

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

20240418-1000 Meeting

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

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning everybody. As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:01 a.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube on The 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 and Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at Redistricting@michigan.gov For additional viewing options or details for accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at Michigan.gov. for those accommodations.

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

This meeting also is being transcribed and those closed-captioned transcriptions 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 that may be Accessed by visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, Executive Director For the Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov or 517-331-6309. I will ask the secretary to take the roll, please.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: 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 absence is due to military duty state the county, City, Township or the village and state which you are attending the meeting remotely. I will begin roll call alphabetically with Elaine Andrade?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present attending remotely from Mexico.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Juanita Curry?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Anthony Eid?

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

>> CHAIR EID: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present attending remotely from Osceola County, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Steven Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present attending from Lee County, Florida.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present from Carrollton, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present; attending from Highland Township, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Richard Weiss?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Go back to Brittini Kellom. Mr. Chair, you have 12 Commissioners present and you have a quorum.

>> CHAIR EID: We will move on to adoption of the agenda.

As a reminder to the public watching you can view agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Anyone?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Moved.

>> CHAIR EID: Motion moved by.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Mr. Chairman, it is anticipated that we will go into closed session regarding the negotiations on attorney fees with the Plaintiffs. We have a couple of presentations, mapping VRA, et cetera. Where our experts will be presenting. I would suggest or I would move that we move those presentations up to prior to the closed session.

>> CHAIR EID: I was going to suggest the exact same thing in discussion. Would you like to amend Commissioner Weiss' motion possibly to do that? Moving new business items mapping presentation, VRA presentation and partisan fairness presentation to take place before unfinished business?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, that's my motion.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay it's an amendment to Commissioner Weiss' motion, does that moment have a second?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I will second it.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay all those in favor of the amendment to the motion to move new business items AB and C to be above unfinished business please raise your hand and say aye.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: One second, please, Chair, I had computer issues and had to rejoin. What are we voting on right now, please?

>> CHAIR EID: No worries Commissioner Wagner we are voting to amend the agenda to move items new business A mapping presentation, B, VRA presentation and C partisan fairness presentation to take place above unfinished business. And that is to facilitate the meeting better because we may have to go into closed session to discuss the appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: All right thank you.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: This is a motion to amend Commissioner Weiss' motion to approve the agenda. And the amendment is as Anthony stated.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Understood, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Is there any other debate about the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Are there any opposed please say nay?

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it. We will now go back to the original motion to adopt the agenda as amended. That was made by Commissioner Weiss and seconded by Commissioner Calhoun, is there any further debate on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Who seconded it there is no Commissioner Calhoun.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: There is a Commissioner Callaghan.

>> CHAIR EID: Muldoon, looking at a name and saying a different one. Okay, seeing no debate, all those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed?

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted. Next up on the agenda is the public comment portion of the meeting without objection we will begin the Public comment pertaining to the agenda topics portion of our meeting.

Is there an objection?

Hearing no objection we will now proceed with public comment. Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote live 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 the host wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. 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 For troubleshooting.

You have 90 seconds to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. We have three public comment speakers today. First on the list is James Galant.

>> CHAIR EID: Is James here with us today?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: He is, James can you unmute yourself.

>> Did I do that, am I good, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, we can hear you.

>> Thank you Mr. Chair. James Galant these are my opinions. I'm there to thank you Mr. Eid as the Chairman for your stated commitment to more closely following Robert's Rules of Order. The problem is that it appears that Secretary Benson has missed some of the decisions that you made by consensus and did not list them in the minutes as required. Hearing no objection thing you keep saying needs to be listed in the minutes. And if you don't that is called falsifying public records. The Chair asked the Vice Chair to facilitate the public comment all Kellom decided she would not provide the instructions to the public for the comments as required in the rules. Having no hearing no objection you suspended the rules and denied me my first amendment rights because I heard you on the next agenda item, two minutes is the part that would have I got my time. Secondly you facilitated to Mr. Fink in direct contradiction to the rules, only Vice Chair can be facilitated to while an issue is before the Commission before the motion. That is the direct contradiction, hearing no objection you suspended the rules and Mr. Fink turned around and just facilitated that closed session thing and did the whole thing. So therefore today Mr. Anthony Eid the Chairman is the face of Marxist style Communism and see you as a vulnerable adult. You are a majority white man. And you were ay the Senate, at the student Senate providing under a secret society. I don't know if you knew that but under a Constitution is a secret society that is what the student at Wayne state University is and you presided over that, and Secretary Benson was there when they constituted a Constitution of their own that is how Communism works. The contradict the state of being that is here. What you voted on you're not going to do and when you don't list it in the minutes that means it's a felony falsifying

public record. And the Michigan State University orientation materials facilities about Roberts rules and to the nonprofit thing and said we can say no objection all the time. But as a public body...

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Gallant. Second on the list of public comment is Anthony Skannell.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning Michigan redistricting Commission. I'm joining remotely from Detroit, Michigan. Proud to say I'm not affiliated with either democrats or republicans. And okay on to agenda topics. Well, appeal to the Supreme Court. I think you know what I think about that. But now we are talking about attorneys' fees for the opposing side. Geez oh, Pete's not trying to save the Michigan taxpayer a dime here. Let's say you are successful did you want the Hickory map back? I heard one Commissioner said he did, I think that is a little ridiculous. I would not want it back, so that is the Supreme Court. Okay and moving on your schedule for this whole operation, I kind of felt myself agreeing with the comment from a Commissioner who said we could probably get it done in I don't know seven days. I'm looking at your schedule yet. Okay, six days of mapping, three public hearings, five more days of mapping, five more public hearings. And there is a submission to a Court somewhere in there. So 11 days of mapping basically. That seems like a lot, but whatever. Maybe you're doing a thorough job. I'm interested to see moving on what is fast maps? I have no idea what that is. Next I see Michigan State IPPSR I checked out their map and think it's pretty good. I don't totally agree with it, but I see what they were doing and think it's worth checking out. I submitted a draft map this morning but had to e-mail it the public comment portal looks locked down and can't post to it and maybe you don't want to hear from us really any more.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: That ends your allotted time.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Has someone checked into that the comment portal is up and running?

>> CHAIR EID: I was muted. We will discuss that. It will be up when we start mapping.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: It's scheduled to go today.

>> CHAIR EID: Wonderful. Thank you, Mr. Skannell for your comments. Next up on the list is our final speaker, Jamie Roe.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Excuse me Chair I have another question. The public comment portal is down because it was up?

>> CHAIR EID: Submissions to the portal had concluded when we submitted maps to the Court. But it will be reopened up for the Senate drawing.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: To me that makes no sense to close it down. Who is the decision maker on that one?

>> CHAIR EID: I'm not totally sure. Ms. Wagner if you would like to.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I would definitely like to find out because that public comment portal should be available at all times to the public since we are in litigation. So I think we are stepping on toes doing that.

>> CHAIR EID: I hear you. We can add that item for our next meeting. We will now move on to new business. In accordance with the amended agenda, the first item is new business, item 6A, mapping presentation. This item will be facilitated by MICRC Executive Director Edward Woods III. If there is no objection, and I do not hear any, please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Eid. What we are doing is basically an orientation as we prepare for the Senate remedial plan. And as a result of the public I'm sorry as a result of the closed session being requested by local counsel, we are trying to save our resources by having these presentations go first. The first one will be mapping presentation that will look at the 2011 map, the Hickory map, I'm sorry the Linden map which is the Senate map and then the six districts that the Court has instructed the Commission to reconfigure. The second presentation was going to deal with and this will be done by Kim Brace. Who is with the election data services. The second presentation will be dealing with the overview in terms of how we approach the Voting Rights Act presentation in light of the Court order. And that will be done by mark Braden and last but not least there were some questions raised by Commissioner Callaghan regarding partisan fairness and those will be addressed by Dr. Lisa Handley who is also represented by Election Data Services. So once again this is just an orientation for the Commission before they begin mapping. And then once we go into closed session, our consultants will be excused from the meeting so they can work on other projects. And not be charging the Commission for being with us as a part of this meeting. Without further ado we will turn it over to Kim Brace. Kim, thank you for being here.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank you, Mr. Woods. It's good to be with you guys again. I have up on the screen a couple of screenshots so that we can kind of take a look at where we stand and moving into the State Senate plan.

As a way of orientation I thought I would start with just looking at what was the plan last decade. This was drawn by the legislature. And this is the area in question. In the Detroit, Oakland and Macomb area. You can kind of see the configurations, District 4 was long, and District 1 was long on that side.

When you came into existence as Commission, this is what the Linden plan looked like. So things got straightened out a little bit. You're still going down into southern, well Wayne County and Detroit. In District 1. And the districts came up in the Macomb and Oakland.

This is looking at just a comparison between those two. You can see how the red lines are the legislative drawn one. While the colorization is the Linden plan that you adopted.

Let me get to that other, okay.

Sorry, the Zoom stuff was up on top of this image. This is the specific districts in question. These are the ones that the Court had thrown out. So we looked at just looking at where those are located, District 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 11 are what the Court looked at or threw out. This is the area we are looking at for modification. Again, like what you have done in the House one, it's conceivable you are also expanding out a little bit. But these are the six districts that were thrown out by the Court. So I wanted to give you all kind of an overview, starting point for what or where we might be going in terms of the line drawing for the State Senate plan. Are there any questions? I don't hear any.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you so much, Mr. Brace. Commissioner Eid, we will return it back to you for the next agenda item.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Mr. Brace for that presentation. I know we are all looking forward to reconfiguring these districts in compliance with the Court order and trying to get it right.

We will now move on to item new business item 5B, VRA presentation. Without objection, I will ask VRA counsel mark Braden to facilitate this item. Seeing none, Mr. Braden please take it away.

>> Here we go. I always forget to unmute myself. Good morning everyone. Let me start out with the overview, which is I would strongly recommend to the Commission that we follow exactly the analysis process that was done for the House Districts. The cliché is don't mess with success. So I would put ditto under that. Just to go over it again, the procedure was for the Commission to move forward with its drafting process to create some proposed possible plans. And then take those and other plans that the Commission desires and submit them to us, to myself and Max Palmer and Lisa, Dr. Palmer and Dr. Handley to review those plans for potential compliance issues regarding the Voting Rights Act. Your original plans would be drawn race blind, not using race as a consideration or even having it available to you on your drafting screen. We would then look at that and determine whether or not we thought there were issues that might be able to be addressed in minor modifications of the plan.

The process we are talking about here is to ensure minority communities have an equal opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The methods that we have used, the statistical methods and the data and the graphics, we would propose to be exactly the same as used in the House line drawing process. Namely we would look at performance in the primary because the Court has directed us to look at the primary. And taking the position that almost all these districts, if not all of them, the general election is irrelevant in a sense because the democratic nominee will always win. So

the question of whether or not the minority community has an equal opportunity to elect in this geographic context requires looking at primary. We will look at primary data to determine whether or not the minority community is really two criteria, is a majority of the eligible primary electorate in a proposed District and look at another metric as to whether or not the minority community is a majority of the actual turnout in that District.

And then we will provide that data and analysis to the Commission. And from that you can make the determination as to which plans you want to move forward with to public comments or whether there are plans that you might not want to make, very minor modifications if we had concerns about voting rights compliance.

So that should sound familiar because I'm proposing to do exactly what you did in the context of the House Districts. Again, your process and the plan you approved was reviewed by the master, Dr. Grofman, and the Court and was approved so I think it would be quite unwise to change it in any way. If anyone has any questions, I'm not going over again in-depth discussion of the Voting Rights Act. And I'm happy to do that if the Commission desires. But I think everyone on this phone call has already heard me opine on what the Voting Rights Act requires. And I think we would be following an old path that is familiar to everybody that is on the Commission but I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Mr. Braden, are there questions? Ms. Schaar, sorry.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I would like to note for the record that Commissioner Kellom, Vice Chair Kellom, has joined the meeting. Commissioner Kellom, can you tell us where you are joining remotely from today?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Good morning and I'm attending and joining remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning Commissioner Kellom. Okay once again thank you Mr. Braden for that presentation. Are there any questions for VRA counsel? I do not see any. Moving right along today.

>> Okay thank you very much everyone. Have a nice spring day.

>> CHAIR EID: Well, I don't know where you are at, but it is a beautiful day here in Michigan. Starting to feel like spring and summer.

>> This time of year you feel pretty good when the sun is out, and the flowers are blooming so take care everyone. Nice talking to you, good-bye.

>> CHAIR EID: Next on the agenda is new business 6C, partisan fairness presentation. This is to be facilitated by Dr. Lisa Handley. Is there any objection? Hearing none, please proceed, Dr. Handley.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Can I share my screen?

>> CHAIR EID: Let's see. Can we turn on share screen for her? Wonderful, thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Did it work?

>> CHAIR EID: We can see your screen and looks like seats to votes ratio.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: This is embedded in my usual partisan fairness PowerPoint, but you've heard it enough. But we can go back to it if you have any questions. What I really just wanted to do was to talk about the Senate plan that was drawn in 2012. And then the changes that came about because of the Linden plan. And just talk about the scores and how they were vastly improved by the Linden plan. An issue, the following comments were made about the fact that when you were working with the House, as many changes as you made, they budged the scores not so very much. And the reason was because you were dealing with 110 districts. You were only playing with about 10 or 12 districts. This time around, when you go, and you start redrawing the ten State Senate districts it will have more of an impact on these scores.

The first score is the seats votes ratio. In the -- and the scores I'm giving you now are slightly different than the earlier scores because this now includes the 2022 elections. So I'm looking at the democratic index for all 16 contests. It's weighted by year. So no one year counts more than another year even if another year has more or less elections. So it includes all 16 elections in your matrix, statewide elections.

And this is true for the 2012 plan and the 2022 plan. So looking first at the seats votes ratio, in 2012, if this plan had been in place, you have -- you can see a proportionality bias in which even though the democrats won a vote share of 52.9%, the republicans would have won 20 seats and 52.6% of the seats. So you had a proportionality bias plus 5.5% for the republicans.

Now, in the 2022 plan, you have a proportionate bias of 2.4% in favor of the democrats. Now, the big difference here is that we have a single member District system. And you expect that the party that wins a majority of the votes gets slightly more than a majority of the seats. So there is nothing about this proportionality bias in 2022 that raises suspicions.

The vote share was 52.9% for the democrats. And seat Chair was 55.3 and that is about what you would expect in a single member District. What you don't want is exactly what happened with the 2012 plan. And that is the party in which is less than majority of the votes actually gets a majority of the seats. That is a bias point. That's what you had in 2012. That is not what you have in 2022.

Okay, okay here is our lopsided margins score. So in the 2012 plan, you found that democrats were winning their seats by much higher percentage of the votes than republicans. So that the lopsided margin was 8.6% in favor of the republicans. In other words, there were many packed democratic districts where democrats were winning with 80, 90% of the vote. And republicans were winning with like 54% of the vote. You brought that lopsided margin down to 47% in the 2022 State Senate plan.

It's still higher than 0. But I'm not sure how far down you could get it given the nature of Wayne County and the large amount of democrats in Wayne County.

Okay, in the 2012 State Senate plan you had a mean median advantage for republicans of 5.3%. And in the 2022 plan it goes down to 1.3%. Which is excellent.

And, finally, in terms of the efficiency gap, you went from, read that, 9. does that say 9.2? 9.2 in favor of the republicans. Down to a 1.9 in favor of the republicans. So, again a vast improvement over the 2012 plan.

Now, the advice that counsel last time around was you don't want to create a plan that looks more like the 2012 plan in terms of the scores that you're getting for partisan fairness. You want to keep it as close as possible to the 2022 State Senate plan. So those are the targets that we are looking at.

And, again, you're going to find more movement as you're drawing because you have fewer districts. Are there any questions?

>> CHAIR EID: Are there any questions for Dr. Handley? Commissioner Orton, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question. So it makes sense we are going to see more movement since there is less districts that were over all that we are drawing from. It seems to me that it's going to be hard to stay at these numbers that we had in Linden if we, how do I say it, if we are trying to stay more in Wayne County. You know, as we -- we stretch things out because we were trying to get lower numbers. But if we don't stretch things out the numbers are going to be higher, right?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Most likely, yes, they will probably be a little bit higher, yes. Sorry. Let's see what happens. I think that the best I can tell you is you don't want to reach the 2012 State Senate plan number. I would not be surprised if they are a little bit higher. I think in terms of the House they were a little bit higher. This time around they will be a little bit more impacted by the movement that you make. The courts haven't told us what's -- what a bad score looks like, that is a score that is unacceptable. But, again, I think that your anticipation that the scores are going to go up slightly is correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Dr. Handley, I know something we were struggling with from when we were doing the House was trying to determine how...(he froze).

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I can't.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: It sounds like Chair Eid's computer froze. Are you there?

>> CHAIR EID: You hear me now? Test, one, two, three.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Got to love Comcast. What I was asking is something we were struggling with on the Senate map is trying to determine how much value a small change in the scores make. For example I believe we had debate on two maps that had a difference on the lopsided margin scale of a couple fractions of a percent. Can you talk a little bit about that? About, you know, how much difference is, like, half a percent on these numbers versus like a whole percent? How does the map work to really determine how big of a difference that half a percent to one percent makes?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Again, the courts have provided no guidance on this. I think the changes that you're going to make this time are going to be more -- are going to be larger. In other words, you know, I don't think I would worry about a change from, you know, a 1.8 to a 1.9. I don't think I would worry about that. And I think you had some changes like that in the House and it just didn't present a problem. I don't even know if the Court thought about partisan fairness.

I think that the changes are going to be bigger this time. And that's because of the number of districts that you're dealing with. So when before a change from .8 to .9 was not a big deal now a change from say 1.5 to 1.9 is probably not a big deal. We are not going to really know until you start playing with the numbers. But once you're going up more than a fraction, in other words, once you are going from, say, 1.9 to 2.9, we are just going to have to see how easy it is to stay closer to the 1.9 than to the 2.9. This is in terms of priorities, this is below, for example, communities of interest. And it's below compactness and it's, I mean, and below the Voting Rights Act. So those things come first.

So if you have a good reason, that's not related to party at all, to political influence, then I think you can trouble justify a change from say 1.9 to 2.9.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you. Commissioner Lange, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So in previous meetings we've had legal counsel say that one thing that is not taken into consideration is geography. People live where they live. We look at the 2012 plans, there has been a shift in population since 2012 that has been talked about regularly. If we are focusing, which we are, the Senate maps strictly on the Detroit area, the geography of Detroit is basically when you look at the politics of it it's a very blue region. So with consideration for VRA, communities of interest, is it really a good idea to give a target that is potentially low? I could understand the full target if we were redoing the whole state but if we are doing a specific area and if we are listening to the people of that area and drawing based on communities of interest, not looking at race, and those numbers go up, then would that not still be justifiable purely for the demographics and the geography of the area?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That is really more a legal question. And I don't even know the lawyers can answer that because there is not much legal opinion out there. All I can say is that the lawyers suggested you keep it as close as you can, but don't violate other, more important criteria in order to just keep the numbers low. Again, I would expect some change. I would expect higher things like efficiency gap scores. I think that will happen. But the geography of the state is such that's not going to change. I mean, I guess I would ask the lawyers, I don't want to say something the lawyers disagree with, but I would say that some change is expected. I think that it's a balancing act. I don't think that you should see numbers like you saw in the 2012 plan.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, are there any other questions for Dr. Handley?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Eid. As always our consultant about if any Commissioner has any questions Dr. Handley and others have made themselves available to ask questions as we go throughout the process. And happy to coordinate that as we go along. That same process was used with regards to Commissioner Callaghan so whether you have been on the Commission for a short time or a longer time our consultants as you know work for the Commission as a whole and are available to answer any questions or concerns that may arise. So once again I would like to thank Dr. Handley, Kim Brace, and Mark Braden for their orientation presentations. And if it's okay with you Commissioner Eid we can go to our closed session.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes, thank you, Dr. Handley for that presentation. Not only myself but I'm sure the general public appreciates it as well. Next up on the agenda we are moving back to unfinished business. So we have unfinished business item 5A appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. This item will be facilitated by our local counsel, Nate Fink. If there is no objection. Is there any objection? I do not see any. Mr. Fink, go ahead.

>> Nate Fink: Thank you Mr. Chairman and good morning everybody and hope you are all doing well. I would recommend that the Commission pursuant to Section 6.2.5 of the Commission's rules of procedure go into a closed session to discuss the pending litigation, agree et al versus Benson et al specifically the pending appeal before the Supreme Court of the United States and also discussions and negotiations related to the Plaintiff's attorney fee request related to the Agee versus Benson pending litigation. And under the controlling case law and the Detroit news versus the independent redistricting case from the Supreme Court this is a permissible reason to go into closed session, so I would recommend that the Commission vote by roll call vote to go into closed session right now.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lett, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we go into closed session for the purpose of discussing the pending litigation.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I will second it.

>> CHAIR EID: There is a motion by Commissioner Lett and a second by Commissioner Orton. Is there any discussion on the motion? I do not see any hands. All right, since there is no discussion we will move on to a roll call vote. Department of State can we get that roll call vote when you get a chance.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely certainly I'm ready. The motion before you is to move into closed session to discuss pending litigation. I had to bring my screen up I'm sorry. I will do the Commissioner votes by alphabetic order starting with Commissioner Andrade, a yes vote means you are in favor of moving to the closed session, a no vote means you are not in favor of moving to closed session. Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?
>> CHAIR EID: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?
>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?
>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?
>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?
>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.
>> Commissioner Orton?
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
>> Commissioner Szetela.
>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes Vallette, yes, Commissioner Wagner, no. Commissioner Weiss? Yes. With a vote Mr. Chair of 10-3 the yes prevail.
>> CHAIR EID: Okay, the yes have it, we will move to closed session. Please Commissioners check your e-mail for a link to that closed session and when the closed session is over we will return to this open meeting to finish our business. Thank you.

[Closed session in progress]

[On the record at 11:32 p.m.]

>> CHAIR EID: We have quorum, but I will give it just another minute for the other members to join up. All right everybody welcome back. I'm now reopening the public meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission at 11:37 a.m. Department of State, if you could take the roll one last time.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely Mr. Chair. Will Commissioners please say present when I call your name. We will begin with Commissioner Curry?
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?
>> CHAIR EID: Present.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?
>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?
>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?
>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon? Commissioner Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Andrade?
- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan? I'm going to go back to Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Muldoon?
- >> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lett we can't hear you.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm here, present.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Chair you have 11 Commissioners present.
- >> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Ms. Young.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Welcome.
- >> CHAIR EID: Okay, Executive Director Woods I see your hand.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. Commissioners Muldoon and Callaghan are having some Internet difficulties and are trying to join. I think one joined. You will see the name Edward Woods but I'm not sure who that is at the bottom. But I can assure you it's not me.
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: I got logged back in Muldoon.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: If we can get his name changed and we will be doing the same for Commissioner Callaghan. Commissioner Eid?
- >> CHAIR EID: No problem, Commissioner Muldoon you are present.
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.
- >> CHAIR EID: Just let us know whenever we have another Commissioner join for the record.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think she may be on, but she is on the phone. So we can move the 248 area code from the attendees to the panelists we will have Commissioner Callaghan. Thank you.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Hello, thanks, I'm here.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you Commissioner Callaghan.
- >> CHAIR EID: All right that gives us 13. Okay, next up on the agenda is unfinished business item 5B, final State Senate remedial plan. This item is to be facilitated by Executive Director Edward Woods III. If there is no objection. Is there any objection? Seeing none please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Eid. Let me go ahead and pull up the schedule so everyone can see it. All right, everybody able to see it? This is just a highlight for the public once again highlight for the public. The public hearings that the Commission is doing. The complete schedule, the complete schedule is in our meeting materials with regards to the final Senate plan and I can show the whole entire thing from the public. Our first round of public hearings, this is where you bring your ideas, your maps, your communities of interest, what have you, it will take place May seven in Macomb County. We are looking at being at the Warren community center. Once again the Warren community center in Macomb County. 10-3, 4-seven and then there will be a lunch break and the Commission will take a lunch break from 12:30 to 1:30. May 8 Oakland County and looking at being in Southfield at the Pearl's event center. And once again 10-3, 4-seven, there will be a lunch break from 12:30 to 1:30. Then on May 9 looking at being in Wayne County, same timeline, and we will be at Wayne state University at the student event center, Wayne state University at the student event center. Once again this is an opportunity for you to come, bring your ideas, your suggestions on how the Commission should draw the maps, what communities of interest should be included in those boundaries so once again I want to invite the public as a whole to come out, to come out to these first rounds of public hearings. The Commission will submit the draft proposed maps to the Court on May 22nd. And then there will be a second round of public hearings and this is where you will tell the Commission which map that you like or what minor changes may need to be made in the map to capture community of interest. And this will take place June 11, 12 and 13 and we are in the process of identifying those locations. It will follow the same time schedule as the first round of public hearings, the same time schedule 10-3, 4-seven with a lunch break from 12:30 to 1:30. Public comment period ends on June 21st. And then the Commission is to submit the final State Senate map to the Court on June 27th. That is a Thursday, June 27th. This is kind of an outline of the schedule with regards to the Commission and its public hearings that we wanted to make sure the public was well aware of with regards to this. Once again as always, the Commission values public input. They brave it, love it, feed off it so I want to encourage you to do it. It's once again on our meetings and materials, if you have it on the meetings and materials where you can get the whole entire schedule and what I'm going to do is just put that up so everybody can take a look at that. And I will share that at this time. So that the public can see the entire schedule as it relates to the remedial plan. Today is a regular Commission meeting. As you know the Commission meets the third Thursday, I repeat the third Thursday of every month. They will start drawing Senate maps next week, start drawing Senate maps next week. Election Data Services will have our team there, our mapping consultant was to start drawing Senate maps next week 4-7. Then you will see the schedule as it relates to the mapping schedule that the Commission will follow.

And you can see those dates once again, this information I repeat this information is under meeting materials for today that you can print that and have that for your own records with regards to that. Each of these meetings we will have public comments and so if you want to sign up for public comment you can do that as well. The dates that are underlined, I repeat the dates that are underlined are dates that relate to the Court. Once again the dates that are underlined are dates that relate to the Court. The dates that are bold are actual in-person meeting, they will be hybrid meetings so if you are unable to come in person you will be able to join remotely. Then the dates in italics is just a remote meeting with regards to the virtual public hearing. If there is any questions, Commissioner Eid I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Executive Director Woods. Commissioner Lange, I see your hand. Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Director Woods, just for clarification because I know we have changed the rules a couple times. For this schedule that's upcoming will the public be allowed two public comments or was it changed to just one? What is the rules for the public comment?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: It will be whatever the Commission desires to do. We've had different we've had two minutes and are able to come back. The Commission did five minutes so it's really at the discretion of the Commission with regards to that. And I expect or anticipate that the Commission will make a decision so that people will know prior to our meeting next week, Commissioner Lange, do you have a suggestion as to what that should be?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do not have a suggestion. I was just curious so the public would be aware so if they wanted to sign up for a second, if it is being offered both in person and online would be available to do that.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: We can add that item to the agenda for the Tuesday meeting before public comment so that everybody has an understanding. My suggestion would be we tried a lot of different ways. We tried one minute. We tried I think three minutes. We tried one time every hour. The way I liked best was when they had about five minutes to say whatever they wanted to say. And then moved on to the next person.

But we can add it to the agenda at the beginning of next meeting and vote on it then.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Right now we are at 90 seconds, Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton I saw your hand.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Ms. Schaar has her hand up as well.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe Megan Schaar will answer this but seems to me at one of our last public hearings we voted something in, I don't remember the amount of minutes. But we said that that was just for public hearings going forward. So maybe she can fill us in.

>> CHAIR EID: Ms. Schaar?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: Currently the Commission allows at meetings 90 seconds one time for public comment. However, the Commission can make a motion to change that at any point. For public hearings I'm going to actually need to go back and check the minutes. I believe that it was just a one-time motion as opposed to an ongoing. So I will confirm that with the Commission prior to Tuesday's meeting.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you. That would be very helpful. Is there any more discussion about the Senate remedial plan schedule?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Curry has her hand up and I don't know if you see it.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, wasn't the minutes allowed for each comment based on how many people arrived? And so if we, you know, if a whole lot of people arrive we would probably reduce time but if it was a remedial amount of people there we can let them go like two minutes or something. Can we kind of decide on that and have it in the plan? Just a question.

>> CHAIR EID: So I think we will figure out exactly what was voted on last time for both the regular meetings that are virtual and the public hearings. And as a Commission we will make a decision on how to move forward with that. Ms. Schaar?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: Commissioners I was able to find that. It was a motion to change the number of times and amount of times commenters are able to speak at public hearings and provide comment is, so that is three minutes to speak at public hearings going forward is what the Commission currently has in place. And, again, that is just for public hearings. For any other meetings it is currently one time 90 seconds. I hope that helps.

>> CHAIR EID: okay, does that answer your question, Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, I just made a suggestion.

>> CHAIR EID:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think Commissioner Eid we can consider Commissioner Curry's suggestion at our next meeting when we have a broader Dixon the timelines and making it one of the options for consideration.

>> CHAIR EID: Get it on the agenda and make sure it's before public comment so we can have a system. Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, I would like to make a suggestion whoever has their finger on the button when Mr. Scannell and Mr. Galant are giving public comment if you let them continue their thought. We do it for everybody else. It sucks we don't do it for them. We cut them off bam as soon as they hit the minute mark. So it would be nice if we let them finish their thought.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Wagner. All right, any more discussion on the final State Senate remedial plan? I do not see any and just for the public that

schedule will be posted on our website. Fees come out, show up, speak up let us know how you want these districts drawn and we will go from there.

All right next up on the agenda we are moving back to new business. We are at new business D, fast maps. This topic will be facilitated by Executive Director Woods. If there is no objection. Is there any objection? I do not see any. Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. Commissioners it's 11:53 and want to look to our consultants working with the sign language and closed caption to see if we have any wiggle room to 12:30 as well as MDOS staff.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: We are available until 12:30 but I cannot speak to the interpreters.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Annette has another event and has to be done by 12:30 and need to hear from regional interpreting if they are available and can give us a thumbs up or down. That is fine. Thank you, so we will move right ahead. This particular agenda item was requested by Commissioner Wagner. This is with regards to the fast maps with regards to the algorithm that Dr. Petering would like to use. He is saying his cost would be \$250 per hour of his time. If he was to do a map. But obviously the cost of the algorithm to configure the map there would be no charge to the Commission. So at this time I would like to defer to Commissioner Wagner if there is anything else that she would like to say on this topic. But I did follow-up.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No, I just thought he had a good presentation the last time I brought it around. And for \$250 as opposed to, you know, whatever else we are spending doing all this, I figured it might be a cost saver so.

>> CHAIR EID: This is referring to the algorithm approach of creating maps and his software program, correct, Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Correct and he gave a very detailed presentation earlier. I don't have a date of the presentation he gave earlier maybe Edward could pull that up. In case you all want to refer back, but I personally looked at all of his information and history and was very impressed because with the computer unless you program a bias into it there isn't one. So.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I certainly would be interested in hearing a little more about this. Maybe have him come back next week because it seems like the Commission struggled with redrawing the maps the last round and it might be helpful to have him at least run a map for us based on perimeters we set so that we have an alternative to look at as well because I think this map is going to be a significantly more challenging for many Commissioners, particularly based on how difficult the House maps seem to be.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I have two concerns with it. The first we were charged last time he came to present to us without realizing at least I did not know we were being charged, so I don't like that. And \$250 an hour applied to that as well. At least that is what I understood from the e-mails I read. My main concern is that I don't believe that the voters in Michigan who voted for this proposal wanted one person with an algorithm to be drawing the districts. They wanted 13 Michigan citizens to redraw the districts so that is my main concern.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That's mine too.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Commissioner Orton. Commissioner Szetela, I see your hand once again.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: That kind of gets to the point of my concern is that we had one person predominately who submitted draft maps and through the portal those maps were adopted by the Commission into the Motown Sound and effectively it was one person who also happens to be a politician who redrew a lot of the districts on the House maps. So how is that better? It seems like we kind of deviated from our own processes because people were struggling and just took what was handed to them. This might be a more neutral way maybe to like I said create an alternative map. He can run the map for us and decide we don't like it and not do anything with it, but I think it's at least worth exploring.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's not worth exploring.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I agree with Commissioner Orton's last comment about the voters, but I will also say I think the other resolve is to actually work together. I don't think we need to diminish the efforts of any one Commissioner and people have individual opinions about how the process took place. But the solution, if we are stating that people have, quote, unquote, trouble withdrawing the maps, is for all 13 Commissioners to give voice, all 13 Commissioners to participate in the live drawing process and not rush through or do anything for the efficiency of time. I would really like all of us to work together. I have always enjoyed that when we all give voice. So I'm faithful and trusting of our Commissioners to get it right this time instead of siloing and leaving it up to a computer that does the opposite of what some say and Commissioners are suggesting this say that the people of Detroit, Black people, et cetera, need which is to build trust so algorithm is not the way that we build trust.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I agree.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I also agree with Commissioner Orton and Commissioner Kellom. It's supposed to be done by 13 citizens. I don't agree one person should draw it.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I mean, I agree with the collaborative approach, but I find it particularly ironic coming from Commissioner Kellom because when I was drawing the House maps at one point you said I should not be allowed to draw and certain people on the Commission should not be allowed to draw and later you started asking for people to collaborate. So I think that collaboration includes Commissioner Wagner, Commissioner Lange and I being able to draw as well. Not having changes immediately reversed in new maps and consideration of what we have to offer; otherwise, it's not collaboration. And, you know, there were people last time around who did not participate at all. I'm sure Commissioner Vallette did not draw a District.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I did draw. I did draw I drew with.

>> CHAIR EID: Guys, one at a time please.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I drew with Commissioner Eid's help and Commissioner Muldoon's help. I drew.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay. So I stand corrected. But I think if we are going to take the position there needs to be collaboration that means collaboration for everybody not just particular people.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I agree with that.

>> CHAIR EID: Hold on. I saw Commissioner Curry's hand first and you will be right after Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We were hired with 13 Commissioners to draw the maps and try to insinuate doing what we were hired for would be not following the rules of why we were hired. And just leave it out of the schedule for now. We don't need that injected into our business.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Curry. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm just speaking specifically to Commissioner Szetela's comment. I think my definition of a collaborative process like there is no secret that Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Wagner, Commissioner Szetela, you all find solace, not saying you are best friends or anything, but you like working together because there is a lack of trust, et cetera, whatever you want to call it. And I don't want to name it with the rest of the Commissioners. So by definition when you all take a turn there is not that synergy that exists, and it did not exist. I never said you all should not be drawing the map Commissioner Szetela. When we collaborate, meaning if I say Commissioner Szetela, Commissioner Wagner, what do you think engaging in the process when the three of you all drew maps you engaged with each other so that is a three-person collaborative map so that is what I'm talking about. I don't think anyone erased suggestions and there were very few times the map process for the three of you happened in a live way. I can speak to Commissioner Lange. I do remember there were times where she felt more comfortable drawing, but I really wish this time around we would get rid of that even if what is happening now is unnecessary. Commissioner Wagner had a suggestion. Commissioner Szetela, you turned it into basically shooting

down the fact that we can draw maps and you have done this before. You have critiqued your fellow Commissioner and it's been a backhanded remark. In Commissioners don't respond but I'm not going to stand for it. It is hurtful, not because we have soft feelings but it's just unnecessary. So if you don't like what we do that is fine but don't attack it. We are fully capable, and we drew a darn good map that the City of Detroit was proud of.

>> CHAIR EID: So just a couple things. Please let's speak through the Chair. It will bring and make the conversation happen a little easier. Everyone please keep in mind speak through the Chair instead of speaking at each other directly.

And the item we are currently discussing is the fast maps, the algorithm approach so let's try to refocus the discussion on that. I saw Commissioner Callaghan and then we will go to Commissioner Lange and then to Commissioner Szetela. Commissioner Callaghan is on the phone, and I believe she is muted because of that. Can we get her unmuted?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: I requested she unmute so she should be able to now.

>> CHAIR EID: There we go.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I believe that is our ASL interpreter.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: We can hear you, Commissioner Callaghan.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Thank you. So to Anthony's point back to the fast whatever fast map that we are talking about, I assume this was before I was one of the Commissioners because I don't recall this presentation. I would appreciate it if someone could maybe point me to when that presentation occurs so that I can watch it offline. And then my other I understand Commissioner Orton's irritation with being charged with the presentation. I agree that would be very irritating. Maybe it's my background but I can't imagine being opposed to using a tool that might make our job easier. A computer algorithm is just a tool. I use my computer to take notes while I'm in the meeting. Not opposed to see what an algorithm can turn as a tool and a starting point that we did as a group of citizen Commissioners to change and modify and tweak and do whatever we want to do but at least we would have a tool to help us out in the background so I don't think that is a bad approach. My question would be is how, maybe the presentation given by this person who runs the tool would answer it for me, how does that tool work with the existing mapping tools that we were using prior? That is what he produces with that one we can plug into the tool? Do they interface? Do we get a printout? I don't understand how that works. So I would be interested in learning more, thanks.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Callaghan. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Two points. Listening to everybody's objections or yeah or nay, I'm in favor of it looking at the last time around. The first time around and not realizing there was a cost, I don't know how anybody didn't know because there was an e-mail about it. I didn't request the presentation and I knew that there was a charge.

So I don't know if it was missed or what. And as far as collaborative mapping, there was collaborative mapping. And I'm going to say it, some of us were attacked when we were collaborative mapping. And I even asked on some districts what do you think, what do you think and I got crickets. So before putting all of this on one person or two people or three people maybe everybody needs to look at themselves individually also and maybe we can get along going forward and maybe we can't, we will see what happens. That's it.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Lange. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I just think every day we do is recorded and the video does not lie, and the video speaks for itself about what Commissioner Lange, and I were referencing. I can provide some background on the first time around when the professor came and spoke to us because I was Chair at the time. There was a payment for that. I believe it was \$250 for a presentation. As the Chair I was not made aware of that cost at the time. It was considered an expense that our Executive Director at the time Suann Hammersmith approved and in her authority to approve expenses that were that de minimis and did and came to the attention of the Commission later because people were surprised there was a cost associated with it and they were not aware. So that was an issue before. But, again, it was a matter of decision making by our Executive Director. It was within her discretion. She did not think she needed to bring it to us because it was with the spending limits she had in her job as Executive Director, if that alleviates some concerns there. Then with respect to having him come in at a minimum it's worthwhile having him come in and present to us. Again we have three new members. A lot of people forgot what happened in the meantime and what the algorithm does and it's worthwhile to listen to the man this time around.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid, just to move the conversation along, it's 12:, 10 I'm more than happy to reach out to Dr. Petering to do a complimentary presentation to the Commission. I do agree with the sentiment if you are making a proposal you should not get paid for making proposal to the Commission. But if he is willing to make a presentation, I think that would be in the best interests in moving forward and more than happy to do so if we can just and get a date that works with him. I have his contact information. I know he is eager to come before the Commission. And I think with that perimeter I think that serves in the best interests of the Commission.

>> CHAIR EID: Are there any motions from Commissioners for that? Or any motions on this topic in general?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I don't know that we need a motion, but I can make a motion that Executive Director Woods' approach. I'm sorry, what is his name again Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Petering.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: A motion to authorize our Executive Director, Mr. Woods, to contact Mr. Petering whether he would be willing to do a presentation at no cost to the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. There is a motion by Commissioner Szetela and a second by Commissioner Lange. We've had discussion on this topic already. But I guess I will open it for discussion on the motion itself. Is there any discussion?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We should take a vote.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay. Seeing no further discussion, let's take a vote. All those in favor of having Mr. Peterman in to give a presentation to the Commission and have Executive Director Woods approach him for that. Please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: That actually was not my motion.

>> CHAIR EID: Restate your motion.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Authorize the Executive Director to approach Mr. Petering to see if he is willing to present to the Commission without cost.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, does everybody understand the contents of the motion? It is to have Mr. Woods approach Mr. Petering about having a presentation to the Commission without cost; is that correct Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid can you do a roll call vote please for clarity?

>> CHAIR EID: If Commissioner requests that we can.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Roll call.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Can we get a roll call vote, please?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. The motion before you from Commissioner Szetela, she moved to authorize our Executive Director to contact Mr. Petering to see if he would be willing to provide a presentation to the Commission at no cost; is that correct, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you. A yes vote means you are in favor of this motion. And a no vote means that you are not in favor of this motion. I will begin with Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Andrade?
- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Mr. Chair, with a count of six yes to seven no votes, the motion does not carry.
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Had that planned, huh?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What?
- >> CHAIR EID: Just remember to keep the quorum Commissioners and please raise your hand to speak and be recognized by the Chair. I will now...
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: My hand is up.
- >> CHAIR EID: But you were not recognized by the Chair, Commissioner Wagner. You will have your turn; I'm giving you your turn and let's move on now. The Commissioner took a vote and speaks in one voice.
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No, it does not.
- >> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Point of order.
- >> CHAIR EID: I hear a point of order. I did not see who that was from.
- >> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Kellom.
- >> CHAIR EID: What is your point of order, Commissioner Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: She continues to shout past you and be unprofessional.
- >> CHAIR EID: We will move on the floor is closed and in the interest of time I will entertain a motion to table new business items EFG and H to the next meeting.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is a little bit problematic for G and H. I don't care about F.
- >> CHAIR EID: How about E executive director Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: E is just an announcement. We got legal counsel. I just wanted to refer back to Commissioner Weiss with regards to the map submission that they would do a VRA analysis when they review all the other maps. So that was just an update.

>> CHAIR EID: My notions to table business items E and F so we can move on to G and H?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I had my hand raised but I will make the motion, Commissioner Eid, to table new business items E and F until our next meeting.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela. I appreciate it. Is there a second?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I will second.

>> CHAIR EID: Motion made by Commissioner Szetela and seconded by Commissioner Weiss. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Lange, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Is it possible to bring up the agenda on the screen so I can see what those are? I don't have it in front of me.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Lange E is to institute for public policy research and F is the Commissioner application and it's on the screen right now I think.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Is there any further discussion on the motion? Okay, seeing none, all those in favor.

>> Roll call.

>> CHAIR EID: All right, we have a roll call vote. I will state the question first. The motion is to table agenda items new business E and F until the next meeting. We can get a roll call vote.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. The motion is before you a yes vote means you are in favor of tabling items E and F to the next meeting and a no vote is you are not in favor of tabling to the next meeting. I will begin alphabetically with Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> 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 CURRY: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Mr. Chair with a vote of 11 yes to two no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR EID: We will move on to new business item G Election Data Services. This item will be facilitated by Executive Director Woods if there is no objection. Hearing no objection, please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Kim Brace and I met last night with regard to I shared with you an agenda item with regards to the fiscal year 23, invoices were not submitted for a total of 1800. We had concerns what with the Commission in terms of timely invoices and Mr. Brace were able to work out agreement if the Commission would pay for that and the invoice would have to come out of this year and we are roughly at about 85,000 left in the cap. As relates to mapping consultant. Roughly at \$85,000 as relates to the cap, so we will need to increase the cap. So the Commission would increase the cap for Election Data Services from \$1,779,000 to 2.5 million. Obviously if we don't spend it we don't have to spend it all. But that would be the cap. Election data service would provide a \$60,000 credit to the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission. This represents 2% of 2.5 million, which is 50,000 plus 10,000. The Commission will not receive an early payment discount of 2% within 50 days of date of invoice until contract value exceeds. The 2.5 million mark. Each EDS invoice will be turned in by the 10th of the month and EDS will be effective 24. Mr. Brace is here if he has comments to suggest. But I move the Commission would accept the agreement we were able to work out with EDS.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lett, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move the Commission adopt the proposal as presented by Executive Director Woods.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Weiss to approve the recommendation. Is there any discussion? Those in favor to adopt the recommendation say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed?

>> Nay.

>> The ayes have it. Thank you, Executive Director Woods. We will now move on to new business, Item F, February financial report. This is once again being facilitated by Executive Director Woods, if there is no objection. Hearing none, please proceed.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Hello, Commissioners. I just want to make sure you understand where we are with regard to our finances. As of February 29th. We have expended, just so everyone is clear, \$2,455,901.91. We are missing invoices that we did receive today. So we will be able to update what we have with regards to sign language interpreting but did receive the invoices today and will provide an updated number. The technology usually lags a month behind, but we will have that number as well but once we get the March information from legislative services Bureau that we need to request. So I just want to be very, very clear we are at 2455901.91. And we have met with the legislature with regards to our increase of \$3,331,200. And just want you to know where we stand as of February 29 so February 29, 2024, Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Director Woods. Let's see, Commissioner Lett, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you. So Commissioner Wagner had a question on how much we had spent or have spent on counsel, line 19 shows litigation counsel at about \$1.099 million from October through February. Local counsel \$304,634. And VRA counsel \$193,944. Obviously we would have March, which will be coming out shortly. But that gives you where the money is being spent on legal counsel across the board.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Szetela, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, Mr. Woods sent out as part of our meeting materials and if not would you mind sending it out to everybody?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I sent it out yesterday and I did not want to assume, Commissioner Szetela, that the Commission was going to vote for the back pay of the fiscal year '23, so that number was not included but it will be included and I'll update it and send it to you. But it was sent out last night after I met with Mr. Brace.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you very much.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for the report Executive Director Woods. Commissioner Lange, do you have something else to add?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do and want to make sure I heard that correctly. I was looking at it. So the February, I guess it would have been February did not include the back pay that the Commission approved for themselves?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No. The back pay, no, the fiscal year '23 amount that you just approved for Commissioner Brace of \$1800.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: But I mean I just want to make sure I have the numbers right. When the Commission voted to get themselves a raise, they voted for back pay when they were drawing last, correct? So would that be included on the February one, is that something that has been dispersed?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: The money was disbursed, but I believe it was March, Commissioner Lang, and I will verify and get back to you with regards to that. And, once again, it was the restoration of the Commission's salary while they were mapping. I think it's what you are referring to. Because part of that time in between the House and now the Senate, the Commission has been paid at its 25% of the Governor's salary.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The back pay they approved for themselves? That's how it was worded in the motion, I believe, was back pay. I just want to make sure I understand.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay, I think the motion you are referring to, I know what you are talking about, it was restored to the 35% and then after that they would go back to the 25%. So, yes, you will see that motion that was approved by the Commission in the March bill because that happened in March.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It was not in February. Got you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Commissioner Lange. Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would note we are at the cutoff time. I would move that the table, the balance of the agenda to the next meeting and adjourn.

>> CHAIR EID: There is a motion to table the remainder of the meeting. To the next meeting is there a second?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I will second.

>> CHAIR EID: The motion included adjourning is that right Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay the motion is to table the remainder of the agenda to the next meeting and adjourn. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, let's take the vote. All those in five of Commissioner Lett's motion to table the rest of the items on the agenda and adjourn, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed? All right. Well, the Commission is adjourned at 12:28 p.m. Thank you, everybody. See you on Tuesday.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: At 4:00.

>> CHAIR EID: 4:00 on Tuesday.