

MICRC

20240620-1000 Meeting

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

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning, everyone. As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:04 a.m. This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube on The Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel. For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at Redistricting MI. Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at Redistricting@michigan.gov For additional viewing options or details for accessing language translation services for this meeting. People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at Michigan.gov. This meeting is also being recorded and will be available On our website at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for viewing at a later date. This meeting also is being transcribed and those closed-captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on the same website, Michigan.gov/MICRC website along with written public comment submissions. There is also a public comment portal that may be Accessed by visiting the website Which is www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, Executive Director Of the Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov. For the public watching and the record I will turn to Department of State to take note of Commissioners present.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Good morning Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely please announce during roll call you are attending the meeting remotely and unless absence is due to military duty state the Physical location by stating the county, City, Township or the village and state which you are attending the meeting remotely. I will begin roll call alphabetically with Commissioner Andrade?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Present From Mexico.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry? Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning Ms. Young. Present remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you. Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I'm, present attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.
Commissioner Lange?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett? Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Present From Carrollton, Michigan.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

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

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Thank you. Commissioner Szetela?

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

Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present. Attending remotely from Highland
Township. Commissioner Wagner? Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present attending remotely from Saginaw Township,
Saginaw Michigan. You have ten members present and you do have a quorum.

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

>> You are welcome.

>> CHAIR EID:

>> CHAIR EID: Move to adopt the agenda. As a reminder to the public watching you
can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. I will entertain a motion to approve
today's agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: So moved.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion by Commissioner Weiss. Is there a second?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: All right, we have a motion to adopt the agenda made by
Commissioner Weiss seconded by Commissioner Muldoon. Is there any debate on the
motion?

I do not see any hands so we will go to vote. All those in favor of the motion please
raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

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

The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

If there is no objection the next item on the agenda is public comments. We will
begin public comments pertaining to agenda topics for today's meeting. Is there any
objections, Commissioners?

Seeing none we will proceed with public comment.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote
public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed. I will call your name and
our staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer you will be prompted by the Zoom
app to unmute your microphone and speak. If you are on the phone a voice will say the

host wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call you by your name And Please note if you are experiencing technical or audio issues or do not hear from you for three to five seconds we will move to the next person in line and return to you after you are done speaking. If your audio still does not work e-mail redistricting@Michigan.gov and we can help you trouble shoot to participate during the next public comment period. You will have 90 seconds to address the Commission and please conclude your remarks When you hear the timer.

We have quite a few folks who signed up to speak to us today, first up being Susan Smith.

>> It does appear you are unmuted. Can you say something, we are not able to hear you yet.

>> Yes, I can. I don't see myself. Can I turn on the camera myself or not?

>> I don't believe you can, but you can go ahead and address the Commission.

>> Okay that is fine. Good morning Commissioners. I'm Susan Smith redistricting Chair for the League of Women Voters of Michigan. The desire for fair maps was a motivation for passing the constitutional amendment that created the Commission. The Commission's partisan fairness expert Dr. Lisa Handley gave a helpful presentation to the MICRC on June 12. In her presentation Dr. Handley noted that using the partisan fairness composite scores the top six maps were.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Heron, Kellom, Finch, Cardinal and Starling. During the following discussion with the Commission Dr. Handley noted that the partisan fairness scores on the Dove map were an outlier on the efficiency gap measure. And fell in the middle on the mean median difference measure. And that the Dove map was not the fairest map.

Dr. Handley pointed out that there was very little difference in efficiency gap scores for the various maps except the Dove map which scored 4.6%. The League of Women Voters urges that the Dove map be eliminated from consideration as you deliberate on which map to send to the Court. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Ms. Smith for addressing the Commission.

Next up is Yousif-Yousif.

>> Hi, Commissioners, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can, good morning.

>> Good morning Commissioners. I have concerns about three maps which disenfranchises the community and maps split the Chaldean, Huron, Szetela and Starling please do not use the three maps. There are nine other maps that respect the Chaldean community, we are a protected minority asking for one District of a community of interest, November 4, 2021, you were discussing Dr. Handley's analysis done on the Chaldean community in Sterling Heights in the meeting. Look at her analysis of Sterling Heights and include the Chaldeans in Troy and east of Sterling Heights was not on the Linden map and disenfranchises the Chaldean community. This is not the first time

stated, it's on the portal with the same District as Linden. My comments in 2021 was please include east Sterling Heights with rest of Sterling Heights and Troy and do not disenfranchise the community living in Sterling Heights. But it was not included and left to Detroit and Linden map was thrown out, Heron maps east Sterling with sections of Detroit and should not be considered based on this alone. Starling and Szetela also with the Chaldean and look at Dr. Handley's map you have other maps to choose from Chaldeans in Michigan have been in Michigan for over five decades and own many businesses and consider this. And thank you so much for all your time.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Yousif. We appreciate your comments. Next up is Jamie Roe.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. I want to thank you all for the opportunity to speak and all the hard work you have done throughout this process. As you reach the end of your work everyone is interested in how you will go about landing the plan. Your priorities are clearly laid out in the Constitution one equal population and VRA compliance, two geographically contiguous. Three reflect the state's diversity and COI, four partisan fairness using accepted measures, five no disfavor or favor for any politician. Six consideration of City and Township boundaries and 7 compactness. Some have argued moving the goal post at the end with partisan fairness and elevate priority five above all else. Please don't allow the rules to be changed at this important time. The Cardinal map and VRA compliant contiguous and with the St. Clair and Chaldean COIs in Macomb County where I live and scores the best on standards of judging partisan fairness, no favor to any politicians and communities were taken in account and it's reasonably compact. As you have heard Heron and Szetela maps we heard so much of destroy the COI splitting it in three districts and you look past this fact in the name of the new found partisan fairness standards. That would be a violation of the Michigan Constitution. Please use the Cardinal map which protects every vital COI and it's a fair map. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Roe. We appreciate your comments. Next up is mayor Robert A. McCraight.

>> Good morning can the Commission hear me.

>> CHAIR EID: We can.

>> Thank you for allowing me to comment and your hard work on the Commission as well. It's not an easy task in front of you and I'm short and to the point we have a few numbers from the City of Romulus here. We feel that the Cardinal map divides Romulus which is African/American and feel disconnected. We had a great connection to remove that feeling but removing that community to another community under a different District would substantiate the concerns and fears and lessen their voice. Also the Dove map 373 divides our community and would like to see those taken away. We favor Szetela and 404 and Kellom in the 403, they support our initiatives. The reason Romulus is different than most communities is we House DTW the largest airport in the

State of Michigan, 34 million travelers annually and 80,000 jobs and 0 tax come from the airport to our community the burdens are caused by the airport and placed on 25,000 residents who work here. Economic development we have 3 million square feet in growth industry to the region in recent years and want to make sure that initiative is substantiated by one voice at the Senate level and we have already been split in three factions at the House and want to make sure we stay whole and in District 4 in the City of Romulus. We do have unanimous support from elected officials to support the initiative. Thank you very much.

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

Next up is Sandra H.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can, good morning.

>> Okay good morning.

It's the job of this Commission to draw maps that prescribe to the standards of the United States Constitution. The Michigan Constitution and the Federal Voting Rights Act with those considerations at the top of this list it's clear the best map under consideration is the Cardinal map. It has four Voting Rights Acts compliant districts and protects the vital communities of interest in Macomb particularly Lake St. Clair Clinton watershed and Chaldean neighbors and achieved the highest partisan fairness that this Commission has chosen to follow of any maps under consideration while also protecting our communities of interest. I urge to adopt the Cardinal map if it's not selected I urge Curry's map and outstanding of protecting the communities of interest in Macomb County and I'm concerned what is going on with Macomb with sinkhole and incidents and the fact we need representation in our area who has a clear understanding and comprehension of the issue Kandis Miller has done a good job fixing the sinkholes to resolve this. Working with elected officials it accelerated progress and we want this to continue. Again thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission we appreciate your comments. Next up is Nancy Tiseo.

>> Good morning I want to thank you for listening to the analysis of Dr. Handley on the partisan fairness that direct her work. I appreciate Dr. Hadley for the newly partisan fairness standards and attempt to put it above communities of interest. The truth is that VNP has changed since the constitutional amendment was passed in 2018. It was a ballot committee for the donors, and they are a political dark money group and used countless dollars from unknown sources on the scales you use to choose the best map. The fact is the Cardinal map has a partisan fairness score as good as any map using accepted measures of partisan fairness as required by the Michigan Constitution the Cardinal map also defends important communities of interest in Macomb County where I live such as the clear Lake St. Clair and Chaldean communities of interest.

The Heron and Szetela maps promoted by VNP destroy the Chaldean community of interest by dividing them into three separate districts. I do not question the sincerity of voices that have come to the table, but I think they have been sold a bill of goods by the dark money group to parroting talking points. You have done solid work on the maps and clear the Cardinal is fair, protects communities of interest in the region and among the best partisan fairness scores. Please consider the Cardinal map, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Nancy for addressing the Commission. We appreciate your comments.

Next up is Rick T.

>> That participant is not present, but Chair I would like to say for all of our attendees can you please make sure that you are named the same way that you signed up for public comment?

Otherwise I'm not able to determine who you are or where you may fall in line. So if you have a generic iPhone or phone number in the attendee list if you could click on the triple dots and then click to rename yourself whatever you signed up as that would be helpful. So that we can proceed. But there currently is no Rick T. Signed up, Chair.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, how about Robert little?

>> That participant is also not currently logged in.

>> CHAIR EID: Do we have a Hibah with us this morning?

>> Yes we do. Hello.

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning, hi.

>> Hello everyone. My name is Hibah. I'm a college graduate and resident of Southeast Michigan and believe the Szetela and Huron maps are the best for making sure communities of interest, especially communities of color have their voices heard. For example Muslim communities are kept together in Hamtramck with neighboring Detroit with Dearborn and Dearborn Heights. I lean to the Szetela map over all because it includes Pontiac with like-minded communities in Oakland County such as Southfield which helps protect Black voters as a whole in Oakland County. Thank you for your time and let's all work together to protect voices of color and helps protect democracy as a whole. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Do we -- let's see next up to speak is Omar.

>> That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, how about Ilesha?

>> That participant is also not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Let's go to Hafsa.

>> Hello, everyone. My name is Hafsa. I'm a resident of Farmington Hills and a college student. I want to make sure communities of color and immigrant communities have voices heard during elections and us of migrant and Arab south Asian and Black communities. With that in mind I think that maps 376 and 404 do the best job protecting

these various communities of interest. For example, in both maps Muslim communities in Hamtramck and adjacent neighborhoods in Detroit are kept together. And likewise the communities in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights. I appreciate the Commission giving time giving ordinary communities members as mice and please ensure fair maps are drawn for all.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up is Alex Adle.

>> Good morning everyone. My name is Alex and I'm a resident of Ann-Arbor and a community activist. As we go through the redraw process of State Senate maps my primary concern is making sure communities of interest including communities of color and LBGT plus communities have their votes heard during elections. With that focus I think the Huron and Szetela protect the various communities of interest in Southeast Michigan. Between the two I lean towards Szetela map or map 404. For example it protects Black voters in Oakland County continuing Pontiac with Southfield and LBGT plus voices are heard keeping together Ferndale and Detroit neighborhood of Palmer Park. Thank you very much for your time today, let's work together to ensure fair maps for our communities which will protect our democracy.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Alex for addressing the Commission. We appreciate your comments. Next up is Kurtis-Fernandez.

>> Hello. Can you all hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can good morning Kurtis.

>> Good morning.

I want to thank you for having me here today. I want to again reiterate my support for the Szetela and Heron maps. I lean towards the Szetela map because it does a slightly better job of protecting communities of interest. For example Black voters in Oakland County by keeping Pontiac with Southfield. And it also protects LBGTQ communities by keeping together Ferndale with the Palmer Park neighborhood of Detroit. Again I think the two maps Szetela and Huron are the best maps for fairness and for equitable representation with a slight preference towards a Szetela map. Thank you for your time. And thank you for all your hard work.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Kurtis we appreciate your comments.

Next up I think it is a Ms. From the NAACP.

>> That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Let's move on to Dan H.

>> Yes, good morning Commissioners, thanks for the time. I urge the Commissioners to reject the Huron map, as a citizen living in the 11th District it's ruled unconstitutional by Federal courts and troubled by the fact minimal changes have been made to that District. Worse is the limited changes seem to have been done to benefit the current incumbent which is not in the guidelines. Huron and Szetela divide the Chaldean community of interest into three districts. Diminishing their influence. The Chaldean community is a vote vital part of our region and should be given the same consideration

as others in the region. I urge the Commission to reject Huron and Szetela. Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next we have Nomi-Joyrich.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can good morning.

>> Good morning, thank you to everyone on the Commission. You have one of the most important tasks in our state. I studied the maps and analytics. My favorite map is Szetela. It addresses the concerns and comments of so many different communities of interest. Including the Chaldean community as well as many others. I've heard many leaders of Pontiac explain this map gives Pontiac the strongest voice and Black representation. Szetela improves on partisan fairness addresses the concerns of all communities of interest. I also love the Huron map and appreciate that it's truly a collaborative map and the most nonpartisan of all the maps. It's one of the few maps that improves on Linden partisan fairness with a .3 mean median score and the Cardinal has a very unacceptable 2.6%. Claims that the Cardinal has a comparable score is simply untrue. Huron does the best job at addressing the communities of interest, all of them. Thank you for providing us with the various metrics for partisan fairness. When you evaluate all the metrics, not just cherry pick a few of them it's clear the Huron is more fair than the rest. Huron is the strongest for my own community of interest. And keeps Farmington Hills intact and keeps me in the same District as my Synagogue. I urge you to adopt either the Huron or the Szetela map. Again thank you so much for all of your patience and hard work. Democracy is depending on you, and I thank you for rising to this challenge.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We appreciate your comments. Next up is Sherry-Gay-Dagnogo.

>> Thank you for this opportunity to make a comment. I know there are a number of things and I believe you called not too long all go that is on the call but I'm happy to be on today as the Plaintiff agent asking you guys to strike the Huron map which is 91% the same as the Linden map from the 6 Senate District. I'm here to support the Crane with the cleanest boundaries, VRA compliant, compact, contiguous. I note the number of people are still leaning towards one of the lower ranked compliant is partisan fairness and the Crane does provide that and is not the highest rating for VRA compliance. And so the Crane map is supported by the NAACP, supported by the Arab American civil rights league. It's supported by many of our community members in the Latina community. It ensures strong, free African/American seats. And a seat that is in the middle east community that is held together. This is the absolute best District that I saw. I saw that that work was built up on based on the initial Curry map. The progression through the Orton and then the resulting of the Crane map. That is what I'm supporting, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We appreciate your comments. Next up is Angela Davenport.

>> Hello, yes. I wanted to say good morning Commissioners and I hope you can hear me.

>> CHAIR EID: We can, good morning.

>> Excellent. So thank you for this process, the MICRC was created to make sure partisan fairness standards are being upheld and grateful for the work you are doing. That said in my opinion 376 Huron and Szetela are the two best maps not just in terms of fairness but just in terms also of racially fair. And in my opinion these are the two maps that truly adhere to the spirit of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. But for me being a lifelong resident of Southfield since I was five years old, 404 is the one I would like to uplift. This map would ensure Pontiac receives the Black representation that it should. And would connect historically marginalized communities of color in Macomb together giving them a strong voice with East Point. So that said my whole life I've done things in Southfield with Oak Park Pontiac and would love to see that continue. Also lifting up LBGQT communities in Ferndale and Palmer Park I just really see this map giving communities of interest the strongest voice. And want to say that everyone deserves to feel like their voice is being up lifted in a democracy. And this map achieves that. So thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up we have Lori Krauth.

>> Yes, hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning we can.

>> Good morning.

I really appreciate the time you're putting in to crafting these maps and making them available to the public. It's not a job I envy. Analyzing them all the maps with the highest partisan fairness scores are 376, Huron and Szetela. Huron you don't hear from much I'm part of a kayak community and kayak on Detroit river and regularly on nearby lakes and my lifestyle depends on the kayaking community and has a key interest in the waterways and aligned with the environmental community of interest. Huron does a great job uniting the communities and a voice for the environment and waterways and combines the Detroit river front and Lake St. Clair and River Rouge and Ecorse. I love it's the best mean median score. It makes sense it was developed by a republican, democrat and independent Commissioner representing all the political interests. I also really like Szetela 404. Likewise it has an excellent partisan fairness score, especially good at putting together the LBGQT community which is also a community of interest. And it solicited actively comments from many communities of interest from the Chaldean Asian American, Italian and Bangladeshi communities and unites environmental communities and two key environmental communities of interest. I will leave it at that. Thanks for your time.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Lori we appreciate your comments. Next we have Richita.
>> She is present but before I promote her I want to acknowledge that Commissioner Curry has joined us Commissioner Curry can you tell us where you are joining remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY:

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Okay, we will come back to her. I'm not sure if her sound is not working or what. But we will come back.

>> CHAIR EID: Wonderful. Welcome Commissioner Curry.

All right Raisha.

>> Hi, everyone, good morning.

I'm Raisha and I'm a community member and Muslim Asian, American who deeply cares to empower my community. I wanted to come here and share that after looking at the complicated maps I believe map 404 and 376 is best. In the maps reviewing the maps the partisan fairness is high and from what I'm able to understand it will serve the community I care about and communities of color, most compared to the other maps that exist. Thank you so much for listening. I hope you finalize the most fair map for all including communities of color.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Raisha. We appreciate your comments. Next up is Rhonda Williams.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: Let's go to Michael Davis.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can, good morning Michael.

>> Good morning, I'm Michael Davis with Promote the Vote statewide coalition and it's different from PTB and not a member of the coalition. Reviewed by Dr. Handley last week. She said relying on elections compared to 16 produced vital scoring and the score cards weighted 14 elections over five years making it more reliable than VMP and Promote the Vote and Dr. Handley's method Dr. Handley included 2012 elections which is an outdated high watermark to skew the results. Dr. Handley said three of the four elections had an aggregate score fell in Presidential election years. Presidential contests make up three fourths of the index makeup less of Promote the Vote. Dr. Handley may think the historic true preferences we use fewer Presidential elections than Dr. Handley. Dr. Handley including an out dated gerrymander was confusing relative to other state's gerrymander and approved by voters like the examples you were given. To your credit you have done that. Dr. Handley and 404 on top of the list. It should not favor parties but not at the expense of people and you have maps that accommodate multiple COIs so no one COI override the maps with more considerations and better partisan fairness scores, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Davis. We appreciate your comments. Next up is Anthony Scannell.

>> Hello Michigan Commission. One map would split in particular the one of my family's members houses from across the street neighbors there and I thought that was interesting. Not saying you shouldn't choose it, but I wouldn't like that. I did not realize they lived on the edge of a voting precinct but that would be the Heron map which many people seem to like. I don't know if you noticed the Plaintiffs like the same few maps I did, interesting. But okay I'm concerned about this document of procedure for the selection, step one, this facilitated discussion why did the collaborative maps come first in alphabetical order?

I think the individual ones are supposed to be on an equal footing so I would amend that. Step two the whole rounds of elimination, I don't really know where that is coming from in the Constitution. I mean I guess that's the way you want to do it. I don't like elimination. Three rounds of voting there. It seems pulled out of a hat. If it comes to step three the ranked vote, I have an issue with the secretary will create a Microsoft form and to me that is in essence a secret digital ballot because from the time the choice is made by you, voted in ranked order and then it's revealed to the public it's held in secret for a period of time. The rule Section 9.1 all votes must be held and determined in public. I would amend that step three B and C or just apply Section 9.2 of rules and request a written ballot should the ranked come up and dispose of the Microsoft nonsense, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Scannell. We appreciate your comments. Next we have a James Gallant.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Prior to calling on Mr. Gallant, it looks like Commissioner Curry's sound is working, can you tell us where you are joining remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Joining remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you and Commissioner Wagner is also now present. Commissioner Wagner can you tell us where you are joining remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Live and remote from Eaton Township, Michigan.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you and welcome Commissioners Curry and Wagner.

>> Can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes Mr. Gallant we can hear you.

>> Thank you James Gallant Marquette these are my opinions. Please publish the Voters Not Politicians policy change you denied by unanimous consent Mr. Chair because I could not find it on the website and not added to the posting. Former Witjes and former member said this is going to get messy and here we up and you are deep again, there you go. Concerning the policy for selection of the final maps that you have today in front of you where it says secretary that means Secretary of State Joyce Benson. Okay.

And now you are more than half the way through, and you formerly consider the VNP policy changes that violated Mike Brady to follow Robert's Rules and no voting before a

motion remember. Under step one of proposal policy it says you do facilitate. What facilitate a dialog and a discussion then you can amend the map by majority vote but amendment is a secondary motion to an attachment to an immediately pending main motion so where the is the main motion you are supposed to talk to this is bass backwards and you know this is a violation of Robert's Rules of Order. This is why you should have a main motion to approve the final Senate map and 12 motions to approve the draft maps laid on the table so you can continue to bring them off the table and amend them and you breach like Mr. Scannell and move on without a second motion pending.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Gallant. We appreciate your comments.

All right, next is Mr. Gilmer-Hill.

>> Good morning, can I be heard.

>> CHAIR EID: We can good morning.

>> Good morning and thank you all for all your hard work. I have to say the word bass backwards is new to me. I would like to comment on a community of interest issue I have specifically with a few of the maps that connect Pontiac Southfield and Oak Park I believe that decision is very well intentioned. I think it's very important to focus on Black communities of interest and block voting power, but the Court was pretty clear the way to do that is considering communities of interest that have ties. Southfield and Oak Park absolutely make sense together and I think they make much more sense with Farmington Hills given the Black middle class and Jewish middle-class community of interest that does exist there. I would urge Southfield and Pontiac don't have anything in common except for the fact they happen to have relatively large Black populations and that is specifically what the Court said should not be what you use as a proxy for communities of interest. I think you shouldn't fall into the trap of just connecting together all the Black people in Oakland County. I think that's not the right way to make a VRA District and I believe the other maps you have available prove you don't need to do that in order to get a VRA District. So specifically that is maps 404, 364 and 385 which is Crane, Dove and the Szetela individual map. Those all create this sort of what to me looks like a racial gerrymander in Oakland County. And I think you can empower the communities in Pontiac without doing that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID:

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair, you are muted if you are speaking.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you. Okay at this time we will return to Rick T.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can good morning.

>> Thank you for the Commission for the opportunity on this important issue. I currently live in one of the districts that has been ruled unconstitutional by the Federal courts. So I and my neighbors are impacted by your decisions.

I have many Chaldean neighbors who are very concerned about their community of interest being split apart into two different districts by the Heron and Szetela maps. Please don't pick either of those maps. The map that does the best job of meeting all the criteria that guides your work is clearly the Cardinal map. It defends the Lake St. Clair community of interest by keeping the 12th District unchanged. It creates a new District where I live that defends the Clinton watershed community of interest in a new fair 11th District. It defends the clear Chaldean American community of interest by keeping three major Parishes, their foundations which do so much good work in the community and a large segment of Chaldean population in a District where they must be heard. It also has among the best partisan fairness scores. The Cardinal map is the best map and I hope you should adopt it. Thank you for your time and I wish you the best of luck in your deliberations.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Rick, for addressing the Commission.

Next we will return to Robert little.

>> Good morning.

Having studied the proposed maps the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission is facilitating for usage, I firmly believe that the most effective and useful map under consideration is the Cardinal map. That's number 373. The Cardinal map most successfully fits the perimeters of the stated goals the Commission is framed to find while protecting the equity of the process and the interests of the people of Macomb County. In specific, the Cardinal plan serves the voters in the Chaldean community while it fits a priority on protecting the watershed of the Clinton river. I urge the committee with all the work that they have done to approve the map that fits best, that would be the Cardinal map. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: The map.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next up we have Ayesha.

>> Hi, can everyone hear me?

>> CHAIR EID: We can, good morning Ayesha.

>> Good morning.

My name is Ayesha and live in Farmington Hills and go to Wayne State and it's important to protect the voices of communities of color such as not limited to Asian communities. This is the Szetela and Huron maps do a good job with the collective power of the communities are maintained. I do lean towards the Szetela in this regard. For example it's Szetela map keeps Asian communities in Troy, Rochester Hills together. Warren with a sizable Black and Asian is kept whole and combined with Madison Heights which has a small but growing Black Asian populations and major center for Asian owned businesses. Thank you for your time to draw equitable maps to protect democracy.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Okay is Ms. Carrie with us.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I don't see anyone by that name in the attendees list.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, I do see a few attendees that have their hand raised. We will go to I think it's safe.

>>Good morning Commission. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak today. It's Thursday, June 20th at 10:52. And my name is safe AI pronounced safe like the base is safe and calling on behalf of Warren C Evans administration pledging support to the Crane map. We believe the reason why we are supporting the Crane map for several reasons, and it supports constituents of this District. Two, it ensures fair representation. Three, it satisfies the needs of Black and Brown communities. Four, it empowers people by enabling them to select members of their communities as representatives. Five, it has the least amount of cuts within county lines particularly the Wayne county. Ensures Senate seats in the City of Detroit and 7, satisfies several communities of interest. Again thank you for allowing me to speak today. Appreciate you.

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

And last to speak is KF.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair Commissioner Lange does have her hand raised.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Never mind, I'm just going to draw it back, but I think we need to be consistent in our policies. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID:

>> Good morning, you just called KF in Ferguson. I fully support the Crane map and it's quite telling most of the input has not supported the Crane map which is a fair map and keeps the minority and Black citizens involved more. I also notice how ironically certain buzz words were used like joining Palmer Park with another community. But some of the people that probably are voting for that map were nowhere to be found when all the people were being evicted in Palmer Park. I would hope based on the previous caller and what Ms. Danielle said the Crane map is the most fair or fairest map and there is no reason to even think about any other map. And that's my input.

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

And we have a Priya-Roy.

>> Hello Commissioners, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR EID: We can good morning.

>> Good morning.

Hi, everyone, my name is Priya from Hamtramck. And I'm a recent high school graduate planning on going to the University of Michigan this fall. As a young American I value that maps have partisan fairness and represent community of color. I have seen them struggle and doing my review of the State Senate maps I feel that map 374, the Huron map would be best. Therefore I thank the Commissioners for their hard work and dedication thus far and urge them to continue working towards fair maps for all

especially those that ensure all communities of color do not have their voting rights diluted. Thank you for listening.

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

That concludes public comment for today's meeting. We thank everybody who provided input and invite you to show up, speak up and let your voices be heard.

Next on the agenda is item 5 unfinished business. We have 5A. FY24 budget supplemental budget request. If there is no objection, I will ask Executive Director Woods to facilitate this item. Is there any objection, Commissioners? Hearing none we will move on. Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Commissioner Eid is everyone able to see my screen. I want to thank our local counsel Dave and Nate Fink for working with me on the budget supplemental and also Michigan Department of State. The Commission's request is included in the budget supplemental. After completing the fiscal year 25 budget the legislature will address the request. It is expected to action request will be completed before the 4th of July. Wanted to give you an update publicly with regards to where we are with regards to the supplemental request and just want to thank everyone that is involved, knowingly, unknowingly behind the scenes in terms of making this happen. So that's where we are with regards to the supplemental request, if there is any questions, I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR EID: Are there any questions for Director Woods? Commissioners?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, thank you, Mr. Woods.

And thank you to everybody that helps, you know, make that funding go through and do all the work to get those requests in. I will move on to new business. First is item new business 6A2024 procedures for selection of a Senate map. Without objection I will ask local counsel Nate Fink to facilitate this item. Is there any objection Commissioners?

Seeing none we will move on. Mr. Fink, the floor is yours.

>> Thank you chairman and good morning Commissioners. If Mr. Woods could share his screen, I would appreciate it. Otherwise I can share the document. I just wanted to go through the proposed 2024 procedure for selection of the Senate plan, the Senate map through this remedial process.

This document, the red lines on this document that you can now see on your screen are against the House plan, House remedial process that the Commission had adopted before going through the voting process and ultimately adopting the Motown Sound P may during the remedial phase. The red lines are the changes relative to that document. Most of the changes are simply changing words like House to Senate. And updating dates. Because obviously the previous dates related to the House procedure, and this relates to the Senate.

The only substantive change, or proposed change that we have included in this document is in one of the voting procedures, sorry, do you know what? I think this may be the older version, Edward. I have the other one if you want me to pull it up. I believe you shared it with the Commission on Tuesday. As he is bringing that up as a preview and of course this was shared with the Commission on Tuesday as I indicated with the red lines. So Commissioners can see the suggested change to the voting procedure in the initial round of voting related to the trying to achieve a constitutional majority before moving on to ranked choice voting if it becomes necessary.

There we go. Thank you, Edward. So as you can see right here, this is in Section C within -- Edward if you can just scroll up so it's clear for the record, it's step, think it's identified as step two, yes, subsection C. So the proposed revision is as follows, and you can see it on your screen. You E the voting process as it stands now all of the collaborative maps and individual maps would go will go forward to an initial vote to be taken by the Commission. Of course any individual -- every individual Commissioner is eligible to submit one of the maps that had been presented for public comment. They can submit that map in for the voting process and the collaborative maps then go in. Under the proposal I'm presenting now the Commission would take an initial vote on I believe it's the 12 maps unless the Commission decides to remove any of those from consideration which I believe was done before, of the collaborative maps, which I believe was done with a couple of maps, one or two maps, before the House procedure. But of those maps that get presented for the vote to the Commission, the Commission would take the initial vote. If a constitutional majority is achieved, and to remind the Commission what a constitutional majority is would be a majority of the Commissioners present and within that, that majority must include at least two members from each of the three groups. At least two republican affiliating Commissioners, at least two democratic affiliated Commissioners and two unaffiliated Commissioners would have to support that particular map. If the Commission achieves a constitutional majority on a plan, in that first round of voting, that map gets adopted and that is the map that gets put forward to the Court.

If though constitutional majority, the proposal I'm presenting to the Commission now, any plan whether it's a collaborative plan or an individual plan that does not receive more than one vote in that first round would then be removed from consideration for the subsequent round. In your rules you have adopted a procedure that would have three rounds of voting in this initial set of voting to try to establish a constitutional majority before you would move on to the ranked choice voting. Because there is more plans under consideration than there were last time around during the House plan, I'm proposing that in order to sort of stream line this and I think make for a more efficient process and a more effective process the proposal that I'm presenting here is that any plans receiving one vote or less will be removed from consideration from the

subsequent round of voting. But, to be clear, any plans removed from consideration pursuant to this subsection during this voting process would still remain eligible for submission during the ranked choice voting process should that process become necessary. So if the Commission does not achieve a constitutional majority during either rounds one, two or three of that -- the voting process for that initial step, any maps, any plans that had been removed because they didn't get more than one vote during that initial process would still be eligible to be submitted for ranked choice voting and if necessary the random draw. I'll pause here because I see there is a couple of questions. I think Commissioner Lange's hand was up first but I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah can you say unconstitutional?

You cannot remove maps especially if they are an individual map, and tell somebody, a Commissioner on this Commission that they cannot vote for a map that is being withdrawn. Not happening. I'm short. I don't mean to be blunt but that is kind of my nature, not happening. We have a constitutional right to vote on whichever map we feel is the best and you can't eliminate the Constitution specifically says. So I appreciate what you are trying to get at because of the number or I would suggest changing it to say that individual maps are not included this that. But the collaborative are. Otherwise you might end up looking at another lawsuit. And I'm just throwing that out there. Because there is a constitutional right for Commissioners to vote on whichever map. There is nothing in the Constitution that says maps get thrown out. So I think you are walking kind of a gray line with that. And I would rethink it. Just my opinion. I'm not an attorney. Thank you.

>> Thank you Commissioner Lange. If I can just respond to that. I hear your concern. The Constitution doesn't say anything about how many rounds of voting have to occur in that initial set. And to be clear, there would be one round of voting where all of the maps would be under consideration and all the maps would be able to be voted on, individual, collaborative. The concept here is there are a number of maps under consideration, and I think that ideally the Commission would be able to select a map through the constitutional majority process for lack of a better term rather than ultimately going to ranked choice voting or random draw if it does become necessary. Obviously those are there and if we get to that that is fine. But if a map, whether it's individual or collaborative can only achieve a single vote in that first round which again they will all be able to be voted on in that first round, then it seems to me that in order to sort of stream line the process and ideally achieve this constitutional majority that that would be the best way to do it. Again, this is just a proposal. Obviously the Commission can discuss whether it wants to adopt this revision. It's just an option for the Commission to consider.

Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just curious what is the genesis behind this suggestion?

Is this something that you thought of on your own or is this coming from a Commissioner?

>> Nate Fink: No, it was not coming from a Commissioner. I consulted with some folks in MDOS. We had sort of worked through, you know, they had initially drafted, I believe or at least the revised version of the House procedure. And in sort of trying to conceptualize ways to streamline this and make, set up a process which we are most likely to achieve a constitutional majority, this seemed to be a way to do it. Like I said it's just an option to present. The Commission can discuss whether they want to have this as an option, or not. Or as part of the procedure, or not. But, again, if a map, it would be voted on, all the plans would be voted on the initial round if they are not able to achieve more than one vote, it seems to me that it just makes sense to remove that from the batch. And hopefully then make it more likely that you can achieve a constitutional majority. Because, again, everybody has an opportunity to vote on whichever map they want in that first round. But I guess to answer your question directly, no, the idea did not come to me from a Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So it seems to me you're trying to force a consensus where there isn't one. So we have 12 maps going into voting. We have in the past had many maps. I believe we had eight Congressional maps, it might have even been more the last time around. If a map is not generating interest it's not going to be voted on and don't need to remove it. By removing it we are having an option or situation where we are bound. Take Crane Orton's map are similar. If we go through one round and votes for Crane then it drops off and then as we continue deliberation and come back to maybe the Crane map was pretty good maybe we can get a consensus around that now we no longer have that option because it's removed from consideration. So I think eliminating maps after one vote makes absolutely no sense. I think we should leave as many options out there. It's not hurting us to leave a map there. I mean it's not like you know there is some requirement we have to discuss it again but it is giving the Commissioner number one options. Number two the ability to discuss and actually collaborate and come to a conclusion that everybody agrees with rather than being forced in to now there is only three maps left and you have to pick one of them. That seems very much trying to ram down certain maps that don't have consensus behind it, and I think it's a terrible idea. I don't see why we would do it. We have been through this process many times. We went through the first round with three different maps and had like I said many maps and didn't need to have a rule like this in order to move things forward. And then we did the same thing with the House and I'm sure we will do the same with the Senate with is 12 maps and seems unnecessary and very much moving away from the concept of having a decision that is collaborative and worked on even if it takes some time and instead trying to force a decision on a particular map

even though it might not be what the people want and echo Rhonda's concerns about the individual maps with a constitutional right to submit them and after one vote it gets eliminated and it's contrary to the constitutional intent.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: I'm not a liar but I think it's pretty clear the Constitution doesn't say anything about every map is required to have multiple rounds of votes, so I think that is a bit of a red herring. With 13 Commissioners and 12 maps and if it can't garner a vote it doesn't have much momentum behind it. Does it hurt anything? Eases discussions and ability to get a consensus behind one map if we drop off the ones that obviously have no support across the Commission. I like the proposal. I think it makes sense. Makes the whole process more streamlined and more collaborative. We are not arguing over the outliers that nobody has any interest in.

>> CHAIR EID:

>> Nate Fink: Just to respond to Commissioner Szetela, this is like I said I'm trying to present an option that I certainly do believe is you know constitutional, whether the Commission wants to do this, it's up to the Commission ultimately, not trying to force a consensus and I do think to the extent that we are able to create a situation in which the Commission, again, can vote on, take an initial vote which I think satisfies the constitutional language. But if a map, a plan gets one vote when we have 12 under consideration it seems to me that it makes sense to remove some of those options as you move forward, as you try to achieve constitutional majority with the understanding that ultimately that's not achieved, those maps would still be eligible to be submitted through, for the ranked choice voting process. They are not being removed entirely. But, again, just an option for the Commission to consider.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I also just want to point out that just mathematically this proposal is rigging the vote. Because if anyone wants a particular map to advance past the first round they have to name it in the first round of voting and means they can't vote for another map which they think is a good choice and leaves people who number within don't have individual maps or who have not heard the map they want advanced named, have to potentially you know commit to a vote they wouldn't in the first round which eliminates their votes in the voting pool. So it just seems, you know, shenanigans is a phrase we hear a lot in the YouTube channel and seems like Shenanigans and attempt to rig the voting.

>> Nate Fink: If I can respond, I don't have interest in rigging voting or anything like that or creating a process that would encourage that. It's, you know, simply an option to be presented to try to make this as efficient process as possible to hopefully achieve a constitutional majority through if they become necessary in rounds two and three of the first set of voting.

>> CHAIR EID: Mr. Fink, can you pull up the document again and go to Section D?

>> Nate Fink: Commissioner Woods, can you pull it back up?

>> CHAIR EID: Can you scroll down a little bit?

I'm looking at subsection E here. Another option could be to increase the rounds of voting. You know, maybe we could go instead of three go to five before headed to ranked choice. That could be another thing we could look at.

>> Nate Fink: To be clear, if I may, you mean.

>> CHAIR EID: Please.

>> Nate Fink: As an alternative in other words we would not adopt this language but instead add more rounds of voting?

>> CHAIR EID: Yeah, as an alternative or in addition to. We probably would have to vote on those separately because I kind of see this as three separate things. We have the original language with just the Senate map like the Senate name being changed from the House and the dates being changed and then we have this proposal that you just presented and perhaps a third with an increase in the number of times before moving to ranked choice. So I mean those could be one thing or it could be three separate things. But if we can't come to consensus as there are more maps this time around, maybe increasing it from, you know, a first, second and third time to five times and then if we still can't reach majority is constitutional majority after a fifth time going to step three, the ranked choice voting process could be an option. I would wonder what peoples' thoughts are on that.

>> Nate Fink: Commissioner Lange and Szetela have their hands up.

>> CHAIR EID: I believe Commissioner Lange had her hand up first.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like the constitutional amendment the part that talks about the voting brought up so we can see it.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Please give me a second.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: I have it, Edward.

>> Nate Fink: I also have it.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Are you able to read that at all, Commissioner Lange?

I can't quite tell how large or small it is.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry could you increase it just a little bit. My eyes and glasses are not as good as they used to be.

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: How do I do that?

Hang on. Let me see if I can figure it out. Give me just a second.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: If you want I can switch.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Perfect. Thank you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Is that better?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That is, okay, I'm still unmuted. That is much better.

Thank you. Okay.

So, again, I would be open to a compromise as it relates to the collaborative maps. But clearly here it says each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan. You cannot

remove a Commissioner's plan. They have a constitutional right to have that plan in the pool. We've done it that way through every drawing session, Congressional, House, Senate. You can't come in 8th hour and change the rules and take away somebody's constitutional right. It doesn't matter if the Commission doesn't like that person's map or not. They have a constitutional right, and you can't tell -- don't roll your eyes Mr. Eid. That is disrespectful. Any way you cannot tell a Commission they cannot vote for the map that they want if it's their own map. I just feel like it is a gray area that you're putting us into for no reason. We have gone through this process multiple times. There is no reason to change it at this point. Like I said I would be willing to compromise as it relates to the collaborative maps. But for individual maps there shouldn't be a compromise on that. I mean, the Constitution says what it says. So I'm going to leave it at that until you guys decide you're going to vote or whatever you're going to do. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: For the record I wasn't rolling my eyes. I had something in them. And you don't know how I'm going to vote yet. So why don't we wait to see how that happens. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, I want to make a motion to adopt the 2024 procedure for the selection of a Senate House map with the amendment of removing the proposed language under step 2C that was added there. I want to remove that. And then under I would also amend step two, what is currently listed as E, but the original was D. And then the one below it E/F to say after a fifth vote. So D and E and the original will now move to ranked choice after a fifth vote. And then we would remove that language from step two vote C entirely. That will not be incorporated in the final plan.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid, can you have her repeat that again just for the record, please?

Commissioner Szetela if you don't mind?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I move to adopt this proposal with the removal of this language in C. Any plans receiving one vote or less remove that. So we are adopting it without that language. That will then make what is currently D part of C. So the numbering will return to the original. Then if we go down to the next Page, under the two items that Commissioner Eid had mentioned what is currently listed as E but will be D in the final and under what is currently listed as F and will be E in the final, change the third to fifth. So we will have fifth, five rounds of voting, if we cannot reach a consensus after five rounds of voting then we move to ranked choice.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: I'll second that motion. So essentially it's the same as the one that we originally got that only has the changes to the House being changed to the Senate and the dates plus increasing it from three rounds of voting to five before moving on to ranked choice. Is that right Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, we will move to discussion. Mr. Fink?

>> NATE FINK: I wanted to there is one part that I think Commissioner Szetela missed there which there is an extra word in what I think we don't have the document in front of us but I added in the word remaining which that should probably be removed as part of Commissioner Szetela's motion as well. It's just in, you have to scroll up Edward.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's in D and current yes I will amend the motion of the striking of that word as well, remove remaining from the current D which in the final draft will be C.

>> NATE FINK: Right, just wanted to clarify that.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a question that's unrelated but kind of related. Our policy, when we change our policies does it not require a three-day before we can vote on it, any changes made, presented, or is that just on certain ones, not necessarily the voting?

Can anybody answer that?

>> CHAIR EID: This was sent to us on Tuesday. So I think we've had the 48 hours.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It's 72 hours if I'm not mistaken.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think she is referring to the rules and procedures, Mr. Fink, so if we can take a look at that. I know this is not a part of the rules of procedure. This is a mapping policy. So let's just make sure with regards to that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you, Mr. Woods, that is what I was wondering if this falls under our policies, or not.

>> NATE FINK: If this is direct to me on parliamentary questions I refer to MDOS, but I think they have their hand up actually, someone from MDOS.

>> CHAIR EID: MDOS.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: So the three days refers directly to the rules of procedure. It indicates that these rules may be amended, referring to the rules of procedure from Section 14.2 with prior notice the prior notice and the agenda must be submitted at least three days prior to the meeting. So that is specific to the rules of procedure.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: We are voting on the one Edward sent out last Thursday, the 13th with the only additional change being changing it from three rounds to five. So I think we were noticed of this accurately for what we are voting for at the moment for the motion that is on the table. Okay is there any more discussion on the motion? Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So Commissioner Eid I could be incorrect about this, but I believe I need a second on that amendment.

>> CHAIR EID: I seconded it.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: On your amendment.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Amendment, yeah.

>> CHAIR EID: Remove the word.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I will second it.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, so we have an amendment on the floor to remove the word removed from the original motion. Once we vote on that we can return to the original motion, Department of State?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: It's to remove the word remaining, my apologies, I just want the record to be clear.

>> CHAIR EID: That is very important, thank you so much for that correction. Is there any more discussion on the amendments?

Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Just could someone explain what they are again? I'm confused. Are we amending or approving or amending and approving what are we voting on, what is on the table?

>> CHAIR EID: Right now Commissioner Szetela made a motion, but she is amending that motion to just remove that word that is highlighted. So we got to vote on that and once that happen we will return to the original motion which is actually what is on the table. Does that make sense?

What is actually on the table is the document that minus what Mr. Fink presented so that would not be in it and also changing it from three rounds of voting to five.

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No, it makes no sense to remove the word remaining unless you remove the paragraph that eliminates that. Are we voting on those two things?

Those two changes are together?

So are we voting on removing the remove a map after round one and the word remaining?

Because just removing remaining makes no sense.

>> CHAIR EID: Department of State.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: You are voting on the ability to amend the main motion and you are amending the main motion to include removing the word remaining from that subsection so you are voting on whether that main motion can have that inclusion. Does that help?

>> Yes.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: So the first vote is whether or not you can amend the main motion to have the inclusion of the removal of remaining from subsection as it's currently listed D as in David.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you so much for that explanation. All those in favor of the amendment please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed please raise your hand and say nay. Okay that is adopted. We will now go back to the original as amended. Department of state can we restate what the original motion was?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. So now you are voting on whether or not to adopt the 2024 procedure for the selection of a Senate map as presented with the removal of the proposed changes in subsection C, D and E related to removing of maps receiving one or less votes each round along with the inclusion of language in step two subsection F to change it to five rounds of majority voting. Are there any questions? I'm happy to state that again.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, it would be E and F, they both reference third, so both E and F would have third changed to fifth so it's two sections, just want to make that clear.

>> MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you for that.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, is there any more debate on that, what we are actually voting on?

I just want to make sure everyone is clear, and everyone has an understanding. All right we will now move to vote, all those in favor of the motion to adopt these Senate rules for selection please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: All opposed?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and the rules are adopted. Thank you Commissioners for that discussion and thank you Department of State for helping me keep it organized. It gets a little hard when we have smaller amendments like that but we got through it so that is good. Next on the agenda is item new business 6B, Senate deliberations meeting schedule.

>> NATE FINK: Mr. Chairman, I had my hand up. So I know the Commission has adopted the procedure which again as adopted other than the change from three to five is substantively the same as the House procedure which we did do an overview of before. I know we are short on time today. The next steps in the process that I didn't discuss in my presentation I alluded to them but didn't discuss them are the ranked choice voting process and the random selection process. Given the short timeframe that we have, I can go over that process at the beginning of Monday's meeting or, you know, after public comment, before you actually go into deliberations if you would like. Again, given the time constraint that we have here. But I would encourage Commissioners to read through that in advance of the meeting on Monday. And I'm happy to give a brief overview of that right now. If Commissioners would like that.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS:

>> CHAIR EID: There are no changes.

>> NATE FINK: I'm sorry Director Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I can modify my report, but I think we probably want to get this on the record for the public, so everyone knows what is happening.

>> NATE FINK: Sure. So then I will go ahead and give an overview of this. So I'm not going to read this verbatim, but the policy is as it's presented here on the screen. If the Commission through its five round of voting does not achieve a constitutional majority and select a map through that process, then we will move into the ranked choice, the ranked choice voting process. And the procedure for that is laid out here, the secretary will call on each Commissioner in alphabetical order, each Commissioner will then audibly indicate which draft proposed map they would like to submit for their ranked choice vote. Each Commissioner may submit one draft proposed map. More than one Commissioner may submit the same draft proposed plan. Again, and like I said we discussed this during the House procedure, it's still the same here so if you have a single map that more than one Commissioner wants to submit as their submission for the ranked choice voting process, they can do so. And the secretary will record which Commissioner has submitted which draft proposed map and the Commissioner's corresponding party affiliation. Because that plays into the determination as to which map gets selected through the ranked choice voting process. So after that, after that process, after the map submissions have been made and selections have been made by the various Commissioners, the secretary MDOS will create a form, a Microsoft form live during the public session while screen sharing so that everybody can see how the process is working, containing all of the names of the draft proposed maps submitted pursuant to the previous step. And the Commissioners will then rank in order of preference the most preferred to the least preferred among the options that were submitted. Once that form has been created, this is just getting into some of the nitty-gritty details, but the secretary's MDOS will send an e-mail to each Commissioner containing a link to the form. And the link will be distributed publicly to make sure the process is secure and only Commissioners are participating in it. Each Commissioner will have ten minutes to complete the form and submit the map. If for some reason the Commissioner is unable to access the form due to connection, Internet connection issues or any technical issues, the Commissioner will convey their preferred Rankings to the secretary verbally and publicly for the secretary to record and include in the votes in the ranked choice voting calculation. After the ten minutes have been completed, the ranked choice form has expired, and each Commissioner present at the meeting has voted the secretary will tally the votes. The secretary will read each Commissioner's ranked votes so the votes become a matter of public record and will be read aloud for each Commissioner present to audibly confirm their vote on the record. One at a time in alphabetical order. In terms of how the votes are calculated each plan will be assigned, you scrolled down a little too far there Edward, each plan will be

assigned a point value among the number of choices. This comes from directly from the constitutional language giving the lowest ranked plan one point and the highest ranked point plan a point value equal to the number of plans submitted. So if there were five plans submitted for ranked choice voting the highest gets five points, the lowest ranked plan gets one or one point. The Commission shall adopt with the highest points and this is as I alluded to before why it's relevant which Commissioner submit through the party affiliation of the Commissioner submitting the maps for this process. The Commissioner adopts the plan with the highest total points that is also ranked among the top half of plans by at least two Commissioners not affiliated with the party of the Commissioner submitting the plan or in case of a plan submitted by a nonaffiliated Commissioner affiliated so if an unaffiliated Commissioner submitted a plan you need two democrats or two republicans or at least one of each that also had the plan ranked in the top half of their selections.

The secretary will announce the results of the ranked choice vote and share excel spreadsheet publicly via Zoom to display the total point value achieved by each plan. The results will also be publicly posted on the Commission's website as part of the public record. If we have two plans through this process that are tied for the highest point total and also meet the requirement that at least two members of the Commission who are not affiliated with the submitting Commissioner, it's in the top half of their selections as long as we met those requirements then there will be a random selection using an independent accounting firm to do a random draw of the two highest, of the tied selections.

If through that process, though we do not, sorry, did -- can you scroll up a little bit? I guess you are right there. So if no plan meets the requirements of this ranked, through the ranked choice voting process and we don't select a map through that process then MDOS will use an independent accounting firm to randomly select the final remedial State Senate plan from among all of the submitted plans that had been submitted during the ranked choice voting process. So if you go back a step to where the ranked choice voting process begins, again, not the initial voting round where you are trying to achieve the constitutional majority, the majority voting process but in the ranked choice voting selection each -- any map that is submitted by a Commissioner for that process is then included in the random draw should the random draw become necessary if the Commission does not achieve does not select a map through ranked choice voting. Now, I realize that this can sound a little bit confusing, but we want to make sure it's all out there for the public record and if there are follow-up questions we can discuss it today and a continued discussion on Monday if necessary. But the Commission back in 2021 had considered different options for a determination as to how you account for maps, plans that are submitted by more than one Commissioner for the ranked choice voting process. Because as I indicated more than one Commissioner can submit the same plan. The procedure that was adopted by the

Commission in 2021, that is the procedure that is in place, is as follows: If a single plan is submitted for ranked choice voting by more than one Commissioner, the secretary will vote that for the record that plan that a particular plan, plan A for example say was submitted by two Commissioners. One republican, one democrat. Okay that will be noted for the record. When you actually go into the ranked choice voting process that map, plan A, will only appear once as a single line item, a single option in the ranked choice voting ballot. Even though it was submitted twice it will only appear once for people to vote on. But, again, the record will be noted that that particular map was submitted by both a republican and a democrat. So when you move into the voting process and determining whether you have two members of the opposite party or either unaffiliated or from the opposite party you factor in both the fact this was both the republican and democratic submission. But again in the ranked choice voting process the plan A, even though it was submitted twice will only appear once. This is from the process adopted by the Commission back in December of 2021. Before voting on all of the initial maps.

So if we don't submit a map through the ranked choice voting process and go through random selection again under the procedure already adopted by the Commission, any plans that were submitted by -- if a single plan was submitted by more than one Commissioner so going back to my example of plan A gets submitted by both a republican and a democrat then that plan A will then appear twice in the hat so to speak that the random draw will occur from. Although it only appears once as an option in the ranked choice voting process it will appear in that example twice in the random selection process should that process become necessary.

I realize this is kind of a complicated sounding process. When you actually sort of drill down into it I don't think that it's that difficult to ultimately understand. And again we wanted to just put it all out there for the public and for Commissioners so that they understand again this process like I say was adopted that I just described was adopted by the Commission back in 21 after considering a couple of different options for how to do that.

So that's the process. I'm happy to answer any questions now or if you had some time to think about it and read through it, if you have additional questions or either additional questions any you may have now or anything on Monday I'm happy to address it then.

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

>> NATE FINK: I hope I did not make you go to sleep. It looks like everyone is here.

>> CHAIR EID: You did a great job describing what is in the process so everybody including the public is aware and hopefully it doesn't get this far. We have constitutional majority on one of them and that will be it.

All right, okay well next on the agenda is new business 6B Senate deliberations meeting schedule. There is no objection I will ask Executive Director Woods to facilitate this item. Is there any objection Commissioners?

Seeing none please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Is everybody able to see my screen?

>> CHAIR EID: We can.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Perfect. Thank you. The Commission has voted with regards to the schedule for the Senate deliberations to meet on Monday, June 24th from 10-1 and also 4-7. Tuesday 10-5 with lunch 1-2 and then Wednesday June 26th from 10-1. What is being proposed or discussed is looking at doing a hybrid schedule where the Commission would meet Monday 10-5, Tuesday 10-5 and Wednesday 10-5 with lunch from 1-2. Hybrid schedule means that you can participate if you are not able to come in person, you would participate remote like we mostly do, like we are currently doing now.

What is before the Commission is do you want to look at remote only?

We have the Attorney General's office and remote in Lansing and we have Detroit Marriott Southfield which also would be remote as well and what is before the Commission is to identify how it wants to meet next week with regards to the meeting schedule. I did share some information via e-mail. I did receive an e-mail today during our meeting. And for full transparency the Detroit Marriott Southfield will cost \$100 a day with the third day free. Just so everyone is aware of that. 100 a day with the third day free. And with that 100 there is a service charge that will be added to that as well. Obviously we don't pay taxes. So I just want to make sure that comes out to \$122 for Monday, \$122 for Tuesday and Wednesday is free if we go all three days. If there are any questions I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would say we do remote only and if I can get a second I will speak as to why I think that that's the best thing that we do.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I will second that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you. The reason why I'm remembering that I had reached out to Executive Director Woods after our town halls and while we have done our constitutional duty and you know, we offered public comment or public comment period ends the 21st I just think we need to be aware of the financials that we've spent. Our town halls we spent 13345 to get nine comments from the actual town hall itself. It does not include online comments. When we are talking about attending hybrid, I'm worried about additional costs for AV. Travel for Commissioners, not all of the Commissioners live close to those areas. And what if there is only one or two Commissioners that would even want to attend in person. I think everything that needs to be done with the deliberations while I have not attended in person, I have seen everybody attend in person and most of you have your computers out in front of you

and are staring at your computers any way when we are doing the mapping and stuff so I think in order to be conscious of the taxpayer money that we are spending, we should do virtual. So that's my reasoning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY:

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: You're on mute Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I got it. I just want to say that the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission, the application, when they hired us they already made stipulations, they knew they were going to be out of money for this, that and the other. And one of the stipulations is that we meet in public. And so if we have to meet in public they knew they had to pay the bill so I don't think we should use that as an excuse not to meet.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes. So I -- thank you Commissioner Curry. I had asked Edward to take a look into this and if it would be possible to meet in person for a few reasons. I do think meeting, doing this in person would be a lot better. And I think everybody who is able to attend should attend. I hope we have all 13 people there. Everyone is invited of course. But I think the, you know, the financial aspects I think are vastly overblown. We still spend significantly less money than every other redistricting across the country even with the remedial process. So I don't really think that is a good reason to decide whether to be in person or in public. I think we all need to be there to, you know, to be there with the people, we are a public body and all public bodies meet in person. But more importantly than that my rationale is what is more likely for us to get a constitutional majority because I don't want to go to ranked choice, I don't want to go to ranked drawing. I want to get a constitutional majority and call it a day. And I think it's more likely that we get that if we are there in person. So that's why I think we should be in person. And that's my opinion. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a follow-up on that. I'm kind of curious on your thought process on why you think being in person would get us a constitutional majority as opposed to being online or virtual?

I mean, all discussions happen in front of the public. So I'm kind of curious what you're thinking is on that.

>> CHAIR EID: Well, I agree all discussions certainly do happen like you know over Zoom while we are at it but there is a real added benefit to being in person. There is more camaraderie and see body language and face and I'm looking now and can't see everyone's face and I can't see your face Commissioner Lange, that is your choice, that is okay but when we are in person you can see bodies language and visceral reactions to different things and it just I kind of think it's, there is a reason why public bodies meet in public. So it's not really so much of a deliberations reason. It's more so a humanistic reason of being there, in person. I do think we are more likely to get the majority that way. And go from there. I could be wrong.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of clarification too just for the public record my camera is broke and has been broke so it's not my choice. Just so we are clear, thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Got you, I wasn't trying to single you out. I'm saying there are a lot of people whose faces I don't see. That is everyone's choice. That is all right. I have my camera off sometimes too. But I do think there is an advantage to being in person. Is there any other debate?

The motion before us is to meet virtually. Is that correct, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That is correct.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, so we have a motion by Commissioner Lange, seconded by I think it was Commissioner Szetela. Is that right, Department of State?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: That is correct.

>> CHAIR EID: All those in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: All those opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: We might need a roll call for this one.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Certainly, Mr. Chair. A yes vote to the motion before you means you are in favor of the motion and a no vote means you are not in favor of the motion. I will get my mouse over there. Hang on, I'm sorry. Commissioner Andrade?

>> ELAINE ANDRADE: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> DONNA CALLAGHAN: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yep. Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Lett is out, I'm sorry. Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes, did you catch that, yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Commissioner Weiss, sorry, my mouse is acting up sorry, Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: Mr. Chair with four yes and eight no, the motion does not carry.

>> CHAIR EID: All right, thank you Department of State.

>> YVONNE YOUNG: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR EID: So the other options were either in Lansing or Southfield; is that correct, Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes, that is correct.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay is there any preference per Commissioners, which one of those would be better?

It doesn't matter much to me but if more people would come to a certain place, we might want to take that into consideration. Commissioner Szetela and then Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Because we are supposed to be addressing Detroit it seems Southfield would be a better choice because it's closer to people in Detroit if they want to attend the in-person hearing.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> MARCUS MULDOON: Yeah, I would say Southfield would be a little easier for me and a couple other Commissioners live in that area. There are a few that don't but I propose we do Southfield and then remote if needed.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay, is there a second to that, Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Second that.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay we have a motion and a second to be meeting in Southfield next week.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid, if I may just so we know what the mapping procedures there was a time on there so I just wanted to make sure that everyone understands that if the Commissioner does into with the proposal it's from 10-5, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, as it will be what the Commission voted on the mapping procedures so that will be understood that needs to be adjusted.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Woods. All right, everyone got that? Everyone have an understanding of the motion and the second? Department of State?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: I just wanted to let the Commission know that I will be unable to be there in person on Tuesday. But Ms. Reinhardt has indicated that she is able to be there in person to assist with coordination of in-person logistics. I will be able to attend virtually and facilitate the deliberations though. I just want to let you know.

>> CHAIR EID: All right, thank you. Okay, we have a motion and a second. Let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

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

>> Nay.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: All right the ayes have it and the motion is adopted.

Thank you, Commissioners. Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: In light of the time, Commissioner Eid, if you want we can table all these other items until Monday. There is nothing pertinent. I have enough to execute what needs to be done in Southfield.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay I will entertain a motion to table new business items C and D as well as agenda item 7, all of the approval of the minutes to Monday.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: So moved.

>> MARCUS MULDOON: I second.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Commissioners. We have a motion by Commissioner Weiss seconded by Commissioner Muldoon to table the remainder items of new business 6 and approving of the minutes from 7 to the meeting on Monday. All -- is there any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none all those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

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

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and those items are tabled.

Is there an Executive Director's report today Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We can table all of that too. I know we are over so I just want to respect our interpreters and our closed caption.

>> CHAIR EID: Any MDOS updates?

>> MEGAN SCHAAR: One second we can wrap the meeting. We don't have it.

>> CHAIR EID: All right.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I move that we adjourn.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion and a second, motion to adjourn by Commissioner Lange and seconded by Commissioner Orton, all those in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed?

The ayes have it and we are adjourned at 12:05 p.m. See everyone on Monday.