

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.

ICRC

02/23/20 Meeting

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

>> Dustin: All right. Good afternoon, everybody.

As Chair of the line drawing and Redistricting Technical Services Committee, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order.

The Zoom webinar is being live streamed to YouTube for anyone in the public watching who would like to prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at Redistricting Michigan to find a link for other viewing options.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning.

We have ASL interpretation available for this meeting.

If you are a member of the public watching who would like easier viewing options for the ASL interpreter on your screen, please e-mail us @redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will provide you with additional viewing options.

Similarly, members of the public who would like to access translation services during the webinar, can call, sorry, can e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov on full details on how to access language translation services available for the 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 @redistrictingMichigan.gov for viewing at a later date.

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

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

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

>> Sally: Good afternoon, Commissioners. When I call your name, if you could unmute yourself and say present and indicate the location that you are attending remotely from that would be great.

Steve Lett.

>> Steve: I'm present and I am currently in Ingham County.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner.

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

>> Sally: And Dustin Witjes.

>> Dustin: I'm present and I am attending from Ann Arbor, Michigan.

>> Sally: All members of the subcommittee are present.

>> Dustin: I will now look favorably on a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

>> Steve: So moved.

>> Dustin: All right. Second by Erin.

>> Erin: Second.

>> Dustin: Okay, that being approved, we are going to move to public comment. A few notes about public comment for those of you joining us for the first time, because this is a virtual meeting members of the public have to sign up in advance to address the Commission.

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

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

To those members of the public participating in public comment, please note you will have no more than two minutes to address the Commission. And you may also submit your thoughts to the Commission and public by e-mailing [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov). The Department of State will provide your written thought to the commission by indicating in the e-mail that you would like to submit your written comment as public comment. It will be included in the online archive of the Commission.

Public comment sign-up links are also posted on the redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook, and Twitter @redistrictingMichigan.

I would like to recognize Sally Marsh from the Michigan Department of State, Director of Special Projects, who will call upon members of the public to address the Commission.

>> Sally: Thank you, Commissioners. And it looks like our public comment participant is not on the line.

So we should probably move on to the next agenda item, Mr. Chair.

>> Dustin: Okay. So without that I guess we are going to start our discussion about regarding the line drawing proposals that we all received.

Who would like to start?

Sue?

We can't hear you, Sue.

>> Sue: I would be happy to provide a little bit of context for people who may be watching for the first time and have not followed this process through if you would find that helpful.

>> Dustin: Sure.

>> Sue: I see you shaking your head. So just to let people know this request for proposal was issued on January 22nd.

So a little over a month ago and there was an option for bidder questions to be submitted and then the Commission answered those bidder questions and then the proposal deadline was February 10th.

After the proposals were received, internal staff did a review on and made recommendations based on their review of the proposals, Which are provided for this Commission.

And, subsequently, then this meeting today will be held to further discuss these proposals.

Of course, everything that is done here is a recommendation to the full Commission who will have the job of making sure that the best proposal is selected.

So, again, it will be a full Commission decision, but you are here to create your recommendations to take to the Commission on Thursday then.

>> Dustin: Erin, I saw you had your hand up.

>> Erin: I was just going to start.

I thought it was interesting we were provided the evaluations because I glanced at it and did not know what I was looking at and put that aside.

And we had three that actually fell within the perimeters of the RFP requirements, correct, Sue?

>> Sue: That is correct. There were four submissions, but the one didn't meet minimum qualifications and actually did come in late also.

>> Erin: I read through all of these.

My kids were wondering what I was doing.

And I don't know how you guys scored them all.

Do we want to go over how we scored them?

Do we want to -- things that stand out?

How do you guys want to handle the actual discussion?

>> Dustin: It's all the same to me.

We can go over how we scored them or we can just have a general discussion about each whatever seems easier for both of you.

>> Erin: Okay, and reading over all of theirs I was very impressed with data election services.

I think out of all three of them they probably came out slightly ahead of the other one that I scored.

I scored Election Data Services. They came out with 86.

I'm looking at my paperwork.

And then Haystack and Q2 which are collaborating.

On their bid.

They came out as an 84.

So those two I was very impressed with.

And the last one which was the one with the redistricting partners, they scored a 79.

There were parts of theirs I was very impressed with the fact that Colleen Malloy was on the California redistricting Commission and was Chair for the final phases of that I believe.

I was very impressed with their timeline that they provided for us and the training that they brought forward in their RFP.

I didn't know if they because it seems like we had some of their training you know some of the key points that they brought out we already went over those.

So I don't know if those were just in addition to or if they actually knew that we had gone over some of those points before.

But I like the fact that they have someone on their team that was actually a Commission.

And, you know, has gone before.

So but when I scored them, and in reading it, Election Data Services came out on top for me.

And then Haystack and Q2, Haystack they were second.

And redistricting partners was third.

So I don't know if you guys, you and Steve want to discuss points or what you want to do with that.

>> Dustin: Steve if you want to go let me know what your three were in order if you don't mind because I think we are basically all going to have the same thought process on these in my opinion.

>> Dustin: Can't hear you.

>> Steve: Let's try it that way.

>> Dustin: There you go.

>> Steve: This is the new state computer, the new better model and I'm using it works not as good as my old one.

Sorry, Sally.

I looked at both of them.

I read them for content.

I do not score them.

I read your scores of the -- our staff and thought they were appropriate.

They obviously are very close.

If you score them.

I thought it's a pick em.

In my opinion.

However, I guess I would give the nod a little bit to Haystack.

That's the one that worked with California and Arizona.

Because they worked with California and Arizona so they know what we are up against.

They are very clear both of them were really very clear we are up against the time crunch of the census data that does not come out timely which evidently it won't.

And Haystack had given a to my point of view had given okay here is what we need to do right now.

We need to do this.

We need to do this.

We need to do this.

We're going to take the information we have.

We will use it to the best of our ability.

Then when the census data comes out, we can tweak it which is what I have been saying for the last month.

So if I got to vote I would vote for Haystack.

I would not be dissatisfied with either one.

They are all coming out of Washington.

That makes sense.

That is where the game is played for these people.

And so that's where I'm at.

>> Dustin: All right. I guess I will go over mine.

I also believe that both Election Data Services and Haystack are the top two.

I felt something along with Redistricting Partners something was just missing; therefore, it did not score as high as I wanted it to.

Because I did have some high hopes and then honestly, I did not look at the one that didn't -- that came in late or it did not meet specifications per how the state scored them.

I go in favor of Election Data Services for a couple different reasons.

Both the looking at what was provided screen shots of how things work.

That also that they are trying to put a team together of individuals who are not in one particular political party.

They are trying to stay in our lines by having some republicans, some independents, some democrats on site.

My biggest difference between Haystack and Election Data Services though is that Haystack highly suggests that we as Commissioners do not have to stick to a particular program question.

I know a lot of Commissioners including myself stated that we would very much like to be able to go in there and draw our own maps and like tweak it ourselves and save it and see how things look.

Which is something that Election Data Services would be able to do.

And I also like the way they are able to basically create portals for the online and our community in Michigan to publicly comment on said maps that we are trying and give them some sort of input as well.

Which in my opinion is one of the most important things that we are doing here.

We want everyone to have some kind of voice.

And I know I'm a big numbers guy so looking at all the data points that would come in or what we could look at with election data services blew me away.

And how the map drawing software would actually work.

Now, with that being said, both of them, both Haystack and I'd be happy with both Election Data Services and Haystack without any question.

They are both fantastic.

I think when I scored them in total with election data services, I gave them a 90.

And I gave Haystack I believe it was an 86 or 87.

When the brownie points basically came from allowing us to use the software as well as the population of Michigan to go in and use the software as well.

Kind of important to me.

That's where I stand on this.

What I prefer Election Data Services, I would be happy with both.

Erin.

>> Erin: Sue, you had mentioned that you had -- you guys' staff provided your recommendations.

And I don't know if that was on an e-mail or something.

I didn't get.

I got your scores on the evaluation but which one did you all decide over Haystack and Election Data Services and Redistricting Partners?

Who came on top for you guys?

>> Sue: I will let you know that Julianne and Sally and I scored them.

And when we were all done, they were even Steven so we scored them both at 87.

And we really and collectively we scored Redistricting Partners at 72.

So that was below the minimum requirements and we didn't move forward with much discussion on them after our scoring.

But we collectively did our scoring, we did it individually then we collectively discussed our scoring.

Chad Basset from Michigan Department of State helped us with process and technical issues.

Also and Mike Brady sat in on the discussion to provide you know context also.

But the cumulative scores were you know even at 87 for each one.

We felt each had some high points with Haystack they certainly have the experience with independent redistricting Commissions whereas Election Data Services has technical expertise and they have worked with other states in redistricting but have not worked specifically with Commissions.

So you know, that was one point.

But on the list and maybe Sarah you can send that real quickly to Erin if you would.

The rank again rationale.

So I mean each has their high points.

Each has something to contribute.

I think maybe after an interview Commissioners would feel at that point then they might better be able to Judge who they might like to work best with.

>> Steve: Are we planning on having both of these make presentations to the full Commission?

>> Sue: Based on this committee's recommendations, if that is your recommendation, then we would invite -- we would present that to the Commission on Thursday. And they would be invited to the meeting the following week.

>> Steve: Well I would make that motion that we invite and submit it to the full Commission for their edification and their comment and then invite them for the next week.

I would make that motion.

>> Erin: I would second that as well.

>> Dustin: Okay so on the motion of bringing what Election Data Services and Haystack in.

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Dustin: In for interviews with all of us bringing that motion to the table.

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Dustin seconded by Erin, all in favor raise your hand.

Opposed same sign.

Motion passes unanimously.

Okay, so that was my thoughts too Election Data Services and Haystack I think one of those two would probably be the better option for us.

But, again, it's up to all 13 of us at the end of the day who we want to bring in but those would be my top two contenders for sure.

>> Steve: That is easy Dustin there is only two.

>> Dustin: Yeah, I know.

Is there any further discussion on the proposals?

>> Steve: Well, as I understood the e-mails coming from the executives who were going to have some pricing information now.

>> Dustin: Correct, that was the next part of the discussion on the agenda was in regards to pricing.

>> Steve: Okay I apologize I don't have the agenda in front of me.

>> Dustin: You are fine.

I take it Sue you might have that information I would imagine.

>> Sue: I do have that information for you.

So, yes, do you want it for all three?

Or just the top two?

>> Dustin: Oh, let's take all three just for funzies.

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.

>> Sue: Okay so with Redistricting Partners, their quote was \$438,000 without travel costs.

They didn't provide those.

And that is a big question mark regarding whether there will be travel or not travel due to the pandemic.

But they also provided additional pricing information on hourly rates on some of the people so we are not real sure if that is complete or not.

For Election Data Services their quote came in at \$989,000.

If I take travel out it would be \$959,000.

For EDS.

Then on the Haystack proposal without travel their quote is \$933,368.

So, again, they are virtually I mean within \$16,000 of each other.

>> Dustin: 933,368 for Haystack without travel.

>> Sue: Right and \$949,000 without travel for Election Data Services.

>> Dustin: \$949,000.

So 989, 949 for Election Data Services Haystack is 949 do I have that right?

>> Sue: Actually Haystack with travel was just over a million dollars.

>> Dustin: Okay.

>> Sue: 29368 again that is kind of an unknown so it seems wise just to look at them without travel.

Because I think nobody knows.

So 949 for election data without travel and 933,368 for Haystack without the travel.

So again they are nip and tuck.

>> Dustin: Okay, so.

>> Steve: I have a question.

>> Dustin: Yes.

>> Steve: Do those quotes include the licensing fees for the software?

>> Sue: Those quotes include everything they told you they would do in their proposal.

>> Dustin: Including the training as well I would imagine because I know Election Data Services, they had different options whether it was online, in person or phone support basically.

So I imagine the number would take the more expensive option into account.

>> Sue: And I'm not sure off the top of my head on that.

>> Dustin: Sorry, my computer just blew up at me a little bit here.

I apologize.

>> Steve: At least it's keeping you on.

Mine just disappeared.

>> Dustin: I never really dealt with programs close to six figures before it's all kind of new to me.



But the differences do seem, I mean, I don't want to say chump change because we are dealing with so much money but we are not talking 200 or 300,000 difference in the software except for the first one of 438,000.

So okay now does the pricing change any one's opinions on both Haystack or Election Data Services at this particular point?

Or no.

>> Steve: Not for me.

>> Dustin: Same.

>> Erin: No, but Connie Malloy's group is looking bet R for me just the mom in me that likes to save money.

[ Laughter ]

Dustin: Okay, so there was the discussion of pricing.

So with the next agenda option was discussion regarding recommendations to the Commission for whom to invite which we basically already did, both Haystack and Election Data Services.

I was not anticipating this meeting going so quickly.

But yeah Sue.

>> Steve: Sue wants to say something.

>> Dustin: Cut me off.

>> Sue: It can't go that quickly.

No I was just wondering if you are thinking about presentations, what do you think is a good amount of time to allot to these groups to present what they want to provide for the Commission and then also for the Commissioners to be able to answer questions of them?

>> Dustin: Personally given the size of the programs in question, I would say two hours in total, 90 minutes for each, 30 minutes questions and answers after that.

For both.

That's just me.

I mean I don't know if they are going to be able to go everything in their proposals and what they want to tell us within an hour or so, so 90 minute buffer or 30 minute buffer on top of an hour would probably be a good thing to do.

Because I mean I personally I have given presentations on software in much less convoluted as these that took two hours and it was a heck of a lot smaller than what we are dealing with now.

>> Steve: I would think an hour, I think that is an hour with a half hour for questions. I bet we don't have a half hour of questions though.

>> Dustin: True.

>> Steve: Sue, I would get ahold of these two before Thursday.

And ask them if we invite you in to present how much time do you want?

And if they say three hours you can say ah, no.

>> Dustin: Think again.

>> Steve: And go from there but my guess is they will be able to handle it within an hour.

But if they want an hour and a half, I'm not going to quibble with them.

That would be three hours, we might want to have you might want to schedule an hour for decision making by the Commission.

Though it probably won't take that long.

But if it does get a little likely we are not cut short with having to beg the translators to stay.

No offense translators.

>> Erin: I don't know.

I think we might need more time for questions just based on our Commission and how they we usually run.

We might want to go 45 minutes for questions just in case.

That is an awful lot of money to not get all your questions answered before you make the decision.

>> Steve: Well we put an hour on the back end so we got some flex time in there.

>> Steve: Does that sound good?

>> Sue: Our meetings are typically four hours.

It takes about an hour to get to the heart of the meeting so I mean this would be the sole focus of the meeting for sure.

But I think we have maybe about three hours total.

We can add an hour on for deliberation if we want to do that.

As long.

>> Steve: That is my suggestion I thought we were scheduling three-hour meetings, I'm looking at my schedule.

>> Sue: I'm not either.

>> Dustin: I think that is what most of them were.

>> Sue: Looking at four to five hours here.

>> Steve: Well I think four hours I mean go 4.5 and if it gets over early it gets over early if it takes longer, we will have to figure out what to do.

Does that work?

>> Sue: I think we can make it work.

I think the better question then when I call would be if given an hour can you adequately present your proposal to the Commission and allow for a half hour for questions and answers if you are invited to present to the Commission on March 4th you know based on what happens in the Commission meeting on Thursday.

>> Steve: Right.

>> Sue: Okay.

>> Dustin: I agree.

I think that is a great idea Erin, you?

>> Dustin: Yes, no, Erin.

>> Erin: I'm sorry, yeah, I was thinking that's a good idea and then I was also wondering with these figures will we get an updated budget, Sue?

>> Sue: We will definitely be talking about budget.

In the very near future and yeah, when the Commissioners decide this will go right into our budget and then we have some other consulting proposals regarding to look at going forward also.

So we will build it as we go.

>> Erin: Thank you.

>> Steve: We can do a ProForma budget for Thursday's meeting just comparing the two.

I think that would help, Erin if we go with EDS or go with Haystack here is what it's going to look like to our budget.

Just ProForma.

>> Erin: That is what I was thinking.

>> Dustin: What was the original amount we had budgeted for the software for redrawing the lines if you know off the top of your head out of curiosity.

>> Sue: We didn't have anything specifically budgeted because we were waiting for proposals to come in and we did not want to Jade the process.

I mean if we said it was going to toss a million two, we probably would have gotten bids for that amount.

So.

>> Dustin: Got it.

>> Sue: So we held off and I felt the VRA and the mapping consultants would be up wards of a million dollars.

I did not think necessarily one would take the full budget but you know then the VRA legal counsel that will be on top of that.

And I think Edward wants to propose some marketing assistance.

So there are a couple more coming to the Commission that will add on as we go.

>> Dustin: Anything else?

Steve.

>> Steve: I have nothing further.

>> Dustin: I have nothing further.

>> Erin: No I don't.

>> Dustin: Okay so over Haystack and EDS to the entire Commission on Thursday. If we don't have anything else to discuss I would entertain a motion to adjourn at this point.

>> Steve: So moved.

>> Erin: Seconded.

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.

>> Dustin: Seconded by Erin all in favor raise your hand.

All opposed same sign.

We are adjourned.

I hope everyone has a good rest of their day and I look forward to seeing all your smiling faces on Thursday.

Good-bye.

>> Good-bye.

>> [ Meeting concludes at 1:35 p.m. ]