may have been the median strips of the freeway for example.

That was a separate census block.

So they have cleaned up and eliminated a whole bunch of things.

But it is important to take a look at the geography and how it relates to redistricting.

It's also important to understand some of the dynamics of what's going on in the state.

I'm going to show you a couple of maps that we compile and we do for looking at redistricting.

This is population change from 2010 to 2019 using the American community survey.

Information from the census Bureau but it's important for us on the redistricting side to begin to look at the dynamics of where change is occurring.

That's going to impact your line drawing capability and direction on that side.

John Morgan will show you similar maps.

What is unique in terms of bringing us both together we suddenly realize when we were talking and talking about what we could do, we both have the same ideas.

He on the republican side, me on the democratic side.

And what is great is that we can bring that combined experience to you.

So you will see some things in multiple forms but it's all designed to give you information and important data that you need to be aware of.

So certainly from population change the key thing in the State of Michigan is Wayne County.

It has lost 71,000 people according to the 2019 population estimates.

These of course are not the final PL numbers.

We will have to see what those hold when they come out in the end of September.

But these start to give you some ways of looking at where your tasks are and where they are important.

And where change has occurred and what that means to you and to redistricting standpoint.

If we look at it in a different way and we look at how many legislative seats could fit into these geographies and what kind of change there might be between 2010 and 2019.

And this is where we see the impacts for Wayne County where they are just on the population basis, they are likely to lose a whole state house seat.

And a third of a state Senate seat.

Just because of population.



The population is not there anymore.

And so these perimeters are important for line drawing and for the Commission to understand.

Now, I want to address one of the key things of the census data, the lateness problem that you have and all of us have.

Block level population data.

Won't be released until September 30th.

I am in regular weekly contact with people over at the census Bureau.

I don't see that being before April or before September 30th.

They are planning to release the entire nation all on a single day.

For those of us that end up working with multiple states, I'll will grow some more gray hair on September 30th from the standpoint of dealing with all of what is coming out.

But what we are seeing is that some people do recommend using American community survey results.

They are after all generated by the census Bureau.

But the key thing to remember about American community survey results is that they are really a stretch in time.

In order to get smaller geography out of the ACS, you have to get down to the block group level and that's on a five-year running scale.

So the 2019 data really is a collection of surveys from 2015-2019.

It's not focused on 2019.

In fact, when people talk about time series and survey methodology, many times we look at the midpoint of that time series.

So what we are really looking at is data that could be best categorized as 2017.

And what has happened in Michigan in the past three years since that time, that's one of the key things that you need as Commissioners to be aware of and so we have looked at and seen what we can do to help that out.

We are proposing to add to the ACS.

We are not excluding the ACS.

In fact, we are using ACS in all of our states that we are involved with.

But we are supplementing that with population and demographic estimates that are there for 2020.

And down to the block group level also.

So we can bring together multiple data and data sources to help understand what's gone on in the state.

And particularly for the last three years.

So we get a far better look at what's going on and what's happening today. Even before the PL file arrives.

We can end up looking at and planning ideas that could be drafted now and draw plans now with this information.

We can look at and deal with major issues, for example, Wayne County and what's going on there with population losses.

That can be worked out over the summer before the PL file arrives.

We can take place and hold public hearings and be able to present information, and that is what we do as I mentioned in what we did with Rhode Island.

Showing people what is coming up, in terms of census and the data and how that impacts on what happens with redistricting.

And then when the PL data comes out in September, we will have plan and plan ideas developed that have been brought to the public and then when the PL file arrives, we are talking about minor tweaking with the final data in a short period of time.

So we think we have provided a solution to the issue that you have, that all of our states have in how to deal with the lateness coming from the census Bureau and their data.

Now, redistricting software is also the key on this side.

Since 2000 we have worked with city gate GIS who are the developers of auto bound and now auto bound edge.

We have been testers for Fred's group and provided for improvements and new concepts to be incorporated into the software.

We have developed add on packages to his software and customizations and we sold his package and added our database expertise with his, his software.

So I'm going to turn this over to Fred to talk with you about the software and what we envision providing to the Commission.

So let me stop sharing so that Fred can take over and share on his screen.

>> MC: Can I ask a quick question what does PL file refer to.

>> Yes PL file refers to the public law 94171.

It was passed by Congress in 1974.

That stipulated that the census Bureau would work with state Governments to give them the data in the best form that they find important for states it means precincts.

Before in 1970 census Bureau had only provided data by census tracks.

And nobody knows where census tracks are.

So now by being able to provide data for precincts in your state and a voluntary program that is what leads to PL94171 files.

>> MC: It's public law PL is public law.

>> Kim: Yes, that's correct.

All right any other questions before Fred takes over?

No, we will have time at the tail end also for more questions.

Fred go ahead.

>> Kim: You need to unmute yourself, Fred, I think.

>> Fred: It's a regular thing between me and Kim.

As soon as we start any presentation the first thing Kim says is you need to unmute yourself.

Good morning, everyone.

My name is Fred Hajazi. I'm the president of City Gate GIS.

We have been involved in developing redistricting software in nonpartisan way for about 25 years.

As Kim mentioned, our software was used in Michigan in 2000.

And 2010 for drawing state house, Senate, and then Congressional districts as well.

So I traveled to Michigan.

I'm actually originally from Michigan.

I went to Cranbrook and I came down here to go to University and ended up staying in the D.C. area.

So one of the big differences between us and the other software company, companies that are involved with redistricting is that we also do redistricting consulting. We actually help states implement our software and sometimes actually help with the drawing of the lines.

And I actually have worked with Commissions before, citizen Commissions.

I helped draw the plans in city of Austin.

I was actually the line drawer.

And one of the things that I always tell my staff is the worst punishment for a software developer is to be forced to use his own software so we use our own software to do this kind of work all the time.

And for 2020, we took -- we decided to do a little bit of a different approach than we had done in the past.

In the past we basically developed a piece of software, it sat on a computer, you drew it and calculated the results and that was the end of it.

But with the advent on the Internet, we needed to come up with a solution that allowed a seamless integration between what people were doing on the Internet and what you are doing on your desktop.

Redistricting still has to be from a professional perspective a desktop application.

The reasoning you are dealing with massive amounts of data and to process that data over the Internet neither the browsers that are currently available nor the servers that are out there have the capacity to process this data and be responsive over the Internet. So most of the professional redistricting products or all of them are really still on the desktop.

Maybe next cycle it will be different but that is basically how the application is configured.

So for today's example I have the state of Arkansas.

They are a client of ours.

I selected them because we do have some data for them that is similar to what Kim would be producing for you guys.

And I can kind of briefly go over what we are looking at here and then explain how redistricting sort of happens as you are doing it.

So we have a map on the screen and the map is showing in this case it's showing the state Senate after the last redistricting.

As you can see, all the districts have a little checkmark next to them.

That is because after the last redistricting they balanced everything out and made them all be within 5% so that is what the check box next to each of the numbers means.

At the bottom of the screen we have a spreadsheet so if you have used excel this is excel so each of the districts that are up here also are listed here.

And we have several tabs that we have for this particular client.

On the main tab we have the population totals.

So I have my population total tabulation which means these are all the all persons, all the people that are within district one 82525.

Then I have my target number.

That is the total population of the district I'm sorry total population of the state divided by the number of districts in this case 35.

So that is my ideal population.

Next column shows the deviation that I am from the target number.

So how far am I off, for example, here is 82000, I'm off by .94%.

Minus .94% which means in actuality 787%, 787 persons from where I need to be.

So that's what this first box where it says total population that's what it means.

Then as we get further to the right, we have the racial demographics as a percentage of total population, white, Black, Hispanic and overall minority.

What percentage of my population is actually voting age.

And then I have the same information over here for my voting age population.

That is VAP, voting age population.

White, Black, Hispanic and minority as a percentage of total age voting population.

That is what I decided to show on this particular page as I make edits to the plans, these numbers will get updated and I can see sort of what everything is.

That is really the crux of the redistricting process.

On the secondary tabs I have the actual detail.

So if I go to the racial demographics then I can see the actual total number of white alone Black alone percentage of Hispanics this is the details that get reflected on this front page.

And as I said if you have used excel you can see if I click this, this is the formula that it's used  $V3 \text{ minus } C3 \text{ divided by } C3$  that is what this is.

If I look at this one it's showing that it's getting the information from the racial demographics tab and displaying it here.

So obviously you don't need to know any of this stuff but it suffice to say this is excel if you use excel you would be very familiar with this and, in fact, one of the things that we can do is just open this in excel so if I click this, it will actually open this inside excel and all the numbers I was looking at in the software all show up here in an excel table with all the formulas and all the totals.

And this obviously can be shared you know after redistricting session.

This can be shared so you can see the numbers kind of very clearly.

So right now we are looking at the in this case the state of Arkansas everything is all nice and balanced.

Well we know that the population has changed.

Kim was talking about the ACS data.

So very simply one of the things that we can do is look and see what does this look like in under the new conditions.

So I'm going to change the spreadsheet here and say hey load for me the 2019 American community survey.

So without getting too much in depth into it American community survey is a rolling survey of the census Bureau does.

And it replaced the long form.

If you will remember in the old days the census Bureau would send out some regular forms and then some people would get the long form.

Well they got rid of the long form and they replaced it with this rolling survey.

And we are lucky that we have it at least.

So we have something to look at that shows what the current situation looks like or at least as close to the current situation as we can get.

All right, so the software went ahead and replaced our numbers with essentially 2017 numbers.

Now you can see I have a bunch of reds here.

So for example district one obviously has grown quite a bit.

Now instead of being balanced, it has 113,000 people in it.

And the target is 85,000.

So it needs to go down.

That is why it's red and it's showing that it's 32% overpopulated.

And, again, looking at district one up here all the checked boxes have gone away and some replaced by little down arrows and some replaced by little up arrows.

So this demonstrates for me for example if I'm looking at district 22, if I look at district 22, district 22 needs to grow.

And if I change my district to district 22, I can actually see what it needs to grow by.

It is under populated by 10,000 people.

Now I happened to pick that one because right next to it was district 21 and district 21 needs to go down.

And that needs to go down by 7845 people.

So they are right next to each other which makes my job in this case much easier.

But looking at the overall trends in the state, and this was confirmed by the state itself, the area down here, in the southeastern portion of the state has lost population.

That's why there is all of these districts need to grow.

And the area up here has gained population.

So that's why all these arrows are pointing down.

So these districts need to shrink.

These ones need to grow so essentially everything is going to push from south to north from east to west.

Now, the process of adding and editing districts is simple in the software we go in the edit tool right now I have district 22 selected so I just pick my assign tool.

And I start assigning.

So I'm going to go in here and you can see as I get in, I start to see more details on the map.

I see the road names.

Start to show up.

And actually if I go to a downtown area like this, you can start to see even the building foot prints.

And I do actually have, and this is a nationwide database we do have other types of background information that we can show.

So I can actually configure the view and switch it out to an imagery based.

So I can actually see even down to you know it's like this is using something similar to Google maps, I'm sure everybody has seen it be before and we can see parking lots with cars in it.

For areas where I might be looking at elevation playing a part in my redistricting process and these are all the different base maps that we have, I might pick something that shows elevation.

So for example this one, you know if I'm working well let's go to Michigan so we can look at -- so this is the level of details that we show when we are looking at your state.

Now typically we select district one.

I'm sorry, map one because that has kind of a light background and it's just easier to work with when we have a lot of information displaying.

Any way going back to district 22 where I was making edits, I'm going to click assign and I'm going to go ahead and assign this area here.

And the software goes ahead and says, well, that was a bit of a screw up on my part because I selected a whole county to be assigned.

So it assigned the entire area so I'm going to undo that.

And I'm going to change my geography level to precincts.

So that next time I select I'm just going to select the precincts that I'm interested in.

So I'm going to go back to assign.

And I'm going to this time draw and now it's just going to give me this little bit that I selected so it moved this line and calculated this and now I'm at 8,000 people below.

So I'm going to need to add a little more.

I'm going to add a little bit more here.

And now I went a little bit too high so I probably need to move it back a little bit.

So that is kind of -- that is the process that we use.

Obviously, I'm kind of doing this blindly.

The better way to do it is to actually display some population information so I can see what I'm actually grabbing and I would do that in a very simple way.

By displaying some labels here.

And once I display the labels, I can actually see the population for each of these precincts that I'm moving.

So that's what that little black number is.

For each of these presents.

And of course I can display other kinds of information if I'm interested in displaying, for example, Black and Hispanic population as well, I can select that and now it's showing for me total population Black and Hispanic, total population Black and Hispanic so as I'm moving, I can essentially see what type of an area I'm actually beginning to make edits on.

So in the most simplistic way of doing redistricting without getting into a lot of complexity, this is how the process works.

Obviously, there is a ton of tools up here.

You are looking at a bunch of different things.

We have analytical tools that allow us to compare plans.

We have something called a core constituency map, which essentially means if you pick up District 22 and part of District 21, it will tell you what part you added and what was the demographic of that part.

We try to identify splits. So if you accidentally split a precinct but it did not need to be split, we will identify that.

There are tools for identifying plan errors so if I click that I can check for discontinuities and it came back and said there are 30 discontinuities in this plan so it's mistakes and if I look it will come back in the list district one has no, so district five has one discontinuity.

So if I click it and district five is highlighting it for me. And the first part is the big part, and the second part is this little part here that got accidentally assigned.

So it's in the middle of a river and got accidentally assigned to the adjacent district 17.

So this needs to be corrected.

The software will recommend for me how to correct it, and I should move it to 17.

So that is one of the tools that we run to make sure that at the end of the process there are no discontinuities.

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.

The direct six in this case has six discontinuities and these are like I said little mistakes that the line drawer may have done and did not pick up this little, tiny block probably in the middle of a river, yes, it is and these are probably all the other ones that didn't get picked up.

So the software has the ability to check for these errors.

We also check for unassigned errors similar type of analysis.

In this case it says there are 21 unassigned areas in this plan so if I look at this one it's a little sliver down at the bottom of the state.

So it was hard to see when the person was working that they left this tiny little area out here unassigned.

And then the software will actually identify that and again recommend how to correct it.

There are a number of reports and analytics that the software includes, how am I doing on time Kim, I feel like I'm rambling on.

>> 18 minutes, Fred.

>> Fred: All right I will try to wrap it up.

So there are a number of reports that you can run.

I'll do one very simple one.

We have something called a district member snapshot and gives you a quick overview.

It just gives you a very quick overview of the of a district that kind of gives you a summary of it.

So I just ran it for one district.

This is a common report we run.

It will give you a picture of the district.

What the ideal the total population is, what the ideal is, how far you are off from it, what cities are in there and basic demographics of the -- of that particular district.

So this is a very common one and we run it for all the districts so that people can kind of get an idea of one by one.

All of these reports can be exported to PDF or posted on the Internet.

Very quickly I want to also kind of talk about our ability to share plans online and how we actually do that.

One of the functions that we have is the ability once you have a plan, once you worked only a plan to be able to share that plan with people that are online and get comments.

So for example we have done some work and now we want you to be able to see it, how do we do that?

So it's very efficient in how the software does that.

I'm going to bring a smaller plan just because we are kind of short on time.

To demonstrate how that works.

So this is a small plan.



And what I'm going to do is I'm going to say I want you guys after I've done this edit for you guys to see it so how do we do that?

I'm going to upload and share this plan and I have several ways of doing that.

I can request comments from you guys or I can say just I'm just providing this for viewing only purposes, I'm going to say I would like to see some comments on this so I'm going to upload this plan for online commenting and it's just going to say I've already done it before.

So once the plan is uploaded, the software will provide this little QR code.

So the QR code is that is there so if you are using a mobile device, a phone or a tablet you can just hold it up to this and it will open it up.

So I'm going to actually just click the open so we can see what it looks like.

So this is now we are on the Internet.

So this is the plan we just I just uploaded so now you are on the Internet using Google maps and you are able to kind of look in here and say okay, yeah, that is then you can say I want to put a comment here and my comment is I'm going to put my name in here and I'm going to say why did this move north?

Add comments.

Done.

So I placed the comment here.

It will send me an e-mail so that I can validate this comment.

But going back to the software itself, I can see now after everybody is commenting, after everybody's comment is done, I can go back to access plan store and this particular plan was called Fred new AR plan so I'm going to go to Fred new AR plan and there is a comment.

And I am going to add that.

And you can see one comment was added.

And there is the comment.

So it is immediate feedback on I can share plans for you guys to be able to see and you can see the comments right there.

Why did this move north?

And I place it and tell me and when did I put it, when did I put the comment on and now it's right there for me to actually act on so I can make the edits and make the changes.

The other part of the software is the ability to engage with the public.

So within the software we have something called communities of interest.

Communities of interest allow us, I can kind of go over here, to go to this communities of interest page in this case it's for the state of Arkansas and I can go in here and add a community.

So if I'm for example, you know, down here in this I already put one in here, I'm going to put one next to it so I'm going to add a community and say okay I live in this area and it's going to draw it in.

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

And then give it a name.

And I'm going to add this community of interest.

Again, it sends a link so that it can validate this community so I know who placed the software will know who has placed the community of interest so I don't have one person putting 10,000 different communities in.

So once that is in, then, again, it integrates with the software, I'm able to go in here to my communities of interest page and say download this as an overlay.

And these communities then show up.

Whoops I went too far.

Community of interest, Fred's place and it's in there.

So during my redistricting process, I'm able to see what communities people are placing and then add that or consider that during my redistricting process so I don't accidentally split a community when I don't need to.

So really the main ingredient here that was missing in the past decade is a very tight integration between plans that are online and plans that are local and be able to see what people are doing if they are editing and be able to share with them the results of the process.

And one last thing, I won't get too much into it is the ability to actually do online redistricting.

And that's this tool here.

We can actually open up this plan.

I just uploaded.

This was the little plan that I just created.

So here is the plan I just uploaded.

And if as if as a commissioner or member of the public I want to go in here and make edits I can pick a piece of geography, I want to say I want to put this in district eight and do an assignment and there it is.

And there it retabulates the information here.

So it's a very simple application that we provide that allows individuals to be able to view and edit plans.

And I can -- if you are making edits here, I can go back on the desktop and view those edits.

So I can run analytics on a plan that somebody is working with online, I can put plans for comments, I can collect community input.

So overall, there is a very tight integration between the desktop where the professional work happens and the Internet where we engage with the public.

I guess with that I'm going to turn it over to back to Kim.

>> Kim: I will unmute myself.

Thank you, Fred.

Again, we will have time for questions at the tail end.

What I wanted to do is bring in our next expert on that side.

Sorry for the doorbells.

And let people see and talk with our next member of our team who is Ken Stigall.

I'm going to -- I have Ken's slides up here, so I can show what he is going to be presenting.

And he can talk about those.

>> Ken: I can share the screen.

I have the slides here too I can share.

Let's see what you got.

>> Kim: All right.

So we can go ahead and start in.

>> Ken: Hi, I'm Ken Stigall.

I residence lie retired from the state of Virginia roughly a year ago.

I started with the state the visual legislative automated system.

Virginia is set up with that agency did all the technical set up.

Networks before networks even for all the legislative agencies.

Very much a nonpartisan environment.

Worked with the house and Senate.

The minority, majority party.

Whoever is in the legislative branch.

Started in 1991 as a programmer analyst on redistricting of a proprietary application system on a mini system did a lot of coding, did a lot of programming.

Worked with members, worked with the legislative services who were staffing the redistricting project.

So along about 98 they are preparing for the next iteration of redistricting and they wanted to have the technical technology person in house.

So I went to legislative services just moved a few floors, sister agency.

And spent what I did there was kind of what you guys are doing which was figuring out what needed to be done.

And then ultimately helping general assembly members, colleges and universities that had plans, bringing them in.

That was what I did was database building, report writing ad hoc if they wanted a certain kind of report we can edit, modify, create it and help different members understand what was going on in redistricting.

That some districts have to change.

There is no getting around it.

Even though a district may be perfect, the surrounding ones have to be changed, it's being changed.

So once people kind of understand that even though their area may be nice it's got to change, things get easier.

Go to the next slide, Kim, please.

Yeah.

So we do that 2015, the courts come back and say you have to redraw the Congressional districts.

And Dr. Bernard Grofman was appointed to do that and he wanted to work with us and ended up being me at legislative services to provide technical expertise we called it or he called it.

Long distance drawing maps.

Importing new data, data that didn't exist in 2011.

The primaries.

Election.

Usually it was election data.

And then in 2018 he again was appointed by the courts to redraw Virginia's house districts.

That was even more hands on.

The smaller the districts get the harder it is to do because of the numbers just keep run tomorrow.

The bigger the district the easier it is.

So we worked through that, got that done, there again it's a very nonpartisan expert and just using auto bound and the data.

This is going to be it's brief.

I just want to give you a background.

My what I bring to the table is working with a variety of people and a very nonpartisan way.

Helping them understand what needs to be done.

Technology, process, how it all comes together.

20 years of doing it with Fred, I think I actually, he when he started looking into doing it is where I met him because he was going from a Wayne mini system to the -- a desktop so I have extensive knowledge of auto bound and just the whole redistricting process. Virginia now has a Commission that was being set up as I left.

And one thing I would like to point out as we move it over the next ten years one thing people have to realize generally what we have to realize is this redistricting application data is doing to have to be maintained.

And there is multiple reasons for it.

The big reason you know we look at like we had previously potential litigation requires redrawing of the districts.

I don't think Michigan or you guys would want three years down the road have to go through all this again and figure out how to bring it up.

So kind of keep an eye on thinking about somebody at Michigan needs to wrap their arms around this and just have it available for whomever to look at.

You may find a year from now that there is some error in the data or that the geography want to clean it up, make it look better.

And then there is always there is new data and the members or public or whoever, Michigan, you know they want to see this new data come in.

Maybe American community survey data six or seven years down the road tied back into the application.

And those are all kind of things that I did for over 20 years.

Well closer to 30 years.

So that pretty much wraps up my role in this project with EDS and everyone else.

Thank you.

Take it away, Kim.

>> Kim: All right thank you, Ken.

Next member of our team is John Morgan.

He is with applied research coordinates.

He is the president of that company.

And he has worked over the past decades on the republican side of redistricting.

John and I met a long time ago.

I actually met his father who started in this business.

So we go way back.

So John you want to unmute yourself?

And I've got your slides here too.

>> John: Yeah, I can run the slides or you can run them.

>> Yes.

>> John: Good morning Commissioners I'm John Morgan and I grew up in a small town in Indiana along the lake Michigan dunes area.

And my family later moved to Washington.

My father was a national politics and served in the Regan White House.

I returned to the Midwest to go to college at the University of Chicago where I earned a BA in American history.

I've 30 years of experience doing redistricting in 20 states in the 1991, the 2001 and 2011 cycle this is my fourth redistricting cycle starting now.

I studied demographics and elections for years as Kim mentioned many of my clients have been republican legislatures and groups.

I've worked with hundreds of elected officials and staff over the years.

I've served as a testifying redistricting expert in Court cases as a nontestifying expert for attorneys involved in litigation.

I've worked with redistricting Commissions in Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania as well as county authorities in North Carolina and Georgia.

My area of expertise here is in map drawing and problem solving.

I hopefully can help you evaluate many options and quickly find the solutions that meet your criteria.

I hope I can help facilitate consensus at your direction among the Commission and to help you equitably discharge your duties as Commissioners.

So what I want to do now is I just want to share my screen if I can.

>> Kim: I've got your slides here John.

>> John: But if you let me do it, I'll have the pointer.

>> Kim: Okay.

>> John: Okay.

>> Kim: I need to stop share on mine and now you can share.

>> John: Okay, so what I want to do very quickly for my portion of the presentation is to take a quick look at the Michigan population.

We have already seen a little bit of this.

And I want to look around and take a look at the population and also the distribution because this is the first step in the redistricting process.

So if you look around Michigan, the population in 2010 was about 9.8 million, 9.9 million pretty close.

And as Kim mentioned earlier Michigan has grown about 100,000 people.

So again just looking around very quickly you have population in Wayne County which is Detroit at 1.8 million.

Next door is Oakland county which is the next largest county.

And that has Pontiac and Southfield and Rochester Hills, Farmington and Macomb County and Warren and Sterling Heights. Genesee County is Flint, Washtenaw is Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti. And then over in Western Michigan you have Grand Rapids and Kent County and the nearby communities of Holland, which is in Ottawa County and Muskegon.

And then you've got a lot of population in the I-95 corridor, Jackson, Battle Creek or Kalamazoo. And then Berrien County you have St. Joe and Benton Harbor. And then up in the UP the population is Marquette and Ishpeming. And then you've got in Grand Traverse County. You've got Traverse City and the Michigan Riviera, the nationally known Interlochen Center for the Arts. And then coming back down here, Saginaw 200,000 and Bay 100,000.

So that is the population distribution. And as we saw in Kim's maps, we looked through the population estimates and what the population is in 2019. So rather than go through all of those again, let's look very quickly at the population chain.

So the notable gainers are Oakland County has gained about 55,000 people. Ken about 54,000.

Ottawa another growth county at 28,000 gain. Washtenaw about 23,000.

Ingham and Livingston gained about 11,000 and then Macomb 33,000. And losing side, we alluded to Wayne County, the loss of 71,000.

Genesee 20,000.

Saginaw just under 10 and Bay at just under 5,000.

So one of Kim's maps showed the population of an ideal district's per county, and this is something that is an important first step. And to look at, you know, how much representation does each county deserve just based on population?

So, with that in mind you, look at Saginaw County has enough for two and one quarter house seats, so 2.23.

And as in the case of the current map, it's actually paired two whole house seats are in Saginaw and a portion of that is paired with Shiawasee and it's another house district right there. Wayne County has enough for 20 and a quarter. And then the current house plan is paired with Monroe, so you basically take that little bit of overage of over 20 seats and combine it with Monroe and you have one whole seat in Monroe and a portion of the seat district 17 straddles the line between Monroe and Wayne. It has Flat Rock, another town and the Township of Sumpter. And it goes down to Monroe City. So that ends up being the district that straddles the line.

Now we have a new reality as we turn the corner and look at 2019 data or what will soon be the 2020 census data. There is a change.

So the new ideal population for the Michigan house seats all 110 is about 90,800 people up here at the top of the map.

So that just changes the way things are distributed.

And as we mentioned earlier with Wayne County, instead of 20 and a quarter, it's now 19 and a quarter.

So for example, if you were to pair Wayne County with Monroe as it's done right now, in that same geographic boundary there is one less house seat. And, likewise, if you go to the other side of the state, we talked a little bit about Ken County has grown and so has Ottawa, so there were exactly three seats in Ottawa and now there is three almost and a quarter.

So that change means there might have to be a different pairing of the counties.

So let's look finally with this last map that I will close on.

This is just another way of looking at some of the changes that Kim brought up earlier. And let me back up one here.

So Lenawee County is an interesting example here because it has enough for 1.1 seats. So you can't just draw a house seat that is Lenawee County. It will be too much population.

So you basically have to do what they did in the current house plan. They took one township out of Lenawee and the balance is one whole district. And then that one township is paired with Jackson and a portion of Eaton County. So, again, Eaton County, which is a suburb of Lansing and has the County Seat of Charlotte, all of that is in one house district. And then you have the other house district has a little bit of Eaton, a portion of Jackson and one township of Lenawee and that is house District 65.

Anyway so this is one of the problems that we have to look at right away. So, you know, in your role as Commissioners, you will be looking at a lot of the population changes and you will have to adjust to that. But once you do adjust to it, all the information you will be receiving from the public, plans, comments, portions of plans will all be under that new matrix. But at first, as Kim mentioned, we can use the census estimates to draw some plans and concepts now, ahead of getting the data. And, again, that's my expertise is in drawing maps and problem solving.

So, with that, I will turn it back to Kim and I can take questions later. Thank you.

>> Kim: Good, thank you.

Thank you, John.

Let me flip to our next presenter.

Who is Lisa Handley she is our add on to our proposal.

Lisa and I go way back.

She was a former employee of mine.

Back in the 1990s.

She has gone out on her own, very successfully and is now the leading racial bloc voting expert around the country so Lisa take it away.

>> Lisa: I'm going to ask you to do my slides for me.

>> Kim: Yes, I've got yours.

>> Lisa: Great I'm sure you have heard a number of lawyers tell you not to draw plans that are discriminatory.

In other words, not to draw plans that violate the voting rights act.

Now each of these plans under certain circumstances would be discriminatory.

And on other circumstances would not.

It depends on the context.

More specifically it depends on voting patterns of minorities and whites.

Given that we have a secret ballot, how do we know how minorities and whites are voting?

Next slide, Kim.

Kim: Uh-huh.

>> Lisa: We are going to do some statistical analyses.

The first thing we need to do is build a database.

And the database is going to look very similar to the database that you would use for redistricting.

The exception will be there will probably be a lot more election contests in this database.

And then we are going to use some statistical techniques to determine how minorities and whites are voting.



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.

One is called ecological regression analysis and the other is ecological inference analysis. These are the two standard techniques to determine how minorities and whites are voting.

Next slide.

So what happens when we do this analysis?

This is an example of a contest I analyzed in a county in the Midwest.

And this is the kind of information that you will get.

We have -- this is the 2008 democratic Presidential primary.

We have Obama and Clinton running.

And the total votes received in the fourth column over, so in this particular county Clinton carried the county.

The next two columns are ER stands for ecological regression, EI is ecological inference. Those are the estimates of the percentages of Blacks, and it's covered on my screen, the percentage of Blacks who voted for the candidates and the others are whites who voted for those two candidates.

Now, we can see in this that Blacks are cohesive and supported their preferred candidate.

We can see that whites are voting against that particular candidate. And we can see that the preferred candidate of the minorities of Blacks in this case did not run this county. So this contest is polarized.

This is a racially polarized contest.

And we just demonstrated the second and the third prong of Gingles. You will remember from the attorneys talking about whether minorities are politically cohesive and whether whites are bloc voting.

So you have a situation here where if this pattern continues over election after election, primary and/or general election, you have a situation where you are going to have to draw minority districts.

That is districts that give minorities an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

This racial bloc voting analysis gives us some additional information.

And it's going to give us the kind of information that we need in order to determine if a plan is discriminatory or not.

Turns out that 50% is not the magic number.

You're not going to go in and draw all of your minority districts that say 50 percent Black voting age population instead you will use the information you glean from the racial bloc voting analysis to determine, first, if the participation rates of whites and minorities are comparable or if for example whites turn out at higher rates.

And you're going to look at the percentage of white cross over for the minority preferred candidates that you could typically get.

So if you have a situation where Blacks and whites are turning out at comparable percentages and there is consistent white cross over vote of say about 30%.

You could draw a district that is less than 50%.

Maybe as low as 40%.

And have it still be an effective minority district.

And still comply with the voting rights act.

On the other hand, if Black voters turn out at a lower rate than white voters and there is virtually no cross over vote then it may be the case that you need to strip substantially more than 50% say as high as 60% Black to give Black voters an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

Now, this is a very district specific analysis and you will do this for very specific areas of the state because it could be the case that in some areas districts with 45% Black voting age population are sufficient to elect Black preferred candidates while in other areas of the state you might need 55%.

Okay, next slide.

Last slide.

Okay, the other piece of information here is you will have heard that you cannot use race when drawing districts.

This would violate the 14th amendment.

This would be racial gerrymandering unless you have to do so to comply with the voting rights act.

If you need to do it to comply with the voting rights act the districts that you draw must be narrowly tailored to comply with the voting rights act.

So you need to rather than taking a number like 50 or 55% you need to do the kind of analysis that I've just described in order to show that the districts that you drew, the minority districts that you drew were narrowly tailored to be effective at electing minority preferred candidates.

Without unnecessarily packing them.

So this is the kind of analysis that I've been doing for well over 30 years.

I won't tell you how many but a long time.

And I've done this for the department of justice for a number of civil rights groups like the ACLU and the lawyers committee.

I've worked for independent redistricting Commissions and I've worked for scores of state and local Governments doing this kind of work.

As Kim mentioned, I began this work a long time ago when I was studying to get my Ph.D. in political science. I'm a political scientist by training. And Kim and I have continued to work together on-and-off on a number of projects such as this one.

And, thank you.

I'm open for questions.

>> Kim: Great, thank you, Lisa.

So in conclusion for all of you, in this day of partisan division and differences, everybody opposing each other on that side, red and blue as the dichotomy that we have all heard about, we found a unique way to help the State of Michigan.

And your Commission to be successful in handling your tasks.

By bringing together a wide variety of different people to help you out.

With that, we are happy to take questions.

>> Kim: Sue, how would you like to deal with questions?

>> Sue: I would defer to our Chair or you can take it.

>> Steve: Okay Anthony.

>> Anthony: Well, thank you everybody for that presentation.

Very informational.

I especially like you know the different points of data that you will have in the mapping process especially when it comes to including different communities of interest measures.

I have a couple questions.

This first one is for both Kim and John.

As you guys mentioned you have drawn thousands of mapping plans across the nation.

Working for whatever party was in power at the time both democrats and republicans.

Now for each of those projects I assume you know you are following the instructions of your client at the time.

But one can make the argument that the end results were gerrymandered maps, since you have those experiences this has the potential to introduce bias into the map drawing process.

So my question is how will you combat this bias?

>> Kim: Good question.

Anthony.

What we have seen in having multiple people in the drawing process it brings out the best of everything.

But it's based very much on data.

Sure, you can try to twist plans right and left.

But the data helps give you some ideas on which way you can go.

We are all in terms of showing data and showing what makes up a plan and showing what the component pieces are so that people can decide.

By giving you multiple potentials, it puts it back into your hands on how you would like to propose.

But giving you the capabilities of drawing different ideas and different concepts.

When we did the work with Rhode Island and the Commission up there, we were a nonpartisan entity.

Just like Ken is and Virginia.

So we are very much cognizant of providing the best combination on that side.

John, you want to add something?

>> John: Sure, let me just add that in this capacity I do not see myself as an activist or an advocate in any way.

I'm here to serve your interests and to draw plans as you direct and provide the expertise that you need.

And I will say I've had experiences, some anecdotes where I worked for Democrat members and they were surprised because, you know, in one case a democrat house member in Florida praised me on the floor of the house for helping her staff draw plans.

Likewise when I drew the Wake County School Board Districts in Raleigh, North Carolina, you know, this was for the School Board Commission.

Not for one entity or another. And as such I made my services available across the board to every member.

And, again, my expertise is on the problem solving.

So I will, you know, work hard to take all the perspectives that are there and to show you the options. And ultimately, of course, it's your decision of how you proceed.

>> Kim: I think that is key.

We do the same thing.

In terms of meeting with both members of the political parties.

Or all members of different constituents.

That's the key in providing services.

>> Fred: If I can add Kim this is kind of important so maybe I can add a couple of words in here.

>> Kim: Sure, Fred.

>> Fred: We didn't really talk about the make up like what the areas of responsibility are within the team.

We have added the republican and the democrat side so that we know what they can bring in, what is important from looking at it from a political side, but the person who is going to be drawing is actually Ken who is not a partisan person.

So that is the makeup.

These factions exist, so we are aware of what we need to look at. But at the end of the day the pen is in the hand of somebody who is not. And then I am totally nonpartisan. I'm the one that actually delivers the view to the Commissioners and to the public.

So the team was made up in this particular way for a very specific reason. To make sure that we cover all Sides, but that it does not become a politicized process. Nobody is going to be able to come back and say well you guys had this drawn by people that strictly work for the democrats or people that strictly work for the republican. So the plan is going to be skewed.

>> Anthony: Wonderful thank you for that answer. If I may I have one quick question for Lisa as well.

Is that okay, Steve?

>> Steve: Yes, go ahead.

>> Anthony: So Lisa in your presentation you know you talked about minorities and you specifically referenced Black Americans versus white Americans.

In Michigan we have a rather large Middle Eastern and Arab American population, that presents an issue because on the consensus there is no option for that. So they have to self-identify as being white.

Do you know of any measures to account for this population?

>> Lisa: Under the voting rights act you have four protected groups you have African/Americans, you have Hispanics and Asian Americans and you have Native Americans.

People with a middle eastern background would be a community of interest.

They are not actually protected by the voting rights act.

On the other hand certainly you would want to draw communities of interest if they are geographically concentrated.

And the information exists in the census and I'm going to let somebody like Kim answer the question as to what form that will take.

But that, again, that's not a group that is protected but I the voting rights act.

>> Kim: It is Anthony, a good question.

It's starting to take a look at some of the information from the American community survey.

And helping to look at other data sets that are probably in this instance outside the PL file.

Because we don't have the various ancestry and that sort of information.

That is available in the American community survey.

So we can bring that in to help in some of the analysis.

But it's still at a larger geographic level that makes it a little bit difficult to get down to Specific Street or area of the city or something like that.

We will work to try to get as much as possible.

And certainly letting people draw their communities of interest, I think goes a long way to help the Commission in understanding this is the area that people think of as the middle eastern area of the city or the county.

>> Steve: Okay, MC.

I see you have your little hand in the corner.

>> MC: I do.

I think Doug had his hand up first.

>> Steve: Okay, Doug.

>> Doug: Yes, I want to first of all thank you.

This has been very informative.

Now, one of the things I got out of this I got a lot of little pieces and expertise among your area.

And then we have our responsibilities.

How do we tie all this together?

And how do we work together?

And who leads that?

That whole process?

Can you comment on that?

>> Kim: That's an excellent question, Doug.

You have already shown over multiple months working together on your side but you have done that through Sue's excellent getting together of the group and asking questions beginning at each of your meetings to let us see little insights on all of you. We will do the same thing with you in letting our insights be available to you on that side.

So working together I think in the benefits of Zoom that you have been putting into place I think would go a long way of starting to meld our team together with you so that we can be there each of your meetings and providing answers, giving you information, that is what we did in Rhode Island on their Commission.

As I mentioned.

I was testifying before every single one of their Commission meetings.

And this is the information today.

This is the data we have to be concerned about.

These are some of the legal perimeters we have to be cognizant of.

All of that kind of thing we can help and bring forward to you to help in this whole process.

>> Doug: Thank you.

Now, who takes the lead in that?

I mean, who says this is how we should start?

And these are the people that should be involved?

And then this is the next step we should take and this is the third step we should take and so forth?

How is that accomplished?

>> Kim: As the team coordinator I would take the lead initially.

But have available all of our members of the team to help out at any particular point in time.

Given the beauty of Zoom and not having to travel to Lansing or whatever every week or day, we can end up hopefully providing you around the clock expertise and assistance.

>> Doug: One last question.

At some point in this whole process we have to have a master map.

I mean, we as Commissioners may provide comments.

We may provide maps the public may provide maps but there has to be a master we work off of.

Who maintains that?

>> Kim: We would end up maintaining it, but it would also be available through Fred's software so that you will all see it.

You will have it.

You can make changes.

You can make comments to it.

At any step of the way.

You will be able to draw your own because we are going to provide you with the tools and technology so that you can sit in your home and as Commissioners create your own concepts and ideas for one part of the state or another or the entire state.

>> Doug: But the master plan has to be controlled, and is that done by your organization?

>> Kim: Yes.

We will maintain it but you will be able to view it at every step of the way.

>> Doug: View it but we can't go in and change the master, we can change and recommend.

>> Kim: You can make copies of the master to suddenly say this is Doug's idea. Over here.

And it focuses on this part of the state or whatever.

So you will be able to extract the master into your space and draw from your space. For your ideas.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Kim: And that in turn would go back into the system so that all Commissioners could see what you have done, we can see from the standpoint of line drawers different ideas, that sort of thing.

>> Doug: I think Dustin has a question relative to this.

>> Steve: I think MC had a question, MC.

>> MC: I can wait if it's related, Dustin and I think I saw Ken too had maybe a response to this directly any way I can wait.

>> Dustin: That is fine.

>> Steve: Dustin.

>> Dustin: My train of thought just derailed.

Hold on.

Oh, with the piggybacking off of Doug with the actual master database that would be maintained by you folks, I'm assuming that all changes to the master database will need to be tracked so we can see how those changes progressed over time, correct, it's not just going to be overwritten every single time.

>> Kim: No, that's correct.

>> Dustin: I figured thanks.

>> Steve: Who else MC you or?

>> MC: Yes, and I think Ken has something to respond to directly.

>> Steve: Well, get your question out.

>> MC: Okay, it's about the I think I heard Lisa suggest that there was a separate database for the it's the idea that we have data that we need to maintain and it seems like there is multiple databases potentially and so the idea of maintaining this over the long period not just the maps but also the data I want to just understand how many, yeah, and where that sits or how long, yeah, which pieces come together and is it one? Or are there several sets that merge anywhere or are they all separated and are they overlays that are on maps I guess I'm trying to understand it and again how it's maintained over the next ten years.

>> Kim: Clearly from the standpoint there is a master database that is primarily used for the line drawing.

It is the data cube that I showed you earlier.

That pulls all of this together.

Pulls it together spatially so we could see it on the map.

You will be able to see it.

You can have colorizations, all of that sort of thing, that is the master database.

But what we can do and what we do for the racial bloc voting side of things we will extract from the master database the relevant elections that Lisa needs to analyze.

Particularly those election results that have minority candidates in them.

Those are the first kinds of things that she would be looking at in order to analyze.

But it is coming from that master data set on that side.

>> Steve: Okay Ken did you have a comment?

I don't want to ignore you.

>> Ken: I was going to comment on with what Doug and Dustin and MC also.

Each plan -- I like to explain to people that a plan is like a bill draft, a piece of legislation, because the way we were doing it was.

And each plan, once it was introduced, or in your cases you will have a unique identifier on that plan.

And let's say you all agree that that's going to be you will have five of them, ten of them.

But you will pick one of them and they all have unique identifiers and you will say this is where we are going to start.

And then if Doug wants to work on it independently, he would make a copy of it, it would have another unique identifier.

So each plan will be uniquely identified. And then you guys would come together and say, okay, these are the four we are going to take public.

Or however you want to do it, or six or ten or 20. But each one is uniquely identified.



Each time a change is made.

Once it's made public.

>> Kim: That is a part of what is in Fred's software that plan management that he showed you as he looked at different plan possibilities.

That will be there within the software and you will be able to see that and select plans from that master list.

>> Steve: Okay, we are at about the end of our time for election data services. Does someone have a burning question that they want answered?

Dustin wait a minute Rebecca has not asked a question yet.

>> Rebecca: Let me take myself off mute I have two questions and the first should be quick it's about the American community survey.

I got that survey before and I refused to participate in it as I'm sure other people do, I'm wondering what the response rate is on that survey.

And how reliable is that data given that it is not you are not required to respond to in the same way as you are under law for the census.

>> Kim: Good questions. And you are correct. You are not required to submit answers.

What is unique and great is that it is a combination of thousands, and ultimately multiple thousands, tens and hundreds of thousands of surveys. By combining them over time, and selecting those five-year increments, the American Community Survey is designed so that you can look at lower levels of geography.

But if you didn't answer the survey, that is okay.

The Bureau is going to try to contact you and try to get you to answer the survey.

But if you're not able to, there are enough people in the area that it is a representative sample.

It's like a poll.

It's not a census from that side.

But it is a sample.

That is what the American Community Survey is.

It is a sample.

>> Rebecca: Okay. And then my second question is with respect to some of the public comments we've gotten specifically about your company, Fred I know you indicated that your software was used in 2010 and 20, no, 2000, 2010 is that right to draw the lines in Michigan.

I'm wondering to what extent Kim your company was involved in that process?

I looked at the RFP and it indicated that you have not had a contract with the State of Michigan in ten years but I'm not sure if that also meant that you did not work on redrawing those maps in 2010.

>> Kim: That is correct.

We did not we are not involved in 2010.

We were involved in 1980 and 1990 but did not continue after that time.

>> Rebecca: Then I have a follow-up question on that I don't know if you have seen the public comments but we have gotten lots of public comments basically referring to you as being the king of gerrymandering. And, you know, just my own little Google search, there is lots of articles certainly out there saying that you have participated in gerrymandering on both sides. I'm not going to say you are only republican or democratic. But there is this sort of vibe in the media that you are sort of a Picasso of gerrymandering I believe is one way it was referred to.

What is your response to that considering we are supposed to be an Independent Commission who was put in place specifically to avoid gerrymandering? And, you know, are you committed to drawing maps that are fair and are not leaning towards one side or the other?

You know, given that we have a mixed Commission, obviously, the concern on my side is that you might be listening to one side or another and drawing maps that favor one side or another versus being neutral. What is your response to that?

And how can you reassure us that you will, in fact, be neutral?

>> Kim: Good question.

We have pledged to be neutral in your instance in Michigan.

And we are not working with anybody else in Michigan.

We strongly believe that from the standpoint of redistricting it's important to show all the information and provide you with the expertise that's necessary.

We are not listening to anybody else.

And we end up when you end up drawing lines basically, I've always said that when I get finished with a project, I think I've probably been successful if everyone is just a little bit mad at me.

That indeed you can't satisfy everybody on redistricting.

You can try to get as much as you can and try to get coalitions together because after all and most instances a legislative plan is a bill, it has to be passed by the legislature or whomever so you are trying to find the acceptable combinations of everybody's interests and that provides that nonpartisan, bipartisan and the way that I developed this team to bring out all of the different elements to provide you both all the party input and nonparty input in terms of redistricting.

>> Rebecca: Okay thank you very much.

>> Steve: One more Dustin.

>> Dustin: I can yield that was my exact same question based on the comments we received so.

>> Steve: Sue.

>> Sue: We have several groups around the state that are using different types of software for input such as Redistricter, or something like that, how will you integrate those comments and how will you store those so that we are aware of those?

>> Kim: Fred?

>> Fred: Sure, we didn't really cover this too much but one of the things that sort of sets us apart from the other vendors that are on the redistricting side is within the mapping software community there is one company called ESRI whose software we use for our mapping.

They have some 85% of the market out there.

So if you are looking at the State of Michigan any number of counties within the state, they all use the same software.

And that's the basis of our software.

And one of the advantages of that software gives us is the ability to interact with a lot of other products that are out there because it's the de facto standard.

And the ability to really reach out to the public also provides us with the ability to take input from the public either giving them the tools to draw it themselves or being able to take input from things like Dave's redistricting and there are a number of other public products that are out there taking almost all of them right to the format that we can read. Once that data is in the system, then it gets stored permanently as a part of the system and that is part of the record for the project.

And the one last thing I want to say about that is we have kind of hint around it during this conversation about what happens over the decade.

The key part of this is that the software has to be viable over the length of the decade. And we have had experience with this now for 20 years, our software that was used in Michigan is still sitting in some on somebody's desk and it still can be revived from 2010 in Wisconsin.

Your neighbor.

They had a lawsuit.

They pulled the computer out of a closet.

In two years ago.

And fired it up, all the plans that they had done was on it.

They brought it up and they were able to make modifications.

Same thing happened in Colorado and I was just working with Washington this past week and nobody that was there was there ten years ago so they have to go find the laptop that had everything on it and the full information out so they can give it to us so we can put in the new version of the software.

That is a key part of the proposal is we are using technology that is very widely used, it's used in the state at the DOT at the counties and it is something that a lot of people have access to.

If they are creating maps.

>> Kim: Part of the other thing, Sue, is the national conference with state legislature back in 1909 and I was part of the team that worked with the department of justice that looked at the acceptable formats for plan exchange.

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.

Be it a shape file or be it a bloc equivalency, those are the two main ways that people exchange plans and most of all the software that's out there will export the -- their plans in those kind of formats.

So that those become the medians of exchange in terms of bringing in plans or writing out a plan.

>> Steve: Okay we are at the time of our break.

I would like to thank all of the participants.

Kim and Fred Ken, John, and Lisa.

We have been very informative.

And we appreciate your taking your time to inform us.

Thank you once again.

It is now time for our break.

We will take ten minutes.

Well let's come back at 11:00.

And we will start with the next group.

Remember to mute yourselves.

You have so the interpreters are not trying to keep up with us, it's a hot mic so keep quiet.

>> Kim: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> John: Thank you Commissioners.

[ Recess ]

>> Sue: Steve, if you are ready to start, our guests are here for Haystaq DNA.

>> Steve: I was waiting for all our people to get back and we are here.

Go ahead, Sue, and please introduce.

>> Sue: Okay. So the lead for lead for Haystaq is Andrew Drechsler, and he will introduce his team. But thank you for being here today and we look forward to your presentation.

>> Andrew: Great. Thank you very much, Commissioners. And thank you, Sue, for inviting us today.

I would like to do a quick introduction who is going to be presenting today myself; Andrew Drechsler, president of Haystaq DNA; Kent Stigall from Haystaq who is the CEO; and Karin MacDonald from Q2. I will start sharing my screen and launch right into our presentation.

So as I mentioned, the two of us have a teamed up today.

We are going to go into a little bit more detail in terms of talking about what we presented and what we want to do for the State of Michigan.

And for the Commission.

First, just want to introduce our companies a little bit more.

So Haystaq DNA, we have been around since 2003.

We have experience in nonpartisan redistricting.

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

We did the redistricting for the Independent Commission in Arizona in 2011.

Working with the Commissioners there.

Helping them draw their maps.

And most recently we have cofounded the nonpartisan redistricting data hub.

The nonpartisan redistricting data hub is an effort that has been two years in the making to make redistricting data, you know, available to all everybody across all 50 states.

It's an effort as you heard, as you may have heard the data that's collected and used for redistricting is a huge task together.

And that is something that we wanted to do and make widely available so that individuals can use it, groups, communities of interest can use that data and that it's available for everybody.

At the core of what we do we are a big data analytics firm and we have clients as redistricting largely happens once every ten years and you know, we do a lot of redistricting.

But as that during the off time we do a lot of other work.

We have worked in on the political side and we have worked with corporations.

Everything from by helping sell automobiles for Audi and Volkswagen to working in the entertainment, working in healthcare.

So at the core of what we do we are used to working with and dealing with a lot of big data sets.

I'm now going to turn it over to introduce Q2 and she will take over the next few slides.

>> Karin: Thank you so much, Andrew. And good morning, Commissioners, and thank you so much for inviting us to present to you.

It's nice to meet all of you.

I'll talk a little bit about Q2 data and research.

So we are a very small little forum.

We are women owned and you may wonder why we put it on the slide.

It's actually something that is pretty unique in redistricting.

Redistricting traditionally has not had a lot of women in it.

And we also specialize in nonpartisan work and that is also something that set us apart from everybody else in the redistricting world.

And part of that is due to the fact that, of course, there wasn't a lot of opportunity to work in redistricting if you didn't work for a political party until the rise of redistricting Commissions.

And in around 2000 in the 2000 redistricting cycle I first got my opportunity to work with an Independent Redistricting Commission that was the Commission for the city of San Diego in California.

And I was pretty much hooked on the process, I think.

Specializing in Independent Redistricting Commissions set as a consultant and as a consultant team apart. And generally with Independent Redistricting Commissions, you know, the politics kind of fall by the wayside at least party politics do and most of the time candidate politics also. And as a consulting team, one focuses more on working with groups, definitely working, of course, with the Commissioners that are trying to implement a process that is quite different from other redistricting processes.

So, overall, our entire team and my entire little firm has specialized in that particular process and our experience working with Independent Redistricting Commissions, I think is unmatched.

Again, we started with San Diego in the 2000 around of redistricting. And then were hired to be the consultants for the California Redistricting Commission in 2010.

And that of course, was a very similar process to the one that you are currently embarking upon, which was all eyes on this Commission.

It was the first time that California was implementing this big redistricting experiment as people used to refer to it.

And I'll tell you, I know from experience there was actually a vetting pool going on and all bets were against this Commission succeeding. So it was a process where everybody had to pull together.

And we became a very closely connected team of Commissioners and Commission staff and consultants implementing this big experiment that then succeeded. And I know you have talked to some of the Commissioners from the California round and they have shared their experiences. And I hope that was helpful to you in setting up your process.

So next slide, please.

Andrew, thank you so much. I'm going to put my glasses on.

So, again, I started talking about this a little bit.

I want to go back to my colleagues here at Haystaq because they have an interesting round of 2011 redistricting also when the Arizona Redistricting Commission, which came out of pretty much a decade of lawsuits, and perhaps a pretty challenging process in 2000 was reaching out to them.

And they ended up working with them.

They drew two maps. When we say two maps, that, of course, doesn't mean they only drew two maps.

The Commission drew probably hundreds of maps. And then, you know, when we say two maps, what we talk about those are the maps they ended up passing so they started to plan the maps.

There were nine Congressional districts, 30 legislative districts.

And one of the challenging things in Arizona, which is also something that we dealt with in California, was that it was very complex because it was covered by what was then still in effect, which is Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

And again that is currently not in effect and we will see what happens there.

But the one other Section, of course, that Arizona had to implement and that is also very prominent in California is Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

And we can talk about that a little bit more when we get to criteria which is one of our next slides.

But, again, Arizona and California both what is referred to generally in the lingo as voting rights states; whereas, a consultant you have to work with multiple other consultants, usually somebody who does a racially polarized voting analysis, definitely with voting rights Council.

And Haystaq in 2011 worked in Arizona with the preeminent scholar of racially polarized voting analysis, which is Gary King, who developed a lot of the methodologies that are still used by all other people that are doing RPV racially polarized voting analysis for Section 2.

And, of course, they also have worked with some very high powered attorneys on this.

For California we had a little bit of a challenge in that respect, but let me just give you the overview really quickly.

We had four maps, not just two. For California we have to draw 53 Congressional districts.

40 Senate districts.

80 assembly districts and four board of equalization districts.

Again, as I mentioned California, at the time was covered by Section 5, some of the counties were covered by Section 5, which affected our map, north and south, east and west.

And then, of course, we also have a lot of Section 2 districts, those are as you know generally found in areas where you have large minority populations, protected minority populations. And if you have ever been to Los Angeles for example, or you have looked at the demographics of California, you can see that there were a lot of areas where we had to consider Section 2 and then, in fact, implement Section 2.

And, again, the California Commission hired separate voting rights counsel and they hired an RPV analyst who did a lot of the data analysis.

This is also somebody who is now nationally known.

The problem that they had was with timing.

We actually did not have access to the racially polarized voting analysis when we first started drawing maps.

And, you know, kind of the nice thing about perhaps not being in the same round of redistricting is that, you know, when you first are an Independent Redistricting Commission is that you can look at the other ones and kind of learn from their mistakes

or, you know, learn from the lessons that they have learned and perhaps, you know, adapt accordingly.

But this is just all to say that both Haystaq and Q2, we have been through the ringer. We have worked with Commissioners and we have come out on top.

And if you are looking at the reviews for both of these Redistricting Commissions, you see that they are both pretty highly praised for the work that they were able to conduct. And it was hard work.

It was a lot of work.

But, you know, people pulled together.

It's all about collaboration.

It's about bringing in knowledgeable people.

And, you know, just helping out wherever you can.

And bringing all of your skills to the table and then this process actually works.

And sometimes you can even have a little fun in the process.

So the results, again, for Section 5, we talk about preclearance.

We were able to gain preclearance on the first attempt.

I don't want to say that this was just because of Q2 and Haystaq; but, of course, it helps to have good consultants. You know, again it's a group effort.

You need attorneys.

You need a good RPV analysis. And you need good line drawers.

There was a successful legal defense. Also for California, there is a built in period of time when people can challenge the maps.

The maps were challenged.

It was not a big deal. The courts look at it and said they there is nothing here.

Please move on.

These are good maps.

All of the maps were upheld.

And this, of course, was a really big deal in particular in Arizona where they had spent so much money in the decade before on, you know, legal fees and just, you know, in and out of Court and hiring a lot of consultants to make their cases.

And, again, just a point to make here is that choose your consultants wisely. And, you know, they may be able to help you avoid some of these issues.

So all of the maps in both states are still in place.

And, yeah, and they worked pretty well for both states. So let's go to the next slide, Andrew.

Thank you so much.

We thought it might be helpful to maybe look at your criteria a little bit.

And talk about how we can assist you and how we can work with you on implementing them.

So every state, of course, must abide by the first two criteria.



And that is equal population.

And then you should also, of course, comply with the Voting Rights Act. I just talked about this a little bit, and then other Federal laws.

And then districts shall be geographically contiguous. So essentially in one piece. And it may sound pretty straightforward, but if I learned one thing in my career as a redistricting consultant, it is that there is really nothing straightforward about redistricting or redistricting criteria.

There is always some ambiguity.

There is case law.

There are, you know, different ways to look at it, to implement it.

And even contiguity, of course, is something that can be debated and papers have been written on those criteria.

And I've given whole presentations on these criteria.

So island areas in the Michigan Constitution are considered to be contiguous by land to the county of which they are a part.

And that is, of course, really helpful to you because you don't have to grapple with what do I do with these islands and where do I stick them in.

All you have to know is that you have a county that these islands belong to.

In other jurisdictions it may not be that simple.

There are contiguity criteria that have to do with, you know, can you walk across a particular area when it's low tide and then it's perhaps contiguous or can you take a boat from one island to the other.

So luckily you don't have to deal with that, but it gets interesting pretty quickly.

The additional criteria that you have in Michigan, and this is something that I am personally very excited about, is that your next criteria, which is communities of interest. So you have districts shall reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest.

And from my research it looks as if your state ranks communities of interest really higher.

It places more importance on communities of interest than any other jurisdiction that I have seen.

And I'm saying that I'm excited about it because I've literally spent 90% of my career working on that criteria.

You know, academically I started working on communities of interest in 1997. As a lead up to my Masters, when I was in the Ph.D. program at UC Berkeley. And I did a study of my neighborhood and the neighborhood surrounding it to figure out what communities of interest actually are.

And from then on have helped jurisdictions, you know, implement that criterion. I have literally trained probably thousands and thousands of people over the years on communities of interest, worked with community groups on it.

You know, what is it, what is it not.

This community of interest criterion that you have is very broad.

And thus, of course, open to interpretation.

And, you know, but that gives you an incredible opportunity really to bring in people that can tell you stories about their neighborhoods. And I don't mean stories dismissively. I mean, that this is a qualitative way to look at districts above and beyond what you are getting from census data or from other data sources.

So I know you have probably heard Commissioner Baraba perhaps from California talk about how they found a population that nobody really knew about on the Commission when that Commission went out and started to talk to people. You know, it was a seat population up in Northern California and they were asking for representation.

And I am almost sure that when you are out there and you are talking to people under communities of interest, you will have the same experience. And that, of course, can help you shape your district in particular since your criteria are ranked as they are in California.

So this is a -- this criterion has a lot of prominence and a lot of importance and we are here to help you implement that as you see fit.

You would have access, of course, to our expertise. And, again, I would be very excited personally to work with you on this.

The next criterion is consideration of city and township boundaries.

That one is generally pretty straightforward. It just requires you have the particular data sets available.

They are generally available as part of the census data you are getting.

I also have worked with some people in your state on redistricting data sets.

In fact, and know that you have some very qualified people that know a lot about these particular, you know, geographies. And there is definitely a lot of experience in your state already that can be accessed.

Compactness.

Again, one of those criteria where you have to figure out which standards you use. And, you know, any redistricting software that you use will have various measures of compactness in it already.

And all of us have a lot of experience in providing compactness measures and telling you about them like what are the differences? What are we really looking at? Why does it matter? How does it matter? How does it refer to the other criteria?

And that is kind of the interesting thing about redistricting, also is that you have all of these different bodies of, you know, research. And the field kind of progresses a little bit. And the key is to make sure that they all mesh together in a way that you will then have a very good map.

The best map you can possibly draw.

And that you can all agree on.

And that is legal.

So let's go to the next slide, please.

Thank you, Andrew.

So your Constitution also specifies, of course, what you shall not do.

And that, again, is an interesting one.

And it's helpful. It's helpful to know what you can and cannot do.

You shall not provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party.

And you shall not favor or disfavor an incumbent. This is one of those things that you probably have to talk about.

How you are going to implement this.

You know, some Commissions they say, okay, well, if we are not supposed to favor or disfavor an incumbent, perhaps we should not look at incumbent data at all. And perhaps we should not know about this.

But this is something you will figure out as you go along with assistance, hopefully our team, and definitely legal counsel.

So looking forward to the days ahead.

Next slide, please.

We wanted to talk to you a little bit about how we are definitely qualified in supporting a lot of maps.

And we have a lot of experience supporting a lot of maps.

With this redistricting cycle, things have really changed from 2011 in that there is so much software now available.

There are so many more groups out on the ground that are helping people access the redistricting process that even if you were to say we are not going to make any software available, which, of course, you're not; but there would be software available. Because there are, you know, there is people out there that have started, you know, ten or more years ago as private projects to start to design redistricting software.

And these packages are out there.

Some of them are open source.

Some of them are not.

It basically runs the gamut. And I know Andrew is going to talk about software a little more.

The point that I'm trying to make with this particular slide is we are very well qualified to take as many maps as will come your way and help you process them.

And it does not necessarily mean that these are all maps that are coming directly from the Commission.

You have this one sentence in your Constitution that says: Each commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of district to the full Commission for consideration.

That is something that I'm assuming you will all talk about, what does that mean?

Does that mean you're drawing your own map?

Does that mean that the proposed plan is something that somebody else has submitted? Is it a collaborative map?

Is it something that you have drawn in public?

What is that proposed plan?

But in theory the way that we did our map is that we could have potentially 13 Commissioners with separate maps.

So times three map types. And up to 39 maps just coming from the Commission.

And we are very well qualified to help you through this, to figure out how to, you know, evaluate these maps, how to compare them.

And, you know, just help you through that.

And then, of course, Andrew said 100 maps, hundreds of maps from communities of interest in public.

I would say, we were talking about this yesterday, I would say there is a potential of thousands of maps from communities of interest and the public.

And part of that is that community of interest maps, they are, in a perfect world, very, very easy to submit.

They could be a neighborhood.

They could be very small, just a few little, you know, areas maybe an area around a school or so.

Maybe an area around a park.

So they take very little time really to construct and then to submit.

So it's easier for people to just send those your way and say, hey, this is my community. This is why it's a community. And this is why I'd like you to keep it together.

So all of these items, all of these geographies will come your way.

And we are very happy to help you process them and deal with them.

On communities of interest, just a little bit more because, again, it's my favorite criterion.

We would advise that you offer multiple avenues to provide input. And I'm sure you have thought about this already.

I mean, a lot of public testimony will very likely not be received in public hearings. You know, our experience holds if it holds, you know, we will see a lot of people that are participating with you that are not necessarily comfortable or able to speak in public.

Of course, people are now watching, so this is the genius of, you know, the Internet and being able to broadcast these meetings live so people know what is going on. And they may want you to know what they are thinking, but may just not feel comfortable to, you know, log in and give you a public comment and speak in public.

So we think that there should be a variety of tools available, and we would urge you to, you know, make every which way you can think of, collectively think of available to accept public testimony, you know, be that snail mail, be that sending an e-mail, calling somebody, and so forth.

So the -- during the meetings, just to go to the actual public input meetings, what is important is that whatever communities of interest are submitted, and have been submitted, that they actually are available to you.

So this is something where you also have to have a consulting team that is, A, you know, very used to collaborating with your staff and with other consultants.

And but also that collaborates with you to make sure that you actually have access to these communities of interest. Because, again, it is a very important criterion. And, you know, for a lot of districts, it will probably what we call drive your map. It will make you make some decisions.

And let you know which way to move with the map.

So one of the things that makes a meeting go a little bit quicker is if you put, for example, ask presenters to preidentify if they have, you know, submitted a community of interest before. So that then the line drawers or your consultants can pull up that community of interest and you are looking at it on a screen and you can figure out, you know, really where is it. You can look at it. And then they can describe it so that there is no fumbling around and trying to figure out what the testimony is.

So there is some things where you can kind of front load some of these, you know, the administration and the flow of these meetings to make things go a little bit smoother and to save some time in your meetings.

And, also, Commissioners could request the communities of interest or, in fact, any map be loaded in advance for a specific area.

So if you know you are working on a particular area, you know, the communication, again, and the collaboration with the line drawers and the consulting team is such that, you know, you let us know, we pull it up, we have things ready to go, whatever measures you would like to look at, whatever, you know, geography you would like to look at. That is just, again, a way to save time and make these meetings, you know, go a little bit smoother for everybody.

And then, finally, what is really helpful is if you get a lot of community of interest input, which you very well may, for the consulting team to put together a statewide map that perhaps has some pins in there so you can see where you have had submissions for communities of interest.

There is a visual reference there at that point so you know where, perhaps, you want to focus more public outreach, where you perhaps want to bring in some more speakers, or perhaps where you would like to look at some other data sources.

So there are various ways that we can work with you to make that happen, to bring literally, put the place on the map.

So next slide, please. Thank you so much.

Just a little summary of where we see, you know, our collaboration here. We are very conscious of the fact that we would be your consultants and your line drawers, and that we are not here to make decisions.

So, please, whatever you hear from us, these are suggestions. We are telling you what has worked in the past and what we know. That doesn't mean that this is, you know, what you need to agree with. Again, you should see us as a reference and as a resource. And as people that will do work for you.

We understand that it's you who makes decisions and not us. And that's pretty important. And I think that is also pretty unique for people that work with, you know, Independent Redistricting Commissions is that, A, they are, you know, used to working in public. And, B, we really understand what this all means. You know, and how these collaborations really work.

So you will provide the direction. You make the decisions. You know, synthesizing public input. And, you know, poise, this is something we can help you with. You give the direction once you have seen that. You consider the institutional criteria most likely with your attorneys. And then you create the commissioner drawn maps, of course. You request information and data from us. And we will provide it. And then you seek and act on legal advice, Of course.

And then for us we facilitate commissioner map drawing, if that is what you desire. You know, we will clear your technical obstacles, provide training. And that is a really important one for everybody just to make sure that everybody is communicating from the same, you know, knowledge base. And it just levels the playing field essentially, and not just for you but also for the public.

You know technical expertise, again, advice on issues. Documentation is incredibly important.

This is something that you saw in Arizona as well as in California the last time. Where, you know, if you do go to Court, documentation is what you want, what your attorneys will want. And if you have a well set up documentation system in place, it will make things go a lot smoother.

Also, just if you're not going to Court, you know, if you have to write a report, Just to know what you did when and why.

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

We are available to present alternatives and options.

Reconciling combined maps, which sounds a little easier than it is.

But we are very well equipped to do that. And, of course, working with VRA counsel, Voting Rights Act counsel, whoever that may be.

Both Haystaq and Q2, we have worked with some of the, you know, best known voting rights attorneys and also voting rights advocacy groups in the country. So there is -- it's not going to be a challenge for us to come up to speed and work with them successfully.

And then, of course, reporting.

Capturing and categorizing public input.

Drawing under your direction. Again, that is really important.

And then drawing live and in public whenever desired.

You have probably heard that both Arizona and California drew their maps live and in public.

We did do some work outside of the public meetings with small subcommittees just to work on some of the technical issues. Or, you know, figure out some visualizations that should be presented in the full meeting.

But essentially, we are very unique in, you know, wanting to and supporting live line drawing.

This is one of those things that most redistricting consultants just really don't like.

Because essentially everybody is looking over your shoulder.

And we really believe that that is the essence of, you know, a public process.

If you want to draw live and in public, we are there for you. And we are very happy to do it and we embrace that.

Next slide, please, Andrew.

So I'm just about to wrap up. One more, thank you.

So just a little bit about transparency. And I'm going to wrap up here really quickly because I'm cutting into my colleague's time.

Really just to say one more time, we welcome transparency. And transparency is what makes a Commission-based redistricting process different from others.

So I note there are Commissions that call themselves Commissions, that really are not Independent Redistricting Commissions.

You know, a Commission that is made up of elected officials is really not necessarily one that operates under the full transparency spectrum that you are, you know, operating under.

I mean, you are making history.

And everybody is watching you.

And Haystaq and Q2 we are very used to that.

And we would be very happy to make history with you and help you, you know, get this process done successfully.

We really believe in public access.

And we encourage input from all communities of interest.

We've done a lot of work on this.

I actually helped codesign a community of interest tool for California recently.

So I have quite a bit of experience on that one.

Again, live map drawing is available.

And we are happy to do that and implement that for you.

There are snapshots that we can take of everything that we do.

Essentially every time we move a bloc and I know Andrew is going to talk about that a little bit more, these are features in all of the big software packages that are out there. And then, again, making public all of the approved data and the work product that is something we have no problem with.

And we encourage it.

We have a history of collaboration, ask anyone. We are known for our collaborative processes.

And that has worked very well in this particular sphere.

So, also, just very quickly before Andrew takes over, I did want to highlight our history of nonpartisan work. Again, Andrew mentioned the redistricting data hub is really a revolutionary project that attempts to make redistricting data available for every state. Not everybody is as transparent and accessible as Michigan.

And/or California.

There are, you know, redistricting data are hard to come by if you are a regular member of the public or perhaps a group that would like to participate.

So this is definitely a very, you know, nonpartisan, wide ranging project that I'm also part of as a steering committee member.

And then, of course, California statewide database, if I put my other hat on, this is a project that I have directed since the early '90s, that was the first longitudinal redistricting database.

It's public.

It's free of charge.

Take a look at it any time.

24/7 everybody has the same data, so we are not arguing about who has better data.

In California everybody uses the same data.

So that is, of course, what fed into the idea of the redistricting data hub, also.

I am the liaison to the Census Bureau for the State of California for the redistricting data and voting rights projector office.

And I have held that particular position for the last, you know, two, three rounds of redistricting.

I also implemented the geography programs for the census in the State of California, which are the bloc boundary suggestion program and also the school district review program.



So I have a lot of experience with the census as do the Haystaq people, you know, mine is a direct relationship with these guys and it's been very successful.

I also serve on the elections and redistricting standing committee for the national conference of state legislatures, where also just literally wrote part of a book on Commissions in their redistricting law 2020 publication.

So I had a long working relationship with the NCSL. I have taught a lot of classes for them and courses and have served on a lot of panels, and usually related to redistricting data and to, you know, redistricting criteria and Redistricting Commissions.

And then, finally, I think, you know, our nonpartisan work can also be seen in the fact that we have published in peer reviewed journals.

You know, election law journal or in other publications. So this is something that we have a history in doing.

And, again, we have collaborated with other academics and the top minds in this particular field.

And with that I thank you very much for your attention. And I will move it over to my colleague, Andrew.

>> Andrew: Thank you very much, Karin. And next we wanted to talk about the software. And this is something we will give you a little bit of a demonstration and show you what is out there.

But I think we wanted to start off with I know the other firm who submitted a proposal talked a lot about Autobound.

And we frankly don't care.

We are software agnostic, and this is really a decision up to the Commission.

We have used Autobound in our proposal.

We happen to talk about the other leading software and redistricting, Maptitude. And both are industry leaders and have a lot of similar features. And I think the key thing is, you know, we would be happy to walk through in a more depth if we are selected to sort of weigh the pros and cons of using each of the different software.

But, in short, like Maptitude pricing, what we provided for the line drawers is, you know, to use the desktop version.

And we can use -- it's, you know, it allows us to work with a lot of different files.

I will talk about some of the other public software that is out there, mapping software, that how we can bring that in easily.

They have standard reporting measures.

Easy to screen share for live drawing.

I think that is a really important thing.

Given that we are currently in a virtual state, being able to see this in a clear manner is very important.

And while we talked about option to have a version of Maptitude online for all the Commissioners, there was, I know, some desire that some of the Commissioners may want their own desktop versions, that is definitely available.

That is what we did in Arizona.

That is something that we would not only help facilitate but also load up and make sure that everybody understands and is trained well on this.

So that's something that we can do.

That is the only thing I just wanted to flag that wasn't built in.

We built in a license for the Commission.

So if the other Commissioners, each of you wanted, you know, Maptitude did say they would do the 13 licenses for a total of \$48,000. So we already built in 4,000 for one license, so it would be an additional \$44,000.

One last thing on Autobound is, you know, they whatever pricing that they gave to the Commission and the EDS proposal, they did note to me that they would honor that for us, for us as well. So that is something that is something that is a commercial product that is out there.

Again, you guys are the bosses.

We can come with recommendations, but this is just something that we wanted to touch upon.

Just real quick on Autobound, they have a custom display to focus on the most pertinent mapping fields. So this is just a quick load up of screen shots that we had. Over here on the left you can select and you can draw by census blocks and census track, town, county, et cetera.

And, you know, just and then as you're drawing, they have this, you know, you can examine what the changes are on the lines.

So you can see the counties selected and the total population.

The ideal population, you know, currently for a U.S. Congressional seat based off of the 2010 census is 760. So you can see where the deviation is.

And there is just a wealth of information that you can continually look at as you're going along.

And this is -- also on the top it has additional information on some compactness measures.

I know that is one of your lower criterias, but something that is still is something you can look at.

So there is a lot of different information that's available on the desktop version.

And then, finally, just different geographies. So here you have a part of Michigan where you can see, you know, if you wanted to Zoom in and change it as we are going forward, it's something that we can add in layers to see, you know, based on what you would want to look at.

If it's just a regular map, if it's a satellite image, et cetera.

You guys have a lot of control about that.

And then, finally, you know, as we talked about the built in reporting, here is -- there is, you know, 20, 30, almost 30 different reports that are built in automatically in Maptitude.

There is a lot of reporting features in Autobound, too.

Again, a lot of similarities between the too. And this is something. And Kent will talk about some of the custom reporting that we have done for previous Commission in the past in Arizona and just talk about what we did there.

And this is an Maptitude online.

This is the software that we built in in the pricing and proposed that each of the Commissioners take -- you know, are allowed to, you know, so you can draw and you can play around and you can, you know, import partial maps, you know, on this. And I just want to take a second here and just do a live demonstration with what they have.

So just going to go here.

And, of course, it does not work on the first time. Okay. So what you have, I did a quick just a map. And I will quickly show you and open this.

It's a Senate map.

And here you see the State of Michigan.

And this is what each of you would have.

This is currently, again, if you wanted the desktop version, that is something we can provide.

But the online version has a lot of data behind it and it's extremely powerful.

One key thing is we did use this in the State of Arizona and did numerous trainings for the public, and so it was well received.

It was well used.

We had over two -- I think over 200 maps that were submitted. And this is just at the beginning of mapping.

I'm going to talk about some other public software that is out there as well.

So if we wanted to go in, I created one district down there. And if we want to look at that a little bit closer, I will zoom in here.

This is the district that we have.

If you wanted to say, all right, this district looks good. And what we are going to do is we are going to create a new district.

So if you go up to the upper right, you have the ability to say, all right, do we want to add to one or do we want to create a new district?

Going to create a new district and then where do we want to take it?

Do we want to take it from the entire state, which would include the one that I did prior to this or do we want to take it from the unassigned?

Unassigned is all the data, all other individuals in the state that currently don't have a field.

Now we are in a place where we are going to start -- where we can start drawing. And you have a couple different selections. You can do it by census bloc. You can do it by voting district. Or you can do it by county.

I'm just going to quick start with county just to show you how we can do this. And going to select. And you start over here on the left, you are going to see your changes. So you can see the population of this, of the county that I just added in is 112,000.

The ideal value is 260.

So we are off by 148. And we are going to add in another county. So now we are getting closer. And we will add in another county. And this allows you to see that now we have three counties in.

We are still a little short. And let's add in another county. As we add it in, so we are over. And what we are going to do is we are going to take that county and all you need to do is select on that county and it takes it out.

This allows you to say, all right, now we want to start adding in people to get to the, you know, we are still short 56,000.

And so we can start clicking on voter, voting districts.

This is, you know, you can add them in one at a time.

You can see that we are getting closer.

They have the ability where you can draw and add in a number of voting districts quickly. And that allows you to, you know, add it in. And you can see that we are adding in and we are getting closer to the number.

So you can see this is very easy to do.

Add in, take out. And then you can see all the reporting over here. This is something, something that it has layers of information.

Over on the left side, you can see the district. You can see, again, it gives you in another viewpoint, so there is a lot of different options that you can do here.

So if we are close. And you said, all right, we are close with this, we wanted to save this, you can hit the save button. And then you will say what do you want to assign it? District two.

And you can say Senate two and then you're set.

So now you have two districts done.

So this is just one thing that I wanted to quick show you.

Going back to how this can be used for a community of interest.

We will go back here.

We will say we want to do a new plan.

We are going to take a Senate empty.

And we are going to create.

And my sister-in-law is from Blissfield, so we will use her hometown as just a quick example.

And call in the Blissfield map.

And then when you are in the state, you are going to see, we are going to be on the bigger part. But to find Blissfield or any address quickly, we can come down to here and type in Blissfield and it's going to quickly go to Blissfield, Michigan.

So once we found it, we can say, all right, we are going to create a new district.

We are going to -- the source is going to be from everything.

We are unassigned. And then you can say, all right, we are just going to draw, let me just change this down to here, we are just going to draw a line around Blissfield. And then what you have is -- and if you do something like that you can clear it.

We are going to quickly do this again.

Sorry. I did the census blocks, not these, so one more time.

We are going to do census blocks and do -- there we have a better view of Blissfield.

So you can say, all right, this is set.

We are going to save this.

We are going to call this the Blissfield community of interest.

And once that is saved, anybody can view that so they don't have to draw an entire. Then you can share the plan.

So we are going to call this Blissfield.

And it allows you to share.

Then if you wanted to submit to the Commission, all this can come in.

So you can say, please, Blissfield was chopped into two districts last time. Please keep whole.

So that gives you a quick example of how you can do it.

And then add your information and then submit it.

So this is just a quick thing that we wanted to show before getting back to the presentation.

And going back to the presentation, a few more slides here that I just wanted to go through is part of the redistricting data hub. Karin mentioned there is a lot of information, a lot of free tools out there.

We have been working with a lot of these tools as part of the redistricting data hub. So they have the information. And they have been using our data that we have had. So you have Dave's redistricting app. And over on the right hand side you have an example of Dave's.

You have district builder.

You have district R.

Representable is a really neat tool that is out there that really focuses on the communities of interest. And all of these we have been working with. And individual groups that are using these, they can submit them back to us.

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 we can ingest them into the map, so we can show the Commission of what people are wanting.

And then, finally, just a screen shot of the redistricting data hub.

What we are doing and pulling together all the data.

Just a few more slides here before I turn it over to Ken. One, I just wanted to talk about, we have given a lot of thought to COVID-19 and understand that for the time being that the meetings are going to be virtual.

We have plans in place to make sure that we have backup line drawers in case anybody unfortunately would get sick, that we have a plan in place to deal with that. We are used to online presentations and trainings.

We have done a lot of these.

Just not over the last year, but we have done a lot of these virtually. Everything that I did in Arizona for training on the Maptitude online software was virtual and had, you know, a number of people, Arizonians come to those trainings.

And then we also have, if in person becomes possible, we would love to sit in a room with you and sort of have a better collaboration. And we have Midwest, both the line drawer based in Michigan and the Midwest.

Just talking about the team, today you have Karin, myself, and Kent who will be the core of this project and really leading the team. And then we have four mappers. Jaime, Willie, John. And Brad. And each of them have a lot of experience in terms of what they have been done.

They are going to be working closely with Karin and Kent. And we have a support team Sue and Adriana. And this is a bipartisan team. We have republicans. We have nonpartisan.

We have democrats. So this is something I just wanted to highlight that as well.

And then just wanted to visually show where we are all located.

We are located around the United States.

You can see we have people in the Midwest, of course, Michigan.

But I've heard a comment that we are D.C. based. And, yes, the firm is based in D.C.; but the team that you just saw is -- lives in -- live in these states.

And I will now turn it over to Kent.

Thank you.

>> Kent: Thank you, Andrew.

So redistricting is all about data.

And we are a big data company, so we are very comfortable dealing with huge data sets.

Basically there is two types of data.

The geographic data and the numeric data that goes on top of that geographic data the Tiger lines were unfortunately drawn up ahead of time before COVID and other issues

that delayed when census came in. So things like what a census block is which in an urban area that is pretty much a city block.

In more rural areas, the census defines it as anything that is bounded by flow identifiable features. So it could be a road, a stream, a mountain range, or a power line, or something that allows you to define the smallest possible geography. Everything else in the census is built up with census blocks. So a block group, a tract, a minor simple division, a voting tabulation district, you know, otherwise known as increasing the ward.

And even on up to counties.

Now, so, fortunately, that data is out. So we are able to begin drawing with the correct geography that is going to be the 2020 Tiger line files.

What is not out yet is the population data.

And everyone has heard the term EL 94,171, that is basically the population count. That is what has been delayed.

And we are going to talk a little bit about, you know, our ability to use population estimates to do draft maps while we're waiting for that data to come out.

There are a number of commercially available population estimates out there.

We have also generated our own based on the ACS, American Community Survey, which is a rolling survey generated by the census.

We then disaggregate to the block level so we are able to take our population projections, disaggregate to a census block.

And one step we take that I think is really important is we match it up to voter files, so we are able to see how many people registered for voting in an area.

When population changes happen and very often it's not an existing city block with population ten years ago where people are moving in, it's brand new areas that are built up. So an area that might have been a corn field ten years ago is now a subdivision.

Or conversely an area that was populated or maybe bulldozed and no one is there.

So we are able to look based on voter file registration and geo coding those addresses to tell where those people are to make sure that when we are talking the census population projections, we are disaggregating them to the correct 2020 census blocks.

Andrew mentioned some of the other external data that we are able to use in the mapping software.

Satellite imagery we found to be very useful.

So people can actually see things like, you know, what water features or mountain ranges.

And in urban areas you can zoom in and actually say, okay, that is this particular school or this particular neighborhood center.

The software we use and all the major software can export to KMX files which can be loaded directly into Google maps. So anyone with access to a web browser can take a

map that has been exported from one of the Commission's plans, load it up in Google maps, and zoom in and have the satellite view on in order to see those familiar features.

Another type of custom data that we are able to add that is of specific interest I think in Michigan, Michigan, of course, has a significant Arab population, which is not one of the major categories tabulated in the EL 94171 data.

We do have access to commercial database that have a probable origin.

And we have internally built surname and first name look-up tables that give the percent likelihood of someone being Arab or Persian origin. So we are able to provide that as a supplemental dataset, just as another way of adding more context to particular districts that you're drawing in those areas.

Next slide.

So dealing with census delays.

So, you know, this is something where, you know, your legal counsel is going to have to advise you on what exactly you do.

Where we have, you know, some mutually exclusive facts that the Constitution calls for the plans to be released on September 17th. And the census is telling us the data is not going to be available until the 30th.

I would suggest using population projections and the ACS data in order to get draft maps, which, although they won't be exact, they will be fairly close.

And, generally speaking, people like to do a -- draw draft maps ahead of time and get consensus on the basic contours of a plan.

And then zero out the population.

And for Congressional districts where the requirement is the population has to be as close to zero as possible, that step can happen after the final PL data is released.

But a lot of work can be done ahead of time.

Especially with the voting rights districts where, you know, there is available the CVAP, the citizen voting age population up through the Arabic community survey. And most Commissions prefer to start with the voting rights districts.

Because it's important to get those right first and then build out in the state beyond that.

And then with all of this that I discussed, we can move very quickly once the final data comes out in zeroing out the final maps.

Andrew touched a little bit on training.

And I think this is very important, making sure that not just the Commission but also the public are -- have access to the mapping tools. And access means, you know, not just having software available but knowing how to use it.

How we have done it in the past, and what I recommend doing here, is dedicating time during a Commission meeting to doing a live training where we would walk through exactly how to use the mapping tool selected.

That would be recorded.



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 it would be available online to anyone who was not able to attend the meeting when it was happening.

We would also be available to do one-on-one trainings with any of the Commissioners who wanted to get more detail on some of the more advanced features of the software. And we can work with the Commissioners to load any customized datasets that we produced and they would want on their individual computers.

The -- and then aside from training for the mapping software, I think it's important to have training about the redistricting process in general.

It's very easy to, you know, fan up emotions about redistricting and say, you know, look at this map.

It's obviously gerrymandered because the districts are, you know, oddly shaped.

But then maybe you bring up a water feature and show, okay, this is following a stream.

And, of course, the stream doesn't have a straight line, so that is why you know that district was, you know, has that kind of shape.

We found it useful to do a training sessions on things like measures of compactness. Understanding that the census data and how we implement Voting Rights Act analysis and making sure there is no retrogression in the ability of a minority community to select their candidate of choice in voting rights districts.

Compactness is a -- just touching on compactness one more time.

People have an intuitive sense like, hey, I know what a compact district looks like. But when they load up the redistricting software, they are sometimes surprised to see there are dozens of different measures of compactness.

Under a lot the mathematically most compact shape is a perfect circle. But, of course, you can't fill an entire state with perfect circles because they don't nest together. So we are able to go through and show up on the screen, you know, how different districts fair under different measures of compactness.

In the past we have generally produced reports showing multiple different measures of compactness.

So people are able to see how the districts compare in general without any, you know, worrying on the part of the public that, you know, the Commission has chosen one particular measure because it favors a particular favor client.

Okay. So working with legal counsel and the voting rights experts.

So, you know, we are pleased to see in the RFP that the Commission plans to hire an outside voting rights consultant.

Although we have extensive experience in running ecological regression and ecological inference analysis.

We did that, you know, for Arizona. We find it is useful to work with an academic outside expert to sort of provide a neutral stamp of approval.

You know, when inevitably this ends up going to Court.

So we are able to say it's not just, you know, we are saying the districts we drew were good; but that, you know, an outside set of eyes with academic credentials looked at it and approved.

And, that said, we generally do the legwork for providing this data.

One of the most important things is matching election results.

If we are going to do the racial bloc voting analysis, we need to have very accurate results match back to census geography on the bloc level. We have to go through the process of disaggregating election results to the blocks and reaggravating to the new voting tabulation districts because the districts very often change.

In fact, they often change mid-decade.

In theory, local voting districts are supposed to be frozen in preparation for the census, but that is a custom or honored, reached in observance. And we very often found, when we go and look at election results, that things can happen.

You know, that the lines can change.

Even the numbering can change.

We have often had to go in and cleanup datasets where someone thought they had a perfectly clean dataset because they matched in the precinct numbers. And they did not realize that mid-decade the precincts were renumbered. So election results were being attributed to the entirely wrong geography.

From what we heard, Michigan is lucky to have fairly good election data available. But it's definitely something where we do extensive quality control and then do the disaggregation where we are able to say this precinct has perhaps a hundred census blacks and the block has X percent of the voting age population. So we disaggregate most of the blocks and then we are able to reaggravate them to the new geography that would be used for the voting rights analysis.

And I know Karin and Andrew have mentioned this, but we are very proud of the fact that, you know, we achieved preclearance in California and Arizona.

And that we withstood Court challenges.

This saves a huge amount of money for the citizens of the states involved.

Not only did the states not have to be fighting for cases throughout the decade as in Arizona was the case a decade before.

But also municipalities are not having to continuously update their lines and inform people of their new districts.

So there is a huge cost saving involved in being able to, you know, get it right, get it right the first time and withstand Court challenges.

Public meeting participation.

So we would plan to have staff covering each public meeting.

We can preidentify geography. So if there is things like someone has submitted a community of interest, we can load that up on mapping software so that it's available to the Commissioners ahead of time.

And we want to make sure that there is access.

I mentioned before that we need the training in addition to just saying the software is available.

Karin likes to talk about the five As of technology access. Availability, affordability, awareness, abilities, and agencies. So we need to make sure all those are covered. And I believe with the online version of whichever software is available, and available at no cost for the more software selected, that that covers the availability and affordability.

Awareness I think would be part of the public training. And, you know, where in Commission meetings we are able to show how this software can be used.

So here is an example of public line drawing.

This is from Arizona.

It's kind of hard to see in this picture.

It's a fuzzy picture.

It's a screen from a live stream of one of the meetings. So it's hard to tell. But that is Willie from the team and one of the mappers assigned to Michigan if we are fortunate enough to work with you.

And he had his laptop in the meeting. And it was projected on the screen there so Commissioners could say, you know, okay, move that block you know from District A to District B.

We will do it and people will be able to see the changes live as it happens.

Also in the live stream there was the picture directly of the laptop screen. So people could see it more clearly in the public.

I think that helps create trust on the part of the public that there is, you know, if it's, you know, okay, someone went to a, you know, a back room somewhere, drew some maps, and here are the maps.

It's a lot easier for people to be mistrustful than if they actually see the process happening live and hear the debate and have people, you know, doing a little bit of trial and error. Okay, I tried putting this community in and we are over population, and, you know, understanding the rationale that went into those different decisions.

Reporting. So I think this is very important.

I mentioned before how we are a big data company and we are very used to dealing with massive amounts of data.

But one of the things that we pride ourselves in is our ability to distill information and make it usable for our clients and users.

Turning from just an impressive reams and reams of numbers to something that is actually actionable.

And we try to do that in our reporting.

There are industry standard reports that come with any of the leading software packages.

Things like the various different measures of compactness.

Equal population.

Demographics.

Both the overall demographics, the voting age version.

Citizen voting age population, as I mentioned before, is a separate data set from the ACS we can load up.

Congruity, means and bounds descriptions, which some localities prefer to get plan descriptions that way. Others prefer block equivalency files or shape files, all of the software we use can handle any one of those formats.

But then there are also a lot of custom reports that we can do.

One good example, Karin mentioned how Michigan is, I believe, unique in defining contiguity for islands.

The census will say which islands are contiguous in a particular block, but Michigan has specific criteria about contiguity based on what county it's in. So we will program separate contiguity measures so that if the built in measure for some of the mapping software might think an island is not contiguous. And we can tell it, it was contiguous based on the Michigan Constitution.

The, let's see, I just want to make sure I'm keeping track of the versions of the reports, the reports that are here.

Okay. So this one is one that is up. We have it's a combined compactness and competitiveness report from Arizona.

So the compactness, we had three of the common measures of compactness. We worked through with the Commission, you know, dozens of different measures we could have used, and they selected the three that are most interested in, so we generated those with the plan.

And then we had a lot of repetitiveness for parks and fairness measures. So this is one of the things where it gets back to the concept of radical transparency in the process.

So if we had gone off and said, okay, we are going to come up with a custom black box index for partisanship of districts, there probably been a lot of suspicion that someone was putting their thumb on the scale and coming up with an index that would make one particular map look more fairer than another.

So what we did was he had an entirely open process. We worked with the Commissioners to say what elections they wanted included.

In fact, they decided part way through the process to go back further in time to include more elections.

You know, trying to find ones where democrats versus republicans did better or worse statewide.

So we are able to look at various different averages.

To see here we display actually nine different indexes based on the different elections that we were including.

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

I know the Constitution specifies parks in fairness using accepted measures, but it does not specify which measure. So that is something we are expert in calculating all of those and would work with Commission to provide any of the measures that you are interested in and would take directions from the Commission on which ones you actually wanted to use evaluating the maps.

The final slide I wanted to touch on is just data security.

We talked about a lot of the data that is involved.

There is public data and there is data that needs to be protected.

So the vast majority of this data is stuff that we want available to anyone and everyone who wants to be able to use it. Although some data needs to be protected, so proprietary data that contains PII, or personally identifiable information, we have to make sure that is properly protected.

We also need to make sure that even the public data cannot be accessed and changed.

You know, there has been a lot of discussion about the various plan versions. We need to make sure all of that is very secure,

That no one has the ability to hack in and change a plan, change the underlying data, et cetera.

We have a lot of experience in that.

We have secure VPNs.

We use authentication that requires a list of known IP addresses.

We use multi-factor authentication, so not only a password but a second device to give, you know, an ever changing ID number for logging in.

And we have gone through this with our work with multiple Fortune 500 companies. And have done data security audits on us to make sure that we pass all of the security requirements.

We also work a fair amount in the healthcare industry, which is covered by HIPAA, patient data privacy rules.

So we have to meet all of those standards. So we are very comfortable that we will be able to secure and protect the Commission's data.

I thank you very much for your time.

That concludes my section.

And we are open to questions.

>> Steve: Okay. We are at the end of the time that we have allotted for your presentation, Andrew.

And unless there is something else that you're dying to tell us, we would open it up for questions at this time.

>> We are open for questions.

>> Steve: Okay, who has questions?

Juanita?

>> Juanita: Mine is not so much as a question but I just wanted to make a comment that I was concerned about what he just said and he answered that about the data security.

I thought he did a great job because that was on the back of my mind when we heard the first proposal.

So I like what they said about the data security and how they take care of it.

>> Steve: Okay.

B>> Juanita: Just a comment.

>> Steve: Very good.

Doug.

>> Doug: Yes.

I would I'm going to ask the same question I asked to the other vendors.

You know we've got a bunch of different pieces and different people involved in this.

How do you perceive this being coordinated and who is the focal point and who is giving the direction as we move forward?

>> Andrew: Sure. I will start with that. And I will be the overall project manager for this.

So I will work directly with the Commission staff and as directed, the Commissioners. In terms of the project manager, it's going to be led by Karin who will, you know, work closely with the mappers and Kent will be playing a big role in the Michigan project as well.

I think a lot of it is, you know, one of the first things we would do if we were selected is sitting down and just writing out a more detailed plan of action in terms of checking, have regular check ins with the Commission staff to make sure that we are hitting objectives.

That, you know, if there is meetings that are planned, we have people at the meetings and basically making sure that, you know, we are servicing the needs of the Commissioners.

So that is the big overview answer of that.

>> Doug: Okay. And you would indicate to us what we should be doing step one, step two, step three and so forth and direct us in that manner.

>> Kent: I would jump in and say not direct but advise.

The Commission, you're the boss.

But I realize that, you know, we have done this a lot of cycles and this might be new to many of you. So if you have questions about how you suggest we start, we are more than willing to give advice on that.

But we would always take direction from the Commission.

And I would say also on just combining the data, we will come up with a naming convention.

It could be, you know, based on the date of a plan. It could be the Commission who initiated it. It could be some kind of anecdotal description, like try to keep this particular area together.

So that we will have different plan names that people can go back to.

We also have the ability to record snapshots of all the changes that happen in the plan so people can go back and say, okay, I remember two weeks ago we talked about this plan but now it's a little different. What happened and what was the rationale for that? And I have the ability to go back step by step through all those changes.

>> Karin: Perhaps I could add to this, also. You asked who should be the focal point, and that should not be us.

I mean, we don't believe that the consultant is the focal point for any of these processes. This is about you. You are the decision makers.

And we are there to help you implement the best possible process.

So, again, just like Andrew said, I think the first step would be to sit down to, you know, layout a more detailed project plan and figure out how we can work together as best possible as it fits your needs.

So thank you.

>> Doug: Okay. Thank you.

>> Steve: Who else has questions?

Janice.

>> Janice: Do you have a racial bloc voting expert?

>> Kent: So I guess I could be considered that as could Karin.

We have both done this analysis, the ecological and inference analysis and ecological regression and are very familiar with how to combining racial data and election data, including primary data. Because in many of these districts the ability to elect the minority community candidate of choice is demonstrated in the primary but rather than the general election.

That said, we applauded the Commission's decision to seek a separate voting rights expert.

That could be done late in the process.

But we do think it's a good idea to have an outside academic expert, so it's not just us. I can say we have run all this analysis on the plans that we are helping draw.

I think if this ends up in Court, which it is likely, I think we can, you know, work with you to draw plans that will withstand a Court challenge. But someone is going to challenge it, almost inevitably. And that there is an added level of credibility to say we have an outside academic expert who has looked at this data and blessed it.

>> Karin: To add from the Q2 side, we have had quite a few opportunities to do racially polarized voting analysis in California because California has its own Voting Rights Act.

So this isn't something that just happens every day for us because we also work with local jurisdictions.

Q2 does have a team member who has done extensive work on you know racial bloc voting who is an academic who is associated with a, you know, major University and has been through the ringer.

And, again, just like Kent said we have also worked with pretty much all of the experts that are out there.

So thank you for that question.

>> Steve: Anthony and then Rhonda.

>> Anthony: So I'll ask the same question I asked the other vendor as well.

You know your group has worked with other Redistricting Commissions in the past.

I do note that those have been Independent Redistricting Commissions.

But still the fact that you have worked on them in the past has a potential to introduce bias into the map drawing process so I'm wondering how you plan to combat this bias.

>> Kent: I'll jump in first and say the most important thing is transparency in the process.

And make all the data available, do as much of the line drawing as we can in public meetings.

Make sure people understand that the rationale behind the different decisions.

There is always going to be you know a lot of passion and sometimes some mistrust in the redistricting process.

And the more that can be done you know, in wide open light of day, the better it's going to be.

And I'm not naive enough to say that is going to eliminate all possible fear or mistrust but I think the more open the Commission and your consultants if we are fortunate to work with you the more open the better the process.

>> Karin: Let me take it from here and, Kent, and thank you for the question.

This is a super interesting question.

I was not listening to the last presentation, so I did not know you asked this.

So it's interesting because I think all Independent Redistricting Commissions are different.

And as people like you know my shop in particular, we specialize in working with Independent Redistricting Commissions.

On some level you actually start from scratch.

With each Commission because their criteria are different.

The whole environment, the setting is different.

You know Commissioners have different ideas how they want to run the process and you get really used to being very nimble and being willing to completely create a process from scratch and essentially coming in with a blank slate.

And just like Ken said, we have some experience of course that we can bring in.



But I think that is something that is unique about Commissions.

And as a consultant you have to be willing to do that.

You have to be willing to, you know, leave your expectations and whatever, you know, from the last process at the door. And I think we have shown that we are able to do that.

I mean, we have worked not just with the California Commission for San Diego. I mean, we have done some local, very high profile Commissions be that San Francisco, be that Escondido where we have to start from scratch.

Not just as somebody who has extensive experience with Independent Redistricting Commissions and setting up processes from scratch, but also really as an academic who has worked in a political field.

You know, because let's not kid ourselves, I do nonpartisan work but it's still a very political field, keeping biases at the door is something that I and also my colleagues are very used to.

Honestly, I would not have partnered with Haystaq if I did not think that they could do that.

And I know that for my team that is definitely something that we are used to.

And we are aware of that.

So thank you for that question.

Appreciate it.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I have a two-part question. And the first one is for verification. You said it would be additional 48,000 for all of us Commissioners to have a license, so that was not included in the proposal price, correct?

I just wanted to be clear on that.

>> Andrew: Correct. But it would be \$44,000 because we had one license there. And then in terms of adding the public feature onto Maptitude online, I called Maptitude and explained the situation and they included that in, so you have some competitiveness between the two mapping softwares, so that would not be an additional cost to open that to the public.

>> Rhonda: Okay. And then my second question: When you're talking about the maps and potentially having 13 Commissioners do at least three maps each, when I was going back through the RFP it was recommended, it's stated in the RFP the group did not recommend that Commissioners do individual maps. So I was just curious as to what was the reasoning for that, why it would not be recommended when it's kind of in our Constitution, if we can't come to a consensus that is one of the things we could do? So I just wanted to know what the reasoning was behind that.

>> Karin: I should probably take that because that is probably my fault that was in the proposal.

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, again, the proposal has suggestions, okay, and we are very happy to adopt to what you need to do and want to do. And I'm guessing some of the decisions you make you make with advice of counsel.

We have worked in this very transparent world with Redistricting Commissions and one of the demands that really come to Redistricting Commissions is this public transparency expectation.

So that the public knows how a map came in to being.

And if you are drawing a map by yourself and then you come in with a map and you are proposing it, that is a different process than if you have all sat in the same room and you kind of used us as the hands that put your ideas onto the map because that is something that everybody watched.

You know, so it's something that you have to weigh.

Our approach to this is if you think that that is what you want to do and you want to draw your own maps, we are here to support you.

We are here to help you learn the software, which, by the way, is not as easy as it sounds. Even though they all tell you it's super easy, it's actually not all that easy. I mean, I'm still struggling using Word Perfect sometimes.

It's definitely a little of an up-hill battle, so that is essentially why we put that in there.

It's in consideration of the transparency requirement of the demands you will probably face from the public.

And also it has to do with time.

Because with the census data delays you may have less time, you know, your period of time in which you can develop the maps may be much constrained. And I know you are still talking about deadlines and so forth to see what is going to happen.

So that is essentially why we put that in there and I hope that makes sense.

Please feel free to ask a follow-up question of me if I was not clear about that.

>> Ken: I would like to add it's possible to have a hybrid approach.

So, as Karin said, it helps to have trust in the process for maps to have been worked through in public hearings and get consensus with the Commission. But, perhaps, you know, individual Commissioners have preferences like around the edges of a particular map.

So there could be, you know, one or more maps that the Commission has worked through in public. And then the individual Commissioners do their particular tweaks and then make their case for, okay, this is my set of maps that I'm submitting. So not necessarily starting from scratch, although they certainly could.

So there can be a hybrid approach.

>> Steve: Sue?

>> Sue: So if there is a readily available public tool, is that easier to use?

And is that something the Commissions could use in lieu of everybody having the software?

>> Ken: So I will take that from a fairly technical point of view. The online mapping software has done a lot better in the last ten years. And I think for most cases it will work it as well as the desktop software.

If you are drawing on a census bloc level and we are trying to lasso an entire county of trying to assign every block in Wayne County, it would take a few minutes on an online as opposed to on the desktop. But most of the time you are going to be drawing on county minor sublitigation or voting district lines. And those are a lot quicker to assign and update.

So I think it's quite likely that the included online software will be sufficient to people's needs. But we did want to provide pricing if people decide that, you know, you want the full software package on individual laptops.

>> Andrew: And I think that is something, sorry, Karin, for jumping in, that is something we would really want to have a further conversation and just demonstrate some of the free tools that are out there. Because I know that they are very interested in getting their tools out there. So that is something we would definitely, if we were selected, I think that is -- we can do an evaluation and part of -- one of our first steps would be just walking you through each of the tools that are out there, that are available, and giving you the pros and cons of each of those tools and what data is behind them and what makes sense.

So that is definitely an option to use something. And that is why we priced out the Maptitude online version along with our individual license separately.  
So.

>> Karin: Yeah. On that note, if I may add, this is really a very interesting area because all of a sudden, we have all these tools available. And, of course, people have different, you know, experiences with technology.

So user friendliness for the public must be a very, you know, important topic to consider.

There is also a question about whether you make available one software that does community of interest input plus allows people to draw a district map.  
Or do you do it separately?

And, you know, you have options.  
And one option is the one software that we were talking about, Representable, they have focused on just making a community of interest tool available because that is most likely what most people are going to be interested in.  
You know, creating an entire district or an entire map is much more time consuming and actually requires a higher skill level.

So you have to have the time. And, you know, to, one, put in there and time available to do that.

So with a separate community of interest tool, all you do is, you know, do just a small area, you submit it and you are done.

You know, with a larger district, that's a different story.

But, again, like Andrew said, through redistricting hub, also through my experience, you know, in California and elsewhere, actually my team has looked at the usability of all these software packages over the last two years.

Because we are somewhat obsessed with the ability for the public to participate.

You know, which is probably pretty obvious to you right now,

That that is kind of where we are coming from.

And so usability and, you know, who can participate and languages and all of that is something that we have an enormous amount of experience and will be very happy to share with you.

>> Steve: Any others? Janice, were you raising your hand?

Okay.

Is that it?

Are we satisfied?

No other questions for this presentation?

Well, in that case I would like to thank the presenters, Andrew, it's Karin. How do you pronounce it, Karin?

>> Andrew: Yes.

>> Steve: Okay. And, Ken. Did I miss anybody?

I don't think so.

You guys did a wonderful job.

We appreciate it.

You probably generated more questions for us to think about and that we much appreciate it.

Thank you.

>> Ken: Thanks for your time and good talking to you.

>> Andrew: Thank you very much, good luck.

>> Steve: Good-bye.

>> Andrew: Good-bye.

>> Steve: Okay, we have a lot of time that we can take.

We have been at it. And I know there have been several people who have taken breaks. And I think given our status here let's take another ten minutes and come back. You might want to grab a bowl of soup or have a subway deliver or whatever you're going to do.

[ Recess ]

>> Steve: Is everybody back?

Okay, we are set then for discussion regarding the bids.

Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I wanted to mention something before we got into the discussion.

I talked to Dustin the other night, I called him and I wanted to understand better in their committee meetings whether they took a look at the software and understood the differences between the two softwares.

And they had not taken that approach.

They took the approach of going through the proposal responses instead.

So I did some research on the Internet.

I really couldn't find any comparisons of the two.

And I had a conversation with Matt Grossman yesterday and to get his opinion on what the differences were.

And his opinion was that both of these softwares are good.

Don't concentrate on the software because their functionality is basically the same.

Concentrate on vendors and the services that they are going to provide.

So I wanted to pass that along.

That that was his advice.

And from what I saw this morning, it appears to me that the softwares are very compatible.

In the functionality.

So I take his advice on that relative to dealing with you know what the vendors have to offer.

And I'll make some comments on that a little later.

I'll give the others an opportunities to talk about what they heard this morning.

>> Steve: Okay. Brittini, would you help us with the discussion, please?

>> Brittini: Absolutely. Dustin you have a hand.

>> Dustin: Yep. I wanted to give new before we get into the discussions, new prices that I was able to calculate.

So for Election Data Services it would still be \$989,000 with travel. \$949,000 without travel, that takes into account the licenses that they were already bringing to the table for each and every one of us.

Haystaq now becomes \$977,368 without travel.

So they are slightly cheaper now on the without travel side of things.

However, and I added it to the overall cost with travel and I rounded it up by \$2000 to get \$1,050,000 total for them. So without travel Haystaq would be cheaper. With travel Election Data Services would be cheaper. So just something to keep in mind.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Dustin.

Anyone else want to share their thoughts?

Oh, Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I do have thoughts I want to share, but I have a quick question for Dustin. He just ran those numbers.

Would that not if we added the additional licenses, would that not make Haystaq cost more than EDS without travel? Wouldn't that put it \$977,368 with additional licenses where EDS would have been 949, correct?

>> Dustin: Well, yeah. So without travel EDS 989 and Haystaq \$977,368 without travel. And that includes the new licenses that Haystaq did not put into their proposal. And with travel -- wait a minute -- \$949,000 for EDS without travel. \$977,000 without travel for Haystaq.

And with travel \$989,000 for Election Data Services. And for Haystaq over a million, a million 50.

>> Rhonda: I just wanted to make sure my numbers were right and I had them written right.

>> Dustin: Plus or minus penny rounding, not taking that into account.

>> Rhonda: Do you want me to give my comment now since I'm already unmuted?

>> Brittini: Yes.

>> Rhonda: I thought both gave good presentations. I honestly felt one company or group gave a better presentation as far as it went to demonstrating the software and that was EDS.

I liked things that they showed about the software. And I know Doug just said don't concentrate on the software, but there were just some things they pointed out that kind of stood out.

The comments on the maps where if people submitted public comment, they could put that on the maps.

A sample report, I really liked how the reports looked.

The way he presented it, it looked user friendly for people who are not quite as techy like me.

The QR code, how they showed that, I thought that was a neat feature also.

As far as the group and what the group offers, I liked the fact they specifically put together a group that would be bipartisan,

That they included democrats, republicans and independents to try and take that bias out of there.

I liked that they made a conscious effort to do that.

The fact that they also added racial bloc voting expert.

I think that was a very big plus as far as they go.

And the experience, he talked about how he started it around 1979 was it? But to have over 40, 45 years of experience, I think that is really great.

And the fact that he's been an expert witness is also a plus in my book.

The others they've got the experience working with independent citizens Redistricting Commissions, but I just felt personally that when it comes to overall experience and what they have to offer, and everything, I would go with EDS. And the big thing for me, the cost factor in the two is a huge, huge thing.

Because that's a significant amount.

We are going to be doing in-person meetings I would almost guarantee.  
Can't foresee if future, but if we do, we are looking at under a million dollars compared to over a million for in person.  
So looking at the cost point and what is offered, I really like EDS.

I have nothing against Haystaq.  
They did a good job.  
Their program also looked user friendly.  
I wish I could have saw more of it being activated, you know, the different things a little bit more like EDS did.  
So nothing negative to say about them really.

I just think experience wise and presentation wise and money wise they did better and that is just my opinion.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Rhonda. Dustin, I will hear from you, then Juanita.

>> Dustin: Juanita was actually having her hand up before I did.

She should go before me.

>> Juanita: Okay. I will go.

Let me get this straight.

Okay, the first one we heard and the second one is what EDS is the with the lady, right?

>> Brittini: EDS was the first one, switch it.

>> Juanita: Switch it, okay. The last one was the one that was a little higher, is that what we are saying?

>> Brittini: Yes.

>> Juanita: I enjoyed both of them.

Both of them held my interest very well.

I learned a lot in how the process goes.

I felt a little bit I was really swept with number one, but when number two came on there was something about the lady, there is something about when women are kind of involved it's a little softer. It's a little better.

I don't know. I kind of went that way just a slight bit, but I enjoyed both of them.

>> Brittini: Okay. Thank you, Juanita.

Dustin and then Anthony.

>> Dustin: All right. So I'm also leaning towards Election Data Services because it seems more user friendly.

And the fact that their public option in my opinion looks a lot nicer and cleaner.

I also wanted to say that Haystaq would have -- they were suggesting one software for communities of interest and one software for maps, so how much that costs in addition I wouldn't know.

And it sounds like Election Data Services already has that built into it with their proprietary software that they made.

Secondly, and this is just an opinion of mine, Haystaq also mentioned using free options for software that are open sourced and all that.

I would stay far away from that.

As much as possible for two reasons.

One, open sourced software can easily be cracked open by someone and reversed engineered and done something.

Secondly, these are smaller companies and trying to, yes, make a name for themselves, which I totally agree with.

They are trying to do something.

But who is to say they are three years old, two years old or one week old and trying to put something together with open source software that really isn't going to hit everything that we would potentially need to be looking at.

Again, that's me thinking on a security standpoint.

And then other free options that would be available for, let's say, the public to use. Well, if everyone starts using their own free public software, we are going to have things that could have discrepancies, how things look inside of it.

We are going to have different kind of maps that could have different color schemes inside of them, we have to figure out how to handle and look at.

Having one particular platform that we use and that also the public can use for their suggestions and map drawing seems to me like the perfect package in my opinion, As well as the cost factor.

So but, again, that's just me, someone agrees.

>> Brittini: My mute button, thank you, Dustin, that makes a lot of sense.

I saw Anthony, then I saw Doug, and then I want to get Sue or Sue do you want to jump in now?

>> Sue: Just one comment on the open source software. I can tell you that there are groups out there that are using Representable. So I know Michigan Nonprofit Association is using Representable for their 20 communities of interest that they are working with. So regardless of what we choose, there are other groups out there that are going to use this type of software anyway and present them.

It's not our problem, per se.

I mean, this is for our mappers to integrate.

So they should be able to integrate no matter what form they receive.

>> Steve: Keep in mind that people can submit them on a map paper map of Michigan.

>> Brittini: Anthony and my dog is talking in the background, guys.

>> Anthony: So on an overall level, I agree with much of what Rhonda said.

But I think, you know, some things we should consider is you know philosophically these are two pretty different companies, you know. One is a, you know, essentially, a political analyst that, you know, has dealt with the redistricting for many, many years.



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 there are pros and cons with that.

And the other Haystaq is at its core a big data company.

That has worked with other Independent Redistricting Commissions.

And there are pros and cons with that as well.

For EDS I really like and appreciate the team that they put together.

I think, you know, the team is solid.

It has, you know, people on both sides of the aisle.

They addressed how they would take care of bias.

And I was happy with their question, with the answer to their question on that.

And I think, you know, the fact that they have been in the industry for so long has something to do with how they put on their presentation.

However, I think that we may run the risk of the public seeing them as, you know, a tool for, you know, one side to win out over the other versus with Haystaq where, you know, I think on an experience level they have a little bit less expertise than EDS.

It is good that the Arizona and California Commission both used them and came up with pretty good results that are still standing.

And I think that's a big deal that we shouldn't, you know, brush under the rug if you will.

But, you know, overall if I had to decided to, I would probably go with EDS.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Anthony.

Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I agree with what Rhonda and Dustin have said as well as Anthony.

Let me make a comment first on the open source software.

I totally support Dustin on this.

I would not touch that stuff whatsoever.

These are small companies. These people put this stuff out there and sometimes you don't even know who puts it out there.

And if we've got to keep this stuff cataloged for another ten years in case of lawsuits, six years down the road they may not exist. The software may not be out there for us to utilize.

So I would tend to stay away from that and just use the core products that corporations are offering.

I felt more comfortable with EDS.

I felt that the service that we are going to get from them is going to be more involved in particularly with the interface with our Commission.

I felt from the answers I heard from Haystaq was is, well, it's going to be pushed off on the Commission.

You decide.

You do this.

Okay?

They are there for advice.

We really don't have the direction on how to do this stuff.

And so I think the more help we can get on what is step one, what is step two, what is step three. And I think EDS presented themselves in a manner where that is going to be more prevalent with them.

We will get more assistance from them.

I felt very comfortable on the EDS side with John Morgan and Kim as well.

And on the Haystaq side I felt very comfortable with Kim.

I got the impression that Ken may not be as involved as he was today.

That there are other people, map line drawers that are going to be involved that maybe work for Ken.

But I did feel that John was going to be more involved on the EDS side and helping us through this.

So like the others have said, I feel more comfortable with the Election Data Services.

And let me make one other comment.

You know, we got I think four or five public comments that had negative things to say about a couple people in EDS.

About them being part of some -- I took a look at those.

You know, and two of them you could tell where they came from.

They both came from the same city.

They both said basically the same thing.

But they never got into any detail on why.

They felt they were partisan.

They just said they were partisan.

And it's an opinion.

And the others I had no idea where they came from.

I tried to research it and I couldn't find it.

So I've kind of set that aside and not put that as part of my decision.

I mean, I respect them submitting their opinions.

And I don't think there was enough detail in their opinions to justify it being part of the criteria, so just wanted to mention that.

And, again, I felt that EDS was the stronger of the two candidates.

Okay, I yield back.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Doug. I appreciate that.

Let me hear from MC and then Dustin.

>> MC: I want to make sure that we are not sort of accidentally making it, you know, mistrusting the people by not using open source software.

What I want to suggest is, yes, I believe that security is important. But we want to have the power of our Commission rested and invested in the people.

We want the people to trust us.

We want the people to give us essentially maps. And we want them to give us data, and that public software, that open source software is what is enabling. This it's widespread.

It's what some of our presenters have talked about.

So I want to suggest that like I do think we want to encourage people to use this stuff, to actually send it to us.

I don't know that we want to prioritize security honestly because I feel like that is exactly when we get to the least transparency or less input. And so I just want to -- I don't know if that is -- I don't think that is what you were suggesting, but I want to make sure that the public doesn't hear that we are sort of saying, no, you shouldn't use this stuff. You should not give us information, right. You shouldn't use this because it's potentially a data threat.

So I just want to make sure that we are conscious of that, that balance it feels like.

>> Brittini: Thank you, MC.

Dustin.

>> Dustin: Thank you.

So I'm going to touch on that again.

I totally understand what you're saying, MC.

I get it.

But the -- I'm not saying that open source software is bad and that they cannot use it. What I'm saying is that we should not -- if they want to use it to make their own maps and submit that to us, fine, that is all good and dandy.

Election Data Services has that built in.

And we can put the information for the platform that they are using as transparency on our website.

And they can use the portals there for the public to make maps that we would get instantaneously.

It's just a better fit in my opinion because it uses the actual software that if we pick them, as our vendor on software and consultants, it's going to be interfaced and it's going to work wonders.

I mean, I'm like and if someone wants to have a picture of Michigan and draw things on it and fax it over to us or e-mail it over to us, fine, we can look at those, too.

I'm just saying that what I was saying is having someone that -- having a company that says you can use the free software and not use our potential software that we would provide for licenses, then that will cost \$44,000 more, for everyone to have, it seems odd to me.

And that's it.

Like if they want the public to be able to submit those maps, they should have something that they have designed to put the public and the public's hands to help with that.

Not saying open source software is bad.

I use it all the time.

But that's just, again, my opinion on the matter.

Secondly, I don't really want to put too much thought, and this is something that Doug also brought up, with taking the individuals that, well, I don't want this to sound bad so let me see.

Taking the individuals and looking at, yes, this worked in Arizona and, yes, this worked in California or whomever.

Those people are going to be biased because it's the only software that they used.

So they don't really have any way to distinguish between the two.

So I wouldn't really put too much stock in that just because of that argument alone.

They use this, it worked for them.

We could use Haystaq and it not work for us.

We can use EDS and it not work for us. And it's something to keep in mind.

The people that it worked for, and the Commissioners in those particular states who I respect very much and did a wonderful job, will have an opinion and bias toward the software they used.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Dustin. Doug then Anthony.

>> Doug: Anthony had his hand up before me.

>> Brittini: Anthony and Doug, so cordial.

>> Anthony: Thank you, Doug. And thank you, Brittini.

I agree with what MC was saying as far as, you know, trusting the public to provide us with maps of their choosing.

But I also understand the security concerns that Dustin is speaking of.

However, both of these companies seem to have the ability to incorporate data from open source maps software into their maps.

I mean, they both made that pretty clear that they are able to do that.

Because we are going to get maps from Representable. We could get maps drawn on a napkin. As Steve said earlier, we could get paper maps. And these vendors both have the ability to incorporate them into their master files we are then going to use. So I don't really see it as that big of an issue because both of these vendors have very similar capabilities.

I, again, think their decision is really more of a philosophical decision on the two companies.

And I think a good point was just brought up about the public comment.

And that is, you know, kind of what I was alluding to.

And you guys know by now that I always worry about who is sending us in the public comment especially because we don't seem to have that many actually speak at our meetings as of yet.

Hopefully that changes.

But, you know, it is an understandable statement to say, hey, EDS has worked on redistricting matters for the past 40 years.

And that has resulted in gerrymandered maps.

That is why this Commission was created, because Michigan has very gerrymandered maps.

And the people in Michigan doesn't want that to be a thing anymore.

So it is a reasonable statement to make that says, hey, these people have worked on this in the past and here are the results. And where Haystaq, you know, they have worked on these two other Independent Commissions and their results were quite favorable.

And that's not the only thing we should take into account when making this decision. But I do think it's a point that we should all keep in our minds.

>> Brittini: So I saw Doug, then I see Rhonda, and I think I see Rebecca and Dustin. You are getting me on the order today, so I'm making sure I get it right.

>> Doug: A quick comment before we move on. We had a committee that went and researched the proposals and so forth.

So I'd like to hear from -- I know Dustin was the Chair of the committee.

I'd like to hear from the other two and get their opinions on these two vendors as well because they have been closer to this than anybody.

So when we get an opportunity, those two could speak, I would appreciate it.

>> Brittini: Absolutely. I'm making my rounds, so let's hear from Rhonda and then I want to hear from Rebecca, please.

>> Rhonda: I just had one quick comment.

Kind of on the lines of, I apologize, did you hear that?

On Anthony's when it comes to the gerrymandering and the public comment.

I guess I might be looking at it a little different this way.

Gerrymandering is a problem.

But I'm looking at it in terms of it's not really the map drawers that did the gerrymandering is how I see it.

They were hired to do a service by a particular group and that's what they did.

So I guess I'm looking at it that way.

I can understand people being upset and where they would say, well, they are political because these lines were gerrymandered. But if we look at it as a whole, they were an employee and they got paid to do a job. And they were told by their employers what to do.

So I guess I'm looking at it in more of those terms than they went out and maliciously drew lines to affect people.

>> Anthony: I 100% agree with that.

>> Brittini: Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Yeah, I 100% don't agree with that. To me that is the Nuremberg defense. I was following orders when I gunned down 500 people. And I don't buy that at all. That is a bunch of -- excuse my language. I don't buy that at all.

I have significant concerns about EDS. And my concerns started with the comments that we got the public comments. And as always. I do this for everybody, I'm going to dig in, so I did a bunch of research on Kimball Brace. And I want to see where these comments are coming from. I want to see what the concern is because, you know, comments are often bias one way or the other. And want to see the actual truth.

You know, I think the comment I addressed to him as far as he is known as the Picasso of gerrymandering. He has gerrymander has a custom vanity license plate.

So, yes, he has done it for both sides and incredibly effective at it and that is fantastic.

He is very, very good at doing what his people who are writing the paycheck want him to do.

If the republicans come in and say I want you to pack and crack all the African/Americans into this one district so they get one district and we get the other 99% of them, he is going to do that. But I have a problem with that because that is not what we are here to do.

We are here to do something different. We are here to come up with fair districts.

And it concerns me that is this person going to be able to come up with fair districts when he even has a history of quite proudly creating gerrymandered districts. And, again, he has done it for both sides. And he doesn't seem to have political loyalty. It seems like whoever is writing the check, he is going to gerrymander the district for that particular group to the extent he wants to.

And I'm not sure someone with that background is going to be able to create neutral maps for us.

And then, two, I'm concerned about what is the public perception of that going to be if we hire someone who is very, very well-known. And, I mean, there is interviews out there in "The Washington Post" with him. And on the daily show. And, you know, I just think that he definitely has a partisanship that is flexible depending on who is paying him, but we are not supposed to be partisan.

We are supposed to be independent.

So that is my concern.

That being said, I do think the presentation that they presented was much better. It was much slicker.

You know, the cost difference is about 5%.

I don't really consider that to be a huge difference in my personal opinion when you are dealing with a million dollar spend.

But I just have the concern of are the voters of Michigan going to feel that we are doing service by them by putting in a company that has a history of, you know, like I

said, like that's what they, do they gerrymander, that is what his company does. They gerrymander districts for both sides, and it concerns me can they be neutral.

Then on the flip side you have Haystaq who has worked with Independent Commissions, that is what they are focused on. They have done it well. They have a history of doing it for two separate Commissions. And both times their maps withstood judicial scrutiny. And I think that is really what we want to be aiming for. We want to come up with maps that are fair and that can withstand judicial scrutiny. And I feel like we are sort of setting ourselves up for challenges if we hire someone who has the history of being the Picasso of gerrymandering, so that is my thoughts.

>> Brittini: Can I hear from Dustin?

>> Dustin: Two things.

The one thing that I wanted to bring up goes back to what Anthony said in regards to both companies can potentially use and integrate with other particular software packages.

Fine.

All I see is dollar signs going up when that happens.

They are going to not do that for free.

Because they are going to have to make APIs and do a bunch of stuff to actually make it work. And that is just something that I think would be, in my honest opinion, a waste of taxpayer dollars to do.

Secondly, in response to what was just said, writing the person who gives the check to a company and having that company gerrymander the particular districts into what the people have paid to do, well, honestly, that makes sense for anyone because it used to be politicians that did it. So they are not going to just hold themselves out to both parties at the same time.

So, yeah, let's say a republican party hires EDS ten years ago, they are going to take what they want to have for their districts.

If the democratic party had them ten years ago, they are going to listen to what they wanted for their districts. But we are truly independent. And they are putting a truly independent team together. And are going to listen to us in how we want to do it because we are providing them the paycheck.

So, I mean, I don't think that is a very good argument, Honestly, just because that's happened everywhere. That's not just EDS.

That is anybody who did this is going to do that for the people that hired them or the people -- the party that hired them to do that particular work.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Dustin.

Quickly, I'm not sure I have an opinion yet on either side.

I see both sides of it.

I will say that, you know, we all have a set of morals, right? So we can choose if we are going to ultimately decide to do something beyond a paycheck.

That was my quick thought on that.

However, I do think with 13 astute individuals that our community minded, fair, considering justice will push whoever to do the right thing.

Especially since we all have expressed an interest for special communities, special populations, all of that,

And represent diverse interests.

So I see a good opportunity either way.

I share the same thoughts in terms of how the presentations were presented.

But, Rebecca, I saw your hand, so I want you to -- I just had to get that out before it left me.

>> Rebecca: That is okay. My thought on what Dustin said is I think that what he is saying is true to an extent. So if my boss comes in and tells me to paint the wall blue, I'm going to paint it blue.

If my boss comes in and tells me to kill somebody, that is a little different in my mind.

And so what we are talking about is unconstitutional racial gerrymandering.

That to me is your boss is asking you to do something illegal.

It's not just that your boss is asking you to do something you don't agree with. So to me there is a very clear distinction in my mind between my boss told me to do something that I don't agree with or maybe I don't want to do or I don't like versus my boss is asking me to do something that is not legal. And I'm just going to go ahead and do it because that is the person who is paying me.

I have a problem with that.

>> Brittini: Doug and then Rhonda.

>> Doug: One quick comment to you, Rebecca.

The 13 of us are the boss.

And if we tell them to do something and they don't do it the way we want it, we have every right to say, nope, we are going to redo it and we are going to do it nonpartisan. I yield.

>> Brittini: I think, quickly, what I hear being articulated, and I could be wrong, I'm not Rebecca, I'm not her brain, but I think what she is saying is if that is someone's standpoint and that is deep down their belief system, then ultimately, I think we are kind of talking about a more nebulous concept of beliefs here, which have historically affected the way folks vote and get opportunities.

So I think that's more so what she is pointing to.

But I want to hear Rebecca and then MC.

>> Steve: Juanita has been trying to get in, please.

>> Brittini: I can't see her.

>> Juanita: I didn't think so because I've been doing this for the past 15 minutes.



>> Brittini: I can't see you at all. I'm so sorry.

>> Juanita: I'm enjoying this because, first of all, I'm not really one that can really talk about software and all that.

I respect the men on this panel and all the men that are dabbing into software. They know so much about it.

I respect what they say.

But I'm respecting Rebecca, spoke my sentiments to a tee because I was sitting there and I heard the first people talk what is that I got it written down somewhere, but I get excited because this is very important.

And I enjoyed them.

And then when I heard the second one, I was like Rhonda, something before it was almost over jumped in my spirit, middle ways and said this is the one to choose, to me. That is what it said to me.

And I said, and Rebecca said what she said, I said, wow, she is saying everything I want to say.

But that's just me.

It was something and I felt that when it came to the security part, I said what is going to stop anybody from somebody paying them under the table, this that and the other.

I said what is the key -- what is to keep the software being tampered with down through the years or whatever.

But I just want to say that Rebecca had my sentiments.

I felt like Rhonda when she says she gets this little um in her, I had the little um in me, not so much she was a lady because -- because they seemed more honest to me or more some people you can tell they are money or just they can do. But, you know, these people seem like they were just more on the I want to do it because this is what we do.

Period.

And we do it right.

>> Brittini: Okay. Juanita, I apologize again. I had to go to my second screen to see you.

>> Juanita: That is okay.

>> Brittini: Rhonda and I think on the other screen Doug had a hand.

I could have made that up, but Rhonda you talk right now.

>> Rhonda: Okay. This is off topic, but I just want to remind everybody that we signed a code of conduct and how we are supposed to react with the public and people that came in.

So to make accusations basically to saying that one of our prospective people are racially biased and did things that are illegal, I really think goes against the standards that we set for ourselves.

I think we can be respectful in the disagreements that we have with what they do, but do it in the respectful way.

Because this is jumping to me.

I'm having palpitations right now because I don't think people should be treated that way.

Or accusations like that be made.

So I just wanted to make that to a point where we all respect the code of conduct. And we did say that we treat presenters and stuff a certain way.

>> Juanita: Rhonda, you are correct. I was not speaking, but I know when I said. I agree with Rebecca.

I'm only talking about when it comes to the software.

I'm not talking about anything else.

I'm dealing with the software aspect of it.

>> Steve: Okay. Everybody has made their point on that.  
Rebecca.

>> Brittini: Julianne had something to say.

>> Steve: Rhonda expressed the opinion. And I don't want to go down the rabbit hole. Let's stick to what we are talking about which is picking one or the other of these two services to be our map drawers.

>> Brittini: I will say this quickly if we all -- I get what you are saying, Steve. However, what happens, we have to be able to address when we feel uncomfortable. And I think that is kind of the bottom line. And I think we can address that as adults and then go back to the business at hand.

So we have to be able to feel comfortable with that.

That's why I was trying to forward it to Julianne because I think she was going to kind of buffer and pad that piece of the discussion.

So, Julianne.

>> Julianne: No, thank you.

And I certainly concur with the Chair.

Everyone is weighing in.

I was just going to highlight that, again, without that there is political gerrymandering and there is racial gerrymandering. So the Michigan maps were the last round that this was partisan gerrymandering.

And I just caution the Commission again that all of the opinions have value, but really imputing that it is one or the other wholesale I would just caution against that.

But, again, definitely appreciate the spirited discussion.

Just wanted to highlight that there are different forms of gerrymandering.

And without examining each specific case or situation, it really is impossible to know broadly to draw those conclusions.

So that would be my only comment on it. And I know the Commission wants to keep discussing and deliberating, so I will step back off into mute.

>> Brittini: Thank you. I saw MC's hand briefly and then Cynthia has a hand.

>> MC: I guess I'm thinking about how the process would go with each company. And because one has sort of had a partisan process in the past and has a lot of history and the other company has sort of a history of creating a process that has worked with independent citizens, I think that's where I'm at is like the idea that, yeah, that one knows sort of the how to include the people in a way, again, as part of a process and that they have done that and included the people. And then another one has not necessarily worked with the people. And a process that they demonstrated they can do very well.

But it's not necessarily a people process.

So in my mind right now that is kind of where I'm at.

I wanted to offer each of them would set up a process. And I think many of the Commissioners have spoken to the idea. We have a we direct, but we need their input. And I think trusting that input, like having the idea they would lead us in a process that would include as many people. And, right, that's the part that where I'm at right now.

>> Brittini: Thank you, MC.

Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Okay. I'm having a hard time finding words today.

I agree with what Dustin has said about the technology piece. And it seems to me that EDS is more user friendly for us as Commissioners, as well as the public.

And I really like that they may be offered and brought in that piece.

I'm sorry I can't remember her name.

But that we were missing.

That we didn't get any bids on when we asked for that to be included in the VRA.

>> MC: Lisa Handley.

>> Cynthia: I appreciate that. And I think that could be really valuable to us, and I really like what she had to say.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Cynthia.

Sue.

>> Sue: I want to clarify a couple things on costs.

So the racially polarized voting expertise that EDS brought in, that was not part of their original agreement.

So we would have to reach out to them and ask if there is an additional cost for that.

And we weren't real sure if their public comment tool was in their cost either when we reviewed that one, so those are questions.

Another question I would have is does every commissioner want to have a mapping license?

So some have expressed a clear desire to have a mapping license.

Some are probably not going to want a mapping license.

So that might be something that you would want to consider.

As far as my understanding with both, there is no extra cost for integrating public comments.

That was one of the things said, what is the cost for this going to be?

My assumption is we ask them to write this into their RFP, so I believe it's included with both.

Costs can be negotiated, too.

So you could consider that if you prefer one over the other. You could negotiate a cost that might be for the company that you feel is the best fit.

And then, lastly, the racially polarized voting that Cynthia just spoke about, Haystaq did include that, had already included that as one area of expertise.

So I don't think that would be an add on with them.

So just a few comments about costs and things that you might want to consider there, even though I don't believe cost is a primary consideration when the bids are so close.

>> Brittini: I agree, Sue, on the cost part.

Was there another hand that I missed?

>> Steve: Dustin.

>> Brittini: His animated hand is stuck there.

Anthony and then Doug.

>> Anthony: This is a question for Julianne, as far as, you know, different legal measures that may come up: Are both of these vendors as far as we know in compliance with what you know they might need to provide to the public as far as intellectual property and stuff like that?

>> Julianne: So I think, to answer your question, Anthony, so I think that the one vendor has their software and the other vendor is using more publicly available software.

But, certainly, as far as compliance, yes, the Commission could use either software. And also the point again about the gerrymandering and stuff, if for political parties that hire kind of that gerrymandering is the spoils of war being the party after an election, if those maps were consistently turned down by -- on violating the VRA, excuse me, racial gerrymandering grounds, they would not be hired in the future because their maps, if they were consistently getting challenged and struck down, they wouldn't be as strong.

So that I think -- does that kind of go to the point about compliance, Anthony?

That both of them -- that it would not behoove them. And that is not getting in the philosophical discussion or how they operated in the past or those kinds of things. I'm just making the statement that a vendor who consistently -- vendors who consistently get their maps struck down for illegal racial gerrymandering would have issues, I think, finding future work.

And, to clarify, both of the vendors have proprietary software that they are using. And EDS has selected Autobound. And I think Haystaq's proposal during their presentation today they indicated there was some flexibility there. And I think that was the focus of some of their slides and some other people's comments.

Did that address your question, Anthony, or did I miss something?

>> Anthony: No. You got it. Thank you.

>> Julianne: Okay.

>> Brittini: Doug.

>> Doug: You know, one of the options that we have, and I was very impressed with Lisa and her credentials, but one of the options we have is maybe we go back to if we decide to go with EDS, we go back to them and say, yeah, we will accept your proposal and your dollar amount but you have to include Lisa as part of that. And then there is not an add-on cost to that.

So I think that is an option we got on the table as well.

And see what their response is.

>> Brittini: Any thoughts about what Doug just said?

We are allowed to think. Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Yeah, I think that is a good idea.

Good option.

>> Brittini: Julianne, then Anthony.

>> Julianne: I just wanted to note that in their proposal response that Dr. Handley was not included.

Now, certainly, that does not preclude the Commission from asking that question.

I just wanted to make a note of that.

>> Brittini: Thank you.

Anthony.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I think it's a good idea.

But we do have a new VRA, RFP out now. And I would be interested to see, you know, who applies for that.

And what their qualifications are before we make any decisions on where to go with that.

But it is something we could consider going forward.

>> Brittini: I don't think Doug's idea was a bad idea.

Doug, go ahead.

>> Doug: I just want to add onto what Anthony said.

But the VRA, RFP doesn't include a -- the qualifications that Lisa brings, so that is completely separate.

And that is something we -- I think we need as we go forward.

So we can do that and reduce our costs, I think that would be prudent for us.

Brittini, unless people have something to say, I would like to put a motion on the table that we take a vote on Election Data Services and Haystaq.

>> Brittini: You would, would you Doug?

Okay. And Dustin seconds that.

>> Anthony: Is there discussion on that?

>> Steve: It's been moved and seconded, which one of these two companies that we would prefer.

We can take it one at a time I suppose.

>> Anthony: Is there discussion on the motion?

>> Steve: Just a minute. I was just going to say that before we do that, there can be further discussion.

Is there any?

Anthony.

>> Anthony: I think at all of our previous hires we have always put in sometime between the day where we interview the clients or the applicant and the day that we decide and the day that we have a vote to confirm them, or not.

So that we can have time to, you know, study and rewatch the presentation if we would like.

And I personally would like to do that.

>> Steve: You making that as a motion?

>> Anthony: There is already a motion.

>> Steve: Are you making that to amend the motion?

>> Anthony: It's Doug's motion.

What do you think?

>> Steve: You can amend his motion. Do you want to amend the motion by adding a timeframe to consider?

>> Anthony: Yes.

>> Steve: Is there a second?

Richard has seconded it.

Is there any discussion on the amended motion, which would be to delay the vote?

I assume until our next meeting.

Is that what you are meaning, Anthony?

>> Anthony: Yeah, just a point of clarification.

I thought, and I might be wrong on this, I'm not a parliamentarian, but I thought because it's Doug's motion he might have to accept the amendment or not, but I might be wrong on that.

>> Steve: You are. You have the right to amend.

Now, you may not get your amendment passed, but you have the right to propose an amendment. Is our parliamentarian going to come in on this? Julianne?

>> Julianne: I would love to. So the motion is to take actions on the proposals today, that is what is on the table.

And, again, if during the discussion it's determined that the Commissioners -- it would be appropriate to either withdraw that motion or if the friendly amendment is to add time, then would that be at the next meeting or put some perimeter on it? But, again, Anthony is correct, as you know, Steve, you've noted that we can't have two competing motions on the table.

So to the extent the friendly amendment clarifies the first motion, it would be appropriate.

>> Steve: So the question then presents to Doug is this a friendly amendment that you would accept?

>> Doug: It is if people feel they need more time.

I think Dustin has a question.

>> Steve: Dustin.

>> Dustin: So I wholeheartedly disagree with that statement.

Because the extra time needed was when we were interviewing six people, seven people with 30 minutes.

No real questions and answers.

Just besides the ones that we were providing at this particular point.

This was a full-blown presentation, about an hour long and 30 minutes of questions and answers after that.

I'm pretty sure we all have an idea who we want to vote for at this particular point.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I have to agree with Dustin. And I think as far as this with one goes because as we stated it's such an on demand thing right now for map drawers. I think we need to move on it. And that's just my opinion.

>> Steve: Okay. We have a motion -- an amended motion to delay the vote until the next meeting.

It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor of the motion raise your hand.

All opposed raise your hand.

It does not carry.

We are back to the main motion. Is there any further discussion on the main motion? Janice.

>> Janice: I just want to we are going to vote on who we want to pick, right?

That is what we are talking about.

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Janice: Is that going to be with we are going to say we want Lisa Handley? Is that what we are going to vote for that company with her?

Or are we going to vote --

>> Doug: I was going to have that as a second motion if this passed, if EDS ended up to be the ones selected.

>> Steve: To be clear, she is not included in the contract, our response to the RFP. So you're voting on what their response was to the RFP without her.

I mean, they brought her along on the dog and pony show so that we could see what she was like, okay?

Any other discussion?

Janice.

>> Janice: Well, I'm just a little confused. If we vote for them, are we going to go to them and ask them for her?

>> Steve: I think that is what Doug's second motion is going to be depending on how the outcome of this motion comes out.

>> Janice: Okay.

>> Steve: Any further discussion?

Okay. Sally, we will have a roll call.

>> Sally: Hello, Commissioners. All right.

>> Steve: Before we do this, I guess we are going to -- the way it's kind of set up is you will say who you want to have -- who we want to hire or we can do it, okay, who wants EDS and we all vote and then who wants the other. Which way -- I guess we can do it you just name who you want, okay?

If that doesn't work, we will do it a different way. So when they call the roll, you name who you pick. It will work.

>> Julianne: Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: It will work. It will work.

If it doesn't, we will try something else.

>> Sally: I do have a point of clarification. And, Julianne, I don't know if this is what you were going to speak to.

But, you know, not to halt your process, Commissioners, but if you vote for EDS without Lisa it might not allow you the kind of bargaining leverage that you would want to have.

So you could also amend the current motion to be contingent on including Lisa so the question could come back to you if they were going to include your expertise, for example, at a higher price, or something like that. But by voting for them on their own, I just want to note that that might seed some of your, you know, bidding leverage.

>> Steve: Well, I guess my opinion, this is getting back into the discussion, I guess my opinion is: If we do that, then I think we would have to offer that same option to Haystack because that wasn't in the RFP.

And they may have someone that we like even better.

I don't know.

I'm just saying.

If we are going to be fair to one side, we need to be fair to the other side.



Dustin.

>> Dustin: Can we have her fill out the RFP?

>> Steve: Have who fill out the RFP?

>> Dustin: I can't remember, Lisa, for the VRA.

>> Julianne: So, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Sure, she could. Go ahead, Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you. So we could also, building on what Sally is indicating, another option is, again, adding that as an addendum to the RFP, The current RFP, and whether that would be extended, I believe Haystaq indicated today that Ken or Karin could serve in that capacity. But, again, if the Commission is desirous of getting that input from both of the proposed vendors, I did think it was interesting that both of them responded to the RFP and the racial bloc voting issue when it was part of the VRA Council RFP. So I did think that was interesting.

But, again, voting on it contingent with Dr. Handley or even in that case there is a chance that the RFP would need a subsequent amendment to add that, to add that to it formally.

>> Steve: Anthony.

>> Anthony: Yeah, Lisa Handley was a large part of EDS's presentation.

I don't think it's unreasonable to make an amendment like Sally was saying based upon how large of a part that she played.

I believe EDS will figure it out if they have to, if they do end up the one that we choose.

>> Julianne: Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: I guess I will ask counsel a question. If we do that and submit -- take a hypothetical that EDS, in fact, wins this vote contingent upon Lisa being part of their RFP, are we going to then open ourselves up to a legal challenge from Haystaq saying you changed the rules after everybody made their presentation?

>> Julianne: No. The Haystaq -- so, no, if the award is contingent on the inclusion of Dr. Handley, and if that is not an agreeable term, then the deal would fail. So it would not -- there wouldn't be one.

Q2 said they have an RPV expert available and referenced their expertise in that area in open session today.

So, no, if that is the desire of the Commission to move forward in that manner, then, no, it would not be inappropriate to do so with the contingent -- I would amend my recommendation would be to amend the motion to add the condition of Dr. Handley's participation and move from there.

>> Steve: It's your motion, Doug. What do you want to do?

>> Doug: I don't know.

Basically two options, we vote on it to just choose the vendor without Lisa.

And then deal with that separately afterwards.

Or we do what Julianne just mentioned.

I'm afraid what they will do is turn it down or come back with a different dollar amount, Which would negate what we are voting on.

Would it not, Julianne?

>> Julianne: Yes. So if they did a counter, you know, that --

>> Doug: Yeah, let's say they came back with half the amount, \$50,000 more.

>> Julianne: Exactly. That would be, again, it's not a blank check for Lisa. So either the Commission wants the proposals as presented. They want to offer the condition on cost or you want to set what the limit would be. But, again, that would -- I would recommend the contract be -- that there be an addendum in that case since it does not speak directly to it.

>> Steve: Well, if we send them a vote and send them what is, in essence, an offer, the offer being we will take your price as long as Lisa is in there and they come back with anything other than that, other than what we've said, that is a rejection by them.

>> Doug: Correct, it is.

But, you know, like Sue mentioned, we don't have to accept the dollar amount that they offered us.

You know, and this is our counteroffer.

I think I would amend the motion to include that at this point.

>> Steve: So as I understand then your motion is that we are going to vote. And the way I've set it up is for each person to vote for the company they want and EDS' would be their contract contingent upon including Lisa in their contract offer price.

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Steve: Is that what you want?

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Steve: That is kind of a new motion.

Can we have a second on that, please?

Rhonda has seconded that motion.

Now, is there any further discussion or have we kind of beat this one to death?

Not saying that you can talk all you want.

We got until 2:30.

>> Brittni: After you just said we beat it to death, no one is going to say anything.

>> Steve: Hey, I have not said anything about who I want.

Okay.

>> Anthony: Who do you want?

>> Steve: Who do I want?

When I looked at these, it was a pick 'em.

Either one of them is going to do a good job.

I kind of favored Haystaq because they got the best name.

EDS I thought was the old company with what's his name.

That General Motors.

I think that is why Doug likes him and EDS worked for General Motors forever.

A little different name, but the same initials.

>> Doug: That is not the reason I liked them, but --

>> Steve: But the -- I thought Haystaq's presentation, not necessarily their presentation, but their response to the RFP was saying, hey, we will do the line drawing. Now, if you guys want to do it, they said that today, if you guys want to do it, we can get you a license and you can draw all of them you want.

But you tell us what you want.

We are the experts.

We know how to draw these lines.

And then if that's not what you told us or that is not what you want, we will go back and we will do it again.

I thought that made a lot more sense to me.

I also heard them say, and we have talked about the software, well, EDS is using auto bound and Haystaq said we will use Autobound or Maptitude. Take your pick, whichever one you want, so can't see a difference there.

That is my own personal thing. Like I said it's a pick 'em, whichever one we want I think will do a good job.

The Nuremberg defense did not make a lot of sense to me, but I understand Rebecca's point of view.

Having said that, the other person -- who else was on our -- Erin, Janice, who else was on the committee?

Erin, your turn.

Doug wanted to know what you thought.

>> Erin: I was happy with either one.

So I could go either way.

But when I went through and read the proposals and considered everything, I thought EDS was a few points above Haystaq.

But, as I said, I think we would be good either way.

So that's all I have to say on it.

>> Steve: All right, one last chance.

All right. Sally, call the role and vote for which one you want EDS or Haystaq.

>> Julianne has a hand.

>> Julianne: I apologize for the interjection. And I have the amended motion as Doug and Rhonda as the second.

Was the vote called, Mr. Chair?

I know then you went into your impressions.

I just wanted to ensure that vote was called.

>> Steve: I just called that vote.

>> Julianne: Okay.

>> Steve: It's not an amendment. It's a new motion.

>> Julianne: New motion.

>> Steve: Erin, just a minute.

>> Erin: Clarification of what we are now voting for, please.

>> Steve: You are voting either Haystaq or EDS. EDS has the contingent that Lisa must be included in their contract price as presented.

Okay. Sally.

>> Sally: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With that, Commissioners, I will be calling on you in alphabetical order by last name. But per sort of your procedures, I will be starting with the second person on the list since the first one I started with the first person. So please say the company as the Chair stated when I call your name.

Juanita Curry.

>> Juanita: Haystaq.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Anthony: Can you come back to me Sally?

Is that allowed?

I just need a moment.

>> Sally: Julianne, is that allowed?

>> Julianne: I'm sorry.

>> Steve: This is a friendly consensus building group, yes, that's allowed.

>> Sally: Okay, just verifying.

Thanks, Anthony.

Brittini Kellom.

>> Brittini: I wanted Julianne to speak because I think she had something to say.

>> Julianne: And I hesitate to even say it, but you are voting on mapping contract versus a mapping plus RPV contract.

So that distinction I think should be clear in both that we are expecting those services from both of the vendors for that price that was quoted.

And, again, I hesitate to raise it, but -- and I know that the second vendor -- the second presentation, excuse me, indicated that they had that expertise on staff. But really calling out that in either case that the Commission, what they are looking for, what the Commission is looking for as I hear it is now mapping plus RPV, RPV analyst.

>> Steve: The motion is under vote.

We are going to continue to vote.

Erin, I will address it unless you have got a point of order, no?

Okay.

>> Erin: I wonder if it would be a point of order, don't we have a racial profiler or whatever that is, don't we have a bid out there? Are we waiting for bids on that?

>> Steve: We have a Voting Rights Act that we are working on.

>> Erin: Okay.

>> Steve: Keep going, Sally.

>> Sally: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Brittini Kellom.

>> Brittini: Haystaq.

>> Sally: Rhonda Lange.

>> Rhonda: EDS.

>> Sally: Steve Lett.

>> Steve: Contrary to what I said, EDS.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> Cynthia: EDS.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn.

>> MC: Haystaq.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.

>> Rebecca: Haystaq.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> Janice: EDS.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner.

>> Erin: EDS.

>> Sally: Richard Weiss.

>> Richard: EDS.

>> Sally: Dustin Witjes.

>> Dustin: Election Data Services, EDS.

>> Sally: Doug Clark.

>> Doug: Election Data Services, EDS.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Anthony: Thanks, Haystaq.

>> Sally: Okay. I have a vote of five for EDS, sorry, five for Haystaq and eight for EDS.

>> Anthony: It passes.

>> Steve: What is the split?

>> Sally: I was just verifying that. And, general counsel, I'm not sure if this requires, if this requires the partisan split off the top of my head, but --

>> Julianne: That's what I'm checking on right now.

>> Sally: I believe we have the partisan split regardless whether it's needed on EDS.

>> Steve: I would think we would just by the numbers.

Okay.

>> Julianne: Okay. I have it.

>> Steve: And.

>> Julianne: Sorry, I was having computer difficulties. So it is a -- the for hiring consult paid staff or consultants requires the vote of at least one commissioner affiliated with each of the major parties and one non-affiliating. So that is under Subsection 12 of the Constitution. It's required.

>> Steve: Just a good thing to do that always, anyway. So we have that, Sally. So let's see, Sue.

>> Sue: Yes.

>> Steve: You will contact EDS if you would, please.

>> Sue: I'll be happy to.

I'm sure they are listening.

>> Steve: Yeah. You are probably right with the contingent offer and see what they have to say. Doug.

>> Doug: Do we have to get purchasing with this at all, going back to them with the decision?

>> Steve: On what grounds?

>> Doug: Well, they issued the RFP.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Doug: But, I mean, do we need to have them involved?

Or is it okay to have Sue involved to go back and make the offer and finalize it?

>> Steve: Well, I think I would think that what we have done in the past has indicated that we were making the offer to either Sue or Julianne whoever we have.

There is not much negotiation here.

It's a contingent offer.

>> Doug: Not a negotiation at all.

>> Steve: Pardon?

>> Doug: With when we hired Sue and Julianne and Edward, it was not an RFP.

We didn't have purchasing involved in the first place.

>> Steve: No, Sue.

>> Doug: Want to bring the question up whether we should move forward.

>> Steve: Sure. And I'm being against my own advice here, recommendation. We have to be careful. And I'm very bad at it, of stepping on everybody's lines so that the interpreters can interpret without trying to interpret multiple people at the same time.

I apologize.

I will try to do better.

But, Sue, can you check on that for us?

And let us know?

>> Sue: I will check with Chad Bassett just to see procedure because he issued -- all the questions went through him, the proposals went to him, so I will check with him and make sure we are doing that in a proper way.

>> Doug: Perfect, perfect.

>> Steve: Okay, VRA legal counsel bidder questions.

Who is handling that?

>> Julianne: That would be, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

So we have --

>> Steve: Just one minute.

Before we move on.

>> Julianne: Yes.

>> Steve: I want to thank everybody for their input. And if I was -- I didn't want to shut down any discussion, but I wanted to keep it all on the discussion of the companies.

Some people can get very involved with what their thoughts are, and that was clear.

And we got that, and I think we came through that very well.

So thank you for your opinions on everything.

And we all did a good job.

And this was not necessarily an easy vote, an easy discussion primarily because of a lot of the public comments and e-mails that we got. It's clear there is a lot of people out there that are very passionate about gerrymandering and how this is going to be done.

But, for the public's consumption, you know, there aren't 50 map drawers out that are not busy right now because there is 50 states that are redoing district lines.

And so everybody is busy as it were.

So thank you all the, Commissioners, for the discussion.

Julianne, thank you. I appreciate you allowing me that moment of personal privilege.

>> Julianne: Well, you are the Chair so you have it. Thank you for recognizing me and moving on to the bidder questions.

I have a very brief PowerPoint and you will see why in just a moment.

So the vendor questions, the proposed responses were circulated in your agenda packet for today's consideration.

And they included -- and so those included.

We have received additional questions just this morning, two additional questions that were filed late, so they do not have to be responded to but there are prepared responses, proposed answers to those two questions, to encourage people to submit proposals and to be responsive, quite frankly, to people's inquiries. But, however, they can be posted without including those two questions. But I would recommend that we do make an effort to include them.

So the first question was regarding disclosure of subcontractors.

And if they should be listed in the proposals submitted.

And so, yes, our answer would be that the proposal should capture those details particularly under Section 4.14.

And they should be -- in their corresponding response.

So that was our advice on that particular answer, on that particular additional question.

The next question was in regard to political contribution disclosures. And the question in the citation into the statement of work, I think there is a little bit of conflict there. So we make it clear in the proposed answer that the proposed questions, the proposed political contributions are required from the bidder so the entity that is bidding and political contributions from individuals are required, only attorneys that are identified as key personnel. So there is not a specific political disclosure, political contribution disclosure, excuse me, from staff.

And the question further asks for a clarification or for ease can the contributions be limited to those that are over \$250 and made in the last ten years.

Again, I think this particular proposed bidder is thinking that all of the staff or the entity has to make these disclosures. And we provided the clarity that they do not for all staff. But the RFP does not have any time limit or monetary disclosure. So we also make that distinction.

And those are the two questions that were added. I would be happy to leave them on the screen or go back to them if you like.

The original RFP, the goal to post the answers is tomorrow. So if the Commission can either act to adopt or talk about all of the proposed vendor question, answers, but certainly it could also be discussed tomorrow if the Commission would like to do that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Thank you.  
Is there any discussion regarding the questions?  
Those are all the questions that we receive from everybody?  
Sue is shaking her head, yes, so I will take that as an affirmative.  
Is there anybody who has any suggestions for different answers other than what were provided?  
Is everybody good with those responses being sent back to the bidders?  
By consensus that sounds like that is affirmative, Julianne.

Is that in a VRA then that's it?  
>> Julianne: So the VRA, the VRA questions with the additional two questions would be -- that's what would be approved for posting.

>> Steve: Right.  
>> Julianne: Is that correct?  
>> Steve: Right.  
>> Julianne: And we have the form.

I just wanted to note how the motion was made.

>> Steve: Motion was made that the Commission would by consensus adopt that and everybody acknowledge that that was right, so it was by consensus.



>> Julianne: For the seven. Thank you very much.

>> Steve: You're welcome.

We have announcements and we are right at the end of the day.

Sue, do you have -- does anybody have announcements?

Sue would be the one?

>> Sue: I see Edward's hand.

>> Steve: Oh, I'm sorry.

Edward.

>> Edward: Thank you, Sue, thank you Mr. Chair.

Just want to remind people if you have not selected your preferred pictures to please do so today.

And e-mail them back to me.

Thank you very much.

Ongoing thanks to each of you who are providing presentations to our local Governments. I'm hearing excellent reports.

So thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you.

>> Steve: Edward, give me a call once we get done here.

I want to talk to you about one of the spots to go to. And did you get my Robert Redford picture?

>> Edward: I sure did. Dashing. Thank you so much.

>> Steve: Great. Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Edward, I note three of ours and, pardon me, were yesterday and have you sent them yet or do we get a little bit longer?

>> Edward: They are not ready yet. So as soon as I get them, you and the other two will have the time as everybody else to select.

>> Rhonda: No problem, wanted to make sure I didn't miss them somewhere.

>> Edward: Not at all. Thank you so much.

>> Steve: Okay. Sue.

>> Sue: I could thank MC for partnering with me.

We spoke to the Blue Brigade on Monday.

There were 66 people in attendance.

So MC did a great job representing Commissioners and commissioner point of view, so I appreciate him for that partnership. And I'm willing to team with anyone if you so desire when you give a presentation.

Thank you.

>> Steve: What is the Blue Brigade?

>> Sue: They are a group in Lansing that is promoting blue politics. And we told them we can't be political, but we did share our process and they are very interested in a fair redistricting process.

>> Steve: Good.

Any other announcements?

Doug.

>> Doug: Not announcement, but MC did you have certain slides that you used during that presentation?

>> MC: Edward and Sue basically did. I think the whole team, I'm guessing Julianne, and the State Department, they put together the presentation. So it was well packaged. And this was an extended presentation, so it was a little bit longer.

We did some more criteria, but there is basically a standard package that, again, I think the staff have put together that Sue and I used.

>> Doug: Okay. Can we get a copy of that?

>> Sue: So the standards slides are five slides that Edward put together. And anybody who is doing a presentation should have the standard slides.

What was added was I asked him to add one for criteria.

We had an hour-long meeting and so our presentation was -- it may be 5-10 minutes, and then the rest was questions and answers.

So the two extra slides were about the criteria. And then the one slide that defined the communities of interest per the Constitution.

So that language was put in so there was an understanding of that.

But we are happy to share that.

>> Doug: Okay. Thank you.

>> Steve: Anybody else got anything for the good of the group?

Entertain a motion to adjourn.

Erin second.

>> Cynthia: Second.

>> Steve: Whoever said second, I saw Cynthia, so we will do Erin and Cynthia. All in favor say good-bye.

>> Anthony: See you all tomorrow.

>> Steve: See you tomorrow.

>> Have a great day.

[ Meeting concludes at 2:30 p.m. ]