

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

20240516-1000 Meeting

Captioned by Q&A Reporting, Inc., [www.qacaptions.com](http://www.qacaptions.com)

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair, it looks like you have a quorum at this point, are you good if I start the webinar and take us live so you can begin at 10:00? Anthony, are you on? Okay I'm going to go ahead and start the webinar and take us live so anything you say or do can be seen and heard by the world now, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning, everyone.

My volume wasn't working for a minute. Can everyone hear me now?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Wonderful. Okay, As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:00 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 effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at [Redistricting@michigan.gov](mailto: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](http://Michigan.gov).

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: The interpreters are having tech issues, but we are working on resolving that now just for members of the public unless it has already been resolved.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Kellom. To our language interpreters can you just let me know when those have been resolved, please? Thank you.

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available on our website at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://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 at the [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) website along with written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting the website which is [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.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 Of the

Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov.

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

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: 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 physical location, county, city, township or the village and state which you are attending the meeting remotely.

I will begin roll call alphabetically with Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present remotely from Wayne County.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present from Mexico.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid?

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

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Good morning present attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lange?

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

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present attending from Grand Traverse county.

Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present; Carrollton, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton?

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

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Vallette?

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

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner?

Commissioner Weiss?

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

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: And Commissioner Lange, I see your hand is up do you have a question during roll?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I received a message that Commissioner Wagner still has not received that link. Is it okay if I just forward her mine to see if it goes through and you can correct the name when she is able to log on?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. Thank you Commissioner Lange. And I will note for the record when Commissioner Wagner has joined but you do have a quorum with 12 Commissioners present.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Ms. Schaar.

>> CHAIR EID: We will move to adopt the agenda.

As a reminder to the public watching you can view the agenda on our website at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC).

Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we approve the agenda as presented.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion by Commissioner Lett and a second by Commissioner Weiss. I do have one amendment I'd like to make. Now that we are in discussion. The minutes for the meeting are not ready to be adopted yet, so I request we amend the agenda to remove item 7, minutes from May 12th.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: Who was that that seconded?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Commissioner Lange.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Ms. Lange. So we have amendment to the agenda to take off item 7, minutes May 2nd made by myself and seconded by Commissioner Lange. Is there any discussion on the amendment? All those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed? The ayes have it and the motion is amended and we will now move to adopt the agenda as amended. Motioned by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Weiss, is there any further discussion on the original motion? Seeing none we will move to vote. All those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

Without objection we will begin the public comment portion of today's meeting pertaining to agenda topics. Is there any objection Commissioners? Objection Commissioners? Seeing none we will proceed.

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 last four digits of your phone number.

And please note if you are experiencing technical or audio issues or do not hear from you for three to five seconds we will move to the next speaker in line and return to you after you are done speaking. If your audio still does not work e-mail [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we can help you trouble shoot to participate during the next public comment period at a later meeting.

You will have 90 seconds to address the Commission today. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

We have seven folks who have signed up to give public comment today. The first being Mr. James Galant.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair before we do that I do see that Commissioner Wagner is present. I'm going to work to rename her now. But Commissioner Wagner, can you please tell us where you are joining remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'm joining remotely from Eaton Township.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you very much, Commissioner Wagner. Okay, I will go ahead and begin public comment with James Galant. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you and welcome Commissioner Wagner.

>>Thank you, James Gallant, Marquette these are opinions. Welcome to the May 16th version of the wizards of Oz with the Detroit Michigan United States in America as the emerald City. First we saw the MICRC's presiding officers exposed as the wizard of oz by toto for wrongfully pulling the strings to ensure that the other members continue to struggle to understand the Robert's Rules enough to protect themselves. As instructed by Mike Brady. Second your magic eye is not magic. It's science based. It literally slows you down in the picture so we can see your closed session electronic communications during this public meeting. It looks like winks and nods from where I'm sitting. Now a quote from Robert's Rules of Order Page 28, chapter three, paragraph 34, quote, if the Chair makes a mistake and assigns the floor to the wrong person when a preference in recognition was timely claimed his attention can be called by point of order and he must immediately correct the error. That is like Szetela did about Fink facilitating issues before the Commission. That was a direct contradiction to the rules. This is a point of order when the chairs customary practices establish without a vote falls to the ground and yields to the approved parliamentary law manual, Robert's Rules of Order as Mike Brady instructed at your first meeting. The yellow brick road that you built, Mr. Eid is crumbling right here in front of God and everybody.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Gallant. We appreciate your comments. Next to speak is Kelly Goldberg.

>> Good morning, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you. And I appreciate the tireless work you all have done in a very complicated time. I was just

going to give a kind of boilerplate remark, but I have to say your work is more important than ever as we watch the aftermath of the near assassination of the Slovakian leader. Democracy matters and having people believe that their vote is protected and counts and hasn't, you know, they have not been assigned to an area where their vote will have less impact and meaning. I'm Jewish by choice, I grew up in northwest Detroit in a diverse neighborhood. I've lived in Michigan all my life. And I would just urge you to look at the redistricting maps with the highest partisan fairness scores because that is at the core of whether people feel they are being represented or not. And those maps are 349 and 350 and 371 and 376. And I again thank you. I know this has not been easy and you have had to listen to a lot of people who would throw you off course and I just ask you to stay the course and stay true to the mission of protecting our votes and giving everyone the most representation possible. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Chair, can we have her repeat the numbers? She just said them kind of fast.

>> 349 and 350 and 371 and 376. The Jewish community is very diverse and not everyone belongs to a temple or a Synagogue. There are many people who are merely culturally Jewish and not affiliated with an obvious Jewish institution. So we just don't want to be just lumped into one District. So thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Ms. Goldberg and we do have a partisan fairness analysis taking place and hope you tune in for that, the next up to speak is Gary Morehead.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can good morning Mr. Morehead.

>> Good morning Commissioner and chairman. I'm just responding to a comment that one or maybe more Commissioners made and agreed to or expressed agreement with yesterday about having a classification scheme for the various maps. I'm glad there is the great diversity you have of maps, but it does kind of create the desire to put them in smaller groups and be able to compare them. So I would suggest these four items for classifying the maps. First District 1. Does it stick to the river or wrap around Dearborn or perhaps even head towards Ferndale? The second one would be the Lake St. Clair lakeshore, is it in one or two districts? The third one would be how many districts have any piece of the City of Detroit? And the fourth and final one would be kind of an unusual one, but I think it works as I've played around with this our Novi and Livonia those two cities substantially in the same District? And if you take those four variables and build some groups with that, I think you will be there. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Morehead. Next up to speak is Norman Clement.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay that brings us to Kermit Williams.

>> Hello.

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning.

>> Good morning.

First of all let me thank the Commission for all the work that you have been doing. I'm Kermit Williams, former City Council president in the City of Pontiac. We worked really hard on the original State Senate maps which include us with Southfield and part of Detroit. I'm very disheartened with our community of interest possibly going to Rochester or Rochester Hills, with the addition of Waterford. I think the District that we currently have stood up not only to the Federal lawsuit but shouldn't be changed. So I understand that you guys are looking at partisan fairness, but one of the things is possible representation that we have. So the way that the maps are crafted we may not have any representation from Pontiac going forward even though it might be a competitive seat with Rochester and Rochester Hills being a part. But it will be packing in our votes in a way that we don't see a way going forward. So I would encourage you to keep us with Southfield. If you look at the economic numbers there is much more in line as communities of interest than it is going west versus going south.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Williams.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: We appreciate your comments. Next up to speak is Anthony Scannell.

>> Good morning Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. Joining remotely from Detroit, Michigan. And I've looked at most of the maps. And not too crazy about honestly the collaborative ones. But I like the Lange, Wagner and Szetela maps.

I think they are all all right. And really don't have too many comments about the maps until I hear these analyses too. But guess we will have to put that off to the next meeting. And, yeah, another thing I've heard about, I've heard this phrase come up Detroit centric districts which I think is a good thing to look at. But also it would be interesting just to note how many districts contain a part of Detroit at all in any given map, not centric but if it has even just a little part you should say maybe it's in six districts or five districts in this map. And one thing I was well that has come up is the naming convention. And well, you have the technical names, you know, 050924. That tells you what day the map was made on. And version three let's say, it says okay it was the third map worked on May 9th or whatever. But it's like a technical name and it's fine to have that but we wanted, it would be helpful if we had a name that grouped them together that showed where they came from and I had a suggestion for that and made the pumpkin map and changed it and you could name it the pelican map and both start with P and come from the pumpkin map and didn't want to do that so now we are confused.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Scannell. The final speaker we have today is autumn Butler.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, well, that concludes today's public comment, please feel free to e-mail public comments at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) or use our public comment portal

that is posted on the website and found at [Michigan.mapping.org](http://Michigan.mapping.org). We appreciate everyone who offers public comment in whatever way you choose and invite you to keep sharing your thoughts.

Next on the agenda is item 5A, VRA analysis. If there is no objection I will ask VRA counsel, Mark Braden to facilitate this item. Is there any objection, Commissioners? Hearing none Mr. Braden the floor is yours please proceed.

>> MARK BRADEN: Thank you and good morning everyone, as a starting point since we were successful last time with the House plan on getting approval of the compliance with the V RA by the special master, Dr. Grofman and by the Court, we -- I intend to follow that same procedure with the Senate plan and not make any changes in a generalized sense from that since the old cliché is don't mess with success. And I would suggest that is a cliché we should follow.

Basically the objectives, let me just say there are three things I intend to do. And here comes up the inevitable PowerPoint. But I do think the PowerPoint does help. I'm going to do first a brief, again, a brief recap of the Voting Rights Act. We are going to then review the Senate plans provided to the Commission to Dr. Palmer, myself. And the purpose of that analysis is to address the opportunity of Black voters to elect their representatives of choice to the Michigan Senate.

What I won't be doing is offering an opinion on any plan's compliance with the Michigan constitutional requirements. I only am offering an opinion of graph plans with the Voting Rights Act. Following me you will have someone beginning to talk about very specific provisions of Michigan law, namely the partisan fairness. But that's not on my platter. The Court has specifically directed me to only be involved and advise on compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

So let me just, I will do the overview. I know that there has been a lot of presentations done on the Voting Rights Act to the Commissioners. But let me just walk through it again. To prove a violation under, of the Voting Rights Act, we have what's called the Gingles test or the Gingles test from the 80s from North Carolina. There are three preconditions for the issue of in the issue of compliance. First, do you have a minority group that sufficiently is large and reasonably geographically compact to constitute a majority in a reasonably configured District? That minority group must be able to show that it's politically cohesive and the minority must be able to demonstrate that the white majority voters vote sufficiently as a block to enable them to regularly defeat the minority preferred candidate.

So, you then move on to what is called the totality of the circumstances. It's really a question of whether or not the minority community as traditionally gotten its fair share of political power through a variety of local issues you can appraise that through. But it's just a question really of whether or not the overall political situation, the totality of the circumstances, both political and social, show that the process is not equally open to minority voters.

So in this, where we are right now, there's no genuine issue before this body as to whether or not Gingles requires the consideration of the Voting Rights Act for the Senate.

The Commissioner, its experts and the Court and the Plaintiffs all agree that there's legally significant polarized voting is present in Michigan. And in the area under consideration here in the Tri-county area.

So you need to adopt plans that comply with the Voting Rights Act. Again, I'm not looking at compliance with the Constitution. I'm looking at whether or not the proposed plans are reasonably configured and whether race was not impermissibly used in the creation of any plans. The Court has told us not to use race in drawing the plans except in a very limited sense. And at the very end of the construction of the plans.

So these -- your process, as I understand it, of drawing the plans for the Senate is similar to what you did or virtually identical to what you did in the House, which means it was a race blind draw. That you did not bring up, you did not have Kim or John Morgan bring up race on the screens in the drawing process. So race did not dictate how you draw.

So what we are looking at here is not how many majority, minority districts are drawn. We are not looking at any set racial target. In other words, we don't have a magic number that you have to get to. We don't have a specific number in the process. What we are examining here is how many districts are likely to perform with the election of the Black candidates' communities of candidates of choice.

It's not a guaranty. We have elections. So no matter how you draw the districts, there's no guaranty of any particular outcome. That's why we have elections. But we do have tools that help us make strong predictions as to whether or not the Black candidates, the choice of the Black communities are likely to win.

So this body, the Commission, can comply with the Voting Rights Act through the creation of majority-minority districts or cross over districts or influenced districts for potential compliance with the Voting Rights Act. That is an option of this Commission. This Commission gets to use these different approaches to determine whether or not it should adopt a plan. So this is integration of these racial issues into the back end of the process where you are already examining plans for all the variety of other issues that you are examining plans for.

So let me move on to the next slide. To do this, to determine whether we believe the minority community can elect its candidates of choice, we look at elections. We obviously look at census data. But basically we are looking at elections. In this particular situation, we are principally looking at primary elections. The Court has told us, and that is the reason we are doing this, the Court has told us that in this particular area the probative issues are addressed in looking at primary elections and not general elections. And I think everyone on this, on the Commission, now understands that issue. Because, in fact, most of these elections in the general elections are not



competitive on a partisan basis. So the democratic candidate is almost always going to win. And that candidate is almost always going to be the choice in the general election of the minority community.

We are looking at what the Court has told us to look at, which is primary elections. And so we have done something different than what you see in much of the litigation around the country on compliance with the Voting Rights Act because of that sort of unique geography and political geography of this area. So we are looking at the primary elections to determine whether or not the minority candidate of choice is likely to win.

And, again, this analysis we are doing, Dr. Palmer has designed and helped us with, is based upon estimates of Black and white turnout in the democratic primary. And we are also looking at the potential democrat primary pool. But we are looking first at the actual turn out in the democratic primary. The theory underlying this is pretty straightforward. I think it's difficult to argue that the Black community doesn't have an equal opportunity to have a candidate prevail in a democratic primary when it's the majority of the people actually showing up to vote.

Now, that doesn't result in a guaranty of any particular election results. But what we are looking here not at a guaranty of a particular election results but where there is an equal or likelihood of success of the community. It's difficult, I think, to argue that it isn't extremely likely that in a primary election with a majority of the voters who are Black that their preferred candidate is likely to win. The good news is this is a type of analysis that was accepted by Dr. Rothman and accepted by the Court. So I think it provides a firm basis for us going forward.

If we can go on to the next one.

Here is the meat of it. First of all, here are the general elections and limited utility to us and the Court has told us of limited utility. Which simply shows what we sort of already know, which is in the Tri-county area it's going to be difficult for democrat candidates not to win. You know, almost all the races. So we have the composite score, which is a menu of different races combined together. Sometimes people have difficulty understanding that. Or being comfortable with it. I have the more simplistic Biden numbers from 2020. But elections are elections. So but this gives you a picture of what we are talking about.

What I think is the next slide is the meat of what we will need to examine, the primary election results. And so what we are looking at here, and we have a whole, just like we did last time we have a series of specific charts with numbers attached to them and made available to the Commissioners and to anybody coming into the system. But the graphics help especially when we are here as we are talking about the larger number of plans. Basically to cut to the end, I'm totally confident that any plan that has four districts where the Black electorate has shown up and is the majority of the primary turnout, all those districts undoubtedly comply, in my opinion, absent some activity that I'm not aware of. In other words, if there are plans here that were drawn, that are not

reasonably configured in the sense that race was used or some other factors were involved, that might affect my analysis. But assuming as I do for our analysis that the plans that we were analyzing were drawn race blind, and are drawn in an effort to be in compliance with the other constitutional provisions, then all the plans which have four democrat primary turnout districts certainly it's hard to imagine the successful voting rights claim in those cases. I just can't see that happening. Certainly don't see that happening with this Court. I think the Court has already told us that that will work.

And that's, if you look at the overall Tri-county Black-white breakdown, this is slightly more than proportionality. It's 25%. So the Tri-county electorate is Black. This is slightly more than 25% of the seats.

Now, the other plans, which are three seats, are a little more complex. It's likely, I think, that most of them would be viewed as compliance with the -- compliant with the Voting Rights Act. But they would require some additional analysis, very specific analysis to the plans. And might or might not require some tinkering, very minor tinkering to potentially create an additional seat.

Now, here is the issue that arises here, the reason why I say that, the difference between three and four, majority of the democratic primary turnout can often be very small numbers that in a normal sort of political analysis the difference between the District where the democratic primary turnout is 49% Black versus one that's 51 percent Black and the reality of the world is frankly there isn't much difference. And it's not likely to significantly impact the ability of the Black community to control that District and elect candidates of choice. It's very simple and clear when you have four, if you have three, then we have to move further down and be involved in more complex analysis at a lower level. I think most of these probably would work. But it's easier to defend four than three. Four is pretty much a walk in the park. Three requires me to roll up my sleeves and come up with a reason why it doesn't work.

it may simply be they have only three but the differences are too small to be meaningful in the real world analysis. Or possibly they would, you would want to look at them and say, okay, well can we tinker and make very minor changes based upon race to get to four. I think four, although I won't say it's a magic number, I don't believe it is a magic number, four is much easier to defend because that's over proportional representation, which frankly I would suggest to you pulls the supports out of any voting rights case that may be brought against this. Again so everybody understands this analysis is based upon plans that I am assuming are reasonably configured and comply with the state's other constitutional requirements and weren't drawn using race. And if the assumptions are incorrect and we have to revisit these issues, but I assume, certainly from my watching, although I have to admit not totally the full-time watching deliberations of the Commission, seems to be accurate in the plans that were considered during the process in the last few weeks.

So I am available to and since there are so many plans, and I will also admit I'm a little confused by some of the labeling trying to figure out which ones are which any plans you have of a question we will have to bring up the chart and Dr. Palmer may have to help me out. So I hope that wasn't too long and wasn't too boring and was at least illuminating to most of the Commissioners.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Braden we do have a few questions, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah there was another batch of maps that were sent over yesterday with the 515 date do we have analysis on those as well? I don't see any of them on this list.

>> MARK BRADEN: Dr. Palmer I don't know the answer to that. If they appear on this or didn't get them soon enough to put them on this list.

>> Dr. Palmer: I sent it end of day yesterday but I don't think they made it into the slides. There were nine additional plans I think that came in yesterday, six from the Commission I believe and then three from individual Commissioners. I think we can update those figures for you all. The plan from yesterday, the collaborative plan V2 had a four performing District under measures. None of the other ones did. They all either had three or four or a mix but we can provide the exact numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay thank you. Then I had another question, the coloration on that chart, that's just -- that doesn't have any impact, does it? Like the more purple doesn't mean better but an illustration and I want to clarify that is accurate.

>> Dr. Palmer: Yes, the color across the two bars to make it easier for cross metrics.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you.

>> Dr. Palmer: With so many plans it got a little bit cluttered.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was just going to ask the same thing about the other maps that we sent in that were sent in yesterday. When can we see the analysis on that?

>> Dr. Palmer: They are all available and I'm not sure how materials get distributed to the Commission.

>> MARK BRADEN: We can figure out some way to get it to you today. I'm trying to think who is actually printing this out, who is John, are you doing this?

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may speak.

>> Sure.

>> MR. MORGAN: I have the -- Chairman Eid, is it okay?

>> CHAIR EID: Yes, go ahead please.

>> MR. MORGAN: I have the information Dr. Palmer created, you know, which are the spreadsheets with the data that is used to go in to making the PowerPoint. And then also there are some reference maps that Dr. Palmer created. So I have that, and I can display that if you need that now or later in the process. As far as the information

that went in the PowerPoint I did not create the PowerPoint slides, but we have the base data that would go into creating them.

>> Dr. Palmer: If it's okay for me to screen share, I can share the most updated version of the performance plot.

>> Taylor: I am about to pull that up right now, Dr. Palmer.

>> Dr. Palmer: Orton plan version one from yesterday has four performing districts on both measures.

>> MARK BRADEN: Bingo.

>> Dr. Palmer: If you look to the top you will see the version two, sort of the blue Teal, alphabetical within each category as performed on both measures as is the Orton map of 4 each and you will see versions 1, 3, 4 and 8 towards the bottom of that chart that came in yesterday as well.

>> MARK BRADEN: I have to admit I need better eyes or a larger screen to read some of this. But I'm hoping that everybody has better eyes and better graphics than I do at times here.

>> Dr. Palmer: As the process continues, if plans are eliminated, next week or in later meetings this week we can start dropping things from the graph to make it easier, to make comparisons. I think in the House round there were not so many that we had to do that. But there is a lot more plans this time.

>> CHAIR EID: I have a couple questions, Mr. Braden. So, first, I'm wondering what -- is there a correlation between the composite score, the composite score and Biden 2020 score before the primary turn out and primary pool score. And I'm wondering is there a correlation between those two scores? It looks like there were some maps there that had 13, but those 13, some of them are four on here and some of them are three on here.

>> Dr. Palmer: I can probably answer.

>> MARK BRADEN: I'm trying to figure it out myself.

>> Dr. Palmer: The correlation, I think it's you know given there is not that much variation on the democratic primary turn out of only three or four, there are some maps that are four that do -- that are, you know, on the higher end of the composite. I think that for the most part the ones that do well on the, you know, the highest level of composite have higher level of turnout as well. But I have not tied an exact correlation. I can do that if that is useful.

>> CHAIR EID: I'm not sure if it's useful or not. I'm trying to determine which number is the most useful for us to look at in determining, you know, there is no magic number, but is four okay? Is three okay? That type of thing.

>> MARK BRADEN: And the response to that is my view is four is certainly going to be okay, absence of a very unusual circumstances, which I have trouble imagining where there would be a claim there under the Voting Rights Act. And three, I think most of the threes may well be okay because they are probably in such a narrow range that

the difference between three and four is actually not particularly meaningful. Or could be changed so simply with so few movements of people around to not be meaningful in reality. But that's not for all of them. Certainly it's much -- it's more of a reality of defense rather than the real world. The reality of defense is it's hard to visualize a claim against a four plan. It's not so hard to visualize a claim against the three plan. And some of this sometimes goes down fairly simplistic roads. I don't think that is likely to be where this Court is with the special master that is involved. But, again, four is pretty much but suspenders and a belt. Three, you might be just dependent upon the suspenders.

>> CHAIR EID: Another thing I'm noticing is that a lot of the plans we did first, you know, I see a lot on there from like the end of March. The first one there is March 24th, March 25th, March 29th. So it seems to me the ones we did first, you know, a lot of those are four whereas a lot of the ones we did later are three. In what area of the map turns it from three to four? Is there any particular area or District where that happens?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Mr. Chair?

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry I just have a quick question and looking where I need to be looking you just said maps from March?

>> CHAIR EID: I'm sorry, April.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay I just wanted to make sure I wasn't insane and not seeing it, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: No, that is my bad. I see 424, 425, 429 some from 57 and some from 59. And I just think it's interesting, so it makes me wonder what is the difference here? What areas do we have to look at if we want to bump one of the ones from three up to four? Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, I just wanted to point out Mr. Braden and Dr. Palmer did not say that in this moment when they were talking but to your point, Commissioner Eid, the earlier metrics that you were looking at, the composite score and Biden performance were all general election information. They said that earlier, but I just wanted to make sure there was no confusion so even with President Biden's performance that was not in a primary. Those were just general election numbers.

>> CHAIR EID: That clears that up thank you.

>> MARK BRADEN: Yeah, to be candid with you, that's the primary stuff is more relevant for Dr. Handley consideration. We had it here. It's kind of interesting. But, in fact, Dr. Handley will be providing you an analysis on your metrics, which are better frankly for the overall notion of partisan fairness than these metrics are. Yet the Biden, I will just give you my opinion, the Biden metrics are not particularly good metrics. You are much better off with other types of metrics on the partisan analysis. That said, everybody elects -- everybody, most people understand the Biden metric very simply. And it's the most commonly, generally used for most people. Because, you know, the

one who lost for president. Biden numbers certainly are not really good substitutes for how people vote for the Detroit, I mean Detroit area legislative seats. They are somewhat compatible, but they are further apart than some composite number, assuming the composite number is done with some degree of sophistication. So more than you wanted to know probably. So.

>> CHAIR EID: No, that is very informative. That clears up that issue.

Any thoughts on the other question I asked on the areas that -- because it's interesting to me. None of the maps we have drawn have two. None of them have five. They are all either three or four so I'm wondering what area brings it from three to four? Or is there, you know, is there anything we can do there? Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA:

>> Dr. Palmer: To quickly answer the question there, there is a set of maps that I think will be provided that map each of these plans and show how the performing districts and the ones that don't. And I think you can make comparisons across if you were to pick a map with four and a map with three you could make some digital comparisons across them to think about those different areas.

>> CHAIR EID: That would be useful.

>> MARK BRADEN: We have a slide. Do we have it for this presentation? We had a slide showing the different percentages of Black voters in the different plans, and the different categories. I think if you look, there is probably a correlation there. Is that, max, is that the dot graph? I'm assuming there is going to be a correlation from four to three in the plans that have a lot of 90% and 80% districts. Distribution by plan. That -- there is probably some degree of, I mean, but it's likely there is some degree you can find correlation there. I'm guessing the plans, making a guess here, the plans that have three are much more likely to have the higher percentage Black population districts, the ones that have four probably don't have or have fewer districts above 80% as an example. That, don't, you know, don't take that to the bank as gospel. That's my gut reaction to what that is probably there. Maybe Mr. Morgan or Mr. Brace, who I now see on the line, might have or max has some comment on that or maybe I just wasted everybody's time.

>> CHAIR EID: We got a few hands up. I will say I think what was useful when we did this with the subset of House plans that we had was y'all had a PDF and you had some districts in blue and some districts in green and that was a lot easier to visually see which areas were compliant and not as compliant, even though I think they were all compliant at the end of the day. But that could be useful too. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I was just going to say I think it's pretty intuitive if you have three districts that consist only of Detroit and no other districts pulling into Detroit you're going to have three. If you have something different as a configuration you might have four. I mean I just think that's intuitive and just look at the maps. It's pretty obvious I think.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you. Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: I can defer to Kim on this. Go ahead I think.

>> CHAIR EID: Hello, Kim, welcome. We can't hear you, there you go.

>> KIM BRACE: There we go. All right.

>> CHAIR EID: The microphone you are speaking from was echoing.

>> MR. MORGAN: While Kim is getting that sorted I will just say we do have the excel spreadsheets with the data that's behind the PowerPoint. And I think you were used to looking at that. And then we also have some basic maps that illustrate what you're requesting.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, let's try Kim again.

>> KIM BRACE: Hello, can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR EID: There we go, hello.

>> KIM BRACE: Sorry about that, my microphone on my computer is not working so I'm in on the phone so I apologize on that side. We do have, as John mentioned, we have Dr. Palmer's graphs that we have put up on the website. And we have the maps that we have created before. We now have them for each of the Senate plans. And I can share my screen to show some of that information. Share screen two. Okay, can you see the screen now?

>> CHAIR EID: We see our web Page.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, that is what I wanted you to start with. Because what we have is if you go down to the mapping comment portal on your web Page, very first one, that will bounce into the my Districting table where all of the data tables and maps are located. So you see it goes into the State Senate. It has all of the plans. And it has one key component for everybody, both in the public as well as for the Commission, it has the plan number that is assigned by the my Districting site. When we upload the shape file to the my Districting site for everybody, it is assigned a District or a plan number. So 393 and there is the correlation here with the longer names that John has put on the maps that is drawn. And most of you recognize. But that's the longer name from that side.

What is also there is in plan attachments, if you go plan attachments for any particular plan, you will end up seeing, right now two different things, but you will soon see more things than that. So you will see a population spreadsheet that is generated. And you can download that. And open that up. And it will show you the populations. Of each of the districts. Okay so there is the populations, the deviations that are there on that side. So all of that spreadsheet information is there, that's what you see on John's screen when you are drawing in terms of one person, one vote. And then you also have, if we bounce over here, the political partisan fairness spreadsheet that is there. And it will download that there. And this is the political fairness calculations that are being done right now.

Now, we do have Dr. Palmer's tables of information also. And those are going up on the website right now as well as the maps that we have created. And if I bounce over, here is the example that we have just for one of the maps. There is map 391. And it shows the information that is from Dr. Palmer's tables. Now, Dr. Palmer had created some maps himself. And those had a different set of labels on them compared to what ours do. His had just the percent of the population that is in each of the districts. But our calculations, like what we had done before, looks at the primary turnout. And whether or not they constitute a majority or minority of the primary turnout. And those are the numbers that you see as labels on the map here. So in this instance we have four seats that are -- you see now seat number eight, District 8 is very close but when you look at the primary turnout it is a one that is effective on that side. So what you have, you will have these maps and all of these maps like what we did for the House, all of these maps will be up on the website. They were generated by Ryan late last night until like 3:40 this morning. And he has uploaded them to the person that helps staff the websites. They are, of course, over in India. In a different time zone than we are. So but we are trying to make sure that we've got everybody covered on that side. So all of these maps will be up there on the website later on today also.

Does anybody have any questions?

>> CHAIR EID: I do not see any, Mr. Brace.

>> KIM BRACE: All right, sounds good.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, Mr. Braden, do you have anything else to add?

>> MARK BRADEN: No. If there should be any specific questions that come up, additional questions, of course I'm always available. Not always, but usually available to promptly respond to anything else the Commission would want. And we have so many plans. The numbers that we have analyzed that it's limiting our ability to sort of get into the weeds to the same degree that we did on the House plans, on each individual one. But at some stage of course we will be able to do that. Post your comments and additional changes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you.

>> MARK BRADEN: I will get off and let Lisa get on.

>> CHAIR EID: That is great.

>> MARK BRADEN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for being here. We appreciate the information and look forward to giving you some more maps. Hopefully cutting down a few as well so you can look at a smaller subset.

>> MARK BRADEN: I will start dreaming about them soon here. Take care. Good-bye.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Braden, and the whole VRA team, Dr. Palmer and everybody else who chimed in as well.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Taylor Thompson.



>> CHAIR EID: Yes, Taylor Thompson.

Okay, next on the agenda is items for consideration 5B, partisan fairness. If there is no objection I will ask Dr. Lisa Handley to facilitate this item. Is there any objection Commissioners? Hearing none we will proceed. Dr. Handley, welcome back. The floor is yours.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Good morning.

You guys have been busy. A lot of plans. What I have done is I have created a summary table that lists the partisan fairness scores for all of the completed plans. You will remember that you can't actually produce fairness scores for incomplete plans. So it went through. Pulled everything off the website and got from Ryan the plans that you did yesterday. And have created this summary chart. And I'm going to do this. It's in excel at this point. Let me, can I share my screen? Hold on. Are you seeing it, or some chart? Can you see.

>> CHAIR EID: Eid we can see the spreadsheet.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You can't see the whole thing, can you? No, I better just scroll down. So you will recall that we have four partisan fairness scores. We have the lopsided margins, mean median difference, efficiency gap and the seats-votes ratio. Now I had not planned on describing how each of these were calculated. You have heard this enough, but of course if during your questions you would like me to address that, I would be happy to.

But right now these are the four scores you have been dealing with all along. And the first thing I would say is that there are -- there is more variation across these plans than there were across the State House plans. And the reason for that is in the State House you had 110 districts and playing with about a 10th of them and here you have 38 districts and playing with about a third of them. So any changes that you make have more of an impact. I think we talked about that before you even began drawing. So you have a wider range in the scores that you did in terms of the State House plan.

Another thing to remember is that sometimes different scores point to more fair plans than other scores. In other words, a plan could score very well on the efficiency gap but not on the mean median difference. That is why it's good to look at all of these scores at the same time. Because they will tell you different things about the plans.

The one thing that I can tell you in summary is that none of the plans that you have drawn scored as high on any of the measures as the 2012 plan drawn by a republican legislature. All of these, all of these plans score lower than that. So what do we have here? I'm going to provide this to you because it's going to be a little hard to see. Because I've got to scroll down. But in terms of the lopsided margin scores, the 2012 plan had a lopsided margin score of 8.6. The State Senate, 2022 plan had 4.7 here. You're pretty much in that, all of them are below 8.6. The lowest is actually 3.6. In favor of republicans. In other words, you're going to, I can't imagine you could both draw majority minority District or districts that provide minority voters with the opportunity to

elect and not have an impact of the margins. I just don't think you will get the margin scores. That's not made for me. Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: We do have a question real quick.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: From Commissioner Callaghan. You are muted, Commissioner Callaghan.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I know I was being muted, could you scroll that spreadsheet off a bit, the bottom row is cutoff, and I can't see it. Thank you, that is all I needed.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay, sorry about this. If I made it smaller.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Oh, no.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Then you can't see it at all, so we are just going to have to scroll I'm afraid.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I did a screen shot so I'm all set and you can put it back however you want to.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I mean, you will certainly have this, it will go on the website, and you can have this within ten minutes of finishing this presentation. Okay, in terms of the lopsided margins scores, nothing is, the lowest is 3.6, the highest is 6.3. In terms of a mean median difference, you got as low as .3 in one plan. You see that plan right here. And your highest is a 3.4. Here is a couple of 3.4s up here.

In terms of the efficiency gap your lowest is down to a .7 on one of these. Here we go. A .7, that is your lowest. And your highest is 4.6. And we are still right up here for these higher scores.

In terms of the seats votes ratio remember you expect the party that gets majority of the vote to get a super majority of the seats. So actually the only plan in which a party received, a party receives majority of the seats without a majority of the votes is the 2012 State Senate plan. So you would expect some skew towards the democrats since they were getting a majority of the vote. And you can see that it ranges in here, the highest is there.

In terms of the overall plans, what I noticed is the some of the plans you did yesterday, these three plans right here, were the plans that scored the worst across the board. But, again, it's not as bad as the 2012. But it's noticeably more biased towards republicans than just about any of the other plans.

And then down here you have some plans that are -- it's hard to, almost all of the plans favor republicans slightly. But you managed to create -- here is a couple of plans that actually come in near zero. Sorry, I can't show you the whole thing or they don't have pretty names. But I don't think that any of these plans are going to get you in trouble. But I should let the lawyers speak about that more than myself. But you can see that some plans favor republicans more than other plans. No plans, I would say,

overly favor the democrats. You come in at your 0 when a plan is slightly biased towards democrats.

That is all I have to say. If you have any questions I'm happy to answer them.

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

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I know that our consultants all like to be vague.

But are there any plans here that, you know, that we have completed and that you analyzed that you would say we should not consider as far as partisan fairness goes, that are too biased or out of the realm of acceptable?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Speaking as a lawyer, which I'm not, I would say I don't think any of these would get you in trouble. But it might be the case, and I would like the lawyers to follow-up on this, but it might be the case that let's say there are plans that are more favor republicans more and you chose this when you could have chosen a plan that favored republicans less. I don't know if that is informative to a Court, or not. So that's why I pointed out there are a few plans that across the board appear to favor republicans more than the other plans.

The other plans look a lot more balanced. The only ones that, you know, maybe you can make the argument you could have done better than these three in terms of partisan fairness, and can you see my cursor? I think you can? These three right here.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: All created.

>> CHAIR EID: Yesterday.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: This is the 11th. This is from an individual Commissioner. But these two were created yesterday. And those, again, they favor all the measures favor the republicans more than the other plans. But.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yeah, I think I asked this question before, but I will ask it one more time. Of these four measures, is there anyone that we should maybe or any grouping of them that we should weigh more heavily than the others?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I think the most accepted and not universally accepted but mean median difference in efficiency gap are pretty well accepted. In terms of the seats votes ratio really all you're looking there is to make sure that the party that wins the majority of the votes wins majority of the seats and you are fine on that one. And the lopsided margin score, you have got a concentration of democrats in Detroit. You're not going to get away from a lopsided margin score that favors republicans. So I would focus on mean median difference and the efficiency gap. And both of those have been considered by the courts and discussed quite a bit in political science journals, but more importantly in the courts. The main perspective is in the courts. So those were the two that I would look at.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Dr. Handley, can you show what you said those two might be the most important ones to look at. You have what the Linden plan, what their scores were at the bottom, correct? Can I see those one more?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yes

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you, so 1.3 and 1.9.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Could you scroll real quick to the top of the.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: List sorry.

>> CHAIR EID: You are good.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: If I tried to put on a slide it would have been too small to see too so. We are just going to have to live with this. But, again, you will have a copy of this.

>> CHAIR EID: Something that is a little interesting, and maybe you can explain this, maybe you can't, I'm not sure, but it seems like in some of these you have an increase in mean median difference from the Linden map but a decrease in efficiency gap.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: This is why you need both scores. They are measuring slightly different things. So that's why you see that. It is odd but this is why you will have to look at both measures.

>> CHAIR EID: Right because the ones with 0.8 efficiency gap they are a little higher on mean median difference but the one that is a little higher on mean median difference and a little lower on mean median are higher on efficiency gap compared to Linden so that is certainly interesting.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Now, again, I pointed to some plans that were, I don't want to say bad but a little less fair than others on both measures.

>> CHAIR EID: Right.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: So sometimes the plan is such that it's being captured by both a mean median difference and efficiency gap.

>> CHAIR EID: Got you. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: One more question and forgive me if you have already answered this, I'm trying to take notes the best I can. So I guess it would be more of an assumption, is it fair to assume that based off how the Linden map was drawn kind of with more long stretched out districts that if those districts were redrawn in a way where they are more compact within an area, would that affect the efficiency gap and mean median difference? Would that play a role in those?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It does play a role here in Michigan. It's not necessarily the compactness of the link. I mean if you were doing this up in another area. What's happening is when you are creating these long districts that are dipping into Detroit and going up into Macomb County, that is impacting it. So it's not just long districts. It's long

districts that stretch out of Detroit and into the suburbs. So, yes, I think you probably meant precisely that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay just for clarification so you said if they stretched out, you know, from Detroit into other ones. If you were bringing districts more Central towards Detroit again, then that could affect those numbers, that's what I'm hearing, right?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That is correct, it's not really the shape of the District it's whether it's bridging the Detroit, how far up it's going into the suburbs to pick up republicans.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Any more questions?

>> CHAIR EID: Any more questions for Dr. Handley?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I will send this to Kim Brace, and he will do what has to be done to make sure that you get this and that it gets on the website.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay.

Let me see how I stop sharing. Okay, very good.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. We appreciate the information, Dr. Handley. It's always nice informing us and the public. And I know we had a few commenters who were interested in the partisan fairness metrics, so I hope that cleared things up. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I wonder if that could also be sent to Edward directly so that he can send it on to us?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Certainly.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay once again thank you, Dr. Handley.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You're very welcome. Good-bye.

>> CHAIR EID: Next up on the agenda is mapping. However, we have been going for about an hour and a half so I think now would be an appropriate time for a very quick break. How about we take a break and come back at 11:30 a.m. Sound good to everyone? All right 11:30.

[ Recess until 11:30 a.m. ]

>> CHAIR EID: Okay everyone welcome back. I will give everyone a moment to come back on. So next on the agenda is mapping, if there is no objection Commissioners I ask we return to the collaborative mapping process as outlined by the Commission's rules of procedure and collaborative mapping policies document. Is there any objection? Seeing known we will move forward. We were going with me. I think now is a good time to have a discussion about if we want to continue mapping or maybe give some of these maps names and, you know, try to whittle it down to make it easier on everybody. Commissioner Orton, I saw your hand up. Were you going to say something similar?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, just, yeah, that is what I was going to say.

>> CHAIR EID: So, you know, we have to think about how we want to do this. We got this information. I know we are waiting for it to come through via e-mail, but there are a lot of maps. And some of them are derivatives of other ones. We did get a document earlier this week that had a lot of that information on there. I think it went up to plan 379. But that showed the maps that came from other maps.

So I really think it's up to us at this point, do we want to proceed with mapping? And try to make changes to what we have? Or do we want to give what we have some names? I would suggest birds because birds are not copyrighted, and we can use them. Then we can progress, you know, we can give a map from a certain family a bird name and then once we update it, have it be that same name and V2, V3, V4 like we did with the original tree progression when we first did this, making it so that folks can see the progression of how the maps came to be, at least from this point. But we do have limited time to make changes as well. So I'm trying to, I would love to hear from you on how you think we should move forward and what the best use of our time is now.

Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yeah, so I mean, it was brought up earlier in the discussions about what makes one map with better scores for partisan fairness and what makes them worse, we need to know that before we do more mapping. I mean we don't want to make the same mistakes until we know exactly which way, which districts are good districts for partisan fairness, which ones don't perform quite so well. And that would be my suggestion to do first is try and figure out that. But I'm not sure we can do that with the information we have at this moment.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I agree. But I -- not just about partisan fairness. I think we need to use the analysis for the VRA as well. And I really think we need to be careful not to chase partisan fairness numbers and sacrifice the communities of interest that we very carefully put in the maps. So I think she said they were all, you know, acceptable. I think we can try to improve. But I just think we have to be careful because right now we are supposed to be narrowly tailoring, right, or tweaking?

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Sorry, I'm finishing chewing something. I apologize. So it looks like we have 11 maps that have four VRA districts. And that 11 I'm not including the two individual maps. There were 13 total but two are individual maps. If you go through the list of partisan fairness and compare it against that list of the 11, there is two on that list that have high partisan fairness scores compared to the Linden map that is map 344 and that is map 364. So the way I would suggest we approach it is let's look at the maps with four. Let's look at partisan fairness so that brings us down to having nine maps. And then take a look at those maps because I can identify three out of that nine that are very, very, very similar to the extent that I think we could probably

whittle two of them out and just have one. And then the other maps, there's I think a little bit more variation. But I think we can kind of whittle things down and then name things.

>> CHAIR EID: When you said high partisan fairness, did you mean, what did you mean exactly?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So.

>> CHAIR EID: You mean scored closer to 0 or further away from 0?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So high meaning not near 0. So like 0 map 364 has an efficiency gap of 4.6 and mean median of 2.5. That is almost double it's more than double for the efficiency gap than the Linden was so I would take it off the list. Why would we mess with it when we have other ones that are better, close to the Linden and also have four VRA districts. Same with 344 it has 1.9 mean median which is not bad, but efficiency gap is 4.6. If you have maps close to Linden if not better why would we keep those other ones on the list?

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah. Well, there is -- so this is a process that has a lot of different considerations, right? We have VRA, we have partisan fairness, we have communities of interest, we have compactness. So I don't think chasing one score at this point over another is necessarily the way to go. But I do think you know the ones that scored better are better. But we might be able to make changes to the ones that have three to get it to four or three might end up being okay if all of the other factors are good too. Same with partisan fairness, right, one that is a little higher might score better on the other measures or the public might like it better. So I don't really think we should necessarily like eliminate any now that are actual, different plans like a different family of plans. But the ones that are just duplicates of plans with changes, or updates to that plan, I think we should look at that. For example, in the document we got last week, or earlier this week. I'm just going to use the first one that's listed is 5924 version 8, which is plan 379. Well, that plan was started from 57 version 6 and that came from 52 version 1 which came from 425 version 3. And then 424 version 3. So do we want to just keep the most updated one? And move forward? Or how do we want to organize this? I see Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, mine is not an answer to the question that you just asked, Commissioner Eid. Mine is just a point that while there may be maps that have better partisan fairness, I believe there's also maps that instituted different communities of interest such as the lakeshore community of interest that may be a little bit higher. But then, again, communities of interest, again, is higher in the constitutional thing. So to just say this one is lower and eliminates a community of interest I think we need to look at the whole big picture, not just the numbers. And based off from the rank criteria that we have. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Sorry I was muted. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I mean I think this kind of hits on the point you raised, Commissioner Eid is that some of these maps are so similar that we can just rapidly knock maps off because they are so similar. Look at 349 to 350 to 362 they are continuations of the same map so why would we continue to look at all three of them or continue to revise all three of them when they just have little tweaks whereas we could pull up all three, look at all three and pick one and move on. I personally don't think that the maps that are hitting with three are so significantly different. I mean we really have kind of four or five maps that we are working with in terms of configuration. I don't think any of these other maps that are hitting with three districts are so significantly different that there is some hidden gem there. I mean if someone thinks there is certainly raise it up and let's look at it. I think there is so much similarity in most of the maps we could go off VRA and partisan fairness and start whittling things down a bit.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think maybe just overlays could help when we know that they are from a similar vein, overlay could help us, help remind us of exactly what was changed and then we can have the discussion of which one to keep.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah. So but I don't want to -- we are not voting now on, you know, taking it to the next phase. You know, publishing it to the Court, right, I think we are trying to decide which ones to keep to make it easier for us and for the public to identify these. I just want to make that clear. Now is not the time to advance anything to the Court. Because we still have a few more days where we can make further changes if we like either based upon the data that we just got or based upon the community feedback. So I don't want to lose those days where we can make further changes either. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, I'm in favor of starting with maps that have scored higher. And we have the scoring for that as well as looking at that against the communities of interest and how they have been observed. And then maybe secondarily looking at maps that were more recently tweaked and turned in. So there is a when we got the complete list of VRA districts, the way that I interpreted that graph it was like these 11 or so maps up at the top that have four and then there were some at the bottom that were submitted yesterday that I would be interested in looking at. The ones in the middle in my opinion are iterations that we can, I understand we are not voting right now for maps to go forward and we still have time. But I think out of respect for the public and ourselves we do need to pair things down so it's very clear what we are talking about, and we are not looking at all these numbers. I'm interested in scaling back because I think we can do that, and we did it for the House maps as well.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes, I think the Commission is interested in knowing the maps, Megan Schaar put together a flow chart that I just sent, updated from the one



from the previous week. She is here and she can use her screen if it would be helpful to the Commission to see the evolution of these maps as we move forward.

>> CHAIR EID: That would be helpful if you can share that, Ms. Schaar.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. So I think there was an issue with whether or not you all have access to Visio so I'm going to share my screen in case you can't open it, but I did make it in a visual format. And I'm sorry that it's going to appear very little. There are lots of veins. But as you can see, the legend is that if it's an oval that was a starting point so you either started from Linden and deleted things or from a blank map. Any diamonds are incomplete maps. And then the rectangles are your completed maps. So here is one family that all started from the 42424 version 3. And I'm not sure that there is a good way to show all of this at once. So I may have to Zoom in on different areas for you and answer questions. Because I know that this is little. I believe Edward did just send it to you though as well. And then there is a separate family off of five to four or 5224 version 2. There's a big family off of 42324 version 1. There's a family off of Juanita's individual map. And then there is two other small families, I can actually move this one. This might help a little. Sorry, bear with me here a second, I'm actually new to Visio-2 so I wish I could make this prettier but I'm not entirely sure how.

So let me get zoomed back in. How do I do this? I don't know why I can't Zoom back in. Is there somewhere you would want to start to look at to kind of assess, is this even helpful at all? I just tried to put it in a visual format rather than words.

>> CHAIR EID: I think it is helpful. Let's go through it and if you can let us know the origination points and we can follow the flow chart as we look through them. Does that sound good to you?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That is fine with me. I do see Mr. Morgan has his hand up and so does Commissioner Szetela.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes let's go to them, Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: I wanted to point out there are a couple of tools available if you need them. There are the spreadsheets from Dr. Palmer that have the detailed information about the VRA information there. And then the second thing is Dr. Palmer prepared maps similar to the green blue maps you referenced last time and then the third thing is Ryan prepared screen shot maps that are on the website. If you want to look at several maps together like, you know, four pane of maps or three pane of maps that is another way to do it.

>> CHAIR EID: Right, okay, I think we can get started with this. But I do see Commissioner Szetela has a hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I guess my question is what is the purpose of this exercise? I mean, what are we trying to derive from this? Why does it matter I guess is so if we have a map like let's just pull one off the list 050724 version 5 final that has four VRA districts, it's got good partisan fairness is tracing it back to the 424 map versus the 429 map really relevant to the like what are we gaining from this? I don't

understand why we are doing the exercise. I just picked a random 050724 why does it matter if it came off of 0424 or 0429 how is it helping to analyze maps we continue to move forward with?

>> CHAIR EID: If they are the same and minor updates between the two let's get rid of the prior ones so we have a smaller subset of maps to work with going forward. I think it's what you had said earlier. We have maps that are just subsets of previous maps. There is no reason to have all three. Let's just have the most updated one.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Why are we potentially looking at a chain that may have no maps that hit the two criteria? That is my point. We have a body of 35 maps, 33 maps, I think two of them are individual. Why would we look at every map when some of those maps aren't even in the ballpark of something we are considering moving forward? That is my point.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I agree that this should not be used for every map. But I will say as a Commission because we are supposed to have a high level of transparency and I don't think this time around we were that good at it. I'm not speaking for everyone but thinking as a whole. I don't think we were as particular because we have way more many maps than we had before. We were not as particular saying why we were drawing because we are better. This time around than we were. So I think it does a good job of explaining the origin of the maps. And it is good for the public as well as for our memories to talk about why we started to draw certain maps. Because we are supposed to besides the scoring pay attention to how communities of interest were considered at the inception of the maps. So if someone is going to, if we are referencing a map, one of the 11 that I'm suggesting. We are not talking about all the maps, one of the 11 maps and don't hear it as a Commission and don't hear certain communities are being considered, that is not a map and I don't care how it scores it's not a map I will hold high in my brain if A it can't be talked about in a way that considers communities. But, B, it's hazy on how it even got to this map family. We have an obligation to be very clear on that.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I understand your point. However, this chart doesn't give you that information. This chart is going to be us looking back at a map that was drawn on 424 and trying to remember who drew what. And what District. Which is the same thing we can do looking at a final map. So the only really way to compile that information is to have gone back to the beginning, watch all the video and compile it. Then of course I do think we did a good job as usual when people finish their turns they talk about what they did and why they did it. I think we have done a good job of that, it's just been our practice. If the goal is to find out why we drew four the chart does not give us that information and looking at it and trying to figure that out is not more valuable than just going to one of the final maps and looking at it and saying, okay

district 8 does anybody remember why this was drawn this way? Because otherwise we are just swirling. And spending a lot of time when we have limited time. Trying to trace something that most people on this Commission probably aren't going to have a good memory of because we've had so many maps.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I think if we start looking at one of the 11 maps and someone has a hard time explaining where it came from the chart can be used as a reference. It's a tool and not a reference point.

>> CHAIR EID: If you want to use it use it. If you don't want to use it don't use it. It's okay.

There are a lot of tools out there. We have also the one that was put in writing. It's a word document that you all should have that does the same thing, just in writing. Right? It's a tool, we can use whatever tools we need to, to try to figure this out.

Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Yeah, I was just going to say that I agree with everything that's being said. We do need a starting point, and I believe someone mentioned like the top of the list, the ones that perform the best start at the top of the list, go through each map. We will give a brief summary of where it came from and what it does. And then continue from there. We can start if we need overlays at any point we can do that, but we need a starting point and start with the highest performing ones.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, so, for example, on the VRA analysis it shows one of the one scoring as four, as five, 9, 24 version 5, that is plan 377. That map was derived from other ones that also scored four. So can we start by just pulling up 5, 9, 24, version 5 which is 377? Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm sorry I just forgot to drop my hand.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I'm sorry Commissioner Eid did you say 5924 version 5 or did I make that up.

>> CHAIR EID: It's 377. It was derived from 5824 version 2. And then that was derived from 424 version 4 which is also on that list. So I'm trying to figure out if we need both or if it's just an update. So let's pull up 52924 version 5, map 377.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Eid, are you asking me to do that?

>> CHAIR EID: You can either use the Autobound software or if it's easier just to pull up the PDF on the website.

>> MR. MORGAN: I would say at this point, just for the first step, I would say just go to the website and get the screen shot and then say go ahead and upload in auto bound or we saw what we need and don't need to upload.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: What was the origin, 429 or 424?

>> CHAIR EID: The origin, the original origin it goes back to 423 version 1. And then it goes to 424 version 2 and then 424 version 4.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: It's the third one on the word document. 377. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't know if this would be possible, but since we know that there are those three or four versions that it came, you know, that it evolved from, would it be possible to put the little thumbnails all on a screen so that we can, you know, see if we can visually tell the difference? And decide.

>> CHAIR EID: I think that is what we are going to try to do.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I can do that. I can try. I can bring up like a blank PowerPoint and just put them in maybe up to four panes on one PowerPoint slide. That will probably give you what you want.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: It might take a minute to set that up, but I can probably do that.

>> CHAIR EID: This one 377 does change, it changes 15 districts. Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Well, it's true that 377 traces back to 344, 343, 342 but that Branch also 344 also branches off and creates the 349 which is another completed map, 350, 351, 364. I mean there is a lot of maps that come off of that. If you look at 377 and decide you don't want it for or its predecessors for 377, I mean it's on a lot of other maps too.

>> CHAIR EID: Right.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: See what I'm saying.

>> CHAIR EID: That is what we are trying to figure out and once we get do that Branch perhaps we give that Branch a different name. We keep configurations but we will have to differentiate somewhere with these.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm just saying if you look at 377 and it's you know go back to the last completed map that it Branched from is 344 and are similar 344 is almost like 377 and we don't need that. We don't know that because 344 also found something different from 377 so you will have to keep looking at 344 for the other three branches that came off of it, unfortunately.

>> CHAIR EID: Uh-huh. [ Laughter ]

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR EID: If we got to do it we got to do it. I'm cool with doing that. We just got to get going and get started and see what we are looking at. See the differences. And try to whittle down so that both us and the public know and can analyze this data further. The only reason I said 377 is because that is one of the more recent ones that had a four on the VRA analysis. So we can look at all of those then we can look at more. We can look at the ones with partisan fairness numbers. We can look at the ones that might be better on communities and go from there. At least we will get down from 30 hopefully to you know around, I don't know, it will be less than 30. So we will give Mr. Morgan a minute to get that up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, yeah, I think the limiting factor will be that each of these maps will be a PDF and I have to insert the PDF into a PowerPoint, which is doable. It will just take a little bit of time here. All right so let me just start with sharing the screen and just looking at our source material here real quick. Okay, so again I can bring things up into the Autbound edge and then on the website you can refer to it by the plan number. You have your additional information on the provenance of the various plans but for example you said 377 was one you wanted to look at, so we go to view and then here is the map of that. Okay so then that will give you a view of the actual map. All right? And then if you want, I do have those VRA maps, but maybe this isn't the time for that. And then, if I bring up a PowerPoint, let me just get this, I should be able to insert this as a graphic. And then put it into a PowerPoint so you can like this is a different slide but like you can put two things side by side.

>> CHAIR EID: Right, let's can you go back to the picture of the map.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right, okay, so the quickest thing to do right now is just to go off the website and just show you each individual PowerPoint. And then if you want me to assemble a comparison I can.

>> CHAIR EID: Right, so this one, correct me if I'm wrong, but this is one of the configurations that tried to keep 7 mostly the same and it has the configuration of 1, 3 and 8 that splits up Hamtramck from Highland Park. That is kind of like the identifiers here more or less. I believe Commissioner Szetela worked on this one last. And I believe it was based off of what we are looking at is 377. I believe it was based off of 364. Which is 5, 7, 24 version 2. Commissioner Szetela, does that sound right to you?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Possibly. I might have gone back to the original map though to do this. The four version. But, yes, the goal was to keep District 7 primarily the same and District 9 primarily the same because that had been changed in a lot of maps and I wanted a map with those preserved.

>> CHAIR EID: Do you think this is the most updated version of that configuration?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Well, I think the other question is that you said it's 423 and 424? Were the predecessors? Is that right?

>> CHAIR EID: I have and, Megan, if you can please correct me if I'm wrong with any of the tools you have. I have before this it was 5, 8, version 2 and came from 424 version 4 which came from 424 version 2. And which came from 423 version 1.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I guess my perspective is this is the most recent map?

>> CHAIR EID: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: But I would not boot 424. So 424 version 4. I would not discard that because this map has changes to it. So I still think we need to keep both of those in the running.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, can we pull up that map, the one that Commissioner Szetela just referenced.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, 424.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's 344 if that helps you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, yeah, so I've got the spreadsheet here. I don't have all the other spreadsheets and word documents you have. But I have a tracking sheet so 344. And a Commissioner Lange has her hand raised, I think.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: While John is looking for that I have a quick question too will we get to view the individual submissions that were submitted that we haven't seen yet either? I believe a couple of those scored pretty good too. I think Commissioner Orton scored pretty well. So I'm just curious will we have time to look at those also?

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, I mean I'm sure we will have time to do that. The individual ones don't usually get the naming convention that we use. Right? It sticks as the individual Commissioner's map. I think right now we are speaking about how to organize the collaborative ones in a way that makes sense to the public and for us when we look at it further. But we are going to look at them. They are out there the day I was there. We did receive a little while ago the partisan fairness and VRA analysis presentations. Okay so if you compare these two, John, side by side, so we have version four there.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: There are pretty significant differences. So 11 and 12 are different in both versions. One is the more complete lakeshore up around tar son island, the other is not and the other has that Sterling Heights, Rosedale, oh, my God I can't talk, Rose wood corridor that the real estate agent was talking about. There are also some changes to the line in Detroit. So, no, I would not say one is an improved version. I would say there are two variations.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes, they do look pretty different to me as well. District 6 is quite a bit different. District 11 and they are different, and one keeps the lakeshore, one doesn't. And 13 is different as well.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: And 7, 7 has Oak Park in with Southfield.

>> CHAIR EID: And both of these had -- were fours on the VRA analysis. As far as the partisan fairness numbers, they are a little higher than some of the other ones but not too bad. So what do we think? Do we want to give each of these a separate name? Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So 344 is the one that had the high efficiency gap. 4.6. So I consider that pretty high. And I would kick it based on that honestly.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: No, I was just going to say that as different as they are we should probably keep them in separate things and going forward look at some of the major changes like that lakeshore District, 11 and 12. Or like the splits and try and look

more specifically at those. And then categorize them in that way. At this point I would not get rid of either one just yet. We are at the beginning.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Would you like to give them a name, Anthony?

>> CHAIR EID: Well, I mean if we all think 377, I think we can all agree right now that 377 should get one. You are the one that worked only both of these Commissioner Szetela. So if you are saying you don't think 344, you know, is deserving of one via the metrics that we have, I don't see a reason not to just create more for a map if nobody wants to go to bat for it. Do you know what I mean? Commissioner Callaghan then Commissioner Orton?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yeah Commissioner Szetela who did you collaborate with on these maps?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Everybody. I mean, I drew them in a meeting, and they were based off of, what was it, 423, 424 then 424 version 2. So I think everybody has touched this map at one point or another.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yeah, but I mean there was a lot of touching at the end that was all you. I'm not sure there is too much left from a collaboration standpoint. It's pretty much all Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, it's not.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I'm just thinking for me it's a little hard to remember them all until we are going through them. So I would say if we are comparing like this and people or someone, you know, really likes one and fine, we name it and we say it's going forward. And then at the end, but not say that we are discarding any of them yet. And at the end, if anyone wants to bring one forward that they realized they did like and want to keep then they can do that. I think it's premature like someone said to completely discard any at this point until we see them all.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay and just to be clear we are not getting rid of anything right now. We are trying to organize these in a way that makes sense, right? So 377. That's the most updated kind of version of this family. 344 has we can look at 344 later. Let's get done with 377 right now. I do see Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Curry. Go ahead, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, two things. I do like 377 because it also keeps that lakeshore community of interest that we heard about so much. My other question would be, I'm kind of curious with the two maps how many districts were changed? I know the first time around with the House map, that was kind of our big thing at one point. You know, some wanted fewer changes, some wanted more changes, do we know how many districts were changed above and beyond what we had to change?

>> CHAIR EID: On 377, 15 districts are changed total.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: 344, 12 districts total are changed.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR EID: That's the total. Remember, we have to change six.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Correct, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So just to put it on the record for what was changed in 377 and where it came from. So these changes were directly out of public comment. 12 was reconfigured back to the full lakeshore based on public comments asking that change be made. So I changed it from 344 to redraw that lakeshore District. That required some juggling on 11. Which also affected 24. And other districts up there as well. So and then this also tries to preserve Sterling Heights with Fraser as well because that was another public comment that we had received. In terms of six, as you can see, I altered that to make Farmington Hills whole. Again that was coming directly from public comment. Livonia is still made whole and then the District 5, which is Canton, was changed based on public comment from both Romulus and also Belleville, Van Buren Township about wanting to be with Huron and not being moved in District 5. That came directly out of public comment and those changes were made there. We received other public comment about not wanting as much crossing of primarily Oakland, Macomb districts and taking a little bit of Detroit and that is how 344 was structured. And so I changed that structure as well and caused some adjustments there. And the last thing I did is I reunited the Jewish community of interest in Oak Park by putting it into Southfield. So it's almost entirely based on public comment these changes that were made.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, I appreciate the comments. I do. But we don't need to defend the maps right now. We are not choosing any maps. We are just trying to organize them. So let's keep the comments, if we like a map or not, we don't need to do that right now. We are comparing. We are trying to get the most recent and updated versions of the maps out there in a way that makes sense. Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Name 377.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, that is what I was going to do. Thank you. So bird names everyone okay with that? Department of State, do you have any bird names for us to use by chance?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Give me one moment and I will come up with them.

>> CHAIR EID: And now once we get this if there is a further update to 377 we can do the same name and do V2 that way the public knows the at least from this point the progression.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Do you want to just use Robin for this one?

>> CHAIR EID: That works for me.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: 377 is now called Robin.



>> CHAIR EID: Okay, Robin, wonderful. Okay I see also on this list of ones that were four for the VRA I see 5924 version 2, which is and 374. If I recall correctly, this was the start of one that Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Muldoon were working on. Does that look correct to you, Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Say that again, I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR EID: To me this looks like the start of the configuration that you and Commissioner Muldoon had started working on. It has that District 1 that goes from the river, from Down River up until all the way through the Detroit river, through bell aisle up to Grosse Pointe. And I have it being similar to.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: 371.

>> CHAIR EID: 371 and then it turned into 374 and then 376.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, and I think this would be an opportunity if you wanted to use Megan's flow chart because I think that family of maps was smaller. And so you can verify what you and I just said. But I believe that's correct.

>> CHAIR EID: Sure, could you pull that up, Ms. Schaar?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Yes, just one moment. Okay, which plans are you looking for?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: On the left side.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Date.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: The four, right there above where your cursor is. I think that is the Section.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That is 050924, version 4 and came from 050824 version 4. And then 050724 version 8. And the first was 050424 version 2.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, that is very helpful.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR EID: Next on this one could you pull up 376, the updated version of it, so 376 is 52924 version 4.

>> MR. MORGAN: 376.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: And 374?

>> CHAIR EID: Correct. And this is the family, again, that Commissioner Kellom and Muldoon were working on last week. So something a little interesting, 374 has four under the primary pool for the VRA but 376 has three. So that's something to point out. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I was just going to say the same thing. It has three for the 376 instead of four and that District 6 is very, very similar to the Linden. And the 376. Which I think is a little concerning.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Can we pull up 371?

>> MR. MORGAN: 371.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, I just wanted to see what this one looks like. I think the other iterations varied between 10 and 8, that is what I remember so I was looking at that.

>> CHAIR EID: So I think what we are looking now is between 374 and 376. Right? One was a more updated version of it. But scores a little bit less on one metric. I'm not sure how it scores on the other metrics. Do you think they are different enough to both get a different Robin name? Or do you want just one of them to have one? To me it seems like 374, since that scores four, you probably want to do that. But if you want to do both, that is cool too. Let me check the partisan fairness on both of them real quick.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Which map came first? Which one is the tweaked version of the other one? Because the northern suburbs are very different.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: The one on the right is 371. That is the one where Commissioner Muldoon and myself and I think I can't remember I think there are one or two other Commissioners that touched the one on the right. But every one after that started to cross 8 Mile and affect communities of interest in a way that I did not prefer. I'm not super crazy about six, the goal of this one, we are not defending, this is the explanation the goal on the one on the right was to create a different configuration for Detroit.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: 7 and 9 are completely flipped here.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry Commissioner Kellom this map on the right is 376. I switched it on you.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, sorry, I did not know.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: We have 374 on the left and 376 on the right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: 374 right now has four VRA districts, 376 has I couldn't hear how many districts 376 is the more updated one. Commissioner Kellom believes that I think you just said you tried to put together some different communities and actually interestingly even though it has one less VRA District as currently configured the partisan fairness numbers are better on it than on 374. I think they are different enough where they should probably each get a different name.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: The northern suburbs are nothing alike.

>> CHAIR EID: Exactly.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Either is five, look at five, Canton is put in with Van Buren Township and Sumpter.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Are you sure this is the right maps that came from the right things?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: 11 is not even close either. This is a totally different map.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I actually had when I plotted this out and I could be wrong, so I don't know. But I had 371 turned into 376 but I had 374 actually came from 351

which is an entirely different Branch. Maybe I marked that wrong but I'm not sure. If you compared 374 and 351 they might be closer.

>> CHAIR EID: You said 351?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Do you want to look at that real quick, John? I think we are following the spreadsheet, not the spread speed the flow chart that was laid out.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is 351 standalone, one window.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Can you compare that to 374?

>> MR. MORGAN: 374, okay.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yeah, that is a little closer. Yeah, I think Marcus he may have meant to pull up Kellom's map, but I think he actually pulled up Szetela's map, 351.

>> CHAIR EID: No, this is perfect actually because now we know this is based on this one and it's an updated version. So we probably don't need to look at 353 much anymore and we will stick with 374. We have 374 and 376, they are both quite different.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: What do you mean 353?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I'm confused Anthony.

>> CHAIR EID: The one on the left right now.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: We have 3, well, we should have up there right now 351 and 374.

>> CHAIR EID: Uh-huh.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: 351 was completed by Szetela. 374 was done by Marcus. I guess I want to ask him did he intend to make tweaks to a map that Szetela developed, or did he intend to make tweaks to a map he and Kellom had been working on?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I don't remember now but I believe it was one me and Kellom were working on it's based on.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I watched a video, and it was very confusing because the talk was about Kellom, but the map was not. So I think that may have just been a mistake.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: So what I was going to say is he initially was going to make changes, tweaks to the map that him and I had worked on but then decided to pull up a different map and started in on making the changes, realizing that it would have been easier on the map that him and I were working on. But then he finished there and that is how we got the one on the left.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I know I was working on one and it wasn't working out the way I had anticipated. That I remember. We have so many maps going.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Looking at the maps the changes are in the Taylor Lincoln Park area.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: And Romulus.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So the one on the right is 351 and the left is 374?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So they both have four VRA districts and both have good partisan fairness scores. So do we want to eliminate one and give another one a name?

>> CHAIR EID: 373, 51 is on the left, 374 is on the right. Okay, let's, it is time for our break. We are actually two minutes over. Let's think about this during lunch and come back and see if we can get some more going. I like that we have started. I think we are making some progress, although it is going slow. But let's break for lunch. Do we need a motion for that?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> CHAIR EID: I was asking if we even need one, it's on the agenda as a scheduled break so I'm not sure. I just want to double check.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: You do not. You have not been the rest of the week either, but I would defer to you, Chair.

>> CHAIR EID: No, if that is what we have been doing and if it's scheduled, that's fine. All right, let's come back at 1:30 folks.

[ Lunch recess until 1:30 ]

>> CHAIR EID: Hello, everyone, we are about to get started momentarily.

>> KIM BRACE: Anthony?

>> CHAIR EID: Yes.

>> KIM BRACE: I got my microphone fixed so that works now and John and I talked, and he has the files that have the blue and green maps for all of them. And so he will be able to show those to help out you guys. And particularly there is a couple of them that have the purple box around the label, if you remember, that was kind of unique. And that may be something to help out. You figure out what you've got.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you.

>> KIM BRACE: Yep.

>> CHAIR EID: So welcome back, everyone. Department of State, do we need a roll call?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Yes, sir. Are you ready for me to roll call? You need to call the meeting back to order whatever time it is.

>> CHAIR EID: I will recall the meeting of the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:35 p.m. I will turn it to Department of State of state to do a roll call of Commissioners present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you, sir. Good afternoon Commissioners. This is a continuation from this morning's meeting, so if your physical location has changed,

please share that when I call your name. Otherwise say present when I call your name for a roll call. I will begin alphabetically with Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner? Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I do see that Commissioner Lett's camera is on so when he comes back in, I will catch him then, there Chair, but currently you have 11 Commissioners present and means you have a quorum sir.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Ms. Young, appreciate it as always.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: During the break I figured a little bit of this out at least for a few of a few of the mapping families. Mr. Morgan, are you still with us?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Where we got confused that we pulled in 374, which is a derivative of 351. That is different than what we were supposed to be looking at. So my mistake there. Let's look at 371 and 376 side by side. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Since we looked at 374 and 351 can we make a decision on naming those?

>> CHAIR EID: I was going to do that next, if you want to do that first that is fine. Do you have any of them up already Mr. Morgan? What is easier for you?

>> MR. MORGAN: I was trying to adjust to what you were asking. So just tell me what you want me to bring up. Do you have any of them open right now?

>> MR. MORGAN: 344 and 377, 376, 374.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay pull up 374.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: And let's pull up 351 which it was derived from. We have 351 which is 429 version 2. And we have 374 which is 59 version 2. These both have a four on the VRA chart and both have the same partisan fairness numbers as well. It looks to me that the only real difference is in districts 4 and 5.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Lincoln Park, isn't that different or something?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR EID: So I believe 374 was the more updated version of this but is there metrically they are the same, so I wonder if there is a preference so want to go with 374 since it's the most updated one?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would actually say just name them both.

>> CHAIR EID: They are pretty close to each other. Do we want both?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I think people especially the Asian Pacific population in Canton is probably going to have some opinions about which one of these is preferred. So I would not want to eliminate one or the other.

>> CHAIR EID:

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Same name version one, version two like we were talking about?

>> CHAIR EID: Do we think they are close enough to have the same verse and have it be version one and version two. They are based off each other. That would make sense to me.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Commissioner Muldoon, do you have an opinion?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: That is what I was saying.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, all right, so let's do that. We will do 351 is the version one since it came first and 374 as the version two since it was a revision. Now we just need a bird. How about Raven?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: That's awfully negative, Anthony. Starling, Sparrow.

>> CHAIR EID: Starling, that works for me. So just so we are clear for the Department of State, we have 351 as Starling-V1 and 374 as Starling-V2.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Noted, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay let's go ahead and close those. Now let's head back to 371 and 376. So these are derivatives of each other. What is interesting here is even though they look pretty much the same, the one on the left, 371 has a 4 for the VRA analysis while somehow the one on the right is only scored at a three. And this was the one that Commissioners Kellom and Muldoon were working on together. So I think we should go

ahead and name 371 in the entire. They both are the same under the VRA analysis.

Could you highlight the differences between the two, John?

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Excuse me, please, just want to acknowledge that Commissioner Lett has joined back with us. So you now have 12 Commissioners present.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.

>> MR. MORGAN: I don't know that the maps are different. I think I may want to look at the Autobound.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, I think it's an area in Lincoln Park. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was going to say, yes, it's District 1 that makes a slight difference and the preference would be to name 371.

>> MR. MORGAN: So you said it's, let me just get this right, 58 version 4. 59 version 4.

These are data points for 58 version 4. And the other one was 59 version 4.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's District 1 that is making the difference.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, that small change in one makes the difference there. How about that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Let me see that. So this is so the one on the left, version four, okay, for 58 for District 1, 6230, 6029. Okay and then going back to the map and that was 371.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, 371.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and then the other one was 376?

>> CHAIR EID: Correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think there may be something not quite right with this because if you look at the two maps they look like they are very similar, right? Are we saying the only visual difference is Lincoln Park?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the data shows that District 1 in the version four more May 8 is 62 Black 30 white in the primary. And the other version is 4248 for District one. So I'm just not sure that the data is matching it.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, well and both of these are very good on the VRA analysis. I'm sorry, on the partisan fairness analysis. So we can tell that they come from the same family. You said you prefer 371?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Correct.

>> CHAIR EID: So how about we use hummingbird for this.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLUM: That is what I was going to pick. Hummingbird is a nice little bird.

>> CHAIR EID: Hummingbird version 1 for 371 and version 2.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLUM: No, I think it should have a different name. I know it's the same family but if you start that I'm just going to try to rally for the public for some distinction.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I wouldn't even put in 376 at all. I mean, it doesn't.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLUM: I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's going to add another map that doesn't need to be in there.

>> CHAIR EID: So 371, hummingbird. Thank you, Commissioners. Okay we are still going through the ones that have four on the VRA analysis. I know you are doing a lot, John. When you get a moment can you pull up 373.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure and again I just want to say I think there is something not matching between the data and the maps you're looking at.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, we will have to figure that out.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: Over the weekend.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right so what map again, please?

>> CHAIR EID: 373. So this is 5924 version one. Okay and this is the one that tried to approximate the Motown Sound House Districts into the Senate districts as a four on the VRA and close to 0 on the partisan fairness analysis. And it was edited last by Commissioner Lett who made the changes to Romulus and Sumpter, Van Buren and districts four and five there. Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes I will lower my hand. I made my point earlier. The problem may be with map 376 so we will have to look at the data. So I'm just flagging that. I think 376 is the one that might be off. So 373 is here.

>> CHAIR EID: You might also want to check 371. But 376, okay, right now we are looking at 373, right, and again it's the one that approximated the Motown Sound districts into Senate districts. I believe it's the only one of this family. So let's go with cardinal for this. That brings us to 362 and 350.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want them one by one?

>> CHAIR EID: You can put them side by side.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

So 350 is the earlier version?

>> CHAIR EID: Yes, and that is 429 version one.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and the second one, please.

>> CHAIR EID: 362. That is 57 version let me just double check to make sure I have that right.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Version 4, version 4, yeah.



>> MR. MORGAN: So 350 and 362.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes. These are both on the VRA analysis. And they score the same on the partisan fairness analysis. Well, some of the numbers are the same. Some are a little different actually on partisan fairness between the two.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would name 362 and not 350.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah so 362 is the updated version, right.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Looking at it side by side just for clarity. We can point out the differences.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Roseville was moved in 11, Franklin in 13 instead of the Southfield Township. Harper Woods was added to ten. There was some adjustments to the line between five and ten. And then the top precincts for Morin were put into 11. So it's just adjusting for community of interest lines basically. So I just named 362 and 350. I don't think we need to alternately name because except for a few line adjustments it's the same map.

>> CHAIR EID: And it's an update. Anyone have an issue with that?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No, but I would like to name it the swift if we could.

>> CHAIR EID: Sure, 362 equals swift.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: My only concern with not naming 350 is we did have a lot of people say they liked 350 but hopefully they realize 362 is basically the same plan with just some minor adjustments.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, I think with 350, what I heard at least, is a lot of people liked that Dearborn District and we put that in a lot of the other maps. So hopefully as you said folks see that, it's the same configuration, more or less. Okay so that brings us to 5724 version 5, which is 361. So this one is the same as swift except for that District 11 and 12 configuration. Do you want to put them side by side just to make sure about that? I'm sorry, I know you just closed the last one.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry, 361 and what was the other one?

>> CHAIR EID: 362.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, 361 and 362.

>> CHAIR EID: So this is a four on the VRA analysis. Let me just double check that and on the partisan fairness analysis, it is in line with many of the other maps. Not being the lowest or the highest. So do we want this to have a different name or since it's built off swift do we want the changes in 11 and 12, do we want to do a swift V2?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm honestly not a fan of V2 and I think it's more confusing for the public, but it's up to you. We already have a V2 for one of the other ones.

>> CHAIR EID: I do think it helps show progression and that is something we keep hearing, folks want to know, and we heard starting it with the same name. I don't feel strongly either way to be honest. But I do think it helps to show just like what the base

was and what it was, you know, what it became. Is that the only difference between these? 11 and 12? Because 13 is the same and goes a little bit into the Southfield area. Nine looks the same. Eight looks the same. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think for us it kind of helps to have the V2 because then we can realize there is just a slight difference, and we can quickly pinpoint the difference. But and I don't know I guess we can just explain that to the public.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: This does have the changes from the swift, what you are going to call one so if you look at Southfield Township, you can see that they are the same, that was one of the changes so, yeah, I think it's really 11 and 12 that are changed.

>> CHAIR EID: Let's go with swift V2 then if that is all right with everybody else.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: You are on plan 361 do you want that to be version one because it came before the prior one? You just did 362.

>> MR. MORGAN: But 362 is actually before 361 because it's I believe the version four is 361 and version five is 36, sorry, 361 is 362 is version 4. 361 is version 5. They are probably just uploaded out of order.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: We are working on 361 right now which would be the later version, the version five that is what I was trying to indicate.

>> MR. MORGAN: Right.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I need to know for the record which one do you want to be version one, and which one do you want to be version two?

>> CHAIR EID: So 362 is version one. 361 is version two.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Shaw.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay I think we have just one more that score four under the partisan fairness under the VRA analysis and that is version two from that day, 5-7. So that is 364. So I think this one is quite similar to the one that we called Robin, 377 earlier. Can we pull those up? Together? Okay but there are some differences here in like the Farmington Hills area and the Detroit area. Never mind, they are not as similar as I thought. Any thoughts on this one Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So this is the one I mentioned earlier. This is closest to 344 which is the April 24th version 4 version. The partisan fairness on this is not great but I would still put it out there because it has different configurations and keeps the District 7 so I would recommend naming this one but not naming 344.

>> CHAIR EID: 344 is 424 version 4?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, wonderful so that takes out one more. Okay.

Anybody birds? Any ideas?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: How about dove.

>> CHAIR EID: Dove works.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: So which one is getting dove?

>> CHAIR EID: 364. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: You said that was the last one. But I don't think that that was the fullest. Wasn't that just what was on the PowerPoint?

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, so there are more updated ones that we have done this week. But I don't have that information right now. Does -- and that is only for the four. We have a few that are a three that I think we should look at as well to see if we can edit them further. But does anyone have the ones with the updates from earlier today? Or that we have done earlier this week? Mr. Morgan?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair?

>> CHAIR EID: Go ahead, let's go with Ms. Schaar first.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Plan 385, which is 51524 version 2, if you are looking at the ones that scored a four on the primary turnout that would be one of them. And then the one I just don't have noted a decision on that you guys discussed was did you talk about plan 349, which was 42524 version 7? I have that noted as a four as well. But I don't recall if you made a decision on it.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: We didn't, and I was going to raise that one up.

>> CHAIR EID: I see, that is the only one we haven't yet. Okay, let's pull that one up first and then.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, let me do this, so the ones from the 15th, yesterday, we don't have those PDF maps, but I have the VRA maps, which can confirm, you know, whether they are three or four. For example, this is 384 and you can see there are three districts. And I can also pull up the spreadsheet and I can open it in Autobound. Or I can open it from website, not those PDF ones.

>> CHAIR EID: That is useful. We will be able to tell just by the green and blue.

>> MR. MORGAN: Correct.

>> CHAIR EID: Right, okay.

Ms. Schaar?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I was just going to say based on the PowerPoint previously that Mr. Braden presented, the only one from the 15th that was a collaborative map would have been that 385.

>> CHAIR EID: Gotcha. Thank you for that.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the 385. Four districts for 385. And then.

>> CHAIR EID: It's the one that Commissioner Orton was working on yesterday.

>> MR. MORGAN: And then we can, yeah, we don't have the easy map, but I can bring it up on the Autobound.

>> CHAIR EID: First things first let's look at that last one that was in the PowerPoint 42524 version 7. Is it 349?

>> CHAIR EID: That is a good question. Let's see.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It is.

>> CHAIR EID: Yep, 349.

>> MR. MORGAN: This will be 349.

>> CHAIR EID: So I feel like this is pretty similar to one of the other ones that were made after.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So it is except around 6 and 5 and 13. So Farmington is separate, separate is split a little bit in this one. In the swifts Farmington was put up into 13. And Farmington Hills was put into 13. And then six extended further down. So it's a different configuration and Northville was also put into six in the swift whereas here it's put in with 13. So it's primarily changes on that western suburb edge.

>> CHAIR EID: The western edge, correct, Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay does anyone want this to have a name or what are we thinking?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would name it Sparrow.

>> CHAIR EID: 349 is Sparrow. Okay, can we look at the one that Ms. Schaar was just speaking about from yesterday's meeting, 385?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this is the VRA map for 385.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay so that Pontiac to Southfield District becomes one here. And I believe this was the one Commissioner Orton tried to keep Commissioner Curry's downtown configuration but put back in that 7 and this one right here, it's a few districts above this area because of that, correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: That's right and this is Farmington Hills and Livonia and Farmington are together in this District 8. And then I can bring up the Autobound version of that. So that was this one, I think. There we go it has the configuration of Detroit that you described of the four districts in Detroit. You have Canton here. Farmington, Livonia, 13, 7, 10, 11, 12 is the same as the Linden 12.

>> CHAIR EID: Do we have so this is four on the VRA analysis. Was this included in the partisan fairness analysis?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: It was. I can provide you those numbers if you would like, Chair.

>> CHAIR EID: Because I know there are a few we did yesterday that weren't quite so hot in that department. But I see this one is in line with the other numbers is what I'm seeing. Ms. Schaar, could you just read off those numbers to make sure?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. The lopsided margin is 5.1%. The mean median is 2.9%. The efficiency gap is 1.8%. And the seats to votes ratio is 21 to 18 with 2.4% to the democrats.

>> CHAIR EID: Cool, okay, this is a pretty unique configuration. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, could we name this one crane?

>> CHAIR EID: Crane it is. Okay that covers all of the ones that scored four for the VRA analysis. There are a few configurations that scored three that do it particularly well on other metrics I would like to look at as well. When we do some mapping on Monday and Tuesday we can try to see if we can edit to get them up to four. And I'd like to start with map 379.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to look at the website PDF first?

>> CHAIR EID: That is fine.

>> MR. MORGAN: And also these are all the collaborative maps that scored four; is that correct?

>> CHAIR EID: Yes, the collaborative maps.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, all right, so from the website, what was the number again, please?

>> CHAIR EID: 379.

>> MR. MORGAN: 379.

>> CHAIR EID: This is the one I brought up at the start of my turn yesterday asking if anybody had any changes. Do you have the green and blue districts for this one by chance?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Let's just look at that real quick.

>> MR. MORGAN: So as Kim Brace was saying sometimes there will be a purple square around it. And I will just go over these since this is the first time we actually looked at one this detail. So the coloration is just "Yes" or "No" on this metric. Let me bring up the correct one. So we don't have the map number, so I need the 379 is 09 version 8. 09 version 8. 09 version 8. And I don't know if you have the spreadsheets, but we have to go to the Wayne, Oakland Macomb tab here to get the full picture. So the districts at the top generally are the ones that are going to score as performing. So you can see that there are three districts that have yes. And the reason they are rated yes is because the Black and Black turnout is greater than the white turnout in two primaries so that is what gets you the yes. And then the primary pool is what's on the map. So the numbers here are going to be, let's see District 3, 8 and 1. So three is 75. 8 is 55 and one is 56. So 3, 75, that's not the right one. 3 is 75. 8 is 55. And 1 is 56 so the numbers are from the democrat primary pool, but the coloration is going to be from the primary turnout from two election cycles, 2018 and 2022. All right so just to review that. So if you look at the spreadsheet you will have more information about other districts. If you want to look and see which ones are close, for example, this District 7, is 49% Black turnout over 48% white turnout in 2018. But not in 2022. It's 45-52 and the primary pool is 29 Black democrat to 42 white democrat. So those are the underlying metrics. And then I will go back to the map. So that is the map. And then I can pull up back to the website version here. 370.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, well, this is that latest District of the three-figure configuration where one wraps around Dearborn with Highland park and Hamtramck together with Central Detroit. And 8 is east, more east side centric but does go up into Centerline and Warren and Sterling Heights with Troy and Madison Heights. Yeah, I think this is different enough to have a name. I cannot think of any birds at this time. Anyone want to volunteer one?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Finch.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Hawk.

>> CHAIR EID: I think I heard Finch. Finch it is. And then the other one that I asked you folks if there were any changes on yesterday was map 378, 5924 version 6.

>> MR. MORGAN: So starting out this is the website map?

>> CHAIR EID: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: And then let me know if you want the VRA map or the data.

>> CHAIR EID: No, this one also was three in the VRA. The partisan fairness numbers are pretty close to 0 though and I'd like to see how the community reacts to it. This was the one that I think Commissioner Weiss had drawn that District 3, that instead of just being the east side and the District 8 taking up, going all the way down to the river instead of a little bit more northern Detroit while as District 3 takes a little bit of the areas east of Woodward up into Warren but not quite as far. And as Troy and Sterling Heights being with Warren instead of Madison Heights.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I propose we call it the blue Jay.

>> CHAIR EID: Blue Jay. Okay any other three VRA District configurations anyone would like to see? There were quite a few yesterday based off of Commissioner Curry's downtown. I know we have one of those already reflected in crane. But is there any other ones? Okay Department of State, I just want to make sure that you got all of that for the record. How many birds do we have now?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: 12. Would you like me to go through them to make sure we are all on the same Page?

>> CHAIR EID: That would be great.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Plan 349 is Sparrow. Plan 351 is Starling version one. Plan 364 is dove. Plan 362 is swift version 1. Plan 361 is swift version two. Plan 371 is hummingbird. Plan 373 is cardinal. Plan 374 is Starling version two. Plan 377 is Robin. Plan 378 is blue Jay. Plan 379 is Finch. Plan 385 is crane.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, thank you. The one from, I got one more, the one from yesterday that I was trying we were trying to get population on right at the end, did that make it into the analysis? That is, I will pull it up, sorry.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: It did.

>> MR. MORGAN: It did, yep.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That is plan 390.

>> CHAIR EID: 390. Can you open that up real quick? The PDF?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes and no, I have the VRA-PDF first which is accessible.

>> CHAIR EID: Sure.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 7 was out of population alignment?

>> CHAIR EID: Uh-huh. What about the partisan fairness for this one?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, 390.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I can go through those if you would like.

>> CHAIR EID: That would be great, Ms. Schaar if you could. Lopsided margin is 6.3%. Mean median is 3.4%. Efficiency gap is 4.5%. And seats to vote is 20 to 18 with a negative .2% to the democrats.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, so this is one of the ones that Dr. Handley pointed out. She didn't say it was problematic per se. But she said it was less fair than some of the other ones, but we are still tinkering at it. Yesterday I think we were just trying to get population. So does anyone think this one should have a name while we work on it further? Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would say, no, because we already have 12 decent maps and if there are aspects of this you want to incorporate in another map it would be easier than trying to fix this one that is so far kind of off the mark.

>> CHAIR EID: Hum. Any other thoughts? I mean, I do think we can do something with 1, 3 and 8 there. It's an interesting configuration. And we're not done with it yet. But I guess we don't need to give it, we don't need to give it a name right now, but it does still need to be worked on. And maybe when we work on it a little bit more we can then give it a name. So Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I was going to say you could also work on it and submit it as an individual map as well.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, I'm not going to be submitting an individual map. That is I don't like doing those personally. But and I think this one was, this one was the one we were all trying to do together that was collaborative, right? It has that six from Livonia up to Farmington and started that at the Wayne State meeting and we have kind of been working at it ever since. So it's not really an individual. Anyone else? Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I pressed the wrong button. I was just going to say that I think it could be worth working on as a group. Or I'm still willing to work on this map to see where we can get it. But, you know, that's just my personal opinion. I happen to agree with you, Commissioner Eid, that I think there is something worth tweaking especially since we know the direction we are going on. We literally weren't able to finish it and we got some preliminary data on it by getting it in yesterday.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm just wondering was there a certain point of this map? Was there something that you really liked in it? Or wanted to do in it? Because I don't remember.

>> CHAIR EID: So this is the one that we, I think Commissioner Vallette started it and y'all were working together a little bit to create like the stacks, if you recall, from that meeting we had at the end of the day, at the Wayne State meeting. And that turned into District 6. And then it kept that Redford Detroit configuration for three that we saw in Commissioner Curry's map. And then from there we were working on one and eight and ten. I think ten is the one that probably needs to change on it. But I think this was the attempt to make that kind of stacked configuration that we heard from the public.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yeah, that's correct, and it takes some of the other districts rather than it wraps, so like the Farmington, thank you, John, Farmington, Livonia area, it kind of creates, not kind of but creates, yeah, a different configuration for the Metro Detroit area. So that was the point of this, it takes in directly some feedback we were getting during the meeting at Wayne State, as well as some public comment that we've been getting in my opinion it combines a lot of things we have heard regarding the suburbs, regarding communities of interest, regarding the Detroit area. So that is what I will add to that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I remember that, now that I see the bottom part I remember that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I would just say it's not done. We still have more time to work on Monday; isn't that right? Or am I wrong about that? I thought we.

>> CHAIR EID: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So let's just table giving it a name for now and look at it on Monday and then there were actually several of these maps that were kind of built on the same configuration that we could probably look at at the same time. Because I know like there were multiple reiterations of using Commissioner Curry's base Detroit map and having this kind of cylindrical wrapping of Detroit from the outside. It might not be a bad idea to look at all of those on Monday.

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, let's keep in mind again we are not eliminating anything today. We are not advancing anything today. That is going to come next week. Just trying to organize our maps into ways that make sense for both us and the public. I think we have done that. This does need to be worked on. Let's just give it a name and we can continue working on it and make it, you know, V2, V3, whatever later. So any ideas? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Flamingo.

>> CHAIR EID: Is a flamingo a bird technically? I will go with it.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I was going to say what about Phoenix.

>> CHAIR EID: What do y'all want to do? I heard Flamingo first.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So Phoenix are not real so we might as well name it unicorn.



>> CHAIR EID: Does anybody have any other map they want to give a name to? I like the idea, but it does clearly need some work both on a population and partisan fairness standpoint. I hope we spend the weekend on looking at different ideas on improvements and what not. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So the two maps I worked on yesterday that were Commissioner Curry's, I would like to name both of those as well.

>> CHAIR EID: What were those numbers?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I believe, I'd have to look but I believe it's version three and four. Let me look really quick. I would recognize it if I saw them.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: 387 and 386 so, yeah, you are correct Commissioner Szetela. They were 51524 version 3 and 4.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is 386. And I can bring the, yeah, this is the quick version of that. And then the other one was 387. Which had the minimal crossings into Oakland.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So let's name 386 the hawk. And 387 the Eagle.

>> CHAIR EID: Can you put those side by side so we can just see the differences between the two?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: The difference is the Canton configuration. Canton, Northville, Novi together in one. And then Farmington, Livonia, Westland together in the other. So one has a horizontal, one has a stacked.

>> CHAIR EID: That is quite a bit different.

>> MR. MORGAN: 386 and 387. All right so 386. 387. There you go. There is your horizontal is 386 and your vertical is 387.

>> CHAIR EID: One of them has changes in districts in 11 and 12 as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Why is, just a quick question, John, why is 12 on the one on the right white, I mean, yeah, white while the one on the left is blue?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so because the sort of rule we are going with is how much is in one of the three counties versus how much is not. This has more of St. Clair than it does of Macomb or it's really close, something like that.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, hawk and Eagle?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: We went from almost, I don't know.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I have a question.

>> NATE FINK: Commissioner Kellom has a hand up.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I was looking at all the maps and wondering if we could pull up the MSU map. I wanted to see these maps with MSU next to it if that is possible. I know we probably don't have an overlay.

>> MR. MORGAN: What's the MSU map?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It was on the public comment portal. And it was also sent to the Commission.

>> MR. MORGAN: Is there a different name for that?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I mean, I could give you what's on the portal. But I didn't know if you had it on hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is that the IPPSR map?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think I've got that in Autobound somewhere.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, that would be great. I just want to look at it, that is all.

>> MR. MORGAN: It might be back a little ways. Just a second.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: We looked at this a while ago.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yeah, I want to look at it again. So to be clear there was a submission in April.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did that get uploaded or not?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm not sure if it did. The only other thing that you could possibly do is to pull it directly from the website that they have or if you have access to whatever they submitted to the Commission. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I think Commissioner Andrade requested, okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think I have it. Let's see if this is it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was going to say I think Commissioner Andrade requested to see it and we never did see it, but I think maybe you guys got ready.

>> MR. MORGAN: Wait a minute.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Well, perfect.

>> MR. MORGAN: This one is going to look really odd. It may have crashed the system. Yep, it crashed the system. Okay, the problem was this when it was imported from the portal, the geographic configuration was completely alien. So Ryan converted it. So that is around May 7th. May 7th. All right there we go. So the issue here was we had to have Ryan manually enter this from the shape file. And he was able to do that. Okay so this is the one. So this was imported from Autobound. So we got the shape file and then it didn't convert, well, it did, but it was not recognizable, and Ryan converted it. So this is the plan.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Can I look at the other maps we were looking at, hawk and Eagle next to this?

>> MR. MORGAN: Hang on.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: This is the map from MSU; is that right?

>> MR. MORGAN: I think so. It's called IPPSR.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Okay, so they just locked in. It just looked very familiar to Linden and why I'm confused but they probably locked in non-challenged districts.

>> CHAIR EID: I think they locked in 9 and 13 but they did make changes to districts 2 and 7.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then when we were drafting Commissioner Curry's map we started with Linden and exited out the Districts that had to be changed. So that could be the districts that are the same or they started the same, okay, all right. It's a little tricky but I've almost got it.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you. I appreciate it. Yeah, and I can see the.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry, in order for me to get this, can we get the bottom edge?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Ask you to do the shape file over it but this is fine. Yeah, they are really, really similar. I just wanted to.

>> MR. MORGAN: There.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Wanted to see it for the record.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so, no, wait, so this is the hawk and Eagle you wanted to look at?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, I don't think, because this was an outside map, I don't think this was uploaded to the Commission portal. It was on another portal.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Correct, yeah, when I was going through public comment, this map refreshed my memory and so then when I went on to see it, I said this looks like something identical we have been working on. So and that is why I wanted to see it side by side in the meeting. Okay so 1, 3, 8 are almost the exact same. Okay, thank you. And the surrounding suburban districts. Thank you, John. I appreciate that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I'm sorry is this being compared to Commissioner Curry's Detroit area?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Eagle and hawk I wanted to see them next to the map that was submitted from MSU. Yeah, and they are almost identical with just minor changes. But I mean that is fine, just as long as we know where maps are coming from.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I guess I don't see how they are almost identical when 7 and 9 are stacked. Instead of up and down.

>> CHAIR EID: You broke up there for a second.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I personally know I did not reference the MSU map to draw it. Yeah, I just I said 7 and 9 are stacked districts. They are not remotely similar to what is in the MSU map. So.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I could see that 10 is similar. There are other Districts that are very similar. I'm not suggesting anything. I wanted to take a look myself with Autobound, that's all.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: You suggested something and suggested it was copied from the MSU map and it was not.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I said they looked similar and want to be clear, I did not say anyone copied anything.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: You said I want to know where the map is.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, let's get it back to order. We've seen the comparison.

>> This is the interpreter speaking a friendly reminder when you talk over each other we cannot provide accommodations.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is so sad.

>> CHAIR EID: Folks it's 2:45. Mapping is now done for the day. I think we did a good job and, you know, nothing is eliminated but we did give names to I think it's now up to 15 but that is certainly better than 30 plus. I hope we all take the weekend to take a look at these options. Come on Monday, prepared with some edits if you would like to make any. And, yeah, start thinking about what you might want to advance to the courts next week. We will be taking all of the maps we advance to the Court on our next public hearing tour, taking place in July. We do have an Executive Director's report today. If there is no objection, I will turn the floor to Mr. Woods to give his report. Before that, Mr. Morgan, I do see your hand up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah I just wanted to say the EDS team has some availability if an individual Commissioner needs help with the map drawing process. I've already heard from one Commissioner, and I will try to schedule that up.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Morgan, is there any objection Commissioners for Mr. Woods' report? All right, go ahead, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Commissioner Eid and thank you members of the Commission. I want to provide you with an update so that you could consider this over the weekend regarding the virtual public hearings as well as the budget supplemental request as well.

We do have virtual public hearings coming up, that we want to promote starting next week. They take place Wednesday, May 29th and Thursday, June 6. They will take place from 10-1 and 5-7:30. This will be the time where we present the collaborative maps. Then each Commissioner presents their alternative or individual map and ask questions. So we want to kind of get that going of our marketing firms are eager to start promoting this and want to put this on the radar so we can talk about next week I will provide like an agenda or an outline so that we can have Commissioners present the collaborative maps and that each individual Commissioner can do the -- can, I'm sorry, do their own individual maps. So I'm going to make sure that that takes place. The goal is to review all the maps being considered by the Commission for the Senate remedial

plan before the June public hearings. And so therefore when people are coming they are familiar with the plan, they have an understanding of the plan, and we want to make sure that that opportunity takes place. And we want to start marketing basically a week from today. A week from today knowing that it's coming up, in two weeks we will start marketing a week from today. So just want to put this on the Commission's radar with regards to this collaborative mapping process and sharing this with the public. And we believe if we do this, they will be better informed when they come to the public hearing. So just wanted to share that.

On the second thing is the update on fiscal 24 budget supplemental. On the request was sent Friday, February 23rd. We met with Senator Anthony's office on April 8th and the state budget offices on May 1. We are told that the fiscal year 24 budget supplemental would be considered after the fiscal year 25 budget appropriation process is complete. As I shared with you earlier, we are in the fiscal year 25 budget. But that does not give us money as relates to fiscal year 24. I'm concerned because it compromises our ability to comply with the Court order and providing the Senate remedial plan by June 27th. I'm also concerned because it has an impact on the small and minority owned businesses that we use to conduct our not only our remote meetings but also our in-person meetings. So just want to raise that out to the Commission with regards to that. Because we are basically at a point right now where we are in a holding pattern because we might not be able to cover our bills knowing that we have to do public hearings in June to comply with the order. So really want to be open and transparent as to where we are. I do want to acknowledge that our attorneys are working with us in terms of getting this matter resolved. But wanted to be clear because last time, if you remember when this happened we got funded in February with regards to being included in the budget. But this is basically different and it's different because one we are under a Court order. Every day we are incurring bills that are impacting businesses. And so just want to make sure that the Commission knows what is happening behind the scenes. But if we were to continue to spend money, we would be out prior to June 1st as well. So just wanted to make sure that everyone is clear. But also want to be clear that our attorneys are working behind the scenes in terms of advancing it. But this is where we are. And even though we are an independent body we do not control the funding process.

>> CHAIR EID: Well, I think we certainly appreciate our legal team is working at it. Hopefully we get that appropriation soon. Perhaps it should be reminded to the office that it is the constitutional duty of the legislature to fund this Commission. We look forward to that.

Does that conclude your report, Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: It does unless there are any questions I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, what if we don't get funded? I mean, have we -- what is going to happen if we can't pay bills, meaning we can't hire anyone to do our public hearings and things. At what point can we not defend our maps and follow the Court order? That is a problem.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Well, I mean we are basically running the risk if we don't pay our bills Commissioner Orton of people not actually doing our public hearings because they have not been paid. I mean, that is our reality. So, you know, we will do what we can. But I mean, that is our reality, you know. I don't know if people will show up, you know, and wait, you know, that long because if the budget cycle usually ends in June for the appropriations in terms of how it works, and they look at the supplemental. You know you are looking at the end of June. I don't know if I answered your question but that is the best answer I can give you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I just think you know as an independent body, we are not very independent if we don't get the funding that we need to follow a Court order to defend maps or create new maps. I guess this is how Government works.

>> CHAIR EID: I think we certainly all hope that they are listening to this. And.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry, I was already talking, did you need something from us?

>> CHAIR EID: No.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm so sorry, I thought you were asking for mapping permission.

>> CHAIR EID: No, you are okay, thank you Mr. Morgan. Any other questions for Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

>> CHAIR EID: Are there any acknowledgments or announcements? Shout out to the staff and getting all this data together under short notice and putting it together in a way to make it easier for us to do our jobs as Commissioner is not an easy thing to do. I appreciate y'all. And I know we didn't make your jobs easier today by naming a whole bunch of maps and you folks will have to go in, you know, and add that piece of information to the data to make sure everything is in order. And I appreciate that. So thanks a lot. Are there any other announcements? Acknowledgments? Okay, with that said the items on the agenda are complete and the Commission has no further business today. A motion to adjourn is in order.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion by Commissioner Lett. I think the first second I heard was from Commissioner Muldoon. Is there any discussion on the motion, Commissioners? Seeing none we will move to vote. All those in favor of the motion to adjourn please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Any opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it, we are adjourned at 2:55 p.m. Good job everyone today. Thank you. Good-bye.

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.