

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.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Good morning. As Chairman of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:02 a.m.

This zoom webinar is live stream 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 @redistrictingMi. Our live streaming today include closed captioning. Captioning, ASL interpretation, Spanish, Arabic, and Bengali interpretation services will be provided for effective participation. Please e-mail us at redistricting@michigan.gov for additional options or details on accessing language translation services for today's meeting. People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should also contact redistricting@michigan.gov. This meeting is being recorded and will be available on our website, www.Michigan.gov/MICRC, for viewing at a later date. This meeting is also being transcribed, and those closed caption transcripts will be made available and posted on the website in addition to written public comment submissions. There is also a -- there is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting the website, which is once again www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. Members of the media who have questions should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, Executive Director of the Commission, at woodsE3@michigan.gov. For the public watching and public record, I will turn to the Department of State staff to note the commissioners present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Good morning, Commission. Please say "present" when I call your name. If you're attending remotely, please announce during roll call you are attending the meeting remotely; and unless your absence is due to military duty, announce your physical location by stating the city, township, or village and the state from which you are attending the meeting. I will call Commissioners' Names in alphabetical order, beginning with Commissioner Andrade.

>> COMMISSIONER ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER JUANITA CURRY: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I will go back to Commissioner Curry. Can you please share where you're joining remotely from, Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER JUANITA CURRY: Yes, remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER JUANITA CURRY: You're welcome.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom.

Commissioner Lange.

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

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela.

Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER JANICE VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER ERIN WAGNER: Present, attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER RICHARD WEISS: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Mr. Chair, you have 11 Commissioners present. You do have a quorum. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Ms. Young.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We'll now go to adopt the agenda. As a reminder to the public watching, you can view the agenda on www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. Are there any motions, Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: I move we adopt the agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER MARCUS MULDOON: Second.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you. We have a motion by Commissioner Lett to adopt the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Muldoon. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none, we'll go to vote. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye.

(Multiple ayes)

Any opposed, please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it. The motion is adopted. Commissioner Szetela, do you have your hand raised?

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Yeah, I just logged in so I wanted to let you know I was here.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Can you tell us where you're attending remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Yes, remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you. Without objection, I will now ask MICRC Executive Director Woods to present the purpose of today's public hearing. Is there any objection, Commissioners?

Hearing none, please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Thank you, Commissioner Eid, and welcome. We're very happy to be here at Detroit Martin Luther King High School for our public hearing, and if you can see the slide, we will go over it briefly because we really want to hear from you. I will express appreciation to Detroit Martin Luther King High School and their principal, Damian Perry. We would like to thank the assistant superintendent, Alycia Meriweather, and auxiliary assistant Eric Jenkins. Shout-out to community organization, civic leaders, and volunteers helping us throughout today.

History of the MICRC. In 2018, Michigan voters passed Proposal 2, a ballot initiative for voters and not legislators to take responsibility for nonpartisan redistricting and creating the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. Comprised of 13 randomly selected Michigan residents that include four affiliating with the Democrats, five who are unaffiliated -- we call them independents with either the Democrats or the Republicans -- and four who affiliate with the Republicans.

The MICRC is responsible for redistricting the U.S. Congressional, Michigan House, and Michigan Senate districts.

The MICRC is required by the Constitution to follow these seven ranked redistricting criteria in ranked order.

One: equal population and Voting Rights Act.

Two: geographically contiguous.

Three: reflect state's diversity and communities of interest.

Four: no disproportionate advantage to any political party.

Five: no favor or disfavor to an incumbent elected official or candidate.

Six: reflect consideration of county, city, and township boundaries.

And seven: Be reasonably compact.

The Western Michigan District Court Southeastern Division found the Commission drew maps focused on race in violation of the Fourteenth amendment, Equal Protection Clause, and disenfranchised Black voters. There was no finding regarding the Voting Rights Act. The Court ordered the Commission to reconfigure districts 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11 and not focus on race.

Why should you care about redistricting? Redistricting is YOUR chance to make sure your voice and your community's voice is heard and represented. Redistricting can keep your community together so we encourage people, hashtag, to #showupspeakup whether you come in person, remotely, or participate in the public comment portal or the mapping comment portal. It's important that you show up and speak up on behalf of yourself as well as your community.

Redistricting will help make sure your elected officials reflect your values over important issues such as health care, education, public safety, and justice.

Why we are here today. We are here today to hear directly from you regarding the six draft proposed collaborative maps and the six individual maps. In the back of the room, you will notice that we have maps that deal with the prior redistricting cycle from 2011 to 2021; the Linden map, which was used in 2022; and then the 12 proposed maps in the back.

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

We also have Ryan Taylor, who is here -- waving his hand in the back -- where if you have any minor tweak organization suggestions to the maps you can talk to Ryan and come before the Commission and share your perspective.

Number two: we want to understand what map best represents you and your Community of Interest as is or with minor tweaks. As I shared earlier, that is why Ryan is here to assist.

Number three: you can learn -- we can learn from your feedback to select the best map in compliance with the Court order and the seven-ranked redistricting criteria.

We do have some public guidelines that we expect people to follow. We have had no incident and don't expect today to be any different. Number one: You have up to three minutes to speak and can return for an additional two minutes to speak, whether you're online or in person.

Number two: you have to address the Commission as a whole and not an individual member.

Number three: any person making personal, impertinent, or slanderous remarks -- or who shall become boisterous or disruptive while addressing the Commission -- may be requested to leave the microphone.

Number four: if any person disrupts the orderly progress of a meeting or refuses to comply with applicable MICRC guidelines and rules, the Chairperson may rule that person out of order and/or order their removal from the meeting.

Number five: we want to thank you in advance for complying with these guidelines.

Last, not least, we want to encourage you again to show up, speak up. You can like or follow us on Facebook, Instagram, X -- formerly known as Twitter -- or TikTok at @redistrictingMI and can subscribe to our YouTube channel. Or as a reminder, you can make comments on the public comment portal or the mapping comment portal at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

I repeat, www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

If you want to call us, call us at 1-866-MAP-FAIR. That's 1-866-627-3247 for questions or more information. Once again, welcome to democracy for the people, by the people, as it's called with redistricting with this Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. Thank you so much. Mr. Chair, I return it back to you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Executive Director Woods. We'll now move on to the public comment portion of today's meeting. Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live or remote public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed. We will start with live public comment first, followed by remote public comment in chronological order. Just like to remind folks, we will be here until 7:00 p.m.; and as long as you're here signed up before 7:00 p.m., we will hear from you. There's also an opportunity to sign up to speak for a second time if you're not able to get all of your thoughts out during your first allotted three minutes. Currently we have two members of the public here in person who signed up to speak. The first being Valerie Kendall. Good morning, Valerie.

>> VALERIE KENDALL: Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I really appreciate this opportunity as a resident and citizen that we are able to weigh in on this redistricting.

Presently, I am the mayor of Harper Woods and was very concerned that my present senator, Kevin Hertel, would somehow be redistricted, I will be redistricted out of his district; so I am here

to say that I really support the Kellom map of redistricting because I have been involved in our community since 2012 as an elected official, and this is the first time that I have had a senator that really cared about my community and what we represent and his thoughts and he would act on. So I certainly did not want to be redistrict out of Senator Hertel's district. So that's why I am supporting the Kellom redistricting map. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Valerie. Could you let us know what district that is? You said you were in Harper Woods, right?

>> VALERIE KENDALL: I believe I'm in 10. I'm sorry, it's 11. That goes from Harper Woods, a part of Grosse Pointe Woods, the shores, and then it goes St. Clair Shores and goes all the way up and up until Macomb County. It keeps me with the Grosse Pointes, which I'm very happy to be about, but it also still carries us through Macomb County but still, it will be under Senator Hertel. And that's all I care about, really, when you get someone that really works for your community, you want to keep them, stay with them in their district. And I really appreciate that. I'm also here to speak on behalf of my club. I was the first person that said would come today. So when I get the second opportunity, I will bring up the resolution by my other club. Thank you very much, guys, for this opportunity.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for the clarification. Next up to speak is Lance Meadows.

>> LANCE MEADOWS: Good morning, Commission.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Good morning.

>> LANCE MEADOWS: I'm here on behalf of ARPI, and decisions on these maps, there's quite a few that I like, you know. I'm just hoping that you do the right thing and make the community equal. Just be fair. Just be fair with us. That's all I have to say.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you. We might have a question for you.

>> LANCE MEADOWS: Yes.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: I'm sorry, Chair, not a question. I would just ask that the public please speak up a little bit more. I don't know about any other online, but I'm having a hard time hearing, and I have my volume turned all the way up, so if they could speak directly into the microphone, that would probably help. Thank you.

>> LANCE MEADOWS: Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Commissioner Lange, could you hear the first speaker?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: The first speaker was really low also. I had my ear kind of right up to the computer. This gentleman when he, his last words before he walked away I could hear much better, so if they speak right into the microphone, I think that will help.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Gotcha. Thank you. Next up is Katrice Braxton.

>> KATRICE MEADOWS BRAXTON: Hi, my name is Katrice. How y'all doing today? How y'all doing today?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Great. How are you?

>> KATRICE MEADOWS BRAXTON: Well, I was here yesterday, and I had commented on Cardinal's map, 373; but as I looked at it more, I see it would be better if we do the map 404 and 376, Heron map, because it give more Democrats in that area -- seats 20 -- and I think by doing that would help the voters in the community to elect the candidate that understand their issues much better than any other ones. So hopefully y'all consider them two maps. And that's about it. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Katrice.

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Could you ask her to repeat the second map she said that she preferred? I know she said 404, but the number of the one after it was the one I couldn't quite catch.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I believe she said Heron, 376.

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Okay. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay, that concludes in-person public comment for now. If more folks sign up, we will resume the live in-person comments; but for now, we can move to remote public comments. We have 17 folks who have signed up to provide virtual public comment at today's meeting, the first being Dylan Linklater.

>> DYLAN LINKLATER: Hi, can you guys hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We can. Good morning.

>> DYLAN LINKLATER: Good morning. Thank you, again, for doing this and allows us to all speak. I wanted to speak also in favor of map 404. I think I currently live in Rochester, and I just think in general the map 404 does a really good job of making District 9 covered fairly, sensible approach for that. I was thinking Rochester, it creates a road corridor between Rochester, Rochester Hills, and Troy, which I think is really nice. Before I moved to Rochester, I lived in Madison Height and kind of reunites Madison Heights with Warren and think that is sensible to keep Madison Heights in Oakland County. For all of those reasons, you know, I think that map 404 is a really sensible approach and think you guys have done a great job and appreciate you guys taking the time to listen to us.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up is Ani.

>> ANI MANOLATOS: Hi, can you all hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Yes, we can. Good morning.

>> ANI MANOLATOS: Good morning. Thank you. Firstly, thank you for your hard work you're doing and thank you for the opportunity to speak. As a resident of Brownstown and down river, proposed District 4 is a strong district for down river resident to keep our community of interest together in map 404. Thank you for proposing a map with a district to keep our community of interest together. Additionally, this map, Szetela 404, is the best map that complies with partisan fairness. Please adopt this map to best reflect the original intent of what Michiganders voted for in 2018 and is your job to respect the will of the people. Don't forget the proposal that passed this

commission with 80 of 83 counties in favor. Please adopt map 404 of keeping the down river community of interest in down river as well as commitment to partisan fairness. Thank you for your hard work and thank you for the opportunity to speak with you all today.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up is James Gallant.

>> JAMES GALLANT: Hello, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We can, James. Good morning.

>> JAMES GALLANT: All righty, James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. So Chair Eid, you just violated the rules again, just what you said at the beginning. You did not say without objection by unanimous consent that you were going to assign the floor to Department of State staff to take note of the members present. Constitution clearly says the secretary will take roll and establish quorum. So you didn't really do it and you're not accepting, you're not yielding to the objections. You're just plain not doing it. So this is how you, as the MICRC collectively, can slow down to get up to speed on the Robert's Rules instructions. You can assume a main motion to approve the final maps and divide that question into 12 draft maps which you have already approved. Remember, you had no discussion after the first couple maps and then your lawyer said, you know, you might want to say something because y'all are required to have discussion after the motion. And so you started doing that and then it's just semantics. And then you just lay those 12 on the table for future debate and deliberation. Remember when Commissioner Fink said you're not in formal deliberations. Oh, this is informal. Side bar: you have backdoor deals going on. This is like the criminal enterprise. This is the RICO Act and ruling under rules you don't know what will be next, Commissioner Eid. You can face the Michigan Supreme Court while participating doing it or can correct it now. See what I mean? You would be there saying, "Oh, well, I figured it out, and I corrected it." These instructions came from Mike Brady of Legal Services for Michigan Department of State, the highest ranking legal opinion so far in this process up to the Michigan Supreme Court.

So please do the right thing here and get back to Robert's Rules, slow down, get up to speed on the actual rules, common law in America, which is Robert's Rules of Order, which you have been instructed clearly. In the transcripts. I encourage everybody in the community to go to the transcript of the first meeting and see how there was no rules until February, see? That means that you had to follow Robert's Rules 100% absolute until you decided on some special rules of procedure and you just kind of made those up on the fly, you discuss them hat the meeting, a couple of three meetings and all of a sudden change into it.

That is Marxist style communism and how it works and why Marx couldn't tell you what it would look it. That ushers in communism and things like, you know, communist China and North Korea and all that. That is what ushers that in and all of a sudden you give up your rights like you members have and look what they have done. He borrowed your votes to do these circumvent and contradict the state of being, our Constitution, semblance of order. So please correct that, you know. This is how it works in America, you know, I think you have conflated autonomy with sovereignty. You don't have sovereignty to change the common law in America,

which was motion first, second, discussion, then vote. You were instructed that. That's how Mike Brady --

(Buzzer)

-- how did he know that before you star? And I noticed that --

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next up we have Gabriela.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That person is not present. The next participant online that is present is Omar.

>> OMAR JAZAERLY: Good morning. Hello, everyone, my name is Omar Jazaerly and grew up in Troy, Michigan, currently a student at Oakland University. I grew up in an immigrant family and live in a very diverse city so for me it's important the voting power of all our diverse communities is protected including immigrant communities and communities of color. For that reason, I think the Szetela map and Heron map, maps 404 and 376, are the best maps for protecting the voices of said communities, protecting voters and different views. I lean slightly towards map 404 because I want to keep Troy and Rochester together because I have a strong connection to the city of Rochester as well because that's where I go to school and where the mosque I attend is.

As a Troy resident, I also live amongst a very large and vibrant Asian community. In keeping Asian communities together in Troy and Rochester, it's important for their voting power. Thank you for your time today, and thank you, Commission, for all your hard work and listening to our voices. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next up, do we have a Yousif here?

>> YOUSIF KAAKARLI: Yes, hello, everyone. I am Yousif, a student at Oakland University. I'm an Arab-American and Muslim-Syrian descent. It's important to me the Muslim and Arab community have their voices heard in elections. I believe Heron or Szetela maps or maps 376 and 404 do the best job of protecting the voting power of Muslim and Arab communities. For example, the Muslim community in Hamtramck and nearby areas of Detroit are kept together in both maps. Same thing with the communities in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights. That being said, if I had to pick between the two, I would choose the Heron map. Besides Troy, I spend a lot of time in Sterling Heights and have a lot of friends there. My gym is there, and my family shops there often. The Heron map include within Senate District 7 part of the east side of Troy together with the west side of Sterling Heights. This section of Troy and Sterling Heights is the same section my family and I spend a lot of time in. And I know it is common for many other families in my city and area spend a lot of time in that area, too. I appreciate the Commission for continuing to listen to all of us as we are considered citizens to work on drawing maps that protect our communities and protect democracy. Thank you for my time -- or your time. Sorry.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Yousif, for addressing the commission.

Next up we have Alex McGuire.

>> ALEX McGUIRE: Hello, can you hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We can. Good morning.

>> ALEX McGUIRE: Good morning, Commissioners. Prior to 2024, there were exactly four comments in the Michigan mapping gallery that talk about the Chaldeans in the Sterling Heights area in the State Senate context. After four public comments in all of 2021, you got 20 comments over the past two weeks from just six unique people and should strike you as at least odd but maybe a few motivated people. Then since yesterday you've gotten 60 comments in support of Cardinal, all of which feature the following talking points, oftentimes copied and pasted verbatim: "protects the Chaldean American Community of Interest."

"Protects the Lake St. Clair Community of interest by keeping Lakeshore whole." "Adheres to the standards of the Michigan and United States Constitutions."

"Scores at the top of partisan fairness measures by the MICRC to judge maps."

And many comments specifically say Heron, which happens to be the fairest map you have, should be rejected. These will be persuasive talking points if there weren't so many and so obviously copied and pasted. They definitely sound like they were written by a professional, maybe someone who has been watching you and knows how to write talking points that will get your attention and push you toward the map the writer wants. Guess whose comment hits most of these? Jamie Roe, high-ranking Republican political consultant in Macomb County whose candidates include Republican candidates on the maps you draw. It's blatantly obvious the explosion of nearly identical testimony in support of cardinal is a coordinated effort by partisan Republicans to trick you into adopting the map that favors their side and into rejecting Heron, objectively fairest. Don't fall for it.

If I still have time, I got to point out that Republican campaigner Jamie Roe said yesterday when he showed up to testify he said you should think about the Chaldean COI is being sacrificed when other COI_s_ are kept together. Honestly, no map perfectly reflects every COI. That's not possible. Every single map you draw keeps some COIs together and hurts other, so the real question should be why should one COI get so much more attention than any other? The answer is because it helps Jamie Roe's business and his political party.

Finally, we should ask why does a Republican operative like Jamie Roe likes the Cardinal map so much. You heard the answer in testimony yesterday from a different Jamie with VNP.

According to data when analyzed by VNP, in closer elections Cardinal provides a big advantage to the Republicans. Jamie Roe is smart enough to figure that out and smart enough to try to trick you about it. This is more of an instance to look at the fairness of your maps on close races using your own data so you can find out what maps will be actually be fair in a closer election.

Again, don't fall for a paid Republican operative's ham-handed attempts to rig process for his own and his party's benefit. Thank you so much for your time and appreciate all the work that you do.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Alex. We might have a question for you. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Yeah. Alex, thank you for that observation. I actually monitor the portal several times a day, and there were over 40 comments that appeared within the scope of a couple of hours. I take screen captures as they're growing, and we're now up to I think 80 from just within about 36 hours with, as you said, the same copy and text pasted language; and then I also the did the same analysis that you did where I went back through and searched our 30,000 comments to look at what was said about the Chaldean Community. I agree that there was no mention whatsoever of these three churches that are now being highlighted. I do want to point out that I was raised Catholic. I'm a confirmed Catholic and familiar with the Diocese in Metro Detroit and the Chaldean Diocese of St. Thomas the Apostle of Detroit where those three churches belong to is actually consists of nine churches, six of which in Michigan; and actually I should say southeast Michigan. There's actually six churches. So why three particular churches are being highlighted when they've never been mentioned to us before, you know, seems a little suspicious as well and just cherry-picked to kind of reject certain maps. I will also say that for some of the 80 comments that have come in within the last 36 hours --

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Point of order.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Yes, we're supposed to listen to -- I respect Commissioner Szetela's -- she puts in the work and everything. But right now we're supposed to listen to the public and not discount public comment that has come IN so I think we should stick to the point of what our job is right now. I mean no disrespect to Commissioner Szetela at all. I do note she does her research and she does it well, but I think the whole point right now is to listen to the public, ask questions if we have it, not to try to discount other public comment that can be done when we deliberate.

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: May I just conclude? My point is simply that we are paying attention, and we do notice when we receive comments like that. Thank you for bringing it to the attention of the rest of the Commissioners.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I'll just say that just because comments come in at a particular time doesn't necessarily mean anything is going on. I certainly think that churches that are located in a Sterling Heights area is indicative of a COI and I mean, you can make a lot of the points that the last speaker just brought up about a lot of comments that we have been hearing. We do appreciate the comments, and all of us are paying attention to this whole process, rest assure.

We will move on to the next speaker. Wesley Wilson.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present. The next participant who is online is Margaret.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Margaret, are you here with us today?

>> MARGARET SCHANKLER: Yes.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Good morning, Margaret.

>> MARGARET SCHANKLER: Good morning. Okay. My name is Margaret Schankler and live in Ann Arbor. I appreciate all the work you did for the first round of maps. I know it is exhausting and that's probably why so few are commenting on these revised maps. We thought we would be back here in ten years, not so quickly. I was a huge supporter of the Citizens Redistricting Ballot Measure and believe it worked as intended. In 2022, we had the most partisan fairness in districts across Michigan that we have had in decades. So that is why I am speaking today. I urge you to protect partisan fairness as much as possible. I know it's number five on the criteria but think that you can make it a priority and accomplish all of those above. In the minimal free time I have had to examine the maps, I was disappointed so many have worse partisan fairness than before and while I understand the other factors such as keeping communities intact, I don't agree partisan fairness should suffer to the extent it does in many of these maps. To cut to the chase, my number one choice is the Szetela map that scores very high on partisan fairness and seems to consider some of the public comments I have heard from communities of interest, specifically in Pontiac, provides the best chance for Black representation there, which I believe is really important. I'm really sad that the outcome of this redistricting could be that Black voters lose representation. That's just not fair. Overall, as I said, I believe the Szetela map provides the greatest map opportunity for partisan fairness and urge you to vote for it. If it somehow doesn't pass, I would be okay with Heron or Kellom. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Margaret, for addressing the Commission. Also, we are going to hear from our partisan fairness expert, Dr. Lisa Handley, around 1:30 today, so I invite you to tune in. She's going to be speaking about the memo that voters, not politicians, created and sent the Commission. I invite you to watch.

Next up we have Avery.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present. The next participant you have that is available online is Kelly.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Kelly, are you here with us today?

>> KELLY GOLDBERG: I am. Thank you. I'm glad you called on me because I didn't get an e-mail verifying that I could speak. My name is Kelly Goldberg and live in Farmington Hills. I'm speaking to you as someone who grew up in and worked in the city of Detroit for a lot of my life, and I would urge you to look at the Kellom map in large part because it preserves the voices of Detroit neighborhoods. I worked in the courts. I've worked in a hospital, and the neighborhood I grew up in, the University District, you know, is sort of what people like to think of when they think of model Detroit. My neighbors, by large part, had college degrees and were professionals it wasn't the highest income in Detroit like Sherwood Forest and Palmer Woods but were a lot of elected officials, teachers, professionals, college professors, and I worry more about the people I served when I was in court: the public, people who took the bus, people who, you know working in the court system whose families were, you know, dealing with the justice system. Having worked in different precincts during elections, those are the voices that need to be elevated. Those are the voices that as Detroit, you know, is "re-elevated" we hear constantly about the struggles of neighborhoods and long-time Detroit residents to be heard. And right now those

voices are not being heard in Lansing because -- and on a national level -- because they have lost representation.

I would urge you to look at the Kellom map and as a second choice I would say the Szetela map is a good option. There are lots of communities of interest but don't think anyone has been more disenfranchised from the voting process than the Black community, especially Black voters at the lower socioeconomic end. So that's what I came on here to say. Thank you very much.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up is Josephine.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present. The next participant you have available for virtual public comment is Kyle.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay. Kyle Stefanski, are you with us today?

>> KYLE STEFANSKI: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Good morning, Kyle. We can hear you.

>> KYLE STEFANSKI: All right, good morning. Well, thank you for allowing me to address the Commission. My name is Kyle Stefanski, resident of Warren. I appreciate the work that you're doing and I know it's not easy work but is necessary work. I want to express my support for the Szetela 404 map it is important to have partisan fairness, and this map demonstrates that. The city of Warren is except together in this map, which is important. Also, the Bangladesh Community of Interest, along the Ryan Road corridor, is kept together, which is important. This connects Madison Heights to connect with Warren, which the cities have an historic relationship with and doesn't isolate Warren from Oakwood County, which is important. I urge you to adopt the Szetela 404 map. Thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Kyle. Next up is Anthony Scannell.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay. Have any of the folks who signed up to speak the first time, have any of them reappeared?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Mr. James Gallant did -- oh, I'm sorry. You asked if anyone -- it's hard to hear on this side of the room so bear with me. It's a little echo-y. No other participant who has not yet spoken and signed up are present at this time.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right. Is there anyone who has signed up to speak a second time?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Yes, the answer to that one is Mr. James Gallant. My apologies. I will go ahead and unmute him.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: You don't need to apologize. We appreciate the work that you do. Mr. Gallant, welcome back.

>> JAMES GALLANT: Welcome. Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We can.

>> JAMES GALLANT: Oh, okay.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Good morning.

>> JAMES GALLANT: Thank you very much, James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. Well, Mr. Eid, you certainly have not been studying Robert's Rules and said you would do your best and mean you would go home at night and study these rule so you can preside properly, and what you just did was the most egregious breach I have ever seen a Chair commit. You did not answer Commissioner Lange's point of order. You let her continue and did not answer to say, is this a violation of the rules? You didn't answer that and then you turned right around and then contributed your OWN to the deliberation on your OWN behalf towards exactly what she was just pointing in point of order not to do; but you didn't call her out of order and then YOU did that and you didn't let all the other members then deliberate on that exact item that you did and hearing no objections bullied everybody. This is the peer pressure I'm talking about that leads down the road to suicide. there is a Pro Publica article I will submit to the public portal how California back in the day were fooled by this exact same thing, all of this flood by this and that and this around it, oh, just appears like your perception to certain maps are certain ways. You don't know these 80 people all of a sudden showed up and live in that community and part of the community of Interest? Probably not. This is how shenanigans happen. Slow down and look at Robert's Rules. That means you're not going home and studying these rules and what point of order you're supposed to read the written rule if there is a written rule, you should have to read it and say, "Okay, they did this."

This is the written rule. That is the answer you give, not to make it up as a sovereign society. This is a secret society you're running under our Constitution. You're going completely making it up; and I learned years ago the Chair seems to own the place like everybody thinks they appointed you Chair so you can get to make the decision on their behalf. But you're only borrowing their vote and this is absolute colluding to circumvent the Constitution.
(Buzzer.)

I believe this may cross the line to actual treason.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Mr. Gallant.

We do have somebody who signed up to speak a second time in person, Valerie Kendall. Give us a second; I don't think your mic is on. How about now?

>> VALERIE KENDALL: Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: There we go.

>> VALERIE KENDALL: Yes, I can hear myself. Good morning. Thank you so very much for this opportunity. I am representing the Grosse Pointe Democratic Club. We, as a board member, we did a resolution for, to request redistricting commission to adopt the proposed map Kellom, number 403, for the new Michigan Senate district. The reason we have done this is because all of our communities stay together and be able to, we share the library. We share school districts and will all be able to continue to do that and make the quality of life better for all of us in our community. So that is the reason that we are supporting Kellom, number 403, district map. And I thank you guys for very hard job that you guys are doing. It's the first time around. Many mistakes may have been made, but I believe the honesty and your heartfelt desire to serve the community is going to be shown forward. So thank you once again.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Valerie. Could you please send the Commission a copy of that resolution, perhaps?

>> VALERIE KENDALL: Oh, Yes. I will do. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: That would be great. Thank you. All right, it looks like that concludes the public comment for now. Once again, we will be here at Martin Luther King Junior High School off Lafayette Boulevard in the heart of Detroit -- well, a little more on the east side but will say the heart -- until 7:00 p.m. and at this time will break and come back at 11:30 and hopefully will have more comments then. Thank you.

(A break was taken.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: An update for folks. It is 11:30. However, we do not have anybody who has signed up to speak virtually, and nobody has returned -- I'm sorry. Let me rephrase that. We have nobody that has signed up to speak in person, and none of the members of the public who have signed up to speak virtually are in, either. We'll extend this break until noon, and hopefully we'll have some more folks by then.

(A break was taken.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: A little update for all those watching on Zoom. We are still waiting for more folks to come through to participate in this public hearing, but as of now we do not have anyone. We will try again at 12:20 before breaking for lunch at 12:30.

(A break was taken.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We do have one person who has signed up to speak and signed up for a second time allotment as well. Is there a Michael Davis here? While we are waiting for Michael, do we have anybody online who has come through?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: We do not have anyone that has signed up previously; however, there is an individual who has raised their hand, indicating a desire to speak. That person is Jamie Roe, if the Commission would like to allow for that.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Yes, let's have him on. Good afternoon, Mr. Roe.

>> JAMIE ROE: Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I guess this is the world we live in today. Those who work on one side of the political divide attack and vilify anyone who dares to speak up and defend their interests if they're in conflict with the other side. You wonder why you have so few people on that room today willing to offer up comments on the path forward? Just look at the vile comments directed at me, and you will find the answer. I didn't make up the rules for how this Commission operates. The people of Michigan did when they passed the amendment to our Constitution which created it. I and other citizens of this state have simply tried to abide by them. It is simply amazing that one member of this Commission is allowed to organize, work with outside groups to push their map, and joins in when a commenter personally attacks another commenter who points out her map destroys a clear community of interest in the community in which I reside. This should be a clear message of the lengths one member of this Commission will go to get her way.

If you believe one Commissioner didn't know that comment was coming and was prepared to join in, I have a bridge to sell you. That display was shameful. Also to vilify Michigan resident

who provide online comments is simply disgusting. This Commission has done some solid work in building and create maps that well represent all the diversity of our state and meets all of the partisan fairness standards created by this Commission. The Cardinal map IS such a map.

When those facts are pointed out, the other side attempts to move the goal posts and personally attack anyone who tears to point opt those facts. They also change the opinion of a woman today earlier in this session. It's reprehensible and nothing more than an attempt for one member to force her judgment over yours; to bully her to your side. Let's face it: it isn't the first time. I love this state, and I love my community. That's why I have tried to make my voice heard. I also live in an unconstitutional district, and I have put my faith and trust in the idea this Commission will do the right thing.

Look past the theatrics and personal attacks and focus on the facts. I thank the members of this Commission for your diligent work.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: thank you, Mr. Roe. I believe we do have a question from Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Yeah, I actually don't have a question. I just want to respond to that since I am being vilified, which is, I think, a violation of our ground rules --

>> JAMIE ROE: Welcome to --

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: I, at no point, have worked with anyone on the outside to promote my map or any map, period, so that's simply not true.

Secondly, I didn't say anything about pleasure roe whatsoever -- Mr. Roe somewhat so far. Alex McGuire suggested that. I personally don't know who is behind the comments that were made about the Chaldean Community but is some very strong similarities and some cut-and-pasting. There's nothing wrong with that. It's allowed but didn't suggest Mr. Roe was behind and personally don't think he was behind it, personally. I just want to make that clear in no way, shape, or form implicated Mr. Roe in any way, shape, or form. That was actually Mr. McGuire. To the extent that is what happened, I don't think we should have one commenter attacking another commenter; but yeah, I mean, I have not worked with anyone on promoting my map or any map and am not on one side or the other, and I have nothing negative to say about Mr. Roe whatsoever. He is welcome to advocate as he has done in the past for the Lakeshore Community and now advocating for the Chaldean Community. That's perfectly fine. However, we to sometimes receive these bulk call-to-action and appears those appear what those comments are. That was merely my point.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Roe, for your comments. We appreciate it.

We will now return to in-person. Do we have Mr. Davis here? Yes, please approach. Good afternoon. How you doing?

>> MICHAEL DAVIS: Good afternoon. Thank you. This is impromptu and will be quick. I want to, one, thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission and thank you for the work that you are doing that you are undertaking. Again, Promote the Vote is a coalition of statewide organizations that we've worked to watch all of the maps you have put together. You have

worked with own of our partners to either staff tables in helping put those things together so between APRI, Vote Michigan, ACCESS or DCHC. There's also the NAACP, ACLU of Michigan, League of Women Voters of Michigan are our three core partners. League of Women Voters specifically brought the lawsuit that challenged the partisan fairness on our maps, I believe, in 2019.

So as we are going through this process, I just want to clarify that, you know, my job with our coalition and our partners is to try to take the information that you all are putting out there and try to help distill it to make it accessible for them so that all of their communities and the folks that we work with can make the best decisions about these maps.

That is what our scorecard did in terms of using our composite in looking at the performance of Michigan. Those scorecards and those grades and metrics were produced to help people kind of weed through, you know, first level check to look at what maps were still there that were meeting the most criteria and, you know, clearly keeping together, respecting those communities of interest. So I wanted to make that clear that our scorecards were an attempt to make the information more accessible for our partners. Thank you for, you know, providing the information that you all have provided about your maps. I am in favor, unfortunately -- I don't know what happened while I was out in the hall -- but I do think that Commissioner Szetela's map -- had the bad timing to walk back in on -- Commissioner Szetela did a great job of looking at communities of interest, sitting, listening, and reflecting those into her map along with the other criteria. That map, along with the Heron map, perform the best by our metrics. I hope that more people will show up and folks will continue to give their input about why the maps are the best for their particular communities, right? I'm looking at this from a holistic sense, but looking forward to more people coming to give you more feedback as you continue down this process, whittling, narrowing down to which maps are the best. So thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Thank you for addressing the Commission. We do have our partisan fairness expert, Dr. Lisa Handley, with us after lunch around 1:30 and will talk about partisan fairness numbers, more so on the metrics that VNP put out, which I understand is a little different than the metrics Promote the Vote put out. That's kind of where we invite all to come and comment on our maps, of course; but when the metrics differ, it gets confusing. We'll hear from her about that and invite you to either stick around until then or watch online for that presentation. Thank you.

All right. Department of State, are there any nor folks online that have joined us?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: There are not at this time.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, well, it is 12:30, Commissioners. Can I get a motion to go to lunch, 12:30 to 1:30? I have a motion by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Weiss. Thank you. Is there any discussion on the motion?

All right. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye.

(Multiple ayes)

Any opposed, please raise your hand and say nay.

All right, we will return at 1:30.

(Recess for lunch.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, everyone, we're about to get started. As Chairman of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:35 p.m. Department of State, for people watching on the public record, if we could please get a roll call.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. Commissioners, when I call your name, please say "present." If your physical venue or location has changed since this morning's meeting, when I call your name, please share that venue or location. I will begin alphabetically with Commissioner Andrade.

>> COMMISSIONER ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER JUANITA CURRY: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom. Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett.

Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela.

>> Commissioner Rebecca Szetela: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER JANICE VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner.

Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER RICHARD WEISS: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: And I'm going to go back to Commissioner Lett.

Thank you, sir. Mr. Chair, you have 11 Commissioners present. You do have a quorum.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Department of State.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: At this time, we do not have anyone else who has signed up to provide public comment to the Commission. I do see some folks looking at maps, though, so I invite you to sign up to provide your comments whenever you're ready. We have a bunch of maps here today. The two all the way to my left -- your right -- are some of the old maps. You have the one created at the end all the way to your right, the one created by the state legislature during the 2010 Census cycle. Next to that you have the Linden map that the

Commission created a few years ago, and the rest of the 12 maps are what we are here to decide between. So please take a look at all of them and let us know what you like and don't like, and we'll take it from there.

We will be here until 7:00 p.m. today if anybody watching, anyone from the city of Detroit especially, would like to come provide comment. We will be here at Martin Luther King High School until 7:00 p.m.

Next on the agenda are items for consideration. We do have with us Dr. Lisa Handley and members from our legal team here to discuss some partisan fairness metrics. If there is no objection, we will move on to that and hear from Dr. Lisa Handley. Is there any objection, commissioners?

Hearing none, we will proceed. I see we do have Dr. Handley and Mr. Riley here on screen with us on the Zoom. Welcome to both of you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Thank you. It's good to be here. I have been asked by your executive director to comment on a reports or memo done by Voters not Politicians, and in typical political science fashion have created a PowerPoint and I'm probably going to go into more detail than you wish; but I'd like to take about 12 or 20 minutes and go through my comments about this memo, if that is agreeable. I would need to be able to share my screen.

Yes, looks like I can. Okay, can you see my screen?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We can. Can those online see it? Commissioners joining us virtually --

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: I can see it, yes.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Commissioner Lange. I think we're good.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay, so the Voters Not Politicians produced a memo in which they urge you to look at four competitive elections, four very closer elections rather than look at the composite score as a whole.

Now, the first thing I did was had the calculations checked, and those are all correct. We came up with the same scores over the same measures as the Voters Not Politicians did come up with. The focus on the closer elections, given that the State Senate contests appear to be close, makes some sense; but I believe that this has some unintended consequences.

For a point of comparison, the EDS, or what is referred to in this memo as the MICRC Composite Index, is created using all 16 elections, all 16 statewide elections, beginning in 2022 - 2012 -- and going through 2022.

The Voters Not Politicians chose the four most competitive or the closest elections, and they focused on those elections and their composite score, average scores, based on only those four elections.

So what happens is that the mean/median different scores are slightly different and a little over half of the cases, what it means is all of the plans favor Republicans with one exception, and that is in blue, the Heron, according to the MICRC composite index; and the VNP index, the Voters Not Politicians index.

Slightly more than half are actually lower for Republicans. They still favor Republicans but is slightly lower for Republicans using the VNP index.

However, in terms of the efficiency gap, every single contest -- I'm sorry -- every single plan has an efficiency gap that favors Republicans more when you use the VNP Aggregate Index compared to the MICRC Index.

In terms of the lopsided margins, on the other hand, what you find is that the VNP Index will again all of the plans favor Republicans, but the packing of the districts, the lopsided wins for Democrats, is lower in all or maybe all but one, in 10 of the 12 plans, according to the VNP aggregate scores.

So why is this? Why the difference?

Well, first of all, setting the goal at 3% produced a small, less-than-representative set of elections. What you had is three out of four elections were won by Democrats by small margin. Another was won by a Republican by a small margin. What you left out of that was 12 elections that were not incorporated. Nine of those were won by Democrats by more than 3%, and only three were won by Republicans by more than 3%.

What that means is by focusing on these closer elections you create -- and leaving out these elections in which Democrats won by MORE -- you're creating it look more Republican with the VNP Aggregate Index than with the EDS Index. That's essentially what's happened. And this, what more Republican electorate produces is a reduction in the number of wasted votes, wasted Republican votes. That's why you see the efficiency gap increase being more favorable to Republicans with lopsided margin scores are more favorable to Democrats because they produce less heavily Democratic districts. Again, it's because selecting the contests that they did meant that the electorate, they anticipated an electorate that is more Republican than what would happen if you looked at all 16.

Some additional reasons for the differences. First of all, three of the four elections, or 75% of the elections they chose, were in presidential years when the turnout is higher. That's compared to years in which the state senate elections occur. The EDS Composite Index, 50% of the contests are in non-presidential, and 50% are in presidential.

Here, we have 75% of contests in presidential elections.

Another reason is that two of the four elections occurred in 2020 so 2020 makes up 50% of the composite index. What the EDS Composite Index does is it, regardless of how many elections were in, it weighs by year. So the fact there's four elections in one year and one election in another doesn't mean that the year in which there were four elections counts four times more in the composite score. Each year counts the same. Here, you've got 50% of the aggregate score taken up by a 2020 contest, which there wasn't a year in which there was a state senate election. When you weight by the three years that are included in the Voters Not Politicians Aggregate Index, you see the scores are lower with an efficiency gap of almost slightly higher than the mean/median difference. It does make a difference these election contests were not weighted by year.

The other thing I want to show is that when you, there is a lot of volatility in these. When you look at separate elections, you can see that there is a big difference. This is efficiency gap for two elections both occurring in 2020. We're talking about the same plans, the same year, the same measures but decidedly different scores, depending on whether you're looking at the 2020 Presidential race or the 2020 U.S. Senate race.

So that is why the composite scores are better pictures overall because if you just focus on one or two contests, there's a lot of volatility, and you're not really sure the next election is going to replicate that. You know, which contest it's going to look most like.

Okay. This compares the mean/median difference that the previous slide looked at the efficiency gap in terms of the mean/median difference. Again, U.S. Senate race, which Democrats won by a smaller margin, you can see the mean/median difference is usually larger -- again, particularly larger when we're focusing on the efficiency.

Okay, so what does this mean overall? Well, despite the differences, actually, when you look at the efficiency gap and the mean/median difference and you rank the plans by those two components, you will see that actually the same, five of the same six plans turn out to be in most -- the lowest scoring. That is the fairest plans, albeit in slightly different order. The point is it doesn't actually make that much difference, number one.

Number two, the difference in scores aren't that dramatic when you compare this to what scores look like nationally. This was from The Washington Post. It looks like at plans in 41 states and can see that you've got scores that are much greater than the scores that we're talking about here. Here's some examples of some high scores under terms of the efficiency gap. You have North Carolina coming in at 25%. We're talking here about the highest maybe 4% or 5% or even 6%. And then in terms of the mean/median scores, we can see, again, that high scores are floating around, 12 -- we don't have scores anywhere near that high.

And finally, I just want to remind you that Voters Not Politicians are only looking at partisan fairness. You have to balance a set of redistricting criteria, and those criteria include some criteria that actually have a higher priority. You can't base it on partisan fairness alone.

Okay. That's my quick take on this. Any questions?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I have a couple of questions, Dr. Handley.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Good.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: And thank you for the presentation. I'm trying to wrap my thoughts around it.

I notice that the close years that the memo chooses are not years where Senate elections take place. Is that correct?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct for three of the four years. Attorney General 2018 election was in the Senate election year.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay, so one out of the four was; three out of the four was not. Would it make sense for us, as a Commission, when I evaluate these Senate maps - to look at the years where Senate elections take place instead of the composite that has the 12-

year history of election data in it; or would you recommend just sticking with the composite? Like which data source is the best source? I guess that's my main question.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I would say that depends on whether you believe the electorates, again, the Voters Not Politicians is generating an electorate that is more Republican than the composite index produced by EDS is predicting. I mean, that is essentially the difference between the two. I don't know Michigan politics well enough. I mean, it looks like it's trending Democrat, but that's because you had a lot of incumbent Democrats running in 2022, so I really don't know the answer to that question; but I think it has more to do with whether you believe the, there are more Republican voters than the composite index is suggesting, the composite index that EDS produced.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm not sure that clearly answers the question. Specifically in your analysis, should we give more weight to races that are -- given that we're drawing a Senate map, should we give more weight to the Senate and discount those that don't include Senate elections?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: None of these include Senate elections. These are based on statewide elections. So what you mean, I think, is could you look at years in which the State Senate is up for election. This does not include State Senate contests, none of these composite or aggregates.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: So that is what I meant, yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: No, I think it depends more on what you believe the electorate will look like in 2006. I don't really think we have a good answer for that, but it's just which index do you think is more likely. This is based on what you're trying to do is predict what the votes will actually look like and therefore what the seats that you have drawn will produce. And it's hard to predict and I'm not sure that -- the difference between the years the Senate contests are run and the years that the presidential years is turnout, and in 2016 that they favor Republicans but in 2020 favored the Democrats. And 2018 versus 2022, 2022 favored the Democrats. You have a lot of incumbents running.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm not trying to predict in the future but which data from the past is most relevant. And so if that is all the election data is all equally relevant, that's one answer -- if it's some elections in some years or more relevant than others for objective criteria that we can list, that would be a different answer.

(Overlapping conversation)

I mean, relevant to the Senate map, the State Senate map that we're drawing right now, there was some elections more relevant to that map than others.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Again, the relevance is actually which you think are more predictive. That's the relevance. The relevance is which is going to actually do a better job predicting what would happen in 2026. But that's the question of relevance. Personally, I think the composite score that looks at a broader range and incorporates all of these elections, including those that the Democrats won by a sizable amount is a better measure. I also think it might be a better measure because the state may be trending democratic; but again, I don't know Michigan politics and I'm not the best person to answer what is the most predictive. But the relevance has to do with how,

what we actually think will happen. In terms of comparing the two scores. The two aggregate scores.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I think we have a question from one of the commissioners joining by Zoom. I see a hand raised but do not see who it is.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That's Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Thank you. So Dr. Handley, I don't know if this question is for you; if it's for our legal; or a combination of both. But part of it is kind of a hypothetical, and it pertains to turnout in geography. When we look at the composition of Michigan and look at the election maps and you see what areas of the state vote which way -- say, for instance, Northern Michigan, a lot of your rural areas are very red. A lot of your urban areas are very blue.

So I guess my question is -- and again, I say it would be a hypothetical because I know nobody has a crystal ball -- but we had the Linden map that we had a set of scores for; and from what I have seen, most of the maps that have been presented stay fairly around in line with what those scores now.

So now we're redrawing the maps based on the southeast section of the state, and we're getting a lot of comment about the partisan fairness. So I guess my question is -- and I hope I can word it accurately -- how does, how IS partisan fairness affected, say, when you talk about turnout? Say if there was an increased turnout in northern Michigan hypothetically and Republicans won by 20%. I'm just throwing out numbers. With districts just in the southeast part of the state, how would that relate? Theoretically who gets the most votes gets the most seats but if we're looking at one part of the state to make up partisan fairness and if numbers increase in another part of the state, then does that equate? Does that theoretically make it true? I know I went all over the place.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I think so. I think you will see something like the efficiency gap impacted by that more than, say, the mean/median score because you can have more ways to vote, say, in the north portion of the state. The thing about the senate plan is you only got 38 districts, think it is? And you're changing ten of those districts. You're seeing that in your partisan fairness measures more than the House and you were also working in, say, 10 or 12 districts so it was more. There's more shifting going on and it's going to have more of an impact. Changes in other parts of the state will have more of an impact because, again, they're fewer districts.

The way this works is you're not weighting by turnout so you have a presidential election in your own and the turnout is higher so it's still having even -- if you weight by that year, it still is having more of an impact on aggregate score. That's why turnout matters and there's no correction for that. Did that answer your question?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: I'm not sure that it did, but I understand what you're saying. I wonder if Mr. Raile has an understanding from a legal point because what I'm looking at is partisan fairness is a tool of many tool but is not an end-all of tools because I personally think numbers can be not manipulated but changed and you can't predict.

I mean, if voter turnout, if we were at 50% in Northern Michigan and all of a sudden we're at 75% those districts aren't going to change. So this is where I have the issue.

>> RICHARD RAILE: Let me try to speak to that from a legal point of view, which is obviously going to be different. What the Constitution of the State tells us is that the districts and the maps cannot give one party or the other a disproportionate advantage. It also tells us that the measure of disproportionate advantage is excepted measures of partisan fairness. I'll get into this in a bit. I don't want to jump ahead, but it is my opinion that Dr. Handley is using accepted measures of partisan fairness that has a meaning which is drawn from academic literature and litigation, which I think informs the textual meaning of the obligation here.

The measures are, as I understand -- I think Dr. Handley would agree -- are all statewide measures in efficiency gap that is looking at statewide. It's not measuring is a particular district in Detroit a fair district. It's generally looking at the state. And so we have to be understanding how the votes are being used across the state and have to have a method. This is really what is at the heart of the issue before the Commission now is VNP is proposing one method of choosing elections.

It's different from what Dr. Handley has done. They're proposing that there are differences here. Legally speaking, we have to have a platform, a method of deciding what elections we'll be going to use for that. So we're not so interested in, as you suggest, maybe in the future some election would do something weird that we don't necessarily have the ability to predict today. We're trying to find a reliable method today of measuring how fair the plans are within the meaning of the constitutional criterion. If election patterns change, I'm not sure that it would have much of a legal meaning, and I'm not sure if it would impact the fairness, really, that much. The fairness measures, I don't think, have a problem with the idea that turn-out can go up or down in different groups.

Generally the concern -- and I think this is really what Dr. Handley's method is getting at -- is that you want to be measuring fairness across different electoral environments because election patterns can change for lots of different reasons. One reason that election patterns can change is the timing of the elections, which we have already touched on; but there are other reasons. There are economics that can be doing something; there can be war; there can be national trends. Republicans can have good years; Democrats can have good years.

Generally you want to be measuring bias in the plan and not measuring idiosyncrasies in electoral environments. That's generally why looking at a lot of different elections is, in my estimation, a more accepted measure. Again I'm jumping ahead a little bit. That, I think, is the legal lens through which to view the problem. The fact that you are only redistricting part of the state I don't think is that problematic because as you said, you started with a plan, Linden plan, which had pretty good partisan fairness scores. The parts of the state you're not touching, we're already in a good state. You're fair. You're redistricting a part and trying to maintain acceptable partisan fairness scores there. The question before us now is what is a reliable means of measuring that. Dr. Handley has an index you have looked at for a long time, and then we have

the proposal today. I'm not sure if that answers your question but would be happy to give it another shot.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Both of you have provided a lot of information, and the reason I ask the question is because it seems like we have had a lot of pressure lately from groups to try and get to zero. In my mind, you know, we were given kind of a range, sort of, and geography obviously plays a role in that. I guess I just wanted some reassurance that what we're doing is the right thing, I guess. I know we can't predict, but, you know, when you have a lot of outside voices trying to talk one certain way, you just want to make sure that you did, what you did, and it's right. And I'm going to quit talking. Thank you, Dr. Handley. I do trust your evaluation, and I appreciate the fact that you used multiple. I think people will appreciate that, too, knowing that it's not a very small, narrow area. So thank you both.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Commissioner Lange. Does anyone else have any questions? I got one, but I want to let other people go first.

So Dr. Handley, I think where I'm struggling, because I truly want a fair map -- I really do -- we have -- I think you had a slide on your PowerPoint that had this. I'm looking at our metrics from EDS, and it might be good if you could talk a little bit about what those metrics are and what years they include and how they're weighted. You know, I see essentially five that have the same efficiency gap of negative 0.8%, and the mean-median difference is from negative 0.3 to 2.6 and lopsided from 3.6 to 4% among those five. The seats-to-votes ratio is the same for all five of them. That's what our analysis says, but -- so it seems to me that those are about equally as fair. But this memo we got says that those five are not equally as fair. So that's kind of where I'm struggling with. You know, what is the best way to judge what fairness is on these maps?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I think I pretty much suggested all along that I wouldn't make a big fuss about a difference of -- let me go to the ...

In terms of the efficiency gap between 1.87 and a 1.92. I just -- I mean, I just wouldn't.

Now, it's true that the VNP Aggregate Index is producing bigger ranges than the ranges EDS composite index is producing; but in terms of the EDS composite index, I just, you have like one outlier, the Dove plan.

But all the others seem to be in the same territory. I wouldn't make a decision based on the difference between a 1.87 and a 1.92. I just wouldn't. I would let other factors impact which election I chose. I wouldn't do it on the basis of a very small difference in partisan fairness scores.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: So you should say we should throw Dove out. Dove is definitely --

(Overlapping conversation.)

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Dove is an outlier in terms of partisan fairness, but you're looking at a whole host of other things. Maybe it's better at communities of interest and voting rights. I don't have enough information to answer that question but it is an outlier in terms of the efficiency gap scores. I mean, all of the things being equal, there are other plans that are better, but I don't know if all the things are equal.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: So --

(Overlapping conversation.)

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Point of personal privilege.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm sorry?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: I ask for a point of personal privilege.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Go ahead, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: I'm not sure which is speaking, if it's Commissioner Andrade or Callaghan. Could they speak into their microphone? I can barely hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Sure. I'm sorry. This is Commissioner Callaghan. I now forgot my question. Oh, so you used a phrase "all things being equal." Let's assume with the Dove map all things are equal. There is a difference in the outcome and there's less partisan fairness -- I'm just trying to make sure these numbers actually mean something, right?

So a 4.6 would indicate less partisan fairness than a 1.8 or 0.8. If all other things are equal, then perhaps we should not consider Dove. Could you agree with that?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: If I were relying solely on the efficiency score. On the mean/median, it comes out right in the middle, doesn't it? More or less.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Hmm.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: There were plans that were outliers in terms of both of those scores, and I don't see them anymore. I think they didn't make the 12 that you're looking at now.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: They did not get moved forward.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I think those are the clear outliers. In terms of the efficiency gap, Above is an outlier -- Above.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I don't mean to respect. You're hesitant to use one score standalone as a reason to say a map is not partisan fair. You wouldn't look at one number and use that as a reason to cast it out. I'm just trying to figure out how to look at these numbers ourselves.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yeah, Yeah. I'm really -- I -- I really don't think I would, just because it comes in sort of in the middle when you're looking at the mean/median difference, and I would consider both of those. However, you know, in terms of when I looked at both and considered both in the rankings of the efficiency gap and the mean/median, I mean, it doesn't come out in the top five. I mean, if you were going to decide solely on the basis of partisan fairness and you wanted the fairest plans, it doesn't come out of the top part. I wanted to make sure that you're not just deciding on basis of partisan fairness, but all other thing being equal, it just doesn't come up off the top.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: And when you say the top five, are those the five that were in your presentation? On that slide?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yes, in which the EDS composite score and voters aggregate index came up with the essentially top five. I think there was a difference of one, but I mean it was the Szetela, Heron, Kellom, Cardinal, and Starling they agreed were, regardless of which composite

index you believed was more likely to predict what would happen in terms of the plans you were looking at. You don't actually have to decide because they agree on those.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair, I want to acknowledge Commissioner Lange has had her hand up for quite a while.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Dr. Handley, I'm just gonna make this similar, because I think we're veering off a little bit. You evaluated all of the maps that we presented to the public using acceptable measures; correct?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: And you found all of those maps to meet the partisan fairness requirement, looking at just the partisan fairness; is that correct?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Well, that sounds a little bit like a legal question, but I think there isn't much difference between them. So from a political science standpoint, I would agree with that. Again, I'm not a lawyer, though.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Right. We had to have the maps evaluated in order for them to go forward to make sure that they met all the criteria that the partisan fairness, the VRA, etc.

So based on what it was seeing, all maps were put forward because they met the Constitutional criteria. Is that not correct? Maybe I will ask our legal because I don't want to put you on the spot, but that's correct, right? Mr. Raile?

>> RICHARD RAILE: I am not sure I fully understand your question. I don't think we have weighed in on whether all of these meet every legal criteria, if that's what you're asking. I do think that the legal standard for moving them forward is that the Commissioners have made that judgment, which is different, and maybe that's what you're saying. Does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Well, no, what I'm say is when we did our maps, they went through VRA analysis and it was my understanding that they went through partisan fairness analysis to make sure that they met that criteria. Mr. Fink, I saw your hand. Maybe you could -- he disappeared -- there he is.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: If you'd like to comment, please go ahead.

>> NATE FINK: Thank you for the question, Commissioner Lange. So all the maps sent forward to the public and are under consideration right now were -- you're right -- put through the VRA analysis and you received that feedback from the VRA Council and VRA team. Also, they were put through and you were provided with partisan fairness analysis from EDS and from Dr. Handley. To sort of -- I mean, I'm in agreement with Mr. Raile, I don't think there's been a conclusive determination as well as related to partisan fairness side of things, every single one of these maps, you know, would necessarily meet the partisan fairness requirements under the law. I think this is to provide the Commission and the public with the information and the data on these maps to consider in the context of all the ranked criteria that you're supposed to be considering. There wasn't necessarily a prerequisite, I think, that any map met a certain level of partisan fairness for it to be put forward by the Commission to the public for consideration; but I

mean, certainly when the Commission decides which map it's going to adopt and put forward to the Court, the Commission should believe -- you know, in the context of all the information it has -- that it is, you know, doesn't favor or disfavor political party as the Constitutional requirement states. But to answer your question, I'm not sure that the Commission necessarily made a determination that any particular map necessarily met that standard before sending it out to the public. The Commission can still hear public feedback on all of those considerations and then make that ultimate determination when you vote on which map to put forward or ultimately to adopt and send to the Court.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Okay, so that confuses me a little more because I thought it was based off the analysis that was done whether or not the maps ranked within the analysis to where they would be acceptable. So I guess that was my bad. So I guess my question would be, then, if all of the scores are similar to the Linden scores or within the same or general area or better, would it be safe to assume they all meet the partisan fairness requirement? And obviously not looking at other things such as communities of interest, VRA, which would play a factor, too. I guess I'm feeling like I, through the process, get different information and maybe that is on me. Maybe it's -- I'm having a misunderstanding of what has happened. I guess I'm looking for clarification. But you know what? I will pull it back. I'm done. I don't need an answer. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay, we have a few things. Commissioner Orton and then Commissioner Callaghan and then Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Okay, so my thing is different but I think I understand what Commissioner Lange is getting at. I do believe Dr. Handley that you did say when you did the analysis these are all within the ballpark; these are all reasonable, something like that. Is this true, or not true?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: This is true. None of the values, none of the scores, were kind of scores that we see in the kind of plans that actually got challenged for partisan gerrymandering. I think, but I'm not a lawyer, that all of these plans would meet the criteria of a partisan fairness. You know, I'm not sure that the lawyers can answer that because I can only tell you what kind of plans have been challenged. And this doesn't look like those plans. This doesn't look like the Michigan plan did ten years ago. Let me share the screen again. And go back to -- if it's all right - - to this.

All of these -- why isn't that -- all of these plans fall within the white area. In other words, they're not falling in the Republican or the Democratic area. They tend to be more slightly more favorable to Republicans but are all falling in this white area.

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Okay, thank you. And my real question is, will we receive a copy of this PowerPoint?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Sure. Of course you will.

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: Thank you, Chairman Eid. As a famous one of our commenters is on my opinions, the -- we have not asked Dr. Handley to give us an opinion on whether or not any particular map passes partisan fairness. That is NOT what we are asking Dr. Handley to do. If we were doing that, then we would say, "Dr. Handley, would you kindly prepare a map that, in your opinion, you have drawn and meets what you consider to be the optimum partisan fairness?"

She's not doing that. WE'RE drawing the maps. Then we're giving her a map and asking her, "Would you please analyze this map on the metrics that you have advised us that are important and give us those numbers back?" which she has done.

And then WE look at them, and WE analyze them; and WE vote on them. So there is no "perfect partisan fairness." As I said succinctly, I thought yesterday, partisan fairness is way down the list. There's VRA; there's population; there certainly are communities of interest. Once you have done all that, then you start looking at partisan fairness. So she is not in a position so opine what is or isn't a good partisan fairness score. Here's what the score is. It's up to US, 13 people, to determine if that meets our criteria, the constitutional criteria, to be a fair map. I, for one, certainly would NEVER ask Dr. Handley, "Does this, does this meet the partisan fairness?" She doesn't know. She knows what the score is. She knows what we're supposed to be looking at, but WE determine "does it meet the partisan fairness" as WE have determined what the partisan fairness is? As I said, that is my opinion. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Commissioner Lett.

Any more questions, folks? Dr. Handley, while we have you here, on a different note, we have had questions over the past week or so asking what all of these metrics mean. Could you just like real quickly give kind of a layman's terms of what the efficiency gap is and the mean/median difference and lopsided score? I know we didn't ask you to do that but if you're not prepared today, that's fine. I have been telling people to go back and watch the last presentation. People have been asking that, and people have been asking how our metrics are configured as far as the number of election years and how they're weighted for the EDS composite.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Oh, let's me start with the second question. In term of the EDS composite score, it takes all 16 statewide elections from 2012 to 2022. It include all of those contests. It weights by year so that a year that has more elections doesn't count more than a year that has less elections.

In terms of the lopsided margin, that's the easiest to understand. Are Democrats or Republicans winning their districts by more vote than the other party? Is one party winning by more votes than another party? A lopsided margin of, say, 5.3 in favor of the Republicans means Democrats are winning their districts by a lopsided margin of 5% more than the others so that's more packed.

That's not common in areas where you have lots of Democrats in the same place.

Another measure is the efficiency gap. That just looking than all the wasted votes. Votes are considered wasted if it went to a losing candidate or if it went towards -- if it was far more votes needed to win an election. There are votes cast for lost candidates and votes cast for winning

candidates beyond what they need. Those are considered wasted votes that are looking to see if more Democrats and more Republicans are wasting more votes.

Mean/median is more complicated and is looking to see if distribution is skewed in comparing the overall vote average to the averages across the districts. If the averages across the district is, for example, lower than the overall average, then that plan is skewed towards the other party.

What was the other one -- oh, that simply counting up the number of seats you won compared to the percentage of votes the party got. If the party got 52% of the votes, then 53% of the seats, then seats-votes ratio is such to favor the party that got more seats than votes as I said all along, on a single-district metric system, you expect the winning party to get slightly more or even sometimes more than slightly more seats than votes.

What you DON'T want to see happen is the party that loses -- that wins the majority of the seats - - wins the majority of the votes actually loses a majority of the seats. That's considered an unfairness and does NOT apply to any of the plans, any of the 12 plans that I was looking at. I forgot to mention that I don't have enough information to tell you if using the VNP aggregate score if that happens or not.

There. There's my five-minute description. Does that work?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Well, I think you summarized very complicated numbers very well. People write whole dissertations on this stuff and I'm sure the public thanks you for that summary. Mr. Fink or Mr. Raile, do you have anything to add?

>> RICHARD RAILE: I can talk about different things. I'm not sure how long you want to hear from us because I know you may have other items. I want to start with what I think is the key point that is at the heart of a lot of the discussion we've had this morning, which is we don't have clear guidance from the Michigan Supreme Court about how to interpret the State Constitution's partisan fairness criteria. So we have a lot of ambiguity and think that is fundamentally what the challenge is here. I'm only going to be able to do so much to add clarity. What I can say as also a starting point is that it is important to remember that we did win a partisan gerrymandering case in the Michigan Supreme Court that was filed against the Hickory. That was a summary disposition, which means the Michigan Supreme Court put out a single sentence and signal it didn't view the case as particularly close against the Hickory plan.

The Linden plan was not challenged on partisan fairness grounds. It was not part of the case. Hickory were challenged because the scores were further from zero than Linden plan scores so it was more vulnerable in the sense you were challenged, but the challenge did not succeed. The unfortunate feature of that litigation in winning so thoroughly, we didn't actually get an opinion from the Michigan Supreme Court that provided a framework that told us key information that would inform the discussion.

So we still have in a place when I think about this as a lawyer, where we have to make inferences from Constitutional text from types of litigation that made there on the information and factual opinion like Dr. Handley's that is out there. I was prepared to talk about choice of elections under the VNP analysis, but some of the questions that have come up have steered a little different.

So I do want to say a few words about this question of what is the significance of zero. Do scores have to be zero? How far away from zero can they be? We know in the litigation against Hickory the plan had an efficiency gap of either 4.3 or 4.6, depending on how you measured. You had a mean/median of 2.7 or 3.0, depending how you measured, lopsided, 4.3. They were not zero, and the plan passed review in the State Supreme Court. We argued in our briefing, which does dig into the text in a way I can't do today in a timely fashion.

We filed a lengthy brief talking about these issues. It's an advocacy piece, not advice; but it says a lot of how the litigation team views the text so that is something commissioners could read when talking about these issues. We did argue zero is not the legal standard and one was the one person, one vote standard.

In the legislative and Congressional context, it's made clear zero is not the standard. You have deviations from zero that are small and don't have to be justified. For example, if you have a plan with a total population deviation of 2% have from one with 3%, it's not particularly risky to pick the one with 3%. There's a very small risk but almost negligible because the numbers are just so small.

The courts just don't care about that. As the deviations get further from zero, the state justification has become stronger, has to become stronger and stronger and at some point deviations get too big so no justification can really be offered in their favor. It's just too thick. So to go to Commissioner Lange's question -- actually, it was Commissioner Callaghan who asked about the Dove plan -- and I'm looking at the Handley index. We'll talk about VNP index in a bit.

In the Handley index, it's the case the lopsided gap and margin score are further from zero and noticeably further from zero than the others. The mean/median difference is more in the middle of the back, but still you have a plan that, on the whole, I might say is more vulnerable to a challenge on partisan fairness ground.

What does that mean for me as a lawyer? I won't sit here and tell you it's out, it's illegal, don't consider it. If we had more guidance from the Michigan Supreme Court, maybe I would say that. I don't know. It is in the realm, more or less, of Hickory; but it's more vulnerable.

So in my mind, I would say that plan probably requires more justification. You need weightier reasons that are better explained for adopting that map over, say, the Heron map which has .8 efficiency gap of .3, mean/median difference, much closer to zero. So the Heron map strikes me as a safer choice but doesn't necessarily mean that Dove is illegal.

I'm more interested on why the Commission picked Dove over Heron. I would want -- and I think in litigation we would want to explain to the Michigan Supreme Court there were good reasons for that. Maybe the voting public in Detroit came out in droves in favor of dove and hated Heron or something like that. Maybe there were federal risks related to Heron that made it questionable whether it would get through the remedial process. I don't know. I would want a justification that is stronger. But on the whole when I look at these districts under the Handley metrics, I see numbers like efficiency gaps that are, for the most part, below 2%; mean/median differences generally below where Hickory was that to me aren't going to require a lot of

justification because the numbers are small, so the defense becomes easier the smaller the number is.

In the world of uncertainty, I have to view things in terms of risk and justification and not just in terms of what plan is perfectly safe and what is not. I don't think I would be responsible if I told you there's just no risk contingent to one of those plans, you should choose that. I don't think that's my role and is not something I'm prepared to do in any event.

That leads me to the question of the VNP approach, and the reason that's it's giving you different numbers is, as Dr. Handley said, that the inputs are different into the measures. If you put inputs in, outputs could change. It matters what those inputs are. Again, we don't have guidance from the State Supreme Court about what are the right elections to look at; how would that work. So we have to do something based on inferences.

As I said before, the Constitutional text DOES help us out. It says that a disproportionate advantage to a political party shall be determined using accepted measures of partisan fairness. Dictionaries generally define the word "accepted" as "widely used or found; regarded favorably; given approval or acceptance; generally approved or used."

What the text, I think, is telling us is to go out into the universe where people are talking about and litigating partisan fairness issues and see what methods they are using.

I believe that Dr. Handley's method, the composite that she has picked, is accepted within the meaning of these terms. We know that in the Michigan partisan gerrymandering litigation from last decade composite scores were used with things like the efficiency gap.

And in fact, when the Commission was sued with the Hickory plan, Dr. Warshaw, a recognized expert in this field, used the composite index that was very similar to Dr. Handley's and said Dr. Handley's methods were very much aligned with how he viewed it. There are other cases that we are aware of where composite indexes are used for things like efficiency gap and mean/median difference. Dr. Handley's method is not the ONLY way that this is done, but it seems to me that it is an accepted way that is done.

I am less persuaded that VNP method is accepted. For one thing, I have not seen -- and my members of the litigation team -- have not seen a case where efficiency gap and mean/median difference is calculated by narrowly looking at just the competitive elections, certainly not using a 3% window. That seems quite new to us. I'm not going to say it's never happened, but I'm not aware of it. It was not something someone suggested in the Hickory plan that was necessary and seems somewhat significant in my mind that we are here in 2024 and Dr. Handley has been advising the Commission since 2021 using an index and it's only now that a method of looking at just a few competitive races is proposed as a superior alternative. I find it hard to believe that the VNP group hasn't been paying attention to redistricting until now. I'm not sure what explanation it is, but in my mind goes to the question of whether it is accepted. If it is accepted, it seems like we would have noticed this type of argument before now, even in the context of the House redistricting just a few months ago.

And one last point I would note is that Dr. Handley knows that in this context the choice of the competitive races has a particular partisan impact because the competitive races by the VNP

definitions are actually the good Republican years. One could imagine a different scenario where years with big Republican victories were being excluded and years big Democratic victories were being excluded and we were looking at them. That would seem to me to perhaps overcome some concerns that might be in there about limiting the range; but here we're taking out the years where the Democratic success is very high and looking at the best Republican years, which raises difficult questions. I'm not sure that a finder of fact in partisan gerrymandering litigation would find that particularly persuasive.

All of that said, of course, as I do come back to the point of uncertainty. So we don't know for sure that a court would reject the VNP analysis. I can't tell you that. I think we have very compelling arguments against it if it were used against the Commission in court.

Finally, I would note that this doesn't necessarily mean that the VNP approach should be, needs to be disregarded. I'm not sure that it's legally unavailable to you. I'm not sure there are significant legal risks in giving it some weight or giving it some consideration in your process; and as Dr. Handley said, the maps that are the "safest," so to speak under the VNP approach, also do very well under Dr. Handley's approach. So if you were to pick one of those plans, it would be more or less "safe" as far as we can tell under the partisan gerrymandering challenge, under either method.

So what is being, what is going on here is VNP is trying to use this analysis to exclude plans they view as scoring more poorly under their method. It's ultimately up to you what to do with that information, whether you credit it and want to exclude those maps or whether you want to consider qualities those maps may ultimately have. I don't think I, as a lawyer, am entitled to come in and tell you exactly how to answer that question. So I will end there unless there are questions for me.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Thank you. That was very helpful to me. I have a couple more questions for Dr. Handley, if she's still available.

Hi. So just to clarify my mind again, I'm coming back to your numbers and trying to get, make sure I clearly understand how to experiment them and use them. Interpret them and use them. If we look at the numbers calculated for the old, old map -- not the Linden map but the one in place before that -- would you consider that a gerrymandered map or one that demonstrates partisan fairness? How would you evaluate that?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You're talk about the 2012 map?

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Yes, ma'am.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: 2012 map. If you recall, I showed you a chart from The Washington Post that said it's clearly on the Republican, favors Republicans side of this. I would say as a political scientist it was a gerrymander, and there's two ways to look at it: I, as a political scientist would say, and what a lawyer would say.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: That's fine.

>> RICHARD RAILE: I would be happy to jump in.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's definitely shows a gerrymandered map. What I'm trying to establish in my mind is the range. Where's the ballpark? So we've got all of these other maps that have a range of scores and have small numbers.

Basically, the old gerrymandered map has small numbers or single digits where nobody is in the stratosphere; but if you look from the old map that had 9.2 score and mean/median that had a 5.3 and say, yes, in your mind that was a gerrymandered map.

And then I look at those two numbers and see that in the maps that we've produced are all less than that and they range various -- where does that number start to change from demonstrating a gerrymandered map to a map that is in the ballpark of being fair? You see what I'm saying?

>> Dr. Handley: Yeah. of course we can't really answer that question. We can only say, I'm using two pieces of information. Again, this is a political scientist, not a lawyer speaking. I am sure that this is not a legal opinion. In terms of comparisons, it is an outlier, right? The 2012 plan was floating down there with a lot of other, I mean, not very many other plans, so it was an outlier. It's also true that I think that we know that the legislature instead intended the plan to help the Republicans. I think those two piece of information are informing my opinion that it was a gerrymander; but I mean the word in a political science way and not a legal way. I can't even really use it in a legal way. I don't want to suggest that it was a political gerrymander that, you know, would have been declared illegal, unconstitutional, I guess.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I get that. You're not weighing in on the legality of the map and I'm not ask you to. I'm asking, in your mind, if you look at the old map and say from a political scientist perspective, is gerrymandered based on the numbers you computed? That's what I'm considering the outer boundary. That's like a score of 5.3 and 9.2 hits the gerrymander flag. We've got all these numbers underneath it that are acceptable. Where does "acceptable" start?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: There's no answer to that question. There's just a relative sort of scale, right? I don't think you're gonna get to zero with some of these measures. I guess you've got close to zero in some of these plans but I mean, it's relative. There's no -- political scientists don't believe there's a bright line. I don't think lawyers would say there's a bright line. There's no bright line in which it goes from acceptable to unacceptable. It's just no bright line. I would say that the plans that you have are far enough from the plan that was in place in 2012. It certainly is fair. All the plans are fairer than the 2012 plan.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Okay, thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right. Well, thank you, guys, all for joining us. I think that was very informative and I'm sure the public also appreciates all the comments. It's always nice to hear from both of you, and I'm sure we'll see you again shortly.

We have some folks that signed upped for public comment. We have four speakers and want to make sure we hear from them before we go on our next break.

Darwin Griffin.

I also want to thank all of y'all in this room who have, you know, waded through that about hour-long conversation. I know it might be a little boring but hope you learned something.

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.

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: But it was very informative. I learned a lot and I know when I came here today I was looking at leaning more so towards the Heron map; but in lieu of listening to the comments that were made, it's really going to give me an opportunity to look more into the Dove map as well as the Heron map, so I really appreciated the public comments that were made by the panelists.

Again, I just wanted to ask one quick question. Looking at the Heron map, I'm noticing that there's a portion of the map that's in the Oakland County area that dips a little bit into the Wayne County area. I just wondering why is that.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: John, can you bring up that map?

>> JOHN MORGAN: Yes, I can bring that up. Just a second.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I think you are speaking act District 10 that goes from Sterling Heights through Warren --

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: Right, exactly, that little portion right there that dip down from 10 down into 8, and I was just curious as to why that part dips down into 8 as opposed staying primarily above Eight Mile.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Yes, so this was a collaborative map. I don't recall exactly why this version of District 10 was drawn how it is, but a lot of times it's due to population. All of these districts have to have about 265,000 people in it so sometimes in order to do that you have to cross city, township, or county boundaries, which range lower on our list of criteria than things like having an equal number of people, just about. So that could be one reason.

There are also other configurations here that, you know, cross more or less across Eight Mile and encourage you to look at a whole bunch of the options and look at the ones that do cross from Wayne into Macomb County and Wayne County and Oakland County and let us know what you prefer.

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: Yeah, because I was just looking at that and was thinking it looks like that area that dips down into Detroit has a lower propensity of voters in that little area and so that's what I was curious about. Was that in there so that you could capture the low propensity of voters in that little area, that catchment area, so that way you have more in 10 that have more of an inclination, higher percentage of voters north of Eight Mile as opposed to those a little bit south of Eight Mile? So that was my question I just wanted to ask. >> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm not sure if I understand, but typically we didn't draw lines with that necessarily with the exact voter in mind as to whether they voted or not, right? It was really population more than --

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: So strictly population, not so much in terms of the propensity?

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: I would have to go back to the tape to be sure, but to figure out why, I would figure that is the case.

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: All right, all right. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I would be curious to ask what kind of configuration do you like.

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: I would probably be leaning more so towards having that portion that dips down into Detroit more so into south of Eight Mile as opposed to that little portion from 10 to dip down into that region that's just -- I can't see the number of it. I think that look like it might be -- is that? Looks like 8. Right -- as opposed to having that number, that little portion in 10 that goes south of Eight Mile, we just prefer it to be not dipping lower than eight mile and staying up above Eight Mile.

I think I saw that in some of the other maps that had that line where it is up but I was just curious why in that particular map does it dip down below Eight Mile.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Gotcha. Thank you.

>> DARWIN GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up is Cherise Goodman.

>> CHERISE GOODMAN: Thank you, Commissioners. I am looking at Map 404 and 376. Upon reviewing both maps, I would highly recommend for Community Interest Map 404. Senate District 304 represents the Hamtramck area, the Highland Park area, and the, I believe it's the north side of Eight Mile; as opposed to Senate map 376, which totally takes away that boundary from Eight Mile north and puts it into a whole new different county. The purpose for map 404 in regards to the voters is to make sure that they have the highest amount of representation based upon their needs in the community. Again, on maps 404 as opposed to 376, when we look at the Pershing area, Noland area boundaries, map 376 does not include those boundaries so the communities of interest in that particular area, there is no representation as opposed to Map 404. So with that being said, I would like to state that, again, Map 404 is the better map in representing the people from the voter perspective, interest, when it comes to getting the Senate representation based upon the needs of the community. And thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next we have Greg Millan.

>> GREG MILLAN: All right, thank you. Thank you for having us here to speak to you and for you guys being here, informing us. I'm new to this. I've never been to a meeting like this. I'm not 100% sure how all this work, but what came to my mind after listening to you guys, I'm trying to figure why do we even change the districts at all. But somebody mentioned it's got to be so many people in each district.

But to me, if there's going to be a change, then it seems to be it's a change to favor one party or the other. I don't know. Obviously that's not what you're going to say what is going on, but that's what comes to my mind, that one party wants advantage over the other party, and when you change the districts, that's what could happen, because I'm sure all you guys should be neutral, I would think; but realistically, most people are going to be either Democrat, Republican, or Independent. And we know Democrats and Republicans dominate.

I'm thinking, depending on how the board is made up, that could be to their advantage because I know of outside influences, influence you guys, or try to, and that could change the whole thing. But I don't know; that's what came to my mind.

Going to the maps, from what I was told earlier, listening to Cherise, it sound like 404 is advantageous for the citizens of that area. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Yeah, and just to touch on one of the things you spoke about, so every ten years redistricting is done in the State of Michigan and in most states -- I think all states around the country. That's because, you know, people move; people die; people are born. So you have to have equal representation across all the districts. This process used to be done by politicians, and they would indeed create districting oftentimes to benefit themselves. Both sides do it, if you look across the country.

Now we have this new process that was passed by the people in the 2018 election that make, it so instead of the politicians drawing the districts, it's a group of 13 everyday citizens. We're those 13. So we're trying to draw these districts in a fair manner that looks at communities, looks at political fairness, looks at -- we have after whole list of criteria I can show you after in the Constitutional language. That is why we're here.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Yeah, and I'm not sure if the gentleman was here this morning, but another reason we are redrawing currently is because we're under court order. So I think that needs to be said, too. Why are we redrawing again so soon? We're required to.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Yes, thank you, thank you. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Just to let you know, the make-up of this Commission, 13 citizens, there are four Democrats, four Republicans, and five Independents.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right next up, we have Sammy Monsour.

>> SAMMY MONSOUR: Hello. This is my second comment ever. The last one being your previous hearing on the House. I appreciate all of your work you have been doing and how that process also turned out. I am here today to also support Map 404 and specifically to sort of keep the populations of Warrendale and Melvindale closer together to protect the Community of interest that represents various Arab-American and Middle Eastern populations in that region. It is -- to address some of the other things I have heard today -- the map makes sense. It is in line with some of the decisions made in drawing the House map so it would preserve your consistency in how you reach these decisions. It does not provide a partisan advantage, per se; but it does unite, it does help better representation, which is the ultimate goal of what we're doing here today. And it helps that by ensuring that communities who have more shared interests and more shared needs and in need of more unified services, whether it's due to language similarities or cultural similarities, are best met by those of the electorate. I also hope it helps you all in finalizing these map so you don't find yourselves sitting here again because this seems rewarding but very tough. So I appreciate everything you're doing and really want to push for Map 404 to continue the great work you all did with the House district map. And that's all for today. Thank you. Appreciate it.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Mr. Monsour.

We have one person who joined virtually that signed up to speak. Can we hear from Mr. Anthony Scannell?

>> ANTHONY SCANNELL: Hello, Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. I thought the partisan fairness report right there was pretty interesting in relation to the VNP memo. And, you know, when Commissioner Lett was asking that representative yesterday about, you know, the criteria, she herself said it comes after that and he made that point again today after the ranked things. The only thing partisan fairness even comes ahead of is consideration of the city/county lines and compactness. And so that is another way to look at it. I think the granular pursuit of partisan fairness where you guys are favoring two specific parties -- it's just a fact. It is what it is. There are advantages built in every way in our system, you know, outside of MICRC. Favoring two specific party and that's kind of the thing that led to the spaghetti string districts and one of lines of thinking that got us here and it's also led to the needless splitting of Taylor in the House map. I thought that was a bad idea. I have even more thoughts on what was said yesterday. You know, the ACCESS non-profit group had a lot of comments and especially about Taylor being in with district 2 with Dearborn but the thing about that is if you only took Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, Warrendale, Melvindale, it's really not enough to get a senate district so you need more people from somewhere. So I see why that decision is being made. I tried to take a big picture look and considering what was done to each community and each of the three maps -- Congressional, House, and Senate -- and I remember, you know, the principle of accommodating communities in one map if you couldn't in another and has been supported by Commissioners. So I thought you actually made a pretty good decision about the Linden map and Hickory, for that matter in District 1, where I'm in both of them. I criticize the Court here and don't think they made an artful ruling. District 1 returns to African-American state representatives and senators so I don't understand why they were -- I guess why they were struck down, but I thought you did a pretty good job. But not in the Congressional map. And in the Congressional map, you have this kind of east-west crossing, which really isn't what I favor in any kind of map type, but I put my opinions on paper with the Congressional map, with the Senate map proposal, and that is what I think should still be adopted, the Scannell map. So I can only say what I think are positive and negative attribute beauties about you guys' map. I tried to limit comments to Districts 1,2, 4, where all three check because that is where I live, work, shop, have friends family, Districts 1, 2, 4. I'm concerned about the down river COI, probably the best defined COI.

(Buzzer)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Did Mr. Scannell sign up for a second time?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: He did not ahead of time, but his hand is currently raised.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: He can go again. You have an additional two minutes.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: You're still unmuted.

>> ANTHONY SCANNELL: Thank you so much. Okay. Three minutes -- I appreciate it.

I think down river is really well defined community of interest and, you know, because of the other communities it was next to with voting right stuff, it couldn't be one single senate district or, you know, has too much population, to, all the down river communities are one and two-thirds of a district, about. So I understand it couldn't be placed whole, but seeing all the lines cut through, it's like a knife or something like a pen cutting through the areas that I go through, separating them out. It kind of doesn't feel great but I understand why it has to be done. So anyway, yesterday there was some things said. Victor Jimenez, I agreed what he said about the east side and southwest side, totally agree with that.

There was a gentleman, Steve Walker. I agree what he said about Lincoln Park belonging with Southwest Detroit.

I respectfully disagree with Jamie Roe, who said that he advocates for the Cardinal map. And part of what he said there was rest assured that the Dearborn District 2 is nearly exactly the same as all the other ones but really not when I'm looking at it. It include the city of Lincoln Park, Dearborn, and that doesn't look nearly exactly the same to me, just from my perspective.

So all that is to say I think you should have kept Taylor whole in the House because, you know, you wouldn't have so many qualms where to but it now. You could split. You could to whatever. Seems like most of the big decisions have been made. Melvindale is going, Dearborn maybe, probably, Lincoln Park, most know where that should go. Allen Park and Southgate are kind of blowing in the wind and that's fine. It is what it is. And so -- I can eliminate Cardinal and Heron without even considering partisan fairness just off my community of interest.

(Buzzer)

Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, thank you, Mr. Scannell. We appreciate your comments.

Okay, we went a little over but that's okay. I appreciate everyone who stuck around through the presentation to provide comment.

We will take our scheduled break now since it's 3:15 currently and will make sure all the interpreters and all the people working behind the scenes get a fair break so let's -- if I can get a motion to break until 4:30.

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: Motion.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Second.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: A motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Callaghan to make a schedule break to come back at 4:30. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none --

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Just a consideration. We have it posted that we will be open from 4:00 to 7:00 so I'm not sure how that will impact people that will come at 4:00.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I will be around. I think we will be all right.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: It's to address the Commission, not a particular Commissioner. It depend on how the Commission wants to but just want to make sure we're clear about what is posted.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Well, we have a motion and a second. Is there any more discussion? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Commissioner Weiss, did you make the motion? Or Commissioner Lett. Would you consider changing to 4:00? We can come back and see if there's people; if not, we can take a longer break. I'm just wondering if you would change yours, but I will make an amendment.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Can you please speak into if microphone so people watching YouTube can hear you?

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: I may say something smart if I do that. I move we break until 4:00.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay, I believe we have an amendment to the motion to change it to 4:00. All those -- any discussion on that matter? All those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand and say aye.

(Multiple ayes)

Any opposed, please raise your hand and say nay.

Okay. The amendment pass. Let's vote on the original motion to break and will come back at 4:00. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye.

(Multiple ayes)

Any opposed, please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it. We'll be back at 4:00.

(A break was taken.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, everyone, we're going to get started. I'll call this meeting of the Michigan independent citizens redistricting Commission back to order at 4:06 p.m.

Department of State, if we could please get a roll.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. One second. Commissioners, if your venue has changed from this morning or this afternoon, please share that information when I call your name. I'll begin roll call of the Commissioners alphabetically. Commissioner Andrade.

>> COMMISSIONER ELAINE ANDRADE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry.

Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom.

Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Muldoon.

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

>> COMMISSIONER MARCUS MULDOON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CYNTHIA ORTON: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela.

Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER JANICE VALLETTE: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner.

Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER RICHARD WEISS: Present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You have nine Commissioners present.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Department of State. Did we get Commissioner Curry? I see her on the screen now.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: I will go back. Commissioner Curry, if you would share that you are present and that your venue has or has not changed.

>> COMMISSIONER JUANITA CURRY: I'm present, and my venue has not changed.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you, ma'am.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, we will return to public comment. We do have some folks that signed up for in-person comments. Some of them just told me they want to look at the maps more before they give their comment, ones that we have here, which is fine. Do any of you want to comment now?

Are you Charles? Feel free to approach the mic.

>> CHARLES THOMAS: We're ready?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Yes. hello, Charles. Again. Thank you for joining us.

>> CHARLES THOMAS: Good afternoon. My name is Charles Thomas, and I'm back. I was here -- well, not in this particular building -- but I did comment for the House maps, and I start off there to say what I'm going to remember is pretty much going to be the same.

I am the director of a non-partisan voter turnout organization called When You Vote, I Win. The work of our organization is built on the story of two of my aunts who are Selma foot soldiers from 1965, which brought us the Voting Rights Act of 1965. To me, it's important to note their work and sacrifice was not for those who wouldn't vote but for those who couldn't vote. So when we have the conversation about the VRA and map drawing, it must be to my mind, with that in mind. It must be that it stresses the equal power and value of each individual vote and does not, in any way, dilute its power. If that's the understood belief forwarded while taking into consideration preferred candidates, it must not be one weighted to reward not vote. If the maps are drawn and consider that attempt to make up for participation at levels of 33%, 40%, and 50% turnout, it would involve packing districts and even though I know that we could not vote at the time, it would be t it would reduce my person to even lesser value than it held with the Three-Fifths Compromise. That would be the antithesis of the Voting Rights Act and that cannot be the work of this Commission, and therefore the Heron map and map 404 are the best maps for

partisan fairness. That kind of fairness is what they marched for on that bridge; and again if I ask as I did back then, we are not returned to the decades-long status of "The least votes yielding the most seats." Thank you very much.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

We have a Victor J who signed up?

Yep. Sure. We'll come back to Victor.

Department of State, is there anyone online who would like to speak?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: There is. The first participant that signed up prior to this meeting that is present is Gabriella.

>> GABRIELLA RICHLEY: Hello! I would just like, my name is Gabriella Richley. I am a life-long member of the downriver area, specifically Brownstown, and just wanted to voice that I think overall the Heron map shows partisan fairness. However, I would just say that I believe the grouping in down river district 4 in Kellom feels a little better for representation for Romulus. I think the grouping for Romulus in Heron would drown the community's interest and issues a little bit; but yeah, thank you so much for hearing my comment.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Gabriella. We appreciate it.

Is there any other online participants?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: There is. The next in line that signed up prior to this meeting is Raquel.

>> RAQUEL: Hello.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Hello. Welcome.

>> RAQUEL: Hi, thank you. First time here. I'm not exactly sure, but I will give out my comments on how the Szetela man 404 was great. I like everything you were representing. But on the other one, I kind of really was putting into thought for the Arab-American Communities of Dearborn Heights because they have been lacking appropriate representation in the Senate. The second map is more for communicating for the people than the first one. That's really all I have to say much about that.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: You know -- so I heard you reference Map 404 first.

>> RAQUEL: Mm-hmm.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Do you know the name of the second one you referenced?

>> RAQUEL: Um, Yes. one second.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Or the number, perhaps?

>> RAQUEL: Um ... it was Heron, map 376, I believe?

And that was for District 2 there I was referring to.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay, so that's the one with the District 2 that's Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, going westward into Garden City in Westland, right?

>> RAQUEL: Correct.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay. Thank you.

>> RAQUEL: You're welcome. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay. Can we have the next online speaker, please?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: There is no one that signed up prior to this meeting; however, there is an individual with their hand raised. If you would like to call on them; but there also is another in-person participant.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Wonderful. Yes. Pam Powell? Do you want more time? If you do -- yeah, sure, take your time. We'll come back to you. No big deal.

Let's hear from the online speaker. Mr. Haji.

>> TOM HAJI: Hello. Good afternoon.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Good afternoon. Thank you for joining us.

>> TOM HAJI: Thank you for allowing me to speak. I spoke a couple of weeks ago. I'm Tom Haji in the Chaldean Chamber and Chaldean Community Foundation and advocate for protection of the Chaldean Community of Interest, the clear Chaldean Community of Interest that is well represented in the current Ninth District. It's very disheartening to hear comments made earlier. I was made aware of comments made by an individual stating that Chaldeans are non-existent and don't really, aren't present in the community, and that couldn't be further from the truth. There's over 187,000 Chaldeans in the state of Michigan, 30% of the population in Sterling Heights is Chaldean. Most Chaldeans own two or more businesses. We contribute \$18 billion to the Michigan economy. I'm not sure where these comments come from. You know, this Ninth District, too, has three of our churches. There's a comment made that. You know, most of our churches are out of state.

This couldn't be further from the truth. This is our home, and it's very, very disappointing to hear those comment and trying to weaken our voice. You know, we're thankful for the community members that have spoken up, our neighbors and friends, who have commented in defense of our clear Community of Interest. You know, we'd like to keep the district unchanged, but if we were to, I guess, vote on another map, it would be probably the Cardinal map, which would give us, you know -- which would give the Chaldean people an even bigger voice because that would encompass all of Sterling Heights and Troy. I'm not sure what those, what the prior comments were made by a commissioner or someone, but I was made aware of those. I'm here to defend that. So thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Mr. Haji. We appreciate your comments. I think we have a question from Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Thank you. My question is you were talking about the current districts. So would it be correct for me to assume that you would be happy if the current district stayed the same?

>> TOM HAJI: Yes. You know, a couple weeks ago we spoke on that, but if I had to, you're speak of the Dove district? Yes, that would be our preference, not to change -- it's not required by the federal government so I'm not sure why we're even entertaining it. But if you are pursuing a change, I guess the Cardinal would be the next approved site by our community.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Okay, thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay, once again, thank you, Mr. Haji; and thank you, Commissioner Lange, for that question. Is there any more online speakers?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: There is not at this time.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Wonderful. Did anybody who signed up to speak live, if they're ready, we can take your comments now. We did have a Victor J. Just like to remind everyone here we do have quite a lot of maps back there if you would like to take a look. That's why we're here, to get your opinion on the maps the two furthest to my left -- your right -- are, the first one is the map created by the state legislature in the 2010 Census cycle.

The one next to that is the Linden map that the Commission created a few years ago.

The following 12 are what this Commission has put forth to the Court -- and what we're taking comments on today.

We also have a data spread sheet out front that has all the metrics for all of these maps that might help facilitate discussion. I really encourage y'all to take a look. If you want to take a look and comment again, you're more than welcome to. You can sign up for a second round of public comment or can hold your comment until you have gotten a chance to take a look at the maps. Victor?

>> VICTOR JIMENEZ: Thank you, Commission. I'm back today just to comment on two specific maps. An addition map on Szetela like I had yet, specifically something I liked about the map. I like how Szetela keeps Southgate and Wyandotte out of District 1, Southgate and Wyandotte feels like it belongs to the district south, below the maps that include Allen Park, Lincoln Park, Ecorse for population reasons, definitely should go into District 1 not only because I feel that it probably would balance out and fit the needs you need in regards to population but also they just feel like more industrial working-class, historically similar neighborhoods as to the other ones in District 1.

Also, specifically about Heron, I do enjoy how it doesn't split up many of the neighbors I care about in District 1 but also I would like to add back some of the space up from new Center 1 and Virginia Park, similar to Weiss and Szetela, and move to compensate space east of the west in Counter Creek. Upper half of District 1 I feel like should extend north almost to Boston, Edison, similar to how the Szetela goes further than that. I feel somewhere around Edison, Boston, makes most sense for District 1.

And then, you know, generally any map that include, that does not include the city Southgate and Wyandotte just kind of make more sense to me. And some of the ones that I've also seen that go all the way up like northwest and it takes like this weird curve and turn up into D1, that also feels a little bit skewed. Those neighborhoods like Redford don't almost make sense to me. Looking at the Heron map more and learning more about some actual boundaries, I feel more comfortable with that one if it were to, like, District 1 were to match up with Szetela a little closer. That, I think, is all the comment I have. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Victor. Those are helpful comments.

>> VICTOR JIMINEZ: Thank you.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I want to comment for the record that Commissioner Szetela has joined. Commissioner Szetela, can you state your present for the record?

>> COMMISSIONER REBECCA SZETELA: Yes, I'm in Washtenaw County, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Department of State, and welcome, Commissioner Szetela.

Next up if you're ready, we have Pam Powell.

>> PAM POWELL: The afternoon, I am Pam Powell. I thank you for all the hard work you to and all the trips you have made to visit with us and I'm happy to be here before you. Right now I work with several constituency groups and is a toss-up. Everybody likes this one, this one, the other one, but we kind of lean toward the Crane map. I believe that gives us three really strong districts. It protects the communities of interest. I think that's really gonna be a good choice if we get a chance to choose.

I notice a lot of people that live in the Grosse Pointe area said, "Well, we don't have to be with Detroit," and Detroit was like, "Oh, we don't have to be with Grosse Pointe."

For people like myself that live on the border, we share resource. If something good comes into one community, it overflows into the other. Like Weiss, we share problems. If their plumbing floods or electrical system goes down, we fail, and vice versa. We share resources so for that reason I like they were kind of left intact. I they provide a strong district for us. I think that's basically all I wanted to say and hope you agree and we get that one.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for your comments, Ms. Powell. We appreciate them.

Okay. Well, that, those are all the folks who signed up to speak so far. Once again, we will be here until 7:00 p.m. if anyone wants to come by and provide a comment on these maps. We are also available virtually if folks want to comment virtually instead of coming to see us in person. I do, however, recommend coming in person as then you can take a look at these maps in more detail and go from there. At this time, we will take a break until we get more comments. Let's check back at 5:00 p.m.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, folks, it is 5:00 p.m., and we have somebody signed for public comment, if everyone could take their seats. Just as a reminder to the public, we will be here until 7:00 p.m. at Martin Luther King High School. We have quite a lot of resources here for the public to participate in engagement about Michigan's Senate districts. Not only do we have the 12 different maps that this Commission is currently debating between, but we also have the map that was passed by the state legislature ten years ago in the 2010 Census cycle, as well as the original Linden map that this Commission passed a few years ago. We also have a print-out of some of the metrics behind these maps to help facilitate discussion. I do see we have one person who is signed up to give live public testimony to Commission. Is there a Crystal Childree here?

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Good afternoon. My name is Crystal Childree, and I looked at all of the maps, including the original map, and it's really hard to make a firm suggestion or decision

on what will work best for my community. I'm a lifelong resident of Detroit. But it seems like the Crane map is pretty attractive. Also with the Curry map, when I'm looking at Detroit, but Crane in particular because of how the connection between Southfield, Pontiac, and West Bloomfield is close together.

Huron, if I was looking at blending a tri-county map, that would be something alternative that I would be willing to consider that will bring like the tri-county area together; but I have a question, if that's okay. Because I see that there is a training being offered to really understand the mapping, and was that offered before -- like I think it's tomorrow. Was that offered before tomorrow?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: So --

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Because I'm really having a hard time with getting communications. If it wasn't for my organization inviting me to these events, I wouldn't have any idea that they exist.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Executive Director Woods, would you like to respond to that?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: That is not being sponsored by the Commission. Reach out to Voters Not Politicians.

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Reach out to --

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Voters Not Politicians. That's the name of the organization.

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Okay, and do they offer any training?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I can't speak for them.

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Okay.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I'm more than happy to share with you the information to contact them.

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Okay. So can you -- you said Voters Not Politicians. Is that a dot org? Dot-com?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Hold on. I'll just look it up for you. Votersnotpoliticians.com

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Dot com. Besides that organization or how are we communicating this to residents? Because like I said, if it wasn't for the organization that I'm a part of, I wouldn't have any of this information.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I'm sorry, we can't speak for them but call them at 517 --

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: You can't speak for who?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Voters Not Politicians, the one sponsoring the training.

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: I'm not talking about the training; I'm just talking about how is the community aware of this event?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: This particular event?

>> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: All of them. Your mic went out.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: We advertise on radio stations. We were in the newspapers. We've done social media.

- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: What's the social media? Because that's probably will be the one that would, I would be best --
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: At @redistrictingmi. We are on Facebook, Instagram.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: I haven't seen.
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: That's where we are.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: So are they being sponsored to where you can get more views or are we requesting for people to follow it? Like I haven't seen this on social media at all.
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: We have done boosting.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: That's what I'm asking.
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: Yeah, we have done that as well, ma'am.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Okay, well, I don't think that's working.
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: Thank you.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Thank you.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Ma'am? I have a question for you, if you don't mind.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: I don't mind at all.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Okay. You said you actually heard about this from your organization?
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: Mm-hmm.
- >> Commissioner Rhonda Lange: Do you mind sharing the organization? Maybe we can
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: APRI.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: -- communicate and provide information.
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: APRI.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: APRI?
- >> CRYSTAL CHILDREE: A. Philip Randolph Institute.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Okay. Executive Director Woods?
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: Yes, Commissioner Lange.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Do you think it would be possible to reach out to that organization and provide them with some of the information, whether it be the fliers or other things that you have provided to other organizations?
- >> EDWARD WOODS III: Absolutely. They have been engaged and have participated in the past with our meetings, and we also did a joint effort with them the first time around. I try to remember the name of the high school. Commissioner Eid? Commissioner Rathorne (phonetic), and I'm not sure the other Commissioner we were at with regards to them, and we also did something with them at Lathrop Village as well. So yes, I will make sure they have the information. Thank you for the suggestion.
- >> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: Thank you.
- >> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you for your comments, Crystal. I will just shout out our website where you can also find all of this information as well as an archive of all of our meetings as well as all of the mapping data and everything that goes into making all of this happen. That is www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

Again, MICRC.

You can visit that website to stay up to date with all of our meetings and everything else about this process and feel free to give us a follow on Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, @redistrictingMI. Department of State, has anyone who indicated they would like to promote remote public comment joined?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: They have not -- oh, actually, there is one that has signed up prior to that would be Avery.

>> AVERY HARBISON: Hello.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Are you with us?

>> AVERY HARBISON: Yes, I am. Can you hear me all right?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: We can. Hello.

>> AVERY HARBISON: Hi, my name is Avery Harbison coming in from the opposite side of the state over by Holland, Michigan; but I wanted to comment because my girlfriend actually lives right here the affected areas in Davidson and felt it was important to advocate for map Szetela just because that map maintains partisan fairness while simultaneously keeping a lot of community of interest together.

And out of all the maps that there were, I kind of had to go off obviously not being super familiar with the culture personally, I looked at a lot of other metrics and special comments people left and felt that was the one that kept a lot of really important communities together so I just wanted to advocate for that map.

And then that would be all for me. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right. Thank you, Avery, for your comments.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair, there is a participant with their hand raised online, if you would like them to speak. I believe it would be this individual's second public comment today, if I'm not mistaken.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Is that Yousif who we see raised?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That is correct.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Did you speak earlier today, sir?

>> YOUSIF YOUSIF: Hello. No, actually, this is the first time today. I haven't spoken.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: My apologies. Okay. I will get the timer going, and you can begin. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: For anyone who would like to provide a second round of public comment, if you can't finish up your thoughts during the first allotted three minutes, we do invite you to -- if you're in person -- sign up again; or if you're virtual, let us know, and we'll give you some additional time to finish up your thought.

Yousif, you can proceed.

>> YOUSIF YOUSIF: Hello, Commissioners, thank you. My name is Yousif Yousif calling to advocate for Crane and Dove maps that keep the Chaldean communities in Sterling Heights, Troy, and Rochester Hills together. Please don't split the Chaldean Communities and choose

either of the Crane or the Dove maps. Thank you so much, Commissioners, for all your hard work. Have a great day.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Yousif.

Okay, I believe that concludes the remote public comments and we do not have anybody signed up currently to provide live, in-person testimony. Once again, we will be here until 7:00 p.m. if anyone wants to come through.

We are here and available to hear from you about what you think about these different district plans for Michigan's State Senate.

At this time, we will break until 5:45.

See you then, folks.

(A break was taken.)

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Thanks for your consideration. I hope all is well with you and yours. I'm Edward Woods.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, folks, just another update. I know it is 5:47. Unfortunately, we still do not have anybody who has come through and signed up to provide comment so we will check again at 6:15.

(A break was taken.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: An update for those joining us via Zoom. We still do not have anyone who has shown up to provide public comment on these maps. We will be here until 7:00 p.m., but right now we do not have anybody. We will be here, once again, until 7:00 for anybody who wants to come and provide comment to the Commission about Michigan's Senate districts. We will continue to break until 6:45.

(A break was taken.)

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right, folks, welcome back.

We do have one speaker who has signed up to provide live testimony to the Commission. I'd like to welcome Mr. Gary Moorehead.

>> GARY MOOREHEAD: All right. I thank you, and I got applause from one Commissioner already before I even -- two -- before I said anything. That's great.

Thank you for the partisan fairness presentation this afternoon. It probably cleared up some things in my mind, probably helped me get confused about a few other things; but in general, I REALLY appreciate that testimony and also the questions and answers that went on after that. That was very, very helpful.

I want to say that there are -- well, I want to agree with Commissioner Lett on one thing, and that is that partisan fairness is important, but let's remember, it's like, technically it's fourth, but I would say third behind VRA, communities of interest, and then partisan fairness to make things a little bit simpler.

Okay. It's really important, and I really want you to strive to get to the best map that you can on partisan fairness, but only after you've done the best map that you can on VRA and on Communities of Interest.

So on VRA, there are traditions -- gradations on the four. You know there's one map with three and almost a fourth, and that suggests there can be, you know, so it's like 3.9 or something like that or 3 point whatever.

Among the fours, the fourth District is either more strongly performing or weaker or the terminology that was suggested by some guy towards the back of the room, who I won't name, but who seemed pretty knowledgeable, the Fourth District will either perform with moderate confidence, low confidence, or higher confidence, depending upon the ratio or the difference between the two numbers that you see on the VRA map PDFs.

Where those two numbers are pretty close, it's going to be -- it will perform and certainly meets the legal standards -- but it may usually perform, but you won't perform with high confidence. It will probably perform some or most of the time. There are other maps that have that fourth district has a larger gap, and those maps will perform with higher confidence.

So there is a way to distinguish between VRA maps, some, you know, better than less; and I would recommend -- I don't think this is in state Constitution -- I recommend that you refer maps that have higher performance or higher confidence they're going to perform. Same thing with more or less with communities of interest. There are maps that perform but only after VRA.

There are maps that perform --
(Buzzer)

-- more on COI and less on COI and I would just to that after you look at the gradations of the area and that's it.

Was that three minutes?

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: That was.

>> GARY MOOREHEAD: Can I stay for two?

>> Commission Chair Anthony Eid: You can. Go ahead.

>> GARY MOOREHEAD: Thank you. I just want to hit again I really think partisan fairness is important, but I think legally and ethically you're pound to look first at VRA. There is a way to distinguish between different VRA maps as opposed to simply all of them are okay or all but one would, you know, the 12_th_ would require more legal arguing, I guess.

And there is a same way to, I think distinguish on COI.

And then you get to VRA -- sorry; you get to partisan fairness; as Dr. Handley said, small differences that essentially you gonna look at these maps and say the fairness is the same. But I think by the time you've already looked at the first two, VRA and COI, you're now down to maybe just a couple maps, and, you know, if both have similar partisan fairness, at that point I think you're definitely down to commissioner judgment. So that's what I would suggest.

I know there's a role for human beings in this decision-making process. I know there's a role for numbers and standards, but ultimately, it's gonna come town to the Commission looking at a small number of really competitive maps and just bear in mind, there's a one, two, three process that I would recommend. Thank you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: thank you, Mr. Moorehead. We appreciate your comments.

Department of State, has anybody who signed up to speak virtually joined?

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: They have not.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: All right. Well, it is 6:53. Do we have an executive director's report today?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Just a brief report, just want to remind everyone to hashtag #showupspeakup. Tomorrow is the last day, I repeat, tomorrow is the last day for our public hearings. After that, the last day for public comment will be Friday, June 21. Once again, tomorrow is the last day for public hearings as it relates to the 12 maps -- six collaborative, six individual -- and then on Friday, June 21 will be the last day to submit a public comment to the Commission with regarding the maps. So if you know anyone that is interested in speaking, you can sign up and provide remote comment. You have until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning to do that for tomorrow. Otherwise, you can meet us at the Renaissance High School and sign up on location and speak. We want to encourage anyone and everyone who has a stake in this process to hashtag #showupspeakup to ensure your voice is being heard for the Commission. Once again, we want to thank the great people here at King, known and unknown, who made things happen for us. We greatly appreciate the hospitality and once again want to remind the public it is so important for you to take this opportunity to show up and speak up as it relates to the draft Senate proposed plans that the Commission is considering.

Thank you so much, Commissioner Eid, and I will turn it back to you.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Thank you, Mr. Woods.

Are there any announcements today?

Are there any acknowledgments? Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER RHONDA LANGE: I don't have -- pardon me -- an acknowledgment but wanted to know since we have a couple of minutes if maybe for tomorrow's public hearing when it comes to the public comment portion and our rules for public comment if maybe we could also include in there that when giving public comment, I think it would be best if the public does not make comment of other members of the public to kind of keep any possible friction. I think we want everybody to feel comfortable in giving their public comment, regardless of what that public comment is; so if we could ask the public not to call out other members of the public, I think that might make our public comment hopefully a little smoother. Just a suggestion.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Lange. I think some of that is covered in the rules behind public comment.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Sure. I will be more deliberate and dimensional. Commissioner Lange, if I'm not, please correct me tomorrow.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: I would like to acknowledge where we are today, Martin Luther King Junior High School in Detroit. We appreciate the venue space and being here in this auditorium.

Also, I would like to acknowledge all the folks that make these meetings happen, whether it be our vendors, our staff. We had quite a few staff members in today like Dr. Lisa Handley and members of our legal team.

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.

The work that went into printing these maps, Mr. Ryan in the back showing folks differences between them and comment and how to post public comment, as well as language translation services and sign language interpreters. Also, I would like to give a shout out to the AV team who does a very good job in making sure that we can have this setup that combines in-person and virtual and dealing with all of our many tech issues. We appreciate y'all.

It is 6:58 p.m.

Are there any motions, Commission?

>> COMMISSIONER STEVE LETT: I move we adjourn. I want you to know I'm speaking in the microphone.

>> COMMISSIONER DONNA CALLAGHAN: Second.

>> COMMISSION CHAIR ANTHONY EID: There's a motion by Commissioner Lett and second by Commissioner Callaghan to adjourn for the day. All those in favor of the motion? Or discussion -- Yes. Is there any discussion on the motion?

You know, it's kind of a funny thing. I actually, when I was reading Robert's Rules the other day, it said motions to adjourn don't require a discussion. So that's, I learned something new while studying it.

So -- but we have been doing it so we'll figure it out.

Anyways, let's go to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand and say aye.

(Multiple ayes)

All those opposed, raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it. We are adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

See everyone tomorrow.