

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

ICRC

02/11/21 Meeting

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

>> Steve: Good afternoon.

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

This is a Zoom Commission meeting and is being live streamed to YouTube.

For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using please visit our social media at [redistricting mi](http://redistrictingmi.com) to find a link for viewing on other platforms.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning.

We have ASL interpretation available for this meeting.

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

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

Both of those are on the screen as you can see.

Translation services are available for both Spanish and Arabic.

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

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

This meeting is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be made available and posted on [redistricting Michigan.org](http://redistrictingMichigan.org).

Along with written public comment submissions.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to the communications and Outreach Director Edward Woods, III at WoodsEIII@Michigan.gov.

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

Sally, would you kindly call the role?

>> Sally: Good afternoon, everybody. Commissioners, if you could unmute yourself and say present and where you are attending remotely from when I call your name that would be great, Douglas Clark.

>> Present and I'm remotely located in Rochester Hills, Michigan.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Present and I'm remotely located in Detroit, Michigan.

- >> Sally: Anthony Eid.
- >> I'm present, attending virtually from Oakland County, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Brittini Kellom.
- >> Present, attending from Wayne County.
- >> Sally: Rhonda Lange.
- >> Present, attending remotely from Reed City.
- >> Sally: Steve Lett.
- >> Present and I'm in Lee County, Florida.
- >> Cynthia Orton.
- >> Present, attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.
- >> MC Rothhorn, Rebecca Szetela.
- >> Sorry, I was double muted. Present and attending from Wayne County, Michigan, remotely.
- >> Sally: Thank you. Janice Vallette.
- >> Present, and attending remotely from Highland, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Erin Wagner.
- >> Present, attending remotely from Eaton County, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Richard Weiss.
- >> Present and attending from Saginaw, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Dustin Witjes.
- >> Present attending from Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Thank you. There is a quorum.
- >> Steve: Thank you and note the absence of MC Rothhorn and hopefully he will get to feeling better soon.

The agenda was presented prior to our meeting and has been posted on the Internet for those of you watching or who keep track of us.

Are there any additions or corrections or deletions that we wish to make to the agenda at the present time?

Not seeing any, I would entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

- >> Mr. Chair.
- >> Yes, Julianne.
- >> Julianne: We did have a procurement policy if you would like us to go through that during the consultant selection process portion of your agenda.

>> Steve: So you're proposing to put that where?
Unfinished business?

- >> Julianne: If the Commission would like to address it today if not, I'm prepared to address it next week.
- >> Steve: Let's see we will stick it in there and this is procurement policy.
- >> Julianne: Yes.
- >> Steve: And we will see what we want to do with it.

Okay with that addition, any others?

Okay we have a motion to adopt the agenda.

Erin Wagner motion and a second Brittini.

All in favor raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

It is adopted.

All right, the minutes were provided previously and we did receive a -- I did receive an e-mail from MC Rothhorn.

We have his name correctly spelled in some places and incorrect in the others.

So it is R-O-T-H-H-O-R-N, not TT, so we can make those corrections to these.

Are there any others that anybody saw?

Sue?

>> Sue: Also after these were sent, I had missed one from Edward Woods and I want to look on page three if you will check the communications and outreach report.

It said that interested Commissioners will have the opportunity to provide an update on the commissioner's work during public hearings hosted by Michigan association of counties, townships and municipal league that sentence sounded like those were our public hearings and we want to make sure the minutes are corrected so people understand those are their meetings even though they are open meetings so if we can change that to interested Commissioners will have the opportunity to provide an update on the Commission's work at county, township and municipal Government meetings. I think that will clarify that for our Commission in the public at a whole.

>> Steve: Okay, we will make that correction.

Any others?

All right. If you would approve, I'll take a motion to approve the minutes as presented, as amended.

>> Dustin: So moved.

>> Steve: I think Brittini motioned it.

>> Dustin: I will second it then.

>> Steve: And Dustin seconded it, all in favor raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

They are approved.

Okay, public comments.

And it's my understanding there are no public comments today.

However, for anybody watching who would like to make public comments, and have not joined us previously because this is a virtual meeting members of the public have to sign up in advance in order to address the Commission.

If you sign up you will have to minutes to speak to us.

Public comment sign up links are posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook and Twitter at redistricting mi.

And you can e-mail our office at redistricting@Michigan.gov.

If you would like to submit your thoughts or comments to the Commission you may do that by e-mail to redistricting@Michigan.gov.

And they will be provided to the Commission and they are also archived.

Sue, is there any correspondence that we would be aware of?

>> Sue: I have no specific correspondence that we need to address today.

>> Steve: All right.

That brings us then to your report.

So the executive director Sue Hammersmith.

>> Sue: Anthony had his hand up.

>> Steve: I'm sorry.

>> Sue: Do you have something.

>> Anthony: That is okay. Did we receive any correspondence through our website this week?

I didn't see any and I just want to make sure.

>> Sue: We did receive public comments and they were forwarded this morning but I can send them again this afternoon to you.

The only one that really, I think needed an answer others were about mapping so that will be utilized later that information but one did ask how they could get to the agenda prior to our meetings.

And Sarah reached out to that person and told them the ways that they could reach the agenda so they know what our meetings will have -- will be covering each day.

>> Anthony: If you send that to me later, I would appreciate it.

>> Sue: For the executive report good afternoon Commissioners and thanks for your continuing work provided for your discussion today are updated key dates with approximations of our timelines for the future and we also have three resolutions one is for discharging the personnel search committee which completed their jobs and another is adopting FOIA Freedom of Information Act guidance and procedures and a third for adopting a communications plan.

We will also review the process for selecting consultants and to that end you received for your review a draft of procurement review procedures and guidelines and General Counsel Pastula will talk to you more about that.

This has been a work in progress and I want to explain that I feel lots of times I'm sending things out to you very late but when we develop a policy Julianne will start with a draft, it will go to staff, it will also go to Sally, Sarah and Mike on the MDOS staff and then we will go back and forth and make edits and comments and ask questions and these policies are receiving many, many iterations before they come to you.

And, in fact, I sent one out yesterday that we even had more iterations that happened today so I apologize things are happening so close to the meeting but again these are works in progress and when we give you something to approve, we want to it be the

best it can be, knowing that this will guide our work forward, your work as a Commission and ours as staff.

And also be the groundwork that will be laid for future Commissions so just aside on the policies you are receiving.

And then I have an ice breaker for you today and my question is what do you wish you had known or learned at the beginning of your work with the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission?

I think this will be helpful and we can you know even help to plan for the next Commission things they may want to know or wanted to learn early on in their work with the Commission so who is ready to start?

>> Steve: I'll start.

>> Sue: Okay, Steve.

>> Steve: I think the thing I wished I had had an appreciation for is the amount of work that was going -- it was going to entail and that we would have been able to jump in with both feet into the deep end of the pool a lot sooner.

I did not have appreciation at the very beginning of what we needed, what we need to do.

And of course layered on top of that is COVID and being unable to meet together.

>> Sue: Thank you, Steve.

Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: So I have been thinking about this since I saw it on the agenda. And there was kind of too much to say but I just echo what Steve said I agree wholeheartedly and I do if it's a wish I do wish we could have been quicker at getting our staff together and could have had the ball rolling a little bit faster but it's work in progress like you say.

>> Sue: Most definitely thank you.

Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I'm going to be a little more specific I want to focus on one item that is the Open Meetings Act.

I did not appreciate personally how extensive it was.

And how it was going to impact our business so I picked up on that pretty early and we had some good education on it so the meeting is fine now, thanks.

>> Sue: Good, thank you, Doug.

Rhonda, are you ready?

No, okay.

Let's go to Erin.

>> Erin: I think I was just going to reiterate what Steve had said, it would have been nice and Cynthia it would have been nice to get the ball rolling a lot faster.

Oops.

Can you hear me or no?

>> Sue: Now yes.

>> Erin: I was muted the whole time. I was going to reiterate what Steve and Cynthia said. I think it would have been nice to have the ball rolling a lot sooner than we were able to. But also, I think MDOS has done an awesome job in helping us get there. And, to be honest, I'm rather glad I did not know that much about redistricting because that way I'm not colored in any way, you know. I'm not prejudice one way or the other. So thank you.

>> Sue: Thank you very much.

Yes, I've told Julianne many times that next Commission is going to be so happy they have all these policies.

They will be there in a ready-made package for them.

They can edit if they want to, but we are developing all this from scratch so, you know, big hats off to all the work that she is doing and Edward just getting started with all that work.

But, yes, with those policies.

So thank you.

Janice are you ready?

>> Janice: I really don't know.

I mean, I didn't know anything, you know, other than what I got in that little brochure. So everything so far has been new to me.

And I don't think there would have been a way that I could have known that beforehand. I too wish we had gotten to a quicker start too.

So but everything is new to me.

>> Sue: Okay, thank you very much.

Rebecca?

>> Rebecca: There we go.

Yeah, so I would say I would echo what everybody else said like how much we have to do and how complicated it's going to be but one of my big little pickles that is annoying me right now is the lack of knowledge of what our term is going to be.

I find that creating a lot of uncertainty in my life because I'm searching for a new job and that makes it very difficult when I don't know what the term is on this Commission and how long it's going to last.

I almost wish that when they pass that amendment they would have done like the greater of X or until litigation is finished so that we would have some ballpark to say, okay, this is what I need to commit myself to for two years or three years versus when the litigation ends, and that is very challenging personally to deal with in the middle of a job search.

>> Sue: Thank you for sharing.

How about you, Dustin?

>> Dustin: Can you hear me now?

>> Sue: Yes.

>> Dustin: Okay, my I guess, kind of hard to say.

First thing is just Open Meetings Act and how strict that is.

I believe someone I think Doug said that as well but that is something, I found absolutely fascinating.

Second, is how much trees I'm killing personally printing things.

I think I took down half a forest so.

>> Sue: Thank you, Dustin.

I agree, I'm through a few reams of paper myself so I have to see things and hold them in my hand lots of times to really edit them so it's like I do what I can do.

And ink cartridges too.

How about you, Richard?

>> Richard: I guess I would agree with everything I've heard so far from the Commissioners.

I guess I wasn't realize how hard it is to draw lines with all the rules and the regulations that we have to do before we can even do the lines.

And then everything has to be so public which is good, but there is a lot more involved than I guess I thought there was up front so.

>> Sue: If I knew what I knew now and we head down the road we say yes and keep rolling.

>> I was thinking I'm kind of enjoying it because every meeting is something new, I'm learning but anything that I had appreciation for I did not have appreciation for anything. And I did not know what all this entails and I'm enjoying it and it's knowledgeable and did not think it involved so much but I am enjoying it as I go and hope not to disappoint anybody.

That is all.

>> Sue: That is great Juanita.

We are all learning together trust me on this and learning as we go and developing process and so it's a team effort you know and I'm happy to be part of your team too even though I'm staff team and not Commission team.

Brittini, how about you?

>> I have feelings like Richard was expressing in terms of just the minutia of the job but also like Janice mentioned I can't say that I came in expecting or knowing a whole bunch, so I like to just be open to the experience and just learning so much now so I think, yeah, the amount of detail around kind of like every little decision that needs to be made in the bigger picture, that's what I think is my answer.

>> Sue: So true.

You wouldn't believe the lengthy conversations over a sentence or two of a policy that your staff and the MDOS staff have had.

Some lasting a very long time and some back and forth in several iterations but again we are all trying to make it the best, right.

>> Brittini: The amount of care that is going into our work is it's detailed but it's also I like it.

No complaints.

>> Sue: It is rewarding when you see the finished product so we've got a goal in sight and we will all work at getting there together.

Anthony, how about you?

>> Anthony: This is a very interesting question.

I think I have a little bit of a different take on it because back in 2018 when the proposal to create this Commission was on the ballot I did quite a bit of research back then on it. So I was a little bit familiar with the redistricting process.

But what I didn't expect was for redistricting to become such a hot button issue that it has become over the past couple months.

I think, you know, particularly due to you know everything that happened in the last election citizens are taking up voting rights matters and things like redistricting more than they ever have before.

So it's become a lot more public and a lot more of a hot button issue than I was originally expecting.

>> Sue: Okay thank you.

It is.

We are starting to see lots of newspaper articles about redistricting.

There is interest and that's good that people are interested in the process.

And hopefully we can get those people to public hearings or to give public comment so their thoughts can be included in our work, so appreciate that.

Rhonda, should I come back to you?

>> Rhonda: I really don't know if there is anything, I wish I would have known since it was a brand new Commission and we are kind of starting it out I think for the most part we have done pretty good.

And I guess the best thing about it is future Commissions will have a steppingstone to build off from.

>> Sue: Absolutely.

Yes.

So, again, I think everybody is working to lay a solid foundation.

Everybody is committed to the process so I appreciate all your commitments.

Julianne do you have anything you would like to add as staff?

>> Julianne: As a staff member, coming in, what I wish I knew or had learned at the beginning of my work I wish I was more familiar with teams that is the new platform for me.

So that has been fun to adjust to that.

As far as technology.

As far as work, really, I think I understand and I respect the background for subsection 11.

But the constraints that it puts I think rightfully so on the Commission and staff that's really where my concern has been since I've started and what I've run in to.

Thank you.

>> Sue: All right thank you Julianne and how about you Edward?

>> Edward: I think I appreciate small victories.

We have a monumental task that is not insurmountable but just the opportunity to appreciate small victories and getting to the bigger goal.

So I think that's probably my biggest lesson learned being on at this time.

But it's a great lesson.

It's a great work.

And the mission is bigger than any individual and I'm just happy to be a part of it.

Thank you.

>> Sue: Thank you, Edward.

And I think I would echo, I wish I had been with the staff to the Commission at a much earlier date and everybody on your staff is just kind of jumping in both feet, doing the best we can as quickly as we can and as well as we can to make sure that we provide the Commission with what you need to do your job, so again I think we are all working toward the same goal and I appreciate the camaraderie and the work that everybody is putting in to make sure that we create a fair and transparent process.

Back to you, Steve.

>> Steve: Thank you, Sue.

Council report Julianne, I think we have you down on the bottom for a number of items you brought to us.

Do you have things to add at this time?

>> Julianne: I will just have a very brief statement.

Good afternoon to everyone.

It's nice to see everyone and be here.

Since our meeting last Thursday, our RFP work has been on going.

I submitted the procurement review policy FOIA policy and the OMA memo that we will be discussing later in the agenda as Steve noted.

Please expect presentations on me on the criteria and Constitution and challenges and redistricting.

A lot of the work you have seen is policy based and foundational work for the Commission and excited to move forward and the other critical areas of our work as well.

The next policies you can expect from me are the conflicts of interest and disclosures as well as records retention which I will touch on briefly today.

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

And lastly if I have not spoken with you yet, please expect a call this week or feel free to reach out to me at your convenience.

I really would love to have a one on one conversation with any commissioner that's open to doing so.

Thank you.

>> Steve: Thank you Julianne.

Edward, we've got you down on the bottom for your presentations.

Do you have anything at this time to add?

>> Edward: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to give some shout outs. It's good to work with some people and get reacquainted with others, Tommy Bocklow for the Center for local, state and urban policy provided and what they documented so far more than a thousand different communities of interests.

In Michigan more than a thousand and counting.

And so there is a lot of communities of interests, a broad number, a broad base and looking forward to working with them.

I want to thank not just Tom but all of the students and everyone who is working on that project should be commended and just noted for the record that I appreciate their ongoing work.

And the diligence that they are doing to get every conceivable community of interest out there or letting people know about the process.

So really grateful for that.

Had a chance to meet with the Michigan nonprofit association.

Joan Guftson and Mary Ann Martinez and had a great meeting in terms of what they are doing.

Sue is going to be a part of the press conference next week as they talk about their communities of interest and making those connections and collaborations and if you are a community of interest, if you are an organization or individual that wants to be a part of this work, please go to the website and submit an e-mail.

We want to hear from everybody.

And if we hear from you multiple times that's fine.

If you repeat yourself, that's fine.

But we want to make sure everyone knows that they are an inclusive part of this process and we want to hear from you.

So welcome to suggestions that you may have.

MDOS is always has been great and since I'm a newbie coming on definitely want to thank Mike Brady, Sally and Sarah.

They helped Julianne and Sue and I with regards to communication policy.

That I'm presenting later.

I want to thank Chad who is helping me out now with communication needs and what that is going to look like Mike Doyle and Aneta from MDOS communications had a chance to meet with them to kind of facilitate some of the things we will need to do to implement our communication planning and also want to thank MDOT for elbow helping us with our photography as well so just a lot of partnerships and synergy that is taking place to ensure that we have the most robust, inclusive communication plan possible to best represent the Commission.

So I'll have some more things to report to you later on in the meeting but also want to thank I did reach out and had a meeting with Michigan township association, Michigan municipal league and Michigan association for counties, township with Jim fielder, counties with Derek Molett and municipal league with Matt bot and they will partnership with us to comment during the month of March, during the public comments or at the beginning of the meeting to talk about the work of the redistricting Commission, how people can get involved in our upcoming public hearings so thank you so much for the opportunity to make this report.

>> Steve: Thank you.

Any questions for Edward?

I have one.

>> Edward: Sure.

>> Steve: You indicated a thousand communities of interest from somebody.

>> Edwards: That was the University of Michigan center for local, state and urban policy and that is led by Tom Evoko.

>> Steve: Are we as the Commission going to get kind of a continuing stream of these communities of interest that are being identified so that we don't have a thousand dumped on us at one time?

That is a rhetorical question but go ahead.

>> Edward: I think what they did is just identified a list of just different groups across the state that they have identified.

I think you saw in public comment some are looking at forming their own communities of interest in terms of second homeowners in the northern Michigan.

So I mean I think they could pop up based on how they may see fit based on their particular interests where they live or where they may have a second home or an interest as relates to the state.

So we are not -- I haven't to be honest with you defined what that is or what they may be.

But as we get, as people share whether it's them or other organizations, we just take that into consideration to make sure that they know how to participate in the process.

>> Steve: I guess my question goes more to at some point we as the Commission are going to look at these communities of interest and I guess I would like to see us have a list of these as they come in so that we have enough time to look at them as we

go along and I mean, just to keep us up to date and get an idea of what people are thinking are communities of interest.

>> Edward: Sure, Sue.

>> Sue: We can certainly provide that list to the Commissioners if you are interested in seeing that list.

We are planning on some continuing education Matt Grossman from Michigan State who has happened in the past has some continuing education scheduled.

One of those topic areas will be communities of interest.

I think it's really important for this Commission to determine what their definition is of communities of interest beyond what is in the Constitution which is pretty vague.

So there will be continuing discussion.

Any information we have also will be provided to the person who MDOS finds to develop or provide the tool for public comment.

So they certainly will have all that information so they can overlay any communities of interest into the work they do as well as the mappers.

So definitely if that information is out there it will be shared with the Commission as you need it or want it.

It's a very long list.

Those people can be invited to our public hearings.

So Edward can develop e-mail lists from there.

And make sure that those groups are developed to our public hearings throughout the state.

So there is lots of ways that list will be utilized and that information will be included in the work that you do for sure.

>> Steve: Well either get us a copy of the names for whatever or post them and give the Commission the location of them so we can look at them.

>> Sue: We can certainly send that list out.

>> Steve: Anthony you've had your hand up a long time.

>> Anthony: So I think this is a pretty you know important topic of discussion.

So thank you Edward for bringing it up and thank you for your preliminary work on trying to help us identify who these communities of interest are.

But I think an important point to bring up is that at the end of the day we as a Commission are going to have to decide on what to do with these groups, you know.

Because I mean if you have a thousand groups any group can come together and call themselves a community of interest but since there is no real definition, except, you know, kind of the vague one that is on the Michigan Constitution right now, that is going to be a part of our job is to determine which of these communities of interest you know, we create the maps around essentially.

And I think we are going to have to do that based upon the information that we get from, you know, experts on the topic.

>> Steve: Julianne and then Doug.

>> Julianne: Thank you so much.

Just a brief point of clarification.

The list that Edward is referring to and that we are discussing right now, that is the U of M list that they built.

That they are sending letters to those groups.

To make them aware of the Commission.

So I just wanted to clarify.

This would be a list that U of M has promulgated and is working off of.

And that certainly the work of the Commission is to identify or define what a community of interest is based on the feedback that you're going to be receiving from groups and through the conversations you're going to have as a Commission in the subject matter expert presentations you will have in the future.

I wanted to make that point of clarification so the public did not think this was a list that the Commission has created or that the Commission is working off of so I do understand your question, Steve, about who is on the U of M list but again it is the U of M list that they have begun doing their outreach on.

To spread the word.

Which will be folded into again Edward's broad communication and outreach policy.

The more groups that are contacted, that can spread the word the better and I'm sure we all agree on that.

Thank you.

>> Steve: Yeah, I did not assume it was our list since we have not developed one. But getting other people to come in with a list, that's I mean that is who they think they are anyway.

>> Julianne: Correct.

>> Steve: Doug.

>> Doug: I wanted to point out I recall reading some correspondence from the women's league of voters I believe is what.

>> Steve: League of women voters.

>> Doug: Yep, they have an initiative going on in the state to capture communities of interest and I believe they said right now they got organized for 47 other counties in the state if I recall properly.

We are going to get a list from them as well.

>> Steve: We are going to get lots of lists, I just want to keep them coming so we have a chance to look at them as they come in rather than here, they all are.

>> Doug: Would it be advantageous for us to put a formal definition around community of interest at this point?

>> Steve: I don't see how you can do that.

>> Doug: To go around and do this work.

>> Steve: How can we do it, I'm all for it how can we do it?

>> Doug: We will have to take the definition out of the Constitution and enhance it somewhat on how we are going to apply it to redistricting.

And the size limitation and the Constitution doesn't talk about.

We don't want a community of interest of 25 people I don't believe.

You know.

>> Steve: We certainly don't want a district with 25 people.

>> Doug: You can't have one, yeah.

It's got -- they all have to be equal within 1% of each other.

>> Steve: Right.

>> Doug: Yeah, so I don't know.

Maybe we spend some time in a future meeting and talk about that before these people go running off with their own definitions in creating, Julianne.

>> Steve: Sue, didn't you say we were going to have a presentation on community of interest?

>> Sue: We are working on a presentation and hopefully we can have some more discussion at that time about how the Commission would then determine their definition. There are several groups out there gathering their peers together so for example the league of women voters is talking to the groups that they have throughout 40 communities in the state.

So that conversation is ongoing.

The Michigan nonprofit association has a cohort of 20 different cultural communities that they are working with in Detroit and Flint areas.

And they have made grants and are providing education so those groups can get people to our public hearings.

So everybody who is working on this seems to have somewhat of a different definition or target group that they may be working with.

But I believe that you as a Commission you know want to be clear as to what your definition is based on the Constitution.

>> Steve: Julianne, you had your hand up.

Anybody else?

Julianne.

>> Julianne: No, just to build on, again, it's the opportunity for the public and for the voters of Michigan to advocate on what the communities of interest should look like. And in addition to the nonprofit groups and the academic groups that we've already discussed it's an opportunity for anyone to band together and advocate for their being recognized as a community of interest and how that would be incorporated into your map making.

Really the constitutional criteria says what a community of interest isn't.

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

So through again through your work and the discussion is when the Commission will formulate its interpretation.

It's a large part of your job to work through what that interpretation would be.

And receive the feedback from the public from even individuals in the state, please even if you are not a member of a group or an organization, the advocacy doesn't have to be tied to that.

So and just for clarity the -- it's in subsection 13, districts shall reflect the State's diverse population and communities of interest.

Community of interest may include but shall not be limited to populations that show cultural and historical characteristics or economic interest. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents or political candidates.

So I really think through the presentations and discussions and the feedback you get back from the public that is going to be an iterative process of your work you will arrive at.

I wish there was a definition we could hand you today but it's just not that straightforward unfortunately.

>> Steve: Yeah, Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, and that's why I suggested that maybe we should formulate a definition for a couple reasons.

One so that we know what we are looking for.

And, secondly, so that the people that are going out and collecting this data can comply to our definition.

Not, to the one they formulated.

So I think my personal opinion is it would be beneficial for us to do that at some point in the near future as indicated, jaw Julianne.

>> Julianne: I apologize I just wanted to clarify that the public is going to advise and guide the Commission on not the groups, it will be the collective advocacy of the public on to guide your definition if I did not make that clear I apologize.

>> Steve: We certainly are going to get a lot of comments on what we consider a community of interest.

We have already had some people write to us, telling us what a community of interest was.

And one I can think of now was based on counties, that their community of interest was Kent and whatever is next door to Kent so.

There will be all of those.

We will have lots of opportunity to discuss that before we are all done.

Okay.

>> Doug: Can I make one more comment Steve.

>> Steve: You bet Doug go ahead.

>> Doug: I brought up formulating a definition I don't think we want to get into our first meeting with the public and have that question come up as the first thing.

How do you define a community of interest and if we don't have a standard definition that we are going to use we are going to be red faced, you know.

It's going to be embarrassing for us.

So that is why I brought it up.

>> Steve: Yep, it's a good question and we are going to have to deal with it on more than one occasion.

Okay, moving on then to the Department of State staff updates.

Sally, are you going to enlighten us?

>> Sally: I don't have anything new to report today Commission.

We are working to follow-up and follow through on the mapping tool that we spoke about last week or not the mapping tool the public comment tool that we had spoken about last week.

So when I have more updates on that I will certainly let you all know.

>> Steve: Where are we at on the computers?

>> Sally: They have all been procured at this point.

We actually and, you know, Sue might have even more details than I at this point.

But we have them all.

And so it's just a matter of actually shipping them out to all of you doing the initial set up work like we talked about before and shipping them out to all of you and we can follow-up offline with any additional information you all would need to know about how to make sure you get your computer but that is well on its way to you receiving them.

>> Steve: Okay thank you.

>> Sally: Any more questions?

Good?

>> Steve: Anybody have any questions for Sally?

Seeing none we will go on to unfinished business and the 2021 key dates and I think Sue we have an update on those.

>> Sue: Yes, I think as soon as we hit print things change.

So one of the things that changed was our census data date changed from the beginning of July to the end of July.

I feel pretty confident that we still can go forward even though we know that at the very end we will get that census data but, in the meantime, we can do everything we can do to be prepared for the census data when we get it and our map makers then will be prepared to layer that into our maps.

The line drawing consultant presentations and the voter rights act legal counsel presentations are coming up, the first two meetings in March. So assuming that all goes well with the process we will talk about that in a minute.

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

And those two consultants then can begin their work in March. So we will have them on board if all goes as planned, if you know if not it may be a week or two later so I want to mention that.

Our public hearings are scheduled for May, June range.

Again, there is a lot of work to do to get those public hearings in place.

We have to select locations, find facilities, get all the details that Edward will arrange for us to make sure those meetings happen.

And that we are ready for those meetings.

So for example, we want the public comment tool to be available from the Michigan Department of State that they are procuring because it makes a whole lot of sense if we are going to get a lot of comment to have that tool available for our use.

We will have to have printed materials and information available at those meetings.

So again, Edward has you know second week here, he is rolling.

And working on these things.

But it will take a little bit of time to make sure that everything is set and set in a way that we can host those meetings assuming we can during a pandemic or restrictions will be lifted so we can hold those in person.

Or if we get close to meetings and we have to pivot and hold those virtually, those plans will have to be in place.

So it's a difficult time we are in to plan public hearings.

But hopefully we can do those in person.

And if we cannot we will, you know, we will do them virtually like our meetings.

I did mention in July that we do expect our census data release.

It would be nice if it came before the end of July.

I don't know that it will.

And at that time though after we've had ten public hearings, we can get some draft mapping plans in place.

So even before we will have some mapping plans in place.

So, again, so we can use older data or estimated data to start that work and have our mappers with the technology to be able to layer on the census data so the new work can happen fairly rapidly.

All this leads us up to our September 17th date when we are supposed to have our final proposed maps complete.

And then we will notify the public and there would be a 45 day of public comment and then the final maps would be adopted by the Commission on November first.

So that is the big picture plan.

As your staff we are going to keep working toward everything we can do to make sure that we meet the goals that the Constitution has placed upon this body.

And we are going to do everything we can to help you get there and I think we will have some good consultants to add to the mix also.

Questions?

>> Steve: Anthony.

>> Anthony: Mention the public comment rule are being put online on the website I noticed that this week that California Commission put a whole map drawing tool on their site where any member of the public can submit the map that they want.

Do you think this would be included in the tool that is on our website, or do you think that would be something that whatever wins the bid for the RFP will produce?

>> Sue: I think maybe Sally wants to answer that one.

>> Sally: Yes, Anthony great question and I think for the purposes of the public submitting to all of you a map whether it's a map of their community of interest, whether it's a map of the districts they want you to determine for them or a map of a whole you know the whole state with districts.

The idea behind the statement of work we shared with all of you last week is to have that be part of this public comment tool so that you are able to in one unified way accept both written and you know, geographical for lack of a better term geographical submissions from the public on this public comment today.

Now that said that's all about the public providing to you their feedback.

Your RFP for map drawing you know the statement of work that's involved in that is really you know, about and I'm sure Sue and others can talk more about this, about providing you all with the expertise to have someone who is going to do the really technical kind of integrating public comment census data all the things you all have to navigate at your direction drawing those sort of comprehensive maps for all of you.

So I don't know if that is a helpful answer to your question.

But I think it's really the distinction of the public submission to you versus you know you all determining the maps with the expert line drawer.

>> Anthony: Right I think you answered it my question was in regards to that public aspect so glad to hear that that will be a part of the tool.

>> Rhonda?

>> Rhonda: This goal timeline is online for the public correct?

Then we need to make one correction in December.

I'm not sure if everybody saw that, the December 31st just for clarification.

>> Sue: It is.

Somehow an errant date ran in to that field and I don't know how and that was corrected before it was put on the website.

>> Rhonda: Thank you.

>> Sue: Edward caught that.

How did that get there?

But thank you I appreciate your attention to detail.

>> Steve: Okay anything else?

>> Brittini: Anthony has a hand.

>> Anthony.

>> Anthony: I'm based a whole bunch today and based on the change of timeline for the census data get us from end July to beginning of August to mid-September to come up with the maps that we submit to the public for review so I think you know that gives us 1.5 to 2 months so I think you know during that time it's going to be crunch time and starting from today let's all keep that time in line and keep our schedules open between that time period because we will have to be meeting a lot during those two months.

>> Steve: Thank you, Anthony you are absolutely correct.

That it on that?

Okay, consultant selection process, Sue.

>> Sue: I'm ready.

>> Steve: Go ahead.

>> Sue: I'm sorry I interrupted you.

I thought it might be helpful and Cathleen will help us share a really brief PowerPoint about that whole process so we got to the point where the proposals are due.

So if you will go to the first slide, Cathleen, the second slide actually.

The next.

So our mapping proposals were due yesterday.

At 3:00.

And everything for the VRA legal Council is a week later so those proposals will come in next week.

I'm happy to report we received four proposals.

The -- your subcommittee met this morning, Cathleen if you go to the next slide, we have an internal staffing review that we talked about, so Julianne and I were on the meeting this morning along with Sally Marsh, Sarah Reinhardt and Mike Brady who you know well from helping us from the Michigan Department of State.

And then also Chad Bassett who is our technical person.

He really has the expertise on RFPs and information on various processes that are used to determine how to award RFPs.

So he has been very, very helpful to us all the way along with even from the point where we started developing RFPs.

The first thing we determined would be important would be if each proposal met the mandatory minimum requirements.

And we did review the proposals this morning and determined that three out of the four did meet the mandatory minimum requirements.

So those are the ones that this subcommittee will review.

As we go forward.

Next slide, please.

So our next step is to individually score the five deliverables.

So each of us on this staff review committee will look at the proposals we received and score them on the five deliverables.

And also provide comments.

At that point those will be provided to me so I can compile one report that averages the scores and provides all the comments and we will meet again then.

We will move any that are above an 80 average to the next level for more further consideration.

And then we also will determine if there are any that may be really close to that 80 level. Maybe there is somebody that has a 78.

And we will want to consider them also.

Next slide, please.

>> Doug: Sue.

>> Sue: Yes, Doug.

>> Doug: What are you using as your determination for scores?

>> Sue: We have an evaluation sheet that Chad has provided for us.

And those can be also provided to the subcommittees.

We will provide the report on that sheet and then we will also provide blank ones if you want that, so if you want to delve into it further.

>> Doug: This is something he used before?

>> Sue: I believe it's a process he has used before, yes.

Now, up until this point we've not received any pricing for the proposals.

So we are going to do all our evaluation based on the value of those proposals based solely on their merit and not on price.

But when we do meet for the second time, he will provide the pricing to us and at that point then we will discuss the best value.

We will look at qualify, expertise, experience, their schedule pricing, those kinds of things.

And more.

Next slide, please.

From there we are going to rank each proposal.

State the rationale for ranking them as we did.

As a group.

And then provide the Rankings to the subcommittee.

Next slide, please.

Just as a reminder we have two subcommittees in the works here.

The first is mapping.

And commissioner Witjes is the Chair of that and Commissioners Lett and Wagner serve on that committee.

And their open meeting will be on February 23rd from 1:00-3:00 so subcommittee will meet at this time but anybody on the Commission, anybody from the public can view this meeting just like one of our Commission meetings.

A week later it happens all over again with the V RA legal Council subcommittee and then Commissioners Szetela who is the Chair and Clark, Eid and Kellom will serve on that subcommittee. Their open meeting is exactly a week later on March 2nd from 1:00-3:00. So everything that happens with mapping virtually happens a week later on the VRA subcommittee.

Next slide, please.

What will the subcommittee do? Well, they are going to start with an individual review of the proposals and they will be provided the ranking report with the rationale.

So they will have a few days prior to their meeting to look through the proposals, look through the ranking report and the rationale so they will be prepared for their meeting.

At that point they will have their open meeting to discuss and determine recommendations on which bidders should receive an invitation to present to the Commission.

And they will present those recommendations then to the Commission at the next meeting.

Next slide, please.

After it's determined which bidders will be giving presentations, we will have that presentation meeting at our next Commission meeting.

And at that point then Commissioners can determine which proposal should be awarded the contract.

Next slide, please.

Questions?

Comments?

.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Just for frame of reference when you say anyone basically the score of 80 is kind of a determining factor, is that out of 100?

>> Sue: Yes.

>> Cynthia: Okay.

>> Sue: I missed that part, those two or three words anybody else?

>> Steve: Anthony?

>> Anthony: I guess I'm a little surprised that we only got four proposals.

Do we thing there was a -- I was expecting around ten, but this is the number I'm pulling from my head. So I don't know the normal amount of responses for an RFP on this issue would be, but four and with three meeting with the minimum qualifications seems a little light.

>> Sue: This is really a highly special, technical area of expertise.

It's not everybody that every firm that knows how to do this work and has the technical capabilities I think to provide the services that we ask for.

What we asked for was highly technical.

And with decades of experience basically because this work is only done every ten years so I think for what we are looking for to receive four proposals was good.

It makes it a manageable process for everybody who is involved.

And I think we have some really good proposals to present.

>> Steve: Anybody else?

Not seeing anybody, okay.

Resolution to discharge personal search committees, okay we have a resolution.

>> Brittini: We have a hand.

>> Steve: Sue.

>> Sue: I'm sorry I was just going to finish by saying that there is a policy on procurement that Julianne can present now if we want to continue with this RFP discussion before we jump into the next part, so it's up to you.

But she asked to add this to the agenda.

>> Steve: I know and I looked back through my e-mails and I don't see a copy of that policy.

Was it sent out to everybody?

>> Sue: It was sent out yesterday and then an update was sent out today.

Maybe Sarah can put that up.

>> Steve: I did not get one.

I see Rhonda shaking her head, no.

But I didn't get anything you sent to me until today.

>> Sue: Something was going on.

I sent everything out Tuesday and then I started getting e-mails today from people who said I don't think I got that so I sent everything out again today but I apologize for that.

>> Steve: I still didn't get the procurement policy so something is still going on Julianne you are flagging me down.

>> Julianne: I will definitely wait my turn I would suggest why don't we put it on the agenda for next week and we will have a full discussion on that next week then to make sure everyone has the document they need.

>> Steve: Are Rhonda and I the only two that didn't get it?

We got several people.

>> Cynthia: I didn't receive anything.

>> Steve: We are going to put that over to next week so procurement policy, you can cross off.

Resolution to discharge personal search executive director search committee general Council search committee and communication and Outreach Director search committee.

Sue are you bringing this proposal to us?

>> Sue: Julianne had suggested it.

I don't know if she wants to address it.

>> Steve: Sure if she is suggesting it it's her proposal go right ahead.

>> Julianne: I thought it would be prudent since the Commission created by official vote the personnel for searches and the work is concluded we should dissolve and discharge those committees particularly since you are establishing other committees and the reason it's important going to the OMA if the committees are not discharged then they technically still exist.

So it would be a much more complex analysis of who would constitute a quorum of a subcommittee.

Particularly with the creation of your new committees.

So it's just to tidy up the books if you will.

>> Steve: Okay, everybody understand that?

Okay, I take a motion to adopt the resolution to disband the committees as stated.

>> Brittini: Erin made the motion.

>> Steve: Dustin second.

Brittini: Yes.

>> Steve: All in favor raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

All opposed the same sign.

It passed.

As a point on this Sue is our procedure on these going to be you will fill them out and send them for signature and send them back.

>> Rather than having a lot of handwritten resolutions I will clean all these up, I will complete the motion by commissioner and second by commissioner blanks and send the resolutions so they are prepared to the point where Steve only needs to add his signature and I think for our official record that would look a lot more professional for us.

>> Steve: That is fine.

Next is new business what time is it?

2:00.

Do we want to take a break now or go on for a couple or a little more?

I see a break.

Okay, we will take ten.

Be back at 2:16.

[Recess until 2:16]

Steve: Waiting on Sue.

Sue: I'm here I just didn't have my camera on yet, sorry.

>> Steve: No problem, okay, FOIA.

Procedures and guidelines.

Another exciting presentation by Julianne.

>> Julianne: And.

>> Steve: A little sarcasm on my part.

>> Julianne: By the end of it you will be as obsessed with FOIA as I am.

>> Steve: No I won't and I've been to the Supreme Court and I guaranty I won't be a fighter about it.

>> Julianne: So we are going to I will share my screen and today we are going to discuss the Freedom of Information Act.

So president Johnson signed the Federal FOIA into effect in 1966.

And there was a series of events and transitions in the administration from 1966 to lead to the State of Michigan to adopt our FOIA and OMA in 1976 so it's been in effect since 1977.

And what my presentation will do is I will cover what FOIA is and how it operates and then we will cover the proposed policy.

So to begin the Freedom of Information Act regulates and sets requirements for the release of public records held by public bodies in Michigan MICRC is, in fact, a public body.

The key is all public records are subject to disclosure unless there is an exemption. The exemptions are narrow so the presumption should always be that the record will be disclosed. And that follows through the -- with the third point is to accept for prodisclosure intent and language of the act and respond accordingly.

The first paragraph is taken from the act itself, all persons except those incarcerated, are entitled to full and complete information affairs of the Government.

A lot of this marries with the premise and the foundation of the Open Meetings Act as well.

The second quote that is in orange or yellow there is from a Michigan Supreme Court case, the people shall be informed so they may fully participate in the democratic process.

And this theme is throughout all of the case law in regard to FOIA. That is always the goal is to respect the policy set forth in the act.

So it separates -- there are two categories of records. Official records and non-record materials.

And we will talk about official records would be the MICRC records that document a public function or a public decision. Non-records are comprised of transitory or personal messages. So the non-records materials is information that you have that is not needed to document the performance of an official function. So a transitory record, they have temporary value. So this record would be if you received an e-mail that the meeting time got changed.

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

So you attend the meeting at the new time and that purpose of that document, that message, whether it's an e-mail form or a different form, a text form, would be over. The use of that would over.

And personal records are just nongovernmental business or activities. So they have no value whatsoever in documenting the performance of an official function.

Those e-mails, an example of that would be if you want to meet for lunch, where do you want to go, all of those kinds of things, which hopefully is occurring on personal devices and e-mails.

So what is an official record?

That would be a writing that is prepared by, owned, used or in the possession of or retained by a public body.

So it's in the performance of an official function from the time it is created.

So this would be any document or and I use document in the broadest sense, any capture of information that is either created by the Commission, that is either received by the Commission, that is obtained and used by the Commission.

It's as broad as it can be.

So a writing is defined in an act. And I've highlighted every other means of recording. I cannot stress it enough that anything that you can capture, whether it's in written form, recorded form, photographs, the joke of writing it on a napkin.

All of those, if they meet the definition of a public record, they are subject to FOIA.

So the analysis and the focus is not on the form of the record.

It's the content of the record.

And those are my helpful keep in mind as we go through in the format doesn't matter. Where the record is kept does not matter.

It can be in your car, your home office, your business office, and that again we bring back to work e-mails on a personal account.

Or personal e-mails on a work account.

I strongly urge everybody to segregate your personal e-mails on your personal account and any and all work e-mails on your State of Michigan account.

This will make all of this a lot easier moving forward to capture the records, for me to review and analyze the records and for me to respond to any requests that we do, in fact, receive.

Again, the e-mail address that you use does not matter so if you are using your personal e-mail address to conduct Commission business, then that falls under the definition of public record.

Marking it confidential does not exempt it.

The presumption again assume that everything is a public record and we will move from there.

Cell phones matter because text messages and voicemail may be subject to FOIA if they meet those definitions.

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

Again when these acts when FOIA and the OMA were adopted it was in the 70s.

So there was no way to anticipate pocket computers which is what we, in fact, have or text messaging or cell phones.

So the act, the society has evolved technologically but the act the language in the act has remained the same.

So there for all of these things are captured.

Additional examples of record categorization for non-records are duplicates or drafts. And newspaper articles or reference materials that you receive.

These would be items that you would have for reference purposes but wouldn't be official records of the Commission.

Examples of official records of the Commission would be your budget documents or procurement documents.

And your meeting minutes.

Now, this is where FOIA would intersect with record retention.

If it is a public record then it would be subject to a retention schedule.

Which would set forth what needs to be retained and for how long of a time period it would need to be retained.

I mentioned meeting minutes in the example so we all receive the meeting minutes the Commission adopts the meeting minutes but the office of record or the person responsible for keeping the official record of the meeting minutes is, in fact, the secretary of the Commission.

So individual Commissioners I would never request a copy of meeting minutes from an individual commissioner because you are not tasked with withholding those.

But you are responsible for holding all of your communications all of your documents that you create, again, as it relates to the functioning of the public body.

Handwritten notes is it evidence of a Government activity?

Was it your deliberative notes?

All of those should be retained again for the analysis of whether they can be disclosed.

And I put the last point in all caps.

You cannot destroy any public records without a records retention policy that has been approved by the State of Michigan.

The Commission does not have a records retention schedule yet.

We've reached out to the DTMB.

There is an office there that I'm working with to create the policy and that I will present to the Commission for consideration in the very near future but until that is done, please do not delete any public reference and if you have a question of whether something is a record or non-record material please do not hesitate to reach out.

I'm more than happy to answer specific questions from any individual on the Commission or any staff member.

Are there questions or comments on that part of our discussion?

Dustin.

>> Steve: Are Dustin.

>> Dustin: Does that mean don't delete e-mails?

Because I've been doing that.

I figured those are going to be somewhere on some server somewhere forever to be looked at.

>> Julianne: Correct.

And that's a great question Dustin.

So again the content of the e-mail is what controls.

Even in the records retention context how long do I retain an e-mail?

Is a very common question.

And it is the content of the e-mail.

So, again, the e-mail regarding the Zoom link for this meeting.

That is the meeting has happened we can delete that those kinds of things.

As you start working more towards your deliberative process or more substantive discussions things of that nature, I would advise to not delete any of those e-mails.

And we can get our retention policy in place and get some further guidelines of when that would be appropriate.

But really, I would encourage except for personal e-mails that have no Commission business related again should be on a personal device and a personal e-mail but to the extent they are captured in your work e-mail personal e-mails can be deleted and again transitory meetings or those types of things other than that please I would encourage not to delete e-mails at this time.

Is that responsive Dustin or did I make it worse?

>> Dustin: No, that makes sense so.

>> Julianne: Okay all right and I'm happy to talk offline if you like.

>> Dustin: I've been guilty of it and deleted things from old meetings and thought maybe I shouldn't do that so.

>> Julianne: And then drafts when the information is encompassed into the final document then that becomes, those become secondary or ancillary but until we get through the process anything that has to do with public business or if you have a question if it's a public record reach out to me directly and we can have that conversation.

>> Dustin: Perfect thank you.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: So this is maybe kind of not completely related, but we I think all of us now are on our phones on teams.

We have a chat.

So we are not doing any business.

We are just saying how you doing?

Or whatever?

I'm wondering would it be better if we just do that on our personal phones, move that to our personal phones?

>> Julianne: So the chat, the social items, in the chat, that we will discuss a little bit more even later in this meeting this afternoon about the potential open meeting act violation because really the sunshine laws are how you conduct business and it has to be in an open session so the extent, you're having discussions that are completely unrelated to Commission business then that is, in fact, appropriate.

Again, extreme caution when you're doing that, that it does not veer off topic.

But it's easier to analyze it for my purposes on how easy it would be to get the information and to review it, correct?

So the focus is and that would be a public record that would need to be gone through and if it's personal or has nothing to do with Commission business, then maybe it is not a public record.

But that analysis has to happen based on the content of the document itself or the chat itself or the text message itself.

Is that responsive, Cynthia?

>> Cynthia: I'm not sure.

I do understand what you're saying but I'm wondering if I just want to communicate with one of the other Commissioners or all of the other Commissioners just on a personal basis absolutely nothing to do with business, would it be better to do that using my personal phone?

>> Julianne: If it does not have any relation to Commission business for individual Commissioners, yes.

If it has to do with Commission business, then through the official channels would be more appropriate.

>> Cynthia: Okay then just to clarify, if I said something like because this is usually what it is like missed you at the meeting today or I hope you aren't sick or something like that, is that to do with the Commission?

>> Julianne: Those are social interactions, private conversations.

Now and later when we talk about the FOIA policy we will talk about again the technology trap.

Right, the ability to text, the ability to e-mail and how that can -- how that can press against the Open Meetings Act.

So the more Commissioners you have together the chance that there is a quorum and those are the situations where you need to be extremely cautious that we are maintaining and adhering to the Open Meetings Act, that any Commission business and again a quorum of a committee as well.

So to the extent that they are smaller subgroups you might also be you need to be mindful about quorums of subcommittees or I've talked in the past about constructive

quorums where you have a series of smaller meetings that when you put them together the topic is all the same, it's all deliberating towards the same matter and it would be viewed as one meeting.

So again just that caution of when you do it that it's solely personal, not Commission business and if you are engaging that you be respectful of the quorum and if there is a quorum to not discuss Commission business at all.

>> Cynthia: Thank you.

>> Julianne: And I'm happy Cynthia to discuss offline if that wasn't fully responsive. But those are the broadest, the broadest perimeters that I can give.

>> Steve: Julianne, that brings up a question that I think maybe the other Commissioners might be interested in.

We are using state provided phones, state paid for phones, state everything phones. And can you talk to us just briefly about an expectation of privacy in those phones when we are using them for anything quite frankly?

>> Julianne: Oh, that is an excellent question.

There is no expectation of privacy.

If you use that phone or you use that state e-mail I would not expect those communications to be private inasmuch as you control how they are I don't want to say how they are released but that you should not -- it's a state device so you should not be using it for any personal matters.

It's they are state resources so everything can be captured.

And that's not to say we can set different privacy ratings for confidential or when I send confidential information under the attorney/client privilege is a good example.

But you should have no expectation of privacy using state devices.

And you should frankly not have any expectation of privacy when you walk out your front door.

For that matter.

But is that responsive Steve or did you want something more detailed?

>> Steve: No, I'm fully aware of the expectation of privacy.

I just wanted the other Commissioners to understand that as well when you get these computers that you are going to start using, the same thing goes, they are provided by the state.

They are paid for by the state and anything that is on that computer that might be embarrassing to you, you cannot hide.

>> Julianne: Yes.

>> Steve: The state can come in and say we want to see all of your e-mails or we want to see everything of this and you can say that is private to me, you know.

No.

It's not.

So you want to keep it private use your own stuff.

>> Julianne: Correct.

And what I would also add to that is while I don't have the answers to what technology that the state uses DTMB as far as capture you know of your traffic or what you are doing or things like that I would just my not even knowing any of that information on a specific level I would encourage you to again, only use the work items for work business and personal.

And if you are sending Commission business from your personal e-mail account, then I will get to read your personal e-mails as well.

So that is the next step there.

Were there any more questions on this side?

>> Steve: Erin.

>> Erin: .

>> Julianne: I can't hear you Erin if you are speaking.

>> Erin: Hi, there is something wrong with my mouse.

I was saying when we first started, we were using our personal e-mails to conduct Commission business because we did not have the state e-mails yet.

So in regards to that would it just be those e-mails that are subject to FOIA?

Or our entire e-mail not that I do anything with my e-mail but or would our entire e-mail during those time periods be subject to FOIA?

>> Julianne: So that is an excellent question, Erin. And I was using and it took two days for me to get my State of Michigan lined up.

It was very fast and effective and efficient process so what I did was I forwarded all of those e-mails to my work -- to my work -- my Michigan.gov address and then with a note that, you know, I was forwarding them for the purpose of deleting them.

But, again, any of those e-mails would be captured by the MDOS system once you forward them and anything you would have sent, this is the other key, again, because think of it as a two-way thing.

So it's anything you may have received from the state about Commission business you would want to forward and then anything you sent in response to it.

So it would be both the sending and the receiving from your personal account.

But if that is not, if those haven't bent forward and that has not been done then what it would be a date capture most likely from your personal e-mail account.

So if you -- if someone was looking for a date ranges, they would say a date range and that would be what we would pull.

>> Thank you.

>> Steve: Juanita.

>> Juanita: Yes, Julianne, if someone called you on your regular phone and they just wanted to you know say what you doing and you say oh, just finished working and they want to know what kind of work do you do?

And you tell them oh, redistricting.

Is that anything that FOIA needs to know?

>> Julianne: Okay so then we are going to go this is why I love this topic so much because we are in the Open Meetings Act, we are in FOIA we are in records retention and now we are in the social stuff and fellowship which is the best part about it. In that call you have a beautiful friend who wants to know what you are up to and that is wonderful but I will go all the way to the Constitution with this one so you have to be careful again when you discuss redistricting with members of the public not in writing outside of an open meeting so that is where that would fall in to. You are not creating a record but you need to be very respectful and sensitive to the constitutional perimeters.

Does that help, Juanita?

>> Juanita: Yeah, uh-huh because half the time it's so huge. I could I don't know where to start when they ask.

I say it's just realigning or something so it's okay.

>> Julianne: It looks like Rebecca I think, Steve.

>> Rebecca: I'm following up on Dustin's question with respect obviously we can't delete that is clear but what about archiving I pull stuff in the archiving folder to keep it out of the in box but I have not looked at and normally there is some cycle on when they are deleted out.

Should we be checking that or is it just okay to archive do you have any ideas I don't know what the network settings are on that.

>> Julianne: That is a great question too Rebecca.

The network settings for archiving so archiving it in your e-mail is not doesn't fulfill the retention portion of it.

But, again, that depends on the content.

So if you are archiving everything or putting it through, we will still be able to have access to that and I can double check the time but that would be appropriate.

>> Rebecca: Okay thank you.

>> Julianne: Uh-huh.

>> Steve: That same question goes to deletions, the deletions I mean they are still there.

And if they got a certain time limit that they are deleted after that.

But I guess that's a question we ought to have answered too.

>> Julianne: Correct and again even if you delete something let me make clear it is not gone.

There is metadata.

There is all different manner of technological things that can be done.

But it is just easier if you don't delete the e-mails or the documents would be my preference or my advice, my encouragement, my guidance, I'm trying to think of stronger words that to again if you have a question please call me.

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

Anybody Rhonda did you have your hand up?

I apologize I was trying to I'm like Steve it's very difficult to see.

Is there anything further on this topic?

Or would you like to get into the policy?

Okay I'll bring that back up very briefly.

And we will go into the policy you have before you is a draft FOIA policy.

It has two different component es.

The first starts with is the FOIA procedures and guidelines.

This is how the Commission will process FOIA requests.

It comports with the citation for the Michigan FOIA statute is there.

The second part is a written public summary of the Commission's FOIA procedures and guidelines.

So when you were looking at the document you thought you already said all this, this part is bigger.

I did.

The written public summary is a requirement of the act itself.

And while it's not required, I prefer to structure it in a more informal fashion because the public will be able to see both documents.

The public will be able to engage with both documents but the I prefer to structure it more in a frequently asked question format.

So that's why you have two documents before you today.

So a FOIA request is a legal process by which a person with the exemption of an incarcerated individual can submit a written request to either access view or obtain a copy of a public record.

They would submit the FOIA request to the coordinator which you designate in your rule to be general counsel, me.

What is not a FOIA request?

So if someone sends a question why did the Commission vote this way on this matter? Why did the Commission adopt accept this bid or award this contract and not the other one?

Those are not FOIA requests.

Requests to compile information.

That's not a FOIA request.

Unless it's information that the Commission compiles.

That would be an appropriate FOIA request.

So earlier in the meeting we were talking about lists, that if people are submitting these lists and the lists are being used then that would potentially be a public record.

And request to provide narrative explanations of documents.

These are not FOIA requests.

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

Now, the FOIA applies to the Commission, you are a public body as defined under the act.

And again therefore all records prepared, owned used in the possession of or retained in your official capacity are public records.

And now we will talk about exemptions.

So this does not mean all public records must be disclosed.

Certain information of records may be exempt either under the act itself or under a different state or Federal statute.

However, the default and the presumption is the document would be discoverable.

So the exemptions are provided under section 13 of the act and they are narrow and they are appropriate but when we are going through our analysis again the presumption is that it's a public record.

It will be disclosed unless there is an applicable exemption.

Let's see.

If a person is asking for information or records that do fall under one of those exemptions, we can deny either a portion of their request and redact the materials or an entire FOIA request.

So these are just a sample of exemptions that are listed under the act.

The invasion of privacy, I think is the one people are most familiar with. That is a two-part test that must be satisfied.

The first prong it must be personal information.

Intimate, embarrassing details of an individual's private life.

Which, again, feeds into my encouragement to use for your personal items.

Please use your personal resources and your personal devices.

And if it meets the first part of the test then it must also satisfy the second part of the test which constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy and it would have not helped the public at all understand the operation of the Commission.

So this is a fact and specific analysis and that covers invasion of privacy.

Information or records subject to the attorney/client privilege are also exempted.

Law enforcement records.

Records or information described in other statutes.

So the ones that I've listed, again, really the Commission will not have will not be in possession of any of these records so we have the crime victim rights act.

The income tax provisions of the tax code, certain municipalities hold that information.

And the Constitution for the Commission also designates many of the records public as its base.

So there are really a lot of the exemptions will not apply to the Commission, trade secret information, real property.

And records or information relating to a civil action where the requesting party is engaged in litigation with the Commission.

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

The appropriate channel for that information would be through that litigation through a discovery request.

So we would not be responding to those or providing that information.

Also subpoenas depending on the agency that submits the subpoena.

There are some information especially from Federal agencies they can obtain otherwise exempt information through those channels.

Processing of FOIA requests so the Commission will receive a FOIA request, it must be in writing and sufficiently describe the record so we can locate it.

There will be a search for the record where potential labor costs can be incurred. And then the FOIA coordinator will be evaluating exempt and nonexempt materials, which will also have potential labor costs.

The timing and types of responses, within five business days of receiving a FOIA request, the Commission may, through the FOIA coordinator, so this is not anything that individual Commissioners would be responsible to do.

But I want you to beware of it,

Again, that the timing and is very fast and it's very sensitive.

So we can extend the time to respond by ten business days.

And that's our only extension available.

Request a payment of a good-faith deposit.

If the estimated fee is more than 50.

Grant the request.

Grant in part or deny in part.

If they are asking for the records, they are asking for some of them would be exempt and some would not be or deny the request.

Either through a no records statement or that it is completely exempt.

The fees they must be a detailed itemization.

Again I mentioned labor costs.

There is a formula that is used.

It's the hourly rate of the lowest paid employee capable of performing the work and there is also copying or duplication costs and actual mailing costs.

In the policy the black and white copies are ten cents a page and color copies if available if the document is in color that would be at cost.

And I mentioned earlier if the fee is over 50 a good faith deposit of half that total estimated fee would be required.

And now appeals if you charge if the Commission in its response charges a fee or denies all or part of a request the requester may file an appeal with the Commission either for the disclosure determination being granting denying, granting in part, denying in part.

Or on the labor costs.

And they would have to show that there is an actual error in the calculation of the fee.

There is also an indigent exception in the statute that would apply.
And that would also be available to an individual that qualifies.

So the second option that the individual would have would be to Sue the MICRC and the Court of claims or the third option is to both file an appeal with the Commission as well as Sue the Commission.

So those would be the options for a requester relative to the fee issued or the determination of the disclosure.

And that would be the summation of the mechanics of the FOIA policy before you.
Does anyone have questions?

Or comments?

Or suggested revisions?

I did have one error in the document itself that I apologize for.

On page four, under appeal of fees and disclosure determinations, it indicates that the requester may submit to the FOIA coordinator a written appeal.

I would be handling the initial response so that would be inappropriate.

And I did changed it in the other location but here it should read the executive director.

The requester may submit to the executive director a written appeal that specifically states the word appeal and it is correct later in the document so that would be the only flag that I would like to notify the Commission of.

And I will stop sharing.

All right are there any questions on the policy?

Any portion of the policy or the written public summary that I could clarify?

Any questions on the statute?

It is fairly straightforward.

You just track the statute.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I just want to be honest because I didn't receive this until just a couple hours before I have not had a chance to read through the whole thing.

So I just want to be honest on that.

If we are voting on it.

I may have abstain because I have not had a chance to read it although I trust you Julianne so it's probably over my head anyway.

But I just want to let you know you know be honest to that point that I have not been able to read through the whole thing yet.

>> Julianne: Well and I can assure you it's definitely not over your head.

And it certainly if voting or not voting today that's at the commissioner's discretion.

This is not a time sensitive that it has to be voted on, on this meeting.

Again, the policy tracks the statute.

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

I did not take any liberties with any of the provisions so it's very straightforward and the form is attached also a draft form where we could post that on the Commission's website and if somebody elected to utilize the form that would be appropriate.

If that is convenience for them.

They do not have to utilize the form.

Any writing that is identified as a FOIA request.

One other thing I would like to highlight is in the policy.

There is a portion for immediate response.

If any individual commissioner it is subpart D, immediately forward a FOIA request.

If for some reason a FOIA request finds its way into one of your individual mailboxes, which could happen even with the publication of the designated FOIA e-mail address for the Commission, I would encourage you to forward it as soon as possible and to also capture the date and time particularly if it's in your junk or spam folder that those things be handled.

And turned over to me as soon as possible.

>> Steve: Just a follow-up with that comment.

If one of the Commissioners receives it, that is good enough.

A FOIA request link has to get to the place that it's supposed to go.

Even if we do designate a proper place.

If we receive it, we receive it.

And that is the clock starts.

So.

>> Julianne: That is an excellent distinction, Steve.

And certainly again, my focus is and my support is for transparency and advancing that.

So if we get something and we've already received requests for things right.

So much of the information is on your website but to the extent that the information the individual is not looking for is not on the website, then we can expect a FOIA request or that they want to obtain the records even if the records are on the website.

They still have the right and the ability to file a FOIA request and obtain a response to that request under the law.

And we certainly respect that.

>> Steve: Just so everybody is clear not some of us didn't receive this in time to read over it so we will hold off on the vote until next week.

Rhonda, and whoever else hasn't had a chance to get to it assuming you want to.

Then that will give you time.

It is pretty -- I did read through it because I read through FOIA for a long type.

And so I could skip a lot of it.

It's pretty straightforward.

There are no hidden traps here.

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

Other than if somebody does get turned down and sues us, we have to pay their attorney fees if they win.

>> Julianne: And one other provision I would highlight is that for the deposit of fees if it's an individual who has not paid fees or responded to pick up the Commission would require 100% deposit before responding to that request.

>> Steve: Okay, next?

>> Julianne: Thank you and I believe I am next on the agenda again.

No PowerPoint though.

I thought about it.

So are we prepared to move on, Mr. Chair?

>> Steve: If you're done with the FOIA.

>> Julianne: And we will revisit FOIA next week.

Please send me any questions or concerns or revisions that you would like considered.

The next item on my materials is the open meeting guidance memorandum.

That's dated February 8th.

And it is written in response to the U of M public policy center for local, state and urban policy event on February 25th.

And I made a note at the last meeting that that's not an interactive webinar.

So that but the guidance in the memorandum will carry the Commission through their tenure through their whole term.

So the Open Meetings Act requires all decisions of a public body to be made at a meeting open to the public.

And with certain exceptions all deliberations of a quorum must be also take place at an open meeting.

So deliberation has been defined by the courts to mean any discussion, towards a decision.

It's also been categorized as the act of considering issues, careful consideration and most recently there was a case where the -- you had a quorum that was going to talk about business but then ended up not.

The actual deliberation did not even need to occur.

So these are all things that are in the back of our mind.

So can Commissioners attend conferences, training events, and other non-MICRC events? And the answer is, yes.

There is exemption in FOIA or an accommodation in FOIA Section 3, Subpart 10 that states that the act does not apply to a meeting that is social, chance gathering, or a conference not designed to avoid this act.

So members -- all 13 members can attend social affairs, run into -- nine or more members can run in to each other in public or participate in a conference or training session even if a quorum is present, nine or more of you, you will not violate the Open

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

Meetings Act unless you discuss, deliberate or decide any issue that constitutes business to be held before the MICRC.

So anything redistricting.

It does not even have to be on your agenda so the FOIA policy next week or procurement review policy next week it does not have to be something you identified to be dealt with as business yet.

So it's very broad.

So three reminders.

That you've heard me say before.

Deliberating can also be done electronically.

So be aware of the technology trap.

That is often the most unintentional violation of the OMA.

Both e-mails and texting can be a violation of the OMA.

And remember we just talked about FOIA so not only do we have to be sensitive to the Open Meetings Act but also to the public that we are creating public records.

And social media also falls into this category.

So again if one commissioner posts on their personal Facebook page hey this is a great redistricting idea, and then another commissioner says that is a good idea or that's a bad idea and then a third commissioner sees it because they are on the page but they don't comment, they are generally still considered to be involved in the discussion.

So in addition to the quorum considerations, and the open meeting act considerations about discussions and deliberations and the FOIA considerations about public records, I will also say the perimeters of subsection 11 also apply.

So you're at a conference, you're going to have public wanting to interact with you which is appropriate.

And expected.

But that you have to also keep in mind those provisions as well.

So the OMA will allow you to go to conferences, will allow all members to have the benefit of social events conferences training sessions.

But again, that we have to be mindful of the transparency principles by the Open Meetings Act and the Constitution.

So are there any questions on that memorandum?

And I also attached the Attorney General opinion that discusses sessions that would provide information to members of the public body.

>> Steve: Any questions for Julianne on that?

Or anything she has talked about?

Okay, we are up to communication policy and high level plan communications and Outreach Director.

>> Thanks, Mr. Chair.

And I will share my screen and hopefully everyone can see it.

Are you able to see it?

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Edward: I want to thank once again Sue and Julianne as well as the MDOT staff Mike, Sally and Sarah for their help and expertise in sharing being a part of this process.

Just want you to share with you that our policies we want to have integrity and redistricting accuracy and communications.

Appropriate use of communication tools.

And fortify the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission brand.

Is the purpose.

The scope would include the Commission.

It would include each individual members of the Commission.

As well as the personnel.

The components as you can already see deals with media relations as relates for media relations.

We want to make sure that we are facilitating all media inquiries whether they are verbal, written or electronic.

So that we can maximize sufficiency and ensure openness transparency and accuracy in communications and we will coordinate it so if we provide or forward a request, we will coordinate that with you and loop back with you to make sure you are included as a part of the process.

Same thing with regards to presentations.

Just trying to coordinate that for you.

And making sure that all presentations requests are here.

So we can have openness transparency and accuracy in the communications.

Members of the public who are interested in requesting a presentation we will have a form that is available on the website so they can make a formal request.

So that we can document and track this when it comes to our annual reports.

People are aware of the presentations that we did.

Spokespeople.

The official spokespeople from MICRC would consist of each of you as individual Commissioners.

As well as the executive director.

The general counsel and your communications and Outreach Director.

Groups and network and we are just using this as a generic term.

We want to work with various resident groups and networks in our quest to maximize engagement from the public regarding redistricting.

We will provide materials on the website that comply with our standards of openness transparency and accurate communications for our residents, our resident groups and networks to use in their communication efforts.

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

We just want to make sure that no external resident group or network is an authorized spokesperson nor the Commission.

Use of quotes you know we are going to reach out and try to get quotes from individual members.

And we just want to assure you our checks and balances system before any press release is sent out that we will come and work with each individual person to ensure that their quote is approved.

Media releases.

We just on the right for coordinating disseminating press releases photo opportunity and media briefings and just saying that is something we do on behalf of the Commission as a whole.

Digital communications.

This includes social media.

You know we are going to try to use digital communications to tap into a Brody verse or targeted audience for example of community interests to engage in redistricting.

We also are going to retain the right to remove or hide comments that fail to meet the standards outlined in the Commission's code of conduct in any of our communication channels.

We want to do that.

The website just reiterating and going to thank the state department all the stuff they are doing behind the scenes known and unknown.

Reserves the right the website represents a key component of communications and outreach for public engagement.

So we want to make sure that people are using the website, accessing the website.

Going to the website.

Whether it's submitting public comments.

Whether it's submitting a map.

Whether it's submitting ideas or they have an idea for outreach or engagement or idea for communication.

Send us an e-mail through the website so that we can get those ideas in process them for consideration.

E-mail, just want to reiterate what Sue has already said and what Julianne has already said that we expect our Commissioners as well as us as personnel to use their e-mail for businesses purposes only so just want to reiterate that as relates to the communication.

So that we can ensure that we don't have any challenges.

Alerts and updates to provide voluntary alerts and updates it's already on the website there is an e-mail and short messaging service and people can get e-mails as well as if they would like I'm sorry to jumping ahead to opt in to receive those messages or there is an opt out option available as well.

Branding requirements we just want to make sure we represent the custodial brand of Commission to make sure it meets our guidelines and eventually we will have a style guide and present that to the Commission as well in terms of a style guide in terms of how we are ensuring our brand and protecting the integrity of the brand in all of our publications.

On the authority the last two components the Commission has the right to review and/or amend this policy at any of its open meetings.

And as relates to breaches, the breaches of the policy will be handled with the Constitution of law as outlined or in adopted action by this Commission.

Particularly to that issue.

Are there any questions or comments with regards to the policy?

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I'm reading through it and I see a lot about website and e-mail and as I've said before a big concern, I have is for rural areas that may not have access to e-mail, Internet things like that so is there going to be some statute in the policy that would address that?

Such as a mailing address where they could mail a request to or some way that even those that don't have access that's my big concern because there is lots of areas that just aren't able to get Internet access now and I know the state is making good moves and expanding it but there still are areas so when we are talking about communication policy, that's a concern that I have.

Is having some policy set up in there also for people that may not have the access to the website or e-mail to communicate with us.

>> Edward: I appreciate that.

Thank you.

The communication policy is really in reference on how we are going to be governed so example how we use e-mail.

It's not actually the channel that we would reach the public.

The website is talking about how we would use the website.

In terms of making sure it follows state accessibility guidelines.

So what you're referring to is going to be in the communication plan.

That I will present before the end of the month.

In terms of how we are accessing and getting people involved in those different areas.

>> Rhonda: Okay, when I'm looking at it though, when it says presentations, members of the public or groups interested in requesting a presentation should fill the form out on the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission website.

So that's why I bring this up.

If people don't have access to that website should we not have some policy put in place where they can send something by mail?

Or something like that?

>> Edward: Okay, great suggestion.

Let me add that.

>> Steve: Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, Edward, let me use number six media releases as an example.

So you develop a media release and you want to send it out.

To whomever, it doesn't matter.

So from a Commission standpoint, how is the approval process going to go to make that happen?

In my opinion, there should be some checks and balances before something goes out but I don't think it should be something that is very time consuming either.

And then also associated with that you know we don't want to restrict your ability to get your work done quickly.

You know, so and thirdly, we want to be able as a Commission to at least see these releases before they go out in case people ask us questions so we know it has been communicated out to the people.

Not necessarily to question the release itself.

But to understand it.

So if we are confronted with questions, we are able to and know what has been submitted at this point.

So could you respond to that?

>> Edward: Sure.

Right now we have a great informal check and balances in our team that Sue has let out where we provide information before it comes to the Commission and so I would see the press release following that particular process.

We also mention and I did not put that here so let me make sure I add it.

Is that we would also send the press releases out to the Commission prior to them going to the media outlets.

And so that is something that definitely needs to be added.

Would that address your concern?

>> Doug: Yeah.

A follow-up question on that though.

Who is the final approval?

To send out a media release?

>> Edward: Well, I think it's the way we have been operating it has been consensus of our team.

So you know with working with Sue and Julianne and as well as myself.

And then we also have input from our partners at MDOS depending on the situation.

>> Doug: You are talking the staff and not the Commissioners.

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

>> Edward: I think Sue has her hand up.

>> Doug: Go ahead, Sue.

>> Sue: I just wanted to remind the Commissioners that we wrote into Edward's contract that he would send all press releases to Commissioners before they were sent out to the public.

So.

>> Doug: Good.

>> Sue: He mentioned checks and balances and I think that happens.

And the Commissioners then need to read their e-mails and respond.

If they see anything in there they think shouldn't go out, you know, they need to pick up the phone and call Edward or Julianne or I, anyone of us and just say hey, you know, in that news release I have a question.

I have a concern.

Just let us know because you have the opportunity to see everything before it goes out. The news releases.

>> Doug: Well, I think it's too cumbersome to bring every one of these releases and every one of these memos and whatever to the Commission because we don't meet every day of the week and it's just not timely.

And so what I'm hearing you say is Edward discusses it with you.

And Julianne and so forth.

And you'll give the approval, send us a copy and you will submit it, is that what I'm hearing?

I'm fine with that.

I just want to know what the process is.

And to be a timely process, you know.

>> Steve: What I heard, Doug, is that the team, the executive team is going over these and then they are going to send out to us the Commission before they go out and if any of the Commissioners has a problem with it, it's up to them to get ahold of Sue or Ed or Julianne and say wait a minute.

Something is wrong with this.

We need to take another look at this.

>> Doug: But when you say get in touch with Sue or Edward or whomever, we are talking about within like 24 hours, something timely.

>> Steve: Yeah, yeah, as soon as you get it.

>> Doug: Correct.

So as soon as you read it.

I don't always read everything as it comes in but right away.

But I would say something within 24 hours.

I mean I'd like to see the process kind of written up as part of this.

And how to operate, yeah.

I mean I have all the confidence in the world in Edward and Sue and Suann to do this.
And based on all our discussions.

But I also believe that the Commissioners should see it up front so they know that it's out in the public so that is my comments.

I think Cynthia had a question.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I was going to ask or comments that it would be really helpful to know what the timeframe would be.

Like we don't want to slow the process down.

But if we know we have 12 hours after it is sent to us before it's going to be sent out just so we know how often to be checking or whatever.

I think that would be helpful.

>> Steve: Sue.

>> Sue: I would just make a suggestion that, you know, there is always a subject line. So we could say right in the subject line to help you press release for your review within four hours.

I mean if it's urgent we want to get it out or within 24 hours if it's just a routine run of the mill press release so then you understand right up front this is not something that can wait.

You have to be you know checking that state e-mail.

Reasonably frequently to make sure that you're not missing anything.

And as we get busier there will be more e-mails.

>> Steve: Four hours might be a little short because Doug will be out on the golf course this year when it warms up and it takes four hours to play a round so if he is not getting them, he doesn't have a chance to look at them.

>> Sue: He better take his state phone with him and put it in his pocket.

>> Steve.

>> Edward: So we are clear it really will be depending on what we are responding to because I'm not going to slice and dice press release versus a statement.

And in terms of response to something.

I think it needs to be clear that some things we will want to be in the same new cycle just to be open and transparent and we will need an immediate response time and if necessary, you know I'm not afraid to pick up the phone and alert you.

But I just want to be clear that some things might be faster and not have a 24 hour notice just so we are open and transparent because it's imperative sometimes to be in that same news cycle and not having to say no comment and then trying to get back into it the next day.

>> Doug: Yeah, understand.

>> Steve: Any other questions on communications policy?

Anymore?

Were you done?

I don't want to cut you off, Ed.

>> Edward: I have a couple goals and two more slides and I will be done thank you very much.

>> Steve: Take your time.

>> Edward: Communications and outreach I just want to reiterate we are looking for ideas, we are looking for collaboration.

If anyone has an idea, if anyone has some collaboration, anything they want to with regards to communications and outreach across the State of Michigan, whether it's in the UP, southwest Michigan, southeast, Mid-Michigan wherever you are located, please, please, please submit them by e-mail.

We want to hear your ideas.

We want to know the best way to reach you.

Rhonda just mentioned for people in rural areas and other areas if there is a best way to reach you, let us know.

We want to make sure that there is no stone unturned as it relates to reaching out to you and so if you have ideas or suggestions let us know.

If you are a group or a network, we want to collaborate with you.

I continue to host meetings and collaborations whether it's the league of women voters. Michigan nonprofit association.

You know whoever wants to meet, we want to make sure that we are meeting with different groups who are working across the state to ensure as many people as possible are aware of the redistricting process.

And are engaged in the redistricting process.

So just want to reiterate that and I will be doing some weekend and week out because we want to make sure that we are inclusive as possible.

As relates to the goals for our communication plan, just trying to formalize that.

And as you all know in 2018 voters took fate in their own hands in terms of electing to in terms of supporting proposal two by 61%.

As relates to the establishment of our Commission.

And so we are just playing with the word fate with an acronym.

Talking about fairness.

Awareness.

Transparency and engagement.

In terms of our goals of our communication plan.

Looking at fairness in terms of the background.

In terms of how we are established, why we were established.

Awareness of the Commission.

Making sure everything we do is transparent in nature and engagement.

And this was really based upon talking to the individual members of the Commission.

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

Meetings with the groups and networks and people who have called.

Looking at public comments.

Meeting with my teammates led by Sue.

And in terms of saying what captures what everyone is saying, what are some of the goals that we need to look at?

And I'm just to play on the word on fate knowing what happened in 2018, and then using this to establish our goals for communication plan that would be submitted to the Commission for its consideration.

Once again fairness, awareness, transparency, and engagement.

Mr. Chair, that is all I have.

I can take any questions on that.

But thank you so much again for the opportunity to present.

>> Steve: Thank you, Ed.

Doug?

>> Doug: Edward you said you were working on another document what is the difference between the two?

>> Edward: The policy is talking about how we are going to govern and operate. And the plan is going to be, the communication and outreach plan to implement across the state in terms of to the public, so more of an external communications plan.

>> Doug: Okay, great. The other comment I want to make is I fully support what Rhonda said about people out in the rural areas.

It's a very difficult thing to deal with but we need to deal with it somehow.

Okay thanks.

>> Edward: Thank you.

>> Steve: Any others?

Okay you're going to make some changes and bring this back next week, Ed?

>> Edward: Yes, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Okay, okay, upcoming agenda items and topics.

Sue.

>> Sue: .

>> Steve: Where did you go, there you are.

>> Sue: I'm here.

>> Steve: Everybody moves around on my screen.

>> Sue: Sorry I did not mean to do that on purpose.

>> Steve: I'm sure you did not do that on purpose.

I think Sarah is doing this to me.

>> Sue: Mine stay the same so I don't know.

So at our next meeting we will have an unfinished business we will be voting on the FOIA procedures and guidelines.

And on the communication policy, we will bring back as a new document for your approval the procurement review procedures and guidelines that we referenced. I suspect that general counsel Pastula might have some additional policies for us to review.

She mentioned conflict of interest and record retention that are in the works and also some additional information on the constitutional criteria and some of the lawsuits that she has been reviewing that have happened in other parts of the country. So look for any part of any of those items.

Edward will be back with additional information on his communications and where he is going with his plans to assist the Commission.

And then I'm very excited to announce also that we will have a presentation from California commissioner Cynthia Die and I'm not sure I'm saying her name right die or day.

She has invited Vince Barava to come back and present to the Commission and then she has also invited Karen McDonald who headed the line drawing team.

I know there were several questions about how do we make sure we get the best mappers, how do we interact with the mappers so they will be here to make brief presentation remarks and then also to answer any questions you might have.

So I'm looking forward to you having great questions for them.

And then we will also continue on with our process for selection of the mapping. So things are in the works.

We will have our VRA general legal counsel proposals in so we can let you know how many of those proposals have come in.

So lots to do, exciting times ahead and I would entertain any other agenda topics that you may have.

>> Steve: Question California people, they are not going to be here next week, are they?

>> Sue: Yes, on the 18th.

>> Steve: That is awfully early for them.

>> Sue: Early because.

>> Steve: Early in the day.

>> Sue: They are going to fill the last hour of the meeting so it will be 11 our time what 8:00 their time.

>> Steve: Yes, that is still early for them.

Not for us.

Other questions for Sue?

Topics?

Comments?

>> Doug: The California folks are the ones that worked on the redistricting ten years ago, not the ones working on it now, is that true?

>> Sue: Correct.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Steve: Anything else?

Any -- no, any announcements from anybody?

Edward.

>> Edward: Yeah, just want to remind the Commissioners to check their e-mail with regards to photos.

We are trying to get our photos and videos scheduled on the 23 and 24th in Lansing.

And the dates as listed in the e-mail on the first come first serve basis but we need everyone to sign up and participate.

And then once you sign up and tell us when you are available, we will sent you logistics in terms of parking, where to go and all of that good information as well as working with you on your scripts.

So you will hear from me next week to make sure all those things are done.

But I can't stress enough please, please, please check your state e-mail if you have not done so already.

And respond with the three options that you are available so we can get this done.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Okay, any other announcements?

Everybody get a haircut and go get your hair done and look nice.

Is it just going to be from the waist up we can wear blue jeans and a sport cut.

>> Edward: Waist up and I would encourage business dress highly business dress in terms of attire so you know what we are doing with regards to that but like I said I will be sending you scripts so you are aware and there will be a teleprompter used that you can read from but business attire would be greatly, greatly appreciated.

Like the Chair said above the waist.

>> Steve: And not casual Friday attire.

>> Edward: S correct, thank you.

>> Steve: Anything else?

Good meeting everybody.

Hopefully MC is okay.

And we will see him next week.

I make a motion to adjourn from Erin.

And a second from Brittini.

All in favor raise your hand.

All opposed stay here.

Have a good weekend.

>> Have a good weekend everybody.

>> Thank you, Dustin, you too.

>> It's a long weekend too, right?

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

President's day on Monday.

So all right take care.

>> Good-bye everybody.

[Meeting concludes at 3:29 p.m.]