

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

20240228-0900 Meeting

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

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

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 and written public comment submissions. There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed 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 staff 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 absence is due to military duty state the county, City Township or the village which you are attending the meeting remotely. I will begin roll call alphabetically with Elaine Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present from Skokie, Illinois.

>> 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?

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Present attending remotely from Detroit Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom? Rhonda 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?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Present attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Is Janice 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: Madam Chair you have 12 members present. You have a quorum. Thank you.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you very much.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: 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.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Moved and seconded we approve today's agenda any discussion on the topic? Seeing none, all in favor of approving today's agenda raise your hand and say aye.
- >> Aye.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.
The ayes prevail and today's agenda is adopted.
So for today's remote public comment portion of the agenda, Vice Chair Janice Vallette will facilitate.
- >> 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 the host wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call you by your name or by the last four digits of your phone number. Also please note that if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for three to five seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking. If your audio still does not work you can e-mail redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you to trouble shoot so that you can participate during the next public comment period at a later date. You have 90 seconds to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. First in line to speak is James Gallant. Please give our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes, we can.

>> Hello. Thank you. James Gallant, Marquette Suicide Prevention Coalition, these are my opinions. This is quite the mess you got going here, you know, from yesterday. I don't know where you are at the deliberation part and you were in the middle of it and all the sudden, I don't know. How did you get in there, Madam Chair? And this is the opposite of capitalism what she is doing here. The part about you starting with -- see how you started the deliberation yesterday? You just kind of went, I don't know how we are going to do this and then I don't really know but now we've got three different maps that you came with over the weekend, and you started talking about it. All of a sudden you are voting on it. That is the problem. You had no motion to do anything. And so, as a recap, I'd like to just ask this board to please hire a certified parliamentarian to give a report and recommendation so that we can restore some sort of trust and faith in the system. The process you got going, you are making it up on the fly, as fast as you can. I see we don't have Secretary of State Benson here today too. And the secretary clearly says the Secretary of State is the secretary without a vote here and will call the roll and establish if there is a quorum at the meeting. She has not done that but one time and then she left five minutes later. Remember? That was back in 2021. I would ask everybody to go back, please, to go the beginning, the first meeting when Secretary Benson was presiding, acting Chair. And Lett did the exact same thing. I don't know what we are going to do here, but I guess -- what do you want to do and then just did it. Whether you extremely just violated Mike Brady's instructions to follow Robert's Rules of Order. You have to make a motion first, motion to approve the maps.

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

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes, we can.

>> Okay. So good morning, Commissioners. And again thank you so much for all your efforts. I am -- I just want to express my deep disappointment in the vote that happened yesterday to vote down including Melvindale in District 3, keeping Melvindale in District 3 as it currently is. And marginalizing a historically marginalized community, minority within a minority community, the Yemeni community and diluting their voting power. And depriving them from the representation that they direly, direly need and deserve. And I urge the Commissioners to reconsider, please reconsider today. And make sure that you include Melvindale in District 3.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Adele-Mozip.

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

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Next in line is Christian grant. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Hello.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Hi.

>> Hi, so my name is Christian grant. And I'm here speaking in support of the Arab American and specifically Mena communities.

I would just like to open by expressing my disappointment that the -- there was a no vote to include Melvindale in District 3. And I'm just disappointed that about the detrimental impact that will have on the Yemeni community a marginalized minority within a minority community already. And it dilutes their votes. I would like to also just note that the current lines for District 3 and 15 give the Arab and Muslim communities the highest chance at representation. And the District lines the anti-Arab American discrimination committee is pushing for concentrate the Arabs in District 3 only and dilute the Arab vote in District 15 reducing two Arab reps to only one we are asking to keep the lines for 3 and 15 add Melvin and Motown and put it within District 15 and if possible add Aviation southwest Detroit near Leoni, Michigan.

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

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

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay next in line is Robert Dindoffer. Please allow our staff a moment to unmute you.

>> Hi all can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes we can.

>> Okay, so first thing I wanted to say is there's really been no outreach to the far east side in this whole second round of the process. I know you went to like six and Dequindre but that is Central Detroit and not the far east side of Detroit. I feel there is a lack of voices other than a few of us both from the Detroit side who are, you know, nerd out the most on this process. I tried to speak up for my community which is the second

thing please keep the lakeshore whole. The lakeshore District has been prevented by the Apoll standards in the past and St. Clair and Grosse Pointes belong together and if you look into yourself and think what two communities belong together it makes the most sense. The third thing I wanted to say is that I appreciate what folks are trying to do with District 10 and 12 in the Motown Sound. But I feel like it's not going to work for a couple of reasons, and I have asked for a second comment so hopefully when I'm cutoff I can finish this thought out. Historically it hasn't worked. In the past the Grosse Pointe portion of the District has dominated in a nearly identical District to District 10, 54% of the democratic primary voted for the Grosse Pointe candidate in the last gubernatorial primary the gross point votes made up 55% of the overall vote in the gubernatorial primary.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You are muted.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: That concludes public comment we appreciate everyone who does public comment in whatever way you choose and encourage you to keep sharing your thoughts.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, I believe Mr. Dindoffer said he signed up for a second public comment. Is that accurate Secretary of State?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: He did request one. However, the second public comment that you all voted to approve was during the initial mapping period. So there is not currently a second public comment approved for today. But I defer to the Commission's decision on that if you would like to add one we can. Up to you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I move we had one. We had this discussion before, it was said that during other public comments periods that it was done. The flip-flopping back and forth is very confusing I'm sure to the public so I would ask if there is only one that has been signed up that we please allow him to speak. Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: There is two individuals who requested one so there would be two.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I move we let those pardon me those members of the public have their second.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so it's moved and seconded that we add a second public comment period for today or for what? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Well, I think it's confusing. I think we should just keep it if we are going to do a second public comment we need to keep a second public comment.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so moved and seconded that we just add a second public comment from here forward. Is there any further discussion? And let me just break in and say that Commissioner Kellom is now present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Kellom can you share where you are joining remotely from? Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Sorry I was having connectivity issues because I muted myself and you did not hear me, good morning attending remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any discussion on the motion? Okay, Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, I don't favor a permanent second comment proposal. We have made rule changes as the circumstances require. If you only have a few people, then it's useful. If you have a couple hundred then it becomes a little unmanageable. So I think that, you know, having the ability to cast the rules as the situation requires would be more appropriate.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anything else? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to go back in time when I objected to the second public comment being done at a particular meeting, it was also said by Commissioner Lett that second public comment was allowed. And that he sat in many meetings where it was allowed, all I'm asking whatever the Commission decide we do we do it and we stick to one thing because obviously it is confusing the public and it's not fair to the public if we keep switching it up.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So my understanding was that when we were doing public hearings, and listening tours, then, you know, we wanted to hear from the public. That was the main focus of the meeting and so we had second public comments. And then normally we didn't during our regular meetings. But any way that's my understanding. Anything else? Okay, can we have a roll call vote, please?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Certainly Madam Chair. Commissioners you have heard the motion before you to add a second public comment for the public from this point forward in your meetings. We will do a roll call vote. I will begin with Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The motion is from this point forward?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: That is correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: If it was during the mapping process I would vote yes but no to terminate second public comment.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Steve Lett?

- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Marcus Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Elaine Andrade?
- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair with a vote of nine no to four yes the motion fails.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange is your hand up again or still.
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It's up again, I would ask the Secretary of State, if she is acting as a parliamentarian, to look at Robert's Rules for second public comment if it's required under Robert's Rules, thanks.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I can do that, thank you.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I would like to hear from the two that are signed up for second public comment today even though you all just voted that all down but I would still like to hear from them since they did the trouble to say they signed up for second public comment and they are here so let's do that.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: I think that would have to be a motion. Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I'll motion we add a second round of public comment for today.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I second that.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, we have a motion, I couldn't tell who the second was because there were two.
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Donna Callaghan seconded.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: So we have a motion and a second to add second public comment for today. Any discussion on that? Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID:
- >> CHAIR ORTON: You're muted if you are speaking or maybe.

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm good, no discussion.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I just wanted to ask Sarah when they signed up and asked for second comment, did you tell them at that time we were not allowing it?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I did.
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Thank you.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay any other discussion? Can we have a roll call vote, please?
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely. Commissioners the motion before you is to add a second public comment just for today's meeting. A yes vote means you are in favor of that, and a no vote means you are not. I will begin with Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Marcus Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner?
- >> 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: Madam Chair with a vote of 11 yes to two no, the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Sarah Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I wanted to respond to Commissioner Lange question Robert's Rules of Order 928 it talks about public sessions I'm sorry this is 929 in meetings of many public bodies the public may attend these attendees are not members of the meeting body and ordinarily have no right to participate, some bodies especially public ones may invite nonmembers to express their views but this is by the officer subject to relevant rules by the body. The public comment segment of your meetings does not stem so much from Robert's Rules as it does the Open Meetings Act of Michigan which does require a public comment session which is why you all have one, but it does not speak to a requirement to allow a second public comment. All of that is really determined by the body itself.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you for the explanation. So we will move to the second comment period. Can you facilitate that, Sarah Reinhardt, since you know who they are.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Our first second round participant is Mr. James Gallant. Please allow a moment for us to unmute you.

>> Hello, can you hear me? Hello.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, we can hear you.

>> James Gallant again. These are my opinions. And thank you very much. And thank you to Sarah that is exactly what I was going to say and shortened me up a little bit here. Yeah, if you could just get with a couple of the issues I'm bringing to you, these are the ones I'm bringing to you right now. Please publish the documents that appointed Sarah Reinhardt to be the secretary. You said secretary. She answered you. She is a secretary without a vote. No, the Constitution says the Secretary of State, Joyce Benson. And this other lady, she is doing the roll call, and she is establishing a quorum. So this group of people is now the Secretary of State. No. That is an elected position here in Michigan. In the Robert's Rules of Orders that came originally in the orientation materials, we never get those. We couldn't get those. When we go onto the website, you still can't get them on the link. They are not published. So please get those. And please stop texting during the meetings, that is a no-no. And I think we should examine how did we get this second public comment then even to begin with. The union lady said she was told. So who said was she told by that it was supposed to happen a year later, okay? And then Commissioner Szetela did support that. And said, yeah, yeah, she supported it. And I believe, and that is what I was saying, I didn't say that, Robert's Rules doesn't talk about public comment. But Szetela quoted me. I think that was slanderous what she said to me and tried to get on me, so did Lett. Ride on my little thing about Robert's Rules, then you say the opposite. That is slanderous. That is not cool. So please get with a couple of issues I keep bringing because they are the fundamental issues. The other folks deal with the maps, that is

fine. But I'm getting with the fundamental issues that we need to go all across America, all across Michigan, every...

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our next public comment participant for the second round is Robert Dindoffer. Please allow a moment for us to unmute you.

>> Thank you. And I appreciate the vote for a second public comment, I appreciate that folks. As I was saying before, and I tried to spit it out real fast is the lakeshore District that includes a lakeshore District that would include Grosse Pointes and lakeshore has been a dream District for people in the area a long time but prevented from the Apoll standards because of the county line. Between Macomb and Wayne Counties. And so when I saw that there was an opportunity for it, I spoke up. Other folks had spoken up in the first round of redistricting about the lakeshore. It's a true community of interest. I hope you will keep it whole. And as to the Motown Sound and the District ten configuration there we have had that District before, almost identical and it has always played out in a particular way. In the democratic primary the Grosse Pointe candid wins about 55% of the vote every time. It happened the last time in 2008 there was a competitive primary the Grosse Pointe candidate got 55% of the vote and each community put a candidate up and the Grosse Pointe candidate won. It would not be the end of the world for us Grosse Pointers, but I don't think it's fair. Additionally in the 2018 gubernatorial primary, if you look at all the primary votes from the precincts in that area, the Grosse Pointers had roughly 5% more votes than the Detroit and Harper Woods portion combined. So again.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And that concludes our second round of public comment.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you very much. Okay, so next on the agenda is new business 5A mapping deliberations. Without objection I will facilitate this item. Hearing no objection, I will ask VRA counsel Mark Braden to provide a VRA analysis of the logical outgrowth of public comments by the Motown Sound map completed by the Commission yesterday. Mr. Braden.

>> Good morning we submitted Brace submitted to Dr. Palmer the Motown Sound two map and the minor changes that you made in it have no effect on my belief that the Court would conclude that that plan complies with the Voting Rights Act. Let me be clear again. It's my view that all of the plans now being considered by the Commission, all 11 now comply with the Voting Rights Act, again that analysis is based upon the fact that the candidates of choice of the Black community and all of these districts in the Tri-county area are the data shows that they would overwhelmingly win the general election.

The -- we have done the analysis that we've talked about looking at the democratic primary. That analysis is driven from the Court's direction. Looking at that, concluding what we looked at that in two separate ways, one, what we believe through statistical analysis to be the percentage of the Black voters in the democratic primary. Each of the

plans under consideration in the Tri-county area provide either 11, 12 or 13 districts in which the actual Black turnout in the democratic primary is a majority. The Black population in the Tri-county area is roughly 25%. Each of those plans provide roughly proportionality actually more than proportionality to the Black community. If you like we can show, again, I don't want to get between you and the work that you're doing, because I think the simple answer is the voting rights consideration at this moment is very much peripheral if you change the districts we probably should run the numbers again but you are on firm ground to go forward with the considerations of the various tricky issues you are dealing with and other communities and how to put them together.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Are there any questions for Mr. Braden? I have a question.

>> Sure.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't see any others. So I thought I understood when we were talking about this before, and we showed how many performing districts that some of the maps that we put forth had less than ten, say or less than nine. And so we were advised that that wasn't good enough.

>> Yep, let me -- if we can I think if Taylor is on the line or Kim has these we can bring up the chart, the new version of the chart. Okay, and so here is the democratic primary election performance of the districts. The difference being here is the original charts that you saw were really in the smaller -- they didn't do the complete three county area. So they showed lower numbers than these. And so under the lower numbers, we would not, in those plans, the lower ones, the ones that you're not presently considering some of which showed lower numbers would not in my opinion have been compliant with the Voting Rights Act. Looking at them and the real driving factor in this is the notion of equal opportunity. And we went through, and I won't waste everybody's time by doing it again the various Jingles factors but when you look at the end of the three Jingles factors we talk about the totality of the circumstances which really looks at the sort of notion of the overall political performance of the minority community in a particular geographic area.

And the Supreme Court has been relatively clear, relatively clear for the Supreme Court, and cloudy for most other people, but I believe and on the notion of proportionality. If a system provides proportional, the potential for proportional representation or greater than proportional representation, the Court has looked at that and said, well, that is obviously not a system that is unfair to that minority community. So that's the reason why we have slightly -- this is the newer, broader geographic area which is the three counties. Before we were looking at the narrower ones and simply the districts that were in essentially Wayne County were the ones that are overlapping out of it. I think this is a better perspective. And the districts that you rejected earlier still have the problems that they had potentially. I think all these districts now pretty clearly work under the Voting Rights Act. And that issue simply is off your agenda, your decisions on which, your decision as to which of these to approve, they all comply in my

opinion and I hopefully in the Court's opinion with the Voting Rights Act. So the other considerations that you're thinking about and discussing will be, you know, wrestling over are the ones that should be driving the process. You're in compliance.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you for that clarification, Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Braden I want to go over a few points of your conversation, first and foremost when we look at the maps on the draft proposed maps it does not show that Pontiac is a VRA District, an opportunity District on the map. And so I think what we are trying to get to is how many -- how we can count the democratic primary turn out and count the democratic primary pool as relates to the opportunity districts. And so when we pulled up the maps we could see that. If we look at the VRA analysis and the VRA data, the VRA analysis is a map. And the VRA data shows the districts that are opportunity districts whether it's for the primary turn out and the primary pool off the map. So I just wanted the public to know where that information is located. It has been published since it was turned into the Court on February 1. And how they are able to count to get the numbers that are shown on the screen.

>> I think that it would be relatively easy for Mr. Brace to or maybe John has this to take this and create the same graphic we did before. I don't see a problem with that. I don't know whether John can do it on the fly.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I'm not really looking for a graphic, I'm just looking to explain to the Commission and to the public how the numbers were obtained and where they are located since February 1st on the website. Because they line up with your primary turn out numbers and primary pool because they have been published, they are on the website for the public to see since February 1st. So I'm just clarifying what's on the screen and letting the public know where they can get the information and then why Pontiac, which is an opportunity District, is missing because it does not border Wayne County. It's north of Wayne County. But it is and you can see that in the data when they pull it up, I believe it's District 53 where they can see Pontiac so it's more for clarity sake.

>> I understand what you are saying, yes, that is all in the system. There isn't anything, any of these are created from and you are exactly right, that the -- that exists in what is already in the public domain available on the website. I mean we could create some other type of graphic if you desire or if someone thought that was useful, but all the data is absolutely there. There is nothing that has not been analyzed. The only thing that might need to be put into the system which may or may not be in the system right now would be the changes in what I'm calling Motown Sound 2. That was done last night by Dr. Palmer. And I don't know whether that has -- it's clearly it's contained in this chart so I'm assuming it appears in the website but I don't really actually know the answer to that.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That information will need to be posted once it's received so we can have that as well.

>> I think he was working with Mr. Brace on that. But, if not, it's -- the work has been done so putting it in the system. The work has been done from the data in the system. So I'm guessing that simultaneously doing it has been included but I don't know so we can confirm that and make it happen, if it hasn't happened. I will check with Dr. Palmer and Kim or.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Brace has his hand up.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, attorney Braden is correct. We have updated the map so that we now show a small inset at the bottom of the map for Pontiac, and we communicated that to Director Woods last night and sent him a sample. We are proceeding to update the maps to reflect all that in additional graphics.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Brace are you prepared to run the numbers for the Commission for the new map for Motown Sound two?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, the E2 or E1 plan?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is correct.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, and those are up on the website. They were posted last night. All of that information is up there on the my Districting site under the comments tab and link.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so anything else, Mr. Braden?

>> No.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you very much for the explanation.

>> My pleasure.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Chairperson Mr. Brace can you present that to the Commission? Because that was not provided to us to post off of the link to the Commission's website? So can you provide a presentation to the Commission, so they understand all of the numbers and the 7 ranked criteria but particularly the partisan fairness, compactness score and the VRA?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, I was trying to pull those together and don't have them quite yet but will have them within the next ten minutes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so while we wait for that, so and you're talking about on the new map, the changes that were made to the Motown yesterday, right?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that's correct, yep.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay then we can take off or pick up where we left off yesterday, just making any tweaks to maps that people want to make. Commissioner Kellom, we kind of had to cut you short. I think you said you were finished but I just want to make sure that there wasn't something else that you wanted to look at.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No, there wasn't anything else I wanted to look at. I made my plea for District 16 and 17 and I was in favor of or in agreement with Commissioner Szetela in that I mean I don't want to prevent anyone from tweaking

maps but I think we could be a little bit more productive and eliminate maps that are less performing or even that not favorable for other reasons to the Commission.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I just I have two things. One was for Commissioner Kellom, I was curious if she had seen the public comment out on the portal in the two maps where someone redrew District 16, 17 and 18 to change the configuration there. I'm just curious if you had seen those ideas that were out there? And then secondly I wanted to renew the motion I made last night but I kind of want to hear Commissioner Kellom's comment first.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, it's me again, sorry you all I'm at a doctor's appointment this morning. But if we are talking about the 16-18, that configuration, I did look. And this isn't just recently but this comment has been out for a while and has been substantiated from people that have come out to our hearings but particularly there was a public comment that has evolved over time regarding Motown Sound, the person is in favor of Motown Sound had a fix for 16 and 18 Commissioner Szetela if we are talking about the same one. I do like the configuration that with Livonia and the western bright more area. I think it's Livonia with Farmington, more of like a vertical strip that is happening opposed to east to west configuration we have for 16 and 17 if we are talking about the same one. The short answer is, yes. I think that particular suggestion might change a little too much. But I do like what it does to that area.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Are you talking about the one that grabs Southfield and pulls it down through Redford?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, I'm also going to check to make sure my yes is a real yes.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just wondering if you would be okay with me creating an alternative map and just redrawing those districts so you can look at them. The downside is you are going to lose a VRA District on that. But if we are still otherwise compliant according to our experts, I think that's okay.

And then you know the alternative on that is you could look at readjusting Inkster or readjusting another District to add one more back in. If you are okay with that I would like to play with that so we have something you can look at.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is totally fine. I'm okay with that. The rest of our friends might not be but, yes, I'm okay with that option.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: All right do we have John on today?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So, John, can you create an alternative map for the last Motown Sound you were working on yesterday? I think it was E1?

>> MR. MORGAN: So make a copy of that one and you are going to edit it.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Give me a moment and I will share the screen after I have created the plan. The copy rather. So we designate E2 for edit of Motown or E1 edit one?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I think E2 is probably less confusing.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Before we see this we are making these tweaks because these are communities of interest that geographically and demographically have no business being with parts of Livonia and the suburbs. And, shoot, I lost my train of thought. It's an off set for the public comment that we received regarding the Redford not Redford but bright more communities and that portion of Metro Detroit area being kept together particularly I know that there are areas like sweet potato and light busters and the old Redford theatre, that area is currently and has been under a long-term plan for revitalization so it's very important to the neighbors and people in the community to continue to have a voice, to continue to have a way to relate and gather with each other so they can get through the neighborhood projects done in a way that expresses them. I'm sure Commissioner Szetela or anyone else might have something to add in terms of the community of interest. Even if you don't necessarily agree to the changes, I think we could all collectively still talk about what these communities share. Okay, I'm done.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: All right I agree with you especially the combination of west Detroit with Livonia. There is just no commonality there and those communities are dealing with very, very different issues. Okay so I see you have this opened.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I just need to open, I copied the plan, I just need to open the correct one.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: For the public record in is correcting this from let me read off public comment Motown Sound redraw 16-18 public link, it was submitted by Nicholas barns on the 23, comment W10104 want I'm working off his version two map. So what I would ask you to do, John, is just delete districts 16, 17 and 18 and we are just going to rebuild them. That is probably the fastest way to do it.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm seeing if I can do it from this menu or not.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: You can, I do it all the time. Collect 16 and hit erase and it will take it out. It's just the easiest way to do it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

I was in the right place, looking at the wrong thing.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay so if you can just close out of that and we will start with District 18 because that is the furthest west District. And you are just growing to grab the area of Farmington and Farmington Hills we deleted out to the blue line that divides Wayne County and Oakland County. And we are going to actually that is not even Oakland County at that point. Just grab up to the blue line.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay hang on. I want to walk 21 and 19.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay that will make it easier. Okay so you're basically putting Livonia and Farmington together is hour we are going to do it. So just straight up and down. Yep, all of that. And then just bring it down into Livonia. Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: No, that is fine.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I saw that not responding and it strikes my heart.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think it's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah. Just let it do its thing.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: There we go.

>> MR. MORGAN: But I will save it. So most of these appear to be whole precincts, maybe one.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will get the blocks because it's split.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes. You locked the one District so it's not going to change it.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will Zoom out to look at the other areas.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: There was one precinct on the bottom that wasn't selected yet.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Gosh we will see what the population is, but I'm worried we will go over.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's not that much.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Not 5,000 but it's something.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: All right, so we are still.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: All right so now we are going to do District 17, which is going to be grabbing that upper part of what is left of Southfield. All right.

>> MR. MORGAN: I got to grab a split precinct.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Going to Redford.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: You have four stacked precincts one on top of the other all the way down the west side.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: On the west side there so start there and start pulling up. We will leave the eastern districts. They will need to go into 16 but I want to go on the west side. Oh, no.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will deal with this.

>> KIM BRACE: Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> KIM BRACE: While John is dealing with that, I do have the map up here so you can see the VRA analysis map for the E1 plan. And it shows the inset that we've created.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Great.

>> KIM BRACE: So let me share my screen. On that side and make it a view for you guys in just a second. And bring up...okay, what we have created is for the E1 plan. Can everybody see the map on the screen?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yep.

>> KIM BRACE: Okay, so for the E1 plan, we have created the map like what we have done before on the other plans of the effectiveness of the plan based upon the data that Dr. Palmer has been generating. And so what we have here for E1 is the districts that are effective. They are in green. The reason why District 10 is not showing up as green is because there are two sets of data that goes into the colorization of the 2018 and the 2022 election results. Both of them have to be effective together. And that's what generates the green coloring. In District 10's instance, it's one of those years are effective and the other one is slightly off. And not effective. So that is why it's showing as blue. It does have a box around the label. The label is coming from the primary turnout. And we see in the primary turnout the African/American community was at 37% while the white community is 26%. So we are seeing that as being effective in the primary turnout. I would also note on this graphic is that we have now started creating insets for the Pontiac area so that we can show that particular District as attorney Braden has talked about so indeed District 53 is one of those that now can be seen on the map. And can be then counted on the side of effectiveness. So this additional feature here I must have grabbed an older version because now it has a label that says Pontiac area on it. Again, this is coming from the analysis that Dr. Palmer has been generating. And that is in the spreadsheet table that Dr. Palmer generates. And indeed when you go to the far side of that you can see the turnout in the primaries and whether or not both primaries, the 2018 and the 2022 primary shows more African/Americans than whites in the primary turnout. If both of them are there, then it shows a yes in this column Z. If not, both of them, then it will show a no and that is why you have in District 10 you show it's not in both instances.

When you get over to the primary turnout itself, and that's coming off of columns AD through AG to evaluate that and that is where the label is coming from to show where or what is effective on that side. This table is up on the my Districting website along with the graphic. So that people and the Commission as well as the public can see this information. It was put up last night. And is available for people to take a look at.

We will be adding this for any particular plan that you've looked at, modified, created and that sort of thing. So that it's there on the my Districting site under the appropriate headings and columns on that side. Let me see if I've got -- I had this up here. Well, I did have. But it does, it will show up under the my -- I know where it is. It's right there.

In the proposed draft proposed House plans, it will show up there. There is the E1 plan. It allows the public as well as the Commission to look at the plan attachments. There are many of them. And it does a pop up. So I was showing you the VRA analysis map, that's this one here, the PDF, the data itself is the excel file underneath it for the VRA data. There's also the compactness scores, the partisan fairness scores, the population matrix and an overall map of the District. So that is in the plan attachment. Column. There is a separate map when you want to compare the District that is being or plan that is being looked at compared to the Hickory map. The shape files are available and a link to the comment Section of the my Districting site where people can go and comment about this particular plan. So this is in the right now the 2024 draft proposed House plans. We are making a further modification as you end up ultimately deciding which plan or plans was set to the Court, and will have an additional tab here that says Court submitted plans. So we are getting that prepared so that is all there on the comments Page link on the my Districting site.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you for sharing that with us.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, I can bring up the map again if you like.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yep. And I'm sorry I incorrectly stated this is version two that person shared, it's actually version one, I mentioned the wrong one. Okay, so I'm trying to figure out where we are. So start moving up. So just continue up that line. Through Redford. Just grabbing those westerly precincts. O, that is connected.

>> MR. MORGAN: So you're saying you don't want that? Sed Szetela you can and go and select the middle precinct for now. And just continue to go up from there and see what the numbers are. It's not exactly the same as what this person has on their map, but I find that sometimes when people use Dave's it does not exactly translate to what we can do with ours.

>> MR. MORGAN: No, the Dave stuff is a different data set.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yep, yep. We will add 23 we may have to back out some okay so that actually looks okay.

All right and then everything else is going to go into 16.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and if you want to make adjustments on this, you still can if you like.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right I almost got this and have to make sure this is not a split precinct.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Like this one is.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: At the very least 16, 17 and 18 are good with population you are looking for and I'm Zooming up to show.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So, Brittini, can you look at that? Can you see it where you are at? So it's putting Farmington and most of Farmington Hills in with Livonia, the eastern edge of Livonia, Southfield is with the western edge of Redford and then we have now like Detroit District with a little bit of Redford combined so that we are no longer going into Livonia with west Detroit. And, again, District 18 is now no longer going to be a VRA District and you will be down to ten but according to Mr. Braden it's a VRA compliant map and it's better respecting the communities of interest and those communities that have kind of similar concerns and issues are now going to be grouped together again instead of stretching out vastly different communities.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN:

>> CHAIR ORTON: We can't hear you and it looks like you're not muted but we can't hear you. Okay, yeah, now we can hear you. Now we can't. Can't hear you. You could join with your phone for the audio. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I understand why -- I understand the reasoning for wanting to try to do this. But I pretty vehemently disagree with it. For kind of a lot of reasons. One, I think it's far outside the scope of what we are tasked with doing. The Court didn't say we have to change districts 16, 17 or 18. None of those three districts were even challenged. And thrown out in the summary judgment phased. No one has even challenged these districts. None of them even touch a District that we have to change. 17 and 18 are -- don't even touch a District that touches a District that we have to change. So there are two orders of magnitude removed. 16 is one order of magnitude removed because it touches a District we have to change. 17 and 18 are far off what we have to do. I also don't think that it makes a whole lot of sense from a VRA perspective to lose a VRA seat. We already know 16, 17 and 18 they all perform. They all already elected a candid of choice person for those three districts. And, finally, from the community of interest standpoint, I don't agree with that either. What we heard last week from folks in Detroit is to draw horizontally. They said okay don't draw vertically like old districts 5 and 6 used to be drawn which we changed. They said if you can't do that perhaps draw horizontally and that is what we did with 16, 17 and 18. And I also don't really like how it's shaped. Shape to me is an important thing but I don't like how 17 has this portion that just comes south, and I don't like it and it's far outside the scope and don't think we should adopt to make these changes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom, can we hear you now? I can't hear you. Nothing. Sarah Reinhardt, can you try to help Commissioner Kellom or maybe you already are.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. I will try to connect with her.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. Okay, so are you wanting to do something else with this map, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm sorry I was on mute. So I did want to make one more change to address the VRA issue. But I do want number one Commissioner Kellom put a comment in the chat for host and panelists, I'm just going to read it because everybody who is in the meeting can see it but the public cannot I do like that configuration. I don't like that it takes away a District. So that's her comment. I did want to address Commissioner Eid's comments. I think you know, we have received comments about that particular configuration. That was the original bacon mander we drew which were Districts 16, 17 and 18 and combine western Detroit particularly bright more which anyone who is from kind of western Wayne County is very familiar with bright more and some of the champs that community has with the eastern side of Livonia going into almost the western side of Livonia. Those are not two communities of interest that belong together. The only reason why it was drawn that way was again because we were directed we needed to reduce the Black voting age population in the western Detroit districts we had originally drawn. So I do think they were racially gerrymandered. I think the record shows that very clearly and I think Patrick Lewis and Richard Raile yesterday very clearly said we had the discretion to fix those districts that were drawn using the same criteria we had drawn districts that the Court ordered us to redraw as part of our redrawing process, so we have the clearance to do that. And I think we should. Just because they have not been challenged yet does not mean they couldn't be challenged if we leave them in place. The only requirement on that would be that a new set of Plaintiffs who live in those districts come out and challenge those districts and they would win if they did. Because we already have a finding against us in terms of how the districts were drawn. So rather than wait to fix districts that frankly don't all line with any community of interest in the first place I think it makes more sense to fix them now and avoid more litigation. Kind of my thoughts on that. So we have this out here. Brittini, I'm going to take a stab at making a change in a new version that will bring back up the VRA. So if John, if we can rename this E3 I would appreciate that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom, do you have something? Can we hear you now?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Hello.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah we can hear you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So I have a few questions about what we are trying to do here. At least at this point in time. I thought from where we were now we were supposed to be making changes based on public...

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Donna?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think maybe we lost you again. We can't hear you, Donna, if you are speaking. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, for the public Commissioner Kellom has said she is still in an appointment but said horizontal us was in reference to Detroit more Central area/districts.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay well Commissioner Callaghan, you can try again. We are hearing, okay, I think they need...Commissioner Callaghan, are you speaking?

>> MR. MORGAN: I believe it's the Arabic interpreter.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Arabic interpreter, we can hear you, thank you. You need to mute. Sarah, can you mute the Arabic interpreter? Sarah Reinhardt, are you able to mute that person? Thank you.

Okay, Commissioner Callaghan, you want to try one more time? We can't hear you so we will proceed. But try again. We will take you when we can hear you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Now my line says it's unmuted.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Now we can hear you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm sorry about the confusion and I have a few points and concerns about these changes. I understand the changes. I'm not even going to say whether I like the changes or don't like the changes. I would need to have some time to look at them. And understand what the impacts of them are to those communities involved. And I don't have I can't do that while we are actually drawing the maps online. However, I thought we were passed the point of doing wholesale map redraws. I thought at this point we had completed that process, and we are now only seeking to make minor tweaks based on specific public comments for the map we had published on to the portal. So I guess one of my questions would be now of one comment because Commissioner Szetela directly referenced it where someone would request these changes and had a map with the suggestions. But beyond that one person do we have a basis for making these comments? Are there lots of other public comments from these districts for people asking for the changes, that would be my first question.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela, do you want to answer that?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, so I think that is a bit of a comment for Commissioner Kellom who is not available right now because she had made some reference to people asking for it during public meetings. So I'm not sure specifically what she's referring to. I know what I'm referring to is that public comment that was submitted online where they specifically provided a redraw for those districts. Because they have actually come up several times. So.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: That would be very important to understand the metrics around that. I could never vote for redrawing three complete districts based on one person's comment with no opportunity for anyone else in the effected districts to have any say about it. So that is a concern. But we can wait until Commissioner Kellom is

here to maybe elaborate on the public comment we had received since the maps were published.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I see that Commissioner Kellom's hand is up so maybe she can answer that right now.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Okay, that would be great.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: My apologies for all that. I'm in the car and can address this. And give my perspective. I'm taking a pause to see how I want to answer. The changes I suggested today are changes that I all thought about. When we originally drew the districts we draw based upon the information that we had at the time. I think we are also drawing from our personal experience, right? As citizens whether we talk about that, or not. People don't draw areas of Detroit because they're not from the area and there is discomfort and a reliance on the public to come out. There is also a reliance on what is available and myself, Juanita, Commissioner Eid. And an interesting fork in the road. When we were at Ebenezer, yes, when we were at second Ebenezer and we had the maps in the rear of the room, the purpose of us having those maps is so that the public engages. I think now we are past the point at least and I will speak for myself, we can have a hundred people make a comment about something and if we are swayed because of the sheer amount of people, then that's not as important to me as like the qualitative comments on top of me doing business and knowing that area. So the configuration that we draw, and that we drew before makes no sense for that area. If the rest of the Commissioners were to drive through the Redford, bright more, that area of Detroit and to see the Stark difference between the people that live there on top of the folks that live in Livonia it is beyond night and day. So if we are drawing for representation, if we are drawing for communities of interest, this is my attempt to just like we did yesterday with the Yemeni community and Melvindale, not about a wholesale change it's about the purpose and the spirit of this process is to draw for Detroiters. It's to atone what happened to Black representation and Black people. So if for nothing else and a very important exercise to show as a Detroiter, and I take that heavily, I don't speak for all Detroit but because there is no one else that can speak to that area besides maybe Juanita, I feel like as a Commission you all are either going to take I'm telling the truth and I know what I'm talking about on top of the public comment. It was a man and his wife. Then there were other people that are from the area that we have no business being with Livonia. We have no business with Livonia. It's close to us but we are a totally different neighborhood. And I agree with that. So I don't know if what I said makes sense, but I think a part of this mapping process is to listen to the public, is to listen to fellow Commissioners at the point of us being citizens and not politicians particularly in this area of Detroit. This is not a secret. People are literally quiet because they don't want to make a mistake when it comes to Detroit. So when suggestions are made and maybe not taken outside of the Court's suggestion. I get that. But I also want to give you all something to think about. It is a change that we did

not talk about previously. But it's an important change. So just kind of putting that out there.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I appreciate that, I'm from Farmington Hills so the areas you are drawing right now, I mean, I'm definitely directly impacted. Because you are drawing lines around my House, right? So I know this area. I can look at it and I can figure out do I think this makes sense. That is not really my point at this point in time. So like I said it's not like I'm against these. I think they are terrible districts and that is not the point but if this is the right time to do this given we have done a wholesale redraw of districts and always have a comment we can point to that supports that change is one. And we have done three districts. I don't feel comfortable with that was my one issue. Another one, and I know we did or put a considerable amount of effort into community outreach, but it was focused frankly on the Detroit area for this portion, I'm not talking about what you guys did previously back in the very beginning, talking when we are doing this redraw. It seems to me that the outreach for public was focused on the Detroit area. And this is not the Detroit area. So I'm wondering are these people going to be God smacked to find their District changed and with no effort and communicating with them and getting their feedback on that. That is concerning. Especially since we can only point to one public comment and redrawing three districts. Then my last concern is one that Commissioner Eid also brought up. Is that we are reducing a voting District. We have a wholesale redraw of three districts based on one public comment, after the public comment period is closed with no community outreach and we got rid of an opportunity District. I think that's just a recipe for nothing good.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I have a couple points. Wouldn't characterize it as being based on one District or one comment. I don't think that is accurate. I think Commissioner Kellom just said that she spoke to people about it while she was there.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry excuse me. Just for the record.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So it's not just the one comment. The comment just happened to have a map which is what I was using as a reference. There are other comments if you go to the portal and look at the maps where people have dropped a pin into the Livonia area and specifically complained about the configuration of specifically District 16 and 17 because it come binds Livonia with west Detroit and those communities just do not absolutely go together. And there have been multiple comments about it. It's not just a single comment. And then I also think we need to consider the perspective of we are submitting this map to a Court. To a magistrate who is going to review it for the constitutionality and submit it to a Court. We want our map to be adopted and the Districts that were drawn here and Commissioner Callaghan I know you don't have the benefit of having gone through this process because you were not a Commissioner at the time but 16, 17 and 18 were specifically drawn because we were trying to reduce the Black voting age population and what is now District 16.

That's pretty much how we originally drew it and had to redraw it at the direction of our experts because he said the Black voting age population was too high and why we combined the districts on top of each other Redford and Livonia.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Point of order. Commissioner Szetela you are putting words in the rest of our mouths. Maybe you draw it with that in mind and maybe that's your opinion. But that's not my opinion of how I was trying to draw things. So please don't characterize all of us as doing what you're saying that you think we did.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Well there is a transcript that records what we did so it's not really my opinion but that is another thing to consider with, you know, redrawing these districts is one we have public comment from the people in that area that say they don't like it. We have Commissioner Kellom and my experience from growing up around these areas and doesn't make sense from a community of interest perspective and we also got the concerns about potential constitutionality as another consideration. And the fact that this isn't just up to us anymore. It isn't just our voting and deciding on something. It's going through two levels of approval. And we've got to think about that as well. So that's kind of my thoughts.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mean, I just think a lot of what was just said was really disingenuous. I think these districts hurts Detroit and hurt the Black community because, again, we already know that 16, 17 and 18 performed for the Black community. We had an election. That's what happened. So this is I think we should keep them the same for VRA reasons. I totally disagree that them being drawn in the horizontal configuration is comparable at all to them being lumped in of bacon mandered District they are completely different and don't look like bacon strips they look like big squares and it's completely different. The districts perform. We don't need to change them. There seems to be this idea that you know changing them increases the likelihood of the Court picking our maps. I think it's the opposite. I think if we change too many districts in which in this Motown Sound map we are changing 8 more districts than we do. If we adopt the changes it will be 11 more districts than what we have to. I think that increases the likelihood of the Court picking the other guy's map. And our lawyers have said that. Pretty clearly. So, you know, I understand the reasoning, but I do not agree with it. And I do not think it makes a whole lot of sense from an analytical perspective because you are getting rid of VRA districts that were not challenged and we already know performed adequately.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm just going to say this and then, again, I think Motown Sound is as it was originally created and the tweaks we made yesterday is a viable action. I think we are getting lost in the weeds in the spirit in which I offered these changes, which is listening to people. And I for one specifically remember originally drawing these districts based upon our previous advice. And I said in the

meeting this makes no sense for this area that we are grabbing east to west. I said that out loud. I think also to address another comment that was made, when we drew we had to draw the whole State of Michigan, and this is not news to anyone. There were so many people that got to freely and with pride and honor draw their neighborhoods and their areas and Detroit continues to be this issue that people and I can't say it any other way and you know I love you all individually but you are not from these areas and you are arguing with people down how this should be drawn. So I offered this knowing that it would likely get pushed back. I did not know it would be so fiery. I get that it is outside of what we are originally charged with-drawing. El -- if that is the issue it can be more plainly stated and it does something poorly for the VRA districts, we get that. But that is also not the only reason we are drawing. We also don't draw the maps to have a hundred people comment on one thing. It's not about numbers either. I think this Commission sometimes continuously misses which was also a little bit of yesterday, there are people that are behind these maps. And the people that are angry, the people that speak out more are the people that have the luxury of doing so. So when we are drawing for Detroit and going into the Senate maps, I hope you -- at least for me as the Black people on this Commission and as a Detroiter I'm getting a little emotional. I hope this is a learning experience. And your privilege and listening. So I'm not crying because I think that these -- that this map is just wonderful. It's a disappointment. Which is why I voted the way that I did for Melvindale. So we continue to hang on to metrics and all it does not do anything, what does it do for the people? What have they said? So they have said previously that they don't like -- did not like our whole map, okay? And go to Court and lose that lawsuit. And so now I am just offering the suggestion as an answer to the people. If it gets voted down that is completely fine. Motown Sound is still a viable map, but the discussion is being unearthed here. I just want people to be careful how they are expressing themselves. Because people are listening to you. And that's also a part of, you know, what we are being judged by our character, right? So as far as I'm concerned you know, we can move on. I know we have lots of work to do. We have some maps that should be eliminated but I did want to for the good faith just like yesterday we attempted to draw out suggestions for Melvindale, Dearborn switch. And doing the same thing for this area. I'm glad we got the opportunity. Yeah, that is all I have to say about that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to have my hand up. Sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I just -- I agree with what Commissioner Kellom said, I think it's about the people and listening to the people and what is right for these neighborhoods. And I also don't agree that our lawyers have said that if we do this our maps aren't going to be adopted. I think Mr. Lewis and Mr. Raile were quite clear about this yesterday and I specifically pushed them on it about addressing the

other districts that have not been challenged but unlikely are unconstitutional and are very clear it's within our discretion as a body of the legislature, a derivative of it to go ahead and make these changes and you know frankly I think we should because I think we will end up with another lawsuit if we don't. So in light of that I would like to move to approve these changes to District 16, 17 and 18 as part of the Motown Sound map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Is there a second for that?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I want to clarify as an edited map that will be analyzed for VRA analysis, is that what you are suggesting.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, I'm just saying to accept these changes because people have made comments about we need to vote on the changes so I'm saying accept these changes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Then submit it to VRA analysis as part of it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so we have a motion and a second to accept these changes to the Motown map is how you phrased it Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Is there any discussion? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want clarification. Pardon me. Would that be like a Motown Sound 3 or would this be part of Motown Sound 2? How would those changes be reflected? Would it be like a whole new map? I just want to have clarification.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would ask Sarah to weigh in on that, but I think we can probably just keep it with the Motown Sound E2 designation unless Sarah thinks we should rename it in some way. Sarah Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi, yeah. I really defer to you all on that. If you would like to add a different name to it, I know that the naming conventions we have used in the past have been for members of the public to be able to differentiate more easily and providing public comment feedback. But I know that for today's meeting I think the final decision will be made today. So really it just comes down to ease of use for you all. So if you are able to easily remember or differentiate this map between the other maps, then I think it could stay as it is but if you want to rename it you are welcome to.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: No, I just want to reiterate that clarification for what we would actually -- this is going to replace Motown Sound then?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No. It's just an alternative map so we would have Motown Sound and Motown Sound E2, which we can then have a VRA analysis on and potentially vote for today if we want to vote for it, yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so we have Motown Sound the original. We have Motown Sound E1, which is the small tweaks that were made yesterday by Commissioner Kellom. And then we have Motown Sound E2 which is this one, just want to clarify.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Right.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Kim Brace says yes.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is John Morgan just to point out the starting point for this was the Motown Sound E1, which had the changes made from yesterday.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes. I had to take a very important phone call and I missed some of the conversation. But I just want to ask, Brittini, is she comfortable with the one she had? Because I was in full agreement with the first one that she had. We are not changing it, are we?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Hi Commissioner Curry. So this is just an alternative map. So we have still and that was my point of clarification also. We still have the original Motown Sound. We made those tweaks yesterday in the meeting. I think that is Motown Sound E1 and then this map that makes the changes to 16, 17 and 18 and slightly other things is E2. So it would be a third version of I guess a second version of the original Motown Sound map. So the original version is not going anywhere. What we did yesterday doesn't go anywhere and is separate from the changes that were just made. If I'm understanding correctly.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay I think I got you all. I'm sorry I missed that part. And as far as Melvindale, I heard Brittini say that unless you live in Detroit you really cannot relate to the sentiments of the people of Detroit. I'm very aware of what she is saying. And I stay in Detroit, I'm very familiar with every area just about of Detroit. And even the Melvindale part. There are a lot of mid easterners that frequent the Melvindale area all the time. So when I put that vote in for Melvindale for it to be changed a little it's only because the mid easterners are up the street and use Melvindale because they have a common interest on a building on outer drive in Melvindale where they are constantly there, all the time. So I figured they should have a piece of it since they were there always in Melvindale. I think they go to school there and everything. So but I'm in full agreement of Brittini's, the map she draw. And so that's my part on Melvindale. I'm just very close to every area and I feel like if you really don't live in Detroit, you don't know the centers of Detroit. So I'm in agreement with that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. I see that Nate Fink is on. Do you want to say something?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you I wanted to let the Commission know litigation counsel from Baker Mr. Lewis and Mr. Rile have just joined and are available to have a discussion to

the extent the Commission wants to do so about the revisions that or proposed revisions that were just made so I just wanted to make the Commission aware of that. And they have not been in the meeting and have not been, you know, monitoring what has been going on this morning but have been on standby in case there was an issue that came up. So if there are specific questions to be directed. I see Commissioner Szetela has her hand up and Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Eid so I will stop talking now.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Kellom, did you have something else? Your hand is still up.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think I did. But I might have forgotten so I'm going to put my hand down. I apologize.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, for the litigation counsel or for General Counsel because they -- Mr. Fink, have you been here the whole time? We seem to be having this confusion on what was said yesterday on if changing more districts outside of the scope of the Court order makes it more or less likely of our map to get picked by the Court. I think that's really the discussion we are trying to have. Can we get some clarification on that?

>> Richard Raile: I can try. In part I think I may -- let me start talking because I'm struggling a little bit with the premise. The specific issue before the Court, when you say pick the map you're talking about the remedy phase. In the ongoing lawsuit. And it is my position that more or less outside of the area that is -- that was struck down, the specific districts that struck down may not have much of an effect either way on whether your map gets approved by the Federal District Court. On the one hand, it is my position, and I think there is a case called Covington recently in the Supreme Court that supports my position that if there is some type of principle of least change implicit in the Michigan Constitution it's certainly not expressed, it would have to be implicit, the Federal Court is not the proper entity to enforce that against the Commission.

And, also, just based on my read of the Court, I don't think that that would even be their priority. So I think that the panel would likely be amenable to that argument, and I think that it's -- I don't think that the Federal Court -- there is no Federal principle of least change for sure. That is very clear. It would have to be under the state law. It's not expressed. It would have to be implicit. And I think there are good arguments it's not implicit in any event the Court wouldn't -- it would have to be a state Court lawsuit somewhere down the road. So I don't think the Federal Court would or should look at scants of changes that are maybe more than are strictly necessary to remedy the violation. Okay, so that is point one.

On the other hand, the Court's remedial powers are limited to the districts struck down. So if you go and do more than that, I don't know that it necessarily helps you. Which is why in my bottom-line conclusion to the question you proposed was I'm not

sure it really matters that much. I can defend each under legal principles. The Court's priority is going to be the remedial issues. Then there is a third point to make, which I do think is important, which is that if you're going out and making changes that otherwise create other legal problems, maybe they are not a logical outgrowth that creates a state law problem, maybe it weakens a minority opportunity District so you have a Voting Rights Act problem, those types of things could affect you in the remedy proceeding and could affect you down the road. I don't have the kind of information to really advise on that. So I'm not sure if that's responsive to what you all are saying. But maybe, you know, feel free to follow-up, Commissioner Eid, if that's not helpful.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, it's kind of like I understand why but it kind of sounds like it's kind of playing both sides a little bit, Mr., you know, because by that logic can we redistrict the whole state? How far can we go?

>> Richard Raile: So the answer would be, again, it would be a question of state law and that happened in Covington, the North Carolina legislature had a remedial task, and it went and changed parts of the states that were quite far away. And the Federal Court said that cannot be done. And the Supreme Court reversed and said that's not the job of the Federal Court to police that. It's beyond its remedial authority. That's why I say at the remedy phase here, if you did in theory redistrict the state, and I don't encourage that, I don't know that I have doubts, I think I would have a compelling argument that the Federal three-Judge panel does not -- it's not there to police that issue. There would be presumably if you did that there would be some kind of state action and then there would arise a question under the state Constitution of whether there is some limits. You know, and it would be a state law case. It would have to be as I said implicit. There is not a bar on mid-decade redistricting in the Michigan Constitution. I could make I think there are compelling arguments to be had that the any such bar would be tied to the principles related to disbanding the Commission. I don't know exactly how that would work or whether we would win that. So I'm not encouraging you to go and redraw the whole map. I think there would be some risks associated with that. Although it's very unclear you might actually win a case like that. But here I think you have a policy question in front of you of what you want to do with this opportunity. And it is correct that in some ways litigation counsel doesn't want to take sides in that policy dispute because that is not our job. We are leaving that to you all. And then the final point is I do understand from Commissioner Szetela's comments yesterday part of what is motivating this is that there may be concerns that, you know, the racial gerrymandering went beyond the scope of the Court's opinion and maybe this is a good opportunity to sort of fix that. As I said yesterday I think that is a defensible view even against the state law challenge. If you wanted to do that. Because you would also have a principle of Federal supremacy that could defend you in that state challenge. It doesn't mean you have to do it. I don't believe you have to do it to get your map through the

three-Judge panel. The panel is stuck with the districts that has jurisdiction over.

Whether you want to be preemptive ordeal with that is not something where I feel like the litigation counsel is in a position to really put the thumb on the scale one way or another. I hope that's helpful. I'm trying to answer the question, but there is uncertainty with what you're dealing with, does that make sense Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, that helps. I think I do not want to put words in your mouth so please correct me if I'm wrong. But what I'm hearing is essentially it's up to us, it's whatever both sides are defensible but it's up to us.

>> Richard Raile: I think that is a fair summation of my bottom-line view. We would defend if you went out and did what Commissioner Szetela described, I'm not even sure that is what you are doing as Mr. Fink said we are not sort of watching play by play. But what Commissioner Szetela described to me of going out and preemptively changing other districts based on a view that racial predominance affected them, I'm very comfortable defending that. If you choose not to do that, I'm very comfortable defending that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I was just going to say that that's my understanding of what was said yesterday is that it's within our discretion, that it's not going to hurt us one way or another and it sounds like you are confirming that, is that accurate?

>> Richard Raile: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yeah, I still have to reiterate, my beef with this is not that these are bad changes. I think they may be good changes my question is the timing. We worked really hard and put our best effort forward to produce the very best maps we could and produced ten of them so the public would have some variety to choose from and to give us feedback on that. And we did the best we could and put it out there and came and did their comments and then the first thing we did when we get back oh, yeah, never mind that map we are going to do it all over. It felt like a bait and switch. If we thought this was so great why didn't we do this before until after the public did not have any available to weigh in on it and why didn't we go out to the outlying communities to ask for input because we didn't. We got a lot of Detroit input now these changes are going far beyond Detroit, and we didn't do any outreach. We did not get public input and waited until anybody had to give any to decide to make the changes and one day they won't have a chance to go to the portal and say anything to us, we will know today and it seems like a pretty big day to make the day we are voting on the map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I see other hands, I've been waiting to say something.

>> Richard Raile: Can I address that? To some extent that is a policy concern that is outside of my purview, to some extent there is a legal concern there which goes to the logical outgrowth point. I've been addressing least change which is sort of a different legal construct. The logical outgrowth doctrine we talked about yesterday would require as a matter of state law, we believe it's implicit in state law would require that changes after the public comment period be the logical outgrowth of public comments. So if I don't know this again because I don't know what exactly is going on here. But if there is not a fair tie between changes that are happening and public comments there is a vulnerability under that doctrine. Again, I doubt that the Federal Court would be able to enforce it. I can be proven right, they might come in and try to reinforce that and then there would be potential state law problems down the road. So I do think you should weigh that concern. There is a legal component to it but it's different from maybe a least change. So I recognize it's very complicated but hopefully that is helpful.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Orton you said you had something to say so I will wait, and I don't know why my hand keeps getting take end down but if you want to speak first please go ahead.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So I want to kind of agree with what Commissioner Kellom was saying. I feel like we put maps out and in this instance called Motown, you know, we put a Motown map out. People made comments. And now if we choose a map where we've made huge changes like this it's no longer the map we put out to them. That they were saying that they liked. You know, we can all say oh, they all said they liked Motown, but this is not exactly that same map. That's just what I wanted to say, go ahead, Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Two things. One we were talking about legal discussion. I think the argument or discussion and I'm not a lawyer, just work with them, could be we were charged with this task of redrawing Detroit districts that were problematic. And born out of that was a further examination of issues wholistically that were caused and caused us to listen to Detroiters, caused us to listen to citizens in a different way. And so what I see and, no, we could make -- we could say this is not the Motown map. Where really it is. It goes back to what I was saying before. Are we saying that the suburban folks AKA majority folks are going to be upset with this map? Because these are comments, these changes reflect comments that we've been hearing for a year and a half. But we did not honor those changes because we were given a certain set of instructions, nor did we make these changes in this round because we were also tightly following the rules of not changing what is outside of what the Court has asked us to. And so I have said, you know, that I did not like this area, and it should be changed. If I'm just going to be treated anecdotally and not people but other citizens have said this. I don't have meticulous notes where I recorded every single public comment. So if this is going to be, you know, a computing or a statistical

gain then that part of it is unfortunate but I don't think we should hold the attitude this is a new wholesale change that though one has said because that is untrue. And people have been talking about this western side of Detroit forever. There was the white buzzer I mentioned earlier he is a prominent citizen of the committee. He spoke out and had owners from sweet potato sensation and that whole area came to the first hearings in Detroit so to say that is a little dismissive that this change came out of nowhere. I just completely disagree with it. These folks have been speaking about this area for a long time. And in general, you know, people have said they did not like in the past when we were drawing the map, there was a lot of dissatisfaction. So we are not redrawing the state. It was not that I heard our counsel say you could just draw everything but what we attempted to edit are changes that were like I said born out of this process, reflective of us understanding that we made mistakes, and we are changing those areas. Because if that is the case we wouldn't have changed southwest. We wouldn't have changed areas of Dearborn. We changed the areas we were supposed to change. So, yeah, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, so I just wanted to touch on the supposed novelty of these changes. We actually did have three collaborative maps that included redraws of District 16, 17 and 18 including the Rosebud, sunflower and the Marigold all which had the same kind of east-west horizontal or vertical versus horizontal configuration. So it's not like this is something unique that is coming out for the first time. It's been proposed in multiple maps that have been out there. In terms of Richard's concerned about the logical outgrowth as I mentioned when I first started drawing these districts, and I specifically asked Commissioner Kellom about them is we received a public comment that included a map attached to it which is the very map that we just redrew these districts using. So this came directly from a public comment about the best way to redraw those districts 16, 17 and 18 it included to draft maps in it and the draft version one is the map that I used in redrawing these districts so it's direct outgrowth of public comment we received during the public comment period of time specific to the Motown Sound map so I don't really think we have any issues there.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom, your hand is up again. Do you want to say something else?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know why it's not. I will try to figure it out.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So we had quite a discussion on that. We still have a motion. Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes, it seems like the question becomes and it's at the Commission's discretion what do you consider a logical outgrowth? And I think that's kind of where the Commission is having some tension with regards to, you know, what is that, how much does that include based upon the advice that has been given by counsel how much of a logical outgrowth from public comments does the Commission

want to consider. As you have heard that is really up to the Commission. So just wanted to reiterate that, hearing, summarizing some of the discussion that was saying, you know, how far does the Commission want to go as relates to the logical outgrowth.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: My hand is really up this time. Thank you Commissioner Orton. I think it's two different things happening, and I think this is just perspective. A difference between a logical outgrowth of comment and a logical outgrowth of the process. For my perspective I'm speaking from the process because if I go if we go by comments Detroit area or the Detroit area had the same issue, and I don't want to punish those citizens for that. It is not up to all of them. It's easy to say we will come out to the hearings, but some people don't have computers. So the way that we are trying to do outreach to them is not effective. Some of them are blue collar or hardworking people, whatever their jobs are so they can't come in, in the morning. So these are things that maybe were different in other parts of the state. So if we are not going to adjust our ears and our methods, to redraw for the area that we are supposed to redraw, and that includes communication, I think the expectation has to change. And maybe that is the teacher part of me. But if you cannot expect something from someone if you have not been taught how and we saw that at the hearing. There was a huge gap in understanding we were the City Council or another body and thinking we had control over things we simply did not have control over. So if we are conducting or, you know, going through this process, looking at comments, that might be something that's not relevant to the City of Detroit. This is also why we are getting larger organizations and less citizens, that's not by mistake that shows you that citizens still aren't one hundred percent engaged in this process and I want to be careful we are not punishing them although there is not a comment for something and it's not valid. I think we use what we have. So I just wanted to quickly address those differences. There is a difference between the outgrowth of the process like this process has given us an opportunity to choose differently and say, all right, how can we get this right? And if we are still looking for public comment, we might miss what we are actually supposed to be listening to and what we are actually supposed to be doing.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I certainly understand that, but, you know, I mean, we've had hundreds of comments saying put Melvindale back with District 3 literally hundreds. And some of that is advocacy, of course. But that's I mean, this is a public comment is a practice in advocacy. It's a practice of people coming out and speaking to us. And, you know, because of different equitable issues like Commissioner Kellom just said, different folks are going to be able to do that differently. But I don't understand why we are making such a big change for an area that had less public comments than an area that had hundreds of public comment. But they are different areas. For me it's more so

like the districts perform. We just seem to have a disagreement on what is actually best for Detroit. In my opinion how it was is perfectly fine because the districts perform.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, I just want to say Commissioner Kellom, her last statements because that is exactly what I struggled with this entire time is having the everyday average citizen, that one lone citizen and making sure their voices are heard and not drown out by organized groups and that is what I wrestled with the Detroit area is not getting the public comment that I felt and really wanted to have for the area to do them justice. So thank you for bringing attention to that. And I would like to call the question.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, question.

>> Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Question is called so I suppose we will need to have a roll call vote for this.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry, I had to bring my screen back. The motion -- would you like me to repeat the motion Madam Chair, the original motion?

>> CHAIR ORTON: To move this changed version of Motown Sound FCE2 forward.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You don't want me to put District 16, 17 and 18 in there just name it Motown Sound E2?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes I believe so.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: All right got you and to submit for VRA analysis; is that correct?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay, a yes vote means you are in favor of adopting the changes to the Motown Sound E2 map and submit it to VRA for analysis. A no vote means you are not in favor of that motion. I will.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That's not correct at this stage this is a motion to call the question, so we are just voting on whether or not we are going to vote on that one.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay I'm sorry, thank you, Commissioner Lett. This is to close the discussion, call the question for the voting of the motion that I just mentioned. We would start with Commissioner Eid to move forward since the question has been called. If you are ready to move forward so that we can vote on the previous motion that I mentioned, you would say yes and if you are not then no. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: 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:
- >> 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: Unanimous vote Madam Chair.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Then we will do the next roll call vote.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: So now we are back to Commissioner Szetela move to adopt the changes to the Motown Sound E2 map and to submit to VRA for analysis. A yes vote means you are in favor of that motion and a no vote means that you are not in favor of that motion. Commissioner Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> 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?
- >> CHAIR 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: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What is the vote so far? I just need your vote please, ma'am.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Oh, geez.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This does not permanently change the map just as a reminder.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, I'm going to say no.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair, with a vote of eight no to five yes the motion does not carry.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you. Commissioner Kellom your hand has stayed up so I'm assuming it does not need to be up.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No, it's not me. On my end it's not yellow so I don't know why that is doing that.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: All right, okay, so we are still in the mapping deliberations. Are there any other tweaks that people wish to address? Okay, then I believe next we would need to pull and go through the maps that are being considered and look at all of the information regarding them before we get ready to take a vote. Commissioner Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would like to remove the Bergamot, 1, 2 and Lily for consideration.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I second that.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay we have a motion and a second to remove those before we start discussing. Commissioner Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, I'm actually opposed to that. I believe yesterday it was stated that the rules for all of the maps that went to public comment get moved forward. And I know it didn't perform as well, but there were people that commented positively on Water Lily. So I'm against that.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, I still don't see any need to do that. We are going to vote on all of these maps, at least they are up for a vote and if they don't get any support they will naturally fall off.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Lange, your hand is up, but I think just still. Did you have something else?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you. I'm not sure if the Commission wanted our opinion on this question, legal opinion. But I'll offer it anyway. We did look at the rules that the Commission did adopt. And I do think that it's permissible for the Commission to do this if it wants to, which would be to, you know, drop a couple maps before you get to the voting procedure, but I think the rules you adopted for the voting procedures would allow for it. But, again, it's ultimately up to the Commission, if you want to just go ahead and just put them all in and as Commissioner Lett said, it will just sort of naturally happen. Or if you want to get rid of some now I think you could. But I just wanted to mention that. Thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So just from like a policy standpoint, we have already had these out so like what if -- what is taking them out now actually do? Like for example let's say we vote it down, right, but then let's say hypothetically, let's say we can't come to an agreement and that we have to go to a ranked choice vote, and I want to submit Water Lily, would I still be able to do that?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't believe so. But Mr. Fink, or Ms. Reinhardt maybe have the document in front of you?

>> SARAH REINHARDT: So, yeah, the only thing that I can think of is because you have not gone through to present the maps that are up for a vote yet. The result would be that you would no longer need to present those maps to the public if you vote to remove them from contention. And then, you know, as to whether or not a Commission could still actually vote for those maps, it -- the rules of procedure does say that you would like Commissioners could put forth the map that they wish to vote on. Or during the random selection or, sorry, during the ranked choice. And during the initial vote that a Commissioner could state the name of the map that they preferred. So I would defer to your legal counsel on whether or not a Commission could still vote for them at that time. But I think that, you know, the rules that you have made are subject to, you know, decisions that procedural decisions that you all choose to make or amend with. So I'll defer to your legal counsel on that point.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Mr. Fink?

>> Mr. Fink: So the rules talk about the draft proposed maps and if by taking this vote right now you are removing some of your quote draft proposed maps from that designation and from that group, then I do think you would at least according to the rules as you have them now, I mean, this isn't -- this component is not a constitutional issue from the way I read it. This is just in the rules that you put in place. Then you have to have this vote about you know, the constitutional majority, determine whether or not you can get through that process and if not then the constitutionally go to a ranked choice voting system. How you determine what is considered within that group is provided for in your rules and the rules currently say that for the ranked voting process,

which I think I'm looking at my other screen on the rules that Mr. Eid asked about, the secretary will call on each Commissioner in rotating alphabetical order to audibly indicate the draft proposed map they would like to submit for the ranked choice vote. So I think if you are taking this vote now and removing some of those maps from that designation, then as the rules are drafted now I think you would be precluded from offering up one of those, for example, of Water Lily or Bergamot is removed right now you wouldn't be able to do that unless the Commission I suppose could take up another vote to reconsider that or something. But I do think it wouldn't be, you know, provided for within the rules to consider one of those in the ranked choice voting process.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, I think I'm good, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Kellom? Do you mean to have your hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was just going to respond to what Anthony said like what would be the point of my view is just efficiency and it also kind of goes against what I was saying if we know already what maps we like and not just like but are better maps then we can start from that premise. That's what my train of thought was.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, sorry, my train of thought came back to me. I was just going to say what Commissioner Kellom said, the purpose is just so we don't have to present on those four maps that don't seem to have a lot of support and have the lowest VRA numbers to begin with because they each only have nine I think based on the last count I saw. Not including Pontiac so that is just the point of it to be more efficient because we are limited on time and sounds like we will have the ability to bring the map in if we go to ranked choice voting so it's really trying to save time.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I understood to say we cannot bring it in when it gets ranked choice voting.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Unless there is a motion to reconsider so you can redo that. I apologize for the interruption. It was Bergamot, Bergamot two, Water Lily and what other map?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Hold on, let me look. Water Lily and Tulip.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Got it, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yeah so in order to save time we will get rid of those but we are spending more time discussing whether we can get rid of them and, in fact, I thought we had to kind of with the public go through each one and say why you are not considering it. I understand that, you know, we don't want to sit through the whole VRA analysis if we are got not going to consider it. But I do think we have to say specifically why we are not going to put them forward.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So my thought on this is I agree with that. I think we should probably eliminate, if we want to eliminate like those four we show do it one by one. So

that we state the reasons why for that one. But we will take this vote, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just going to withdraw the motion so we can move on.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you. Okay, so then we, I believe are at the point where we will start looking at the maps and look at all the information about them. Is that accurate? Okay, so I think I don't know if the list I have in front of me is not critical, it's according to how many districts were changed. So I don't know if that is how we should go but the first one I see is Daisy two so I guess we would have John bring that up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure, so I would bring up the map in auto bound, but you want to reference some of the other documents, I might take those from the my Districting site because they are all in one place rather than me hunting around in the file folders if that is agreeable.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sure.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

All right so just a moment, I will load, which one was it? You said the Daisy two?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: While that is being pulled up I thought it might be helpful as a reminder to reread some of the items you might consider discussing while this is being reviewed. It's recommended in the process document for you to discuss information about the map to go through some of the various numbers associated and analysis associated with the map but also for each Commissioner to express during this discussion if the map is preferred and why or not preferred and why as you all alluded to earlier. So that's it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, and then is that like not a vote but are we going to go around? Or people just say it if they want to say it because not everyone is going to say they like the map.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I think it's more say it if you want to say it, if you have something to contribute what your preference is or why you don't prefer it, now is the time.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so.

>> MR. MORGAN: So this is the Daisy two plan. In my version of Autobound and then if we need to reference the documents, we can pull them from the website here.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so just as a reminder, this is the plan where every other District was locked besides the 7 that were required to be changed. And so maybe we just take a moment to look at it. Can you move it so we can see down just a little bit? There. If anyone wants to talk about any of the configuration, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'll start, sorry, I did not raise my hand. I think though the Daisy 2 performs well in terms of VRA districts. And by locking the districts and I said this before does not allow a lot of opportunity for the districts we are tasked with redrawing, particularly using District 8 as an example, it scoops down into almost downtown and doesn't make geographical sense and it does not do the best for the demographics and communities of interest for Detroit.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, I was thinking more of if someone wants to just kind of describe the districts and without an opinion of whether we like it or not like it. But I guess it's okay if we want to say our opinion while we are describing it. Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure, so like what was just said, this map only changed the districts that the Court said we had to change. And in doing that the other surrounding districts like 5 and 6 are the same as Hickory and as well as this is one of the only maps that has three and 15 being the same as Hickory. We heard from a lot of folks they did not want 3 and 15 changed. As far as what did change, you have a District 1 that includes River Rouge and that area of Down River up through southwest Detroit, incorporating some parts of downtown Detroit and the west side of Detroit. You have a District 11 that starts in downtown Detroit and goes up the river through the points. You have a District 12 that takes into account East Point, crossing south into Detroit, taking in Harper Woods. East English Village, Rosedale. 9 didn't change, 13 did not change. 7 and 14 did. District 7 has a suburban Oakland County District of Royal Oak, Madison Heights, Huntington Woods Berkeley and process over 8 Mile a little bit for its closest neighborhoods. Royal Oak Township here is split between District 6 and District 7. And what else? 14 is a Macomb County centered District that crosses into the northern portions of Detroit. And Commissioner Kellom already spoken District 8 and I think it was she was very accurate in what she said.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so, John, could we see the partisan fairness and VRA, whichever way you want to do it? And I just want to say Mr. Morgan we really appreciate how good you are at helping us see the map and see the different areas and take your time. It's appreciated.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thank you. So I'm just getting a fresh download of this. So it's just in my downloads. But this is the partisan fairness for that plan. Just double check. 29 Daisy 2, okay.

So the Daisy 2 the top line numbers are the lopsided margin 5.4. For the republicans. The mean median is 2.4 for the republicans. Efficiency gap is 3.1 for republicans. And the seats vote ratio is 1.7 for the democrats, the seat count is 60 democrat, 50 republican.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay what other item did you want to look at from this list or something else?

>> CHAIR ORTON: VRA analysis I guess.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that is going to show the map, so this is the PDF version of the maps that were created. So counting district 18 which was not changed in this likewise 17, 16, 5 and 6 so you've got, well, you can reference how many performing districts you have in the plan.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, and so after a second maybe the VRA and this was called analysis or data? I can't remember.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the analysis. The data is the spreadsheet. Okay so when we have looked at this before we generally were just acknowledging that the what makes a performing District is this area here which is the estimated turn out at primary for 2018 and 2022 and Black higher than white it gets the designation of yes and the secondary point is the primary pool which is a little bit different. And that has another yes-no in it. But the ones that show on the map and the ones that seem to have been highlighted by the legal team was this one here. And so, yeah, if you want to look at that.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> KIM BRACE: As I mentioned earlier today, that column Z is the one that colors the green versus the blue on that map there. And then the text that goes in there is column all the way to the right-hand side that tells us it's AD and AE that shows you the percentages on those sides as labels.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, if there are no questions we will keep going so I suppose I should start at the top, districts shall be of equal population, but we know in all of these plans that already has been met. I don't know if people want to look at that, or not. We can look at plan deviation.

>> MR. MORGAN: The quick version has that, and sorry Executive Director Woods has his hand up.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I just want to concur with the Chair that all of these maps have been reviewed for the 7 ranked redistricting criteria when presented to the Court by the February 1 deadline. The only thing that would be different would obviously be the one done yesterday and the only other thing that would be different from what was given to the Court besides the one done yesterday would also be the public comments that were received after they were proposed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. So are you suggesting since we know they all comply with 7 ranked redistricting criteria we don't need to go through each of them? Or we need to.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I will defer to legal counsel on that. But it was stipulated, and I think we talked earlier through the Mr. Braden presentation and also echoed by Mr. Brace with regards to the opportunity districts to make sure that everyone understood where they were located as it relates to Pontiac not showing up initially. I know they are in the process of correcting it if they have not finished it already. But that information is there. It's also available with regards to the data and then the explanation

was provided by Mr. Brace with regards to districts that might be blue but have a purple box around it because the data wasn't consistent between the 2018 and 2022 election. So I would defer to legal counsel and the will of the Commission.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay it will save a lot of time if we don't have to go through every one, we just need to go through the one that we made tweaks on yesterday. Unless legal counsel want to chime in and give us any bad news. Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you. So just so I'm clear the question is can you avoid going through the analysis on population and VRA as to all the districts that you've already had that discussion and analysis in the record. As the VRA issue I would ask Mr. Braden feels the need to or is welcome to jump in to the extent he thinks there needs to be, you know, more of a discussion as to those other maps but to the extent you already had that discussion on the maps and those have not been changed since you had the discussion I don't see any reason you need to you know do that more. You certainly can have a discussion to the extent it's relevant to your consideration of you know the different maps. But you know, I think just important that we have a very nice, clear record, discussing all of the ranked criteria for all of the maps in our record and to the extent that it's not there, particularly for like the new map, it should certainly be done. And those are all relevant criteria to discuss but I don't think you need to go over and essentially be redundant on things that have already been discussed. Thank you. And I see Mr. Braden's face has popped up here.

>> Mark Braden: And I believe that all the plans including Motown Sound, the new version of Motown Sound all comply, I believe, with the Voting Rights Act. So you can obviously you can there are issues you might wish to discuss on that issue relating to, you know, other aspects I guess. But in the sense of I need at this time to affirm it and go through each one and say it complies, you believe it complies with the Voting Rights Act I'm as limited. I'm not sure that is a worthwhile use of your time.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Great then we won't do that. So okay then do people feel that it's worthwhile to go through each map and just take another look at them as we are at this one right now with Daisy before we move on to voting? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like to see each of the maps just as a reminder because some of them kind of, but I don't think we have to go in depth if we can bring them up one by one and maybe take a quick note that would be great.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so Mr. Morgan, I'll just give you the names that I have on this list that are done by how many districts were changed in them so it's not alphabetical but that way we won't miss any.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right.

>> CHAIR ORTON: This is Daisy 2. Next is Tulip. And after we look at it, I think I'll try something. I would motion that we disregard Tulip or take it out of the line up. Because I personally haven't heard any positive about Tulip. So if anybody wants to second that, we can discuss it.

- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I'll second.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so a motion and a second to take Tulip out of the consideration. Is there any discussion? Commissioner Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I see it up close before I vote?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, thank you. So this was the one, it changes the 7 districts that were required plus District 4, 9 and 13. Any discussion on this? And I'm only doing this because I believe this is one that there isn't any favorable comment for. I could be wrong and maybe somebody likes it so we will see. So can we have a roll call vote? Unless somebody has something. Last chance.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Are we ready Madam Chair?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: You were calling for last chance.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: I didn't see anything.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioners, the motion before you is to disregard and remove the Tulip map for consideration. A yes vote means you are in favor of the motion and a no vote means you are not in favor of removing the Tulip map. I will begin with Commissioner Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: 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.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: This is to eliminate Tulip, right?

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Yes, sir.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair with a unanimous vote the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay then we will move on to Bergamot 1. Commissioner Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I actually would like to make a motion to remove the Daisy from consideration as well.
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Second.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: And I can just speak to that real quickly I think out of all the maps we have it's the most problematic primarily because it by locking districts effectively recreates District 1 and what was District 10 are virtually identical and I just don't think we have a realistic opportunity by the Court being responsive to the order and keeping districts 5 and 6 which the Court specifically mentioned but did not order us to do it because it was not part of the jurisdiction specifically mentioned they combine Birmingham with deep into Detroit as being objectionable. I think this map is problematic and we should not even consider advancing it. Any other discussion on the motion? Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: I think it should stay in consideration. It doesn't mean we got to vote for it at the end of the day. But I like the map. I think it you know it does good from a VRA perspective. And while it's not my favorite map, I think it is a, you know, it's a good choice for us to have.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Anything else? Okay so can we have a roll call vote on removing Daisy 2 from consideration?
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry, I got to bring this back up. The motion before you is to remove Daisy 2 map for consideration. I will begin with Commissioner Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT:
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett we couldn't hear you if you said something.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: I lost focus. We are voting to remove?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Remove Daisy 2 from consideration.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you, sir. Marcus Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Elaine Andrade?
- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Donna Callaghan?
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair with a vote of nine yes to four no, the motion carries to remove Daisy 2.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so we are moving on to Bergamot 1. If you will pull that up, John, thank you. Commissioner Szetela your hand is still up. Do you have something else?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Is it down now?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah sed Szetela okay.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: So this is Bergamot 1. It changed.
- >> MR. MORGAN: The material is ready if you need it.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: It changed the 7 that we had to change plus districts 9, 4, 9 and 13. And let's see and it also changes 2, 3, 5, 6 and 16. If anyone wants to speak to this they can, or we will move on. Commissioner Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't want to speak to it. I have a question. Is this the map where they were trying to keep a Hispanic community of interest together? I think there was a couple of maps.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: It does.
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: But was that on this particular one?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, it's District 1.
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay then we will move on to Bergamot 2.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just a moment.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, does anybody want to speak to this map? Can you move the map so we can see the bottom of District 1? I believe it's probably the same.

>> MR. MORGAN: I believe the difference between these is in this version Harper Woods is with District 10 and the other version it's not.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. Okay, if no one has anything else for this map, then we will move to Spirit of Detroit. Oh, first I'm sorry, let me say this changed the same exact districts as Bergamot 1. So now Spirit of Detroit. And Spirit of Detroit changes the same districts as well. So that is the 7 we had to change plus 4, 9 and 13 plus 2, 3, 5, 6 and 16.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right, give me a second. Okay that is the Spirit of Detroit.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Does anyone want to speak to this one? This one changed the same, the same as the last two or three. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'd like to speak to it. I think it's a good option. Let me get this cat out of the way. Thanks. Yeah so it's the Spirit of Detroit. I think you know some folks were there last week when Commissioner Kellom and I were describing to the public, but you know, it started off from Bergamot and then we made some community of interest changes for the Detroit community specifically. Those changes resulted in a couple of things. One, as you can see some of the districts, 5, 8, 11 and 12 cross 8 Mile. In limited ways that I think make a whole lot of sense. And the other districts like District 9 let's just take it from the top so District, it changes a lot of districts, but District 2 includes Melvindale with Allen Park and some of the Down River communities. District 1 is similar to the District 1 that we saw before but includes Ecorse and Down River, southwest community. District three has pretty much all of Dearborn with a little bit of the Warren area. District 4 is a more Detroit centered District than what we saw before. It's comprised wholly of Detroit. Five has Detroit with Oak Park and also recombinates Royal Oak Township. Yep, that little area right there. District 8 combines the community of interest from Ferndale to Palmer Park and Palmer Woods while also taking in a little bit of northwestern Detroit. District 9 combines the downtown, midtown, University areas along with new center, new center commons and has a horizontal configuration up the river through bell aisle, stopping at Grosse Pointe park. District 12 is a combination of East Point, Harper Woods, East English Village, morning side, and District 10 is the points along with some of St. Clair Shores.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And Harper Woods is in there as well with District 10.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So ready to move on to Water Lily? Which also changes the same exact districts as Bergamot 1, 2 and Spirit of Detroit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay this is the Water Lily map, the original Water Lily.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, anyone want to describe this one at all? This one came from Spirit of Detroit; is that right? Anthony, please.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I believe we kind of made this one and Spirit of Detroit concurrently from Bergamots. Because for this one, Water Lily, the biggest difference is these districts don't cross 8 Mile. So you have, you know, District 5 is only Detroit. District 4 is only Detroit. District 8 is only Detroit. 11 is only Detroit. You don't cross 8 Mile until you get to 12 and 10. But the districts 1, 9, 3, 2 are all pretty similar to what we just said in Spirit of Detroit.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This has a District 8 that is centered around Detroit and Highland Park. A District 11 that is centered around Detroit and Hamtramck. The District 12 in this configuration includes Harper Woods. Along with East Point. And northeast Detroit. Instead of the last configuration that we saw that has Harper Woods with Grosse Pointe in District 10.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Because this one doesn't cross 8 Mile if you go to districts 6 and 7, District 6 has Oak Park, along with some of Royal Oak going up into Birmingham. Royal Oak Township is split in this one. District 7 is the rest of Royal Oak along with Madison Heights and Hazel Park. District 14 is more Macomb County centered. It has -- it's only Macomb County but also includes the City of centerline.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. So now willow.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we see the partisan fairness numbers for this one?

>> CHAIR ORTON: If anyone wants to see anything on any of these please speak up.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 5.6 for republican. Mean median difference is 2.9 for republican. The efficiency gap is 3.1 for republican. And the seats vote ratio is 1.7 for the democrats. 60 democratic seats and 50 republican seats.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then you said you wanted to see willow?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, that is the willow map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anyone want to talk about this? So this one came from Water Lily. Which Anthony already described where that came from. It does cross 8 Mile in those specific ways and has the lakeshore District and keeps Ecorse and river around together. Has a really compact District 8 right there in the middle. I notice. And it changes the same districts as those that have been before it, Water Lily, Spirit of Detroit and the Bergamots. Okay so Motown Sound. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> CHAIR ORTON: You are muted.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: How do we feel about eliminating this one? I have not heard much in support of it compared to some of your other maps.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I like willow.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You like willow?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I do. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I actually like willow and I believe this is someone of the few maps that actually has 12VRA districts as well.

>> CHAIR ORTON: It did score high, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's one of the best scoring in terms of the VRA.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the VRA map if that confirms what Commissioner Szetela was saying.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So this map has actually I mean all of the partisan fairness scores are barely close together but not close together and willow has the worst score as far as mean median efficiency. It goes from the best score of like a 2.4 to a 2.nine-and-a-half percentage worst than our best option. I would like to have a better understanding, I don't know, what 2.4 and 2.9 means to you but it doesn't mean a lot to me in terms of what does that imply in the voting and can you tell us if it's meaningful or is it meaningful it's higher is it a half percentage or a full percentage, there is nothing attached to it or explanation of what those numbers are.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Maybe one of our people can come on and say. I will just say that Lisa Handley has reviewed all of these and said they are all well within the -- a good range. So Kim Brace, I see that you are on.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, Dr. Handley is one best suited to talk about these scores and what do they mean. Unfortunately she is in a trial up in New York or some other place this week. So she's really unavailable for us during the day. Because she is on the stand. But as Commissioner Orton says she said they were all within the realm.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Within the realm of what? There is nothing to this. I don't understand. I mean all of these numbers are kind of goofy because they are estimates and what not but I'm saying within the realm, but I don't know does that mean the democrats are more likely to lose 20% of time or more likely to lose 50% of the time? I mean I don't know what that number means. Is it like a wash and nobody would ever know the difference? No explanation.

>> KIM BRACE: We can try to get her on the line to give you a little bit more distinction on that side. Unfortunately, she's much more cognizant in what it means on that side.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: More important if you ask 90% of the citizens in the State of Michigan what is really important for us to do is get partisan fairness right. So I don't want us to just go oh, it's kind of the same and wave it off. We need to understand what we are approving.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Well, we had the presentation by Dr. Handley that explained how they come about, the different formulas they use to come about each of these metric and that is probably the explanation we will get.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I see how it's computed, and a mean median is. I get that. I don't have a good feel personally to how that would apply to a closed election. I would love someone to tell me in a closed election what might that mean. I don't feel I have any understanding of the difference of a 2.4 score verse a 2.9 score might mean in a closed election and that is what we are supposed to be getting right. I think we should pay attention to it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Braden do you have something?

>> Mark Braden: This is on the other side of my Chinese wall but let me make a brief comment. First of all we have actually litigated this issue. And went up to the state Supreme Court. And my understanding of, I looked at the numbers in detail, one by one recently but all the plans that we are considering now have numbers over all that are the same or better than the scores that the Michigan Supreme Court approved. So at least from the perspective of the Michigan Supreme Court and Michigan law, these plans all comply with partisan fairness.

The reality of your concern about these numbers is real because these are all political science constructs. Each which -- you have multiple ones of them because I can assure you that each one of them has some significant limitations. And circumstances. So the long and short of this is this is kind of a gross level look, how it would affect individual elections, the answer is you can't pick these numbers and drill them down to an individual election. I have used this analogy before but let me use it again, this is political science. It's not hard science. You know, if you're doing chemistry and you got an oxygen and hydrogen atoms at a certain temperature and pressure they give you water vapor or ice. These numbers don't provide you an ability to, you know, really say how does this, you know, is this going to affect this or this in a particular race. No, they are two gross of numbers for that. These give you -- the reason why you have multiple ones you will notice that they don't all agree. And here is the other limitation, not to give everybody a headache, the geography of the State of Michigan, you have geographically based plans, the geography of the State of Michigan when combined with the partisan break down of the state make it extraordinarily different to draw a plan to zero or, in fact, impossible a plan to zero out all these numbers. So these give you some general guidelines. They really don't tell you who is going to win any particular election in any particular year. Voters do different things at different times. I'm sorry that is certainly not a satisfactory answer to you. And I don't really want to wade into trying to describe what the statistics are based on. Because if I remember, I will remember that I don't remember. I will just make too many mistakes describing the underlying statistics.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I will just make one comment here, two actually I'm not a lawyer. And maybe I'm wrong when I say this, but my understanding is that the Supreme Court has said racial gerrymandering is illegal but partisan gerrymandering is not. So I don't know that I would expect the Supreme Court to come in and weigh in on partisan gerrymandering. They have not agreed to address that, that wrong. That is something the citizens of Michigan have asked us to do. Of all the numbers we see, all the maps, they are almost all the same and vary by maybe a tenth of a point, sometimes a little bit more. This is the only data point, this is the only map I'm aware of that has a data point that varies quite as much and it's the mean median one partisan fairness is a fairly important one and willow has the worst score on that behalf a percentage point over the best score. That is the only point. Making partisan fairness important willow gets dinged on that criteria.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Callaghan let us get back to you on that answer. As you know we bifurcated our litigation counsel from our Voting Rights Act counsel. And so we want to get that answer to you through our litigation counsel. We are trying to find the statistician to articulate that difference. If you give us a minute we will try to get that to you as you continue to deliberate. We are working on it right now thank you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Thank you, that would be very helpful.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yeah, getting back to the willow map I just at first I kind of liked it because of the Voting Rights Act numbers. But then when you look at it's got a lot of negative comments and particularly in District 14 where it's split between three separate counties. I mean Warren is already split between four districts. But then one of those districts is in three counties. So that's -- that doesn't have for me good optics.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Two things. One can you pull up the partisan fairness numbers for this map? We have not actually seen it yet. Well, I thought we just did. We looked at Water Lily or was that willow? I thought we looked at Water Lily.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let's see. Okay.

So the lopsided margin top line is 5.6 towards republican. Mean median is 2.9 towards republican. Efficiency gap is 3.1 towards republican. And the seats vote ratio is 1.7 towards the democrats with the seat count 60 democrat seats and 50 republican seats.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay thank you. The second thing is for me what matters is it's either at or better than what we originally had with Hickory. Because I do think that map was fair from a partisan fairness perspective, giving both sides the opportunity to win if they receive, you know, the most votes statewide. But, yeah, that is really a great question. How much does, you know, going from 2.4 to 2.9 matter.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I have a couple comments. I would certainly encourage Commissioner Callaghan to go back and look at Dr. Handley's report on partisan fairness the most recent one she gave to us and the original one going back about two years ago. One of the things she did mention in those discussions was that compliance with the V RA can sometimes effect the partisan fairness measures and that particularly for the lopsided margin and the mean median you can see the numbers go up the more attention is given to complying with the Voting Rights Act. So give on this map has 12 or 11VRA District I believe willow has I don't really think my opinion 2.9 is that significant of a variation on the mean median particular lay given the efficiency gap and seats to votes are the same for all the plans not just the Willis will but all the plans. And you know I just think our general goal, and someone can correct me if I'm wrong is we were generally based on Dr. Handley's analysis trying to stay below four, the closer you get to 0 obviously the more fair supposedly the map is. But this would be what we would consider within specs to be 2.9 and so I wouldn't throw out a map simply because of that. And then if you are going to throw out a map because of that we also would need to throw out Bergamot, Tulip and Water Lily 2.9 mean median partisan fairness. Just from my perspective I don't consider 2.4, 2.5 and 2.9 huge variations and that one map should be considered versus another, thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: To echo on that when you look at the partisan fairness of all the maps I believe the seat vote count is what a lot of people looked at and it's 1.7 in favor of democrats. Also I think we need to remember we got to take into consideration these are ranked in the order of importance and community of interest, VRA, equal population, all come before that. So if this map was done based on community of interest and it moved it a half a percentage point, I think that's kind of one of the given a takes of whole ranked process. So just kind of want to put that out there.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, I would agree with that. Okay, we are moving on to Motown Sound. And this is the original Motown Sound. So this one changed the same exact districts as willow and those before it so that is 7 districts we had to change plus 4, 9, 13, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 16.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay give me a second to get that up on the screen.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Are you having trouble Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah but it's almost resolved. Just one second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Does anyone want to speak to this one? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'll speak to it, but anybody else please feel free to jump in. This actually was the same as the Spirit of Detroit map that we just looked at a second ago and changes District 10, 12 and 13 to make it more VRA compliant. This adds District 10 being in compliance with the V RA. And to do that it moved in, you want to

Zoom in on that area, it moved in Harper Woods to be along with the Grosse Pointes. And for District 10 and District 12 it has East Point much like Spirit of Detroit going down into northeastern Detroit and taking up a little bit of the lakeshore area of St. Clair Shores and District 13 then takes on remaining Lake St. Clair Shores and Macomb County.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, just looking at the map of voting rights effectiveness I did not think District 10 qualified as being a VRA District that it wasn't performing under this map.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want me to load that?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, if you could, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, just a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So it has the box around it but when we drew it and asked Mr. Braden if it's close enough, he said, yes, he would be very comfortable considering it a VRA District. So I don't know if to me it's a VRA District. And but maybe he wants to chime in on that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Before Mr. Braden talks I also have the spreadsheet if you need to reference that, and I will go back to the map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't see Mr. Braden showing his picture.

>> Mark Braden: My smiling face is back. John, could you bring up the statistics for it? And would you just highlight that column for that particular District? Yeah, there we go. And so.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to go to the voting data or demographic as well?

>> Mark Braden: Voting data. Let's look at that first.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here is the estimate. I will turn it on.

>> Mark Braden: Yeah, that would be very competitive assuming we had a totally polarized voting. Yeah you can see how close the numbers are and you can see why it wasn't colored. Do I think if you want my view, I have no problem going to a Court or in this case the master and arguing that this on the face of it, with these numbers is so close to that that this is very highly likely to elect a candidate of choice in the Black community. I don't see any reason that is not what would happen. We have used the other sort of cutoff kind of a higher standard but the truth of the matter is if you look at these numbers, most of the time, which is what we are talking about here, the candidate of choice of the minority community certainly has an equal opportunity to be elected in this District with these numbers, you know. They don't quite make a majority so that is the reason why we did not color it in. But it's basically a push given the flex in these turn out numbers you understand these turn out numbers are estimates. So the difference between the two of these is certainly within the margin. This is not the exact term, this is statisticians won't like me when I say this but for terms of what the rest of us know this is the classic within side the margin of error with the technique being used.

So essentially it's a push. And being a push means it's more likely than not there is an equal opportunity for the Black community to elect its candidate of choice.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Szetela, your hand is up, did you have something else?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm sorry, is it down now?

>> CHAIR ORTON: It is.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so if there is nothing else on that one we can move to river walk.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we see the partisan fairness numbers on this one too please.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sorry.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the top are lopsided margin 5.5 for republican. The mean median is 2.4 for republican. The efficiency gap is 3.1 for republican. And the seats vote ratio is 1.7 towards the democrats with the count of seats 60 democrat, 50 republican.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay so river walk next.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: River walk changes the 7 we had to change plus 4, 9 and 13 and one more than the previous ones we have been looking at. So districts 2, 3, 5, 6, 16 and 17.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I can talk a little bit about river walk river walk created a western Wayne District to account for population moving to the western side. It also made some tweaks that we will see in other version of Motown to cleanup boundaries in Detroit so it shifted people from District 1 to District 7 so Wildemere Park wasn't split and shifts people from 1 to 9. And it improves some compactness around Jefferson avenue or gold coast. It switched garden view and part of Warren avenue commons with north so that kept communities together. John you are getting really good at this, you are a pseudo-Detroiter thank you. Whether bee neighborhood from District 16 to District 4. And added far west Detroit and Grandmont from District 4 to District 16. And it kept Rosedale and Grandmont COI together but ended up splitting it at the end because of population shifts that occurred. So I think on this map it actually still was split. That is towards District 16. District 16 and 4. And then moved Evergreen and outer green and help come from District 16 to 17 and finally shifted northwest community from District 8 into District 4 for population. So those are the small tweaks that were made which sound like a lot, but they were incremental to this map on top of the western Wayne District. We thought it would create a little bit more for the VRA and it didn't but more importantly it was keeping communities together and neighborhoods together.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Is there any request to see any of the documents with that map?

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

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so next is Commissioner Szetela's map. Do you want to lead that, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah. John, if you can just get it open.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, just one second.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yep.

>> CHAIR ORTON: You want to speak to the districts that it changes, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I can. Once we get a map up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry it takes me a minute to find the right one here sed Szetela it's all right, it's all right, no worries.

>> MR. MORGAN: So it's loading there and just want to confirm since I haven't shown this yet, I just want to confirm that it is what you think it is.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It appears to be, yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay se Szetela okay so we are just going to start with just generally this map was drawn around communities of interest. I was trying to preserve from our last round of public comments plus anything else we received the community of interest maps. I went over them when I originally presented. But District 1 is built on the Latin X community. We received a map from Oscar for that one and was drawn around that. District 2 is keep Allen Park Melvindale and Lincoln Park because of community of interest. District 3 and 15, Dearborn and Dearborn Heights very high Arabic population and received community of interest maps around those districts as well. And they had requested that Dearborn be in two districts so this is keeping Dearborn with Dearborn Heights in two districts together and then keeping those parts of Dearborn Heights that have commonality with that strip of Dearborn Heights along Dearborn and Dearborn Heights and Ecorse creek together because they tend to have unique issues around flooding and so I wanted those communities to be together. District 4 is again keeping communities there. There was a specific rouge community of interest, so the District is built around that. District 7 which is immediately to the east is built around the Dexter-Linwood community of interest that was submitted there. District 9 is built around the Bangla Town community of interest that we had received. District 8 is keeping together the LBGQTQ+ of Ferndale and portions of Detroit including Palmer Park. District 5 is keeping together Oak points with parts of Detroit, and it also butts out a little in Southfield to keep together the orthodox community of interest we received feedback about that wanted to be kept with Oak Park as well. So if we just go a little to the east I'm going to go over to District 10 and District 11. So this is a little unusual for some other maps we have done because this does split the five Grosse Pointe communities into two different districts so Grosse Pointe Park, Grosse Pointe and Grosse Pointe Farms together with Morningside, Cornerstone, East English Village,

Jefferson Chalmers and Indian Village as well. And the reason for that was the request of the neighboring communities, Morningside, East English Village, Cornerstone, to be with those portions of Grosse Pointes. It also promotes VRA compliance in this map as well then East Point, Grosse Pointe Woods and Grosse Pointe Shores combined with Harper Woods and portions of Detroit to create another VRA District as well. District 13 is portions of the Bangladesh community we were not able to include in District 9 due to population, so it includes portions of Detroit as well as the lower portion of Warren to keep those communities together. And then if we could kind of drag over to 16 and 17 so this was again built around communities of interest keeping Rosedale and Minock and Grandmont together in District 16 with Detroit combined with a small amount of Redford as part of that community. And then District 17 is Livonia and portions of Redford combined as well. Southfield I reconfigured which is District 18. To put 18 and 19 so that is Southfield mostly whole because that was split previously with 19. And then if you go down to 25 and 26 this creates another VRA District here. This is Inkster which was originally placed with Garden City based on previous advice we had received and by restructuring that you're able to bring the VRA levels in this map up to there is 12 VRA districts in Wayne County which is I believe the highest of the maps and 13 if you include Pontiac and can we look at partisan fairness for this map? So the lopsided margin 5.5. Mean median is 2.4. Which is equivalent to Motown Sound and those two are the lowest mean medians of any maps we have. Efficiency gap is 3.1 which is the same as every other map we have. Then the seats votes is the 60/50. 1.7 negative 1.7 positionality bias as well and that is the same for all the maps we are looking at. So it does have slightly improved mean median compared to some of the other maps. But it is equivalent to the Motown Sound in terms of that number.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. MORGAN: Were there any other data you wanted to look at from this list?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, I mean you can pull up VRA which is the map, is that the analysis?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah se Szetela yep.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: As you can see most of the maps we are looking at if you are looking in that Grosse Pointe area because you're keeping the Grosse Pointes together it ends up resulting in not as strong VRA districts by breaking them up, which I understand there is concerns about that part of the community not wanting to be broken up you actually are able to achieve greater VRA compliance, number one criteria. And as I noted before you know, the Grosse Pointe communities are kept together in the Senate map and Congressional map so we can't always do everything in every map but it's a compromise to have improved VRA because the reason we are redrawing is because of our Detroit concerns. And then this one changes Inkster and I was asking Mr. Braden about this during the meeting about a week or two ago. It was a District challenged as part of the original lawsuit and dismissed I can't remember the exact

reasons it was dismissed but I believe it was sort of a technical issue and this is fixing this while we are in here fixing things, so we done have to come back and potentially face another challenge over it. Changing a few lines in the area it creates Inkster, Romulus and parts of Canton and in 25 has the added benefit of reunifying, excuse me a community of interest that was identified to us in District 25 which is the Native American community of interest so that is now intact in District 25.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. So we only have one map left but we will need to go through all of the ranked redistricting criteria. So it's the Motown Sound E1 where we made the few little changes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay this is the Motown Sound E1 that was drafted yesterday.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Uh-huh so Commissioner Kellom, do you want to talk about just the small changes that you made? So we have already talked about the Motown Sound map.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I want to look at all the ones I just said because those are the changes that occurred in this map are the changes that I mentioned in river walk. So this was a cleanup of the communities of interest and neighborhoods. It addressed the -- I can't speak, it addressed the reunification of the Grandmont-Roseville community. And I'm trying to make sure I'm not leaving anything out and cleaned up the boundary with southern border of 4 which also reunified a community that Warren Dale area into 3. So I think those are the main two cleanups that are important because they reflected changes that are not in the Motown Sound and do make that aspect of communities of interest much, much better. Anyone else, Commissioner Eid or Szetela do you have any other recollection?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, I'm good.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Does anyone want to see any information about this one?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we see the partisan fairness numbers? I don't think we saw in the changes had any sort of effect on them Oregon okay, so the top line numbers are on the lopsided margins 5.5 for republican. Mean median difference is 2.4 for republican. Efficiency gap is 3.1 for republican. And seats vote ratio is 1.7 for the democrats and the seat is count is 60 democrat and 50 republican.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Any other things from the list?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah the VRA analysis.

>> MR. MORGAN: Maybe.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Maybe.

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> CHAIR ORTON: This one has 11 and a half as we were counting them, right? If we count 1. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think it should be the same as Motown Sound. So.

>> MR. MORGAN: It is.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: The numbers are slightly different in 16 and 4 but not in any meaningful way.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: How does 4 compare to the original Motown Sound?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, just a second. All right so this is original Motown Sound. And just on this metric, which is the, what is the label, the Black voters and their democratic primary, 50.9. And 16 to 22.5. District 4 is 85 to 5.9. And District 3, which is not a VRA District on this metric, is 8.7 to 58. So those are the three we look at. So if you focus on the Black number, it's 50.9. 85 and 8.7. So 51.3. 87 and 6.7.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. MORGAN: I was trying to put them side by side but it's not quite as simple.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So it did go, the numbers did go up a little.

>> MR. MORGAN: There you go kind of side by side.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Is that 87 and 4 on the one on the left?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes. So the one on the right is the original one. And the one on the left is the E1.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

Okay, are there any questions about this map or any of the maps? We have a few minutes before the lunch break. I do have a question for Mr. Braden if he is still on. So in particular District 4 in most of the maps, is that percent okay? Seems very high.

>> Mark Braden: Sure, and your concern in regards to that is appropriate. Because, certainly, there have been both political science articles and litigation dealing with the question of whether or not the District is packed. And under normal situations, the answer to that would be here, 86%. You start out going that looks packed. Given the geography of this area, given the democrat graphics of this area, and given the performance, I don't believe given and looking at the total, all the surrounding circumstances I believe you can have these districts. They make sense. They make sense because that's the community that exists geographically. In Central Detroit to attempt to do something else would frankly, likely go against the current that we've heard from our panel. Our panel directed us to initially draw these plans race blind. And if you draw a race blind plans you get districts with a fairly high, a very high concentration in this area. So we have been told that's what we need to do. We were able to draw these plans and still have plans that informally provide districts where the Black population is able to elect its -- their majority so being able to elect their candidates of choice? The primary process in more than a proportional to the overall region. So based upon that, based upon the totality of the circumstances, I am comfortable with this District. And that high percentage. Is it will we see some

criticism? Sure. And has there been criticisms of districts at this level in litigation in the past? That is correct. But this is Detroit. You draw race blind. You get a District like this, and it makes sense. You have created a compact District that represents that community. But the Black community in this standard Metropolitan area in the democratic primary clearly is in a position to have an equal opportunity to elect their candidate of choice. The primary data and the turn out of the democrat, the Black community and democratic primary seems to me to solidified that further. I'm comfortable, as I said on all these plans. Let me just say, there's not a better level of compliance because you have 12 versus 11 districts. It's really simply a question of whether or not you are providing equal opportunity overall. It's kind of the totality of the circumstances. So the decision as to which one of the plans that are presently under consideration, this issue as far as the actual compliance with the Voting Rights Act I think has been resolved or at least my recommendation is to include that it has been resolved. So your decisions ought to be based on other factors in my opinion as rather than whether this District has arguably 12 or 13. That effectively they both comply with the Voting Rights Act.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you very much. Are there any other questions or comments about any of the maps?

Okay seeing none, then without objection we will now recess for lunch. Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: I'm sure everybody is hungry, but there was the question that Commissioner Callaghan raised about the partisan fairness issue. And I believe that Patrick Lewis from Baker is going to be available in the next like couple of minutes here to hopefully address Commissioner Callaghan's concerns, or at least have a discussion with her about that. So if possible, I would ask that the Commission wait for him to pop on here. Hopefully it will be a quick discussion. I don't like to stand in the way of anybody and lunch, but Patrick is about to jump on right now.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> I think I saw Patrick.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I see him, Mr. Lewis.

>> Nate Fink: Patrick you did not hear my intro before you jumped on but let them though you would be joining to at least try to have a discussion with Commissioner Callaghan and anybody else who has any questions related to this partisan fairness issue. You may or may not be able to you know provide a satisfactory answer, but you will do what you can. Thanks.

>> Patrick Lewis: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead whenever you are ready.

>> Patrick Lewis: Am I answering or are we getting a question I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes Mr. Lewis we are waiting for your answer.

>> Nate Fink: It may be easier, if Commissioner Callaghan would like to, she can present the question herself or I have sort of a summation of what I think her question

is, which I can just share if that is easier and more streamlined. So Commissioner Callaghan said she understands the mean median but how many elections in this area at issue would be effected by this and decided by a margin of .5. If the answer is none then the difference in scores would not be very important. If the answer is several then very small differences are significant for this area. Do we know the answer to this question? She says no we do not. That is the info she is seeking. So that is the question, and you can take it away and Commissioner Callaghan if I mischaracterized that in any way.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: You said it right. I understand the statistics and how you compute it. I'm trying to understand given the closeness of elections in today's political environment I mean we say this is a very small difference but in these days the small differences can be very important so if you can help me to understand how that small difference would have impacted based on some past elections of what we see.

>> Patrick Lewis: So I think in that regard you're asking a question that I think you know you will want one of your political scientists to address. Unfortunately it I'm not a political scientist that has gone through and looked at the data. I can speak very generally that the mean median measure is a measure of skew. So it's looking at you know the vote share in the average District and the median District and looking at that skew. And so when you look at these numbers, you know, the median percentage for example willow was the question, you know, the mean is, you know, 53.9% dem, median is 51% so you see you know greater than 1% but in terms of looking at how many elections statewide would be decided by that margin I think that's a question, I think that you probably would want to get and I don't know if Kim Brace's team would be able to address that or you know, you probably need to direct that to a political scientist. I wish I could be more help, but that question is, you know, is one that gets right into the data and the political science. It's a little bit outside of can as your litigation counsel.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay so I believe, Director Woods, are we still trying to get a statistician to be able to answer that for us?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes we are still trying to get an answer and I can tell you more after the lunch break.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you very much. Okay then without objection we will now recess for lunch. And seeing no objection we will come back at 2:00 p.m.

[Recess until 2:00 p.m.]

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Hi Anthony, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR ORTON: We can hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I can hear you.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Good, I think I have my problems fixed, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Hello everybody. Guess what I just got in the mail?

>> CHAIR ORTON: What.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: A summons for jury duty. Aye Eid have fun with that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go do your civic duty Janice.

>> KIM BRACE: You committed your lifetime, come on.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I served before.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think we have all done enough civil duty for one lifetime.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I call this meeting of the Michigan independent Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:01 p.m. Will the secretary please call roll?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Certainly Madam Chair. Good afternoon Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If your physical location has changed from this morning's meeting please share that during roll call. I'll begin alphabetically with Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?
Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I am going to go back to Commissioner Curry. Madam Chair you have 12 Commissioners present, there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you very much.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome. So I did forget to do one thing. So Director Woods I will go down the 7 ranked criteria of the map Motown Sound E1 unless we need to have the statistician say something first. Okay, so we will do this then. I had failed to go down each one of these just for the record when we were talking about Motown Sound E1. So John, if you could pull that one up?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Excuse me Madam Chair I see the entrance of Commissioner Curry. I just want to acknowledge.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

So here is the map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: So equal population.

>> MR. MORGAN: The first thing I would point out is the largest or the smallest District is District 59 and the largest is District 21. And those were the same as the Hickory plan, so whatever you have done is still within the range of the Hickory plan as we discussed. This is the quick way to do this.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay and we already looked at the Voting Rights Act compliance on this. Districts shall be geographically contiguous and you ran your.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, I checked it for dis-contiguities and there are none in the plan.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay and we've already talked about districts shall reflect state's diverse population and communities of interest when we were making it and then Brittni went over again to describe. Districts shall not provide a dis-proportionate advantage to any political party. I believe we looked at the partisan fairness, but I don't remember if it was specifically after we made the changes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, we did look at that. I can pull that up again if you would like.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't think it's necessary as long as we did it on the record. Okay districts shall not favor or disfavor incumbent elected official or candidate. That is true. Districts shall reflect consideration of county, City and Township boundaries. I believe we kind of addressed this while we were making the map. We did cross country boundaries for specific reasons. And talked about neighborhoods a lot. Anyone want to say anything else about that for the record? Okay then districts shall be reasonably compact, and you showed the same districts are the largest and smallest but, yeah, if you want to show the compactness score.

>> MR. MORGAN: Compactness score the quick way to look at this is to look at the least compact District and you know as I said previously we can look in more detail if you like. But at the very least you can see that the least compact District in this plan is District 58. This is on the, sorry, which one Polsby-Popper and District 58 is also the same one in Hickory and have not created a District that is less compact in that measurement. And then let's see Schwartzburg same as District 58 is the least compact on Reock. District 29 which was not a changed District is the least compact.

On the length, width. District 29 which is not a changed District is the least compact. The convex hull it's District 58 is the least compact on that metric. So none of the changes that you made resulted in a District being the least compact. So it's within the same range at least of the Hickory plan.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you so I think that is what we need to do for the record. So then I think I don't believe we are going to be able to have a statistician come talk to us right now. So I think perhaps we are ready to move on to our procedure for voting where we will first talk about the two we like and is everyone ready for that or does anybody have anything they want to discuss before we get to that point? Okay I don't see anything so Sarah Reinhardt would you lead us in this procedure?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure. So let me share my screen really quick. So we just wrapped up step one which is an overview of the plans where you all chatted about the individual plans and made adjustments. So step two is the actual vote. So the vote is written to occur in this way. The Commission Chair or Vice Chair will call for a motion for the secretary to conduct a roll call vote. And you will vote by stating the name of your preferred plan that you would want to be selected. The secretary will record the votes. And then once all of the votes have been taken, the secretary shall confirm if any of the maps meets a constitutional majority, which is a majority of the Commissioners present, also achieving that two, two, two threshold, which is two votes from a Commissioner who affiliates as democrat, two votes from a Commissioner who affiliates as republican, and two votes from a Commissioner who does not affiliate with either. So if none of the maps during this vote meet that threshold, then we will go back through this process two more times. So I'm going to stop there. If we do need to go on to the next step if it fails three times would be to go to the ranked choice so I'm happy to break that down again if we get to that point. Or if you want me to now I can, but I think maybe this will suffice for now.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes, thank you. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I could be getting this wrong, we could have already done that before we took the lunch break but I feel like I remember Commissioner Lett making a suggestion that it was more of a discussion that we partake in the discussion among us as Commissioners and then we rather than doing what has been explained.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yeah, I see Mr. Fink's hand raised but I will quickly say I believe what Commissioner Lett's comment was in reference to was additional piece that was in step one the overview of plans that was in the version from 2021, that is not in this version. And that would be that someone make a motion for each Commissioner to state their top two preferred plans. Just as a way of like being transparent and letting everyone know kind of where everyone stands. So instead of doing that, that's what the discussion was that you all had as you went through maps where you all indicated if you had preferred maps or what you didn't prefer about certain maps and that was kind of the informal piece to that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Just to expand on that a little bit, Ms. Reinhardt if we can scroll up just a little bit that last paragraph in step one where it talks about facilitating a discussion offering the opportunity for each Commissioner to express which map they prefer and why. I know this morning there was discussion about each of the maps as you went through each of them, but I don't see any problem at all with Commissioner Kellom or anybody else having some additional discussion right now speaking specifically about one or more maps. And there was that I think there was a reference to what had been the picking the two maps as Ms. Reinhardt pointed out, that particular provision is not in this set of rules. But to me it would make sense if there is some desire to just have a bit of a discussion about, you know, specific maps and why you like that particular map before jumping right in to voting.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you. That is why I asked because we were previously going over the maps without giving opinions, so we were just giving map metrics. So if we go just to the vote folks don't need discussion but I was just making sure, yeah.

>> Nate Fink: Absolutely.

I think the rules certainly allow for that. And, you know, probably make some sense so thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I would like to listen to everyone's favorite map and why. I mean, if we could do it like quickly and not take you know, three hours.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So are we doing that? I can start.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Please.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I like Motown Sound E2 the best because it's the best map just straight up. It's the best one. It has the most VRA districts as long as you count District 10 as being a VRA District which we heard earlier we should. It has the best partisan fairness numbers of all the maps, 5.5 for lopsided margins, 2.4 for mean median difference, 3.1 for efficiency gap. And a seats to votes ratio of negative 1.7. The only map that was Daisy 5.4 lopsided so .1 difference but I'm fine with that and we eliminated Daisy 2 earlier. It was by far the one that most people liked in our public hearings last week, you know. I also think it's a good compromise. I'm not totally happy with it. You guys know I really think it's a shame we did not put Melvindale back in District 3. Still think we should. Perhaps we can do that in the Senate District when we get to it. That was the number one thing we heard but heard comments saying it could go the other way so all right. It changes a lot of districts, it changes 8 additional districts. But you know I think that is where we found could be characterized as reasonably necessary. When we started this process I did not want to change districts

5 or 6 but you all convinced me to come around on that. So I think it's the best map. It's the one that I'll be voting for. If I had to choose a second option, I mean I don't know it would probably be either Water Lily or Daisy two but we eliminated Daisy 2 so that is what I think.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just going to try to be real quick because I'm about to be on the road. So I actually really like the Motown Sound. I wish we could have agreed to make those changes to 16, 17 and 18. Because I would have considered voting for it if those changes had been made but otherwise my favorite map is the Szetela because that is the only map that actually addresses those districts that I believe are likely unconstitutional. It also has the highest number of VRA districts, it also has among the best partisan fairness because Motown Sound does have identical partisan fairness so that would be my first choice would be the Szetela. And then the Motown Sound I like. I just don't know if I could vote it without fixing 16 and 17 in particular. Thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid your hand is still up? Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So let me take my hand down before I forget at the end. I'm not going to repeat other things that were said. My first choice is Motown Sound. For a lot of like I'm looking through my notes from the public hearing it is the most the map that has the most interactions in terms of public feedback and it has overwhelming positive overwhelmingly positive public feedback. It does not mean it didn't get negative critiques. I do wish that it included 16, 17 and 18 but like I wrote some remarks from folks that came out number 27 was a woman from Huntington Woods she said it's the best balance of the 7 criteria. She liked what it did for her area and spoke to the support for the Detroit community. I have keep neighborhoods together. Working areas that is number 30 at greater grace. Number 33 there was a white gentleman from Lathrup neighborhood of keeping Blacks, whites, immigrants, straight, gay, lesbian. This idea, it was great representation for all sorts of communities within Lathrup village but understanding it had impact on the Detroit community. He also echoed the sentiments of criteria number 26 from House District 5 doesn't go very far above 8 Mile and it was an intentional step towards crossing 8 Mile. And most of the comments approve and enjoy that we reunited the Royal Oak Township. Kept Huntington with Berkeley in a way that I don't think it may have done before. So that is my first choice.

My second would probably be Spirit of Detroit. I personally am not going to vote for my map that does not echo the sentiment of Detroiters. And they spoke about sweeping into neighborhoods just for the sake of an intentionality. What they like about Spirit of Detroit and Motown Sound is what is not happening in our other map choices. So those -- that would be my analysis.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yeah, I was just wondering if Commissioner Kellom meant Motown Sound or Motown Sound E1? And then I can give you mine.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm sorry, we have, yes, Motown Sound E is it E1 or E2?

>> CHAIR ORTON: E1

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: E1.

>> CHAIR ORTON: E1 you made the small tweaks.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Motown Sound E1, we changed the name to Motown Sound.

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Okay so I would vote for Motown Sound E1 as well. I think it is the best collaborative map and we heard just so many people speak up for that map that that's my choice.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Mr. Fink, do you want to go before me?

>> Nate Fink: I was just trying to clarify so Commissioner Eid when he spoke he said Motown Sound E2. I may have misheard that or so I just want to make sure that I have it clear because, you know, I'm certainly dumber than most if not all of the public but I just want to make sure that we can be clear on this. So is -- Commissioner Eid which one were you endorsing?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The most recent one that includes the changes that.

>> Nate Fink: We made yesterday.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I believe it's Motown Sound E1.

>> Nate Fink: That is the same one that Commissioners Kellom and Andrade just said they support. Okay, I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so I'll take a turn. I had to put my hand up because if I just keep waiting I never go. So I like the willow map because it's based on Bergamot, and I feel that was one of our first like genuine attempts to follow the Court order and follow COIs. So I really like that.

I also like that it has the lakeshore District with the Grosse Pointes and St. Clair Shores. And I know there's lots of controversy about that. But it still leans democrat. If that is what people are worried about. But it is fairly competitive. So I think that's good for everybody. And it still has good numbers that are well within what we've been told is good. And it had up at the top of the most VRA districts. And so I don't think people should be scared of that. I think that's one problem is that people have been really scared of that District, that particular configuration. So anyway I really like that map for that reason. Partially for that reason.

And I also could be swayed to Motown Sound E1 because that's what most of the people that have spoken to us like. I do want to give people what they want. I'm not convinced we heard from everyone, but anyway those are my thoughts. Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Vallette was muted.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We did not hear you because you were muted.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Well, that was great. I also like Motown E1.

Mostly because that's what the public seemed to want.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay would anyone else like to share or discuss? Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I like the Motown Sound E1. Mainly because I'm a native of Detroit. And I pretty much think that is the sentiments of the people that live in Detroit. And I've been here for over 50 years, so I think that's a good choice. Keep it short.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I'd say the same thing. The Motown E1 with the public feedback and everything and the slight changes we made I think the public, you know, that's what they want also.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I agree with the prior speakers as to the Motown Sound E1 for those reasons. I would note, however, that we certainly heard those people who showed up in support of that Motown Sound. And I don't know exactly how many people showed up at let's say 500 different people showed up and you look at a District contains 91,000 people, that means .005% of the population in any District voiced an opinion. That's not a lot of people voicing opinions. And so I think what we have done with the districts that we have drawn in Motown Sound certainly comports with the 7 factors that we need to look at, population, et cetera. We certainly did not look at race when we drew those until the very, very, very end. So to say that the race was the only thing we looked at, we managed to avoid that.

I would say that I really can't vote for the Szetela map. It wasn't a collaborative map to start out with. It changes districts that don't need changing. And therefore it's not one that I could consider.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anybody else? Okay I don't see anything else, so Sarah Reinhardt do you want to take it away? Oh, Commissioner Lett your hand is up, and I don't know if it's again.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: It's again. I move we take a vote.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, I don't hear a second on that.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I will second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Moved and seconded to take a vote any discussion? I see Commissioner Eid's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Just a quick point. Yesterday we talked about getting language in from our lawyers to do this and you know pending the appeal or whatever we spoke about yesterday, did we ever get that language, or do we want to talk about that after we pick a map, it doesn't matter to me. We brought it up yesterday.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: Thank you, Commissioner Eid. We do have some proposed language that addresses the issue that I believe Mr. Raile spoke to yesterday related to the appeal. It's in the form of a proposed resolution, a little bit more formal I think than some of the motions that you typically take up. But I can sort of read some of the language. I'm not sure if -- actually I see Commissioner Lett has his hand up, did you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That sure the resolutions there really has nothing to do with this vote and I think it could be more confusing at this stage of the process than, you know, getting the vote behind us then we can discuss the motion.

>> Nate Fink: Go ahead and do the vote and pick your map and before you leave today we can have a discussion about that resolution.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Sarah Reinhardt? A roll call vote, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Commissioners, the motion before you is to vote for the final selection of a final remedial State House plan to submit to the District Court. When I call on your name, please state the name of the map that you are voting for. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Before we start, I hate -- I don't hate to interrupt, I interrupt all the time, can we pull up the list of the maps that we are voting on so if somebody is unsure they can look at that list and say, okay, I'm voting for whatever?

>> CHAIR ORTON: I assume someone is working on that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I assume.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry, go ahead.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead, Sarah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I can't screen share while I'm taking the vote, but I have a link to the list online if that is helpful and everyone can kind of pull up their own list. I will pop that in the chat. For members of the public that is just at Michigan.gov/MICRC. And if you select draft proposed maps from the menu you can see the names there.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Give me a second, I'm typing it out and I can post it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Thank you. Can you have Zoom up a little? Great, Mr. Fink?

>> Nate Fink: So I believe the Commission voted to remove Tulip and Daisy 2 from consideration.

>> CHAIR ORTON: You are correct.

>> Nate Fink: So if you maybe want to strike those through or just delete them. Just to avoid confusion. Thanks.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I think we are ready Sarah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Again Commissioners please vote by stating the name of your preferred map. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Motown Sound FCE1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, so I wanted to abstain for lack of information, but I was told that that's not in our rules. So if possible could you come back to me so I can make up my mind?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly. Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Willow.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Szetela.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Szetela version four.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You got cutoff at the beginning sorry would you mind restating that.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Great, thank you. Elaine Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'll return to Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: For the gentleman from Detroit, Water Lily.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Please allow us a moment to tally the votes. Motown Sound version FCE1 received nine votes. However, it did not achieve a constitutional majority.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Because it did not get two, two and two you're saying.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That's correct it did not achieve the threshold for party affiliation so the rules of procedure would outline that the Commission go back to discussion before conducting the next round of voting.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, can we see what the breakdown was, please?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The party affiliation breakdown?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Okay, there was -- the reason it did not achieve the constitutional majority is it only received a vote from one republican affiliating Commissioner. It received four votes from democratic affiliating Commissioners. And three votes from independent or non-affiliating Commissioners, excuse me.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so discussion? Try to convince each other. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This is not convincing. I just -- I pulled up the maps as they exist on our website. And I think that unless it was not genuine, but I know that it was I think the moments that we shared together whether you were virtual or in person but particularly in person you felt the momentum, the ah-ha moments and it was around Motown Sound. Whether it was a few people in the audience or the whole of Detroit. We know it was not every Detroiter that was there. But what I will say, and I think Commissioner Curry was trying to put it into words, Detroit is a City that you might live in your neighborhood, but because of how it's constructed you have a passion and voice like your neighbors are Redford and bright more, your neighbors are southwest. So I think that the people that we heard from including the folks that are online represent the passion and the Spirit of Detroit. The sentiment of Detroit. And what I heard collectively was a resounding voice for the Motown Sound map. And the qualitative matters to me. We can talk metrics all day and partisan fairness all day, but number one is communities of interest, which is code for people. And in this case it's code for Black people. And they have spoken about this map. And there's no other map that touches Motown Sound when we are talking about neighborhoods. So that's all I wanted to say on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, Madam Chair, don't mean to put you on the spot but I think this is going to be, you know, it's going to be up to you considering, you know, we need one more republican vote, and we have three that voted otherwise. You did mention that this was your second choice. You can be like maybe I don't really think there is like a whole lot of huge differences between Motown Sound 2 and willow. They both cross 8 Mile in different ways. I think the way we did it in Motown Sound, it just makes more sense to me because it specifically looked at those communities, you

know, that we have debated for the past two weeks. So do you want to speak on that a little bit? What is your like hold up on voting for it?

>> CHAIR ORTON: So my hold up is really the lakeshore District. I do like how we crossed 8 Mile in Motown Sound. You know, all those things make sense to me. But I'm really sad that people were just scared of a lakeshore District just because they were afraid it would be too republican. And it doesn't show that in the numbers. And so anyway that is my thing. Commissioner Curry. You are muted and we can't hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: If I could persuade you at all Cynthia, Madam Chair, I would like to say that I'm looking at what we've done and what we have accomplished and I think you all have done an excellent, a very great job in what we had to work with. But it would be so kind if you could think of the Detroiters when you reconsider your decision. And try to make this a relatively equal vote, please. I know what the Detroiters want. I've been here forever. I've lived all over; I mean I have been all over. And I think we have chosen the best map for this particular case that we are in right now. We just would like for you to reconsider if we could. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I just wanted to say that Cynthia is not the only republican. We have two other republicans. We have Commissioner well Rhonda and Erin. And we could probably hear from them if they wanted to talk.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Vallette, I was going to say that on top of something else it's not just Cynthia.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Forgive me or republican that can hear me. I am sorry, I did not mean to single out just one person thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Did you have something else Brittini? Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I will say I'm not afraid of the lakeshore District. I'm not afraid of making any change. This is more pointing out the process. I think what happened with Detroit is we had a few Commissioners drawing and others that were comfortable with those Commissioners drawing. So it's unfortunate that the lakeshore could have gotten as creative as many hands were in this cake that we were building and also the offset of the votes. We have a tendency to dig our heels in strange ways and keep making a plea for the people, what is the best map for the people. And it's also nothing personal. If folks had spoke up about the Szetela map and have made a comment and engaged with that map I would have been talking about the Szetela map outside of some of the too many changes that I think makes that map challenging. But I think this is the point where we have a balance of what did the Court ask us to do. What are our 7 criteria. And what are the people of Detroit saying. And the lakeshore District is kept together in every map, also as a person that almost went to Grosse Pointe academy. And, again, I shop there. That is a very exclusive community. And to make a change or to make a whole vote for one area doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me. If we weren't going to do it for the Yemeni and Melvindale we shouldn't be doing

it now for a map. So that's what I think. Especially a District that you can't even sit in their park unless you have a House there. So sorry Grosse Pointers. I know you are going to beat me up for that but I'm just being honest.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Way back when we started this whole process I think it was about 50 years ago, the and I was the first Chair, one of the first things I said, and it's still true is don't let the perfect get in the way of the good. And there's a lot of good in the Motown Sound E1 map. Compromises have to be made. And I'm not, Commissioner Orton, I'm not telling you you got to compromise what you feel is right. So that's all my comments. I won't make any more.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do we have to -- is District 12 in the Senate map, which is the lakeshore District and the Senate map that goes from Grosse Pointe all the way through New Baltimore and like up to anchor Bay, is that one of the ones that was struck down? Can somebody remind me? Mr. Fink?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's not.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so it's still in the Senate map at least now. We will have to change that later. But as of now it's in the Senate map. I don't know if that moves the needle at all.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anyone else? Commissioner Lett? You said that was your last comment.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't have a comment but a motion to take the second vote.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Motion and seconded can you do a roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair we are going to take a second vote on, let me pull up the exact language. For the final selection of a final remedial State House plan to submit to the District Court.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I'm sorry, Sarah, I see Commissioner Vallette's hand.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Sarah, can you please tell us what happens if we can't come to a decision on this?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, I'm happy to. I will share my screen to show the process. So for this vote if a constitutional majority is not achieved we will go back to discussion and take one more vote. If a constitutional majority is not achieved by that vote, then we would move to a ranked choice voting system. So this would be where we start off with calling on each Commissioner and rotating alphabetical order. For each Commission to audibly indicate what draft proposed map you would like to submit for the ranked choice vote. And then once we have that list of maps that you all want to submit assembled, I will pull up a Microsoft form to create like a little survey for you all

to fill out where you rank them in your preferred order with one being the most preferred. And however many there are, the last place being least preferred. So I would send that out to you all and you would have about ten minutes to fill that out then you would send it back to me and our team would compile the results. And the way the ranked choice vote works is say that I'm just using hypothetically like what are there eight maps at this point that are submitted? Nine.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Eight.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Eight. So if you vote.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Excuse me.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: There are nine.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Remember, we had ten then we took away two with Motown Sound.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. That is not my strong suit so for the nine maps the map that you rank as your first choice, so your most preferred number one will receive nine points. The second ranked map on your list would receive eight points and so on, so forth. So we would tally that up and the maps that from all of your votes that receives the most points would be the selected map. Now, there is a small chance that the -- I'm sorry, the map that receives the most points and achieves a certain threshold prescribed by the Constitution would be the selected map. So what that means is that let me find the exact language here. The Commission shall adopt the plan receiving the highest total points, this is directly from the Constitution that is also ranked Monday the top half of plans by at least two Commissioners, not affiliated with the party of the Commissioner submitting the plan. So there is still kind of a party affiliation threshold there for that as well. So once we tally that up, if there is a map that does meet that threshold and has the majority or the most points, then that would be the selected map. If two maps tie or if no map achieves that threshold, then we would move on to a random selection, which is also described in the Constitution.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Before we take the vote, could we possibly see Motown with the willow overlay or the other way around? Either way? From John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so you want to pull up the Motown Sound E1?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is here, and you want an overlay of willow?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, just a second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sorry to spring it on you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, all right, so all right so let's see trying to align things. So we've got.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We can't see your screen.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right I'm sorry I just assumed I was sharing but I'm not so let me try this again. All right so this is the Motown Sound E1. And that is what it is. And then the layer manager, added in the.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: John, wondering if it would be better the other way around, I'm not sure. It could be my brain. Don't mean to interrupt you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Either way is okay with me.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, you could also look at them side by side if that is another way you want to look at it.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, give me just a minute. I don't know if other people want to look but I would like to.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the dark blue line is the overlay of the willow map. And sorry there is one other thing that may be a little confusing. Let me put the numbers on because the big change going from Spirit of Detroit or Lily to Motown Sound was the movement of District 7 into the interior of Detroit. So I think that may help if I put the labels on. Okay so in this case the outline District 7 is here so that is the District 7 in willow. However, the colored in map of 7 is here. So that's a pretty -- that is one difference.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay I've seen it, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Unless there is anything else, any further discussion on the motion? And we will have a roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right Commissioners are you ready to vote? Okay, please state, oops sorry. Let me pull up the exact motion once again. This vote is for the final selection of a final remedial State House map to submit to the District Court. Please vote by stating the name of the map that you would like to vote for. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Water Lily.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Szetela.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: John Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Szetela four.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Elaine Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Motown Sound E1.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. Allow us to tally the votes. Just a moment. I have a total of ten votes for Motown Sound E1. With four democrat affiliating votes, two republican affiliating votes and four nonaffiliated votes meaning that Motown Sound FCE1 has achieved a constitutional majority and is the selected map.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Okay, so we've completed that business. I believe we have an Executive Director report from Director Woods. So without objection please proceed, Director Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Are you able to see the screen?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Perfect, thank you very much. Just want you to know that the fiscal year 24 supplemental budget was submitted on February 23rd to the House and Senate appropriations chairs and copied to the Governor legislative leadership and budget director and will send a copy of that and post it today. We requested additional 3,331,200 for pending litigation, this was appropriation for this current fiscal year. And in addition we provided the updated fiscal year budget that was passed by the Commission earlier this month. And the first quarter financial report for fiscal year 24. So as we get more information I will share that with you, but I just want you to know that was done as voted by the Commission with regards to the updated budget.

Redistricting outreach. We go out and do outreach and talk about redistricting as the three-legged stool of democracy and talk about the census and it was roughly 18,000 a year that money goes to individuals' community if they are counted and comes out to 180,000 over the course of ten years. People understand census. People understand voting. But as we've heard today and throughout the process with regards to redistricting, in terms of education, this has been an ongoing thing that we have been trying to do since the inception of the Commission. We have been trying to do it since the outreach. We do have some time in March where people are asking for more information. I heard feedback that the Commissioners that they like the maps at the back. That they could see, they like the new wrinkle with Orton and Commissioner Eid

talk about the maps and momentum at the last public hearing knowing we have to redo the Senate maps. We need to educate to prevent misinformation. There was never any ruling on the Voting Rights Act. We all know that. But somehow the voting rights and another thing that has got misconstrued and gone out to the public and we have not had an opportunity to do all the presentations that we wanted to do within that three-week period. So now we do have some time in March, part of April. To do it. So we want to educate, we want to take advantage of the momentum from the reconfiguration of the state House plan and utilize March and April for redistricting outreach campaign in Metro Detroit to kind of explain and build on what we have not knowing what the timelines are but taking advantage of this time.

And so the plan is to basically work with a contractor. We can use the informal contract procedure process which is under 5,000 to get us out to business communities, business groups in the whole Metro area. Not limited to Detroit but in the whole area we have been talking about with regards to the House in terms of outreach and getting people involved. So just kind of wanted to share with you the plan that I have with regards to that. It's really being in front of people's faces in terms of face-to-face meetings. There might be some virtual that we would partner with other groups to actually conduct the virtual meeting but really taking advantage of this time that we have to do that and doing it within our means with regards to that informal process that we have.

If there is any questions with regards to that I can take it at this time.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't see any questions. So I have a question. Since we will need to be helping with this education out in the community, do you need us to let you know schedules or will you send us?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I will send out, check people's availability. We kind of want to get the dates first then we can do availability. If you're not available, we get it. I know some people are out of town. Might not be back. But if you can do virtual, you know, we will provide those opportunities, but we just wanted to let you know what we are trying to do to kind of address some of those issues that came up so that we are further ahead when it comes to the Senate. So just wanted to share that basically that feedback came from Commissioners as well. So we are just really taking advantage of the collective feedback from citizens as well as this group to let you know how we plan to do it. So that we are further ahead. And then having said that I want to thank each and every Commissioner whether you did something virtual or in person or over the phone for the interviews, the outreach, the education, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, because as you know many hands make work light. And I greatly appreciate it because the number of you really stepped up and gotten gauged, got involved and did an outstanding job so thank you for that.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Then the last thing I want to do is we have Kristen Taylor working with us with event planning and administrative assistance. She was on a contractual basis and I'm looking to move her from a contract basis to part time hire and paid for hours work like a contract but on a part time basis and just want a motion to make that happen. And that would be retroactive just so we are clear because her contract was up to 5,000 and I know sometime last week she mentioned that she was running out of hours. And I spoke to our Chair about bringing this process to the Commission as a whole so this is, hold on. Hold on. It would be retroactive to Monday, February 19th.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'll make that motion.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would make that motion.

>> CHAIR ORTON: We heard you so it's motioned and seconded we hire Kristen Taylor to part time employee for event assistance and administrative support retroactive to February what did you say.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Monday, February 19th.

>> CHAIR ORTON: 19th. Okay is there any discussion on that? Seeing none, can we have a roll call vote, please?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Certainly, Madam Chair. If you don't mind please allow me to restate the motion to ensure I have it correctly. I see it on the screen, but you added a little bit, Madam Chair, and I want to be sure it's correct. Commissioner Lett, to move to bring Kristen, and I put her name in there, Taylor part time from contract employee to part time employee for event assistance and administrative support retroactive to Monday, February 19th, 2024; is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sounds like it.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay, thank you, sir. We will begin the roll call vote with Marcus Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner?

>> 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: Won Curry?
>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Anthony Eid?
>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?
>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Rhonda Lange?
>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Steve Lett?
>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair with a vote of 12 yes to one no, the motion does carry. Thank you.
>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you very much.
>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.
>> CHAIR ORTON: Do you have more, Director Woods?
>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Of course. We got to celebrate. And I want to do it this way. I really want to thank the Commission for being engaged in a process where you selected a map. It might not have been the map you preferred but you came together through a challenging process with the courts. We added three new people who contributed and rolled up their sleeves and got engaged and got involved. The interest was just overwhelming, you know, in terms of people's interests coming from different sides and hearing the investment of time. You guys were back to working like you were before. And putting the hours in as legislatures of the mapping process which is your constitutional authority. And I just want to tip my hats off to you. I mean I can see the stress, the decisions, which were wrestling with and going through. Everyone, I've heard from all 13 of you, you were all engaged. You were all concerned. You were invested in the project. You gave it your best. And the State of Michigan is really in your debt for what you have accomplished and how you invested the time and doing it and I just want to salute my hat off to each and every one of you and to thank you. Because it worked. It might have been ugly sometimes, it might have been hard sometimes, you might want to pull your hair out, but you made it work. Individually and collectively. So salutations, congratulations, you did an outstanding job for what has taken years and years to get right in other areas. You took the time, and you did it and you did it collaboratively. And you worked it out and I just want to say kudos and also thank you. Because I see what you sacrifice. I hear what you sacrifice. And how you're in pain. Some of you are sick. Couldn't even move sometimes. Had doctors' appointments you with were on by phone from your doctor's appointment and chiming in from your other appointments. Your commitment and dedication is overwhelming as

legislatures in this redistricting process, having a bird's eye view I would be remiss if I didn't thank you individually and collectively for the sacrifice, time and commitment that you've made. Some out of your own personal expenses to make sure you were vested in this project and did so on behalf of the State of Michigan and its citizens so kudos to you individually and collectively and thank you for taking me along on this ride to serve as your Executive Director. I am truly honored and privileged. And congratulations, great job.

>> CHAIR ORTON:

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That concludes my report Chairperson.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay well thank you very much.

We do not have a legal liaison report today. Do we have any updates from Michigan Department of State?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

>> CHAIR ORTON: And then I see your hand Mr. Fink.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I have no updates.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We have a legal Cynthia.

>> CHAIR ORTON: You do, okay, sorry, I thought there was not.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You think I never have anything to say.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay what would you like to say for your legal liaison report?

Hearing no objections, please go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We have a resolution we need to consider that was worked on between Baker and the Fink law firm. And I don't know, Nate, you going to do this? Is anybody from Baker going to be on with you?

>> Nate Fink: No, I can present it. I spoke with them about it, and I can share it. Commissioner Lange, do you have a question?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, sorry I just wanted to know did we receive this in our agenda packets, this resolution you're going to talk about?

>> Nate Fink: No, the language just came about shortly after the meeting yesterday. I can share my screen.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So my question is we won't be voting on it today, correct? Because we haven't had the 24 hours.

>> Nate Fink: So this was I believe this was -- my understanding this was discussed yesterday or at least the litigation counsel explained this issue, which is the recommendation that the Commission adopt a resolution that states that the plan the Commission just adopted, the remedial plan the Commission just adopted will be in effect for this 2024 election cycle. Assuming the Court approves it. And subsequent years unless the Supreme Court or another Court vacates or otherwise reverses the District Court's injunction related to the Hickory plan. If such a reversal does happen on appeal, then the Hickory plan would go back into effect. And there was a discussion

had about that yesterday. And so that's what the language of this resolution would address.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay but my issue is our policy states that we get 24 hours to review anything that we vote on. And I haven't seen it. And I would like to read it firsthand and have time to consider it before voting on it just per our policies, our rules of procedure.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Madam Chair, I have a suggestion. Let's have Nate brink it up on the screen so everybody can take a look at it. It's not very long. And have a discussion then I will have a couple of motions.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Are you able to share, Mr. Fink?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I have it if you want me to do it now.

>> Nate Fink: Sure, that works too. I don't know if you want to Zoom in a little bit Edward. It's a little small for the folks squinting at the screen.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: There we go.

>> Nate Fink: Including myself, not just you, Commissioner Curry.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That work?

>> Nate Fink: Yes. So I can just give a very short description. I pretty much already described it. It's formal language at the top which you know notes that the Commission had adopted the plan to comply with the Court's order. And the first resolve or the initial resolved clause states that the Commission here by adopts a remedial State House plan by roll call vote and we can even add in there the Motown Sound E1 is, in fact, the plan that was adopted. But then the further resolve clause is the one that again just in sort of layman's terms says that currently as you know the Commission is appealing the District Court's decision in the Agee case which struck down and issued and ultimately issued an injunction preventing the use of the Hickory plan, that is why we spent all this time together over the last couple of months redrawing the map. But this resolution would state that it's the intent of the Commission that if the Court, if the Supreme Court reverses the District Court on appeal, then the Hickory plan would, in fact, go back into effect and the remedial plan the Commission just adopted would then be replaced again by the Hickory plan. It would go back into effect.

So the language here, I don't know if you can take a moment to read it if you want.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange, if we have time to read it here is that sufficient for you? Or not?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No, it's not. We have a set of rules of procedure that we are supposed to abide by. I was told I had to abide by our rules of procedure so I think the rules of procedure should be sent the same for everybody. I want the 24 hours to review it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So is the gist of this if we do not adopt this resolution we are basically dropping our appeal? Since we have adopted a new map that supersedes the Hickory map?

>> Nate Fink: No. So during the discussion yesterday from litigation counsel, there was this description of the fact that by adopting this new map, adopting Motown Sound E1, that is arguably or is a legislative act by this Commission. And there is the possibility that the Supreme Court could determine that by doing that, by adopting this remedial map, assuming the District Court approves of it and that becomes the map for the State House for 2024, there is the possibility that the Supreme Court could essentially reject our appeal, our pending appeal of the District Court's decision related to Hickory saying that it's become moot.

By not adopting this resolution, it's not guaranteeing anything. It's not conceding. It's not dismissing the appeal as Commissioner Callaghan as you probably recall, the Commission decided to instruct the litigation team to file a motion to extend the time in which we would file the sort of initial substantive brief in the Court and that was done and it moved out to I believe it's early May. And with the understanding that the Commission would decide at a later date whether it wants to pursue the appeal. Whether or not the Commission adopts this particular resolution, passes this particular resolution does not -- is not dispositive of whether or not we continue to pursue the appeal. That is a separate issue.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So I was not able to attend yesterday's meeting, but I did listen to the YouTube video last night to hear what the lawyers said. So I heard some of that. What I mean but just to be clear so what if now that we have gone through all this and we look at we go huh this map is a lot better than Hickory, maybe we don't want Hickory anymore, let's just put this one in place. We voted on it. Let's lay it out to the Court and see what they do. Forget about Hickory we don't like it at least like the new one.

>> Nate Fink: That is a decision that would fall to the Commission and it's something the Commission could decide to do. My advice to the Commission would be to not take up that particular decision right now, today because there is no time crunch on that issue. As I said, we've already moved the deadline out and filed a motion with the Supreme Court, moved the deadline out to file our initial brief to early May so no work is being done on that or has to be done on that right now. And so before the Commission were to make a decision like that, I would recommend that the Commission have another discussion with the lead litigation counsel about that issue.

This particular resolution is on sort of a sub issue related to the appeal. Which is that on appeal now that the Commission has adopted this map that the Court, you know, if they accept the map that the Commission has just adopted as the remedial map then it's possible that the Plaintiffs will argue in the Supreme Court as it relates to the Hickory map that the Commission by taking this action and adopting a new map has mooted its

appeal. That the Court shouldn't even consider the appeal anymore. Just let the Commission and the state use the map that the Commission adopted through its remedial process. But we don't know. That is not like a certain slam dunk thing at all. It's just an argument that is likely to come up. If the Commission takes this proactive step by stating that at least for now that it's the Commission's intent that if the Supreme Court ultimately reverses the District Court's decision, the injunction preventing the use of the Hickory map, if the Supreme Court does reverse that decision, that the Commission would, believes that the Hickory map should then go back into effect.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So to be clear, to be clear voting for this resolution and if the Supreme Court should decide that the Hickory map is valid after all, we have voted for this resolution that says in the event that the Supreme Court says, no, the Hickory map is good we will revert to the Hickory map, are we committed to that path? Or can we at some point in the future say regardless of the fact we passed this resolution today so we would go with the Hickory map if the Supreme Court says we can, we can still change our mind and say no, never mind we want the Motown map?

>> Nate Fink: So you're not committing permanently to anything by -- to absolutely reverting back to the Hickory map by adopting this resolution. Because you can still decide at some point if you so choose, again after consulting with the whole legal team, to dismiss the appeal. Because the only way you will actually get to the point where hick which could go back in effect is by pursuing that appeal and trying to get the Supreme Court to reverse the District Court's decision, so between now and when the Supreme Court decides on that and to be clear a decision on that is not likely to come for many months, if not over a year, that is what the litigation team told you but the briefing process will start much sooner than that. But between now and then between now and when you get a decision from the Supreme Court, the Commission could certainly decide we don't want to pursue the appeal anymore. And at that point there would be no further challenge of the District Court's decision to throw out the Hickory map. And then assuming, again, that the Court allows the Motown Sound E1 map to go forward, then that would be the map and there would be no reversion back to Hickory because the appeal is not being pursued.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: All paths remain open to us until the Supreme Court makes a decision and at that point some paths obviously are closed down. We can't revert to the Hickory map or committed to the Hickory map but not until the Supreme Court actually makes a decision.

>> Nate Fink: That is right, and there will be time between certainly now and when the Supreme Court makes a decision and also on the tighter timeframe which is when the briefing will start in the Supreme Court. And the Commission will take up a discussion about that. You know, that was the expressed intent is you were going to try to get a little bit more time. We got the additional 60 days and have that time to have that discussion.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Okay got it, thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Lange your hand is up but I think it's just still up, I'm not sure. Okay so I have a question, Mr. Fink. If we -- does this resolution have any bearing on if the Court chooses the special master map instead of over our map, does that have any bearing on our options at that point?

>> Nate Fink: You mean as it relates specifically to this resolution?

>> CHAIR ORTON: This resolution does it have any bearing.

>> Nate Fink: I don't think this resolution would have any bearing on that at all. If the Court ultimately goes with the special master's map then that's -- I don't think that is a legislative act because you did not adopt that map. And so this mootness argument, right, the argument that we are trying to proactively address with this resolution wouldn't be in play I don't think because you that wasn't a legislative act to the Commission, it was the Court picking its own map or picking the map of a special master. So under that circumstance if you decide to continue to pursue the appeal and the Supreme Court agrees with us, our appeal, then the Hickory map would go back into effect, whether or not you pass the resolution.

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, this resolution deals with the appeal. It doesn't deal with what we are doing here today. And the reason that Baker is requesting this is because there is a couple of times in the appeal that if the Supreme Court's decision is, and I will just use letters A, then the Plaintiffs will argue that the appeal is moot. If the Supreme Court's decision was B, then we would argue that the Plaintiff's response is moot. So what we are trying to do with this is to put ourselves in the position that the Plaintiff can't say the case our appeal is moot. I think that's the simplest way. That is what this procedure is, procedural in the appeal only. Whether -- to say this would be something that would arise in the future is probably one chance out of a hundred. But why not have it in place if it's there. If there are any more questions I would like to try to answer them.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I have a question. We aren't going to meet again, we are not scheduled to meet again until March 21. Is it important that we adopt this resolution today or can it wait until March 21?

>> Nate Fink: If I may, I would recommend that the Commission take this up today because if the Commission has adopted its map, it's remedial map taken legislative action by add documenting the remedial plan and I believe that this is all sort of, you know, ideally part of one sort of one action even though as Commissioner Lett says this relates to the appeal. It does not relate to the new map that you adopted directly. And doesn't have any effect on that directly, today. It's just about what might happen if there were an appeal in the eventual of that. That said.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So as I said I have a couple motions. One I waive to move the 24-hour rule.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay we have a motion and a second to suspend, waive the 24-hour receiving documents 24 hours in advance of the vote rule. Is there discussion? I see Commissioner Lange's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Legally is that allowed?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Under Robert's Rules it is, yes, if we I mean.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Suspend the rules and procedure?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yes. Sarah Reinhardt, do you want to speak to that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, sorry it took me a moment to unmute. Yes, it is allowed under Robert rules. The Commission sets the rules of procedure so as long as it does not conflict with any kind of constitutional requirement, any adjustments or modifications to those rules of procedure are subject to a vote of the Commission. An example of this which you do pretty frequently although we don't refer to it as modifying the rules of procedure is adjusting public comment duration. Because that is something that is actually in your rules of procedure so every time you adjust that you technically modify that. So hope that is helpful.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you I have a second question too. We just got a 60-day extension to file an appeal. So what's the rush? Why can't I have 24 hours to do my due diligence?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well one thing is the briefing will start before that, so we need to get it in place as soon as possible.

>> Nate Fink: Yeah and another thing Commissioner Lange is the -- this is all sort of a single legislative act that the Commission is taking today, right? So you adopted the map and as part of that you have this resolution. You see it references the remedial map. And so the recommendation is that you do it as all kind of part of one single or at least all within the same session so to speak or meeting.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I guess for our special meetings I don't know if you have going on tomorrow, but we have to turn this in tomorrow.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Correct.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: That is 24 hours correct, to have an extra meeting?

>> CHAIR ORTON: To call a special meeting.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yeah.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I don't know if it's 24 hours.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I know there is a timeline.

>> CHAIR ORTON: There is a time limit, but I don't know if it's 24.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I thought because, just an idea for Commissioners that might want to read through it that don't, you know, that gives them time to read through it if you said tomorrow at 3:00, met for 15 minutes to take a vote and put it in place. Just an idea.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: If everyone takes 15 minutes to log in and do a vote on it tomorrow, it wouldn't be or take much time to do. And I think it kind of satisfies both sides.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Yeah, it is a good idea. I'm not sure if we would have interpreters and everyone on board, you know, available to do that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I won't be available tomorrow.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Sarah Reinhardt, you have a hand.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi, yeah, unfortunately I will not be available tomorrow. I will actually be on a flight at that time. But I also just wanted to note that suspension of the rules is also in the Commission's rules of procedure. It is Section 14.10 I believe it is.3. So it states except for the rules derived from the Constitution or state law the Commission may suspend its rules of procedure in whole or part by majority vote of members present. So just wanted to add that as well.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, Commissioner Muldoon, your hand is up. Okay, I thought it was still up. Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Just another suggestion along the same line that Commissioner Muldoon had maybe not another whole meeting, but we are not talking about a document but a paragraph. So perhaps if it would be helpful we could take a break for 30 minutes or an hour and give everyone time to read the paragraph and reconvene and take a vote at that time and that would eliminate the need to reassemble all the Commissioners and the translators and signers and everything for another day.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, good suggestion. Thank you. For me personally, I think if the document is put on the screen and read, you know, or we can all read it, whatever but if it's read out loud that would be probably nice, then that would be good enough for me. But, you know, it's just my opinion. So the question at hand or the motion at hand is to suspend the rules to be able to vote today. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was just going to say proceed.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, anything else before we take a vote? We should have a roll call vote.

>> YVONNE YOUNG:

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: One thing and can someone clearly state what this resolution does in one sentence? Not necessarily for me but we were discussing so one clear sentence.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sure. If the Supreme Court or any Court of competent jurisdictions reverses the District Court and the map that we just adopted, the Motown Sound E1F1 is then no longer any good we revert back to Hickory, okay?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Just for clarification, what we're voting on right now is just to suspend the rules so we can then potentially vote on the resolution, do I have that right?

- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: You have that right.
- >> CHAIR ORTON:
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I move that we vote.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: We are. We are waiting for a roll call.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The motion before you is suspending the rules for the 24-hour requirement for documents to be provided to you. Please state your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Cynthia Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Elaine Andrade?
- >> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Donna Callaghan?
- >> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Marcus Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of ten yes to three no, the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay thank you. Commissioner Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay, my second motion would be that we adopt the resolution as presented and was on the screen, if we could bring that back up.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: While that is being brought up, Sarah, you have your hand up.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yeah just wanted to note for the record that motion required a two thirds vote. And it did achieve that threshold, so I just wanted to note that.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: My notion is to adopt resolution 2024 -- whatever it will end up being pertaining to the adoption of the remedial State House plan to comply with the order in Court in Agee versus Benson number 1:22-cv-00272 presented this date, February 28th, 2024. And the body of the resolution is contained therein. I move we adopt that resolution.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I will second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay we have a motion and a second to adopt this resolution. Can you scroll down? Is that all there is that paragraph or is there more?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No, that is it. I can show you attachments and amendment, but that is it. Hold on. Let me get to that other monitor.

>> CHAIR ORTON: I see, thank you. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I just wanted to add my two cents on this. You know, I think Anthony Scannell actually stated it the best at our meeting yesterday that if everybody or might have been last week if everyone agrees Motown Sound which is a better map and we do why do we want to go back to the Hickory so I will definitely be a no on this.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anyone else? Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I just want to know why you want to vote to uphold something that pissed off Detroit in the first place?

>> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Szetela, your hand is still up. Probably because you didn't mean to.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes, sorry.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Anyone else have anything? Okay, roll call vote, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair. I'm going to paraphrase just a bit the motion that Steve made. Which is to adopt this resolution pertaining to the adoption of the remedial State House plan to comply with the Court order which Steve read the numbers for. Presented this date, February 28, 2024. Does that work for you, Steve?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, ma'am.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I apologize, Mr. Fink has his hand raised.

>> Nate Fink: I apologize for jumping in at the moment. But I want to sort of clarify something or make sure that the record is clear, I guess. Because we have this resolution and again it's just addressing this issue that we've already discussed. There

is a box at the bottom, this is -- actually was drafted by the Baker folks that has each individual Commissioner's identified. This particular resolution is just addressing this appeal issue and should not be indicative of a reflective of the Commission's earlier vote to adopt the plan that, you know, to adopt the Motown Sound E1 plan. That I suppose could be made in a separate resolution, but I just wanted to make sure that is clear because if someone is voting for this it's not as though they are they had voted in favor of that particular map or didn't vote in favor of that particular map. I just wanted to make sure that that's clear here. You already have in the record from earlier today the vote as it was taken on that map. Thank you.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead, Sarah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You got me on this one.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: That's okay.

The vote is before you a yes vote means you are in favor of the resolution and a no vote means you are not in favor. I'm going to start again if you don't mind with Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you. No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you, Rebecca. I know that was twice for you but thank you. I'm sorry Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'm sorry, I did not hear, what are we voting on right now?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: This is the adoption of the resolution for the remedial State House plan to -- that Steve Lett shared.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: To pick up Hickory, no.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I'm sorry can you repeat your vote? I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: If it was to pick up Hickory as a starting point again, no.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay, thank you. Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Elaine Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Donna Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Marcus Muldoon?
- >> MARCUS MULDOON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Cynthia Orton?
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: Madam Chair with a vote of nine yes to four no, this motion carries.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you.
- >> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is all I have for the legal liaison report.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you. So I think I don't think there is any other reports. So correspondence was received in advance of our meeting along with written public comment submissions to the Commissioners. Are there any future agenda items that Commissioners would like added? Okay Mr. Brace?
- >> KIM BRACE: Yes, Madam Chair, sorry, I was able to be in contact with Dr. Handley. She is on her way back from Mississippi.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Brace we are good. Thank you.
- >> KIM BRACE: Okay very good thank you.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Just real quick do we want to keep the name of this as Motown Sound FCE1 or shorten it just Motown Sound? Motown Sound final? Or just you know I'm thinking about how this will be communicated to the public. So.
- >> CHAIR ORTON: Sarah Reinhardt?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Because the vote was already taken where Commissioners stated the name of their preferred map and a vote was taken with the name as Motown Sound FCE1 I would recommend keeping that name or if you choose to adopt a new name I would at least add that in parentheses at the end or something like that. But that may just end up being more confusing so that would be my recommendations to just keep as is.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I would concur. We already had press calls just so we are clear and that is the name that is out. I just want to make sure we are clear and saying the same thing Motown Sound FCE1 not Motown Sound E1 because it's already out and we already have confusion on that already but that is listed on the website. Motown Sound FCE1 so we can stick to that because someone just called while you were talking, Commissioner Eid, with regards to that. That I put to voicemail because

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

we are in the meeting but if we can just stick to that it would be greatly, greatly appreciated so thank you so much.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Okay, so as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business today a motion to adjourn is in order.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we adjourn.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Moved and seconded that we adjourn. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR ORTON: Any opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes have it and we are adjourned at 3:44 p.m.