

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

20240131-900 Meeting

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

>> CHAIR ORTON: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:00 a.m.

This Zoom webinar is 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 at 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 Redistricting@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 public 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 WoodsE3@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. Please say present when I call your name, if you are attending the meeting remotely please announce during roll call you are attending the meeting remotely and unless your absence is due to military duty announce your physical location stating the City, County Township and the Village and state from which you are attending the meeting remotely. We will begin alphabetically with Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Attending from Imlay Township, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Remotely from Mexico.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry? Commissioner Eid?

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Present attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present good morning and attending from Wayne County, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present attending from Lee county, Florida.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Present from Carrolton, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Present attending remotely from Battle Creek Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: From Wayne County Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Remotely from Highland Township, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner? Commissioner Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present attending remotely from Saginaw Township Saginaw Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: I'm going back up Commissioner Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: One more time, 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: Reminder to the public watching you can view agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the agenda. Motioned by Commissioner Curry.
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Seconded by Commissioner Weiss. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Seeing none, all in favor of adopting 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 adopted.
- Vice Chair Janice Vallette will facilitate the public comment portion of this meeting.
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Without objection we will begin the public comment pertaining to the agenda topics portion of our meeting. Hearing no objection we will now proceed with public comment. Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live 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. I will call you by name or the last four digits of your telephone 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 have 90 seconds to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. First in line to provide public comment is Susan Miller. Please allow our staff to unmute you.

>> Hi, am I unmuted?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes, you are.

>> Thank you. Yes, working with the pro-democracy group Voters Not Politicians, I invested many hours in trying to pass proposal two which created this Commission. And I've watched your work with deep interest and appreciation. Your job is a difficult one given the multiple indices of fairness that need to be considered in map drawing. Watching the current process I have some concern that the Commission may now be moving towards packing voters of color into a few safe districts and reducing these voters' ability to influence elections and surrounding districts. Doing so will not achieve fair mapping with respect to this community of interest. I encourage the Commission to study previously submitted maps, some of these maps provide examples of House Districts with majority-minority representation that reach a 50% plus threshold but do not pack voters of color into a small number of safe districts.

In redrawing the House map, please hold in mind the deep concern about politically partisan gerrymandering that sparked the work to create a citizens Redistricting Commission. Extreme partisan gerrymandering has been a powerful tool of antidemocratic interest. It would be regrettable if this current round of map drawing led us back to an unfair and insurmountable advantage of one political party over.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Alex McGuire. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Alex McGuire connecting from Sterling Heights I would like to thank the Commission for the opportunity to speak on behalf of my community. It sounded on Monday like the Commission received advice to totally disregard any map that comes in from the public because you can't prove that it was drawn race blind. Please don't ignore these public comments. Many people are volunteering their time, their energy

and their lived and professional experience to share their knowledge with you. Please don't throw that away.

And especially do not throw it away just because it's too well researched. Again thank you so much for your hard work and for listening to me. Have a good day.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Sarah Howard. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Good morning.

>> I'm Sarah Howard, the attorney for Michigan AFLCIO fair maps project. We are concerned about the advice you were given to ignore maps submitted by members of the public. That is simply incorrect. There is nothing about the Court's directions that require rebuffing the very same public maps you solicited. It's your intent that matters, not the intent of those who submitted maps for your consideration. Even so you have options from groups dedicated to doing this right and intent you can trust like Promote the Vote map as one example. Again it's your intent that matters. The Court found fault with your prior maps because race was a predominanting factor drawing Detroit districts the last time. You are not prohibited from any consideration of race or even talking about it. You simply cannot let it predominate and become the sole motivator for the new maps. You can consider it as it impacts communities of interest or as it impacts doing right by the correct VRA advice. So you do not inadvertently pack or crack communities of minority voters. Achieving these results does not happen by accident. It happens when you weigh all of these pieces of information appropriately. The public map options are your only fully legal choices right now and we urge you to consider and select one of them that complies with all criteria. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Elizabeth Gary. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Good morning.

>> I'm Liz Gary, another lawyer working for the fair maps project and Sarah Howard's colleague. Without considering the public map you are left with no constitutional options. You do not have a map you drew that meets the Court's requirements and with the VRA avoiding packing and the state law criteria including partisan fairness. All of those boxes have to be checked for this new map to be constitutional. You've asked organizations to help you turn out public comment. We should not then be suspicious or surprised when groups of people turn out to tell you about their community of interest. It does not make the views of those commenters illegitimate because they showed up as part of a community to tell you about their interest and how maps are drawn. You spent too much time considering how to achieve less requirements like keeping municipalities intact or achieving compactness. To the detriment of complying with the

Court's directive maintaining VRA compliance and achieving partisan fairness is itself unconstitutional. Thank you very much for your work on the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is James Galant. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you. Next in line is Sue Statler. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Susan Astler, resident from Corktown since 1975. Both my Districts, House and Senate, are under review. Thank you for all the efforts you are taking to listen to the public. As you know in 2018 the voters chose to end the undemocratic approach of having the Michigan legislature design the districts. We wanted to end gerrymandering, that at least was our hope, and we are now among the minority of states that rely on citizens such as yourselves to create fair districts. So I applaud each of you for undertaking this challenge and trying to do this very difficult job. And I know it is difficult and I want to emphasize that as you regroup with new members and develop your response you keep before you the intent of the voters in 2018. As you examine options, please do not organize voters of color into a few safe districts the way they were before 2018's election. Thank you very much for your work and your transparency.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Ryan Reese please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Can the Commissioners hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Thank you very much. I'm the Reverend Ryan Reese of District 14 thank you to the Commission for your continued efforts. As a resident of one of the affected regions living with people who are threatened with disenfranchisement from some of the redrawing of recent maps and the wholesale dismissal of publicly submitted maps, I reiterate my great displeasure of potential of this decision. It's a grave disservice to the public who was solicited to have maps in comment and given no drafting process to include rubrics to offer evidence of race neutrality. The Commission to at the advice and plea of single individuals negate public maps is not fair or reasonable to the process and negates the purpose of allowing the maps in the first place. If not calling into question the validity of these public hearings in the first place. If public commentary is not to be considered, we might as well go back to purely closed-door sessions in the legislature. I'm sure the Commission, if they look at the maps, will identify trends common across all of them. And work from there in a way that does not draw partisan gerrymandered districts just to satisfy one community that already has representation at the Senate level. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Michael Davis. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Good morning, can I be heard.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes, you can.

>> Good morning, Commissioners I'm Michael Davis Executive Director of Promote the Vote. I addressed the Commission imploring you to use mapping criteria January 11 should evaluate and redraw the districts of consideration given to all mapping criteria to improve and ensure fairness, January 25th we said the Commission should redraw the districts with consideration of all mapping criteria and comply with Court orders without impacting districts, January 26th, 11 majority minority districts with Black voting age plus 50% 51 to 60% and protects communities of interest and preserves partisan fairness without diluting voices of minority communities. Not once did I say the maps were driven or dictated biracial quotas because I mentioned a number and that is what you focus on is not our focus. If you look at what we changed, you will get a wealth of COI on neighborhoods before you get to the BVAP. We drew as you should be drawing to comply with the Constitution. Race did not predominate but the law and constitutional law requires plans with VRA. As Mr. Braden said, you can be conscious of race as long as it did not dictate it was a factor but not the factor because the Constitution are left to do so, or you have gerrymandered maps. If you need clarification look at Promote the Vote website thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is George Higgins. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me now?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> All right I just wanted to thank the Commissioners again for continuing to hop on every day and go through this mapping process. My name is George Higgins I'm a Fraser resident and grew up in Warren Michigan and watching this process since day one. You know with the original maps and now with the Court remedied you know period. I just wanted to point out how well Ipsers latest analysis really described how backward I believe your current approach is with regard to partisan fairness. You know creating a new shore District with St. Clair shores and Grosse Pointes without East Point or Harper Woods really gives one party a new chance to win in that District when does well statewide. If you're going to do that you need to balance that by either creating another safe District for the other party somewhere else or you know looking at 62 doing something to make 62 more competitive doing something to make 58 a little bit of a safer seat, right? But if you don't want to open up a can of worms really, I think the easiest thing for the Commission to do is to incorporate East Point and Harper Woods into any District that includes St. Clair shores, again municipal boundaries are not merely as important as the partisan fairness. So I really would just urge the

Commission to put partisan fairness top of mind and keep that in mind going forward.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Chris Gilmer hill. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Good morning can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> All right, hi my name is Chris Gilmer hill lifelong palmer Woods resident. I would like to speak briefly about a couple of tweaks the Commission should seriously consider as you work to bring everything into perfect compliance with the V AR and partisan fairness ahead of submitting the maps. You have done a really good job given the circumstances. I know things are running into a hurdle but should be proud of what you are doing because we are getting there. It's possible to fix a lot of the maps that are at 10 creating a new VRA seat where there is not one in the Grosse Pointes area. You can do this without breaking up the COI that includes like five Grosse Pointes and Harper Woods by like in the context of the Spirit of Detroit map, adding morning side, East English Village Cornerstone and Moross and Morang in 10 and moving St. Clair shores into District 12. Those balance out. Echo the previous commenter and you should consider partisan fairness and taking competitiveness in account which is something your analysis from the experts currently has not done. People talked a lot about the lakeshore District in that context, but I would like to specifically point out that District 13 you redrawn is a bigger issue from a safe democratic seat to a toss up in the Roseville area. You can touch the red District in somewhere like Taylor. Urge Taylor whole to fix that, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Anthony Skannell, please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Hello Commission. Looking at Mr. Palmer's tables, I was thinking about, you know, primary turn out amongst different groups and thought it was funny myself sometimes I turn out to the primary but then for a certain party but not for their general vote. That is a different story anyway. I'm in a different category that is not really counting voter wise.

That's fine. Third parties. But I'm looking at what you're trying to do, adjust some of the districts and let's say they are from Mr. Braden's perspective they are the ones on dot matrix that have purple dots in any plan, and you want to adjust, unpack those, I guess. And even if you don't, Mr. Fink said you could put out unadjusted ones and the adjusted version both for public comment. So I think it's going great. Keep up the great work.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Robert Dindoffer. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Hello folks can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Okay, great. Listen, I wanted to you know reengage with the idea of how maybe everybody can get what they want from a community of interest standpoint and how it could affect compliance. And I don't want to talk about any specific percentages of any, you know, voters based on race or any other factor. I just want to talk about communities of interest. And the idea that the folks across Macomb county and a little bit of Oakland just to the east of I75 from Madison heights to Roseville are very similar in terms of the community feel. And I ask you all to just go if you live in the area, drive through the neighborhoods there and you will see they are similar. There may not be a lot of testimony on that but a District that is stretched that way could work. A District that stretches on the lakeshore that we talked about as a clear community of interest obviously works. And then if you did that, just thinking of taking the Spirit of Detroit and reconfiguring districts 10-14, that would allow you to make three districts that reflect migration patterns and similar community feels and lifestyles across 8 mile, one that includes Hazel Park, a little of Madison Heights and north Detroit and south Warren and north Detroit, another east out of Detroit plus Harper Woods plus East Point and a little of Roseville south of 696. Those three districts I'm not telling you percentages, but I just think from a.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Hamid. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Good morning Commission can you guys hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> I reside in Madison Heights. I just want to mention when the voters of color rallied and voted for the new redistricting process we celebrated. We celebrated because finally for the first time in my life and my parents' lives, we would have our communities of interest representing and finally be free from the republican gerrymandering of the last 40 years that ensured even when we had representation that it could never effectively represent us. And right now you're doing it again. These maps are drawn lumping St. Clair shores and Grosse Pointe together makes that lakeshore community of interest the single most overrepresented one in the entire Metro area. Why do you guys feel compelled to draw a House District when they already have a Senate seat? There are plenty of other community of interest in the area that could have got a fair shake at representation. The map and the public can see this plainly as an attack on partisan fairness. That is it. Thank you, guys, for your hard work.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Robert Dindoffer. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I don't believe that participant requested a second public comment today.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay next in line is Robert Reese, please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> Thank you again for the additional time. Ryan Reese actually. I would like to further address a topic broached yesterday on the subject of eyeballing lifestyle differences. The use yesterday of 696 and the fashion that it was in the midst of describing different communities based upon rental and owned property and purchased disparities heavily of an outside or eyeballing where I live in work in District 14 with a mistaken of community identity. To put it another way using rubric living on the wrong side of the tracks as a way to pack the communities carefully together to minimize their impact in the same way is the same as racism or classism by another name. Subsequent talking points on this matter are pointedly vague but the underlying reality is clear. Call boundary 696, 8 mile or the railroad but the rubric being stated had obvious intent for anyone living in the communities. The concerns are valid that a danger to pack COIs is very real. I cannot tell you how many times I have had in the last year conversations along the lines of oh, you live there. That's a bad part of town. None of this changes the constitutional necessity to maintain partisan fairness. These citizens deserve proper representation, and this is your constitutional task. Not to treat them as lessers in need of minimizing. Thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Anthony Skannell. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice, that actually concludes.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay, thank you. That concludes our public comment e-mail public comments to the Commission at redistricting@Michigan.gov. We appreciate everyone who offers public comment in whatever way you choose and invite you to keep sharing your thoughts. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. So the next business on our agenda is 5A legal counsel regarding line drawing. Without objection I will ask legal counsel Nate Fink from Fink Bressack to present. Hearing no objection please proceed Mr. Fink.

>> Nate Fink: Thank you Madam Chairwoman and good morning to all the Commissioners and everyone here. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Commission very briefly.

The agenda you have approved for today indicates that the Commission is going to be addressing some mapping considerations as it relates to some of the maps that you have drafted and are considering making some modifications narrowly tailored modifications in response to the VRA feedback analysis that you have received. Yesterday I spoke a little bit about a suggestion that I had for the Commission as you go into that process. The suggestion being that you perhaps ask your mapping consultants, Mr. Brace, Mr. Stigall, Mr. Morgan, if they have suggestions as you're going through this process later this morning to see if they have suggestions as to how you might make some minor tinkering with some of these maps in order to perhaps identify and include an additional opportunity District in District or districts in those maps.

And, as I said yesterday, these mapping consultants that you have are very, very experienced in doing this sort of thing. And I think that it's appropriate for the Commission to ask them if they have suggestions.

I understand that in the past you have been -- the Commission had been advised to avoid receiving, I think feedback and too much feedback or suggestions from the mapping consultants through the process, going back to 2021. And I just want to be clear that the posture that we are in now, where you are at and what you're attempting to do, the Commission is attempting to do later this morning and over the next couple days here perhaps just today, we will see, I do think that it makes a lot of sense for the Commission at this point to ask your consultants excuse me ask your mapping consultants to provide you with some suggestions.

Now, the decision, the ultimate decisions as to where these lines are drawn is absolutely with this Commission. And exclusively with this Commission. And it's going to be up to the Commission to decide if a suggestion, a suggested modification to a map makes sense and that is going to be in the context of all of the constitutional criteria that we've talked about extensively in the last couple of weeks. And that falls to the Commission. You need to determine and make sure that if a modification is made that it's still from the Commission's perspective complies with the constitutional, all of the constitutional criteria including balancing -- making sure the population numbers balance out. Addressing communities of interest, making sure that you're comfortable with communities of interest in whatever the modified District might be. Looking at the partisan fairness numbers and addressing all of those criteria. That falls to the Commission. That's not the mapping consultants' responsibility and they are not going to do that for you. But they can provide you, I think, I hope, with some suggestions because they're experts and can look at the map and may be able to see things in there you may not be able to see in terms of how you might be able to make some narrowly tailored revisions to some of these maps or maybe all of these maps so that you have some different options that you can present to the public for public comment over the next few weeks that will be up coming.

So but again just to be clear, I think it's perfectly appropriate for the Commission to consult with and ask those mappers to provide some suggestions as you go through this process. Happy to answer any questions, but I just wanted to make that clear. I think I said it yesterday but just wanted to be very clear about it this morning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Mr. Fink. It's nice to have that clarification. Are there any questions for Mr. Fink? I don't see any. So we will move on. Yes, Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes, sorry. I was wondering if you could speak specifically to the numerous comments we received about not using submitted maps. We've had a number of them submitted. And we decided to, because we considered them perhaps

tainted speak to the submitted maps as well as if we had any collaborative redrawing of those maps and whether you consider them still off the table or can we still look at those?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you for the question, Commissioner Andrade. Just to be clear, I never said to the Commission that those are clearly off the table. What I had said was there are risks involved in considering these maps, right? Again, we don't know how the maps were drawn. We weren't -- none of us were in the room while these maps were being drawn. So there is some potential risk involved. Now, some of these maps, the Commission brought in and did some modifications to those. I know the Commission has made a decision or had at least I suppose call it a preliminary decision not to send them to public comment. I want to reiterate what I said before which is the Commission to this point has not set a cap on itself in terms of how many maps it's going to send forward to public comment. And so if in response to public comment that you received through this process, you decide maybe you do want to send some or all of those maps through to the public to hear feedback. And frankly spend some more time considering the pluses and minuses of whether or not you want to ultimately adopt a map that was submitted by an outside group, I think that would be a perfectly fine approach. And, you know, it leaves your options available to you. You can continue that discussion over the next few weeks. And continue, you know, thinking about it and considering the feedback that you receive. And, again, like I never said take these off the table and I'm not saying that now. I don't think I said that before. And I certainly it was not my intention to say that before. It was just to explain that there are risks that the Commission should take into consideration as it relates to the maps that were not drawn, you know, in a public forum like these other maps were.

So I don't know if that is helpful or if that provides any clarity. Commissioner Andrade, just you know like I said, you're welcome to consider them and to think about them. You've received public comment, just, you know, general public comment that you used to then to I think, I know in response to public comment use that and responded to public comment in your collaborative maps and tried to address that. And in a sense it's a form of public comment. And, again, you're not limited at this point to a certain number of maps that you send forward to the public. So Commissioner Lett, do you have a question? Sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, and I will direct this question to you and to mark Braden. Say we get, as we have gotten, a number of maps submitted by various groups who for the better or for the worse have a viewpoint that they want to advance and for hypothetically say we look at that -- a map that a group has submitted and determine and say, well, that map looks pretty good as a cursory review. It doesn't have districts that look like snakes or birds or bat wings or anything like that. But we still don't know exactly, but what the group used in determining how to come up with their various districts. So my question is if we think that this map would be one worthy of

consideration, could we not simply take the map and the districts and then analyze it from the constitutional query that we are supposed to use and go right down through and say, okay, we've got population. We've got communities of interest. We've got contiguity. They are compact. Blah, blah, blah. And do the same thing we are doing with maps that we've drawn from scratch, and we get down to the bottom and say, okay, now we are looking at partisan fairness and we are looking at what the racial population makeup is. Is there anything wrong with that approach? In other words, trying to, my words, not the commentator's words which I am sure will come back to haunt me tomorrow try to sanitize the maps from race and do our own evaluation on them separate and apart from what the presenters, submitters of the map may have done?

>> Nate Fink: You had directed it to me and Mr. Braden. I'm happy to take a crack at it and if Mr. Braden has anything to add I think we can do it that way. Broadly speaking, I think it does make sense for the Commission to do a review of the maps that it's received of considering all of the ranked criteria. And go through that analysis. Have that discussion about whether you believe, you know, any of these maps, maybe all of the maps that you've received are compliant with the understanding that you still have this potential risk hanging out there. But again you don't have to make a decision today or tomorrow or for about a month really as to which of them ultimately which of all these maps you are considering you are adopting. So you have time to factor and balance the potential risks and consider those. And so I do think that it makes sense for you to do a review of these maps that, you know, you have already at least made a preliminary decision to set aside and just have a discussion. And, you know, maybe there is some positive aspects of some of those maps you want to put into one of these other maps that you already have or maybe you just want to push one of those through or all of those through. So I'll see if Mr. Braden has anything to add.

>> Mark Braden: I can talk for a long time, but let me make a couple observations on the comments that you received. One, what the comments show is that reasonable minds can disagree on exactly how to interpret the Voting Rights Act and how to interpret the Court's directions to this Commission.

Every Supreme Court decision on the Voting Rights Act has been at least 5-4. Or lots of them are more fractured than that. So it's a difficult decision-making process. In fact, the only comment that you received, that I fundamentally think is wrong is the comment that you could come up with a plan that everyone gets what they want. That, of course, everybody on the Commission knows is not true. You cannot come up with a plan that will satisfy everybody. That's a given.

So, what to do with the plans you receive from outside sources? Certainly considering them presents no problem as public comment. If you decide to go that route. I think the question of what to put out for public comment and what to consider is basically a question of what time is available for you. Certainly considering these plans, considering them is totally appropriate and walking through the process. At the end of

the process, the concerns of the ones we expressed, you expressed and decided as not to use the plans going forward is the question of whether or not they used race. Because this Court, the courtroom we are in, the direction we got from them, I think pretty much expressly said don't use race.

So what about these plans? If they use race in creating them, does that mean you can't consider them? And I think the answer is you can consider them. And you should certainly go through the process and glean from them what is useful in your decision-making process. I would be concerned if you took them as presented to you if you believe in that race was used in drafting them.

If at the back end of the process if you like the plans or like parts of those plans, that then becomes your decision as to how to do it. Certainly we know now, or we believe now, that race is appropriate to use in narrowly tailoring the plans to get to ones that have equal opportunities to the Black community to elect candidates of choice. In many ways it's a question of timing. Do you have enough time to do that? And do you have enough -- and do you want to put them out for public comment? All of which I think is totally appropriate. Those are really your calls. I think that you have a number of ways in which you can go. If you think that these plans, or particular plans that in part, then, yeah, they become your plans when you make the decisions on them. So I think that there is a degree to which you can use parts of these plans that would be comfortable. But once you do that, somebody is going to raise potentially somebody is going to raise the question as to whether too much race was used, whether race was actually used in the creation of them. So that you just -- it's easier to attack plans that apparently used race in their construction. And that seems to run counter to what this three-Judge panel said.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: As a follow-up, mark and Nate, we could look at these plans, and I believe that I'm correct, we could look at a particular plan that was submitted and say, okay, we don't necessarily like the whole plan, but they have certain districts or certain parts of districts that are intriguing, that we could incorporate it into one or more plans that we've drawn. And as I have used the term we could better up our plans by going in and looking and seeing what some of these submitted plans have used in different parts of the districts that we have to look at. I don't see any problem with that other than what mark and Nate you have already said. Once we do that then they become our plans, which is -- there is nothing wrong with that. I think that insulates us somewhat from the comments that we've been concerned with, that perhaps race predominated a little more than it should have. But we go through and do our own analysis, our own evaluation, our own rundown of the Constitution. And try to use the best parts of everybody's. Thank you.

>> Mark Braden: I think that is a totally reasonable position to take. And it becomes your plan rather than their plan. I think I will say thank you. Given the fact that at least there has been some public expression that these plans were used, created using race,

I think, in fact, you actually have to do something like that. I would be concerned about taking a plan and just deciding you could agree to one of these plans where it's been publicly said that they were created using race. And so if you take a plan that was publicly created using race, we know they used race and you go through this whole process of analyzing it, I think that would be the way to get to using one of these plans that you would need to do the additional steps. I don't think you want, I would be hesitant of compliance if we have plans that were drawn using race, that you didn't go through these other steps that the Commissioner mentioned. If that hasn't confused everybody then I have not done what lawyers do. I mean, it just it is as you heard in the comments, it is a lot of different views on how to comply. But our compliance here is driven by this particular panel's view of the law. And it's not -- we are not debating how I might interpret, you know, the most recent Supreme Court decision. We are bound by this panel's interpretation of where the Court and they have been clear on the limitations and the use of race than some other Court panels, to be candid with you across the country.

But there are a myriad of different views on that issue across this country.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well since the three of us are lawyers it's easy for us to confuse everybody.

>> Mark Braden: Yes. But I do believe that we have some tools. Maybe we can or if the Chairman wants us, we can go on to the sort of next step. I think we have some responses to the Commission's inquiries that Max has done, or Dr. Palmer has done in response to the request from the Commissioners. And there are some additional tools that Kim and team have created which I think will help substantially.

>> Nate Fink: There is one more question and Commissioner Lange's hand is up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: There is Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't have a question I more or less have a comment so if Mr. Braden wants to finish his thought, I can give my comment when he is done.

>> Nate Fink: He was about to transition to the next item here so go ahead and make your comment. Sorry I did not mean to supersede the Chairwoman on that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So my comment is since we are bringing up the outside maps again, I personally, and this is just my point of view I still have problems with it. I think it would be one thing if these were maps based on a community of interest or an individual community of interest or even several. But we are talking full on maps of an entire, you know, 7, 8, 9, 10, up to 15 districts actually they submitted maps for the entire state. This is our job to do the maps, not theirs. And then I think back to the town hall that we just had, and we had a Detroit citizen, I believe his name was Mr. Woods, who also expressed concerns about organized groups drawing the maps and felt like the actual citizens of the areas' voices would be reduced by doing so.

So whatever the Commission decides, I just hope we will keep that in mind, that there are everyday citizens that are concerned that their voices aren't going to be heard

because these bigger groups may have, I'm not going to say motives but may not have their best interests in hand. So I just want all of us to consider, you know, just the individual voices too when we make our decisions. That's all I got thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you Commissioner Lange. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think this is a good topic of discussion. You know, personally I don't have an issue with considering the third-party maps. I don't know if I would consider MSU's map like an advocacy group. But I consider them you know they are a University. They are professionals. I think they surely know more about this than I do. Probably more than most of us do. Now that argument I think could be made for the PTV map possibly. But you know we have to look at this wholistically, right? Like what is best to do? What -- we have to try to figure out how to mitigate the risks while still learning from these maps that the public submitted. Even if we don't pass them, we can still consider them. We can still try to learn things from them. And it could be a way to help us get to the final goal, whatever that may be.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, is there any other discussion on this or questions? Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think this will be resolved when we actually get more into the process. I agree with Commissioner Lange. I also stand behind my Commission if you all want to start to kind of edit and look at certain areas from outside maps. So be it. But I will be honest that is not going to be a process that I will actively be a part of. Simply because I mean it's actually fun for me to listen to people and then look at the map and then look at the comments and look at the map. I like that engaged process. I think as soon as we start the other and as soon as we start even if we are looking at areas of outside maps it does not matter where they come from but particularly other organizations, I'm going to use the word motives because we know also that there are people that particularly in the City of Detroit there is a political warfare just to say that honestly. And people vying for certain areas and wanted to expand their leadership in certain areas. And though that is not our concern or the criteria inevitably when we draw these lines that is a fall out of making some of those discussions. So that is behind the logic of not sweeping whole areas and districts together because you have to think about, again, though that is not what we are tasked with and entering in muddy waters when we have that discussion, there are larger issues of equity, of apartheid, corruption, of all those things that have hurt the City and are behind gerrymandering. So there is a huge call to order with the maps that we are drawing. And once we start using maps to compare or to make improve ours, even though you know they could be integrated changes, I think it sends the wrong message to the people that walk to the corner store to buy bread or get their groceries. It sends the wrong message to the organizations though I respect Black leadership and respect a lot of the organizations outside of, you know, any ethnicity or background in the Detroit and Metro Detroit area. Respectfully we are not listening to them. They

have not done the work we have done the past two years to sit ten hours plus of comment I do not think they should be catapulted to the front of the line and have a voice to impact what we are doing now.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Commissioner Kellom. So if there is nothing else on this subject, our next business is 5B, VRA Hickory analysis. I believe Commissioner Callaghan and Commissioner Weiss requested this. And I believe Dr. Max well palmer is ready to facilitate this item. I think.

>> Mark Braden: He has prepared what I understood and what we understood to be the two requests Dr. Palmer has done analysis of the Hickory plan in the same manner that the other plans were analyzed, and he can explain that. And the other request we understood, and Dr. Palmer has done this is to expand the analysis to include all of Oakland and Macomb counties in the analysis sheet too. So.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We will take those one at a time. So without objection I will ask Dr. Palmer to facilitate this item. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Dr. Palmer.

>> Dr. Palmer: Thank you, good morning. I'm going to share my screen with you. And show you an updated version of the same document that we were looking at yesterday. I don't know if this has been distributed to the Commission yet. But I have sent it on to Mr. Braden and Mr. Brace. So this is the same spreadsheet that we saw yesterday for the Hickory map. All of the variables are exactly as we talked about yesterday. The only difference is the map. The key takeaway, if we look at the column and look at primary turn out is higher for Black voters and white voters, they are looked to be 12 districts where it's higher. There is also one District that I'm counting as not higher but where in one election Black turnout is higher than white turn out but in the other election it's not. And we haven't had that circumstance in any of the new maps we're looking at. This is the first time we've had that arise. So I'm counting that as a no. I think our effort is to always be conservative when we have sort of more mixed evidence leaning towards it not performing but that might be something more marginal. I can Zoom in a bit more to make it easier to see. Are there any questions just on the Hickory analysis?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't see any.

>> Dr. Palmer: I'm going to turn to the expanded analysis. I did this a little bit differently than just including Oakland County. And what I did instead was I looked at the envelope of wane, Oakland and Macomb counties. And included every District that's fully in those three counties. And so there is a depending on the map there might be districts you know that start in Oakland County and go north or go west into other neighboring counties. I'm not including those because that is too far afield from the area we are interested in.

And so just as an example, I'll go to the Spirit of Detroit map. And in this new sheet there are going to be two tabs now for every map. And the first tab just with the name of the plan is looking at the districts in all or in part in Wayne County. The expanded

sheets now include those districts plus districts that might entirely be in Oakland County or entirely in Macomb county as well. So there is a lot more here. Let me Zoom in a little bit more again. So there is two districts that stand out. This is going to be the same in every single map that I looked at. In Hickory, in all of the proposals that I evaluated, and I included this for all 15 of the maps and we are 17 with modifications that we've looked at and not just the maps that the Commission was considering yesterday. In addition to districts all or in part in Wayne County which you are already looking at, there are two districts entirely in Oakland County that perform for Black voters. The first is District 18. This is right at the border of Wayne and Oakland County. And in every map except for one that we analyzed this District has not been changed. So this is the exact same boundaries and population as in the Hickory map. And so we will see that District here. It's District 18. And we will see that it performs under both Black primary turnout and our democratic primary pool.

And then the other District is District 53. And that's also 100% Oakland County. And that is further north, around I believe it's Pontiac. That one has not been changed by any of the maps. And so these results don't actually change how maps perform relative to each other. It adds two performing districts to every single plan that we are talking about. So if a plan we are looking at yesterday had ten performing districts, when you include districts entirely in Oakland County it goes to 12 and that shift is going to be the same for every map that we've looked at. There's no map that created additional performing districts in Oakland County beyond what was already there under the Hickory map and only one map modifies District 18 at all.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So I have a question. So since including these extra counties, districts in these counties add two, so then we can say so Spirit of Detroit then would have 12, but that doesn't solve our problem of it not having 11, Mr. Braden, can you look at my understanding.

>> Mark Braden: You are exactly correct, and I would suggest to you this expansion out that was done gives you more information, but that information is not particularly relevant. It is certainly not material to your decision making. Because all the plans are the same. I think for purposes of the easiest path for you, there is no easy path for you but an easier path you don't need the expansion. It does not give you additional information that-assists you in what you need to do. And so I think it's useful to have it and I looked at it and see that it doesn't change anything. And so I would suggest it's just probably easier to use the original geographic area for analysis. You can include this. But it's basically none of it ever changes anything. So don't do it. Is my suggestion. I think it makes it easier not to include this. But it's solely the Commission's decision.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Eid, you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is that also true for Macomb that same sentiment, Mr. Braden?

>> Mark Braden: Max, is that true because you have done that too.

>> The first District entirely in Macomb that shows up in District 13 it's not anywhere close to performing District with the 17 or 15% Black voting age population. It's not going to perform in the primary or in the pool. There's no Districts in Macomb that I think are relevant to the VRA analysis.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I can understand excluding Pontiac because that is outside of the Detroit Metro area but why would we exclude districts with Southfield and Oak Park because they are within the Detroit Metro area bubble?

>> Dr. Palmer: I'm not excluding them in the expanded analysis. All I'm saying the only District in that area is District 18, which is unchanged in all the maps except one. And in the one that changes it, it continues to perform. So it's now included in this analysis. If you look at the expanded sheet you can see it. But it does not seem like most of the maps are making any changes in that area.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So Mr. Palmer I did not mean with respect to your analysis, I meant with respect to Mr. Braden saying it's not relevant. I know it's included. It was more about the comment it does not change anything and it's not relevant because I certainly think Southfield and Oak Park are relevant because they are part of the Detroit Metro area so I'm wondering what the rationale for that is.

>> Mark Braden: I think you picked up the distinction between relevancy and material. You are exactly right, it's relevant but strikes me as immaterial to your decision making because nobody changes anything ever there effectively. So I don't -- certainly you can consider it. It's relevant in the sense that it's -- you could view it as part of the standard Metropolitan area of Detroit so it's relevant but spending time to include that in your analysis it's kind of not material because it's going to be the same no matter what.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Right, I actually did change it in my map. So are you saying for maps where it was changed it could potentially be material?

>> Mr. Braden: Sure if you have change there that could conceivably be relevant, sure. I don't know. I'm not familiar enough with your map to comment on the degree of changes or anything. I'm guessing that's the one map that, in fact, shows some change although it does not change the effectiveness of the District in any way.

>> Dr. Palmer: If I can show that's correct here. This is the one map, or this is the previous version of it that do make a change to 18. That increased the Black VAP of this District. It was performing under both Hickory and under this there is no additional districts in this area that are now performing. So if we had if under the more limited analysis there were let's say 10 performing and you have 12 functionally expanding the range is going to add two districts everywhere. That said when I provide updates today as the Commission draws and asks for updated analyses, I will include both versions

the Wayne only version and expanded version for every map automatically so that you have this data if you want it.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So to summarize what you are saying is that 18, that is unchanged from Hickory in every map besides Commissioner Szetela's individual map does perform as a VRA District.

>> Dr. Palmer: Yes, that is correct. For example if you look at the Hickory map here, District 18 is majority Black VAP. And we estimate large majorities of Black voters in the primaries for example.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So it performs?

>> Dr. Palmer: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I saw another hand, but I don't see it now. Anybody else have a question? Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I do Cynthia, but I can't get to my...

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I have kind of a broader question about the data in general. So when this was first presented to us, you had mentioned a lot of this is estimates obviously because we don't know what people's ballots actually say. And one of the things you had mentioned was that you selected the primary that had the highest turn out. And so kind of looking back through the data obviously we don't have all of the data under lying this spreadsheet, there is no formulas in it or anything like that. My question for that is: You know, historically what we have received from Dr. Handley and her report when she analyzed turnout was that Black voter turnout and white voter turnout were different depending on the election and that there were in general Black voter turnout tends to be lower than white voter turnout. However, in some kind of particular elections like the election of Barack Obama in 2018 and 2016 and the 2020 Presidential election, those particular elections seem to be highly motivating for the Black community, so the turnout was very high. On the inverse side the white voter turnout in those elections tended to be a little lower than normal. So kind of the range for Black voter turnout in a non-high interest election was typically around 30 to 40%. And in a high interest election it was closer to 60% for white voters, for a kind of standard election, the turnout was, gosh, I have it written down. Let me look real quick. I believe it was kind of average turn out for white voters is around 45, 46% with actually I'm sorry no the average is around 60% so quite a bit different with the lowest turnout in those same elections that tended to attract or be highly motivating to Black voters, their turn out was lower at 45%. So my question is: How did you decide what was the highest turnout primary and the highest turnout for whom? Because it seems like there is a disparity between when a white voter turnout would be high and when a Black voter

turnout would be high. And so how did you resolve that difference and how did you make those estimates as to what the high turnout election was?

>> Dr. Palmer: That is a great question, and I will try to break it up into a couple different pieces. First political scientists studied turnout in countless papers. One thing that is really challenging as you mentioned is that turnout is a function of who decides to vote, which will vary from election to election. Vary based on candidates on the ballot and how competitive it is. We are trying to get our best estimate of turnout at the county level. And so for every precinct we don't actually know in say 2022 what the turnout rate was. We actually have is the number of votes cast in the democratic primary. Presumably most people turning out in the primary cast a vote in one of the contests. It does not really make sense to imagine turning out for the primary and not voting for anybody. But there is a slight variation. Maybe I have a House Congressional primary and a House primary and vote in one and not the other most people don't but a little bit of that. We look how many votes were cast on the primaries that happened on the exact same day. In some precincts there is only one primary that day, maybe only one District is contested. In others it's possible there were three primaries for the Senate and Congress at the same time. Whichever is the highest number of votes cast is what we are going to use. In our estimates. So it's really not going to make a difference, it's usually a small number of votes across them but that is going to reflect the people who actually turned out to vote. Then we can use that to then estimate what share of that Electorate were Black and white in each primary.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So my particular concern is about District 17 where it's so close to the wire. So from what I understand, from what you just said, that really you're estimating who turns out and based on that then estimating that balance in the primary. So I think Commissioner Callaghan kind of hit on this point last night. It's kind of an estimate on an estimate. And we actually would need to look at actual data especially for these districts where they are very, very close if it would actually perform. Is that a fair statement?

>> Dr. Palmer: No. There is not actual data for these districts necessarily to say that. If we are redrawing districts that are going to have had parts of the districts had different primaries in past years and so we can't just combine turnout that way again. And there's not some actual data out there of turnout by race that we could reaggregate to these new boundaries in order to say what turnout would have been if such data existed that is what we would have done initially because we don't have that kind of data available here. We have to estimate it. That's the best we can do.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Right, no, no, no I understand I was just speaking right now we are looking at estimates but in the future we could potentially have actual data analyzing the districts as they are configured and again you would be making an estimate of what people's ballots said because we don't know that specifically but that is

my point. Right now they are estimates because we don't have the actual data and won't have the actual data until elections are taken.

>> Dr. Palmer: Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, any other questions for Dr. Palmer? Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, I would just like to add one thing to Dr. Palmer's comments.

What's important from our side, from a mapping purpose is these calculations are done down at the precinct level and that precinct level information is what goes into the mapping system. So while Dr. Palmer is correct in terms of which primary is higher and that sort of thing, we are utilizing down to the precinct level, which I think he is too because he's using our data set. So it's getting down to the very, very small level. It's not necessarily -- it's not until after you're line drawing, you are aggregating to the larger districts so the purposes of at least having some good data down at the precinct level, that's been incorporated into the data set that we've created.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. Anything else on this topic? Okay so our next business is 5D, the VRA effectiveness plans. Without objection, I will ask Mr. Kim Brace to facilitate this item. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Mr. Brace.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, Madam Chairman, thank you very much. What we have done is taken the excellent data from Dr. Palmer and put it into a map form for the purposes of helping you all starting to look at what, where some territory is you need to be looking at. I'm just attempting to share. There we go. Let me show you some of these maps.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We are not seeing your screen. I think we are seeing Dr. Palmer's screen. Thank you.

>> KIM BRACE: Yep. I am.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Now we can see it.

>> KIM BRACE: Okay, great. So what we have, let me expand it a little bit so that you can see overall, what we have done is taken Dr. Palmer's data and mapped it out on each of the plans. So I'm showing you the Daisy-2 plan. That's the one that had 12 districts that were affected. And the other ones are less than 12. But I wanted to start off with this to kind of get you and give you an understanding of where things are. What we have done is we have shown in the color scheme on the map between yes and no are African/Americans majority of primary turnout? That is utilizing Dr. Palmer's information to look at the districts. So we see that the effective districts on that side are the ones in green. And we see them as a label, we've added on the estimate of the District in the democratic primary. So what this does is lets us, given Dr. Palmer's data see, where African/Americans are majority and where they are not as it relates to the democratic primary turnout.

So what it lets us do is start looking at spatially where things are. So, for example, if you look at District 8, you see African/American turnout of 80% compared to whites in the territory. They only constitute 12%. If you look at districts that tend to cross the line, you've got District 12 in this plan where African/Americans are 68% of the democratic

primary and whites are 16%. If you look at, flip it the other way for example, District 7 up here, you have whites constituting 54% of the democratic primary. And African/Americans constituting only 9.4%. You can end up starting to see some areas that might be of use and interest. One of the things that we noticed is that this configuration of District 11, you see African/Americans are just a plurality and whites are 30%. So African/Americans are 32%. There is a basic conflict between a yes and a no in this configuration of District 11. We will see that differently in other configurations of District 11. But District 11 is that Grosse Pointe area that is of concern and of use to understand a little bit about what's going on. And it does change as you put different territories in.

Also take a look at District 26. 26 down here is of course outside of the area that we are talking about. But it is dead even in terms of African/Americans and whites in terms of turnout in the democratic primary. I'm not suggesting that gets changed. I'm saying it's a real toss up from the minority side. But it's already pretty well there on that side. I'm sure there's other whites that are voting for African/American candidates in that area. And so that may be helpful on that side.

You take a look at something like District 3 in this configuration, whites really are a larger percent of the primary than African/Americans are. But you see differences in other maps in this whole territorial issue.

What this lets us do then is look towards helping you focus where there might be some changes possible. So if we look instead, for example, let me bring up the Tulip plan to show you just kind of the opposite of where things are. The Tulip plan ends up in this whole area north of 8 mile run. 8 Mile Road. You see that whites are majority in both 7, 14 and 13 in those districts. District 11, in this configuration that crosses over the border have African/Americans as a majority. So if you wanted to look towards making changes in areas, look along the edges of where things are changing and fluctuating in terms of effectiveness. In this configuration in Tulip, District 1, which goes into some of Detroit, you still have whites being a majority, which is why this is shown as a no in that effectiveness map.

10 ends up pulling back from the Grosse Pointes. And goes up into above 8 Mile Road. And whites have a much larger share in that District configuration.

We have prepared maps of each of the plans for you, not only the six that we looked at or you narrowed down yesterday. But we have now gone and expanded it to include all of the maps that you have in consideration. I think there is 13 or 14, something like that. We have created maps of each of them. And I would be prepared to show these to you as you look at whichever plan you want to and how you might want to think in terms of changing it if you're going to make changes to it.

This hopefully is a useful tool to you all to help focus your direction. That was what our goal was to give you some clues on where you might want to look towards making changes.

Let me show you one other piece. The Spirit of Detroit map. If we look at Spirit of Detroit map, Zoom it out a little bit, here is in District 11 that crosses the 8 Mile Road, you get an African/American District in District 11. But District 6 and 14 and 13 all north of the road does not produce an African/American effectiveness seat. And you can see those numbers. You also see that 18 is showing effectiveness as has been noted before. And District 10, which goes north of the road, now has a strong white majority, not necessarily an African/American support.

So these are tools to help you in looking at maybe focusing where you could make changes. Because that's part of the exercise now of what kind of changes you want to do. So we've produced these maps to look at each of the plans and let you see where changes might be suggested on that side. And how they might be configured.

I see Commissioner Szetela has a question.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, and this might not be necessarily for you, Mr. Brace. I don't know if Mr. Braden is still on the phone. So kind of to Anthony's point if we are not counting District 18 because it's in Oakland County, this map, the Spirit of Detroit would only have 10 current districts which means it needs to add one more. But if we are counting 18 as being within kind of that bubble of Metro Detroit, then this map has 11 opportunity to elect districts and would pass that VRA analysis. So I'm just trying to understand with respect to like this map, does this map still need changes? Or can we rely on that 18 as part of or District 18 excuse me, as part of the overall count? Or does this map require additional changes?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Braden?

>> Mark Braden: It's my view if you use -- let me close my door here. So I don't get background noise. There we go. Well, this sort of goes to the question of what we want to do the analysis on. If we expand this map out to include the additional districts, in other words we include the whole other county into this analysis and ultimately you still need to increase this by one. You are just changing the number at which you are aiming at. We are aiming at 11 because we are not including that. We are not including Black districts or candidate of choice Black districts in this analysis. If you include it in the analysis you go from desire to get to potentially get to 11, change it to 12. So it's effectively doesn't change anything. I mean, sure, you can include it. But it's sort of the same across all plans.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, and that is correct. And you see this in the Daisy-2 map. You do have 12 districts that are effective. If you count up all the green. And so that becomes kind of the new benchmark while the other one's Spirit of Detroit is down at 11 districts. The two Bergamot are at 10. The Tulip and Water Lily are at 10. All of that. So you're just raising the floor to a certain degree, but as Mark points out it's kind of an even moving up of the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So then just to confirm we still need to add one more District to the Spirit of Detroit?

>> Mark Braden: That would be the safest, yes. Is the answer. Again, these are all of my answers are a little bit gray because there's a point at which, you know, you look at this and you get a District that's close to majority Black turnout in the primary. Then reasonable people can look at that and say it's likely to provide an equal opportunity. We are trying here to offer a way to have a higher degree of security under the Voting Rights Act and the highest degree of security is having more plans where the Black there is a Black majority of turnout in the primary. Certainly there is a good argument to be made if you get close that reasonable people can look at that and say, yeah, that is an equal opportunity. So the safest way is to have an additional plan that would be an additional District that would be turned green. But I'm certainly prepared to argue that the plans that contain 10 green districts and other districts which are very close, I'm happy to argue to the Court that that works. It's we are talking about probabilities to some degree. This is often the type of discussion one has with a client that's outside the public domain. But the reality here is we are looking, we are at a stage of talking about probabilities of analysis. As you heard this morning, there were what I assume to be totally competent, good lawyers taking a different position on some of these issues because it's cloudy. The safest place, the easiest to defend would be to add as an example an additional District that is green in color. For use of a better term for it. That was a lot of talking.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So just to kind of follow-up on that, does it have to be specifically in Metro Detroit? Like so just on this map you see District 26, you know, if we were to flip District 26 even though it's not within the Court's order would that still be acceptable or are we kind of stuck with having to do something with 10 or 3 or 15?

>> Mark Braden: I'm going to be unpleasantly vague here too. It's clearly the easiest thing to do is to do it within what I would say is the standard Metropolitan that are close to touching the districts. The Court says changing the districts that are unconstitutional and obviously that means you have to change some other districts. So that does seem to cabin it. And I think it's cabined. I know you can't draw a new plan for the whole state. So you are limited because you have a whole variety of other limitations in your Constitution on how to draw plans. So we are talking here about a remedy of the specific findings. So the further out you go geography wise you do in the more vulnerable it is to not complying with the Court's order. So as much as the geography should be cabined, the degree of cabining really that becomes a balancing act to some degree for the Commission. If you could solve the problem by something that was very close and maybe a little further afield, I'm not going to say that that wouldn't be acceptable. The closer geographic, the tighter the geographic changes are, the easier it is to say it's a remedial plan and meets the Court order.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay thank you I am sorry I know I ask hard questions.

>> Mark Braden: No, the answers are, sad to say are vague. That's the reason why is I'm sure you have heard many times, there is so much litigation in this area because it's not the law just isn't real clear.

>> KIM BRACE: Let me, before Commissioner Eid goes forward, let me give an example here. I've pulled up the Spirit of Detroit map. And what we see here is that most of the area around the outer edge is overwhelmingly white in population. And not real strong African/American seats next to it. Except if you look down here in District 3 and District 4. Here might be an area of looking at how you could end up looking at these two districts in this Spirit of Detroit map to make the four being a little bit less African/American and the three being a little bit more African/American. It's not to be saying that this is necessarily the exact solution. But it is kind of what you want to take a look at in what these maps might tell you and where you might be able to start in making changes from that standpoint.

>> Mark Braden: Let me say one thing here, insert myself for just a second. Kim's observation is 100% correct. And we created, as you may remember, another chart that we have been looking at or talking about as much which is the dot matrix that shows the different level of districts based upon total voting age population. This one, I'm not sure my camera works well enough, but I think everybody knows what I'm talking about. So if you look at the Spirit of Detroit, you have a District that is sort of heavily 85% turn out. I'm guessing that is a high, I'm sure four is close to or maybe more than 90% Black VAP District. In addition to our analysis as the performance side of this, I can tell you that people doing voting rights analysis in talking about whether plans are fair or not, one of the standard things they look at is whether districts are packed, or not. And a lot of different views as to what packs are or not but 85% Black District I will tell you, and I will make a prediction here, Dr. Grofman will look at that and his initial reaction to that District will be that that's a problematic District and it looks to be packed. It has many more Black citizens that are necessary to elect a candidate of choice. Now, that's I'm not telling you that would invalid date the plan or whatever, but that is another consideration which is the reason why we did that chart. There is -- that is an issue. Now, we are in Detroit. So the geography of Detroit naturally leads you to districts which have very high Black population because the City has very high Black population. So I'm not saying that District is in and of itself makes the plan invalid. I most certainly don't believe that. I can tell you that is the classic indicia that political scientists will point to and say, oh, the plan is unfair because the districts were drafted in as a racial gerrymander and you know if you divided them up, the Black community would have an easier opportunity to elect the candidate of choice. So that is the reason why we created the dot matrix. And certainly the districts, the plans which have very high Black percentages, those are the types of districts that political scientists doing these types of analysis will kind of that will jump out at them. I'm not saying it's decisive or it's the end

of the analysis. But certainly it's the area that will raise concern, likely to raise concern with Dr. Grofman to be straightforward.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Can we go back to the Spirit of Detroit map again?

>> KIM BRACE: Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I mentioned yesterday I knew there were -- we could fix this map and add another District. And to me there is actually two ways we can do it. We could go into Dearborn which is District 3.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela, can I ask you to wait, the next thing on our list is mapping considerations. So maybe we can talk about that then because we have a couple other hands for this discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, are we still going to have Mr. Braden and Mr. Brace at that time?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I believe so.

>> Mark Braden: I have a comfortable Chair and maybe another cup of coffee but it's not that far away.

>> KIM BRACE: I'm here all day.

>> Mark Braden: I'm here all day.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I may not be, but we can look at 10 and 12 to fix that but disrupted other communities of interest. So there are solutions that are going to involve hard choices, that is all.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have a few questions. You keep saying this 11 number with the analysis yesterday. Now we added a couple so the floor on them have raised is what we have seen only because we are comparing it to Daisy, right? If you were to compare it to Hickory, the original map, well if you compare it to Hickory, Hickory has even more VRA compliant districts because that is why we drew it that way, to comply with the V RA. So would all of them be deficient if the bar or it's a comparison is what I'm trying to say, correct? You are comparing these maps to other maps. But how do we know which number is right? Is ten right? Is 11 right? Is 12 right? Is 13 right? To me it just seems like it depends what the control group is you are comparing it to.

>> Mark Braden: You are absolutely correct in the sense it depends. But let me say a couple things. One I will tell you that I will use the distinction again here it is certainly relevant to your consideration to look at what you did in Hickory. But it's absolutely immaterial because it fails the first part of the analysis. The Hickory plan, the Court has told us the districts are not reasonably configured. So a District that's not reasonably configured, which is what this Court has told us of these districts are makes that 12 number irrelevant. Doesn't matter how many theoretical districts you can draw, simply trying, we could go and use one of the computer systems and come up with a plan that certainly would be able to draw 12 districts, maybe even 13, who the hell knows by ignoring all the various criteria and making it the paramount consideration. That is what

the Court concluded. So we know for sure that the Hickory plan is, in fact, not a consideration and provides now guidance to us as to how many districts here.

The numbers are just tools for you. Yet which gives you a notion of how people both the courts have traditionally, and political scientists have looked at these. And these numbers provide you a notion as to what is available to be done. So these are tools for you to put into the context of everything else. So what -- if you adopted one of the plans something along the line that had ten districts I'm quite happy to argue to the Court that it complies especially if you have additional districts that are close and appear to be close to likely to be as an example, this is majority test we have here and this is the safest most conservative way to look at it. Equal opportunity well by definition if the Black community is turning out more than 50% in the primary election then it's clear they have an equal opportunity to win that primary, might in reality may not be equal opportunity and may be five candidates for the Black community or whatever but as a matter of the plan the plan clearly provides. Okay if you have a District that's 45% of African/American turnout, is that -- is the Black community likely to control that democratic primary? Well, the answer to that is I don't need to be don't need to take my socks off to do the math here, yeah, it's pretty likely that most of the time that 45% there will be sufficient white cross over voting to make that work. So I don't view necessarily the 11 as being an absolute number. You need to balance it. The safest plans are the ones that are on 11 so it's easier to explain to the master and to the Court that it clearly is here but if you get close and existing plans are close and you balance them against all your other requirements and the answer is yes so I don't think there is an absolute magic number. I can tell you there are failing numbers and all the plans that could read 8 have no chance of passing in my view muster. The ones that have nine unless you get some other additional Districts that are like and very close, the ones at nine I think are going to be very difficult to defend. Ten, yeah, certainly I think there is going to be an argument if you come up with a plan that has ten primary majority Black districts and you have one or two other ones that are close, then I think you can look at that and say, yeah, the Black community probably does have an equal opportunity to elect their candidates and probably will. And it's likely will. As I've said all along, it's not a chemistry experiment. And so the numbers provide you guidance. But you're also going to get guidance in your public comments and from your personal experience. Some of you know these districts and you live in them, or you know about them. And so the numbers provide you guidance but they're not to be all end all of this analysis. Your judgments on this is very important and the judgment of the people commenting on them is very important. Did that help you at all? I mean, I keep babbling on.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You know, what I heard is mainly that you're comfortable with that.

>> Mark Braden: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, you know, these are complicated conversations.

>> Mark Braden: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have just two more questions. We've heard previously that Middle Eastern folks are also VRA protected. So.

>> Mark Braden: I think that is probably right, I think that is a tricky question for sure, but I think the answer to that is yes. I would -- that would be my opinion although I'm not sure I can point you necessarily to a Court that has held that point.

I think people have discussed it and I think it's a logical. But I just don't know if the Middle Eastern first of all I don't know what the definition would be of a Middle Eastern community. And I don't know whether they are politically cohesive, so I don't -- I don't know. I don't know obviously Egypt in the middle east. And I'm not sure as an example we have Israel immigrants I'm sure in the Metropolitan area, would they be politically cohesive with Palestinians in your community? Probably not. So it raises some tricky questions. But I think basically you're correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The reason I ask is because, you know, we know District 3 and District 15 say white but we know that's they say white because there's no check box for people of Arab American Middle Eastern north African dissent so I would caution against changing those. Also on the same vein 1 and 2, Black and white and know there are significant Spanish and Latino races there. Which kind of brings me to the next question on how is it, you know, best to do this. Because it looks like 26 is pretty close. But and it looks like just adding some population to there would flip that. But 26 isn't close to any of the districts that we have to draw. That we were ordered to redraw. So when we are talking about community of interest, when we are talking about increasing the chances that the courts picks our map and not special master's map, how do you -- would you say it's safer to try to do this by looking at the districts that we do have to change? Like 10, 12, 13? Or districts we don't have to change.

>> Mark Braden: Well, I do -- it depends specifically on what the changes are and how you come to them. That is the real analysis. All things being equal, which of course they're not, but assuming we live in an alternative universe where everything was equal the narrow the changes are the better you would be. And changing it but everything is not equal and ultimately the judgment here, are you lucky Commissioners, there is no way around the difficult step of trying to sort of balance these. Absolutely, it's -- I know what is easiest for me to defend. It's easiest for me to defend plans that have 11 or more districts as to why they comply with the Voting Rights Act. I think it's quite possible to defend ones that have 10. If you have other arguments as to why you are at 10. As such as the other districts will perform because we heard it from the community. We looked at it and if 40% of or 45% of the democratic primary is Black and we are just going to think that it's likely they are going to control that. That is a totally logical thing to do. And but you need or have all these balance and considerations, sure. We have not factored in, in our VRA analysis in any way, shape or form Hispanic communities. That's a, you know, obviously you members of the

Commission have considered that to some degree. And but that's, you know, that complicates it in very difficult ways to figure out and simply the sort of traditional Black-white voting rights litigation. And you're exactly right. The question of very valid question of the interest of what appears to be from what I understand second hand just listening to your discussions that there is thought to be or is a Middle Eastern community that would identify itself. And that's an important, very important consideration on this. So you have to balance all of these different thoughts. I can only tell you what is easier to defend. 11 is easier to defend than 10. I do think it's not 8 plans I can't defend. Those I will just tell you straight up are very likely to be decided to be on violation of the Voting Rights Act. I think nine plans are hard, I could maybe in certain circumstances argue they comply with the Voting Rights Act. 10 and more are just easier and more likely to be accepted by the Court. But how you get to those numbers, that's the hard job that you have. As much babbling as I'm doing, the hard job is for you, the Commissioners to make these tough balancing decisions.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Just one comment on these numbers. I know you say the Hickory assessment is not relevant. But it does show a progression which is informative.

>> Yes.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: It shows if you draw a map based mostly on race you get a whole lot of opportunity districts. We know that's not legal. The next progression is that if you draw a map considering race heavily you don't get as many when you consider mostly race but you get a lot. That is what Promote the Vote did and what the Trillium maps did and came up with 11 because they considered race from the get-go. Daisy is the next one now and realize Daisy-2 barely, barely made it in. It was on the borderline of being compliant and not compliant with VRA. Daisy was drawn with making as few changes as possible to Hickory. So it was heavily constrained by the previous illegal map. And so it barely scooted in. So again there is a racial taint to Daisy that I think is still there. The best map we have that scores the highest that was drawn race blind is Spirit of Detroit. I think there are ten numbers pretty defensible if you think about it from that perspective. Perhaps we can tweak it and improve it and get it to 11. But just based on the fact of where it sits in that progression of totally completely race tainted to having race be a strong consideration or a taint to the map that we drew I think Spirit of Detroit is the first one that comes up that doesn't have any of those issues.

>> Mark Braden: Seems to be totally correct to me. Your analysis on that. It's, you know, to do what the Court expressly said to us, which is don't use race, it's easiest to defend plans based upon a starting point where you didn't use race. I'm not saying you can't do it other ways. But that your progression makes total sense, and it shows the reality of what is involved. If you really focus on race, what a shock you can create

more districts that perform if that is your principal consideration. And the courts told us that can't be our predominant consideration. That is the Court's position. And so we live in the universe that has to what the Court has told us to do. We need to do it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I just need some clarification with respect to District 3 which is Dearborn. So I think you kind of touched on this, but I want to make sure imperfectly understanding. So in order for us to say there is a potential that Arab Americans could fall under the VRA but in order for us to make that determination wouldn't we have to go through the Gingles factors and determine you know is there a compact minority group? Which actually in Dearborn Arab Americans are not minority but is there a minority group, do white voters typically vote as a Black to prevent candidates of choice from being elected? Wouldn't we have to go through those before we could come to the point where we say this is a community that needs to be preserved and having not done that analysis and not having it there wouldn't the VRA concerns of the Black Detroiters take precedence over a community of interest?

>> Mark Braden: You don't need to go through all the Gingles steps for you to consider any community one that you want to protect. That is a decision for you. In other words, let me use a totally different community. I've heard in a discussion some discussions and I don't know the details of LBGT community in northern Detroit or maybe up into across the lines there. And you have used that at least in some discussions I've heard as a community you think should stay together in a District. Is there any voting rights consideration in the sense of the Voting Rights Act there? And I would tell you the answer is, no. But that doesn't mean you shouldn't -- you can't rationally decide that is an interest you decide to protect. You are exactly right. Could there be a voting rights claim if you divided up a community Middle Eastern community? And the answer is I think probably the answer to that is yes, if as you rightfully point out you go through all the Gingles steps. That is, is it large enough and geographically compact enough and can you get a reasonable configured District around that community, do they vote as a block? And are their candidates subject to majority white population regularly defeating their candidates. So for a voting rights claim, yes, you have to go through all the Gingles steps, but you don't have to go through all the Gingles steps for you to decide that you want to do that because that is the community you recognize as a logical community of interest. So.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, good discussion. Is there anything else on this? .

Okay, thank you for all your answers, Mr. Braden.

>> Mark Braden: I'm not sure everybody thinks that way but yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Next on our agenda is mapping considerations. So without objection I will ask Mr. John Morgan to facilitate each of these items. We have them listed as starting on the agenda as starting with Daisy-2. And I believe that Mr. Morgan

can provide insights for the Commission to consider. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so, again, based on the discussion with your legal counsel, I am helping you work towards drafting narrowly tailored District that address this. And I can bring up Daisy-2 and look at it. One of the first ways to do this is to use, and I will share my screen now, we will use the maps that Mr. Brace showed us. All right.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I feel like as we do this, we can kind of have a discussion as to, well, yesterday we kind of already decided we will send forward these six maps to the public for consideration or for comment. But then we can have a discussion as to whether we want to make any changes and send that version forward as well is what I'm thinking. Unless somebody has a different thought on it. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I thought to get to that point we had to like, you know, a Commissioner had to say I want this map to go to the next round for public comment on February 2nd or whatever. And then we debate a vote of that. Is that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We can do that. I just to move us forward yesterday, I just suggested we just send all of these maps for public comment and then any other if we make any other versions, we can send those too. But we can revisit all of them and vote on them one by one or we can vote on and say as a block we want them to go forward. Whatever people want. Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I think that we should send them all forward now and have them posted and let the public see them.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would second what Commissioner Vallette says. Rather than making tailored changes right now why don't you see what the public thinks about them as is. And then if you need to go in and make tailored changes make the tailored changes, it just seems to make more sense.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: The only question I have, I agree sending them forward I think is a good idea. But I guess are we sending these forward that are on the website now or on our portal? And, if so, I think we do have a couple that need some adjustments in population. When I looked this morning, I believe there is Daisy has the change that I made the other day. It still doesn't show up, the Spirit of Detroit is okay. Water Lily version seven has a couple districts that are out of whack. Version three and I think it's five or seven, not seven, or, no, version three on the 26th and version 3 on the 24th are okay.

Bergamot is okay. Bergamot 2 is okay, and Tulip needs some adjustments.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay well, I would suggest since we have this time now and we have everyone on board, we could use this time and Mr. Morgan to look at each of these maps on the agenda. And we can fix the population discrepancies if any and see federal government we want an amendment, but it would be a different version. I think

we should, well, we should make sure that the population is good for all of the ones that we send to the public. But if we are going to make changes beyond the population, then we should make another version of that map to also or to also consider sending.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Would that be a correction though of the map versus creating a new version?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think just to fix the population deviation I think that would just be a correction.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Okay sounds good.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yeah, thank you. Just Commission just to kind of reiterate the purpose of this discussion for the agenda is to take a look at in light of the counsel that we received from our Voting Rights Act counsel, in light of the feedback and analysis we received from Dr. Palmer. Mr. Morgan at your direction is going to provide some insights on how some of those can be adjusted. So it's really looking at the seven ranked redistricting criteria and being deliberate, building a record why we are moving these maps forward. None of these maps have been formerly moved forward and just considered as doing a deeper analysis. And so that's what is taking place at this time. So please go through this process in turn to ensure that it is following the 7 ranked District criteria. Go through this process as relates to the opportunity districts. Because we don't want to send a map to the public that's going to need more changes. The maps that you vote for whether it's today or tomorrow need to be as close as perfect as possible so that you're only making narrowly tailored changes as Mr. Fink said at the beginning of our discussion. Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, I will go back to sharing my screen. Okay, so what I was pointing out is just looking at the Daisy-2 plan. You asked me to bring that up and I was just going to again start with what Mr. Brace had shown, which is the effectiveness map. So just doing a quick count, if you include 18, you have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, if you take out 18 you have 11. So that is kind of where we were in discussing these districts.

One of the things I would point out is as we look at these several plans, you can refer back to some districts that exist in other plans. So, for example, this District 5 and this District 6 are carried forward from Hickory. They were not specifically struck down by the Court. And while I'm not saying you have to recreate this District exactly; you do know that a District that is configured in this way for 5 and 6 or close to this way would probably show up as an effective District. So that is just something to think about as we look at other plans. And in this Daisy-2, you have a District 14 that shows up as effective and a District 13 and a District 12 that show up as effective. As we look at other plans you can reference districts you know perform. So the other thing I will do is I'm going to switch to Autobound. And so in the Autobound program this is the Daisy-2

map. And what I wanted to point out to the Commission is this now has the racial data in the matrix, which was what was requested. And the designation I put on that is J because basically behind the scenes the letter J is referencing the matrix that has the racial data, the previous version we were looking at did not have the racial data. So at this point the first question I have is do you want to make any changes to Daisy-2?

>> CHAIR ORTON: My comment is, no. Because it seems to be good on all the numbers. And comply. So I think we could move on to another one. But does anyone else have a different opinion? I don't see any. So can we just make sure while we have this one that all of the population deviation is good? Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I just had a quick question. John, could you switch back to that other map that you had up just before this one? That showed the District? Mr. Braden was talking about having high numbers. This has 80% versus 12 would that be a problem maybe?

>> MR. MORGAN: I want to point out Commissioner Weiss I point out here this is not the voting age Black population, which I think is what we were referring to before. This number is the estimated Black turnout percentage in the primary. So this goes back to Dr. Palmer's spreadsheet. So let's see you said that was District 8. So here on District 8 that would show up here. So I believe that's the estimated number here that we are looking at, the 80%.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Okay I was just curious. I wasn't sure, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Just a quick question why is 11 blue? On this map?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so my guess is that if we go back to the spreadsheet and we look at 11, it shows up on the -- remember when we had this discussion of the primary turnout there were two metrics that Dr. Palmer talked about. The first metric was the Black versus white turnout estimated turnout in primary. You have 45 versus 51 in 2018, 45 versus 51 in 2022. And so it gets a no on the primary turnout. And so therefore this is the one that's on the theme. However, what we are looking at on those numbers is the electorate by race and party. In this case it is the potential primary pool, which is what we are identified here that Dr. Palmer talked about. So in that sense it doesn't meet the test -- I'm sorry, it does meet the test, I lost my place, there it is, okay, so it does meet the test there. So the number on the map is 32 versus 30 which is the primary pool. Which is a single number. If you use this, you would be using potentially two numbers. So as Dr. Palmer pointed out in his determination of giving these a yes he has looked at both numbers and, sorry, this one here is 11. So he is looking at both numbers and in this case both of them are not majority, so you have Black turnout is behind white turnout in 18 and in 22. So it gets a no. But if you look at it on the potential it's right on the edge. So this could be an instance where Mr. Braden was saying you know you could look at this District and say arguably there is some opportunity there. And you look at the potential primary.

>> KIM BRACE: If I can add, John is very much correct in that and that is why we have colored it a little bit differently in looking at this and particularly for this plan. And attempting to note the distinction between those two columns being yes in one and no in the other is an important consideration. And so we are just trying to show the degree of differences on this regard.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Okay thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is a box here outlined in purple. I don't know if that is what Mr. Brace was referring to where it gets a no from the first version, but it gets a yes on the second version considering the primary pool as opposed to the primary actual turnout.

>> KIM BRACE: That is correct. That is the additional distinction that we attempted to show in that side. So you could tell that there was some difference compared to the other ones by having that box around it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I have a question about that. For Mr. Braden. When we -- so we are trying to get, you know, to 11. You can keep that screen up, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: You bet.

>> CHAIR ORTON: If we try to get to 11 and this map that we are looking at happens to be at 11. But if we are talking about this type of a District, District 11, is the Court or, yeah, the Court I guess, are they going to be looking at these numbers? I don't think so from this analysis. I think they will be looking at just the numbers that are on the matrix normally in Autobound which comes from just census and political data. So they will be looking at like Black VAP and things like that. Or which numbers do we need to for sure know are in the right category?

>> Mark Braden: Well, first of all, I believe, in fact, I'm going to recommend this, we can do it a different way I guess, but I don't think there is any question that we will be providing to the master all the data, which the Commission now has. In other words, everything we or you've got, everything that Kim has, we sent to the master. So and we have people who I mean for want or, Kent, and maybe John, I think both of them, and I know Kim, all three of them have actually worked with Grofman so they can tell you what Bernie is going to actually ask him for but basically it's going to be everything you have gotten. So the Daisy plan my memory is that the Daisy plan is the only one that shows a difference between the two metrics. The Daisy plan is the only plan that has one more District that has a higher demographic democratic primary poll versus the actual democratic primary turnout. The turnout number is sort of the, I would suggest is a better analysis or arguably a better analysis than the poll number. But to be candid with you the poll number, if you have the number of blacks in a District who are eligible to participate in a democratic primary or majority, I think there is a pretty strong argument that that District provides an equal opportunity to the community to elect. But if you want to really look at the way it's usually looked at it's usually a turnout question. It usually includes a turnout question. So the safest basis for analysis is probably a

democratic primary turnout race based on numbers. The other ones I think are relevant. But I don't think and again when we get to relatively small numbers of differences, the data is good and the analysis is well done, it's the best that can be done I think right now. With that said, these are -- they include wiggle room. They include, you know, that. So these are approximate numbers even though they appear as percentages out to decimal point. And, you know, the actual numbers will, in fact, be somewhere around those numbers but not exactly on those numbers. So in all likelihood. So it's, you know, this is one of those things where close enough is probably close enough.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you for that answer. So did anyone think that they wanted to do anything with Daisy-2 besides check and make sure that the populations are all within deviation, please? Which I think they must be.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Check on the 7 ranked Districting criteria, Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so population is good.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, let's try it this way. Focusing on the population and then I will -- okay so I think the simplest way is just to go down the list and just make sure the districts are accounted for here. And we are looking for -- so the overall plan deviation is 4.96. So we know that the largest District is 59 and the lowest is 21. So all the districts are within those bounds. So if we look at 59, which is not one we did that is negative 2.48. And then 21 is positive 2.47 so that means that all the other Directors are between those two bounds. So that should satisfy your deviation question. If we look down the list 123 you can see the ones that are in this area, they are either within the plus or minus 2.5.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you. Then geographically contiguous you already ran the contiguity check, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: I did. I did that, yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, and then communities of interest. And we know that this plan is the one that was done with all the districts locked besides the 7 that we had to change. So we -- though that there was some compromises we had to make with communities of interest to get them to fit into the area that we had. Does anyone else want to say something about that? Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I just want to reiterate the third criteria is reflect the state's diversity and communities of interest. So I really want to make sure the public knows it's the and, not an either/or.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes, I thought this one was the least likely to reflect the communities of interest and/or the state or diversity.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Because of the constraints we had.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Because of the constraints, correct.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I agree with that. It also doesn't take in a lot of the public comments that we heard around Oak Park Royal Oak Township, Ferndale and Palmer Woods. And I can't tell but may split up Cornerstone morning side the community there many Harper Woods or right by Grosse Pointe. So I don't think it does a very good job of representing the community of interest or public comments we received mainly due to constraints of not changing districts.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So the next one, this District shall not provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party. So we ran the partisan fairness numbers on all of these plans, and they were all about the same. And about the same as our original Hickory. So I think we can say true to that.

Districts shall not favor or disfavor incumbent elected officials or candidates. We did not consider that at all. So that qualifies. And districts shall reflect consideration of county, City, or Township boundaries. I think the same could be said as was said for communities of interest, we were working within the constraints of just the 7 districts that were struck down. So we can only give so much consideration to that.

And then districts are reasonably compact. I think the same goes for that. We were working within the bounds of the Court, they gave us of those 7 districts. Does anyone have something else to add? Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yeah, I think we should make sure we reference the partisan fairness scores as well as the compact, I'm sorry, reasonably compact, the measures for those as well. And I think Mr. Morgan has both of those available.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thank you, would you like me to run a partisan fairness report?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Just a quick question Mr. Morgan if the reports had been done previously, we can reference them. That would be great. I don't think they made any changes to them.

>> MR. MORGAN: Mr. Woods, in this case, we did make the minor change, I believe on Monday to this. So just to be complete I was going to rerun this here. I don't think it's going to change any top line numbers.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay, great, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan, your hand is up. Did you have something?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN:

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. MORGAN: I will repeat the top line numbers and if someone has another version of this to look at, to compare that's good. If not, I'll just read these off so the lopsided margin test for the Daisy-2 with the changes from Monday for I believe for deviation it's 5.4 for republican. The mean median difference is 2.4 for republican. The

efficiency gap is 3.1 for republican. And on the seats-vote ratio it's 1.7 for the democrat and seat count is 60 to 50 democrat to republican.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. I believe that was the same. Okay so I think, unless somebody has something that they want to do on this map, I think we are done with Daisy-2. I don't see any hands, so thank you. .

The next one on the list is Spirit of Detroit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want me to bring that up in Autobound to look at that before you consider making changes to it, yes?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, and I think we should go through all of the criteria for it and then again if we make any changes to it, it would be a separate plan. Is that what you're saying, Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> KIM BRACE: Commissioner, we do have Kent is available so that we can tag team between him and John. I know that some of the reports that John just ran we need to get PDFs of and that sort of thing. And exporting of the shape file so that we've got that documented for the purposes of going up on the public website. And so we've got Kent in line that he could do, you know, one plan and then John do another plan and vice versa back and forth between the two of them on that, in that regard.

>> MR. MORGAN: I have Autobound and this other map if you want to refer to either.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Maybe we should go through it as it is first, through all of the criteria first and then look at if we want to make changes. So population deviation.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just a moment here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: I just need to update the matrix on this.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Director Woods said this, and I wanted to be sure, so we are obligated to make changes to the maps without making copies to, I guess adhering to the guidelines that were discussed all throughout the earlier part of today and then those, okay go ahead.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We are not obligated to make changes, but we are going to save the maps as is. We are just going to go through all the criteria to put on the record.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay, okay, okay, thank you. I'm just I knew I think I have this wrong, but I want to ask, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Then we will decide if we want to make changes, which will be a different version.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think Mr. Fink had his hand up first. So I want to let him go first.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: I put it down because I think Madam Chairwoman, I think you addressed the question. But just to be clear to Commissioner Kellom, and to all the Commissioners, that my understanding of what the Commission intends to do is to send forward, I mean you will go through this discussion map by map but I believe the concept is that the Commission tends to send all six of these as they are assuming you are satisfied with all of the ranked criteria. And then after you have made that decision you will go through, I think as you go through each map you will then decide okay, we will send this map through as it is now. And then you will make some changes to it and have that new version also sent on. It sounds like that is what the Commission is discussing conceptually to do. The Spirit of Detroit as it exists and once you are satisfied with the compliance with the 7 ranked criteria, that version will go on. And then you can go in and decide if you want to make some changes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Great, thank you Mr. Fink.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Let's hold on. I need to have some clarity because I'm not clear on that, Mr. Fink. I thought we were looking at the purpose of the presentations earlier were to address any concerns with regards to the maps. For example, opportunity districts. Or anything along those lines. So if the maps were going to change before going to the public, the Commission would be doing that now.

>> Nate Fink: Absolutely. Right now. Absolutely.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I want to make sure we are very clear on that.

>> Nate Fink: The distinction and there was already this discussion the six maps as they exist without any modifications, those I believe the intention is those will be sent on and then right now the intent or the Commission will be working on any number of those maps that it wants to address the VRA considerations and address the opportunity District with issues. And then decide if it wants to send those modified versions on as well. So, yes, absolutely.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I guess my concern is, just so we have clarity in this discussion, it does not make sense to me to send something on that would not be approved by the courts. And I think that's where Mr. Braden was talking about opportunity districts that we could not defend 7. He could not defend 8 or 9 but he can possibly do 10 or 11. And so my hope, you know, and my counsel, this is why I'm asking you as our legal counsel, is that we only send maps to the public that can actually be approved so that therefore if the Commission does decide to change it after the public hearing they are minimal changes. So it's not like we are sending version A of Spirit of Detroit, for example. And then sending a version B if we try to change it. It should just be one map that is close to perfect as possible.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This is what I was hearing. That is why I posed my question. Because I was hearing two nuisances. So what I said at first was correct then. There should just be one map of each version and the maps that scored lower

because they don't meet the criteria and present as we discussed before too large of a legal risk in terms of defending VRA standards and guidelines.

>> CHAIR ORTON: That wasn't really my understanding. So I guess it's good we are having this discussion. I guess.

>> Nate Fink: Just to be clear, as I have said repeatedly, I think it's perfectly fine for the Commission to send on whichever maps it wants to for public comment. And you've heard from legal counsel, from me and from other legal counsel that some of these maps, as is, perhaps with ten opportunity districts like the Spirit of Detroit could be perfectly fine in the eyes of the Court ultimately. And that may be, you know, ultimately the decision of this Commission, the Commission decides to adopt a plan like that but the Commission still has some time left where the Commission can decide whether it wants to try to make some modifications to a map like that or some of the other maps. And see if it can make effective modifications, if the Commission is satisfied from -- satisfies the 7 ranked criteria and is appropriate to send on for public comment.

And so my understanding was that, again, this is ultimately a decision of the Commission. I don't personally see a problem with the Commission sending on a couple of versions of one or more of these maps, one that as it exists now and one that was clearly drawn race blind. And then another version that takes into account race. And makes some modifications to address the VRA compliance issues. So ultimately that is a decision that falls to the Commission. But, you know, and I'm happy to you know continue the discussion about that. But at this point I think it makes sense to use this time to try to make some modifications to some of these maps to make narrowly tailored adjustments to address the VRA potential VRA issues. We've already heard from legal counsel that if you have got a map with eight, it's very unlikely to be defensible. I think the Commission has already made the decision you are not even really considering those at this point. As you move up and closer to the number that had been provided by VRA counsel, you're getting closer. And so at this stage where you are not required to pick the map and adopt the map, it seems to me that the more options the better. So if you use this time to look at some of these maps, try to make some narrowly tailored tweaks you can do that. And then you know you still have some time left in the week and you can decide if you want to send forward a couple of different options. So I hope that provides some clarity. Commissioner Kellom you have your hand up. Does that help?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, I guess to go back to the question it seems this is necessary as an exercise, the question of versions and trying to adjust the maps into this level that we described because of legal situation it is. So if that is the case, I think I would add more clarity because this would create a better case or best-case scenario when we are talking about what happened with the courts. I mean and I've already said personally I don't know right now if I'm comfortable making additions, not that I'm the only person that can draw or make suggestions, but I want to not feel like

I'm leaving my colleagues hanging if I'm quiet. Because I'm comfortable with this simply because of what Commissioner Callaghan echoed the same Commissioner Lange has already said. I think the number 11 was a mistake because of the existing -- because of the maps that it uses, and I think we would have been talking about a different number had those maps not even been submitted. So thank you, it does add clarity. I do understand exactly what you are saying, Mr. Fink as well as Director Woods.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom I have a question for you right now we were going to look at Spirit of Detroit. And I know that you put a lot of effort into that map. If we decide to look at it to see if we can make any changes, would you like us to wait until you in the meaning to inform those changes? Because we can easily move on to the next map.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Well, I mean it's possible either way whether I was on camera, or you know in the meeting and off camera now. I think I would still have the same opinion. Because there was so much that went into that map organically with all of the Commissioners understanding that any changes to it, to me, seem like trying to push a certain number when I think the map as is defensible. So I think that's what I was referring to. If you all make changes, I'm not going to be frustrated or upset. I just think that it would be more of an exercise to say, okay, we have done it. And that fact right there makes me uncomfortable because it reminds me of where we were in the past and it also after hearing Mr. Braden, I think this is a map that as is would be fine. I think the basis of comparison, the comparison pool is problematic. We are comparing this map against maps that, in my opinion, should never have been sent for analysis. And now we are stuck with this number 11. So if we are able to do it qualitatively while still observing all the neighborhoods communities of interest, all of those things, then I think that is great. I just don't see that right now. But, yeah, Commissioner Orton, that would be the answer to my question. I mean answer to your question.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Briefly, I know Commissioner Kellom I know you said you stepped out of a meeting and as Commissioner Orton noted, you were, you know, obviously very involved in the collaborative mapping process. Throughout this whole process but particularly as it related to what has become now the Spirit of Detroit map. And so I would sort of echo Commissioner Orton's sentiment, and I hear what you are saying at least as it stands right now what you have heard from legal counsel is you may be comfortable with just you know kind of going through with the Spirit of Detroit as it is now. And as I said, and I think I've said repeatedly, I think that makes sense to send that through for public comment and send the other maps through for public comment assuming that the Commission is comfortable with them. But if the Commission is going to go through as you said this exercise and try to do some narrowly tailored tweaking to that map or the other maps but in particular this map which you had, you know, spent a lot of time with, I think it really would be beneficial if the Commission can

get your perspective on that. Now, maybe it's not while, you know, we can do it this morning or early afternoon but perhaps if the Commission makes modifications hope there I you can provide some perspective and feedback on what the modifications were in terms of discussing the communities of interest. And the other considerations to make sure that to the greatest extent possible the Commission is addressing that and adhering your perspective on it before deciding whether to send a modified version on in addition to this original version. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm just going to stress where I'm having a hard time. A lot of data to take in for one. But that is fine. Data is good. But when we are doing the maps, you know, the collaborative mapping was pretty much blind mapping is what we are calling it. We did not look at race. We looked at communities of interest and population and, you know, being contiguous, this, that and the other and obviously VRA is one of our top criteria. But then as I'm hearing the analysis, as I'm listening to while you evaluated it on maps that were not, I don't know if it's just my feeling or if maybe other Commissioners are feeling it, I feel like we are setting ourselves to a target and that makes me nervous. Maybe that is just my opinion. But it's almost what it seems like when we are talking narrowly tailored. I mean I understand the VRA. I just don't want to put ourselves in that position again, I guess. I don't know. And I don't know if anybody else is feeling that. I'm just expressing a concern, I guess. That's it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, it does feel like that. Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: I hear the concern, Commissioner Lange. And I don't think this is a target. I think this is the sort of the concept all along with this remedial mapping process is you were going to draft collaborative maps in a race blind way and hear from VRA, the VRA consultants and VRA counsel after they had a chance to review the maps and provide you with some feedback on that. And we've gone through that process, and they have done that. And the understanding I think, or the recommendation at this point is again when you are not at the stage where you are adopting a map. You are determining what maps to send forward to the public for feedback. You can take a look at some of these maps based on the feedback you have and try to bring some of the maps you have been told either are not in compliance or face risk of VRA challenges. You can spend some time. You still have some time left here. Look at these maps. Again, you're not looking at a target. You are just trying to improve the prospects that they will be compliant under VRA and again as I said you can work with the mapping consultants and provide you with some recommendations. You can look at what you might be able to do. And then you can consider all of the communities of interest and all of the other important considerations at issue here. All of the 7 ranked criteria. And then see what you've got and decide if you want to send that forward. But I would strongly encourage the Commission to take or to use this time that you have and try to present as many options as you can to the public. And you have some maps here that I

think are still under consideration that have in particular I think Tulip, Water Lily and the Bergamots that are at nine under at least under the original VRA if you are not including Oakland County number. And, you know, of course spirit is a ten. So it would seem to me if you are going to be sending other options forward, you have been told that nine is, you know, eight is very difficult to defend. Nine is quite difficult to defend and I should not be characterizing exactly, you know, the level of difficulty in defense of each of these, the different stages. But you understand that as you get closer to that 11 number it's more defensible. And so at this point I think it makes sense to spend some time trying to work with some of these other maps and seeing if you can improve upon them from a VRA perspective.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So what are we doing right now? Are we going to do that?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I believe so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I believe we were on Spirit of Detroit. And what we had done with Daisy-2 was go through the criteria and make sure that it meets each one and then see if we want to make any changes to save this as a different version which we would also have to see if it meets the criteria but we can do it a different way if somebody has a different proposal.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, you know, I'm very, very comfortable with this map how it is. I'm comfortable with every aspect of it from VRA all the way down to compactness and Township boundaries. So I don't want to make any changes to this map. But if we want to try something else, you know, we had a comment earlier today to put in Grosse Pointe and Harper Woods with Manistee, East English Village and that community into 10. And put St. Clair shores into 12. That could be an idea. Just to see.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Can we go through the redistricting criteria first and get that on the record and then look at making changes?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Didn't we do that already the other day I think on Monday when we went and described each map?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, but not specifically down the line. And Director Woods would like us to put it on the record. But straight down the line.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid, some things were changed so this is more of a quality assurance type check. So that's what we are doing right now.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So John if you can pull up Spirit of Detroit we will just go through the list and make sure.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I will focus on the Autobound version of while we have these other maps here, I will only bring those up if you request them.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, yeah, we need Autobound right now. So population deviation. We can see it's within, it's those same to districts which we did not change, right? So we know that those are okay.

So geographically contiguous.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, I ran those checks on this.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay and then the state's diverse population and communities of interest. So I think we can each speak to this was done specifically with that in mind in each area. Does anyone have anything specific they want to point out? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think we pointed these out the other day but point them out again. This map I think does the best job of respecting communities of interest. In District 9 you have a District that's composed of the downtown, midtown, new center areas, going up to Belle Isle, but not crossing into Grosse Pointe. In District 1 you have the Down River communities of Melvindale, Ecorse and those Down River Areas combined with parts directly northeast of them in Detroit. Again, following the river. District 2 and 3 changed while you took out Melvindale out of 3 and put it into 2. We've heard both ways Melvindale can either go into 3 to support the Middle Eastern community of interest or it can go into two which you know some Commissioners have said as well. It changed 3 by taking Melvindale out of 3. It replaced that population by recombining Dearborn so now 3 is all of Dearborn and just a couple precincts of western Detroit, which bodes well for that community. District 4 is completely within the City boundaries of Detroit. District 5 recombines the communities of Oak Park with Detroit and Royal Oak Township which we have heard about. District 8 combines the Ferndale community with Harper Woods and the LBGT community of interest out there. District 6 combines Royal Oak with its like communities like Huntington Woods, Birmingham. And then you have District 12, which combines the East Point portions of Detroit with east -- with those three neighborhoods of East English Village and around there. Then you have District ten which is Grosse Pointe being combined with Harper Woods up to some of the lakeshore areas of St. Clair shores. And then also you have District 7 that supports the Bengali APIA community of interest by having the Hamtramck areas and it's, you know, it's neighborhoods surroundings combined with parts of the east side of Detroit. And you have 11 that is the northeastern portions of Detroit crossing slightly over the 8-mile boundary. And I think that supports the community as well because we know population has shifted to go past the 8-mile boundary.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would love for someone to do this too if possible.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thanks. I have a question and it's not pertaining to this map. Just something I can't find in my notes. Prior to the 2020 redistricting cycle, can anybody perhaps legal, Kim Brace, anybody tell me how many Detroit centric opportunity to vote districts there were?

>> CHAIR ORTON: That is a good question and maybe somebody is looking that up and doesn't look like they have an answer at this moment.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If they can get back to me that will be helpful.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Until we get an answer on that we will continue going through the list. So districts do not provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party. So we have run the partisan fairness before, but I don't know if you want to do that again or.

>> MR. MORGAN: So what I would say here is there have been no changes to the map since the last time we ran that. If you want me to run it fresh I can but Mr. Brace has the spreadsheet that has all of the plans in one location if we want to use that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, yeah, we can just use that, and we know that it performed like the others. They all were very similar. So, Mr. Woods, do you feel like we need to show that right now or just show it or have it in general?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I'm sorry, I was sending a message. Can you repeat that?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Partisan fairness.

It's on the spreadsheet with all of the maps listed and they are all very similar. Do you feel like we need to show that report or show that spreadsheet right now?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: As long as EDS can stipulate there are no changes, I'm fine with that since it was ran on Monday. I know that there was changes to the Daisy-2 and there might not have been any changes at all. But we just want to make sure that it's clear that there were no changes since it was presented on Monday.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, as long as we...

>> KIM BRACE: As long as we are talking about there is no changes, Edward is correct. I just want to make sure that we have the most recent.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, this should be the most recent; and also Commissioner Lett has his hand raised.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: It's a mistake. I will take it down.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, all right, then districts shall not favor or disfavor any incumbent, elected officials or candidate and they don't -- because we did not consider that. Shall reflect consideration of City, Township boundaries. Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes, I think there is one area of this map where it breaks up St. Clair shores into three the City of St. Clair shores into three districts that does not

meet the criteria six. But I think Commissioner Eid said we might -- he would be willing to go back and look at that later.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, and I do know it was considered when the map was drawn. Just obviously choices were made. And then Directors shall be reasonably compact.

>> MR. MORGAN: And we did run the compactness report and discussed those I believe on Monday.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. So that's good on this original Spirit of Detroit version.

Then before we start on making changes or on another map, I see that it is nearly the time that we have scheduled to take lunch. So I would say before starting something we would take the lunch recess. I don't see any objections, so we will take a lunch recess until 1:00.

[Recess until 1:00.]

>> CHAIR ORTON: I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:00. Will the secretary please call roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name and if your location has changed from the last time, we called roll this morning please let us know where you are attending remotely from. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with-Elaine Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry? Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I have been present since 10:04 this morning from Eaton Township, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Wonderful, thank you. Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I will return to Donna Callaghan? Juanita Curry? Brittni Kellom? Ten Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Sara Reinhardt. I see Juanita Curry on there. Maybe she is having technical difficulties with audio. But anyway.

Mr. Braden.

>> Mr. Braden: We had a question that was asked that nobody had an answer to which I now looked up and found the answer to which is the 2011 House plan. And there were ten majority Black districts in the Detroit area. There were 11 majority Black Districts in the state in the 2011 plan.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange, does that answer your question?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That does answer. So 11 total in the state, 10 specific to Detroit itself?

>> Mr. Braden: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So my other question, without, well, we have multiple maps on average how many are we averaging in the Detroit area now on our current maps?

>> Show them the pictures and --

>> KIM BRACE: Current maps are basically in the ten, 11 and 12 range.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you.

>> KIM BRACE: The key in what Mr. Braden mentioned, he's looking at -- he pulled up the majority African/American count of seats. That is different than what Mr. -- Dr. Maxwell has generated. And so we are having Dr. Maxwell run the 2012 plan through his system.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Dr. Palmer, are you talking about?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes Dr. Palmer, thank you Commissioner. And when I get those, I will be able to share those with the Commission too.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you very much.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid, you have a hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I'm just I'm not sure how useful that data would be considering it's not really an apples-to-apples comparison. I mean, we know that Detroit did lose significant population within those ten years when you compare the 2010 census to the 2020 census. So I'm just not sure if that is really a good comparison to use.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't know if she was meaning it as a comparison. He just asked the question and that's the answer. .

So I feel like we were kind of getting bogged down a little bit. When we went to break. But what I would like to do now is to just to start us out, is Mr. Morgan, is he on? Mr. Stigall? Do you have your hand up?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to take over for John for some time and when we get done working on maps, he will come back in.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Then I wonder if you could pull up the Spirit of Detroit. .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm opening up now y'all had ran through the review of it, I believe. At this point were you speaking of making edits or making a copy and making edits? Or were we going to run through all the plans first?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Making a copy and making edits, I believe.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right, let me close this back out and make a copy of it. And it takes just a minute.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We cannot see your screen by the way.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And now you can. So copy plan.

>> CHAIR ORTON: My thought is, since this plan is the closest, it's nearly up there to 11, and Commissioner Eid, you suggested that maybe you saw an area that we could try to see. I thought maybe it would be good to get our feet wet with these changes just by doing this one that is hopefully the easiest. And then move on. Would you be willing to help guide that? Or I think what we want to do first is hear our mappers suggestions, since they have so much experience and then kind of go from there. Is that good?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I guess I have not opened it up. I made a copy of it. And it's just called copy right now, with today's date, give it a name and such at the appropriate time. We don't know much about it. You know, drawing maps per se, but individual neighborhoods and stuff really comes up to you all. I can bring up these, let's see here, where I was going to go was...

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think we were kind of jostling looking at this and looking at the map, the, yeah.

>> KIM BRACE: Right, yeah, and I have the effectiveness map up on my screen. Kent, I think if you look between District 4 and District 3.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> KIM BRACE: That might be the one that is the most candidate.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That's where I was going with it, but also looking just all the way around it. And if you come over here to 10, 11, well, 10, 12, or even 13, you can make something happen. But in looking at this map the people in Detroit know it more than anybody. But looking -- my guess is the core of this Black majority District of 4, 8 and 5 is probably up in here. There was another plan we looked at that had 3 and 4 configured differently. And 3 was real close to being majority African/American District. So if you just look at it there, to me that's the most logical too. Some people may see this as being packed. You know, or that is a terminology that is loosely used because you really can't say because Detroit is majority Black. But there again is a place right

there where if you could, you know, twist these two districts together you may be able to do it right here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I'm not seeing where you are pointing.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You're not seeing it?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I mean, I see your cursor up at 60 and 61. Is that what other people see? I don't know.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well, hold on a second. Because that is the problem here, we are having. So I'll go back over here. I'm trying to show the other screen. Let me back up. The area is 3 and 4 right here. That is 4 is 85%. And 3 is like 15 or 20. I was trying to get to show -- I need to change the share on this. Which is at this top. Just a moment. So now when I show it, y'all see the Spirit of Detroit comparison map now?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, so, yeah, what I was talking about, the population that, you know, 4 is 85%. And some might think just by glancing at it that it's packed minority. So you could maybe make I saw a couple plans where these two districts were configured differently, 3 and 4, make those two work together. But you might be able to also do it up here around 10, 12, 13, 9. Just depending on how you want to make it work.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid, do you have an idea keeping communities of interest in mind, how you would approach either one of those or your own?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I mean there are a lot of interests here, right? I think the least risky way would be to look at areas 10, 12 and 13 on the right side because those are districts that we've already changed. So it doesn't bring in more changes to any other District. It also doesn't trade one VRA protected group for another VRA protected group, which is what you would be doing if you tried to combine districts 4 and 3 in the Dearborn area. So I would rather look over there. We had a suggestion from public comment earlier, I believe from a guy named Chris, he suggested putting Grosse Pointe with Harper Woods, morning side, East English Village, Cornerstone village and Manistee in 10 and putting the St. Clair shores parts of that District with District 12. So you know, that could be a possible avenue to go on. But I would suggest staying in this area of the map if we want to try to make changes. Again, just because I think it's less risky on a variety of levels.

>> KIM BRACE: Commissioner Eid is voicing a point that I was about ready to make. And I would agree with him. Looking at the 3, 4 you have to be careful of the Arab community in that area given what has been created over there.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So if we were going to try to make a change in that area, Mr. Stigall, can you kind of...

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me get some numbers up here. If you know the neighborhoods, you know, without looking at specific race populations, I guess that's always the hard part is when will you look at it and how to look at it. But you could start

by I think previous plans more this was in 10. And 12, I keep going back, 12 is 70% Black at this time. African/American. So I mean, if you are going to move some around.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think what you would have to do, and I don't really -- I don't agree with this per se, I like I said I'm comfortable with Spirit of Detroit how it is. But, you know, for our purposes right now, I think if you want to turn 10 to be from blue to green on the other map, the commenter's suggestion was put the Grosse Pointes in 12. .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And then work from there.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And this is a copy, right?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Just wanted to double check.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm just going to start the process of manipulating and assigning those. So we can see what we got. 12. Let me get the add on here. Something like that? I know this is all water, but we will put that in 12 and just to start hopefully. I'm going to make this so you can see the -- so we can see what we are doing here. Just a second. So can everybody see these numbers now?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Can you make them bigger?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can make them as big as you can stand it. Okay?

>> CHAIR ORTON: On my screen it's still a little hard to see but maybe others can see.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's pretty big.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right, so we are at 12000. So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think you need -- so it would include there are two more Grosse Pointes there. There is Harper Woods as well. So I think you would.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to go all the way up.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I didn't know. And do you want to get the population numbers? Then are you talking about Pushing, Maple Ridge and East Point in either 13 or 10?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think what the commenter, that is what the commenter was trying to say was to put that, loop it around and go down to put it in 10. And that could work on population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: East Point is 34,000. And 10 is 60 over. So do we want to shift to East Point into 10 at this point?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No, no, no. Talking about leaving, are we -- without the numbers it's hard. We have to figure out what we are doing here. It's not what I want.

That's not what I want. I'm trying to figure it out what to display what we are looking at, which is this. So, yeah, here is the precinct numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So if you go south and add regent park into 10.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now you are trying to reconfigure I guess the population between 10 and 12. And make it work.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Without messing with 13.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, without messing with what you just did on 12. So I think you're going to need a couple neighborhoods there. Like you will probably need the outer drive area.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, it's 14,000. And that is not going to do it. I don't think. We are going into 7 just a little bit. But Denby.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, we definitely want to keep together those three of morning side, East English Village and Cornerstone village. So just as long as you are not splitting those up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's start with Denby right here. Just as a, you know, as 4,000. That has to be cut out. But assign that and I will take that back out and put it in 12. Does that make sense? And that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, looks good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah. And then these few here that split this neighborhood.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So at this point, I think there are some residual stuff right here. And those are just little splinter blocks that got left over and formerly had been in 10. So we are just going to Zoom in here and you can kind of see that. So unpopulated but it does make the neighborhood appear to be split. 10, these two little pieces come down. So this point, the numbers between 10 and 12 appear, total population within perimeters.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so why don't you Zoom out then and let's see what we have done.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, do you think that change would be sufficient? Do you want to run it to see if that changed anything on the metrics?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I have a question about that. I guess when we do this, we just make these changes and then send them on and wait for the results? Is that how this is happening?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes. That would end up being the way to do it so you would want to save this as a new plan or a plan A or however you want to label it. But the shape and the active matrix needs to go to Dr. Palmer so that he can then run it through his system. Just as we did 2012 one earlier for Commissioner Lange.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So we won't know at this if it influenced the numbers until after it has been.

>> KIM BRACE: Until after it goes through Commissioner or Dr. Palmer's system, yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So we will revisit this.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Kind of want to look at these. This information, any of these tables.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So, Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I was going to say if Commissioner Eid and the rest think you're done with this and are ready to send it on I could start another map while Kent is sending that. Or we could do something different. I don't know if you consider this finished or if you just want to send it as is or if you want to make other adjustments.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well you know it's hard to say because we don't have the racial data on, right? So like we are kind of guessing, checking based on our knowledge of just where generally, you know, generally people are. Like demographic standpoint.

>> KIM BRACE: John, pull up the other matrix with the race on it I thought.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's hold on to that for a second and talk about it first before you even display it, please.

>> Nate Fink: I was going to say, you know, in light of the fact that you're now making narrowly tailored or trying to make narrowly tailored modifications to these maps to comply with the Voting Rights Act having received the feedback from the VRA consultants, I think it's appropriate for you to look at some of that racial information as you're going through this process. And so I think it would be good if Mr. Brace could or Mr. Brace's team can bring that up. I don't know if Mr. Braden, if you have anything to add.

>> Mark Braden: Total agreement. At this stage where my magic work and trying to tweak the plan to make a District appear to be more likely to provide an equal opportunity by its very nature you have to look at race. And we are at a stage now we want to make the ball roll forward in the right direction so you should absolutely look at race at this stage to make the small, tailored changes to get you to where you want to. There is no other way of doing it except by luck and sort of knowledge. But you got numbers, and you should look at them. And that will make it move quicker, I believe.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We have, we clearly have Commissioners that are uncomfortable in some regards doing that. So like should we have a discussion about that now? Maybe if we should or shouldn't, I don't know.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sure, we can have a discussion. I kind of feel like that's what we were talking about earlier. And we got the go ahead from all parties that, you know,

beside Commissioners, the other, the legal parties that is fine now. But we can still discuss it if we want. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just curious, Anthony, were you using Promote the Vote maps for inspiration for these two districts? Because they are very, very similar to the two districts that are in the Promote the Vote map.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I've not looked at the Promote the Vote map since whenever we put it forward last week. I was specifically referencing the public comment from earlier today. I would have to double check, but I think the guy's name was Chris. And he suggested putting St. Clair shores in 12. And the Grosse Pointes, the Grosse Pointes with Harper Woods, morning side, East English Village in District 10. I think we did the opposite here. We flipped District 12 and 10 but that is what I was going on. Any other thing that will look similar to is merely coincidence.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so did we want to -- we are waiting for the matrix, right?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, well, let me assign these blocks that got to 9. These are water blocks. And they got assigned by precinct. Let's just go ahead and get those put back into make them contiguous. These belong in 9 and got moved out of 9. And this block I believe was in 1. This was that one. I cannot do this. We will look at which table? I'm just going to open it up here. And, you know, you got -- so looking at the table right now, as percent of racial demographics as a non-Hispanic white, Black and those. So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So are we looking at this, or not? Can you just take this off until we actually decide? I don't want to look at it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You told me to bring it up. I'm sorry, okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I thought chairman said we were getting ready to look at the table.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is that what you said?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I thought that is what we were waiting for but if you want a discussion about that totally fine. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm still not comfortable looking at the racial data but it's up to the Commission. If the Commission is going to look at it just so you know I'm going to walk away where I can hear but not actually see it. That is just my preference. Thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so it seems to me that we are -- our options are we can look at data and look at the racial data and make our best guess as to what we're moving around. Or we can just make moves like we just did without any racial data and send it off and wait for the analysis. And then decide to look at it again and, you know, see whether it worked or not. So is there -- we need to come to a consensus on what we want to do. Any comments? Suggestions? Go ahead, Mr. Braden.

>> Mark Braden: I absolutely understand the Commissioners concerns and empathize with them but really don't know in a practical sense how you could make changes, minor changes in these districts presumably to make them more likely to be viewed in compliance with the Voting Rights Act without considering race in some manner.

So my view is, and hopefully the Court's view is, that race can be used in a narrowly tailored manner to adjust the plan to comply with the Voting Rights Act. And I think that's the step we are at right now. We are trying to make minor changes, tweaks in a plan and the tweaks essentially have to be based upon race or otherwise it's just an impossible to get there. I mean, it would just be throwing darts at plans. You could do that. If you had an unlimited amount of time, maybe that would work. But I think otherwise it's extremely difficult to do it without looking at some racial numbers in a very cabin, narrow way at areas that you're thinking of tweaking to make them work.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I understand it's definitely hard to tell one way or the other. Say we send this and save it off will we have it first thing in the morning if we had to adjust it? Then at that point could we try to do it without looking at the data, you know, if it came back and didn't pass for the adding a District to the green, then we look at the data to say okay, can we get it without. Because I mean I understand narrowly but this to me is not narrow. This is a large, I mean it was what 30,000 people change. That to me is not narrow. It's half a District.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So I believe that we were told, maybe an hour or less to turn around.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes Commissioner. This is Mr. Brace. It has taken Dr. Palmer only about 45 minutes to get something back to me. So I had it back just as you were coming back and to answer Commissioner Lange's question. So it should only take about a half hour, 45 minutes to an hour.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: So theoretically we could send this off, go to the next map and probably have an answer before we are done with the next and get through another map or two.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> KIM BRACE: Right, that is why we have got two map drawers here. Both Kent and John. So that when you finalize like Kent has done this here on his machine, he will need to back off then and send stuff off to Dr. Palmer so that John can pick up on the next District configuration you want to change.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I think if we sent it off because we made an attempt to do it without using the data and it comes back not where we need it to be, then look at the data. Because you tried and obviously, we can't without, you know, seeing it necessarily. But if it does pass then hey, we did it without it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, I like that suggestion.

>> KIM BRACE: Sure.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Then we kind of exhausted our resources at that point, our options at that point.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I think we kind of covered everyone's opinion at that point because you tried to do it without it twice. And if we couldn't succeed then the third time you just almost have to unfortunately. Because otherwise I think we will make huge changes, that is half the District changed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I think Commissioner Muldoon made a very good point. I would be more comfortable if it was blindly done and ran a second time. He made the point of the 30,000 to add so then it's at what point is it no more or no longer narrowly tailored if you don't get it at that point then you are grabbing more of a certain race and then more. You can't really consider it narrowly tailored any more. So I like his idea.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, is there anyone that doesn't feel comfortable with that approach? I only see Commissioner Muldoon's hand up. I think it's just still up because I don't think.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so Mr. Stigall, I think off screen we have already authorized you guys to take care of these little things.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right, I'm going to stop sharing and get this cleaned up and sent on its way.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid, do you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, just to be clear, you know, I made this tweak, it does not necessarily mean I like the tweak, right? I'm trying to move us along, but I do prefer the other configuration. I just thought this way makes more sense to me because it only changes districts that we already changed. So it kind of helps, you know, multiple things at once. But that doesn't mean I like it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay appreciate that. At least you got us started. Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Very briefly, just to sort of follow on what Commissioner Eid said there. You will -- it sounds like the Commission will send it off for another VRA review. As Commissioner Eid indicated he may not love the changes for other reasons he did here, and that may be the case, you know, for other Commissioners or maybe if folks do like that, at some point if you decide to send this forward to the public, you're going to want to have the discussion about the pluses and minuses of this map beyond just the VRA considerations that you addressed. And I just wanted to make sure that I noted that. I think Mr. Muldoon, Commissioner Muldoon has his hand up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: We will still send for public comment if this one had the 11 in it, we will still send this one and the original forward to public comment so that we can

see the comments on both where it may come back people like the original one better and the other one just doesn't get considered after that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, that is a further conversation that we will have I think when we decide exactly which ones we are sending forward. So this is not the end for any of them or the.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Right but they both go forward or could go forward to the public comment. We don't have to take this one because it passes versus the other one that is right there borderline.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Exactly. Yes. Thank you. Okay, so next, Mr. Morgan, would you share your screen? And I think since we got a little taste of it, I think I would like to ask you to pull up -- well, we can't see your screen yet.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will share the screen here. All right, so this is the Autobound and then I do have the effectiveness maps available as well.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So next on our list is Water Lily. Would you pull up Water Lily?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, while that is loading, here is the effectiveness map. So the labels here indicate that the yes is more Black voters than white voters in the democratic primary and no is not true for that statement. And then as we talked about earlier the actual numbers, I think are the primary pool. So while they Autobound is loading, you know, just referencing this map so there is 123456789 that are Wayne County based. And then you would get the plus one additional District including 18. So you were contemplating trying to configure two more districts, one or two depending on what you want to do. There was some discussion about District 3. And then you see the adjacent districts, there were 10, 13, 14, 7 and 6. And as I was saying earlier, I'm just going to go back to the Daisy, I'm not saying at all, you know, you have to use this but there are other districts that are effective. Like this District 14, which you can refer to, if you want to. And then so I'll go back to Water Lily and here is the information.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So that is interesting. So you're saying we can do an overlay of if we know Water Lily in that area has performing districts, we know that I mean, Daisy and we know Daisy was we did that collaboratively. Not using race. We could overlay that on this.

>> MR. MORGAN: Or Spirit of Detroit, or Bergamot or any of the others, if you wanted to overlay, and again I will just go back to Daisy again. The five and six from Daisy were not touched.

They were the same as Hickory. But even if you do want to work with those, those are districts like this configuration in Spirit of Detroit, 5 is showing up as effective but 6 is not. But, you know, there are many differences.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

Well, that seems like a possible good option because then we are not just shooting in the dark, at least we know in a map that we made without using race there are performing districts. So Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Seems like all the ones where 5, 6, all the ones when we went across 8 mile is where it started making them more I guess call it compliant, carried those districts across the 8 mile like 5 and how Spirit of Detroit crosses and 8 crosses, all those become and south of 8 mile they were not I don't want to call it compliant. So just crossing that 8-mile threshold in some of the ones that don't could create two districts that in turn now are compatible.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah. Okay, so Mr. Morgan, just to ask your experienced advice. If you were to look at this, where would you start to try? Or would you go with the overlay idea?

>> MR. MORGAN: So, again, this is the Water Lily map as it stands now. So you look at the districts on the margin. So looked at 10, 13, 14, 7 and 6. Potentially 3. Probably not 2. But, again, those are districts on the border. And then if you are looking to do two districts, you know, it depends if you want one, it's probably fewer moving parts. But if you're going to do two then you would have to explore 6 or 7 or 13 or 14. Or 10. You know, you would have to nominate one of these Districts to look at to make changes to. So you could do an overlay if you wanted to approximate a District from another plan. Or you could use the knowledge you have and start with that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

Well, could you put an overlay of -- well, first of all, can we look at the other view, the effectiveness view? Daisy and then Spirit of Detroit, kind of look at both of those up in that 7, 14 area?

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the Daisy and again 5 and 6 are the same as Hickory. And you wanted the Spirit of Detroit. So and the Spirit of Detroit you have 5 being effective. 11 is effective. And if you recall 7 has moved completely out of Oakland County into Detroit. That was done with Commission Kellom and Eid's working on that. And so these are examples of districts that they do cross, but they are effective. They cross the 8-mile line, Wayne County between Macomb and Oakland.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so what if we looked at an overlay of this map on top of Water Lily and just look in the upper area to see if changes would be feasible.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right. And do you want the Detroit neighborhoods on as well? Or I can turn it on-and-off as needed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: I have neighborhoods available. I'm just going to turn the visibility off for a moment. And then you want the Spirit of Detroit. Get the correct one.

Okay, so the lines in blue are the districts from the Spirit of Detroit.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so if you were looking at this, I'm looking at like up by 7 and 14, it's a lot to look at. Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I know there have been a lot of talk when we were looking at like Spirit of Detroit and stuff the Ferndale area, was it Ferndale, Royal Oak kind of tying into 8.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: If that would help or not.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, what if we try that? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree that that would work. But then it kind of seems like we are just going to recreate Spirit of Detroit from Water Lily because that's what it came from in the first place. Do you know what I mean?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, I guess but we are trying to bring this map up.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: It is quite different if we look. I am a fan of having different options for the public to make comment on. On the different configurations. So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I do agree. I like having more options. To me it seems the biggest difference between Water Lily and Spirit of Detroit, Spirit of Detroit crosses 8 mile at certain points and Water Lily doesn't.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, that's true. So.

>> MR. MORGAN: The mechanical part of this would be if you were going to take District 5, which is this almost square District and move it up into Oak Park, then you would have to take population away from 5 and put it towards another District like 8 or bring 7 down to take that population, which you could do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right. Well, I see Commissioner Eid's point of giving the two different options of lots of districts crossing 8 mile or lots of districts not crossing 8 mile as a good option to put out there, I think. Because we've had lots of public comment both ways. So that would be good for getting public comment. But I do also think that we have had a lot of public comment about that Royal Oak area being split up. So I would like to try putting that together.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so the one big difference that I just mentioned between the Spirit of Detroit and the Water Lily as it stands now, is that the Spirit of Detroit entirely moved 7 interior here, in this area. So this is 7 on the Spirit of Detroit. So I think what you're looking at doing is recreating something closer to this version. But then you would have to, again, if you took Oak Park into 5 then 5 would be overpopulated and would have to put some of 5 somewhere else.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to start with that process? Or do you want to do something different?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I do kind of want to just because we have to make changes to some of these maps so they will be viable options for VRA. So not knowing where else to start I would say let's start there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

All right, so you don't intend to make changes to 18 at this time?

>> CHAIR ORTON: No.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I am just going to lock that but might make 6 and 7. Do you think you will make changes to 17 or you don't intend to do that?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Can you Zoom out a little bit?

>> MR. MORGAN: So these are 16 and 17, which I'll go back to the map here. Those are already performing districts. So you don't want to make changes?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't believe changes were made to those in this map so I would not like to change things that were not already changed, especially over there.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 16 I'll lock. 17 I'll lock. And we can always unlock these if the need arises. But this just helps streamline any accidental changes. All right, 4 might or might not change. 8 might or might not 6, 11, 14. So the first move you are saying is take some of this population currently in 6 into 5 is that what you wanted to do?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes. Can I see the effectiveness map one more time for Spirit of Detroit, I guess?

>> MR. MORGAN: Spirit of Detroit. So this is Water Lily and Spirit of Detroit. Okay, so that, again, if you recreate it exactly of course you will get that. If you don't, you will get something close to it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, okay, thank you. Okay, so I think Commissioner Kellom, are you willing to help with this? Are you on? Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so you want to take some of this Oak Park into 5?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I will use the select box.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that it kind of gives us a half step before we actually assign them all, so you can see what the population would be. Let me clear that because that's too much. All right so 1.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom, I know that you very intentionally made this District in your Spirit of Detroit map. I'm wanting to just create in this current Water Lily map I'm wanting to see if it's feasible to bring it up to the 11 number. So I want to add some of this, but maybe not all. But I don't -- I'm not familiar enough with the area to know which exact parts people have been talking about in public comment. I mean, I recognize some of the names, but I don't know the area. So could you help guide that a little bit? Even though I know you're not crazy about this idea.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah. It's a conundrum because suggestions, what I can agree to is informing you about the community. If that makes sense.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I can't give you directional suggestions because then on a human level I feel like I would be nearing what those communities of interest have already said. So using language like well what could work, I'm going to refrain from saying that. Because what it seems like could happen is a split of this community so the Oak Park community, I lost my train of thought. Township has expressed wanting to be

kept whole. They are parts of the northeast Detroit area which are Palmer Park that have asked to be in community with Oak Park, Royal Oak Township and Ferndale, which is 6 and 7. This whole little area that you're looking at. Right? That is that chunk. Oak Park also has a strong Jewish community as well. And of course you see neighbors, Southfield, Berkeley and Royal Oak. It's nestled right against 696. And even if you are taking greenfield down, you are running through Oak Park to go through other communities. Okay, what else would you like to know?

>> CHAIR ORTON: So in this overlay outline that we are seeing right now, this Oak Park, wants to be combined with the part that's below it. I don't know the neighborhood names so sorry. But is that what you are saying.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Oak Park, Royal Oak Township, Ferndale and Palmer Park are areas that have asked to be together. The area that you have selected, which I'm glad that John put the overlay on. But is not the community that mentions what I just mentioned. That is the east. So you would be putting the Oak Park community if you are looking to put some of 5 and 6 together. With African/American neighborhoods that have had strong ties there, lots of schools over there. 48221 is a very high voting population. That's not just 48221 but I'm just giving you information about the area. The Black clubs are important, schools and parks are important, and the Detroit community is important. So just keep in mind when you are crossing 8 mile in certain ways you have to be very intentional because obviously those are suburbs and no longer Detroit. Yeah. I think go ahead.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well, so this overlay, the blue lines are Spirit of Detroit. So if we just stay in that, in crossing 8 mile then those are areas that you feel have a community of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yep. I believe in the overlay that you know, the Spirit of Detroit is not perfect at all. Because there are parts of Livonia and Brightmoor and other Detroit areas that shouldn't go together. That's like in 16 and 17. So if it were up to me, I would fix that as well and I know how we feel about changing too much but Brightmoor should not be with Livonia at all. Yeah, if you are looking to like Commissioner Eid said if you are going to recreate the Spirit of Detroit in Water Lily, then I mean you can be free to do that. I just I don't know what other changes. I don't know. Not with just this map. I don't know if we are just going to be arbitrarily crossing 8 mile. Because that's what it seems like.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well, as has been said, that's how to get enough districts that are performing.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, that is what we did last time too only.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So I don't know if I should say this out loud but I feel that either we try to reach what our VRA expert says we need to get to for the Court. Or we just say we can't do it and go with the special master. And I don't think any of us want that. So I feel like we need to try. I don't know how you all feel but that is what I think. So I

guess I'll just try here. Mr. Morgan, if you are looking at this, I know that you aren't necessarily a Detroit neighborhood expert either but maybe you know quite a bit. What would you think?

>> MR. MORGAN: So two things I would observe. I like some of the neighborhoods but that is really not that relevant. And then the second thing is the outer boundary here in blue is District 5. So if you're contemplating crossing in a similar spirit of the Spirit of Detroit map, this would be one area where you could cross. And you're not specifically recreating District 5. You are just using this as a guideline.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, okay, well, let's start with that then.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And see where we can go from there.

>> MR. MORGAN: This first portion that is highlighted is 8800 people. So I'll go ahead and add that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: And, let's see, this area here, you Zoom out to the townships so you can see this. Sorry. Oh, labels. Let me turn on labels. Okay so this is I believe the Royal Oak Township which doesn't have a lot of people, but I believe this is what Commissioner Kellom was saying would want to be, not want to be, I don't want to personify this. This is the area we are talking about having included with the Spirit of Detroit District 5, which is here. So you would probably look at including that next.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, so please do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And really if someone sees something we are doing that they think we should not be doing, please speak up. Because we need to do this together. Just trying to help us move us forward.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I took those areas there which were Royal Oak Township and then this next one to make it contiguous and I will assign those. So now you moved maybe 12000 people between 5 and 6. So you could continue to go up to this and take more population or you could compensate by taking population out of 5 to begin the process of balancing them and you could put that in 8 or 7 or you could look further south to 4 but you would have to circle that all back around. So bringing 7 down into 5 is one option or taking surplus population from 5 and putting it to 8 is an option.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, can you Zoom out just a little bit so I can see?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep. Right now you have all of this entire square and you've added this population, part of Oak Park Township and then part of -- sorry, Oak Park City and Royal Oak Township.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: 5 is over so again you could take more into 5 and then take more out of 5 or you could just balance you know, tick for tick and say I just took 10,000 out, now I'm going to put 10,000 from 5 into 7 or 8 if you wanted to.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, let me see. So as we are doing this, we are not knowing how much population we need to affect a change.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well, let's go back to the Water Lily map. So at this point you've moved a substantial amount into 6. Sorry taken away from 6. So you would to have do 6 would have to eat into 7. To regain the population it needs. Or it could go directly down into the areas from 5 to balance out.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right, but I mean we don't know how much population it's going to take to create more opportunity districts.

>> MR. MORGAN: You can get a little bit of an indicator here. The starting point of the, again, this is not strictly speaking voting age racial data. This is an estimate of the primary data. So it would 17 Black almost 18 to 47. And at this point you're taking some of that out. You know, you probably would have to do more to change the balance of that to then what you have so far.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, okay, so I think go ahead and Oak Park, go ahead and take a few more precincts there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to go north first, or do you want to go northeast first?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think northeast. Looks to me like we have some dis-contiguity there up above.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, that's because I was using the voting precincts. So we will come back to that in a moment.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. MORGAN: Shall I take the rest of this or just enough to fix the dis-contiguity? This is I believe Royal Oak Township this little piece.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, just take enough to solve that dis-contiguity. Well, it's unfortunate we have to go clear up there. It's not contiguous. But can you just zoom back in where you were? Can you just take that little 0 population part that hooks in there?

>> MR. MORGAN: Which Section?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Up just a little bit. Just that little 0 there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Which one?

>> CHAIR ORTON: From District 18. Oh, we have 18 locked so I guess we can't do that. Doesn't matter, it's 0 population. So.

>> MR. MORGAN: You meant this here?

>> CHAIR ORTON: No, I mean just that one little.

>> MR. MORGAN: This.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Now you moved about 25,000 people and you've taken in most of Oak Park in this area. And then Royal Oak Township and now 6 is under so you could take 6 into 7 or you could take 6 through 7 down into 5, if that is what you want to do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think 6 into 7. That area, Royal Oak. The portion of that was already kind of outlined there. Try that for now.

>> MR. MORGAN: So let me backtrack to the Water Lily map here. So what you're doing then is you are going to stretch 5 up and then you're going to end up, if you put 6 into 7 and 7 will be light and you will pull 7 down into this area. So that's potentially what you're looking at doing conceptually?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, or maybe using part of 8 to do that as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Was my thought.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so this will go into 6, this entire area potentially?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 6 is a little over.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: And actually you can see, I'm not going to -- hang on. Let me just undo that selection. So you can see the blue line if you did take up to the blue line then that would be the same District 6 that's in the Spirit of Detroit. But you also know that it will work on population. So if you don't do that, then you could take a different portion of 6 if you wanted to use some of this into 7 you could also do it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so let me just look at it a second. Okay so I'm going to ask your advice. If you were looking at this, what would your first thought be?

>> MR. MORGAN: So let's look quickly, go back to the Water Lily map and look what the starting point was. So the starting point for District 6 was 17% Black. And at this point you probably have not increased the primary turnout in District 6. You have affected District 5. But I'm guessing that this District 6 is probably not and actually you can look at it if you look at the Spirit of Detroit version 6, it's 3% Black. So if you were to recreate exactly that District that is what you would end up with and you have not created it exactly. But just in general you are knowing that you're probably going to end up with a District that is not moving towards being effective. But then the next thing to do is I look at the spreadsheet. So bring up the Water Lily here. And the starting point for District 5 you do have the racial data here if you want to reference that, or not. But it's available on this spreadsheet. But when we are talking about the primary, the number that was on the PDF map is this number here. So it's 92 and this is the democrat primary pool so going back to that. That number, that 92 and 3 is this number on the spreadsheet here. Okay? So you probably reduced this number by adding this portion of Oak Park. So with that in mind, if you take away from 5, you're a long way from making 5 not effective.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think 5 has more opportunity -- you can make more changes to 5 without affecting its effectiveness.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, and so.

>> MR. MORGAN: So, yeah, but keep in mind so far, you've only reduced 5 percentage of Black population and potentially the primary as well. You have not increased 6. So 7 is the one that you would likely increase at this point.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yep. Okay so just from what I see, I can see Commissioner Kellom is uncomfortable, but I'm just trying here so. Is this -- does this make sense, John, numbers wise we are talking, if I took Bagley and those top like green acres and Sherwood forest and that area, kind of that area and put it in 7?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure. And so you do want to work on 8 or do you only want to take the 5 portion first?

>> CHAIR ORTON: You can take the 5 portion first.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, all right so we will switch to blocks. And use the box. That is going into 7, yes?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes. I don't see any other way. Unless you have.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is what we were discussing before is that you're looking to make 7 more effective.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then you said down to Bagley?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I believe so.

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Can we take those blocks out at the west?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. Okay so I'm just going to do a save here since we made several moves.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: And point out 6 is still not in alignment. So you have the option of putting 6 in alignment this way or doing something else to be determined later like taking the northern part of 7 or taking this portion of 7 or something else.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 7 is currently down to Bagley. So you could continue to go south into 5 which is overpopulated. Or you could take some of 8 if that makes more sense to you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Let's see, so out of 5 we do still need, we need to reduce 5 by 12000 people approximately.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. So like if you are just keeping this to 5 you could go into this area or you could take the green acres and stuff that is more proximate to the border of 7.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I do think I want to take some of that up there, but we still need to reduce 5. So maybe we go west a little bit to Pembroke and McDowell.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into 7?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes. Zoom out just a little bit to see.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here, let me do this. I will Zoom to District 7 but then I will Zoom to District 5 so that puts the focus on the boundary of 5. So the red outline is 5. So it's Oak Park Township including Royal Oak, sorry Oak Park City, Royal Oak Township and these neighborhoods in Detroit.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So you can look at this area. You can look at, you still need more in 5 and you can go south or go west depending on what you want to do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: What would you do?

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sorry, don't mean to put you on the spot but you are the one with experience.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure, I think either those options is reasonable. Let's take a step back and look at the Water Lily map. So District 7 has changed substantially. It's going to have to change more potentially. So you would need more of 5 or more of 8.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think I want to take some of 8.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so the area that is closest to the border like green acres?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, green acres, state fair, Sherwood forest.

>> MR. MORGAN: That still does not solve 5.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: You can take a little bit of this and maybe Schultz or something else from 5.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah. Does anyone have a suggestion or know, should Palmer Park and palmer Woods stay together? I've heard those names a lot. I don't know if they need to stay together. Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I thought palmer Woods was going to go with we had comments to put it with Ferndale.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Just the palmer Woods part?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I don't know about Palmer Park.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the program just crashed. So I'll have to take a moment to bring it back up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hopefully not much of nothing is lost. Just a moment.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Hopefully.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: For the roll taker I have rejoined the meeting, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Donna did you say Palmer Park or Palmer Woods?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Palmer Woods.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's actually Palmer Park that wants to be with Ferndale.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Palmer Park not Palmer Woods, I get them mixed up.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They probably both should be but if you are going to pick one Palmer Park that is where the LBGT community of interest that moved into Ferndale is.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I want it to be with Ferndale.

>> MR. MORGAN: Give me a moment to readjust this. So it looks like everything was more or less captured. But when I reopened the plan, it does not keep the overlays.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So we have that. So change the updates.

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

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, we are basically back where we were. We have Bagley in. And I don't think we have lost anything significant. We were just looking at the green acres area.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so from what I understand, so Ferndale.

>> MR. MORGAN: Ferndale is here. So let's refer back to the Spirit of Detroit. So the Spirit of Detroit has the Ferndale area in with that area in 8. And you're potentially putting it in 7 but keeping it together.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, yeah, so let's take, let's see, we need -- okay let's take the top three right there first of all green acres, Sherwood forest and palmer Woods just to get an idea of population first.

>> MR. MORGAN: And you will probably need to take some off the north end of 7 at some point. Add to selection. Just a minute. Okay so this potentially satisfies the Ferndale community of interest you were discussing. So that is 4,000 people, so I will assign that and then you are still going to need to lose some population from 5.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah. 7 let's see. I think for 7 go down kind of one more layer.

>> MR. MORGAN: Fitzgerald potentially?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I was thinking beside but, yes, try that.

>> MR. MORGAN: So either Fitzgerald, Mary Grove or something to the west over here depending on what you prefer.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Try Fitzgerald Mary gold -- Mary Grove, sorry.

>> MR. MORGAN: And assuming this move goes in, I will save again.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. Just while you're doing that, I just wanted to check with Mr. Stigall that the last changes that we made on Spirit of Detroit got sent through to be evaluated VRA?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, they were passed on to Kim.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And passed on to the next.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, Max has those.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so, yeah, you still have to move some out of 5. While 7 is okay, keep in mind it's still going quite a ways north here. And this might not help you with what you're looking to do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, so Zoom in a little bit more to the 7 and 8. There. I wanted to take...

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry, you did or did not want to take Chalfonte to 7?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I kind of do because I don't like it hanging out there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let's do that because that will put 5 pretty close to where you might want it to be.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: 5 is now within population tolerance. And looking back at this configuration of 5, it's going to turn off the neighborhoods for just a second. Okay, so the blue outline, again, was the Spirit of Detroit version five. And the current version of five goes a little further south, but keeping in mind where our starting point was with 5, it probably would still be performing in that configuration if the Spirit of Detroit configuration was performing, which it was.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so 7 is good on population. But I feel like we need to Zoom in right there, yeah, kind of where your cursor is.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I think you probably don't want to go all the way as far north as this for 7 because using the Spirit of Detroit outline it doesn't have a 7 but this District 8 was performing and then backing up to Daisy or another version. Let's see if we can find another version. Bergamot doesn't do that. Tulip doesn't. So I guess I'll just back up to the Daisy. So you haven't recreated the Daisy version or the Hickory version of 5. You have a different version. But you are coming closer to approximating 6 but not exactly. Because you've kept Ferndale in it. And we don't have the tail end of 6 but I believe it went quite a ways up. Yeah, so I think you potentially might cutoff the northern part of 7 or something like that for 14 or 13.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, well I want to take in -- can you Zoom in just a little bit more, right where your cursor is?

>> MR. MORGAN: All right, I'll put the neighborhoods back on.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so would you this is going to move us population wise in a wrong direction, but I think we can fix it. Can you choose from so to go into 7 from 8, University District and then the Gulf and the park, yeah, clear over to Grixdale Farms and everything up so Penrose and State Fair. Can you move that block and move all that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, into 7, including State Fair?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I should have asked you first. Before you assign.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So that is getting us further away population wise. We need -- what we need to be doing is moving from 6 to 8. How would you do that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Oh, well, you're not necessarily moving from 6 to 8. Before you do anything here, what you're really doing effectively is you're changing 7 to go south on 5 so 6 is going to end up being closer to what's in the Spirit of Detroit map but not exactly.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right. I'm just saying population wise.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, this represents 7,000 people. So you have to take off 7,000 people on the north end of 7. Which you were probably going to do anyway.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right, okay.

Well let's try this. See what happens.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want the State Fair and Penrose as well?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Maybe we shouldn't move up first and take some off of the top of 7.

>> MR. MORGAN: So there is quite a bit of population here. 6 is still overpopulated. So it would potentially have to lose. So you would probably send this into 14. Or eventually you might pull 8 north into 14, which is similar to what the Spirit of Detroit does where it is District 11 goes up into this portion.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Of is this Oakland, Macomb? Let's see.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Macomb. Okay, so Zooming in on this, so this is, what, 7, 10, you are probably talking about 10 or 15,000 in this area here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay and we need 8500. So take like down through Madison Heights. Where it looks like there is a line.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I moved away. So and this would probably go to 14?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, I'm thinking 14.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

All right, I'm going to lock 57 and 58 in case these voting precincts are not wholly contained in 7.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so now you have 6 is over still by a little bit. So you would have the option of taking this in to 5 and shedding a little more from 5 if you wanted to and that would recreate the same District that is in Spirit of Detroit. Or you could take 7 could take a piece of that or 14 you could. But 5, sorry, 6 is currently overpopulated, if you want to address that or just continue working on 7 and 14 and 8. We will have to go back to 6 at some point.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, we can go ahead now.

>> MR. MORGAN: So do you want to take this roughly the same boundary as the Spirit of Detroit or do you want to choose a different one?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Zoom in just a little bit on the bottom part of 6.

>> MR. MORGAN: Currently 5 comes up. Just north of 10-Mile. Just barely to get that Royal Oak Township portion.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Let's see any input from anyone in that area? Or John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure, I still think probably you have room to spare in 5. So taking this area here is probably fine. And then you would have to shed a little bit more from 5, which probably works.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, go ahead and do that. So that part into 5.

>> MR. MORGAN: You could potentially lose a little more of 5 to 7. Or to balance those out.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, how much population is in Bethune? We will see what the population says but I'm thinking the whole neighborhood. It looks to me like it's split in that overlay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, looks like Bethune was split. As I recall when we were drawing the Spirit of Detroit in that area, Commissioner Kellom was using road boundaries as well.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There was a little bit of focus on roads on that one as well as neighborhoods.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that is 7800.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We can't do more than that.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I will assign that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then I will do two things here. I will save as soon as that is done.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then we will just back out a little bit.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay silly me, I'll have to do that again because I assigned it from 5 to 5.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry about that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: That is your one mistake you are allowed for the day.

>> MR. MORGAN: I did that one.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Braden, you are not muted.

>> MR. MORGAN: I wondered why it wasn't changing the numbers, so I realized I assigned it from one District to the same District.

>> CHAIR ORTON: It has happened to me before too.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah. Let's try that again. So into 7, that is correct.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so 7 is a little high. But 8 and 14.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, you were also looking at possibly taking more off from the north end you said.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right.

>> Excuse me.

>> MR. MORGAN: So we did not take the State Fair, Penrose yet. That can be done. Or you could, yeah, sorry let me turn off the neighborhoods so you can get a better view of that. And because of the parks, I think you can see the boundary.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, I can so.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 8 and 14 are out of alignment and 7 you might put some of the northern part of 7 into 14.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think that's what I would like to do.

>> MR. MORGAN: And then if you leave 5 alone that is fine, but you also have the option of taking the State Fair area into 7 if you needed to. Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Up above let's take some of that. You have saved, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: I will do that again. And Mr. Stigall pointed out if something goes wrong, we can pull it up from a previous save point with no great trouble.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so you are looking at taking this area first?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, let me see, yeah, just that first precinct right there, the 2139. Try that, into, can't see.

>> MR. MORGAN: 14.

>> CHAIR ORTON: 14, okay.

So now.

>> MR. MORGAN: You might need a little more, but you can leave this as is if you like. So you have 8 and 14 are out of balance so one thing to consider is while you were contemplating making changes to two districts, once you finished balancing 8 and 14 you may want to save that and then proceed to changing a second District.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, let me just look for just a second. Okay so we are just going to move some from 14 to 8. And then neighborhoods don't go up that high. So I don't think we need the overlay on for the neighborhoods.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. So let's see, these do show the population of the voting precincts. So we do have this voting precinct here. It's currently in 8. And then, okay, so now you're looking at moving from 14 into 8?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Probably take these three?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, start right there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that is about 12000 people. Probably one or two more.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay grab that one, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so assign that?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 14 is slightly over, so you might want to take another precinct. 8 is on. So if we took that whole precinct, it's probably too much. But.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Select that precinct though or do blocks and part of that precinct.
>> MR. MORGAN: You can do that and also add this to 8 and take this into 7. 7 is at 0. And this is 1100. So 0 plus 1100 is within toleration. So.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Try that. I like that I wanted those in there any way so.
>> MR. MORGAN: Let's try going into 7. And these are two neighborhoods, but it's one voting precinct.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Uh-huh.
>> MR. MORGAN: So if I click on the precinct, it's that area and assigning that to 7. Okay, so 7 is still on population and now you have a little more room to accept this precinct here in 8. Okay so the plan is within plus or minus 2%. The smallest largest are two districts that are not configured. So my recommendation would be if again, it's likely that District 7 in this configuration, in my opinion, would probably show as a performing District. If not it would be close. So my suggestion is to save this as it is, which gives you a one District shift. And then continue if you want to do a second District shift. Does that make sense?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes. I would like you to save this. I don't know what we are calling these as we save a different version.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so.
>> CHAIR ORTON: Maybe, Sarah, a suggestion? Or, John, suggestion?
>> MR. MORGAN: Well, normally we would give it today's date. So it would be today's date version one keeping the Water Lily designation.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, all right, that's fine. And going to Director Woods' point, you know, we had talked about sending all of these forward and then if we make changes sending that version forward too. But to his point, if we can improve them to the VRA analysis, then maybe we want to revisit whether we send the ones that are farther out of VRA compliance along or if we just want to send the final one. I guess that is a discussion for later when we deliberate but Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I was going to ask two called Water Lily with separate dates and the public will know one is changed for VRA purposes? That does not seem clear for me.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Do you want a different identifier on it or wait until we discuss to see how many we are sending out? I don't know.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Surely, we can wait to discuss what we are sending out. To me personally it would be confusing to the public to have two published or two draft published Water Lillies where they don't know with only a date being different, they won't know what is what.

>> CHAIR ORTON: That makes sense. Commissioner Muldoon?
>> MARCUS MULDOON: I think we just put a B so Water Lily B so we know originally that just the straight Water Lily and B would be the second version.
>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, can we do that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay do you want B or 2 or B is good? What do you prefer?

>> CHAIR ORTON: B is fine, yeah. Commissioner Muldoon, did you have something?

>> MR. MORGAN: So if you wanted to do that as a standalone plan you can. But then what I'll do now is I will copy that, then we will just save. And I don't know if you want to call this C or just continue. Internally it's not a bad idea to just do that. You could end up discarding B or C. But I think the point of stopping here was you have probably adjusted one District, this District 7 is probably now the effective District. And so that's a one seat shift. And then you would be looking at shifting another seat like 3 or 14 or 13 or 10 to get your second seat.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I will call this C unless there is another reason.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead. Commissioner Muldoon, your hand is still up. Okay.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I think it makes sense to have C, you know, AB then we can say get rid of B if we find that C worked out better than B or we might find out that C didn't work, and B worked better.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, and Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you. It looks like Mr. Brace has received the results back from Dr. Palmer on the changes that Anthony, that Commissioner Eid had made. An hour or so ago. So I don't know if the Commission wants to take a look at that. Obviously, we want to avoid jumping around too much and confusing things. But if you want to try to get some feedback on that and see how things played out, just a thought.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> Nate Fink: I'm not telling you that's what you should do but I wanted everybody to know the information is available.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think we have been wanting that information. So what's the will of the Commission? Do we want to stop and see that information and then come back? Or do we want to keep working until we are done with this map and then look at that information?

>> Nate Fink: If I may, if I can clarify. It looked like maybe you were do agree couple different verdicts versions to Water Lily; is that right?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> Nate Fink: B is complete.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> Nate Fink: I recommend you send that on to Max, to Dr. Palmer so he can get started on that. And then maybe hit pause and look back at the results and then jump back in on this version C that you were going to start working on. Just a thought.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so Mr. Morgan do you think you could send that off while we're looking at the VRA results and then come back and continue helping me?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. So what I will do is since I potentially will continue drawing, I will send the shape file to the rest of the team and then I think that they can extract what they need to send it to the VRA. Is that okay, Kim?

>> KIM BRACE: You need to send the shape file plus extracted spreadsheet.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, just send me the shape file and I will build the rest of the reports and everything.

>> MR. MORGAN: Is that okay Kent will build that?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that will be fine.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will take the screen down and you can bring up the VRA discussion.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Send it to me, John.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Stop share.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So Dr. Palmer, are you.

>> KIM BRACE: Actually Madam Chairman I have the results from Dr. Palmer.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: So I can share my screen. Provided I can, yes, okay, okay, can you see me now as the saying goes?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, I can see your screen.

>> KIM BRACE: All right, so what we have we called this revision 1-31 for today's date on the Spirit of Detroit. You ended up making changes in districts 10 and 11 or 10 and 12? I'm trying to remember.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 10 and 12.

>> KIM BRACE: 10 and 12. Okay, so let me get okay so from the population side or the voting age population side, what you've done is made District 10, it is still a majority white seat. And District 12 is still a majority white -- these are voting age populations as you can see here from this yellow column. If we go over to the other side of the spreadsheet, what you have done is with District 10, it is still a majority African/American seat in terms of turnout for 10. But for 12 it is not a majority African/American seat. For turnout. Both of them are effective, if you look over here in column AH. You see yes and yes. But you've got a no here in column Z. So what it means is basically you've kind of switched between the two of which is effective or not. Both of them are -- have a majority African/American in terms of the electorate percent of the electorate here in columns AD as in dog. But it's not in terms of the estimated turnout. So District 12 is a little bit on the thin side from that side.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so any questions or comments? Go ahead, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is it closer?

>> KIM BRACE: That's a good question. I don't have the spreadsheet right now before the change.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I might.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And was the primary metric that we were using, was it -- in the original SOD, Spirit of Detroit I understand we are using column Z but was column AH the one in blue, did that change? Or does that still have the same amount of districts that say yes in that column?

>> KIM BRACE: As I recall, I think both of them were yeses.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: Go ahead, mark.

>> Mark Braden: I'm looking at the chart here. What I believe to be the case is that in the column with democratic primary turnout, there were 10 districts. I'm assuming we are not counting the extra, this is the District that is, so we had 10 in the prior plan. And I gather here there is still 10, did I count them up right?

>> KIM BRACE: There is still ten.

>> Mark B are -- Braden: The poll of the democratic primary voters there is an additional District that has -- that is majority Black, potential primary voters. So that's one more. So in the sense of the argument as to whether this District would perform for likely to elect the candidate of choice of the Black community or at least try the actual question is give them an equal opportunity to elect the candidate of choice, I would be inclined to say this plan is slightly better than the prior plan. And I would think that it probably does. That's the way I would interpret it. It does slightly improve on the prior plan in the democratic primary poll of voters. And it makes a majority. So the concept there just so everybody understands why I say that is if you have a majority of the potential Black voters, potential people who vote in the primary are Black, that would be my definition of the floor on which you would base the notion that they have the equal opportunity to elect.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: This is different from what we were looking at yesterday because yesterday we were counting yeses in the other column which have not changed. Maybe they have always agreed before and this is the first time we have seen where they were not in agreement. Because we've got more yeses in one column than the other. Can we pick and choose which of the yes columns we want?

>> Mark Braden: The chart we distributed, I believe yesterday, in the first version of this chart, all the plans except one had identity across. Well, actually two. In the original plans that we were looking at, the original chart that was created, Daisy-2 had 11 democratic primary turnout districts. But had 12 democratic primary poll voters. And then Szetela's plan had nine democratic primary turnout number but 11 primary poll numbers. Which one to use? Well, the easier ones to defend in Court, or to argue to the Court is the democratic primary turnout numbers. Because there has been some history of issues about differential primary turnout and issues like that. That said, what we are really looking at is whether or not the actual District lines, the procedure, is a

procedure that provides less opportunity to choose the candidate of choice. My view is basically that it's -- it is, in fact, easier to argue from the primary but I also think it's a pretty compelling argument if you have a District where the poll of primary voters is majority Black. It's hard to argue that that District does not give them an equal opportunity to elbow lit their candidates over choice. And the question of turnout is simply another subject. That is a political dependent upon the candidates, et cetera, et cetera.

So the original chart we used has both of them. And since there had not been a difference generally, we had principally talked about the primary turnout number. You know, so two different ways to look at it. This clearly does seem to improve the performance or the number of districts by one. Where the democrat primary poll is above the majority.

>> KIM BRACE: Right. So basically, you're kind of caught the same way if you looked at the original Spirit of Detroit or, I'm sorry, the Daisy-2 map that we had shown earlier today where there was the box around the numbers, that's basically what you're seeing in this one now, the change.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so does anyone have anything else about that? I think it kind of felt like a shot in the dark because we were doing it without any data there. So I guess.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I guess my question would be, I missed this part of the mapping and apologize for that I had another commitment but based on the changes made we saw a tiny, tiny improvement to the voting rights score. How did we improve or degrade the map on the other criteria? Can anybody speak to whether it was an improvement or a degradation of the other criteria?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well, I think Commissioner Eid did it just so we could get a start on changing things and see what would happen. He stated that he wasn't real happy with the changes. I don't think anyone was really wanting to make changes to that map. So.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I understand that I'm just trying to now we have gone through this exercise when the Commission looks at this changed map if you look at the Spirit of Detroit and look at the revised Spirit of Detroit, how would you compare those maps other than the voting right, the tiny improvement for the voting right, is it basically the same map? Have we heard an interest of community in trying to achieve VRA compliance? Have we, I mean, what's the consensus on what the change did? So far?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Do you have an opinion?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I certainly think it's from a community standpoint it's worse. But for a few reasons. You know, Harper Woods, East English Village, morning side, I don't believe they want to be with Grosse Pointe which is what we did. And then I also kind of I don't know this for sure because we have not heard it directly, but you know, I

kind of doubt that St. Clair shores wants to be with East Point going down into Detroit. And that's what the changes were. So while this may have helped, you know, let's call it 10 and a half or something on the VRA measure, I certainly think it made a significant downgrade in the COI consideration.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom, I see your hand went down. I assume you were going to say the same type of thing.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, it completely the exact same thing. Communities that literally said the words please do not put us with the points. Because their resources and their voice get drowned out. That is what was done with the map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so I think we will come back to each map, each version of each map and decide, you know, what we want to do with them. But at this point are we okay just moving forward with what we're doing, trying to get more compliant districts in the maps that we have left? Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you. I just want to remind the Commission that part of the concept with those modifications that were made and putting it through the VRA analysis was sort of see how you did, how the Commission did with making modifications without looking at any of the race data or narrowly tailored revisions. You have now seen how one round of that went. So perhaps it would be appropriate to discuss whether the Commission now wants to take a stab at doing revisions using perhaps some of that racial information? Rather than just, you know, kind of trying to figure out where there might be communities that can be moved around. So just wanted to throw that out there. Thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think Brittini's hand was up first.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Brittini?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't even know where to begin. I think and I don't want to speak for the rest of the Commissioners, but I do think that I'm a bit intuitive. I don't know if this is a Fink question. Or Mr. Braden question. I don't know where this is going to land. But I get the sense the Commission of the whole is very uncomfortable. Folks are off camera. They are not talking. Because we don't know what this process is. And for some of us that have drawn before this feels dangerously close, like I can feel the tension across the screen as to what this process was before. So that aside because we've heard different versions of that all day. If we could have some clear legal guidance. And I know this gets sticky because no one wants to recommend things to the Commission because we are clearly confused and uncomfortable. So please because I know these people say something that is going to be clear, hi guys this is an exercise. We need you to do this. So that the courts can see this is not going to work. Hi, we need you to do this because we have to hear because at this point or it is going to be folks drifting off into sleep. People not walking away but then clearly, they don't want to be on record earlier. I am a big fan of transparency. So what is this so we can

get it over with? And move on to something that represents how we have drawn all last week when folks were excited and chatty and for me in particular as a Detroit, it's uncomfortable having folks grapple with the City. It seems they are man's but there are Black people and immigrants and people behind these decisions. Let's just talk about it. Let's just have a nice resolute conversation to do the work it requires, and our experts and staff have tried their best to couch this conversation. But just speaking from experience, it doesn't seem like it's translating well. Okay, that's all I wanted to say.

>> Mark Braden: I'm happy to express a clear view on one point. You drew these plans race blind. And as we felt we were required by the Court to do, and we were required to the Court to do it in my opinion. Now we are looking at whether or not these plans comply with the Voting Rights Act. There's no way to give an opinion on that without using race. Just zip. Zero. You have to use race to try to identify how many of these districts are likely to elect the candidate of choice with the minority community.

If you have created districts that don't create a reasonable number of districts where the candidate of choice is likely to be picked, that will be a violation of the Voting Rights Act. You have drawn all of these plans. If you use race to modify them, I know no way to do a narrowly tailored change to change the number of districts of one or two districts. I know of no way you can conceivably do that process without looking at race while you do it. You need to bring the race numbers up as part of the process of doing this. I know that's different, and this is a change of how you drew these plans. But you can't fine tune without knowing what the numbers are you're attempting to find tune. So you have to look at race.

Two, which, again, we all know that no matter how you draw the plans there are going to be some communities of interest and some changes that people aren't going to like. And that is sort of a given. And that is your decision as to how to balance those and look at those. But you certainly can't, you know, that point comes after you decide how to comply with the Voting Rights Act. I think to comply with the Voting Rights Act I'm totally confident the plans that don't have only have 8 districts are a nonstarter. The ones that have 9, maybe we can defend, maybe question can't defend upon, you know, but it would certainly be easier to defend districts as compliance with the Voting Rights Act that have 10 or more districts.

Two, you received two pieces of paper, two basic pieces of paper to look at. One includes a chart that shows those districts that have very high concentrations of African/Americans in them. That is the starting point for most VRA people looking as to whether a plan complies or not. A starting point is often part of these District's path. So if you have got plans, that have districts, that have very high, you have got plans that have a lot of districts above 90%, I understand the dynamics of geography of Detroit and demographics of Detroit. But I can just tell you that the more districts you have, you know, above 85 or 90% the more difficult it's going to be to be viewed as in compliance. So those are the two things you want to be looking at. So when you are looking at just

out of the blue, I'm not making any comments upon all your other criteria, which are very important, I look at the Spirit of Detroit and I see District 4 that's in above 90%. I can just tell you that Grofman will look at that and go that District is packed. That is way more than the Black community needs to elect its candidates of choice and you divide that District up you probably create, you will think you will probably create another Black District that will all elect candidate of choice in the primary. So, again, just to sort of try to move it forward, you have to bite the bullet if you're going to do this. You cannot do this. You can decide we will go with the plans we do race blind and that is a totally legitimate thing to do. I'm not saying you can't do that, and we can defend these plans. But I'm just saying if you want to make some small adjustments and narrowly tailored changes, the only way that is successful is using race to look at the numbers. And to be cognizant of the other chart we gave to you, because, you know, be thinking about whether there are these very heavily concentrated Black majority districts which will be like a Beacon of a problem for people looking in from outside too. Now maybe that is totally inappropriate but I'm just telling you that is the reality of them looking at it and saying, geez, why do we have 95, 85 plus districts, people will be concerned that that by definition something that large of a number is to look as a starting point for equal opportunity and have to use race.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Two follow-ups then I have to go off camera briefly. So then I feel like the other criteria could be used to make that a defensible map. In this area, District 4 is nestled within an area that has lots of Black people. You got Brightmoor. So there aren't a lot of choices when you are dealing with a City like Detroit that is blatantly Black. So that is one thing. I was almost thinking we need to take another map. Chunk out the area of 5 and 6, take an overlay of the best map that we like and then start to draw based upon COIs and other information. Because I don't know, I think you have myself, and this is I don't represent all folks, right? I have myself and Commissioner Eid, you have Commissioner Curry. But largely without saying it, people are uncomfortable. There I don't know what to do. And people aren't willing to take stabs at it even when they are willing, they are still relying on my voice. And we all at this point I really do feel confident there is the same amount of information that we've all heard in different ways, and we've got to be comfortable with synthesizing it. Otherwise yes, we need another approach because this is not working. But maybe again that could just be a Brittini-ism.

>> Mark Braden: My view and one I'm more than happy to advocate to the Court and the master, one or two districts that appear to be a very high Black population far in excess of what it would need to elect I don't see that as a violation of the Voting Rights Act. And it may, well, given the demographics and geography make total sense and is the right way to draw the plan assuming there is a right way. There is no one right way. I'm totally happy to do that. But if you do that, you need to show that you don't end up with eight districts that are, you know, that we can point to that we are comfortable

performing looking at race data. So I mean you need -- I raise the 90% because I just know that's where the people who do this look at. It does not mean it's not appropriate in this situation.

In fact, my -- for whatever the hell my personal opinion is worth, I think it makes total sense. The geography of Detroit having a District that's 85 or 90% Black probably makes a lot of sense. But I will have to tell you that pressures the notion of having equal opportunity. The language you hear from these political scientists and the people drawing these plans are well that looks packed to me. And you're wasting Black votes. So that's the concern. And, again the one clear thing I can say to you I can imagine how you can adjust these districts in a useful manner and not totally wasting your time without using race. You got to look at it. We are trying to adjust these in the least way possible. And you got to look at the racial numbers to do that. And so that's it. I talked too much already. So sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mean this is hard, folks. What we are doing is hard. I think this is why the appeal is important because on one hand you have the courts telling us not to use race at all and we have our VRA experts again saying you have to use race to narrowly tailor some of these Districts to comply with the V RA. So we have this conundrum, and we have to try to fix it. But I don't really see a way to fix it without either going north of that District 4 and recreating just the old districts 5 and 6, which it doesn't seem like anyone really wants to do. Or going south and breaking up another VRA protected group in the Middle Eastern community which also nobody seems to want to do. I will say at this point, because we did the, you know, the changes to districts 10 and 12 already, the more like you know, 30,000 people, while Mr. Muldoon said earlier was after we do that then we could turn on some data and make smaller changes. And I would feel a little bit more comfortable doing that now. But I mean if 10 is defensible, which is what we have heard today, you know, a few times now, and I'm okay with that. Why are we creating things that nobody wants to create? It just doesn't make sense.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So it's a little disturbing to hear this conversation which is why I asked the question earlier of the question is the map degraded because I wanted it to be spelled out for anybody. We made tweaks, little tweaks to two districts and wrecked three communities of interest so there is that whole community over there that no longer has the representation they would want because we made a tweak. And what did we get out of that tweak? We got a half a point. We didn't get very much out of that at all. We barely moved the ball. So now to get the other half point that we supposedly need we got to go make another tweak. Only this tweak is going to be like what District 4 because it's a Black neighborhood, yeah, all those neighborhoods are Black so it's a lot of Black people there. We can shove them down with the Middle Eastern community

and wreck two more large, very important communities of interest that we have heard over and over and over not to do. And that's just to get what? Another half point on a VRA score that's based on a value that came from a map that's not even valid. So I'm with Commissioner Eid. I really, I don't think we should be trying to do this. I think the Spirit of Detroit map is defensible and logical saying it's the best score drawn race blind that achieves the best results for the most people.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I make a motion we move forward with the Spirit of Detroit as is to the public comment? Can we at least get one that is going forward so my motion is to move forward the Spirit of Detroit map for public comment, if I can get a second.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'll second if it's the original.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, the original.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Seconded.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have a motion and second to move the original Spirit of Detroit map on to public comment. Do we have any discussion on that? I don't see any, so all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: All opposed raise your hand and say nay. I can't see everyone, so make sure you make an audible, if there is.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Do you want a roll call, Cynthia?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I guess so Secretary of State did you hear that.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I heard part of it and want to be correct and be so kind to repeat it move the Spirit of Detroit map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Original Spirit of Detroit map forward.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: The original Spirit of Detroit map, go ahead, I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Forward to public comment.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay, got it. Thank you so much. I just wanted to be sure I had it right in the minutes. So you just heard the motion a yes vote means that you are in favor of the motion. And a no vote means that you are not in favor of the motion. I will call Commissioners alphabetically beginning with Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Steven Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela? Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: I didn't hear you Janice, I'm sorry.
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you.
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: You're welcome.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner in.
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Elaine Andrade?
- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Donna Callaghan?
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Juanita Curry? I think Juanita is off. If I'm not mistaken. Are you there, Juanita? Back to Rebecca Szetela? Madam Chair there are 11 Commissioners and all responding positively and affirmatively with yes.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so the motion carries so the original Spirit of Detroit map will go to public comment.
- So if there is nothing else on that, I would like to go -- Mr. Braden.
- >> Mark Braden: I'm confused because I thought at the beginning of this process the Commission had made a decision that they were going to submit all of the plans that we are talking about right now for public comment in their original form. So did we just vote to do what you already decided to do or am I likely confused?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: We had a discussion of that, but we did not have a motion. So it was not official. Now this one officially is the first one going forward of a comment.
- >> Mark Braden: Okay I will get out of the way because you are doing the important part. I do believe it is important for you to put out all of the plans that you think are appropriate on the list we are looking at right now in their original form for public comment. That will certainly improve our ability to defend whichever one you choose. And I think every single one, before you do anything you should have a -- you have a discussion, I believe, and should follow throughout in sending them all out for public comment. So I will shut up.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: In that case I would like to have a motion we move the Daisy-2 forward also.
- >> Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have a motion and second to move the Daisy-2 map, original, which we didn't change forward to public comments. Is there any discussion on that motion?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Just wanted to confirm on the motion I know you added the original Commissioner Orton that Commissioner Weiss' intent was to move forward the Daisy-2 original plan. Not the Daisy-2B maybe. I'm not sure what it was called. The one Commissioner Eid made minor adjustments to today.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: The one I was looking at is Daisy 2FC, but I guess I don't remember what the other changes might have been.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't think we made changes to that one today.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't think so either.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry, maybe I'm mixing it up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Whatever the latest Daisy-2 map is, I think that's the one you're talking about, right, Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: We have not got the response back from Commissioner Eid's changes, so we are all on the same page. We are talking about the Daisy-2FC is what we are talking about and posted on the website -- that was Edward.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, sir, that is it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We are waiting. Did we make changes to that?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I mean, it has not got back yet. You were working on it but I'm thinking what Commissioner Weiss intended was the original Daisy-2FC that is listed on the website. It's been there a couple days or so but it's not what happened or transpired in today's meeting.

>> CHAIR ORTON: But I don't believe we changed anything in today's meeting, did we?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No, you didn't I, was thinking Spirit of Detroit. The last edits on Daisy were made on the 29th by Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Mr. Morgan has his hand up.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was going to say the same thing it was Monday changes Commissioner Weiss made regarding the population where we adjusted one voting precinct to bring the population into one. That's all.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Eid, do you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, we are good, keep going.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so if there is no more discussion then all in favor of moving Daisy-2 forward to public comment raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

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

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Nay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: They, that is Commissioner Kellom saying nay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I believe there is two nays.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Orton can we make sure we do a roll call vote on these just for the record.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Good afternoon and Commissioner Orton, I just want to be sure that we are talking about Daisy-2FC.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay, thank you. The motion before you is to move Daisy-2FC map forward to public comment. A yes vote means that you are in favor of moving the map forward and a no vote means you are not. I will begin with Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Nay.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> YVONNE YOUNG: He is clearly on the phone. We will come back to him.

Marcus Muldoon, Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes, reluctantly.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: And I'll go back to Commissioner Lett. Who is on the phone. Sarah, shall we move forward, or shall we wait?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I think you can go ahead and move.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Yeah, that's what I was thinking. With nine yes and two no votes the motion carries. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you. So the Daisy-2 map also moves forward to public comment. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I motion we use Bergamot 1 to the next phase of public comment. We are doing the five that we did the other day, right?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So we have a motion and a second to move Bergamot 1 you said.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is correct.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Forward. Discussion? Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I just wonder why are we resisting sending them all? Mr. Braden has said evil times he thinks we should send them all. I don't understand why we are not, if someone could explain that to me.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And Mr. Fink I don't know.

>> Nate Fink: I intended to have a hand up, thank you. Earlier today there was a discussion on I think each of the maps that were just moved forward. You went through the 7 ranked criteria, discussion on those. I know there was a discussion a couple days ago on all of these maps where you sort of had the pluses and minuses as you move forward with the remaining maps, that I think you're considering sending forward in their original form, you know, the pre-VRA tweaking form so to speak, I just want to make sure that the Commission is satisfied with the discussion that they had on each of these other maps in terms of the pluses and minuses. And the analysis of the criteria, all of the ranked criteria, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Commissioner Eid would you be opposed to amending that motion to do the final I believe there is four that we haven't talked that were initially moved forward just to move them all forward?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure. I can change the motion to also include Bergamot 2, Water Lily and Tulip, it's Tulip, right?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I believe Tulip. I will second it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so we have the motion now is to move all of the remaining original race blind maps forward to public comment. Is there any discussion on that? Okay, so can we have a roll call vote on that, please?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely having heard the motion Commissioners I will begin alphabetically yes means you will move the maps forward and no means you are not in favor of moving the maps forward I will begin with Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett? Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?
>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Sorry yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?
>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Hallelujah, yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?
>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Andrade?
>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?
>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry? Commissioner Eid?
>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?
>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Sure, why not, yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair with a vote of 11 yes, the motion carries, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you so all of the original maps that we have been discussing will be moving forward to public comment.

So now, Mr. Morgan, I wonder if we can go back to where we were and see if we can get more of these maps into what our VRA expert feels is compliant. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do not want to stop the positive momentum but how about a recess until 4:00 p.m.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay we have not had one in a while. Not a recess we will just take a break. Just a quick break. We will be back at 4:00 p.m.

[Recess at 4:00 p.m.]

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, it's 4:00. We are back from break. So Mr. Morgan, I'm hoping that you can share your screen and pull back up, so this will be Water Lily C. I'm hoping that we can get this map, you know, get a couple districts to be compliant and have them evaluated.

>> MR. MORGAN: Mr. Fink has his hand up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Fink? Nate Fink: Thank you Mr. Morgan and I understand there is some frustration with going through this process and trying to see if you can make these modifications for VRA compliance purposes. I just want to make an overall comment which I think all Commissioners are aware of. I know all Commissioners are aware of, but we talk about the ranked criteria in the Constitution. And VRA ranks above a lot of these other considerations including communities of interest and not that you don't discard the interest at all, I'm not saying that at all but try to keep that in mind

as you are trying to push through and see what you can do to address the VRA compliance issues that you're tackling right now. Just wanted to keep that in mind. And ask you to keep that in mind. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> Nate Fink: I don't know if someone put this up on the screen.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, Sarah was showing us.

>> Nate Fink: Sarah put it there. So I think it's important for everybody to keep that in mind as you are going through the review of and the minor work you're doing. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay, Mr. Morgan, so that would be Water Lily C, I believe is what we were going to start working with.

>> MR. MORGAN: So as we talked about before, we saved a Water Lily B, which made changes to one District. So before moving forward, let's look back at the earlier map here. The effectiveness map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so you can kind of follow along in your head. We changed 5, 6 and e and affected 8 a little bit and definitely 14, but probably District 7 will be an affected District as redrawn. So with that in mind you have adjacent districts 13, sorry 13, 14 and 10. You also have 3. And those are four Directors districts you can look at to make another affected District. And one suggestion.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I do want suggestions but just looking at this, my first thought was thinking of -- so I think we have seen that if we don't bring them up above 8 mile it's hard to get enough districts that are effective. And I think that's why Hickory was effective in that way, had more districts that were effective because we did take them out of Detroit and past 8 mile. That being said, I think your screen went away, but I think I want to -- I want your opinion any way on bringing 8 and 11 kind of -- going clockwise from 8 and 11 up through 14, 13 and 12 in that area. Does that make sense?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure. So two things. I think this is a two-step process. So let's go back and look at some other versions of 13 and 14. So look at the Daisy 13 and 14, right? So we understand that Daisy didn't touch 13 at all. So this is the same 13 that was not struck down by the Court. But this shows up as a performing District. 14 in this configuration does as well. All right? And then let's look at the Tulip version. So the Tulip version, District 14, is not performing but it's close. And then if we bring up the spreadsheet for Tulip and we focus on District 14 which I just pointed out was close, if we look at the primary turnout here, it doesn't have a yes, it's 41 Black, 46 white for the estimated primary turnout and 38 and 47 so those numbers are fairly close. And lastly over here on the primary pool it's 29 to 31. So that's also close. So that configuration is Tulip 14.

So what does Tulip 14 look like? One thing we could do is bring up an overlay of the Tulip version of this. You could also bring up the Daisy version of 13 and 14, not that

you create those exactly, but the concepts are there. So that is stage one is that I encourage you to look at those because those are examples of performing districts that are in that area.

And then the second thing to consider, going back to the Autobound, when you said about you know, 8 and 11, looking at 8 and 11 as they are currently configured you have Highland Park in 8 and it goes all the way up here into Macomb county. And District 11 currently as drawn has Hamtramck and then has Bangla Town and then it goes north up to 8 mile. So I'm going to go back to the Spirit of Detroit. So the Spirit of Detroit has Highland Park and Hamtramck in a District 7. And currently in the Water Lily B/Water Lily I believe they have Highland Park and Hamtramck in separate districts. So a secondary option would be to, you know, after you potentially look at the configurations of Tulip and Daisy in for 13 and 14, you also might consider looking back at something that might be a little more east-west with 8. And leave a little more and maybe picking up Bangla Town and Hamtramck maybe. And then 11 could go up like that. So you could end up with some sort of combination where you have something like 14 here or again the Daisy version of 14 has this portion which I think goes down to 7-Mile.

So those are some ideas to consider before actually doing anything.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you for those ideas. So my goal here is to try to get this in and in the numbers that are VRA compliant, but not make it look just like another map. Because we want to give the public different options to tell us about, to comment on.

So with that being said, okay, this is really bold here, but I'm going to ask for, I think we have clarified that it's fine if we use racial data at this point to narrowly tailor some VRA compliance. So could we have the thematic circles?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure, and you don't want the neighborhoods or another map overlay at this time?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Not quite yet. I think we will before we start moving things around.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so the first thing is right here the active matrix is just showing districts in the view with total population. However, in the active matrix, the racial data is there. So you can see what the current state of any of these districts is if you want to. And then we can also, if you want, put themes on the voting precincts and/or townships.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think I don't know. Voting precincts or townships, whichever you think would be the most informative at this time.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, do you want to look at any of the other data before you look at the thematic maps?

>> CHAIR ORTON: No. I think it just gives a quick visual idea of areas for me.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so let me ask Mr. Brace when we do these thematics I believe we want to use some kind of Black population. Do you want voting age or total population, and do we use the A or the C there?

>> KIM BRACE: We usually use the A or the C is personal choice. But it's the first one you mentioned.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so this would be voting age population Black A is that like all persons?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes. Well, that is alone, that is Black alone. That is going to be the low numbers.

>> MR. MORGAN: The higher number would be the C.

>> KIM BRACE: The higher number would be the C, that's correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is one and our threshold here would be voting age population, so this is similar to what we previously looked at.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And the C means combined?

>> KIM BRACE: That means combined, yes. So if you remember the census ended up doing whether or not you selected one race or you could select multiple races. But the multiple races gets you more than 100%.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: But the C gets you a larger number than A or alone number.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I made these adjustments. But I don't quite have my control back. So just a second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's graphically processing the whole state. So it will take a moment. Okay.

So then so I don't have the labels are in population. But if I do a pointer on it, when I click on it, I believe that is showing us the percentage. So it's voting age Black C which is the more inclusive number. And the total voting age pop is there. And that is 18%. Which is basically correct. So the size of these, it's relative to what's on the screen, I believe. So this.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that is correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: This 18% is bigger than 12 percent which is 45% here. But the point I'm making is when you see this big circle it does not mean it's 80 or 90% it's relative to what is on the screen is bigger. If we go to an area where we know there is high concentrations of Black voters, now that's 88% but you will see that the size of the circle is similar to what we just saw. But relative size of that neighborhood, that's large and this at 74% is small. But it's very large when you compare it to precincts in Macomb county. So I just wanted to clarify that on the circles.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay, so when so in thinking of how to do this, we are trying to come into VRA compliance with another District. Do you feel that these dots are not as helpful as the information on the matrix?

>> MR. MORGAN: I think that you could use these dots for fine tuning or to help your understanding of what's on the screen, certainly. What I was suggesting before is to use an overlay of one of the other plans which has a District that you know is in compliance, close to being in compliance or effective rather. So you can still use these circles if you like. But I also think it's a broader brush stroke to look at an entire District rather than these precinct dots.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so.

>> MR. MORGAN: We have them, and they are available.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So I think they can go off for right now. But thank you for showing them. And then so I think maybe look it up. Can we look at the effectiveness map of not Tulip, Daisy, I think.

>> MR. MORGAN: I put up Tulip because this is close. And Daisy has a 14 and a 13. So you can't recreate both of these as it stands now in Water Lily, but you could approximate one of these two. So you could, again, 14 might be easier to do. But you could also approximate 13.

>> CHAIR ORTON: That's what I was thinking. Yeah. So why don't we overlay the -- what was that one again?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that is Daisy or Tulip. Tulip is not quite there. But Daisy is.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Overlay the Daisy.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Let me see the current Water Lily we are working on right now.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the current Water Lily I believe the Daisy 14 will be basically this Township and then potentially down to 7-Mile, approximately.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so, yeah, so please overlay I forget these names Daisy.

>> MR. MORGAN: Daisy, so go to the layer manager. Daisy. And the layer properties, purple. Okay, so what's different between Daisy and the current 14? So the current 14 has this portion of Madison Heights and this portion here as well. You can potentially keep Madison Heights and go a little south in Detroit and then take centerline into 13, something like that might work. But in taking away from 8 you will ultimately have to have 8 take from 11 and 11 potentially take from 13 and 14. So that's the population circle that you're looking at.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right, okay can you Zoom out just a little bit? So my thought is to maybe into 14 add from 11 instead of 8. But does anyone else have thoughts? Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I actually have a question that now that this map is up. 8 seems to me so oddly configured that that northeast portion of it, how can they be a COI with the bottom portion of 8 to the southwest? So anyway, if anybody could answer that I would appreciate it. But no, I have no comment on that other map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, well, we were trying not to break up COIs while trying to comply with Voting Rights Act. So that's why it went up further I think in my view of this, at this point, it's not that we are trying to how do I say it? I don't know how to say it, but I remember Dustin Witjes said COIs are who you don't want to be with, they are who you want to be with. That is how I see it. We can't necessarily put everything together that wants to be together but try not to break up people that want to be together. Does that make sense? I don't know if that makes sense. But anyway.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Makes sense to me, Commissioner Orton.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I know, again, if we don't try to comply with the voting rights act, we are saying take the special master's map and I'm not ready to give up, so I want to keep trying. And I'm happy if anyone else is willing to help. So John, what is your thought if we brought 14 down into 11 instead of taking 8 further?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so, again, thinking about the tube of toothpaste here. So if you bring 14 into 11 you will take away from 11. So you could go right down here, and you could get into 11 and then 11 is going to have to take from 14 and basically go up north like that. That's possible. That would be basically would trade between those two.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: The other option would be recreate something closer to this 14 and then potentially look at 8 moving into Hamtramck and Bangla. That is possible. And then you would have 11 doing something closer to what Spirit of Detroit does here or 11 would go.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so what I'm seeing, but tell me if this is not feasible, I'm seeing 14 like the right edge, the east edge of 14 coming down, crossing 8 mile. And then scoot up just a little bit, please. No, the other way, up. And then so I'm thinking 8, 14 and 11 all turning clockwise a little bit. Does that make...

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: That is what I was thinking too Cynthia. I think that is something good to try.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Good help me.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then what that might end up doing is going back to the Daisy configuration. You might end up something closer to what 13 is, not exactly, but that might be something closer to that because see, this is 13. And in Daisy.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I see.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is 14 in Daisy. So what you might end up doing is recreating something closer to 13, which also works because you have the Daisy version of 13 which is exactly the same as Hickory.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, well, again, my goal is not to recreate any map because I want to give more options. But I think let's just try this. Unless you think it's really helpful, I would be okay with taking away this overlay and just putting up the neighborhoods.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so.

>> CHAIR ORTON: With that in mind we will kind of with those three districts kind of go clockwise.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: But you're the expert. So what do you think? What do you think we should do?

>> MR. MORGAN: That might work to some extent. I think that you will have to be cognizant of what happens to this upper portion of 14. Because I don't think you will move towards the change you want if you have this, this and this. So you're going to have to reconfigure it like approximate 13 or approximate 14.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I see, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Because if you keep Madison heights and bring 14 down here then you will have to remove some of 14. Commissioner Eid had his hand up. I guess he maybe put it down.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Do you want to say something, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I think you are going down the path I was going to suggest.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I thought you were going to try to move 14 on the east side there to come closer where it's got that, where 8 is now.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right but if, where 8 is.

>> MR. MORGAN: 8 is here, 11 is here.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: 8 goes to 11 and 11 goes up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: The problem is look how high 14 goes on the west so then we are really stringing that out and we are not really changing the population.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the suggestion would be Madison Heights plus part of centerline plus maybe up to 7-Mile or something like that, which would approximate 14. Or the other way would be to approximate 13 and then I'm not sure how that would turn out. But so either of those is close to what you want to do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No, go ahead.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well I'm thinking, yes, I like what you just said about approximating 14. So can you move us towards that and then we will see where that leaves us. This is a copy so we can always just scrap it, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. We could go back to B, which has none of these changes. Okay, so and then just thinking an additional move ahead, after you take away from 8, 8 will need population. So you would have to either take from 14 or take from 11. So, again, one possible thing, I'll put the neighborhoods on because you had asked for that, sorry, let me get that on there.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Push 11 up to where 14 is now?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, here is you take 11 into a small portion here in Macomb County, which is not exactly, but similar to what's happening here in the Spirit of Detroit version. So that might happen. And then you also have the option of looking, you talked, I've heard you talk about the community of Hamtramck and Bangla Town. Sometimes maps have Highland Park and Hamtramck together. So if you were to need population from 11, you could potentially take all of this community, that direction. That is one possibility. The first step is you want to do 14. So you're going to overpopulate 14 and that is understandable. So the first step is to take all of this into 14, right?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay. So we are assigning into 14 by voting precinct.

>> CHAIR ORTON: What I really hope doesn't happen is we end up with six maps that all look the same because that is not helpful.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: It would be confirming that you get to the same endpoint.

>> MR. MORGAN: Mr. Stigall has his hand up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That 14 you are drawing is the 14 that is in Bergamot. If you take farewell, Pershing and Butler and put it in 14 that is what is in Bergamot 1.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is where you are headed.

>> MR. MORGAN: You will go down to 7-Mile or something. Okay, so and then you will probably have to take off later this portion and put it into 11 or 13 or something.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That northern part of 14 there are a couple of precincts. I looked at it with Bergamot because it stuck out in my head. The two precincts by Warren county, 58 can hold at least one of those. So you know you start moving a little bit then you can move further down in Detroit.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: So taking from 8 you would do these three potentially or this whole Section?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well, do the three first.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then you can also look at these if you need to. So let's start with this.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Wondering if we saved before we did this part of it. because there are some conversation on the YouTube chat that might be interesting if we are considering the neighborhoods in this District.

>> CHAIR ORTON: This was brand new version of just a copy of this. So there was nothing to save before we started making these moves.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: All right, thanks.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, this is the continuation of Water Lily B. Now it's Water Lily C. I think Mr. Stigall has his hand up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think it was still up but, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Got it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So I'm not looking at YouTube chat or anything but if any Commissioners have anything to add that is pertinent to these neighborhoods, please add. I'm just trying to get to VRA compliance at this point.

>> MR. MORGAN: As soon as that finishes, I will save and Zoom out so you can look at it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: 14 will be overpopulated and that is to be expected. And Cynthia you have got this piece here of Madison Heights that 14 probably has to keep. So you would potentially look at shedding populations into 11 or 13, somewhere over here when you are ready for that. And then when you adjust 8, you have the option of going north, but keep in mind let's go back to the starting point here of Water Lily. The original 8 before any adjustments you have was very strong on the Black to white democratic primary. And then you moved north and lost a little bit of 8 here. So there was probably plenty of population that could have been moved without affecting the effectiveness, without affecting the effectiveness of this. So that is where we were, and this is where we are.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so up top of 14 where Mr. Stigall pointed out that top, yeah, it was a precinct, that top precinct, he suggested that 58 can handle that. So let's see about that.

>> MR. MORGAN: So just this one is 1500 so you could do that. I'm assuming that it won't affect the other two districts when we look at 8. 8 is there, 28 and 29. So they are within one. And you will take one away so it will be 28 to 28 so that should be fine, okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: So this goes into 58?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: So let's make sure 58 is unlocked.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Actually, before you do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We have not touched 58 up to this point.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's correct. So if you want to keep it that way, don't make that move now but Mr. Stigall's point was that as it stands 58 is under populated so if you added a 1500 precinct there, it would still be within tolerance so that is an option if you want to come back to that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think we should come back to that because I'm not sure we want to touch districts that are out further that we haven't touched.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so do you want to put a portion of 14 and 11 as a holding place? Or.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, I do.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: But I think.

>> MR. MORGAN: 14 is over by 26,000. So you would probably have to take, let's see, 8, 11, 15, 18, 20, 27, that's almost the right amount. This plus that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: But I don't like that. Well, I think first of all 14 is going to need to come down a little more.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to reference 14 in one of the other plans or bring an overlay on top? Or, wait, I have the overlay up but it's hard to read.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is the Daisy.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan do you have any suggestions of like which neighborhoods to add into 14? I'm wondering about Sherwood and north town or Davidson or, you know, and Krainz Woods the ones we have gotten to but not gone in to.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I don't have any specific guidance. But those particular neighborhoods, I guess I would just move east.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, that is what I'm thinking. Okay, yeah, that little Section there that your cursor is near. Start there, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: So we are adding more to 14?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so now 14 is 33,000 over and then 8 is 25,000 under. And 11 is 4500 under because you took a little bit from 11, quite a bit from 8. And so, again, what I was going to say is the purple thick outline is from the Tulip or sorry not the Tulip but from the Daisy. So this is the Daisy boundary in the Detroit area.

So we have this part and this part but not this part. And then I think, yeah, so you have this portion that needs to be accounted for. So that's one of the reasons why the numbers aren't quite working. Because on that end so you will have to take out a portion of it so as soon as I get the mouse back, I will save.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: It doesn't sometimes when we make a lot of changes, we can lose the memory buffer.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so while that is saving where would you go from here? Do you think we should try and balance out the population first or get 14 down to where we think it needs to be?

>> MR. MORGAN: Well, so I think that, you know, 8 has changed a lot. So I think you might want to look at what makes sense with eight. And I mentioned the Bangla Town

community and Hamtramck. If that makes sense you can put some of that area into 8 and then 11 would need to go north.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah. Commissioner Callaghan, were you saying something?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No. No.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just waiting for the plan to save. A little longer.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Let's hope it saves.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Cynthia, he was advising I would take Bangla Town, maybe Hamtramck and go to the east and wrap 11 to go up above 8 mile.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Take some out of whatever that other one was just added too much too.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

While we are waiting, what are people's thoughts about changing that one precinct that Mr. Stigall mentioned into 58 I believe it was, which we have not touched. Is it worth touching a District that is beyond the scope of what we are working in? Shall we just leave it?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I say just leave it.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I say leave it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are already far beyond the scope of what the Court says needs to be changes so even further beyond that scope I don't think is a good idea.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think it's saving, yes, it just saved.

>> CHAIR ORTON: You are not sharing your screen in case you thought you were.

>> MR. MORGAN: I thought it was going to drop out but it's okay.

Okay, oops up here so I just completed a save. It did slow down a little bit so okay so I'm getting things a little slower. So what I think we should do quickly is let me exit the program and come back into it. That will only take a moment, but I think that is a good thing to do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Please do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will put another map up for you to look at there.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Is that like a splash Page or something?

>> MR. MORGAN: Almost. Yeah, because I just took it down for a second because Autobound edge is going really slow.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And it quit sharing just so you know.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I do apologize this is taking so long but at least we are trying something is what I think. Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yeah, I just wanted to say thank you for doing this. Because it's something that needed to be done. Just to and you're doing a good job.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was going to say the same thing. No need to apologize. It would be nice if more people participate, help you out. Because I know what you are doing is hard.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well thank goodness John is here to help. But.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm reopening the Autobound plan here. I'll be right back.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We will all feel good after we get a map and see if we can get it in compliance and then we can look at it and see what we can do.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So did we come to a conclusion about the modified Spirit of Detroit? Are we going to send that for public review or no?

>> CHAIR ORTON: We did not come to a conclusion.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I can look at that a little bit more after Cynthia is done and see if we can continue to.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Get the rest of that half point.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay almost back.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Imaging the neighborhoods then I have to confirm that it saved where we thought it did. It was a memory error, so I don't think we lost anything, but it was getting slow because of the memory. That's what happens sometimes when we make a lot of changes. It just eats up the memory. All right. So I'm bringing the share back on.

>> KIM BRACE: What happens with Autobound it saves each of the individual moves and so that's what is eating up the memory.

>> MR. MORGAN: Exactly.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We need to be more efficient with our moves.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's okay.

It's doing what it's supposed to do.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so if you would move down to Hamtramck, we just need to make sure we keep that whole community of interest together. That we know about. So.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 8 needs a lot of population. So I'm pretty sure in terms of just population and also the community of interest, if you take the Bangla Town, Hamtramck and potentially all of this area, it probably will be -- it will affect the population without being too much.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, that would look good too. Just from a compactness. So try that.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right so we will restart with so many things. Okay, here, voting precincts. We are talking about into 8.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want Davidson probably or not yet?

>> CHAIR ORTON: If it can handle it Davidson and Buffalo Charles as well, I believe.

>> MR. MORGAN: We will come back to that then.

let's do Hamtramck first. Theoretically the voting precincts should be okay to use. So I will assign those. That was a lot of population.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so 8 has 8,000.

>> MR. MORGAN: 8 is over but keep in mind we could potentially add or change things around up here in the north and you also have Noland and Krainz Woods and garden areas to consider.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, finish that.

>> MR. MORGAN: This one?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, and the partial neighborhood there.

>> MR. MORGAN: One at a time.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then I will take the rest of this Davidson portion back into 11 just so we are following neighborhood boundaries, and you can adjust from there.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. I think there may be a portion north as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: This here?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep. Okay so 8 is 10,000 over. And then 14 is 33,000 over and 11 is 40,000 under. So that's where that stands. So you need to lose a little bit from 8.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, something we are not really in this area right now but down below like Hamtramck.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Just that little sliver to the east right here, just that little sliver needs to go into that neighborhood. I don't know if it's populated. If you can just fix those.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into 8. So that is just a choice. So the neighborhood boundary, yep.

>> CHAIR ORTON: There is not population because.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Then it's fine like it is.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So now so we need to take some of 8.

>> MR. MORGAN: To 11 or 14 depending on where you go.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so I think in my mind, if you Zoom out just a little bit, the not quite that far.

- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Take that arm off of 8.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: So what I'm thinking is so we need to take away from 8 so I'm thinking the northern part of 8 including that little arm to go to.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: 11.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: I was originally thinking 11 but I don't know. 11 or 14 and 14 needs to come down on the east side of it, you know, on.
- >> MR. MORGAN: When you say come down 11 goes up into it.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, yeah.
- >> MR. MORGAN: So I will put the neighborhoods back on. So the first step would be to put these into 11 potentially?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Let me see. Yes. Over to Noland I believe. Unless somebody.
- >> MR. MORGAN: You would not want to put this into 11 automatically, right? Do you want to wait and see what this is first?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, but, yeah, just the 8 portion, not what we have on 14.
- >> MR. MORGAN: Okay.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: You clicked on, okay, never mind. I think my screen might be a little delayed. So I'll try not to back seat drive.
- >> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this portion first. And that's going to get you about half of where you want to get population ones.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Take 11 north into 14?
- >> MR. MORGAN: Or finish 8?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, he needs to do 8, I think.
- >> MR. MORGAN: So when I switch to the voting precincts it should give us the population of this area. So let's see. So 12, 24, 33, 4,000, that is almost exactly what you need.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: That's not contiguous really.
- >> MR. MORGAN: No, into 14.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Into 14, okay.
- >> MR. MORGAN: Or not, if you want to do something else.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: We are wanting to move a little bit more from 8.
- >> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, so this is the right amount of population to take from 8 and the other consideration is if you were to take from eight down here that just undoes the community of interest that you kept intact in this area.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Right. So potentially put this in 14.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: 11 takes the rest of 14?
- >> MR. MORGAN: 11 would go north and take the east side of 14.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Do that, please, John.
- >> MR. MORGAN: Okay, all right so we will try this into 14. Voting precinct. And a little more here. Okay so I just have to undo this one here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We are getting close. This is exciting at least close on population, that is all we know.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I'm going to save this now because we just made a bunch of changes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: And then let's see when we are looking at the population numbers, so we are 35 under, 35 almost 36 under in 11 and we are over by 39,000 in 14. So they should be pretty close to balancing. However, that move into 58 is an option if the population doesn't quite balance the way that we expect.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right, okay so yes, we just need to do that then. We need to move 11 up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

So we are going into 11. We can probably use precincts because we are moving large population.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: So start with that first?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I will think we will go one more over, but start with that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then you probably will need to go north. You can also go here but you probably will need to go north as well because remember you have this piece of Madison Heights which is in and the version of Daisy doesn't have Madison Heights in there, right? So you will probably end up having to go a little north as well.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So for right now Zoom in a little more.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: North for population or for community opportunity District?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Population.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, it's a bit of both, I think.

>> CHAIR ORTON: For right now can you start, and I don't want to break up centerline so just kind of below there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want all of centerline in 11 or not really?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Choose what you think just by eyeballing it. Population wise. And we will just.

>> MR. MORGAN: You will need 20,000. So that is going to be a lot.

>> CHAIR ORTON: All of that.

>> MR. MORGAN: 3, 7, 9, 10, yeah you might end up having to take all of centerline but I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead and take all of it. I don't want to take part of it.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that is 18,000 so start with that and then see what you want to do after.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I want that one precinct.

>> MR. MORGAN: I would take that one as well so, yeah, do that one. Okay so 11 is okay, 14 is just a little bit over, so you would have the option of moving this into 58

which you don't necessarily want to do or just splitting one of the precincts along this line or probably you don't want to do this because it's a neighborhood. Or you could actually this might work, 14 is over. You could take this out and that is a neighborhood that's split.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Right, do that because we don't want to split that neighborhood anyway.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Good eye.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's what I do. That is a little more than I thought but it should be okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Close.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So it brings us within our deviation.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. And here the deviation 4.96, largest is sorry smallest is 59 largest is 21. So that means that everything you changed is within those bounds.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: That is a really ugly District though.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. So will you take the neighborhoods off. We know we kept neighborhoods together so if you can take those off just so we can see a cleaner view of the entire.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so neighborhoods off. Okay and then the other map overlays are also off.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, well, unless somebody has something else, I would like to just send this off for VRA review. And then we can discuss it after we see what the findings are.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I agree. I like that idea.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

I don't see any opposition. So please do that. And then do we have anything else back that we have sent off? For review? No? Okay, so I have a question then. It's 5:00. We have an hour left. Do we just want to go on to the next? Next is Bergamot 1 and Bergamot 2 and I will say if we change one of those it will be easy to change the other one, you know, because they are the same. But Commissioner Eid, do you have an idea?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would be willing to take another shot at.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I forgot.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Detroit changes more that we moved the large population around and erased blind fashion.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you for reminding me and I forgot you already said that. Mr. Morgan, did you have something first?

>> MR. MORGAN: I was going to say if Mr. Stigall is available, we can switch map drawers and I can send this off to the team.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Great.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yep, I'm here and where do you want to start or who is going to start or?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Bring up Spirit of Detroit, the one we already worked on, right? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I guess it's Spirit of Detroit 2 or today's date. I don't know.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think I put today's date and B on it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I looked at so many in the last three hours. I want to make sure this is the edited one.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Got some extra Caffeine in me now so let's go. I'm sure we called all use some after the meeting we had today.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Why not. Let's see. Yeah, this is the edited Detroit version.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Want the neighborhoods on or? How do you want to approach that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So remind me with the spreadsheet which one out of the ten and 12 we have in here which one did perform, and which one did not perform?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think what happened it flip-flopped. I don't think I have the new one up. But it flip-flopped 10 and 12. Halfway flip-flopped 10 and 12.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: But one of them currently under column Z said yes and the other one said no.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 10 now says yes. And 12 says no.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe that's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we double check that?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm trying to see if I have it.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: In the old version 12 was a yes and 10 was a no. And in the new version, those two flip-flopped and both turned into yes on the dem primary.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, but I'm looking at column Z the primary turnout.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the old one.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So in the old plan, in the original Spirit of Detroit District 12 is a yes. District 10 was a no. Average is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 12 and the second one is the last one is 10. So it was yes and no. 12 was a yes. And 10 was a no.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 10 was no and no in the old version. And the new version it's yes and yes and 12 is no and yes.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Correct. I believe that is correct. I don't have the new numbers. I just have the old numbers.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is what I'm looking at the old ones but it essentially, I got them halfway because one District had two nos and no one District only has one no. So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right, okay, so in this version then 10 is a yes and 12 is a no.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: When you say this version.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Spirit of Detroit 2 that we moved District 10 to include East Point and a couple of the neighborhoods in Detroit.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: And 12 is a no in this version.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Not quite performing.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, well, how can we rearrange 10.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: My brain said a hundred times look at race and I know you all are hesitant on it but talking about making it work it sounds to me like he is saying do it. I can understand if you don't, but you can turn on just show the Black and white. My guess is all you need is to move a few hundred people.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think you're right but.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If you know the neighborhoods you can really, really well you can look at it without looking at the numbers. Personally there is a hundred different ways to move these numbers around but more than a hundred, thousands. Like 11 has an extra 780 people. So one way to do it would be to take you know a smaller neighborhood and add it into 12, and 12 is overpopulated and need to add into 10 and maybe out of 12 and into 10.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I really want to try to keep this to 10, 12 and 13. And right now 10 is performing. But 12 does not perform. So, correct?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm looking here like Franklin. I know what you said but Franklin right now is a split neighborhood. And in my mind when you can undo small changes tailored that will make a note measurable difference that is the impression I have gotten. I'm not a legal consultant either.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So let's try to put the only issue is 12 is the one that is not performing but 10 is. So if you're saying put Franklin in 10, then we would have to move -- okay, so let's try this. Let's try Yorkshire Woods and Morris and put it in 12.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's see the total population. And maybe before we start making commitments to this. Take some like this?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Not really why I didn't show the numbers. So that is 4,000 people. And I don't know the population of that neighborhood. But is that enough to tilt 12 significantly?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Does anyone have the spreadsheet that shows what the statistics were? How far apart, how far off is 12 now? I need to see those numbers. Otherwise I don't know if 4,000 is enough or not.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 10% of a District is 5,000. 1% is roughly or 10% is 9,000 so 5,000 is 4500 people so that is 5% of a District. You know, if it's 80% Black it probably will tilt those because you're looking at for 10th of 1%. If you want to look at those numbers, you can look at them. But.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So, Anthony, maybe to help maybe we can Zoom out and like probably get we will probably get criticism for this but look at the shape of the District and just see kind of what do you think?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It seems to me you're going to have to put some people in perhaps in the neighborhood that is highlighted into 12.

>> CHAIR ORTON: At least, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So let's start there. .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Assign that to 12. It's in the middle of doing it.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I just want to be sure we don't flip-flop the neighborhoods again. 10 is good and 12 is bad or 12 is bad and 10 is good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: But they are so close and that is why it's going to be hard to do without actually looking at the numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: At this point, since we've already set this off once because it was what Commissioner Muldoon was alluding to earlier, we sent it out once and changed all of East Point I think now would be an appropriate time to actually be able to pull up those numbers.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want me to label the features or?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mean, I don't think we need like the dots per se. But I mean I think you can look at.

>> CHAIR ORTON: A spreadsheet.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: A spreadsheet. .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Aggravating. Get down here. But right now we are looking at 10 is down a bunch of people. But you can see, you know, by moving that number, I don't know if you want to look at voting age or total population, but just for a general idea, that right there 10 is still, you know, what is the word I want? It's still majority-minority. Or whatever label you want to, how you want to look at it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Uh-huh.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Whereas 12, you know, you really still haven't moved the meter.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On 12. Okay, so below that.

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's look at two more of those neighborhoods Denby and the neighborhood above it, let's add those to 12 as well.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Gosh, stop it. I had it on blocks and I'm not zoomed in far enough. So if we look at Demby, and we are looking at 2600 more people. Put those in 12?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Put those in 12. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now you got it's 53% minority.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Ten is almost minority still.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: General sense like you said we don't though frankly what the analysis would come back at.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Right. Add that last neighborhood to 12 as well. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Total populations.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Now for ten Zoom out a little bit.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me get these few blocks here. Is Harper Woods.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Harper Woods is in 12 that is correct.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want to keep it in 12?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Absolutely.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: This split neighborhood right here.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Do me a favor and remove the racial data now.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: All right here is what we are going to do. Go to the border of 10 and 11. We are going to add a little bit of these neighborhoods into ten to make up for that population deviation, that is going to bring the population on 11 down and we are going to fix that by moving some of 13 down into 11.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want to do it up in here or in Detroit.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: We need to make sure that there are more Detroit neighborhoods in ten. So let's start there. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 33,000.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Put Franklin in there too.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Add Franklin too into 10. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want all of Franklin?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: All of Franklin.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are taking some.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Uh-huh.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: And I did a terrible job. Almost like it's in 12. I'll get it right this time.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: So at this point 11 is under. Well, you can see the numbers.

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: So we need more people in ten. Zoom out, please. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 13 could give up a precinct.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: So what we will do, do you see the precinct right there, read my mind.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's an interesting shape.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: But I mean the question is what is the demographic of that precinct? Right?
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Exactly.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 3,000 people so it's going to -- well, ten still needs a lot.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay how about.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: The numbers are in 12.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: The numbers are there in 12 so what is the -- okay, yeah, go ahead and assign it to 10.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you look at the graph for ten now to see how that changed?
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's still within a percent or two. It's 53%.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: 53. All right.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know. 12 is still very, you know, over all high, population. So that needs -- you took some from 7 which, yeah. This is a little bit of a split-up neighborhood.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I'm just trying to think about.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: But 7 still works actually.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Trying to think about how do we reduce the population on 12, only way I can really think of is going into the Grosse Pointe area a little bit. But, you know, I would rather not. But that's the only thing I can really see because you're here on the border between 10 and 12.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: That's all I see too.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: So I guess let's take just a few precincts of Grosse Pointe and put them into 10.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: So that would be up in this region?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Right.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do you want to come back over in here?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: That is Harper Woods.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Stay away from Harper Woods.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Unless you have a better idea Kent, how we can get this to work.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I mean why couldn't you put -- well, however, any time you split any area, you run a certain amount of risk or disadvantages and advantages to

doing any one thing. When I look at it, I look at it as, you know, this is not, you know, shore front.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These precincts.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Actually the drive and Hays right below ten. It's currently in 12, outer drive.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What is the name of it?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Outer drive. What if we put that in 10?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put all this in 10?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Maybe not all of it but how we need the population to work out.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can take a selected piece of it. 12 needs to drop, well, 12 needs to drop 14,000.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's going to be all of it plus. I'm not so sure you couldn't do something. 7 can take some. So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 12 needs to drop first.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 11 needs people and takes some from 7 and 7 takes a larger piece on 12. Does that make any sense?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That can make sense. The only issue I'm worried, if you do that you will flip 12 from a yes to a no but let's try it and see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Another way to do it, and this is just going by speculation, you guys know the neighborhood, if you took you know like well morning side you want all of these villages together.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do it with outer drive and if not the only other way to do it is looking at the upper precincts of Grosse Pointe.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, let's see here. We have Grosse Pointe Shores, would you want to leave all that in 12 or you know like I'm just selecting and see what it would look like. Does that fit with the north of 8 mile?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's a whole different Township. So, no, but I mean we could try it and see if it works numbers wise.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We say that but what I see is these neighborhood roads crossing over.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is true.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All through here and I know they live in different localities like all across America. But at the same time and they are different county Government, county seats, granted, yes. If you did that you are keeping most of the shores and Grosse Pointe.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's assign that to ten and see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: To ten. Guessing as everybody is that if anything you improve the minority percentage, I'm guessing. The ten is right and 12 still has to drop some. And 11 still needs a chunk. And it's probably going to get to 11 through 7.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm thinking 13 is going to have to end up going south a little bit. Right? If we put some of 10 into 13, 13 can go south then 11 can come up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put that into 13 and 13 would be good that number, 2994, that fits right into 13. Does that make sense to you?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes. That's what I'm saying.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Drop that into 13. And now 10 is a little low but they are altogether now 10, 11 and 12.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So let's try taking out the outer drive, Hayes area. And put it in either 10 or 7.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm just going to select it. And I have to change that, but I will get that up right now.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So ten is high. Now can you check the demographic makeup of 12?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 10 is low. 12 is good. 7 is high. So 7, 10 and 11 and they all touch right there so I think so 12 is 48%, the largest minority and up to 55.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And ten.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: But ten is down in population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right so we will put either some of 7 or 11 into 10 right now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Somewhere right in there I'm thinking.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's try that. That neighborhood right there. That is kind of split. Put that all into ten. .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 4500 and that will make ten about exactly right. You might want to flip it. But Von-Steuben in 11 but 7 is still high.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 7 is still high. Okay, let's go but.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Look at the whole neighborhoods and you can kind of get a pretty good idea where you want to go.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 7 is high you said. What is low, 11?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 11 is low. 7 is high. Yeah. So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: By about the same amount?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: By about the same amount?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 1600.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you check ten with the change that was just made?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 44% and 53% minority.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is good enough to see if it made a difference. It made not have. We may need to do more tomorrow but a small improvement there. Now let's just look at 7 and 11 and normalize the population there. .

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Ten could come down further in here.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: I want you to put outer drive in ten.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Outer drive back into ten.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Outer drive back into ten.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's try it.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I see where you are going with it okay now the neighborhoods on the west end of ten that we previously put into ten, put those into 7 or 11, whichever way it makes sense. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 45 and singular precinct.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Put that in 7.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me bring up the populations for the precincts so we can at least get these numbers. .
- So these are precincts, but you see that will be about 3500 or 3300. Which would put ten about right.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Those would go into 11, correct?
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Do that and we will see if that helps ten perform or not. If it did, good. If not, we will undo the outer drive change and try a different thing. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right we will put that into 11. I got to fix that again. So 11 is just a little high. And what did I just do? I didn't put all of it into there. Assign all that into 11. Yep, how many times am I going to do that wrong?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, that can go into ten.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I got it.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Cool, we are within deviation.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 11 is just a little off but it's whole neighborhoods. I think.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, so where are we at 10? Did that change how ten performs?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Ten is 45%. Non-Hispanic Black and 53% minority.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: How is that going to turn up on, you know, Dr. Palmer's spreadsheet? Or we won't know until we try it, right?
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I certainly don't know. I mean if we bring up, you know, if you have been moving, you know, predominately like this from my understanding is predominant or heavily white and we move those into ten which made 12 better. But, you know, technically VRA from the way it's been discussed it could have, you know, basically you know, tit for tat and just tilting you know 10th of a point here and there and it goes back and forth so I'm not certain. Now, if you wanted, you can go in here and move, you know, what you know is, you know, Black neighborhoods like right in here. I don't know, you can make ten 2% high rather than just 200 people.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: 11 is low right?

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 11 is low.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: 11 is going to perform.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: What if you came up here in 11.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Before you do that, I agree and see where you are going. Let's add the one neighborhood that is right above Franklin. Put that back in ten.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put it back this ten and see if it can do it the first ten times. Put 10 and 11 and do you have another area you want to move or attempt to move?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: There are more people in that neighborhood than I thought.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I see it, you know, it's urban.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes. So that is 2700 right there and would not do it and both of these would be 4500.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: That will put 13 too high but then.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was going to put them in 11.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Put them in 11. Okay, yeah, do that. .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Total population are all in place now, correct? Yep.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Looks like it.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Ten went up a couple of 10th, so it's the largest non-Hispanic race 46.39%.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: And it's over.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 11 is way up. 12 is the largest single population. I mean from what we can read. So.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay I don't like it but let's send it and see if it works.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: See if it works.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Any thoughts from anyone else?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Good job, Anthony, thanks for working on that.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: We want to start right here. This is Detroit B? Do we want to save it as Detroit?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: It was B.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: I think now you can have a C.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Save it as a C. And I'll get that previous version as B, right? Is that the deal?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: That is correct.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Or do you want to move this forward as B?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: No, think C, having the progression could be good because on B it did flip on the one metric at least. But the half metric or whatever we are calling it.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Renaming.

>> KIM BRACE: I would agree. You want to keep versions so that we can backtrack and see where we are to make sure all the reports are correctly labeled.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well, this is going to be under score C.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Kent, you can stop sharing your screen and do what you need to do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: And we will move on to Executive Director report. Without objection I will ask Director Woods to present his Executive Director report. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you very much. I'm just going to just want to put one slide on my -- on the screen so everybody knows our meeting dates for February. So that there's no ambiguity and complete clarity for the public are we meet tomorrow 9-1 and 2-6 and February 8, 10 to 2, a regularly scheduled meeting so Commissioner if you have an agenda item or something you want to discuss regarding the business of the Commission we will need that on no later than Monday. But that is for the agenda items for February 8 the regularly scheduled meeting. February 15th is a virtual meeting. It will be like a virtual town hall, and it will be with the Commissioners. It will be similar to what was done last week. We will rotate time, so people can facilitate and take feedback from the public in a virtual setting. So we will meet 9-12. 1-4 and 5-8. On February 21 we will have our public hearing from 10-1, 2-5 and 6-8 on that Wednesday. We want to thank Mike Brady from Michigan Department of State as well as Bishop Charles Ellis of greater grace temple. They will be hosting us for the public hearing on February 21st at those times. On February 22 I want to thank Mike Brady again and Bishop Edgar Vann, Second Ebenezer Church that Thursday 10-1 and 2-5 and 6 to 8. On Tuesday, February 27th, we will be meeting virtually from 8-11 a.m. And then on Wednesday, February 28th we will meet from 9-1 and 2-6 which will also be a virtual meeting. So just wanted to share those dates with you and public, so everyone is clear on the dates and contractors want to thank the Michigan Department of State for their assistance. And if there is any questions regarding the dates that the Commission is meeting in February, please let me know. Hearing none that concludes my report, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you. So I will just say along with those dates, tomorrow is our last day to get where we want to be to send the maps out to the public. So we I think have learned a lot today about trying to reconfigure these maps. And hopefully we can get where we want to be tomorrow and do our vote.

So, without objection I will ask Department of State if they have a report or an update. Hearing no objection, Sarah Reinhardt, I do see your hand, Mr. Fink, after.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I have no update so I will let Mr. Fink speak.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Fink.

>> Nate Fink: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. I actually was just wondering if Mr. Brace had received any of the reports for the earlier map which you had sent out. Because it would be nice to have that. If not I'm sure he will share it upon receipt but just wanted to see if they have it yet.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We can wait on that for tomorrow, Madam Chair. That will be fine.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> Nate Fink: That is fine because we are almost to 6:00 here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Maybe first thing in the moment would be a great way to kick it off.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Correspondence received in advance of our meeting along with written public comments to the Commission. Are there any announcements from any Commissioners? Seeing none, our business is finished for today so a motion to adjourn is in order.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So moved.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Moved and seconded we adjourn, all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay. Okay, we are adjourned at 5:48 p.m.