ICRC
01/21/21 Meeting
Captioned by Q&A Reporting, Inc., www.qacaptions.com

>> Steve: Thank you. Good afternoon, fellow Commissioners, and all of you in the public who may be watching this afternoon. As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed to YouTube for anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they currently are using please visit our social media at redistricting MI to find the link for viewing on other platforms. 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 ASL interpreter on your screen, please e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will provide you with additional viewing options.

Similarly members of the public who would like access to access translation services during the webinar can e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov for details on how to access language translation services available for this meeting.

Translation services are available in Arabic and Spanish.

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. For viewing at a later date. This meeting is also being transcribed, those transcriptions will be made available and posted on redistricting Michigan.org along with written public comment submissions.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during our after the meeting should direct those questions to Anita Kiersnowski at the members of Department of State and members of the media should have her contact information, she is the press secretary. For purposes of the public watching and the public record I will turn to the Department of State staff to take note of the Commissioners present. Sally, will you please call the roll?

>> Sally: Yes, good afternoon everyone when I call your name please unmute yourself and state are you are remotely attending the meeting from city or county so first Doug Clark.

>> Present, and I am currently located in Rochester Hills, Michigan.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Yeah, Juanita Curry I'm present and I'm from Detroit, Michigan.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Hi, I'm present and I'm remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> Sally: Brittini Kellom is absent. Rhonda Lange.

>> Present remotely, attending from Reed City.

>> Sally: Steve Lett.

>> Present and I am remotely attending from Lee county, Florida.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> Present and remotely attending from Battle Creek.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn.

>> Present and remotely attending from Lansing, Michigan.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.

>> Present and remotely attending from Canton, Michigan.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> Present and remotely attending from Hyland, Michigan.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner.

>> Present remotely attending from Eaton county.

>> Richard Weiss.

>> Present remotely, attending from Saginaw, Michigan.

>> Dustin Witjes.

>> Present and I'm remotely attending from Ypsilanti, Michigan.

>> Sally: Thank you and there is a quorum present.

>> Thank you. At the next step we will approve or adopt the agenda if everybody has had an opportunity to review it. I would be open to any additions or deletions that may be appropriate. Anybody have anything?

Seeing none, if we would adopt the agenda for today's meeting, please raise your hand.

   [Hands raised]

Thank you. If you would not adopt it the same sign. The agenda is adopted.

   The minutes were provided to us by the Executive Director. And were given to you. Were there any additions, corrections or deletions that need to be made on the minutes from January 14, 2021?

Seeing none, if you would approve the minutes as presented, please raise your hand.

   [Hands raised]

Thank you. If you would not approve them, same sign. They are approved.

   It's my understanding that today we do not have public comment. However, so that the people who may be watching are familiar with what we would do and can do in the future if you would like, 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 that members of the public will be called on in the order in which they sign up to address the Commission.

   To those members of the public participating in public comment, please note you will have no more than two minutes to address the Commission this morning. Excuse me, this afternoon. But we don't have any this afternoon. So if you would like to submit your thoughts to the Commission or participate in public comment in an upcoming session of

the Commission, you can e-mail our office at redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will provide you written thoughts to the Commission. Public comment sign up links are also posted on the redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook and Twitter at redistricting MI.

So if in the future you wish to address us personally in the virtual meeting that we have, please sign up as indicated. And we will be more than happy to listen to you.

Correspondence, Sue, do we have any correspondence for this meeting?

>> Sue: We have not received any correspondence for this meeting.

>> Steve: We always allow time to address any e-mails, mail, or other communications that we receive, that we feel would be beneficial for the citizens of Michigan that watch us for us to comment on and we have in the past and we will continue to do that. Correspondence that we do receive we look at. And if we want to know if yours got here, you can go on to the website, redistricting Michigan.gov. I think that's correct. And org I guess, redistricting Michigan.org or redistricting Michigan.gov, and you will be able to find where they are kept. And you can read them at yours.

So executive director report, Sue.

>> Sue: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I want to continue to thank you for your work. I appreciate all the work that's being put into this Commission and also the Michigan department of staff who works so diligently on behalf of the Commission. They are great partners to this Commission. I'm looking forward to our continuing discussion today regarding communications and outreach director position.

As you have seen we have a draft RFP for the mapping consultant. And I want to thank Doug Clark for doing some of the initial work on this consultant RFP. Also to Rob Surber and Mark Holmes who provided some technical expertise to us. And to Chad Bassett who is the chief drafter of the RFP and also the MDOS staff and Julianne and who have gone through many, many versions of this RFP to get it to the point where it is for you today.

I'm going to leave most of the time for Rob Surber's presentation and especially for the discussion on this RFP, which is lengthy, so I thought we would do a really quick ice breaker today. I'm going to call on you and the question is: What is your wallpaper on your personal phone?
So Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Yeah, can I pass?

>> Sue: Sure.

>> Rhonda: Thank you.

>> Sue: Erin.

>> Erin: Mine is 100 bills.

>> Sue: Okay, Steve?

>> Steve: I have a scene of an ocean with an iceberg that replaced my scene of Spartan stadium football.

>> Sue: Okay, Richard?

>> Richard: Actually I have a younger picture of my two grandsons.

>> Sue: Okay, Doug?

>> Doug: And I have a younger picture of my granddaughter and my grandson.

>> Sue: Okay, MC.

>> Steve: I have to step away for a few minutes. Sue, will you please handle it?

>> Sue: Sure. MC?

>> MC you are on mute.

>> MC: Thanks. I have my two girls.

>> Sue: Okay, Dustin, how about you?

>> Dustin: Just the default that comes with the phone.

>> Sue: Okay, Rebecca?

>> Rebecca: I was just going to say the same thing. I'm really boring. I just have my default that came with my phone. I never changed it.

>> Sue: Okay, how about you Janice? Oops you are on mute.

>> Janice: I have a pink glittery heart for Valentine's Day.

>> Sue: Assume. Cynthia.

>> I have a Japanese wood block print that I think is pretty.

>> Sue: Very nice. Anthony.

>> Anthony: I have this, it's like one of the default ones, it's like the red tone shift Type 1, so red is my favorite color.

>> Sue: All right. Juanita?

>> Juanita: I just have the default that goes with my phone.

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

>> Julianne: Mine is the Terracotta Warriors in Xi'an.

>> Sue: Okay. Mine is my eight-year-old granddaughter who I adore. She means the world to me and that is the most important thing I think I can put on my phone.

So, all right, next up is the legal counsel report, so I will turn the floor over to Julianne.

>> Julianne: Wonderful. And I also will be sharing or having assistance sharing a PowerPoint, so if we could cue that up. Thank you so much. So this will be me update for today's meeting. Thank you, Cathleen. Next slide, please.

I wanted to give you a status of where I am in my work currently. The first item, Sue has already mentioned, we have been working with MDOS on the templates. The first one is coming up, today.

The second is I will be circulating a privileged and confidential memorandum today with guidance on Subsection 11. I'll also be providing a one pager that will be public facing and can be posted on website.

And lastly, but not least, the next document you can expect from me prior to our next meeting will be the draft bylaws.

I indicated I would be forwarding a privileged and confidential memorandum so I'd like to touch on the attorney/client privilege. Next slide, please, Cathleen.

The purpose of the privilege is to promote full and frank discussions between me and the Commission, so the individual members, the Commission as a whole. The key concepts are that it's a confidential communication between privileged parties, which our relationship is. And requesting or providing legal assistance. The Commission -- it's important to note the Commission holds the privilege, not individual members. So the Commission is my client. My client holds the privilege. I do not hold the privilege.

It can be waived both intentionally or unintentionally and I put two examples on the slide. It would be disclosure to third parties. Sharing the document or the e-mail communication or forwarding to a nonsecure e-mail account. And by nonsecure I mean other people have access to it or it's a shared account.

So, okay, I'm sending you the privileged and confidential memorandum. What are your options?
Next slide please, Cathleen.

So after individual members review it and decide what your own personal preference is, you can choose not to discuss the confidential document as a body, so as a Commission. One on one conversations with me are completely appropriate. Those can occur by e-mail, telephone, text, whatever is most convenient to the commissioner. And no formal action would need to be taken by the Commission.

If there is a desire to discuss the confidential document as a body, as the Commission, as a group, the options would be to convene a closed session under the Open Meetings Act or to formally waive the privilege. And then the document becomes a public record.

I want to pause here really quickly. The first memo I'm providing is a privileged and confidential document. I want to assure the Commission I do not intend to make all of my communications and correspondence with the Commission privileged and confidential. I don't believe that's an appropriate course of action. And I believe that privilege should be used when it's most appropriate.

So my next guidance document will be also on Subsection 11 but the gifts and gratuities portion and I anticipate that will not be privileged.
Even if a document is not privileged, I still plan on preparing one pagers for the ease of the public in reference going forward.

So now I'll return back to the closed session because that really is the focus of the information I'd like to convey.
Next slide, please, Cathleen.

So what are closed sessions?
They are a meeting or a portion of a meeting of a public body that will be closed to the public. So the statute sets forth very limited and narrow purposes to undertake a closed session. The personnel issues if it's requested by the individual and one of them under

Subsection 8H is to consider material exempt from disclosure under state or Federal law. That would bring us to FOIA, which under Section 13.1G is information of record subject to the attorney/client privilege. So that is why my memorandum to you, that is privileged, and confidential is an appropriate basis to hold a closed session, if the Commission needs or would like to do that.

So procedurally to go into closed session it requires a duly made motion with a second and a two third roll call vote of members serving. What can we can do in a closed session? We can discuss freely the privileged and confidential communication, respond to questions, ask whatever questions regarding that topic are appropriate.

All decisions must be made in the open session. So the only thing we would be doing in closed session is having a group discussion.

Moving forward, if the Commission is interested, either on this topic or any future topics, any correspondence or memorandum that I would be providing to you at your request I would recommend that the Commission adopt a formal resolution to set a time, place, and state the purpose of the closed session. And that's twofold. One, to give the public notice that the Commission would be dropping it to a closed session during a meeting. And the second reason being given the current technical requirements for your meetings, I think it would be easier to plan to do that.

Having said that, the Commission does have the ability to go in and out of closed sessions on the basis of a writing from your attorney during any meeting.

Let's think. I think the next slide, please, Cathleen, is just if I know it was a very brief synopsis and I'm trying, like, Sue to be respectful of your time today given the weight of the agenda and the length of the RFP but I would welcome any questions or comments that the Commissioners might have.

>> Julianne: And if there are no questions at this time.

>> Sue: Anthony had his hand up.

>> Julianne: Anthony, thank you, Suann.

>> Anthony: Can you guys hear me?

>> Yes.

>> Anthony: Cool. When you say the Commission holds the privilege and not individual members, could you touch on that a little more?

>> Julianne: Certainly. So the Commission as an entity or as a body is comprised of its individual members, so you can't individually -- two Commissions can't waive the privilege and the other 11 hold the document as privileged. Either the document is privileged and confidential between myself and the Commission or it is open. So you decide for -- you read it and react to it your own personal way, whether you would like to have additional discussions on it. But the actual privilege is held by the full body, acting, as you, know through formal actions of the majority of Commissions. I hope that is helpful, Anthony.

>> Anthony: And what does that document that you're going to circulate, like, what does it cover?
Does it cover like individual things that in the future we mandate to be privileged?
Or is it kind of like a catch all type of thing?

>> Julianne: No, thank you for the question, Anthony. No, what the document -- and, again, given the documents that were sent out to the Commission yesterday, I felt it would be more reasonable to send you the memorandum after today's meeting, because it's privileged, we can't discuss it in open session anyway, so that was my rationale behind that.

So what each document or each request for information, so, again, the privilege is a two-way street, so it can be either individual Commissioners wanting legal advice or assistance. Or it can be my offering of legal advice and assistance. So each document or each topic and depending on the advice given or what the question is it would be weighed whether it would be privileged. And there are some attorneys who put in on everything. Just as a standard practice, I don't believe in that. I think that it should be weighed whether it's appropriate if the legal advice and assistance provided in the document it is something that should carry the attorney/client privilege or if it's something that can be something more public facing.

>> Anthony: Thank you.

>> Julianne: You are welcome. If you have any additional questions, Anthony, please reach out.

Are there any other Commissioners that have any questions or comments at this time?
And, if not, let me reiterate that I am available at your convenience to discuss this topic or any topic you would like.

All right thank you, Sue.

>> Sue: I see Steve Lett has joined us and I will push into the next report, so he knows where we are. Next, we will discuss old business and Michigan Department of State updates from Sally. Thank you.

>> Sally: Hi, everyone. So I'll be very brief as well. Just a couple things for you. One an update on computers. I'm happy to report that those first ten that we talked about will start arriving, they are in route right now, they will start arriving in Lansing on Monday. And just to remind everybody what the process should be, moving forward for the rest of the week. Essentially the initial security set up will happen in Lansing. And then those computers will be shipped to your individual addresses. At that point I feel a support technician will be reaching out to all of you in your various geographic regions to coordinate with you to meet up and finish the setup of that computer.

So if you get contacted by a field support technician and you feel like they are not on the same wavelength with you, I know some of you have talked with folks, with field support technicians and they were a little bit ahead of the game in terms of contacting

you, just let me know or, of course, let Sue know and we will help make sure everyone is on the same page. You know, as usual you all are unique, so I just you know there is the chance that wires could get crossed but everyone should be on the same page.

In terms of a place to meet up, just know that it is, you know, it's an option, you can go to a local coffee shop or something like that if needed. You may also the field tech may be also able to meet you at the nearest Department of State branch office. But that's something they would have to coordinate specifically with our team. So just know that is an option. And they would have to coordinate with our team in order to do that and do that safely. But it's possible.

So that's how that will work, and I'll continue to update all of you on the other computers.

But it's exciting. Seems like we are turning the corner on getting them to you, which I'm thrilled about.

And the other thing I wanted to mention is really introduce my colleague Chad Basset who Sue mentioned but really introduce Chad. He is the purchasing and expenditure manager for the Office of Financial Services for the Michigan Department of State. What does that title mean?

Among other things, he is a procurement specialist and expert. And so he helps our department sort of leads on RFP, RFQ, requests for proposal and helps guide staff through the process and then manage those vendor relationships. So he will be on hand in this meeting to help you, to help all of us really answer any questions about the RFP, especially if there are sections where you are like why does this exist here or why is this structured this way? The RFP template that you all saw is based off of a standard state format and protocol. Believe it or not, Chad did try to slim it down as much as he could for this process and for all of you. So but that said there is typically a reason for things existing or not existing on it. So he can help provide any of that perspective as we talk through it.

And I just wanted to say in terms of the RFP, when you get to that discussion, you know, don't hesitate to ask those questions. And if it's helpful for Chad or myself or Mike Brady or Sue or Julianne to talk through how the process kind of works start to finish, if it's helpful to talk through the different sections of the RFP and what they are aiming to achieve, all of those things are options. Really the point of a kind of request for proposal process is transparency and clarity, making sure that any potential consultant or vendor has the opportunities to make their case to all of you, why you should select them. And then the public is clear that you're using objective standards to review and select that vendor or that consultant when you are using taxpayer dollars.

So just wanted to kind of provide that introduction and just say, you know, Chad and, of course, all of us we are here to help if you have any questions during the RFP discussion.

>> Steve: Thank you, Sally. I'm sure that everybody that is going to get one of the first computers is happy to hear they are on the way though.

Richard seems to have his problem solved, so he probably won't want one now. I'm sure Juanita is ready to get a new one.

>> Juanita: Yes, because my previewer on here is not installed, so I can't get any of the contacts or anything that you all sent.

>> Steve: Well, sometimes that is a good thing.

Okay.

>> Sally: I'm sorry, did you have something on that?

>> Sue: I wanted to give you the names that are on my list. And we still have one computer that is not assigned. So I have Juanita, Brittini, Richard, Dustin, Janice, Rebecca, Cynthia and staff. But there remains one computer, so if there is another Commissioner, that I didn't say your name, that wants to be next on the list, you know, we want to add you certainly there is a computer for somebody else.

>> Steve: Any volunteers for a new one initially?

MC?

>> Sue: MC and Doug that don't have them. MC, are you next?

Got it. Thank you.

>> Steve: Okay, thank you. Good news, Sally. Wonderful. We have a signed acknowledgment of our offer and employment contract to deal with.

Doug, you signed the letter. Did you speak with Edward?

>> Doug: Yes. Myself and Sue and Juanita had the discussion with Edward and the negotiation with Edward. And then I did sign it, but I forwarded it to Sue. And Sue actually sent it to Edward. It's part of the process. The reason I signed it and rather than Sue, we were having some communications difficulties on our phones and our e-mail. And she had some access issues, so I took care of it on my end.

>> Steve: Okay. Very good. Has everybody had an opportunity to at least glance over the contract?

It's pretty much similar to the ones we have been using. Are there any questions, comments, discussion before we vote?

Yes, Sue.

>> Sue: I want to let you know, I think everybody had an opportunity to read it, but 4.4 section 4.4, media releases was changed to say: News releases, promotional materials and commercial advertisements pertaining to the employee's work will be shared with the ICRC prior to submitting to the media or published.

Previous two staff contracts prohibited us from sending out news releases without express or any of these materials without express ICRC permission, which creates a timing issue. Certainly, for the communications person to have to wait for a meeting for another week, if, you know, if a more immediate response is needed, that really ties his hands. So I wanted to make sure you're aware of how that was changed. And he is

more than willing to share with the Commission anything he does prior to sending it out, so you have an opportunity to reach out to him.

And the other thing he mentioned is he would never use a quote from a commissioner without expressed permission. So if you say something in a meeting and he wants to utilize that in a press release, he would always reach out to you before he would do anything like that.

So I hope that's a good compromise for what kind of tied my hands in sending out news releases and that. Doug?

>> Doug: Yeah, I just want to add to that. Sue and I have had a number of discussions regarding this. And basically what we came up with was that there is basically three alternatives. One is that any time a news release was or press release needed to be done and it comes back to the Commission for approval. And like Sue mentioned that seems kind of an unmanageable situation, particularly from a timing standpoint. Because our meetings are not every day, so that wouldn't -- I don't think -- and Sue doesn't think that would be feasible either.

Second alternative would be just to let Edward release them on his own. And we didn't think that was an appropriate thing to do because there is no checks and balances.

So the third alternative, which Sue just mentioned, was, and we felt this was probably the better approach, was that once he gets his press release put together that he sends it out to each of us. And we have a, let's say, a 12-hour period of time or 24-hour period of time to read through it. And if there is something, we don't agree with on it, communicate back to him. If we are all okay with it, you don't have to communicate back to him. And that makes the process more timely by doing it that way. We can get something out to the press. And it also allows us as a -- as Commissioners to understand that something is going out to the press and understand what it is just because we read it upfront or have access to it upfront, so we don't get blindsided by questions and our answers to those questions are different than what our communications director has submitted to the press.

So, I mean, my recommendation is that's the way we proceed is that the third alternative.

>> Steve: I don't think that we need to hold up the contract based upon the broad language that's there. However, I think that the -- what you've described comes close to us making a decision not in a public forum.

And I guess I would ask Julianne to give that some consideration so that -- and bring back something to clarify how we are going to work this. I agree. We need -- he needs to have flexibility in what he is going to do, but I think we are coming awfully close to having a meeting without it being open when we do it that way. So we need to come up with a policy that is going to prevent us from getting in trouble.

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Sue: There was a communications policy that will be developed. We are just not there yet. But, Julianne.

>> Steve: Sure. No use in getting in trouble right away. Give us some time.

>> Julianne: I will take this opportunity to just give a friendly reminder to Commissioners.
When we push out information to not reply all back because, again, you can have a constructive quorum where there is a round robining, right, so you start just with a conversation between two Commissioners but by the time the end of the conversation is happening, either directly or indirectly, if there is a majority of Commissioners weighing in, then there will be an issue. So I would just remind the Commissioners to be sensitive to that issue during their communications.

>> Steve: And I would also think that if it goes out to all Commissioners and the approval is a nonresponse, that, in fact, is also a vote.

>> Julianne: As a group, yes. If it's individually being sent, then that would not be a problem.

>> Steve: So, okay, any other -- Doug, anything else that we should be aware of?

>> Doug: I don't have any other comments on this.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Sue: Cynthia has her hand up.

>> Steve: Anything else, Sue? You had something?

>> Sue: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I wanted to clarify with Julianne. So you are saying if we receive something e-mail from you or Suann or Edward, then it could be sent to everyone. But if we have a response or a question, we just respond to the sender, not to all?

>> Julianne: That's correct, Cynthia. And I would go a little bit deeper and say any communications that blasted out to all Commissioners at once. And I know there is different ways of sending the group e-mails, BCC's, anything, but it would be the safest course of practice for individual Commissioners to just reply to the sender would be the best idea to avoid that.

>> Cynthia: Thank you.

>> Steve: Anybody else?
Okay, we have a resolution. I'll read it. Resolved, the Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission hereby approves the offer letter dated January 15, 2021, an employment contract for Edward Woods -- contract for Edward Woods, III, say that three times fast, for the ICRC commission communications and outreach director position, which on acceptance shall be effective as of February 1st, 2021.
 Why the February 1st, 2021?

>> Sue: Edward has a job and that is when he is available to start. In the interim, he will be doing some volunteer work with us, so I can assure you.

>> Steve: Okay, very good. That answers the question.

Attached to this resolution is the letter which has been signed by everybody. And the employment contract, which has not been signed.

I would offer that up to somebody to make that as a motion. Erin had your hand up first as a motion. And, Doug, I'll take you as a second. And we will have a roll call vote. Make sure we are all on the same page.

Sally, would you do the roll call?

>> Sally: All right, Commissioners, please say yea or "Yes" or "No" when I call your name. Doug Clark?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid?

>> Yea.

>> Sally: Rhonda Lange?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Steve Lett?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner?

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Richard Weiss?

>> Yes.

>> Dustin Witjes?

>> Yes.

>> Steve: Well, if Edward was watching, it was a close vote, Edward; but you have been hired, assuming you sign the contract. And I have that in front of me, and there are no changes that I'm aware of, so I will -- am signing that presently. And I assume I'm going to send it back to Sue. You want just the signature page or do you want the whole thing?

>> Sue: You may send me just the signature page. We've approved the whole thing and we will send the whole thing to Edward, but I just need your signature to send it out.

>> Steve: Okay, we will get that out to you when this meeting is over. And I'll also send you the resolution, which I am signing as Chair.

Okay, if Edward is watching, welcome Edward. We look forward to you joining our merry band of Commissioners.

New business presentation on mapping consultants and software. We started at 1, 1:40; and who, this is going to be Rob and Mark, right?

>> Yes.

>> Steve: I see Mark.

>> Mark: Good afternoon, everyone.

>> Steve: Good afternoon.

>> Rob is on as well.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Steve: Good. I can. We can hear you. Out of curiosity, how long do you anticipate your presentation is going to be?

>> Rob: Probably, maybe half hour, 20 minutes or so.

>> Steve: Okay, all right, let's go. Take it away. Anthony, yes.

>> Anthony: Just I want to make sure I'm following along, this is the 47-page PDF titled proposal instructions?

>> Rob: No. This is the presentation at 1:45, on the agenda, I believe if I'm --

>> Sue: Rob and Mark are going to give a presentation on mapping prior to us discussing the RFP, so they have a little bit of continuing education for us and things that we are going to want to consider in that RFP.

>> Anthony: I was just -- I didn't know if you sent it out to us beforehand, or not.

>> Sue: I did not send the PowerPoint out ahead of time.

>> Anthony: No problem. Thank you.

>> Steve: Okay. Rob and Mark, go ahead.

>> Rob: I will share my screen. And can you all see that sufficiently? And hear me okay?

>> Yes.

>> Rob: Okay, thank you. And just to sort of reintroduce, I was here in early December sharing with you about the data and the kind of the redistricting committee's work on preparing data over the past 25, 30 years and helping you with sort of understanding what is currently available. And thank you for inviting myself, and Mark Holmes is also here. And Mark heads up the State of Michigan's mapping software team that helps provide services to all the departments and is a key contributor to that committee's work and preparing data.

This particular presentation is designed really around the tools and the RFP more as a continuing education. It recognizes that this Commission is not going to be doing the drawing of the work or turning the dials or making the maps. But that, in order to create an effective RFP, and in order to ultimately help make the best decisions in selecting appropriate vendors to help support your work, this information may be a good tool for

you to help you do that more effectively. And so that is what we are going to talk about today.

And Mark is here. Mark has quite a bit of experience in some of the RFP work and some of the detailed mapping work, so he likely will jump in as certain discussions and questions come up.

I just wanted to give you an overall presentation approach. Kind of what I was saying just a minute ago, we want to help you as a Commission have perspective on what is important, what's generally best practice, what is out there in the industry. We understand that, you know, you come from different backgrounds and want to make sure you are all to a certain level of understanding.

And that is the next point here is there is a number of tool terms, acronyms, lingo. And we want to make sure that you are aware of some of that and what it means so that you can be an effective participant in this process.

There's also just some general guidance around how some of these products are licensed and some of the costs and how some key considerations as you're thinking through the RFP and what to ensure is in there.

There is going to be some key requirements to ensure that the line drawing and the redistricting services are going to meet your needs. And we are going to talk about that a little bit.

And then ultimately some ideas around what you should be looking for in a vendor, some of the more soft skills around some of the vendor capabilities that you may have an opportunity to select from.

A little bit about redistricting in general, just as it has it has changed over the years. Back in 1990, there were a few products out there what they called a geographic information system. It was a -- you install it on a desktop computer and you could do some limited work, very limited. And at that time it was mostly -- there was quite a bit of manual work as well.

In 2000, in that cycle, some of the desktop products became more and more common. Most of the states out in the 50 states were using some product out there at that time for doing their redistricting and drawing boundaries.

In 2010 you started to see more web-based tools, more interactions with the public than ever before and in some of the states. More ways to get more people involved. It was less of a specialty where you had to hire some very, you know, very experienced person just to turn it off. And so this became more available to more people.

And then in 2020 I think one of the big, important pieces here is it's becoming -- it's still a desktop product to help draw the plans and make the reports and meet your criteria. But more and more it's becoming what they call a Saas or a software as a service solution. Basically what that means is you may have vendors replying to your RFP that is talking about not installing anything as a possibility, but it's all Internet based. Everything is run from a server somewhere else and all the sharing and

dissemination is happening completely via the Internet. So that is an example of how that's changed over the years and how some of the RFPs have changed.

Why is it important to kind of know the common features?
Well, one of the items that you're going to have to sort of continue to work through is that while you're not doing the mapping directly, you're going to be interacting with a vendor with capabilities and they likely are going to be using terms, talking about different things they are doing, and you want to be as engaged as you need to be throughout the process.

And so some of these software products, you know, they should be able to, the tools and the vendor, the service provider should be able to create and report redistricting plans. That seems like a basic capability, but that is something that is very important for Commission work, to be able to have those available at any time.

Templates are important. You are going to set criteria that is important to this Commission. That criteria can be set up ahead of time so the templates are there. You don't have to start from scratch each time. Your guidance is sort of driving how things are done by the service provider.

You have to be able to add additional data throughout the process. You have to have that capability because you as a Commission may want to add something that is really important. Maybe it's part of your discussion that comes up. And we need to add this or we need to add that. So in these capabilities you have demographic information. You have census data. You have historical voting statistics. I talked about that last time in my presentation.

And a number of the mapping related boundaries and lines that need to be able to build your plans.

These are big words, desegregation, aggregation. Basically what that means is that the capabilities, when you have data, you want to make sure it's apples to apples across all the districts. And sometimes the data comes in and it's not summarized quite right for the areas that you're looking at. So you have to be able to do some work on the data to make sure it's fairly distributed across all of the mapping-related tools and geography.

You also need to be able to use statistics to balance, make sure your populations are balanced. These are common capabilities that a vendor should be able to provide for you.

Other features, you know, a term that's been thrown out in this in redistricting process, community of interest. And really what that is, is if there is areas of the state that really are like communities that have very similar interests, you may have data that you want to ensure that you're drawing boundaries around those community of interests and not splitting them for representation in the redistricting process. You need to be able to add authoritative data.

I shared about last time the center for shared solution at DTMB is working with the committee that I talked about earlier to create lots of information that is standardized and available across completely for the state across time. Well, you need to be able to add those if the Commission so chooses.

You need export maps. You're going to be wanting to communicate maybe publicly or you may want to communicate amongst yourselves or between the vendor and service provider. And if you have a map that represents something very important to communicate or something you are wanting to express, you want that map to be easy to export and share.

You also want to be able to merge plans. Throughout the process you might be working on different parts of the state. Let's say the Upper Peninsula or let's say the Commission is looking at plans by region of the state, but at some point, you want to bring them together. The tools need to be able to do that easily, so you can see how the pieces of the puzzle fit together.

And then, again, it needs to be able to provide feedback ongoing through tables, statistics. Again, the tables and statistics really should reflect this Commission's areas of interest, whether it be fairness around voting or communities of interest or population considerations or racial considerations.

As a part of your process, you want to be immediately what did that do to some of the factors that are important to us as a Commission. And the tools need to be able to do that.

And also need to be able to compare plans. If you are getting input from let's say the public or some other communities that you're working with, stakeholder groups, you're going to want to be able to compare plans. How are they different?
What is this plan emphasizing versus that plan? Again, these are ways while you're not doing the actual work, you are able to participate very, very effectively with the process.

I just showed you some examples because the important part of the line drawing and the mapping is to become really comfortable with maps. As I said last time, this is really about building maps. And if you think about Legos or other types of where you're piecing together a puzzle pieces, if you ever put together puzzles, you know the importance of getting it right and making sure of the complete picture.

Well, if you think of puzzles, the pieces that you're going to be sort of participating with are these building blocks of geography. And I just wanted to show you some examples just so you become familiar with these as you think about your role.

Congressional districts. Again, Michigan has 14. Word is likely Michigan is going to lose one. Maybe down to 13. But these on in this map is showing the Congressional districts. Again, a way to build how it has been in the past. Maybe it's an important building block for you.

State house districts. We have 110 state house districts. And you will see those building blocks. Those are provided as a part of the tools.

The next one is state Senate districts. There is 38 of those. Again, building up.

The next one it almost coalesces. And it's hard to even see them, but this a very important, very critical building block is a census building block or geography called blocks. And that is roughly a city block. But there is 329,885 census blocks that represent completely the State of Michigan. And each one of those census blocks has a population that becomes very important in the redistricting process.

So, again, just so you're familiar with the tools, need to be able to work with all of that efficiently and speedily.

We also have block groups. There is 8205 of those.

Minor civil division. Let's see. Census tracks. We have over 2000 of those.

Minor civil divisions, which is cities and township building blocks for making districts, there is 1516 of those.

And if you think about those made up of cities, which is 276 cities and a 1240 townships, so that represents those building blocks.

Counties, there is 83 of those. And then voting precincts, and that changes over time, but these are essentially your election precincts from each jurisdiction. In 2020 there is approximately 4754 of those. In 2016 there was 4800. So those change a little bit over time depending on what the local communities are doing. But, again, it gives you a perspective of the perspective you have at your fingertips.

Now, to me one important things I wanted to share is that the software is about checking validity of your criteria. So you as a Commission will come up with a number of factors that are very important to you. Let's say, for instance, political fairness, right, as an example, through past voting history. So you might want to be able to really set that criteria as a starting point. And the tools need to be able to work with that and ensure that when it reports back you can see in a dashboard or some form of statistics how is that meeting your criteria.

So but in some of the checks you don't want anybody left out. So these tools should be able to look at unassigned areas. You want no gaps in the State of Michigan where they are not represented by a district.

You also want to make sure everything is contiguous; meaning, that you don't have breaks where there is a district here and then another district is out here and they are separated. They need to be together as a basic measure.

Also look at compactness. Compactness is about how tight or compact the district is. And that is a measure of fairness as well over time to ensure communities of interest and areas that are staying together.

Also finding areas that are assigned to more than one territory. You know, you should be making sure that validating, that there is no areas with overlap. You don't want more than one district representing an area. So these tools need to find those and ensure it's not happening.

Deviation, you set targets, populations, calculations, deviations. You don't want it below a certain threshold. In the past, state, house and Senate district had a certain threshold of population. And you did not want to go below. And the software should ding and identify, hey, we have a problem here. It's not meeting our certain criteria of threshold.

And ultimately you need to continue to link geography and data so you can work with it together, okay?

The next one is just some examples. Again, becoming familiar with maps. You're going to see a lot of maps through your process. And the tools need to be able to create plans and districts that are easy to read, that are legible, that are understandable, that the committee or the Commission can work with.

The tools can create districts on the fly. With some of the new capability, you can be sitting in a room and say, well, if you grab this district and add this, what happens to the districts? And literally you should be able to do that type of work as a Commission on the fly if you so choose to.

Okay?

And then you can also look at the reports and statistics. They can be updating while you as a Commission are looking at the maps and maybe making some adjustments to that map. The charts and graphs and the map is changing as somebody is literally following your direction as a Commission.

So they need to be able to continue to give analysis, quick reports, export them, print them, make them available to you to take home, look at them in a packet that you might review offline. Things such as that are very, very critical to ensuring everybody is participating and effectively, you know, working through this process.

Here is an example whereas a plan, as a software. And you are selecting a district and looking at, show us this district and what's the population? What is the racial characteristics from the Census Bureau? What is some of the voting patterns? That particular product should be able to do that and you should be able to see that on the screen, legibly on your computer or, you know, projected in a Commission room, okay?

So, again, that is just some examples of what they can look like and how you can interact.

The reports, population summary reports, demographic, election history reports, community of interest reports, other kinds of factors and reports should be able to be printed or displayed on your screen.

And then, again, other validations for fairness like compactness, deviations, population deviations, or racial deviation. Those can be made available to you so you as a Commission can continue to check what the plan is saying, to what is important to us as a Commission in our scenarios.

Now, the software itself, it's important to note, and I kind of mentioned it earlier, there is quite a few features that have changed over time. And one of the big features is this

online software as a service. It allows you to really just connect via the Internet securely with log-in password, those sorts of things. But then you can really do all the work and you don't have to worry about installing or something is, you know, a server is not working. That's been a real effective across the nation. And a number of areas have been using software as a service. That doesn't mean you have to do that. You can get software installed and you can do that approach as well. But you may see that as a capability in an RFP and something to be considering.

Sharing plans, critical. You may be working on plans and you need to bring them up, share them with the Commission, share them with other stakeholders, whatever your desire. But you need to be able to do it easily. You don't have to mail them or, you know, wait for two days; you should be able to see them and share them easily.

Getting public review and input. Again, being able to publish something, having a way that there is a way to get input from public and have a common, centralized way to receive that, and then maybe distribute that to Commission members or use it as a part of an agenda or go over a particular question-and-answer period. Those sorts of things the tool should be able to provide for you and make it easy.

Also, marking of the tools. Sometimes you don't want to actually go into the software and don't want other people changing something, but maybe like, you know, similar to a magic marker on a screen that's over, you can sort of draw on it and say I want to look at this here. This is something I'd like to talk about in the next Commission meeting. They should be able to allow you to put comments, similar to some of the Word documents and some of the other office productivity tools that you may be already familiar with. And these tools should be able to provide that as well.

Other considerations, you want to be secure. You want to make sure your data doesn't get, you know, somehow corrupted in any way. You want to make sure that your data is clean. The data is accurate, to your standards; and maintains that and is not corrupt in any way. So the consideration of ensuring that that is there in the systems that would be provided.

And then there is also other products out there that other groups may be working with that you want to look at, yet you should be able to bring in other product from other software to be able to look at their plans as well.

Just real quickly around costs, I mentioned that in a previous piece of information I sent. But it really depends on numbers of users and platforms, particularly around the software itself. They license it for desktops, number of desktops, traditional laptops or, you know, traditional PCs that you might have. Or they could do it just to have an online service, software as a service, or both.

And we've seen in the past desktop licensing ranging from 6,000 to 10,000 per license, depending on what is needed. So and how many people need it.

Again, it all depends on what the Commission feels they want to have available to them.

The Saas products can be a flat fee for unlimited per user. So it makes it a little easier for a licensing and being able to provide the information. Some of that is less manually incentive to install and ensure that the licensing is kept up to date.

There could be hosting fees on a software as a service though, and it would potentially come in an RFP response.

Also, security and terms for Saas solutions. You wants to meet your requirements to ensure, you know, who can see the information; who has access to it; those sorts of things. You know, you don't want a security breach as such.

Possible costs for integrating and configuring with other data. You may as a Commission have a starting point of information already loaded up, but there may be in your discussions might come up another priority. You want to be able to say do we have that data, is that data, is it available out there?
You might have to purchase it, you know, as you are going through the process. And you want to make sure that you can, you know, cover, that might be an extra cost and make sure it's configured with your current software.

Training costs. Sometimes there is, you know, training comes with the product. Sometimes it may not. And you may have to still account for that as well.

And then just ongoing support and maintenance. Depending on how much needs to be supported, you may have to have some service on retainer, hey, we have a problem. We corrupted some file, how do we get it back? How do we undo something. You want to make sure you get back in business as quickly as possible and so forth, so you have those costs.

Just some real quickly some considerations around the RFP itself. I'll go over this just as in preparation for some of the other discussions we are going to have soon.

But the scope needs to be defined. What is the role of the vendor and the requirements that needs to be fairly clearly laid out? You should be considering asking what is the experience of the vendor?
Company background?
What are some of their past projects and references related to that, right?
Resumes of staff. Their knowledge, what have they done in the past? Have they done similar projects? Are they experienced working with technology, committees, and the public?
What does their experience look like?

In reviewing proposals, you have to consider, you know, vendor responses. They should show to you very clearly their understanding of what you're trying to do. They should be reporting back. They should have read your materials very well and you should feel comfortable that they understand your project, they understand what you're trying to do.

You know, and, again, they, you know, there should be a thorough review of the company and staff experiences and reference checks. And then a short list, presentation, software demonstrations.

Something I've always suggested, and this is up to the Commission, but really talking to them in person, having them kind of share what they are doing. Do a demo of what they have done sometimes is be very effective.

And sometimes they will bring in subcontractors where you want to understand that, the subcontractor role to their role. You know, how are they working together? Have they worked together in the past? Consider timeline. They should be really clear on how they are going to meet your time, that you are going to have very specific timelines to meet, very clear deadlines maybe, very clear outcomes, deliveries of certain things to certain outcomes. You are going to want to see how do you plan to get there, right?

You want to see strong project management, meeting facilitation experience. You know, that they are driving to keep costs and budgets on time, on schedule, meeting your expectation. Again, knowledge of the -- it's not just around the project manager, but it's around the team, do they understand the whole process? Do they understand this type of data and statistics?

And then, finally, just some of the soft skills, really think about the capabilities to consider and an ability to listen, listen, when all said and done, listen. I can't just state that enough, that the importance of some way to listen to the Commission, hear what's being said, maybe repeat back and really digest. And then take that, asking the right questions at the right time. Clarifying, making sure there is a, you know, and then translating. There is a lot of technical details in some of this, but at the end of the day you're trying to get a job done. And you want to -- you don't know maybe the right lingo, but you're going to need or want somebody that can really understand what you're trying to get to and then kind of connect that with how to get it done and do it well to support your needs.

You don't -- you also want to make sure that the Commission is all to the same level as a part of the discussion, that the vendor is able to bring everybody to the point where they can -- nobody is left behind in the discussion. Everybody is a participant and everybody can contribute if they want to. And that there is good facilitation in that from a technology standpoint.

You want to be educated on important topics that will contribute. What is important? Based on this then I think it would be important to talk about risk, you know, to drive a success.

It's important that they would also know when to ask for help and create that relationship with the Commission. And then, of course, be an effective presenter, effective, you know, explainer. You're going to be having lots of different discussions with maybe different stakeholders, different groups. So, again, that is part of it.

And then just I just put in here just the importance of orals, oral presentations can really be helpful for you to sort of picking up on some of those abilities that may not come through in the written documentation, so something to consider as well.

And then that's pretty much it. I think I've kept it under time. And open up to questions. And Mark Holmes is here as well and certainly can jump in. And, Mark, if I missed anything, I'd be happy to sort of jump in as well.

>> Mark: Any questions the group might have right now? We can open that up?

>> Steve: Doug, go ahead.

>> Doug: I thought this was great. This is really great information. There is one item. And I noticed this is focused toward the RFP and the RFP process, but there is one item I would like you to come back if you could at a future meeting and talk to us about what's the process that the Commission interfaces with the redistricting vendor?

And, you know, how do we work together?

How do we funnel our requests to them?

How do they, you know, typically, this is from a typical perspective. And how you know how would you recommend that we work with them? Let's take an example of making changes to districts. Do we do a rules based method?

Do we do some other type of method?

And give some examples of how you have seen these processes work in the past. I think that would be helpful, too.

>> Rob: Okay, we can certainly have that discussion and discuss.

>> Doug: Yeah, you can work with Suann and Sally and we can get that lined up.

>> Rob: Other questions?

>> Cynthia: Well, I don't really have a question, but I really appreciate the information that you gave us. It really helped clear up some thoughts in my head. And I agree with Doug, that would be really great for a future conversation, his idea.

>> Steve: Anthony?

>> Anthony: So I think, you know, everything in this PowerPoint was very useful because we are going to have to obviously decide between vendors. But I'm wondering because none of us really know this field too well, of the people who create this software, are all of these things that you listed commonly found in the RFPs that we're going to be receiving?

Or, you know, I just don't know. And you are saying they are commonly found. Like are they actually commonly found or are we really going to have to look out for these specific things on each one?

Like I guess what I'm asking is: How different can we expect the software to be between different vendors?

>> Rob: Mark, do you want to add to that?

>> Mark: Sure, yes. So a lot of the foundational piece listed in there, the ability to do work, those are all, you know, from what we have seen with -- those are main components and some proposals could change and some new tools for collaborations and there may be some differences there between some of the platforms that allow you to, you know, share the information or if it's a software as a service of how you are interacting with it, if it's either on the desktop or in a cloud. I think that is where you will see some variations.

But for creating the maps and using the core data that needs to feed it from the census geography, the statistical information that goes along with seeing those results changing and what the impacts are, those are all pretty standard, you know, within software today. So the expectation is you will see a lot of that common functionality across the proposals that you will receive.

>> Steve: MC?

>> MC: I believe --

>> Mark: I hope I answered the question.

>> MC: I may be losing you, so I'm not sure if I'm breaking up or so I will try to say it. The Center for Shared Solutions, that's where you, like Rob and Mark, that is where you're coming from, is that true? Do I have that correctly?

>> Mark: Yes. We are a group within DTMB. And we are under the GS manager within Center for Shared Solutions. So our team updates, for example, all of the county maps and municipal city maps and variations. And we have that statewide data that we are maintaining and we can provide, you know, that would be coordinated, that you want to have included in your system.

>> MC: Excellent. So I think my question is: As we -- if you could -- can you hear me?

I apologize I had to turn off my video.

>> Steve: We can hear you. Go ahead.

>> MC: The relationship between -- you know, we are putting out a request for proposals. We will receive proposals and I think, Mark and Rob what I'm asking is: The relationship that the State, right, the Center for Shared Solutions where you with are doing all this data, right, will our vendor, the people that write the proposals, will they be working with you all?

Is it our staff?

Is it the Commission?

There is a part of me that wants to try to conceptualize there are pieces we will be using from you all, I think. And could -- you either of you talk to that, how that relates to our RFP and maybe it's already in there. Yeah, a little more understanding.

>> Rob: Well, really, I'll go back to it's really up to the Commission, first of all, first and foremost, of how you want the groups to work together. But in the past, and when I

presented previously I kind of explained it as we were the service provider to help facilitate the creation of all these data sets basically.

And then we made it available simply to be able to plug in to some products that would work with it. And then we were hands off in terms of the actual drawing and all of that. So, in essence, we could, let's say, I'll put a scenario out because it's totally your decision, but you could say, okay, have a meet and greet and explain how to use the data. We could give a tutorial. We could say here is how you get it in and maybe with the vendor say is it working good?

Good. Do you know what I mean?

And we can do it in that way. And that is sort of how we have done it in the past to ensure that all the data is ready, all the data is clean, and it works with the software.

>> MC: Thank you. I've neglected to add because we are working with a limited budget, what imaging is if there is public data that we can use, that we know is good and, let's say, non-unbiased, right, to not, right, request our proposals to duplicate that data, so to speak, or that we wouldn't pay for something that we can, yeah, I want to use our budget well, so that is the crux of what I'm asking.

>> Rob: Yeah, because so let's say you are in a different state, and, you know, whatever that state would be. Some states may not have the complete data that we may have already. And so a vendor may be bidding on something like another state thinking that they have to provide that, too. So it might be important, again, totally the Commission's decision, to say we already have this. So everything but this, you know, something to that effect, might clarify and help get a more targeted response, yeah.

>> Sally: MC, on that point, I wanted to jump in real quickly and mention that that is actually addressed this the RFP. And I can talk a little bit more about that. But under the database section of the RFP it specifically talks about using the data from the Center for Shared Solutions and the U.S. Census and a couple of other sources.

I would also you know just advise the Commission if you look up GIS open data for the State of Michigan, the Center for Shared Solutions helps make available publicly available data when it comes to all of these topics that they are talking about.

So what you are describing in terms of data that we know everyone agrees on and is sort of the authoritative source, Michiganders can go right now and look up some of the data that Rob and Mark are talking about. Rob and Mark correct me if I'm wrong on any of the details there, but I think it's important to emphasize a lot of what they are talking about and is already available to the public.

>> Steve: Sally, to follow-up on it, I looked up the RFP proposal and from what I heard Rob talking about, I think our RFP covers a lot of that. The RFP is very detailed, MC. So if we find something that we think ought to be in there, we can certainly add it. We have plenty of reserved paragraphs that we can use.

Who else? Doug.

>> Doug: I have a question. And I didn't see it in your presentation, Rob, but I want to bring it up. One of the items that I think is important, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, is that, you know, we will probably start off with a base map and then make changes to it based on input from the Commission, or whoever. And they will redraw another map, and they will take that second map and maybe we will tweak that a little. And the third time and a fourth time.

But then at some point we may get to the point where we say change number five is no good, I want to back off and go back to change number four.

And, also, as part of this discussion, I also want to track what changes I've made from version to version and I also want to track why I made them.

Now, is that a function of the Commission or a function of the redistricting software people or both?

>> Rob: Well, I will take a stab at it and, Mark, jump in here as well.
Versioning is a very important function. I did not mention it in the presentation. But you really do need to have versions dated. You have comments like this version, this version represents this emphasis, or whatever it is, right? You should be able to have that. And, you know, going back to a version is certainly a capability of these tools and should be a capability of these tools.

To me it's both because it's the interface between the Commission and the let's say the service provider. Let's go back. And they should be able to do that really on the fly for you, I mean, in a work session, let's say, if that is how you're doing it.

So, Mark, you want to jump in?
To me that is a basic capability, and maybe didn't mention but certainly should be there.

And I would say you should be able to, on a tool, comment on, you know, what is the distinctiveness of the plan? This emphasis plan, right, and have descriptions about it that you can always refer back and jog your memory. Because you may be looking at a lot of them and, you want to, you know, have some key terms in there that you can search for.

>> Doug: Well, it may also become important at the end when people question why did we redistrict this way? And we have documentation on all the changes we made so that we can justify, you know, from a legal standpoint or just however we did it, we can justify that to the public.

>> Rob: So that would be a requirement to the software service provider. Document these as we go, keep them with the plan, bundle it together, you know, as a part of your output, yes.

Mark, I'm sorry, you made it sound like you were going to say something, too.

>> Mark: I know my Internet connection has been unstable here; but, yes, I agree with that, that would be capabilities within the software. And these are some of the good example of some of the questions as you get to maybe short list presentations or demonstrations that it would be good to walk through with the vendors as well and, you

know, ask each of them as they do their demonstrations and presentations to the Commission.

    >> Steve: Any other questions for Rob?

Anthony?

    >> Anthony: Do you guys know of any sort of, I don't know, like an agency or a -- is there any entity that governs this whole industry of map drawing software as a whole?

    >> Rob: Mark, would you say that -- would that be -- well, I was going to say this is at the state level, right?

    >> Anthony: I'm not sure. Is there a State one?

Is there a Federal one?

    >> Rob: Do you have that, Mark? And do you know of particularly the industry oversight for the GIS products?

I think there is one, right?

I can't remember.

    >> Mark: Sorry, I missed the first part of that. I was just switching over to the phone here.

    >> Rob: The question was: Is there a national or other bodies overseeing sort of the redistricting software or similar tool capability for this space?

I mean, there is GIS oversight, right, committees, you know, for this mapping software.

I was thinking news chick, but that is a state level, right, that sort of oversees State.

    >> Anthony: And, you know, it could be there is not any sort of like, you know, internal, in industry governing agency; but I would think that there might be.

    >> Mark: It looks like I'm unmuted now. I was switching over to my cell phone. It just unmuted me. It told me. So, yes, to my knowledge, not -- there is no standards, book qualities I know of on a national basis, you know, that it's setting up some of the standards I think just from the program overall. There are different, you know, like Federal, I'm trying to think of some of the acronyms that I think do. Some of the maybe oversight or just from an organization standpoint there is the national I don't know if it's NLCS I think is maybe an acronym. So I know they have done webinars and presentations around some of this information as well and what to be looking for.

    So there is an organization at the national level that they have a website and webinars around this. That is probably the closest thing.

    >> Rob: National Conference of State Legislatures or Council of State Legislatures.

    >> Mark: That would be a good resource in terms of information there.

    >> Anthony: Can you repeat what the acronym stands for?

    >> Rob: National Council of State Legislatures, NCSL, I believe.

    >> Steve: Okay, Dustin, you put up a comment. And I think I would like you to present that to our presenters here and along the lines are they, you know, how tied in are these vendors to a specific party?

>> Dustin: Right, yeah, that was one question that I had. I'm wondering if we are using vendors to help draw these maps for us, because I was always under the impression that we were going to be doing that, do we need to take the political affiliation of these vendors into consideration while they are drawing these maps?

>> Rob: I'm not sure I'm qualified to answer that question because that is sort of, I think a Commission decision. I think there are. There are service providers out there I believe that have done support for certain sides of the aisle. That is general knowledge. I think there is others who may be aren't. So but I guess to me that would be a Commission discussion on whether that is a criteria of importance, or not.

Mark, do you have any other knowledge about?

>> Mark: No, no. I would agree. I don't think I can answer that question. It's more of a Commission question or something to talk through.

>> Steve: Sally?

>> Sally: Commissioners, if I could just hop in here on this question, and we will get to this when you fully discuss the RFP, but there are provisions in the RFP right now that really talk about disclosure of that kind of information. So, you know, depending on what consultants, what individuals do offer a bid for this service, you would have that information about, you know, potential politically related conflicts of interest that that individual might have. So I just wanted to mention that.

>> Dustin: Okay, I appreciate that. It's something I put in the chat but thought it would be better to bring it up to everybody so everyone can hear so.

>> Steve: I think we could be safe in assuming that whoever is out there providing this service has worked for one side or the other or both sides since those are the people that are going to want this service, number one.

And, number two, they are the ones with the money and going to pay them. So I don't think you're going to find a neutral.

Okay. Any other questions before we move on?

>> Anthony: I will just add, that is our job to make sure whatever we are getting remains neutral because we can edit, we can decide how we want to use the software that we are getting, you know, however we want as a Commission. So, you know, we can always adjust the perimeters, adjust the different things that, you know, different metrics that were in the presentation that we just received to, you know, to make sure that everyone is going how we as a body decide we want it to.

>> Steve: Well, we always have the option to change vendors if we feel that they are absolutely skewing this in a way that's not going to be unbiased and fair. So.

>> Rob: If I can just add just, again, some of the capabilities to be considering and some of it is going to come with the products, but the transparency in making sure no one is left -- you know, everybody is at the same point and being a part of that process. Tools need to allow that to happen so that there is no, you know, mystery to what you're trying to do. I think it's very important that it's, you know, transparent; you can share it,

your criteria. You know, you should be able to, with some of these tools, show me that again. Right?

Let me see the statistics on that. You know, because that is not maybe what we agreed to or whatever the case. You really should be able to have that sort of ongoing transparency between what you're seeing and what you're comfortable with.

So, again, similar to what I just shared, but to sort of piggyback on the other comment.

>> Steve: Anybody else?

Okay, Mark, I'm assuming that you have something for us today. Am I correct?

>> Mark: No. I'm just supported Rob in that presentation.

>> Steve: You are just carrying the bag.

>> Mark: Yes. Are there any questions on the data or anything that we produce in DTMB support? So those are some of the questions that came up there. But, yep, just helping Rob and any questions around the GIS portion of it.

>> Steve: Well, if nobody has any questions, number one, I want to thank Rob and Mark for being here with us. And, again, providing us with some excellent information, considering that we come in knowing nothing. And sooner or later maybe we will catch on.

And, having said that, it's 2:32. We are going to take a break. Cynthia?

>> Cynthia: Will we be able to have a copy of that PowerPoint?

>> Steve: I'm sure we will. Sally or Sue, Sue, can you get us a copy sent out?

>> Sue: Absolutely. I will send out a copy. And also Rob and Mark have agreed to stick around while we discuss the RFP so they can help answer any questions that might come up as we go through that.

>> Steve: Okay, that will be next on the agenda. We will take, say, ten minutes, 2:43 be back here.

>> Anthony: We do have their previous two presentations. They were sent out to us. So if anyone wants to reference those, we have those as well.

>> Steve: Right. Okay, see you all back.

 [Recess]

I'm just turning on my video so you know I'm here, but I will turn it off because I keep getting messages that my Internet connection is not stable currently.

So.

>> Steve, you are there and you have a nice ceiling.

>> Almost as good as Doug's.

>> Doug: I have beams going across my family room. When I bought the house, they were stained and dark but the house was always dark and that faces to the north and where the sun doesn't come in, so I painted them white.

we get it lightened up.

>> Steve: I've had to do that every house I have been in. It seems I will get smart enough to know that my wife will make me paint dark white, so I ought to buy a white one to start with.

>> Doug: I have all my big windows like the sliding glass doors face to the north so I don't get a lot of sun coming in from the south side. And I don't think of those things when I buy a house, you know.

>> Steve: Do we have everybody back?
If you are not here, raise your hand. It looks like we do. And our next is a review of the format for the RFP for consultants, specifically map drawing in this one. Line drawing and redistricting technical services.

I made a lot of jokes about this contract, but actually I was impressed. I realize that there is a lot of stuff that has got to be in there because it's the State. And over the years when you run in to a problem, you add something and you never take anything out. So that's the way it goes. But there were, certainly, things that I have not thought of. Of course, I did not give it a lot of thought. But it certainly is a process and a task for somebody who wants to contract with us to have to provide us with a lot of information.

Sally, are you handling the discussion or is Sue? Sally is. You got your hand up so.

>> Sally: Well, I thought if it would be helpful to the Commission, I'm happy to kind of talk about some of the kind of content of the RFP and how the team came to the draft that is in front of you before you guys dive into your discussion. And then, you know, of course, let you all take it away. But thought it might be helpful to provide just a little bit of overview and background information, if you would like.

>> Steve: We are always happy to hear from you, Sally.

>> Sally: Great. A couple of things, one, in drafting this RFP, the team looked at RFPs for similar services in several different states, you know, to try to not reinvent the wheel in terms of what was listed, what was asked for, and all of that. So California, Arizona. Mark was able to provide other RFPs from Alaska, several other states.

And, in large part, some of the structure scope of work in this RFP mirrors some of the California Commission's RFP because I just felt it was a really logical way to layout the scope of work instead of just a bunch of random requirements that didn't really follow in logical order.

And, you know, and Chad can certainly speak to any of the particular pieces a little bit more. But I just wanted to highlight for all of you a couple of things.

One is that the vendor questions worksheet, as Steve mentioned, is really just asking any bidder to give you all as much information as would be relevant to you in making a determination.

And you can see in some of those questions asking things about particular experience that they have had, especially related to redistricting that you all will want to know about in determining a vendor.

There is also a section in the RFP that asks for resumes of key personnel and talks about the need for the firm or the key personnel or both to have experience doing redistricting work.

And then the sort of the section that begins on Page 17, the statement of work and contract activities really starts to give the bidder -- this is where, you know, a statement of work or a scope of work really exists within the overall RFP.

And so, you know, the idea here just to kind of build off of what Rob and what Mark were talking about to you all earlier is there is -- you need someone or, you know, the way that this RFP is written is to seek an individual or a firm or a set of individuals who can, at your direction, do the technical process of the mapping. And it asks for them to both talk about their ability to that at your direction and asks them to describe the software and other tools that they will use to do that for you all.

So, you know, just to address, I think, Dustin's sort of questioned earlier about oh, I thought we would be doing it. It's certainly not that you won't have to ability to interact with the maps or do it yourself. But, again, you all are decision makers. So the idea here is that this is someone who can do the legwork for you and have expertise in doing that legwork and working with data and analyzing data so that they can report back to you, you know, take in your instruction and report back to you both in real time and between meetings.

So I'm happy to walk through in a little more detail. I don't want to waste your time though. But I would highlight from a content perspective the statement of work and/or I guess it's more called, yeah, statement of work and contract activities, the scope section is really where the content is different in this RFP than the overall template, which has a lot of sections, as you noticed, that are really standard and part of kind of normal requests for proposals and some of the terms that a bidder agrees to.

So I'm happy to answer any questions. But I just wanted to give you some background on how this draft came to you.

I should also say Mark and Rob were able to review the scope of work and provide any edits and the vendor questions as well. And Chad Basset, of course, really helped shepherd this through. So it's been a collaborative process at sort of a staff level to bring it to you all at this point.

>> Steve: Okay, who -- I take it Julianne and Sue and you who worked on this. You said staff, and that covers 5,000 Secretary of State employees, I guess, but go ahead.

>> Sally: So Sarah, myself, Julianne, Sue and Mike and Chad Basset, and, like I said, Mark and Rob also were generous enough to review it, as sort of more of content experts. So many people tried to bring this to all of you in the form that it's in. Which is not to say that there are not edits or changes that need to be made, but more just wanted to assure you that it has been reviewed by several folks with either procurement expertise or some content expertise.

>> Steve: Good, fine. Sally, are you going to lead the discussion then?

>> Sally: I would leave it to you, to all of you or one of you or perhaps Sue, but certainly not myself.

>> Steve: All right. That is fine. Are there, to start off, does Chad or Julianne or Sue, or who else you mentioned, have anything at this stage to add? Anyone have any comment to add before we open it up for questions by the Commissioners?

>> Chad: Yeah, I do not have anything to add before we get started. So other than this is just I start with the standard template that we use for, you know, all RFPs for, you know, executive branch agencies. And kind of tailored it to the Redistricting Commission. And removed things that would not apply to you and that sort of thing. So that is kind of how we got to where we are and look forward to finishing these RFPs up with you.

>> Steve: Okay. Julianne, do you have anything?

>> Julianne: Thank you, Steve. I definitely appreciated all the subject matter expertise that Chad and Rob and Mark brought to the table and enjoyed working through the draft with them, again, to be very, very sensitive to the autonomy of the Commission and the singular purpose of the Commission.

>> Steve: Sue?

>> Sue: Again, I would thank the whole team. It certainly was a team effort and reiterations. And I apologize we could not get it to you more quickly. But I will tell you we were all working. Everybody was adding and then we have a new version. It's going to be kind of like the maps themselves. And many, many versions until we got to this point.

And, you know, I would suggest to you look at the timeline. It's a pretty streamlined timeline, with Chad said he kind of started with, well, if we could get this done by March 1st, what would we have to do?

And in order to do that it's still going to be tight because after those proposals are received on February 10th, if this is approved and can go out tomorrow, there is still a lot of work to be done in between. He mentioned it takes about four to six hours to review a proposal. So depending on how many come through, you might want to rely on staff again and MDOS staff to do the initial review. Chad has agreed to help us if that is the way the Commission wishes to go. And then, if possible, we could bring maybe a recommendation to the Commission for the top consultants that we would recommend based on the proposals and the Commission may wish to interview those people.

So in order to make this happen by March 1st, it really is a pretty tight timeline.

>> Steve: Agreed. And, Rob, anything to add at this stage of the game even though you have told us everything?

I think Rob disappeared.

>> Rob: I'm here. Sorry. I'm fumbling for the unmute. No. I think it's well said, everyone; and I have nothing else to add.

>> Steve: Okay. Actually, I'm going to ask Doug, yeah, you kind of kicked this thing off with your two or three page RFP proposal. And they managed to expand that as all good attorneys and bureaucrats do. And so we know we are dealing with professionals. What are your thoughts?
I'll assume you've had a chance to look at it.

>> Doug: Oh, yeah, I read through it last night. And what I had originally put together was just a statement of work. I didn't -- not the whole package. I mean, because I realized the State had certain things they had to incorporate and, you know, that are standard on every RFP and I didn't know what that those were.

 I have a number of questions.

   When I originally put the thing, with the draft together, I specifically talked about three deliverables. One on Congressional districts. One on state representatives. And one on state Senators. But I don't see in the RFP where it specifically states those. So maybe get some comments on why those are not specifically stated, or if they are stated they are inferred somewhere.

>> Sally: Hi. So, Commissioners, I was just looking to find the correct part. That is a great point, Doug. So currently I believe it's on Page 22 of the document. It talks about those final redistricting plan reports.

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Sally: And then it cites the Constitution. So, to your point, it could absolutely be a line added to indicate that it's those three sets of maps. But that is where that is mentioned right now.

>> Doug: Okay. But then they would have to go to the Constitution to see that.

>> Steve: Well, let me jump in a little bit.

>> Sally: It's also in the background section I would say; but, yes.

>> Steve: As I understand your question, Doug, you specifically said that they had to come in with the Congressional districts, the state rep, and the state Senate districts.

>> Doug: Correct. That is what I see as our deliverables to act of legislature in the state. I could just infer we are just doing the Congressional districts, you know. And we don't have it priced out to do all three.

>> Sally: Doug, just to add to the places where it's cited in the document, also on Page 18 at the top of this it talks about you all seeking qualified experience contracting to provide mapping and line drawing services for redistricting U.S. House and Michigan State House and Senate Districts. So that is, sorry, it took me a minute to find that specific reference; but I found it eventually.

>> Doug: Yeah, I must have missed that then. Okay.

>> Sally: Great flag and thanks for flagging it.

>> Doug: I don't know if you want to add it somewhere else or if that is good enough for the RFP perspective.

The other thing I didn't see was, and it may be in here, is a requirement for archival of data and the final deliverables because at some point, like, for example, all of our e-mails are going to get archived somewhere. And so why shouldn't the work that we have contracted out to a vendor get archive and provided to us, back to us?

>> Chad: Yeah, that is something I thought about last night after I finished up for the day, where is the repository going to be for this information?

>> Doug: Right.

>> Chad: And how do we hand it off in ten years to the next Commission if that format is even viable in ten years as far as the technology?

>> Doug: We may, Chad, we may want to have specific software and have the software put it in escrow for ten years.

>> Chad: Yes, that is very -- we do that in many contracts.

>> Doug: I don't know if it's in this one. I didn't see it in this one.

>> Chad: I will make a note of that one.

>> Doug: Okay. And then another item that I talked about in the presentation was versioning. And I didn't see any change or any statements relative to tracking our changes during the development process.

>> Sally: Doug, I believe both of those points are mentioned. And it will take me a second to find it, so I will come back once I find it.

>> Doug: I will go on.

And another one, another question would be, and not really a question, it's just how this is going to work, once we select a vendor through the RFP process, then they will be issued a purchase order. And then they would get paid off of that purchase order and then the State would put that pick up against our budget. Is that how it's going to work?

>> Chad: Yes, so what we would do, once we award, you know, a contract to a vendor we will create, you know, a master agreement with them.

>> Doug: Yes.

>> Chad: And since the Legislative Bureau will be paying the bills, they would be paying against either, you know, a DO or a standalone invoice against the contract itself.

>> Doug: Okay. But that would hit our books and go up against our budget then.

>> Chad: I believe so. I'm not familiar with the budget part of it, but it would make sense.

>> Sally: Yes.

>> Doug: Um.

>> Sally: Doug, if you want, I can follow-up on your other questions about track changes and document storage. So in key deliverable two, starting on Page 21, right now it's written down is a public meeting participation. And it talks about under that section documenting the ICRC's instructions and public testimony throughout map

development. This should allow the ICRC and ultimately the public to track changes and reference the reasons or rationale for given map or given change and the public testimony or other submissions related to a given map. And it goes on to talk about digitally storing, producing, and projecting plans, maps, and line drawing on screen. And being able to transmit that clearly and being able to provide those files, PDF, and corresponding instructions to the Commission and the public in between meetings.

>> Doug: I think it's handled through that.

Another question, I only have a couple left, once we submit, put the RFP out and got it done and put it out, how are the vendors identified to respond back to them or do they have to go look for this?

>> Chad: Yes, so we are doing this kind of twofold. I received access bid letting software, basically it's ERP. And that is where we pay all the State bills and do our bid letting and so on and so forth. So I got access to Redistricting's, the department, so I can issue bids on behalf of you.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Chad: So what we are going to do, once the RFP is finished, I will put it out on it's called Sigma. I will put it out on Sigma. And how it goes out to the end users as vendors are concerned, so vendors, they sign up in Sigma underneath certain commodity codes. So if a computer consultant wants to receive business about, you know, anything IT related, they sign up for X amount of, you know, commodity goals.

So what we do when we publish this, I will probably select five, six different commodity codes. And any vendor that is registered underneath those commodity codes, they will get notification that, hey, there is a bid out here that may interest you.

So then also what we will do, we are also going to put a copy of the RFP on the Redistricting site for public consumption, too.

Then, also, a third aspect that we also use is do we know any vendors, have we heard of vendors who may do this or think may do this? And we also give them a heads up and say, hey, this bid is out there.

So there is multiple fronts because we obviously want to get the best vendor nationwide that can, you know, provide this work for us.

>> Doug: Correct, correct. Yeah, I know we have already got one request to do some training for us. And we responded back to them saying we want to wait until the RFPs come.

>> Chad: Cast a big net.

>> Doug: What is that?

>> Chad: So we want to cast a big net and get as many as we can.

>> Doug: Oh, yeah, good. I was just concerned how we would get them identified.

I have, I'm trying to find the page, a question, and, Rhonda, you may help me. It dealt with our discussion last night about the timing on the RFPs.

>> Rhonda: Okay, before we go further, as far as discussion, I have never dealt with RFPs, so I contacted Doug because I had a question, just so everybody knows. It was on the RFP timeline. Actually, page one was a question I had.

Oh, and there was another one regarding the State that I had.

I'm showing that the deadline for bidders would be approximately 3 p.m. on the 28th. And then it says anticipated date the Commission will post and answers to bidders' question is on Friday, January 29th.

So my question is, A, who is going to be answering the questions that bidders may have?

Because I know we are scheduled to have a meeting from 3:00 to 6:00 on the 28th. But then we don't meet again until the 30th. So is that something that Chad is going to handle or is there somebody, attorneys? How are we handling if there are questions regarding the RFPs?

>> Chad: Yeah, so I think when I put these dates in there, I was operating space because I wasn't really sure what the meeting schedule was or anything like that. So we can, you know, we can make these dates accommodate, you know, schedules and meeting schedules and that sort of thing.

>> Rhonda: Okay.

>> Chad: But usually what we do is we receive all the vendor questions by the date listed on the RFP and we compile them. Then we kind of -- I'll go through and answer the ones that are pretty easy and pretty black and white. Then I will forward on to, you know, Sue or whoever, say, hey, these take a little bit more, you know, thought than I can deliver on this. So this is more of an ICRC question than, you know, a mechanical question of how an RFP works.

>> Rhonda: And then the other question I had asked Doug about is, like I said, because I've never dealt with RFPs, was about the Michigan economic impact, which he explained to me, because it's going through basically the State of Michigan, that that is something that they automatically have in there. So he kind of answered it for me because I was not sure why, you know, we had to know the number of employees employed within the State and things like that, how it pertains to the work to be done.

>> Chad: Yeah, that is a requirement for any RFP that we put out, that the legislature put it on DTMB, I'm sorry, the legislature put on DTMB for any bids is to if we have a multiple bidder, which one is going to add more economic value to the State. So we have to do kind of, you know, some math on that. And, you, know sometimes there is no math at all on it because they are all Michigan based companies.

But I thought, you know, in the spirit of that legislation or the economic, you know, impact of Michigan and maybe it's a good idea to keep it in the RFP. So, you know, the legislation has no bearing on this. So you can remove it if you want to, but I thought it would be a good idea to keep it in there.

>> Rhonda: I just wasn't sure. Like I said, I never have seen an RFP before. I've seen contracts. But not an RFP, so I was inquiring about that.

And the only other thing I got, I did not get through all 46 pages, I got through about 22 or so. Sorry. But just a couple typographical questions. On Page 19, Paragraph C, the second sentence, it says along be the 2020 UC Census, so that should be U.S. Census?

>> Sally: Good catch.

>> Rhonda: And then one other question, page three, number five, delivery of proposal, it says the bidder must submit its proposal, shouldn't that be their?
It just sounds better to me as their because they are people and not things, I guess.

>> Chad: I will review that. And I know Sue is an English major so --

>> Sue: They are company, too. So if it was a company, which and typically would be a firm, not an individual working, so then you might use the word its, so I was okay with its.

>> Rhonda: Okay.
That's all I have.

>> Doug: I had one other typo, since we are talking about that. Let me get the page number, 15. You have a table set up and you have the items numbered, but you go from 6 to 8, there is no 7?

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Dough: So that is all the questions I had.

>> Steve: Good questions. And I think the records archive. And I don't know if Sally has found it, or not. But I was glancing back through here and I didn't see it right off the top of my head. I think it's probably assumed. However, we don't want to do that. And there are plenty of reserve paragraphs that we can use, so I think we should add something in that -- unless, Sally, did you find something? I was looking. I didn't see anything specific to that.

>> Sally: I think the language that is most direct about that, and I would be curious, Julianne, if you think any of the litigation language also might encompass that.

But in terms of storing, it does require digitally storing, producing, and projecting redistricting plans, maps, and line drawings on screen. So it does talk about the digital storing, but it's not quite as explicit as I think what, Doug, what you and Steve were talking about. Julianne, unless you think that it's covered in some of the litigation related. And it does require assistance in litigation but --

>> Julianne: Thank you, Sally. It was a topic we talked about. And I'm searching the document as well to find the language that we discussed to make sure it's in there. And, certainly, if it doesn't rise to the level that Doug is stating, we will definitely amend it to reflect that. But I'm also looking through it right now.

>> Doug: And the other point associated with that was escrowing their software so we would have it available ten years from now.

>> Chad: Yes. I made a note of that.

>> Steve: I saw where Sally was talking about that paragraph. And I think I would be in favor of putting in a specific paragraph that they will store this material just to store it, so that they have it. So it's clear, they are not saving it for litigation, though that is what it may be used for, but the expectation is that they will, in fact, keep a copy of it, as well as a copy that we keep.

Okay, anybody else?

Anything else?

Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: There was one other thing, and I can't find it, where it was talking about, they designate one particular person to work with us. And if they decide to let that person go where they are no longer working for us to give a 14 days' notice, I don't remember which section it was in. My question is: What happens if there is extenuating circumstances, maybe the person did something not ethical, or what have you, where they are terminated from that company, then how would that relate to that section of giving us 14 days' notice if they are switching our contact person?

>> Chad: Yeah, so to me, I mean, in a situation like that, you know, really it shouldn't apply. Most -- the reason we use that, those terms in there is because the larger companies, they use their A team for when they submit bids. And a lot of experience and so on and so forth. But then once they get into the project for a month, they move the A team off to the next bid response and put in their newer people perhaps who are not quite, you know, on top of it. So we want to prevent and make them think twice about doing that. So that is kind of why the number is a little higher than, you know, than you think it would be.

>> Steve: As I recall, going from memory, reading that, if they are going to make that change, they have to give us who the new person is going to be. And we get to approve or disapprove of that person. Am I right on that, Chad?

>> Chad: I believe that is the way the language reads because, yeah, we don't want them to put somebody in who has been involved in litigation before on map making, or something like that.

>> Steve: Right. Julianne, you got anything to add on that?

>> Julianne: Yes. So I'm looking at the record, reading it in conjunction with the background and the litigation section. And I think the preservation of the software that Doug mentioned, and then if we -- we have a requirement that they are holding the records for four -- that they are holding the records for four years after the conclusion of the contract, whenever that is, at the end of this contract term or if any of the options to extend are taken. So it goes about four years after that, but that is just for them holding it. We are going to be holding it -- the records will be archived, certainly, for the next Commission, but just archived even past that.

So I think we are covered on that aside from the language that Doug on the preservation of the software. I hope I'm saying that properly, Chad.

>> Chad: Yeah, escrow image, I believe.

>> Julianne: Thank you. Because a big part of accessing records is you can save things forever. But if you don't have the software to be able to recall the data in the future with how fast things evolve technologically, then -- then the information or the records are useless. So a big part of the records retention protocols is you have to be able to access the records.

And I know we are kind of talking about records three different ways now. And I've added a third way. But I think those are when you read the sections together. And, certainly, it would not hurt if the Commission wanted a separate section to be drafted and added in there to address it in one place, that would be fine as well.

>> Steve: I think we could safely put in a provision that says you are going to, you know, archive the records and you are going to escrow the program that Doug is talking about. I think that comes into one paragraph, talking about that, my opinion.

>> Julianne: And that's currently on Page 44.

>> Chad: And as Rob was talking earlier about software as a service, mapping software, I'm not sure how escrow works with that type of software, so I just --

>> Doug: I'm not either, but when they do escrow it, or however they do it, we need to make sure it's the right version too that they have used.

>> Rebecca: There typically is not a software escrow with software as a service.

>> Chad: I didn't think so.

>> Rebecca: Yep.

>> Steve: Okay, Doug, go ahead.

>> Doug: When we do escrow, when we do, we will make sure it's the same version they are using because the software companies upgrade monthly or quarterly or whatever.

>> Sure.

>> Doug: Yeah.

>> Steve: What other comments?
We are all done? MC, you've lit up, that means you have a comment.

>> MC: I'm pleased with it. I just really appreciate all the work. I have no other additions or comments. I'm ready to approve at this point.

>> Steve: Yeah, Rebecca?

>> Rebecca: Yeah, one comment, and I'm not sure, this might have come up when I walked away, someone at some point mentioned in the chat, I thought it was Dustin, that he would like to see a comment on political affiliations because that has come up multiple times. And I don't see one in here unless I'm missing it. And, Julianne, feel free to crime in if I missed it somewhere, but do we want to add something like that? Asking about, you know, political affiliations and contributions?

Now, you know, maybe it's not applicable because I'm guessing we are probably going to be doing with businesses versus individual. And I thought it was Dustin who raised it, but I'm not sure.

>> Steve: You are correct, Dustin raised it. And I guess Julianne can answer it. But I thought that was in the questions that they have to answer and provide their resumes, et cetera.

>> Julianne: Correct. And it goes even further. And looking for the page site where we are requesting disclosure of their relationships.

>> Steve: And prior litigation.

>> Julianne: Right. So it's prior litigation. It's prior contractual relationships. I'm looking for the page. I do apologize. I have it. It's on Page 11. So what we are asking for -- and as Sue noted, that a lot of the bidders are going to be anticipate companies or business entities. So they might not have, you know, a designated affiliation. So what we did was we asked for a list of contractual or past relationships, current relationships in case they are currently involved in a redistricting cycle in another jurisdiction and if they anticipate any future relationships.

So if they know there is something out there, they are going to also be bidding on to let us know that, too.

And then what we also did is we made it a continuing disclosure. So in the event that there is additional relationships to disclose, that that would also be a requirement. So if they are not anticipating doing anything and then in a few months, you know, in the contract they decide they would disclose that as well. So I think that speaks -- again, it's not a question of what is your affiliation, it's the question of tell us who you do business with. And some might -- some entities might work more on one side of the aisle or the other.

I hope that is responsive. And that was on page hopefully I gave, I think it was nine or ten if I recall. .

>> Rebecca: Yep, I found it. Thank you.

>> Julianne: I added the conflicts language in there as well. We added that in.

>> Steve: Also, Rebecca, if you look at 12 down at the bottom, it talks about describing all relevant experiences from the last 20 years, which would be two cycles, two redistricting cycles. So if they have been around for a while, they are going to have some of that experience and whether they have been involved in expert testimony, et cetera.

So I think we have got it covered pretty well without just boldly asking are you a republican or a democrat and who have you given money to. And just because they are a business doesn't mean they didn't give money.

>> Rebecca: Exactly. Well, and they are going to identify principals as well, so we can always look at that on the side if we choose to, like we have done for everybody else.

>> Steve: Okay. Other questions?

As I have made my notes here that the thing I think where we are is asking for another provision paragraph, however we want to call it, about archiving the records and keeping track of the programming somehow for a period of ten years or lifetime, or whatever.

Doug, is that what we are looking for from your point of view?

>> Doug: Yeah, that is what I suggested.

>> Steve: Okay. Can you put that in the form of a motion for me?

>> Doug: To add that or for the approval of what we talked about?

I think there are some other things we are going to add, but I will.

>> Steve: Let's do that too because we can wrap it up in one big package.

So we want to talk about archiving records and programs, so that would be one. What else?

>> Doug: Yeah, archiving the data and the final deliverables because you need the data, and the escrow of the actual program.

>> Steve: Yep.

>> Doug: Okay. Oh, boy, I can't remember the other things we talked about. We talked -- I've got them written down but I don't know which ones we said were in there and which ones weren't.

>> Steve: Go over them again and we will figure it out.

>> Doug: Okay. One was the three deliverables being identified more specifically. The Congressional districts, the State Rep Districts and the State Senate Districts.

>> Steve: Okay. I don't think that can be added relatively easily.

>> Sally: That is at the top.

>> Steve: I think it's in there, but I can't see why we just can't put it in there and say here is what you're going to do.

>> Sally: Right now that is at the top of the scope of the paragraph of the scope, so we can add it again. But I do think, and, you know, others correct me if I'm wrong, I do think it's explicit enough and covered.

>> Steve: Okay. You good with that Doug?

>> Doug: I'm good with that, yeah.

>> Steve: What else?

>> Doug: If everybody else is. I asked the question relative to the finances, which doesn't really deal with the RFP, but how are we going to get money from them which is through a purchase order and that sort of thing.

And then versioning, tracking changes during the development of the maps.

>> Steve: That is in here, and I just read it somewhere.

>> Doug: Yeah.

>> Sally: That is on Page 21 at the top of Page 21, under public meeting.

>> Doug: And we talk about how the vendors will be informed, which is an administrative thing.

And then we talked about some things Rhonda talked about, a couple items there. And so some of it was typos or grammatical things, or whatever. And then I forget what the first subject was that we talked about, Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Changing the dates for --

>> Doug: Oh, yes.

>> Rhonda: Answers to questions, so we have time to actually review any that we need to answer personally. So maybe changing it to rather than Friday, January 29th, to Saturday, the 30th, so if they have to have their questions in by 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, the 28th, that gives us time to review any that we need to address. And we can answer them hopefully on the 30th, in our meeting, and then post the answers for them.

>> Steve: Sally?

>> Sally: Rhonda, a question on that point because I think it's a great suggestion, Chad, would it be better on the following Monday? And with it being the Saturday, should it be within kind of the calendar workweek?

>> Chad: I think so because we want to pose questions on both the bid letting software and also the website, so it makes sense. Because when we post it on the bid letting software if we did it on Saturday it's not going to cycle through until 8:00.

>> Sally: Okay, great. And maybe Monday the 1st.

>> Chad: Yes.

>> Doug: Those are the only things I had, Steve.

>> Steve: Okay, so I would see basically we are down to archiving the data in the programs and then the dates.

My suggestion on the dates, and I think we just took care of that though, would be to have the team, i.e., Sue, Sally, Chad and Julianne, review those dates and make sure that everybody has enough time, including the people that are responding to the RFP and their questions and us, to look at them and give a response. So if that is good with the Commission, that would be the way we would proceed.

Rhonda, is that acceptable?

Okay, you are shaking your head, yes.

All right. Then, Doug, if you could make a motion that the RFP as presented is acceptable with the addition of a paragraph somewhere dealing with archiving data and programs in a separate paragraph.

>> Doug: Sue has a hand up.

>> Sue: Just a technicality. Is it possible for you to start with the resolution that was provided?

And then, in addition to this, you could add your extra paragraph?

>> Julianne: So what I would recommend is that the motion is made to adopt the RFP and then someone makes a motion to amend it. And then you vote on the motion to amend and then you will vote on the primary motion, which is the RFP.

>> Steve: I lost my resolution. Hold on. Yes, we can do it that way.

>> Sue: Would you like me to read it?

>> Steve: I've got it. Doug, go ahead, make a motion.

>> Doug: I make a motion that we approve the RFP and have purchasing submit it for approval or for to the vendors.

>> Steve: Okay. And a second?
Erin, second.

All right, so the motion is to adopt the RFP as presented. It's been moved and seconded.

 Now, is there an amendment, Doug?

>> Doug: Yes. I move to amend it to include the archival of data and final deliverables and the escrow of the software that was used to deliver -- to determine the deliverables.

And I also include in that the adjustment of the dates on the RFP submittal and review of its responses.

>> Steve: And those dates would be handled by the staff?

>> Doug: Correct.

>> Cynthia: I second that.

>> Doug: Cynthia, okay.

>> Julianne: So, Mr. Chair, you can take a vote on the motion to amend.

>> Steve: Yeah, I'm just writing down on the resolutions.

>> Julianne: All right. I apologize.

>> Steve: All right. We are ready to vote. We are going to vote on the amendment first. Everybody clear?
Anybody need it restated?
If not, if you would adopt the amendment, raise your hand.

 [Hands raised]

>> Dustin: I vote, yes.

>> Steve: Thank you, Dustin. Same sign with the exception of Dustin?
Okay, not hearing Dustin, the amendment is adopted.

 That brings us back to the main motion now as amended, the main resolution as amended, if you would adopt the resolution as amended raise your hand.

 [Hands raised]

>> Dustin: I also vote, yes.

>> Steve: Okay. And if you would not, if you vote against it, raise -- the same sign, raise your hand. Dustin?

>> He said yes.

>> Steve: You're not voting against it, right?

>> Dustin: No, I'm not. I voted for it.

>> Steve: It passes with a 12-0.

All right, okay, I will sign that and send it back to Sue.

Julianne, you want copies of these too as long as I'm sending stuff?

>> Julianne: That would be great. Thank you so much.

>> Steve: Okay, all right, so that takes care of that.

 Calendar for future meetings. Sue.

>> Sue: Sally had reached out with possible dates. And we talked a little bit about would it be possible just to have a consistent meeting. And then our kind, general counsel said, you know, according to the Open Meetings Act, within ten days of your first meeting of the year, you're supposed to post your schedule for the year.

It's like so I'm wondering, based on the feedback that came back, if we could do 1-4 in the afternoons of Thursdays each week as a starter point. This seems to be the best time and day of the week for everyone.

There is one exception in February and March, and that would be on March 4th, if we could move from 3 to 6 because Sally and Mike Brady are not available to us for that meeting until then.

So open for discussion. Does it help to have a consistent day?

Once a week?

Can we just do as a starter?

We can always cancel a meeting and we can always add a meeting, so with appropriate notices, of course. So just open it for discussion.

>> Steve: So you're suggesting Thursdays weekly at least.

>> Sue: Rhonda has her hand up.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I have to be honest, the 1 to the 4 and the evening ones are a little rough for me. I'm willing to bend and, you know, mornings work so much better for me with things I do outside of our meetings. Like I said, I'm willing to bend some, but I kind of like it when we mix it up a little bit.

That's just me personally. Obviously, I'll go with whatever the whole group decides. But I personally prefer mornings.

>> Dustin: I kind of have a response to that.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Dustin: I have a job, too; and I can't just always constantly be changing the times for my boss and my supervisors to approve things randomly throughout the day. And fixed schedules make much more sense, that is my thought on that.

>> Sue: We do have one Commissioner who is unable to attend on Thursday mornings between 9-11, so that wouldn't, you know, knock that person out consistently, and that is why I mentioned the afternoon.

>> Steve: MC.

>> MC: And that was me. And I think I told you, my boss is pretty, yeah, I think if I am not -- I guess I would be willing to say let's shift it for Rhonda. I think I will make -- I can make that work Thursdays, Thursday mornings. If we can make that, that morning time is preferred. I'm okay with that. I can change my schedule around.

>> Steve: You have your hand up, Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Yeah. I'm not asking anyone to shift their work schedules or anything for me. I am just simply stating what works best for me when I'm most aware and awake and concentrated, and, like I said, we are 13 people. So if 12 of you think that 1-4 is the best time, then 1-4 is the best time. I was just giving my personal preference. And I don't expect anybody to have to make special arrangements to accommodate me.

>> Steve: Doug?

>> Doug: Just a suggestion, always have it on Thursdays and on even Thursdays we have it in the morning and on odd Thursdays we have it in the afternoon.

>> Steve: Who else? Erin, you have your hand up.

>> MC: I would be okay with that.

>> Dustin: That is fair.

>> Steve: Let's hear from the rest of the troops, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: I'm super flexible. I can do it mornings. I can do it afternoons. I do think having it on a regular day might make sense because it's just more predictable, but I'm super flexible.

>> Steve: Janice.

>> Janice: Well, I'm exactly like Rebecca said, I'm super flexible, too. I do want -- I do like the idea of having it the same day every week. I was thinking, I mean, if we add times, we can always do those in the afternoon. You know, like, say, we decide we want to have a meeting on Tuesday, we could maybe do that one in the afternoon -- in the morning. So but I can go with anything, too.

>> Steve: Anthony?

>> Anthony: Yeah, I mean, you know, I don't want to hold anything up. I can do whenever y'all can do. I do think we might -- let me keep in mind we are going to need more than one meeting a week, you know, coming up, shortly, so.

>> Steve: Erin?

>> Erin: I'm just going to put this out there, but I have four teenage boys and sports are probably coming back into the picture here shortly. And mornings, I'm with Rhonda, I function better in the morning; but I am flexible as well, so.

>> Steve: Four teenage boys and one dog?

>> Erin: Currently we have five dogs in the house. We only have three. We have two that are visiting, so, yeah.

>> Steve: Juanita, you are muted. There you go.

>> Juanita: I'm pretty flexible, so it doesn't matter too much.

>> Steve: Cynthia?

>> Cynthia: So I am flexible, but I need to know kind of like Dustin just what to plan on. So if it was consistent day and a consistent time, even if it's two different times, different weeks of the month, that would be great.

>> Steve: Well, I think what -- that is fine. I mean, did I get Richard? I don't think I got Richard, did I?

>> Richard: I'm pretty flexible. Like I said, I mostly am a handyman, fixing stuff, I'll get you tomorrow, you know. So you got something you want to do, have a meeting, that is fine with me.

>> Steve: Well, we are coming into golf season so all of our retirees, you got golf leagues that are going to interfere in your mornings? Not seeing any hands up, I guess not.

All right. Well, that's fine. The will of the group seems to be the Thursday mornings, afternoons. I think mornings were kind of the set, so put out a schedule, Sue, and we will see what everybody -- see how hard they scream.

But, I agree, we are going to be scheduling more meetings than that because we are going to have more people coming in to give us education, et cetera. And, obviously, they are going to have their schedules that we are going to have to deal with, also.

>> Sue: And, just to clarify, I kind of what I thought I heard was that you were going to alternate times, sometimes do mornings and sometimes do afternoons. Maybe every other week on the schedule.

>> Steve: That was a proposal.

>> Doug: Yeah, that is just a suggestion.

>> Julianne: So, Mr. Chair, I know we are still on the discussion phase of what the Commission wants to do; but for setting a cadence of regular meetings, you will need somebody to make a motion.

>> Steve: Yeah, I know.

>> Julianne: Okay.

>> Steve: Is the alternating proposal something we want to consider? All right. Make your motion, Doug.

>> Doug: I motion that we have at least one regularly scheduled meeting each month, each week of each month, on Thursdays. And on the even number days of the month it will be in the morning and on the odd days of the month it will be in the afternoon.

>> Steve: Second? MC.

Any discussion? All in favor of the motion raise your hand.

 [Hands raised]

>> Dustin: I vote, yes.

>> Opposed? Same sign. It passes/ Anthony you are opposed?

>> Anthony: No. I was voting yes.

>> Steve: All right. Sue, will put out a schedule? Sue, anything further on scheduling?

>> Sue: I just want to let you know coming up, next week, we will have some discussion on the budget. Julianne mentioned she will have some draft bylaws for us and we will have vendor questions for the Voting Rights Act, legal counsel consultant.

So those are, you know, pretty far down the road, so I think we can get those out earlier in the week. We will send the full proposal. But, again, the formatting would be the same. And the only thing different would be the vendor questions and the statement of work, specific to the Voting Rights Act.

>> Steve: And Edward is going to be on board starting February 1st.

>> Sue: He will be officially on board February 1. He wants to meet tomorrow. So we will be talking tomorrow. I'm sure, we have talked already a few times and, you know, we feel there are things that need to be done fairly quickly, so we are going to get busy.

>> Steve: Okay. And is one of those discussion topics going to be meetings out in the community?

>> Sue: Absolutely, absolutely.

>> Steve: All right. Rhonda?

>> Sue: And partnerships with other groups that are trying to get communities of interest involved, communications, policy, yes, plans, all of the above, yeah, lots to do.

>> Steve: Okay, Rhonda?

>> Rhonda: Sue, I have a question, next week when we discuss our budget, will we be getting a printout?
I'm a visual person to kind of see where we are at, what we spend on what and where we are sitting?

>> Sue: Very little has been spent. The bills are pretty much lagging. So the only expenses that have been paid to date are for cell phones and weekly pay. And also MDOS is picking up some charges. So we are going to look at the big picture. They're, for example, currently paying for meeting translations, the transcriptions of the meeting, the recording, those kind of things, so they are covering a lot of our expenses also from their budget. So we need to look and see how much they can do going forward and what the Commission may need to pick up.

>> Steve: Doug?

>> Doug: Yes, I'd like to add an additional thing. You may have been working with this with the RFPs, Sue, but when I had drafted the RFP thing, the RFP in the fall, there were three of them. And I think another one is of importance to us, and that is, it's called a polarized voting analyst assistance and expertise, which really deals with somebody who has expertise in helping us to identify communities of interest.

So I think at some point then we need to start to address something similar to that or if we want to do that. But I think that is key that where we are moving forward, too.

And, when we end this discussion, I've got one other comment back on the calendar, so if you don't mind, Steve.

>> Steve: No.

>> Doug: That's all I had.

>> Steve: Sally?

>> Sally: Doug, I just wanted to respond to your point about racially polarized voting experts. And I'm really glad you raised it actually. That will be part of the Voting Rights Act Council RFP that all of you will review. So it will be part of that, that expertise will be part of that RFP for all of you, so look for it.

It really is part of that RFP, in part, upon the recommendation from Justin Levitt who you all heard from back in the day. And that's how the California Commission has framed their RFP for voting rights, I think in part along his recommendation. So take a look at it and kind of see what you think around that. But it is, like you said, a very specialized expertise on racially polarized voting.

>> Doug: And Justin highly recommended it. It's the one that he did present to us, that's why I brought it up. We don't need to put it on the next meeting agenda. I think we should wait until the RFP is drafted, then we can go from there. That would be my opinion. Okay, thank you.

>> Steve: Okay, Sue, anything else?

>> Sue: I think we are good on that topic. Are we ready to move to continuing education?

>> Anthony: Real quick.

>> Steve: Anthony.

>> Anthony: I think that, you know, the -- so we have the RFP, you know, drafted taken care of, approved, that is amazing. Good job and special shout out to everyone who worked on that. Steve, you kind of alluded to this a minute ago, but I think the next big take on this is figuring out how we are going to do these meetings. And how we are going to do them safely, you know, with social distancing intact and all the safety precautions that I'm sure all of you would like. So that's probably the next big ticket item we have to worry about.

>> Sue: Certainly it will be very important with that. I mean, Edward will be pretty much the point person on organizing those meetings and finding places that we can meet.

By the way, Walter Sorg sent a list. He'd already thought about that. He sent a list of different venues and what the square footage was and, you know, that might be options for us, so we will take a look at that from Walter.

>> MC: And a special appreciation for that, shout out to Walter Sorg. Thank you.

>> Steve: Okay, Doug, you had something you wanted to bring up?

>> Doug: I want to go back to the calendar for future meetings.

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Doug: I know we identified Thursday as a consistent day, but that is only dealing -- but that is -- this subject was brought up during the discussion. I think we need to meet more than once a week. I think we got a lot on our plate and we can't be short sighted on it. I think we should go to a minimum of two days a week.

>> Steve: Well, as I understand, Julianne, you can help me with the open meetings, we are posting this as the yearly regular meeting, that does not prevent us from setting whatever schedule we want to set. And it does not prevent us from changing Thursdays with an 18-hour notice.

>> Julianne: Correct. So the cadence that you are setting is just for regular meetings. So the public knows through the rest of the year, if they want to attend a meeting, that it will be on Thursdays. So, again, you're going to have to add more meetings.

I think last meeting the Chair indicated probably this summer maybe we will be meeting five days a week. But by setting a cadence of regular meetings, you are not risking yourself at all. As long as we adhere to the meeting notice provisions and the Open Meetings Act, you can have as many meetings as you want.

And I know that Doug is bringing up setting more than one day a week as the regular meeting schedule. But it wouldn't -- whatever is the will of the Commission, it does not restrict you to -- from amending that schedule in the future.

>> Steve: Just a procedural to get that set, Doug. We can adjust it as needed. And, obviously, we have not been meeting just one time a week for the last couple of months. So it's not going to restrict us in any way, shape, or form.

>> Doug: But what I'm suggesting is that we don't meet enough. And maybe we can get a straw vote. You know, not as an amendment but a straw vote among the Commissioners, whether we should meet more than once a week permanently.

>> Steve: You're making that as a motion?

>> Doug: Yeah, as a straw hold only, yes.

>> MC: May I offer that you say the number hours? And meaning like one day and eight hours is different than two days, you know, four-hour meetings, for example. I think if you suggest number of hours it would be useful for me anyway.

>> Doug: Well, I would suggest two days, four hours each.

>> Steve: I think people get burned out pretty fast after four hours.

>> Doug: Yeah, that is why I would not want to go eight, yeah.

>> Steve: Well, I think our business as we keep, continue to go is going to dictate how many times we are going to meet. I know we are meeting this Saturday. We meet Thursday and this Saturday. And I don't know what else we got coming up. But we have kind of been letting the business dictate as we have gone.

Rhonda, you had your hand up.

>> Rhonda: Are you sure we are meeting this Saturday?

>> Steve: I thought we were.

>> A week from Saturday.

>> Steve: I'll be happy to take it off my calendar.

>> Rhonda: I just want to make sure I'm not missing something because I don't have it on my calendar.

>> Doug: I have it as the 30th of January.

>> Steve: I do, too. I'm sorry.

>> Rhonda: Okay, I just wanted to make sure I wasn't missing something.

>> Steve: We are meeting next week Thursday and Saturday.

>> Doug: Correct. Well, I just didn't want us to get into a reactive mode with an overload of work. And I just thought that maybe at least twice a week of getting together would be more prudent.

>> Steve: I think we are amenable to doing that. Cynthia?

>> Cynthia: I agree with Doug. And I feel like I really learn a lot when we have people come, teach us something, like today. And every time they come, I'm learning a little bit more when I think back to those first couple days that we had. You know, it was starting from scratch and it did not sync in very well. But now it is a little more. And I think we need a lot of that before we are going to be able to take on the work that we have to do. So if we could consistently schedule that in, it would be good.

>> Steve: I guess my question, and I think Doug's question, is anybody opposed to more meetings as long as they are productive and we have something to meet for? Not seeing anybody shaking their head vigorously one way or the other, so I think we can certainly schedule as many meetings as necessary provided that there is a reason to meet. And I'm sure there are going to be lots of reasons to meet.

>> Julianne: Mr. Chair, it might also be appropriate after the budget discussions and when you are weighing in how much work outside of meetings that individual Commissioners are doing based on the volume of materials that are going to be coming forth. Even if it's not amended or added today, certainly in the very near future the Commission could revisit it.

>> Steve: Sure. Put that on the agenda. Do we have a motion? You got me off topic. No? No. Juanita.

>> Juanita: What time are these two meetings coming up going to be?

>> Steve: Okay. It is next Thursday at 3 and next Saturday at 10. Am I correct on that, Sue?

>> Sue: Yes, 3-6 on the 28th and 10-1 on the 30th.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Steve: Anything else for the good of the group?
If not, we are at our time to leave. Sue?

>> Sue: Briefly on continuing education. I provided a spreadsheet, and I want you to look at the options for future consideration. Doug added the one today, process for

interfacing with the mapping consultant. But look through those. We want feedback, so reach out to me and let me know, you know, would these be helpful? Do you have other suggestions? We want to provide you with what you feel you need.

And at the same time if there are any people watching in the public, they also get that education, also. So, again, let us know how we can better serve you in continuing education.

>> Steve: Did everybody get that continuing education sheet? Anybody who didn't get it, raise your hand. Juanita, you can't get them?

>> Juanita: I can't get half of the stuff you are getting.

>> Steve: Sue, would you mail her? Put her on a mailing list, snail mail.

>> Sue: I can do that.

>> Steve: Okay. That will take care of that problem. Well, maybe.

>> Sue: As long as the mail doesn't get it there.

>> Steve: Maybe. Okay. Anything else, Sue?

>> Sue: I'm good, so thank you very much everybody. A lot of heavy lifting today. And a lot of work to get to this meeting. So thanks, everyone.

>> Steve: Julianne.

>> Julianne: It was wonderful to see everybody today.

>> Steve: You will get over it. Don't worry about it. Okay, if not, I would take a motion to adjourn from Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: So moved.

>> Steve: And a motion, a second. MC is giving me the V for victory sign, so I take it that's it. So if everybody is in agreement with adjourning, turn off your TV. If you're not, hang around.

>> Rebecca: See you next week, guys. Good-bye.

>> Have a nice week. Take care, everyone.

>> Good-bye.

 [Meeting concludes at 3:58 p.m.]