

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

MICRC

20240123-1000 Meeting

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

>> CHAIR ORTON: Good morning, the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission is live in Detroit we look forward to hearing from you.

As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:06 a.m.

We are live streamed on our Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel.

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.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation and Spanish, Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. E-mail us for Redistriction@michigan.gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should also contact us at Reidistricting@michigan.gov.

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed and those closed captions transcripts will be made available and posted on the Michigan.gov/MICRC website along with written public comment submissions.

There is also a comment portal and can be accessed visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC. Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods, III, Executive Director for the Commission, at Woods E3@Michigan.gov or 517-331-6309.

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Good morning, Commissioners.
When I call your name, please say present.

If you are -- you are all attending remotely so share the City, state, Township or village and the state from which you are attending the meeting.

Again please say present when I call your name.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Elaine Andrae?

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRAE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN:

Present.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you.

Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Eaton Township, Eaton County, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present remotely from Saginaw Township, Saginaw, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair, we have 11 Commissioners present.

You have a quorum.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

As a reminder to the public watching you can view agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

I would entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Moved and seconded.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Excuse me Madam Chairperson.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I want to be clear we will have a presentation from Lisa Handley immediately after the adoption of the agenda on partisan fairness.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

Any other discussion?

Seeing none, all in favor of -- I see a hand by Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Don't we need to amend the agenda to include that presentation and adopting what we have right now?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so is that a motion to amend the agenda?

Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: It would have to be because our current agenda at least the one before me does not have the presentation by Dr. Handley.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'd like to amend the agenda to include the presentation from Dr. Handley.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So moved and seconded that we amend the current agenda to include the partisan fairness presentation by Lisa Handley right after adopting the agenda.

Any discussion on that?

Seeing none, all in favor of amending the agenda raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the agenda is amended.

Now, all in -- so now back to the motion of adopting the agenda as amended.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the amended agenda is adopted.

So we will now have our partisan fairness presentation by Dr. Lisa Handley.

Please proceed, Dr. Handley.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Good morning, Commissioners.

I think I'm coming in at Kim Brace to send me the link to do this but Lisa Handley.

And I'm going to give you a refresher course on partisan gerrymandering.

Am I going to be able to share my screen on this link?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I believe so.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Can you see it?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Thank you, thank you.

This is -- you have seen this before, some of you recently, the new Commissioners. I just wanted to give you a little refresher course and remind you what the partisan fairness measures that you're viewing as you're drawing, where they came from and what they mean.

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.

You will recall that the Michigan State Constitution requires that you draw districts that you not provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party.

And that this disproportionate advantage is determined using accepted measures of partisan fairness.

Now, built into the GIS package that you're using are four commonly accepted essentially Court approved measures that we have discussed previously.

And I just want to refresh your memory and also show you how the plans that you drew stacked up after the 2022 actions.

I'm going to use an example here.

And it's going to follow us all the way through, this is hypothetical.

This is a jurisdiction with ten districts.

There are 500 people in each District.

But turn out varies.

You can look down the total votes column to see the turn out vary from 332 to 399.

And it shows how each of the parties' candidates did, party A and party B.

Okay, party A got 57 or 50.7% of the vote in the jurisdiction party B got 49.3%.

But party A only won three seats and won seat one, five and nine.

And party B won the other six.

Now, that means that the seat vote ratio is disproportionate.

Party A wins three seats or 30% of the seats with 50.7% of the vote while party wins 70% of the votes with 49.3% of the vote.

The seats proportionality is simply percentage of seats minus percentage of votes so party A is 30% of the seats minus 50.7% of the votes which is a proportionality bias of minus 20.7% of this plan, this election.

And the redistricting plan that produced these results is clearly bias in favor of party B by an enormous amount.

How did this happen?

One of two ways or in this case both ways.

First there is packing.

You can take party A supporters and you can pack them into a single District or a limited number of districts where they win say in this particular example 100% of the vote and therefore get 20% of the vote or 15% of the vote in the other districts.

Or you can crack them across districts.

So they can never get more than in this example 35% of the vote.

So it's simply a matter of are you packing party A into a small number of districts and cracking them into the rest of the districts.

Now I want to show you how the plan that you drew improved upon what the state legislature had done ten years earlier.

The proportionality bias in the old 2012 plan was 6.9 in favor of the republicans.

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.

When you drew the plan prior to the 2022 elections, you actually produced an almost 0 proportionality bias, very, very impressive.

You can see the plan favored republicans only very slightly, at a .5%.

Since the 2022 elections we updated the GIS matrix, the composite index and here we can see the proportionality bias slightly favors the democrats with 1.7% proportionality bias.

Okay, the second measure is actually a measure of packing.

This is the lopsided margin measure.

And the point of this is to determine if one of the parties is winning seats with a higher proportion of votes than the other party that suggests that there is packing going on.

So in this particular example, party A is winning districts with a much higher average vote, 63.6% than party B which is winning at 54.9%.

You can see it down at the bottom there.

This is the average.

The three districts that party A wins is about 69.9, 50.7% and 70.3%.

The average is 63.6% in terms of party B you can see they are all winning districts or in the 50s.

And the average is 54.9%.

This indicates that party A are packed in a few districts.

Party B is winning more districts with a lower vote margins.

The way that the lopsided margin score is calculated is simply take party A average the vote and subtract party B win vote here and it's 63.6 minus 54.9 or bias in favor of party B of 8.7%.

So how did you do?

The state legislature adding from 2012 that had a lopsided margin of 10.1% in favor of the republicans.

In other words, the democrats win the seats at a much higher percentage of average vote.

The plan that you passed prior to the 2022 elections had a lopsided margin of 5.3% and the 2022 elections did not change that.

So you essentially almost had the lopsided margin score.

The mean median difference borrows from statistics, and it tells us that a distribution of scores, for example, are normally distributed if the mean and the median are the same but they are disproportionate or skewed, the distribution is skewed if the mean and the median are not equal.

This is one of the reasons, for example, that median income is reported rather than mean income because you can have a billionaire that skews the average up and suggests that everybody in a particular jurisdiction is much wealthier than actually is a fact.

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.

Usually something like income is reported in terms of the median rather than the mean because of this possibility of skew.

So here what we are doing is we are going to compare party A's median vote share to the mean vote share.

You will remember the mean vote share was 50.7%.

Now to produce median we just took the percentage and the percentage by which they won or lost these districts.

Percentage of vote they received in each of the districts from lowest to highest and took the median or the middle value.

Here there is two middle values, but they are the same.

So our median is 46.5%.

So the mean median difference simply is 46.5.

And subtracted from 50.7%.

You get a median mean difference of 4.2%.

What that really means is for party A to win 50% of the seats they have to win 54.2% of the votes.

So you simply take 50 and add 4.2 and that shows the skew.

Okay, how did you guys do?

And move over here.

So in 2012 legislature drew a plan that produced a mean median difference of 6.1% in favor of the republicans.

In other words, in order to gain 50% of the seats, democrats would have to win 56.1% of the vote.

In the 2022 statement that you drew the mean median difference was 2.7%.

About a third of what it was before.

And after the 2022 elections, it actually dropped to 2.3%.

This is in favor of the republicans.

So democrats would have to win 52.3% from the vote to win 50%.

Finally the score we looked at is the efficiency gap.

The idea behind the efficiency gap is to look at the number of wasted votes for each of the parties.

A wasted vote is either the number of votes passed or the losing candidate in a District that that party lost.

Or the number of surplus votes that the party achieved in a District that they won.

So for example lopsided margin District, the surplus votes would be quite high compared to a more distribution of voters.

So what you're going to do is simply calculate the efficiency gap is compare the wasted votes party A to party B divided by total number of votes statewide.

So in this example you can see the number of surplus votes, the example party A won the first seat and only needed 200 votes to win so there is 79 surplus votes.

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 party B won, and party B lost so all of those are 120 are surplus.

So you add up all of the lost votes, all of the surplus votes and get total wasted votes for the two parties and you simply subtract the total wasted votes of party B from party A divide by the total number of votes and get efficiency gap in this example of 21.3% of the party in other words party B votes much more efficiently distributed across the districts than party A's votes.

How did the Commission do in 2012 the plan had an efficiency gap of 11.6. Efficiency gap in the plan that you drew dropped that to 4.3% and after the 2022 elections, the efficiency gap is 3.1% in favor.

Now, to produce these efficiency or produce these partisan fairness scores, you can approach it one of two ways.

You can choose a single election.

And input that single election into the box where it asks if you -- what election you want to look at.

And there are now 16 general elections in the matrix because we added the three from 2022.

We can choose anyone of those.

Or you can use the composite index.

The composite political index incorporates all 16 elections but weights them in a way that if a year is contributing more elections, it does not weigh more in terms of calculations.

So, for example, in 2018 there were four elections.

2018 does not count more than 2020.

So each year contributes an equal percentage of the scores that you're trying to calculate.

So each of these four measures have advantages and disadvantages associated with them.

And no mathematical matter is universally accepted.

In fact, sometimes measures actually disagree about how fair a plan is.

For example you remember that the seat to votes disproportionality bias showed the plan was slightly biased in favor of democrats while the other three measures, the lopsided margins measure, the mean median difference measure and the efficiency gap measure said the plans favored the plan favored the republicans.

So you have to look at all of these measures, not just one of them.

And this I believe accords with the Constitution that says looking at measures like this is the way to determine if you have created a plan that is fair.

Yes, that's my conclusion.

So I would be happy to take any questions that you have.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm just curious because it's been a long time, when doing the evaluation you're evaluating democrat and republican, but how do third parties fit into the evaluation as far as votes wasted if you have green party libertarian and are they counted because if they don't have a candidate they may vote for one party or the other.

So I'm just kind of curious how third-party supporters fit into the equation.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: They don't and the approach we adopted they don't.

This is just looking at how the plans fair in terms of the two major parties.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any other questions for Dr. Handley?

Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Dr. Handley it's nice to see you again.

Met you when we were out on our mapping.

I have one question that kind of bothers me.

Why is the term that you use in one of your columns wasted votes?

I personally don't like that term.

I think it gives the impression to people who vote oh, my vote didn't count.

Wouldn't it be wiser to call it votes not needed to win or something different?

I would like an explanation if you could, thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Well the terminology is not mine.

This was invented by political scientist and a lawyer who came up with the term wasted votes.

But I see what you're saying.

And I guess I do agree with you that they are not wasted votes.

But this is just the term that has been used by the inventors of the efficiency gap.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Maybe you could call the inventors and ask to change the term because it gives a false idea of if you vote your vote doesn't cost.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Lost candidates and surplus votes beyond what is needed to win.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Hi, I wonder if you could review for us again how we know when our score is good enough?

What is the standard for measures success?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I'm going to borrow from, unless the lawyers are in the audience who answered that question the last time, I'm going to offer two answers from a couple of the lawyers who were involved in a workshop we did a few days ago.

The first answer is you don't have to get to 0.

I think that we were told that one of the challenges to the 2022 plan was a partisan fairness plan and a Michigan Supreme Court threw it out saying there was no obligation to get to 0.

On the other hand, I believe that another lawyer told us you probably want to not do worse than what you have done.

In other words, you probably don't want to see an increase in the partisan fairness scores.

An increase in partisan bias in any plan that you adopt.

Because you did so well, you don't have a whole lot of room here.

You certainly don't want to have scores that are significantly higher than the scores that you achieved.

So I'm going to leave it at that.

We don't really know what, you know, if you will get a challenge and what the challenge would argue.

But I would say to be safe I wouldn't go very much higher than the scores you already obtained.

But you don't have to get to 0.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anything else for Dr. Handley?

Well, Dr. Handley, on behalf of the Commission thank you very much.

O, it looks like we do have one more, Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY:

>> CHAIR ORTON: It looks like you are on mute, Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, good morning, Dr. Handley.

This information that you just gave us, is it possible that we can read it again without, you know, can we read this again and kind of study it a little bit?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I believe that it will be provided to you.

The PowerPoint itself.

And I know it's going to be posted if it has not already been posted online as well.

But certainly you can get a copy of this.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Dr. Handley for your presentation.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You're welcome.

I'm going to stop sharing now, okay.

All right.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Good-bye, good luck.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So now we will move on to public comment guidelines.

Without objection, MICRC Executive Director Woods will review the public comment guidelines.

Hearing no objection please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Madam Chairperson.

Welcome Detroit.

We are so happy to have you 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.

Whether you are here in person or virtually.

We thank you for coming out to this public meeting to share your input as relates to the seven districts being reconfigured in the Michigan House of Representatives and the impact of surrounding districts as a result of this task.

We want to remind you that we welcome, welcome, welcome public comments so integral to the democracy process.

However we want to make sure you address the Commission, not individual members of the Commission or any innuendos we ask you hold to the time period of 90 seconds. And we also ask that there are some civility and de quorum in your remarks and how they are presented so the Commission can understand them clearly so that they can consider them when it comes to drawing fair maps with citizen input.

So once again welcome to Detroit.

Thank you again for being here.

And we look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you, Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

And Commissioner Janice Vallette will facilitate the public comment portion of today's meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Without objection we will begin the public comment pertaining to mapping.

Hearing no objection we will now proceed with public comment.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so.

Please step up to the nearest microphone when I call your number.

You will have 90 seconds to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when your 90 seconds have ended, and you hear the timer.

Please also go to the public comment tool and share your comments in writing including any specific area of the map about which you are speaking.

The public comment tool is at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

And there is a public comment station here this morning with volunteers to assist you in assessing the website if you would like assistance.

Additionally, we have the -- if you have a time constraint or don't wish to wait, please use the public comment portal.

First in line to provide public comment is number one.

>> Good morning, Commissioners and staff, I'm Sarah Howard the attorney for AFLCIO fair maps project.

First let me say thank you for your dedication to this project of drawing fair maps for Michigan.

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

It's a difficult thing to do under the best of circumstances now under this Court order you have been given a nearly impossible task with no real direction.

In 2021 your then General Counsel gave you the terrible advice you were forbidden from looking at partisan data and had to cross your fingers and hope you would luck into a fair map blind.

It's no surprise that the maps you passed disproportionately did advantage the republican party despite both the Michigan Constitution and overwhelming public comment calling for 0 partisan bias.

Now the Court has walked you into the same situation on VRA compliance.

You have to try again to draw a map that complies with the VRA, but you are not allowed to look at any of the data that would help you get there.

I can only imagine how frustrating that must be.

You are all working very hard.

But it is stressful and challenging.

And time is running out.

So we urge you to take advantage of your experts.

Ask your consultants to produce two or three maps for you to consider and debate.

You can give them the criteria to meet, telling them for example.

[Timer]

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number two.

>> Hi, I'm Jamie cofounder and executive director of Voters Not Politicians the nonpartisan volunteer driven group that wrote and helped pass the amendment that created our independent citizen led redistricting process.

First and foremost thank you for your service to the State of Michigan.

Millions of people all over the country in other states have District maps drawn in secret by and for politicians.

In Michigan voters demanded a fair transparent process instead.

Voters Not Politicians is confident you as a group will adopt new maps that satisfy all of the constitutional criteria that allow historically marginalized communities to elect the candidates of their choice.

That keep communities of interest together.

And that improve upon the partisan fairness of the Hickory plan.

None of these criteria needs to be traded off for another.

We are also confident you will respect the Court's decision and limit your changes to the districts that were ordered to be redrawn.

And that you will consider the feedback and suggestions of the public especially maps grounded in data and expert analysis.

In 2018 voters gave this Commission exclusive authority to adopt District maps.

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

I have every faith in your ability as a Commission to fulfill the trust that we the voters of Michigan have placed in you.

Thank you so much.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number three.

>> Hello.

Thank you again for making the effort to redrawing the districts.

I know this takes time and effort but with great power comes great responsibility.

I am back before you because this is an important issue for young people despite what you may see in this room.

The current District maps have minimized voices like mine for open season for oppression, but our voices won't be silenced. I'm standing before you as the president of Wayne state college democrat advocate and a student in our community.

Please take the time to reflect on me, my brother, my friends and my family when you draw these districts.

Remember my voice in every line that you draw.

Because it's not just a voice from me.

But the voices of many.

Partisan fairness is crucial in these districts.

And should not be at the expense of the people of different groups of people.

I hope you will take this duty with great honor and serve as well, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Individuals who have signed up -- I'm sorry, number four.

>> That's okay good morning, Commissioners today I return with a focus on importance of the matter for the youth.

I extend my gratitude for the Commission for the crucial hard work.

Like I stated yesterday the significance of fair representation for my parents, church of Detroit predominately made of Black Detroiters cannot be overstated.

Marks of substantial step forward.

I advocate for prioritizing fair maps for people of color and emphasize partisan fairness is a crucial plea for equitable representation.

Thank you, guys.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide a live or remote public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed.

I will call your name and our staff will unmute you.

If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

If you are on the phone, a voice will say that the host wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute.

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 will call on you by your name or the last four digits of your phone number.

Also please note that if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for three to five seconds we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you trouble shoot so that you can participate during the next public comment period at a later meeting.

You will now have 90 seconds to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is Sheila.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Participants one, two and three are not present.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay, then next in line is Annie-M.

>> Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> That's me.

That is a shorter name.

Can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Thank you.

So as I addressed you all a few years ago, Michigan voters out of 83 counties voted in favor of nonpartisan District line drawing.

You have a public mandate to draw fair maps and those maps can be drawn fairly considering partisan fairness.

The last election revealed if partisan fairness is used and close to 0 as possible the party that receives the share of popular vote will receive the corresponding number of seats.

Last time the party with State House got 51 across and 51% of the seats in the Senate State House.

Consequently, these maps are appropriately fair and decades of partisan gerrymandering by one particular party.

Please continue to adhere to the public service that the public wants fair maps and elections from 2018's voting results as well as making sure that you consider partisan fairness per the Constitution and your public duty to the voters who voted this in.

Thank you for your service and thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Alex McGuire.

Please allow a moment for the staff to unmute you.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Hi, my name is Alex McGuire from Sterling Heights.

Thank you for speaking on behalf of my community.

Monday morning I heard speakers implore the Commission not to touch the districts effected by the recent Court decision and almost immediately after the Commission started talking about redrawing lines in Southfield and Oak Park which is outside of the area affected by the recent Court decision.

I find this immensely concerning as the work that the Commission did previously in these areas was exemplary.

There is no need to redraw the whole Metro Detroit area.

These maps can absolutely be made compliant with the equal protections clause while respecting partisan fairness and not straying outside of the effected District.

I want to thank the Commissioner for efforts and Dr. Handley for her presentation.

I hope you all have a great day.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Ryan Reece, please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Reverend Ryan Reece speaking from House District 14.

Thank you again for taking the time to hear my comments and thank you again for your service to our state.

We do appreciate it.

As I spoke yesterday, I'm concerned about making sure that both voters of color in our area and also our partisan fairness are in good conjunction.

There have been excellent commentaries and thank you Dr. Handley for her time and presentation.

Voters especially of color in Detroit and Wayne County spent decades knowing their votes might not actually count the way they want them to.

The outcomes of decision elections may have been decided in committee chambers in back rooms in state capitol.

Prioritizing both making sure that the citizens and neighbors that I have here in this area are properly represented both in terms of the communities of interest there and their partisan fairness helps to provide equal measure of enfranchisement to our Detroit voters and I ask that you continue in this effort to keep both of these things in mind.

Thank you very much for your time.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is George Higgins.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me now?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> All right, I just want to again thank the Commissioners for their hard work drawing the original maps and again for now redrawing the maps specifically those districts required by the Court.

This was obviously a new process back when the maps were originally drawn and you know even though you know the Court took issue with how some of the ways how those maps were drawn, they did produce competitive and close elections here in Metro Detroit that were as a previous speaker said generally representative of the partisan ballots of Michigan voters.

And the Commission tried its best.

It needs to try again and try harder to remedy based on what the Court said.

And when redrawing the districts I'm just hopeful and happy there was that presentation on partisan fairness by I think Dr. Handley.

Keep the mandate for partisan fairness top of mind.

It's of the up most importance that it should not be sacrificed for the sake of speed or drawing new communities of interest.

Communities of interest are a mandate.

The Commission has to contend with but if new communities of interest are being drawn they should be done so the eye to advancing partisan fairness rather than distracting and I think there is a strong lakeshore community of interest in the Senate with District 12 and the State House CC2 basically already is a lakeshore community of interest besides Frasier. So I don't think we need more lakeshore in the State House don't need St. Clair shores in one District I think Harper Woods should be incorporated there along with Grosse Pointe.

We don't need to have St. Clair shores and Grosse Pointe yet another lakeshore of interest we already have 62 in the State House, and we have 12.

[Alarm]

And that's it.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Anthony Skinnell.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Thank you, Commission.

Sorry to say that or see that the Supreme Court of the United States denied your -- the pause in the mapping process.

But oh, well.

I think you're doing an okay job any way.

I was not happy back in 2022 or 21, whenever with the Congressional maps.

I thought at least for my District House District one and even Senate District one but that remains to be seen how that is going to turn out.

I thought they were okay and saw a commenter say something like that yesterday Oscar thought House District one and Senate one were okay.

And I took a look at what you did with the House District.

It just had River Rouge in addition to parts of Detroit and you added Ecorse and then another Down River District.

You took Melvindale out of Dearborn and put it with Allen and Lincoln Park, and I think that's fine.

It's perfectly fine what you did.

There is arguments to be made for both ways with Melvindale going either way but it works out and Ecorse River Rouge is great.

So keep it up.

Appreciate it.

Good work.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is James Gallant.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me now?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Thank you very much. This is James Gallant, Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. These are my opinions. And I want to thank Madam Chair for learning some working knowledge of Robert's Rules.

You are catching on here. You are catching on a little bit. So please maintain that semblance of order because it's the primary job here of the Chair to remain -- to remain in order for the approval set of rules.

And no one has the right to speak until you, the Chair, assign the floor under a motion with proper support to approve a specific action like approving the maps.

And here you are talking about the maps a week later and you have no motion to approve the maps. Or like discussing political fairness with Dr. Handley.

You only approved a presentation from Dr. Handley.

You did not, I repeat did not legitimately approve a conversation with her for you to discuss that because you had no motion to discuss political fairness with her.

Now, I encourage, and I commend Commissioner Curry and Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Weiss and a few others talking about we need to follow the rules here.

Request a point of order so that the Chair will have to read the written rule onto the record for you.

And you did not get any information here.

Commissioner Curry didn't get any information, no handouts yet and now you are talking and discussing it.

And you made a decision there by consensus. And I believe you are making consensus decisions and not writing it in the minutes.

You have to say, every time you say hearing no objections, every time you move on, like yesterday when you adjourned.

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.

[Timer]

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Malek-S.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Good morning, Commission.

My name is Malek. I'm a resident of District three, City of Melvindale and also a manager of the Melvindale Islamic center, a nonprofit in the City of Melvindale and wanted to make a comment in regards to the current idea of removing Melvindale from the current District three.

I'm against that.

And many of our members at the Melvindale Islamic center are and would like to preserve the voting constituents and keep District three intact.

Removing Melvindale just to add west Dearborn to District three would be a disservice due to the fact that west Dearborn and Dearborn Heights have similar socioeconomic status, so to do that basically the voting power of the constituents that would be remaining in District three would be diluted like the City of Melvindale moving into Allen Park would be diluted as well.

I was fortunate I was on this meeting today and listen to Dr. Handley's presentation as it was a very good reminder to myself and to the Commission of when we are making District lines, we have to ensure that we are not basically discriminating or diluting any community or group of people's voting power.

And I think that would definitely happen if we were to remove Melvindale from District three.

I appreciate the time from the Commission to speak.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

We have one person here in person who is asking to speak again, and we are going to allow that.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We have one more remote public comment participant.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Next person in line is brook Harris.

>> Good morning.

My name is brook Harris I'm a resident of the Boston Edison historic in State House District eight.

I would like to thank the Commissioners for your lives to do this important work.

I would also like to encourage you to make this work perhaps a little bit easier on ourselves and consider the maps that have been uploaded to the public comment portal especially those drawn by Detroiters and those with supporting documentation like the one from MSU's institute for public policy and social research.

The IPPSR map does a good job of keeping my neighborhood intact.

And connecting it with surrounding historic District and community of interest and ensuring that Detroit voters like me have the opportunity to elect people to represent our communities without creating a ripple effect that changes multiple District boundaries. I'm confident that you can adopt maps that meet the criteria outlined in our state Constitution and also cause minimal disruption to other districts not outlined in the lawsuit and I wish you all the very best of like doing such and doing it swiftly. Thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Yes, we have one more in-person.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak again.

My name is Sarah Howard attorney for AFLCIO fair maps project.

You are expert mapping technicians and don't have to be.

No one expects you to be.

All you have to do is make use of the experts you hired.

Give them criteria to meet like here are the COI priorities.

Show us two to three maps that keep those together, change only the districts reasonably necessary to comply with the Court order and comply with VRA population.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair apologies, I need to interrupt for a moment, please.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Per our rules isn't public comment they get one turn?

I just -- I know in our first round it was each person was allotted 90 seconds.

We have written rules that talk to this, so I don't think it's right to allow an individual a second 90 seconds.

I guess that was a point of order.

My apologies first.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I know that at one point we did when we were having public hearings, we did allow people a second chance after everyone else was finished. I don't know.

We will have to review the written rules and see if we took that out.

Do you have that handy?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Currently the rules of procedure allow for two minutes although the Commission adjusted that time to 90 seconds at one of your previous meetings.

And it does not currently allow for a second round of public comment for individuals that have already provided public comment.

But that is at the discretion of the Commission.

So if you all wanted to change that, you could.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So my memory on this is a little foggy.

But I seem to recall that the second comment came from Robert's Rules of Order which we have adopted as our rules of order, and it was Mr. James Gallant who had raised the issue of something within Roberts rules that allows a second comment at the conclusion of initial public comment.

That being said I think we probably need to look at that again because it's been a while, and we are a bit hazy, but I would suggest allowing Ms. Howard to finish her comments to verify that and look at it for the next meeting.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, I'm fine with relooking at it.

But if that's the case then every person that signed up pardon me signed up remotely should also have that opportunity and anybody else that's in person should have that opportunity.

Fair is fair.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So my suggestion is that we let Ms. Howard complete her thought and then we can have a discussion and a vote on how we want to proceed unless anyone objects to that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do because I think we need to vote on how we are going to proceed because if there are still people that are attending online that signed up for public comment and want to give additional public comment they should be allowed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, then that ends the public comment portion of our meeting. So I think that we will put that on the agenda for later to discuss that.

Okay, well, next is the mapping process by the Commission.

And we left off with Commissioner Donna Callaghan's turn.

So we will proceed with that.

Commissioner Callaghan?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Madam Chairperson.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We do have one of our attorneys Richard Riley who is on that can speak to the communities of interest when it comes to mapping.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Riley.

>> I'm happy to address an issue that the General Counsel has asked Baker Hostetler to weigh in on concerning what I understand to be a difficult issue that has arisen in the mapping concerning the interrelation of communities of interest and racial identity.

And, you know, we at Baker have not been, you know, watching moment by moment what's going on, but it has been relayed to us that there has been some difficulties arising because of what our frankly understandably competing concerns.

On the one hand there is this directive originating with the three Judge panel to engage in redistricting that is not race based.

And a directive not to be considering race in the line drawing.

And at the same time there is a directive both from the Constitution and I think it also comes from the three-Judge panel, at least implied, that communities of interest should be doing a lot of the heavy lifting in the line drawing.

And one of the challenges arises where you have an interrelation between racial identity and communities of interest.

For example, I understand that one set of issues arises where, for instance, you have an Arab American community.

And there's a desire, naturally, to view that as a community of interest.

And take some account of that in the line drawing.

The same can be said of a Bangladeshi community of interest.

Even a Jewish community of interest.

There's a religious element there but there could also be a racial element there.

And so questions arise, is that racial gerrymandering?

What can be considered and what way?

There is a follow-on consideration to that, what about African/American communities?

After all, they are communities of interest as well.

How should they be viewed?

What can the Commission consider consistent with the equal protection clause.

What cannot be considered or should not be considered to create a safe path for maps that the Commission prepares to be affirmed in Court.

These are difficult questions.

And I'm going to state very clearly up front that there is not clear case law addressing these issues.

And that is because the racial gerrymandering that exist to date concern what I would refer to as racial targets, percentages typically based on census data.

Black voting age population, Hispanic citizen voting age population.

And typically the redistricting authority runs into problems when there's a target of 50% target, 55% target in this case.

We had lower targets, but it was a similar idea.

And the movement of voters to hit those targets results in predominance.

To my knowledge, and I've read all the Supreme Court cases and most of the lower Court cases in this area, there is not a case that addresses what do you do with communities of interest.

So we are a little bit in the dark.

But based on what I know of the law and what we would envision being sound defenses for your work, and bearing in mind the importance of giving you flexibility to do your work in the best possible way and considering the broadest amount of information that's relevant to communities of interest, I can discuss what I think is a solid framework.

And I would be very comfortable defending this framework in Court.

What I would propose is that the Commission can consider racial information that is intertwined with community as part of a wholistic evaluation of the lived experience and on the ground realities of people and places in Michigan.

I would give an example of this, actually stepping outside of Michigan and going to a neighborhood close to where I live in northern Virginia where there is a Hispanic population that's largely Salvadorian immigrants.

That population lives in several housing complexes there.

There is a Catholic church that has mass in Spanish.

There is a Salvadorian restaurant that is owned locally, there are grocery stores that sell ingredients that Salvadorians use this their cultural dishes.

There are festivals.

There is a community that is there.

In my judgment, if the redistricting authority in Virginia informed itself of all of these facts, not just race, but the totality, the wholistic understanding of who these people are, cohesive cultural ties to each other socioeconomic status and work together in the same types of employment.

They have similar incomes.

All of these things wholistically and it decided in drawing lines to try not to split that community to the best of its ability given all of the other considerations.

I do not believe that that would result in racial gerrymandering.

I'm not 100% certain of that given the absence of case law.

But given what I know of the standards of the equal protection underpinnings there and given the fact that the concern under pinning these cases is stereotyping it seems clear to me that drawing a community-based map on a wholistic analysis of shared ties that may include race but are not limited to race would be proper.

If we apply that concept to the problems that the Commission is confronting, it seems to me very defensible for the Commission to look at, for an example, a Middle Eastern community that shares a similar geographic area and make an assessment of who is there.

I would certainly encourage the Commission not to stop at racial identity.

It should look deeper than that.

If there is an assessment based on perhaps knowledge of Commissioners, public comments, all of the information available to you, that these people share similar institutions, perhaps there are religious institutions, a mosque, an Malachy Catechist Church or Syria orthodox church where these folks frequent, if there are restaurants, businesses, cultural events, food, culture that is binding these people together it seems to me that the Commission is entitled to inform itself of those facts and line drawing adjustments on the bases of all of those facts.

Not just Middle Eastern race or ethnicity but a totality of assessment that these people really share cultural ties.

They belong together.

This is really a community that has a life of its own that can be recognized.

I would feel very confident standing up in Court and telling the three-Judge panel that that is not a racial gerrymander.

That is a proper consideration of communities of interest.

Race may have been a factor, may have been part of the assessment, but it was not the whole assessment.

I would certainly encourage the Commission in those types of judgments, again, look beyond race.

Look at ties, look at institutions, look at neighborhoods.

Look at who's there.

I would also encourage the Commission to stay away from data.

Don't be looking at percentages.

It does not really matter the number of people.

It doesn't matter what percentage is there.

The census data isn't really that informative.

Definitely don't be trying to hit percentages of Hispanic voting age population.

That could be very problematic.

I would definitely stay away from that.

But look at who these people are.

What are their shared ties?

What are their shared interests?

Look there and I would feel very comfortable defending that type of District in Court.

That raises the next question, of course, this case involved Black communities.

And one question is, well, if the Commission is permitted to consider the cultural connections between Arab Americans and Hispanics and other groups, why can't it consider cultural ties among Black communities?

Again, there is not a clear answer here.

But I would feel comfortable defending the position that if the same framework is used, that considerations that have a relationship with race but go much beyond race can be properly considered by the Commission.

For example, if you inform yourself based on the knowledge of Commissioners who live in the area, public comments, the Court has actually directed the Commission to have a public hearing in Detroit at a later stage.

It clearly wants the Commission to be listening to Detroit folks.

And if you understand that there is a particular community that is predominately African/American and you look beyond that, there is a historically Black church where civil rights leaders have spoken in the past.

There are African/American owned businesses that members of the community frequent.

They share similar socioeconomic status.

They go to the same schools.

They have similar concerns.

So on and so forth.

Institutions, cultural ties, shared experiences and you inform yourself of all of that and race is one factor.

It's a small factor that is going into the considerations, then I would feel comfortable defending to the Court that that is not racial gerrymandering.

In fact, I would feel comfortable defending to the Court that that's what the Commission should be doing because one of the criticisms that the Plaintiffs have levied against the prior map is that the percentages that the Commission went and hit caused it to make decisions that make little sense on the basis of community.

And that the losers in that process were the African/American communities in Detroit.

Therefore I would feel comfortable standing up in front of the Court and saying the Commission listened to Black residents of Detroit.

We all know from experience and from the Court's own findings that Detroit is nearly 80% African/American.

So we know who lives there.

And I would feel comfortable saying they listened to those people.

They learned about where institutions were.

Where communities were formed.

And they did informed line drawing on the basis of community and the consideration that these folks happen to be African/American was part of the mix, but it was by no means limited to that.

It was a wholistic, fair consideration of the reality on the ground. I would feel very confident defending that in Court.

Please do not be looking at Black voting age population, shooting for targets, trying to achieve percentages.

So on and so forth.

Focus on community.

Focus on who is there.

If you're doing that, and a consideration of the race happens to come into the mix, I don't think that disqualifies and otherwise cohesive community for protection under what the Commission is doing.

Hopefully I recognize there is a lot of nuisances there but I'm hopeful that, that can provide some assistance in moving forward with these very difficult issues.

And I'm available for questions if there are any.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Mr. Raile.

I see Erin Wagner's hand up.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: From what I'm understanding it sounds that we can consider the African/American Detroit voters that are at odds with our maps. As a community of interest as long as we considered them as a cultural ethnicity which I think was where we were going before.

Am I hearing you correctly?

>> I think that's right.

And I would stress to go beyond race to learn about who these people are.

It starts with race but it's much deeper than that.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Well yes but personally I was considering them a COI because everyone has in the same area to frequent the same shops and markets and everything.

So, Juanita, I think you would be perfect to advise us on those neighborhoods that we need to keep cohesive as well as the Detroit public.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Is there any other question or comment?

I don't see any.

Thank you, Mr. Raile.

>> Thank you, everyone.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So we will move on to Commissioner Callaghan with mapping.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Thank you.

I'm going to pass my turnover to Juanita.

And let her take a mapping turn.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, this is not a one woman show.

I want everybody to have a part in what he just said.

You can go from there.

And if you don't understand that, how do we understand everybody else's?

You know, Black folks want the same thing as all the other cultures.

We are a culture.

We are a people.

We have a lot of things that are in common other than color.

In fact, color is not one of the most because we are all shades.

So one color is not really the matter here because we have many, many shades of color.

So but we have a whole lot of cultural things that are in common.

And it doesn't take just one person to spell that out because I don't want to be attacked today as yesterday.

So that's just think of we eat a lot.

We eat the same things.

We have had the same pressures.

The same -- we had the same fight for many, many years.

I mean there is nothing unusual about trying to see if we got anything contiguous together.

We have a lot in common.

Anybody that is human can see that.

And we don't have to just select just me to choose that.

You say from your heart what you think.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Juanita.

I guess I will take my turn back and ask for your help.

What I have wanted to do at one point in time with my mapping time was to see if we could create a map that changes the required districts, but as few other districts as possible.

I have one started where we changed the required ones plus four, nine and 13.

Apparently, it did not get as far along as I thought it did.

I think that was version 011724V4.

So if we could at least take a look at that map and see if that meets that criteria and what shape it's in and maybe try to proceed from there and put together some good communities.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We will look at this but if we want to make edits to it, I suggest we make a copy of it and then do that.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Sarah, do you know if there was a map further along based on the criteria, I just laid out there?

I know it was not started this week.

I would say it was started the previous week.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So the 11724V4, let me see.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This plan is 11724V4.

And it has edits, well actually it's just it looks to me like it's just really eight and nine and maybe a little bit of four has been edited.

And of course 10 and 11, 13, 14, 7.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The most recent version of the map family which I've added the flower name Astor to is 11824V1.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Shall we look at that one, Commissioner?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'll also add that yesterday Commissioner Orton pulled up this map to apply the overlay from the Cone flower map which is the map that Commissioner Kellom had started but I don't think any edits were made to it at that time.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this is a copy of the 11824V4.
Is that the one, is that what we want to open at this point?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: V1.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay V1.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Commissioner Eid do you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What flower did you say this one was?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Astor.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This changes the 7 required districts plus districts 4, 9 and 13, correct?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, I believe so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Can we look at the population of the districts to and see where we need to make adjustments?

Obviously one, eight and nine.

Kent 7 is 3.35 down.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Commissioner Curry, you had a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I did.

I'm trying these flower names, which I've never heard of before I guess is to my ignorance but if we are going to use flower names why can't we use names that we see all the time?

Like Roses and Tulips and instead of all these different names that I've never heard of before?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I think these were picked as native Michigan flowers.

I guess if you are a gardener you have heard of them but otherwise not so much.

Maybe we should have gone with Lake names, but I think it's too late now.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't think it's too late.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Can you scroll back down through the districts please?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Commissioner Szetela, do you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I was going to echo what Juanita said, while, you know, I'm an avid gardener and know the names of the flowers but were supposed to be about Detroit and Lupine and Bergamot for people in Detroit may not be flowers they are familiar with and try to refrain from using these more exotic and focus on what are simple, Tulip, Daffodil, Roses, that is why I wanted to use Rose bud yesterday because I want recognizable to citizens of Detroit and the remapping is supposed to be about the citizens of Detroit, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Commissioner Eid, do you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I yield.

Never mind.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I want to start with one and can change the map name.

I don't care if they were flower names, I wanted to get away from version one turning into version eight that was my goal.

Lakes, flowers, animals, I don't care, something simple.

What I would like to do is see if we can get version one on to be correct from the population standpoint so if someone has a suggestion of how we can get that population down where it should be moved into, nine seems a good candidate since nine does not have enough population.

We can start swinging things around.

Does anyone have a suggestion?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so on this map eight is low.

Nine is low and one is high so I would suggest going from eight into nine so putting some of nine into eight and then that will let you normalize the population on eight.

You can then go from nine to one and do the same thing.

And the numbers should just about even out.

District 7 is also slightly low so you could even start there.

But I would go north and come down and curve around into one, so those numbers are low, and one is high.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I would be happy for you to drive that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Stigall you have your hand up?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was going to suggest since this is from last week, we make a copy of it and start working and doing edits in the copy but certainly it's y'all's provocative.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, please do that.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: At this point do we want to put a flower or some other name on there?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Can we please call it the Tulip plan?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Is that a statement or a question or?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: That was a statement.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is correct that the name is Tulip, correct?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes, could you please rename this one with today's date and put version number and attach Tulip as the flower, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just wondered does Sarah already have one like a different one named Tulip?

She has quite the extensive spreadsheet.

I don't want to change her stuff and then it causes more confusion.

I think the people in Detroit can remember Astrid.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Anthony?

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.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't know if you purchase flowers, but I purchase flowers every year and I never heard of these before.

I go everywhere.

To all kind of beautiful stores and pick up flowers without these names.

I've never heard of them but if you want to leave it like that keep things complicated.

Help yourself.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Kent, your hand is still up.

I think that you just forgot.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If I may Commissioners, I think Tulip is a lovely name. Commissioners are welcome to change the names of maps as they evolve, and I will just keep record of where they come from so this will be the Tulip plan born of the Astro plan.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: The date is wrong, and it says 23rd and it should be 24th 011823 instead of 011824 then Tulip.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I see I miss typed the name and will change it when I close it if that is okay.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Okay so if we are ready to proceed with some mapping work, Commissioner Eid, could you please make the changes that you suggested between one, eight and nine?

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay next move.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do you want to turn the neighborhood maps on then?

Okay Juanita, let's do this together.

What do you think of gateway and Russell industrial, Boston Edison, Arden park being in District eight?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You are not going to put this all on my shoulders.

They had 13 people to do this.

And just like I can select the Dearborn area, the Bangladesh area, the Mexican areas, if I can do that, you can do that with the Black areas.

You don't need my input.

Do what you want to do and then I will be last.

Because if it's up to me then I don't need any of you all.

This is a 13-member thing that we are supposed to be doing.

And if your heart is not large enough to have mercy on people that you want to split up, you don't want to be split up.

So why split up anybody else?

I don't want -- let's try to be contiguous on everyone.

Let everyone have a fair share.

That's what they want is fairness.

You can see fairness.

You know fairness when you see it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay well let's do that then.

Let's put those three neighborhoods into District eight.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which three neighborhoods I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We have to normalize the population on eight so south of eight into nine.

Let's take gateway.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I would just suggest again, I made this comment several times that we try not to break precincts when at all possible. Secretary of State has asked us not to break precincts, election law requires us not to break precincts unless we have a good reason so I would just encourage doing adjustments please not break precincts because it causes chaos in the elections on the ground level.

Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Eid, are we going to continue more south?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: How many people are in Arden park?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is approximately 233.
265.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so let's put that and Boston Edison in district eight. We had someone from Boston Edison speak about the MSU map. We can look at that later where that map has about --
[Off mic]

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: At this point we have a piece of north end up here in eight.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm prioritizing the neighborhoods at the moment.

So let's stick with that.

Okay, then I see a few more blocks on the Boston Edison side that should be in eight.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think the neighborhood boundary is splits right there. So Atkinson, yeah, so somebody knows that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's put that in eight because it will help with the population.

Okay, now eight is okay.

Let's go between the border of nine and one.

So it looks like one is about 17% high and nine is about 15 percent low.

That means unless we want to change other Directors, we are going to move some of one into nine.

The question is: Where?

We have some maps that have the Mexicantown, Hubbard Farms, West Side Industrial Complex with District one and we have some where it is with District nine.

I would love to hear opinions on this area because I as someone who lives very close to there think it could go either way.

I think either way is fine for the community there.

But I'd welcome some other input.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The highlighted area is 2065 people.

It's currently in one.

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I believe that is if you put that into nine, you're going to be splitting the Latino community of interest that Oscar spoke about yesterday.

We have maps of community of interest available online on our mapping portal.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I believe he said he liked the previous District one how it was.

All right let's try that neighborhood then that you are highlighting right now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is approximately, they are missing some blocks, 4,000.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So let's assign that to one.

I'm sorry, to nine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are getting some little pieces mixed up.

We will go back and get those.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, we can go back and do that some other time.

Okay now let's look at what do we need another 20,000 folks?

Ish?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are over 12000 in one and under 10,000 in nine.

So it's about an even swap there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, well let's put Central southwest in nine then.

See how many folks are in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We still have 7 down 3.35%.

What was your direction again?

Excuse me?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Central southwest.

Okay now nine is a little high but it's in the green so that is progress.

Elaine, does this do what you want it to do more or less?

I know it's not perfect but.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: I was just wondering if you could again keep Mexicantown and that together and then take out Chadsey-Condon and put it back in one.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Go for it.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: That is Hubbard farms, Mexicantown.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So those two neighborhoods have a population of 1787.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Then just south of there as well.

That is probably not a lot of population there.

But it should stay together.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So you want to put this in nine?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: At this point in area is I don't think there is many people here.

That's like 30 people.

All that area is 31.

It's part of west side industrial.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Then just below that though too.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That will go in nine and we will fix the tail here and unpopulated pieces.

Put that area in nine?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes, then go back up to Chadsey-Condon and put that back in one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put this area in one?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: At this point one is .03%.

Four is at 2.34.

And nine is at 2.44.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Can you Zoom out just a little bit?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to fix a couple of these.

Fix a couple of these little ones because it will show up.

And like this little area probably should be in one to follow the neighborhood boundary.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Go ahead.

You can fix those, yep.

Okay Commissioner?

>> CHAIR ORTON: What about that little piece at the bottom of Delray?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is a single block.

So maybe it would look better in one.

There is four people in it.

I don't know if they are up here or down here.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: I mean, it would look better in one.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Delray is just about exempt from people.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Who is up now?

Seven?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There are a couple a little over 2.59, 12 is 2.59 and 2.51 and they are close, but they are under 2.5.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: 59 and 2 and I don't know what that means.

>> CHAIR ORTON: It looks to me like 12 could take a few people from nine. Even them both out.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: We need to move a few out of 12, right?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Your 12 is 2.59 if you want to be under, you know, 2.5 or better you can probably move.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: And 7 has 3.35 and I don't know why they are showing up green.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Six is locked, but it could use a little bit from seven but it's locked.

Eight could use a little bit from seven and balance it.

Well, actually seven is locked too.

So 14 could, you know, well 14 is right at the borderline low.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: I'm done.

If somebody else wants to take a swing at it that is fine.

>> CHAIR ORTON: It's actually about time for our lunch break.

So I would entertain a motion to recess for lunch.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Moved and seconded that we recess for lunch.

We will reconvene at 1:00.

We need to vote, sorry.

Is there any discussion?

Okay all in favor of recessing for lunch raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and we are recessed until 1:00.

[Recess until 1:00 p.m.]

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Richard, how are you doing?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: You getting a lot of snow?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's terrible here.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: It's snowing here and kind of slows down and speeds up and slows down.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's kind of the same everywhere.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I think it's about 30 some degrees out here.

Let me look.

Yeah, 34.

So it's got to be pretty wet.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah.

Well my car is frozen from the looks of it, so I think the wet has turned to ice.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yeah.

Most likely.

The good thing is I think tomorrow it's supposed to warm up pretty decent.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That will be great.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: It's supposed to rain and might get rid of some of it.

Actually three, four days are going to be 36, 38, 37, 37.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Pretty good, doesn't it?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Sounds good it might melt some of the snow.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: How is your family?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Great as far as I know.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Have you talked to Ipsi?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I talked to him quite a while ago and his paperwork and

I told him I was sorry to see him go and that.

You know, he has to do what he has to do.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, about Doug?

How is he doing?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yeah, I've talked to him a couple times.

He said he has been watching so that is good he is paying attention and looking to see to get everything squared away.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I kind of miss them.

I miss them a lot.

And missing you because you disappeared one day, hu?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I didn't feel good for a couple days and I'm not sure what it was.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Something.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Something got to me so take a little break.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Juanita, Richard just so you know we are live on

YouTube and when you are talking the ASL has to interpret what you are saying.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I understand that.

I did not want to get too crazy here but thank you for reminding me.

I did know that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I didn't either, I thought I just -- I will be quiet.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Me too.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Ready when you are, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens

Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:09 p.m. Will the secretary please call roll?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Certainly, Madam Chair.

Commissioner Andrade?

- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

Commissioner Lange?

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS:
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss, you are on mute, sir.

And you're on mute and we are calling roll.

Commissioner Weiss.

- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Excuse me, can you hear me now?
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Yes.
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you Madam Chair we have 12 Commissioners present.

We have a quorum, thank you.

- >> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

So we will continue our mapping process.

And we are on, it's Donna Callaghan's turn.

- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'll pass, I'm through.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: So the next Commissioner in line is Juanita Curry.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a moment.

Let me get this up real quick.

- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I pass.

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.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay for the next Commissioner in line is Anthony Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so there is a few different things that I'd like to see over the next couple days.

We have maps that we should probably run the partisan fairness scores on.

We still have Commissioner or the map that Commissioner Kellom edited that has to be completed.

But we had a few Commissioners now try to make a plan that only changes what the Court required us to change.

And that keeps ending up changing more than that.

So I'd like to just try to make one that doesn't change any of the districts except for the ones that the Court said must be changed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I just have a comment on that.

In terms of the Court's order itself.

Hold on one second.

I'm going to share my screen because I think we keep coming up, against this.

And I think it's creating a lot of unnecessary frustration.

So let me share.

Okay can you guys see that?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So this is the actual Court's order with respect to redrawing the House Districts.

And if you see here I have it highlighted to make it easier in this order we prescribe a schedule for redrawing the unconstitutional House Districts, reviewing the boundaries of sorry redrawing the boundaries of those districts will unavoidably affect the boundaries of other districts.

We therefore expect that the District lines for not only the unconstitutional districts but also other districts as reasonably necessary will be redrawn.

So that's the actual Court's language.

Their language was not don't touch the other districts.

Their language was we expect you to touch the other districts and are giving us permission to do it.

So I think if we stop putting that unnecessary restraint on ourselves it's going to be a lot easier.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so can Mr. Morgan, can you pull up a plan that has everything locked except the seven districts that are unlocked or must be changed?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Anthony, I'll being do this.

And that would be a copy of what plan?

I know we have been over this a couple times, and I want to get it right.

The Hickory plan?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think Commissioner Orton tried to do this yesterday, I think, and I think Commissioner, I think, I don't know who but I think Commissioner Andrade tried it and it may make sense to bring up the Hickory plan and clear out the districts that the courts talked about and lock everything else.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This plan is a copy of Hickory, and I may have already deleted out those plans.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, so the surrounding area is deleted out. With districts two, three, four, five, six, 57, 58, 61, 62 and 9 and 13 locked.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so, again, we have a few different maps that change a different number of districts.

I'm trying to see if one is possible to be created that doesn't.

Can you overlay -- I think we can use some of the districts we already created on the other maps to help do that.

So can you overlay let's just go with the Tulip plan on top of this one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So to do that I have to go to the tool plan, open the tool plan and export the shape files, it will be for a minute.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do you have the plan for the Berg.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can overlay any plan that has been shipped to the website.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, then you can do the Bergama one, that should work okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The what?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The Bergamot plan.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So the Bergamot districts are in Navy.

And you can see, you know, nine is significantly different.

The tail end of one and two.

And predominately that little bit of four has been clipped.

And, you know, five in here, five, six, I guess.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This is good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: May be a little bit down in here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right, okay, so we are going to paint with a broad brush here.

This isn't going to be perfect by any means, I'm trying to see if it's possible to do this.

So why don't you start by assigning the overlay that is on districts, sorry, you are changing something.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was trying to make four and three visibly different.

When you say the overlay, you want to put one straight in here?

Or do you want to start up ward?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Start with 7 and 14.

Just put them in as best you can.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Will do.

Shall I unlock six and put that little piece into seven?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, we are keeping six locked.

We are keeping everything locked except the ones we have to change.

If that part of six is already in six, just leave it.

How much more in terms of population do 7 and 14 need now?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay at this .14 and 7 are representative of what was in the previous plan with the little differences.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I'm asking so what is the population on both of them?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 7 is 3.35 under.

And 14 is 14%.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so let's turn on the neighborhood boundaries in Detroit.

So for 7 you're going to add in those neighborhoods that are directly south of eight mile until you have a population necessary to make a complete District.

Let's just go by precincts.

Like I said we are doing broad strokes here.

It's not going to be perfect.

Fix all the little stuff later.

And add Palmer Park into it as well.

Actually you are already over on population so never mind.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If you want to fix that real quick.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think that must be...well, let me see.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We will do the same for 14 that needs about 13,000 more people.

So let's take it eastward up until it reaches District 13, which is locked.

So sure wood, Nortown and that area to the east of it, uh-huh, right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And Nortown?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If it's necessary for population which it looks like it is you can go ahead and add that one in too.

That's fine.

You can add it.

And now go westward until you hit where we ended the westward District.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area in here?

That is 7.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Go towards District 7.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I got it kind of messed up right now.

Just a moment.

Now we have this is kind of split up in here, do you want to clean that up now or later?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's clean it up later.

Let's go to the left, yeah and add Nolan state fair into 14.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So that precinct went south of Nolan and included Greenfield Park.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you keep going left.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you keep going left?

Yeah, so state fair and Penrose also add to 14.

So essentially what we've done is crossed eight mile and instead of eight mile it has gone into seven mile.

Okay now I'd like you to go to the intersection of where four, five districts four, five and six that are currently locked are.

So you will head a little bit south.

Yep, right if that pave way area.

And basically what you're going to do is start there and make a District that goes under the two that you just created.

And up, over District nine which is locked.

So you're kind of going around the locked areas currently.

Up through University District.

Up through Greenfield Park, to Davidson and grant.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm sorry Commissioner this area and then over to?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So districts four and six are locked.

So you got to go north to the unassigned area north.

Yep, and keep going.

Up until you reach where District 7 ended.

Hold on one second, you are adding this now to District Four but District Four is locked.

So maybe you can just pick a different number.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well, four was not locked.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, four is locked.

Four was not in the Court order.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can lock it, but it was not locked coming in.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are locking everything except what was in the Court order for this map.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe that's four now.

Is that right?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, that is what four was originally.

So let's go out and lock it so it doesn't get changed.

Okay so now we are going to curve around this area on districts four and District nine.

Yep, and go up to University District, Detroit golf.

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.

Palmer Woods, Greenfield Park and you will take it above District nine.

You're probably going to have to go into blocks for the Greenfield Park area because that precinct is connected to Nolan.

Yeah, you can do the whole neighborhood on that one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All of Greenfield Park?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Green field, Hawthorne park, Cadillac heights, northeast Central up until District 14.

And you're going to keep going eastward in between districts nine and 14 until you reach District 13.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Is it possible for you to just back out for a second? I'm just trying to see what is happening here.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Eid's, you know, you got these unassigned areas.

I have to do it by block.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, we will worry about that later.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's a lot of people.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Commissioner Szetela asked to Zoom out so Zoom out so she can see what we are doing.

Okay, so.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: A little further.

I'm just trying to see the whole Detroit area, that's all.

So are you copying this map from somewhere Anthony?

I'm just curious what the source is.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do you mean?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Are you copying it from another map that has been submitted to us?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I'm doing this live.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so let's go Davidson, grant, and those blocks in the neighborhood to the east of it as well.

Yeah, that whole neighborhood.

You can add the neighborhood to the east of grant as well.

I can't see the name of it right now.

Okay wonderful.

Now this still needs about 45,000 people.

But we've taken care of the areas in between nine, 14 and 13 as well as the areas in between four, five, six and seven so the only way to go is south.

So take Highland Park and go all the way down, up until where you reach the overlay that we have on the map already for the Down River District that was already created.

And just keep going south using the unassigned areas until you reach the population that is needed to make a full District.

While trying to keep the neighborhoods whole.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anthony, do you see over to the west there are a few sections that didn't get assigned?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, like I said I'm just trying to paint with a broad brush here and we can go back and fix those areas later.

I don't think they are going to make -- I'm just trying an experiment here to show if it is possible to make a map that doesn't change districts other than what we have to change.

It might not look pretty, but I think it's possible.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was wondering Commissioner Eid as you're drawing could you since I'm not familiar with the Detroit area and you're trying to keep it within the Detroit area, can you tell me what communities of interest you're taking into account when you're doing these?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The Detroit community of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That's your answer?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: For right now, yeah.

Okay it still needs 30,000 people.

So just keep going.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies for the interruption wanted to note for the record that Commissioner Kellom joined at 1:40 p.m.

Welcome Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And that blue line is the over way from the other map from the Down River District, right?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, it is.

I'm going to turn off the neighborhoods just for a moment to make sure we are not missing anything.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure, whatever you got to do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Eight comes down into here, deep.

And that's still a significant unassigned population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right, right, so, yeah, just follow that line as best you can until you reach the population that's needed.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this area here just, well, keep it in eight, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yep.

That's close enough.

Now you can look at the overlay for District one.

Which is the same as from the other map and just put that in here.

And pretty sure you can just do that for much of the other districts as well.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The one right here?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yep.

Okay so that is the District one from the other map.

And you need 9,000 people.

So take more of that unassigned area to the right of it and add it in.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay next move.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Are you waiting for me or the software?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Are you waiting for me or the software.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You need 8,000 more people so keep going until you get that.

All right, there you go.

Yeah, those are a little over.

But, again, I think those can be fixed at a later time with some minor tweaks.

You need three more districts.

If you start a new District and keep going up the river, through the, yep, just exactly how you just put the mouse that should create one.

Yep, so keep going, through Grosse Pointe until you reach the population needed.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Some of those precincts right there, add them into 11.

Maybe just one more precinct.

That's probably a little too much.

Okay and now you can have a District that is the rest -- kind of follows the overlay of what is overlaid of District 12.

So if you follow those lines, you can do the rest of northeast Detroit and Harper Woods and some at East Point.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Where do we want to go here up to the shore?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That's close enough just fill in the rest that is unassigned to the last District.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, thank you Madam Chair.

Anthony, I just have a question.

And maybe you can explain it to me, eight seems like a rather odd configuration.

So what COIs are we combining in eight that would make sense of that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm sorry, what was your question?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Wagner, he asked what your question was and if you answered you were muted.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was so muted.

Sorry.

And now I just didn't understand eight's configuration.

Why it was more like a Z shaped and cut.

I'm just wondering what COIs you are trying to place in eight that coalesce and make sense together.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I am mainly concerned about the Detroit community of interest and complying with the Court order at this point.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm just curious what you mean when you say complying with the Court order.

Because it appears you actually redrew an almost identical District to one of the districts that was struck down.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Which one would that be?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Whatever one is yellow.

I can't see the number on it.

13?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 13 was not struck down that is locked.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: That is locked, okay.

Yeah, and then by the Detroit community of interest it's like 700,000 people so how are you dividing up that what you're referring to as a Detroit community of interest?

Because it does not seem like there is much rhyme or reason on to what you have done here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is your opinion.

I respect your opinion.

I can have a different opinion.

And, yeah, this is good enough for now.

I think what I've shown is that it is possible to make a plan that does not change more districts than what is necessary.

We can change more districts than what is necessary according to what is reasonably configurable.

And we have a few plans that do that.

But I wanted to prove that it was possible to do it without changing districts.

And we are well within the population deviations at this point to be able to just tweak minor things and show it.

And I think that's what some other Commissioners wanted to see as well.

So I'll end my turn.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, to kind of add on to what Commissioner Szetela was saying I believe District 11 is the one that was shot down by the courts and looks like it is drawn almost identical.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so the next Commissioner in line to draw is Commissioner Kellom.

But I believe that it is time on our agenda for the Executive Director report.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you just make sure this is saved as something? And if you can Zoom out so everyone can see it beforehand, that would be great.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Eid there is 4235 people highlighted that are under -- not designated to a District.

Do you have -- would you want to complete it?

Or not?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Those would go in eight.

They are a part of eight.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela your hand is up, is it again?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Can Kent announce what he is naming because sometimes it's hard to see.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We were creating these districts using precincts.

And these were locked because four was locked and six were locked.

So at that point I just highlighted the census blocks that had not been assigned because they were locked in a precinct and assigned them to eight at Commissioner Eid's direction.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, no, no, when you rename it as Commissioner Eid has requested if you could announce what you are renaming it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Sure I'm sorry it's a copy of Hickory right now, yes.

So I can save this -- Commissioner Eid, I will save this plan and give it whatever flower name you want.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I will leave that up to Department of State, whatever you guys want.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, sir.

>> I nominate Daisy.

It's nice and easy.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So done.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: How is Petunia?

Daisy.

>> CHAIR ORTON: You are suggesting Petunia.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry I did not hear someone suggest it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Daisy was suggested.

Does that work?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That works great.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The plan that Commissioner Eid just edited created is 012324V2HD Daisy.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Kent.

So without objection I will ask MICRC Executive Director Edward Woods III to provides his report.

Hearing no objection, please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you so much Madam Chairperson. I'm going to defer to our legal local counsel Nate Fink to talk about the notice to vacate draft proceedings.

>> Nate Fink: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairperson and thank you Director Woods.

So I presented our proposed amendments to the Commission's rules of procedure last week with the understanding we would have a discussion today.

I've received and the Commission received some suggested revisions to our proposed revisions from Commissioners Szetela and Lange.

And before we get started, I just wanted to just say that one of the recommendations that they include is to allow.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of personal privilege.

>> Yes, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Apologies Mr. Fink, is there any way you can speak up and I have my volume all the way up or get closer to your microphone.

>> I will try to speak up.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> Can you hear me better now?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Actually I can.

>> Nate Fink: I'll pretend I'm trying to get my kid's attention.

As I was saying Commissioner Lange and Commissioners, there is or was a proposal from Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Lange to include -- to allow for the initiating member of which will be the member or members of the Commission who is seeking to have someone else removed that they could have their own counsel present the notice during the presentation of notice Section of the special meeting.

And I don't personally see any problem with that particular provision.

So I just wanted to just kind of get that out of the way.

Obviously, it's up to the Commission whether to allow for that.

The current rules already contemplate the responding member would be or is entitled to have counsel if they want.

So I don't really see a problem with doing it this way.

Then there's another proposed revision that Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Lange have included, which is to take out the language that allows the Commission to reimburse attorney fees for the responding member if the Commission does not vote to declare that member's seat vacant.

The rationale or at least part of the rationale provided by Commissioner Szetela and Lange for that revision, proposed revision is that there was a question raised earlier or last year, August of last year, about whether Commissioners were entitled to have Commission-paid counsel for their individual representation in the pending Federal case.

The Agee case.

And the legal team's opinion that was presented to the Commission was that in that circumstance the Commission was not obligated to provide and pay for individual Commissioner's counsel.

The reason being that each individual Commissioner in the Agee lawsuit has been sued in their official capacity.

Not in their individual, personal capacity.

And so as a result, and we presented a memo to this effect and had a discussion about it, the Commission's representation is through the Commission itself, and not on an individual basis because individual Commissioners do not have personal, individual exposure in that case.

In this circumstance, my opinion is when we are talking about a Commissioner who is facing possible removal from the Commission, if they do prevail I can -- I see this as a different circumstance than when individual Commissioners are sued just because they happen to be a member of a Commission and it's sort of a formality, a technicality as to why they are named in a lawsuit.

Whereas here the right to keep someone's seat is an actual personal interest.

And I wasn't counsel to the Commission at the time that the Commission adopted this particular provision that would provide for paying for attorney's fees for the responding member if they do prevail.

But I can see the logic there more so than certainly more so than providing any funding for individual Commissioners in the context of a lawsuit in which they are sued in their official capacity.

So that was one, you know, particular issue related to one of -- that was the only other suggested revision to our proposed edits to or revisions to the rules of procedure. I'm happy to engage in a discussion on that.

And our original proposal to the extent that anybody has any questions or comments.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I any way I think it's odd they are my requested changes, and I was not allowed to present on them.

Putting that aside so I want to clarify first of all the removal of the language about payment and reimbursement for individual attorneys would apply in either circumstance. So if the person who filed the notice has an attorney and they want or wants to bring an attorney then they would be responsible for their own legal expenses.

Same thing with responding party.

In either case I think you kind of nailed it on the head.

You said it's a personal interest.

It's not an interest of the Commission.

Each individual Commissioner and their particular position on the Commission is not a Commissioner interest it's an interest of the person, a personal interest which is why it's inappropriate for attorney's fees to be paid for an individual.

That was the basis of the recommendation that Baker Hostetler made originally.

They specifically said in their opinion, or their memo individual members are not entitled to public funding for their own lawyers and that the state Constitution does not afford funding for their legal counsel.

I think that's pretty clear.

The state Constitution grants the Commission funds that are awarded by the legislature related to the Commission's business.

And individual members' interest in their individual seat is not Commission business.

So I think taking that out is appropriate.

I don't think it ever should have been added in the first place.

And it just doesn't belong in there because whatever expenses might arise from a notice on either end belong to those individual Commissioners not the Commission body as a whole.

Commissioner Lange, did you want to add anything on to that?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'll just add too that underneath the hearing, it's an option to get an attorney.

It's not a requirement.

So whether it be the responding or the people that file it, that's a personal choice they are making so the takes payers should not be on the hook for either personal choice.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Commissioner Lange, thank you for that because that reminded me of another point that if this was Commission business, the Commission would be supervising the retention of that attorney and reviewing the contract and setting the rates.

And the Commission has no involvement in any of that because it is not Commission business.

And that's just further evidence, thank you Commissioner Lange as to why this should not be allowed and why the Commission voted previously to not allow when I asked for an individual attorney the Commission voted that it would not be paid for by the Commission.

That was the entire point of the memo.

So I think we need to be consistent with our past policies and I think that language needs to be removed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any other discussion?

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just think it's a little disingenuous the comparison of a Commissioner trying to get their own legal representation and a legal Court case in which they are named in.

It's quite a bit different than a notice to vacate.

The provision to repay legal fees has been this our rules.

Since the beginning.

It was put in there for a reason.

It also creates an equitable discussion considering that we have a few people on this Commission who are attorneys.

So theoretically logically speaking they would be able to represent themselves to a greater degree without incurring expense compared to Commissioners who are not lawyers or legal experts.

So I agree with Mr. Fink's analysis.

I would appreciate in this Commission would adopt the proposed procedures without Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Lange's amendments.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange, you have something else?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

I just want to go off from what Commissioner Eid just said.

My understanding when Mr. Fink brought this forward, pardon me was this was going to be for any case that may come up.

Any future ones, what have you.

So it's not always going to be an attorney that has that experience.

That very well could have just been me who has no legal experience whatsoever.

So to say that it's a disadvantage seems insincere personally.

And, again, the taxpayers should not afford the expense of this, period.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I was just going to say the status as a lawyer is frankly irrelevant.

If someone personally wants to hire a lawyer to represent them that's fine.

As contemplated by the changes that Commissioner Lange and I requested we are considering hiring an attorney to handle our portion of the presentation on the notice.

That is despite the fact I'm an attorney.

And any lawyer will tell you that attorney who represents themselves is a fool.

So the fact that someone is an attorney does not mean they are not going to hire an attorney.

The fact of the matter remains it's individual expenses related to an individual interest that has nothing really to do with Commission business which is what we are authorized to spend money on.

We are not authorized to spend money on individual choices of individual Commissioners.

Thank you.

>> Nate Fink: I want to address a couple quick points.

First the Commission under the current rule the Commissioner's obligation or option actually as Commissioner Szetela pointed out on Thursday, I think it was, the Commission's option to pay for the responding member's attorney's fees only comes in effect and is only triggered if that Commissioner prevails.

And so it's not as though the attorney fees are just provided regardless no matter what the outcome is.

It's if the responding member prevails.

And I think this is to me it seems to be a fairway to address the issue and the concern that we want to have citizens of every socioeconomic background, anybody to be able to serve on the Commission makes that possible.

And if a member is required to take on the cost of defending themselves in some sort of notice to vacate proceeding, that could make it financially impossible under certain circumstances for them to be able to retain counsel and defend themselves and protect their right to serve on the Commission.

And so I think that that's an important point to make.

And I just wanted to be clear that the memo that had been provided in August, again related to individual Commissioners are sued in their official capacity which is equivalent to the Commission itself.

It's just a formality as to why they were named.

That is why individual Commissioners are not entitled to their own lawyer to be paid for by the Commission in the individual Federal lawsuit.

And I just wanted to make those two points.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you Madam Chairperson.

I take exception to trying to deflate the applicability of having an attorney for a Defendant and not having it paid for.

Clearly as attorney Fink has just it rated, that they are put to their defense because of another Commissioner bringing an action to remove, now that action may be frivolous.

That action may have some partial viability, or it may be an open and shut case.

But at any rate the Defendant should have the opportunity to defend himself and not be put to his personal expense for that.

The argument has been made by Commissioner Szetela that this is not Commission business.

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.

Well, it is Commission business.

I don't see how it could not be Commission business.

You're trying to remove as you have in the past, other Commissioners.

And that is all Commission business.

It might not be mapping business.

But it is Commission business.

There's all types of Commission business.

Changing, modifying rules is Commission business.

Deciding where we are going to meet is Commission business.

Deciding if it's going to be remote or in person is Commission business.

So everything we are talking about here today is Commission business.

And that then brings to the point that any Defendant, whether it's Commissioner Eid or Commissioner Clark or Commissioner whoever, should be in a position to have his defense or her defense covered in the event of a win.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I just want to point out that the analogy to Anthony being a Defendant is completely inappropriate.

This is not a criminal proceeding.

This is specifically saying in our rules that it's not a quasi-judicial procedural and not a Defendant or criminal jeopardy.

If anything it's equivalent to a civil case and the Defendant does not have the right to have their attorney's fees paid for by the other side.

If it were a criminal case within the context of criminal law if you have the need for an attorney and you have to go through a process.

There is a process where they examine your income.

They determine whether you are qualified for it frankly making 39,000 a year I don't think he would qualify as needing to get a Court-appointed attorney.

And if he did qualify under those criminal procedures, he would have an attorney appointed by the Court.

He could not go out and pick his attorney and have the legal fees covered by the Court. That's just not the process.

So you're trying to make analogy to a process that is completely inapplicable to what is going on here.

It just doesn't apply.

The other issue I would raise that nobody has thought about is the IRS has very strict guidelines are what are reasonable expenses that can be reimbursed.

Reality is it would not fall under the guidelines I can tell you that flat out.

Something like this is going to end up being taxable to him if you do cover it and the reason for that is it's not Commission business and those IRS guidelines define what is company business and what is not.

And so at the end of the day you could be creating a tax liability for him over his choice to hire a particularly expensive attorney on top of that so thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Lett you can speak for it.

I will jump back in.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett, she said you could go first.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I respectfully disagree, Commissioner Szetela.

You're correct in that it is not a criminal proceedings.

However, the proceedings will result in the death sentence for Commissioner Eid.

He will be banned from the Commission for life.

And that is the same as a death sentence in this case.

As far as the IRS goes, if it's not a reimbursable expense, which I would not disagree with, if we pay him for his attorney fees, then it would be a compensation to him which he would have to declare.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I think we can go on and on going back and forth in my experience working with attorneys, lovingly, you all like to really dig deep and have a spirited debate.

But I think it's time for myself to call the question.

As this when it comes to Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Eid it can be a very tenuous space of airing out things for the benefit of, I don't know whoever is listening.

And I will continue to hold us to a professional standard and not allow it to be a passive aggressive discussion on anything else, so I call the question.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I don't actually think there is a question because I don't think we are voting on that until Thursday.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is up to the Chair to speak.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so can I have our parliamentarian remind me when the question is called.

I don't remember what to do.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You end up having to take a vote to call the question.

There are, I would note, a number of proposals here.

So the question could be called in one of two ways.

One would be to call the question and all that is before us which would be the two provisions that have been put there or take each one individually.

But it has to be the vote has to be taken to call the question, which required a two third vote of those present.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Does it need to be seconded to call the question?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes.

>> Nate Fink: Madam Chairwoman.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> Nate Fink: I wanted to clarify Commissioner Lett refer toed to the two proposals. The document I'm referencing we have been discussing had been primarily the proposed revisions that Commissioner Szetela and Lange had made but that is not a complete version of my -- of our proposed changes. There's the other provision that we talked about a little bit on Thursday. So I just want to make it clear what actually is before the Commission. But the proposed changes that I provided that our firm provided were in sort of a memo form and I believe Director Woods had provided that. But I just wanted to make sure that that was clear.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so right now we have a call of the question to end discussion and it's seconded.

And I believe we probably need a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, before we get to that, my -- before we can call the question I just want to ask just for clarity of the record if there was a motion before the Commission for the question to be called for the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: The motion in front of the Commission.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That's my recollection as well there was not a motion on the floor for the question to be called for.

So rather than calling the question, Commissioner Kellom if your intent is to end discussion the motion would be correctly framed as a motion to end discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: My mistake I thought Commissioner Eid posed a motion.

So I'm making a motion to end debate.

>> Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Motion to end debate and it's seconded.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of clarity or information.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If this motion goes through, then am I not allowed to make a recommendation for additional changes or is that something I would have to submit an e-mail to since this is going to be voted on on Thursday?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Motion to end discussion would end all discussion on this particular agenda topic so if you are wanting to submit additional changes it would have to occur via e-mail with legal counsel.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Can we have a roll call vote?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: One quick question.

Sorry this is Commissioner Wagner can we address Commissioner Szetela because she did have her hand up before the question was called.

>> CHAIR ORTON: No, because the person who called the question had their hand up before her.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Got you, proceed.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Okay Commissioners, a roll call vote has been requested, the motion before the Commission is to end discussion so a yes vote would be yes to end discussion.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Cynthia Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry Commissioner Vallette I couldn't hear that.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Elaine.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: With a vote of ten yes to three no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

So we will turn it back over to Director Woods for the rest of his report.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Orton.

At this time I want to go ahead and share my screen just so we can have something, but I just need -- give me about 60 seconds to do that.

Thank you.

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

All right, Commissioners we've had some requests from our consultants, so we need to establish some timelines in order to meet the Court imposed deadline of Friday, February 2nd.

Is everybody able to see my screen that is virtual?

I'm unable to see your faces.

So I don't want to assume that you can see it.

But Commissioner Lange, Wagner, Curry, Szetela or Weiss if you can do a thumbs up.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: We can see it.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay great, thank you.

As you know we've had a proposed mapping calendar that the Commission has approved.

From last week 9-1, 2-6 but we were doing last week.

This week we have one in person meeting that we did yesterday from 10-3, 6-8:30 and maps and collaborative mapping the same from 10-3 and also 6-8:30.

We also have meetings scheduled for Wednesday from 10 o-5:30 and Thursday 9:00 to 5:30 the meetings for the rest of the week will take place at the Cadillac place in Detroit and we also have a meeting on Friday.

Having said that and understanding our timelines in terms of where we are we have remote meetings scheduled for next week from 9-1 and 2-6 on Monday through Thursday.

And the reason why we need to end at 6:00 on that particular Thursday is we want to make sure we give our mapping consultants time to gather the information to post on the website but also to submit to the Court in their required format.

In addition to the mapping consultant that we -- I just talked about the VRA consultant needs 48 hours for review of the maps to ensure compliance with the Voting Rights Act. And so what I would like to recommend that the Commission votes to forward maps for VRA counsel review by Friday, January 26th.

This does not necessarily mean it will be the maps that are forwarded to the public but they are the maps that the Commission needs to forward for VRA review that they can look at if there needs changes to be made or whatever needs to ap there is amicable time for the Commission to do that before they vote on Thursday, February 1st.

And as I shared with you earlier the mapping consultant needs the Commission's maps no later than Thursday February 1 to comply with the Court's deadline so just reiterating that process to get the maps have to be voted on by February 1st so we can be submitted to the Court.

Having said that, you know, we need to move on maps, I don't know if individual maps and I know some people wanted to hear from our constituents that spoke at our public comments, Sarah Reinhardt our MICRC secretary did an outstanding job providing the Commission with the public comments.

So you can hear what people are saying.

But I want to reiterate that we do need to coalesce around maps the Commission wants to move forward.

And because of the timelines that are needed by our consultants, we kind of need to kind of work backwards to ensure that we meet the deadline.

And so knowing that they need 48 hours I know we were looking at giving it to them Friday so we can actually start on Tuesday.

On the other thing that we need to do, we talked about it yesterday, we've had the presentation from Lisa Handley is to make sure that we are running partisan fairness numbers, you know, starting once we come back from break, starting to run those partisan fairness numbers so that we can have that information available for the Commission's consideration.

And so there is basically one thing I really need, actually I want to maybe it two because all I can do is make recommendations, the voice comes from the Commission.

The first recommendation Madam Chairperson is I would like the Commission to consider votes to forward maps for the VRA Council no later than Friday, January 26th.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move that we have maps ready to forward to VRA Council no later than this Friday.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I'll second that so we have a motion and a second that we have maps voted on to move forward to our VRA Council this Friday.

No later than this Friday.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, there is.

Executive Director Woods, I reached out to you earlier today and said I was going to give you a call at 3:00 and this is why.

You're requesting we approve some maps by this Friday.

My concern is there was or appears to be a lack of communication put out for the residents of Detroit to know about these meetings.

There's been concerns brought up about transportation issues, cost issues of getting to these meetings to give public comment.

And so I'm just going to put it out here now the reason I was going to call you at 3:00 was to see if it would be possible to do a virtual town hall.

And I would have volunteered my time on Saturday and get the word out to the residents of the Detroit area, in particular, those that were affected by this ruling so we could actually have some real time input from them.

We had the lady that gave comment earlier or it was yesterday that said did you reach out to churches or this or that to -- and I don't mean this or that, I don't mean that in a rude way.

But to get the public here, to inform them that we are doing this.

So there is my concern with having them done by Friday.

I still want to have the public comment if that's allowed and I will get with you at 3:00 to discuss that my concern is we do have some Commissioners that are very knowledgeable about the Detroit area but we in my opinion have not heard of or heard from the people that we need to hear from about I want to make sure we do this right I guess is what I'm trying to say this time around and make sure it's right for them so if there is anything we can do to extent it a bit or anything added they can do to get that input that's my concern.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Commissioner Lange with all town hall meetings we can use those to increase awareness.

I'm more than willing to make myself available on Wednesday or Thursday to create such town hall meeting in a virtual for people to participate.

However, they are also able to participate at our Commission meetings.

In a virtual format whether they want to come here and offer comment so we can refer to them you know from awareness standpoint as relates to the town hall meeting, there was no cost for anyone to park here.

At all with regards to that.

We had a press conference with regards to that.

I've done interviews with regards to that.

So in terms of getting the word out and best to do more than less.

But Saturday it's not going to work from the standpoint, the Commission has to vote in terms of getting this information to the Voting Rights Act Council to do the analysis and come back for the Commission to meet the deadline of February 2nd but I'm willing on Wednesday or Thursday to work with whoever to do awareness town hall meeting if that is the desire of the Commission more than happy to do it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any other discussion?

I think a virtual town hall to get the word out is a great idea and we have been trying to get the word out so more is better like you say and at a town hall we are asking them to come give us public comment but they can't share we can't take in public comment at a town hall because it's not an open Commission meeting.

They need to get that to us at our open meeting or through one of or other channels.

Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: I would like to remind everyone that we have a staff person out in front of the hall here to work with in I members of the any members of the public for my redistricting site and see what is going on and how the plans came about and all of that so that is available for anyone that comes down here.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Lange, are you available Wednesday night or Thursday night?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm available whenever as long as the word can get out to the community members that have been most effected.

I will make myself available.

Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

We can discuss more at 3:00.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have a motion and second to vote no later than Friday to have our maps ready to send to the VRA Council.

Can we have a roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Commissioners please state your support with the motion with a "Yes" or "No."

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Sorry I was on mute, yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry Richard can you say that one more time?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, please, I vote yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Elaine Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Snow.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: With a vote of 12 yes and one no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

Director Woods, do you have more?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes, thank you.

Also want to make a recommendation that the Commission identifies the map for the public's consideration by voting on that no later than Thursday, February 1.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sorry so you're saying let the Commission vote on maps to send to the public no later than February 1?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Correct but obviously that will give it to the mapping consultants to meet the Court order deadline of Friday, February 2nd.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Understood.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I will make the motion we vote on the finals on February -- by February 1st.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I second, Commissioner Kellom seconds.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So we have a motion by Commissioner Lett, second by Commissioner Kellom, to vote on the maps to move to the public no later than February 1st.

All in favor raise or any discussion or the motion?

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is there a recommendation on how many maps we're going to be sending to the public?

I know before we sent three.

Is there a recommendation on how many?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I want to get the timelines first, Commissioner Eid. And then we can go to that if you don't mind.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any other discussion?

Okay all in favor of voting to on the maps to send to the public no later than February 1st raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail.

And the motion carries.

Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: In understanding Commissioner Eid's point I really wanted to kind of leave that up to the Commission after the VRA analysis because that might weed out some maps in and of itself so instead of handcuffing us now because we are still doing partisan fairness and other analysis with compliance with the redistricting criteria the Commission can look at that next week.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I can appreciate Director Woods' comments as well as Commissioner Eid's.

We are a little bit ahead of ourselves.

We have not started looking at partisan fairness on these maps yet.

And I think we need to do that in order to be able to look at what maps we want to consider moving forward.

You know, I don't think we want to send ten forward, but we certainly don't want to send one forward, so I think we are just a little bit ahead of ourselves.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think we are kind of agreeing, Commissioner Lett. Starting with partisan fairness immediately and then also the VRA analysis you know next week and then whatever the Commission decides in terms of what maps they will move forward or setting a number that we can do that so consequently you might want to sentence maps for VRA and analysis even though it may be five or three or two or whatever the Commission decides to move forward.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

Anything else Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes.

Just want to remind everyone I gave you a narrative yesterday, but the attachment was sent today so take a look at the budget.

On the budget as we already know we voted to ask for one hundred percent increase from the state legislature to cover our pending legal costs.

So please take a look at the budget.

That was sent.

And then we will go over that tomorrow.

If anyone has any questions, feel free to ask me and then obviously we will do the vote and the whole presentation for the public tomorrow.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so that brings us to the end of our agenda.

Are there any announcements from Commissioners?

Seeing none, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

>> I second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting.

Is there any discussion on that motion?

Seeing none, all in favor of adjourning raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay the meeting is adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

[Evening session]

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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm going to take us live and give you a thumbs up when we are ready to begin, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

Good evening. The Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission is happy to be in Detroit and are happy to hear from you.

As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 6:08 p.m.

We are live streamed on our Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel.

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.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation and Spanish, Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. E-mail us for Redistriction@michigan.gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should also contact us at Reidistricting@michigan.gov.

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed and those closed captions transcripts will be made available and posted on the Michigan.gov/MICRC website along with written public comment submissions. There is also a comment portal and can be accessed by visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods, III, Executive Director for the Commission, at Woods E3@Michigan.gov or 517-331-6309.

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Good evening, Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name.

If you are attending the meeting remotely, please state the county, City, Township and, village from which you are attending.

I will call Commissioners names in alphabetical order starting with Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

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.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?

Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Attending remotely from Saginaw Township, Saginaw Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I'm going to go back to Commissioner Wagner.

Madam Chair, you have 12 Commissioners present.

You have a quorum.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Ms. Young.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR ORTON: As a reminder to the public watching you can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

>> So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Moved by Commissioner Eid, seconded by Commissioner Weiss is there any discussion or debate on the motion?

Seeing none.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Earlier we were talking about adding a discussion about the public comment.

I think you said we would add it to our discussion this afternoon, if I'm not mistaken.

So would that be appropriate to add?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sure.

Would you like to move that we add that?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I move that we have a quick discussion regarding public comment and the number of times people can give public comment.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Would you like to add that before the public comment this evening?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Could we please?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I will second that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have a motion and a second to amend the agenda to add a discussion about public comment before the public comment this evening.

Is there any discussion on that?

Seeing none, all in favor of adding amending the agenda to that, to include that item raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the agenda is amended.

Now we need a motion to adopt the amended agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So moved.

>> CHAIR ORTON: It's moved and seconded that we adopt the amended agenda.

Is there any discussion on that?

Seeing none, all in favor of adopting the amended agenda raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The amended agenda is adopted.

Okay, so we will -- before the public comment guidelines, I guess, we will have this discussion.

Commissioner Lange, do you want to start us off?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, thank you Madam Chair. From as far as I remember when it came to the public giving two sets of public comment, that was during our public hearings when we were gathering input and was not necessarily during our regular meetings.

Once the public hearings stopped, we were giving a single public comment at our regular meetings.

So I think we should stay the course on that.

I know there will be a public hearing once the maps are in that 45-day review and are required to have a public hearing so I say at that time if somebody wanted to sign up for two, that would be appropriate, just my thoughts.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I respectfully disagree with that recollection.

I sat through any number of meetings at the MSU union in which we had people sign up for one and then for two meetings or two comments there specifically I do remember Sarah Howard because she was at almost all of our meetings at the union.

And she would always sign up for two.

Once everybody got through then they would come back if they had something more to say.

And have a second time to do it.

So I would respectfully say that that's something that we have done in the past.

And I really was quite flabbergasted that we had an objection to it this time.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange, your hand is up.

Is it again or.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It's again.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: During all of our online meetings we've had one public comment when people given public comment.

My comments today were very specific about it.

If we were going to do it for one, then everybody should have been given that option including the people that signed up online.

I'm not going to fight any more.

I'm so sick of this.

I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Is there any more discussion on this?

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I guess then just to make it clear, I would move that any of the comments that we take either in person with these fine people that we have sitting out here now or anybody online we would offer them once they have completed their first comment they can sign up and have a second comment.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I'll second that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have a motion and a second.

And is there discussion?

I see Sarah Reinhardt's hand.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I did just want to note that when we've allowed second public comments in the past, for those individuals who have signed up to provide public comment remotely that's something that we do ask them to indicate at least an hour in advance of the public meeting when the virtual public comment sign up closes.

So at this point if the Commission wanted to implement this rule change for today's proceeding, it would be allowed for in person public comment but not for virtual public comment and for that reason I would recommend that if this change were to occur that it would go into effect at the next meeting.

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.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I understand that problem.

But we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12, about 19 people here and to institute this now immediately would seem to be fair.

If a few people on the phone miss out, I'm sorry, I apologize.

I didn't think it was going to be a problem.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any other discussion?

Okay then we will take a vote on the motion to allow starting now in-person and remote public comment commenters to sign up for a second chance to speak after everyone has had a first chance but for the remote people that wouldn't go in effect until tomorrow's meeting because of the time constraints.

All in favor say yes or raise your hand and say yes.

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm going to abstain due to lack of information.

This is Commissioner Szetela.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay the ayes prevail.

And the motion is adopted.

Without objection, I will ask MICRC Executive Director Woods to review the public comment guidelines.

Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

And welcome.

Welcome, welcome to each and every one of you who are here to provide public comment.

We want to thank you for engaging in this very important process of democracy.

And want to affirm we want to hear from you even though, how do I want to say this regardless of where you are or what perspective you may hold.

As part of 90 seconds I want to remind you we want civil interactive discussion.

We don't want you to call out a Commissioner or make innuendo but address the Commission as a whole.

We want to hear from you and know how to improve the maps and clearly understand the communities of interest that are impacting the City of Detroit residents.

You are welcome here and we look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you so much for investing your time and coming out tonight whether you are in person or here or coming on virtually.

Thank you again.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Ms. Vallette will facilitate the public comment portion of this meeting.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Without objection we will begin the public comment pertaining to mapping.

Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with public comment.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide in-person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so.

Please step up to the nearest microphone when I call your number.

You will have 90 seconds to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when your 90 seconds have ended, and you hear the timer.

Please also go to the public comment tool and share your comments in writing including any specific area of the map about which you are speaking.

The public comment tool is at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

There is a public comment station here tonight with volunteers to assist you in accessing the website if you would like assistance.

Additionally, if you have a time constraint or do not wish to wait, please use the public comment portal.

First in line to provide public comment is number one.

Number one, you are now invited to address the Commission.

>> Good evening.

I live in Grosse Pointe Woods District Hickory ten I believe so I'm directly affected by the Court order.

First, I would like to thank the Commission for all your work to date.

Satisfying the 7 constitutional requirements for districts is not an easy task as we now know.

I do urge the Commission to fix the problems identified by the Court and only the problems identified by the Court.

Do not try to outsmart the Court and redraw the other districts.

There is no need to do so.

Let us not drag this process out more than necessary.

And not draw into question legitimacy of the Commission.

We draw other districts will result in elongating the process and draw in question the integrity of this Commission.

For my community of interest, I like most of us could choose one of several.

My most important community of interest is with the 2, 515, 974 other Michigan voters who voted for the MICRC and competitive districts across all of Michigan.

Don't give the Court a slam dunk to institute their maps over the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission's maps.

The people of the State of Michigan voted for the MICRC for a reason.

And I hope the Commission fulfills that mission and not the Federal judiciary.

Thank you.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number two.

>> Good evening I'm a resident of Wayne County City of Detroit particularly and I strongly feel that Detroit residents have been grossly disenfranchised with the redrawing of the map.

If we are so concerned as a Commission to uphold the Constitution and have a democratic society, then I think there needs to be very consideration of the boundaries. It's like playing in a sports activity.

Change the rules in favor of one opponent so that opponent can gain victory and the other opponent loses and I feel that's what has been done up to this point.

So I ask that you reconsider what has been done and that you would look forward to a democratic society where we all have the same opportunities to do the things that only a few have an option to do.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number three.

>> Good evening, Commissioners my name is Andre-Sabbath I'm not familiar with the redistricting process.

I'm just here for some information, how does it work?

And do I currently still live in the 13th District?

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE:

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We have folks outside with computers to help determine that and if you want to work with them and sign up for another round of public comment you can.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number four.

>> Hello Commissioners.

Firstly thank you so much for all your hard work.

Protecting the fairness of our state elections.

My name is Tristin, a resident and registered voter of Kalamazoo, Michigan.

And I care a lot about the fairness of our democracy and protecting the voices of the people.

Although I'm not a resident of Detroit the decisions you made impact the entire state.

Voters agreed to create this Commission in order to correct and prevent partisan gerrymandering and unethical manipulation of election results to undermine the

collective will of the people. As such, it is vitally important that when you redraw the districts or some of the boundaries you take special care to ensure they properly reflect all voters equally regardless of partisan affiliation.

Thank you again for all the time and effort you put into this role.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number five.

>> Good evening I'm Chris Hill a lifelong Palmer Park resident in Palmer Hill.

Thank you for spending so much time listening to comments from Detroiters and specifically giving us the opportunity to have the extra round and more time to tell you our thoughts.

We do appreciate that, and you are taking extra time to listen to us so that is appreciated.

In the first round of comment I would really like to focus on the Black COI question that I know the Commission has spent a lot of time on with the updated legal guidance you got this morning saying you should consider African/American communities of interest like Arab and Hispanic communities of interest.

I would like to say Oak Park and Detroit are a community of interest.

That the Oak Park, Royal Oak chunk I outlined for you yesterday is a community of interest.

I would like to stress you can draw a Detroit-centric District that includes Ferndale LGBGT with Palmer Park and I would like to read an Article that was published on that quote I think it would be a mistake to say Palmer Park is no longer a gay neighborhood who tracked the gay migration in Metro Detroit.

There is a strong gay presence in Palmer Park but now it's an African/American gay presence and not a white gay presence.

I will pass along job information showing majority of workers in Oak Park are actually Detroit residents and/or not majority but largest chunk are from Detroit and largest workers from Detroit are from Oak Park work in Detroit.

The same is true for Ferndale.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number six.

>> Good evening, Commissioners my name is Amanda Siggins and live in Cadillac Michigan and came here tonight to make public comment because your decisions affect everyone across the state.

I appreciate all of you taking your time to be on this Commission.

I value your work and I just want you to remember that when you're deciding on the map and the districts that to keep in mind the special populations of people who are dealing with housing insecurity and homelessness. Especially here in Detroit because those people are not equally represented in Government, and I just want you to remember that those people struggling with those issues are not counted in our census and they are still not represented in our Government well.

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

And I just want you to keep that in mind when you're drawing the maps so that you keep the maps as nonpartisan as possible so that we have equal representation for everybody.

Thank you so much.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number seven.

>> Hi, how are you?

My name is Mr. Clark resident of the east side of Detroit.

One, just of course want to thank you for of course opening up this space this week for people to share feedback and contributions.

This is a challenging position to be in, I'm sure.

And so I'm appreciative of that.

I'll be short and sweet.

I think of course would echo the sentiment of just wanting to make sure we are honoring the integrity of neighborhoods.

It's something that is super important particularly right now for Detroit as we are going through our own redistricting of our own with our City Council districts largely because our charter mandates and equal number of people in each District and so what we have been finding through seeing some of the meetings that have been happening public meetings is there is a really big importance in neighborhood identity and folk wanting to be in a similar status or similar cultural clusters with folk.

And I do think there is an importance to that.

And you know that has been one of the challenges the City of Detroit has been facing and carving out new maps.

And so just want to echo the importance of neighborhood identity and also of course making sure that, you know, the information is accessible for people.

But of course thank you so much for having these meetings.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number eight.

>> Gratitude Commissioners my name is art and I first want to express incredible amount of gratitude to the Commission for this really critical work.

We understand that folks have other regular jobs and are taking this on in addition to all the things you carry.

I think for us it's really, really clear when we talk about protecting democracy in this country one of the things that is critical is actually having fair maps that have partisan fairness.

We are seeing a number of states across the country where this is flatly not the case. And it's having a substantial impact on policy outcomes that disproportionately impact some of our most marginalized communities across the country.

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 think for me it is clear that there is opportunity to both be really thoughtful and taking into account communities of interest while also making sure that partisan fairness is upheld.

I remember casting my ballot in the State of Michigan knowing that regardless of that ballot being cast the majority at least in the State Senate had already been predetermined.

And that ultimately disenfranchises us no matter where you are in the State of Michigan. I want to encourage the Commission to hold both communities of interest that are really, really critical.

A lot of folks have a lot of important thoughts on that and also preserving partisan fairness that is incredibly important to protecting democracy in the State of Michigan and modeling to neighboring states like Wisconsin and Ohio.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next is number nine.

>> Hi good evening my name is Diego and almost lifelong resident of southwest Detroit.

First, I would like to thank you as everyone has for the work you are putting into this process.

Historically southwest Detroit has a strong sense of community amongst those that live in the neighborhood.

For generations it has been an area where newcomers have been able to find a community and forge a life for themselves.

When I'm in southwest Detroit I feel like I'm in a small town and recognize people I went to high school with.

And grocery store and on church out and about on Verner highway we need representation to understand the lived experience of those who call it home.

So southwest to me includes the neighborhoods of Spring Wells Village, Mexicantown, Chadsey and Condon, everything south of 94, 96 to the east up to the Dearborn City limit to the west and the Detroit river to the south.

You will notice my description includes south of Fort Street in a neighborhood called Delray.

This population has been severely splintered because of the construction of the new bridge.

But if you ask most the residents who live there have a strong sense of identity to southwest Detroit. And above all I would like to encourage folks to continue displaying that effort to partisan fairness to ensure that we have competitive and fair districts.

Thank you.

>> Diego.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: I have to mash can you rename southwest Detroit slower so I can write those down?

Thank you.

>> I can also submit a written comment online.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Give it to me, but I want to hear it again.

>> Mexicantown and Chadsey-Condon, which is that neighborhood north of Michigan.

And the kind of limits I would draw is everything south of 94, 96 to the east, up to the Dearborn City limit to the west and then the Detroit river to the south, which would include that Delray neighborhood.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: One more time just way slower.

>> I'm so sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Spring Wells and what is after that.

>> Spring Wells village.

Mexicantown.

Chadsey-Condon.

And then kind of in the corners to the north is 94.

The east 96.

The south is the Detroit river.

And then to the west is the Dearborn City limit, which kind of, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Thank you.

I ask because like sometimes that's what is missing from public comment.

It's interesting or would be helpful for you to know what people see and the areas in which you are talking about because then you know you are bringing us back home with you, I'm a native Detroiter and live in North Corktown and I don't live where you live so thank you so much.

>> Sorry for talking fast.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: No, you are okay.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you.

Next in line is number ten.

>> Hi, everyone, good evening my name is Elizabeth, and I am from Kalamazoo Michigan.

First of all I want to thank you all Commissioners for being here tonight because as my friend said you will have regular jobs trying to make our communities better.

I just want to say I'm an immigrant.

I moved to Michigan about 25 years ago.

I don't live here in Detroit, but I live in Kalamazoo.

And I just want to echo what my friend Diego said about keeping the communities together.

It's important for us immigrants who are in the minority.

I want to say that we really agree with keeping southwest or southwest Detroit in addition to those communities together.

It's really important to us immigrants and minorities.

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 thank you so much.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number 11.

>> Good evening, Commissioners my name is Nelly and I'm also from Kalamazoo, Michigan.

I also really want to thank you for being here this late at night.

I know dinner probably sound really good right now and yet you are listening to all of our testimony.

So I deeply thank you for that.

Even though I reside in Kalamazoo I do call Michigan home state.

Even though I emigrated here about 24 years ago.

And southwest Detroit for me even though I don't live there is a pivotal part of the community that where I have very fond memories of people that I love and care about, my friends, my community, a lot of my community resides there.

And so southwest Detroit is also a pivotal part of the Detroit community in itself.

And I urged you to please keep it together with no boundaries that split it.

I will not go through all the names of the neighborhoods again as my friend Diego had mentioned them.

But I am here to tell you and to urge you to please follow the Constitution as required.

And because partisan fairness is above City lines and nice shapes.

Keeping our neighborhoods together is more important than anything.

So thank you very much.

Have a good evening.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is number 12.

Sarah, do we have any more?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, we have one more, number 13.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: So that would be number 13.

>> Hello again, this is Norman Clement. I'm a resident of the City of Detroit.

I follow this process pretty much for the past three to four years so again thank you for doing this process again.

Just reminder that people have come out of those communities are here.

They probably share maps before.

And communities of interest is a very, very top priority subject.

Make sure that we are keeping those boundaries whole, and representation is represented and that is the main thing we are concerned about.

You know we want to make sure that the boundaries are not just a straight lines on the streets but also, we understand the movement of people happen every single day.

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.

Since 2020 we have a mass population of African/Americans that moved in Macomb, Southfield, parts of Farmington so the management of people are all over, not just in Detroit.

So making sure the communities of interest are part of those boundaries and the interests that you have and keep doing the good work and you know we will sit and listen, look back and give our feedback.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote commentary to the Commission will be allowed.

I will call your name and our staff will unmute you.

If you are on a computer, you will be promised by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

If you are on the phone a voice will say the host wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute.

I will call you by name.

Or the last four digits of your phone number. Also please note if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for three to five seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they have done speaking.

If your audio still doesn't work, we will -- you can e-mail redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you trouble shoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later meeting.

You will have 90 seconds to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line with public comment is, sorry, I lost my...Ryan Reece.

Can you give our staff a minute to unmute you?

>> Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Thank you very much.

I am Ryan Reece, Reverend of a congregation in District 14.

Thank you as before for your service.

I want to thank you for bringing in the speaker earlier today.

Along with the legal counsel that spoke afterwards.

I find that both of their information that they presented to you in the morning's meeting was of particular value.

In helping to address making sure that the numbers continue to stay correct without changing districts that do not need to be changed, protecting both partisan fairness and also at the same time helping to ensure the communities of interest and voters of color are allowed to receive the full representation that they deserve.

And this would be a pivotal importance to the people in my District and neighboring districts.

I would ask that you be mindful of those numbers and those requirements while considering the legal counsel that was given later on in the day about ways to address communities of interest in focusing upon their unique heritage, their unique regions and unique interests.

Do keep all of that information in mind.

And work to preserve the hard work that has been done already in past redistricting efforts.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is James Gallant.

Please give our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Hello, can you hear me now?

Can you hear me now?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Okay. Thank you.

James Gallant, these are my opinions.

So to the Commission as a whole, I believe member Lett's manners in public meetings amounts to bullying. It appears he overstepped his authority and bullied the Chair when he appeared to answer the Chair's request for advice from a parliamentarian. And he seems to answer his own points of order in preference to the Chair in the past.

He is out of order and that may constitute abuse in Michigan.

Please hire a certified parliamentarian to advise on the complete record of your special rules and Robert's Rules as a parliamentarian authority manual.

It appears that General Counsel Nate Fink would be out of his professional capacity to act as a parliamentarian. A lawyer, yes, okay. And Secretary Benson should be here now because she is the secretary.

And I believe Mr. Woods said that Sarah Reinhardt was the secretary at the last meeting and Mr. Fink should have corrected her.

Please do that, Mr. Fink.

And any member please request a point of order specifically for rules is not a debate, Page 366, Line 8.

Because it's not only that you have no debate before a motion, you only have limited discussion to frame the motion.

This is fundamental principle of parliamentary law in America and goes back 600 years. There was no immediately pending motion to discuss.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Jeff S.

Please give our staff a moment to unmute you.

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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Next in line is Hada-Hossain.

Please give our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> I'm here on access and immigrant to the U.S. and raised in Dearborn home to one of the largest and diverse Arab and Middle Eastern communities in the U.S.

I was required to check in white on applications if I was to walk down the streets, I would not be told I'm white.

As a middle eastern and Arab American and US citizen this was done for a reason, to effectively limit the data of Arab American minorities and consequently obscuring financial aid.

This is not the first-time bill. The redistricting process had to reopen.

Our community of Arab Americans and are our communities of interest. They are Dearborn, Dearborn Heights West Detroit, Melvindale, Hamtramck, Sterling Heights, Livonia, Canton, just to name a few.

The redrawn maps cause an unfair count and without a fair count of our community in the U.S. census we will be constantly invisible and power to vote is at risk of being diluted. As a part minority and US citizen we have the same equal rights as everyone else. And the redistricting process limits us. I'm here and invisible as it tends to do so. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Kayla-Cox.

Please give our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Next in line is Jackson Hamstra.

Please give our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is also not present.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Is there anyone who has not spoken who would like a chance?

Okay, that's all the public comment we have.

Did you want to speak again?

Okay.

>> Signed up for a quick second round.

I appreciate this.

I will be brief.

I wanted to make the point that respecting Black communities of interest is not in conflict with partisanship or fair partisanship but it's also not completing the job of ensuring fair partisanship.

Communities of interest I described even when they cross eight mile, they are crossing safely democratic and the Districts around Palmer Park, 5, 6, 7, 8 are safe democratic and any plausible configuration would remain so.

The communities of interest will not alter partisan fairness any way.

That is not the case further east like Grosse Pointes, Harper Woods, Saint Clair Shores. So my plea to the Commission and made by others in redrawing the seats and doing the narrow redraw touching those necessary to keep communities of interest intact you also keep in mind the partisan fairness at all steps and you shouldn't be afraid to make changes elsewhere on the map that fix partisan fairness if you mess it up by recombining districts further east to fix communities of interest.

If you make a very competitive Grosse Pointe St. Clair shore seat out of what is a safe blue it would justify making a more democratic Taylor seat where currently there are two republican seats. These are the kinds of changes you should be making but the only sorts of changes you should make elsewhere on the map.

If you touch anything it should make partisan fairness better not worse.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you.

Did you want to speak?

>> So the question that I had is this here is the membership board that is going to decide the new redistricting of Michigan, right?

As far as the districts, correct?

So you guys have prepared several maps of what you want the districts to look like, right?

And I wanted to know how many maps are there and do we have a say so as far as confirming which one like as in a voting method to decide that, hey, this is what we want or you guys are just going to listen to what we have to say and then it's still up to you guys to make that final decision or is the people going to have a voting-type system to decide what the new Districting, what they feel like the majority agrees it should look like?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I thank you for that.

Me and my microphone, I'm holding it down.

I'm not letting it go.

So you have the ultimate like we take a vote and review the maps.

However, it is up to the public to give as much context as possible because, you know, the 13 of the Commissioners we have our own individual areas in which we live, play, stay, work, whatever, right?

So if enough folks, citizens, the people sitting out here don't just like Diego got up here and even though I shop in southwest and go to differ taco trucks and drive around Detroit I'm not a southwest resident so I can't pretend to know every nook and cranny like he listed out.

For example, if you came and say this is a community of interest I'm a part of, I echo the discussion of going into eight mile and Ferndale and including pieces of Royal Oak Township as it's not affectionately called sometimes and those are things we need to

hear because a lot of Commissioners don't live in the City of Detroit and have that knowledge.

While we have the final say in quotations whatever we decide, do or don't do is built upon each citizen's public comment, written comment, hey, I looked at this map.

I like what you're doing, Commissioner X, can you tweak this area.

Because I think you forgot the COI.

So that's what we are waiting to hear.

The courts have said we cannot, you know, mention race.

We cannot have maps that are based on race.

We know that we are redrawing the City of Detroit.

That is mostly one race, right?

So the way that that is discussed, the way that is better informed is to talk about communities of interest.

So talk about it until you are blue in the face so that we have a clear, clear, clear, clear, clear picture of what the possibilities for these districts have to be, okay?

Does that make sense?

Or do you want something else?

Come to the mic.

>> The question was: We are voicing our opinions based on what we feel is just, right?

But at the end of the day you guys are amongst each other. We are saying what we are saying but at the end of the day you guys have the final say so because we can't come back and say oh, we don't agree with that, it's what you are saying is what I was trying to figure out.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: There can be some discourse while we are in the process like coming to meetings like this.

The written public comment.

All of our meetings are live so when we are drawing if there is enough time we are going to draw tonight.

No you can't talk during the process, but you can take notes furious notes I saw Commissioner Kellom you were drawing this area.

I don't agree with that.

I don't like that and I'm probably going to hear that comment.

I will run across it and then I can provide feedback.

There was a community of interest that came on Tuesday.

And you know, they shared that they did not like this.

So I'm going to try to redraw this area based upon that.

Everything that we draw has to be, that's one of our criteria.

We have to consider communities of interest and means we have to consider you.

So our final say as a citizen I'm not a politician, nobody up here is.

It's based upon what you all are saying.

That's what it's supposed to be.

We got it wrong the first time, but we are trying to get it right now.

>> How do we view whatever you guys have already came up with?

Like the different maps, how many maps are there and how can we see what you guys have pretty much came up with to say, okay, we like this one?

We don't like that one?

Then allow the majority to say okay, yeah, we kind of like this one then y'all kind of favor that one versus us not even seeing what you guys already got in mine.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, so there is a computer outside where you can see the maps.

But then in the comfort of your home you can go to the MICRC website and look at our draft maps.

That will give you like more of a relaxed space.

Look, look, look.

Look at technology.

They are pulling it up.

It's this website right here.

I'm not being facetious, but this is where you would go to look at the maps.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Excuse me ma'am I really want to encourage you if you have comment I have Ryan Taylor who is outside, and he can drop your comments on any of the map as related to the community of interest.

Or if you have public comments in general to please, please, please do that for the Commission's consideration.

Thank you so much for coming.

>> CHAIR ORTON: That concludes the public comment portion of the meeting.

And we really appreciate everyone who offers public comment in whatever way they choose to do so.

We encourage you to keep sharing your thoughts.

Next on the agenda is the mapping process by the Commission.

So without objection we will start with Brittini Kellom.

Hearing no objection, please proceed, Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, John, I think you're my mapping buddy or Kim, is it both of you all?

It's John?

Okay Mr. Morgan?

So what I would like, which version, Commissioners was I redrawing or recreating District eight?

Which version was that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I believe that was 11824V5PM.

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.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Oh, my goodness, thank you Commissioner Eid. Okay, so version five 11824.

I'm going to if that is okay with the Commissioners I'm going to -- Sarah Reinhardt has something to say.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Can we pause that just a second?

We have one more individual who has just arrived who would like to provide live public comment.

Since we are just taking in lots of public comment tonight let's hear him.

>>Hello.

My name is Brandon Snyder I'm born and raised Detroit.

Currently living on the northwest side of Detroit.

I am involved with my community and in 2022 last year or the year before last I also made comment about the importance of making sure that we have districts that are known communities be remain intact.

This today I want to talk about the importance of compactness.

Making sure that District lines and districts that have neighborhoods remain intact.

One place I think in particular that is important is on the east side, the northeast side. Right now one of the things I think is most important is making sure communities that are the same, that represent communities of working-class communities remain the same and remain connected with other communities.

A place important like this that you can think of is the northeast side of Detroit being connected with communities like Harper Woods and East Point.

The last thing I will say before I go back in, thank you all for being generous to offer me time to speak is that there are community organizations, there are community groups, there are people who are interested in submitting maps being interested informing people of this opportunity and informing people of what's going on.

One of the maps that I have looked at that I think is important that reflects this idea of compactness as well as keeping communities together is Promote the Vote maps.

So you know I would encourage folks if you are interested in learning about compactness, interested in learning to make sure neighborhoods remain the same.

Making sure neighborhoods remain intact and take a look at maps like Promote the Vote because they are made and reflect the will of Detroiters.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Now we will go back to Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, version five 118:24 PM.

Our goal is to looking at working in that area and then doing overlay of another map.

>> Commissioner Kellom if you can let's narrow down the plan name and see if I can find it real quick.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 11824 version 5PM because it was worked on in the afternoon, that one.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will bring that up, share my screen and if you can just confirm that's what you think it is and I mean I've got the name correct.

But it will help to just confirm that it is what we think it is.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It looks like it.

It's at an angle.

I think this is.

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like there is a large portion that is still unassigned.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

Uh-huh.

This is the correct map.

This map name is 11824 version five PM.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and you want to continue editing this.

So it's been our practice to save this as a new plan and give it today's date and a number and if you want you can add an ap natural name a flower or something else if you want.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: The naming convention is 01 for January 23, '24 version three House District COL for collaborative and if you want to add an additional name you can, if not it will stand like that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I can't think of anything that creative for a flower.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Lily, Lilies are peaceful.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

Okay so again this is unassigned area we identified before and have a new name for the plan, so we are ready to draw.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, can you pull up the population?

I was working on District eight, John.

And I can't remember.

I don't think I finished it.

And I know that we need to assign that area that is unassigned.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's right.

District eight it looks like.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's under.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, it's slightly under. It's just 2000 under.

So it's negative 2.3.

Which is generally within the tolerance that you have been using.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: .

Also met me know if you want me to add the Detroit neighborhoods maps.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I do, please.

I will assign the unassigned area first and then come back.

As usual, Commissioners, you can have suggestions because I'm looking at the far screen over here so I can't see, I'm not looking to my left, and I don't know what is happening behind me.

And neighborhood names are what I enjoy working with.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay also I'm going to change District 11's color because it's close to the unassigned color.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I thought it was unassigned at first.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, there you go.

Now you can't miss it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you.

Can we assign the unassigned area?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, let me see what District number.

It looks like all of the District numbers are taken so you would assign it to an existing District such as nine, which is here.

Or possibly 12 which is currently on population.

Or 11 which is under.

So would you like to look towards adding this into nine?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM:

>> KIM BRACE: Commissioner this is Kim Brace.

What you have is nine is under populated and 14 is under populated.

So those need to gain territory.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

Let's start with assigning some of those areas that are unassigned into nine.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so the pink District here is district nine and this is the border of nine as it stands now.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So why don't we assign Gratiot, Gratiot Town, Kettering, the rest of Gratiot Grand.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is a little more than you requested, but I think you are moving that direction, yes?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

Ideally you see how it kind of caps at the west and east Canfield and East Village.

I want to see what happens if I fill all those areas in.

If it's on overpopulated I see 11 is under slightly and some could be added there but let's see what happens.

>> MR. MORGAN: Nine still has quite a bit of population to go so you want to move up to the Connor creek industrial?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hang on, I have done something the computer does not like.

One moment.

Yeah, I know but it's not letting me Zoom in.

I'm stuck.

Okay give me a moment.

Okay almost back.

Just a second.

Okay I think we are back.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Great.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think we are just about back to where we were and I'm going to save the plan.

Okay so taking distribute nine all the way over to the Connor creek industrial it takes it to within 9,000 population and then as you mentioned District 11 is also slightly under populated.

9,000.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm probably going to end up you can assign that little piece into 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: That much or not quite as much?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let me see what that does.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is only 1300 people so that is nowhere near enough, but it gets you on the right path.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I can come back to that, but you can assign that for right now.

And then.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: For nine what is 12?

12 you can assign that piece that is unassigned Jefferson, Chalmers, River Bend, Fox Creek, and probably going to end up assigning.

>> MR. MORGAN: Those into nine?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so if I trim this portion here that is beyond the Fox creek neighborhood that would take District nine to within the population and District 11 is still a little bit off.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, so you can trim that little piece and then we will look at what is happening between 11 and 12.

12 is slightly under as well.

But.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm also a little concerned here about 14 because it's showing it being substantially down and I'm not seeing one that's substantially up, so I'll have to look for that in a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So at this point nine is within the population tolerance. It's negative .32%.

291 people off.

There is this unassigned territory here.

11 is under and 14 is under and that is way up here.

So do you want to work on 11 or work on 14?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I want to work on 11 and then maybe I will shave parts off the top.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

So you're looking at the next unassigned area are Ravendale, Chandler Park, that area?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

This is going to get -- maybe take Chandler Park, if you have to take more you could take Chandler Park and Chalmers but some of that.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's not currently in 12.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No, I know it's not in 12.

>> MR. MORGAN: 11 is very close and I will Zoom out so you can take a look.

So presumably the deficit in 14 is roughly equal to the unassigned population here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Commissioner?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I see what you're trying to do and it's smart and like this configuration.

A lot of this will come down to where you want the three neighborhoods to be.

What I would suggest is starting is going back up and starting in 7 and then you can equalize the pop like from 7 to 11.

Then you can decide if you want to go -- keep going from 11 into those three neighborhoods or 12 into those unassigned neighborhoods after you fix the population on 14.

>> MR. MORGAN: So what Commissioner Eid was saying is 14 needs more population.

So one option like he said would be to go into 12 or 11 potentially to get your additional population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Then those downstream changes will allow you to assign morning side, East English Village and Cornerstone village to whichever and decide between 12, 10, 9 or 11.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, I'm leaning going to 12.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Me too.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Not the points.

Okay so, John, let's go into 7.

This is the part Commissioners as you know, you already know me, I have a difficult time with because it involves putting Detroit into some suburbs.

I agree with there are certain areas across eight mile that north or the north part of Detroit, it would not be the end of the world for it to go into 7.

However.

>> MR. MORGAN: 7 is currently on population it's 14, it's low.

So the adjacent districts are 7, 8, 12 and 11.

So you could take population from 12, 11 which we were just working on, 8 or 7 to complete 14.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Say that again.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure.

So 14 is the one that's currently under populated.

So the adjacent districts are 7, 8, 11, and 12 here and you can take from anyone of the districts.

So for example if you did not want to cross eight mile you can take from 12.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let's take from 12.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

So this is the border between 14 and 12.

So you would take these.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Exactly.

Yes.

Let's start chipping off the western border of 12 and putting that into 14.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

So I just put the population totals on to give us an idea of how much population this is.

So your deficit is 15,000.

So you get 7, 12, 18 without going into East Point.

So roughly some combination of these will get really close to where you want to be.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you, John, for your wonderful math.

We can start taking out those pieces, the 3462.

And again we are adjusting for the population.

14 is under.

So we are currently moving areas of 12 into 14.

So that we have the correct population for 14.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so those adjustments put 14 right on the money, and it does not cross the municipal boundary if you wanted to be sensitive to that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, that's good.

So now let me look and see.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 12 is under populated, right.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay John we will go back to that area. Yep, go get my people and put them into 12.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioners as we know east English Connor stone and morning side is a tight knit community and a lot to revitalize the area and another community of interest in terms of wanting to be together. And without breaking the neighborhoods.

>> MR. MORGAN: This appears to account for all the unassigned population. I can run a check if you want to confirm that completely or go with this and just make adjustments to probably 11 and 12.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 12 is over by 5,700 and 11 is under by 3,700, so you can potentially split something between these and balance those out if you like.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, that sounds good.

Sorry translators, I'm giving you all kinds of sound evens.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 11 would need to gain a neighborhood for example wade.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And what is that Eden gardens?

>> MR. MORGAN: Probably wade will just about do it so let me click that in and see how that looks.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: 12 is still a little bit over at 3100 so you can continue if you wanted or you could adjust it elsewhere.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You can try another area, the 11 is just so close. You can try.

>> MR. MORGAN: With both of them they would be overpopulated by 1%.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Wagner, your hand was up do you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was going to ask Brittini I don't know if it matters but up where you were just working that top right left of Cornerstone village does that need to be put in from ten into 12 if you put that part, yes? Is that part of Cornerstone village?

>> MR. MORGAN: It is and would affect the population of ten.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: It would not be much because there is only 1003 there but I didn't know if Brittini wanted to keep that whole village together or not.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Wagner.

I do want to put that into 12.

I didn't see that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay that would put 12 more overpopulated.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Well, John, we have to do what we need to do.

Cornerstone village they were very clear on morning side that whole area.

And that was I did not do that on purpose.

I think that's just like the function of mapping.

So we are going to put that area that's in ten currently into 12 to keep Cornerstone together.

Because those are a thousand people that likely will not be happy if they were separated.

>> MR. MORGAN: Now 12 is over by 4,000.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, so we will go back and take Eaton garden.

And put that into 11.

Eden Gardens.

Excuse me.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay 11 is positive 185 and 12 is positive 144.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, I think for right now I can live with that.

Commissioners, do you have any objection with the way the numbers are now?

Mostly because I wanted to also try an overlay after these tweaks so I'm trying to figure out are these numbers we can live with?

Commissioner Kellom has a shared turn all the time.

Now I'm looking to my left to ask you all and for those that are remote are these numbers that we can live with for right now?

>> CHAIR ORTON: John, could you pop out the matrix so we can see the list and make it a little bigger?

And Commissioner Wagner, you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was just going to tell Brittini they look good, Brittini, go ahead and do your tweaks you want to do.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Wagner.

>> CHAIR ORTON: You got them all under the 2.5 deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay Commissioner Callaghan thank you for inspiring me to draw eight the way I wanted to after how many days.

So what I wanted to try is this map but overlaying a City -- sorry, I have my retainer in now, City Council District map.

I want to see what the -- how it compares.

So, John, if you can grab that overlay and place it over Lily, then I can see what I'm looking at.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so you sent me the City Council boundary proposals that were available.

So I'll pull up a PDF of that then I will show you I did some approximations to bring that into the mapping software.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just one moment.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Brittini, Commissioner Weiss pointed out that District one is slightly over the 2.5.

It's 2.7 something.

I'm sure you can do something little.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We the operative word is we.

We can all, we can go back and look at that.

One being slightly under.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Or maybe your overlay will help you.

Help us.

>> MR. MORGAN: One thing we could do also I can put the neighborhoods back on and see if there's anything that's not following the neighborhood boundaries and that might be an easy fix.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So for example this neighborhood is already split.

So that might be a place where you could just take a little more of that neighborhood which is already split.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let's do that, John, and see what we get before we do anything else.

>> MR. MORGAN: So again you are just looking to take do you want to take the entire neighborhood or just the minimum to get below negative 2.5?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I mean, we can start with the minimum.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm always a fan of keeping neighborhoods together.

I wish Diego, our person that us with here giving public comment was still here.

But let's take what we need to to balance things.

First.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I know where that neighborhood is.

I just realized what I was looking at.

Porter Street.

Some industrial, I don't know what they do over the water.

It looks like that is a loading area when I drive-by.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's the west side industrial.

And as actually as it turns out it's very sparsely populated.

So you can both leave clear the minimum maybe.

And also unite the neighborhood.

But let's see.

No, not quite enough.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And I don't know if I necessarily want to go into

Corktown.

And correct me because that is retracing the area like you have an idea.

What do you all think about taking that piece that is into nine and putting that into one?
The rest of that industrial area off by the Detroit river where Jefferson is.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think when we were discussing this area before, it was put with what you're trying to put it with, with, I can't see the District number now but one with the other districts there or the other neighborhoods there I mean.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay thank you, Commissioner Orton.
I don't know how much population is there.

But we can try.

>> MR. MORGAN: It could end up being 0.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That's what it kind of looks like honestly.

>> MR. MORGAN: No, a little bit there.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Get towards WC, might still be 0.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, it's this one here, the actual block goes over here.

So let's assign it and then unassign it if you don't like it.

So you may not want to mess with this now but there are some water blocks that have 0 population but for now this takes care of what Commissioner Weiss was talking about.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, sorry, I don't know what is wrong.

Let's try the overlay of the Council District map.

And at first glance just to give some context of this map I think it does a pretty good job but not sure and want to see the overlay of keeping some of the districts that were contested, keeps those neighborhoods together particularly John R is an eastern boundary, Grixdale Village and Penrose and some COIs we talked about that have they are not new communities of interest.

But have historically been together for a long while.

So I'm interested to see what this map looks like over the one, over the Lily because Lily already had some adjustments that we made that as a Commission we were on board with.

And then I made some tweaks to, you know, my same eight mile Livernois area so I want to see where this fits.

That's my thought.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so this is the map that you sent to me.

This is I guess a proposed City Council boundary option too.

And what you will see is the City Council Directors are very close to the population of a House District.

However, just remember there are some island communities that are in some of the districts you've drawn.

So the boundary -- because of that additional population, you know, these boundaries might not quite fit perfectly.

But I will overlay what I have.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you, John.

And that community that was outlined in the center of the Council District map was a Hamtramck area, I believe.

>> MR. MORGAN: Exactly.

So these townships, cities rather would be in one of the House Districts.

So again it just won't be perfect aligned to this map is all.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the thick blue lines are the Council districts.

So this is District Four.

This is District three.

This is District five, six, seven, two and one.

I'll just flip back to the PDF for a second.

So, again, what I brought in here approximates the Council districts.

I did not have a shape file, so I just used the PDF to guide me.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can you put up a neighborhood overlay?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you.

Keep scanning, I'm looking.

And if you could go west if you don't mind, I want to see, yeah, that area.

Uh-huh okay personally I will be interested in tweaking the map -- tweaking Lily a little bit more because I think what the overlay, again, we're not trying to achieve perfection. But like much, much, much better.

I think the overlay keeps neighborhoods together even more.

And by neighborhoods I need to be specific in what I'm talking about the communities of interest as we see is similar to the numbers in our standards that we have.

I don't exactly know if I want to do that this evening in case someone else wants -- I know other people might want a turn.

But I do -- I do like what I'm looking at.

Our map -- this map Lily is very close to this.

But I think with some minor changes it could get even closer to what we're seeing in the bold blue areas.

I'm open to any feedback with that.

But that was my hope.

I wanted to see both.

Thank you so much, John.

I appreciate you.

>> MR. MORGAN: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Good job Commissioner Kellom.

It's actually time for us to move on to Executive Director report.

And Commissioner Eid had his hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I just want to agree with that.

I think over all like the main ideas are pretty close to the Detroit City Council overlay.

It's not going to be perfect because you have Hamtramck and you have Hamtramck and oh, I cannot think right now.

>> MR. MORGAN: Highland Park.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Highland Park to worry about as population but the overall ideas I think are pretty darn close, so I agree.

>> CHAIR ORTON: -

>> MR. MORGAN: I will save this plan and close it down.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And we are calling that one Lily?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so we will move on to our Executive Director report.

Without objection I will ask MICRC Executive Director Edward Woods III to give his report.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you so much Mr. Orton at this time Mr. Brace will run the partisan fairness on the four maps that are completed and then they will also run partisan fairness on the last map that was just completed by Commissioner Kellom.

>> KIM BRACE: Okay microphone picking up, okay?

What we have done is I'm just bringing up the Rose bud plan and I will demonstrate for you on how easy it is to run the partisan fairness ones or calculations.

The partisan fairness calculations is a report, which is in the report Section.

And it is simply running a report that comes up with a list of the various reports that are available.

There is a partisan fairness report that we have created.

And you end up needing to select which are the calculations that are going into the partisan fairness.

Now, we tend to, if I can have my glasses going right, we tend to look at the updated democratic index for dems as one. And the second one is the republican updated index.

In that instance that is the bottom -- the spreadsheet along the bottom of your screens that is the updated one which includes the 2022 election results along with the rest of the earlier decade.

By doing that you can then display, and it pops up the partisan fairness calculations. So here is Rose bud.

And the partisan fairness calculation.

So in this instance it shows that for the purposes of lopsided margins, which is across the bottom here, lopsided.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Excuse me Mr. Brace this is Commissioner Wagner is anybody else seeing a Black screen for your sharing?

Because that's all I'm seeing.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, I am too.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

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.

>> KIM BRACE: Good.

Sorry about that.

Let me stop sharing and go back and share again.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Perfect thank you.

>> KIM BRACE: Sorry about that it pulled up and create add new screen I'm -- image and I was looking at the old one.

So this is the Rose bud plan.

It is there in the title of the file name.

So partisan fairness for the Rose bud plan.

And it has, if you remember the calculations that were done two years ago, it has four different tabs.

Those are the tabs that Lisa, Dr. Handley talked about this morning.

That includes lopsided margins, and it shows the overall calculation that goes into the lopsided margin calculation and shows the advantage or disadvantage of for which party and what is the percent that is the advantage.

Lopsided margins of course is upwards of the difference between the average democratic victory margin and the average republican victory margin.

So that is 5.6%.

In the Rose bud plan.

For the mean median difference, it looks at the median for the individual District calculations.

The democrat and republican scores, which are these over here in column L.

And it looks at then the statewide mean percentages that are coming up.

And for the democrat and republican.

And it looks at then the difference between those.

And in this instance, it shows that republicans are slightly advantaged by the score of 2.5%.

On the efficiency gap, the efficiency gap looks at the number of wasted votes, if you remember Dr. Handley's discussion this morning.

How many total wasted votes are on the democratic side versus the republican side.

And what is the gap between these.

And in this Rose bud plan it's 3.1%.

And then finally on the seats-votes ratio, you look at the share of the votes for the candidates on the democratic side, how many seats is it generating, what is the percent of the total chamber seat numbers that would be democrat and what is the proportionality bias in favor.

And that's the difference in the seats and the vote shares.

So what we have is you can immediately see these calculations for really any plan that we have.

Now, I would caution you we need to make sure we have a complete plan.

These calculations don't really mean anything until the entire in essence state is assigned.

So with holes in some of the plans, it's really not advisable to run those yet because we want to have as much of a complete plan as we can.

Now, you have basically looked at four different plans.

And Dr. Handley looked at three other ones.

So we have run the calculations for all four of these plans.

And let me stop share for a second because I want to show you a different spreadsheet.

And that is I have created a spreadsheet that will allow us to fill in the information from each of the individual plan spreadsheets for the different scores.

So if you remember Dr. Handley had looked at the 2012 plan, which the republican legislature enacted.

And it looked at the average winning margins between democrats and republicans.

And the republican advantage of 10.1 percent.

Oops.

Sorry about that.

Let me share that.

There we go.

Sorry, I was looking at my screen, not what you were looking at, sorry.

So what this summary spreadsheet table allows me to do is basically set up a row for each plan that we're looking at.

And then report the different calculations in the rows for the plan.

Right now I've loaded in the 2012 plan, which is what the republican legislature enacted.

And the two different calculations we have for the Hickory plan, the one that you had passed in 2021.

The first one is stopping at where we were looking at Hickory two years ago with just data that went up to the 2020 election.

So last decade plus the 2020 election.

That's in this first row.

In the second row, we have added in the 2022 data.

And if you recall, that is the two differ tables at the bottom of Dr. Handley's screen shots in her PowerPoint.

And so I've done this kind of layout so that we can look at all of these and will be able to fill in all the plans as they're being generated and fill in the numbers here.

Now, that is a manual fill in.

It's not an automatic like what we just showed you.

But we have set up or I've set up this spreadsheet so that it is something that you can utilize to kind of keep track of where all the different plans are and how they can compare on all four calculations.

So with the mean median differential, there is calculations 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.

I need to fill out the advantage and the scores there.

On the Hickory we have the efficiency gap.

The wasted votes and the way that those are calculated and who is advantaged.

And then the seats-votes ratio.

And how those are calculated.

So as we get plans, we will be able to fill in the various plans.

Again, as I mentioned we want to have whole plans.

So that we are seeing a complete set of information.

If you remember Dr. Handley said this morning that when I ran that one earlier, you can run it on any kind of calculations that are in the spreadsheet.

So if you recall and I'll go back in, share another spreadsheet.

So for example the partisan fairness spreadsheet, it is pulling in, in this instance the composite scores because that is what we identified when we were looking at the plan and running that partisan fairness.

So those two boxes that were there, that drop down menu had let you set up which of the data you want to compare.

And as Dr. Handley said you could do individual elections if you wanted to and look at just the 2020 Presidential race for example.

Or something like that.

And see what that is.

There's a lot of different ways of looking at it.

Kind of the composite score gives you the overall advantage in all of the data.

And so that's why we put the composite scores.

But these spreadsheets can be run to show anything along here and then that's taken into account in all of these calculations.

A spreadsheet is created, as I showed you before, excuse me, a spreadsheet is created whenever you are running partisan fairness.

And what we will be doing is we will not only fill in that summary table that we showed you, but we will also have these fairness reports for the individual plan up on our website to go along with the map of the plan and all of the other information that we do for each plan.

This will allow the Commission and the public to see what is the information that comes about because of all these calculations.

I'm happy to take any questions that anybody might have.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Wagner, did you have your hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was just wondering if he was going to do that for all four completed plans like, I think.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

All -- we have in keeping track of what you guys have done we have four plans right now Rose bud is that first one.

I know I'm not going to pronounce that right but the one that starts with a B, that flower. The Daisy and the Lily and I don't know that we have Tulip done yet. But I've got all four of those done and run just like the Rose bud one. I have let's see.

So for example, where is Rose bud?

That is Bridgemon, all of the calculations for that plan.

So all of these have been run so far as long as we have a final plan or a relatively final plan.

We will have this up there and what plan makes it up you can see in the title we have adopted the titles and the calculations.

The plan names that Sarah is keeping track of.

And the master list of the plans that are being created.

So that we will be able to then track those and show any spreadsheet that you need.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I have a quick question and being a new Commissioner and first time going through this working with partisan fairness I understand how it's calculated and running reports and applies to whole state but once we have the data starting tomorrow is this the report we would look for any individual map and determine which specific districts as you have them listed here with -- how do we make amendments to the maps once we look at it and try to make it more fair?

What is the process for that?

>> KIM BRACE: The process, there are four different calculations and the way to understand the data.

The one that as I remember the Commission two years ago tended to look more at the tail end of your process at looking at seats-vote ratios.

And whether or not the plan and how the vote share compared to the seats share compared.

So that was one major score as I remember that the Commission looked at.

In terms of that but efficiency gap is also one.

I mean you've got as Dr. Handley said, you've got four different ways of looking at it, giving you slightly different scores.

That is useful for most of us analyzing to see whether one individual score is slightly biased more in one way or the other compared to the other scores.

So you kind of take a look at all of these together to see how it is.

Now, for example, in the efficiency gap we know that looking at the wasted votes and how any of these plans are drawn, there is a basic finding more towards the republican side in a lot of these scores.

So it's not necessarily -- there is a slight bias towards republicans in the State of Michigan is what the data is showing us.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Did that answer your question?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I guess we will find out tomorrow.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Good evening, giving you a list of four complete plans I asked to run partisan fairness on.

Did you get a chance to run those?

They did not have flower names yet because we had not imposed that naming convention yet, but it was 011724 version 3.

011824 version two.

011824 version three.

And then 0122 version two.

Did you have a chance to run those?

>> KIM BRACE: I have your list in front of me.

I have run I think two out of the four.

And I'll run the other two tonight for you.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you so much.

That would be fantastic.

>> KIM BRACE: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any other questions for Mr. Brace?

Commissioner Szetela, your hand is up.

I don't know if that is again or still.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Sorry, let me try to take it back down.

Is it down now?

>> CHAIR ORTON: It's down.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Mr. Woods, do you have anything else?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Brace, did you do all the partisan fairness including the one that was just completed by Commissioner Kellom?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

I've got the four of them that have gotten names to them.

Those so far it seems like the Commission had finalized relatively this -- those plans.

So I felt safe in running those.

And Commissioner just the four that she has identified, I'm running those.

I've already run two out of the four.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay what about have you run Commissioner Kellom's last map that cousin completed?

>> KIM BRACE: I will run Commissioner Kellom's too that is on John's machine.

I don't have Commissioner Kellom's plan.

But he can run them right now.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: All right can we be able to do that tomorrow morning?

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.

>> KIM BRACE: Certainly, yeah and I'll add Commissioner Kellom's plan into that master list of all the scores for all the plans.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: All right, thank you very much.

Just want to remind everyone that Commissioner Lange talked about the Michigan MICRC virtual town hall meeting, that will take place, this is notifying the public that will take place Thursday, January 25th at 7:00 p.m.

Once again that will take place Thursday, Thursday virtual town hall at 7:00 p.m.

We will be issuing a release out tomorrow so you will know how to register.

It will be a Zoom meeting.

So if you want to have the best opportunity to interact with the cohost Rhonda Lange and cohost Commissioners Rhonda Lange and Brittini Kellom, we invite you to register. If you do not want to register you can also participate on the Commission's YouTube channel as well.

But if you want to have interactive direct experience talking real time you will need to register through the Zoom link that will be issued out tomorrow.

Also want to alert the Commission that as relates to our mapping process and procedures, that Sarah Reinhardt will provide a presentation on Friday that talks about deliberation, the public hearing and adoption of final map procedures for the Commission's consideration a presentation on Friday then the Commission can vote on it on Monday.

Once again, it's a presentation on Friday for the Commission to vote on it on Monday.

Let's see if there is any other things I need to share with the Commission.

Oh, I want to thank the Michigan Department of State in particular.

Megan Schaar, she was the one that brought the computers here for our new Commissioners so let's give Megan a round of applause because if it wasn't for her, we wouldn't have them.

So really grateful to Megan for that.

Want to thank David Moore for updating our website.

For those of you who have been asking questions, you can find right off the home Page how to view draw maps in addition you can find how to put comments in either the public comment portal or the mapping portal that is all updated and on the front Page so I want to thank David Moore for that.

And the public is out there.

Last but not least we got to give credit to Sarah Reinhardt, so let's give Sarah a round of applause, all she is doing and juggling and making things happen. It's greatly appreciated. And at this time, Commissioner Orton, that's all I have. And note for the record I finished before 8:30 p.m.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Good job, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was just going to ask Kim can you just add all of those to that spreadsheet so we can look at them altogether tomorrow?

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

And I think he already indicated he would, so we are good.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Brace he asked you a question.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I asked if you could add all of the maps you talked about a second ago to the spreadsheet you showed us so we can look at the results of everything at the same time.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: All right, cool, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay are there any announcements?

Seeing none, okay, there is a motion to adjourn, and it's seconded.

Any discussion?

Seeing none, all in favor of adjourning raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it and we are adjourned at 8:26 p.m.