

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

12/16/21 10:00 am Meeting

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

>> Rebecca can you give me a thumbs up if you can hear me.

Test, one, two, test.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Test, one, two.

Test one two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning, everybody.

Good morning everyone could we quiet down, please.

When I say all right you say okay, all right, when I say okay you say all right, okay?

Yeah!

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, everyone, and good morning.

As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:05 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.gov](mailto:Redistricting.gov) or details for 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 on the [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 the [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) website 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: Hi Commissioners can you hear me okay?

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe Ms. Reinhardt is remote and are going to take the roll or are you going to do it?

>> I will do roll call.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> Hold on just one second. Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please share you are attending remotely and as well as your physical location you are attending from.

Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

Commissioner Curry I believe you are still muted.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

Rhonda is present by phone but looks like she is experiencing some technical difficulties right now.

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

Cynthia Orton?

MC Rothorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

Erin Wagner?

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

>> Thank you.

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> 11 Commissioners are present, thank you.

We have a quorum.

CHAIR SZETELA: As a reminder to the public watching You can view the agenda at [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC).

I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved.  
Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn. Is there discussion or debate on the motion?

All in favor raise hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Without objection we will now begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics portion of our meeting.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is Sarah Reinhardt with MDOS. And we have Commissioner Lange on the line. Can you let us know where you are attending remotely from?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. 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.

And just to orient the people who are online today we have at this point approximately 50 people in person for in person public commentary that typically would take us a little over an hour to get through so just to give the people who are online sort of a timeframe of when we might move to online it will be about an hour from now. First in line to provide public comment is number one you are free to address the Commission.

>> My name is Sarah Howard. I represent the AFLCIO fair maps project. This is obviously your last meeting before you vote on the maps. And the state Constitution does not layout the mechanics of how you are to do that. It is up to you.

And it is obviously an incredibly important part of what you're going to be doing.

You must decide on the process today.

The last thing you want is to show up the day of the vote and not have clarity as to how the voting is going to work.

The maps for the next decade should be decided on a clear predetermined and open process.

Your staff have drafted documents to help clarify how this will work but that document includes important questions for you to consider before adopting it and need to discuss this in detail today and come to final agreement and has to include what days you are going to meet in the next two weeks.

If you have to stay after 2:00 today, that is what you must do.

This needs clarity and not chaos as you are picking the next map.

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.

Thank you.

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

>> Good morning. I'm Crystal Boyd, assistant to Sarah Howard. All 15 of your maps disproportionately and unconstitutionally favor the political party, the test across all maps, 52 favor the same political party.

This is not a matter of opinion.

It's an objective, quantifiable fact based on your own data.

However, at this point you're choosing from a limited set of options.

Here are some objective facts about those options.

On your four metrics, Linden is the least unfair of your collaborative Senate maps.

On your four metrics and according to plan score Hickory is the least unfair of your collaborative house maps.

Michigan AFLCIO cannot endorse any maps because they all fail the constitutional requirement for partisan fairness.

But they are the least bad options on a menu of bad and mediocre choices.

Palm is the most biased map.

On every single metric of partisan fairness in either direction out of all 15 maps you have drawn across all chambers and across individual and collaborative maps.

Thank you.

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

>> Good morning.

I am Erica Bryant and live and work in the City of Detroit.

I ask the Commission to take more time to ensure that the maps are fully representative of the racial economic and community dynamics of the City that I love.

And to invest more time building equity and fairness in these maps which will guide our electoral process over the next ten years.

Although you have worked hard, the current maps do not achieve this.

The Michigan Constitution demands more.

Two factors that should guide your decision making which are particularly important to me and my community are one compliance with the Voting Rights Act. And, two, maintaining communities of interest when the benefit is for multiple communities.

The Congressional maps submitted under name of Detroit Delta known as map 6836 Kellom Senate map and promote the map vote are most important to me and my community.

Thank you for your time.

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

I'm sorry number four.

>> Good morning.

My name is Sharon Wilson.

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.

And I am here this morning to request that the Commission takes the additional time to refine the maps so that majority minority districts in adherence to the VRA communities of interest and partisan fairness complement one another and not work against others as displayed in the current maps.

I recommend, please, look at the Chatum map IDF6834, the Kellom Senate map and Hickory Handle 11 house map IDP2940 to garner the essence of what fair maps look like.

We implore you to extend the 45-public comment period to go back to the drawing board to create maps that are equitable and fair.

We want fair maps.

We deserve fair maps.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

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

>> Good morning.

I'm Sylvia Sims and a resident of Metro Detroit community for most of my life.

I'm coming to you as an African/American citizen wanting to express my concern about the fairness in which you are redrawing these maps.

Current maps prior to prop two gerrymandered the districts where African/Americans and other minority communities could not and did not have equal representation.

So my ask is for you all to properly do your job to ensure that our community receives the electoral representation that is fair and is just.

Otherwise, there really would have been no need to have this Commission.

We could have just left things the way they were.

So the maps that I'm asking you to consider are the Chatum map, which is map number F6834, the Kellom Senate map, the promote the vote maps ID number 01655, 01659, 06250 and the Hickory Handle 11 map, IDP9240.

The house map for the Senate is totally right now unacceptable so bottom line we are asking you to look at these maps to make sure that they represent a majority minority community.

And take them back to the drawing board until they are done correctly.

Thank you for your time.

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

>> My name is Michael Wise and live in Oakland County for over 20 years. The Commission has not created partisan fairness and needs to create and choose the fairest maps. As the Commission knows from their own analysis, every map still has a measurable republican bias.

For the Senate Linden is the best in terms of partisan fairness.

Palm has the highest republican bias of all the draft proposals.

The Commission must vote no on Palm.

All the house maps still have too much republican bias.

The Commission should work to improve the house map.

Of the options available, Hickory is fairest according to the partisan fairness measures and has the most majority Black districts.

The alternative Magnolia and Pine drafts are worse than Hickory.

Chestnut is the best of the maps but still republican leaning. The current revised version of the maps still lean right giving republicans an unfair advantage.

All the Commission's draft maps would give republicans an advantage.

The maps still need revisions to be considered fair maps the Commission needs to prioritize partisan fairness.

Thanks for all you are doing.

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

>> Number seven is here.

>> Hello, everybody. My name is Mark. I'm the chairman for the Midland County Board of Commissioners and here on behalf of the community of voices called Gladwin, Midland united.

Today I'm representing over 600 voices from Gladwin, Midland united who signed an online petition of support for the Lange Congressional map or a modified version of the Apple and Birch maps that reflects keeping Midland County whole and connected to Gladwin County.

Numerous voices from County and City leadership to citizens from both Counties have individually made public comments, made map portal comments, sent e-mails and sent letters via the U.S. mail and still we have seen no response from you to take action to correct this injustice.

Please put Midland in the District where it belongs and read this position that explains why it is so important to keep Gladwin and Midland County together.

Thank you for your time. And I am speaking on behalf of all of our board of Commissioners, all seven Commissioners, thank you again.

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

>> My name is Joe and I'm proud to join with more than 600 residents who signed the petition urging the Commission to keep Gladwin and Midland in the same Congressional District.

As the Drain Commissioner, I'm uniquely qualified to speak on behalf of the watershed connecting Midland and Gladwin Counties and can confidently say Midland and Gladwin Counties in their entirety are best served by being put in the same Congressional District.

We share similar needs from the Federal Government and our voices are stronger together.

Now we are all here together in unity the Gladwin Midland united voices asking you to support the Lange Congressional map or a modified version of the Apple and Birch maps that reflects keeping Midland County whole and connected to Gladwin County.

Thank you.

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

>> My name is Tim. I'm the supervisor for the Township.

I'm speaking on behalf of our colleagues in Gladwin County.

Our Township was hit hard during the 20 flooding and dam failure.

As the crisis unfolded partners in Midland and City of Midland were essential in helping us get through the debris management. They opened up their City landfill for our debris at no charge.

This disaster highlights how important having a unified voice in Washington is for our community.

I'm asking to keep Gladwin and all of Midland County together to support Lange or just that keep Midland and Gladwin County altogether with the City,

Apple or Birch maps. Thank you.

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

>> Number ten.

>> That is okay. My name is Kathy and I'm one of the 600 plus voices of Gladwin Midland united asking you to support the Lange Congressional map or to adjust the Apple or Birch maps to keep Gladwin and Midland in the same Congressional District. I've been watching your hearings and it's the same five or so partisan voices from the City of Midland that continue to argue for a split Midland County.

They are not the majority.

Instead of listening to a few partisan individuals I would ask you to listen to the community.

The more than 600 people republicans and democrats who came together once they learned of your plans.

In fact, it's only taken four days once the Gladwin Midland leadership team informed the community and people are still signing.

Keep Gladwin and Midland in the same Congressional District and I would like to turn this in so that the Commission can see the petition signatures that have been collected to date and will turn in a complete list before your December 28 vote.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

You can hand that over to our General Counsel on the end here or Yvonne.

I want to note for the record it's 10:23 and Commissioner Orton has arrived and is now in attendance.

Number 11.

>> My name is Nancy. I live in East English Village in Detroit. And my neighborhood was excited about this process and took it seriously and submitted a bunch of maps to try to keep our community of interest together with our neighborhood and the



surrounding neighborhoods because so we could continue to work together for the good of Detroit.

We submitted, and I do appreciate that the current Senate maps do -- did make changes that keep our neighborhoods together and I do appreciate that.

But I was shocked that the house maps two out of three are worse than the current politicized District so far as keeping community of interest together.

And the Magnolia and Hickory maps, I'll show you this, they split my neighborhood right down the middle.

And right on my street they split it and split the two neighboring communities away from each other also.

Whereas, the Pine map respects keeping us together.

They keep east English village together and Cornerside and Warner side. We work together for economic development and betterment of all our residents. So we really urge you to, if you need to improve it, okay, but keep the concept of the Pine map.

Keep that and reject the maps that tear our communities apart.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for sharing that.

Number 12.

>> Hi, hello. My name is Mary. I live in Huntington Woods, Michigan. I want to commend you on all the hard work you're doing because I cannot imagine what this job must be like.

Several of us are here today to talk about Royal Oak Township.

We understand it's very difficult for you to delve into each community in our state and understand each community's own unique history.

Of all the collaborative maps, however, Royal Oak Township has been split between two House Districts.

This is a Township in south Oakland County, just north of Detroit.

It's only .55 square miles.

It's an area...and has a population of less than 2500 people.

In 1833 Royal Oak Township was established as a 36 square mile civil Township.

Beginning in 1921 various parcels of the original 36 square miles were annexed to form what is now nine cities in South Oakland County, leaving the Township with just slightly over a half square mile. Or to put it in other terms, 13 blocks, one traffic light.

Please don't split this Township as you have on all of your State House maps.

It should be considered the quintessential definition of a community of interest.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 13, Nina Abrams.

>> Good morning, Nina Abrams from Huntington Woods. Linden, Hickory and Birch are the fairest maps. Fair maps create equitable representation. They influence who wins elections, who considers what laws, and who says when they are passed.



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

We have a diverse electorate and a Michigan backlash against people of color.

Michigan citizens rely on you for voting protection.

Your task is difficult.

You have drawn reasonably fair maps for the State Senate and Congress.

But the State House maps need reworking badly.

The eight mile road boundary between Wayne and Oakland has served their voting communities well.

Horizontal shaped districts for these Oakland, Wayne areas will better serve Michigan.

For example, Royal Oak Township is now divided into two parts, which is (inaudible).

And the least objection is Hickory. And I want to thank you very much for your service and time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 14.

>> Good morning.

My name is Wanita. I was born and raised in the charter Township of Royal Oak. And I'm here to let the Commission know that I do not want Royal Oak Township, charter Township split in your House District maps.

I thank you for your consideration.

Have a good day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 15.

>> Good morning. My name is Dana Hill and I'm from the City of Crain Woods, Detroit.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to speak to the redistricting process.

Detroit, Flint and other communities of the color across the state have suffered under the last 20 years because of the representative have never been in the majority because the maps has been rigged for the opposite party.

Racial justice and partisan fairness go hand in hand.

You need to do better on both.

Of the maps submitted, the Linden State Senate and the Hickory State Senate, State House map do the best in both areas.

Although Hickory is your best State House map, all the State House maps lean to republican.

Please reopen the map process, the mapping process. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 16.

>> Hi. My name is Stephen from Detroit, Michigan.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to speak on the redistricting process.

Detroit, Flint and other communities of color across the state have suffered under the last 20 years because of the representatives have never been in the majority because the maps have been rigged for the opposite party.

Racial injustice and partisan fairness go hand in hand.

You need to do better on both.

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.

Both of the maps submitted, Cherry State Senate and Hickory State House map do the best in both areas.

Although Hickory is your best state map, it leans republican.

Please reopen the mapping process. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 17.

>> Hello, my name is Marvin Hart. I'm from Detroit, Michigan.

I want to thank you for providing me the opportunity to speak on the redistricting process.

The Voting Rights Act is meant to help voters of color elect representatives of their choice so that those representatives can make a difference in the legislature, cracking Black communities and tilting the playing field to republican fail on both counts.

Despite this I favor the Cherry State Senate map and the Commissioner Szetela State House map.

Please pick the maps that follow the Black communities to have a chance at being in the majority and the state legislature.

Although Szetela map is your best State House map, it still leans republicans.

Please reopen the mapping process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 17.

>> Sorry 18.

>> Do we have number 18? Gicarto.

>> Good afternoon.

My name is Gircarto from the home City of Detroit, Michigan.

And thank you for providing working class people like me the opportunity to speak on the redistricting process.

I want to speak in favor of the Cherry State Senate map and the Commissioner Szetela's State House map.

These maps score well on the partisan fairness metrics and well provided both parties with a chance to win a majority in the state legislature.

Please do not adopt the Palm State Senate map as it packs democrat voters together in the Washtenaw County.

Folks in the Metro Detroit area have for too long been packed into safe democrat seats.

Please don't adopt maps that continue to do this.

Thank you for the next decades, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 19.

>> Hi. My name is Clarence Hayes from Detroit east side. Thank you for providing working people like me the opportunity to speak on the redistricting process.

Voting Rights Act is meant to help voters of color elect representatives of their choice so that those representatives can make a difference in the legislature.

Cracking Black communities and tilting the playing field towards the republican party fail on both counts.

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.

Despite this I favor the Linden State Senate map and the Commissioner Szetela State House map.

Please pick the maps that allow the Black community to have a chance at being in the majority in the state legislature. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 20.

>> Hi. My name is Derrick and I'm from Detroit.

Thank you for providing me with Wayne County resident opportunity to speak on the redistricting process for decades.

Michigan has rigged elections on systems which one party and not the other one can regularly lose elections and win control of Government.

You must do everything in your power to fix the system.

Please vote for the map that gets closest to the partisan fairness, which are the Cherry for the State Senate and Hickory for the State House.

Although Hickory is your best State House map, they are leaning republicans.

Please consider reopening the mapping process.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 21.

>> Good morning.

My name is Natalie. I'm a native Detroiter and lived in Southeast Michigan for over 30 years.

I'm an active member in the Warrendale, Coty, Rouge and Aviation subdivision community associations.

The NAACP and the Detroit Alumni Association of Delta Sorority Incorporated.

I'm asking the Commission to review the following fair and equitable maps: The Congressional map submitted under the name of the Detroit Deltas, map IDF6834. The Kellom Senate map. The promote the vote maps and the next vote Hickory Handle 11 map, map IDP9240.

That improves upon all the maps offered by the Commission.

I recommend that the MICRC use the Hickory Handle 11 map as a template to improve on the previously submitted maps by the Commission.

All the other maps submitted by the Commission for public review do not meet the VRA and VAP standards of our community.

I look forward to you adhering to the communities recommendations.

Thank you for listening to my opinions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 22.

>> Thank you.

Good morning, I am Dr. Deborah Hunter. I'm an active member in the Boston Edison community.

I am the Detroit Public Schools Community School District Vice President.

And I'm a member of Delta Sorority Incorporated Detroit Alumni Chapter.

My focus this morning is on social and economic disparities.

Of course, educational disparities and inequities.

Detroit, Flint and other communities of color across the state have been denied their full political voice in Lansing and in Washington by illegal racial gerrymandering that has resulted in Black school districts experiencing significant funding and resource gaps. The impact of COVID-19 on education and the shift to remote, and the shift to go to remote and digital learning has further exacerbated our educational disparities for Black children.

Please, please do the right thing.

Support the Delta maps, the Kellom maps and other maps that you will hear about from other ladies in red.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 23.

>> Hi. My name is Josh and I'm from West Bloomfield District 11.

I oppose the Apple map due to the fact that it separates Commerce Township from West Bloomfield to communities of interest and share many commonalities.

Chestnut and Birch, I prefer Birch because Farmington is not split in the map like Chestnut Novi are with the Bloomfield area and important to keep them together.

However, I believe the Commission needs to take more time and improve the house maps in an effort to reduce the level of partisanship that is currently present and bring more fairness.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 24.

>> Good evening.

I'm a student and I've lived in Michigan whole life and plan to spend the rest of my life here. I'm from Commerce Township and I have a problem with the Apple map and how it separates Commerce Township and West Bloomfield.

Growing up my family and friends consider Commerce Township an extension of West Bloomfield, which is why I don't think it's a good idea to split them up as districts.

I think it's unfair to the community of Commerce Township of not taking into account what they want.

Everyone I know from Commerce Township has a problem with the Apple map.

And that's why I prefer the Birch map because it keeps Commerce and West Bloomfield together.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 25.

>> Good morning. My name is Morgan Johnson from Redford. Thank you, regular folks, like me for the opportunity to speak on this redistricting process.

I want to speak in favor of Cherry State Senate map and the Hickory State House map.

These two maps score well on partisan fairness metrics and will provide both parties with a chance to win a majority in the state legislature.

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.

Please do not adopt the Palm State Senate map as it is an unjust map.

Although Hickory is your best State House map, all the State House maps lean republican.

Please reopen the mapping process.

And also on that note, on both sides of the aisle we need to pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Act.

So everyone here should be able to vote.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 26.

>> Good morning.

My name is Wayne from the City of Detroit, retired from 91. Thank you for providing us the opportunity to speak on the redistricting process and want to speak in favor of Linden and Hickory State House map.

These two maps score well in the partisan fairness metrics and will provide both parties with a chance to win a majority in the state legislature.

Please do not adopt the Palm state map biased as one of the partisan.

Hickory is the best State House all the State House maps lean republican and please reopen the map process.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 27.

>> Hello. My name is Ronald Junior from Detroit, Michigan.

Thanks for providing working folks like me the opportunity to speak on this redistricting process.

I want to speak in favor of Cherry State Senate map and Hickory State House.

Please do not adopt the Palm State Senate map as biased towards one of the major parties.

Although Hickory is your best State House map, they all still lean republican.

Please consider reopening the mapping process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 28.

>> Hello, Jennifer Austin, City of Midland.

The Midland republican machine is trying a last-ditch effort to influence this fair process. It feels a little, I don't know, arrogant to me they thought they could attend one hearing, make a few statements and expect the MICRC to do their bidding.

Especially when so many of us at the grass roots level have been working diligently alongside the MICRC to create fair districts for Midland and the state for months.

Republicans have the money and connections.

We on the grass roots level do not.

We can't take out a full page ad in the paper or call a press conference because we are average citizens who don't represent large corporations or wealthy political machines and don't need to circulate a petition because we made voices heard with a thousand

comments online and in person with the constitutional structure like all individual citizens.

You have seen my data and know it's far more than five partisans commenting. It's easy to click a button and sign a petition.

It takes more work to form a comment.

We support the MICRC and implore the acquisitions of gerrymandering by the very people who gave us gerrymandering maps for decades.

We support the Chestnut map and the Linden map for reuniting the Tri-Cities in Mid-Michigan.

We ask you continue work on the partisan fairness of the Hickory map giving Midland zero political bias District and Flint, the two VRA districts they asked for.

Thank you for all your historic work and giving us fair maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 29.

>> Good morning, thank you, Commissioners.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead, sir.

>> Good morning. Thank you, Commissioners.

I'm Chris, independent voter resident of Midland County.

I know you heard a lot of complaining regarding Midland.

The schemers have been whining and misleading in every forum they can to spread misinformation.

Midland and Gladwin Counties are historically linked is flatly untrue.

Second, that Midland and Gladwin drainage entities could not operate across jurisdictions is a phony argument.

I own a farm in Midland with a major drain through it.

The affluent goes where most drainage goes, Saginaw County.

The Counties of Midland, Gratiot and Saginaw are in harmony to improve the drains.

It gives reps with no loyalty to the people fair districts will have closer races and motivate the winner to work cooperatively for all their constituents.

Unrig elections, please reunite the Tri-Cities.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 30.

>> I'm from Livonia.

I want to speak in favor of the Linden State Senate map and the Hickory State House map.

These two score well on the partisan fairness metrics.

And are close to ensuring that the party that wins the most votes wins the most seats.

Please do not adopt the Palm State Senate map as unfair map.

Hickory might be your best State House map but all the State House maps lean republican.

Please reopen the mapping process to make things fair.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 31.

>> My name is Dallas. I live in Berkeley.

I rise to comment on the proposed maps because the redistricting process is important. These maps will be in place for the next ten years and will affect our lives.

As far as the Congressional map, I strongly support the Birch map.

It's a Congressional map with the least, with the best partisan fairness.

In considering the Senate maps, I prefer the Linden map. It's closer to 50/50 than anything I've seen.

Please do not consider the Palm map.

It's the worst of the maps.

All of your house maps lean to the right, benefitting the republicans. However, the Hickory map is the least bad of the house maps and that is why I support Hickory.

And thanks for all your work on this process.

I appreciate it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 32.

>> Good morning. My name is Uvette Anderson and representing Wayne County Community College District. And I'm a member of Delta Sorority Incorporated Detroit Alumni Chapter.

Wayne County Community College District represents 43 communities. Three of the campuses are located in the City of Detroit.

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: With everyone else talking, it's very difficult for us to hear the speaker. So we would like to do a couple of housekeeping items.

One, if you will turn your cell phones off or on vibrate, that will be most helpful. And, two, if you want to have a personal conversation, that is great but we ask you please step out into the hallway.

Thank you so much.

Sorry, Ms. Anderson.

>> I ask the Commission to reconsider the proposed maps.

They dilute minority voting strength. Commissioners, please take the time to reconsider and redraw the maps.

Currently the state rep maps there are 12 districts.

The proposed maps have six.

The VRA provides for minority, majority districts.

There are currently four Senate districts, the proposed maps have zero minority majority.

Consider the Kellom Senate maps.

I urge the Commissioners to keep Wayne County Community College District intact with the communities that they serve.

We want fair maps now.

Thank you for your work and thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission.



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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 33.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Danielle. I am a resident of southeastern Michigan or Detroit for my entire life.

I am a member of the Detroit Branch NAACP as well as Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Incorporated Detroit Alumni Chapter.

I am asking the Commission to adopt the Chatum Detroit map F6834, the Kellom Senate map, and use the recently submitted Hickory Handle 11 map. Hickory Handle 11 map, P9240 as a starting point for creation of a workable house map.

Another option is provided by the maps submitted by Promote the Vote 06155, 06159, 0250,

All of the other maps submitted by the Commission are not workable.

Please remember that representation matters. And return to the table to provide Detroiters with the opportunity to elect people of their concerns just as you provide that opportunity to everyone else in the state.

My full statement is in the portal.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 34.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

I hope everyone is doing well this morning.

And happy holidays to everyone here.

My name is Dennis Bryant. I'm a member of the UAW.

And I am a resident of Southeastern Michigan for the last 30 years.

And I'm currently a precinct delegate in my community.

Factors that are important to me and my community are maintaining minority majority districts, VRA compliance, maintaining communities of similar interest, emerging minority communities, and providing opportunities for African/American elected representation.

And keeping the Latino community intact.

I do not believe the current maps as submitted by the Commission meet these requirements.

However, I am confident that the promote the vote maps meet these standards and I strongly recommend to the Commission adopt these maps or go back to the drawing board to create maps that are more representative.

I look forward to you adhering to these communities recommendations.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 35.

>> I'm a mom, a member of voter access for all coalition.

As a resident of Wayne County, I'm showing up for the tens of thousands of incarcerated citizens across our 30 plus state prisons who have been entirely whittled

out of our democratic process and the guaranty of representation due to prison gerrymandering.

A third of the state's prison population was sentenced in Wayne County.

But the only prison in Wayne mound closed in 2012.

Meaning that 100% of Wayne County sentence residents are exported out of our County and counted in other Counties.

Fortunately, this year we have the valuable opportunity to reverse this injustice.

To do this the Commission must use the decennial census data from the U.S. Census Bureau as a starting point for creating the maps regardless of which map is selected through this process.

A dozen states have already done this.

And Michigan should not overlook this.

The Promote the Vote maps take this into account.

As a supporter of keeping our communities whole, I plead with the Commission to ensure that incarcerated citizens are represented in those Counties that they call home. Where their families live, where their children go to school, and where over 90% plan to return.

Remember, they are a part of our communities and we cannot continue to take from Wayne County.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 36.

>> Lori from Huntington Woods. Thank you, Commissioners.

Today I ask you to redraw your house maps not only are they overly partisan but each house map splits my neighbor community of Royal Oak into two separate districts. The Township once 36 miles square is now a half mile square with 13 streets and one traffic light.

I volunteered at one of its two polling places recently. And amazed in the larger Detroit population area there is a small town where generations have grown up and stayed and they greeted each other, saying he is the God son and she was my sister's piano teacher and she married my cousin, his grand dad was my grand mom's neighbor. Please redraw your maps to be fair and avoid dividing this proud community yet once again thank you for your consideration.

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

>> I'm Janet from Commerce Township. I do not believe any of the proposed maps meet the requirement for partisan fairness that was the emphasis of proposal two. And all favor the republican party, which does not reflect the voting population of Michigan, thus giving the majority voice in Congress.

Having volunteered hundreds of hours to collect signatures and pass out lit and door to door canvassing, I'm disappointed in the results.

We asked for partisan fairness and we did not get it.

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.

With that said, the Birch map is the least bad offering for U.S. Congress.

In all of the house and Senate maps my area is drawn exactly the same.

Commerce Township, the southern part I live in, is tied very closely to Walled Lake and West Bloomfield as has been stated by many other people from Commerce Township. I have a Walled Lake zip code but a Commerce Township mailing address.

Although you fall short, I want to thank the committee members for your efforts and the long hours trying to draw fair maps.

Your job is not done.

Do not stop.

Do not settle.

Thank you.

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

>> Hi, Commissioners. My name is Steve Prange and I live in Commerce Township.

Thank you for the work you have done so far.

Unfortunately, I don't think your current maps meet all of the seven criteria, particularly the number for no advantages to political parties.

Studies have been done to create near zero political bias districts.

It can be done.

We know many of the districts that were drawn ten years ago were drawn to favor one party over the other.

I'm looking to you to make sure that that is no longer the case when I cast my vote in elections over the next decade.

Please follow the law and make sure there are no advantages to political parties in the new districts, please review the Promote the Vote and the AFLCIO maps.

If any of their maps do a better job of meeting the southern criteria, please adopt them and provide us with the best maps possible. Thank you.

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

>> My name is Molly from Midland. I know you understand the purpose of proposal two and you have exemplified that in your work in the past year. And the maps are better than anything in decades. And I applaud your historic work, if they are not perfect.

I ask you to stick to the purpose as you finalized voting on the proposed maps.

You saw the petition that the Midland GOP waved around for Lange Senate and maps because it gives safe republican districts, and of course they would want.

Called a fake press conference to drum up support and both are outside of the process that you all set up for public comment.

And that is disingenuous.

600 people out of 81,000 is a small percentage, less than 1%. Please continue to work in a bipartisan manner as you have done all along and vote on the collaborative maps

when the time comes. I believe the house maps need more work on partisan fairness, but Hickory is the best.

I also support Chestnut and Linden.

Please choose from these collaborative maps, stay true to the purpose and the historic work that you have done already. Thank you.

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

>> Hi. Name is Norman from Detroit change initiative and working with the process since the beginning of February.

We are at this point beginning to vote, there is concerning things about this process that I thought that we took care of before then.

Right now I can support the Chestnut and back the Linden. I cannot back any map in the house right now. Promote the Vote has the best optics and meets requirements for the house and should follow that.

I also am concern, we created this body, the citizens for transparency and have a proper process on this goes out now and you know to work on the transparency and trust and believe in the process.

We definitely want you guys to be more transparent with the upcoming vote. And thank you for listening to me and hope we can get down to business with fair maps for all.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 41.

>> I'm speaking on behalf of the Michigan Unitarian, a nonpartisan, faith-based statewide organization.

Thank you for your considered dedication to this sacred work.

The Szetela Congressional map is the best and only map to have a perfect partisan fairness score. The Birch map is also fair.

The Linden Kellom and Szetela maps come close to being fair, but they still favor one party and require tweaking.

Please do more work on the house maps.

While Hickory is the closest, none of the closest have an outcome that accurately reflects the way we vote.

None of the house maps are acceptable.

The Promote the Vote maps achieve all of the benchmarks and can serve as a guide for how to improve the Hickory.

We do not want to delay the process.

But they absolute worst outcome would be settle for inherently unfair maps.

Please continue your good work and redo the house maps. Thank you very much.

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

>> My name is Debbie and I live in Bloomfield Township.

As far as the Congressional maps, I strongly support the Birch map.

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.

It makes more sense for the Bloomfield communities and for Birmingham to be kept together.

We share common services and our students overlap in our two school districts.

Birch is the Congressional map with the best partisan fairness score.

In considering the Senate maps, I prefer the Linden map.

It is closer to 50/50 than we have seen in the last 30 years.

Do not even consider the Palm map.

It's the worst of all of your maps.

All of your house maps lean the to the right, benefitting the republicans. However, the Hickory map is the least bad of the house maps and that is why I support Hickory.

Thank you for your work on this process.

I'm sure you learned a lot by doing it.

We appreciate your efforts and happy holidays to all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Number 43.

>> I'm Jenny and live in Plymouth. Thank you for your hard work and dedication in the process.

I have spoken to you and provided written comments and data several times during the year, sharing my concerns about prison gerrymandering.

It is unfair to count people in the location where they are incarcerated when they have no connection to those communities and the elected officials are not serving them.

They should be counted at their last address prior to incarceration for redistricting purposes.

I was disappointed you did not choose to make this adjustment when drawing the maps.

By not adjusting for this you siphoned out of Wayne County and other parts of the state.

I'm deeply concerned about the house maps.

They are all unfair on several metrics and request you take the time to create more fair house maps, and when doing so please adjust for prison gerrymandering.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 44.

>> Good morning. My name is Rick Blocker. I'm a resident of Southeastern Michigan.

I just wanted to come to you to talk about the Congressional maps today.

None of your Congressional maps complies with the Voting Rights Act.

Section Two of the Voting Rights Act covers minority majority.

In the last 40 years, the Voting Rights Act has been under numerous attacks, but this stays in place.

You have no majority Black districts.

In the last 40 years, we have had at least two majority Black districts.

I have -- I further want to state your consultant made a statement that you can go over 50% under the right circumstances for community of interest.

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.

If this statement had been made earlier in the procedure, we wouldn't have been stuck with maps between 35-45%.

We must have the opportunity to elect people that look like us and who share our interests.

Please redraw your maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 45.

>> My name is Allen Wolf from Bloomfield Township, and I'm a volunteer for Voters Not Politicians.

I strongly believe in our system of representative democracy.

I want to thank each of you for your contribution to depoliticizing map drawing in the State of Michigan.

I'm interested in two things, partisan fairness and that minorities such as Blacks in Detroit, Pontiac and Flint have a strong voice in Government.

We are nearing the end of what has been a tedious and time-consuming process for you as members of this Commission.

I want to ask those of you who are democrats or republicans to approach this final step for representative democracy.

Give us the fairest and most competitive maps you can.

Those who are inclined to go to Court to challenge the final maps don't.

Let the candidates, the idea is and the party that best represents the people win.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 46.

>> Hi. My name is Briana from Waterford, Michigan. Thank you for providing the Detroiters an opportunity to speak on redistricting process.

I speak in favor of the Linden State Senate map and the Hickory State House map.

These two maps score will not be fair on the metrics.

And will provide both parties with a chance of the majority of the state legislature.

Please do not adopt the Palm state map as it is basis -- based towards one of the majority parties.

Although Hickory is the best State House map, please reopen the maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 47.

>> Hello. My name is Vanar from Detroit, Michigan, 1191 Laborers.

I appreciate the Commission providing the opportunity to speak on the redistricting process.

None of the 13 Commissioners should vote to approve a map that has the disproportionate advantage to a political party.

The democratic Commissioners in particular need to veto unfair maps.

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.

All of your state mouse maps disproportionately disadvantage the republican party and democrats voted for all of them.

Please make sure the vote no on anything but fairness. Fairest maps, Linden for the state and Hickory for the State House.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 48.

>> Hi. My name is Jay and I'm from Detroit.

I appreciate you for providing me the opportunity to speak on a redistricting process. I want to speak in favor of the Cherry State Senate map and the Hickory State House map.

These two maps score well on partisan fairness metrics and will provide both parties with a chance to win a majority in state legislature.

Please do not adopt the Palm State Senate map as it is unfair and unbalanced map.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 49.

>> Hi, my name is Emma from northwest Detroit, Michigan.

Thank you for providing me this opportunity to speak on redistricting process.

Detroit, Flint and other communities of color across the state have suffered under the 20 years, under the last 20 years because their representatives have never been the majority because maps have been rigged for the opposite party.

Racial justice and partisan fairness go hand in hand.

You need to do better on both.

Of the maps submitted, the Cherry State Senate and Hickory State House map do the best in both areas.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 50.

>> Hi, I'm Lance Meadows of Detroit.

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to speak to the redistricting process.

Black voters deserve a choice to pick their own representatives and deserve to have those representatives have an equal chance at serving their community and majority, which is the only way for them to deliver their districts.

The Commission needs -- maps needs to be better on both racial and justice and on partisan fairness.

Although Hickory is your best state map house map, although the State House map leans republican, please reopen the mapping process, please.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We are at 50.

Okay, so just to let everybody who is online know, we are at number 51.

>> Hello, my name is Mari and I live in Ypsilanti.



I'd like to thank the Commission for all the hard work you have been putting into this historic work.

We still need more majority Black districts in Detroit in order to comply with the Voting Rights Act and give Detroiters fair representation.

The house maps still do not meet the criteria for partisan fairness.

Having said that, Hickory is the most fair.

It will be good to go back and make adjustments in the name of fairness; but, if not, it's the most fair of the available choices.

The Palm Senate map is most politically biased of all the maps and it unfairly packs the Ann Arbor together, which is the opposite of what that community wants.

For the Senate I would urge you to adopt Linden as I think it's the most balanced.

Also incarcerated people should be counted at their original address rather than where they are incarcerated for the State Senate and house maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. So do we have number 51? 51, okay, I guess we had a numbering issue. And for the people online, we are up to 78 people speaking in person. So we have about 30 more to go. Go ahead, ma'am.

>> Hello.

How are you? My name is Donna.

I'm the supervisor of the Charter Township of Royal Oak.

I know how hard it is to serve.

The choices you have to make.

However, I would like to let you know I had something wrote but I'm just going to speak from my heart.

I would like to let you know that I am the second generation lifelong resident of Royal Oak Township.

My parents came to Royal Oak Township in 1919.

So throughout my life I have heard the stories of how nine cities incorporated away from Royal Oak Township.

Now what we used to be 36 miles, we are a half-a-mile.

It would be a grave disadvantage for you to split Royal Oak Township.

A proud African/American community.

We always have been.

We are very close knit.

It would not be an advantage to us at all for you to have two representatives here for such a tiny community.

Please reconsider and do not split Royal Oak Township.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 52.

>> Hi. My name is Crystal and I have been a resident of Southwest Detroit my whole life and now a community organizer and advocate for the Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation.

Today I want to thank you for all the hard work you have done, but also want to ask you to review the state maps to have more partisan fairness and to have VRA districts represented.

The less bad map is Hickory Handle 11, but it would still need a lot of work.

For the State Senate map I think the Palm is the worst map and Cherry is the best because it has more competitive districts.

For U.S. Congress, I am in favor of the Chestnut map because it shows more partisan fairness and it has the most communities of interest represented and the districts are also competitive in that map.

I ask that you please make sure to continue to evaluate all the comments that you have received.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 53.

>> Hello. My name is Joe. I'm also an organizer with Detroit corporation, soon to be joining staff of City Council in Detroit.

So State House Hickory Handle 11 is the best prototype you guys have.

It has just the most fairness across the board.

Hickory Handle 11 needs to be looked at and used as the prototype for the house.

Senate Cherry is the best because it's competitive. And Palm is the worst because it's least competitive and not very fair.

And for the U.S. house just lack of VRA districts as a whole is very troublesome.

Chestnut shows the most balance but overall like a VRA, districts is not good.

Thanks for your time.

Thanks for listening.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 54.

>> Good morning. My name is Arilin, a resident of Oak Park, Michigan; but I grew up in Royal Oak Township.

My parents had a house built there in 1965.

And I'm addressing the Commission to ask that you do not split Royal Oak Township.

It's already been chopped up enough.

And I'm asking you to do what is fair and just.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 55.

>> Hello, Commission. My name is Justin Smith and I'm a resident and organizer from Macomb County.

I'm here today like many others to urge you to choose the least worst of the available options for Congress, Senate and house.

None of the maps are ideal for Macomb especially in the house, but want to urge the Commission against adopting Magnolia.

Instead push for Hickory.

Unfortunately, these districts make little sense on the ground. And I believe will cause confusion for residents trying to figure out what District they live in and will also complicate the jobs of local clerks. That said, again, the best option for house is Hickory.

I also want to advocate for the Linden State Senate map.

Of the available options, it's, again, the best for Macomb and little difference between the maps in my county.

But statewide it is one of the best options.

Finally, I want to say that Birch is the best option for the Congressional maps.

None of them are particularly representative of the communities in Macomb.

But, statewide, it is one of the best options for representation for Michigan and Washington D.C. Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 56.

>> Hello, Commissioners.

I'm saying hi to you again.

I'm here today the focus of my message like many people who preceded me is to ask you to please review the maps of the house of representatives in Michigan.

It's very clear that there is a high level of dissatisfaction with this map and it's the most unfair.

So everyone, many people before me said, please take a look at those maps.

It's especially striking for me, the fact that a nonprofit, a local nonprofit in Detroit modifying on ten of districts came up with a much better, much fairer version of this map.

So it is doable.

Please work on this.

My last seconds, I just want to ask, I am really worried that on the 30th you won't spend enough time in the voting process.

You already have a system, please follow the system.

And make sure when you vote you have a sound process.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. 57.

>> Hi, this is Kurtis with API vote Michigan.

I want to thank you for all the support you provided for API community here in Southeast Michigan and for our map.

Today I would like to discuss the AAPI community and the west side of the state.

Only Commissioner Szetela map is the fairest currently.

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.

Any other map would disenfranchise and mute the communities of color in the important cities of Kentwood and Wyoming and Kent County.

Within both cities combined communities of color comprise over 30% of the population. Only together will Kentwood and Wyoming have the strongest voice possible so please keep them together.

Please also take adequate time to enact the process for voting on final maps that choose the fairest plan and that ensures all plans of each District type receive thorough discussion before voting.

Do not enact a process to allow a vote based on who makes a motion first.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 58.

>> Good morning members of the Commission.

I am here today. My name is Christian, a resident of the Greater Grand Rapids Area. And I drove here from Grand Rapids today to address some concerns that I have and that many communities have with the State House maps in particular.

Now, as it stands right now, the Szetela map is currently the map that does the best to keep the communities of Kentwood and Wyoming giving them fair representation.

Kentwood and Wyoming are direct suburbs that are directly south of Grand Rapids.

They are very much working class communities.

These communities have at least 30-40% people of color in these communities and that population is growing rapidly.

So I would ask that instead of lumping these districts in with more rural communities like has been done in the past lumping them in with East Grand Rapids in particular, that you try to keep these communities together and give them the fair and equitable representation that they deserve.

So thank you for your time today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 59.

>> How you doing Commissioners, everybody here? My name is Dee Jones. I came here from the west side of the state to speak about this.

First of all, I would like to say that this side of the state deserves fair representation because there is a lot of people of color that stays on the side of the state and they should be represented.

That should be reflected in that map here on the east side of the state.

I would like to talk about the Szetela map. This is the only map that shows fairness, putting Wyoming and Kentwood, I work for KTV for three years and seen all of the people.

I know that Wyoming and Kentwood is very niched together, and that is the only fair representation map that actually keeps people of color together.

We live in a society where the barriers are already against us.

I'm not asking you guys to side with any political party.

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.

Just make sure it's an even playing field for every single map and should be even regardless of the political affiliation and who is running it and should be equal. And if that District believes that person deserves to represent those people, then that should be the map.

Thank you. I appreciate it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 60.

>> Hi. My name is Dan from Grand Rapids too.

I come to you today to address you during this last meeting and speak in favor of the Szetela house map.

Which matches the others on the east side of the state, but is different on the west side in Grand Rapids.

Up until the first week of November all the State House maps had the City of Kentwood together with the City of Wyoming and Gaines Township.

This changed, however, after what I believe was unfair influence from several prominent, rich, white and mostly men who issued public comment and said that Kentwood should be together with East Grand Rapids, Ada Township and Cascade Township.

The needs of Kentwood and Wyoming are vastly different than other areas and has many, many more people of color compared to the affluent areas of East Grand Rapids and Cascade and Ada.

Thank you for your due diligence.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 61.

>> Hello, I am Lilly from the suburban City of Kentwood, just south of Grand Rapids in Kent County.

I am also a community organizer, the founder of the Disability A team of West Michigan, the organizer of a stop Asian hate rally in Grand Rapids.

And the elected democratic nominee from House District 72 last year.

Although the State House maps of Hickory and Commissioner Szetela's look the same in East Michigan, only Szetela's map State House map is the only fair map in West Michigan.

Only Szetela's map combines the two cities of Kentwood and Wyoming.

Both of which has a sizable communities of color population of over 30%, which is huge in West Michigan.

And they are known as working class cities.

Dividing these two working class cities will disenfranchise and mute the voices of the communities of color.

The other maps display and likely.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ma'am, thank you for addressing...

>> Will lead to racist results.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

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.

>> Thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Number 62.

>> Hello, my name is Mercy Decker. I'm a resident of Detroit also Wayne County. I live about a mile up that way in the north end Piety Hill area.

I have a comment about the process.

A comment that is general and a specific comment about the process.

Please make sure when you are doing in the rules for submitting the maps do closely align with the Michigan Constitution.

It's there for a reason.

Please make sure you are following that.

Second, recognize that the suburbs do not represent the cities of Detroit.

I cannot tell you how frustrating it is to have someone from the suburbs represent my community and my neighborhood because...just because someone looks like me does not necessarily mean that they represent my community of interest.

So please make sure the suburbs and Detroit we recognize those are two different areas because Detroit has very, very specific needs.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 63.

>> I want to thank you once again, Commissioners, for being here.

I'm asking you to support the Birch map, the Linden map and throw the Palm's map out. I have a serious concern with the fairness for our house maps.

This process was put together to make sure that our community would have fairness in the community for the people and not the politicians running our concerns.

So anything that is less than 50% for our house maps would be unacceptable.

We are asking for fairness, that is all.

And we are asking for justice.

That is all.

We want a chance that for our loved ones to be able to grow up and have the opportunity to be the best they can be.

And we need that from you putting the maps together that will help support our loved ones and our communities so we have fair representation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 64.

>> Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is art Bryant. I'm the mayor of Grosse Pointe Woods.

There is one map, Pine, which still shows our fourth precinct as being in another District.

Could you please correct that and put our City together for the sake of the one map?

It had been an error on some of the other maps and was corrected.

I guess they missed the Pine one.

But please put on that map the fourth precinct back in with Grosse Pointe.

Thank you very much and thanks for all your work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 65.

>> All right, good morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning.

>> Good morning, Commission. So thank you for your service. My name is Mark Paine. I'm a resident of Detroit and ask the Commission review and have a robust discussion of all collaborative maps.

How they meet all criteria ahead of the vote and establish clear procedures for the voting process based on your status recommendation.

Once established I ask the voting be accomplish here, during the actual vote so the public can witness a transparent and fair conclusion to your work.

These lines will last ten years and have a lasting impact.

The voters rights act is part of criteria one. And the Michigan Department of Civil Rights said in the current form the maps dilute majority minority districts and strip the ability for minority voters to elect legislatures to reflect the community and any meaningful opportunity to impact public policy and law making.

Please take the time to discuss the State House maps.

Hickory is the least bad, but you can do better for Michigan by taking a bit more time drafting.

Also, I want to lift up what your VRA lawyer said, you can go over 50% for community of interest purposes.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. I'd also like to note for the public record that it is 11:30 and Commissioner Brittini Kellom has arrived. Next in line is 66.

>> Hello, my name is Francesca Stevenson. I'm a resident of Detroit.

And I would just like to echo what everybody else is saying that a lot of these maps are unfair and they give republicans an advantage.

And as somebody who was a circulator for proposal two and spent a lot of time in the cold and the rain getting signatures, I am a little disappointed with the results.

In having said that in terms of the house maps, you know again they are all biased.

But I have to endorse the Hickory one just because it is the closest to fair out of all the options proposed.

In terms of the Senate maps, definitely the Palm map is the most unfair and we should not go with that one.

It offers too much of an advantage to republicans.

The Linden map from what I understand is close to 50/50, which is good.

And which is something that we should be striving for.

And as for the Congressional maps, I think we should go with Birch.

Thank you very much for your time.



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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 67.

>> Hello, I'm a proud Michigander, born and raised, except for a year getting my degree I lived here my whole life.

I'm proud Michigan stood up in 2018 to say that voters should choose politicians and not the other way around.

Regardless of your party affiliation, please limit the bias of District maps with your choice.

Each side can educate with outreach and evidence they believe shows that they are the voter, they are right.

Do not take away a voter's voice and hold illusions you are on the side of good.

The goal needs to be accuracy.

I like the naming the tree naming convention for joint maps, but Palm is more actively named because it's a slap in the face of justice.

It will abuse the rights of others.

While still biased, Linden and Cherry are far more partisanly fair and accurate Senate map options.

Hickory appears to be the least biased house map.

But there is still some glaring concerns.

Please do all you can to limit bias.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. 68.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Laida. I'm a resident of Detroit. And I'm here today to urge you to continue your work on the house maps.

The Department of Civil Rights has informed the MICRC on December 9th, that the proposed maps violate the Voting Rights Act and should be redrawn before they are formally adopted.

On your agenda today you will be discussing alternative house maps. I hope you take this time to discuss the changes you will be making to create more voting rights districts and addressing partisan fairness.

My partners and I at Next Vote submitted P9240 with modifications to only ten districts on your Hickory map that achieve more VRA districts, partisan fairness, and includes communities of interest.

Please use this and other maps that have been submitted to the Commission as references on how you can improve your Hickory map.

You have heard from communities of interest in Flint and Detroit and informing you that their voting rights districts have been cut in order to achieve lower criteria goals. Number one criteria is Voting Rights Act. And I urge the Commission to have a robust discussion on every map on how it will meet the ranked criteria before you vote.

You cannot ignore what you have heard during the 45-day public comment period.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 70.

>> 70.

>> You skipped 69 so you must not want me to speak, I guess.

My name is 69.

I'm Telice Chapman. The Detroit Clergy rise in support of the marginalized and the oppressed citizens of this community who call for voting District maps that reflect the people who live in them.

Wayne County's majority Black voting districts now have their political destined threatened by insipid, anesthetized and tactless people who sit in seats of power and making decisions. We call upon you today to move with dispatch and dignity, character and God consciousness and rule on the right side of history, in favor of fair mindedness, integrity and good deportment.

Honor the good names and rich history of the people who fought for the right to vote in the first place.

Who knows whether God has you in such a place for such a time as this.

Furthermore, it is a gesture of slight to see several of you sitting, preoccupied with your cell phones and computers while concerned citizens of this state gather in this room fighting for our political future.

This is a political life and death matter.

We, therefore, call upon you to draw the maps without bias and keep the voting process fair.

Thank you.

My name is Reverend Tellis Chapman, Pastor of Detroit Baptist Church in Detroit, Galilee Baptist Church in Detroit, and I approve this message.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Do we now have number 70?

>> Hello, I'm the Michigan State director for the human rights campaign, but I'm here today as a resident of Detroit and lifelong Michigander.

Thank you all so much for your work on the first ever Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission.

This work is essential to making sure we have a fair and representative democracy.

At the moment for State Senate I like the Linden map best.

Palm in my opinion is not a representative map.

And for Congress I like Szetela.

The place where I believe the Commission has more work to do is State House maps. It's an important Branch of Government and closest to the people and be very representative.

I definitely understand the challenges of the Metro Detroit and Detroit areas and how drawing those districts would be very difficult.

Please spend more time making sure there are more representative districts so people can have a greater voice in their Government.

Thank you again for your work. And remember this will affect us for the next ten years, so please take the time to do it right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 71.

>> Good morning. I was here about a month or three months ago speaking to you about my concern that you had not actually given a very clear process by how you approved and drew specific communities of interest.

And, again, I have another concern.

I don't really know how you are evaluating the comments during this comment period. And that concern is manifested because I have seen people commenting on maps 21 times. Nancy Tiso commented on the Palm map vaguely about how great the communities were on 21 different locations.

And I'd like to share another one.

This is somebody that supports the Palm map.

She says this map although it includes portions of Washtenaw, which I'm not a fan of, is better in representation of Jackson as a whole.

Jackson County should not be divided and lumped in with Ann Arbor as a community. They are significantly different than each other and vast many arenas.

Mixing heavy agricultural common sense with over educated people with work and life experience is especially putting apples and walnuts and goes on to say individual life forms east of Jackson County.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can submit the rest of your comment online.

We have to respect the time because we have a lot of people in line.

Thank you.

Number 72.

>> I'm Dr. Steve Junior, president and senior pastor of the Liberty Temple Baptist Church.

Right to vote is not about partisanship.

It's about citizenship.

I do understand the complexity of your work.

However, do understand rat poison is not 100% poison.

But just enough to kill a rat.

There is a VRA initiative that protects certain constituents of our community.

And they must be protected.

We don't need to go in closed session to talk about it.

we need to keep it very open and direct.

We don't need more hurdles.

We need a clear path to make sure we have fair voting in this community.

So I urge you, redraw the maps, draw them fairly so when my granddaughter decides to run for office people who she represents look like her on her interests can do it fairly and equitably.

That's all we ask for.

That's all we need.

You know my name.

And I approve of this message.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 73.

>> Hi, my name is Laura.

I'm a resident of Hamtramck, Michigan; and urge the Commission to approve maps that keep Asian American and other Black indigenous and Latin X communities of interest whole, achieving partisan fairness.

Voters should be able to elect their reflective and responsive leadership and not the other way around.

I support the Chestnut Congressional and Linden Senate map because they best balance community of interest and partisan fairness.

The State House maps proposed by the Commission still do not achieve partisan fairness.

While Hickory is the best of the worst, we encourage the Commission to seriously consider the map ID, P9240.

Hickory V1 is as it maximizes partisan fairness as well as covering communities of interest.

We encourage the Commission to extend the public comment period beyond this 45 days to allow time to incorporate changes to achieve partisan fairness in the house maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 74.

>> I'm a resident and engaged citizen from Flint Township and reside and work in Detroit.

Thank you so much for your hard work thus far.

I'm here today to take time and care to discuss a process for voting on final maps as a few folks have mentioned today.

We thought you would go over this two weeks ago, but it did not happen. So please enact a process that reflects what the people want and the fairest one in each category.

Do not get to a point where we end up with a process who makes the motion first gets the ball rolling without discussion. So discussion is super important so you can tell us why you are voting on which map. So please adopt what your staff proposed.

I will plug the State Senate Palm map is the worst, so please don't vote on that.

This late in the game, the biggest ask is to have a process for the vote on the 28th.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 75.

>> Good morning.

I'm the former president and CEO of access.

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.

And I want to thank you for the critical and difficult job you're doing in protecting our democracy.

I live in Dearborn.

And I'm here on behalf of access.

You know, the Dearborn community, the Dearborn, Dearborn Heights has the largest concentration in the country of Arab Americans.

The Redistricting Commission has split this highly concentrated community into seven House Districts, ensuring we do not get the representation we deserve.

I urge you to continue to work on the house draft maps and please consider the community of interest map C1510.

As you redraft the house map.

The Commission has drafted more fair representation in the Congressional map of Chestnut and Linden.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 76.

>> Hello.

I would like to thank the Commission for the work that you do.

I'm here on behalf of access.

I live in Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, the largest Arab community in the country and submitted our own community of interest maps C1510. But in your house drafts you split our community into seven districts.

We support the Chestnut Congressional and Linden Senate maps as it will allow for our representation of our -- for representation of our community.

I urge you to continue to work with the house maps.

You have time to do this.

It will impact our...my community and family for the next ten years.

Any maps with fewer Voting Rights Act districts than current are not acceptable.

You need to add more time to your schedule and continue to do your work to ensure communities like mine are represented.

It is more important to get this done right than to get this done fast.

And more time to your schedule and continue to work in the house maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 77.

>> Hello, everyone.

First of all, thank you, Commissioners, for, you know, doing the difficult work.

It is the first time we are going through this process.

I grew up in the City of Detroit, went to school here, had my kids down the street at Henry Ford.

And I want to talk about communities of interest, you know, our Black, Asian, indigenous, and Latino communities.

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

The Congressional map named Chestnut and Senate map Linden, you know, they look good.

And we want to support partisan fairness for State House map Hickory IDP9240.

And I want to remind you to extend the time to allow for these changes to take place because the work that you're doing right now is not only for all of us, but also for a group of people that are not in this room and cannot be in this room and our children because my children will not be able to come and represent themselves until the next ten years.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 78.

>> Hello, my name is Veronica Adams. I live in Detroit.

And this Commission, as you know, was formed to correct a travesty that has Michigan having the most gerrymandered districts in the country, looking in minority rule and making us a national embarrassment.

And I know that you all opted to be on this Commission because you care about our Constitution, democracy and ensuring that every vote matters.

And so, that being said, it seems that Hickory comes the closest to restoring fair representation in our state.

And Linden the closest to reflecting the will of the people for national representation.

Palm, no way Jose.

It reminds me of Florida and Texas.

So aptly please do not go by the way of either of the states as far as electoral politics.

Make Michigan proud again.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 79.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Jarin. I'm a social outreach coordinator and specialist at LBGT Detroit, the largest LBGT nonprofit.

Earlier in the year we submitted a map CA19 of the Palmer Park area, which is primarily populated by Black, LGBT+ people.

Our request was that you keep this area together in one voting District.

Unfortunately, you did not honor that request in spite of it receiving the most public support out of any map submitted to you in the state.

So I'd like to request you vote on the maps that best support this community.

They are for Congressional Chestnut, for State Senate Linden.

And I know you have heard this all day there are no fair state maps at all.

Please come up with better state maps.

If you need an example, refer to P9240.

Consider this immediately.

Thank you.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Do we have any more or is that it?

Okay, so we have completed the in person comment for this morning. At this point we will move on for remote public comment. We are supposed to break before Noon, but we will try to get a few in before then.

So individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live, remote commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so.

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 or last four digits of your phone number. Also please note if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and return to you after they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail us at [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.

>> Hello. This is James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. Your September 17, 2020, transcripts reveal Secretary of State Joyce Benson has disoriented the MICRC concerning the requirements of Roberts Rules of Order by sowing disinformation and misinformation in the public record and the elections process in Michigan to benefit the democratic party.

Your actions to schedule a formal vote on a specific future date is not trauma-informed practices.

Because the fundamental pennant is empathy, which is understanding and responding to the rights of others.

As I identify as a person of color myself, breaking the rules is systematically being systemic racism on its face and on the face of this Commission.

So please cancel the first future final vote until the work is actually done.

And please do not support the Promote the Vote maps if they address that prison gerrymandering thing, like the other speaker said. Because the other states changed their state laws to allow for that.

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

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you. Good morning.



I'm Chris Andrews from Haslett.

I ask you to analyze individual elections to accurately assess the fairness of each map. You're reliance on composite data for ten years may be a crucial mistake.

If it is, we face another ten years of flawed democracy.

For instance your analysis of Hickory projects a democratic majority but Next Vote looked at 2016 and 2020 separately and found a huge republican majority and a small republican majority.

This is easy to test.

I ask that your consultants analyze fairness separately for 2016, 2018 and 2020.

Here are the results of the individual districts as well.

Please read my comment W9304 for additional information.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next is Rich Thrush.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Hi. Good morning. My name is Rich Thrush. I want to encourage the Commission not to select the Birch Congressional map.

It guarantees one party representation everywhere in West Michigan.

It disenfranchises the 210,000 minorities and almost one half million urban people population in the second largest Metropolitan area in Michigan.

The Grand Rapids six City area.

This map also splits up the three large West Michigan cities in separate districts.

Chestnut is the best map for Michigan overall and the Grand Rapids six City area in terms of minority and urban representation.

Chestnut provides a District with many commonalities in West Michigan such as center of higher education, industry and business, urban needs and issues and concentration of minorities.

Thanks for your diligent efforts to create fair District maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Joel Ombry.

>> Hi, my name is Joel Ombry from Grand Rapids.

I have comments on your maps on two levels.

First, at the Congressional level, I urge you to adopt the Chestnut map.

This map is a good choice because it does a good job of giving minority populations in West Michigan a voice in Washington.

It also combines Grand Rapids and Muskegon areas, which are already considered combined statistical areas.

Please reject the Birch map as it breaks up the lakeshore region and it's very poor from a partisan fairness perspective.

At the State House level, please approve the Hickory map.

It does a good job of enabling minority representation by creating a southern Grand Rapids District and keeping Wyoming together and recognizes similarities between Grand Rapids and suburbs like Kentwood and East Grand Rapids.

Please reject the Szetela house map.

Grand Rapids suburbs like Cascade and Ada with farmland when they really have more in common with Grand Rapids Metro area.

Hispanic areas it also the Hispanic areas in Grand Rapids.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 5, Anthony Skinnell.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thanks. I'm joining from Melvindale, Michigan. And last week and I don't know if it was Michigan Secretary of State, but they said they demoted you from panelist and cut me off at 49 seconds and thought we had 60 seconds at the meeting. And it would be okay if you returned to me to return my time, which you did with everyone else, but we lost Mr. Skinnell. How many comments have you gotten from Down River at the meetings? Very few. And think you would be interested in what I have to say, but you are more interested in adjourning at 2:00 every day and vote no confidence if I had to vote especially Congressional because the person who drafted it in the Congressional map where I live, she was quoted, saying COIs don't matter in Congressional maps. So thanks for nothing.

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

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> I'm a resident of Wyoming in Kent County.

At this point I'm sure you are all very tired and burned out from this whole process. As am I.

I know many people here today have been trying to convince you to reopen edits of your proposed maps. And while I too wish you had been able to get maps that show no political bias and achieve efficiency gap of zero, I recognize that this process needs to be wrapped up soon.

With that in mind, I believe you should adopt the Hickory State House map and reject the Palm State Senate map in favor of Linden or Cherry.

These maps come closest to achieving the overarching goal of this Commission that is being partisan fairness, representing communities of interest.

And representing communities of color in the Metro Detroit area as well.

So please consider passing those maps and rejecting as well the Szetela State House map as it does not represent my community of Grand Rapids very well.

Thank you for your time.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Sarah, number 7.

>> Hello, Commissioners. Thank you for the time today. I live in Grand Rapids and want to speak today on the maps affecting us here in West Michigan. For the State House I'm very concerned about the Szetela map. It splits up the communities of interest across Kent County including Hispanic community in Grand Rapids and Wyoming and Suburban Townships on the east side of the state. And links Wyoming, the second largest in the Metro, with unrelated rural communities. Support the Hickory state map and effective job of representing the comments I've heard from citizens in the count at public hearings and meetings and keeps Community of Interest here in West Michigan together. For Congressional maps I strongly encourage you to support the Chestnut map. It's the most balanced and fair map in West Michigan and connects Grand Rapids and Muskegon who share similar issues, concerns and economic resources.

For Congressional maps, I'm particularly concerned about the Birch map and does not give a voice to the large minority population here in West Michigan and dilutes the voices of residents.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to citizens today on the desire for fair maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Rebecca Grayson.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> Okay, this is Rebecca Grayson. I live in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Kent County.

The fair maps in my opinion in the Senate would be the Linden and Cherry maps, which are much better in terms of the partisan fairness than the Palm map, which is most unfair map in front of the Commission at this point.

Palm has a high republican bias and would create an unfair playing field.

But in the State House I support the Hickory map, that has the best partisan fairness scores of the three options in front of the Commission and the most majority for the Black American community.

Thank you so much for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 10, Diana Abouali.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Diana, you are unmuted and free to address the Commission.

>> I live in Dearborn with access and have Arab ancestry within the African MENA origins within the white racial category.

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

The fact is Arab Americans have distant issues and experiences with national level data on Arab Americans to secure variations affects communities in the Metro Detroit area. The Arab MENA communities are lumped into the white racial category by the U.S. census, is quite distinct from the white population.

Nationally among Arabs living in the U.S. and 70% live in multi generation and 78% are U.S. citizens native born and naturalized.

We are in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights and the largest community in the country, the redistricting commission has split this highly concentrated community into seven House Districts, ensuring we do not get the representation we need. I urge you to continue to work with the draft maps. And please consider the community of interest map, C1510 as you redraft the house map.

The Commission has already been successful in fair representation in the Congressional map of Chestnut and Senate map.

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

>> Hello. Thank you for having me today. I live in the City of Dearborn Heights and I'm here on behalf of Access.

You have heard from my community throughout this process and we have engaged the Commission.

We have come here before you with our public comments.

We have submitted our community of interest maps C1510.

And we still continue to be ignored as a community of interest in your house maps.

Dearborn and Dearborn Heights is home to the largest and most diverse Arab outside of the MENA region. You need more time to continue to work on the house draft maps to address the Voting Rights Act for many communities throughout Michigan.

You also need to address the partisan fairness in your house maps.

You still have work to do.

And the great thing is you have the time to do it.

The Commission has recognized our community in the Congressional map of Chestnut and the Senate map of Linden.

All your house.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Okay, at this point we are due to take a break for lunch and it's 12:01.

We stopped at 12 and we will pick up number 13 after we resume, after our recess. So, without objection, we will recess at this time.

It's 12:01 and will recess to 1:01 p.m.

Without objection, we are in recess until 1:01 p.m.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:06 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: I will be calling your name for roll call if you are attending the meeting remotely, please respond indicating you are attending remotely and where you are attending from roll call will begin now.

Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Brittini Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Hold one moment.

We think she is on the line.

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Cynthia Orton? MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: 12 Commissioners are present. We have a quorum.

And Cynthia Orton is walking in the room, so we are at 13. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

All right, we were in the middle of our public commentary and we will pick back up where we left off.

We do have one person who has signed up for in-person public commentary, so we will go back to that first and I will reread the directions so everyone is familiar.

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.

So please step to the 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 is number 80.

>> Do we have 80.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: I don't see her.

We will move on and add her.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will return to remote commentary and same rules as before. I will call your name and the staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted to unmute and speak.

If you are on the phone, it will say the host would like you to speak and press star to unmute.

If you have technical or audio issues or do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move to the next person in line and return when they are done speaking.

If it still does not work, you can e-mail us at [redistricting.gov](mailto:redistricting.gov) and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate at a later hearing or meeting. You will have one minute to address the Commission.

Next in line is number 13, who is Rachid.

>> Thank you all. Can everyone hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> Thank you all.

So my name is Rachid. I grew up in Dearborn Heights and come from a family of 14. I'm a part of my block club and the board of good fellows.

I live here the City of Dearborn Heights and here with access. Thank you, everyone.

Again, I'm part of the Arab community of Dearborn and Dearborn Heights, the largest Arab community in the country. We are disenfranchised in the redistricting process of a community of interest.

This is important for my loved ones, my daughters and family that we speak up today. All of your house draft maps cut through Dearborn and Dearborn Heights right down. And I think that is very political power of representation. So I think the current house map, which was found to be constitutionally gerrymandered and allows for better representation of my community.

My community supports the Congressional map of Chestnut and the Senate map of Linden.

I urge you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Next in line is number 14, Mohammed.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Belal.

>> Happy Friday, Junior. I'm a father of three boys under four. I am born and raised in Dearborn, Michigan.

This is my home.

I'm a member of Access where I serve my community as a mental health advocate.

I am here representing Access and my community of Dearborn and Dearborn Heights.

And the MENA community in Michigan has a unique experience with specific community needs that can only be met with representatives that understand my community. Access supports of my community providing social and community services that are not accessible by the state.

The MENA community is already a social and politically marginalized group that continues to be left out of redistricting processes.

I support the Congressional map of Chestnut and the Senate map of Linden and will allow the best representation of my community. And I urge you to continue your work by redrafting the house map and considering our community of interest map, C1510, in these draft house map.

Thank you very much.

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

>> I was born in Lebanon and grew up in Michigan.

I am on the board of my block club and member of Access and live in the City of Dearborn and here on behalf of Access.

You are obligated to follow the Constitution and the ranked criteria.

You have failed to do this.

The Voting Rights Act is the number one criteria and you continue to ignore communities that are protected by the RA.

You have grass communities in Detroit Dearborn, Dearborn Heights and Flint and other places of the state to elect officials to understand our needs and interest and leaving us without a voice in Lansing for the next ten years.

You have the ability to remain our concern by adding more time to your schedule to redraw the house maps.

I support the map of Chestnut and Senate map of Linden, but cannot support what you have done with the house maps.

Acknowledge what you have heard during the 45-day public comment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. I believe we have a few more in-person individuals.

Are we is this 80?

>> Thank you, Commissioners, for your hard work and commitment to this process.

My name is Briana, a member of the Southfield Deltas.

The closest maps I support are the Chestnut Congressional map, the Hickory State House map and the Linden State Senate map.



And I understood during this process you attempted for fair maps and they should represent my community of interest.

Yet all these are not quite yet right.

Foremost when determining the final maps, the City of Southfield be intact as a house voting District.

It's important majority minority communities like ours are kept intact so interests are not diluted in the voting process. And the same for Oak Park. And to do that the Linden and Chestnut should be Oak Park be part of Southfield instead of Beverly Hills. Oak Park is part of Delta service area. And currently the Hickory map has Oak Park gerrymandered.

It's just as important to keep Oak Park whole as it is to keep Southfield whole. We do not want our Black votes diluted.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. At this point we will shift back to online.

Next in line is Meredith.

>> Hi, name is Meredith. I live in the City of Detroit here on behalf of Access.

Thank you, Commissioners, for your hard work in the Chestnut and Linden Senate maps, but I urge you to continue working on the house maps. And they are not fair, including one the Voting Rights Act.

Not considering the facts and data in your Voting Rights Act analysis is leading you down a path of disenfranchisement despite best intentions.

Look at how politics work in Detroit and not try to hit a certain number.

The districts you drew for Metro Detroit area are all the same.

You have not given communities of interest any consideration and cracked communities in order to create majority white VRA districts.

This doesn't make sense.

You have work left to do.

It's important to get it done right than quickly.

Please be more thoughtful how you draw Detroit Dearborn, Dearborn Heights and Flint and add more time to your schedule and continue to work on the house draft maps.

Thank you.

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

>> Hello.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> Hi, my name is Sara on political science, here on behalf of Access. Dearborn and Dearborn Heights are the largest and most diverse Middle Eastern and African/Americans outside of the MENA region and served 50 years and the community of interest map C1510 in August.

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

We took it in account of the Congressional map of Chestnut and splits us in two districts and accepts us.

Linden is three districts, which we accept, but cannot accept house maps presented by the Commission.

All of your drafts cut our community of interest in seven districts in the maps and dilutes our ability for equitable representation. Our voting power and the ability to elect representatives that will speak for our community's unique needs is impossible in any of these house maps.

We urge you to continue to work on the house draft maps during this period, extending the 45-day public comment period is better than having ten years of no representation for the MENA community in Michigan.

Representation matters.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 20, Jamie Kim.

>> My name is Jamie Kim. I live in Huntington Woods and I'm with Access. And I've been with Access for almost 20 years.

The Arab American community that Access most directly serves in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights is the largest and most concentrated Arab American community in the country and consists of folks from a diverse background.

Southeast Michigan receives more Arabic speaking refugees and immigrants than almost any other region, in the country, and it's the largest community here in the United States. The Arab American community is not captured in the census and therefore not represented in the redistricting process.

The Redistricting Commission has split this highly concentrated community into seven House Districts, ensuring that the community does not get the representation they need. I'm here to ask you please continue to work on the house draft maps and consider the community of interest map C1510 as you redraft the State House.

The Commission was put in place to end gerrymandering and the maps that are the closest to the fair representation are the Congressional map of Chestnut and Senate map Linden.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 21, which is Delaney.

>> I live in South Lyon, Michigan; but I'm here on behalf of Access and as a proud member of the American Arab American community.

So using the best data from the U.S. census, a report was created by Access demonstrating that a picture of a unique community emerges when we dis-aggregate from the white racial category.

Without a fair count in the census we are not considered in the political process of redistricting.

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.

That's why we have submitted our own community of interest map of C1510. Thank you for taking our community of interest into account in the Congressional map of Chestnut, in the Senate map of Linden, which our community does support. However, we cannot support the house maps presented by the Commission as they all disenfranchise our community by cutting our community into seven districts, diluting our voting power.

I urge you to listen to our community of interest and extend the 45-day public comment and provide better representation for the Arab American community in Michigan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 22.

>> Good afternoon. My name is Suerour. I grew up in Dearborn, Michigan, I call home.

I work at Access and we are not protected in the Voting Rights Act and diluted of voting power to elect candidates of our needs.

We need to recognize our community for representation that is needed.

This is our only way to have a voice.

Access served this community for over 50 years and understands the needs of the community.

They submitted the community C1510 in August.

The Commission recognized our community in the Congressional map of Chestnut and Senate of Linden and all house cut community of interest and cracked in seven districts in the house maps, diluting equal representation.

Work on the house draft maps during this period.

Extending the 45-day public comment period is better than having ten years of no representation for the MENA community in Michigan and continuing the history of exclusion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 23, Elham-Alesseng.

We can barely hear you. If you can turn up your volume a little bit or speak louder, that would be helpful.

>> Can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that is much better.

>> I live in the City of Dearborn on behalf of Access.

Detroit is home for the largest and most diverse Arab and Middle Eastern and north Africa MENA.

My community of interest originates from culturally geographically and religiously diverse countries inviting experiences and narratives not expelled to a single experience or partisan line.

We are not common in the census as our racial and ethnic which is the only resource of demographic data you are using in the redistricting process. And invisible Government processes hinder ability to get funding or policy concerns addressed.

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.

That is why we submitted our own community of interest C1510. And thank the Commission for taking into account in the Congressional map of Chestnut, the Senate map of Linden, but cannot support the house maps presented by the Commission. All house maps have partisan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 23, which is that was -- Zainab.

>> I live in Inkster and here with Access.

The MENA community of Michigan is the largest and most diverse mostly concentrated in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights.

We have been involved in the economic and cultural development for Southwest Michigan for 50 years. Guided by Section Two for minority vote dilution, I ask the Commission not to divide my community of interest but reflect throughout the redistricting process fairly.

Drawing District lines without splitting communities of interest will provide us with an equitable opportunity to participate in the overall local process and not to elect representatives not of our choice.

They split Dearborn and Dearborn Heights in seven House Districts ensuring we do not have representation we need.

Add time to redraft the house maps and consider C1510 as you redraft the house map. And I support the map of Chestnut and state map of Linden. The maps will provide representation of my community.

Commissioners, you have the ability to draw the District lines and maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 25, Asraa.

>> I live in Dearborn and am on behalf of Access. And I urge you to continue to work on the house map. Access is leading our community for fair representation by submitting the community of interest map C1510 and the Senate map of Linden and Chestnut are the best representation of my community.

We continue to be left out of this process and our community of interest has been split in seven House Districts. And all of your house draft maps the MENA community has unique with specific needs and can be met with representatives who understand my community.

Redraft the house map and consider our community of interest map C1510. And the draft house map, the largest needs representation at every level of the process. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 27, Mikala.

>> I live in Detroit and I'm here on behalf of Access, who serves the largest Arab American community in the country.

We support the Chestnut Congressional and Linden State Senate maps for Arab American community.

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

We urge you to continue to work on the house maps.

The Michigan State University institute for social policy and public research recommended the MICRC reevaluate its approach towards compliance with the VRA in light of these questions.

They need to assess if the districts can have preferred candidates to win racially polarized elections and ask you to carefully consider what the citizens of Michigan have to say during this 45-day public comment period and through the online portal station submissions as well.

You applaud yourself for having overwhelming engagement from our communities.

Now please listen to us when we say your job is not done.

Continue to work on the house maps.

All of your maps put a thumb on the scale for one party over another.

Fairness is when both parties have to win majority of the votes to win.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 29, Mariam-Bazzi.

>> Hi, everyone.

I'm here with Access and I'm a lifelong resident of Dearborn.

Thank you, Commissioners, for all your hard work and the Congressional and Senate maps.

We are thankful for your consideration of our Arab American community of interest and the redistricting process as is evidence in the Chestnut and Linden.

Partisan fairness in all your draft house maps, the truth is we may not be able to draw perfect lines in maps but you can ensure the communities of interest and underrepresented communities are not divided because of partisan lines.

We urge the Commission to make sure our community of interest, the Arab MENA community which contributed to the civic and economic life to the Detroit area is connected.

This social justice lens is the only way our community can feel represented and included in the political process.

Adding more time to the schedule is better than continuing to disenfranchise communities across Michigan for the next ten years. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 30, Rima.

>> Hi. My name is Rima. I'm an Arab American. I'm here with access. Can you all hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Metropolitan Detroit is home for the largest and most diverse Arab American and north African communities outside of the Arab region. And 3.5 of Arab descents live in the country and not on the census as a racial and ethnic category.

It originates from culturally geographically and religiously diverse communities and cannot be distilled to a single experience.

Without the count in the census, we are constantly invisible and factored into this part of not factored into this part of the political process of redistricting.

That is why we submitted our own community of interest map C5150. And thank you for taking the Congressional map of Chestnut and Linden, but we cannot support the house maps presented by the Commission.

All your house drafts continue to provide a partisan advantage to the party with the least amount of votes in the most recent election.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 31.

>> Hi, Commission. This is Shams. I'm a civic engagement specialist at Access. As many other community members have addressed, Dearborn and Dearborn Heights serves as one of the largest concentrated Middle Eastern communities outside of the Middle East.

That being said, we want the Commission to consider Melvindale, West Detroit when drawing our community of interest.

My community faced negative stereotyping and negative exclusion and we shared labor concerns and discrimination, civil rights and equality access to healthcare and issues such as environmental justice.

The Redistricting Commission has continued to marginalize our community by splitting Dearborn and Dearborn Heights into seven districts on the house drafts.

I urge you to continue to work on the districts and take into consider C1510 as you redraft the house map.

I support the Congressional map of Chestnut and Linden.

Thank you.

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

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good. Let's move on to Cindy Weir, number 33.

>> Greetings, Commissioners.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Greetings.

>> First off, thanks, first off, I have to take this opportunity to say how proud I am of all the Voters Not Politicians volunteers who are working so hard to create this Commission to take politics out of redistricting.

Our team in Midland collected over 21,000 signatures.

That is a heck of a lot more than the 600 that the Midland republicans have on their petition that they turned in today.

Second, I'm very proud of the Michiganders who voted for this Commission.



Now all eyes are on this Commission to see that you fulfilled the goal of better representation that we all worked so hard to achieve.

That said, the maps I support, U.S. Chestnut for the Congressional, Linden for Senate, Hickory for State House and needs work on partisan fairness.

Thanks for your hard work and keep us proud, keeping politics out of the redistricting process.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for your comments.

Number 34, Joe Wier.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> All right, thank you.

Hello. My name is Joe Wier from Midland County. And thank you for listening to what I believe the majority of citizens in Midland and putting Midland in State Senate and Congressional Districts that are fair and competitive.

We in Midland have not had the opportunity to vote in fair elections in decades.

We know that competitive districts will result in better legislatures for all Michiganders.

This was the whole point behind creating the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission.

The objections to these fair, competitive districts are coming from a highly partisan minority that have been fitted politically from the current gerrymandered districts.

It's time to end our dysfunctional politics.

Please continue to keep the goal of better Government for Michigan as your focus, as you decide on the final maps.

I recommend Chestnut for Congress and Linden for State Senate.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 35, Alison Wilcox.

>> Good afternoon. I'm from Midland.

Earlier this morning you heard from members of the republican establishment of the Midland area complaining that they don't want Midland County split from Gladwin County and touting the number of people who signed their petition.

I speak today on behalf of myself and members of women of Michigan action network.

A grass roots community of more than 1500 people in the Mid-Michigan area.

We are not politicians.

We are ordinary citizens.

Over the past year you have heard our comments giving us collaborative maps that reflect the reality that the Tri-Cities in Mid-Michigan are longstanding communities of interest with ties to numerous to explain in just one minute.

The Midland GOP is calling your collaborative maps gerrymandered and complaining about citizens participating in the process.



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.

Please continue the work you have been doing in a bipartisan manner.

Thank you for putting Midland in the Chestnut and Senate map and improve the Hickory map.

We appreciate your work.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 36, Drew Beckman.

>> Hello, Commissioners. My name is Drew Beckman, a student at Michigan State University.

A few weeks ago I asked this Commission to publish additional partisan fairness data for each of the proposed maps.

Currently only a weighted average of partisan data is being used to calculate fairness of the maps.

It's a good start, but additional data is needed.

I'm asking one of the Commissioners move to publish partisan fairness data for each map using individual 2020, 2018 and 2016 statewide races so the public can access the maps, meet our standards across a wide breath of elections.

If you are planning on reviewing all maps today, the reports could be generated for the discussion and part of the public record.

This is not just important for the public but also members of the Commission.

A map that is fair at one aggregate data point but swings five seats with 1% in the vote total is not fair.

Without multiple partisan fairness scores, the Commission can discuss which are robust enough to properly distribute seats according to the people's vote. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 37, Micah Perkins.

>> Thank you for your work on this panel.

I represent 10,000 skilled labor workers in west and Southwest Michigan.

I just wanted to comment positively, first of all, on your Hickory map. It's a very fair map overall and keeps Wyoming together and Hispanic areas together in that community of interest.

It also links East Grand Rapids and Kentwood and Cascade. And they have quite a bit in common and keeps Walker and Grandville and Grand Rapids together as well.

One area that does deserve some negative comment is the Birch map.

It's a very negative map for our area in that rural and Ottawa and Ionia don't want to be with Grand Rapids.

This District does not give voice to the large minority population in West Michigan 210,000 people are being disenfranchised with this map.

In this map the concentration of democratic voters in Grand Rapids is completely disenfranchised.

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

The Grand Rapids area includes 492,000 people in the six City area.

This is a significant.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 38, Onida.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Numbers 38 and 39 are not currently present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

We will move on to number 40, Joan Long.

>> Good afternoon. I'm Joan Long, a lifetime resident of the Metro Grand Rapids area.

I would like to respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposed map. Regarding Congressional map Chestnut, I approve of this map because of the strong partisan fairness of connecting Grand Rapids, Kentwood and Muskegon, which all have common -- which have strong communities of interest.

Regarding Congressional map Birch, however, I strongly disapprove of this map for several reasons.

Most importantly Metro Grand Rapids did not belong with the rural Counties of Ottawa and Ionia.

Regarding the State House map, Hickory, I approve of this map.

Because of its overall fairness.

But regarding State House map Szetela, I strongly disapprove of this map as one of the reasons being that Ada is a suburban Township and should be linked to the Metro Grand Rapids area.

Regarding state map Linden, I approve of this map because it puts Grand Rapids airport with the Metro.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 41, Joanne.

>> My name is Joanne Bird and I'm calling today from Park Township. I'm a Holland resident, a long time Michigan resident and lived here my whole life and active voter. I believe in fairness above all things and find the Linden map in the Senate the most fair map.

The most unfair map in the Senate is the Palm map.

Oops, it says start my video. I guess I did not have the button. On Linden map in the Senate I find is the most fair map and most unfair map is the Palm map.

In the house the Hickory is the most fair and creates most majority minority seats. And I thank you for your work on the Commission.

And, like I say, I'm just all concerned that fairness and voting is for everybody in the State of Michigan.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.  
Number 43, Julie Dye.

>> Can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> I'm Julie Dye, Potawatomi Tribal Elder, Dowagiac, Southwestern Lower Peninsula. I'm advocating for the State House Hickory map, which keeps our indigenous community together more so than the other maps.

I'm also in favor of the Senate Linden map over the other choices offered.

My community has almost nothing in common with the furthest east Counties represented by the alternate maps.

With that said please veto the Palm map and do your best to keep Cass County with Berrien and Van Buren Counties. Meegwetch. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 44 Cathleen.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rather -- Cathleen, if you are able to unmute yourself, you are welcome to address the Commission.

Cathleen, if you hear me, if you can unmute yourself, you are free to address the Commission.

It appears Cathleen may be experiencing technical difficulties.

And, for the record, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49 are not currently present, so we can move on to number 50.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good.

Karen Feldman.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Karen, if you are unable to unmute yourself, you are free to address the Commission.

>> Good afternoon. I'm Karen Feldman, a long-time resident of Oakland County and speaking on behalf of the map labeled Birch as it keeps the majority of Oakland County in one Congressional District.

Due to the industrial business and technical interests of the population on this map, Birch gives us the greatest opportunity for fair representation.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Number 51.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Colleen and live in Brownstown and I commented several times before. And, of course, in adherence to the Voting Rights Act and partisan fairness is what is important here. But because this is the last public hearing, before the Commission votes, I wanted to say that Linden is the fairest Senate map. Hickory is the most tolerable house map and Palm is the absolute worst. Please don't consider it.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 52, Dorothy Munson.

>> I'm Dorothy Munson, representing the Grand Rapids nonpartisan election protection coalition in the foundation.

The Senate Linden map would provide a good break down of districts for effective representation in West Michigan, in Michigan overall.

It is wonderful to see that the Grand Rapids urban, suburban populations have two districts for representation because of how large it is.

Special thanks to you for including Cascade Township in the north District.

Linden is really the best map to represent the people of West Michigan.

Absolutely please do not select the Palm map.

This is the worst of maps for votes to seats ratio for all of Michigan.

It is similar to the maps currently being used in the Michigan Senate.

Thank you all for staying the course and doing the difficult, mind numbing and seemingly endless work of the Commission with professionalism, curtesy and attention to detail.

Happy holidays.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Happy holidays.

Number 58, Lisa Ingram.

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> All right. I think the Congressional District map for Chestnut is the most fairest for at least from where I live in the Great Lakes Bay Area.

It's a good combination of the Tri-City areas.

I'm not too happy about the Linden Senate map, but I can live with it.

It puts myself in an area with Thomas Township and other areas that don't really serve my interests.

And then I do like the Hickory map.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 59, Jenna-Mahmoud.

>> Hello.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hello.

>> Can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> I'm Jenna, a long-time resident and part of Access. I urge you to continue your work on the house maps. You divided and separated our community of Dearborn and Dearborn Heights, doing so marginalized the community and impacts resources and weaken the ability and to vote for representatives who truly represent us and needs impossible.

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

We have done work for the community and submit our interest in it and supported the Congressional map of Chestnut and Senate map of Linden.

A community we cannot support the house map presented by your Commission.

Your house drafts continue to disenfranchise our community by cutting our community of interest into seven districts.

We need fair representation to be able to support representatives that truly support us.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 62, LaCracha Handy.

>> Flint Township, resident in Genesee County.

Every map is leaning to the right and too much republican bias.

Why is that the case when you know good and well the maps need to be fair with no political bias.

So please explain all of this nonsense.

I urge you to prioritize partisan fairness.

In the Senate vote no on Palm and in the house vote yes on Hickory.

Thank you for your service.

I trust that you will do the right thing by making sure we have fair maps.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you. Number 63, Manar-Alnashi.

>> Hello. I grew up in Dearborn and live in Inkster, a member of Access. And our community has made significant economic contributions to Michigan. And I'm asking you keep this community together.

In August Access submitted a community of interest map to ensure that we have the representation needed to serve our community and we have done that over the last 50 years.

All of your house drafts cut up our community of interest in seven districts on the house map, ensuring we will not have representation in Lansing.

Our voting power and the ability to elect representatives that will speak for our community's unique needs is impossible in the house maps and urge you to continue to work on the house draft maps during this period extending the 45-day public comment period.

That is better than having ten years of no representation sorry to the MENA community in Michigan.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 64.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not currently present. We can move to 66.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sophia Chue.

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.

>> Good afternoon.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good afternoon.

>> My name is Sophia Chue, a member of the Caribbean and Black and U.S. citizen. It has been intriguing to see how democracy works in the U.S. and encourages us as immigrants to become citizens to make our voices heard.

And thank you to make it this far.

I want to let you know we are pleased with the Linden and the Chestnut map as it keeps our community of interest intact.

Our concern is with the other map, the house map and we wanted you to take a look at map P9240 as we discuss with our other community groups and I think that closest fits our request.

Thanks for all that you do and I wish you a wonderful holiday season.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you very much.

Number 67, Anisa.

>> Thank you so much for doing this really important work.

My name is Anisa and I grew up in Dearborn and I'm here with Access.

The Arab American community that access serves most directly Metropolitan Detroit is the largest and most concentrated in the nation.

But the community is also unique in its diversity successes and challenges.

When Metro Detroit in Metro Detroit we have many people with Lebanese, Iraqi and Lebanese and Egyptian ancestry and smaller communities of people from Sudan, Morocco and Algeria.

The community is one of the oldest Arab communities with roots back to 1890s and we receive more Arab speaking refugees than almost any other Metro area in the country.

The largest community in the County, it's not captured in the census and left out of the redistricting process.

The Redistricting Commission has split the community into seven.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 68, Eman Mohammed.

>> Hello, hi, can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> Hello. I'm a Yemen and born and raised in Detroit and moved to Detroit after I got married and have four children which all attended the Dearborn Public Schools District. I'm here with Access.

The most recent issue of the Access health journal published in 2018 identifies a growing body of research indicating that Arab Americans and refugees are subject to a host of stressors including discrimination, lack of social support and economic hardship that could detrimentally influence their mental health and under emphasized due to current lack of data.

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

We have done the work for the data and have our maps C1510 and have taken community of interest in account with Chestnut and Senate map of Linden which our community supports and thank you very much.

We cannot support the house maps presented by the Commission.

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

>> Continue to disenfranchise.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 69, Patti Weber.

>> Patti-Weber.

Hello.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hello.

>> Hi, everyone. Thank you so much to the Commission for having me today.

Just a brief statement.

I appreciate this opportunity.

I appreciate all of the comments I've been hearing from citizens in representing various communities.

I want to speak briefly on support of Congressional map Birch.

Just from a personal point of view, I lived in White Lake Township for 20 years, Oakland County even longer.

My son went through the Huron Valley Public School, went through the school through that District.

And so those are the two communities that I feel best represent me as a citizen.

And the Birch map addresses and serves those under one unified voice in terms of my District than would be all contained within Oakland County. And also all of the schools within the Huron Valley District would also be represented individually.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 70, Ayah Mohammed.

>> I was born and raised in Dearborn and currently enrolled at Henry Ford early college and graduating this year.

I'm here with Access.

We have done the work for our community and submitted our own community of interest map C1510.

You have taken our community of interest into account in the Congressional map of Chestnut and the Senate map of Linden, which our community supports and thanks you.

You have to do better on the house maps.

You need to continue to work on the maps before you take a final vote.

As community we cannot support the house maps presented by the Commission.

All your house drafts continue to disenfranchise our community by cutting our community of interest into seven districts.



You have the ability to give a voice to the largest Arab American population in the country.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

We are going to go back to 64, Baqir-Muhyedeen.

>> Good afternoon. I grew up in Dearborn and in the Detroit. I'm a proud Michigander and active member of access.

I'm also member of the Islamic center in Detroit, Melvindale, a suburb of Detroit and part of Arab community of interest.

It's isolated in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights and Warrendale and we have immigrants. I have included C510 because we understand community's needs.

All house drafts disenfranchise the community, cutting us into seven districts and support Chestnut and Linden for fair representation of our collective community including Melvindale.

I urge you to reschedule and rethink the smaller communities, the impact you will have on the youth and the message this Commission will be sending as a whole.

Happy holidays and thank you for your time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Happy holidays.

Number 72, Lois-Maharg.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If that gentleman is still on, can I ask a question real quick?

Do we have them?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: One moment. I can bring him back on.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> Hello, yes, I'm here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you for your comments.

I really appreciate them.

You know and this is something we've heard a lot today from members of access, but I'm looking at our house map and I see you know we have District 15 that includes all of Dearborn Heights with Dearborn.

We have District 3 that includes Dearborn with Melvindale and a little bit of Detroit and District 4 which has Dearborn with a little bit of Detroit.

And that seems to follow the community of interest map C510, at least that is what we tried to do.

So are there any like particular areas in that COI map that you think should be looked at?

>> I will have to look at it more carefully to answer this question.

However, the fact that Dearborn is split up and separated into various maps is troubling in itself and does not reflect what has been in the districts historically.

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

We are looking for a map that includes Dearborn altogether with Dearborn Heights and Melvindale and some parts of Detroit or at least split into two, but seven is ridiculous. It will really water down our votes and the engagement of our community in future elections as well.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you.

>> You're welcome.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Okay, so we are going to go to number 54, Kermit Williams.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Chair, we still have Lois on the line.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I apologize. So 72 first, Lois-Maharg, then we will return to Kermit in 54, so 72 first.

>> Hi, I'm from Scio Township. Please keep partisan fairness in mind as you vote on the final District maps.

Of the collaborative maps the Chestnut for the U.S. Congress and the Linden for State Senate are the fairest.

That no State House measures up is disappointing, but Hickory is the fairest of the bunch.

If you consider alternative fair State House maps, please weigh the consequences carefully.

Another 45 days of public comment would further delay preparations for the 2022 primary and move us into uncharted territory and no new State House for 2022 sticking with the current house map instead.

Explore all scenarios that may arise from reopening the process with your legal counsel before deciding to do so.

You followed the process in the state Constitution fair more transparent than anything that went before.

Please vote for Chestnut and Linden and Hickory is a fairer map on December 28th.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 54, Kermit Williams.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It appears we are having technical difficulties.

Can we take a five-minute recess to resolve the computer issues we are having on the other end? So it is 2:00.

So we are going to take a ten-minute recess and we will return at 2:10.

That is not true.

That is not true.

We will take a ten-minute recess.

No, that is true.

2:10.

Thank you.

Hearing no objections, we are in recess until 2:10.

[ Recess ]

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It looks like we may have our technical issues resolved. So as Vice Chair of the Commission I call this meeting back to order at 2:14. Will the secretary please call the roll?

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Yes, thank you.

Go ahead, sir.

Doug Clark?

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name.

Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Brittini Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Returning to Rhonda Lange if you are attending remotely, please share where you are attending from.

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Thank you.

Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: MC Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Erin Wagner? Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: We have 12 Commissioners present, there is a quorum. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. All right. We will return back to remote public comment and I believe we have Kermit Williams waiting.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you so much.

I'm Kermit Williams, Pontiac City Council president.

I wanted to take a couple seconds to thank the Commission for all the hard work that you guys have done throughout this process.

We are almost at the finish line, and I'm very excited about it.

I would just ask that you would set a minimum standard for debate for each one of those maps as you guys deliberate.

You've heard a lot from us over this process.

I would love to hear from each Commissioner before you guys vote on the maps that is going to change the course of Michigan history for the next ten years.

So, again, happy holidays. Please consider making sure you take enough time to go through each map before you set that for our redistricting.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 73, Claudia Warren.

>> I've been a Midland County resident for 40 years and it's encouraging to see that through this collaborative mapping effort the Tri-Cities have been recognized as one entity.

I encourage you to endorse the following collaborative maps.

Chestnut for Congress and Linden and with tweaking the State Representative, redistricting for decades has been a closed door process dominated by the republican party resulting in gerrymandered districts that rig the election.

Statewide this republican dominance has been devastating for public education, environmental protection, infrastructure regulation and workers' rights.

Here in Midland County these gerrymandered districts have resulted in legislatures who are uninformed, indifferent and unresponsive.

Today thanks to VNP and this Commission we want a seat at the table.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is 74, Linda Barth.

>> Good afternoon.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good afternoon. We can hear you.

>> As a citizen of Michigan, I would first of all like to thank the Commissioners for their hard work and willingness to be open minded as they tackle the duties. I'm a resident of Midland and Realtor in Midland for 44 years.

I cannot emphasize enough the connection we have with Bay City and Saginaw.

When we market our area, we use the tools in the toolbox which include informing people relocating here about the amenities our sister cities have to offer and add to the benefit of living here.

The Commission has done an excellent job of recognizing our Tri-City of interest and balancing the criteria in a weighted order.

I support the Chestnut, Linden and Hickory, but Hickory with a little tweaking.

Recent publicity out of Midland and Gladwin is that we should ignore the importance of our COI and revert back to way things used to be. This Commission was tasked with many things including using political fairness as one of the criteria in creating the new maps.

Businesspeople and former politicians should not be allowed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is 75, Rosa Holliday.

>> How did they knock me out?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can, Rosa.

>> I want all of my time.

I was knocked out. I'm Rosa-Holliday from Bay, Midland and the Saginaw area. And I support your Chestnut map for Congress, the Linden for the State Senate. And actually on the house I just don't have one to support.

If you tweak the Hickory, that would work for the house.

And absolutely a no vote for the Palm map.

And I encourage you to continue to work to make fair, competitive maps for Michigan.

We will have to live with these maps for another decade.

And, Commissioners, you're doing a good work, so I thank you for that.

And encourage you to continue to give us a good map for the house so that we all can be able to live with that.

I just want fairness and competitive.

So thank you so much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 76, Judy Mega.

>> Hello there.

Your Chestnut Congressional map is decent, but it's last on the list for preserving communities of interest according to the nonpartisan redistricting open maps coalition. True communities of interest which do not include Counties are linked by public policy issues that maybe effected by legislation.

If you could do the Wyandotte and South Gate into Congressional six as the Birch map does, it would add a true community of interest to that map and be closer to the goals outlined by the Constitution.

Many people have requested this change in the online portal.

We share the following Federal issues as a COI.

Police and Federal, fire assistance, Down River mutual aid program.

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.

Down River Area narcotics and swat team.

An industrial site and Congress person regularly helps us two separate representatives would be duplicative and waste of taxpayer money and share geographic interests and communities intertwined and please keep us together and improve Chestnut for COIs a win-win.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 78, Laurie Evans.

>> Good afternoon. I'm connecting with you today from Troy. And thank you for the say on the final map proposals.

I ask the Commission to vote to approve the Linden map for State Senate as this is the one map that has the highest degree of partisan fairness and comes closest to meeting the criteria under which the Commission has been asked to operate.

This looks like the best map for the state.

I am however as so, so many others said today disappointed in the Commission's proposals for the State House districts.

None of the maps meet the fairness criteria that has been established nor effectively meet the other criteria for our districts.

Looking at these maps, Hickory is reluctantly the one tolerable choice for the State House.

The other house maps go way too far in creating extreme partisan gerrymanders which we worked to eliminate with the proposal two.

I urge you to look at Hickory and see if it can be made stronger for the state.

Birch provides the best opportunity for partisan fairness across the state and should be approved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 79, Kevin Grimm.

>> Hello, I'm Kevin Grimm from Troy. In 2017 I was a Voters Not Politicians volunteer because allowing them seemed clear conflict of interest and Michigan is one of the most partisan gerrymandered states in the country.

This Commission and public hearings like this, therefore, mark a huge step forward for the electoral process.

It marks a huge step back and may aggravate partisan fairness in the State of Michigan. Please start over with the State House maps.

Among the State Senate maps, I urge to approve the Linden map.

It has the highest degree of partisan fairness and comes the closest to meeting the redistricting criteria.

The U.S. Congressional District maps are also disappointing in their partisan bias, however, it appears that Birch provides the best opportunity for partisan fairness and respecting communities of interest and should be supported.

Thank you.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 80, who is Karen Tighe.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> It's Karen Tighe from Bay City, Bay County, Michigan, part of the Tri-Cities.

Thanks for all your work.

You folks have been amazing.

We have seen you in Midland and hosted you in Bay County. And nice to see Santa Rothhorn up there.

Early in the process you recognized the Tri-Cities, the Bay, Saginaw and Midland as a true community of interest, that existed through history and thus became an area of Mid-Michigan that's now functioning as a Metropolitan region.

You drew the maps that honored the Metro relationships while still slightly favoring republicans, but still it's a balanced District overall.

Our hope is that you don't fall prey to a last-minute push bipartisan groups from Midland, which are hoping to carve Midland out of the Tri-Cities and putting it back with Gladwin County. And it would result in a stronger bias and dilute what you did create for the Tri-Cities.

We support Chestnut, Linden.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 81, Susan Smith.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners.

I'm Susan Smith, vice president for advocacy League of Women Voters of Michigan.

The league is pleased to see that you intend to review and adopt a process for how you will conduct the final vote on December 28.

We encourage you to discuss each of the proposed maps before taking any votes.

The Commission has received thousands of public comments concerning the maps.

Now the public needs to hear from you.

How did those comments influence your thoughts about the maps? You have spent hundreds of hours developing these maps.

Please take the additional time needed to share your thoughts with the public, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is 82, Kathi Harris.

>> Hello.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> Good, thank you, my name is Kathi Harris.

I am a member of the Grand Rapids Randolph chapter and also our proactive organization.

And I'd like to speak to you regarding first of all fairness of maps.



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

We would like to encourage you to consider and making sure that Michigan, the maps of Michigan are drawn, the lines are drawn fairly and take that into consideration. And also, I'd like to ask you to support the Hickory map is the most fair map, that would support for Grand Rapids area.

And, I'm sorry, the citizens of Michigan voted to have you control, have control of this redistricting process.

I lost my notes and train of thoughts.

But you are all selected to give us a chance to have a fair representation in Michigan, so please take this into consideration when finalizing the maps for the state.

Also I'd like for you to consider prison gerrymandering.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 83, who is Emily-Clancy.

>> I'm here today as a resident and voter in northwest Detroit's Grandmont and a lifelong Michigander. I want to say I appreciate the Commission's work through the process and support the Linden State Senate map because it's the most balanced and keeps a community of interest the Grandmont communities together.

Palm is the worst Senate map because of the huge advantage for one political party and clearly not what our communities are asking for.

The Hickory map is the least unfair of the State House maps but the Commission should do better and take more time to deliver on racial Justice and partisan fairness for our State House maps.

The Hickory map shows my Detroit State House District separated from the other historic Grandmont, Rosedale districts and extended all the way out to Livonia take into consideration the comments made here today.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is 84, Wendell Anthony.

>> Thank you.

Reverend Wendell Anthony.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wendell, we are getting a lot of feedback. Do you have the Zoom meeting playing at the same time? And maybe are you on your phone at the same time? If so, if you could turn off or mute your computer and just talk on the phone.

>> Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could you say something again?

>> Is that better?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a thousand times better. Thank you very much.

>> I'm Wendell Anthony, president of NAACP. The maps are not representative of Detroit and people of color and violate the Voting Rights Act and the 14th and 15th amendment.

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.

In addition, it violates Section two of the Constitution with racial polarized voting and it must be drawn.

We support the Promote the Vote maps 6155, 6159 and 6250, which are fairer than any maps in consideration.

These maps focus on equity fairness and inclusion.

Detroit should not be cracked or packed in one District to reduce the impact on another.

We want fair maps drawn. Promote the Vote has a number of VRA districts and highlight needs that are rejected and votes suppressed.

We demand new maps reflective of the African/Americans and people of color.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Joel Arnold, 85.

>> Good morning or I guess good afternoon. I'm Joel Arnold. And packing Flint in a single District would be a clear mistake.

Our City would be subjected to a decade of a partisan gerrymander when this is not even necessary to ensure that we have Flint representation for majority minority District as we have long had.

The submitted map P7273 achieves the goal of ensuring representation of communities of color and allows for the City to elect a second representative as has been the case for the last decade.

Next Vote actually incorporated this map into a statewide map, which is P9240. So I ask you please revise your maps for the State House to reflect statewide map P9240 to ensure quality representation for the City of Flint without creating a partisan gerrymander.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 86 Essence Wilson.

>> Good afternoon. My name is Essence Wilson and I'm a resident of the City of Flint.

I wanted to share that I believe for the Congressional map that either Chestnut or Birch version two are best. And for State Senate map either Linden or Cherry version two. When it comes to the State House map, map P9240, which was submitted by Next Vote, should be a guide for the Commission as relates to the City of Flint.

This map has incorporated a previous map that was submitted, P7273, which many Flint residents have spoken in favor of.

Flint has long had two representatives and should be retained.

Flint needs to preserve a majority minority District, but the entire City should not be packed in a single District to accomplish this goal.

We ask you that you would take the time to get these maps right even though it will extend your approval timeline.

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.

Flint has suffered enough.

Please do not subject us to ten years of an unfair and under representation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Judy Davis, 88.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Judy, you are unmuted and free to address the Commission.

>> Hi. You can see me.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, thank you, the Commissioners, for your commitment to this process.

I'm Judy Davis, a resident of Southfield and a member of the Southfield chapter of Delta Sigma Theta. I support the Chestnut Congressional as well as the Linden State Senate map, which are the most fair maps with respect to representation of our communities of interest.

However, you should also include the City of Oak Park as a part of our contiguous COI of African/American citizens in the State of Michigan.

For the State House, I also support adoption of next vote's Hickory Handle 11, that has been mentioned a number of times.

It's P9240 in the mapping portal, which is a vast improvement over the other proposed State House maps.

However, I do ask that the City of Southfield be kept intact.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 89, Suzanne-Waldrep.

>> Hi. I appreciate the Commission for all the hard work and effort you have put into this.

My name is Susanne-Waldrep from North Oakland County. But I cannot accept due to the lack of partisan fairness in any of the maps.

I helped campaign for prop two and these maps do not reflect the intention of prop two as there is no neutrality in the maps that are drawn.

Please take more time to improve the maps before coming back and presenting them to the people of Michigan.

That being said, the best maps that are being put forward right now are the Linden map for the State Senate and reject the Palm.

Also for the house reject Pine and Magnolia as they are highly partisan and don't reflect the will of the people of Michigan.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 90, Wanda.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 91, Kim Derrick Hunter.

>> My name is Kim Hunter. I'm a Detroit resident lifelong.

In a state with more registered democrats, the Commissioners have managed to draw maps that favor republicans, that needs correction. And the Commission needs to align itself with the historic ongoing struggle for Black and Brown voters to be heard.

The fight for racial justice is linked directly to voting power. And drop prison gerrymandering. It's a modern version of the three fifths compromise where enslaved, nonvoting, Black bodies were used to give voting power mainly to white slave holders. Linden is the best State Senate map.

The Palm map is the worst of any of the maps, period.

Please vote no on that.

Hickory is the best of a very bad set of state maps.

Please, you know, use that one or tweak it as best you can.

Think about racial equity when you draw these maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 92, Lori Ross.

>> I can't hear.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Lori, you are unmuted and free to address the Commission.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Lori, can you hear us?

>> I can't hear.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: It looks like Lori.

>> My name is Lori Ross, a resident of Genesee County. I wanted to raise the point that while it is essential that Flint retain a majority minority District in the State House, we should not be packed into one single District.

To do so would ensure a partisan gerrymander and subject our City to another decade of gerrymandering.

In particular, a map submitted by Next Vote reflects the wishes of many Flint community members.

Map P9240 is a statewide proposed map which incorporates incorporated work that Flint residents did to issue, I'm sorry, ensure that our City has both a majority minority District along with a second opportunity for a seat that has been the case for the last decade.

Please use map P9240 as a model on which to move forward with redistricting Flint in the State House of representatives. And thank you for your service to our state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Numbers 93, Matt Cummings.

>> My name is Matt from Redford, Michigan.

It's vital to our democracy we have fair maps that represent the communities of Michigan.

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

The decisions you make will affect the Government for at least the next decade.

That in mind, I urge you to vote no on the Palm map. It's blatantly gerrymandered and embarrassing it was allowed to get so far in the supposedly neutral process.

Instead please support the Linden State Senate map, which is the fairest available maps.

And for the State House map, Hickory has the least partisan bias. However, it still does have significant bias.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 94, Scott.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Scott, if you are unable to unmute yourself, you are free to address the Commission.

>> Hello.

Hi. Am I unmuted?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> Okay, thank you.

I'm Scott Stensaas from Grand Rapids, lifelong Michigander.

I did work on the petition to get the Commission established and also campaigned for it.

I'm very pleased with the work the Commissioners have done thus far and very impressed with their persistence and hope that you all have a good rest after this.

Anyway, competitive districts is my big issue.

And I think that the more competition we have, the least less partisan slam dunk District I would like to see obtained.

I believe the Linden and Cherry Senate maps, the Hickory house map, and the Chestnut U.S. Congress maps are the preferable ones.

Thank you and happy holidays to the Commissioners.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 95, Sarah Abbot.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you.

On October 4th Commissioner Szetela said, quote, at the end of the day communities of interest come before partisan fairness.

So I would not want to break up Ann Arbor just to hit a partisan fairness goal.

End quote.

On September 15th Commissioner Szetela said, quote, I don't really think Ann Arbor and Jackson go together either.

I just don't like it.

End quote.

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.

So what happened? Because on October 29th she and Commissioner Eid bullied their way into slicing up Ann Arbor. Was she lying then or is she lying now? I believe most of you know breaking up Ann Arbor like this is wrong.

If you scored the Senate plan using mid-term elections when the Senate is actually up for election, you would see that the Palm plan is fair.

Please respect communities.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We do request people focus on commenting on the plans, not attacking individual Commissioners, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Or address the whole Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for your comments.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sarah, if you can unmute yourself, I believe you had about ten seconds remaining.

>> Thank you.

So I don't know if you heard what I said at the end, but I said please respect communities of interest, please keep Ann Arbor together, please vote for the Palm Senate plan. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Jamie.

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

We can move on to number 97.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Karen Adams.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Karen, you are unmuted and free to address the Commission.

>> I was hoping this would be more nonpartisan, but it seems to favor the current party in power.

So I hope you will continue to work to make these maps much more fair.

That was the goal of the whole idea of having these Commissioners.

For the U.S. Congressional map, I think the least objectionable is the Chestnut map.

I still struggle with the house and Senate maps.

I think Linden for Senate is about the fairest.

I live in Commerce Township, Oakland County, and, none of these maps really address our concerns.

And we are really suburban Detroit in western Oakland County.

Please do not put us with a District that goes up into the thumb of Michigan.

We have nothing in common with that area.

We need to be in Oakland County and we need to be part of suburban Detroit.

I thank the Commission for their work.

And I hope you can tweak this a little bit and make it more fair.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 98.

Sureena-Koppolu.

Go ahead if you are on.

>> Okay, so I encourage you to vote on Birch because it's good for my community. For example, we want to keep the county together.

That's it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Karen -- Emily-Jernburg, number 100, thank you.

>> Hello. This is Emily-Jernburg and I want to thank the Commission for all.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Emily, it sounds like your audio is very faint.

>> Is this better? Is this better?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You still kind of sound like you are in a tunnel and I can't hear you.

>> Here we go. Is this it? Is that it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's a little better, yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Is this Mr. Jernburg who is on the screen right now?

>> Oh, no, I got to put her on.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Let's bring her over to this computer.

Can you reset the time for the technical?

>> Okay, so sorry about that.

You can hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can hear you now.

>> Okay, great. So I just want to thank the Commission.

I know you worked super hard on all of this.

And it reminds me of people who work so hard on a project and then need to take a break sometimes and just get some distance and then come back together.

So what I notice, what I like is the Congressional.

The Szetela and Birch and Chestnut are the most fair in my opinion as well as Cherry and Linden for the Senate.

So first was Congressional, then Senate, then the house I'm really struggling because the least unfair is Hickory in my opinion.

But it's still not fair enough.

And so with this important Commission of coming up with an end to gerrymandering, making sure that everyone has the right vote, has the same vote, I ask you to go back and take a break.

Have a good time on your vacation, then come back and work please. Thanks so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. 103 Shari-Jonsson.



>> Hi. I'm Shari-Jonsson calling in from Holland, Michigan.

I have been very impressed with the commentary today. And I just have a brief comment that I would support the Linden map and the Hickory map.

And that's all I have to say.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is, sorry, Joan Parker, number 106.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Excellent. My name is Joan Parker. I'm in Jackson, Michigan.

And I appreciate all the work that you've done, but I do agree with so many speakers that your work is not done.

The maps are getting better, but they are still not fair.

For the State House maps, Hickory is the best that you have in hand.

But the seat count for 53D to 57R still gives majority of seats to the minority of voters.

This can be fixed.

And I urge you to take the time to do so.

And I also urge you to reject the house maps, Pine and Magnolia.

For the Senate I urge you to keep working on the maps starting with either Cherry or Linden as the most fair today.

And, finally, to echo the voting access for all coalition's multiple points of advocacy, I urge you to end prison gerrymandering by counting incarcerated citizens where they lived before, they went to prison.

This is a longstanding way to disenfranchise Detroit and other cities.

And it has to stop.

And even though I live in Jackson.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 107, Cindy Krieg.

>> Hi, my name is Cindy Krieg.

I'm from Grand Rapids.

I volunteered for a year and a half to make a more fair system.

For Congress the Birch map currently divides West Michigan into three safe republican seats, cutting out democratic voices.

The Chestnut map combines several minority sectors giving them representation.

Please choose the Chestnut map for partisan fairness.

For State House Hickory does the best job of representing communities of interest in Grand Rapids by having districts for the four quadrants and core City, allowing minority representation in several sections.

Please use Hickory.

The Szetela map still has an arm reaching all the way across the middle of Grand Rapids to grab Eastown and include it with unrelated Cities to the west.

Eastown has nothing in common with Standale and Walker.

Thank you for your time.

I appreciate all your effort.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next is 108, Carrie Hatcher Kay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not currently present. And the next participant in line is number 111, Donald Biddinger.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Great. I must say that I am glad that many people have shown up today and spoken up that wouldn't normally get involved.

That is good to see.

Having said that, I also feel that these people were provided with specific scripts as to what their party or organization wanted them to say.

It is very apparent that they all do not like or agree on the same State Senate map.

Yet, they seem to have been prodded to speak against the Palm map.

The Palm map is the only proposed map that keeps our County of interest in Jackson County whole and our community together.

All the other maps split us up with Ann Arbor or other...take other parts of the other Counties.

The map shows the most positive support online in green and yet, because of this, it is chosen for partisan reasons to be attacked.

Please keep our Jackson.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Allen, number 112.

>> Can you hear me?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: It's very faint, Allen.

>> How about now?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Still very, very faint.

>> How is that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That is much better. Thank you.

>> Thank you, guys, first off, MC. Second off I find it kind of interesting that a 50/50 plan, the Palm plan is called unfair, a plan that actually gives a chance to both parties. I do think it's interesting that when the State Senate is actually elected, I think you should use those numbers because the plan is fair and even according to the focus of gobbledygook.

At the end of the day, it's a community of interest argument with Ann Arbor.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm sorry, we are not able to hear you.

It's too garbled.

Please submit your comments online.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, we will move on to the next person in line.

Patricia.

>> My name is Patricia, a resident of Royal Oak Township. And I would just like to add my voice to the house map, that is very, very unfair, I feel.

And I'd like to give you a little history.

Due to the incorporation of the nine cities, the Township began to shrink in 1921.

The annexation of the original 36 square miles left the Township with two noncontiguous parcels.

Despite incorporating as a Township in 1972, the northern parcel was annexed by Oak Park through local referendums in 2003 and 2004.

The annexation resulting in the Township loss of 20% of its property tax value.

I urge you don't split Royal Oak charter Township in your House District map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 116, Callie-Bruley, Callie.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Hi, my name is Callie-Bruley. I am a resident of South Gate, Michigan.

I want to talk a little bit about the final vote process.

My concern from watching past Commission meetings is sometimes like a single Commissioner might make a motion before there is adequate chance for people to participate in the discussion of what is being made.

It's really critical this does not happen during the final vote process.

Take time, and I know we are going past the meeting time, but today to determine a process for voting on final maps.

It's really critical to enact a process that leads you to choosing the most fair plan other than a process that would maybe allow a vote on a procedural power move based on who makes a motion first.

It should include making sure each plans of the District type receive discussion on constitutional and public comments before a vote takes place and supportive of what your staff suggested.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number, oops, sorry, I lost my list.

Who is next?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We are at 117, Bob Carrico.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> Hi, I'm Bob from Franklin, Michigan.

And I'm thankful to the Commissioners for all your hard work.

But I'm afraid you may be vulnerable to push back, a lot of push back in the form of public outcry and Court challenges as your proposed maps consistently have shown a republican advantage on three out of the four partisan fairness scores.

To help mitigate this reaction and achieve as much fairness as possible at this point, please choose the Hickory map for State House and the Linden map for State Senate. And please definitely do not choose the Palm map for State Senate under any circumstances.

I thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Carol Chi.

>> From Sterling Heights, born and raised in Detroit, west side.

The Birch Congressional map or Birch V2 has the most partisan fairness. Perhaps you will have to merge with parts of Chestnut that people all day long have been talking about.

The Linden Senate maps have the lowest republican bias of the three collaborative maps.

Cherry is a close second choice.

The Hickory house map has the lowest republican bias of the three collaborative maps and most majority Black districts.

Say no to Palm. But I've got a relative in Ann Arbor and I know people out in the Jackson area. And maybe you have to mix that, the Palm with the, what is it, the other map.

The Magnolia and Pine maps, say no to those.

Majority of Michigan citizens voted for prop two to end gerrymandering in our state to achieve partisan fairness.

It still has not quite happened.

It's only fair to have competitive districts.

The party with the most votes should get the most seats. And being fair is the American way.

Thank you for your work.

Consider Promote the Vote maps and AFLCIO map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Catherine-Diggs.

>> Member of the Detroit Hamtramck coalition for advancing healthy environments reflected in COI map 2780.

Our COI, which is a very religiously, ethnically and racially diverse one is in many ways representative of many COIs throughout Detroit where Detroiters face numerous injustices from unsafe housing and now gentrification.

You did not meet our demand, that of many and previous public hearings that Detroit be kept whole with minority majority District with 50% Black or Brown vote.

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.

East side of Detroit in with the Grosse Pointe and Grosse Pointe Farms will guaranty Black and Brown voices will not be heard.

A 45-day extension for revision and public comment is better than ten years without representation.

Detroiters need representation and suffered enough injustices.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Jackie, number 124, Dilley.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, great.

First off, I'd like to thank you for all your hard work up until now and also encourage you to continue your good efforts by redrawing the house maps.

All are unfair and gives majority of the seats to minority of the voters.

Of these Hickory is better than the others.

So if you do decide to go with one of the existing maps, please do choose Hickory.

As far as the Congressional maps, Szetela is fair.

Birch and Chestnut are okay, but not great.

Apple and Lange are extremely unfair and should be removed from the list of possibilities.

Even though fixing the house maps will extend the process, they are simply unfair the way that they stand now.

Please take a break and come back after the 30th and redraw the house maps fairly.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Michael Davis, number 125.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners.

I'm Michael Davis with Promote the Vote coalition. Throughout this process Promote the Vote has demonstrated a commitment to helping the Commission succeed.

In fact, PTV was the only statewide coalition of civil rights organizations to submit maps, each fairer than the maps currently in consideration because they return the voice to the voiceless.

In years past Black and Brown voices in Metro Detroit were silenced by gerrymandering because they stuck to boundaries and municipalities. But Promote the Vote's maps focus on equity and fairness, improving the number of VRA districts and ensuring voters who were once disenfranchised are empowered once again.

Are your maps better than the ones we had in the past? Slightly.

Could they be even better? Absolutely.

And the maps submitted by Promote the Vote.

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.

I want to remind you of the conviction of speaker number 35 who received an ovation in the room.

She spoke to the harms of prison gerrymandering and how PTV maps address the issue, not because PTV gave any special care, but because we knew enough to care. The people of Michigan deserve PTV's fair equitable maps. And I urge the Commission to consider those.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Linda Appling.

>> Hello. Can you hear me? I thought I was number 125. I don't know.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> Okay, my name is Linda Appling. I live in Eaton County, the City of Lansing.

I recommend Chestnut for Congress and Linden for the State Senate.

Hickory is the fairest map you have for the State House.

However, it is biased for republicans.

This is reflected in an analysis by Next Vote.

That analysis projects a huge republican majority would have occurred in 2016.

A small win would have occurred in 2020 for the democrats.

The Commission should run analysis for the individual years of 2020, 2018 and 2016.

The political geography has changed over the years, others share these concerns.

If you accept Hickory, I urge you to put Grand Ledge back into Eaton County.

The community of interest has expanded with the newly approved GM battery plan for Eaton County.

Development will involve Lansing, Dewitt Township, Grand Ledge at a minimum.

I would also urge you to look at...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. That concludes our public comment for today.

However, I would like to mention that all e-mailed and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting in our meeting materials. And we also review the public comment portal on our [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) website on a regular basis.

We appreciate everyone who provides public comment in whatever method they choose to do so and invite to keep sharing thoughts, community of interest and maps.

So I think we are going to take a recess for about ten minutes so everybody can get up and stretch their legs, and then we will return back to our agenda.

So it's currently 3:05, hearing in objections, we will stand in recess until 3:15.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we ready?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need a minute.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Need a minute, okay.

All right. I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 3:20 p.m.

Will the secretary please call the roll? Not really, no.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Commissioners, roll call, please say present when I call your name.

If you are attending remotely, please share where you are attending from.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Rhonda Lange? Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: January Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: Erin Wagner? Mr. Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: You have a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Updated budget projections for the September 30, 2022, fiscal year end budget without objection I'll ask our Executive Director Sue Hammersmith to provide updated information about the budget, please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you Chair Szetela provided is the MICRC 2022 budget as approved on November 18th, that is the third column over.

You asked for some changes to that budget.

With recommendations.



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.

If you go down the expense line and travel costs, in order to add nine additional meetings starting in January more than what had been planned one time a month to go from once to twice a month that cost would go from approximately 26,000 to 48,000.

If you go all the way down to facilities and security, again, to go to two meetings a month it will add 45,000 to the budget.

Below that the consultant line drawing I estimated an additional 100,000 in support litigation efforts.

The contract only runs through the mapping process.

If you go down to the VRA legal counsel, I believe there will be adequate funding left within the existing contract.

It could be utilized to support litigation if needed.

Under general legal expenses, there was additional 26,000 added that would be for extending the paralegal contract past March 31st.

And the subscriptions that we have for legal counsel.

And then at the last meeting communications and Outreach Director Woods indicated that the promotional outreach and advertising budget could be reduced by 45,000.

At the suggestion of Commissioner Clark which I thought was a good suggestion in columns through March 31st in the budget and that would be if there was no future litigation and this Commission had completed its work, it could be finished by March 31st and that would be the end of our fiscal year expenses.

You can see at the very bottom what those expenses would be about 2.2 million.

The next column over adds the expenses from April 1 through September 30, assuming there might be extended litigation.

And from that there would be additional 1.8 million for a total budget of just under \$4 million with the appropriation being 3.1 million.

So given these recommendations for the full fiscal year that goes through September 30th, this Commission would need an additional 827,000 in order to do its work during this fiscal year.

Questions?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I've got just a few questions.

Yeah, I had asked Sue, I called her and asked her to put the expenses into two categories, one through the end of March assuming we would not get any lawsuits against us.

And the other one from April 1st to the end of the fiscal year.

And that will detail out for us what additional things we will have to do because of lawsuits.

And I think that one of the big reasons I recommended that is I think that will help when we go to get extra money.

So that we don't spend it all in the first three months but we got a heck of a lot of big costs coming if we have to go in Court.

And it kind of delineates the two for us.

And I think it will help in that argument when we go to get more money and it's already separated and recognize those two different paths that we go down.

As far as the money goes, there is 100,000 added to the consultant line drawing. And to support the litigation, I fully support that.

I think it's going to be needed.

And I think that is a good add to that.

And I only had one other comment.

And it may be factored in here by the reduction of the 45,000.

But I think as we go forward, whether it's the first three months or the extent of the whole year we need to add a technical because we will be confronted with documentation.

And we want to have it professional.

We want the grammar and all the good thing to do professional documentation.

And I've talked to Edward about that.

And he has some ideas where he could get a person but we need to have it included in the budget to add it to this.

And I don't know if that 45,000 if that is what was intended for that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Edward?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: A technical writer and last meeting 49,999 for the technical writer as well as for the documentary.

That is one and therefore with writing the report it would be close to what we are doing the documentary so we kill two birds with one stone.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is that price factored in here?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No. It's included in the current budget.

The reduction does not impact that at all.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, so but it's included up in the AV security facilities area?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No, it would be in the 177600, it's in that part where you see reduction, it would be in that new price.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: But it's included?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that is one thing we need to discuss and give the approval to if we want to have somebody do that.

I think we need to have a professional do that.

And then bottom line is if we go in to the second part of the year, fiscal year, we are going to have big legal costs and we will have to go back to the legislature to get additional money or wherever it goes.

So I think this will detail it enough to begin to present a case.

And I would suggest that if we do approve this budget that we go ahead and start putting together a plan, of staff, on how we are going to approach the state Government and what the plan is and who is involved and so forth.

And maybe talk about that in the first meeting in January.

So that was my insight on it.

The only thing I would suggest is we decide if we want to tech write it or not and I highly suggest we do.

And I bring that forward as a motion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As a motion to approve the budget as is?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll second it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay we have a motion by Commissioner Clark to approve the budget as written with a second by Commissioner Rothorn is there any discussion or debate on the motion? And do we have any one online? Is Rhonda or Erin online? I couldn't see them if they are.

We have a motion to approve the budget as submitted by Executive Director Hammersmith all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed hazed raise your hand and say nay.

It's adopted.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Kind of going along with this, and I've been thinking about it for a while, with the budget as is and approved, we have a significant amount of legal expenses anticipated in the coming year or years and/or years.

And this represents, you know, well north of a million dollars.

I think it would behoove us as a Commission to appoint someone of the Commission to work with Julianne and the legal team as she phrases it so that we can keep an eye on what the expenditures for legal work is, and this would be on a preapproval, not preapproval but a pre -- we are going to go do this, we as a Commission would have someone that is looking at that, knowing that that is going to happen.

And can have some input on behalf of the Commission.

So that's my motion.

And if someone seconds it, I may speak a little more some time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll second it.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think as I said I will speak a little more.

I think based upon we are going to have to go back to the legislature obviously.

I think we want to be able to best present ourselves saying the Commission is trying to keep control of what we are spending.

It does not mean we are not going to spend well north of a million dollars.

But at least it means we are looking at it before we do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm thinking about is how it sounds like a policy too.

Because I think we have this with Edward too where we have an excuse me Outreach Director where I believe we have a policy that he consults with I think either Commissioner Curry or the Chair; is that correct? Or is it always Commissioner Szetela?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think the way the policy works I go to Commissioner Curry and if she is not available it's Szetela as part of that and I want to comment on the communication policy during my remarks as for future follow-up thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That seems reasonable because we have existing policy and seems it's reasonable to have another similar situation.

And as you pointed out we have a significant amount of money.

We should be, yeah, monitoring it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

Good afternoon to the Commission.

Just for clarification, in what manner would this be different than the committee that was proposed at the last meeting? And I understand it's one person but again if it's a designee of the Commission then that person -- I guess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn go ahead.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I appreciate that and I was asking myself the same question and trying to frame it as a policy rather than as a committee.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Vice Chair Rothhorn, regardless of the term used, if it's a Commissioner authorize to engage in approve or monitor or whatever and again, I know Commissioner Lett is not finished presenting the full idea, but again, that would trigger the discussions happening in the open and make the recommendation back to the Commission.

I mean, I guess I fail to -- I guess I'm curious how this is different than from what has already been discussed and rejected by the Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: How is that different from Commissioner Curry with press releases it goes to Commissioner Curry and if she is not available it goes to me and we don't bring that back to the entire Commission to ask for approval and think this is the same.

We have one person who has sort of approval authority with respect to the administrative functions related to the legal function is that correct? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would like to second Steve's.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's already seconded.

You want to super second it.

A third.

Amendment.

Speak into the mic.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry, Steve be the individual that we select to fulfill that role and then the Chair as the backup.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I will second your amendment.

Any additional discussion or debate? Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was going to ask outreach director Woods to help us understand the policy as you understand it or whatever those comments were you wanted to make around your own policy or is it not related to this directly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You were speaking more about updates at the end, yeah, that is what I understood.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I just wanted to again reiterate that what the legal team does is respond to lawsuits, which we are in the middle of doing right now and awaiting a Supreme Court decision.

If the Commission is going to take any legal action the full Commission needs to authorize that.

So by granting one Commissioner additional power, responsibilities, influence, I really don't see how that comports with how the Commission has functioned to date, how your relationship with your attorneys has functioned to date.

But, again, thank you for allowing me to make those statements and I appreciate the time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right any additional discussion or debate? So we have an amendment to the initial motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by myself.

To propose that Commissioner Lett be the point of contact as the primary point of contact. In the event he is unavailable, I would be secondary as the Chair or when I'm no longer Chair, whoever the Chair would be the secondary, the way it has worked in the past.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

1, 2, 3.

So we have 3 opposed and we had 6, we have 11 here.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, I would do a roll call vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's do a roll call.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: When you restated you added verbiage where you would be a secondary or was that the version.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what he said.

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.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I thought I heard only Steve or Commissioner Lett, excuse me, so it was Commissioner Lett.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And then the Chair but right now I'm the Chair but when I'm not the Chair then whoever is the Chair.

Like the same process we follow for press releases.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So Commissioner Lett.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is Sarah Reinhardt for the Secretary of State for the record I concur with General Counsel Pastula that I did not hear that as part of the amendment.

So Commissioner Clark could you clarify if that was part of the amendment, please?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, the amendment indicated that I would like to nominate Steve as the point of contact and the secondary would be the Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Maybe your microphone went out.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Motion to amend to appoint Commissioner Lett to that capacity, and it's being amended to add the Chairperson.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No it's not being amended.

That is what he said the first time.

He just restated it again, that is what he said the first time.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we do a roll call vote, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely and if I may just a point of clarification about what the motion in particular is.

So my understanding is that there is a motion to appoint an individual to provide, is this to provide oversight or authorizations to the legal team? I guess I'm a little confused and want to make sure there is clarity prior to the vote on what exactly the function of this person is in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oversight is what Steve has said.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Will that hi make any sort of determinations without coming to the full Commission? Or is it mimicking the communications policy?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: This is Commissioner Lett.

The idea is to provide a set of eyes from the Commission since we are going into what will normally and certainly be a very active litigation season and if there is just said if there is something that I or whoever is doing it feels isn't appropriate we can bring it back to the Commission to say we are going to have veto power, no, I'm not asking for veto power.

I'm certainly going to exercise oversight on a couple of million dollars that we are getting ready to spend.

I think we can't go to the legislature and say we just authorized a couple million dollars for litigation, well, who is the watchdog on that? Well nobody.



So we need somebody there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, not in favor of that at all.

We are giving way too much power to one particular person and it's inappropriate in my eyes.

If there is something that needs to be done, it has to be brought up in front of all of us. I don't see why this is giving way too much power to one individual.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Dustin I just said that.

I just said that.

I said if I see something that is unthwart, I'm going to bring it back to the Commission. I don't have veto power.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I wanted to note for the record that Commissioner Lange has joined us by phone Commissioner Lange can you share where you are attending remotely from.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm not sure if this comment is extremely necessary but I'll go ahead and say it again.

The hard time that I'm having, my vote, no, was because it sounds like the same vote that we took last time.

And it sounds like maybe a loophole was detected and we are back to this kind of square one of wanting to monitor what happens with the legal team.

And if that is still the case, if we are unhappy PI with the way that turned it, I would like that discussion than under the guise of something else.

Because it's still oversight.

It's the same.

It doesn't matter and it's still the same to people that wanted to do it the last time with all the love and respect in my heart honestly.

It sounds like the exact same thing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm looking at is mimicking a policy that we have with outreach.

We have every two weeks we have like a season where we are going into intense litigation.

The idea is between meetings when we can't meet who on the Commission will help guide or who can be responsive, right, that is I think the spirit of the policy that we had for the outreach and that is the spirit of this policy.



>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I understand like I understand the reason behind it just historically because we have two Commissioners that are attorneys, when that type of dialog takes place, my fear, and it's not a real one, is how is that discourse going to play out.

I don't want it to interfere any of the good stuff we have going on.

That's all I'm saying.

I want it to be amicable.

I want it to be integrous and I want it to be done professionally.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I guess I don't understand if you're not going to veto it when you see something that you don't like, you don't agree with, what is the scenario what are you going to do?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Bring it back to the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: But you are then stopping the legal process they want to do.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Not without the approval of the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: But from when they say they are going to do it to you say I don't like it to when we meet, it stopped, right?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I guess I would have a discussion with the legal team and say this needs to go before the Commission.

And they may put the brakes on it and may say we don't have enough time.

We have to respond.

Perfect example would be with the Supreme Court.

We got to respond in two days.

I don't have time to bring it back to the Commission but hopefully if I'm the one doing it, I'm going to look and say, yeah, that has to be done.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much I again want to reiterate as I did at the last meeting this counsel as a body has hired and retained counsel with expertise in the subject matters that this counsel needs.

That this Commission needs.

And that, again, either we are responding to litigation that is happening or if it's anything being advanced on behalf of the Commission, we can't take action in your name without your approval.

These are -- this is a traditional and customary attorney/client relationship.

And the other thing I would like to point out is again at the last meeting I believe the Chairperson was advocating that a waiver of attorney/client privilege had been done.

That was not -- and whether that was or not the majority view or the majority of Commissions it was not put to a vote so we don't have any information on that.

But to give individual Commissioners the ability to weigh this and have some direction on the way that the defense of claims against the full body would go is just highly irregular.

And to me it seems again like a repackaging of the committee idea that was solidly rejected at the last meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So how many Commissioners saw the response brief and the answer that was filed on Monday before it was filed? You did.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I guess I don't know when it technically was filed. I got a response brief.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you see it before it was filed.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I can't tell you that.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: You're suggesting if I understand you right that before we respond to pleadings, all 13 Commissioners would have the opportunity to red line them?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was not saying that.

I'm just saying how many people actually saw it. You are saying you can't ask without Commissioner approval, but yet you filed a response brief on Monday that none of us saw as far as I know.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Well, Madam Chair, our job is to defend you in a lawsuit. And somebody sued you and we responded.

If the Commission wants to operate in that factor, then it will have to build a lot more money in its budget because we will have to convene meetings for you as a full body, again, not one or two Commissioners.

This is just highly irregular that the full body would say, "Yes" or "No."

And, again, under the Court rule, we have seven days to respond.

So if you're talking about the manner in which the legal arguments are made or just the signing off of briefs, I guess it's all just very confusing and brings us in my view right back to where we were last week.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So my second question is who is watching over the staffing of these legal team meetings that are happening each week? I've heard that it's costing us 3,000 an hour or more because of how many people are staffed at each meeting. And that again would be something where I would think we might want some oversight.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So Madam Chair two things.

I always love it when people hear things yet my phone doesn't ring.

So I encourage all the Commissioners as I've done from the beginning of time to reach out to me with questions and concerns then we can have a productive discussion about those things.

I also have concerns with information being provided parsed out to select Commissioners that continues to occur.

And also since I've been here in January, I've been very firm that all of the Commissioners are to receive the information at the same time.

So again if the full Commission would like to meet and say, yes, file this 40-Page brief that your legal team just worked, that is the intent of the Commission then that is fine. But again is it that we are responding to make sure we are responding timely? Is it to see who is working on it? Or it just doesn't make any logical sense whatsoever to me. And then that's my personal opinion.

But again, to the Commission side of it, if it's in regard to the billing, then I would suggest and we would have to amend the contract because I review the contracts and I keep track of the requests for services.

But if the full Commission wanted to take over that function, the bills could be submitted to the Commission and presented to the Commission for approval if that's the concern. But again I don't see how in a time span of seven days or three days to file a reply brief where it would be a prudent use of Commission time or resources but that is up to the body in its discretion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So that really gets to the point of it.

Is that the point of having one person as the point of contact especially someone who is a lawyer like Steve, he could look at it and say, hum this looks great or look at it and be like I'm concerned about this one point and I think maybe the full Commission should consider it.

That is the point the same with the press release.

When it comes to Juanita, she says it looks good or doesn't look good or talk to this person or whatever.

It's a filtering function designed to make it more efficient and the same.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just because you can't see me, when whoever's turn is done, may I have a turn to speak?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Absolutely.

I think what Steve is proposing is just someone having eyes on staffing of meetings, making sure we are not having three partners and five associates sitting at a meeting or having you know, just knowing what is going on.

So that the Commission who is the ultimate client is aware of what is going on.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Lett then Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: This conversation has gone down about ten rabbit holes and in the weeds.

It's a simple motion I made so we can have some oversight on it.

And I call the question and a roll call vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry what.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I still get a chance to speak correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we let Commissioner Lange speak.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We are working to get Commissioner Wagner on the line dialing in right now so we do have another moment or two so Commissioner Lange please proceed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange please proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

I'm looking at the almost I feel like an outsider because I'm always on remotely.

And I feel like I see things in a different manner.

Lots of times.

And I am seeing this as I think our General Counsel makes a very good point.

I don't feel they need oversight.

And I almost feel in my personal opinion that some of this is coming from a place of some type of personal feeling.

And I could be wrong on that.

That's just how it appears to me.

The fact is, is somebody going to be sitting in on the meetings and how is one Commissioner having oversight of them going to get the information to the whole Commission any faster than what our General Counsel already does would be my question.

I don't see it as being constructive personally.

And having one person and an attorney we have seen, no offense to either attorney we see both attorneys on the Commission have opposing views to our General Counsel.

So I don't see where it would be productive.

And I still feel that any issues should be brought to the Commission as a whole.

And that is all I got to say.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange.

So do we have Commissioner Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, Commissioner Wagner, I believe you are on via phone can you share where you are attending remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'm attending remotely from Ingham County, I believe.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so we have a -- the question has been called.

Just for Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Wagner who have just joined we had a motion by Commissioner Lett seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn to appoint similar to the way we have right now for our communications policy appoint a contact person to be sort of a liaison for legal to sort of watch what's going on I guess would be how I would say it, oversight and if needed report things back to the full Commission.

And then we had an amendment by Commissioner Clark which was seconded by myself where he wanted to make that point of contact Commissioner Lett and then in the alternative that Commissioner Lett is not available then the Chair because obviously the Chair position changes.

So at this point we are going to go ahead and vote on the amendment first and we are going to do a roll call vote.

So this is on the amendment to appoint Commissioner Lett as the point of contact and then secondarily the Chair of the Commission.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair did you take a vote to end debate? Or if no one else has any I'm sorry if no one else had any comments.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: There was a motion to call the question; is that correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, motion to call the question.

There is no debate on that.

So we have a motion to call the question.

Let's go ahead and vote on that.

One again let's do a roll call.

What? Okay let's do a motion to terminate debate and call the question all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Was that you Commissioner Lange did you say aye?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, I did.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, and then Commissioner Wagner what was your vote?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Aye as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all opposed say nay.

All right at this point we are going to vote on the motion to amend made by Commissioner Clark which was to amend to appoint Steve Lett and secondarily the Chair and we will do a roll call vote on.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Madam Chair Commissioners please indicate your support of the amendment to the motion with a yes or a no.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> 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: Thank you.

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: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 6 yes to 7 no, the amendment does not

carry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now we will vote ton primary motion which is a motion for someone on the Commission to be appointed as oversight for the legal functions similar to the policy we have in place for communications.

Once again can we do a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Commissioners indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No."

Once more I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order to cast your vote starting with Janice Vallette?

- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.
- >> 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:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Your microphone is not on but yes do you want us to have a liaison person for legal similar to what we have for communications like you are for communications?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry the motion was to appoint an individual Commissioner to be the liaison for oversight of the legal team so a yes would be in support of that motion and no would be in nonsupport of the motion.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think it takes more than a minute to think about this. Can you come back to me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's your call on that, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, Commissioner Curry, we can return to you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you.

>> 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: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And returning to Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was a no in case you couldn't hear it.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry, can you repeat? Is that a no?

Turn on your mic.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is a no.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Five yes to eight no, the motion fails.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you Ms. Reinhardt.

Next is unfinished business agenda item 5B physician final vote process without objection I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith and Sarah Reinhardt from MDOS to present the draft documents.

Please proceed.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you.



I want to give some credit to Sarah Reinhardt and Yvonne young for starting this draft and then the full MICRC staff and MDOS staff not to review and edit and create this document for the Commission.

This is a process for the final vote.

So as we know the Constitution has certain criteria.

And this details that.

So the Commission can use its own process in conjunction with and making sure that they comply with the Constitution to follow this process.

So step one would be an overview of the plans.

And in an open meeting so the public knows what we are voting on.

The Commissioners are all fully aware of what we are voting on.

It's suggested that be done in alphabetical order by grouping.

So you would start with State Senate and then go to State House and then U.S. Congressional.

You would take your own notes on each plan.

Which would be part of the public record.

And throughout this document there are decision points so here we go with the first.

Should Commissioners present their individual published plans at this time? There has been no public presentation of any of those individual plans.

Obviously, the public could watch your collaborative plans as they were developed or could go back to the videos.

But does this Commission feel that the individual plans should be presented to the Commission? Second question will they present during this meeting? I would say that's not likely.

I don't think we will have enough time today to even get to that agenda item should they present then on the 28th.

Again so everybody is aware of each plan and the public watching the process unfold is aware of each plan, the sequence in which they were developed and how they are similar and how they are different.

And then lastly should the Commission do an overview of all plans in each type of District or go through all the steps for each one at a time.

So I think we as a staff would recommend you start with either State Senate, State House or Congressional.

You can choose where you start.

And go through all those maps one at a time.

The collaborative ones, the individual Commissioners could present the maps they developed and how they developed them again if they were based on a certain map or if they started from scratch, et cetera.

So thoughts on these questions?

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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If I may, Director Hammersmith, I'm screen sharing right now the document and I'm happy to take notes on what some of the Commission's decisions are on decision points.

The recommendation to present today December 16th obviously given time constraints and the wealth of public comment received today from the members of the public, it's likely that there may not be time to get through all of the drafts.

You might expect something similar on the day of the vote, a wealth of public comment coming from members of the public which may provide time constraints to the actual day of the vote itself.

So something the Commission might consider as hesitate as I am to say it scheduling an additional meeting between now and the 28th which is the day of the final vote.

So just another point to consider.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a suggestion and we may need legal counsel's direction on this.

But we have a three day meeting.

So what if at the end of the first day we don't adjourn, we just go into recess and pick it up where we left off on the following day so we don't have to have public comment all three days? We just get it all up front.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: That is the plan.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: That will be one meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, so really, it's a function of how many people are going to speak is how much time it's going to eat in, okay, thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was going to say something similar.

We have the 28, 29 and 30th booked so we could do the presenting on the 28th and just hold voting until the 29th if we need that time.

Now I was also going to suggest I would like us to do the U.S. Congressional maps first and then the Senate and then the house.

I think we will get the most done that way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments? Commissioner Rothhorn did you have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I like the idea of giving us some Congressional, Senate and then house, I like that idea.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to try to schedule an additional meeting? Maybe on the 27th or do we think the 28, 29 and 30th will be enough time? Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I would rather just go until 5:00 like 10 to 5:00 for example instead of like.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Instead of adding a day.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is Sarah Reinhardt with the Department of State if I'm understanding the answer then to decision point number one should Commissioners present the plans during the final vote, so, yes, there would be a presentation of plans and then the additional distinguishing question would be should Commissioners also present their individual plans at that time as well?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would think, yes.

I would say present them all.

Any comments, concerns? I'm seeing lots of nodding heads.

Anyone, yeah, I would just assume we are going to as Commissioner Eid suggested start with Congressional go through all the Congressional and then once we finish with that go through all the Senate and then go through all of the house.

So I think question two is sort of an answered but I our absence of time.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we will not be getting to those plans probably today but we will be getting to them on the 28th but then that will be our agenda item on the 28th. Or director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I just want the Commission to know we do have the facility on the 27th if needed.

I spoke to the contractor yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay and we have it 10-5 on.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: There is no one in there but we would need to know today because that would also impact set up in terms of the audio.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What about the I'm sure I have it on my agenda never mind I will look.

Okay so our 28th, 29 and 30th are all starting at 10:00 a.m. are they going to 5 p.m. as well?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is up to the Commission.

We don't have a cutoff like we do at the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to ask can we go later than 5:00 if we need to.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I wanted to highlight with the 27th if the Commission elected to schedule that as a working meeting that would need to be an independent meeting because the meeting on the 28th, the vote, the final vote can't happen before the 28th.

So I just wanted to make sure that the Commission was aware of that distinction.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right, okay, Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just wanted to clarify it sounds like we don't have a cutoff date as far as the location.

But if we are wanting to go later, we should probably make sure we have our interpreters and everyone available for the time that we are thinking.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Commissioner Orton our staff has been working closely with our interpreters and translators to make sure they are notified of availability and if you all decide to adjust the times or extend them today, we will be sure to coordinate closely with them to ensure their availability.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair and also if the Commission was desirous of scheduling an additional working meeting on the 27th, those presentations could occur on that day.

The Commission will have Dr. Handley's partisan fairness report and the accompanying memorandum from legal counsel as well.

I keep saying accompanying when I talk about it and a legal memo likely as well.

So there is certainly enough business that the Commission could engage in.

Should it elect to work on that day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Want to move on to the next one, Sarah? I think we have covered everything here so step two go ahead Ms. Reinhardt if you want to present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sue, I will let you continue.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: All right so step to this would be discussion before there is any voting.

So the thought here is to have each Commissioner state their top two plans, the best plans they feel that should be published by District type.

So again, if you choose to start with Congressional, it would be a round Robin of I prefer these two Congressional maps I prefer these two Congressional maps so just kind of a round Robin discussion to get a feel for what maps the Commissioners think would be the ones that should be published.

And, again, some decision points here so I guess we have the December 28th meeting covered on question one.

One of the questions was the top two or more than two.

Considering there is only four, five and six plans for each type of District, two seems adequate.

You might want to go to three.

Would you want discussion first? I'm assuming you would want presentation of the plans first and then would you want any discussion before you talk about the best two maps that you feel would be representative of what you feel would be best for the State

of Michigan and based on the comments you've heard? And, again, I'll publish plans and go through all steps for each.

I think we are recommending that you go through the maps one by one initially through step one and then when you get to step two whether you wish to have some discussion before you do a straw poll or if you just you feel you're ready and you want to do a straw poll at that time.

So that would be step two.

Thoughts on that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I would also add that this step in particular the part about disclosing favored plans each Commissioner disclosing their favorite plans came about after discussion with a few Commissioners.

And it's really just to allow all of you to know where each other stands.

Prior to going into any discussions.

But of course the question before the Commission is whether or not you want to switch these two steps.

And have everyone do a discussion of each of the plans first and then go around talking about which ones are your favorites.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thoughts, comments, anyone? So we are going to have a presentation, right? We will go through and present.

And then do we want to have discussion on those plans as we go through or do we want to do the presentation and then have some discussion and then do the straw poll? Does that make sense? And the straw poll is meaning just here is my top two plans here is what I like the best so we sort of have a feel as to what people are thinking.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: I feel have those after the presentation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Have the presentation.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: So you know exactly what your thoughts are as opposed to presenting or these are my thoughts and there is a presentation, oh, wait I want to change and these are really my thoughts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Step one is our presentation, step two is kind of our discussion. So I think the thought is have some discussion about you know comments, objections, concerns, what I don't like, what I love then we move into a straw poll. Does that make sense?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And for clarification Madam Chair, do you want to have discussion after every map that is presented? Or after every map type? So for example, for State Senate after each map you would discuss it or would you wait until all state Senate maps are presented then you would discuss it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say that second, discuss all the maps, then have a discussion on it seems to me to make the most sense.

I just don't know how I feel about straw polling.

I think that is kind of iffy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Straw polling.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, I don't know how I feel about that unfortunately.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So just to clarify you were in favor of us having the presentations on all the plans and then discuss so let me clarify.

Having the presentations on all the Congressional and then having a discussion collectively.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Then we move on to the Senate and do the presentations on the Senate then have a discussion on the Senate.

I think that makes sense to structure it that way.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Again I don't know I'll have to really think about it but I don't know if it would be appropriate to say these are my top two because you are basically voting at that point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I'm honestly not crazy about the straw poll either. Something I had suggested to Sarah and staff was that we do like a preliminary vote. And before a final vote rather than a straw poll, so like we do our discussion and we do our presentations and discussion, then we have a preliminary vote on all the plans to see what plans get two, two, two. Because if a plan doesn't get two, two, two, it's not moving on. And that is sort of like isolates out the plans and then we would move on to a final vote of anything that hit two, two, two.

Does that make sense? Rather than a straw poll.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It does, but I still think that that is basically voting at that point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't think that is appropriate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well I feel like so have you read the comments online that people are concerned? So people are concerned that there is going to be a rush to vote.

So we have our discussion, we have our presentations and then someone is going to quickly make a motion like I want this plan and we could potentially get enough votes on that and we have never had any votes on any of the other plans even though because it's two, two, two you could have two republicans, two democrats and two independents in favor of two separate plans.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I see what you're saying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You foreclose a vote officer happening on the other plans. So we received a ton of public comment both in person and online about the public doesn't want that to happen.

They want a vote on every plan.



So even if it's just a preliminary vote to kind of whittle things down, I think that is what the public is asking for, for transparency purposes.

They want us to vote on everything Orton then Commissioner Eid and Wagner and Lange if you have comments just shout them out because I can't see you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I kind of feel the same way Dustin does about a straw poll but I think maybe that's the better way to go than what you're saying about a preliminary vote on each plan.

It would just streamline it to do the straw poll I think if that is the reason we are doing it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I'm not having a consensus of what a straw poll is can you tell me what you mean by that and I could be saying the same thing but it seems like it could be beneficial.

I know we talked about having a discussion.

The preliminary vote piece Chair Szetela I don't think is a horrible idea because the way that I think about it is some of our maps need to be like eliminated altogether. So there has to be some way either by asking like which ones are we just not going to...I don't know. There has to be some thought but it's a vote and kind of a weeding through how we are going to process the discussion.

So I don't know what I'm really articulating, but that is my thought.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah I mean just to clarify so what the proposed plan is, is that there will be a motion and that each Commissioner will state openly their two top favored plans and so the comments on line about that were okay so let's say we go down the list and you have got, you know, five people saying they like plan A and five people saying they like plan B and now everyone in the room knows what is favored so one person rushes and makes a motion really quick immediately after I make a motion to adopt plan B and bam you force a vote on it and there is not a vote on plan A even though people were in favor of it.

I think we should avoid and somehow we need to whittle out the chafe what we are not going to vote for and whether that is through a straw poll or otherwise there has to be a way to do that and making sure someone can't rush in and make a motion for a vote.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The rush piece to me sounds like a bias so that would be us as individuals and human beings and Commissioners deciding we will not come in, oh, yeah, this is the map I want and I'm going to be a snout and ignore everybody else in the whole process we have been doing.

So that would be my response to that on an individual level I feel we need to have some integrity and say we are not going to rush the vote.

But whatever.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, I think that what is so wonderful is that the voting step actually addresses that.

So for the voting step, again, all of the plans of that District type are open.



So when the Commission votes it has the opportunity to vote on each Commissioner votes excuse me, they would have the opportunity to vote on any of those five plans so they are all presented simultaneously if you will.

So that way there is not that okay let's vote on plan one, plan two because is plan one just because it was voted on first gets more -- so it kind of -- the way that the voting procedure addresses the concerns and stating the preferences or that kind of that doesn't have any effect on the fact that all of them are moved forward or for potential vote in the next step and I believe that is exactly what Ms. Reinhardt was going to say something along those lines.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You are absolutely right General Counsel that is exactly what I was going to say.

The next step, the voting step does account for deterring a rush to first motion. Which I know is a concern of yours, Commissioner Szetela or Madam Chairperson. And you would also propose alternate plan which I will let you kind of present more fully when we go to the next step.

But I did want to also add that you know if the Commission is not comfortable doing the disclosure of your top two favored plans during the discussion, you're more than welcome to do away with that.

But the way it is as structured with having the disclosure of your top two favored plans prior to discussion is really to allow the Commission to come to the table and everyone lay their cards out about where they are at coming into the discussion.

And it allows you all to perhaps have a more robust discussion knowing what some of your peers favor or disfavor.

And perhaps ask your colleagues or your peers you know what is it you do like, what is it you don't like so that you can engage in the discussion knowing where everyone stands.

But of course you're more than able to switch those two in order as well.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a question and it may be a legal question about this.

The Constitution states that as far as the individual plans that those come into play if we cannot agree on a plan.

So did we change things up to where we are considering even the individual plans before the initial vote or should we -- should we be voting on the collaborative plans and then if those don't have the two, two, two consider the individual plans?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think the plan was to vote on everything, all the individual or collaborative, that, that is what is available to vote on or everything that has gone through the 45 day public comment period and includes both individual and collaborative.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Does that meet the Constitution? Demands?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair.

In response to Commissioner Lange's question, yes, there is one pool of maps right now.

So the Commission is continuing to use the distinction collaborative and individual just for identification purposes.

But all of those maps that have gone through the period are in one pool and up for a vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Was that responsive Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Well then it brings up other questions for me.

So that is where my confusion is coming in because of the language of the Constitution. If they are all in one pool, and being voted on, if none of those get the two, two, two or whatever then individual Commissioners again get to put in maps? See where my confusion is coming?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, I definitely hear the second set of question that is being raised.

And let's definitely connect on that topic, Commissioner Lange.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so I see Commissioner Eid go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you Madam Chair.

You know Ms. Reinhardt took the wind out of my sails just now because I was going to say exactly what she said.

I think the straw poll idea is a good idea because you know once we get out in the open what everyone thinks about however whatever map they think is best in my open discussion on those maps and you know we might convince each other something else or we might not.

I do think it's a good idea to have some sort of preliminary idea of what people are thinking before we take a final vote which would be on step three.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I agree.

After Sarah Reinhardt's explanation I understand the idea of the straw poll first.

Because that will kind of serve to eliminate maps that no one brings up as their top two. We don't even then have to center the discussion around those maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So do we want to add first of all I think for number two I think we can take out the five because I don't think we will do top five because that will be silly.

So let's just take that out right now.

Make some progress.

Do we want to add an additional step of we will do the straw poll and then do we want to actively say, okay, this map didn't get in the top two, so do we want to not consider it anymore? Or do we just want to let that fall by the wayside? If it's not in the top two we don't look at it.

That sounds fair to me Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Eid.

Or wait for discussion maybe, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think wait for discussion, if someone brings it up in discussion and wants to convince people that that should be, then I think that is fine. But if no one is interested in it we just don't no one brings it up, then it doesn't get talked about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sorry my computer is about to restart and I do not want to happen.

I will fix that later.

I understand what you're saying.

But I don't think we can actually restrict how anybody wants to vote like when it comes to actually voting.

Do you know what I mean?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would add to that and say everyone is going to have their own top two so I would say maybe the top three move forward potentially under the favorites because if you just do the two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well, I think what Sarah is proposing is that we start out, so let's say we present the Congressional maps and say okay everyone throw in your top two and then we go into the discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now she has explained that I think that makes a lot of sense. So we are having the presentations then we do the little straw poll, then we launch into discussion and that is the point where people can be like hey you picked map C and I think map D is better and here is why and we can have that discussion and move it forward.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And I would also offer regarding the elimination of any maps prior to the actual voting phase.

If you all want to build in kind of a like a runoff voting style in that format, we are happy to make adjustments to the voting format to accommodate that.

But I don't think that any sort of informal elimination of proposed maps at this point would want the amount of consideration due to each of these maps as you enter into this final vote which is a very big occasion and you want to make sure that each vote gets its full discussion sorry each map gets its full discussion and consideration in the final vote.

So I would advise against informal elimination based on your stated top two favored maps at this stage.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

So again, and I know we are building the steps and the phases, but the constitutional requirement is each plan be voted on so if a plan were to drop out for a reason that it does not meet you know 14A or 14B, then it would be inappropriate to vote on that map, correct? But to the extent that the maps all satisfy the requirements of subsection 14, then each map would need to be voted on.

Again and that is why we proposed that procedure where all five are on the table and the Commission can choose to vote.

So the distinction I think for the straw poll is just to lead the discussion, but that all the maps it's critical that all the maps be voted on.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So can you scroll back up again, Sarah? Scroll back down to four and should the Commission discuss all published plans at once or go through the steps one at a time.

I think what we coalesced around we will go through all Congressional and then all Senate and then all house.

So we will do presentations, discussion, and then presentations, you know, presentations discussion, vote, presentations, discussion vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Got it that is clear thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's move on to step three which is the vote itself a motion will be made by the Commission to conduct a roll call vote to adopt a plan by District type so we would maybe move to address Congressional maps, each Commissioner will cast a vote stating the plan they wish to vote for all District plans of that type. Then the secretary will record the vote, check for constitutional majority and announce the results.

And if there is like I said the two, two, two at that point that plan would be adopted.

If no plan satisfies that criteria, then we would move on to the ranked choice voting.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Correct so as an example for step A, the motion would be as a Commission if I were a Commissioner, I would motion that we vote for a State Senate plan to adopt by stating one preferred plan name.

So when it comes from my turn to vote I would say the name of the plan I want to vote for.

For example, dogwood, I vote for the dogwood plan and each Commissioner would proceed similarly so on, so forth.

Alternatively, Commissioner Szetela had proposed a different format of voting which also makes a lot of sense.

And allows consideration of the vote for each of the maps.

In a couple of different rounds.

So I know Commissioner Szetela you briefly explained it but if you would like to explain it in a more detailed fashion, I think it's certainly a plan that the Commission should consider.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I mean I'm actually okay with what we have here. Because I think as long as we are not having that ability to force you know I like that the voting process itself is for a District plan, not for a particular District plan. I think that eliminates the concern of the public that someone is just going to rush in and bring a motion right away and we are never going to consider other plans which is what they don't want.

So I think this is good.

And I think it's more clean and streamlined than doing alternate rounds of votes. The only question I would have for the Commission is if we vote once and we don't have a majority do we want to try a motion for consideration to see if we can get majority the second time or do we want to move straight to the ranked voting.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Indeed that is decision point number one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think in that case then we should have more discussion and try voting again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Witjes go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I agree we would have more discussion on a map. But I would say you can only do that one time before you move on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Before ranked voting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We don't want to prolong it forever.

General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair, my only comment would be that for Roberts rules the motion to reconsider at the same session would be the vehicle to bring it back.

And I heard Commissioner Witjes certainly the Commission could put it in its voting rules that restriction in this manner or the Commission again could establish an alternate rule just for the voting procedure.

But if the Commission is comfortable with the motion to reconsider and I know you have used it on four earlier occasions so that would be an appropriate to just continue to follow that as written.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I just thought of this.

Is the motion to reconsider actually really necessary? I assume we automatically start talking about it at that point.

Seems like a waste of time but I don't know the answer to that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I mean judging by our procedures we would discuss it first and then have a motion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are an informal bunch here.

Much to some people's dismay.

Okay so then so that sort of resolves question one so then question two is if there is no constitutional majority from the vote reflected in step 3A can we then have individual Commissioners move for particular plans.

So not just a full any Senate plan particular plans because you come and say I want the dogwood are we okay with that or do we want more discussion and if we can't do a reconsideration on all the plans then move to ranked choice?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: More discussion never hurts so I mean in my opinion having someone say I move to make XYZ plan be the one that we adopt I think it goes against the spirit of what it is we have been doing all year anyway.

So I feel it should always go back to discussion and try to get the voting to happen.

And not have someone just sniper something in and say I want to make this one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We also would have the possibility too if there are two leading plans to possibility have a radio vote motion after discussion.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I would just recommend that you build that discussion into the procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so let's say for point one if there is no constitutional majority, I lost where you are at Sarah can the Commissioner motion to reconsider the vote and we would add into that after continuing discussion, yeah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Am I understanding correctly the Commission is in agreement that there would only be essentially two rounds of voting for this Section where if the first vote failed you would go into discussion and then go back and you could only motion to reconsider once.

So if the second vote still does not achieve a constitutional majority, then it would go into ranked choice.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any thoughts on that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe that was suggested by Commissioner Witjes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't know.

That is a hard one.

Maybe three just to give it one more chance? I don't know.



>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I actually like to leave open option two in case we do get that situation where we have you know a few people voting for one plan, another bundle voting for another plan and then maybe you know a handful of other people voting for a third.

Maybe give that option to us to have someone bring an individual plan after we have already had the one vote and the discussion and the motion to reconsider.

I mean maybe have that as another.

I would not want to restrict someone's ability to do that I guess would be my point.

Because it might help resolve the deadlock, you know.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: A deadlock also can be broken by discussion and then voting on what is the wording here? Voting on, sorry how it's written there so not just one plan.

So for example I motion that we vote on a State Senate plan to adopt by stating the preferred name of the plan.

After discussion somebody could change their mind and everyone would be on the same Page.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are you proposing? More than one round of reconsideration is that what you're thinking?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm not sure on the rounds.

I just don't know if decision point two is necessary to where we motion to approve any particular map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right, I feel like we could take two and three out and just go with one.

And then I think motion to reconsider twice might not be a bad thing because if we can't do it after three votes then it's time to go to ranked choice, right? Yeah.

So is everyone okay with taking out two and three, we will just go with the process in one that we are going to do the first vote, have discussion if we don't have a concurrence and maybe take another vote, reconsider and then if that doesn't work then more discussion and then if we have a third vote and don't move forward then it's time to move to ranked choice.

Does that work for everyone Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I just have a question Madam Chair.

How did Arizona or California vote when they began to vote? Do we have any ideas from them? How they did it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have no idea.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I can provide the voting procedures for all those.

I have that as reference material.



>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm sure they went over the same discussion that we are having now and probably came up with a better solution or a better way or something.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Of course their frameworks may be different. So but again and the Commission what you are discussing now the Commission has the flexibility in this area to set your voting methods.

But the Constitution lays out some hard textual requirements but opposite those or in addition to those or leading up to those the Commission has the flexibility.

And I did want to say that I had that and will circulate it to the full Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, any other questions? All right so moving to number four, there is and we have already touched on this should we structure the vote as a runoff vote to narrow down the field or should the Commissioner vote on all published plans at once without no runoff structure? It sounds like no one is in favor of it being a runoff, is that right? Right, but that is the next step.

Okay so we can just take off number four and let's move on to step four.

And we have to get through this by 5:00, guys.

So all right ranked choice voting if no constitutional majority is achieved the Commission will proceed with ranked choice voting.

Following the procedure listed below so each Commissioner can submit one plan for each type of District to the full Commission for consideration.

And so that can be either a collaborative or an individual map.

And you know like I say we have five people that say map A and five people that say map B and then three people say map C then those are the three that we are going to rank choice.

So.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I would add Madam Chairperson.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That for this particular part, for the submission of a plan, it's actually really important, the vote is determined by the Commissioner who submits the plan.

So how it's structured here is that if anyone of you wants to submit a plan one of the collaborative plans or one of the individual plans you would raise your hand to either be called upon by the Chair or be called on in alphabetical order.

That is a decision point for you all to make later and once that person is called on, say I'm called on as a Commission and I say I want to submit the dogwood plan, and every other Commissioner who wanted to submit the dogwood plan would put their hand down and that one Commissioner will have been the Commissioner who submitted the dogwood plan.

Does that make sense?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not following that but Commissioner Eid go ahead maybe you can help clarify it for me.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I had a question about that too.

And I think what Ms. Reinhardt is getting at is how it says each of the published plans may only be submitted by one Commissioner.

So that's what it says in the last sentence there.

What that means is if multiple Commissioners wanted dogwood, dogwood can still only be submitted once.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now, I think that is what she was saying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My question is why is that? Why can a plan only be submitted by one Commissioner? Why can't a plan be submitted by multiple Commissioners? Because if this part doesn't work and it goes to the next well and by the way I hope it doesn't get to that point.

I would much rather adopt any of the collaborative plans to not get here just so that is clear but if we do.

If the ranked choice vote doesn't work and it goes to the random process and let's say 12 or 11 out of 13 of us wants one particular map, why can't we have that map, why can't the 11 of us that prefer that map have that map in the drawing?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Presumably that would have already been voted on in the prior step if that many people wanted it.

So Commissioner Witjes and then General Counsel.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think I'm understanding it this way, you're saying you submit map A to be into the ranked choice voting and then it's my turn I also submit map A? That would be stacking the deck.

You can't do that I don't think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right and everybody can vote, you can't write Apple, Apple, Apple so it doesn't matter.

If five people pick A then one of the choices is A.

Right? Even if like there is a bunch of people that want it.

You have -- you can't repeat and I think it actually says that you can't repeat choices AAA as my 12 and 3 plans.

My favorite, most bestest plan.

My little red crayon.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: We will be here all day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is why I'm asking the question.

I want some clarity on this because how can each Commissioner submit one plan of each type like the Constitution says if we are limited to only the five total plans that we vetted for the 45 day public comment up to this point?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because the plan you submit is your preference.

So you submit A, she submits B, he submits A and that is your plan that you submitted.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I understand that and it works for this step the ranked voting step.

I'm more worried about if that also doesn't work and it goes in the random drawing set, well then, each Commissioner has not had a chance to have their most preferred plan go in random voting, random selection.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Preferred plan it's there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think where you have a confusion is when we -- if we get to that random selection, it's all the plans that were eligible to be voting on is my understanding.

It's all of them.

Even if we do ranked choice voting and we have ABCDE and we only did ranked choice voting on ABC because that is what we submitted, D and E would still go into that random selection process because they were eligible to be voted on.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right I do understand that.

What I'm saying is, what I'm saying is, try to be clear here, example you just gave D and E, well let's say one Commissioner wants D, one Commissioner wants E, but 12 Commissioners want A.

Why can't 12 Commissioners submit A like how it says in the Constitution each Commissioner may submit one plan and then the random drawing would essentially be in that case 12A because 12 Commissioners want A I'm sorry 11 Commissioners want A and then one Commissioner wanting D and one Commissioner wanting E?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because that is not how the Constitution.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If I may, these are very -- you know the reading of the Constitution is and particularly with this step and the points that Commissioner Eid raises and Commissioner Szetela are all things that we all considered.

And spoke about at length with your legal team.

So I would just ask General Counsel to clarify the interpretation of the Constitution that sits before you here in this proposed format for the vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair and I know that under new business A on the agenda is future discussion with legal counsel.

And certainly when the memoranda regarding this topic was submitted, the request was made to have the opportunity to walk through it with the full Commission.

And we obviously need our guidance from the Michigan Supreme Court so that can be done appropriately and in line with their interpretation of the Constitution.

But this Section has been the guidance has been provided to the Commission. And the for ranked choice voting, if one Commissioner would submit the plan and what I hear Commissioner Eid asking is whether kind of if five people like A then that would get put into the final, in the event there is going to be a final random draw, but the representative of the Secretary of State's office then there would be five tiles kind of in that random draw.

If that were the case, then that plan would have been adopted or could have been adopted during the first majority round particularly given that now the Commission is doing three rounds of voting in the first round to attempt to get the majority vote. But the need to submit a plan more than once into the ranked choice, again, to calculate it would be difficult because if Commissioner Eid submits plan A then that controls kind of the vote that's needed for that plan to be successful in the ranked choice voting process.

So if we have multiple Commissioners submitting the same plan, then the determination of whether it needs the criteria for succeeding in the ranked choice voting that is set forth in the Constitution, again, that the Commission does not have any discretion on and thank you for highlighting that, Ms. Reinhardt.

So the ability, the plans need to be submitted once.

So that the Commission can properly track the vote and determine very clearly whether it meets that criteria that is highlighted on the screen.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So what General Counsel is referring to the language of the Constitution and determining how the vote turns out is this part I have highlighted here which states that the Commission shall adopt the plan receiving the highest total points that is also ranked among the top half of plans by at least two Commissioners not affiliated with the party of the Commissioner submitting the plan.

So for example, if I am a Commissioner and I'm an independent affiliating Commissioner, and I submit the dogwood plans, the dogwood plan, the requirement for that plan to succeed in the vote or to come out on top in the vote is different based on my affiliation as an independent than it would if I affiliated with the democratic party. Does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So yes, that makes sense but even in that case 11 of us could prefer a map and not get adopted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That is correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: But in that scenario we get to the ranked choice voting, that doesn't...let's hypothesize that does not solve the issue and go to the random voting.

Each Commissioner has not had a chance then to submit their map if we are hamstrung to the five maps that have been put out for the 45 day process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We already made that decision though.

I mean I think what you're getting at you want to bring in other maps if the maps that have gone through the 45 day public comment period are not adopted but we have already crossed that bridge that we can't vote on that because it hasn't gone through the 45 day public comment period.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't want any new maps to come into play.

What I'm saying is I want the correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Somebody is not on mute.

Someone on the Zoom needs to mute.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Holiday season y'all.

No, I do not want any new map to come at this point.

But when we took that motion, I was unaware that each plan may only be submitted once.

Because in that scenario I just laid out which again I hope we don't get there.

I don't think we will.

But in case we do we should talk about it and plan for it.

If 11 Commissioners prefer one map and two Commissioners hold it up hypothetically why should every map have a one and five chance of getting selected instead of the map that 11 of us prefer, have 11 out of 13 chance of getting selected.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't see how we would ever get to the point if 11 Commissioners prefer a map it has not been voted on.

That is a mathematical impossibility that that would happen.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's say I submitted an individual map, which I didn't.

Let's say I did.

Or let's use dogwood as an example.

Okay, let's say everybody except two democrats prefer that map, that map would not pass.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Two democrats didn't vote for it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Doesn't matter if you have two other democrats voting for it, it passes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Eid, I would, sorry I would note as well the Constitution says it shall the Commission shall adopt the plan receiving the highest total points, that is also ranked among the top half of plans by at least two Commissioners not affiliated with the party of the Commissioner submitting the plan. Note, it does not say two Commissioners from each affiliation pool. It just says two Commissioners not affiliated with the party of the Commissioner submitting the plan.

So, in theory, if I am an independent affiliated Commissioner, any two Commissioners not affiliated as an independent ranking this plan in the top half would achieve that threshold.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or if you are an independent, you could have a republican and a democrat or if you're a democrat you could have two republicans or a republican and an independent as long as they are not -- as long as you have two who are not of your affiliation. I mean, there is no blocking ability like you're thinking of.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Are we sure of that, General Counsel? Can I get your opinion on this? Because I just want to make sure that we got this all done.

My scenario still stands even if ten of 13 of us agreed on a plan, why should that plan have a different percentage in case it gets to the random selection then 10 out of 13.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Brady, I saw you had a comment.

>> MR. BRADY: Good afternoon. Mike Brady from Commissioner of state and want to acknowledge the question of Commissioner Eid.

And we contemplated and what if ten Commissioners all agreed. I think the fair response there is the one that has been offered, the ten Commissioners all agreed, it likely would have been adopted.

I think what is perhaps at least, you know, more likely mathematically is you could have a split five, five, three or four, four, five, right? So if in that situation, if there were three different camps, if you will, and only three maps proposed and that is the split any combination of those three, that does not arrive at a two, two, two, you know, with majority, which is, of course, seven, then in the random selection you could have a situation where that let's say six, six, one even as a possibility where the random selection, if it comes to that, and to be clear, I think we all want to avoid that internally. The Department of State does. But if it were to come to that then the one map in the scenario of six, six, one, that one map that had the support of one person and only one person would have an equal weight in the drawing.

So that map would be weighted by, you know, just one-third as opposed to the other ones, if the other ones could be introduced multiple. And I don't see a restriction in the Constitution. And based on conversation with your General Counsel. But it's up to you and your legal team. I'm not aware of any counsel you have been given that restricts the ability of the individual rights of Commissioners per the Constitution to submit maps. The language I have seen says it does not need or one map would need to be submitted by Commissioner, but I've not seen anything in the Constitution or otherwise that has been submitted to you by your legal team. Not that I would be privy to all of that, but it would limit your right to submit multiple maps, in order to affect the map if there was to be a random drawing.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Mr. Brady. So I think the takeaway is you might not feel it's fair, but that is what the Constitution says. And if we get to that point where, you



know, we have three maps submitted and we don't end up with a winner through ranked choice, then, yes, it's going to go random selection. And every map that is submitted out of that pool has an equal chance of being randomly selected.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I do not accept that. And I don't think that is what Mr. Brady was just saying either.

He just said that the Commissioner could, if I understood you correctly, I may I not have and if I did not, I apologize, but the Constitution says each Commissioner may submit one plan of each type to the full Commission for consideration.

I'm okay with it, with not doing it for the ranked for step four ranked voting and maybe only doing this for the random drawing if it gets there. But if we can't agree on something by the random drawing, I will submit a map. And even if it's been voted on, even if it has been chosen by another Commissioner, I don't see anything limiting me for doing that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't think anyone is saying you are limited from doing that. It's not going to get to add another tile to the vote.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I disagree.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The question was posed for if the legal team had looked again at the ranked choice, specifically the vote, and Ms. Reinhardt got to make the statement that we knew everyone was waiting for. But, yes, that is directly from our interpretation that it would not require two from the same party.

So theoretically it could be adopted if it was proposed as long if a plan was proposed as long as it was in the top half of plans by ranked in the top half of the plans by two other Commissioners from not that party or unaffiliated but from the major parties it would go through.

So that is completely accurate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you think as to his point he does not agree that if we go through the ranked choice voting from his opinion if five people submit map A and three people submit map B and six people, I'm going way over 13 I think, six people submit map C that what he is saying is that that should be additional tiles in the pool, correct for random selection.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And that is an excellent question.

And I think where the -- where we had interpreted the Constitution where the question from the Commission was if they are how many people need to submit one plan.

So certainly the specific question that Commissioner Eid is asking we will provide that answer to the Commission in writing.

Because that is a -- it does not -- and it needs to be answered so it does not impact the accuracy that counts for the ranked choice but it also reflects the will of the Commission in the random selection if necessary.



And I will review the memos to make sure that the question hasn't been responded to in the event and if it has, I'll recirculate and if it has not, we will prepare that answer for the Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so we are out of time.

We have to leave at 5:00.

So I think we've gotten through a lot of this.

We are still kind of stuck at step four so we will have to pick that up when we come back on the 28th unfortunately.

General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair I would recommend setting another meeting to have the voting procedures adopted prior to putting them in service.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have leeway to stay past 5:00 I thought we had a hard stop at 5:00.

Okay can we try to get through the rest of this in the next 15 minutes guys so we can Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was just going to say a motion for an added meeting on the 27th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Here today you are saying or for the 27th.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: We can't hear you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah so, we have a motion to add a meeting on the 27th do we have a second?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Seconded by Commissioner Rothorn, any debate or discussion on the motion? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mean I think that was the only question I have through this whole thing so you won't hear from me for the rest of it, I will throw that out there. That is the Monday right after the holiday.

People might be traveling.

We can certainly schedule a meeting but we can get through this now and then let's just get through it now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well I think in any event Ms. Reinhardt aren't you going to need to get something amended back to us? You are taking notes as we go.

So we would have to get something amended back to us any way so.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes likely.

If the Commission as I'm taking notes, if the Commission is comfortable with approving the procedure sort of as amended, I think we all understand the intent of what you have expressed here today but if you would prefer me to actually draft something more formal to bring back to the Commission, I'm happy to do so.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What would we like to do here? Would we like to push through and see if we can get through it in 15 minutes with a motion to approve or okay let's try to do that.

So are there any other comments about the ranked choice voting?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will withdraw the motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dustin Witjes just withdrew his motion.

Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Without objection.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say we restated it so without objection

Commissioner Witjes will withdraw his motion.

Hearing no objection the motion is withdrawn.

All right, does anyone have any concerns about step four in terms of how we do the ranked choice voting?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If I can go through the remainder so we have an idea how the process will unfold.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Eid I highlighted the question the piece which you were questioning for us to return to at a later time.

So aside from that point what will happen is that each Commissioner will be provided a ballot to record their votes.

There is an example ballot at the end of the document which I will show you in just a moment.

It's a paper ballot I should say each Commissioner attending the meeting in person will be provided this paper ballot.

And on that ballot, you will rank your submitted the submitted plans in order of preference.

Each Commissioner must only choose one plan for each rank for example you can't write two different plan names for the number one rank.

And also note that the ballots are part of the public record so if you are doodling on it make sure your doodles are appropriate.

Commissioners attending the meeting remotely we have not forgot about you.

We can you can cast your votes in a number of ways.

Including e-mail to the secretary which will be part of the public record or audibly by phone.

You will be allotted ten minutes to complete this.

If you need more time obvious you will have more time.

We want to give the public expectations exactly how long it will take for you to complete your ballots.

After you complete it, you will return it to the secretary.

The Constitution says after you return the ballots each plan shall be assigned a point value inverse to its ranking among the number of choices.

My partner calls this I think like the NBA draft plan style.

I don't know what that means.

Maybe someone does.

But it's a point system similar to that.

So after receiving all the votes the secretary will tally the votes, two members of our team will tally them separately and compare point totals to ensure accuracy.

After we have totaled all the votes the secretary will read aloud each Commissioner's ranked votes for every Commissioner to audibly confirm.

So we will go through each ballot or each e-mailed tally to audibly confirm if how we recorded your vote is how you intended to submit, if this accurately reflects your vote.

And then after confirming all of those votes we will readout the results of the ranked vote and we will share excel spreadsheet that displays the point totals so that members of the public may also see how each point scores.

And then results will also be part of the public record.

So there is a couple of different outcomes from this type of vote.

The first being that a plan could just out right win.

And which case we would announce the plan with the highest point total is plan.

There could be a tie vote where there is a tie between two plans with the highest point totals in which case it would proceed to a random selection.

And then the third outcome could be that there is just no constitutional majority, no plan achieves the threshold in which case it would also go to a random selection.

So these are a few decision or one decision point for you all which I alluded to earlier that is when Commissioners are submitting their submitting plans for consideration in the ranked choice vote should the Chairperson call on Commissioners raising their hand to submit a plan? Or should the secretary call on Commissioners in rotating alphabetical order similar to how we do a roll call vote?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My vote is rotating alphabetical order because that is how we have been doing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Should the secretary do it or should the Chair do it who do you want to call it? I don't think it matters.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Secretary does the voting so I imagine it would still hold true in this case.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's just have the secretary do it quick and easy.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We are happy to do it but I would just note this is not technically a vote.

It's just Commissioners submitting plans, raising their hands to submit a plan.

It's consistent with your current procedure that would be the function of the Chair. However, just given this particular the difference of this particular function we are happy to the secretary is happy to perform that as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I don't think it's critical one way or another. You can just put secretary or Chair and we can decide about it at the time. I don't think it matters.

Okay we have a hard stop at 5:15.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Last step.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have one quick question. And I have seen this come online and want to address it. So if we can address it, it would be great. How do we deal with the top half ranking when we have an odd number of plans? General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: If there an odd number of plans the top would be calculated rounding down from the half to reach the closest whole figure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: There is seven plans the top half would be three plans not 3.4.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

Moving on to the next part random selection go ahead.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you it's random selection.

If we do get to this point, we are retaining an independent accounting firm similar to how we performed random selections in the past like during the application period for example.

And they will perform the random selection for submitted plans.

They use an accounting software to perform this function.

And they will enter the names of the plans, push a button and out will pop a randomly selected winner.

And that is really about it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is the example ballot.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We produced this.

There is kind of like a word bank so these are all the plans you can choose from for State Senate note these are not actually accurate State Senate plans.

I just typed in whatever name popped into my head.

And then this is where you would fill them out one being most preferred and six being least preferred.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Financial vote procedures as amended.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Second? Seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

He beat you to it.

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.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor of adopting the what are we calling these Commissioner final vote procedure as amended during the meeting please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the procedures as adopted are the procedures as amended are adopted.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Motion to adjourn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, wait, wait, wait, jumping the gun.

Okay so General Counsel do we need to extend that Robert contract today or can it wait to the next meeting.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair thank you for asking.

Before I answer that I believe we have two Commissioners we need to capture their aye or nay votes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange and Wagner can you verbally indicate what your vote was? Are they still on.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: This is Commissioner Wagner I voted nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange? Commissioner Lange are you still on?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe she is having audio issues.

And unable to unmute.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I don't know if there is something that MDOS.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is she in the chat.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Can do to unmute her.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My vote is nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Nay okay thank you.

Do we need to do the Robert half contract for today.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair.

So I'm awaiting guidance from procurement.

So all the contract would do or excuse me all the extension would do would extend the time only, it adds no funds whatsoever.

The maximum contract amount is still 49,999 as the Commission adopted previously.

It would just extend the term of the contract through the end of March which aligns with your consultant contract and staff contracts and all the other contracts.

So if the Commission would like to bring that back and I will have the documentation for the next meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Director Woods did you have an update for communications that needed to go today.

Now you can make your motion Commissioner Witjes?

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: Motion, oh.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair approving the minutes of December 2 please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let me find it.

Okay new business agenda item 6E dates, no, that is not what I want.

Where is it approval of minutes.

Approval of the meeting minutes for December 2 held in Lansing the draft minutes have been provided to the Commission prior to the meeting and posted on the website are there any edits to the meeting minutes? I would entertain a motion to adopt the meeting minutes from December 2, 2021.

Motion made by Commission Rothhorn seconded by Commissioner Lett.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay and Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Wagner if you could verbally indicate I would appreciate it.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: This is Commissioner Wagner, aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was Commissioner Wagner.

Thank you, all right as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission well the items on the agenda are not completed but we have run out of time I entertain a motion to adjourn.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes, seconded by Commissioner Lett.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

And Commissioner Wagner and Commissioner Lange if you could please verbally indicate.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was an aye from both of them.

Thank you.

All right, we are adjourned at 5:11 p.m.