

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.

MDOS MICRC

07/18/24 COMMISSIONN MEETING

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

[ Please stand by for captioning ]

>> CHAIR EID: Good morning, everyone.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Good morning.

>> CHAIR EID: As Chairman of the Commission I call this meeting to order at 10:00 a.m..

This Zoom webinar is live streamed on YouTube on the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission's 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, Arabic, and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participating in today's meeting.

E-mail us at [Redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.gov) for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for the meeting.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should also contact [Redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.gov).

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed and those closed-captioned transcripts will be made available and posted on the [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) website and written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed via visiting [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://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 and at [WoodsE3@Michigan.gov](mailto:WoodsE3@Michigan.gov) or

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.

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

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: It looks like Yvonne unmuted herself but I'm unable to hear her. Are you there? I will go ahead and take roll. Bear with me just a moment, Commissioners.

Commissioners, when I call your name, please state that you're present and tell the public where your attending this meeting remotely from. I'll begin with Commissioner Andrade.

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: Present from MI Township Michigan.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you. Commissioner Callighan.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Present, attending remotely from Mexico.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Curry.

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

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid.

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

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present attending from lake County, Michigan.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present and attending from Grant Township.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: Present.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present from Battle Creek.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Attending from Wayne County.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner.

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 WAGNER: Present from Eaton County.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present. Saginaw.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: I'll go back to Commissioner Kellom. Chair, with 12 Commissioners present, you do have a quorum.

>> CHAIR EID: Wonderful. Thank you so much.

We'll now move to do you want the agenda. As a reminder to the public watching, you can view the agenda at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC).  
Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would like to make a motion to amend Unfinished Business 5C to move it up to 5A so the new order would be A legal expense and B archives and C archives and so on.

>> Second.

>> CHAIR EID: There's a motion and a second to reorder the agenda. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we'll move to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand and say Aye.

Any opposed please, please raise your hand and say nay.

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: Roll call vote?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Unfinished Business 5C Notice to Vacate Legal Expense to the beginning of Unfinished Business and proceeding with the rest of the list there and state of the archives becomes Unfinished Business C and so on. A yes vote means you are in favor of amending the agenda in this way and an into vote means you are about.

Commissioner Andrade?

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: Nay.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Nay.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR EID: I'm going to abstain on this one.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: What is the basis for abstention?

>> CHAIR EID: Conflict of interest.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom. I don't think she's showing.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Nay.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Nay.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Nay.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Nay. With a vote of five yes to six no, with one abstention, the motion does not pass.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Thank you, Ms. Schaar. Is there a motion to approve the meeting agenda?

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

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion and a second to approve the agenda as presented as it was sent out to us. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none, we'll move to vote. All in favor to adopt the agenda please raise your hand and say Aye.

>> Aye.

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

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and the motion is adopted. Next on the agenda is Public Comments. If there's no objection Commissioners, we'll begin the public comment portion for today's meeting. Is there any objection? Hearing none, we'll move on.

Individuals who have signed up and have indicated they would like to provide remote commenting to the Commission you will be allowed.

If you are on the phone, a voice will say a host wants you to speak and press STAR six to unmute. I will call you by your name or the last four digits of your phone number. Please note, if you're experiencing technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for three to five seconds, we'll move on to the next person in line and return to you when they are done speaking. If your audio does not work you can email [redistricting@MICRC.gov](mailto:redistricting@MICRC.gov) and we will help you troubleshoot. You'll have 90 seconds to address the Commission and please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. We have three individuals who have signed up to speak teed, the first being Mr. James Gallant.

>> JAMES GALLANT: Can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR EID: We can. Good morning, Mr. Gallant.

>> JAMES GALLANT: Marquette suicide prevention coalition now has a stated purpose to help common law Parliamentary law. It hears the issue of [indistinct] as compared to inform at deliberations during the public meeting is at the heart of our case of controversy. It was provided to you that you must make a motion, second that motion to approve a specific action to bring the business before the Commission like you're going to bring business to this vacate thing. The discussion comes after the motion.

It appears what you're doing is blending the standard code to Parliamentary procedure. They allow this during the meeting and that's wrong and institutionalizing Marxist style Communism. I would suspect the members are getting up on the real rules. Please help us to get a formal Attorney General opinion on this subject. The state board of Canvassers are

doing the same thing. And who appointed secretary chair today? The second couldn't be here and attention my opinion she will [ Music ]

>> CHAIR EID: Did we lose him?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: His 90 seconds was up.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Gallant, for your comments. We appreciate them as always. Next up is there Anthony Skinnell.

>> ANTHONY SKINNELL: Hello MICRC and I'm happy to see that the special master and the plaintiffs, people seem to be satisfied with the Crane A1 submission or final decision you've made and I guess we're waiting other the court, if that's right, if I haven't missed anything. I eagerly await that. I've already voted in the August primary in our new Motown sound, District one. And so that was pretty fun. I put my ballot in the drop box. You know, it's funny, when that was up for a ballot proposal a few years ago, I didn't even vote for the absentee ballots, for anything I said no and now that we have it, I'll use it. Anyway, I therefore would like to reopen my inquiry as my top issue for the MICRC right now. My inquiry for the ongoing and current constitutional eligibility of each of you Commissioners on the party affiliation question. If you filled out an application five years ago, I think, right? 2019 or I don't know when it was filled out but some time ago, do you still affiliate with the party you said you did in 2019?

[ Music ]

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Skinnell. Next up is Tokin.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: That individual is not present.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. That concludes today's public comment portion of the meeting. Please feel free to email comments to us at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov). We appreciate everyone who offers public comment in whatever way you choose and invite you to keep sharing your thoughts.

We will move to Unfinished Business. 5A State of Michigan Archives.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Chair, before we do that, can we just acknowledge that Commissioner Kellom has joined.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Joining remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you so much, sorry, Chair.

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

>> CHAIR EID: That's quite all right. Thank you Ms. Shar and welcome Commissioner Kellom.

A5 if there's no objection I would ask Director woods to facilitate this item. Are there any objections? Seeing none, Mr. Woods, you have the floor.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Thank you very much. Let me share my screen. Is everyone able to see my screen?

>> CHAIR EID: Welcome.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Perfect. I want to thank the State of Michigan archive team and I just wanted to give you an update on where we are with the archives in terms of the archive. The website AAM has processed our commissions website from 2020 onward so therefore, this means since the exception of the Commission, I believe it was September 17, 2020 was the first meeting. The Archives and the internet archives way back machine. The historical versions of the website will be preserved and accessible as it was on a specific date and access would be via dedicated MICRC web Commission. Archiving all 2700 plus individual digital files published on the website since 2020 and other relevant files identified by the Commission. Examples include the PD reports, minutes, maps, Public Comments, using Preserorvika and online portal archives Missionology. Wanted to make sure you are aware of that taking place and two more things. Social media will archive the content of Facebook, Twitter now X. Social with a dedicated MICRC portal and the paper over all collection, any records available in hard copy such as boxes from MDOS, former publications and transfer of overall collections will be cataloged and described in the archives of Michigan online catalog.

What I wanted to share with you as the produces that is other going with regards to the Commission's records.

As many of you know, other states have used what is taking place in Michigan as a best practice, as a bench mark. We have already heard how the state of Colorado adopted the Commission's rule and procedures and Ohio looks at the Commission in regard to its own ballot proposal and how things are functioning in Michigan. This will be a topic for Research and we want to make sure we have everything set up and present in the state's archives so that people can readily find the information and then making sure that whatever hard copies or information that you may have in your possession, that we can get to the archives of Michigan as well. So it can be catalogs.

If there's any questions, I can take them at this time. All right. Hearing none, I can move to the University of Michigan. The University of Michigan is working in concert with the State of Michigan Archives with regards to that. However, just so we're clear, at the University of Michigan, they are also the depository for voters, not politicians. And also the depository for the close up program that was previously run by Tom Melvaca who is now retired and we are working with them, taking a tour of the facility.

As you know, in the past they have made a request to hear directly from Commissioners individually with regard to the process of serving on the Commission and how you felt and wanting to do individual interview to get your perspective. In order to participate in that, they do request a sign off, but it's the choice of each individual Commissioner as to whether or not they choose to participate. But they are interested in getting this project started in August and I will be reaching out to you with regards to that.

But just letting you know that we will have it, the archives obviously at the State of Michigan but also at the University of Michigan and once again, the University of Michigan will also have all the archives from voters, not politicians, as well as the close up. If there's any questions, I can take them at this time.

All right. Commissioner Eid, I think because of what's happening, it would be nice if we had a committee that could kind of just assist me with regards to this. There's going to be a lot of moving parts in the next couple of months, to make sure that everything is there. And I would like to suggest Commissioners Elaine Andrade, Commissioner Cynthia Orton and Commissioner Janice Vallette to assist me with regards to a subcommittee in archives.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay. That would have to be a motion from a Commissioner to establish that kind of subcommittee. Are there.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we establish the Committee as suggested by Executive Director Woods, provided that the three named individuals that they would serve.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion and a second to establish an archive subcommittee with Commissioners Andrade, Commissioner Orton, and Commissioner Valette to sit on subcommittee. Is that right?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That's correct.

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

>> CHAIR EID: Any comment on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Let's ask if they would agree to serve.

>> CHAIR EID: What do you all think? Commissioner Vallette? Commissioner Orton? Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I am happy to serve there.

>> CHAIR EID: All in favor of the emotion please raise your hand and say Aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed say Nay.

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and subcommittee is established and I'm sure you will work well with Mr. Woods in order to make sure we have a good archival process there. Thank you in advance.

Next another agenda is Unfinished Business 5C, Notice to Vacate Legal Expense. At this time I'll transfer the Chair to our Vice Chair, Commissioner Kellom to hand this.

Of the agenda.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Eid. We'll have local Council who I know is present because I see his face and he's getting ready to speak and he has his right to speak and Nate Fink is ready to present. If there are no objections? Hearing none, please proceed.

>> NATE FINK: Thank you, Madame Chair. Good morning to everybody. I hope everybody is doing width. Commission will recall that there was a notice to vacate request committed requesting the removal of Commissioner Eid from the Commission. I'm not suggesting and I don't think it's appropriate for us to relitigate any of the issues that were addressed in that request. But there's one remaining issue.

One issue hanging out there. They decided not to proceed with the notice to vacate and not to proceed with the removal. Rule 3.4 E-2. I can share that provision right now.

Can everyone see my screen? Okay. So as I indicated, this is the Commission's Rules of Procedure. This is section 3.4 which relates to a

notice or request to remove a Commissioner from the Commission for various reasons. 3.4 E-2 states, I'll highlight the language here.

If the vote to declare the Member seat vacant fails, the Member may be reimbursed for reasonable attorney fees utilizing the load STAR method and the Michigan rules of professional conduct which includes the relevant factors calculating the load STAR amount and adjustments upward or downward when prepare.

The key term in what I take from that is that the Commission may -- must but may -- reimburse Commissioner Eid for attorney fee that's he incurred related to the notice to vacate proceeding because the Commission did not vote to remove him from the Commission.

His counsel in that proceeding was the Dykema law firm led by Steve Leedle. They submitted invoices -- I say invoices because they submitted their full array of invoice and then a discounted invoice. Those invoices have been shared with the Commission. I reviewed those invoices and they appeared to me to be reasonable. The rates that they have included, particularly the reduced rates that they provided seemed to be reasonable. The amount of time and the time entries that they provided seemed to me to be reasonable. Nothing jumps out at me as being inappropriate.

I would not recommend either an upward or downward adjustment as provided for in the Commission's rules as it relates to the invoice that was submitted. So if the Commission decides that it wants to reimburse Commissioner Eid for his attorney fees related to that proceeding, I don't see any issue of with the invoice that was submitted. It seems to be reasonable to me. And I'm happy to address or answer any questions that anybody might have. But that's what I have.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So I don't have any particular questions but I do have comments on this. Are you fine with me proceeding with this at this point?

>> NATE FINK: I don't have any issue with it. I don't know if there's any motion before the Commission at this moment about, but it's an agenda item. I would defer to the Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I don't see any issue with comments, as long as they remain germane to what Mr. Fink just presented and it doesn't open up something we have discussed in previous Commission meetings.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: In case there's -- I would make the motion that we pay the invoice as stated and then we can open it up for whatever discussion we want to do.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Szetela has asked to make comments and we have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Lett and a second by Commissioner Weiss. Is there any discussion on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I think Commissioner Szetela is probably going to have some discussion.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Right. So that's why I was going to give her this opportunity. I'll making sure I'm still following the rules, Commissioner Lett.

>> NATE FINK: If I may add something to clarify? I think the motion was made to pay the invoice. I think it should be clear. As I indicated, there were two different invoices. There was the original invoice and the reduced invoice. I believe that the reduced invoice, should the Commission decide to pay one, that's the one the Commission should consider paying. So I would suggest that perhaps the motion be modified to be clear that that's the invoice. And just to be even more clear for the record, that's the one in the amount of \$16,730.10.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That would be correct. I interpreted their billing as the discounted invoice was the one they were asking to be paid. For my motion. But it's the discounted invoice.

>> NATE FINK: Okay. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Okay. Thank you for that, Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah. The first thing I want to comment on is looking over this bill, there's multiple entries here on discussion on amending the Rules of Procedure.

I don't think that's appropriate to be included this whatsoever because we have counsel. Mr. Fink was advising on the Rules of Procedure and draft revisions to it. There is a reference as well about Mr. Lidel communicating with Mr. Fink about changing the Rules of Procedure. The fact that Mr. Eid wanted to use his counsel for Rules of Procedure, there's no need for that as we have our own counsel.

I want to raise the fact that this new Commission and I know the three Commissioners were not part of this discussion but just for background, in

the summer of 2023 I, Commissioner Lange I believe also and Commissioner Wagner at various points asked for our own independent counsel because we were named in the case. Commissioners were free to hire counsel for whatever reason and they are responsible for the cost associated.

I think it would be inconsistent to say now Commissioner Eid went and chose his counsel and that the Commission not paying for them in the past, those would not be covered. The expenses for Mr. Eid were in a personal capacity and not on the behalf of the Commission as a wheel and I don't see any Constitution where it authorizes us to pay for individual Commissioner's legal expenses. The Commission's legal expenses but not individual Commissioners.

I think it's inappropriate for the Commission to take that position that he should be paid for this. And I think it's particularly concerning in the context of what the allegations in the notice were. They were allegations of corruption and now the Commission is considering paying Mr. Eid or personally enriching him for allegations, potential corruption and I think that's a disturbing position to take. If you want to take it, knock yourselves out but it's not apportion I can ever support. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I totally agree with Commissioner Szetela. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you Madame Chair. In response to Commissioner Szetela, clearly stated teed, this is specific to a motion to vacate which was brought other by Commissioner Szetela against Mr. Eid is under a separate provision to pay for his expenses, not the Commission's expenses.

If he prevails, which he did in this, then his attorney fees are covered by the Commission, if we so vote. So to compare that, Commissioner Szetela wanted her independent oar separate legal fees paid under a provision, under the lawsuit, the Agee lawsuit which covered everybody, not just Commissioner Eid and/or Commissioner Szetela. There's no particular provision for that. We debated that back in the day and it was determined that we weren't, the Commission wasn't going to pay for separate, in effect, 13 different attorneys if all the Commissioners chose to go that way on the individual lawsuit. It has nothing to do with trying to kick one of the Commissioner's off, which seems to be Commissioner Szetela's want.

The Dykema firm is a well-respected firm in Michigan. Been around a long time. Mr. Lido is a well-respected attorney and under the formula used in determining reasonable rates, as attorney Fink has said, you look at the load star method which you like, what is the nature of representation in this. It was to represent Mr. Eid, Commissioner Eid, in what I would at least consider -- Mr. Fink may have a different opinion and I'm Commissioner Szetela has an opposite view -- this was a rather unique situation in that we are a new Commission. This had never been tried on or alleged to be in play. So there was certainly unique question that's required significant Research on his part.

And his hourly rate and he spread it out. He didn't use his hourly rate on everybody. He had other less paid associates working on it so that lowered the cost. It is within Commissioner Eid's purview to ask to have paid the invoice and in the circumstances to have been brought which I consider and former Commissioner Clark considered and we so put in a report that they were unfounded.

To continue to push after that report resulted in these expenses. And evidently, and I'll say this, from Commissioner Szetela's comments today, they are almost libelous, against Commissioner Eid. So I would urge the Commission to approve the payment of these expenses. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So a consume of points. With respect to Commissioner Lett's reference to this supposed report that Commissioner Clark and himself prepared. Number one, there was no such report. [Laughter]. To claim there was a report issued to the Commission. You were never authorized for you two to get together to make a decision on behalf of the Commission and that was something you did on your own.

Those allegations then were relevant to Commissioner Eid's employment with a particular interest that had worked closely with the Commission during the drafting of maps. The notice was significantly broader than that. The notice was did drawing of Districts to benefit Democratic politicians and included many other things. So what you did in the summer, what you and Mr. Clark did on your own and formed your own little committee and demurred the decision of what you thought was merit, that had nothing to do with the notice. The notice was broader and the report had nothing to do with the notice. Commissioner Eid prevailed. I also want to point out that the question is actually the same in some ways.

He has independent counsel that he's acquired. The Commission changed the rules in Jan, obviously, in consultation with Mr. Lidel based on the billing where it indicates he was communicating with Mr. Fink about the procedural changes made it benefit Mr. Eid. In Jan before we had any kind of pretend hearing and notice, it was pretty obvious that this Commission was not going to entertain the notice, consider it seriously, or have a hearing other it, because they were already changing the rules to create this loop where Commissioner Eid gets to be compensated if he responds to the notice. If that rule was longstanding I would say, no, that rule exists. It was created to benefit Mr. Eid. I think you would have taken a different view on covering any legal expenses.

I think there's a little bit of intellectual honesty here. In the case of Agee where you have people named but this that position individual attorneys would have been appropriate and the Commission said they were not going to pay for them. The only benefit here of hiring an attorney was to benefit Mr. Eid and not benefit the Commission and not designed to epigastrium had the Commission as a whole. It was for his own individual benefit. If you want to reimburse him for that, it's on you. You own that. It's inappropriate and I'm not going to change my opinion that it's inappropriate and ultimately you are going to do what you want to do and you get to own that.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Callaghan? Gan what this would mean for anybody else who is thinking of possibly serving on this committee in the future, they would have to be aware that theorizing themselves up too being accused of corruption or other behavior.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: You're breaking up a little bit.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: And that person to serve on a Commission for not that much money. Is it better now?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, now.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: I just think it's a terrible precedent to set that any citizen westbound opening themselves up to thousands of dollars of legal fees to defend themselves against anyone on the Commission who has an axe to grind against them who wants to make accusations and they have to have their reputation smeared publicly and not defend themselves or spend thousands of dollars of their even money to try to get their reputation back. I don't think that's a precedent we want to set for this Commission going forward. In my mind, that's ridiculous.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: That's why we put the rule in in the first Chris plays that the Commission should reimburse Commissioners if there's a notice to vacate and the notes to vacate didn't succeed.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: For clarification, acting Chair Kellom, when there is, would it not be an abstention because this is regarding Commissioner Eid and therefore he wouldn't be able to participate in the discussion in favor of or against doing the, paying the bill? I just want clarification on that so we're doing everything correctly.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I am not aware of Commissioner Eid's inability to speak during debate and discussion on this matter. But if Megan, if you have any guidance since Commissioner Lange has raised a pint of order.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: I don't believe there is anything in your Rules of Procedure regarding this. It would appear that it would be inappropriate for him to participate in the vote, and thus, I would advise not participate in the discussion and I would defer to the Commission.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Fink, did you want to say something or no?

>> NATE FINK: The section 3.4 members subject to the allegations of the notice may not participate in the matters by the Commission and I think that's more contemplating the discussion of the request to remove. Not necessarily this component of the discussion after the fact. But that said, I mean, we're hearing from plenty of Commissioners and hearing their perspective. So, you know, I'm not sure that it's necessary to hear from the Commissioner who is the subject much this but I don't know that there's explicit rule in a way. But I guess I would defer to the Chair on this to make a call in that context.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Okay. Commissioner Eid, did you feel particularly impassioned to continue your statement? If not, I'm going to hear from other Commissioners during this time.

>> CHAIR EID: I'll yield. I may come back though. We'll see.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Do so with caution. Automatic. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah. I'm sorry. I forgot to address Commissioner Lett's claim that's I'm somehow libeling Commissioner Eid. First of all. Libel is written and slander is spoken. It wouldn't be libel any way.

>> CHAIR EID: Point of order.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I have it, Commissioner Eid. So Commissioner Szetela, before Commissioner Eid was going to say point of order, I didn't want to interrupt you the last time. I am totally fine to have the floor open to you as you express factual information but if you can avoid coloring it with assumptions or references to whether people have feelings about one person or another. If you're presenting exactly what happened that could be backed up without any conjecture that would be great. And you're totally allowed to respond if you feel like you disagree with someone else but I really would like this portion of the debate and discussion topics to be the legal fee that's related to today's discussion. If we can do that and we still have an emotion presented by Commissioner Lett to have the Vietnamese. This doesn't have to be an exhaustive thing but I would like Commissioners to shed light on whatever they deem in a respectful way with no innuendos.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm laughing because I feel like you should have chimed in when Commissioner Lett accused me of libel. You said nothing. If I can complete my sentence. Nothing was said libelous against Mr. Eid and as an attorney, Mr. Lett knows that as well. My vote is no as I think this is totally inappropriate.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I call the question.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: There is no further discussion on the matter.

>> That window needs to be seconded.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Call of question by Commissioner Lett and second by Commissioner Muldoon. Is there any discussion on the matter? Okay all of these in favor of the discussion ending, please raise your hand and signify

--

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Can we have a roll call, please?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. This is a motion to end the debate on the question of reducing the invoice. If you are in a favor of ending discussion it would be a yes vote. If not, it will be a no vote. We will do this in alphabetical order beginning with Commissioner Callaghan.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Yes in debate.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON:

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm going to vote yes and wondering whether Mr. Eid should be voting on these matters.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: I believe your attorney Mr. Fink already weighed in on this and Rules of Procedure more at the notice to vacate than this part of procedure. So I would defer to acting Chair Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: My understanding was Mr. Fink said there was a difference between the discussion and voting. I'm sure he can chime in on this. This vote benefits him. It's a conflict of interest and he shouldn't be voting on it.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: So this is a point of order I would need a decision from acting Chair Kellom.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Um.

>> CHAIR EID: There's nothing in the rules that say I can't --

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Eid, you're not the Chair.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Mr. Eid, you're not the acting Chair and there's no point of discussion.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I'm going to say so this runs mere cleanly and so it doesn't turn into a mudslinging because every time I gets involved, I'm going to be honoring the vote of order. Commissioner Eid will not be participating in the vote.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid, for the record, can I have your vote as abstained then?

>> CHAIR EID: Sure.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela, I don't think I got your vote. Or if I did, can you restate it?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It was a yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you.

Commissioner Valette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Andrade I did not hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you. With a vote of nine yes to three no with one abstention, the question is called.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Megan. There was a motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Weiss for the motion for the Commission to pay the discounted invoices a notice for Mr. Eid to vacate by the Dykema firm but all of those in favor? I'm thinking it will be a roll call vote for this as well.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. This is the motion to pay the reduced invoice of \$16,730.10 to Dykema four legal expenses incurred representing Commissioner Eid in the notice to vacate. A yes Vietnamese means you're in favor of paying the expenses and a no vote means you are not. I will begin alphabetically with Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

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.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid, is it correct that you're abstaining due to conflict?

>> CHAIR EID: I'll abstain. I don't think it's due to conflict, but I'll abstain.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Andrade.

>> COMMISSIONER ADRADE: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Callaghan. With a vote of nine yes to three no with one abstention, the vote is approved.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you. Because that item is completed, Commissioner Eid, I am returning the role of care back to you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Kellom. I would like to thank you for addressing that portion of today's meeting. I would like to thank the Dykema firm with their assistance in this matter.

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'll now move onto New Business. However, I do see Commissioner Curry's hand raised.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes. I just wanted to make a statement that this was my first time even hearing about a lawsuit. So I want to vote yet for more discussion but I'm fine with the lawsuit and I just wanted to make that clear.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Curry. Okay.

Commissioner Lett? Mr. Fink?

>> NATE FINK: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify for the record and Commissioner Curry. There's no new lawsuit or anything. This discussion related to the Commission's decision to reimburse Commissioner Eid for his attorney fees incurred related to the request to remove him from the Commission that the Commission had addressed back earlier this year. There's no new lawsuit or anything.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I didn't think it was a new lawsuit. I was just stated that I had not heard in detail all I had heard today. Never heard of it.

>> NATE FINK: I just wanted to make clear so there's no confusion that there's no new lawsuit. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Glad everyone is on the same page and glad we can put that business behind us.

We'll now move onto agenda item 5D, Unfinished Business, public comment analysis.

If there's no objection, Commissioners, I'll ask Executive Director Woods to facilitate this item. Are there any objections? Hearing none, Mr. Woods, you have the floor.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Right. I just want to inform the Commission that the University of Michigan students are putting together or compile be their data into a booklet and also will be sharing lessons learned for the consideration of the next Commission with regards to the analysis of public comment. So just wanted to make sure that you are aware of that and will be receiving that. So it's just more info. Once again, I want to thank that entire crew for all that they did in aggregating the Public Comments. As the Commission may know, that was something that came out of our lessons learn that had we would do that so that the Commission can use that in its consideration in drawing a map and so it was just good to see the

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 following its own advice through the lessons learned process. So just wanted you to be aware of that.

If I may, Commissioner Eid, the rest of the Unfinished Business and New Business is mine. So if you want, I can just go to the next item?

>> CHAIR EID: Are there any objections, Commissioners, to Executive Director Woods continuing on to his New Business items? I don't see any, Mr. Woods. You can continue.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: All right. Thank you. I'm going to put this on the screen.

All right. Just want to note that the fiscal year 24 Budget Supplemental Request was paid for. I should say, was voted on. It was voted on June 27th for the amount that the Commission requested. \$3,331,200. Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just wanted to say the screen is a little strange. The subtitle is covering up part of the slide.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Hold on. Is that better? It's something they wanted me to do. Is that off now? Sorry about that. Now it's trying to .. okay. How about that? Is that good? Does that work? Okay. Thank you. Let me stop that share.

Does that work? Okay. Thank you.

We're still waiting for the funds to be deposited. So just want you to know, although the money has been approved, it has not been deposited. I would like to express appreciation to governor Whitmer, State Senator Sarah Anthony, State Senate office and state budget office and Attorney General's Office and the Department of Michigan state for working with us for and this was done as a tag team along with Nate Fink and David Fink as well. Once the money is deposited, we will be paying the outstanding bills that haven't been paid so that we can be current.

If there's any questions are regards to the fiscal year 24 Budget Supplemental Request, please let me know.

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

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I'm going to assume that there are no questions. Is that correct?

>> CHAIR EID: It does not look like there are at the moment.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: All right. Good. We're in the process of completing the draft report for the House and Senate Remedial Commission Report. As you already knew, the Senate remedial plan was submitted to the court and is scheduled to be ruled on no later than a week from Friday. We have started on the House and we will continue with the Senate if the court approves the plan.

I just want to show you where we are with the report right now and so that you have context of where we are so that you can see it. It's pretty much set up similar to the previous Commission report.

The main difference here is that this is done, that only includes the House remedial plan but it's the House and signal remedial map. This will not be a full Commission report but it will be done on the House and signal remedial maps. It has a table of content that outlines everything with regards to that. After the table of content, it's a foreword that I've been working on with our local [indistinct] to make sure everything is there.

This one is the draft language we have for the House and we'll be sending this out to you for your review. It has a purpose statement in terms of why we're doing the report, according to the Constitution, that we're required to do this. The seven rank District criteria. After it has the following plan, the legal description, and interactive map. This is the same information you can get off the website. It's just in a booklet. It will be done electronically where you can hyper link done through the Michigan Department of technology management and budget. It has the map voted Motown sound FCE-1.

After that it has the voting rights analysis so that you can see what was actually off the website. Then it has the population. It gives you a that's too meeting materials so people can see the dates where the meetings were so people can follow it, as well as the mapping data.

It goes down and gives you the population by the Districts. All of the Districts are in there so that people are aware as well as the new Districts that were changed so they have all of that so they can see the data. Same things happens here with the Voting Rights Act analysis that we showed you earlier. The Motown FCE-1 voting age population available another website and put into a booklet. The Community of Interest and links to the comments on the state Hughes remedial map which is the mapping comments portal that links to the Public Comments portal and the comments from the Commission meeting.

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.

These are best obtained through the transcripts from when these meetings actually took place. We talked about partisan fairness and put the same information from the website placed in here by District so that everyone can see it. After that you see the mean median difference which is on the website. The efficiency gap which is also on the website. And the seats to vote ratio. And then we have the compactness information that people are able to see.

Then after the compactness information, we have the appendix which lets people see the old map, the 2022 hickory map. Then they are able to once again see the 2024 Michigan House of representative map. And then it has the cover where it lists avenue of the Commissioners that participated.

Now what we're also adding to the Commission report is the court order and opinion that initiated the court order and the court order that came out on December, I mean 21, I believe. And also the opinion that came out in March with regards to the approved map. And then we will also add the core retention as a part of the appendix. Just kind of wanted to give you an overview of what's being worked on in terms of putting the report together. We will ask the Commission to vote on the report in September after we see where we are with the Senate. Just wanted to make sure you're aware the report follows the same outline as the approved Commission report that was created in 2021 for the maps.

Having said that, there is no deadline or requirement of a deadline for Commissioners who would like to submit a descending report as to be included as a part of the Commission report. And so my goal is to get this done before the end of the fiscal year which is, September 30th, in terms of actually being voted on.

Our meetings are III Thursday of every month and it would be helpful to get any descending reports by Thursday December 12th so that we can include it in the Commission report. Once again, anyone that submits a descending report that does not, I repeat, that does not have to be approved by the Commission. But it does need to be included in the report.

So this is, since there's nothing in the Constitution or in our rules with regards to a deadline, I am just throwing it out there that the Commission make a deadline for Thursday, September 12th so we can actually put it into the book and have it for the Commission to vote on September 19th.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we do you want that as the deadline for the dissenting reports if any.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion and a second, Commissioners. The motion was made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Weiss. We'll open the floor inform discussion on the matter. And we'll start with Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just want clarification. So ascending report, if we Vietnamese this, it would be due September 12th and that could be written by anyone who voted no on either map, House or Senate?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Correct. If you voted no on the House for Motown sound FCE-1 you can submit a descending report. If you voted no or it wasn't your first choice, we did rank voting, on the Senate remedial ma'am, you can submit a descending remedial report.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah, um, I've already had some -- excuse me, one second. Sorry. My throat is bothering me today. I already had some chatting Executive Director Woods about this. The last time we did the dissenting reports, those of us submitting them worked on them until June and that was almost six months after the original report. As Mr. woods has indicated, there is no deadline in the Constitution. I will be preparing a descending report and I will not be able to get it done bicep. I was clear with Mr. Woods with that, that I would be taking the same amount of time like I did last tyke, five to six months. It is a significant of amount of work to get this done so it's well Researches. We have tens of thousands of pages of documents to go over. September is a grossly insignificant amount of time and significantly shorter than what we had for the last dissenting records and I would make an emotion to amend the deadline to December 31st, 2024, to give me adequate time to prepare my dissenting report.

>> Seconded.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay we have an amendment to the original motion made by Commissioner Szetela. Seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to extend the deadline in the original motion to December 31st, 2024. Is that correct? Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Is there any discussion on the amendments?  
Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah. I just wonder about timeline. So we need constitutionally, we need to create a report, publish a report, correct? And you're trying to get these dissenting, any dissenting reports into the report? Is that correct, Mr. Woods?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: That is correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So timeline wise, how would that work? Because when the lawsuits are complete and we complete our work, we go dormant. So how does that all work with dormancy?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I would have to defer to Mr. Fink on that, in terms of what happens if we were too in dormancy mode in December and how would that deadline of December 31st work. I don't know.

>> NATE FINK: I think the Commission should complete all of its work before it goes dormant and that window include publishing its report and any dissenting reports related to its work in its remedial phase. So I don't know exactly when that dormancy date is going to hit. We are hopeful that the court is going to approve that by July 26th. And presumably shortly thereafter the Commission will be ready to go dormant because of the litigation is concluded. I don't know that that's going to drag out into December. I would did he ever back to Edward on the timing of that. I definitely think that the Commission needs to complete all of its work which, really, the last major piece of that, I think, will be completing this report.

So I absolutely agree that the deadline should be set in advance of the anticipated for target date for dormancy.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Curry, do you have a hand raised? Already.  
Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: My understanding of the dormancy is that we vote to go dormant once all litigation is completed and into further action is required of the Commission or its members.. Again, there's no specific time frame of that. It's a Vietnamese of the Commission and after we vote there's 30 days to wind things up and that's when we stop getting paid once the 30 days have passed. Before the dormancy period we continue collecting paychecks and once the dormancy period continues we stop collecting paychecks. It seems the time frame to commit sash slash submit

dissenting reports is the act of the Members and the Commission will be active until the reports are completed. That's my understanding.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lett? can't hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Speaking to the amendment to go to December 31st, I would speak against that. The first report done covered all of our work through the adoption of all of the maps. We're now dealing with six Senate Districts and however many representative Districts we did in a much, much shorter period of time.

So I cannot really see how we can justify taking five, six months to come up with a dissenting report when the major portion of the report will be done by September.

So I would encourage a vote against the amendment.

>> CHAIR EID: Is there in this case discussion on the amendment to the original motion? Seeing none, we will vote. This is just voting on the amendment to extend the deadline in the original motion to December 31st, 2024. All in favor, please raise their hand and say Aye.

>> Aye.

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

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: I think we might need a rule call, Department of State. I think I saw five and four.

>> Absolutely. This is a vote on the motion to amend the deadline until December 31st, 2024. You would vote yes if you want it amended and if you did not want that amended to December 31st you vote no: Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I'm sorry I stepped away. So the deadline for what? Can you just tell me quickly?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: There's a motion on the table to set a deadline of September 12th, 2024 for all dissenting reports. Then there was a motion to amend that deadline and extend to December 31st, 2024. We

are currently taking a vote on whether you would like to amend the main motion so that the deadline is December 31st, 2024.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I don't believe she's on anymore.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you. Commissioner Szetela. I did not catch that.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Muldoon?

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Andrade?

>> COMMISSIONER ADRADE: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Callaghan?

>> It looks like she got bumped off.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Okay. Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: All right.

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 WAGNER: Did we lose our ASL interpreter?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: No. I still see they are logged on.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Commissioner Callighan is back.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Can I get your vote to amend the deadline to December 31st, 2024. The original motion has a deadline of September 12th, 2024. So this is to amend that too December 31st.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: With that, vote we have a tie so the motion fails.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would like to make a motion to amend the deadline to December 15th, 2024.

>> Seconded.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would like to speak to it, Chair.

>> CHAIR EID: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: So it's kind of shocking to me that only, anyone would vote no to this. Like I said, we were given six months for the last dissenting reports to prepare them. There's in a timeline in the Constitution. You guys get to collect a paycheck while I'm working on the dissenting report and I've told you that's not enough time for me of September. So it is a sharp practice that the Commission would seek to vote against a simple request to an extended deadline to accommodate a Commissioner asking for it?

Again, I'm asking for December 15th. I may get it done before that. I may not. I think it's a reasonable request, given the time it took to prepare the last dissenting reports.

I don't understand what the objection to it would be, only. It seems spiteful to me.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I call the question.

>> CHAIR EID: Doesn't look like there's more discussion. You would like to save us the vote, Commissioner Lett?

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 LETT: Sure. Sure.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you. Okay. Let's vote on the amendment to Commissioners extending the deadline to December 15th, 2024. Can we get a Roll Call, please?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Absolutely. This is a motion to extend the deadline for dissenting reports to December 15th, 2024. It was moved by Commissioner Szetela and supported by Commissioner Wagner.

We will start this round with Commissioner Kellom.

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Lange. Sorry. She is not on. Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: I didn't say.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Andrade. I did not hear you, Commissioner Andrade. Evenly not entirely sure what is going on with your sound today. Can you try one more time or can you do a thumbs up or thumbs down so that we can see for the public record? Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: [Motioning thumbs down]

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: I recorded your vote as a no.

Commissioner Callaghan?

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR EID: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: With a vote of six to six, the vote fails.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Is Mr. Fink available? Commissioners have the right to submit a dissenting report which is why we were given time last time. If for some reason I don't meet the deadline, I have the right to submit a report, can I not? They cannot take away my constitutional right to create the take away my right if I cannot hit the deadline.

>> NATE FINK: For each adopted plan the Commission shall create a report for the basis of achieve the plan for plan requirements and shall include the map. A Commissioner who votes against a redistricting plan may submit a dissenting report which shall be issued with the Commission report. A Commissioner who votes against the plan has a constitutional right to submit a report but the provision that indicates it will be issued with the Commission's report mean that's it has tube part of the Commission's report and it's certainly within the Commission's discretion to set the deadline for when it will publish the report and that falls within the Commission's right to govern itself and operate under its Rules of Procedure. Obviously, any Commissioner can do whatever they want in terms of publishing something on their own after the fact, if they want.

But in terms of making it part of the constitutional report, it has tube included within the Commission's report.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: If I submit it at a later date, do we have to reissue the report? It's required to be included.

>> NATE FINK: It's required to be in the report but if the Commission has issued its report with its right to set deadlines and govern -- theoretically, under the hypothetical you're describing now, five years from now, a Commissioner could decide that they want to submit a dissenting report and

it becomes part of the report. I don't think that's a reasonable interpretation of the constitutional provision. The Constitution gives the Commission the ability and right and provision to govern itself and set rules and deadlines that are reasonable.

I'm not speaking as to what that reasonable deadline is here. I'm just saying it's certainly within the Commission's purview to set a deadline for when it's going to issue its report.

Two months from now, 60 days, you know, when, again, a lot of these issues have already been really discussed fairly extensively as part of the public record, to me doesn't seem to be unreasonable. But, again, I defer to the Commission as to when it wants to set that manufacturer deadline. But it's certainly within the Commission's right to set the deadline.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It seems you're taking apportion the Commission can take silence reports.

>> NATE FINK: Not at all. A Commissioner has a right to submit a dissenting report that goes within the Commission's report and the Commission decides that a particular time frame is reasonable. Again, we're not talking about the Commission saying you've got 24-hours to submit your dissenting report. We're talking about a couple of months here which to me, again, seems to be fairly recently. Again, I defer to the in addition Commission as to what the Commission deems to be appropriate in terms of logistics of putting all of this together and getting the materials together and compiling them into a report.

Again, if the Commission wants to set that deadline out a couple of months, fine. If it wants to extend it beyond that, fine too. But to have this, I think what you're asking about would be some sort of unlimited amount of time for a dissenting Commissioner to submit their dissenting report, doesn't seem to me to be a reasonable interpretation of that constitutional produce vision.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I would like to make an emotion at this time to amend the original motion to extended deadline to December 1st, 2024.

>> CHAIR EID: Is there a second?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Seconded.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Excuse me, Commissioner Eid. We want to make sure the cameras are on for our ASL interpreters. If they can to do a camera check, that would be greatly appreciated. Perfect. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Any discussion on the amendment to the motion, Commissioners? Hearing none, we'll vote. Can we get a Roll Call please?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Commissioner Orton's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: My hand was up. So all of this discussion, it kind of goes to my original question of timeline. My only concern with this is that we can't drag it out forever. So we are expecting to go dormant soon, as soon as we get all of our work done. So I see the conflict between giving Commissioners a chance to get their dissenting report, should they wish to do one, into the Commission report. But with you also need to respect the taxpayer money that we are functioning with and end as soon as we can.

So it seems to me that we can't just drag this out to the next fiscal year. We need to end it. And like Commissioner Lett said, it's not the whole body of work that would be dissented. It would be just these two quick redraws that we had to do on 13 Districts.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Commissioner Orton. Commissioner Vallette, I see your hand but I think you took it down. Do you have anything to add? All right. Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah. I think Commissioner Orton, like I said, we were given six months after. And I think, you know, without you having awareness into my personal situation, this is not something I'm going to be able to do bicep. It's just not going to happen. I'm not going to get into the specifics during a public meeting. You're welcome to call me and talk to me about it but I'm going to require additional time and asking for the Commission to be reasonable and give me the time that I'm going to need. I don't think that's an unreasonable request given that I'm asking for less time than we had last time. So yeah.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I would like to give Rebecca some extra time. I just, and like she said, I don't know her personal. But can we come in the middle of what we have and when she had. Maybe before the holidays? You know, wrap up before Thanksgiving which would be the middle of move. It's two weeks shorter than she just said. I get the feeling that she's going to keep cutting the time until we give her an extension. So I would just like to change the time. I would like to give her some additional time but I don't think we need through December. I don't think we need, you know, like the middle of between when it is now and the end of the year.

And I do understand not wanting to go into the fiscal year. Is that the major reason that we picked September 1st?

>> CHAIR EID: I'm not quite sure why that original date was picked. I'd like to be done before the holiday season, personally.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Indeed, I would be okay with mid-November. Something like that. Late October or November. I think I saw Commissioner Andrade. Did you have something to add Commissioner Andrade? I saw thought I saw your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: I was justifies going to say mid-November.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I agree with Commissioner Vallette that we should allow at least some time to give to Rebecca. Commissioner Rebecca. So I think we should go at least until November.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: Now there's a weird fax noise in my background. I'm fine with the December date. Like Commissioner Szetela said, in good faith, this could be anyone. If you're asking for an extension, you should have it. Those of us that want to turn in reports earlier, I'm sure we can do that so it's not that we're all waiting until December. I don't have a problem with making that accommodation.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela? We can't hear you Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm sorry I said I withdraw. Sorry.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just another timeline question. Say we vote a certain date, end of November or whatever. And then someone gets, or everyone who wants to do a dissenting report gets their report in by that date, then what does the timeline look like after that? Would we, we don't have to vote on any dissenting reports so would it still need to be added into the Commission report and then submitted.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Woods, maybe?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Speaking to the timeline, if the simultaneity line were December 1st, that would complete all of our business and the anticipation on the dormancy window take 30 to 60 days to wrap everything up from there. That would be a reasonable time, assuming we don't get sued again.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner does he tell a motion on the floor is yours. Do you want to keep it and vote on it or change it at all?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Let's keep it and vote on it.

>> CHAIR EID: It was December 31st, 2024, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: All right can we get a roll call vote?

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: The motion before you is to amend the main motion for the deadline for submitting dissenting reports to December 31st rather than September 12:00, 2024.

I will begin this round Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commission you are Muldoon.

>> COMMISSIONER MULDOON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner wise.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.

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.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Andrade.

>> COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Callaghan.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR EID: No.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Commissioner Kellom.

>> KIRSTEN ELLING: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: With a vote of eight yes to --

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Excuse me. I think Commissioner Lange is on.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: I'm sorry.

Commissioner Lange? Commissioner Lange? You got it, perfect. Can you give me your vote on amending the deadline.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you and I apologize that I missed you. With a vote of nine yes to four no, the motion carries so the main motion is approved.

>> CHAIR EID: That was the amendment to the motion and now we have to do the main.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: Thank you. The amendment.

>> CHAIR EID: Lots of amendments. It's all good. Appreciate all of your help. Commissioners, we still have the main motion on the table with the deadline of December 1st, 2024. Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a question of Executive Director Woods now that we have pushed the date or for Commissioner Szetela's report.

Do you think it would behoove you or we in the best interest of the Commission to move the date for our report to be done?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I'm going to still keep working on it. And all we would have to do is just add it. It's fine. It's not impacting me at all. Because all of the information is on the website. It's just compiling it into a report. That's not going to impact me. We would add hers when we receive it and the Commission would vote on obviously, the report as it would you tell voting on her portion. So that doesn't impact me.

>> CHAIR EID: I have a question for Mr. Fink before we vote on the main emotion.

Because we're in this adjointed remedial produces, is the Commission report and dissenting report even necessary?

>> NATE FINK: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: All right.

>> NATE FINK: I'm happy to explain. We considered that and reviewed the Constitutional language. If the Commission issues a plan, whether it's remedial or otherwise, the Commission should comply with its constitutional obligation to issue a report.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Thank you for the information. All right. Any other discussion before we vote on the main emotion?

We'll go ahead and vote. All of those in favor, please raise your hand and say Aye.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Chair Eid, I apologize. Can I have the motion repeated now? I wasn't present when the initial motion was made, just so I know what I'm voting on. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Of course, Commissioner Lange. It's no problem. Department of State could we get a readout as motion as amendment?

>> The motion before you is to set a deadline for Commissioners to set dissenting reports, if any are to be submitted. And the deadline is now December 1st, 2024 in the motion. So you're voting on a December 1st, 2024 deadline for any dissenting reports.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

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

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed?

>> [None]

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and the motion adopted. Next is CD and E. I would like to ask Mr. woods to conduct if no objections. Seeing none, Mr. Woods the floors yours.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Commissioners, just an update, I want to share with you the financial report. When we look at the May Financial Report, this is where we are \$173,037.72 in the hole. As you knee we did submit a fiscal rear Budget Supplemental Request in February to be acted on. As a shared earlier, it was approved in June. This is where we are. As you can see, our cost, a lot of it related to our pending litigation as it relates to the Agee case and having meetings in May. With regard to the cost that we have, I believe almost everything is in here. We're still waiting to receive some bill that's we haven't received yet. But I'm working with our insight and we went over everything and as far as we know most of the bills are in. There are a few outstanding bills but not that much. This is kind of where we are for May with regards to our spend something.

You're total expenses \$300,309.34. We were in the hole and obviously we didn't, as I shared earlier, we did not pair our vie invoices and held them out because we were in the heel in May and we use the accrual process. We went through the audit process with Commissioner Lett and we talked about the accounting system versus the cash system. As predicted, in May we ran out of money on the book side though we have cash in the bank. In June we still have bills that are outstanding, including our bills from Abicuss, the one for technology usually comes in with the July financial report which comes in August.

These are our bills that we have as it relates to our mapping. And this should take us, total in expenses at this time just like it was in May. We still have some outstanding. \$233,484.31 and that left us in the hole of \$405,522.01. I want to stipulate for May and June, these are the views that we have received at this time. We have outstanding invoices that have not been paid. When everything is said and done, I expect that number to go up 40,000 to \$50,000. Once we get the money from the state budget office deposited to our account, we will be paying all of these bills that we have been holding so that we do have cash flow.

If there are questions on the May or June Financial Report, Mr. I'd, I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR EID: Any questions, Commissioners? I don't see any Mr. Woods. Would you like to continue to the supplement?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Sure, thank you.

Okay. It is the supplemental amount. This is the \$6,662,400 and we ask that times two and ask for additional money due to pending litigation. \$870,000 includes staff salary as well as 13 salaries by the Commissioners. This is a budget, not what people received, but what the budget was based on. 13 salaries at 25% of the governor's salary. The rate changes to 35% when mapping. Once again, this is the budgeted amount, not what people actually received. The staff salaries is for the executive Director and assistance. Travel costs and business related travel. \$100,000. The technology cost looks like that's going to be possibly do you know so we'll wait to see what happened.

When we receive our final bill there could be cost savings there with regard to technology. Our meeting cost are anything related to having a meeting. Whether it's sign language, translation closed caption. Consulting. Litigation counsel two Ms. Five projecting for this year. The plaintiff counsel is the amount of money we're working on in terms of settling with the plaintiffs.

So we believe we can pay some of that pun out this have fiscal year budget and the rest of what we owe out of next year's fiscal year budget. Any savings or anything we have will be to offset the amount of money owed to counsel in the Agee case. The special masters is the reviewing special master and the mapping special master. The cost that the court said the Commission had to pay. \$190,000.

Public relations, the firms we hired during the mapping process. The legal fees was budgeted with regards to Commissioner, the notice to vacate proceedings, I should say that took place earlier. That's where that's coming from and the professional services deal about our accounting group. I see it dealing about the promotion that we did during the mapping process. Office supplies postage copies, toner and printing of the postage that you saw on the back during our Commission meetings and public hearings. That gives us a grand deal of \$662,400. I want to be clear of where the money is going and need a motion to approve this fiscal year 24 amended budget. If there's any questions, I can take them at this time.

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

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just have a question about the special master cost. So 190,000. I wonder if that includes this Senate redraw special master review as well.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Includes beating.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'd like to make the motion to accept this revised budget.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: There is a motion and a second. Any discussion on the motion, Commissioners? Hearing none, we'll move to vote. All of these in favor of the motion, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR EID: The ayes have it and the motion is adopted. All right. Thank you Mr. Woods. I would like to take a moment to thank everyone that we work with for being patient on the payments. We have the funds and we will sure get them out. I would like to thank the state legislature for doing their constitutional duty and appropriating us the funds to get this job done.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Just so we're clear, Commissioner, we do not have the funds. It's been approved but we do not have them.

>> CHAIR EID: Yes. Thank you Mr. Woods. Phased to get them, correct?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Yes.

>> CHAIR EID: Wonderful. Okay. Next up on the agenda is item number seven, Approval of the Minutes. We've had quite a log of minutes logged up that we haven't approved yet from May 14th up until June 26th. Are there any motions regarding these motions? Economizers?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move to approve the minutes as a group subject to additions, corrections, deletes here.

>> Second.

>> CHAIR EID: We have a motion and a sect to approve the minutes as a group. Does that include all of them, Commissioner Lett from May 14th to June 26th?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That's correct.

>> CHAIR EID: Okay any discussion on the motion?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: I noticed something after we did a review of the minute that's Commissioner Wagner on May 21st actually left at 11:40 a.m. and not 11:49.

>> I make that motion.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: All in favor of the amendment to correct the minutes please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: Any opposed? The ayes have it. We'll move back to the original motion to adopt the minutes as a group.

All of 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 minutes are adopted. Next on the agenda is the executive Director's report. Without objection I'll have MICRC Director woods the three to provide this report. Any objection? Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Thank you. In the interest of time Mr. Chair I can defer my report to the next meeting. A lot of the business items we have already presented.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Do we have a legally a soon report today, Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We do.

>> CHAIR EID: If there's no observation, I'll ask our legal Liaison to provide a report.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you. There was a situation that came to the attention of our counsel, Nate Fink. He received two letters. One from

the Deputy Chief of staff from the AFL-CIO and a second letter from the counsel of the Michigan Senate. And I will read the pertinent parts to you. The Deputy Chief of staff -- Edward, I misspoke. Not Nate. It says that it came to my attention today that recently Commissioner Szetela send an email to a number of partisan elected officials in western Wayne County soliciting their input on a mapping produces and apparently requesting they support her preferred arrangement of the areas for State Senate. He acknowledges that I do not have the email. He goes on to say there are several people who are interpreting this as evidence that the Commission is not truly independent and they may try to make some noise about it. He strongly agreed with the interpretation and urges too let the mapping process play out without interference. The letter from General Counsel for the Michigan Senate was along the same linings. It was sent to Mr. Fink. A right to you and your capacity as counsel it has come to my attention that yesterday Commissioner Rebecca Szetela sent a group email to Senator Dayna Polehanki and several other elected officials requesting feedback on proposed mapping changes as part of the Commission's public comment period. As you know, independence is at the very core of the Commission work. The members of the Senate Democratic caucus deeply respect the independent nature of this process and wish to invoice any appearance of self-interest as the Commission considers changes. As such, we decline the invitation to provide comments. So this is how the situation came another attention of the Commission.

The background is that Commissioner Szetela sent out these emails, as the letters say, elected officials. Some in the County and Townships and two or more in the State Senate or and/or representatives. Saying that in essence we were mapping and if you want to see what we're doing, ear is a link and go look at it. If you want to see a link to what I, Commissioner does he tell a was doing, go look at this. Soliciting input -- we've had input in the public. People coming in and elected representatives coming in and saying this. Many I'm not aware that they have taken the liberty on our own email, not our state email, but our own email and sent letters out requesting comments:

That's really not the issue. The issue is by Commissioner Szetela doing that, the people who wrote these letters obviously think that there's, there may be something wrong. And so it's not that it is wrong. What it is it makes it look like it's wrong. In other words, it's the appearance of not being transparent.

It's the appearance of one Commissioner and thus all Commissioners trying to put their thumb on the scale and tip the balance somehow in favor of some preferred. It's not within the pursue of the Commission or within our rules. This is what has come out and I certainly, all of the mapping is done now, hopefully and so the point of this report is to draw the attention of the Commission and the public because this is a public record now. That we as the Commission, at least certainly I as the Commissioner, do not condone this type of activity. It draws an inference that it's not as transparent as it should be. And not appropriate. That's the end of my report.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes. Commissioner Lett, I have a question and forgive me. I've been sick. But did you provide those letters that you received to the rest of us? And if you did, can you direct me to which email to find them in, please?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Direct I to which? Where to find them?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes. If you have sent them to us.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't believe that these were published. Nate? Were these sent out to everybody? The letters?

>> NATE FINK: The letters that you referenced? They were shared with the Commission. I can get you the dates much. They were forwarded on.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I didn't ask for them to be published. You're only a liaison, Mr. Lett. Your rank is no more than the rest of us. Thank you, Mr. Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Just for the public record, I provided copies of both emails to the full Commission. Do you have copies of the emails Mr. Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I do have copies of this email.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: How did I request that people provide their feedback in these emails?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You told them they could comment back and look at the ones you were doing and provide feedback they thought appropriate.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I asked them to provide feedback via the public portal or tom maps not to me. At into point did I ask them to respond back to me at all. I asked them, I alerted them to the fact that maps are happening, asked them to provide feedback and told them to provide it to the full Commission and not me. I want to point out that the Constitution specifically says in section 11 a Commissioner may communicate about redistricting matters too members of the public to gain information relevant to his or her duty physician such communication occurs in writing which is exactly what I did. Not only is it acceptable, it's expected and authorized under the Constitution. In my area there was little to know communications going other about the fact that we were redistricting and those redistricting plans were going to affect the communities I was living in. I don't think there's anything inappropriate to reaching out to my Township supervisor and Township clerk and in other communities along with the people in the House or Senate to advise them this was happening. There's no evidence that anything like that has occurred with me. Gain information relevant to the performance of my duties which is the decision on which map to vote for. I will point out that at the time that I sent out the communication we had draft maps in place. We were not currently drawing maps and the purpose of it was to find out, did they want Plymouth with Canton? What was their preferred configuration of the area. People who live in the community and the fast way to get the message out since our communications department was not targeting communications toward the people in the area was to reach out to the politicians because they have a built in nets work that would allow the people in the community to comment to the Commission in whole, not me directly. I would point out we've had multiple situations where we have had Commissioners who have done the same thing. Anthony Eid has been on Twitter and Reddit asking people for feedback and nobody has complained about that. He had a meeting asking people to push a particular map and there's nothing under this in the rules. You are making much ado about nothing and slander me for doing my job and doing something expressly permitted under the rules and the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: As I said, in my report, what you did is not the question. The result is the question. I didn't write the letters. Obviously, somebody thought that whatever you put out there wasn't appropriate and wrote letters to the executive Director and to the attorney saying that in essence this did not appear to be appropriate and wasn't very transparent. While you may have had all of the good intentions that you just claimed, the way you went about it didn't work very well because you got a letter from

the General Counsel of the State Senate and the AFL-CIO Commission. Yeah. It didn't work. And it looks bad. It's not a good look.

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's your opinion that it didn't work. It's your continue it didn't look good.

>> Court of order did he remember think a personal attack and a violation of rules of code of conduct [overlapping speakers].

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Commissioner Eid, this is hard for our sign language interpreters so we need something to take place, please.

>> CHAIR EID: If they can give me the ability to mute, once again, that would be great. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't see this as a personal attack. I was very concerned when I received copies of the letters from the AFL-CIO person and the General Counsel for the Senate. This is very concerning to me. We do have the ability to in writing communicate with public but not elected officials. That is, I thought it was clearly understood by all of us that we don't communicate with elected officials about mapping. And I just find it very concerning and the fact that two people. The fact that two told on the situation leads me to wonder how many others didn't tell. It's concerning because it looks as a Commission that we are not transparent and that deals are going on or something and I don't like that at aural.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Callaghan? Commissioner Callaghan, we cannot hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Appearances matter and while technically as Commissioner Lett said, there may have been no violation of the strict rules, by appearances, there definitely was a less than forthcoming and transparent mode of working. The fact that the contact was made to elected officials on personal email without copying any of the members of the Commission just looks bad.

It's tainted. It taints the whole Commission. If we want to maintain the trust of the citizens of the State of Michigan, we have to be above those kinds of actions. What we do matters. The appearance matters, else we lose the trust of the state. That taints the Commission. Not just for us but for all of the Commission that's comes after us. It was completely inappropriate. It was a betrayal of the other Commission members because it looks like we're all bad. Public wondering what are the other members doing? It doesn't look good and I think you knew it look good and why it

went out in a personal email. It was very inappropriate and I'm very disappointed that happened.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It's astonishing to me [Laughter] that in the same meeting where we were talking about a notice dealing with a Commissioner who was alleged to have drawn Districts four candidates of office and you had no concerns of that. You wouldn't even hold a hearing other than that four crying out loud, you are accusing someone of being inappropriate for following the Constitution and seeking feedback in writing. Nowhere does it say politicians are not members of the public. We have had many, many politicians providing feedback to us. If you remember there were many people losing their minds about Molinar contacting us and I'm drawing the name of the other guy who ran for the Attorney General governor who was a Republican who also came and provided feedback to us. Politicians are members of the public. The point where it crosses the line is when you're drawing Districts for them which is what someone else did and known is concerned about that. This is a witch hunt and an attempt to make you feel better to try to find something bad of what I supposedly did because you're all mad and I --

>> COMMISSIONER CALLAGHAN: Baseless accusations.

>> CHAIR EID: Since my name was brought up I'll respond quickly. The allegations that Commissioner alleged only by her and you can read the response I put out by them, they are false and slanderous and she's trying to make false -- equivalencies that don't exist. I don't appreciate the false equivalencies and I think we can all see through it. I'm going to go to Commissioner Kellom and if we move through the topic. If we want to do something further as a Commission about this, we can or we can leave it be as it is after having this discussion. I appreciate the comments everyone has made and I appreciate everyone trying to keep them as tame as possible. Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR KELLOM: I just wanted to add very quickly, I am not mad at your personal decision to do whatever you want to do in terms of fighting for the old maps. Not fight be for the maps. Whatever the case. That is water under the bridge.

I think though the distrust that Commissioner Szetela continues to have and hangs onto the fact that it's something personal was driven by her decision to not invite us. Like, if Commission Szetela asked the other Commissioners

that this is what I'm thinking about or there was an invitation to be collaborative of the maps, I think that would have been a totally different situation. But the decision too specifically seek in a deceptive way opinions of political figures, I think is unconscionable. That's baseless that I have done that as asserted.

It wasn't a couple of Commissioners that found fault with that decision and Commissioner Szetela, it was just about the whole Commission maybe with the exception of, I can't speak for Commissioner Wagner or language. Everyone had strong feelings and if it was up to me, you wouldn't have been able to participate. I did not feel comfortable. Though I had positive feelings about your map I did not feel comfortable about you engaging in that process because you talk about how decisions are made and you map off line and it was a horrible look and very hypocritical of you to champion and petition for Anthony Eid's removal for whoever he contacts and here you are sending emails. So if it was something in the constitutional rules you would have felt comfortable in the beginning and you didn't and you did try to save face and you were caught. That's okay but I wish you could use this opportunity to not say it's a witch hunt and slander. You sent the email and didn't ask anybody and we weren't supposed to do this and you would hang somebody by their toenails and they did that. We're holding you accountable. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm not sure what you're talking about with all of these emails that I supposedly sent. That's fiction. I sent one email to people from Plymouth Canton and one email to Angster. That's it.

There was an editorial published in the Jewish news where I was seeking feedback in the maps and no one had a problem of it then. This is simply more the same. This is behavior specifically allowed under the Constitution and you reach out to members of the public which includes political officials, by the way. You ask for their feedback and try to gain information relevant to your job which is what I was doing and I directed them sorry at public comment portal. All of the shade being thrown at this meeting. When it's thrown at someone else, your hackles are up. It's a habit too bash other Commissioner Lange or Wagner or myself repeatedly since the trial and it's a pattern. I did nothing inappropriate and I don't care if you think I did because I'm following the Constitution and I don't care if you think it's appropriate or not. [Laughter]. This is for the public because there's nothing inappropriate about what I did and everybody knows it. We're

allowed to reach out to the public. You had no issues with him talking to the guy from Taylor over the telephone either and the guy admitted it. No concerns there [Laughter]. That was not in writing. But, again, you want to selectively point out something I did following the Constitution which is ridiculous.

>> CHAIR EID: Commissioner wise?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Thank you very much, Commissioner Szetela, for your opinion. The problem I see is we had two other individuals who sent letters who have the opinion you did something wrong or questionable and you have to form your opinion from there. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: I have to add for the record the phone call I got from the gentleman from Taylor, we did not discuss mapping issues. I directed him to the website on our posting meeting notice so he could come and talk to us --

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: You did the same thing I did in the email. Thanks.

>> CHAIR EID: All right. Thank you Commissioner Lett for your report. Please keep us updated and if anything else happens about this matter in the future. We'll move onto item 12 Future Agenda Items. Are there any agenda items Commissioner who's like to have added too Future Agendas. I have one during this process we did a lot of public engagement to areas including west land and but, you know, lots of areas within the tri County metro Detroit area and I would like to see where can we get that Mr. Woods?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: We have a request out to a vendor to verify what was there and I had some of that as part of my report today and time didn't do it but yes, we can do that for August. We'll make an agenda item under New Business so everyone can see it.

>> CHAIR EID: It might be a good idea once we hear from the court to update the community members on if that happens.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Sure.

>> CHAIR EID: MDOS Updates.

>> MDOS MEGHAN SCHAAR: I would be remiss if I did not provide a reminder in Sarah's place that early voting for the August primary begins on July 27th, if not sooner. That is the Constitution alae mandated period and

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 primary election date is August 6th. If you need information on voting, please go to [Michigan.gov/vote](http://Michigan.gov/vote) to get all of that information. Thank you.

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you Ms. Shar. Get out and vote, everybody. It is a privilege that we are lucky to have.

>> CHAIR EID: Correspondence if any available was received in advance of our meeting today. We'll move onto Announcements. Are there any Announcements?

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Yes, Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR EID: Go ahead, Mr. Woods.

>> EDWARD WOODS III: Thank you I want to remind the next meeting is Thursday August 15th at 10:00 a.m. and it will be a virtual meeting just so we're all another same page. Once again, Thursday August 15th at 15th at 10:00 a.m..

>> CHAIR EID: Thank you, Mr. Woods. The items on the agenda are complete and the Commission has no further business. A motion to Adjourn is in order.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Second.

>> CHAIR EID: Motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Weiss. All in favor say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR EID: All opposed say nay. We are Adjourned at 12:23. See you all next time.

[ Meeting Adjourned ]