

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

MICRC

11/04/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:03 a.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube at Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel.

For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at Redistricting MI. Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at [Redistricting@Michigan.Gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.Gov) for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at [Michigan.gov](http://Michigan.gov).

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) for viewing at a later date and this meeting also is being transcribed and those closed captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) along with the written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC), this portal can be utilized to post maps and comments which can be viewed by both the Commission and the public.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, our Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission at [WoodsE3@Michigan.gov](mailto:WoodsE3@Michigan.gov) or 517-331-6309.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good morning, Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and disclose your physically attending from. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present attending remotely from Lansing Michigan.  
Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi, Rhonda. You are sounding a bit muffled.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can you hear me now.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: It sounds like your reception is a little garbled.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm, present attending remotely from Reed City Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Got that.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. You can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved. Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there discussion or debate on the motion?

Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We do have a Braille vendor we need to approve so I would like to amend the agenda for new business 6A the approval of a Braille vendor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion to amend the agenda to add approval of a Braille vendor to item 6A do we have a second? So motioned by Commissioner Rothhorn seconded by Commissioner I believe that was Weiss. To approve the Braille vendor. Is there any debate or discussion on the amendment? All in favor of the amendment please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

Commissioner Lange I believe you were an aye can you confirm that one more time.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, I was.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you so the amendment carries. Did we have another amendment for discussion about individual plans?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll make that amendment. Let's move to I would like to motion that we talk about our have a time to understand how individual Commissioners can adopt or submit their individual plans before the end of the day today. Again that would be new business item 6B.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, do we have a second for that? Okay motion made by Commissioner Rothorn seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Go ahead Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was under the impression we could no longer submit individual maps that were not there unless we run that we can't vote on one on December 30th.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That may exactly be true that is why we want it on the agenda to make sure every Commissioner knows about it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Perfect thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, all in favor of approving the amendment please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the amendment is adopted. Moving back to the commission motion by Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett to adopt the meeting agenda and all in favor please raise your hand and say aye. Opposed raise your hand and say nay. The agenda is adopted. All right thank you everybody. At this point we are going to move on to public comments.

Without objection we will now begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics portion of our meeting. Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with the public comment pertaining to agenda topics.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. Please step to the nearest microphone when I call your number. You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is number one.

>> Good morning, Commission. Thanks for all your hard work as usual. I want to thank Commissioner Eid for promoting the voting on Monday evening. I spent Tuesday as an election inspector sitting in a precinct and these details will be important bounded by the south Boulevard and sandwiched between up dyke and 75 in Auburn Hills. While I was working you made Oxford whole on the Pine map and thank you for doing that. And there by created a great opportunity to strengthen Pontiac Auburn Hills and Waterford by moving the precinct that I sat at, with those details into Pontiac. Taking

the Bloomfield Hills Township Bloomfield Township precinct you added out and substituting in three small precincts in Waterford for the three most distant ones that are currently in there. The VRA statistics go up and everything gets better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number two.

>> Hi, my name is Kyle I grew up in northern Monroe County and also taught in southern Wayne County and Huron Township in tale, I supported proposal two and exactly what we are looking for. I want to look at the Pine map the proposed districts of 40, 65 and 60. The biggest thing is combining Taylor and Monroe. Those are two very drastic different communities. Monroe and northern Monroe county is much more variant and agricultural and Taylor specifically is a more suburb of the City of Detroit. A very good dividing line would be Wayne County and Monroe County itself. If you need to combine Township in Wayne County with Monroe look at Huron Township. It's the most agrarian and rural population in Wayne County that could be combined with Monroe. I think Ipsi and Ann Arbor and Jackson and Chelsea looks great and the big thing is to keep Taylor whole so thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number three.

>> Good morning. My name is Rylan, a student at Michigan State. We are dismissing the feedback and breaking them up to create areas of partisan fairness. Supporters of this Commission voted for it in proposal two and lead to fair maps that did not benefit a party or incumbent politicians and prioritize public input on the community of interest that is fully transparent and open process. The Commission has repeatedly ignored both the testimony of voters and expressed concern with ripping apart the communities of interest. The Commission does not get to decide who the communities of interest are, we do. We live in these areas and the citizens of the state have turned out in droves both republicans and democrats and we plead you continue to listen to us and take our input on community of interest. Thanks so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number four.

>> Good morning I'm crystal Boyd legal assistant to Sarah Howard the attorney for if fair maps project. Your State Senate map gives republicans a disproportionate advantage. But your State House map needs even more work. We strongly encourage you to keep working to get all four metrics to 0. Please stay the course. Remember that your seat count by itself can mislead you. The question that your society votes ratio seeks to answer is can the party that wins 52.3% of the vote get 52.3% of the seats. The question you should be asking instead is can the party that wins the majority of votes get a majority of the seats. Remember that a District that gives the republican party a 2% bonus over their statewide vote is not a democratic seat. We published a report last week on this matter. And we encourage you to at least skim it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number five.

>> Good morning, Commissioners I'm Sarah Howard the attorney for the fair maps project. We knew and predicted when you started trying to fix the prorepublican bias in

your maps and get to partisan fairness republican partisans would accuse you of gerrymandering for democrats. Last night the state GOP sent an e-mail begging people to come here and say exactly that. Here is a couple of the suggested GOP talking points we expect you to hear. Number one quote you are gerrymandering for democrats under the guise of partisan fairness. Number two quote Michigan is not a blue state we are a purple state that is elected at the top of the ticket in the past six years three republicans and three democrats. If you hear comments along these lines, you will know where they come from. By the way, six years ago was 2015. Since then one republican and two democrats have won the top of the ticket. If you redraw Detroit to reflect actual communities of interest as you should, it will help you, not hurt you on partisan fairness measures. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number six.

>> Hello, my name is Shaun Lee I live in Leoni Township Jackson County. I'm here today because I don't agree with the way you have split up Jackson County and combined it in with wash or Ann Arbor. We actually have nothing in common with each other. And the Michigan civil rights chief Executive Director John Johnson junior says that the proposed maps violate the Voting Rights Act. Protecting the Voting Rights Act is a paramount concern and is listed in the first of priorities for a reason. The communities of interest are more listed above partisan fairness and they must respect the input from the thousands of voters across Michigan who have asked them to protect our communities. Thank you for your service. And please consider everyone's input. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number seven.

>> Hi, in the course of collecting thousands of signatures and having thousands of conversations with Michiganders of all political stripes and no political affiliation, the two things I heard most when I was volunteering for Voters Not Politicians was shocked at the way redistricting is done previously. And the fact that their representatives do not listen to them. Do not meet with them, don't represent them. And that's the importance of partisan fairness in your maps.

If you don't solve that problem in your Michigan house map, it's not going to solve the problem that we've been trying to solve with this Commission. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number eight.

>> Hello. My name is Kristina and I work for the UAW region 1D but coming to you as a resident of Genesee County and thank you for the maps and unpacking Lansing yesterday and the work you did on Flint. Listening to the people and what they asked for. I would like to ask you the Commission consider looking at 2016 statewide election. While evaluating partisan fairness while drawing the maps 2016 was the closest statewide election over the last decade. I think running those numbers with the proposed maps will point you in the direction of fairness and where to make changes. A

4% efficiency gap is still too high but you're making great progress and it's very appreciated thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number nine.

>> Good morning.

I'm Karen Andrews and I have lived in Clinton County over 60 years so I feel like I can speak for the majority of Clinton County. We are a rural community. Agricultural community. Small town. We need to be kept intact. You've asked for public comment repeatedly. We have expressed very simple requests keep Clinton County intact, it's logical, it's common sense, it's very clear boundaries. Lansing and East Lansing should be intact as well. But they should be separated from Clinton County. We do not share communities of interest. That is an important factor in your rules and regulations for devising your maps. However, we do not feel like you're listening to us. And we also feel like if we are combined with Lansing and East Lansing like you have set up in the map for the State House, we will not be well represented. So please listen to we the people. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number nine.

>> You were number nine sorry number ten.

>> Good morning, all. My name is Eric. I'm a student here at MSU. I wanted to reiterate the importance of representing the communities that you guys are drawing these lines for. As a student here I don't want the areas of Lansing and East Lansing to be split up in two different districts. I think that is just one of the things we need to remember that are important here. Something I wanted to highlight as well is the City of Ann Arbor some of the Counties there were broken up from Marshall to Calhoun. That was about four different Counties and other municipalities along that line. We want to make sure things like this are not happening that favor one party or the other. If myself as a student can see that I think a lot of the public can see that and I'm sure you guys know that as well. So I just wanted to reiterate that importance, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 11.

>> Good morning thank you. My name is Steve. I'm actually a director of UAW region one and represent 73, 83 Counties I want to thank you for all the hard work you have been doing. Where you started and where you are today, I commend you on listening to the people. Listening to the voters and making the changes. I encourage you to keep moving forward with them changes especially what you did with the Flint and Lansing. I spoke in Flint about the looking at splitting the Flint up when it would have went to two different places that frankly did not give a damn about the City of Flint. I want to go back in a little bit of history to remind you what you are doing. In 2012 the voters of this great state overwhelmingly voted down the emergency manager financial act only to see the republicans turn around and ramp it down their throats now we stand in front of you after 2.5 million people voted for you independent people to do what is right for us in the State of Michigan. Thank you and have a great day and weekend.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 12.

>> Good morning, everybody I'm a student here at Michigan State University I want to encourage you guys to focus on communities of interest rather than partisan fairness. I think an example is Benton Harbor and it's in a District with Saugatuck and South Haven and New Buffalo tourist traps and Benton Harbor has a serious crisis with the water. And having them as tourist traps, they will not be heard potentially distracted elsewhere to the tourist traps and more predominately white areas.

I encourage you to go back and reexamine Berrien County and Benton Harbor in particular and make sure, to try to focus on trying to disconnect it from the other areas to have a Benton Harbor focused District. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line as we have number 13, is that right? 13?

>> Thank you for all your hard work my name is Eugene I live in Farmington hills in Oakland County I addressed you a couple weeks ago at TCF. I spoke of the importance of geometry as people live in specific areas because of common interesting. Living in the 14th Congressional District I know what it's like to be gerrymandered. They were complaining you ignored the fact they elected you and wanted politics fist which is exact opposite the reason we were told to support proposal two. If you are going to take into account politics it has to be for both sides. Better is you do what was promised to the voters prior to communities of interest as I mentioned and promised by the Executive Director of Voters Not Politicians in 2018. We should not have gerrymandering. In any way, shape or form. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. All right that's good. That concludes our in person public commentary.

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

If you are on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call on you by your name.

If you experience technical or audio issues and we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking. If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later hearing or meeting.

You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is Mr. James Gallant. Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Hello, this is James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. Yesterday we saw this Commission's true colors and they are not red, white and blue like our flag. Commissioner Witjes attempted to bully the Chair and Vice Chair. And I applaud Szetela for doing the right thing there. And now Witjes did not want the Vice Chair. He wanted Rothhorn to continue to facilitate the discussion concerning the maps. Before the issue was legally legitimately as required under current rules of procedure as they are written go and check.

I believe the court, including Justice Bernstein, will see clearly that the maps are not currently before the Commission until there is a motion that has been properly seconded.

Your alleged new model is not new at all. This is the Dutch polar model. And it's cheating. And it's crooked. If you're not following rules of procedure in this country in the fundamental principles of parliamentary law. You all know it's not really before you until you make the motion and yet you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Ms. Tapia.

>> Hi, good morning, Commissioners. I want to thank you for all the hard work you are doing in editing these maps.

I really wanted to thank Commissioner Britt Kellom for her hard work and focusing on Detroit. Please continue to focus on Detroit and Flint and those VRA districts. It's critical you listen to communities of interest. You still need to make changes to cherry Senate map that has not addressed issues for Detroit and Flint. I'm working with cohort members nearly 40 nonprofit community of interest across the state that have submitted their community of interest maps. And the LBGT Detroit Palmer Park community of interest continues to be cut in all of your maps. This particular community of interest has the most public comments of support on your portal and you continue to ignore it. If you are not listening to the communities of interest, who are you listening to. I appreciate the work you have done on partisan fairness but please continue to do your work in Detroit and Southeast Michigan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Anthony Skinnell.

>> Hello, Commission, I call this map prison gerrymandering. If you wanted to know why it's better R for Wayne County well you would have all right known why because I have said it the whole time beyond Mickey Mouse ears and should have changed it before this point. The problem is some Commissions are skeptical of certain public input and think it's problematic to pay attention because I've been paying attention you disregarded similar live comments given by peoples from Trenton River Rouge and Ecorse and by your Congress map. I see a stall tactic this is an emergency managers style and a person not from our locality gets to make decisions and said COIs don't matter because it's all about allocating money that as side what COI could you say the chest nut Congressional districts would and I don't think you could and MDOS will not

hold you to that what about the border of Berrien Congressional District that you know will call it for the canard I cannot remain silent while you act like this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Mary Ann Mahoney go ahead.

>> Yes, thank you. Sure can you hear me? Marian. Okay thank you this is Marian-Mahoney, a 26 year resident of Novi in southwestern Oakland County. On the State House the Pine map is best but still needs work. Please do not split the City of Novi between districts and include Novi precincts in District 110. On the State Senate the cherry map is best but also needs some work. Please remove Washtenaw County from District 11. Washtenaw County has no common interests with Novi or the rest of District 11. On the U.S. Congress please move forward with the birch map. The chestnut map is terrible for Novi. We belong with Oakland County neighbors where we have shared economic interest along I-96 and I-696 corridors. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 5, which is Carol Chi I'm not sure which way.

>> Hi this is Carole-Chi can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can good morning.

>> Good morning thank you so much for taking my comments. I would like to thank Brittini Kellom and Juanita Curry and working a couple days ago and working Tuesday at the election in Sterling Heights and I appreciate what they did with Detroit. And keep on working on this please. All of you. The party with the most votes should get the most seats in Michigan. Partisan fairness above all even though COI is important I understand that completely we shouldn't have to overcome have to have four votes to overcome one vote of the other party as in the past ten years and I agree with live speakers number today of today number 4, 5 and 11. Two of them were lawyers and I think the last one was a UAW guy. Thanks for your work. I know it's hard to do but keep on working. Thanks again good-bye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Nina Dodge Abrahms, number nine.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Nina, if you can unmute, you are free to address the Commission.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Let me take off and do the video. I'm Nana from south Oakland County I'm asking you to please not split the cities of Royal Oak Township 2400 people Oak Park Ferndale or Berkeley. You are dividing communities of interest middle class Black Jewish gay water problems and libraries. There is no purpose to having these as vertical Directors going over 8 mile. They should be southeast Oakland should be horizontal districts. Also this would do better for giving Detroit majority minority districts. Republicans gave 17 minority majority districts. You should do no less. Fair maps create level playing

field and a healthier state for everyone. Thank you for your work on all of this. I'm hoping that you go back and you look at getting partisan fairness. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Chris Herweyer, number ten.

>> Yes, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you, good morning, Commissioners my name is Chris I'm are resident of Wyoming in Kent County I want to thank you all for listening to our testimony over the past several months. The changes you made to State House maps in the Grand Rapids Metro yesterday is evident of that. Over all these changes have gotten you a lot closer to achieving maps that are not biased towards any political party. And over these final two days I hope you will continue refining the maps in Metro Detroit and Flint areas to help achieve efficiency gap of less than 1%. Doing this is the only true way that we can achieve partisan fairness in the State House so that the party that are E receives the most votes wins the seats. I look forward to seeing the final drafts at the end of the day tomorrow.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. At this point I'm going to ask my Vice Chair to facilitate calling the names out. Next on our list is number 11, Anita-Fitz.

>> Hello, my name is Anita-Fitz I'm a retired IT manager and long-term resident of Rochester Hills. I have spoken before but I think my request warrants repeating and that is to keep Rochester and Rochester Hills together in the same District. They are the same community. And they share the schools, community activities, library, hospital, and the same downtown. So as a matter of fact the downtown merchants and other businesses depend on Rochester Hills customers. That is their way the community has grown over especially the last 40 years that I've seen. It is very much a suburban area whereas Oakland Township is more rural. They have different issues, different concerns. And I would like to echo the comments made earlier about the fairness criteria that is not being met. Gerrymandering refers to creating political advantage and that is what we want to avoid. So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next is number 12 Barb-Handley Miller.

>> I'm from Bay County Michigan and I'm speaking to support the Congressional birch version two map you have drawn and specifically District 8. Thank you for the map joining urban cities of Flint Saginaw Bay City Midland there will be many benefits shared urban industrial economic educational Saginaw watershed issues so thank you. You are hearing push back from some Midland residents who want to be paired with Gladwin still and a Congressional District that would move west from there across Michigan. You listened and you wisely set aside that map. Because you knew that it was not in balance. It was a concession partisan District. You are hearing cries of

gerrymandering in this District. And that is just not the definition of gerrymandering. This is a fair competitive District. In which either party has the potential to win. So it just doesn't fit those talking points. And please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 13, Ciara-Lowe.

>> Thank you for incorporating feedback but the State House maps still need work. Partisan fairness is the most important thing to keep in mind when drawing the State House map just like the State Senate map. Folks are complaining about gerrymandering tell and focusing on partisan fairness is the way to combat that, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Number 14, Lori Lisi.

>> Can you guys hear me yet.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Okay sorry my name is Lori Lisi from hunting ton Woods and want to thank you for your pain staking work. This is the third time speaking before you and my message is the same. I consistently have been asking for fairness in your maps. Myself and many others stood in the rain and snow to collect signatures for this initiative and went door to door and the message we heard from those at the doors was consistently they would vote for this because of fairness. Your house map is not even close to a 0 efficiency gap. That's a very objective measure that you guys can use to when choosing your final maps. If you are running out of time there is no shame in adopting other ideas. In fact, there is wisdom in using other good maps that have been submitted to you guys. And I would ask why maps were encouraged to be submitted if there was though intention to possibly use them or look to them. Thank you again for your good faith efforts and keep up the good work, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 16, Laurie Evans.

>> Good morning, can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you, good morning, my name is Lauri Evans 24 resident of Troy. When I first viewed the final drafts of the State House District maps the Commission produced, I was relieved to see a Troy District that kept our City intact and showed attention to communities of interest and partisan fairness these are two of the goals I worked hard for campaigning for proposal two. I'm here because of the suggestion the Commission may now be considering dividing Troy across districts. Undoing partisan fairness and unnecessarily dividing a City that is uniquely united across a diverse population. I'm deeply concerned about a proposal to divide Troy. Excuse me while Troy is a large City the largest in Oakland County it is a unique integrity. We are unified around shared economic, social, educational and recreational resources. Dividing Troy and dividing our representation would create a damaging split in what is a natural community of

interest. I urge you to return to original mapping and keeping Troy whole thank you for your time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are going to take a break for a moment and return to actually we will go to Matt next and then return to in person comment so Matt please continue.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I live in Georgetown Township. I worked in Allendale my children attend school in Spring Lake and all are in Ottawa County which is West Michigan. The birch map cuts Ottawa County in three districts so I live in one, I will work in one and my kids will go to school in a different one. This is not acceptable. There is no reason Ottawa County should be divided into three. That's the birch map. The chestnut divides us in a gerrymandering way which is what we are trying to avoid. Splitting Georgetown Township and agricultural communities like Allendale to gerrymandered GR Grand Rapids is an in Muskegon is a partisan dream the apple map has a clear community of interest along the lakeshore. Hundreds of Ottawa County are asking for the this. West Michigan should not suffer because we done have someone on the Commission from the area. This is more important to listen to people like me. Nobody wanted gerrymandering. So apple.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Do we have the in person live in person yet? We do not. In the green jacket sir are you ready to speak?

>> Sir, did you sign up for public comment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will move on to Regina Randall. Our next remote public comment then we will return to you, sir. So Regina Randall, please.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you let's move on to Judy Hart.

>> Can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Judy Hart I live in Washtenaw County and I'm a 69-year-old, I'm a 69-year-old resident of Michigan. I want to thank you for taking partisan fairness seriously which is reflective in the new maps. Please do the same in the house. Please don't let people sway you to change the good work that you have done. In Detroit the VRA seems to be suspect. Please continue to make partisan fairness a priority. And again thank you very much for your hard work.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. So we will return to live in person public comment sir in the green jacket when you are ready, please approach the microphone and begin speaking. He is not ready. Okay, yeah, I can't see him. Okay so let's move on to Margaret number 21 live remote public comment, please.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. How about 22 Ben, Umanos.

>> Hello.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hello.

>> Hi.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can hear you.

>> Lakeshore communities have specific needs issues such as erosion water levels and algae blooms along restoration efforts are Federal issues for the Great Lakes, Muskegon, Grand Haven, Holland, Saugatuck, South Haven and Benton Harbor are also lakeshore communities the apple map keeps lakeshore whole and respects the African/American communities Benton Harbor Muskegon and Muskegon Heights and respecting Hispanic in Allegan and Holland and do not gerrymander. The chestnut map from GR is a classic case of gerrymandering. It dilutes traditionally conservative voices across three Congressional districts. The apple map is close to respecting the lakeshore community of interest. Please keep Ottawa County and give the lakeshore a voice, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Okay so we will return to live in person public comment, sir, please approach the mic and you can begin speaking.

>> Thank you. My name is Dennis and I live in the City of Midland. Please elevate the State House map version 5 that you are just now working on because it keeps Midland whole and it connects with Gladwin. Over half of our community voices have been completely dismissed. Please give the City of Midland a Congressional District plan that puts Midland County back together in a separate District than Flint. If provided alternate maps with multiple competing comments and have not done this for Midland and has shown partisan bias putting forth maps that local democrats have asked for. Midland and Flint are vastly different communities Midland population is 40,000 Flint is nearly 100,000. Midland is focused on Dam repair and flood reduction Flint on the water crisis. We have competing airport MBS versus Flint Bishop. We have different host care delivery systems Mid-Michigan health versus Hurley medical and it was the first healthcare system approached by University of Michigan to be affiliated with a large reason is we have multiple hospitals in Clare Gladwin.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Sir. Next in line is the remote public comment is Michael fields. Number 24.

>> I would like to thank each of you for your time and consideration allowing me to speak before you today. In the summer of 2017 I spend a considerable amount of time gathering signatures for a ballot initiative that has been passed but I the voters of Michigan and created this Commission. While collecting signatures I promised those who signed my petitions that this initiative if passed would create a fair playing field for the voters. The voters and not politicians should have the right in determining who governs us. There for I plead with you to make certain that the districts you are residing

are as fair and balanced both politically and geographically as possible for the people of Michigan. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 25 Ed Saunders.

>> Hellos thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. I would like to speak in favor of the current Senate State Senate map. I really appreciate your following all of the rules that were laid out in the Congressional or in the constitutional amendment. And in particular balancing the sometimes competing needs of partisan fairness and communities of interest. Particularly recognizing the corridor the I-94 corridor between Washtenaw and Jackson. The rail line there and the considerable amount of interplay between those two communities. Thank you for all of your hard work. I know it's a tough job.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for those comments. Number 27 Ryan Husse.

>> Yeah, thank you for allowing me to speak today. And thank you for all the work you have done on this. My name is Ryan Husse I represent roughly 1100 active and retired electricians between Washtenaw and Jackson County mostly. For far too long their voices have been drawn out especially in Jackson. I appreciate the Senate maps you guys have drawn now. My members in Jackson County are finally going to have a voice. And their politician in Jackson County is going to need to represent them. So again I thank you very much for the work you've done. And please continue to work on the house. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Next is number 30, K.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Number 30 is not present? That is okay. Should we move to 31? Number 31 rod Thompson.

>> Hi good morning my name is rod Thompson. First, I would like to thank you all for the very important work you're doing. And for the opportunity to speak to this Commission. I've looked at the preliminary maps drawn for the Michigan house and I wanted to make sure you heard from me. I'm a Troy resident. All of my life. I grew up here and now I live here with my own family. I love the City and I know the City. We are a strong and very close community. And we do not want to see our City divided into two different voting areas. That would be a mistake for the City. We do not want to be split up like much of the country today. We want to speak with one voice. On all the issues that are facing our City. Not two different voices. Troy should not be split in half. We want to remain a strong and whole community. It is my fervent hope you keep Troy whole so we can be as united a City as possible. I thank you for taking my input and hope you will seriously.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 32, Karen.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Numbers 32 and 33 are not present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks very much 34, Judy Maiga.

>> Hi good morning I would ask again that you please add South Gate and Wyandotte to the chestnut Congressional map in District 7 southeast manage with gross aisle before it advances for public comments for reasons that I've stated before and posted online. I would also respectfully offer discussion during map drawing that questions the authenticity of some comments presented by the public does not instill a desire to #show up and #comment. 60 seconds is barely enough time to introduce yourself and creatively convey the request that many people have that meet the requirements of the act and draw fair maps that don't favor either party. I would ask that personal non-substantiated assumptions of people being coached be left out of the final map drawing process. And comment about Albion and Battle Creek and written off as not real in some way. This is not acceptable. Please do not allow this to happen. Criteria says maps and you-

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 35 is LaCrasha Handy.

>> Good morning, Township resident in Genesee County. Partisan fairness is a community of interest and we need to keep that in mind that is why the people of Michigan voted for the proposal that created the Commission. I see improvements on the State House maps but there is still work to be done. The maps need to be fair. No political bias. Even a little bit is too much. The map needs to include fair representation for Michigan's diverse population and please don't forget about the City of Flint. People of color needs fair representation. It is our right. I know your job is not easy. So I want to say thank you for all you have done so far. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 36, Elizabeth Harris.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Elizabeth, if you can unmute yourself, you are free to address the Commission. Elizabeth if you can hear us if you are able to unmute yourself you are free to address the Commission. It looks like Elizabeth may be experiencing audio difficulties.

I recommend we move forward.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we have 37 Wendell.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present we will move to 38.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 38 Robert Hosack.

>> Can you hear me now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> I live in Cooper Township. And the current map that I've seen combines Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids which we have nothing really much in common. We both have separate airports. We have separate businesses. And it seems like the rural

community of Kalamazoo County is misrepresented. And above all we want fairness. And we don't want one political party to really be dominant. Thank you very kindly.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 39, Richard Williamson.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good. Number 40 then max Lewis, please.

>> Hi, are you able to hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Hi, thank you so much to the Commission for giving me a chance to speak. I just want to say thank you to valuing partisan fairness recently in your map drawing sessions. You know not only is this required by the Constitution, this really reflects my opinion, the soul of Voters Not Politicians, the reason that we are all here today. So thank you so much for properly having partisan fairness in your maps. I did want to give a really quick tip when using election data to help with your assessing partisan fairness using the 2016 election data is going to be your gold standard. Just because this is the closest election we have had in recent history in Michigan. And so this will give you much more accurate, clearer picture of what is actually fair for partisanship compared to a year in which one party that is significantly better than the other. Such as 2014 or 2018. So just please consider using 2016 election data and Thank you for addressing the Commission. For valuing partisan fairness for the Constitution.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Ken Mitchell number 41.

>> Hi in my 45 year resident of Clinton County and ask you keep Flint whole and the people are differ than Ingham County and Clinton County people support the police and place higher graduation and education. The values have nothing to do with party affiliation but the Norm of the people of Clinton County. The only reason to break up the community is pure partisanship and that is what you are supposed to be against. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 42, Art-Reyes.

>> Hello.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hello.

>> Okay, sorry, my name is art Reyes, I am a resident of Genesee County and proud member of UAW598 in Flint. I want to thank you for the changes you made in Flint yesterday and a representative that lives in the community represents us in Lansing. Keep the State House map moving forward please. Thank you for the work you are doing but I reminder we voted proposal two in to get as close as possible to 0% partisan bias. It seems a lot of people who are now screaming about gerrymandering were against proposal two. We ask you to move to fairness so that we can have better representation in the State of Michigan. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 43, Amanda Oster.

>> Sorry. I was told I was 49. Can you hear me? The Pine version five you are working on connects Midland whole and Gladwin. Fair maps that did not benefit any political party or incumbent politician. It would prioritize public input on communities of interest and that it would a fully transparent and open process. Watching the Commission's work over the past two weeks, it's obvious none of that is true. And Governor Whitmer's own department of civil rights has spoken out against this Commission's maps because of lack of respect for the Voting Rights Act, the minority voters it is meant to protect. You're gerrymandering for democrats under the guise of partisan fairness. Michigan is not a blue state. We are a purple state that is elected at the top of the ticket in the past years, three republicans and three democrats. We are not asking you to rig the maps in our favor. We want the opportunity to compete. The Commission was created to draw fair maps, instead you split communities in the name of partisanship. Stop gerrymandering our state.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 44 Matthew Wilk.

>> Matthew, we can see you moving your lips but you are on mute still.

>> Sorry, technical problems as usual. Good morning my name is Matthew and they are almost a textbook example of cracking. My children looked at the map and described it as a bunch of French fries and I think that is unfortunately accurate. You heard dozens that the voting power of Detroit is cracked and it was. Once Detroit is cracked you were forced to adjust lines and the cracking extended to the remainder of Wayne County. For instance Northville and Northville Township are split in two different House Districts. That has not been done for as long as our residents can remember. You have heard today the same comment around Novi, Royal Oak, Rochester, Troy and others expressed in a bipartisan fashion. Livonia which is a community of interest currently has one House District House District 19. Now it is proposed to have three. There is no reason to do that other than to facilitate the cracking that occurred earlier. The constitutional provision expressly provides the communities of interest takes precedence over partisan fairness. And the Commission should work with that as a guide.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Let's move on to number 45, Garrett Brown.

>> Can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Sorry there was a little technical difficulty. Let me pull my comment up here. Okay I'm Garrett Brown the former mayor of Albion and I addressed you before and appreciate the opportunity. Recently I guess I want to again stress and request that Albion be placed back with the State House District with Battle Creek. I think with the

school bonds providing a good context of understanding the concern that communities like Albion have, so urban school bonds passed while rural school bonds failed. A couple years ago in 2016 Albion was forced to join a majority white school District with Marshall. This results with Albion's Black community of interest being overlooked and marginalized, forcing Albion into a rural State House district that includes parts of several other Counties. I think it will likewise marginalize Albion's Black community of interest. So I'm strongly suggesting and requesting that Albion be placed back with Battle Creek. There are a number of other residents in Albion who are trying to join and probably will comment today, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Let's pause the live remote comment and move to the next in person public comment so ma'am I think you just walked in. Are you ready to address the Commission? Number 15?

>> Hi, my name is Emma. You're gerrymandering for democrats under the guise of partisan fairness. Michigan is not a blue state we are more of a purple state. At the top of the ticket in the last six years three republicans and three democrats. We are not asking for you to rig the maps in our favor. We simply want the opportunity to compete. The Commission was created to draw fair maps. And instead you are splitting communities in the name of partisanship. Stop gerrymandering our state. Feel free to add additional just we really with are purple state and there is no need for us to decide to split this either way. It really needs to be more of a fair map. Democrats and republicans and liberal allies say we are a blue state but we are competitive purple state. Thank you for your time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Let's return to in person excuse me to the remote public comment. Number 46, Michelle or should we.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our interpreter Katie has her hand raised and Katie I didn't know if you had something you wanted to say.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry Katie, we can't hear you. Nod your head if you accidentally raised your hand. Got it. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so let's move to number 46, Michelle.

>> Hi, I want to thank you for your time. And I am from Muskegon County. And I just want to express my support for keeping the lakeshore communities together as we are communities of interest. Please do not gerrymander us into Kent County as we have nothing in common. And it creates partisanship advantage not fairness. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Number 47, Robert George.

>> Thank you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to address you this morning. My name is Robert George and I'm from the City of Ann Arbor I come before you to speak

on the current State House maps you are working on. I'm very upset that yesterday Commissioners sent to the breaking up of the Albion Battle Creek House District. It has an incredibly strong community of interest and I know this because I attempted Albion college where I earned my degree for four years and went to Battle Creek for meetings and going out for the beauty. They are willing to break up the African/American in the two cities alluded to by other commenters this is wrong. Watching the individual precincts of other minority groups in Grand Rapids and Oakland County at the house level and completely disregard a community of interest that has been repeatedly been spoken in favor of is not taking into consideration the Black interest. The shape of the District should not matter please put Battle Creek and Albion together thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 48, Jason Colella.

>> We can see you Jason but we can't hear you. No we are not hearing you, Jason. There we go, yes.

>> Hello, my name is Jason. I'm from Muskegon Michigan. And I am speaking today about the Congressional maps. First in favor of the chestnut map but more so against a lot of the other variations of the map in which Muskegon County is placed in connection with rural Counties going all the way in some versions all the way to Lake Huron. The community of interest here in Muskegon County is West Michigan. Not rural counties and not the coast of Lake Huron. So the chestnut map which has Muskegon County in connection with Grand Rapids, contrary to one of the previous public comments just a second ago is the strongest community of interest. I-96 the major highway connects Muskegon directly to Grand Rapids. I know countless folks who live in Muskegon work in Grand Rapids and vice versa. A lot of times people are going out to Grand Rapids, keep West Michigan together with Muskegon with Grand Rapids.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 49, John Poelstra.

>> Do you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we do.

>> All right very good. My name is John. I'm a resident of Hamburg Township which is in Livingston Township County. I believe that Livingston County fits the direction of a community of interest much like Clinton County. As a relative medium sized County population all of our school Directors intercom Pete with each other annually. Our children County wide play on the same club sport teams and drive regularly to other Livingston County stores churches and family and friends outside of our Township. In short, we know each other and developed close relationships with one another at a County level. But the you wish to divide up Livingston County into other districts specifically Senate District 22, contrary to others oppose such action I myself would more than be happy with that decision from a political perspective. It would give.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 50, Sarah Holmes.

>> We can't hear you, Sara.

>> On mute again. Can you hear me now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, thank you Commissioners for splitting I'm Sara-Holmes from Washtenaw County. And I'm wanting to thank you for splitting Ann Arbor to address partisan fairness. The newly redrawn districts of 27 and 29 are fair and representational. And we hope that not only the House Districts but the Senate map too is a huge improvement and we hope to -- we hope you will continue to keep these newly redrawn maps. We though there has been a lot of push back to go back to what they were. But those of us in Washtenaw County know that the only way for us to have fairness is to split Ann Arbor. So thank you for your hard work. And please keep these newly redrawn maps. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 51, Bronwyn.

>> No we cannot hear you but I can see your lips moving.

>> Can you hear me now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> Wonderful I want to thank you all for the work you are doing on the Commission. My request is that we don't partisanly gerrymander these maps. Michigan is not a blue state. It's a purple state. We've seen it go both ways. It's just really disconcerting you know people voted for this because they thought it would be fair maps. Not that it would be done in the name of gerrymandering. That's what we have been seeing. There is nothing more to it when we are chopping up communities of interest, just to have more partisan maps. There is no other way to look at it. I think it's really going to lose a lot of public trust in this process if we continue down the road of gerrymandering. So I know it's a long process, I thank you for the work that you're doing and I just ask you to go back to the maps that are more fair, they are not chopping up Counties in four or five different places. I ask that you go back, follow the communities of interest and please don't gerrymander this to favor one party over another.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 52, grace.

>> Hi good morning my name is grace. I'm a recent graduate of Albion college. During my time as an Albion student, I became very familiar with the unique socioeconomic challenges that Albion faces. The Black community in Albion and Battle Creek deserve to be represented. If Albion were to be directed with rural areas the values of the entire Albion community would not be represented in the legislature. Please present a map with Battle Creek and Albion in the same District in the final round. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 53, Janice Harte.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice, you are free to address the Commission.

>> My name is Janice-Harte remaining partisan and community of interest and my community is Clinton County which I was told to be take end as the primary. I had to listen to one democrat after another for partisan attack. Now I see that you're promoting for democrat interests and I plead for fairness and for what was promised. Excuse me. You are splitting Clinton County in a partisan manner that we can conclude is for winning elections. I lived and worked in Lansing and East Lansing and my vote never counted and they are basically one party communities. They have very little in common with Bath Clinton County and where I lived for 16 years, a community where I finally had a voice. And now you are taking that away. Stop the democrats from unfair influencing groups especially by groups that may sound nonpartisan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. 54 Norman Clement.

>> Hello how is everybody doing today?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are doing all right.

>> Good, good, back again. Just to let you guys know the first time I have been...we have been doing this work of gerrymandering since me working this work on redistricting since January, all the way through March and May. And after you guys approved the efficiency gaps, I know there is something I've never here before in all the meetings gerrymandering, gerrymandering, gerrymandering. That means you guys are doing an excellent job and getting better. That means keeping the efficiency gap 0 for partisan fairness. Partisan fairness. Everybody is not going to get what they want. And they must understand that. But you guys have done the job and still continue doing the job and keep doing that job on the state and the state reps and the State Senate maps on getting to 0. That is the key. Partisan fairness. Also I understand communities of interest. But things change. This is what this Commission was brought to do. 0 efficiency gap. Thank you for letting me talk to you guys.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 55, Laura.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Number 56, Justin Roebuck.

>> Hi, Commissioners, my name is Justin the Ottawa County clerk. Thank you so much for your time and for the critical work that you're doing. I'm here this morning to voice support for the apple Congressional District map. I know you have heard from hundreds of my fellow residents in Ottawa County asking to be kept together in one Congressional District because of our shared cultural values and economic ties. We support the apple map because it represents a true lakeshore community of interest and because it keeps Ottawa County communities together. The birch map splits our

communities in three different directions basically places Grand Haven with on the Lake Michigan side with Saginaw Bay the chestnut map cuts through Ottawa County and puts generational farming communities in with Metropolitan areas. In order to lump Grand Rapids with Muskegon. I'm here to strongly advocate for the apple map and thank you for the hard work you are doing. We appreciate the time. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Number 57, Bob Carrico.

>> You're free to address the Commission Mr. Carrico.

>> This is Bob Carrico and I'm a resident of Franklin Michigan and Oakland County and I would like to thank the Commissioners doing an excellent job with partisan fairness on the State Senate map. Please do the same with the State House map. One suggestion I can offer is to excuse me start using the 2016 election as a metric for partisan fairness. It is the closest thing we have to a 50/50 election. This would provide a better gauge than with those election years when one party had a more sweeping victory over another. I thank you very much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 58, Allen Poehl.

>> Can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Great thanks. I wanted to echo what a lot of my fellow citizens are saying. That Michigan is a competitive state. In the last six elections republicans have won the top of the ticket three times. Democrats have won the top of the ticket three times. I think if you actually want to create Mary maps you need to give both parties a chance to win both chambers of the legislature. I don't understand you are breaking up communities of interest for partisan reasons to try to guaranty that democratic majority. That is a very definition of gerrymandering. On a side note, I also thought it was nice to see some Commissioners finally stand up to Commissioner Szetela. This is not queen Szetela's Commission.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

>> I appreciate if she would instead of ram rodding the Commissioners, she would listen to them thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for keeping your comments not directed at one Commission. Number 59, Jerry McCaleb.

>> Can you hear me as a resident of Grand Haven I'm advocating for the apple map because it does the best job of the Lake showered community grand haven Muskegon and Holland. These are diverse communities so everyone is well represented. These lakeshore communities also have specialized economies and whether it's tourism manufacturing or agricultural it's all related to their proximity to the water. And they deserve the specialized interests of representative who can focus on those special needs. To break up these communities and tie them to large or inland communities does not give them adequate representation and will water down their influence and

result in the very thing this Commission was designed to eliminate. So to make fair and representative maps these Lake shore communities need to have fair representation and again I advocate for the apple map because I think it does the best job and keeps our lakeshore communities and their interests together. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 61, Donyale-Stephen-Atara.

>> Good morning.

I'm Donyale. I will enter my comments into the portal so you can have my full statement. I've already commented on the maps in the portal but for the record chestnut requires more work. And I do not support version two of cherry since you are unwilling to allow Commissioner Brittini Kellom to make the map more equitable for Detroit and its ability to select an African/American to have a fighting chance to run and win the District. I hope that you will be more open today to completing the Pine version five house map with her assistance. Instead of attempting to mute her. The attempts to silence her voice while addressing the various comments from the African/American community incorporate those comments into a more workable map for our community are disappointing and concerning. Thank you to Commissioner Kellom and Juanita Curry for listening to the concerns of Detroiters. Please continue to make the VRA revisions to the maps. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 62, Kathy Leikhim.

>> My name is Cathy from the City of Midland please supine version five State House map because it keeps Midland whole and connected to Gladwin. And I'm asking why there is no Congressional map that puts Midland and Gladwin back together in a separate digit from Flint. I posted a link to the portal from of a Detroit news Article award Midland Gladwin region 54 million to aid in flood recovery. This Article is a great example of how unified voices and representation helps our community. Please consider a Congressional map that does the same as Pine version five. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 63, Diane Karabetsos.

>> Hello.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hello we can hear you.

>> Great, I'm Diane I'm an elderly resident of this point. I wanted to comment on what a strong community of interest we are. I feel under Snyder we lost our voice. It's fun to make fun of Grosse Pointers but it's not funny when you lose your voice. We were gerrymandered and diluted in our voice. The top of the points we are connected horizontally with Detroit and the bottom three Grosse Pointe cities and connected with Detroit. But we residents spend a lot of effort, time and money in our own interests on education, social, economic, et cetera. I feel that we don't have a voice. And if you look

at a community of interest and you will give Grosse Pointes back together again and not be political. Thank you. Thank you for your time and effort.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. 64, Barb.

>> Hi, thank you for the opportunity to speak. Again I just want to reiterate the goals the Commission is to prioritize partisan fairness. And ensure that districts reflect consideration of County, City and Township boundaries. Your job is to get as close to 0 on the partisan bias scores as possible and if you are over 1% you still have work to do. Specifically in my area of Rochester and Rochester Hills, essentially all of the house maps as drawn are still the same. So I would ask that you look at the issue of partisan fairness and take that into consideration. You don't need to carve out of Oakland Township within the proposed House District 37. You have enough of community population to make it strictly its own House District. And so I ask that you consider looking at that area again. And I thank you for your time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 65, Denise.

>> Good morning.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning.

>> I'm talking today about partisan fairness. We the people of the State of Michigan have come to vote in non-gerrymandering. Doing this you have to get down to a 0 percentage. That way everyone has a voice. I echo Mr. Clement and the lady before me you have some work to do. I hope all the Commissioners will take an honest look at these maps and do the right thing by them. When you look at Pontiac, I have not heard Pontiac's name used very much. You need to look at Flint. You need to have voices from what Michigan looks like. Red, yellow, Black Brown and white and we are Michigan. And you guys can do this. Stop the inner fighting stop grabbing one little piece of the map and put your arms around it. You are put in here to look out for all of us. Stop the gerrymandering.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 66, Lois-Furry.

>> Good morning can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you. I'm coming to you from Holt in Ingham County. And I am a former volunteer for Voters Not Politicians. Together with my husband, I collected more than 600 signatures for proposed two. And overwhelmingly the hundreds of Michigan voters we talked to and that is both republicans, democrats as well as independents wanted to sign the petition to achieve partisan fairness in our state. As others have said, your job is to get to as close to 0 on the partisan bias scores as possible. Unfortunately I'm extremely disappointed to see that the updated Pine house map has a plus 4% efficiency gap instill benefits republicans on all partisan fairness measures. I want to

remind you that partisan fairness is not just a nice thing to have if you can get it. It is your constitutional duty. As your expert Dr. Handley said Michigan is a.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 68, Jennifer Austin.

>> Hello Jennifer Austin City of Midland. Last week you proposed making a seat with Midland and Gladwin as a compromise for the Tri-City and Congressional districts Commissioner Kellom was the only one to say a deal was inappropriate and I thank you for that. Yesterday you talked about giving the people options for the next round of maps. Please give us the option of a Midland and Bay City House District as drawn in the original Pine map. Include all adjustments made Monday and Tuesday especially those made by Kellom Curry and Eid to Detroit. Take the map that reflects the needed changes to Detroit Flint and Grand Rapids and give us a Bay City combination. The maps continue to lean republican a Bay City Midland House District has near 0 political bias improves the partisan fairness of the entire map and unites two already closely aligned sister cities they are economic and social and other ties between us and make the maps more fair. When you removed that district, we lost a seat that was competitive and instead gave a strong republican seat. Put Midland and Bay City back together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 69, Mark-Payne.

>> Good morning, everybody.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning yes, we can.

>> My name is mark Payne thank you for the work of the State of Michigan and changes in we recollect with Detroit having clear clean boundaries and VRA you can go to 55% BVAP to keep communities together. African/American population needs population wise for over 50 years. We can look at the portal and concepts dealing with the maps. The Michigan vote to Detroit and make changes to reflect public testimony I ask the Commissioners submit their own maps to reflect these considerations particularly in Detroit. The Commissioner has map drawing experts and your own skilled person who said she is willing to help. This is your historical obligation and give thoughtful time and legal thought to Detroit and Michigan. Also please continue partisan fairness in your map drawing thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Number 70, Yousif.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. Yousif from Troy please add another Senate map for comments and includes Troy Sterling Heights and Rochester Hills one is not enough. We need to see more options I'm same with house maps please publish more than one for comments. I would like to see Commissioner Kellom chestnut willow or Walnut completed and published. Please add another can you also add the published Senate house and Congressional map in the Michigan mapping portal? District R, so we can make changes to the public maps. The apple V2 does not include Chaldean and Farmington Hills in one but has Chaldean in Rochester and Sterling Heights and

support apple V2 for Congressional and I thank you and will pray for you Commissioners.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. 71, Elise-Lang.

>> Hello.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hello.

>> Hi, my name is Elise-Lang I want to thank you for this opportunity to be heard. I live in the City of Jackson Michigan. Partisan fairness and purple states are obviously a hot topic today.

I was not going to talk about it because I obviously did not get the memo but I'm going to get on the bandwagon. I was only going to talk about how cherry map doesn't appropriately represent a community of interest. But in the spirit of partisan fairness for the purple state the Commission would do well to reexamine Jackson County. In the cherry map. And I like what Yousif said about giving other options for the Senate, the Senate boundaries. My family lives in the City though we go to church to the doctor, to work and to events outside the City but still within Jackson County. And the cherry map Jackson County is all split up, why? I don't understand. If this is supposed to be a democratic experiment, I plead with you to please listen to the voices of the people being affected.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Our final commenter is number 72, Robert Dindoffer.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Oh, great, hey, so a couple things. One, I really appreciate what Commissioners Kellom and Curry were trying to do in Detroit in the State House. And I think they need to be given their opportunity and I'm glad that all of you are getting engaged with that process today. I think it's important for the people of Detroit. And you know selfishly as well given Mr. Adelson's updated guidance you could add that last precinct of Grosse Pointe Woods into State House District 4 without causing a VRA concern. Second, as people are talking about other options in State Senate one suggestion if you wanted to make Jackson County whole is put the Ipsi Ann Arbor District back together but in my home area in the Lake St. Clair you could swap Algonac out and new Haven in and it would flip the District blue. I'm pretty sure you would end up with the same seats votes and could be alternate options.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We do have 67 who has rejoined us, Alice so our final comment maybe for the day is number 67 Alice please proceed good morning.

>> Good morning great. I was just going to bring to your attention because last week you were working on splitting up Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti seat Senate seat which is a little concentrated. And you didn't have enough time to adequately look at the many ways that you could split it and I was going to bring to your attention that I have done

that for you. Using your cherry V2 map. And I have 7 submissions on your comment portal. If you would like to have alternatives, they are P8674 and P8672, P8671, P8669, P8667, P8666 and P8665. I just wanted to bring those to your attention thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. That concludes our public comment for the morning. I'll turn it back over to you, Chair Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Normally we take a break after public comment so unless there is an objection do you guys want to get started or do you want to take a ten-minute break? So it is currently 10:35. Hearing no objections we will stand in recess until we will say 10:50 because we are not good about being back in ten minutes so we are in recess until 10:50.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right as Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 10:53 a.m. will the secretary please take the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and disclose your physically attending from. I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Attending from Detroit, Michigan.

Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present. Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending from Reed City Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present. And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

Okay, so we have concluded our public comment and will move on to unfinished business agenda item deliberates with proposed maps is carried over from the previous meeting and the Commission will begin our deliberations. So Mr. Stigall, we were going to we were intending to return I believe to Pine three. But I did attempt a merge on these two plans yesterday so I put in the Pine three with the Pine five to incorporate those changes. Does anyone want to take a look at that? Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So just as a clarification, myself and Commissioner Eid also sent you a shape file with those but it includes the Dearborn changes that Commissioner Eid included so just I don't know if you would include those. You had included those but just making sure it's the right one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I did not mess with Dearborn. I was going to leave that for him, so I just merged the Detroit area from three in with the rest of the state from five.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And ours merges that plus the Detroit and Kent is raising his hand so I'm done.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, the plan that says Pine V3 and V5 was from Commissioner Eid and Kellom. The plan at the top up here that is Pine V3 and V5 merged RS is the plan that Chairwoman Szetela has. So these are two different plans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What I would suggest is that we bring up the Pine V3 and V5 but before we do that, I think we should probably call it something other than Pine so it's not confusing. Any thoughts as to the name? Can we just create a copy and then we will just rename it and we will work off that? Then we can put the one that I did as a shape file and just see if there is any differences.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So name Magnolia any thoughts on Magnolia.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Cotton wood.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: She is no, she says Magnolia can we rename Pine V3 and V5 to Magnolia and a date on it so it's following like our naming convention? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There it is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have Magnolia so can we open that up? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, I take that back. I was thinking ahead the shape file of this is out there. I thought I had to create another one but I don't. I should point out for some reason there were I did some checks on this. And there is some little pieces that were unassigned and I think it's the geography. I'll show them to you real quick.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just to knock these out. So like the dis-contiguities there was 22 of them and it's a bunch of those little bitty pieces.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That came from remember all these? It's that kind of stuff right there that we have been dealing with. There is another one there. And it's that part of Flint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom would you mind Districting Kent on filling in the dis-contiguities.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These pieces and these two and 26 is what it appears.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, Kent you can assign those and correct them rather.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And these 89.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Go ahead and assign those to 89, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is I believe in the original plan it was in 26.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, myself and Commissioner Eid couldn't remember. There was some areas.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I mean I can overlay it but I've done this a couple times and that was 58 underneath there is 58.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think pretty positive we did to 89 to 26.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 26.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I just messed it up. Just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My understanding is Anthony and Brittini took the former map and made some changes to it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They combined two maps together so remember how we started with the version three which had all those Detroit area changes and then yesterday we worked on version five.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, Szetela se we did Battle Creek and Benton Harbor and Lansing and Flint and they merged for the Detroit districts from verse three with everything else we did yesterday.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Did they make any additional changes other than that?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Changes to Dearborn so the changes that Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Other than that it's a straight merge so we have some inconsistencies with population when we merged.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We will have to continue to tweak those.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I did run a check on these numbers and everything is pretty clean, except the little geography issues and just from combining and importing the plans. Unfortunately part of our problem. I have a Pine three and Pine five as overlay

layers in green and blue you can sit on top of them and see if -- where the differences are.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This one I'm not sure of. I can turn on the overlay layer to see which way it's supposed to go.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That would be great.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

I believe this is part of V3. I was looking at it earlier and why is it not showing up? Okay in this area V3 and V5 should be the same. I don't know why. We will try it again.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know either, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So for some reason it just won't load the shape file. There is the difference. So this okay so that little piece in V3 is that little dot right there in V3 is in District 95. And V5 it's in, yeah, in V3 it's in 95. In version five it's unassigned. In version five it's in 72. So this is one of the districts that where there is a difference in V3, V5.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Should be assigned how it is in version five so that means it would be assigned to District two.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, 72.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 72 thank you. You know what I meant.

[ Laughter ]

Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While we are waiting is it okay if I review my notes? We have version five we are working from. Is that correct we are working from version five or integrating version five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's a merge.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So version five was Grand Rapids and Lansing without Detroit and now it's version five includes the Detroit changes that we made. Is that accurate?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No. So version three was the Detroit changes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Version five was everything we did including Flint Grand Rapids Benton Harbor and made some changes where else, there was someplace else. Along like the Battle Creek. That is what I'm thinking and one more.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We approved yet is that true.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, version five was approved yesterday so Anthony and I last night worked on merging version three and five and took Detroit from version three and merged them into all of the changes we had already approved on the map from yesterday from version five. That way we don't have to reduplicate everything.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Now which one is Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is the combined version.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Magnolia is the improved version five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: With all the changes from, Battle Creek Grand Rapids, Benton Harbor, Lansing, Flint that we did yesterday plus Brittini's changes from two days before.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for catching me up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And Anthony and obviously when you merged the plans, it's not a perfect fit. So there probably is a little bit of adjustment in deviations that are going to need to be addressed.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this is the plan. And where the filled in colors is Magnolia. Green is V5 I believe and the blue is V3. So it takes a minute to kind of wrap your mind around.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is the opposite. I think the blue is V am I right? Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just happened to land on Grand Rapids. So V5 is not on right now. V3 is in blue. So the merged plan is different from V3 in this area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, that is accurate. I mean I'm glad that it's different because that is V5.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to turn V3 off and turn V5 on. V5 matches Magnolia and that is the way it should. I'm making sure we are on the right Page.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I would agree with assessment.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So V5 matches Magnolia as far as I can see. If there is any differences.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's just look at that south of 82 District 82.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, I did skim this so yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we changed it okay no that is accurate very good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So that came on. Lansing V5 matches Magnolia because this was significant changes all the way, 95, Battle Creek, 71, 81, I did see one place we got to fix something. Well maybe not. It was a different plan. So and then we start getting near -- here is a differential right there. 51 in Magnolia goes up like this. Here is a District. This District in V5 there is a District here and a District up here. So there is differences around there, around west of Flint, east of Flint there were changes made.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: East of Flint.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then we get down into the Detroit region for lack of a better word and you can see a little bit different, five, of course five is different in here. Magnolia is 35, actually probably about the same. They are the same damn color. I can't see the difference. Well that is what I just realized that is two districts and it should be two districts or could be. You start seeing it, well, because we are getting into Detroit.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: And we knew that needed to be.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There will be some cleaning up. They are not going to fit perfect.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You got it and you can see V5 is the green outline, Magnolia has two districts right there. This little District in the V5 I think this was 8 they all have been renumbered online. But there was a District right here, went around through here like that. And now we have you know, this pink District and a blue District and these two are essentially the same. I'm going to change colors of this plan District right here. Because that is 16, I'm going to change that color because there is some differences there. So you can see there is changes from five to Magnolia, pretty much the same up here. Changes you know in all of this area. Right up in here. So anyway, if the sponsors of or authors of these changes want to take over, I think other than Flint, the concentration of changes, yeah. From here up. Approximately.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so can we take the can we take that layer off? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can turn the precincts off and you can see the contrast better. I should have done that earlier.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, it's fine. It's fine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You're fine?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah. All right, so is that a hand Commissioner Witjes? Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So the merge is basically complete here as far as I can tell, right? In Detroit? So can we run the partisan fairness numbers? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So we do have this 28, I noticed a couple out of whack but if we see the 28 and 8 and you are at 8 it looks almost like I have not studied it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I missed that part. We should focus on plane deviation first.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: MC can I request you facilitate this discussion?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You can. Please do. And so I'm just facilitating. So Mr. Stigall we are I think Mr. Witjes you said we will look at plan deviation and try to make adjustments first. Is there someone that would like to help us with this? Do you want to try to help us with plan deviation Commissioner Kellom? Do we want.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think we all should help with plan deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Who is driving so Mr. Stigall has a voice that he can...

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So the area that kind of needs to be fixed is near Troy as Kent highlighted.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So 28.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The colors.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is the Troy area.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is Troy right there. I'm going to change the color of 37.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Is the Christmas stocking looking thing next to it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In this area Commissioner Orton did you have a hand?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question. A little north of there Kent when we were looking at it before it looked like there was something that, a little bit more north, maybe it was just in the other overlay. Okay, it's fine. I just thought maybe there was something that wasn't contiguous.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the only part that I saw and there may be more that were significantly changed is this area from V5.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: V3 this area is different from V3 and V5 right up in here.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We don't know why when we were merging it maybe it was because it was so late last night but why that conflict happened. So we were hoping that this morning we could talk about it as a group to fix that because that is a part of why the plan deviation is like it is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Got it so if you recognize that is not potentially that yeah do you want to start with 28? What are you thinking Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't have a preference we can start with 28. What I'm openly saying I don't know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Why it happened.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And I don't know that I have a solution. I think that is where we kind of put our heads together and think about the comments and those things, what makes sense. And Chair Szetela does Tetris while you are facilitating.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm looking and thinking we have Troy and got some comments and we've had comments about trying to keep it whole. I think there may be some plans and we even got in the Pontiac area we got a public comment today just about moving a few things. Wondering this often it all needs to mix together. Do we have anyone that has a plan meaning what I'm looking at is communities of interest or other people who have ideas on the portal we could potentially look at is there any Commissioner that has a sort of an idea to help us adjust 28 in particular or the area around it? Again thinking about all the comment we received and know these maps need work just how do we reflect the communities as best we can. Any Commissioner have a portal or a portal submission or something we can look at, Commissioner Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are you looking for deviation or looking to make wholesale changes based on -- I'm trying to understand what you are asking.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looking for deviation but know as we move and adjust, yeah, we either break up communities and understand how we are breaking them up better, yeah, so yes deviation and yes like where is the best way to which best way to go.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think he is looking for both.

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's both.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Qualitative comments.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we put on the thematic dots for Asian Americans.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, just a moment. Cut of this.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, thank you.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton? Is your mic on Commissioner Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm sorry I thought it was. This does not solve that problem but at the top of District 16 I just want to Zoom in and see if that is contiguous. Barely.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Does that answer your question?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's contiguous but may want to look at filling something in if it works out with the plan deviation.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's a precinct. The funny shapes sometimes are predetermined for us.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: That is the Birmingham situation.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton said it's not 28 but do we want to try to adjust that to keep Troy, you know, that...
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: I don't have...I'm a shopper and a consumer of that area. But I don't have any deep insights into the Birmingham area. I know that the folks in Troy spoke about wanting to keep that more whole. So.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: I was kind of Zooming in to see if we could extend 32 to Dequinder and would require some shifting.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: You clicked on blocks Kent.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, Commissioner, those are the blocks. In the southern precinct. There is no population in that area.
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so it would make more sense to me for that to go into 32 especially since there is no population. Does anyone see a problem with that? Then we could possibly from big Beaver road south that dip we could add that into District 16 depending on population. I can't see 16 right now but unless somebody else knows more.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: This is just adding to the conversation. I think that area is a golf course. So, yeah.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can highlight the census blocks.
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we see the active matrix for 16 as well? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 16 is at 1900 while 32 is 980 low. I'll select those blocks so we can identify the population. It's only a couple census blocks actually. So that entire region highlighted. I may be missing something. That entire area has 222 people.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Unless somebody objects, I say put it in 16.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed. I'm seeing it, yeah. Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Orton you are so nice and looking over at me. It's fine.

[ Laughter ]

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right so we are -- did that sort of address what you wanted to look at Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right we are looking to adjust 28 and our lowest deviation right the District that needs the most is 28. And the District that has the most to give is District 8. So we are essentially we've always sort of identified how are we going to cycle the population so 28 and 8 are two and they border each other. So and I think what we are trying to do is work as smart as we can recognizing that we did you know yeah Troy is divided and we were able to keep it whole in other maps. We weren't able to do it as we moved here so I'm just trying to figure out if there is any way to move smart. I think we have the theme on here the Asian community theme but we got to get from 8 into no 8 into 28. Go ahead sorry Commissioner Szetela then Commissioner Orton.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I asked you to turn on the thematic dots and I'm being distracted by something else and can we scroll up to Rochester Hills. So up a little higher. So and 37, 28 is under so we need to take a little more but 37 is lightly populated. My thought was if we can pull the corner of Rochester and put it in 28 is one suggestion. It's not going to get you totally there, that is why I wanted to see the population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was thinking a different direction only because I saw that 28 has a lot of Asian population and those top couple precincts in 8 also had Asian thematic dots on them so if we just move them up into 28, it would potentially balance those two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it would also reduce the African/American population in 8 though. Because that is a VRA District 42%.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 8 is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I mean that is a thing. That is an Oakland County VRA District where we are trying to keep it above 40.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I did not see that one went clear down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I want to bring to people's attention that District 10 is pretty low too. So we are you know 10-28 are both low.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If you modify 8, we are going to end up on 10.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Commissioner Lett excuse me  
Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I don't want to split up Rochester or Rochester Hills. It's a self-contained community. I prefer to keep it there. To get more Asians you are only talking 200 people at the most so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You mean to balance the population?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think the population in that area is fine. It's in Rochester and Rochester Hills should be self-contained, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we will try, okay, where are we?  
Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I was sent a suggestion by I'm assuming it was a member of the public and I showed it to our General Counsel and I encouraged the individual to also submit it to the public comment portal. So I don't have a -- I don't know of a way to necessarily like broadcast it on the screen. But I think it has some guides or suggestions for the Oakland County Troy area. That does not mean that it would not completely shift other things, but I'm just saying we could possibly use that as a thought because it does not seem like we have like many suggestions at the moment. And I hear Commissioner Clark on Rochester Hills. I don't know what the thought, what the Commission prefers about that. But I mean...

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: How do we want to proceed, Commissioners?  
Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So on no on eight can I see eight on the active matrix? This is one of our VRA districts we did not want to mess with and I don't know the population in this area. But would the top couple precincts might have if it's higher Asian population maybe we are not taking away the Black population from that District. So it might not mess it up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm wondering too part of me is wondering Mr. Adelson I'm wondering if we can look at VRA and coalition districts and help us in this area sort of understand right we are making choices that could, yeah, help us make some choices, please.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I'm happy to Commissioner. As I understand 28 has a fair Asian population 14, 15%. And the dot that is highlighted now in District 8 I guess above the Madison Heights that is an Asian community dot. So perhaps seeing if that particular area being shifted into 28 let's see what that does.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so yeah as Commissioner Orton suggested let's try it and I think what Mr. Adelson is saying and let's see what happens. And then we will sort of, yeah, okay so Mr. Stigall and Commissioner Orton I see your hand do you have a question before we do that?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can we write down the demographics for 28 as well before we go.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do that Mr. Stigall will you help reading them out loud? It's very small, the font is very small at this point so could you read them out loud or make it bigger, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Understood. If I make it bigger, we cover up the map. So 8 is 43% non-Hispanic Black.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: And Asian too please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Asian is 4.57%. And 28 is 5% non-Hispanic Black. 13.75% non-Hispanic Asian.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 13.75.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looking at 43 and 4.5 for 8 District 8, 5% and roughly 14% for 28.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we are going to assign that precinct that you -- where we have 17.74% Asian population to 28.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I see though it goes down so it's going to cutoff that other precinct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, so.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Either have to go to blocks or take more than one precinct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, and we also have 25. Next to 28 there is in District 25 just north of you, just north a little bit Mr. Stigall yep that block right there into 28. So that is lower. Lower percentage.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 4885.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay and 28 is under populated do we want to try it? Yeah, because otherwise we are significantly shifting eight in ways that, yeah, we may not be able to...I guess we could go in...let's try the 25 into 28, please. But 25 we did not write the numbers down for 25 and that is okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: See what they are now. So now 25 is 6% low. It is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Population 6% low is that right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 25 is 6% low.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And non-Hispanic Black is 7.6 and the non-Hispanic Asian is 6%. While 28 now the numbers percentage wise are ideal, the non-Hispanic Black is 5.31%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So it went up a little bit.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Non-Hispanic Asian is 13.6.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It went down just a little bit. And I think this is where we want to sort of understand if we are trying to remedy 28. Mr. Adelson those changes in 28 may be okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: The changes in 28 seem to BVAP came up a little bit. But the BVAP is low. And it's 5.3%. So I think there is some room. The goal is to reduce the population in which the deviation in which.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 28 which we have done. And our largest population the one that has the most to give is District 8. So that's our and, yeah, so that is our dilemma. I also believe if I'm not mistaken this is the area where the Chaldean community is present. And 25 for the Sterling Heights area. Is that right? Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, and Chaldean area there is Chaldean population in the West Bloomfield area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I guess so my question was did we potentially impact and make a positive change for the Chaldean community by adding that or is it further north or do we know? We do have those maps, okay, Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was thinking out loud so now 25 is even lower than what 28 was at 6.2% low. And there again you know 10 is going to be the next one probably because it's 3.87% low. I'm just looking, trying to you know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Help us cycle the population it's appreciated, thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Not mess up too bad. So two could give up a tiny bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I'm not sure what the best move is here. But could we just go back and try taking from eight I mean that is what is going to balance the deviation. So we can just take a look at the numbers and we can always undo it but since that one precinct causes a problem, what about the far left precinct and just see what happens with that?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed. Let's try it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Far left undo this, correct? Put that back into 25.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes please.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: For now.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Take the top half of District 8 you are saying and push it into 25. Yes, I agree with that and what I was just talking to Bruce about.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What do we want to do here? Take this precinct or go across this line?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think take the precinct right.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The left precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 28 is 2.53. I think we -- have y'all been trying to get them under 2.5 or at 2.5 approximately.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, but let us see the numbers before you move.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So 28 the BVAP did decrease just under 5%. Yeah, and I can't see when the.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, 28 is 4.99. 5% non-Hispanic Black. 13.4% non-Hispanic Asian.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 8 population is ideal. Or even. And non-Hispanic Black voting age population is 44.17. And non-Hispanic voting age population is 4.61.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Black voting age population increased with that change. And may reflect what our fellow Detroiters were asking for. And we've got our deviation lower. And yeah, I think we are going to go with that. Does that feel good.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It does feel good sorry I was just double checking the African/American population in Madison Heights and it's 8.51% so yes that is fine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good. So now help me remember so I think we were trying to address population deviation again with Commissioner Witjes' intent was to say can we run the partisan fairness so I think we are working at trying to get the plan deviation down to about 5%. So the next smallest District is 10. Right the one that is most under and the largest with the most to give is 33. And ten is one of those VRA districts so maybe we want to focus on 33. Yeah, and this is in that area where we have, I'll just affectionately call it Vallette land. So I wonder Commissioner Vallette will you help us understand maybe where we can make some tough choices?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I would be honored Commissioner Vallette if you would assist, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please use your mic thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I still think we need to keep Milford Highland White Lake whole so I would take around Wolverine lack or Commerce is up at the top. But or wait what is up north, north up there? We want to get the population south. We don't want to get it north, right?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we have more population that we need in 33.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I see what you're saying. Where do we want to move the population is that your question.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Southeast.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If we move it southeast that is ideal. Also want to acknowledge maybe we want to shift the Pontiac area. Maybe we want to shift the Auburn Hills area. I'm not sure there is Troy, there is places close here that we may want to shift or try to keep.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Well I've heard Pontiac and Waterford and Auburn Hills. And I did hear that it was a speaker today said that they actually like that. And I also like it too. And I think Commissioner Clark also thinks that those two areas should go together. Though we haven't put Auburn Hills with Pontiac.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I'm not mistaken, I think we have a map from one of public speakers today and I don't know where it was delivered or anybody in the room who can answer that question. So I'm going to pause. And make sure that I am accurate that we do have, is there any member of our team who can help me understand did we receive a map today from our public comment speaker? I think it was number one. Do we have a paper map? He -- it was a few simple precincts. I say simple. It's not going to be simple. And right the goal is to sort of have maps that help us know how to be smart about our changes. Okay, Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say before we start changing Pontiac area mine would be a larger change and focus on the plan deviation total first.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is about plan deviation but sort of which direction to move it. So I think Commissioner Vallette was discussing where do we move the population that we have too much of in 23 so maybe in 38 so we can bump it in Auburn Hills and that was my only thought does that make sense? I see Commissioner Clark's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What about the top part of 33 and moving it into 39? The very top precinct, yeah, that area over there, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What do you think Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yeah, I would go for that. I think that when we put that in with 33 it was kind of like an afterthought to give it more population but evidently it doesn't need it. So.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 39 can handle a little additional.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Curry I heard your voice do you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I was going to say something but I'm going to hold it for a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: SO Commissioner Vallette, did you want to help direct us?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I'm not very good at this moving it around and around. So I mean if we want to start at the north that is fine let's put where it says Austin corners, which.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Connors.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Awesome okay so put that into 39 is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you Mr. Stigall.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It got worse.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I mean it did bring 33 down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks like we added it to 39 which was also over. And 38 I believe was just a little bit just a little bit under so 38 can accept it better than 39 so do we want to back that out? Again our goal.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Why don't we keep going and add to it's 39, right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right on. So Commissioner Kellom do you have a path for us? I do have that sort of this map that was making Oxford whole. And then you know improving the Pontiac District, so there is a few different places.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Use it as a guide and tell me what you see.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is great. What do I see? It looks like.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to put the populations up there real quick okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Did you say something about Pontiac and Waterford being together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are right, Commissioner Curry, yes. So and I'm going to read it because I have the comment here. Recommended improvement of District 38 to improve VRA compliance. Return the single pink precinct south of Pontiac to District 29. So the single pink, there is multiple pink, but it is to the right. It's in sort of in the middle of the pink District, which is 29. We are going to add that to 38, I believe. No, it says return the single pink precinct to District 29.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Is it that hill part or the mountain? What are they talking about?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, is that the one? No, it's not. That is in 29, yeah. So we are turning -- returning it to 29. Because this is so fresh, I'm just going to transfer the green precinct in Auburn Hills from 29 to 38.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 29 to 38.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This may be an old map.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Mentioning the mountain piece so it's already in 29 so I can't imagine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: At this point we are still focusing on trying to reduce our plan deviation. There was a cycle and Mr. Stigall you sometimes help us understand how we can cycle our population, do you have any thoughts here? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me back up and look at this. So 24 can hold some. And 36 can hold some. So I mean you could put some from 39 to 38 to 34 or you can put this back into 33 and push from 33 to 24, 33 to 36. Does that make sense to everyone? We put this back into 33. And then pass some to 36. Or and/or some to 24.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: For example I'm just going to highlight this precinct. That could go into 24 and be under 2.5%, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are we okay with that Commissioners? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You have multiple ways of doing it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is around Wolverine Lake which I think you were suggesting earlier Commissioner Vallette; is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: You will split up the City of Walled Lake.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that what we are doing if we do that? That is not what we want to do, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I would not want to.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We are concerned about keeping Auburn Hills and the Waterford and Pontiac areas together. That's what they are concerned about. I did not hear about Walled Lake this morning.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay thank you. Commissioner Orton did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think that concern of Auburn Lake, Pontiac and.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Auburn Hills.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's too much for a House District and why we have part of what was requested. That is what I remember any way.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Well I'm thinking for Pontiac we either need to go east or west to connect either more of Auburn Hills with it or more of Waterford with it. They are on either side of Pontiac. So I mean to go north or south to me doesn't make sense.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Kellom then Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Gary more head from Auburn Hills I think if I'm understanding the comment and the suggestion correctly, he is suggesting transferring the three green precincts in Waterford above to District 38. So towards Pontiac.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Aren't they already in Pontiac? I guess the three green.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't think so if I'm looking at...Kent has a highlight there. But I think he is suggesting more of that area into that little elbow looking joint go into 38 might be too much, I'm not sure but if I'm understanding the drawing correctly. Can you see Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it's the one that is highlighted and the one to the left of it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay so this area right here is 3700. So I guess what we are talking about is moving some moving it into one or both into 38 and then having 24 help balance it. Is that the idea?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Probably so, yeah, try it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Curry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Shall we do such? Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will try it so we got to Commissioner Curry now we will go to Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't see the population numbers but just above Rochester Hills in Oakland Township there is two orange districts that are associated with Auburn Hills. And if we move those to 37, if the population allows it, that will allow you to move more into 29. Actually 29 is over now, isn't it? Yeah, a little bit. It will allow you to move more in 29 from the west or the south.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay I think I'm following you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: But I don't know what the population is in that area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Plan deviation is still up there. But we are cycling through so we decreased 33 to where we need it to be; is that correct? Yes. 38 is now where we have extra population. It's our highest. And we are moving it into and.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These are large highly populated precincts that is making it a little more...let's see what we got right here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I thought we would move 38 to the east but we can't move it because it's so skinny. And try to you know adjust more of Auburn Hills, not Auburn heights. Okay Auburn Hills so we want more of the northern area. So do we want to add to -- add to 29 from 38? Is that what we are thinking? What do you think Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The part he is highlighting if we move from that edge of Pontiac then we are actually splitting up the City of Pontiac to move it into Auburn Hills. I don't think that is what we want to do.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think the commenter this morning was trying to improve our VRA. And we did make it the adjustments. Thanks Commissioner Kellom for helping us review it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm trying.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Some of these notes say MC to Pontiac, Michigan State Senate maps hurts the change. So look at the State House maps to kind of get a better look of how they want Pontiac and Auburn Hills to be together. That is what some of my notes say so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we are in the house map so help us say it one more time Commissioner Curry look.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Look at the State House maps and put back with Auburn Hills. So they want Pontiac the State Senate map hurt the change so they want us to look at the State House maps and to put them back with Auburn Hills if you can do that. I don't know if you can do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we think...we are in the house maps and we are looking at the house and we are adjusting the population. Do you see a way we can you know change it Commissioner Curry? Is there something that based on your notes.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I can't hardly see the little letters, if I could see them larger.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The theme we have on currently is the Asian theme is that right Mr. Stigall is that Asian population? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes Commissioner.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, at this point do we want to keep the Asian? I think we are in terms of VRA I think we are looking at African/American.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We are looking at both of them, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So let's switch the theme to African/American.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, a couple people talked about that they wanted the African/Americans to be more or less together or something of that sort.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so in terms of improving the VRA and getting our plan deviation below 5% so 38 District 38 our numbers were over in population so we want to reduce it and we want to add to 29 and our District I'm wondering Mr. Adelson can you help us potentially with 38 and so we are at 46, excuse me 32% Black voting age population and we have a 14.5% 14.4% Hispanic voting age population. Because of our coalition District we believe we may have a healthy voting rights District here. Is that fair to say?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I would agree with Dr. Handley's latest analysis they do vote cohesively with Black voters. The turnout is higher than it is in the western part of the state. The cohesion among Hispanics is a little less, but they clearly do coalesce and point out 38 is 3500 above as far as the deviation. So it may be from a deviation standpoint unless there were portions of 38 like in the western portion of 38 for example, it may be difficult to add population in because without removing some. That is going to skew the deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay and I think Mr. Stigall is helping us with that deviation and high lighting a District there Mr. Stigall that may help us get 38 down into the right area; is that correct? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It appears to me this precinct here and I'm going to clear it so everybody can see it, but that's the top of a Township. Or just outside of Pontiac. It's 2200 people that would lower the population and it would remove white population predominately because white alone in that precinct is 2000. So you would be moving and put that into 24 which would put 24, 24 can take it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In terms of communities Mr. Or Commissioner Clark are you saying I heard a, yeah, what do you think?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Make a move and see what the numbers look like.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Kellom I heard you say that and Commissioner Curry so let's move 2061 into 24 not 29 is that what I'm hearing?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Moving in the gray District not the pink District.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 29 couldn't take it. So now this is where we are at. Excuse me 24 is 1.53%. 39, 38 is at 1.58%. And non-Hispanic Black in 38 now is 32.6.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are back to 6% deviation so now we are looking at 18, District 18 as our largest District to reduce. 18 is another in the Detroit area.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, and this is the Black thematic map.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So ten is only one away if we can funnel through but it's all right very skinny eight in the middle so I'm not sure if we can but it would solve two problems.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what Mr. Stigall was trying to tell us earlier. I'm wondering so Commissioner Kellom I know that we've got neighborhoods we are trying to keep whole so I'm wondering if we want to have the neighborhood the Detroit neighborhood map on here while we are making that shift between 18 through 8 into 10.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Sure we can put that up. The neighborhood layers please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was looking at numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's okay Kent.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, as I see as I look at Royal Oak, which is in 18, if we can move some of the areas where it will go toward ten, I think that is the direction we have to go. That would further support what I heard at the TCF center of having more higher percentage African/American population than they have today so I think that would help what I heard at TCF.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay any thoughts on that Commissioners?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The only thing I would say I see Commissioner Clark what you are saying. I just there are areas where I think it would be helpful for minority population to push in. So I don't want to crunch them all down below 8 mile if that makes any sense either.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's look at the numbers with we are talking about because it may not be right, we may be talking about hundreds of people not thousands. Mr. Stigall again the numbers are small enough and appreciate you keeping them small to see more of the map and help us know the numbers of people we are talking about to move to make these changes so we get below the 5% plan deviation.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think you are looking at for 10 you need about a thousand.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Meaning adding a thousand to ten and we will take a thousand out of 18.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 18 you don't need to take but hundreds. So you need to be careful. So if we look at 12, you can take a little bit from 12 into 10. If it's not too

large a number. And then 18 could, you know, give up a little bit. I don't know if there is little precincts in these areas. We have to Zoom in and look at them.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will try to add a thousand in ten and take hundreds potentially from 18 and potentially from 12 and try to find the path maybe do we want to start again with a couple hundred? Or just a hundred? 12 to move into 10? Go ahead Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Probably a couple hundred since he said hundreds.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we will have to be at the block level. And so those blocks and I mean the people who are familiar with these neighborhoods that that's what I think I'm looking for is trying to help those Commissioners, those of us who know, yeah, who know more, please help us make these choices.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So the Ferndale, Pleasant Ridge, Royal Oak Community kind of effortlessly blends together. And that is also a community where we talk about the LBGTQIA and resources there in the northwest side of Detroit, loves that area. So it's a very bonded Section. So that is why much like Commissioner Clark spoke about Rochester Hills, there is some areas that should be considered I guess just more thoughtful so before we just start shoving people.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Where we are zoomed in to, is in the right area?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, just describing that whole little neighborhood same thing with Hazel Park Oak Park and all kinds of is this meld those are like the first suburbs after you cross 8 mile and the Coolidge 9 mile area something to think about.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't know this area at all but the first row in 18 where he zoomed in the long row it looks like it's part of the neighborhood to the right of it that is in eight so if we chose those to keep that all of that together that would be good.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Brittini didn't Hazel Park have a racehorse area? That seemed like something like.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: They did. That is the other end, I know what you are talking about kind of by 696 it's no longer there. But yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is what I was looking at right up in there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right that is the area, correct Commissioner Kellom? Commissioner Orton is that what we are looking at?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Not meaning that much but if it takes it that is fine and I was talking about the first strip.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: A thousand and a contiguous area and looks like it's clean. It's the thousand and we have an 18 can give that up. And we are moving it into 8. Do we need to look at numbers? And I'm thinking when I say numbers, I'm looking at Black voting age population or do we feel comfortable this is okay and I would believe

8 is where we have the Bengali or is that ten? Do we know where the Bengali community is.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The Sterling Heights Warren area Bengali.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Ten had 9.53% Asian that is what I mean. I'm just making sure we are...I know there are a lot of different communities to respect and choices and that is all I'm trying to move once rather than three times.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, I understand what you are saying. Ten does have some of that population. Kent has a hand.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have a question. This area right through here has 0 population. This is fair park, is that a park or railroad tracks or a parking lot?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Zoom in more.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Because that is significantly separates this neighborhood area and this neighborhood area. And it's all south of 9 mile road. So that is 0 population. That is 17. I'm just trying to look like two different areas from here to here.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Wondering is that where they had the, no, no, no.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to turn on aerial photography and we are going to zoom in and see what it is. That is railroad tracks. That is the rail yard. So generally speaking people are not running back and forth across a dozen rail lines.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, they are not.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 9 mile road. 8 mile. This is, that is Wanda Street. This is west End Street I can't read it very well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is good and what you are helping us know this is a good District to choose to go into 8 because it is a neighborhood and yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I like the aerial for this part of it actually it's helpful.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Leave the aerial on for the moment.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We done have to leave it up but for those specific moments.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It helps so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall let's go back to the version, yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We decided.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: To add it to eight, yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, just a point of reference Juanita you had mentioned the racetrack. That was at 10-Mile. And it's gone. It's now an Amazon facility.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Oh, wow.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: There is nobody living there where the racetrack was.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thanks, Doug, yeah, okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me, okay, Commission District 8 is now 43.75% Black. And District 18 is now 45.34% Black. Asian and Hispanic population are well below 5, well one is 4.47. What other District? 8? We have not dealt with 10 yet.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we are about to do so 8 is, yeah, so we have a couple hundred to take out of 8 because we want to keep it a little bit overpopulated if we can. And we are going to move it into ten so where should we yeah so then we will also take a little bit out of 12 then.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If need be.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If need be, so Commissioners help me. Is that -- what is that line that is sort of on the west of 10 and east of 8? Is that a County line? Is that a major road? Is that something we should cross or should we not cross it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the County line.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's Dequinder road that is the area the Bengali community describes, starts kind of like you know their COI.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We don't want to cross that I believe. What I'm hearing we may want to take from 12 rather than sort of disrupt that community. Is that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm also not in love with the way and this is not always about looks but the way District 8 looks. So yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Any changes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We can go into ten a bit. I would not be against it. But that is just not my decision so that is just my thought.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Again thinking about the careful moves we want to make, I know this was drawn, right, with your with COIs in mind so as we are moving and changes neighborhoods go ahead Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Didn't Bengali say they are located in Warren and that is in 25 the bottom part of 25 along with 10, probably kind of go together some kind of way?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think that is accurate. What you're saying is accurate, yep. So then again, I'm thinking so Commissioner Kellom did you want to sort of fix 8 before we sort of try to do massage 10 or do we want to move into 10.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Move into 10 is fine because I can't process that quickly about what to do with my lightning bolt 8.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead Commissioner Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me 10 needs almost a roughly a thousand.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So I don't know how y'all feel about it. This whole side over here is higher numbers except for whatever.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Adding to 10 from 8. Okay so very good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can cut down on the lightning bolt if necessary but I don't know the neighborhoods.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Do you have some names you can put on it so we can kind of see the streets? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, this is Cadillac heights and this is Davidson.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Familiar with Davidson.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Anything across this line well right there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was going to say let's add Conan garden.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Took this piece in the northeast Central District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can select the blocks and just see what happens.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You are welcome.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's not going to quite do it but gets it in the ballpark.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is only 111 but it does cleanup and follow the neighborhood line.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sounds good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay assign that to ten?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me try that again. Ten still needs a thousand but if we continue to improve neighborhoods.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Uh-huh so two is fine. I think I don't think we want to move.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I went too far.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep. And.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well for example, two you see how this Davidson seems to be split right here. So if you took a little bit of this two and put it in ten, you would be you know doing the neighborhood thing again. This is Davidson.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Kent, try that, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is sort of the area of the LBGTQ neighborhood. So do we have I mean I have that portal submission pulled up.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is the Hamtramck area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So that is not.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is Bangla Town right here. Buffalo, Charles here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is not 8 mile, sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is McNichols.

- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Also known as 6 mile.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep, yep, yep, I'm with you.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: So now excuse me ten still needs a little bit more but we are down to you know just hundreds. 12.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is happening with 12? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 12 has mount Olivet.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Take that please.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Take that Section?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, Kent.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You will also learn how to use your microphone too.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will get there Kent. So we will make this change and it's 34 as our lowest populated and number five District 5 is our highest. So we may this may help us get our plan deviation under. But not quite. But yeah, I think we have made it whole. Let's see if we can find District 5.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Southfield Oakland Farmington Hills.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right there.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Nine is over as well.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mine is over, I thought.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Under.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 9 is under and 5 is over; is that correct? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, side by side so it's just a matter.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you help us here Commissioner Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Absolutely. We got to give some to 9.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we are looking at sometimes it's useful I think we are in the hundreds or are we looking at a thousand Kent to get us under that population? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Hundreds will get it done.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We need hundreds.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Move a thousand it will be even better. So I mean.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's shoot for a thousand.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can do part or a whole precinct if there is a whole precinct. As a matter of fact you can move 2000 like this whole precinct here or 1800 or 2153 any of those would work. You can go.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I thought we were going 5-9 not 9-5? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm stupid.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You won't talk about yourself now stop it.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 1748 you can come all the way over here and get 2800, 2500.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Do we have thematic dots to see what is happening and very conscious of the Southfield and Lathrup Village and don't want to break that up too much and looking at the west side towards Farmington.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is happening with 1632 over there all the way to the edge? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Little piece down here, any of these any of them.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Start with 1632.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's what you want the District to look like.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: To the left, to the left.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Musical interlude there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I know you were concerned the way that eight was going to look Commissioner Kellom. Yeah, the funny shape.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I wanted to acknowledge that yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think that is what public comment is for. You can only do what you can do. I know it looks wonky.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: From an eyeball perspective I would be looking at something like that one.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And we will -- I suggest looking at the numbers. It's 1900. It's you know 1300 white and 300 minority or Black. So it's the same as a lot of precincts in the area.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Buddy Bruce do you have overwhelming suggestions while I bite my cheese?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Kellom, no. I think this -- I understand the adjustments you are trying to make. I think this is a good area for that. So I agree.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Percentage wise they are similar Districts that 13%. That is 10%. And not huge numbers either way.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What do you want to do.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm okay with that unless Commissioner Orton I know you are my catcher do you have a visual problem with the leg that's coming out?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I can get over it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay thank you bless you, thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I guess it would be more about the neighborhoods through here. Which how they tie together. You know, okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are we okay with it Commissioner Kellom can we move on? We got it down .08%. We are headed in the right direction. So 16 and 34. 16 is another VRA District I'm almost certain and 34 is up there on the right. Northeast,

yep, so 16 and 9 are also adjacent so I wonder if you wanted to yeah, 5, 9 and we were adjusting 5 and 9 earlier. Now 16 so that they all three intersect. So the adjustment you made earlier is there a sweet spot maybe? I think Lathrup village is the northeast corner of District five that blue municipal.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 16 needs to give up population and these are singular precincts all the way up through here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right and that is what.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It gets a little more unless you get all the way up top.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No we would cut it off.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Move 16 to 32 around the northern tip around Birmingham and not destroy your.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is happening I feel this is a moot point but what is happening ton southern portion of District 16? Let's look. Yeah. What is happening with 21 and all the other and my friends down there? Uh-huh.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 21 cannot take population that is the deal. It's pretty maxed out but again we have 14 over here.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is 14 doing?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's at 1200, it can take some. Three is at 1300. You can rotate them around.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Maybe we will go north and try by Bingham no Birmingham no I'm sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Here is 833 person population precinct right here.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Zoom all the way in.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That could go to 14 and would that fix -- that would fix 16 because 16 you don't need to move it hundreds. Let me cut on your neighborhood areas.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Southfield road.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, and down here in whole neighborhoods as well unless we can find a split neighborhood. And...

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Winship and try point looks they are split in 16.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Grand River, Mary's is split, this is split right here. So three maybe able to hold enough to make 16 happy. I know it can. So you could.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay Kent I believe in you. So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to try to.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 1162 into the Grand River St. Mary's.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It will work just fine.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Maybe too much but we are going to find out. I think it will barely make it and see if we can do this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You're going to assign it to nine. You did it right that is three but it did go up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Three go up. But at least it took cake of 16 and made a whole neighborhood. So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so cycle out.  
So we want to take 16, take more out of 16 now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 16 is fine. Three we need to lose some. I'm just looking to see if there is a neighborhood. Like right here. This neighborhood is already split. 7 is a little bit low. Put some more of it into 7. This neighborhood is split three ways. We can let me look at this area right here and see if however you want to do it and we can take more of this area and put it in 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What do you think Commissioner Kellom? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You see how it's all right.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let's try to do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's not a highly populated. That is more than I thought.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we are trying to reduce three and put it into 7, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: But I think 7 are we getting into any Arab population in District 7? I don't think the top of it, I don't know.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Putting population in to 7 so.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, is that going to help.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We can try it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You're at a thousand now so that is about right or do we want to do -- I department think -- I don't think you want to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can easily.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will be a thousand over in 7 very good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will do that and then it will oh, here is 154 person block that is what took it up so high. If I put it in the right District. I don't know why I can't do this.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think we should go ahead and do these little pieces down here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Help us with our deviation we are under 5.9.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 7 is 1.42 and 3 is at .15. I'm just wondering if we can -- I don't think we can get that whole neighborhood area. You may be able to. I'm just going to select it and y'all can make an executive decision. Actually you could put that into 7 I believe and stay under 2.5.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Seems like a good idea.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can look at it. It may be pushing it but...yeah, that puts 7 at .235 and now if neighborhood is in two districts or that area is in two districts rather than three, 2.35 so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So why don't we add to 14, is 14 or 14 is over already.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm saying 2.35 so if you want to go lower you could just you know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I'm thinking because 7 is our largest.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put that many in 14.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, let's do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

Now you are 209% on 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's in two districts rather than three and now we are moving on to District 84. Or 34 so 34 I know is sort of on the northeast side of Detroit. Or the St. Clair shores area so 34 is under populated and 84 is in the Muskegon area. Where -- so 84 has too much. So we would have to add to other districts around it that are also let's see what is 101 or Norton Shores? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 101 is 2000 light and 83 is 700 light.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We could move some precincts from 84 into 101. So do we want to take 233? Excuse me 2033? Okay let's take that one please the Lakewood club, Kent and add that to 101.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is a funny shape in here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 2542 is funnier now we are 5.7.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 101 is .3. 84 is .26. 85 is at 166 so everything in that area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's move back to the east side of the state into Detroit area because that is where 21 and 34 are going to be.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 21 is in Central or Royal Oak between Royal Oak and it's Oak Park. Royal Oak park Southfield.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was just thinking and would like to hear Mr. Adelson's comment on this and it was our goal to get below 5% deviation but I think he said something about 7% or something. So when we are working in these VRA areas, it might be better to leave them. I'm not sure. What do you.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was going to quickly say sorry you can add the tip of St. Clair shores into 34 if 34 is in need right is that what you are saying.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 34 is under populated.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Add that is what I would do.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Kellom direct and let's go back to Bruce. Bruce, do you want to respond first?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I appreciate you are 5.7 deviation. That is already pretty good. So there is no like legal bright line you must be under 5. 5 is something I looked at as a good goal because it's half the ten% threshold. It's less likely that you have to painfully justify what you're doing, what you're doing. So my thought is in response to Commissioner Orton's question I think 5.7 deviation is pretty good.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent that is great news. So Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I just wanted to point out 21 is only 2.2. If you lower 34, I mean you could get it to drop below 5 just by lowering 34.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Kellom say something that may be an easy fix so can you help District Mr. Stigall and try to run the partisan fairness numbers after that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Absolutely I want to kind of highlight Commissioner Orton's concern and then Bruce's response. So I think it's appropriate to move kind of the tip, not kind of, the tip of District 6 which is St. Clair shores into 34. Because it does not affect the population and communities of interest or any neighbors around the way that it's configured, District 4 kind of cautions it in and District 2 is right underneath District 6 so I don't think we would have any sort of love loss there. So I would move the tip near St. Clair shores start there into 34 so boom, done.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me Commissioners now I'm waiting on the computer. Let me save and find that unassigned population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are at 12:30. Yeah. And I'm wondering, yeah, it always, yeah, sorry Mr. Stigall I'm seeing your body language and recognizing the computer may be done for the moment. So the computer needs a break. I'm wondering Commissioners are we okay helping, yeah? We usually go to lunch that is what I'm trying to figure out should we, yeah, should we break earlier? Okay, all right so hearing no objections it is 12:30. And Mr. Stigall do you need us to do anything before we...

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No I'm just going to save this, close it down and we will move that one feature to do 34 when we come back. There is no point on waiting on this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you it's 12:30. Hearing no objections we are in recess until 1:30. Thank you very much.

[ Lunch recess ]

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I Kale the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:32 will the secretary please call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Please say present when I call your name if you are attending remotely announce you are attending remotely and disclose where you are attending from. I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: In attendance.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 10 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We were mapping in the State House and yeah Mr. Stigall can you help us see where we were? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'll get there. I have to load up the Zoom so I can share my screen. I should have done it moments ago but I did not. So when we left off, we had computer problems and we did the you know did the check for unassigned areas and it actually found this precinct is not assigned to any District fortunately it fits right into 18 which is where it had been at one time if you remember we were editing.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It belongs in 18 so please assign that Mr. Stigall. Actually our plan deviation of help then I think we were ready I think it was in 34 Commissioner Kellom I believe you were helping us sort of you had identified an area.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Putting this top portion of St. Clair shores into 34.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The top of 6 right in here.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One of these precincts.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2865. That is 2828.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Do you have a preference? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Kellom can you use your microphone.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was but also asking Commissioner Orton a question. Go ahead Kent what were you saying? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The two precincts that border District 34 and District 6 are 2865, 2828, but at the same time District 6 is currently the low a few hundred which may or will bring six below the targeted deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We did recognize we are okay with our plan deviation as of the moment so if it feels important to do Commissioner Kellom just continue.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The only other thing we can do is include the portion of Roseville is 4175 and a little over and keep Roseville whole and I see a hand from Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Just a quick question I notice District 23 is a little bit over and it is right next door. Maybe we could take a few out of there and transfer them over. That might work.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I see your thinking so this is kind of like a lakeshore District so we can do that and that is a choice but I'm leaning towards including something in the southern part of 34 from St. Clair shores just to keep it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I lean to keeping Roseville whole.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So where are we? We have a plan deviation that is within limits. We were considering adjusting it for the lakeshore District. There was a suggestion to keep Roseville whole so I think we are not going to make any changes is that what I'm hearing or do you want to? Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Another quick question what is north of 34 is that a possibility of something along the shoreline to add to that, that way?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 41 is overpopulated anchor Bay harbor. What do you think Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the precinct that runs the shoreline I realized this so this is a different precinct. I'm just pointing it out like that is one precinct.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know. I think I will lean towards the let me see. Kent what are you doing.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm messing up right now. Okay, back to a better visual.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Take some you can do that and let's try to take some for 41 I think Commissioner Orton had a suggestion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Part of what you highlighted Kent or maybe all I guess so I'm thinking.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 2162 and a piece here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: A piece on the side just that little so I'm thinking and we can see what one of them does.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2162 would be right in the ballpark as far as your percentages.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let's try that as sign that to 34, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yowzah you did it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Dropped well below 5%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay all right thank you Commissioners for that. And we are within our plan deviation and we are ready to run the partisan fairness numbers and look at this plan which is the merged I just want to make sure we are on Magnolia correct?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, thank you all for the teamwork. I appreciate that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You're welcome. Do we have we have not looked at Benton Harbor before we did any other changes, we were going to run partisan fairness so we did this to get Magnolia for partisan fairness and after that and I should acknowledge right thank you Chair Szetela has joined us. And I think it was around 1:40.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 1:40 just noting your present for the record.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have a lopsided margin of 6.1% favoring the republicans and mean median difference is 3.1% and efficiency gap is 6.1% favoring republicans and seats to votes is 2.3% favoring republicans and the seat count is 55-55. Any comments.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What was the first number.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 6.1.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have the numbers Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Kellom I was going to see if buddy Bruce had any thoughts with the partisan fairness numbers.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Version five is the closest do you have the numbers Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Version five which we worked on lopsided margin is 5.3 the mean median was 2.7, so a little lower the efficiency gap was 4.3 and the seats votes was 57 to 53 with a negative .5% against democrats, .5% in favor of republicans. No it's the other way. It's in favor of republicans.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me Madam Chair I have both the plans the spreadsheets up here we can look right at them if you want. The top is Magnolia the bottom is Pine V5. So the lopsided margin is 6.1, Magnolia, 5.3 for Pine, V5, favoring republicans. The mean median difference is 3.1% Magnolia favoring republicans. For Pine V5 is 2.7% favoring republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Efficiency gap is 6.1% favoring republicans. Magnolia. And Pine V5 is 4.3% favoring republicans. Magonolia2.3% favoring republicans. The seat count is even at 55-55 for the two parties. The seat the proportionality bias for Pine V5 is .5% republican count. The seat count is 57-53 democrat.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If we took the map and promoted it at this point, do you feel that it took care of the issues that the people of Detroit had when we were at the TCF center?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Clark that is a loaded question. I would say overall, yes. If we had time and tweaking, of course, I would like to create a little bit more representation as we pushed up across 8 mile and play with those numbers. But I think would make us more responsive to the comments in the community of Detroit. One thing I can stand by mostly if not all of the neighborhoods in Detroit are back together.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay great. And Juanita what is your opinion?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry are you on? Is she on? You might be muted Commissioner Curry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair I'm trying to make some of the districts more contrasting so we can more easily see the variety of District shapes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss do you have a question? What if or a maybe. What if we looked at 28 and 21 to see if there is something we can tweak simple and not too drastic and maybe improve that plan deviation a little bit. I don't want to spend more than five minutes on it and look at the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we need to do that if it's below 5%.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: It would not hurt if it's simple, real simple.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Between which one and which one?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Look at 28 or 21 and see if it could be done shifting one or the other if one is too high or low to borrow from a District and I would take a few minutes to do and see if it helps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Rothorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss one thing we have to do excuse me we have to evaluate whether we want to do it or have to do it is around the Flint area is a difference between version five and Magnolia so we will be shifting districts and the plan deviation may shift because of that so I'm not against doing it. I know we do have a limited amount of time and know we will be making some bigger changes like you were saying.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That was the other thing if it's all right I like what you are saying thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I see Commissioner Weiss wanting to try something.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you want to go take a look take a look.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Everybody else take a look at it and pick like 28 and see if there is something we can move quickly that would change that deviation and then if it does work maybe check 21 and see how the numbers change. I don't want to spend a lot of time on this because we have other things to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Start with 28.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 28 is low.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Technically you know 28 is at minus 2.53%, 2.5.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is extra.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: 37 maybe we could borrow a block right up in the left corner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I suggested before is just take that block. It's just one little Township out of Rochester, Rochester Hills.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: As long as Commissioner Clark is not going to step on your toes because he doesn't want to touch it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I already stepped on his toes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go in 44 instead.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's one block. It's not going to kill Rochester Hills to lose one block.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I say to take the corner.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2300 out of 37 I guess it would be a slight improvement and put it 2.5.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Just do it quick.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think it's going to flip-flop.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss barely asks for anything so I think we can accommodate him. He rarely requests any change so we can humor him on this one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 28 is even and 37 is below 2.55, 2.5.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Overall plan deviation went down too. Thank you, Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any changes we want to make to this plan? I would like to look at restoring Battle Creek and Albion back to what we had on the prior plan because we received so much public comment about that. Can we bring up a shape file of would it have been Pine V3? I think that is what it was. Pine V3 or Pine 5. Even Pine I think had it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could we make that change see what it does to the map and that will accommodate those requests so turn 74 into that just carry it along and then we will have to adjust 71 and probably 72 yes, we will have to fix some in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just put these Townships back into 74.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area shall go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Put it in 72 for now. I will see what we have to adjust. Put it into 71.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, this Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: How much population is in there? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It is 3200. I will turn the labels on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, 3200's showing up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is 3200. And what is next to it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 95 is at 168 over and 93 is 742 over.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Put it into 95 because I don't think there is -- do you want to split it? 97, what is the population of 97? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 97 is at 652.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 95 has the lowest.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 32 is over your 2300.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want to split it or put it in 95 and take away from 95 elsewhere. And split it elsewhere and go to the block level.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Most population is around the town.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thoughts?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I like your idea of trying to split it. Maybe put some in 74 because it's low and then the rest in what was it up above that, 93 or 95 whatever just to see what it looks like just to split it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The City of Bellevue, the blocks around that down into 74.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right so like south of this line where my cursor is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, and I probably.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And south of that or maybe up that way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that would work.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will select it and you decide how you want to look at it. I'm just going to select all this area and you can decide what you want to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Maybe those two little blocks right there. Okay that area.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: There is a little triangle down at the bottom.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I see it that area right there is roughly 2300 people and 74 has 1600.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go ahead and put that in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did we go the wrong way? I feel like we may have gone the wrong way. We are still good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 74 is right on the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So 95.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If you want you can Zoom in and see if that is the best split.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So if I'm remembering correctly that was about 3,000, 3200 and we took out 1200 so there is 2000 left so I think we can probably put the rest of that into 95 and it will be able to take it rather than splitting it to ways, if I'm right on my numbers. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Somehow you will have to get quite a bit in 71.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will have to go back down and adjust that. Because this is technically part of 71 even though it's orphaned from it right now. So picky. If you can put it in, I think it's 95, yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 95?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, and reflect for the record that Commissioner Eid has arrived. Commissioner Curry is back on. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it would fit better in 97 if we Zoom out and look. But just my thought.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is 909 people and Commissioner Orton is saying 97 may be a better spot for it so can we look at 97? It can go up to 97. Can you go a little further? I think 97 goes up north too.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm not sure which way it should go.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: My hunch keep it in the Central region.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Keep it with 95 for now because we may need to take some away to ball out 72 and 71.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 95.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 95 it is. The line between 92 and 91 or 71 and 72, sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 71 and 72.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is our biggest deviation. Can you there you go active matrix.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 72 is 2700 high while 71 is 6600 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so can we grab those Townships on the, yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These two in two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are going into 71, right? With yes so grab those right there.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can we see the population? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's 3600 and that will be close to 71 is 3% low and 72 is 1% low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you Zoom out just a touch? And I want to look at that one other Township up above there. Can you Zoom out a bit.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 72 needs some.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 72 is a thousand low. 71 still needs.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Needs to lose 700 or add about 700 so can we see what the population of 66 is? I'm just trying to look around other areas.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 72 goes up and 66 okay we are coming over here. All right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The other thing we can do too and I don't know if Cynthia can weigh in on this, we could grab the additional northern Township and then, well, I don't want to do that so 66 is 300 under and 71, would you mind taking off the shape file? It's making it harder to see what we've got. Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to change the color 72.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That makes it challenging. So you guys know I always see things three steps at a time. So while I'm thinking Commissioner Orton if the population makes sense is potentially taking that sliver above 74 that is the half Township putting it into 95, taking the rest of the half Township on the left that is in 95 and putting it in 72 and taking the Township that is north of 71 along the 72, 71 border and putting it into 71.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think of things one step at a time. So that was a little hard to keep track of. Do it and see what happens.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Put this all the way into 95.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All the way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This all the way in 72 and put this into 71. So like choo.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which one in 71.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The half well let's start with that first because if that population isn't right, it's not going to matter so start with the block on 72 so Zoom back out and I will show you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Come down here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This right here.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, goes to 71.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Depending on the population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I clicked on it so it's low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go up to 72 and grab the rest of the half Township from 95 and pull it into 72.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 2400.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh. This is the way I think it's like Chess I'm thinking three steps at the same time.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Well that is your gift. That's good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So that I want to put in 95 and that should balance everything out, I think. We are okay on 95 so we can just leave it, just leave it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well I did it so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It did not change the plan deviation and holds so I think it's better, let's keep it together.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like to revisit the Rochester Hills change for a number of reasons.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are obsessed with Rochester Hills. Yes, that is fine go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we Zoom in? I just like to reverse it. I presented to the City Council in Rochester Hills and the mayor asked only one thing of me at the end and that was to make sure Rochester and Rochester Hills was together and not split up. He did not care about or they didn't mention any other requirements that they wanted to go through.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well, I mean go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I know, I understand, but it's a minimal change.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It is there and he needs to get it right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Minimal change in the plan deviation that is still supported by what Bruce said earlier when we had a six point something plan deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I know we have heard lots of public comments about Rochester, Rochester Hills keep it whole. I think we can look for other options if there is no other option maybe we have to do this.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well one option is that District I believe has some Oakland Township in it. Move that over to 44 and then increase 28 from 44. Can we scroll up on the top of 37? So take a portion of that in Oakland Township and guess we would have to move it to 46 then something 44 and then down. And I think that is better option than taking it at the bottom part. We can go up to the block level in Oakland Township if we have to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Shall I do this?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark go ahead and drive.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Did you say this into 46?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do this one first. Oh, yeah, let's go back down.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay this.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Back down move that over to 28.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's into 37, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Back to 37, correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The plan deviation did not change at all and going in for the same reason for what we did earlier keeping the Township whole so that works as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, it is a little high on the negative side but we have enough on the other side that we are below five so I don't feel like we would have to fix that, I think it's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I request the partisan fairness numbers but I think what is already going to happen.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry, you had stepped away for a moment and Commissioner Clark while we are running the partisan fairness Commissioner Clark asked and I will let you reask so I'm not misstating what you asked and Commissioner Clark had a question for you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I had a question for Brittini and she answered it and basically it was the changes that we've made in Detroit, do you feel that that's what the public wanted based on the comments we got from the TCF center public hearing? Does that meet the requirements to the best of your knowledge?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can't hear you Commissioner Curry. You are on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Without saying the wrong thing I would just only like to look at it one more time but I was kind of watching and following as she went. And you guys went and it seemed to be okay. I'm just I would like to see it one more time before we say that's it. Just to see. If that is okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Of course it's okay.

So let's take another look.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair, where shall I Zoom in?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead and direct Commissioner Curry and tell him what you want to see.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Start at the lower part and kind of go up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay is that the Down River?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is good and starting at 60 that is the Down River Grosse Pointe.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Here is wood Haven in here can you read what is written?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I can see it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Sorry, I didn't know.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, that is wood Haven and Grosse Ile and river view, South Gate, Wyandotte, that's good so far. Taylor. Lincoln Allen Park Ecorse. Where is Down River area? The -- I see the Allen Park Lincoln Park.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's more south.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: More south.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh so Commissioner Curry you can direct Kent to kind of drag the map so that you can see that lower part of District 22 that is purple. Go, yep, so is that what you're looking for? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I turned on the Township.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No I passed that. I was looking up further and looking for southwest Detroit beside Allen Park Lincoln Park and Ecorse.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Kent can you Zoom in for her.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is River Rouge right here.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm very familiar with those areas. There is a southwest Detroit part that's right we cores Melvindale and River Rouge I'm just trying to find it and I don't see it really on the map. Maybe.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Could that be District one the purple one Commissioner Curry? North of Delray?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's probably south of River Rouge somewhere down in there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: South of River Rouge is like Ecorse.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Melvindale Lincoln Park and Allen Park and down a little bit further and I wanted to see where it was kind of hitting at and but that is good. That is where it all begins right up in there. And then go up, Kent, past, yeah, River Rouge Lincoln Park up to Detroit, Delray.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What is all in that one? I don't see any streets or anything. Any districts or anything, how can I tell? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a moment I'm going to try a background layer that maybe shows better. There is dick's avenue, Southern Street Michigan running up to Dearborn.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm sure Dearborn is fine. Commissioner Eid worked on that. And he and Brittini. And I think they got that pretty well. I think everything looks pretty good so far. Can you go up more? Go up more towards the east? Allen Park. Yeah, I was there and they worked it over pretty good. Doug, I think it's probably as good as we can probably get it right now unless we hear something else between now and tomorrow morning.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I appreciate it.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, it's pretty good. I don't think I would tinker with it unless someone comes up from the comment Section that is a flaw or something we can handle between now and tomorrow, I'm okay with it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So because we more than once have attempted to draw the LBGTQ and I don't know if you are familiar 8 mile, Southfield freeway in the corner do we have.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: MC it's not even as far as even 8 mile. The -- that area is more in Royal Oak Ferndale and before you it's on the well yeah on the curse of Woodward and south of that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Woodward and 7-Mile.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Highlighting because we got comment on TCF and this morning so yeah, I just want to make sure it's in there.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can you put the neighborhood overlay with the actual words with the labels so we will just be faster for this?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is 7-Mile right there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And Woodward.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: When you get to Royal Oak you have a lot of just regular families over there.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This is literally where I grew up. So Palmer Park and do you see it MC.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Palmer Park I'm there almost that is my area too, where I do a lot of business at.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Schultzs, northwest Detroit palmer Woods University District Bagley community all of it is included. On the portal they were suggesting a horizontal orientation but as you can see and I don't want to speak for everyone else the neighborhoods are kept sequentially whole visually. So.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think it's pretty good, don't you Brittini? I think it's pretty good. We will know between now and tomorrow. Maybe too late to make any changes but that is the best we can do, I think.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just from what it looks like to me like it is between 18 and 21 so it's not totally whole and I think we may not be able to have it totally whole as presented on their map here. In the Senate excuse me in the House Districts but in the Senate districts, yeah, we can get there. We are not able to accommodate it in the House District. Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I do think the bulk of the community is in 18 in this map.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I suggest we take one last look at the numbers because we made some changes and then I'd like to put forth a motion if the numbers are acceptable, we move it to the 45 day period.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sure so Kent already ran the numbers I believe and has a report, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I'd like to see the numbers, but there is one more area I'd like to examine and that's the Chaldean community in Sterling Heights I think we can edit that a little bit so they are more represented.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which community is that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Chaldeans.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this is Magnolia as it sits right now. The lopsided margin is 5.7% favoring the republicans. The mean median difference is 2.9%. Favoring republicans. The efficiency gap is 5.4% favoring republicans. And then the proportionality bias is 1.4% favoring republicans. The seat count is 56-54 favoring democrats.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could you repeat the first one again 5.9? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It is 5.7 for the lopsided margin favoring republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Now is that a 0 as we can get that? You know they kept on saying keep it really 0-0 or something. Is that as close as we can get it?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's better it's better.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay that is as close as we can get it then probably.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't know about that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, it's better than it was earlier. It's still not as good as Pine version five that we adopted yesterday. So we might want to look at making more edits to get it to that same level of partisan fairness maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, that is what they were talking about.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I second Doug's motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so well we can create an alternative draft for I know Commissioner Eid just mentioned making additional changes.

It sounds like he may have intention to improve partisan fairness so we have a motion and a second. Commissioner Clark seconded by Commissioner Witjes to advance this map to the 45 day public comment period is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Just something quick I support Commissioner Eid's effort to continue to improve the map because I'm sure there are small tweaks and something he has thought about for getting here so I would like to give him that opportunity to do so. That is all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well I mean before motioning to advance it I think we should look at that Chaldean community. Seems we looked at darn near every other community in the state. So I think trying to figure out a way that they are represented since they are a cohesive minority community that also votes differently from the rest of the Arab community, I think we should do that first before you know making a motion and seeing what it does. I mean we got a little bit of time here so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not disagreeing with you but we have a motion and a second so if you don't want to approve this map you would have to vote no at this point

because we have a motion on the floor. So we have to proceed with the motion. You what? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a suggestion why don't we make a clone of this one and if we want to move this one forward per the motion we can. Just table the motion postpone it for right now, let him make his changes on the clone and see which one we like. We could advance both of them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm thinking we could advance both of them. What is the harm?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Also Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: This I know they were speaking of the Pine version 5 is that what this is?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So what we did earlier is Anthony and Brittini worked together and merged those two plans so we took the they took the Pine version three, no, Pine version five that was the changes we did on the west side of the state and merged them with the Pine version three which was the Metro Detroit changes and blended them together and we worked further on to adjust it so incorporates the changes that Commissioner Kellom brought forth the other day and additional changes we made to Flint Lansing Grand Rapids and Benton Harbor yesterday.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay because I remember getting a couple comments last night concerning that, so that's good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right let's go ahead and vote we have a motion and second to advance the Magnolia map to 45 day of public comment period all in favor we can do a roll call that works.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Where are you going to table that? We are kind of saying one thing and doing a different thing.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Supposed to clone it remember clone it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's Commissioner Clark's motion so he has to make the decision.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Tabling it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are tabling it okay.

So then all right so we are cloning Magnolia at this point and we will have to give it a different name.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Just call it the twin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well I'm just concerned if we decide to advance both then we have two different names or the same name and we are trying not to do that. So or do you want to just keep it Magnolia.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Why can't we make the tweaks to this map without cloning?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The motion was for this map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, go ahead weigh in Mr. Adelson please.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: There was a motion on the floor the motion was seconded and I understand that the motion has been tabled. So if you want to bring the matter back there would have to be another motion, second discussion and vote.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: My suggestion was to clone this one and let him make whatever changes he wants to make on the new one so then we can compare them without having changed this one which we have a motion to move it forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's call it Magnolia version two and if we choose to advance them both we can at that time look at renaming it. And that will make it a little easier.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I ran the diagnostics and shows a couple of dis-contiguities.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you put that in to I think it's 71 is the purple whatever the purple region is I think it's 71.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's 74 that is 71.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you put it in 74? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There you go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What else do we have? By block, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair we are ready to proceed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid take it away.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay I will say the reason I thought to do this before voting because I don't think it makes sense to make two different maps if the difference is Sterling Heights and Troy and figure out which one of those two clones is the best and just do one. So with that said I'll share my screen and show Dr. Handley's voting analysis for the Chaldean communities. This is from her voting pattern of select minority groups in Michigan analysis that we got earlier this week and she was able to identify a cohesive group of Chaldeans in Sterling Heights. So here is what her PowerPoint said and as we can see the concentration seems to be most over here on the west side of the County and then it goes here to east side of the County and there are little pockets up north but the pockets up north are of lower concentration than here in the south. So what I'm thinking is instead of this east west split that we have on Sterling Heights, why not kind of do a north south split where one goes south here and the other goes north into Utica and we might have to go around into Troy. I'm not quite sure how Troy is situated on this Magnolia map but I think it's worth taking a look in to. Now I'm wondering Bruce do you have any thoughts about this course of action or based on the analysis?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Eid, thank you. As we've talked about certainly that this is a Voting Rights Act protected group. And Dr. Handley's analysis does pinpoint geographically where the group is concentrated. So to the extent that you can capture the group in the area, keep the area cohesive I think that would be a good attempt.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we see the map again, Kent? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm looking at it and I have to share it. So from this was the column of precincts I believe that had the largest number. He was referring to. And this is one precinct coming through here. And it crossed this way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, so can we also put on the Indian Asian population dots? I thought we drew in this way because we were trying to keep together the Indian population. So we might be like switching one community of interest for another potentially.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We need to get to at least the precinct level. So this is the Asian combined. We had Native American is that what you're saying?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No Asian I thought we were trying to keep the Asian population together in this District. You can see that is exactly what we did, that is what I remembered.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Most of that, this column of that Commissioner Eid had posted you know most of it I mean it's in 28 other than the population right here and a little bit right there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I see the Chaldean being split up 28, 25 and a little of 23 how I'm looking at this map. If we map what is on Dr. Handley's analysis, then you will see it goes from 28 to 25 and into 23 just a little on 23 mostly split on 28 and 25 but I understand this was drawn for this purpose and we might have to decide which community of interest to go with here. If we do have to make that decision, I mean I obviously am going to advocate for the Chaldean community Novi is there but I think we have Szetela so go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think we have made other districts 110 for example that we made to have a very high Asian population. We have other districts like District 2 and District 8 that have high and District 10 that have high Bengali populations but we have yet to have a Chaldean District. So we should keep that in mind too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Did we keep Dearborn together and I don't know if they are Chaldeans but that is one population that we tried to keep together there, right?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We definitely did. Do it for Dearborn and I think the Dearborn District looks great but the important differentiation between Arab community and Dearborn and the Chaldean and Sterling Heights is they vote differently. Dr. Handley's analysis showed that by and large in Dearborn the voting goes with you know similar to how African/Americans vote. For the democratic candidate where the Chaldeans in Sterling Heights seem to be voting for the republican candidate. So it's a little bit of a different community.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What is the other culture voting for are they republicans or democrats or what?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Muslim Arab Americans, are you talking about the Indian or are you talking about.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: The Indians what are they?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know we can cohesively say that one way or another because there are lots of different subgroups there is Indian and Japanese and Korean and they don't necessarily have the same voting patterns.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Just wondering if the discussion this is the discussion about the Bengali community because we had so many comments and so much discussion about that I'm just wondering if that is the community that might be referenced here.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think it's the Bengali community and they came out in numbers supporting what they wanted. And I think that we should keep them under consideration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah. I feel looking at the map that Dr. Handley produced most of the most concentrated areas of Chaldean population are already in District 28 and yes there is a little bit more that goes into 25. But to do that we would have to unpack and disassemble this District that we specifically designed to sort of focus on the Indian population that was there and had specifically requested a community of interest to be kept together. And I do think I thought when we drew Orchard Lake and West Bloomfield, we had drawn that with considerations of the Chaldean community and received community of interest identification from the one young man who came in and actually brought in a map of West Bloomfield, Orchard Lake, Sylvan Lake and Keego Harbor and specifically identified a Chaldean community there which we did keep it together. It's not like we have ignored the Chaldean community and this map keeps them mostly together along with considering and balancing the other communities of interests that we have.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: In going off we had districts where there is a whether it's a Latino or Asian community and I'm not 100% for example and they may be part of adjoining District and I said is there any way of knowing appreciating what the percentage is between 28 and 25? Of the Chaldean?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They would be white according to Dr. Handley's analysis.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm not sure it's kind of like a heat map of the most concentrated parts and we can examine that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Before we do that but that is okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Percentages that she is showing is that of the total population or the total population as a whole or the Chaldean population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So this says I'm not Dr. Handley this is her analysis but this says Chaldean by Chaldean by voting precinct percent Chaldean so it's the percentage of Chaldeans in each precinct. Does that help? Does that glean anything information that we should know.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I agree and that is what Dr. Handley was saying, just looking at the map and the darker colors indicative of the highest percentages,

Chaldean, so to my question before is there some way we can approximate where most of the population is, that would be helpful geographically with the districts as they are drawn now.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Like this area here is mostly in 28, what I'm wondering if there is any way to just include some of these precincts. We are talking about just a couple precincts which is somehow because this area is the next most concentrated after this area on the west side.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Kent? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have a question for Commissioner Eid. That line west of the dark green none of that is there is a chance Chaldeans are living on that side?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There are Chaldeans that live in Troy the west of that line is Troy. There is no way for us to know how much because it wasn't included in the analysis. So I'm just going by what we have. At the moment. I believe we asked Dr. Handley you know how she was able to just get Sterling Heights and not get West Bloomfield and/or charred Lake and Farmington Hills which all do have Chaldeans in them as well and I think she said that this area was the one that had the most concentration of any of the Townships around Michigan.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was just wondering I'm sorry Commissioner Eid I was just wondering this adjoining precincts on this side are in 28. If there is Chaldeans in there it may be higher. Do you understand.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't know if there are or not. There is no real way. There probably are some but there is no real way for us to know at this point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't think we got many comments speaking on that we didn't get anyone coming in or calling in on that particular view of what you want did we?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't remember.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was going to try to help us make a decision and what I mean the 25 if we just add that like we can try to add, just a little bit south, that is what I mean, like that one would cut it off and do you see what I mean and I think what Mr. Stigall is saying hey because we have right some data but we don't have a perfect data and no way to verify it I think we have done the best we can with what we have and I recognize that your advocacy efforts and I think we can try but I think what we have got is a real cost benefit sort of right? What do you think?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Zoom out on 25. What if we just go north and take those top two precincts that are west of Utica and then just take one more precinct on you know the border between 28 and 25 and put that into 28? At least it does a little bit more.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But you're not getting the concentrated area you're trying to get to. To do that you have to cut all the way across 25 then you will orphan that District below and then we will really have to.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Take the precinct that is highlighted and you can take the vertical precinct and if it doesn't work, we can see we tried.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's a separate version go ahead and knock yourself out.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so the precincts in 28 the top three since they are connected to 25 then we then won't have to go in 32 let's put those into 25.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put those into 25.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is 8,000 people-ish.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah almost.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so now 28 the precinct you highlighted before and then the vertical precinct that is there or we don't even have to do that precinct. We can go one more eastward.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 8500.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Assign that to 28.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm sorry, I will go over here. We should see if it had a difference on partisan fairness, it might or might not and not sure how 28 was previously so maybe we should look at that now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you have the old partisan fairness open? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can bring it up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Look at 28 and 25.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Districts 25 and 28 were 50/50 on 25 and 28 was pretty close to 55. Taking 48.5 and 50.3 to 49.7.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They were already technically this is just a composite I don't think it's accurate for democrat or republican and let's run the numbers to see if it had significant change.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: District 25 is now didn't change at all. District 28 essentially didn't change, it moved it a tenth.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Two precincts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The districts.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Did the overall number change or 5.7 before.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is 51.3 if I remember.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 51.4 so virtually no change.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is definitely within the margin of error.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we see the lopsided margin? I thought I saw 5.7 there at the top and then the mean median, it should all be the same.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: My guess is it can't change. Your elections didn't change. Mean median 2.9. Efficiency gap 5.4. Seats are 56-54, 1% bias and should not have been a change.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm satisfied we did not have to change too much but we were about to keep a little bit more of the community together at least and did not mess up the Asian population either. I don't know if we want to do this for this map. But we might want to run like the yearly election data like how we did for the Congressional and Senate maps. Or not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I move that we move Magnolia-2 to the 45 day public hearings.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I will second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you repeat that Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I move we advance Magnolia version two to the 45 day Commission period which was seconded by Curry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You said it was seconded by Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like to withdraw my original motion and just deal with this map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, well I was going to say is there any discussion or debate on the motion first? Seeing none let's go ahead and vote and I believe we want to do a roll call vote on this.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Is there a name for the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Magnolia version two voting to advance Magnolia version two for the 45 day public comment period.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners indicate support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No." I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 11 yes to one no the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, well we have three Congressional plans, we have one Senate plan and two house plans we have Commissioner Witjes with his hand up what would you like to say? I was taking a moment to celebrate because I feel we are making progress so to what? Just Magnolia. Can we.
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say we have to motion to have the districts be locked and renumbered in Detroit.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you add on to that a request to drop the version two and maybe just add the date and that way it will distinguish it.
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Drop the two, add the date.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me instead of making this name longer.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Because Sarah Reinhardt you know we were using the tree names. Why not just give it another tree name please.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: She really likes Magnolia and fits her personality and a beautiful southern flower.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: It will have a date and a sprout of a tree.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Chestnut is version two or, yeah, well I mean we could rename the original Magnolia a different one and name this one Magnolia. She just doesn't like the version two. How about we rename the original Magnolia version one or something to distinguish it so it does not screw up Autobound edge we don't want to make Autobound edge lose its mind. Yep. Commissioner Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just wanted to make sure that after we did any of the moves, we checked for dis-contiguities and missing we are all good.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, ma'am I did. That is what I was doing. I would check it again when I send it up and look at it because I never know.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: For Magnolia we worked on AM let's call it Magnolia a.m. and call Magnolia version two does that work for everybody? It makes it simpler and so Magnolia will be a.m. and then Magnolia version two is just Magnolia.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Keep in mind all this will get posted on the website and people will be referring to them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is why I was suggesting not having the date, getting it real long where we have to read it out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay I'm going to rename MagnoliaV2 straight Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Magnolia straight up. So we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes seconded by someone is going to have to help me on this seconded by Commissioner Eid to authorize Kent Stigall to renumber the districts starting with one down by the City of Detroit moving up to 110 in the Upper Peninsula and once that work is completed to lock the districts. Any discussion or debate on that motion? Okay any all in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay. All right, the ayes prevail and the plan is or the motion is adopted.

All right so like I said we have two house plans we have one Senate plan, we have three Congressional plans. Do we want to work on any more collaborative plans or do we want to sort of move on to discussion of individual plans and the other items on the agenda? Okay Commissioner Witjes and then.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Would it be appropriate now to take a break from mapping and go over the individual map process per new business before you come back so we are in an in between point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel we need to because I feel like there is some confusion on that point. And discussion that needs to be had. Yeah, do you know what that is fine. We were supposed to take a break at 3:00 so it's currently 2:51. Without objection we will take a break until 3:05. Hearing no objection we are in recess until 3:05. Thank you.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 3:10 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good afternoon, Commissioners please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please announce during roll you are attending remotely as well as you are physically attending from. I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present attending from Detroit Michigan.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Still in attendance.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Michigan department and I turned my microphone off sorry about that guys so I think the what I would like to do personally is I have a proposed alternative map for the house if I wanted to make some changes around the Ann Arbor area to improve partisan fairness on that house map as possibly an alternative. Any concerns about doing that Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: But I thought we were going to have a discussion before we did more mapping.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry you are right, you are right, okay, so thank you for pointing that out and correcting me. All right so first of all do we want to do our new business Braille vendor and get that out of the way? Okay, so we do have, let me see, Executive Director Hammersmith I believe you are leading that discussion so without objection I will hand it over to you to talk about our Braille contractor.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes, thank you very much Commissioner Szetela. I have been searching for several weeks for a Braille contractor to convert our maps into Braille. The first vendor I reached out to in mid-September I thought could do the work. They eventually told me their turn around type was about ten days for one map. We knew that there was no way then that they could produce the maps from the legal plans that we had only a few days before the public hearing started to have those maps in place for people to comment on at our regular public hearings so we shifted gears then and tried to find a vendor who could do the job.

In fact, I never even got a quote from this first vendor and at this point in time they are totally nonresponsive to me. Then I went to a second vendor. Who was one that Bruce Adelson had worked with who he identified and I went to that vendor and I received an update from that vendor this morning. First of all I don't have a quote from them either. They can't do all the work. It will require another company to transcribe. They would need for me to provide all the PDFs of the maps to them. From the legal plans because when they open them, they can't see PDFs unlike what I can find and you can find. So again I don't think we have time to figure all this out and work with this vendor. There was a third vendor suggested by the Lansing chapter of the national federation for the blind and Edward told me yesterday the disabilities network had also said this vendor would be a good one, their name is light house and excited and ready to start as soon as I gave them the word, they would begin preparing what they need to do even without having the legal descriptions or the maps available to them, that they would begin the preparations for maps. You can see from their quote that I provided with the resolution that only includes I think ten maps. Let me just double check. The maps are set. They are on 11X11 and a half or 11X17 paper, real thin paper. It's like a film. Each set of maps is 191. And they estimate 44 Pages long if they do a Michigan counties map, two state senate plans, two state house plans and three Congressional plans. They said they would adjust appropriately. Again, the Congressional plans are a lot easier because there is only 13 districts. When you get to House Districts, it's going to take several pages. So my best guess at this point although I have some people, I'm working with on a distribution plan, is it will take at least 30 if not 40 of these sets of maps, that's why the resolution lists up to 20,000 for maps. There are currently 12 Braille book libraries in the State of Michigan so that is one option for distribution. People we could also keep maps at the Braille and talking library in Lansing. That they could help make available to people also. So that is the basic information. I've been working really hard to try to find a vendor and this seems to be the only vendor who can do the job.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question. What is their estimated timeline for being able to do the work after we get them all the information?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Again they realize what a short turn around we are on. They have not given me an exact date. It depends when they get the legal plans and you know how many plans there are. So the more plans the longer it will take but we knew we could not turn them around in 3 or 5 days but we have a 45 day of public comment so I would work with them to get these out as quickly as possible, make them available.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: They have not given an estimate.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: They have not given me anything definitive.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I mean we are required to do this from the State of Michigan. So I make a motion that we authorize the money. So that Suann can get it corrected it's a necessity for us.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes did you also have a comment? All right so we have a motion to adopt resolution 2021.11.02 which is to approve Braille I keep wanting to say veil, Braille vendor any discussion or debate on the motion? I'm sorry Mr. Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Oh, my Lord this is just without I mean the ones that we are pushing forward to the 45 day per.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is what I thought perfect.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All if favor raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and I'm sorry Ms. Reinhardt how many do we have here right now 12. Okay by a vote of 12-0 the ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted.

All right moving on to our next agenda item is the discussion of the individual plans. And Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I suppose I could lead the discussion if you want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And Julianne and I can go back and forth Szetela se go ahead Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Has everybody received an e-mail from either me or myself and Julianne regarding the question about whether or not individual maps by individual Commissioners can go forward in the 45 day period, yes, no? Okay, so the question is can an individual Commission submit a Congressional map, a Senate map or a house map to be considered under the 45 day comment period without the action of the Commission? In other words, we have collaborative maps that we've all been working on and that we have voted on to move forward. These would be individual Commissioner's maps that would be submitted to be moved forward. Under paragraph 14 it talks about the procedure to adopt a plan and specifically in paragraph 14C small I may submit each plan for each type of District to the full Commission for consideration. Now, that comes after the comment in 14C which basically says if no plan satisfies this requirement for a type of District, the Commission shall use the following procedure to adopt a plan for that type of District. And what they are talking about there is the 2, 2 and 2 vote. So you're into the plan B vote.

It's my position that an individual Commissioner can submit one plan each to be forwarded on the 45 day comment period to allow the public to view it very similar to what we did and allowed on the second, the five public hearings that we just went through. Commissioners submitted some Commissioners submitted plans to be looked at. Independently. Individually. Julianne's position is that's not.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Excuse me Madam Chair I will state what my thoughts are thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: When Commissioner Lett is done, I'm happy to do so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The position that certainly I'm taking is that the amendment does not speak directly to this. It does not say in so many words that each Commissioner is allowed to submit a plan to be considered in the 45 day period. On the other hand it does not say that they can't. And certainly if you read the amendment as a whole, and take in consideration that previously you could submit one and have it considered in the five second public hearing comment period that we had, it makes sense to me at least that you can then do the same thing for the 45-day period. It doesn't seem to make sense to me that you couldn't do that.

Also as we have done as a collaborative Commission the plans, we took out on the road have been modified, new plans have even been made to be considered and we've put several forward and voted on them to move them forward.

So it's also my position if, in fact, an individual Commissioner had a plan that was taken on the road trip for the 5 road trip meetings that they can make modifications to that plan, their plan and then move that one forward. It would be just like the collaborative plans that we can do. So that is my position on moving forward. I believe that without really knowing I believe that is what most Commissioners think was going to happen. Julianne and I have had some discussions prior to this and so this has been on going between her and I. At least and we are getting down to the short time and if it's going to happen, we need to decide how it's going to happen.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair and thank you to Commissioner Lett for the summary. I'm certainly in complete agreement he did raise this at the beginning of October. And we've had some conversations since then. And we simply disagree. So it's my opinion that, again, the Constitution clearly states two opportunities for Commissioners to submit individual maps. The first is set forth in subsection 7. It is an automatic publication and it's a right of a Commissioner to submit a map at that time as included in the Constitution. The second time that that is stated in the text of the Constitution is under subsection 14 and as Commissioner Lett correctly noted that is after a map or a plan excuse me is fails to be adopted by majority vote with a 2, 2, 2 of each selection pool. Those are the two instances that that is expressed in the language of the Constitution. So the interpretation that I have is the words are not there and therefore that does not exist at this time. Another difference that I wanted to highlight in my opinion would be that individual maps now for Commissioners who submitted individual maps under the authority granted in subsection 9, we spoke about this in the past too as a Commission. Certainly the benefit of the public comment, the

benefit of the port, the benefit of the public hearings that Commissioners can modify their maps, Commissioners can advocate as some have done for the elements of their maps to be included in collaborative maps and all of those kinds of things. The difference is there is not the automatic publication requirement. So there is also no language that would allow for a Commissioner to advance their personal map to the 45 days that that would be a Commission thing. And certainly well I will stop there. But I think those are the two main differences in the interpretation and the opinion there. So thank you for letting me provide that and I'm available to answer questions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: In response one I think that mitigates against that position is that if the we go to plan B vote where individual Commissioner can propose a map, one map for each of the three categories, if they weren't published in the 45 day period then the public is not going to have an opportunity to look at those and say okay, this is MC Rothhorn's map and now he's proposing that that is going to be the District map for whichever one. And quite frankly neither would the rest of the Commissioners because there would be no requirement everybody get a look at it for that 45 day period. I don't think that is what is contemplated by the amendment and I don't think that reading the amendment as a whole with the idea that there is full transparency et cetera that we would want to go into a plan B vote and have a Commissioner come in, pull one out of their vest pocket and say here is what we want to present without having had an opportunity to look at it. I'm available for questions also.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair for doing rebuttals. I would also note that if we do get to the plan B, the plan B voting procedure, Commissioner Lett's interpretation presupposes that only maps that were published for the 45 day public comment period could be brought forward by Commissioners. Those would be the very maps that the Commissioners just could not come to an agreement on. Under the vote. Necessitating the plan B voting thing. The text of the Constitution reads each Commissioner under 14C small I each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District to the full Commission for consideration. That mirrors the language in subsection 9 that does not say it pulls from the 45 day pool and again those are the very maps that the Commission just couldn't come to agreement with. So I just really that the language is not in the Constitution. And whether it makes sense or not is certainly an interesting discussion for a different time and I think there has been quite a few places in the Constitution where we could have that conversation but what we have before us is the language and what the language says and what the plain text and the meaning means and there is just no basis in my opinion for moving forward in that manner. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We obviously have a disagreement but certainly the language says the Commission shall use the following procedure to adopt a plan for that type of District. Each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District. And my reading of that is a proposal plan that has already been in the 45 day period. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever that we could come in at the end of 45 days not agree upon a plan under the 2, 2 and 2 vote and then come up with totally new plans that nobody had looked up, nobody had debated, they didn't do anything on and in this plan B it talks about how you do that. Do you rate -- it's a ranking, ranked vote that you take so, no, I can't agree in any way that we're going to have new plans at the end of 45 days.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So everyone is on the same plan can we go over the plan B and the plan C that is after if we can't agree on a map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Plan C is easy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can read it to you. So Section 14 and I'm going to skip some parts of this so I'm not reading the whole thing the Commission shall follow the following procedure in adopting a plan Section A is testing we are not going to read the whole thing before adopting a plan you shall have public notice of a plan voted on and provide at least 45 days of public comment on the proposed plan or plans. So I'm going to skip the rest of that. And then we will move down to the actual voting so a final decision of the Commission to adopt a redistricting plan, thank you for bringing that up, requires a majority of the Commission, I'm under C, including at least two Commissioners who affiliate with each major party and at least two Commissioners who do not affiliate with either major party if no plan satisfies this for a type of District you shall use the procedure to adopt a plan for that type of District each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District to the full Commission for consideration. Each Commissioner shall rank the plan for their preference. Each plan shall be signed a point value inverse to ranking among the number of choices given the lowest one point and the highest ranked plan a point value equal to number of plans submitted. So if there is five plans you rank your favorite plan as five and least favorite as one. The Commission shall adopt the highest total points ranked on the top half of plans by at least two Commissioners not affiliated with the party of the Commissioners submitting the plan or in the case of a plan submitted by nonaffiliated Commissioners is ranked among the top half of the plans by at least two Commissioners affiliated with a major party. If the plans are tied for highest point total the Secretary of State shall randomly select the final plan from those plans. If no plan meets the requirements of the subparagraph the Secretary of State shall randomly select a plan from all plans pursuant to part 14C1.

So if we cannot agree on a plan each Commissioner has the right to submit a plan. And then we are going to rank choice vote on them. If we don't break the deadlock that

way then the Secretary of State breaks the deadlock. Any comments Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Go ahead did you have a comment too?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Seems to me the Secretary of State would do it randomly; is that correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If it gets to that point that is like option C.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is nuclear option I don't think we will get there who is watching but good to know. The ranked choice voting, it seems to me then thinking how to communicate this if we all submit and can't agree on a plan after the 45 day public comment window, then if all of us decide to submit plans all we will be doing is splitting the votes on the best plan. Do you know what I mean? So but I don't think it makes much sense to have plans come in at the end that no one has seen. So this is I guess I'm still a little confused on they seem kind of contradictory in a way.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett go ahead.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: From my position when they say when this says submit a plan, let's assume there is three plans for the three districts so that is nine plans. Each Commissioner in my interpretation picks one plan for each District out of those 9 plans so you could plan one I might pick plan two and submit. You don't have to submit, you could say I don't I'm not going to. So but you can't come in with a totally new plan that hasn't been either a collaborative plan or under my interpretation one submitted for the 45 day period by an individual Commissioner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And so I would just chime in on this also being an attorney, I also agree with Commissioner Lett's interpretation. I think that in order for us to even get to the point of voting on a plan, any plan, whether we are under the getting to the nuclear option or not I think we have to have that 45 day public comment period. We can't at the end of the day whip in and bring in any plan that has not gone through public comment. I don't think that is consistent with what the spirit of the language is. I don't think it's consistent with the letter of the language and I think that if we have that ability to bring in individual plans at the end and clearly seems we do the plans have to be submitted under the 45 day comment period whether they are collaborative or individual plan I don't see the distinction. The important thing is the entire purpose of this exercise is so the public can see what we are doing and comment on it. And if individual Commissioners have the ability at the end if we don't agree to bring in a plan that no one has seen, no one knows what went into it and just slip it in at the end and have us vote on it, I just don't think that is consistent with what we are supposed to be doing which is my concern about this is as well. So I agree with Commissioner Lett's analysis. I think that at this point individual Commissioners can still submit individual plans if they want to for that 45 day public comment period. And you know at the end of the day that Commissioner has to have the support to pass it. I mean just because they submit it

does not mean it's going to get passed but I think individual Commissioners have that right. Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I take a different approach, I agree with General Counsel. Stating that the we vote on the plans that are going to be moving forward to the 45 day period. Regardless on if I think regardless if they were individual submissions or not and vote on the ones we want to move forward that is how I think of it any way. Then on December 30th when we vote and we can't come to consensus and continue go through or don't vote and can't go through the ranked choice voting at that particular point in time we may submit a proposed map.

By that particular language that tells me that I can create one and submit it.

That's my understanding of it. Because if the word submit wasn't there and it said select a proposed map then I would be able to select one from the actual maps that were submitted at that point. Since it said submit, I will be able to create a new one with my name on it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much I will take advantage of subsection 14 being on the screen, if Ms. Reinhardt can X out of the participant screen. So if we pars this subsection, it says that the Commissioner shall follow the following procedure. And, Madam Chair, you did not read subsection A. But subsection A is critical when you read it, and, again, the fullness of subsection 14. So Subsection A is the Commission can't adopt a plan until they ensure that it's tested and meets the criteria. The proposed plans that went forward in the 45 days have already done that.

So subsection B is, again, a separate consideration under that before voting to adopt a plan this is where we are now, correct? Provide public notice of each plan in the 45 days for public comment. This is where we are now. And it references subsection 9 just again to refer to the legal description and the census data. So that's the publication requirement. There is no publication requirement under subpart C. We moved into the vote under subpart C and parsing out subpart C the final decision of the Commission majority vote we all understand that very clearly. I don't think there is any disagreement there. If no plan satisfies this requirement the Commission shall use the following procedure. Subpart I is each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District. It's not restricted to any that have been published. It's not restricted to anything and the exact language used in subsection nine and had each individual Commissioner and I said this since January and I will continue to say it I will never support interpretation that limits the Commission's authority or ability, individual Commissioners or the full Commissioner. So if the interpretation advanced by if the alternate interpretation, alternate to mine to be clear, is that Commissioners are restricted that they can only pick from the published plans being the collaborative plans or individual plans that again I see no language allowing for, then I see that as a

restriction. And before you vote to adopt a plan, any of the plans have to follow and satisfy subpart A which again refers back to the criteria. So you know, I see the two distinction again, the ability to submit individual plans at this point in time which is after subsection 9 has been satisfied. And prior to subsection 14C1 being triggered I do not see that language in the Constitution. In the second thing the difference that I would like to highlight is again the opinion that individual plans can move past the point where the Commission is right now without a vote of the Commission as the Commission has been doing and did today and hopefully will advance another Senate plan. So that individual plans excuse me were automatically published under subsection nine. There is no language where we are now in the process. So I would offer that any individual plans that Commissioners are offering forward that were put forward under subsection nine need to also be acted on by the Commission. But again I welcome the discussion. And I'm so glad we are able to have it. Collectively. And I've certainly enjoyed discussing it with Commissioner Lett but it's more fun to discuss it with the full Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, okay, but why don't individuals who want to submit an individual map do it now and we take a vote on it and if it passes it goes to the 45 day public comment window? That seems to satisfy all of these.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is not the question. That is true the maps that go on to the 45 day period the way I read it or understand it and I'm not a lawyer but critically think as best as I can that all maps that go to the 45 day voting period have to or 45 day comment period have to be voted on by us as a Commission before the 45 days if and only if we can't decide on the 30th we are allowed to create our own maps and submit our own maps to be put into the hat for random drawing by Secretary of State Benson.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or just as an alternative, or you could say I like cherry or Pine and I'm submitting cherry or Pine. You can pick a map if it's yours or not and General Counsel saying you Dustin if you say you are coming in and bring your own map and maybe Anthony comes in and brings the AFLCIO and Brittini brings the promote the vote map and we bring those all in on December 30th and you know I go to the head of the you know the republican party and ask them to draft a map and I bring that in. Those are all going in our pool to vote on without a 45 day public comment period and they go in a random pool to be selected by the Secretary of State is that the position you are taking? That seems to me what the position is without a public comment period on December 30 it goes to the Secretary of State and she does a random and we end up with the AFLCIO maps.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I appreciate the drama in the question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Trying to be clear.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I appreciate it and I feel I'm being very, very clear. The language is not there and that what using the example from Commissioner Lett if you have three of each map you have nine maps you have 13 Commissioners. So if there is a Commissioner that is voting no and again the maps that have been published have already been the opportunity to vote was already there so yes if you are bringing it in, if those maps again I would hope that the Commissioners would bring forward their own maps like they have been doing. But those maps must satisfy subsection 14A. Do they meet the criteria, have they gone through. I lost my train of thought I'm sorry. I do not see that language in the Constitution.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But that is what I'm struggling with before voting to adopt a plan when we are doing ranked choice voting we are voting to adopt a plan. So the Commission shall provide public notice of each plan that will be voted on. So the way I read that is if we don't do the 45 day public comment now and we can't agree in December, any plan that an individual Commissioner submits is going to have to go through a 45 day public comment period. I don't know how you get around that. Because before we vote to adopt a plan, we have to provide public notice and 45 days of public comment.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And I believe Madam Chair, I certainly in the spirit of transparency and the mission of the Commission don't disagree with you. But what you are reading should have been subpart double little I and it's not. So what I'm saying is that the language is just not there. It says if no plan satisfies this requirement the Commission shall use the following procedure to adopt a plan. So that's where we start. So the publication from the drafters should have been included again in subpart I, subpart double I, III, you know, four. It's just not there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Maybe it was intentionally excluded for the sole fact it does not matter. If we get to the point where it's a random drawing and let's say we have four maps, three out of the four get public comments and one of them doesn't, that one could still be picked. So it doesn't necessarily matter that the 45 day period is not going to happen because of that fact alone.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I did not follow your train of thought on that I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'll try again. So if we maybe that part of the language for the 45 day period after we can't if we can't agree and we can submit our own is purposefully not put into the Constitution for the sole fact of it may not matter because let's say we have four maps that are going to be randomly selected three out of the four maps can get a whole bunch of public comment and one can be ignored by the public that one that is completely ignored can still be randomly selected by the Secretary of State to become law. So what's the point of allowing 45 days of public comment after that point if it -- it has potential of not even mattering and to speed up the process to get a map selected for the purposes of what the maps are for?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I guess I'm still not following you. Whether someone comments on it or not does not change the fact we have to give a public comment period.

No one can comment on it. That does not make the plan more or less valid.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct for the 45 day public period I'm talking everything after December if we can't come up with a map, we can submit our own maps to go and be randomly selected by the Secretary of State. Well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Lett?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is one thought. But here and B it says before voting to adopt a plan the Commission shall provide public notice of each plan that would be voted on and provided at least 45 days for public comment on the proposed plan or plans. So that's before voting. On any plan. It has to be published, it has to meet all the requirements, Section nine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Section A.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The rest of that, C, and 1, 2, 3 is the voting procedure. Not the plans that you get to vote on particularly. It's the procedure and the procedure is you got to have 2, 2 and 2 on the plans that were vetted in the 45 day period. And if you can't get the 2, 2 and 2, 7 total, then you go to B, which is a different voting procedure but with the same plans that have been vetted. And if you don't get it there you get the same plans that have been vetted and the Secretary of State makes a choice. Nowhere in here does it say you get to put in a new plan totally out of thin air because you can't decide.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Miss Reinhardt wants to chime in and Commissioner Kellom.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Not chiming in on the debate but certainly wanted to clarify that the Secretary of State does not choose. It's a random selection. And also the random selection does not occur with pulling a name out of a hat. I know that just a figure of speech but just want to clarify for anyone wondering thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for that clarification, Ms. Reinhardt. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Very quick because I'm a bottom line person and I know I have a lot of lawyer minds in the room and that is beautiful but I'm also thinking of the public listening and the work we have to do and this is very important. I'm sorely uncomfortable with any plan that has not been seen, smelled, anything by the Commission. We have done all of this work and nothing should come in at the end. Nothing. Because that would...I can't even imagine like what that could possibly look like. So I don't care what happens what I'm paying attention to voting to adopt a plan and the procedure to sit here with our good buddy Kent, sometimes John and we justified and gone over these things so everything that comes across the Commission's table should have that extreme smell test as far as I'm concerned.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes I'm sorry Commissioner Weiss and Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I want to thank you for completely confusing me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is our job.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: If we can't pick a plan after the 45 days somebody can submit another plan is that what I'm hearing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is one position.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Right so then will that plan get 45 days to the public? Why not? I would be a little upset if you don't let me see the plan and you are just going to adopt it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This is why we have to agree on a plan at the end of the day. So you know we have good plans now. None of them are perfect. But they are all pretty darn good. So let's keep that in mind too. We are not going to get I certainly hope we don't get as far as you know whatever the nuclear option is but at the end of the day what Commissioner Kellom said is true. There is possibly the threat and I don't know if threat is the right word of that happening. So maybe instead of that happening we should agree to adopt a plan after these 45 days.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or another you know opinion is we each as a Commission could say that we are taking the position that individual plans that are going to be submitted have to be submitted by tomorrow and they automatically are going to go in the publication process and we have resolved the issue in a way I think that is transparent. That is open. That follows our Commission and our vision and our values. And I think we've create add record of why we are doing that. Because you know I think we have some differing interpretations and we got three smart lawyers who are taking different positions on things but at the end of the day as a Commission we ultimately decide how we think this reads and what we think we need to do. Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Witjes candidate for law school.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You did not do get on the LSAT Szetela se don't do it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All maps that move to the 45 day public comment period where no further changes can be made have to be voted on by the Commission as a body as a whole to move forward past that particular point of right now.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is one question we are debating.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is the question we are debating. I don't see that in the constitutional language that is required. So Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have two motions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Motion one and I mean I don't want to cut off debate but we have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We got stuff to do.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We beat this horse pretty good I move individual Commissioner can submit a plan to move forward in the 45 day comment period without vote. One plan for each Congress, house, Senate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay I will second that motion and then Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Julianne, I have a question for you. If we hired you obviously to be our General Counsel and this is where we need you the most, if we did not follow the Constitution say as you interpreted it would that leave us open to additional lawsuits potentially?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair and thank you for the question, Commissioner Lange. Certainly my role as your general counsel is to provide general advice, we are attorneys and Counselors and I provided the advice and counsel interpretation. And certainly I think it is safe to assume that anything the Commission does would subject it to litigation at this point but I certainly also wanted to echo and build upon Commissioner Eid's statement is that the plan B or the nuclear option for voting as contemplated under subsection 14 whether you're looking at trying to get majority vote under the first part of subsection C or activating the second I believe that sentence activating the second requirement and it's highlighted. What the Commission is doing right now and what it's been doing and what it strives to do is work collaboratively for a work product that everyone has participated in. And that everyone can support and everyone has options. And certainly what we have been discussing is the process that would go forward if that did not occur and so I would just highlight that and Commissioner Lange yes it could or it couldn't. I mean that really is up to the really is up to the members of the public or people that feel aggrieved by what the Commission has done.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Who has standing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Who has standing that is right. Mr. Adelson, I promoted you too.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you and I accept the nomination. I just wanted to, without weighing in at what has been discussed and we discussed this many times before but I wanted to just stress one primary point and wanted to echo what Commissioner Eid said what my colleague has said that this discussion to me is a significant impetus and motivation to the Commission acting to approve a plan so we don't get to the end of December and then some consequences will not be publicly welcome I will put it that way. I wanted to say that it does give significant motivation to approving a plan so that the nuclear option does not have to be activated. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes, is that a hand?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sorry, Commissioner Lett. I move to amend your motion so all maps that go forward for the 45 day public comment period has to be voted on by us and approved by simple majority.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is an inappropriate amendment because you are overriding the main motion. You can't do that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Like I said lawyer candidate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Unless we have discussion or debate and I would like to do a roll call. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree that individual Commissioners should be able to bring forth their maps tomorrow and have it considered to be entered into the 45 day public comment window but I don't think it should be automatic. I think it should be voted on by a simple majority at least. And the reason I think that is because for two reasons. The first reason is it gives us another map to possibly if we get to the ranked choice voting period which hopefully, we don't but if we do that is another map you know to decide between and could possibly split up the points and then going further if that doesn't work it gets put into the random drawing by the Secretary of State's office. I think any map that gets to that point or has the potential to get to that point should be voted on by us first.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have a couple points on that it's not entirely accurate what you're saying because in order to move into the pool you have to be in the upper half of the ranked choice voting in the first place. If we have four plans only two of them are going into that pool I believe. I'd have to can we pull up the Constitution language again? And two I am concerned from a constitutional perspective if we take it, they have a right to submit a plan and basically allowing other Commissioners to block that with a vote I would be concerned about the implications about that.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair I would just highlight you would be adding the language that people -- that excuse me individual Commissioners could engage in that at this point so if the Commissioner is voting to allow that, then certainly voting to allow whether or not to let their colleagues vote whether or not to go forward would just be another addition of language.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: It does not say either of those things so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I call the question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was just about to. So.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: A motion on the floor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Individuals.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Individual Commissioner can submit plans without a vote of the Commission for the 45 day public comment period.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, I have a longer motion that I have written down. I have that the motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Szetela motioned that individual Commissioners can submit maps for the 45 day public comment excuse me can submit maps one plan each, Congress, house, Senate for the 45 day public comment period.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And those maps go forward, they are not voted on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not automatic.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is the motion I captured.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I heard that Commissioner Lange has her hand up. I can't see her but I heard she has her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry I forgot to lower it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right miss Reinhardt can you call a roll call on this, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm still confused. My answer is I don't think that we should submit any maps and let the public select their maps. If they can't select it then we just have to go in and try it all over again. I don't think we should have anything to do with it. In that way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just for clarification Is that a "Yes" or a "No"? So let me say it again. So this is we are voting to allow individual Commissioners to submit maps so they can go through the 45 day public comment period are you in favor of that or not in favor of that?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm not in favor of it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't know. Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of nine yes to three no the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you miss Reinhardt what was your second motion.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: What is the vote.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: 9-3 in favor so the motion is adopted.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: My second motion is if the vote we do not get the vote on 7 Commissioners on 2, 2, 2 under 14CI, II the plans that are available to choose from are only those that have gone through the 45 day comment period.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Still writing give me a second. I will second that motion. And go ahead.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can we have clarity for the sake that we all didn't go to law school what does that mean?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: You can't bring in a new plan. You can only propose for the rank order voting one of the plans that is already there. It may not be the one that you wanted or the one you favored, but let's say there are nine well let's say there is three plans for each one. You Brittini could put forward I propose plan number one. I could say I propose plan number three Dustin can say I propose plan number two. Well once that happened then I say Congressional then there wouldn't be any proposals but there would just be a vote but you can't bring in as Dustin wants to a brand new plan that nobody has ever looked at.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?
- >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I appreciate Commissioner Lett's example. Currently if we were to carry this through for what the Commission currently has, Commissioner the Commission currently only has one Senate plan. So by this interpretation all 13 of you would be able to select that one Senate plan. Or if the Commission today or tomorrow adopts a second plan all 13 of you would be able to choose between those two to bring forward or those three to bring forward. I wanted to highlight part of my rule unpopular as it is to highlight things so I just wanted to be clear the language in the Constitution that is highlighted under 14C again it says just directly above it if no plan satisfies this requirement for this type of District the Commission shall use the following procedure and then it goes into the procedure that should be used. So what is being

modified is subsection I where it says each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District to the full Commission for consideration. What the proposed motion as I understand it from Commissioner Lett would effectively modify that sentence to read each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District that has gone through the 45 day public comment. You can only use the plans that have already been submitted and not agreed upon going forward. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We can modify an amendment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I don't think he is proposing to modify a constitutional amendment because of course we don't have that authority and I don't think we would need to amend it. I think we are voting on an interpretation which is I already think that those restrictions are in there under 14A and B about the types of plans that we could vote on. So I just think we are clarifying our interpretation of the statute or of the constitutional amendment. We are not rewriting or redefining the Constitution we are determining how to interpret it is that correct Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I concur because we had this lengthy discussion about what plans we can move forward with, the intent of this is so we are clear when we get down to voting that it's only on the plans that have gone through the 45 day period. Now, as General Counsel has stated all 13 people could propose one plan. Well that is never going to happen because of all 13 people do then have to adopt it before it got there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm interpreting it differently and thinking we are making the constitutional language more restrictive by doing this and saying we are able to or interpret it as to the fact I'm able to submit a plan that did not go through the 45 day public comment period per how I'm reading the Constitution. Yeah, I know that, thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I think that is exactly but you are hitting on the point there is a difference of interpretation between the three lawyers in the room as to what that language means whereas Steve and I are taking the position that 14A and B define what plans we can vote on. C defines the process. And that General Counsel is taking a different position. So our position is that it's already in there we are not amending anything but just clarifying a point of interpretation. Commissioner Lange did you have your hand up again?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do and just my two cents, I would be against that. I mean the language is there and it says people can at the end whether it's the 45 day or not and I'm not comfortable going against advice from our legal counsel who we hired for this exact reason.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If it ever came to that point my position would be any plans that have not gone through a 45 day comment period are not valid plans to vote on. So

again I guess ultimately a Court could decide that. Did you have a comment Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm going to call the question, now is the time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Who does. Cynthia?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I call the question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let me restate the motion. According to the motion by Commissioner Lett if we do not get a vote of 2, 2, 2 underneath the constitutional amendment 14C one, 11 plans available to choose from are only those that have been submitted for a 45 day public comment period. That is the motion. So if you are in favor of that you are in favor of limiting the plans that we can vote on to those that were previously submitted for a 45 day public comment period.

If you are P opposed to that then you would be voting no. Sarah Reinhardt.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm confused.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry, Madam Chairperson, did you hear Commissioner Curry's comment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No I didn't.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I am confused. I usually would love to listen to the lady that we hire. With all these other opinions you all have confused me. That's all.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Call the question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's call the question go ahead Ms. Reinhardt. So Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I understand the question on the table just for.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I understand what you are saying too but confusing.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: General Counsel for the clarification what would your recommendation be to vote on this? Because it seems like Commissioner Curry is asking for that.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA:

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think a whole lot of people are answering that who are listening to this.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, it is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So if it helps you clarify do you want people to be able to bring in plans if we cannot agree on December 30th or 31st or whatever day we are meeting if we cannot agree on a plan do you want individual Commissioners to be able to bring in their own plans that have not gone through 45 day public comment periods and that you may not have seen up until that time where they bring it forward.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair to clarify I believe the motion is regarding the interpretation, not the want. There is a difference between the two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So the question is how -- the motion is regarding the interpretation of the constitutional language, not what you would want but how you interpret it.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: She is providing explanation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm providing an explanation to help Commissioner Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Explanation is motion is if you want XY and Z is not the motion so I wanted to clarify. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does that help Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What helps me is that when our lawyer that we chose tells us what we should do and we follow her advice and that is what we should be doing, not everybody else voting on it or having we are hired in as Commissioners. She was in as our attorney to tell us the best route to go. And I think we ought to listen to her.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: With all due respect Commissioner Curry we are the Commissioner. We are the Commissioners and we ultimately have the ultimate responsibility. General Counsel can give us her advice and opinion and she certainly has done that today. I made my motion and I've called the question and it's now time to vote.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: And I understand what you're saying but it's still confusing because I'm wondering how the people that are hearing this is taking this.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I know how they are taking it.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we ready to vote? So we are voting if we come to a point where we do not get the 2, 2, 2 which is in order to pass a plan you need two republicans two democrats and two independents if that does not happen under 14C and I and II the only plans available to choose from are those plans that were submitted whether collaborative or individual for the 45 day public comment period.

So yes, vote means that you're in favor of limiting the plans that went through the 45 day public comment period a no vote means you are not. Yes, potentially bring plans that have not gone through the 45 day public comment period. Sarah Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please state your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: One last clarification no means I'm in favor of someone sliding in and we have not seen it or anything? So yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is Erin on? I did not see her.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 8 yes and 4 no the motion carries.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have no further motions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay well I actually think we should do one more motion because we need to set a time on when those individual plans can be submitted. So Commissioner or Ms. Reinhardt is there like a particular time we need to do for individual plans like Noon tomorrow or 2:00 tomorrow what will work with.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I would recommend Commissioners submit individual plans for consideration by hold on actually.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I've got kind of a question because not having these maps done tomorrow at the beginning of the conversation it said this conversation has been going on and back and forth between Commissioner Lett and our legal counsel since October do you really think that is fair to Commissioners that may not have even considered doing a map that were going to maybe hold off until after the 45 day to say now if you want to you have to do it by tomorrow? I have a hard time with the constitutional part of them being able to. I'm having a hard time seeing how that's right or even constitutionally right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you have a comment Commissioner Lett.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I had a clarification.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That's true.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel Pastula.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair I certainly respect the exhaustion the Commission and staff meals. I wanted for the record to clarify and I'm glad Commissioner Lange raised the question. I wanted to clarify those conversations were just occurring between Commissioner Lett and I. So there were -- they were private conversations and I started the conversation based on the statements he made at either the October 10 or October 11th meeting because I disagreed with his interpretation. I want it clear for the record that I have not discussed this with any other Commissioner aside from Commissioner Lett. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would also add to that that we have known for months that November 5 was our deadline to get plans in order to meet the deadlines that we have from the different agencies down the line. So I don't really feel this is new information. You have already submitted plans. So there is -- it's not a surprise and should not be to anybody.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: The circumstances are different Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I have lots of hands around the room but want to hear first from Ms. Reinhardt because I specifically wanted a date from her.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Recommendation for meeting the publication timeline would be for individual Commissioners to submit their maps to our office EDS and your staff by 10 a.m. on Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 10 a.m. on Monday is what Department of State staff is saying is their deadline to get maps in. Okay so going around the room I saw Commissioner Clark had a hand up, Commissioner Kellom had a hand up Commissioner Witjes had a hand and start with Commissioner Clark and go from there.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that for submission of the maps all that paperwork that we did when we submitted ours has to be a part of that submission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh yes, I think it would be the same process.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We know the partisan fairness numbers and all that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I think I have a third question now. So this deadline by Monday which is why I voted no means that someone a Commissioner can submit a plan without us even seeing it or talking about it as before is that what I'm understanding by Monday at 10:00 a.m.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Same process we followed before where Commissioners will send in the plans then they would be posted, the same way they were before so that we can all see them and look at them.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm not for that. I also think though I would like our process to remain sacred in we engaged in the public and each other to get this work done. I think just in the last I don't know 20 minutes or so I feel like we've as a Commission have engaged in a very dangerous process because we are not attorneys and we have done some interpretation of the law and truly don't think it was our place. But I will say that like I said before I don't think things should come across the table we have not looked at as the same scrutiny we have and I don't know where that is going to land. That was just a dangerous discussion I will just say that for the record.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was just going to say the deadline for Friday yes, we all knew it. But again I was always under the assumption I could have until December 30 in case we could not come to a decision now it's severely redistricted. That being said I do believe the weekend until 10:00 on Monday is fair for us to be able to do that. Because I'm willing to bet that we're not going to be starting completely over from scratch. We are going to be working from the ones we already have, the ones we like the best making changes and the changes in my opinion are not going to be very significant. So the weekend Monday 10 a.m. is a fair time for that to happen.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: As I said before I was confused, my concern was that map could get chosen that the public did not get a chance to comment on am I correct? I don't think that is right. So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Me either.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: The vote is what it should be.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so can I get a motion to make the due date for individual maps Monday at 10 a.m. and follow the same process as before, send them to Department of State, Sue, and our vendors at EDS along with that documentation sheet that goes along with it. Motion made by Commissioner Witjes, seconded by Commissioner Clark and again can we get a roll call on this? And is there any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair can I please confirm the motion was moved by Commissioner Witjes or Commissioner Lett.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes Commissioner Clark seconded them.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is what I had but I was not looking at them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go ahead and do a vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I want a roll call, thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please state your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Could you turn your microphone on, please.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Abstain I was out of the room.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Restate then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The motion is to make the deadline to submit individual maps Monday at 10:00 a.m. That is what the motion is.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Tie vote motion fails.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's a tie so then what are people suggesting for the deadline? Because the 45 days is 45 days, so Ms. Hammersmith? Tomorrow. You voted no. We are trying to give you more time. You voted yes, sorry. Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't think it's enough time for to even be considering this at this late hour. This is for the public. And I know that we are people that citizens too. But to suggest now if I wanted to do a map, it would take me more than one day and that is not fair. But I don't want to do a map. I want to hear from the public. I think that is the point of the first two motions submit the plans for public comment was the intention Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm just uncomfortable with everybody that just happened. I feel we do not have the right to interpret the Constitution. I feel like we do not have a right to vote on limiting Commissioners if the Constitution doesn't do that. And this is all very confusing to those of us who are not lawyers. And I just don't know where to go from here. I do agree that it's not good for last-minute plans to come in and it would be great if they were there for the 45 day comment period and for the Commission to see and stuff. But I just don't think we can limit it like that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Can't do it. It's wrong.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move the deadline be Noon Monday.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Who was the second?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: This is all wrong. This is wrong.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion on the floor the deadline be Noon on Monday to submit the individual plans one per District and then the I'm assuming the same information that we submitted before.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We need to wait until all the Commissioners are back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 123456789.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Doug is not here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question clarification, please. I was out of the room maybe when you were discussing it last time. The point of the deadline or the ramifications?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Miss Reinhardt do you want to address that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The Constitution requires similar to prior to public hearings the publication of all of your maps. This requires significant effort from on the back end for folks to work to publish a publication that contains the legal description. That does take additional time. There is also additional work that your mapping contractor has to do which is why all of next week was blocked out for this -- these efforts to take place. I selected Monday morning because if we made it Friday end of day tomorrow more than likely all of the efforts would begin Monday morning. So Monday morning was selected as the time for Commissioners to submit. Additionally your staff and our department have a meeting Monday morning in which we will discuss how the work plan will unfold for next week so it seemed like a fitting time for us to know the number of individual submissions at that time, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So just for clarity on the way that I voted, it's not that I have an issue with the deadline. For the sake of transparency who even wants to submit another map? How did we get here? So then it's not relevant if.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's by right.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Transparency unless people don't want to reveal.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's by right. I have the right as being a Commissioner to do this.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Absolutely. I want you to feel included. I'm trying to understand how we got to this conversation again the root of it because it came from a place obviously where people want to submit something so I as a Commissioner are trying to understand it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My understanding is that because the way that the Constitution was written and the way it was interpreted by the individuals in the room is my position was that we had until December 30th in case we did not have a chance to vote on it. And we had to then make our own because we had the ability to do so. That was voted down so now we no longer have that particular right at that point. Well, I still think I do. But apparently the Commission says I don't. Then we have the then we changed it to say that all maps that we have to choose from automatically are ones that go through the 45 day period and that is all automatic. We don't need the individual maps can just go on. Now I no longer have a month to make my own. I have one day and if I want to -- if I want to do it, so there is a deadline now that was going to be tomorrow. We have meetings all day tomorrow, at least give me the weekend to think about doing this.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I understand wanting the deadline. What I don't want to see is anything coming after I don't want to see any new map after the 45 day. But so that is where I stand. But it better be something to look at if we are having this conversation, that is all I'm saying. This is a lot for a mysterious map to show up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I just think that we should have known about this before today. I mean we should have known about what was on these -- that 14ABC clause 123 we should have discussed that quite a while ago. I don't think we should have brought it up on the last the day before the last day the maps were to be turned in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a valid point, Commissioner Curry. I agree with you. It's one of many things we would probably do differently if we were not the first ones doing this process.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is easy to figure out and something the public should know about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Dang it, sorry, forgot to lower it again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We had a motion by Commissioner Lett who seconded it over there? Commissioner Witjes. To set the due date at Noon on Monday is there any further discussion or debate? Commissioner Curry? There you are I was going to say you walked away and we are just about to vote.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It does not matter you will vote what you want to vote. Doesn't matter.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sarah Reinhardt can you take a roll call vote please?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm gist saying this time should have been considered two weeks ago three weeks ago maybe when we first started, we should have known about this clause.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Then we should put it off. We should go by what our General Counsel wants us to do. You will have the whole State of Michigan throwing oranges at us.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think they are going to do that any way Commissioner Curry. So apparently Commissioner Wagner is trying to join. And she is having a difficult time, so we just trying to join her in.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, I can.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Can you let us know where you are joining remotely from.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'm joining remotely from Lansing, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we ready? So to restate the motion we have a motion to set the deadline for submission of individual maps until Noon on Monday. That submission would include the supporting documentation that we submitted with the last round of individual maps so that spreadsheet which is filled out.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please state your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No." I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can you restate it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Setting the deadline to 12 Noon on Monday.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 10 yes to three no the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, that finishes our discussion of our individual plans. Do we want to take a break or do we want to press on? Do we need a break? Take a break. Okay so it is currently 4:38. Hearing no objection we will stand in recess until 4:55. Thank you, everybody.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 4:54 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely one moment. Commissioners please say present when I call your name if you are at the attending remotely announce you are attending remotely and announce your physical location where you are attending from. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

Just one moment. I see Commissioner Curry is joining now and connecting to audio. We will give her just a moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Try it again Commissioner Curry.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

Rhonda Lange?

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Lansing, Michigan.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, still in attendance.

Dustin Witjes?

- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I came back.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 13 Commissioners are present.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

We will go back to deliberations and I asked Mr. Stigall to work on Magnolia we advanced and I had a couple proposed changes around the Ann Arbor area which I would like to make a new version for consideration by the Commission and once we finish with that, we are going to move on to Commissioner Clark has some proposed changes to the base of the Senate map we did so we will try to do that. And we will see if there is anything else that Commissioners want to work on but if not then we might be done with our deliberations so we will see how this goes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What about our Congressional was there a Congressional thing we were going to do?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not sure that is why we have saying we will see and I don't know if anyone else has anything else Commissioner Kellom did you have one.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I was going to retract my Congressional plan so I mean the name willow is free. You can change Magnolia to willow but we did all that painstaking work so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So is this -- this is a copy of Magnolia? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is named Magnolia1.1 since it's little brother and the blue overlay is the I will use the set name to do to reference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just want to make some changes around the Ann Arbor area and before we do this, I want you to understand why I'm doing this. And my concern is the partisan fairness on the map. The numbers aren't horrible when you run them at a composite but if you look at the Presidential elections they shift significantly and hoping

this might stop some of that shift can we run partisan fairness on the map for the 2020 election and for the 2016 election? And the reason why it's shifting so much if you look at the break down now, we have a lot of districts because it's a house map but we have a significant number of directions that are at like 50.1% both sides. So it's creating a lot of flux in the plan. Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: If this is something as a Commission, we like to limit confusion in so many plans can we take one out and then have this one be advanced?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Not at this very moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can go with three potentially. I know you are like Heavens to Betsy.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Lots of other words, yeah, uh-huh.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, and I mean people might not like it so we might not get it advanced.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is Magnolia at the moment it's 1.1 because of the District copy of the Magnolia file. Lopsided margin is 5.7 for republican you may have written this down already. Mean median difference is 2.9.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Composite right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, and efficiency gap is 5.4. And then the seats votes ratio is 56-54 favor of democrats with the republicans having a proportionality bias of 1.4% positive or favorable.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So partisan fairness for the 2020 election and you have to click on partisan fairness or it might not work.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Biden and Trump 20.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And Trump 20. Lopsided margins is 5.1% favoring republicans. Mean median is 2.4 favoring republicans. The efficiency gap is 5.3 republicans seats to vote is 56-54 favoring republicans. Proportionality bias is 2.3%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay can we rerun that for so the takeaway on this is the democrats actually won greater percentage of the votes 51% but yet they have fewer seats. If you look at 2016.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Your mic is off Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will save it so if you ever want to reference it. Press 20 partisan fairness. Then we go back to Clinton 16.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Trump 16.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Trump 16. So 5.7% is the lopsided margin. Favoring republicans. Mean median difference is 4.4% favoring republicans. Efficiency gap is 9.2 favoring republicans. Seats to votes was 8.1% favoring republicans. Republican seats 64-46. It improving significantly from 16-20.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we try one more the 2018 gubernatorial election which is Whitmer versus Schuette? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looking for it there it is so it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 2018 I think it's further up. It's above Snyder because that is 2014 there is Whitmer and Whitmer is the democrat and Schuette is the republican. Where is he a little further down because those are all, yep, right there. Schuette, 18.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, lopsided margin is 6.4. Favoring republicans. The mean median difference is 2%. The efficiency gap is .6% republican. The seats to votes favor the democrats 66-44. And the democrats have the propositional bias of 5.5%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so now if we can go in the plan and make these proposed changes and see what everybody thinks and maybe rerun some reports. So what I see is 2348.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 48 you will bring up into Brighton.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 49 okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah so, I mean it's probably easiest to start with 48 and bring that up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Follow the blue line.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Into Brighton.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can do that. Sorry Dustin. We kept Livingston whole in every other map we have so it's their turn. Yep, and if you can put those in.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: To 50.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 48. It can't stay there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go to 49 and extend it to Wixom, yep. Fix 21 and make it all 21.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area into 21.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Into 21.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Put that is area into 22. And 23 will extend into the little jog out there. So we will go in Ann Arbor and cause blocks in 48 to change and assign them for now and we will go and fix them. We love Ann Arbor. Commissioner Orton, sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: While he is making the changes can you describe why you chose these changes or the lines where they are or whatever?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I mentioned a couple times that I want to preserve the Asian community on the east side of Ann Arbor and I think this does this. Bringing Brighton in with the north side of Ann Arbor I think it makes a lot of sense from communities of interest perspective and we had people comment on that specifically that Brighton and Ann Arbor have a lot of connections between them. We have also heard people take the alternate view but like I said every other map we have not put them together and I thought it would be good on this map to try. And then again it

should improve the stability in the map and the partisan fairness. I have not run it on this map so I don't know it might ultimately be a failed exercise but my hope is that it eliminates us having efficiency gaps of 9% and swinging back the other way and it's a really big swing. I think that might be everything. All right so where is my plan deviation off? 50 and 21, 50 and 21. So 50 is 10,000 under. 10,800 under. And 21 is what? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You copied this before and it was properly renumbered.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is okay.

So, okay, so do I have different so what is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Does not appear to change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wondering if we have to rerun the plan, what is 21 off by? We are missing 12000 people.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Maybe. Let's run the diagnostics.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, any time we make changes around Ann Arbor we have problems. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This may have been done earlier today but what is that part of 20 going up to the right? Sylvan Lake?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know. He is talking way up in Sylvan Lake Keego, Lake Angeles.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do we add the part to the right for population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You have changes up around here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can take the layer off too. That will make it easier to see. I see what you're saying yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is some differentials in here. Is that possible?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For plan balance.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Before it was finished or updated.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We made changed today.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are focusing down here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Take the layer off because I don't think we need it at this point then we can see where we actually have variations. And we are mysteriously missing people.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If there is one 10,000 down there must be one 10,000 over. We did not touch 50. So my guess is something is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 12000 are saying are unassigned at the bottom of the matrix.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have to run.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, do the rebuild and, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I exported to plan and put it back this and it rebuilds everything. Most often the errors are fixed or found either one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Here is the area in 50 it appeared to be assigned it did not count it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we just put it back in 50? That should solve that error.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you can just put that into 23.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

Deviation now is below 5%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we scroll out so everybody can see what I did.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What we looking at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The Ann Arbor so people can see around Ann Arbor. A little further west there you go. I just broke up Ann Arbor a little differently broke it in four and then tried to bring in that east Asian I'm sorry east Ann Arbor Asian community. Went up into Brighton. And I mean, any comments, thoughts, questions? I'm sure they will be and Brighton will be. Can we run the partisan fairness and see if it makes a difference? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Check the Asian American demographic population in 23.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I did not Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We had comments this morning saying they did not want Ann Arbor split especially four ways. They didn't want it split. I don't know how they were going to keep them on but someone made a comment that they did not want Ann Arbor split.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This plan has the lopsided Madam Chair the lopsided margin is 5.3% in favor of republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The mean median is 2.7% in favor of republicans. The efficiency gap is 4.3 percent in favor of republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Seats to votes ratio is .5% and the democrats have the seats 57-53.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so by comparison the base plan, the lopsided margins is 5.7, we have 5.3 here. The mean median is 2.9 on the base plan we have 2.7 here. The efficiency gap is 5.4 on the base and this is 4.3 here. And then the seats vote is, was 56-51 with a negative 1.4 positive 1.4 lean. This one is 57 over 53 with a negative half percent over positive half percentage favoring republicans. It improved all the metrics which is what I thought it would do Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Lopsided of the mean median again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh bless you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Lopsided margin 5.3% in favor of republicans. Mean median difference MMD, is 2.7% favoring republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Since I do it all the time and the numbers are decent, I believe this map be moved forward to the 45 day public comment period.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion by Commissioner Witjes, seconded by Commissioner Kellom to move this map forward for the 45 day public comment period. Is there any discussion or debate? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well I think we should check more numbers before we do that. We like how we did for the base map we should check 2020, 2018 and 2016 to see what that does. I was going to mention now this configuration of the map is almost identical in partisan fairness measurements to the Pine version five map that we adopted yesterday. So I think we should make that comparison as well to that Pine map before we vote.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair. For clarity can you identify the map name being advanced by motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Magnolia1.1 but prefer to change it if we are going to advance it so I don't know if we do that now or we do that later. General Counsel do we do that now or later the name change or go with Magnolia1.1 for now and change it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is entirely up to the discretion of the Commission and Mr. Stigall may have an opinion on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What the Commission has been doing so far if a plan passes to be published, it gets you know a tree name.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Before we were using names and digits and dates and then as it carried forward so if this passes then I would change it. Otherwise it doesn't matter.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right so do we want to run other numbers or do we want to just go ahead and vote?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: The numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: More numbers so let's do the Trump Biden race. Can we do this or the motion first?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, the individual members have to be recognized to call the question so if you want to recognize the Commissioner Witjes. My comment was going to be you have a motion made by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Kellom on the table to move Magnolia1.1 or what name the Commissioner will choose move the map to 45 day public comment, move that map be published for the 45 day public comment period is on the table and pending.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We should not look at other numbers right now? Is that accurate?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go ahead Commissioner Lett call the question. Commissioner Witjes called the question I thought it was Commissioner Lett. All in favor of advancing this map to the 45 day public comment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Roll call.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there more discussion or debate on the motion.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Are we running the numbers Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel is telling us that is not appropriate at this point.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: To clarify the motion can be withdrawn or amended but what I'm saying as it stands now you have a motion to forward this map to the table so if the Commission would like to do something different, a motion to amend to get more numbers could be made. The motion could be withdrawn. The motion could be modified. There is a variety of options before the Commission at this point. I was merely pointing out that you do have a pending motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: General Counsel wouldn't it be part of discussion if members wanted to compare the numbers prior to the vote?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Lett the Commissioner could certainly continue that conversation if it chose. But the discussion and debate is on the base the actual motion is whether to move the map forward or not. So again talking about the fairness numbers and that might be seen as an extension of the actual motion. But the motion is to adopt not to examine further.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I understand that but I think the discussion from the Commissioners is to take a look at those before the vote. So are you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does anyone object to that? If no one objections I say run the numbers the data is good, right, okay so this is the 2020 election.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2020 election between president Biden and former president Trump. So the lopsided margin is 5% favoring republican. The mean median difference is 2.4% favoring republican. And the efficiency gap is 5.2% favoring republican. And the proportionality bias is 2.3% favoring republicans with the republicans having 56 and the democrat having 54 seats.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay can we look at 2016? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes. Wasn't there a 28? 2016 is Clinton and former president so lopsided margins in 2016 Presidential election.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 5.6.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 5.6 favoring republicans mean median difference 3.7 favoring republicans. Efficiency gap is 9.2%. Favoring republicans. Proportionality

bias was 8.1% favoring republicans with republicans winning having 64 seats and the democrats 46 seats.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay and then can we run the 2018 Whitmer Schuette election? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Lopsided margin 6.4% favor of republicans. The mean median difference is 1.8% favoring republicans. The efficiency gap was .5% favoring republicans. The seats to votes favored the democrats by proportionality bias 5.5% in favor of democrats. Number of seats favor democrats 66-44.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For comparison purposes can we bring up was it Pine three that we advanced? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Pine five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Pine five. I don't think we ran all this analysis on Pine five before we adopted it. We only did the composite so we have more data so can we just is this the composite for Pine five that you have? That would be the only one we had on it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe it is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Composite for Pine five is efficiency gap of 5.3. And let's look at the mean median.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Lopsided margin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I misspoke.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will run it again and have it sitting in front of you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are running this again for Magnolia.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 1.1.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Magnolia 1.1 is above Pine V5 they have the same lopsided margin of 5.3%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Same mean median difference of 2.7%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The efficiency gap is the same for both at 4.3%. And they have the same proportionality bias of .5% favoring the democrats favoring the republicans with the democrats having 57-53 seats for republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we need to see more or they are identical. Any other discussion or debate? Let's go ahead and vote again Mr. Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sorry guys, lot to say today evidently. Getting some laughs, huh? So I just I don't know what the rush is, right. This map whatever we are going to call it it's just a slight improvement over the previous one. So why have both? Right. And my only fear is we are going to keep improving it which we should do try to

keep improving it if we can but we will have a whole bunch of maps what are everyone's thoughts? Are we going to retract Magnolia one and only have this one? Are we going to have both of them? You know in my eyes it's the same map just slightly improved. The data shows it is very slightly improved. It's about .1 to .3 on the...every measure respective of the election years they are in. For example let's just take 2020 Presidential election 5.1 to 5.0. We take the that is for lopsided margins and for efficiency gap wait I'm sorry it goes 5.3 to 5.2 so again that is a .01 change so it's pretty much the same. All of the seats to votes ratios for each election were also the same. So again I just don't know how many maps we want to have. It's just a slight improvement over the previous configuration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton and I can address it. Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well I think this was done for partisan fairness reasons. It does make a very slight change but it does not make a slight change to some of these areas. It's some significant change to a few areas so I don't see the harm in putting it out there and getting public comment on both ways.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not looking at it from a data perspective. I'm looking at it from a community of interest perspective. Ann Arbor now is split three ways. And you really feel that they are going to accept that very well? In Brighton? You may, I don't.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Working there you know spending a lot of time there, yeah, I don't think so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I think Dustin had some concern over Brighton being changed as well. So I'm kind of looking at it from that perspective. And like Anthony indicated you know the numbers are basically the same as one of the other maps. So I think that's what we have to take into account when we vote. That as well as the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So what I would say on that is Pine version five which is the first map we approved does have the same metrics. However, Pine version five does not include the changes to Detroit. So this map includes the changes to Detroit and then alters the Ann Arbor area to achieve the same numbers we originally had with Pine version five. So I think this is an improvement because we are keeping those Detroit changes that the people in Detroit spoke so eloquently about wanting. And also maintaining the partisan fairness balance we had with the Pine version five. So I think this is improvement and it is different and I think it's worthy of submitting to the public for their consideration because I think people wanted changes this Detroit but I think people also want partisan fairness. We've heard about both. So this is giving them both. All right let's vote do you want to do a roll call?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Madam Chair this is Commissioner Wagner, I have a point of clarification because I'm on audio.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: What did we do with Livingston County in the map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It is split.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is the only map we split Livingston County into three. All right Sarah Reinhardt can you go ahead and call the roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting the Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have to say no.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 10 yes to 3 no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. So considering we have adopted moving this forward for the 45 day public comment period I want to rename it hickory. I library it. It's strong. Produces delicious nuts, what is not to like? If you are ever in a survival situation you

want to be someplace with a hickory tree, I will tell you. That is true, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I move EDS lock the districts and renumber them with number one in Detroit and moving up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Witjes and seconded by Weiss to have EDS renumber of one starting with Detroit up to 110 and lock the map after that point. Any discussion or debate on the motion? All right all in favor razor your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Okay, does anyone else have any other house maps they want to propose? If not, I think Commissioner Clark wanted to open up the Senate map cherry. Senate map or.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We only have one Senate map, one we approved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you send him the shape file on yours.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I sent him the file yeah so, I don't know if you want to bring up mind or cherry. Or do you want to do the overlay or not? I can talk to it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would say bring up yours and we can put the cherry overlay on it so people can verify. Just do his? Okay, yeah that works let's do that. Bring it up.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What was the name of that plan?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't know I mailed it over to you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's house, no it's a Senate.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It was Ann Arbor something.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I had to mail it a second time.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do you know what I had not created that plan yet. That is what it was. So I will just create it right now.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Want me to mail it over?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No I have it. I had not imported it. I don't think I did.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Ann Arbor analysis.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It was something like that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's a Senate plan.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me talk to what I'm doing while he is what I did while he is doing that. I took a little differ perspective on things and did not concentrate on the partisan fairness numbers so they are a little higher than what the other plan had. I focused on and in particular I focused on keeping Jackson and Jackson County whole. And that necessitated some major philosophical changes to the map. So I do want to say I -- the way I approached it I copied the cherry map which has already been approved and moved up. I made changes in the Washtenaw County area. The Jackson area and the County that is further west because the approach on cherry was like a horizontal split from Ann Arbor all the way to Marshall. So there is a north-south District. Mine was completely opposite. I went north south split. So the split right you

know from the north to the south. So I'm going to walk up to the TV screen and show you what I changed, why I changed it. I will wait until he loads this. For the public's knowledge I know there have been a lot of comments about Jackson and keeping Jackson whole. We've had this since this map since Tuesday but we just have not gotten back to the Senate plan to approach it. So it's been in our thoughts and as a different alternative to this area. When you get a chance Zoom in to Ann Arbor Washtenaw County, Jackson area.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me change the color of one of those two to see it better District 29. I'm going to change the color.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We are looking at the cherry map is it not? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It is the Ann Arbor map that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Has been approved.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The map you sent me.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The map I sent you did not have Ann Arbor split.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel that is the current configuration.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think it's the current cherry map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Again.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Zoom out and let's see Oakland County. We can tell pretty easily by that. That is cherry.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So let me look at it again because the plan I imported Ann Arbor analysis.shape. Let me see if there is another one. There is an Ann Arbor analysis 11-1. I wonder if that is it. Same day. Okay, you sent it a second time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You were working with me when I sent it the second time.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes. I'm just going to pop in here real quick and see if I can find it looking for it in my e-mails. That was not it. It was not big enough. Yep, here it is. Huh. All right, I will get I've got it, I will.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You can just overlay it over the cherry map. That will be fine.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Doug is my head in the way?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not at all. We enjoy watching you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Oh, my gosh I can duck.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And you look beautiful Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you I'm sleepy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are you having for dinner because the fish sounded good.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Baked chicken and rice and sweet potatoes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I love sweet potatoes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: MC is on his way down.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Come on.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: See you soon.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the file you sent me and I brought it in again.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is not it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is the one you sent me. I went to the e-mail opened the e-mail and downloaded it is it possible I was sent the wrong -- I mean I was sent the wrong map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well let me look at my e-mail hold on.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I got it from the e-mail you sent me, right, he did. You can do that. That would make it very easy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For the public watching we are searching Commissioner Clark is searching for a plan he had prepared a Senate plan with changes in the Ann Arbor area and he is trying to get that over to EDS so they can open it up so everybody can see so we are just waiting for that to happen. Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Would we have to move to allow changing our procedure to allow this if it was inadvertently sent? If Commissioner Clark inadvertently sent the wrong e-mail I wholeheartedly believe he sent an e-mail to election data and the state and everybody but if he didn't and sent the wrong one technically it has to be 24 hours beforehand.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No because it was not posted so we have not been following the posting.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can you hear me? I apologize for that time. Here is what I did. Rebecca's map went from here and westward and was a northeast west split. And so what I did was I took Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and combined them into one District. Okay.

And then I considered District 27 the Jackson District. What I did and how it shows the dividing line is I took the M14 that M14 road which goes north of Ann Arbor and then south towards I-94 and we are at 94 I went west for about a mile and a half to two miles to here. This area right here. And that is the first exit where M14 meets. I considered everything from there basically to the west because that is where it begins to become rural. So it's really like an urban on 29 and a 27 is a rural split. Okay? So it does not directly go down this road. It would have to go a little jagged to get there. It got adjusted because of some population things. So then I went west towards Jackson on the second District which is District 27 and if you Kent could just scan me to the west, bring it over to the west, so here you see Jackson and all of Jackson County together. You see the western part of Washtenaw County. Which if you go back to our first

meeting in May, the first hearing in Jackson, that's one of the major comments they talked about, Jackson and the western part of Washtenaw County being associated together. Okay, so to get the right population I had to continue west just as Rebecca did on the cherry map. All the way to Marshall. And that's where it ended. We have to do the overlay of cherry. I don't know I can't remember if I changed this area or not. But I did or this one up here. But it was because of population if I did. Because it's all rural and all the Townships are much smaller in population. I chose not to go real far south down to the border. Because that was a community of interest that we as a group decided to do. And I know there has been a lot of comments about Jackson and Hillsdale and that is not part of the change that I made. So basically instead of having the split go from here to north and here to south, I did an urban rural split, kept Jackson County together, and the majority of the County where half the County where Marshall is together. To accomplish that objective. So that is the major changes that I made. I had one area I had to go a little bit east to get some of the rural areas on 27 south and east of Ann Arbor but that is towards Saline and that is more rural than it is urban big City area. So I felt it was best associated with 27 and I was able to keep the urban areas and the rural areas separated.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Did you do anything up around Lansing area?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I did not touch that. I believe this is the only area I touched here. Yeah. I did not want to touch Lansing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My only real concern here with this is I get what you are trying to do with the Jackson west side of Ann Arbor. My only concern is that Saline really, I mean it's basically part of Ann Arbor. And I agree that Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti are closely knit but a lot of comments trying to separate the two out.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand about Saline. There is a rural area between Ann Arbor and Saline for I don't know ten miles maybe, whatever it is. But the reason I did that was because once I combined Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, I was at my population limit.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I get that but the two from Ann Arbor to Saline the City itself, the ten mile claim of rural is a little bit of a stretch because I when I worked in Ann Arbor my building was five minutes away from Saline and five minutes away from downtown Ann Arbor.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The reason I did it that way like I said was population. Because when you combine Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor it was at its limit, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I wonder starting with this configuration Dustin do you have an idea of a change that would improve?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, with the objective of keeping Jackson County together.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Not on the top of my head.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you bring up the overlay I sent you from Ann Arbor?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can you relay it off my machine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I did mine very differently from this in a way that I think preserves those Ann Arbor communities without creating everyone backed in from Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and I feel we received abundant comment we did not want that at all and addressing Jackson but at the cost of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti what they requested. I think there is a different way and make more of Jackson on its own without packing Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti into a single District. I'm actually really curious to see the partisan fairness numbers on this because I suspect it made them significantly worse.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It made them higher but I think they are within scope of what we talked about this morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Kent, I sent you it was called cherry version four, it was from 10 I think it was 1031. If you don't have it, I can send it again really quick.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm scrolling down to the State Senate cherry V2 that was published, cherry version four, 1031 version four.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that is it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Ann Arbor area only.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that's it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So I will share this map that Chairwoman. It's this area generally only.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you Zoom out to see.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 Lansing Shiawassee Clinton.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I had to rebalance a few things there. What I ended up doing is taking the very rural Counties between Jackson and Calhoun and putting them, yep, putting them down in 26 that solves the problem you had with too much population and put Jackson with the west side of Ann Arbor in those areas over there and then put the kind of southeasterly part of Ann Arbor with Ypsilanti and Saline and Midland along with a little bit of Tecumseh as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You still have Ann Arbor split in the northern part of Ann Arbor associated with Jackson County.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I did not do it that way. I combined all of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti. So the input I heard back in May and recently this week was Jackson is associated with western part of Washtenaw County but not the Ann Arbor area. So that is why I did it the way I configured it. I guaranty your numbers are higher than what you have done but was focusing on what the people wanted and I would want Bruce's comments on the numbers I've God.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would say that I also heard a lot of comments about Jackson and Ann Arbor and people wanting to be together with that part of Ann Arbor. We

received a lot of comments about it. People saying they travel to Ann Arbor and work in Ann Arbor and live in Jackson and they feel there are a lot of connections there go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I understand what you are going for Jackson County but I'm of the belief that they are not communities of interest because those particular boundaries are lower on the list of what COIs are but that is just how I take it. This configuration I feel is okay.

However, the northern part of Ann Arbor itself is where I have the issues because that's the super affluent area. Although like I said before that doesn't mean too much but they may if you had to go to Ann Arbor, I would draw like a line straight down and grab just like the most western part of Ann Arbor and not go so far on the eastern side of the north side of Ann Arbor. Northeast, I guess.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is why I made the split at the first major exit of 94.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Either configuration works.

It's just how do you want to handle it me the biggest point of contention how do you want to handle Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti if you want to split them, we have to go with the map that goes further west past Jackson that defines Ann Arbor or if you want to put Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti together then this would be a decent way to do it as well. Both are I'm okay with both. It will have to come down to numbers. But you did put a decent effort into I mean a very good effort into communities of interest as we heard from the public but I see both sides of the coin. Both of you did that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's just two different ideas and configurations, yeah.  
Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, so is the problem with the original cherry configuration that the what we had as districts they are numbered 14 and 15 on the portal currently, they go too far east to west? Or that Ann Arbor is split? I thought we determined already that in order to have a fair map Ann Arbor does need to be split. So what are we talking about here is my question? If it is the east-west, if it is how far the District currently goes from east to west, I think this configuration fixes that problem while still keeping Ann Arbor split so it still maintains part sane balance and it does both of those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I think what I was hearing at public comment which caused me to create this map was we were hearing expressions from people in Calhoun who are were rural feeling they did not want to be put in with either honestly Jackson or Washtenaw. And that other map really stretches all the way out to that. So by having this configuration you get to put them with the more rural areas in Branch. Put Jackson into more of a group along with the western edge of Ann Arbor and then keep Ann Arbor split but in a different configuration. See how far it goes over. This way we are putting Calhoun into more rural areas and that was my I was listening to what people were

saying at public comment and accommodate that and come up with a different configuration for them. Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you. Doug, I have a question. On yours I know what you're going for because there has been a lot of comment from Jackson. So is this just a suggested change that you want to make that you want moved for consideration to the 45 days? Or do you plan on submitting another map that has kind of the same configuration? I'm trying to see where you're going with this.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not submitting a personal map, I'm looking at making a change to the collaborative map we previously did. Relative to Calhoun and Jackson I can't recall any comments relative to that. Nor Calhoun and Ann Arbor. I mean off the top of my head without going back to some notes and going through that. But any way my approach was a rural urban split down the line. And keeping Jackson County whole. And incorporating it with the western part of Washtenaw which is what I heard a lot of. So this week and back in May. I also agree that I heard some people from Ann Arbor saying working with Jackson is fine, you know, so.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like to put a motion we move his forward for consideration as like a version two to it since other Commissioners have been able to make changes and have those moved forward. I don't think it's a bad change. There has been public comment on both sides of the fence of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti being a community of interest and we definitely had a lot on the Jackson County so I put forward the motion it be considered also as an alternative.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anyone interested in seconding that?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'll second this is Commissioner Wagner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton jumped in before you did so we have a motion by Commissioner Lange seconded by Commissioner Orton and I just asked Doug to run the partisan fairness numbers so we can see that as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We have Kent bringing them up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I do think this will negatively impact the partisan fairness numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well depends which way you look at it. But I.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It really doesn't. It's a fair map or it's not. There is no like.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We have different opinions on how we read the data. Someday I will tell you a story about data. You will appreciate it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You better start thinking of a map name dude.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Palm.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's not a native Michigan tree but I spent a lot of time in California so and Arizona so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Palm.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If I did not name it palm, I would name it cactus.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Prickly. So we have a lopsided margin of 5.7. That's up from 4.5 on the previous plan. Actually no wait. 4.6 sorry. Then we have what about the mean median is 3.2. Which is up from 1.2 on the previous plan.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I knew the numbers would be up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Efficiency gap, let's see that, 6.1. The seats vote ratio 1919 so negative 2.3% bias against democrats and positive 2.3 in favor of republicans.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to get Bruce's opinion as well on this go ahead.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Efficiency gap for cherry is .3 with democrats with seats votes of 20-18. Efficiency gap 3.4 this is 6.1. So 3.4 was the cherry efficiency gap. This plan is 6.1. And then anything else? Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner what would you like me to opine on?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: In particular the number we did not get the plan deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we close out of the spreadsheet so we can see it or go back to it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is the one I want you to comment on. Okay so it's below five. It's 4.78. So that is in the range.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Deviation 4.78 is very good.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What about the other numbers as far as like the efficiency gap being a little higher than the other than and so forth how do you interpret that?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I will go back to how we advised previously. There are policy choices for the Commission to make about the level of the efficiency gap, the how the seat count works out, what is the margin of that. Constitution does not have specific requirements for that. The Constitution doesn't say that the efficiency gap has to be a certain number or the mean median difference has to be a certain number. So that is part of the conversation that will be on going with today, tomorrow and the end of December. Our advice has been that the Constitution does not require that there be a certain number, that the Commission has a lot of leeway in deciding how far do you want to go, what number is acceptable to the Commission as a body. That our concern has always been that the numbers reflect like for example the numbers reflect that you're using the four approved measures that Dr. Handley used, that the courts have approved to guide your decision. Not that one is necessarily has more weight than another, Constitution doesn't say that. So there are a lot of policy choices to make. And we've recognized that. I'm sure that you've recognized that. But we are not going to say that one is better than the other or should be adhered to the Constitution doesn't say that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My opinion is, the numbers are higher than what the other plan had. However, they fell in line with what the conversation was with

Dr. Handley. So they didn't deviate above those. So I felt they were acceptable where they are at.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark to your point I think if there was a number that was so outlandishly beyond the range we would talk. If you did a plan deviation of 15%, we would weigh on that. It's the same here. That the if there were a number that were outside the range, we would mention that. But these are choices that the Commission will be making whether as I said today, tomorrow and into December about how far the body, the majority. Chooses to go.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll just close then. I know we have a motion on the table. But I feel this gives Jackson a different alternative to comment on as well as Ann Arbor. And if we promote them this promote this map along with cherry, we will get more feedback in the next 45 days and we will just evaluate that as we get it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I certainly agree. Putting out having alternatives and General Counsel and I have advertised before is a very good best practice. You will be getting comments. Having alternatives I think is a great way.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay I yield back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Kent can you show us the democrat graphics for District 29 now? I think can we see what the two Ann Arbors are 29 I want to see what the demographics are on that. 13%.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 29 is that on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 29% minority. All right so I would just say on this map I don't have a problem -- with the configuration so there would be that alternative option for people in that area as well. So we have a motion on the table. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Commissioner Kellom then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Just in general I think our Senate maps could do a little more tweaking in Detroit, not that I despise any of them in particular but I would like some enhancements done there so if anything that would be why I would not necessarily advance this one, that's all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think we are getting to the point where we are adopting too many maps to go on to this next. I have been pretty consistent in this feeling because these maps they do have the potential, right to be randomly selected but I the Secretary of State or possibly change how we vote in our range preference voting. And I think what is...I don't understand what this is really about.

I thought it was about making it so that the Jackson District 2927 did not go like further east to west. But looking at it, it seems it's actually about not splitting up Ann Arbor which I don't agree with because we already had established that in order to pass a fair map, a map that both contributes to communities of interest and contributes to partisan fairness that is what needs to be done. So and I think Commissioner Szetela's overlay does that. Because Jackson doesn't go as far west into Calhoun. So personally the

map to me isn't a fair map. And because it's not a fair map it's much more unfair than the other map I can't personally support it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm concerned about the communities of color that are in the Ann Arbor area and Jackson area particularly. I think, yeah. But I also recognize that we may not have a significant majority to work with. And I think we tried to split and make an Ann Arbor area with the Asian population recognizing that Asian population and it's not when they are all packed together, I should not use the word packed sorry when they are altogether then it's still 29% so under a packing threshold.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point Commissioner yes that is clearly well below a packing threshold. As you recall that there are several factors in evaluating what you raise. You have a majority minority District. You have a coalition District which is not a majority minority District. It's a minority plurality District. You have influence districts where the minority population is not numerous enough or not cohesive enough to control the outcome of the election however they may influence the outcome of the election. So there are lots of ways to look at this. I mean typically if you have minority populations in the ten% range or 15% that is usually a total minority population. Usually too low to effect influence or control. But in my career, I've seen minorities with as low as 30% control the outcome in the District so really, it's a District by District geography by geography calculation. But keep in mind that influence District calculation if that is something that you wish to pursue, that is different of course than the coalition and different majority minority.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I did have my hand up. I was in response to what Brittini said. Do you want to make some changes to this Senate map? Or a Senate map to improve it? We are almost out of time so I'm wondering when we can do that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I was trying to kind of sketch something now so I could have a more guided conversation but I would prefer to use the cherry version two Chair Szetela's map then we can examine neighborhoods to try and do that. But, yeah, that would be my suggestion. If not, I can submit my own version on Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: My concern is the metrics on this map. We had other maps on whenever it was, we discussed the Senate Monday, Tuesday I don't remember. We had the Elm map and the Spruce map we specifically rejected because their metrics performed poorly. And so this map is equivalent to the Elm map with identical partisan fairness features and I realize it's not our priority it is in our constitutional ranked criteria. So I'm just concerned about this 1919 seats votes a 6.1 efficiency gap, and you know those are the ones that really concern me because I think while I understand what you're trying to do I think we can do the same thing with the configuration I had without coming up with a map that is not, that is not partisan fair.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Again communities of interest out rank partisan fairness and since we have been debating this for a while can we just call the question, please?

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't think the discussion is over yet. I think we are discussing and should not end prematurely. If people have more things to say then people have more things to say.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: She called the question.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm calling for point of order.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You can't do that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: For discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we can go ahead and vote. That is fine. Sarah, would you we are going to do a roll call vote like we have been doing all afternoon.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Madam Chair point of order how about from my understanding of rules of parliamentary procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner or General Counsel we are going to need you to weigh in on this.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If there was a motion to close debate or close discussion that would be appropriate. But I don't think you can just unilaterally close discussion just because I mean we are discussing. And I don't think it's time to end the discussion.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: A motion to end debate takes away the privileges of members of the body and must be adopted by a two thirds vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That answers the question so if someone says they call the question does that end debate because someone says I call the question was the question. The question was does calling the question end debate and I'd sounds like no you have to have a motion. Is there any further discussion or debate? Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Motion and debate.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Second.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I was just waiting. I understand your concern about the partisan fairness numbers. And I told you up front that they were going to be higher than yours. However, I mean listening to Bruce they are acceptable from the standards and they are not as low as some people may want. But they are acceptable within the standards that Bruce communicated about as well as what Dr. Handley told us previously. Like Rhonda says, communities of interest is higher than partisan fairness. So I think that needs to weigh this too. A lot of our emphasis is driving down the numbers. And I took a different approach to it as I'm listening to the citizens of the Jackson area and the Jackson County, I felt this is more appropriate way to go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett is there any debate on that? Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The plan we had up there had a lower deviation I imported it and there is a higher deviation we have been looking at previously.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You're talking about Commissioner Clark.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Clark plan. So I think we should take a moment and.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's even higher is that what you're saying.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No, it may be different.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It may be different.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The geography may not have transferred and something may be going on here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's take a vote on the motion to end debate. Do we need to do a roll call again? For goodness sake Sarah, I'm just working you today. Can we do a roll call on the motion to end debate.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is there discussion on the motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I already said that and nobody raised their hand.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I raised my hand there is no discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, it's a two third vote of the Commission so it would be nine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Importing it the geography issue again we have negative unassigned people so I'm going to export it and nothing is unassigned. Actually a negative number means something was double assigned. So it's always dealing with the geography issues. And seems to be the problem.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Are we ready to vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think so and voting on the motion to end debate.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion to end the debate with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of nine to four nine yes four no the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so now we get to vote on the motion to advance right now it's listed as Senate version three Ann Arbor analysis.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Clark had labeled this prior to now palm.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Palm, okay.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: So is that the will of the body to rename this palm?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we are going to wait until we decide whether it's moving forward or not. So the motion before the body of this point is whether to advance the palm map forward for the 45 day public comment period. And again Ms. Reinhardt if we can do a roll call on that I would appreciate it.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you have a comment?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No I'm sorry I keep for getting to put it down.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Steve Lett.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of eight yes to five no the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right so at this point we can rename it palm.

Commissioner Witjes did you want I know what you were going to do.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Make a motion to have EDS lock the districts and renumber the districts starting with number one in Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And okay all right so do we have a second? Commissioner Weiss. Motion by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Weiss to direct EDS to renumber the districts from 1-38 starting with one in Metro Detroit and 38 in the Upper Peninsula and lock the districts once that occurs. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All right. Once we get that done, I want to offer the alternative maps because I think it's accomplishing what he is trying to accomplish without so can we open up the cherry the one that was published? Cherry version two? General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Please excuse the interruption did you call for the no votes on that last vote?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry I didn't. All opposed please say nay. The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted. I'm sorry. It's getting late.

So let's see if we can do this really quick. So can we open up cherry version two or actually, no, you are right. Make a copy.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Exactly we can't modify that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Make a copy.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Copy of the plan. And we will just leave it and take that off.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Leave it as a copy for now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Leave it just like that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: See if it gets moved. And then if you can just bring in as a shape file that Ann Arbor only area, where did it go? Where did it go? Autobound edge works in mysterious ways a times.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was hitting sort and didn't mean to sort.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Bring it in as a layer because that should make the changes pretty quick. That Ann Arbor only, there it is cherry and I just saw it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Where.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go down a little bit and I thought I saw it on your list. Maybe up. I swore I just saw it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me load it in again. I'm sorry I'm losing it. What was the plan again? Cherry V2.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Cherry but Ann Arbor only it was on the list I saw it. It was on the list. You are just kind of moving fast. There it is Ann Arbor only, that's it. And if we can just go in. And just start adjusting.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Follow the.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Follow the blue lines so 22 is going to be expanded a little bit because we are taking off part of 22.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to do 22.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will start and you let me know if I'm doing it correctly or not doing it correctly. We will go down and now we will take that area 14.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is always the area where it screws up but we will see. We might just have to rebuild it. Okay that little line. Autobound edge.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 15 this will all be 15.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Milan.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You accidentally grabbed a little part outside and I don't know if it will make a difference.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Where?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There are two of them. You can just leave them. I think it's going to be fine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I want to get it right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There is one outside, one that's not in. See that little block there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was doing it by precincts and this corner the precinct is cutoff.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: On the right side you went over a little bit if you can Zoom back into Milan. See the little green sliver right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is one of those geography glitches.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep. Showing a little spot of 22 in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area will be 17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it all will be 17. The one in 17 put in 17 and the other one assign it to 18.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All this to 16?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All that to 16. I think that is everything if we can check for plan errors. I see one that says it's over by 6,000 so we may have something in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is nothing unassigned or does not appear to be unassigned.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just check for plan errors because this is Ann Arbor. So can we run the partisan fairness on this? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes. So the partisan fairness measures first up is the lopsided margins. This plan has a 4.5% favoring margin. Favoring republicans. Mean median difference is 1.2% favoring republicans. Efficiency gap of 3.3 favoring republicans. And the seats to vote ratio proportionality is .3 in favor of the democrats and the democrats seat count is 20-18 for republican.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so it's virtually identical to the original cherry plan the lopsided on the original cherry was 4.6 this is 4.5. The mean median was 1.2 this is also 1.2 efficiency gap on the original cherry is 3.4 this is 3.3 so functionally the same. Seats vote was 20-18 with a .3 democrat negative .3 republican this is also the exact same thing 2018 same balance. So and again I just feel this offers a way to sort of address some of the comments we got about the rural areas west of Jackson, while still maintaining that community of interest and western portions of Ann Arbor and then maintaining that split for better partisan fairness in Ann Arbor which we received hundreds of comments basically saying they wanted to be split and they encourage that split. So and again just offers a different configuration from the very long Districts that are stacked on top of each other.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think this is a good alternative to look at and see what the public says.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So is that a motion Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I will put a motion forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's 20 to 7 is that a motion?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Clark and second by Commissioner Lett is there any discussion or debate on the motion. Go ahead Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree with everything you just said. I think this does both support communities of interest and supports partisan fairness. I don't look at these as either or issues. I think you can do both. I think this map does that not bringing District 14 all the way into Calhoun County.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If before we brought this forward if Commissioner Kellom wanted to look at any Detroit changes she had mentioned like not if we don't have time right now tomorrow morning.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I doubt we will have time. So I will wait, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think I appreciate what Commissioner Orton is saying let's make sure we get it right so we may have to do it tomorrow. I think we are all tired and it would be hard to do this right now. I think. So let's talk a little bit about tomorrow. Let's talk about what we do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I apologize.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any further debate or discussion on the motion? All right all in favor of advancing this map copy of cherry V2 to the 45 day public comment period we are going to do a roll call, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I was building suspense.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm a little confused.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Voting to advance this for the 45 day period.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Wait on Brittini?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, she said no.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: She is not going to try to touch it up anymore?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think they are gone.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Just one moment, Commissioner Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you. No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 11 yes to two no the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. I would like to rename this map Lyndon. And it's a wonderful native Michigan tree known as the bee tree because it produces a wonderful nectar and causes it to be surrounded with bees in the springtime.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Terrible.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I move that EDS lock the districts and renumber 1-38 starting in Detroit and in the UP.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Weiss any discussion or debate on the motion? And Kent it's Linden. I can tell that is what you were looking at me for.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I just didn't want to do it wrong.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: All right all in favor of having EDS renumber the districts from 1-38 starting with one in the Detroit area and looking the map please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. All opposed please raise your hand and say nay? Okay the ayes prevail and the motion is adopted. So here is where we are at. We have it's quarter to 7 we have a couple of we have a couple of maps approved. We have more work to do tomorrow. I don't think we are going to continue deliberations tonight because I think everybody is tired so we don't have any minutes to approve. We do have two sets. Hold on what are the numbers because they are not on my list. October 20, I got to look in my e-mail. Hold on. The proposed Detroit hearing from October 20, 2021, is that right? So any changes to the proposed minutes from the Detroit public hearing October 2021?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Move for adoption.

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 WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motioned by Lett and second by Witjes to adopt meeting minutes from October 20, 2021, any discussion or debate on the motion. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. Opposed raise your hand and say nay. All right the ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted and meeting minutes from the Lansing public hearing from October 21, 2021, entertain a motion to entertain the minutes. Motion bid Lett and seconded by Witjes are there amendments discussion or debate on the adoption of the hearing minutes hearing none we have motion to adopted the Lansing public hearing minutes from October 21, 2021, all in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted.

Okay at this point we do not have any staff reports. Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Move to adjourn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can I ask Michigan Department of State if they have any updates first? Okay can we have a motion to adjourn motion to adjourn by Commissioner Witjes second by Commissioner Lett any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the meeting is adjourned at 6:50 p.m. Thank you, everybody.