

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

12/28/21 10:00 am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:06 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 or details for language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at Michigan.gov.

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

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting 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 or 517-331-6309.

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

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm present, attending remotely from Detroit Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present, attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from

Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present. And there is a quorum.

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

As a reminder to the public watching, you can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there discussion or debate on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do have a discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Under unfinished business I would like to add what was on previous meetings about discussion regarding potentially changing and making some changes to the maps.

So I would like that added under 5A and move 5A to 5B.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So you want to add it before the Commission vote process; is that correct? Am I understanding that correctly?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Correct, because if the discussion goes one way, then that would affect that also.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion by Commissioner Lange to amend the agenda to add an item 5A, changing the current 5A to B and then the agenda title would be discussion of changing maps; is that correct? Do we have a second?

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

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'll second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Lange and seconded by Commissioner Wagner to amend the agenda to add unfinished business for amending maps.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Go ahead, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like to say as far as in favor of it, it's what the public has asked for and as a Commission we deserve to at least have the discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we have a motion that has been seconded seeing no discussion all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

So 123456.

Janice are you up or down? Okay, so 1234567 and Commissioner Curry you had your hand up, is that right? So that is eight.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Nay.

So that is 123.

Then Commissioner Kellom are you on? >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I am on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are you a yeah or nay on motion to the agenda?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: My apologies. I don't have it and I'm leaving to get my booster TMI and can you clarify if there is a moment already on the agenda to discuss that possibility? As the Chair was that something you were going to weave into the discussion anyway?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I anticipate that will be discussed any way but yes Commissioner Lange is specifically asking it be made agenda item and it was on the agenda last meeting so it's proper to have it on there and did not get it carried over.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm a yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So the amendment carries by a vote of 9-3.

All right so at this point we have motion by Commission Witjes seconded by Commissioner Lett to approve the meeting agenda as amended all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Got one nay and Commissioner Kellom if you could verbally indicate.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right so by a vote of 11-1 the meeting agenda is adopted.

Thank you everybody.

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

Individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide live in

person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. Please step to the nearest microphone when I call your number. You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. First in line to provide public comment is number one.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Robert George your friendly neighborhood county recreation Commission.

Thank you for the public to provide comment on your work and I speak in favor of the cherry State Senate map it's the fairest map you created and result will have an even balance and it also keeps together the Waterloo state recreation area which is a major issue for the local community on western Washtenaw and Jackson County.

Please do not adopt the palm State Senate map as it unjustly unpacks voters together and reopen the mapping process for the State House, your maps are just not fair enough.

Taking the extra time to create a truly fair house map that respects communities of interest is more than worth delay in time.

I have faith in Government being able to work for the people please do not let my generation down by creating unfair maps thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number two and for the people online waiting to comment we have about ten in person public commenters today and will move to remote pretty quickly just letting everybody know. Number two.

>> Hello.

I'd like to thank you for being here today.

And doing the job that you've been doing.

My name is Linda Appling and I live in Lansing Michigan Eaton County.

The maps you have, have carved out Grand Ledge from the current voting area Eaton County.

Grand Ledge is an integral part of Eaton County and has a strong community of interest there.

IE the library, Lansing community college, and the upcoming GM battery plant.

Grand Ledge should be put back into Eaton County.

As to the others the fairest maps are for the Senate Linden and cherry for the house hickory.

Please also include a look at W9304.

Thank you for listening to me.

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

>> Good morning I'm Sarah Howard and I represent Michigan's AFLCIO's fair maps project I'm going to address the materials that the Michigan Supreme Court ordered you to disclose to the public.

First the Baker Hostetler law firm memo on partisan fairness and disproportionate advantage agreed with our position there is no intent requirement in the Michigan Constitution. As we've said repeatedly, if your maps do not comply with the partisan fairness standard, they won't pass muster regardless of whether you had intent to create a partisan gerrymander.

Second, we believe you received incorrect counsel when it's been suggested to you, you have discretion in the measures of partisan fairness or how closely to comply with them.

This ignores the plain language of Michigan Constitution. Shall means must under Michigan textual interpretation must get closer to 0 efficiency gap than you currently are and better under measures particularly in the State House thank you.

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

>> Hi, I'm crystal Boyd Sarah Howard's legal assistant and we disagree with Mr. Adelson VRA discussion in closed meeting. The burden of proof is not on outside groups to refute validity of VRA digits the burden will be on the Commission to demonstrate compliance by conducting a proper racially polarized voting analysis. This has not happened yet.

Legal compliance requires a robust RPV analysis at the District level, not the County level looking at more than one democratic primary election that is exactly what Dr. Handley said on Page 17 of her final memo.

You need to assure the public and yourself VRA compliance by insisting your counsel engages and publishes this analysis.

You should not approve any map until then.

finally contrary to what you were told in closed session we are open to the abstract principle that a BVAP lower than 50% may allow the Black community to elect the candidate of its choice.

We simply fear in practice the current districts drawing could fail that test.

Our position on that has been consistent and downright repetitive.

Thank you.

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

>> Hello, my name is Kyle Jones I live in Lansing which is part of eat on County. I would like to thank you for the hard work you have been done and we have been carved out of eat on tan the first map would be one where Grand Ledge is a part of Eaton County and hickory is viewed as the fairest house map, I would encourage you to look at W9304.

Thank you for your time.

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

>> Good morning, everyone. My name is Max. I just want to say polarized partisan gerrymandering in Michigan has plagued our state for generations.

It's so bad that independent political fact checking website ranked Michigan in the lowest tier of population the District representation.

But now you all can fix that.

And if you do fix that, your work will go down as heroic in Michigan's history I'm serious people will talk about how you are able to accomplish something that so many before you failed to even accomplish.

But it's not just in our state.

It's also across the country where people are watching from all over to see if you are really able to take our lowest tier state to fair 50/50 representation.

But if you are able to do that you will inspire other Commissions of other citizens just like yourself.

You have to get it right and pick the maps close to 50/50 that is Linden for State Senate and hickory for the State House and not palm in the State Senate, it is not viable for palm and thank you so much and I hope you think of yourself as heroes and act as heroes and we are ready for you appreciate it.

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

>> I am Bill Lansing grant president NAACP.

First if you can hold your clock for a second, our state president tried to send you a document that she could not upload.

So I'm here to give you some of the items that is on it.

Also hand it to you so you can have it for your discussion later.

I'm going to show Michigan is still racially segregated.

Four Counties contain 73% of the state Blacks and 73% of Asians.

And there is no way in the world you will be able to represent them by splitting them up in Counties they have no representation of them.

That is of great interest to us.

A couple of areas in particular Flint Beecher being separated.

Also Lansing being separated into rule Counties that have nothing to do with Lansing whatsoever.

I hope you will consider this in your discussions or deliberations to put forth a method that would better represent people of color.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. And you can hand that over to our General Counsel, Ms. Pastula.

Number eight.

>> Good morning I'm Chris Andrews from Haslett, thank you for your collaborative good faith efforts.

We are counting on you.

You asked the public to comment and the will of the people has been clear in public testimony.

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'd like to share a tally for the State Senate Linden is by far the most popular map 159 people voice support.

No one expressed opposition.

In contrast palm was the least popular 6 people testified against it and only 22 offered support.

For the State House the most frequent comment by 142 people was come up with something better.

Among your maps hickory is the Leer choice with 116 support comments and only five in opposition.

I would like to leave you with a more detailed tally including Congress.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. And you can hand that to General Counsel Pastula.

I'd also like to indicate for the record Commissioner Eid has arrived and in attendance in person.

Number nine.

>> Good morning.

I drove here from the City of Detroit Michigan.

I just wanted to state that a lot of the maps still need work from our area.

I believe that the City of Detroit in my area or southeast Detroit was an afterthought.

And rushed in this process.

I attended the public meeting in Ann Arbor when you guys decided to add an additional meeting to this.

And the work is still not done.

So I know you guys may be tired, I know this has been a long ride but I'm asking on behalf of the City of Detroit and the surrounding cities you go back to try and get it right.

I really want to point out Pine V5 map is completely unfair and not realistic for the people who live in my community and separates me out of my current District and not representative of the people in the Littlefield community, people that live in the City of Detroit that stretch all the way from 96 freeway all the way to 8 mile.

There is no reason why that map draws always the way up to Clawson, Berkeley and one other City.

So reconsider because it's not realistic.

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

At this point we are going to move on to the live, remote public commentary.

As people come in, we will let them speak as they arrive.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote public commentary to the Commission will be allowed to do so. I will call on your name

and our staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak. If you are on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call on you by your last name or the last four digits of your phone number. Also, please note that if you experience technical or audio issues or if we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move onto the next person in line and return to you when they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work you can email redistricting@michigan.gov and we will help you troubleshoot so that you can participate at a 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 James Gallant. Please wait for our staff to unmute you.

>> Hello, James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. And I believe that the MICRC's birthday was in 1963.

This was the Supreme Court ruling in August of 2018.

The rules of procedure start at the moment of conception, same thing as this abortion thing.

Moment of conception is when the rules start and that is reiterations of the prior.

And the Supreme Court did not address the house physical agency report. You did not site their own ruling from 2018.

The MICRC was not born out of the prop two amendment.

Just like a butterfly is not born out of a cocoon.

It's born earlier as a little grub of a little, you know, caterpillar. And it has to go from that point, not from in the middle of it when all the sudden you spring out of nowhere and you get to make stuff up and change the fundamental rules of parliamentary law of America.

This is what is going to be contested in Court and rules of procedure and your legitimate rules of procedure. And you did not follow the rules.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Ladia-Tapia.

>> Hi good morning I'm joining from Detroit, Michigan.

I am completely disturbed by the release of your memos and public closed door meeting.

There are many concerns for the City of Detroit that was clearly ignored and it's evident by the memos you released.

Dr. Handedly specifically said a District by District voting rights analysis was necessary, that was never conducted.

I don't know how you can move forward in voting for these maps when you have not finished your work.

You have to go back and reconsider.

There are analysis being done right now that look at the City of Detroit and we think that there may be no Black representation for the next ten years in the City of Detroit.

Based on how you have drawn your maps.

There is clear discrimination.

There is clear violations of the Voting Rights Act.

And I would urge you to continue to work on those maps for Detroit because you still need to address those concerns.

You never did a voting rights analysis on the Latino community.

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

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rich, it looks like you just muted yourself once more, I'm going to prompt you to unmute right now.

It looks like you are unmuted now.

>> Good morning my name is rich Thrush representing Grand Rapids proactive, a nonpartisan election protection coalition organization.

Considering partisan fairness for almost 2.5 million people urban population in the second largest Metropolitan area in Michigan and Grand Rapids six City area and representation for a minority population of 210,000 people in West Michigan we are promoting Chestnut for Congressional.

Linden for Senate and Hickory for house maps.

Using the same considerations we are discouraging Birch for Congressional, Palm for Senate, Szetela for house maps.

Hickory is the best of the current house maps but it still lacks in partisan fairness measures with a 48/52 seat count when it should be at least 50/50.

Again thanks for your diligent efforts to create fair maps for Michigan and especially listening to citizens.

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

>> Percy: Hello can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay I'm here so participating in a lot of these Commissioners thank you but we are satisfied with your Birch, the Linden and we also.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Pause his time for a moment. Mr. Johnson, it sounds you may be holding your phone covering up the microphone it's a little muffled.

>> Is that better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Much better thank you.

>> Okay so we are satisfied with the people are pleased with the Linden map.

The Birch map, and we still very concerned with our house maps.

I was very I'm pressed with the Deltas that came at the last hearing in Detroit and I strongly suggest that you take their suggestions and apply some of the maps that they are asking for the house.

They are strong community that know the community and understand our concerns in Michigan.

Please take time to get these maps straight so we don't have to go to Court.

Because I'm connected with the UAW the Baptist preachers of Detroit and Michigan and a precinct delegate.

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

>> Good morning, I'm Richard Williamson from Kent County. Please do not adopt the Szetela State House map.

As the Commission you have taken the time in Pine V5, Magnolia and Hickory to have communities of interest in Grand Rapids particularly Wyoming and created the most Hispanic District possible and leaders asked you in public comment to keep Wyoming together and allow the Hispanic community a strong voice in Lansing.

The Szetela map would crack Wyoming and divide the Hispanic community between rural Byron Center and white Grandville adopting the Szetela map is counter to collaborative map and issue wishes of voters and do not adopt Szetela adopt Pine V5 or Hickory maps, thank you.

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

>> My name is Micah Perkins and I represent 10,000 building skilled trades worker of west and Southwest Michigan.

The Congressional maps is drastic when it comes to configuration for West Michigan. I've been paying attention to the meeting and the Chestnut map above all appears to be the favored configuration.

There is 220 mentions of Congress made in the last public comments and almost half of comments about Congress has been voiced in support of Chestnut that is twice as many as Birch and Chestnut is my personal favorite because it creates a competitive District for Grand Rapids the first time in history.

I ask you support the Chestnut map, thank you.

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will move on to number eight.

Nomi-Joyrich.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> I'm speaking on behalf of the Michigan Unitarian universal social justice network.

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

Please adopt one of these two.

Linden minimizes the population districts but Senate map favor one party and do require some tweaking.

Hickory is the best of the house maps if you insist on voting this week adopt Hickory but none of the house maps would result in an outcome that accurately reflects the way Michiganders vote.

We don't want to delay the process but the worst outcome would be to settle for inherently maps and maps are still unfair.

Please reopen the process and improve the Hickory map.

Thank you and happy holidays.

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

>> Good morning, Commission. This is Kermit Williams again.

City Council president for Pontiac and co-Executive Director of Oakland forward.

I would just ask the Commission to stay focused on what you have done this whole process which is to balance community of interest also with partisan fairness and as you are having the debate today take the time especially on the new 5A if there is a map that is grossly looked at as a Commission as unfair that you guys take that time to really look at it and have that robust debate.

I thank you for not only serving on the Commission, I thank you for the year of work you guys put into it and for this process to come out the right way it takes a little bit more deliberation.

You are almost at the end, don't give up now and don't give up on discussion.

I saw nine for it and three against it and ask everybody will participate in the discussion and everybody voices will be heard.

Thank you again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number ten, Rima.

>> Arab American and middle east and north African community of Dearborn and Dearborn Heights face challenges and not the Voting Rights Act despite it is said so and are not count in the census.

To get equitable representation is through the Commission but it does not seem this is heard.

Access submitted COI map C1510 in August of this year and thank you for acknowledging my community in the Congressional map of Chestnut and the Senate map of Linden, I cannot support what you have done with house maps.

We support the Chestnut maps only in the way it represents our community of interest in C510 however when it comes to fair maps as you heard from partners, we 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.

We have been split in 7 districts.

We will never get the representation we need in Lansing and our communities continue to be left out when we are split into so many districts.

We need to fix this and redraw the house maps to address minority concerns and fix the voting rights districts this Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 11, which is Shams-Al-Badry.

>> Thank you, Commission.

I am here on behalf of access.

As you may know access serves most directly in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights and the largest Arab American and MENA community in this nation and share a community which is rich in history of economic development and social concerns that need to be addressed by a policies that reflect our community's needs.

Because of this we support Birch and Linden and highly recommend you reevaluate the house maps.

Although the largest and we are not in the census and work on draft maps and C1510 as you redraft the house map.

The Commission was put in place to end gerrymandering and you have successfully done that in the Chestnut and Senate map of Linden, I support it in commute but when it comes to fair maps for the entire state, we strongly support the Birch map. you will determine the future of my community and I hope you will listen.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 12, Judy.

>> Hi good morning everyone thank you and thank you to commenter number eight.

This morning who took the time to tally the online comments.

It puts a point on a longstanding question I have yet to find an answer for exactly.

I would like you guys to explain today how those comments were tallied for you and how they are part of your vote today.

If people took all the time to comment and they weren't somehow assessed and given to you on a chart of some kind, then it's really all for nothing.

I would really like an answer on how those -- how public comment is being considered by all of you today.

Down River is a community of interest.

I've commented many times the Congressional map that best preserves that is Birch.

The State House maps really are not anywhere near where they need to be but if you had to vote yes Hickory and yes on Linden for the State Senate and no on Palm for the Senate and please take the time to go back in this effort that is going to affect people for ten years.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 13, Sarah-Woolsey.

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 for taking the time throughout this process to listen to the people and to our concerns.

Today I'm asking you to adopt one of the collaborative maps that were drawn in public view.

The transparency of map drawing at meetings is the sort of openness that voters supported in 2018 and the transparency in the redistricting process that we were looking for.

I urge the Commission to pick one of those collaborative maps that voters have had more opportunities to view, comment on and understand.

After these past few months, any hundreds, and thousands of different comments in meetings, on the portal, on maps, and that you've just heard over and over I really do think that the maps that are selected should be reflective of feedback and the collaborative ones drawn with the input of the entire Commission.

Thank you for your commitment to fair maps and for listening to citizens.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next is 14, Sherri-Masson.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I can.

>> I live many Milford, Michigan.

I am here to ask that the house maps be continued to be worked on.

They still even Hickory gives a majority of the seats to a minority of the voters.

Politically safe districts are really a damage to democracy.

If we don't have fair maps there is no accountability for elected officials.

It's disheartening and creates cynicism on the part of citizens.

Maps should be drawn to reflect the will of the people.

Take election data into account and make house maps as competitive as possible.

Competitive districts require candidates to get out, meet the public, earn their vote not just ride into office on the letter R or D.

Competitive districts will give us serious higher quality candidates, will go to Lansing to legislate on behalf of the people and not a political party or a special interest.

Thank you for your work.

I support.

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

>> Okay, hello.

I found the unmute button.

Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay my name is William Asher I'm a voter who lives in Royal Oak.

I U. You to approve District maps on the basis of voting rights compliance and partisan fairness.

Michigan voters enabled this Commission so that voters like yourselves, not politicians, would draw the boundaries between districts.

We wanted voters to choose our politicians and not the other way around.

For the Michigan State Senate map choice I urge you to vote for the Linden map.

It's the best in terms of partisan fairness and VRA compliance.

For the same reasons I urge you to approve the Hickory map for the Michigan State house and the Birch map for the U.S. house representatives.

Thank you for your service on this Commission.

Please do what you can to make voters excuse me Michigan voters proud of your final outcome.

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

>> Hi, everyone, my name is Scott, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> All right I just wanted to say that when it comes to partisan fairness all the metrics that I've seen, the Szetela State House map outperforms the other maps when it comes to all the partisan fairness measures I have seen.

The Szetela map also does the best at promoting diversity within my hometown of Kentwood.

It creates a House District that focuses on the City of Kentwood which I think is very important.

We have not had a Kentwood resident serve in the State House of representatives since 1997.

25 years ago almost.

And so I think it's long pastime we have a Kentwood focused House District and the Szetela map is the only one that does that as well.

So when it comes to partisan fairness again all the metrics I've seen when it comes to making sure that voters and diversity are lifted up in the process the Szetela map clearly wins out for the State House.

And I ask you to support that one.

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay 18, Rosa-Holliday.

>> Good morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning.

>> I'm Rosa-Holliday representing the Tri-Cities which is Bay City, Midland and Saginaw.

And I'm here again because I'm so concerned about being competitive and drawing fair maps.

So what you have so far, none of them actually is fair.

But the Chestnut for Congress.

Your Linden for the State Senate.

And also on your State House map, if you work with the Hickory, I think we could be able to get some fairness there.

And absolutely no under Palm.

We have a chance to show the country how Michigan has voted and how we have had fair maps and how we have been competitive.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 19, Denzel-McCampbell.

>> A resident of Detroit and an advocate for the independent Commission. I was really disappointed in majority of this Commission handled the VRA memos.

It should not have taken the Supreme Court to step in to make sure the process was transparent with an important topic as myself as a Black resident of the state.

Next, I would like to encourage you to go back and redraw the house maps.

I live in what will be District 16 of each of the four policy maps and feel they completely disregard communities of interest to have the Rouge and other districts and City of Livonia is unacceptable as our voices will be disregarded in representation.

Thank you for your historic work and encourage you to take the final steps to make sure we completely get this right.

Thank you and have a good day.

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

>> Hello.

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

>> Okay, my name is Rachel Goodstein in northeast Michigan a split with no political clump and I want to thank you all for your service and this year.

I spoke in Gaylord my issue is creating districts which are as close to zero partisan lean as possible and nobody should start in a campaign with a head start.

At this point the best maps on that basis seem to be for the house Senate Linden and the State House Hickory but it seems some of them still need work.

There is no new plans that have not been subject to public import should be allowed if it's a consideration.

Abide by open meetings rules ten years from now the Commission should be made up of totally nonpartisan people.

I participated because I am the Chair of the democratic party up in Presque County.

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

>> Hello good morning MICRC.

I'm joining you from Detroit and, well, I just wouldn't encourage you to approve any of the Congressional proposals you've put forward because I mean, for God sakes it started with Birch.

That is the original shape of District 13 where I live.

Birch and to get Chestnut all you did was switch out Warren and centerline for Romulus and so the person who drafted the Birch it took you 20 minutes to find Woodward when that ordeal began I was watching it and he is quoted as saying COIs don't matter so you said we would have to make a convincing case to do at one of your candid conversations to extend beyond 45 days what more convincing case can be demonstrated you can get better partisan fairness metrics and organizations and individuals have demonstrated that you can get better COIs and your own words what could be more convincing?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 22, Francesca-Stevenson.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> I'm a resident of Detroit.

I have addressed the Commission before but I would just like to reiterate my support for the Linden map for State Senate because it is the closest to a 50/50 partisan split and that was the goal of this.

I would also like to say that the Palm map is really unfair and we definitely should not use that one.

As for the house maps, if we have to go with one of the existing ones we should go with Hickory because it's the closest to fair.

I'm going to reiterate what you know a lot of other people have said that I really think we should consider going back to the drawing board here so that we can get a map that is you know a 50/50 partisan split.

You know it's really important that the citizens of Michigan have an equal chance to make their voice heard in elections.

I want to thank you all for the work that you're doing.

It's very important and I understand that it's very difficult.

Thank you for your time.

And enjoy your holidays.

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

>> My name is Danielle and I live in the City of Midland, Michigan.

I chose to address the Commission today to show support for the following maps, the maps that I feel best follow the spirit of nonpartisan redistricting are the Chestnut Congressional map, as it reunites Mid-Michigan Linden and reunites the Tri-Cities in despair and Hickory because it's the most fair but could use some work.

Can you hear me.

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

>> Okay vote no on Palm as it is not fair and does not meet the standards of fairness.

I have commented this before but it keeps coming up, so I would like to reiterate Midland's position should not be on fully recovering we are more than four lakes and needs representation based more than that and the health office and business administration representing business ties commenting on the subject and pushing this narrative are not acting in political fairness as required by the redistricting process.

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

>> Hello, Jennifer Austin, City of Midland. I was not going to speak today because frankly you have already heard what I and my opponents could possibly say about Midland, but invested in the process since the beginning I want to leave you with one last testimony. I want to say thank you for reuniting the Tri-Cities in Michigan and listening to thousands of testimonies and reading thousands of comments and following prop two and placing COI and partisan fairness high above County lines and take a second and understand the historic work you have done.

Nowhere on these maps is the essence of prop two better represented than the Senate and Congressional districts for Midland.

You created Senate and Congressional Districts that are as close to zero political bias as possible.

Just imagine for the first time in 30 years and maybe ever the people of Midland will get to choose the most qualified representative instead of a preordained conclusion by way the maps are drawn.

They are not perfect and more work to be done but if you vote Chestnut and Linden and Hickory being a second choice.

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

>> Hello.

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

>> Okay sorry.

Good morning my name is Marie from Midland Michigan first I want to thank you and commend this Commission on the difficult task you have accepted in working to redraw and revise the state's political boundaries.

Secondly, I want to urge you to prioritize choosing those maps that best reflect adherence to all seven of the criteria.

You have been required to follow.

Especially important is the need to select the maps that have the highest levels of partisan fairness.

Since those issues seem to be at the heart of the maps that are most contentious.

In view of my request, I urge you to select the following maps.

For the Senate, the Linden map.

Please do not use the Palm map as so many others have also indicated.

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 -- for the house maps, I would recommend the Hickory although it does need improvement.

And for Congressional maps, please choose the Chestnut.

Thank you very much.

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

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Yes, you can.

Greetings Commissioners.

I just wanted to say that all eyes are on this Commission to see that you fulfill the goal of better representation that we have all worked so hard to achieve.

The maps that I support and I've said this before, the Chestnut map for U.S.

Congressional, the Linden map for State Senate and the Hickory map for State House.

Is the best option but again I still think it needs a little bit more work for partisan fairness.

If the Commission decides to draw new maps, please continue to work towards improving partisan fairness.

That seems to be what everybody is saying today.

This is a historical moment.

Please make Michigan voters proud.

By keeping the politics out of the redistricting process.

Thank you for all your hard work.

And I wish you all a happy and healthy 2022.

Thanks.

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

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

>> Mark Payne.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mark you are now unmuted, there you go.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mark can you hear us?

>> I'm having technical difficulties.

One second.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure.

>> Okay, thank you very much.

Good morning, Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning.

>> Good morning thank you for the patience, good morning so thank you for your service.

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.

My name is mark Payne a resident of Detroit, I ask that the vote process you have established be adhered to on the actual vote so the public can witness a transparent conclusion to your work.

In addition these lines will last ten years and have a lasting impact.

You can still do better especially on the State House maps Hickory is least bad but you can do better for Michigan taking a little bit more time drafting.

Please take more time to additionally address our ability to elect candidates of choice and assure compliance with the voter rights act z, as a voting rights expert Handley says in 2C we compile election results where all draft districts can be used whether your proposed will provide minority voters with the opportunity to elect.

No mention of this however no mention of this being done is made.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 28, Nicole Bedi.

>> Hi everyone.

My name is Nicole Bedi from Birmingham I'm in support of the Birch Congressional map.

We are part of the congregation of a Sikh technical of Rochester Hills.

You heard a lot from my community earlier in the process we support the Birch map because it keeps together the neighborhoods of Sterling Heights Troy and Rochester Hills so that our religious community as well as the south Asian cultural community can be a constituency with member of Congress.

I've been following this process really closely and I've actually taken the time to tally the pins on the portal.

And I want you to pay attention to the fact that there are actually 1500 comments between the Birch and Chestnut maps where 67% of comments are positive on the Birch map where only 55% are positive on or green on the Chestnut map.

There has been a lot of T attention on these verbal comments like mine organized by groups but a ton of individuals do not have the luxury to take time away.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 29, Claudia Warren.

>> Good morning.

Good morning, Commissioners and thank you for your service in this extremely important process.

I am one of the many Voters Not Politicians volunteers residing in Midland County.

We collected 21,000 signatures to get proposal two on the ballot.

50-60% of Midland County voters approved proposal two.

50-60% of Midland County voters understood that Michigan's redistricting process was rigging the election in favor of one party.

In Midland County and in the rest of the state we all witnessed what happens when one party dominates with a closed mindset.

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.

Public health, public education, environmental protection, and good governance declined over the last 20 years of unresponsive and uninformed legislation. The Flint water crisis and the emergency financial manager fiasco where most of the group.

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

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

>> Thank you, something went a little crazy there.

Thank you for allowing me to speak today and for all the hard work you put in the Commission.

My name is Michael fields from Gladwin County.

After asking you several times for a fair playing field, I am willing to put my support behind the following plans.

If you are going to be proceeding forward at this point, I would prefer you adopt the Linden plan for State Senate, Hickory plan for the State House and Birch plan for the United States Congressional District.

Again thank you for your time and allowing me to speak in this process.

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

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Number 31, Cathleen.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will go to Velma Overman.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Pastor Overman, if you are unable to unmute yourself you are free to address the Commission.

>> I'm sorry, just a second, I'm on now.

Can you all hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, so I just had a couple questions, one was will we lose minority representation at the Senate and at Congress, at Congress and the State House for one with the map.

That was my first question.

And I want you to think about that.

And then Michigan has been increasingly diverse state should draw new maps that provide hold on for a second so I can give this to you the way it is written.

As an increasingly diverse state Michigan should draw new maps that provide substantial opportunities for community of color to elect candidates of their choice. Moreover it is legally required to do so.

So that's what I want us to really think about as we begin to make these decisions.

And I know you've heard so much, but.

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, LaCracha Handy.

>> Good morning. I'm LaCracha Handy from Flint Township, resident in Genesee County.

Maps need to be fair with no political bias.

Even a little bit is too much.

These maps are still leaning to the right.

That's not good for political fairness and it's certainly is not good for someone like me a person of color.

We need our voices heard too.

It is our right.

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

Vote no on Palm and the house vote yes on Hickory.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Excuse me. Number 34 Matthew Hall.

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

>> Good morning thank you for your time and for the work you've already put in on this project I'm Matthew Hall a stay at home dad in northwest Grand Rapids.

Looked over the proposed maps and would like to voice my support for the Birch map for Congress, the Hickory map for the State House, and the Linden map for the State Senate.

While no map can perfectly represent the will of the voters, geography being you know what it is, these three maps come the closest and I look forward to my voice having a little more affect in upcoming elections.

Again thank you all for your time.

And have a nice day.

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

>> Hi, this is Rebecca Grayson from Grand Rapids, Kent County.

I wanted to voice my support for the State Senate on the Linden or cherry maps.

Vote no on the Palm.

And then for the State House the Hickory map is the most fairest.

When the Commission starts to vote make sure that the Commission passes the one of the collaborative maps, not the individual submissions.

This is because the collaborative maps were drawn during the public meetings and the reasons for districts being drawn is how they were drawn outside the public comments and all the commentary you have been listening to and makes it more collaborative.

Thank you so much for your time.

And really appreciate all of your hard work.

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 36, Gina favors.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 37, Cassie-Foley.

>> Good morning I'm Cassie-Foley from Midland as you near the goal of final maps I want to thank the Commissioners for their hard work and the time they have given to this process.

For my area in Midland I'm very grateful for the collaborative maps.

You have drawn that unites the Tri-Cities and Flint.

You have recognized the concerns of mid cities and the communities of the Great Lakes Bay region.

I urge you to choose the Chestnut Congressional map, the Linden State Senate map, and the Szetela State House map.

If you do, I will for the first time in decades live in fair and competitive districts.

As you vote please do it with fairness for the voters as your guiding star.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 38, Susan Steigerwalt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If you can unmute you are free to address the Commission.

>> Thank you for your work.

I'm a retired physician.

I've lived in Detroit for 45 years and I'm a member of DSA.

I wanted to echo comments by others.

Number one, the NAACP and AFLCIO comments regarding Black representation.

Number two the issue that I have is, well, which is combining suburban and City districts does not make much sense since our needs are quite different.

Regarding the maps that we do have I vote for Linden for Senate do not vote for Palm for State House, vote for Hickory.

But it still needs some work for partisan fairness.

And please continue to use VRA and partisan fairness as the basis for your decision making.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 39, Linda Barth.

>> Yes, I'm here. Good morning, Commissioners.

Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, great.

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.

First of all I'm a resident of Midland, 55 years I lived here and I'm also a local businessperson.

And I do support the Chestnut Congressional map because it does keep most of Midland County together.

Also the Linden Senate map and Hickory and it's a little bit skewed but better than most. Keep mid land with the Tri-Cities that best represents our community of interest. Recent attempts have been made to convince the Commission to scrap the maps with the cities and add Midland to the map.

You all worked diligently for logical and more fair voting maps and given a difficult and critical task and shown to the mandate.

Do not let 11th hour by political or special interest groups to undue months of deliberation which led to the current maps.

Thank you for your continued Commission to the process and responsibility you have shown to support fairness, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 40 Joe Weir.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Hello, my name is Joe Weir from Midland County I'd like to thank the Commission for listening to the majority of the citizens of Midland and for putting Midland County into State Senate and Congressional districts that are fair and competitive.

I'd like to remind the Commission that the VMP vote volunteers from Midland County collected over 21,000 petition signatures in support of proposal two and that these were actual signatures on paper petitions.

They were not simply clicks on a Facebook Page.

Your Commission was created out of desire by the majority of citizens of Michigan including the majority of the citizens of Midland County for competitive districts drawn in a nonpartisan manner.

You have the chance to end our dysfunctional politics and start a new era in Michigan. Please continue to keep the goal of better Government for Michigan as your focus as you decide on the final maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 41, Kevin O'Brien.

>> Hi there, I'd like to start out by telling you that I'm a resident of Holland, Michigan. My name is Kevin O'Brien.

I want to thank the Commission for the hard work that you've done.

It's very, very important work.

And I appreciate it very much.

So I support your efforts to comply with the intents of partisan fairness in proposal two.

I support your efforts to meet the intent of the Michigan Constitution and the spirit of political fairness.

So I do want to voice a concern about the private meeting that the Commission held, that was in noncompliance with the Commission guidelines.

And I hope you won't repeat this.

We need transparency and openness.

I've heard a lot of folks talking about Linden Hickory and Birch and our public participation is important.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is James Gallant Spaulding.

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 43, Marie Joppich.

>> Hello everybody and like other people said thank you so much for your hard work.

And it's great that Michigan will have a chance to have truly fair maps.

Like the other speakers today I do support the Linden map.

It's the fairest and please vote no on Palm.

That seems to be the least fair of all.

And then for the house please look at the Hickory map.

And as the other people have spoke, it's not perfect but if we could make it continue to strive these maps are going to be for ten years.

So it's critical that everyone's voice can be heard, everyone has the right to vote and we should make sure the votes all count equally and I thank you all for your great work and thank you so much.

No on Palm yes on Linden and yes on Hickory.

Thank you good-bye.

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

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

>> Sorry for the technical difficulties thank you, can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Great, greetings to the Commissioners and all public present.

Jasna-Pell of Midland Michigan.

Thank you for choosing to be Michigan's public servant and not a special interest servant.

I have to take this opportunity to say how proud I am of all the Michigan residents who volunteered and word so hard to create this Commission to take politics out of redistricting.

They entrusted you, their desires to create maps that will be most fair and inclusive maps, whose primary focus is Michigan 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.

Whenever you make your individual decisions about maps, I ask you to start from yourself and ask yourself this: Is this what would be best if this were my community? What areas do I consider part of my local and regional community? Including school districts, neighboring towns, et cetera.

Ask yourself that while rejecting any bias on partisan politics, skin color or regional economics.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 45, Mary Murphy.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Mary Murphy and live in hunting ton Woods in Oakland County and I too was very active in the Voters Not Politicians which was a major concern of having my voice heard.

And my concern in speaking to you previously was in regards to the Voting Rights Act and partisan fairness.

So I recommend that you vote for Linden for the state.

No to Palm.

Yes, for Hickory.

It's the best of all your house maps.

It could still give some tweaking to make it fairer, partisan fairness so we all have a voice.

We all need that voice.

And for Birch for the U.S. Congress.

Thank you for your time.

I appreciate it.

And I hope all goes well.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 46, Ryan Olds.

>> Hi, I would first like to thank you for all of your efforts to make fair maps.

I've been watching and appreciating all that you have been doing.

However, I am, have been disappointed to learn that on September -- December 16th a candidate for State House Lilly asked you to adopt the Szetela State House map because it's more favorable to her.

I would just like to remind you that this is a clear case of politicians trying to choose their districts and their voters.

So please do not approve of a map just because any candidate has asked you to.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.
Number 47.

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. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good so we will move to 48, Joel Ombry.

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

As we approach the end of the process, I want to thank you for all your hard work. Your task is not an easy one.

As someone who collected signatures in the sun and the rain to get prop to on the ballot in 2018 thank you for your seriousness in this long and historic effort.

And it focuses on Congressional level and urge you to adopt the Chestnut map or the Szetela map.

Those create more competitive districts and minority representation.

Please reject the Birch map as it slants too many Republican seats in West Michigan.

We have seen races where the runner eases off before the finish line and loses.

You are racing to provide the citizens of Michigan fair maps and good democracy.

Do not allow anything than the most fair effort to prevail.

Run through that finish line thank you.

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Number 50, Doug.

>> Hi, I'm Doug Floto.

I'm from Commerce Township and I just wanted to express the desire that we adopt partisan fairness as a strong consideration right now in the house and Senate, important represented by these extremists that want to restrict our voting rights.

And have acted incompetently in regards to the pandemic.

And so I think that the Linden map is the better representation of the needs of Commerce Township in the Senate that the Hickory map is in better representation for the Senate and the Chestnut map for the Congressional seats.

So please prioritize.

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

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

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak and for all your hard work.

I was born and raised in Detroit Wayne County, a District that has the highest rate of conviction in Michigan.

And houses the most prisoners in Michigan department of correction.

Me being a formally incarcerated returning citizen while incarcerated in Michigan I was counted in the census later to find returning home that this miscarriage of justice affected me in reentry to society.

The resources and representation had been siphoned for me to transition coming home. Prison gerrymandering just this is what it does.

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's not fair and it promotes mass incarceration.

We say we live in the home of the free and land of the brave.

Please be brave and deciding these maps.

Take this under consideration and please do what you can to make this right.

It's very wrong.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. At this point we are going to go back up to 31, Kathy Currell.

>> Hi there.

Yeah, I'm Kathy from Midland and I want to thank you all for the difficult work you are doing.

I'm happy to offer my comments.

The Midland Gladwin alliance is republican trying to change this conversation.

Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Sorry I kept getting pop-ups.

Trying to change it from fair districts to watershed and flooding issues and keeping Counties whole is an age old well documented GOP tactic to gerrymander maps.

I'm aware of balancing COIs with partisan fairness scores.

Keep your heads high.

You have an example for the rest of the country and I'm eternally grateful for the work you are doing.

I support the Szetela house map for its reliable partisan fairness scores.

Secondarily the Hickory for house and Linden for Senate and Chestnut Congressional map.

And happy holidays to all of you.

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

>> Cathy.

>> I'm Cathy and one of the 750 plus voices of Gladwin, Midland united asking you to support the Lange Congressional map or adjust the apple or Birch maps just to keep the City of Midland connected to Gladwin and Midland and the same Congressional District. Today I have for you an updated copy of our petition with 750 plus names that I have e-mailed to you.

A group of Gladwin Midland leaders attended your December 16th meeting in person to deliver an early copy of this petition.

Since you did not provide even one collaborative map to reflect all of our voices, we support the Lange map.

Gladwin Midland united is not about political party affiliation.

It's about community and community representation.

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 put the small City of Midland back in the District where it belongs approving the Lange Congressional map or simply make a tweak to an existing map.

Thank you.

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

>> MS. MUSTAFA RASHEED: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 54, Angana-Shah.

>> I live in Berkeley and first and Foremost I want to second as a lawyer myself everything that the representative of AFLCIO said about the need for fairness and what would happen if there was a Voting Rights Act challenge.

As far as the maps I want to support Linden for Senate and for the house none of the maps all of the maps lead to the minority of votes leading to majority control of our legislatures.

We already have that.

That is not what VNP was for Hickory is the best of the worst.

Thank you for what you are doing and it's not easy but it's a historic opportunity to really show the country what a majority of voters can insist on as far as fairness.

Thank you.

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

>> Hello.

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

>> Okay, hi.

My name is Jill Haver-Crissman from Midland and I want to thank you for your hard work together.

I hope you will honor the work of all the Voters Not Politicians volunteers who worked to create this Commission to take politics out of redistricting voting for the fairest maps.

Over 50% of Midland County, 60% of Bay and Saginaw Counties voted yes on two.

A solid majority wants fair maps and real representation.

If you go to -- that said I support your fairest collaborative maps Chestnut for Congress Linden for Senate and Hickory for house.

If you go to ranked choice Szetela map is even better.

I love Midland in a competitive District and Flint with two VRA districts.

Please vote for your fairest maps.

Chestnut, Linden and Hickory or Szetela house.

Remember it's Voters Not Politicians.

Make good history, happy 2022.

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

>> Good morning, Yvonne White, president of the Michigan NAACP and a resident of the City of Detroit.

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.

On the eve of your final vote the NAACP requests you remember the core purpose of redistricting.

To ensure Michigan's democracy works for all of Michigan citizens.

We particularly encourage the Commission to approve maps that ensure Black voters have an equal opportunity to participate in the state's political process and to elect candidates of their choice.

Such to our concerns to the redistricting process itself is a need to ensure that democracy speaks for all Michigan voters.

Especially those who are most marginalized in our state.

The Commission must approve districts that will keep communities of interest whole while ensuring that Black voters and not packed into districts.

This is no easy task but it's an essential one.

We look forward to you making the right choices.

Thank you for your service and for the opportunity to come before you at this historical moment.

Happy holidays.

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

Athena McKay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You are unmuted and free to address the Commission.

>> Good morning.

Thank you so much for your dedication, Commission on this process.

Sitting there in an empty room, hearing our voices, I debated rather to speak this morning given the fact I don't have anything new to testify.

From Flint we have the same agenda to make these maps as fair as possible.

As you read each person's name and as you see those comments in the portal, you can see that diversity of our state and as a Michigander anyone if you have any children over the age of 18, they will be able to vote based on the lines that you draw for the next ten years.

We do support the Congressional map Birch two, the Senate map Linden, Hickory we believe is the worst.

The best of the worst.

There is still things that can be done to improve and P7273 is our preferred community collective map.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Michael Davis. Is it back on? Do we have Michael Davis? Okay, what number is he? 58, okay.

>> All right, good morning, Commissioners. My name is Michael Davis with 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.

From day one we've aimed to be a resource for you in this process. We abided by the same Congressional criteria and same data available. And PTV maps are better across the board by metric and number of partisan fairness compactness, et cetera.

You have heard from us because you missed the mark where you need to go withdrawing and happy you added more time for discussion.

Please use it to discuss better maps, review the report that came from president white Michigan State conference because you are not doing Michigan or yourself favor or map options.

We understand you value the maps you have drafted collaboratively however collaboration should not be beyond the Commission's membership and collaboration is the reason why Michigan voters decided to have you and change the way we used to and we did it better because our goal is to ensure that Michiganders get.

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

That concludes our public comment for this morning. However I would like to mention that all e-mailed and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting. And the Commissioners also review the public comment portal on our www.Michigan.gov/MICRC website on a regular basis.

We appreciate everyone who provides public comment in what manner they choose to do so and invite people to share thoughts, communities of interest, and maps.

All right, at this point we will move on to the next item on our agenda which is unfinished business item the new 5A.

Redrawing of maps and Commissioner Lange, since you requested this be added I will ask you to lead the discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay we've received a lot of public comment regarding this very topic.

I think the consensus with the public comment is everybody wants the maps to be fair.

They want more consideration given to communities of interest.

More consideration given to VRA.

And other things.

And I think we owe it to the public, the state to do that.

In my opinion, and this is just my opinion, I feel that our maps have been consistent as far as on certain criteria, on certain areas such as Community of Interest I feel there is more weight given to certain areas and certain groups than others.

And I would like to see consistency regardless of which way, if we do do it, they end up.

I think the one thing and especially going forward for legal reasons is consistency.

And I'm not personally happy with any of the maps.

I guess I envisioned when we did the maps that we would take into consideration we would definitively pick communities of interest and have them all on one map.

Not making winners and losers on five maps.

It was to come up with the one best map I thought for the entire state and I just don't feel we have done it.

The public does not feel we have done it.

And I don't want to adopt maps based on a timeframe that are going to be in place for the next ten years when in my mind I think we could have done better.

And I think that seems to be the popular consensus of the public is we could have done better.

And so since it was on the agenda before, I thought it warranted a conversation today so that's what I've got.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just in response the first thing I will say is I'm proud of all the maps that we have.

Second, if we were to redraw maps, we are going to have other people say we need to redraw maps again 45 days from now.

It's going to be an endless cycle and loop and it's not going to get anywhere.

The maps that we have proposed in front of us that we are going to be voting on today are quality.

We've heard people say which ones they like.

And we've heard people say which ones they don't like.

So the ones on the table right now in front of us are the ones we should be voting on.

We should not go back to the drawing board in my opinion.

It's just going to slow down the process and we set our own deadlines and we should stick to what we have set.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments? Commissioner Eid? Oh, Commissioner Wagner then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you Chair Szetela.

I agree with Commissioner Lange.

We have heard repeatedly that we need to go back to the drawing board or tweak the house maps.

And speaking with General Counsel, she had made -- she voiced the fact we had only spent a day and a half on house maps.

I don't think that is fair to Michigan at all.

And we at least need to reconsider revisiting house maps, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just as a point of clarification, are you talking about the U.S. Congressional house maps that we only spent a day and a half on or the State House maps?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: State House maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is definitely not accurate.

I see Sarah Reinhardt over there shaking her head, we spent quite a bit of time on the house maps and the Congressional map we did draw quite quickly so I will agree with you there.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well you know I agree with some of the statements Commissioner Lange made.

But disagree with others.

The public has obviously said especially on the house map side they do wish changes to be made.

But I do think the maps support Community of Interest.

I may not necessarily agree with all of the Community of Interest I'm sure Commissioner Lange doesn't agree with others, and that is fine.

But it is important we stick to our deadlines here.

I think what Commissioner Witjes said was accurate.

You know, we make changes now, there are going to be other people who look at those changes and say we need to make more changes.

If we don't adopt maps this week, it puts us in a position where these maps might not be in place for the 2022 election.

That is not a risk I myself am willing to take.

When we have maps that we know by all objective measures are compliant, do follow the VRA, do follow all of our constitutional criteria.

And that we all have had numerous opportunities to work on.

And also every Commissioner has had two opportunities to submit their own maps if they don't like the collaborative maps.

And you know, we've had a legal memo given to us about this.

And specifically on Page 6 and Page 7 of that memo it goes into you know what I'm talking about.

And the memo you know strongly say that we should be adopting the maps that we have in front of us, that have had the 45 day public comment period, that have you know that we've all worked on in numerous hour long sessions without amendment.

So that is what I agree with.

And that is my two cents on the topic.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not sure who had their hand up first Commissioner Lange or Kellom but since you already started Commissioner Lange, I will let Commissioner Kellom go first.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Let me unmute and lower my hand.

I'm of the opinion that it's our job to do the best that we can and we received overwhelming feedback that we need to go back to the drawing board.

And I perfectly understand Commissioner Witjes what you were saying.

This idea that if we continue to basically make live edits to the consistent and overwhelming public comment that we get we will be doing it forever.

But I think we have been given specific feedback that we can go back especially given the perspective of the house map and the Senate maps and we can start with our best maps there and maybe redraw some things.

I understand Commissioner Eid what you shared.

Regarding our timeline and I do think yes, we do have a legal timeline but if we have to reassess these maps in the end because you know there are allegations they were done incorrectly and we end up having to redo this any way I would rather in the spirit of proficiency and being effective do that now.

I also happen to think we could do better for the City of Detroit and for people of color all over the State of Michigan in terms of representation to have a more equitable map.

And thinking of things that scare me the most and make me uncomfortable as an individual and my integrity that would be my concern more than a timeline or timeframe or sticking to that.

Because our people, not numbers.

They are not deadlines.

These are human beings and my personal work, working with disenfranchised folks, working with folks all over the City of Detroit, not just in Michigan and you all, other Commissioners as well when we walk away from this, we will be personally encountering the changes and the decisions that we made.

And I think it's easy now to retire and assess personally how we have been involved in the process and we need to band together and finish this out despite what the Commission decides, I will say that our on record our house and our Senate maps could be remapped.

And I am proud of our work.

But I think you all that does not mean because we are proud of our work this is the time when you know better you do better so we've learned a lot and we have gotten more advice and our consultants have been talking to us and I think we would be doing ourselves a disservice to continue on in the vain that this is the best we can do because it's not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't need to say anything else Commissioner Kellom said it in the best possible way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was just going to agree.

I think Commissioner Kellom voiced my opinion perfectly.

I think we owe Michigan the best we possibly can give them considering we are stuck with these maps for ten years.

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 if the people don't like it, I think we need to go back to the drawing board and give us the amount of time to give them something they actually will consider as their voice to all of us.

So I completely agree.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Wagner.

Sarah Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioners.

This is Sarah Reinhardt with the Michigan Department of State.

Hi Commissioner Kellom.

So in regards to this discussion about timeline and editing of the maps, I think that there are a few key dates that it is important for the Commission to keep in mind.

The first being that April 19th candidate filing deadline and the deadline for the Bureau of Elections the Michigan Bureau of Elections to update the QVF qualified voter file.

This entails the Bureau of Elections updating all 8 million plus registered voters in the state to comply with the new redistricting boundaries.

And as we've made clear before this is a process that generally takes about six months for the Bureau of Elections to complete.

But given the condensed timeline that you all are facing, as it stands now if the Commission were to approve a plan or plans prior to the end of 2021 they would have significantly less time than that, about four months if my math is correct.

So considering the option of the Commission editing maps, were the Commission to edit maps, I drew out a rough timeline of what that might look like for the Commission.

So given the number of maps that you all have and the time it's taken you to edit these maps previously and ensure compliance I would estimate about if you were all to start today hypothetically about at least another week and a half.

So let's put that let's say that you all were to finish editing additional maps by the 7th to remind you all it takes about another week for us to legally publish the maps so the maps would likely be published by January 14th.

That is two weeks into the new year.

As soon as the maps are published that triggers an additional 45 days of publication, 45 days ending on February 28th, that being the 45th day, the end of February.

That means that you would all have the opportunity to vote and to discuss and go through the entire voting process the first day of March. Assuming that by the end of that week March 4th you all arrive on maps selected, that puts the Bureau of Elections at less than two months to complete a process that under normal circumstances takes at least six months.

That timeline so condensed I can firmly say that it is next to impossible for the Bureau of Elections to complete that amount of work this that timeframe.

It's already going to be a very heavy lift for them to complete it in the timeline that we have now.

So two months would not be enough time which would result in your maps not being used in the 2022 elections.

Which will have additional legal ramifications for the Commission that General Counsel can speak further on, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I do have some comments on that.

I know we received and this is where I think this discussion might be a little premature because we did receive a memo from Baker Hostetler which Commissioner Eid referenced.

And I think the point on that was a little more nuanced than what Commissioner Eid has represented.

I think their point was if you look at the history of the adoption of administrative rules and regulations that typically both of the Federal and the state level you would have a public comment period and that does not necessarily mean that you can't change the rules and often and most times actually rules are changed.

I've seen this process myself and participated in it where you have a public comment period and comments are received and that changes our main in response to those comments.

So I think Baker Hostetler said that you know that would be one interpretation of the Constitution itself to say that in response to public comment we can make changes. They thought the most conservative and defensible position was to make miniscule changes so maybe we got a census block that got left out or that is the most defensible and going with the maps we have is the most defensible.

But I did think they left that opening for us which is why I think before we make any decisions, we need to kind of have that discussion with counsel and I don't know if Baker Hostetler is going to be available today or not but I feel there was that discussion that was more nuisance that we could potentially make changes particularly if we make changes in response to public comment which we have abundant public comment that the maps need some changes.

And then two I think we also need to think about this a little bit more compartmentalized than we are thinking about it because I feel on the U.S. Congressional level, I don't think we had a lot of comments asking for changes on those maps and I don't think they need changes in my personal opinion.

I think that the house we received a lot of comments and that we could make some changes on the house map potentially to make it better.

Make it more fair and be responsive to the abundant public comments we received and for me personally based on Dr. Handley's analysis I have some concerns about the Senate maps I think we need to address as well with the potential for maybe making some changes there.

Responsive to our VRA analysis and public comment that we received in Detroit in particular as well.

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 you know, I think I would hope as a Commission we would not be entrenched and consider all the possibilities before us, one of the possibilities maybe we make some changes to accommodate public comments and feedback and then vote and take the risk that someone is going to challenge the maps rather than taking the position that we can't make any changes and we have to adopt what we approved 45 days ago for publication because if we're going to take that position to me it seems very inconsistent to get 45 days of public comments and not do anything in response to it especially when we received very vigorous public comment particularly around VRA issues and particularly with primaries and democratic primaries and are these maps representative and do they actually provide the Black community in Detroit with the ability to elect. I think these are things we need to think seriously about to make sure we get the maps right the first time those are my thoughts Commissioner Witjes then Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will say I think we have quality maps but I see the timeline differently.

We were getting public comment while we were drawing the maps.

Then we went on our five-day well we went on our listening tour in the beginning of the year.

Got all the public comments.

We drafted our maps.

We got public comment throughout that entire drafting process.

We took those comments to heart.

We made revisions to the map.

I see the 45 day public comment period of the people telling us which ones do they want us to pick.

Not necessarily to make changes to them.

Secondly, let's stop the snowball effect of things taking longer and longer to finish and putting more strain on different Government entities.

We were under compressed timeline because of the pandemic and the census data being delayed for so long.

We have something we can vote on to stop that process from taking longer in the future for the Department of State.

Bureau of Elections and everything else.

We have quality maps that we can vote on.

Let's stop making it more difficult for things to be done timely in the future for everybody else.

Because we have things that can majority of us, I believe and feel that we have quality maps and I'll even say majority of the people in the public probably believe the same thing.

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

Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid was first.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sorry I agree with Dustin 100% good job Dustin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think under a normal you know when the 45 day public comment when the final 45 day public comment language was adopted, right, nobody knew there would be a pandemic and nobody knew there would be a census delay and nobody knew that we would be put in the position that we have been put in.

And I think in ten years when they undergo this process again, they will have time after a 45 day public comment window to reevaluate comments based on that and make changes and go from there.

But you know unfortunately I don't see us as having that luxury.

The Constitution did have a deadline.

And we already are well past that deadline.

However, I agree that our lawyers did leave some wiggle room and possibly making changes that would not require a 45, a new 45 day window of public comment.

But I think you said it yourself they said the most defensible position was to adopt the maps as is.

And you know we made changes.

We made a lot of changes.

We had 16 public comments that we did before drafting any maps.

We then had another five and we made pretty big changes to all parts of the maps.

At least in my eyes after that.

So I do think we did the best we could do given the time constraints and we don't have an infinity amount of time here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton then General Counsel Pastula.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I skipped Doug, thank you.

Doug, you went before him never mind sorry go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, I'll be quick.

I totally agree with what Dustin and Anthony are saying.

And I see that we have gotten a lot of public comments recently saying that we should go back to the drawing board.

But we are kidding ourselves if we think we can ever get to the point where we are not hearing that from one group or the other.

We are always going to hear from the group that doesn't feel like the maps are going their way.

Then if we switch them, we will hear from the other side.

So I think we did spend a long time working on the maps.

And compromising and finding good solutions.

And we did spend a long time listening to public comments and taking those into consideration.

And I think the time has come that we need to take action.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

Good morning to the Commission.

And, yes, really it is a -- the Constitution doesn't speak clearly to this issue about making changes at this stage or what would be required.

So that ambiguity in language is what presents the risk management problem that is for the Commission to decide how to go.

We've already heard that the legal risks again we already exceeded the constitutional time limit which we knew we were going to do and advised the Supreme Court that is a challenge and obstacles of the Commission was the census delay on the pandemic.

Ms. Reinhardt has also already mentioned the downstream election administration stresses on director Brady from the Bureau of Elections back in March said turning maps into ballots and the key triggers and what timing was normally offered to the Bureau of Elections.

Again, that was what the November 1st constitutional deadline date was based off of.

So all of these entities, the MICRC included find these stresses pressing on their work.

Of the third risk, again, is the risk of third-party impasse litigation that could be brought.

Now, the least amount of risk is adopt the maps as presented without the amendments.

And I think the easiest way to clarify what was set forth in the Baker memo is the de minimis would be like Scribner areas a precinct out of whack or GIS geographies don't completely match up, those kind of technological errors versus making changes to actual District lines.

And for those the -- your litigation counsel offered the logical outgrowth theory as a possible options.

They are risks and not guaranteed but they would be making changes based and tied directly and tailored directly to public comments.

And I think it was mentioned that a lot of these comments the Commission heard during not only the second around of public hearings but during its deliberation period where it made its map adjustment over a period of eight days.

So the logical outgrowth test again also has risk inherent to it.

And when compounding all these risks is there is no clear way to identify the line where the changes would be tailored and related to comment versus the Court would view them as quote new maps that should have been required to go through the noticing comment period required under subsection 14.

And I think it's also important to highlight that a lot of the legal risks that the Commission is weighing right now whether to assume or take what forum it would be brought in, I think that there is distinct differences between a Federal Court challenge at this time and a state Court challenge.

And also changes at this time based on what information.

And I know I've heard mention the public comment.

I've heard mention the VRA and I know Mr. Adelson is present so if -- I would obviously defer to him to make the comments in that regard.

But I think when the Commission is weighing the risk it's very important to talk through the issues and again what this new information or new data presumably is and how if at all it would impact the maps as currently drafted.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.

Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Because Mr. Adelson is here and on Page 17, we did get public comment today about this and the map from excuse me on the report from Dr. Handley there was I'm looking at Page 17 and it's particularly the second paragraph, I'm going to read it and Mr. Adelson what I'm hoping you might help me do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to clarify Page 17 in Dr. Handley's reports.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, final report to the Commission.

The second paragraph analysis must be undertaken to determine if a proposed District is likely to provide minority voters with an opportunity to elect.

This analysis and I'm going to paraphrase here must be functional, that is it must be based on actual voting behavior of whites and minorities.

What I'm aware of it feels we are trying to predict the future and many of the Commissioners are speaking to this right now.

If we are going to adjust these maps what we want to do is ensure there is minority representation with an opportunity to elect.

That paragraph tells me we might not know that until the actual votes happen.

Is that accurate? We can't predict the future really when we have good data, we know it's imperfect but it's the best data we have and we have great experts and I trust what we have and it sounds like this final paragraph says analysis must be undertaken and it must be functional based on actual voting behavior which we don't have yet, okay, I'll just let you speak now thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good morning we have decisions and events and I will speak briefly in response to your question.

I think one of the things that you may recall going back to June, the analysis that has been done that we did throughout the mapping process when we looked at the recompiled election results and analyze maps and looking at the results of the 2014

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.

Secretary of State election for example, gubernatorial election, the Presidential election, that is a functional analysis and recompiled election results seen through the prism of your districts.

But to the larger point that you make all of these are estimates.

As we've discussed before, there have not been any elections yet.

Of course on your maps.

That has not happened.

So we are using election results from past elections whether from statewide elections or on legislative districts that you've changed, that don't if your maps, if you adopt maps this week based on what you have before you that won't exist anymore.

So one of the things that is important to remember is, yes, these are estimates, yes, these are predictions because there have been no elections on your districts.

Yes, this is what the Federal courts expect.

Yes, this is what the Voting Rights Act speaks to.

Remember there are no -- the Voting Rights Act does not guaranty that election results happen in a certain way.

The Voting Rights Act talks about opportunity to elect.

That is what Dr. Handley's analysis speaks to.

That is what our being together for as long as we were in person, in the room, looking at election results District by District.

So I also have to comment very briefly and I'm certainly very happy to talk about this in greater detail, in reading Dr. Handley's support or report I fully support her analysis.

Her analysis tracks with what we have been doing for months.

I have no concerns based on her analysis that there are VRA compliance issues, issues that need to be addressed.

She analyzed by my count more than 70 elections in my three redistricting cycle experience, I've never seen that before.

Frankly, I've never participated in analyzing that many elections.

And she, her results are quite telling in that they reveal that minority voters have had the opportunity to elect candidates of choice in Michigan over a decade in well over 50% of elections analyzed.

That there is no consistent white bloc voting under the jingles test which we can talk more about if you would like as we go forward.

And that I was also struck that there are relatively small number of elections like a handful that raise any specific question, thought, I wonder why that happened.

It's really important to remember that decisions cannot be made based on one election where there is some anomalous potential result and why things happen the way they did.

It does not work that way.

Doctor Handley by my count looked at over 70 elections and her report tracks with what we have been doing, tracks with her analysis she presented in September, tracked with what we have done as far as the recompiled election results.

But in the end Commissioner you are right, these are predictions and estimates everything you do is a prediction in a sense but that is all you can do.

That is the limit of the law.

That is the limit of the Voting Rights Act.

That is just the reality because no elections have been held yet on what you're doing.

So thank you for the opportunity to speak.

And I'm looking forward to the continued conversation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, Mr. Adelson, so my specific concern reading Dr. Handley's report is that when we were in Detroit we received very specific feedback from a number of people who basically were critical of our analysis that was looking at County wide election data and statewide election data and the comment we heard over and over and over again is you have to look at the primaries and we all know this is true especially in Districts that are heavily leaning democratic or republican the primary is where the real action is at for the election, whoever wins the primary is going to win the seat in that particular District.

And so we heard that very specific comments that we have to look at the primaries and very specific concerns about voter turnout which is also addressed in Handley's report as well and specifically the concern that when you have 35% or less than a certain number in districts which are supposedly VRA districts, those percentages for the Black community are not going to translate to the ability to win primary elections.

And what I'm seeing in Dr. Handley's report is she has since validated that concern.

Specifically table ten and on Page 26 where she looks at the primary analysis for and again, I understand the data is limited because we don't have the ability to pull County wide primary information because it's very District specific.

But her analysis concluded that in the Michigan State Senate, in the house she said we were fine, in the Michigan State house she said we are fine with percentage we have but the Michigan State Senate specifically her analysis for those limited number of primary races showed that you needed a BVAP of 48% in order for the Black community to elect their candidate of choice in the primary.

Now once they had their candidate of choice, they were then able to go on to the main election and elect their candidate of choice there as well.

But she specifically raises this concern that if the amount is lower than 47% in a primary the Black community cannot elect candidates of choice in a primary and that the candidate of choice is not going or the person who is elected in that primary will not be their candidate of choice and ultimately, they will be stuck with that choice when we come to the main election.

Given our Senate maps, all of them have BVAP ranges between 35-44.78%, our Senate maps VRA compliance if we can go into it looking at again limited analysis on a limited number of primaries, are we truly comfortable that those districts for the Senate are VRA comply incidents or is there a concern we need to address?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: There is a lot there.

Let's take things one step at a time and I disagree with your characterization of Dr. Handley's report she did not say 48% BVAP is required for bloc voters to elect candidates of choice.

Much of the contrary.

If we, if you recommend, if Commissioners recommend setting arbitrary percentages not based on significant election analysis and that comment is based on one election then we run a real risk under Supreme Court precedent that we are setting arbitrary percentages of minority voters that would suggest the racial gerrymander.

What are the continuing challenges in Michigan which we talked about and Dr. Handley has talked about previously, you have one statewide primary in the last ten years to analyze.

Dr. Handley analyzed myriad State House and primary elections and some of them there were multiple minority candidates running.

So she was unable to determine who was the minority candidate of choice.

More in the other direction and which I think is a very positive direction, that there were significant support between white and Black voters of the same candidate.

So in that case there are no racially polarized election.

So she did not recommend in her report and I certainly set 48% as a BVAP percentage. She does not say that.

She recognizes and I agree the challenges of limited data meaning limited state and legislative primary election results.

But that is the universe we are operating in.

That has been the universe that we've operated in throughout.

That is something that General Counsel and I have continually advocated finding other primary elections to analyze.

Dr. Handley did that.

And her conclusion is that, yes, without -- with the absence of additional primary election data we have to rely on what we have.

What we have are general election results, recompiled election results, the gubernatorial primary from 2018.

Which interestingly also is not dispositive because there was no consistent lacked cohesion meaning Black voters supporting the same candidate of choice District by District.

So in the main that is something I have been very involved with the last month or so since I saw you going with the data, the elections that we have.

And in Michigan you just don't have a lot of state primary election results, legislative election results and please remember that her analysis showed that in approximately 70% of elections minority voters elected candidates of choice and there was no white bloc voting.

There was a very important consideration under the jingles precedent.

So that is my comments for now, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mayor Reed Adelson we will let Commissioner Eid have a turn because he has his hand raised then we are actually over time excuse me for our lunch break so we will take a lunch break and we can pick this conversation up after, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well first you know I'd like to encourage everyone watching and everyone in the public to read this report.

It's a very you know it's a very thorough 80-Page report on VRA analysis we conducted.

We had someone say we have not done it.

It is it's on the website and please read it.

It's very informative.

I agree with everything Mr. Adelson just said.

My interpretation of reading this report which I read several times was a little different.

I agree with what you said about table ten Commissioner Szetela.

But that is only my interpretation of reading it was that that was only one measure and the next Section talked about the recompiled election results that we did look over when making the Senate map.

And that is what I believe Mr. Adelson was just talking about.

But what I really want to talk about is you know MC's point.

We can't tell the future.

None of us can.

You know it would be nice if we could but we just can't.

Well what we can do is make the best guesses based on evidence and based on objective analysis to make the most educated guess on where to go.

And I think as Mr. Adelson just said our maps do that.

This analysis does that.

And yeah, I think we are good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Eid.

I understand the lunch is not here yet so we are going to keep going.

Sorry I did not want anyone's lunch to get cold but apparently, it's not here yet.

Commissioner Kellom did you have your hand up? So my only comment about table ten I did preface saying there is limited data but sometimes there is canaries in the coal mine that is my concern is it a canary in the coal mine and should we give it pause and think about it because we go on to Page 27 in talking about, I'm going to say his name wrong Godfrey Dillard and that election but that is again a statewide election.

It's not a primary.

So I still and will continue to have concerns because I want to make sure we do right by Detroit.

I want to make sure we do right by the Black population, with our ability to elect who they want to elect.

And I have concerns.

And I'm not sure what I've seen in terms of data has reassured any of those concerns. Commissioner Rothhorn, did you have a comment? Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Rebecca just echoing the same.

I'm just in a pensive place that is why I took my hand down because I'm not sure what I want to say or what I'm thinking exactly at this moment so I guess I'm just listening because I have like I said the same concern and I want to make sure we are listening to the folks of Detroit specifically.

And that we are making decisions regarding these maps that are going to result in equitable and fair maps for everyone particularly those folks of color.

Because yes we can't predict the few -- future and we know the future in Michigan and as I said before I think it's our responsibility to up hold that despite, again, we will have a deadline, we are going to have to go to Court any way so I would rather do it in my usual smile telling the truth and not it be entrenched in the muck of us not feeling like it or whatever because that's not going to serve us at the end of the day.

They are not going to care about that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

So I feel like we sort of talked this issue out.

I can no longer see Commissioner Wagner and Commissioner Lange so if you have further comments, please let me know because I'm not seeing you on my screen. Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe one more question to Mr. Adelson because you mentioned that in the report that that there is no the white bloc, there is no coherence in the voting patterns in the white population.

I think I saw that analysis also with the Black P population there was no coherent voting patterns.

And perhaps it was statewide so if you can help me make sure that -- I just want to understand if that is accurate what I just said.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Sure, let's back up just a minute.

Remember what the jingle Supreme Court decision said.

That is about vote dilution.

For there to be vote dilution whites must vote as a bloc usually to prevent minority voters from electing candidates of choice.

And minority voters must vote cohesively basically the same way usually in order to elect their chosen candidates.

In the 70 or so elections that Dr. Handley analyzed there were some elections where Black voters did not always vote cohesively but more to the larger point that there was no consistent white bloc voting and just as an example, as a contrast, in one of the advising another redistricting body recently that is in another part of the country, we were looking at a Federal Court decision where in this particular location whites voted as a bloc almost 90% of the time to prevent minority voters from electing candidates of choice.

That is not happening in Michigan.

That's what Dr. Handley's analysis reveals.

So the reality is you look at both.

This cohesiveness issue but also white bloc voting.

So just as by contrast if in Michigan 60, 70, 80% of elections showed whites consistently impeding we would have a much different and that is not what the data shows.

I understand from the work that I do, outside of the work with the Commission my scholarship and teaching in law school, my writing, my league of work and my litigation, I understand very well what people's concerns are.

But just as I told you way back when, when we had our first meeting, I'm an analysis guy.

I rely on the analysis.

I rely on the data.

I don't let my personal opinions get involved.

The data and the analysis reflect are reflected in Dr. Handley's report.

And they show the absence of usual white bloc voting.

They also show that in some elections Blacks don't always support the same candidate of choice.

Look at it this way if you run 6, 7, 8 candidates for one office it could be very difficult to figure out who is the minority preferred candidate because potentially all 6, 7 or 8 candidates. And I think Dr. Handley mentioned that too aren't getting support.

It could be different to figure out who is the preferred candidate.

Look at it that way no consistent white bloc voting, Black voters that there are elections where Dr. Handley found that they did not vote cohesively so I know that this is very complex.

And I know that I'm throwing a lot of information out there.

Does that answer your question?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

It helps give more information, thank you.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I think this question is for Mr. Adelson, hey Bruce, and I don't know if it belongs in this conversation or so we are talking a lot about data

and math and numbers and elections and, you know, minority voters, Black folks are not always voting cohesively but when I think about is the challenge and access that still exists despite it being 2021 for voting and where that is placed in the conversation.

Because while it's not a number, it's something real.

And it's something that quite frankly the Black community in Detroit deals with.

Showing up to the polls.

So when you know that that is true and that -- it could be said that is not the Commission's fault and not in charge of getting people out of the house but to me that should also be part of a discussion because that's the history and that is the qualitative data of the culture.

I think when we are thinking about percentages or how we have drawn that part, the Commission does have a little control of we can provide the cushion that ten years down the line but we can't pull you out of your house and get you to galvanize and be the activist of what you need and have given a good shake of map numbers and what we know about your community of interest.

To do what you need to do.

And to me I mean, it seems like the Commission has already made their decision in terms of I get the vibe we are not going towards changing things which would inevitably mean we are keeping things the same for the City of Detroit but it just makes me uncomfortable.

And this would be the case if it was not Black people or not a native Detroiter or another community, I knew had these issues, I'm looking at access because that has everything to do with how you get numbers like I'm a researcher first so those are things I think about.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you very much for your comments.

And you know it also made me recall the conversations you and I had previously and the work that you did previously in looking at communities of interest in Detroit.

Which is something that one of my significant takeaways from the past, over the past year, and working with the Commission.

I want to just put that as side briefly.

Dr. Handley's report she did address issues of voter turnout for example.

But she also made I think a couple of really important points that given the population in Detroit that Black voters have the opportunity essentially to control each election because of the number of people that are in Detroit but also the reality that there is significant white cross over voting in democratic primaries because that is one of the more eloquent points she made and I agree with.

That unlike frankly many other states where I'm working now or have been working now or in the past, that is not always true.

That is something she recognized as well.

So the issue of going back to your point about communities of interest, you know, I've been very clear about my opinions on communities of interest and retaining neighborhoods and communities in Detroit, those are conversations we had in October. And in early November.

And I made my recommendations then about ways that the Commission could address these issues.

Right now I'm focusing on Dr. Handley's analysis and the white data are available, what elections are available and also, I'm very aware of the timeframes and of the General Counsel mentioned impasse litigation and mention another concern I have felt shuns are not held this year on new maps you also run a significant risk of challenges that we really have not discussed.

Running elections based on maps that are out of whack in terms of population.

You are running maps that relied on the census ten years ago.

That is something I've seen in other places.

I know we have not really talked about it because frankly I had not really thought that was a prospect.

So I know I'm throwing a lot of information out.

But I'm relying on right now the what Dr. Handley has analyzed, what she had proposed back in September, the vast array of elections that she analyzed and they all, they track very consistently with the results that I spoke to earlier.

So I very much respect what you have said, that I respect what we have discussed.

I very respect what you did in October as far as the communities of interest.

But this is not October or early November.

And there are the issues that have been discussed with the reality of the calendar.

So you know I appreciate your comments and your including me in the discussion.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Adelson.

Are there any additional comments on this topic.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There is one last thing I want to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn then Commissioner Eid.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One of the things I think I'm struggling with right now is this is such a human process and the Constitution has us listening and taking into consideration public comment.

And we've gotten you know it's a legal process also.

With data.

And we have to do this systematically in order to make sure our maps we are drawing for the State of Michigan for the people of Michigan are defensible and are enacted as soon as possible so we get the unfair maps replaced.

What I'm struggling with right now is that the history of Government and this is part of the VRA analysis we got and recognize the State of Michigan has been and people of color have been disenfranchised and marginalized by our Government.

What I'm struggling with right now is I don't want to be another member of Government that doesn't listen to people who know their community particularly people of color.

So that I'm trying to name it, right, that, yes, and I know we have to use data and I know we have to use a system.

I don't know that I have an answer here.

Because I think I don't know that there is a right answer and I think that is why so many public comment has basically said I'm not envying your job.

Which is my job.

Which is our job.

I think that is what I wanted to say.

Just trying to name the idea we are another Government body and we are trying to do right by people who have been marginalized forever.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Rothhorn.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I agree with what you just said, Commissioner Rothhorn, I think that is what we are doing.

These maps in my eyes do undo that disenfranchisement of minorities.

Being a minority myself, that is my feeling about these maps.

And it's certainly my feeling at least of the purpose of why we were created.

And what we have at least tried to the best of our ability to do.

So thank you for saying that.

And I think it's an important point and I do agree with it.

I do think we should decide I don't know if you are going to change the maps or not because if we don't, we will come back to this topic for the next two days.

So is that a motion someone would entertain or do you want to take lunch first or how do you want to do this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Suggest until after we have gone through VRA analysis because if we say no, we are not going to change something and Mr. Adelson says you are not compliant so I feel this is a little premature and we have next on the agenda the final report and the individual map assessment and I think it probably makes sense to wait for those to make decisions.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Hasn't it been Bruce's position that the maps that we have are in VRA compliance this whole time? I don't see that changing right now unless I'm totally missing what you just said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No I'm not saying he is going to but premature to change anything until the expert says they are all good, just wait.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mr. Adelson are our maps good?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much and Mr. Adelson you know I welcome you to weigh in as well.

I think that the collaborative maps that the Commission drew in preparation for the second round of public hearings and then made their adjustments during the deliberation period, working through that process with Mr. Adelson in open session, those analyses were able to be conducted.

The Commission voted to allow individual maps to move forward for publication. And the legal team did not have that opportunity to go through those maps because, again, they were voted to go directly to publication.

So really these map presentation of both the collaborative maps quite frankly and the individual maps would be critical to give the Mr. Adelson the opportunity to weigh in on the individual maps.

Thank you.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I agree with General Counsel and in response to Commissioner Witjes the collaborative maps we lived those.

We walked through those.

The maps that the Commissioners submitted individually after you adjourned and I guess November 5th, that is something I'm very interested in.

Commissioners presenting them and introducing them, describing them and then we can look at the recompiled election results as we did so many times before in the fall.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so let's just move on to our next topic and then we can revisit this at the end of the rest of the unfinished business.

And maybe even get that done before lunch so next on our agenda is unfinished business agenda 5A Commission final vote process without objection I will ask our Executive Director Sue Hammersmith to provide initial information followed by Sarah Reinhardt the departmental from MDOS to cover ranked choice voting and share the score sheets and Julianne who can provide voting options.

Please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: As you will recall the Commission did vote on final vote procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you hold on for one second Executive Director.

Did you want to take a break or? I know Edward was saying our food would not be here until 1:00.

You want to stretch your legs.

Okay, I'll let you stretch your legs Commissioner Witjes.

All right so let's just take a brief ten-minute recess.

It's 12:27 right now.

Let's everybody get up and stretch their legs then we will come back at 12:37.

Thank you everybody.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we ready, Sarah? As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 12:41 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely, Madam Chair.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and as well as your physical location you are attending from.

I call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner apologies.

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: What am I chopped liver, chopped liver is here.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from

Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I will return once more to Commissioner Curry.

All right 11 or 12 Commissioners are present. And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We will return to Executive Director Hammersmith to go over the final process document and we will break for lunch at 1:00.

Go ahead.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you Commissioner Szetela.

As the Commission approved the final vote procedure at the last meeting, we wanted to bring you the final copy.

In the areas were highlighted where the Commission had decision points, discussed in the previous meeting so the District type considerations were reordered per the Commission's wishes to start Congressional, move to State Senate and move to State House in the plans.

There will be overviews of the plans that is coming up, fairly soon on the agenda.

And so those individual plans can be presented by the Commissioner who drafted each of their maps at the same time we can have VRA analysis which has not been done on those maps yet.

The discussion before the vote there will be the straw poll, there is a lot of discussion about that.

And then discussion about each of the plans.

Step three is voting.

And I think General Counsel Pastula's memorandum did a really clear job of describing the voting process.

A vote by majority with the two, two, two, two democrats, two republicans, two nonaffiliated and majority vote of the total Commission could achieve consideration for a map.

But also that this Commission will not put forth any motions for a specific map but instead allow each Commissioner to state the maps that they prefer to be adopted.

The ranked voting process, I'm not going to discuss because MDOT Sarah Reinhardt has a brief PowerPoint that I think describes the ranked process voting and the options that this Commission has that were set forth in General Counsel Pastula's memo. So I would turn it over to Sarah Reinhardt from MDOS who has a very brief PowerPoint about the three options you could consider for the ranked voting.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right hi Commissioners again counsel Pastula and I are going to tag team this presentation just a bit.

She is going to go through some of the pieces of the memo that was circulated and I'm going to share some visual examples of the options to make it a little more clear. So General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt, yes, Ms. Reinhardt has prepared a much more interesting PowerPoint than unfortunately my memo I'm sad to relay.

I submitted a memorandum that summarized the three stages of voting under subsection 14 adoption by majority vote.

The second is the ranked choice vote and the third is the random selection process.

The choices that are before the Commission in conducting the ranked choice vote are set out in that memo and also reflected in the PowerPoint.

So we will start with some general observations on the ranked choice voting that would apply to any of the options that the Commission would select.

The first is that there will only be one round of ranked choice voting.

The Commission voted at its December 16th meeting to set the maximum number of majority voting attempts at three but the Constitution contemplates one round of ranked choice voting.

The constitutional language is permissive each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type or decline to advance one of the proposed plans.

However, and this is critical of I'll be stating this and I know Ms. Reinhardt will be stating it as well Commissioners that do not advance or identify a proposed plan for a District at the ranked choice stage will not have a selection in the random choice process if one is required.

So the plans, the proposed plans by Commissioner that are identified in ranked choice voting are the ones that are put into the random selection process.

So the Constitution also mandates that each Commissioner shall rank the plans submitted according to preference.

So the Commissioners individual Commissioners have discretion whether to identify a proposed plan but they do not have discretion as to participating in the ranked choice vote based on the constitutional language.

And then the inverse point ranking.

So moving the inverse point ranking is set forth in the Constitution so that language is also inflexible.

As well as the computation for the plan that would win through that process.

So the three options moving on to the three options.

The first is that again each Commissioner has the option to advance or identify a proposed plan or to decline to do so.

Those plans would be identified by plan name and Commissioner names.

And all 13 would be voted on.

So we will -- I will tag team over to Ms. Reinhardt for the visuals on option A.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Before we do that Commissioner Lange has her hand up do you want to take questions or ask her to wait it is up to you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want for clarification what you just said are you saying that if it got to random draw, that a Commissioner could not submit their own personal maps for random draw, did I hear that right? I just want to make sure I heard correctly any map that could potentially go to random draw would have to be one of the ones that through the 45 day and does that not contradict what the Constitution says, if that is the case? I just want to make sure I'm clear on what's being said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Madam Chair.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you through the Chair to Commissioner Lange. So the identified proposed plans would be the plans that went through the 45 day cycle. And I know you yourself I kind of paused for a moment because I know you yourself have submitted individual plans.

So but that went through the 45 day cycle.

So Commissioners based on the actions taken by the Commission at the November 4th vote would be selecting from the plans that went through the 45 days in the ranked choice process and those plans that were identified in the ranked choice process by the language of the Constitution are the ones that are automatically entered into the random selection process.

Is that responsive, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I guess my question is: Can a Commissioner submit a map if it got to the random selection if it has not gone through the 45 day, constitutionally do they have that right? I say it to uphold the Constitution so I'm going to make sure everything I do applies by the Constitution.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

I appreciate that Commissioner Lange and want to be sure I'm responsive to your specific questions.

So again the guidance provided is that they would be selected from the plans that have already gone through the 45 day process.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Ms. Reinhardt did you want to take over?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

So I know that at the previous meeting the Commission went through many different key decision points regarding the voting process.

And since then there have been just a couple more identified that we need you to make a decision on.

So what this memo points out is that there are a few key questions that you all need to consider regarding the ranked voting procedure.

The first listed here is can more than one Commissioner submit the same plan for ranked choice voting? So for example, Jim and Pam submit the banana plan for ranked choice voting.

Another question can more than one Commissioner submit the same plan for random selection.

So together Jim and Pam submitted two entries or tiles as General Counsel referred to them into the random selection.

And is that constitutional? For the last question I defer to your General Counsel.

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.

But for example of the first scenario or the first option for you all to consider that your General Counsel just went through option one each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District.

Now remember this is during the random selection.

So we are at the part now where we've gone through voting discussion voting discussion, voting and you all are not able to achieve a constitutional majority.

So we go to ranked choice voting.

Where you all would raise your hand to submit a plan.

And then you would get ballots where you rank your favorite plans from one being the best or however many five being the worst.

So each Commissioner when you're submitting a plan to consider for ranked choice voting may submit one proposed plan for each type of District.

Each Commissioner can identify a plan to a plan to submit by name and that plan would be listed for ranked choice voting purposes as plan name-Commissioner name.

Commissioners would conduct the ranked choice vote and random selection of the 13 submitted plans.

What does that mean? What does that look like? Here we have the Scranton Pennsylvania Redistricting Commission and Pam said I want to submit the banana-Pam plan and Stanley raises his hand and say I submit the banana plan but mine is the banana-Stanley plan.

Note it's the same base plan, it's the same map but because each Commissioner has the opportunity to submit a plan, they are distinguished in this option but the Commissioner who submitted them.

So Jim submits the orange plan and known as the orange-Jim plan.

So on so forth.

Orange-Michael for Michael.

And strawberry-Kelly for Kelly.

So what does voting look like under this option? This is Michael's ballot here.

So you can see all of the plans are listed here because they are all distinct submissions from the Commissioners.

And he has gone ahead and ranked everything.

Clearly, he submitted the orange plan so you can see that he ranked his as number one.

And then because it's the same plan he ranked Jim's orange plan as number two.

Now maybe he feels Lukewarm or medium about the banana plan so he ranked banana consecutively three and four and disfavors Kelly's plan so he ranked it as number five.

So that is option one.

Are there any questions about this? And I do have a scoring sheet to display to you all how this will -- how the results will be tallied by our team and I will show you after we go through all of the options what that would look like.

All right back to you General Counsel.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we going to get a presentation on option two or is that coming?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We have all three options for you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much.

The second option, thank you so much Madam Chair, the second option would be that again the first option is all 13 Commissioners identify, have the ability to identify a proposed plan and each would be voted on so up to 13 maps would be voted on. The second option is each map would only need to be submitted once for ranked choice voting purposes and that is in order to determine if the constitutional requirements regarding ranking with both point value and party affiliation would be satisfied. The first submission of each plan would be listed for ranked choice voting purposes as plan name and Commissioner name. And that first submission would also be included in the random selection process if one is required.

So this process where subsequent Commissioners could also submit that same plan name for consideration but those would just be used during the random selection process as that plan name has already been identified to occur in the ranked choice process.

This would ensure clarity in the ranked choice procedure but preserve each Commissioner's ability to select a proposed plan during the random selection process. And the Commissioners would conduct the ranked choice voting process up to a total number of the proposed plans for each District type. And in adherence to the final voting process.

And I will again defer to the visuals from Ms. Reinhardt in her PowerPoint.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right so to restate option two is each Commissioner may identify one proposed plan by name for submission into the ranked choice voting. Only the first Commissioner to identify a unique plan will have it included in the ranked choice vote.

Same identifier plan name dash Commissioner name.

Subsequent submissions by the same plan will be included in the random selection but not the ranked choice vote.

It will have total number of proposed plans so if you have five proposed plans for State Senate there would only be five plans to vote on.

All right so let's return to our Scranton Redistricting Commission Pam submits first and says I submit the banana Pam plan and Stanley says I submit the Stanley but Pam submitted it first so we will only be voting on her's.

Jim submits the orange plan and Michael also submits the orange plan but because Jim submitted it first, we will only be voting on Jim's.

And Kelly once more submits the strawberry plan.

So what does the ballot look like for this option? This is Kelly's ballot here.

You can see there is only three choices because there were only three unique maps that were submitted here.

So we have banana Pam orange Jim and strawberry Kelly.

Any questions on this option?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Who is Ryan?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Any office fans that want to explain that to MC? Back to you General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

So the third and final option that will be presented today will be a hybrid approach that combines both options one and two.

So that approach would mean that each proposed plan may be submitted more than once but it only needs to be voted on once for ranked choice voting purposes.

Again, to determine and ensure the Constitution is satisfied as to point value and party affiliation.

So each Commissioner under this hybrid approach would have the opportunity to identify a plan by name.

More than one Commissioner may submit the same plan by name.

And each plan submitted will be listed only once for ranked choice voting with no duplicates regardless of the number each plan is submitted.

The two or more submissions of the same map would be used during the random selection process if one is required.

And Commissioners would conduct the ranked choice voting process up to a maximum number of proposed plans by District type, again following their final voting process.

So this hybrid approach is definitely best demonstrated in the visual provided by Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you General Counsel.

All right so to restate, each Commissioner may identify one proposed plan by name to submit for ranked choice voting.

More than one Commissioner may submit the same plan but each plan will only be voted on once.

Each Commissioner who submitted a plan will be scored and assessed for affiliation requirements for constitutional majority and each Commissioner submission will be entered in the random selection.

So what does that look like from our Scranton Redistricting Commission? Pam submits the banana plan Stanley the banana and Jim the orange, Michael orange and Kelly strawberry.

You note these plan names are not denoted by Commissioner name who submits it it's on the team the secretary to record which Commissioner submits what plan.

On the ballot for Pam it just says banana, orange and strawberry and she is able to rank those.

And that concludes our Scranton independent Redistricting Commission examples.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

The memorandum the Commission was provided I think really is most clearly demonstrated in the PowerPoint, in those options.

Another really useful tool to examine those options that are before the Commission for consideration is the ballot of the sample ballots prepared by Ms. Reinhardt.

And I believe that that as we work through those will give again additional clarity and we are happy to answer any questions throughout that process.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So I think what General Counsel is referring to is the score sheet, the excel score sheet I created that I think was circulated to you all yesterday and I'm happy to share that now to walk through what that looks like.

On how your plans will be scored and how the affiliation requirements are considered.

So this is an example that I filled in where your plan names are fruits.

And this is an example of the third option.

The hybrid option.

So over here, I'll Zoom in a little bit because I know it's quite small.

Over here we have plan submissions.

So this is the very start of ranked choice voting.

You submit your plan name that you want to be considered for ranked choice voting.

So you can see that Doug and Juanita both submitted the grape plan.

And Rhonda Steve and Cynthia submitted the Guava plan and these are the same plans.

So here if we move to the right, are Commissioner plan Rankings so we will take the ballots that you give us and we will fill in all of the scores for each of you that each of you assigned to all of the plans.

So you will see here that in the example that I showed you for option three Doug only voted on each plan one time.

So he only voted on grape once and he gave it first place so for all grape submissions we give it a first place rank.

And same for all the other Commissions.

So all plan submissions that are the same for the third options will receive the same score.

Now if we scroll over here, the Constitution states that points will be assigned to a plan that is the inverse of the rank that was assigned.

So if Doug were to rank the grape plan as number one it would receive 13 points if there were 13 total submissions.

So this formula here calculates the total points that are received for each plan.

And you will note that both grape plan submissions receive the same exact point total. So that's one hurdle that the plans that are voted on need to go over in order to win. And this column here ranks all of the plans highest number of points to lowest number of points so we can see the passion fruit plan has received the most points.

The second hurdle that the plans need to go through is the affiliation requirement.

And the Constitution states that I don't know if General Counsel has the language handy, but more or less it states that two Commissioners who do not affiliate with the Commissioner who submitted the plan must rank that plan in the top half.

Now what constitutes the top half? If you have five plans that you're voting on, the top half, if you divide five by two is 2.5.

So we round down.

That means the top half of five is two.

Number one and number two.

So if you look over here, this formula determines Anthony Eid does not affiliate with either major party so it doesn't count any votes because it's his affiliation.

But it does count votes who voted for his plan the banana plan within the top half for other affiliations.

R and D.

So it looks like there were no Rs who ranked his plan in the top half.

But there were three Ds who did that.

And the top half number is displayed here if you are wondering how many submissions.

So scrolling back over, now we know what the affiliation requirement is.

And we know what the point totals are.

So we can determine if there is a winner.

And that's what this little box right here does.

And it says that the winner based on these requirements is number one.

Passion fruit.

Now I know that is a lot of excel, a lot of math and it's complicated but if there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them and walk through exactly how you will be scored for each option.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions? Commissioner Eid go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's not a question but I just want to say thanks to miss Reinhardt for putting that together.

At the end of our last meeting we kind of had questions how this was going to work and this was really clarifying.

So are we going to we talk about the three options, my choice would be option three.

Because it doesn't split the ranked choice voting but still gives individual Commissioners the chance to submit a map for the random drawing process in case one doesn't pass the ranked choice voting process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ms. Reinhardt did you have a comment about that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Not about that in particular but I did want to clarify one additional thing.

Commissioner Lange you had asked prior to our presentation about how Commissioners may submit plans into the random selection.

I hope that this presentation clarified that just a little bit.

But I just want to restate just to make it more clear that there isn't a second round of submissions prior to the random selection.

The submissions all occur prior to the ranked choice vote.

So every Commissioner who submits a plan to the ranked choice vote, those submissions will be what is entered into the random selection.

And that is in line with the constitutional language.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's say I submit a plan call it orange and then Richard says he submits orange and that I have already submitted it.

And if it goes to random drawing, does it go in as one entry or two?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much to Commissioner Clark's question. For each of the three options before the Commission, that plan would go in twice for the random selection. It would go in once identified by Commissioner Clark as the identified proposed plan for that District type and it would go in a distinct, separate, second tile, second time for Commissioner Weiss' selection of that same plan.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought two weeks ago we were saying that is not how it was going to be done.

I'm confused to why there was a change.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So Madam Chair, the two weeks ago it was that the Commission would vote on one identified plan would be submitted, would be submitted once.

In that those would be the ones that go into the random selection process.

So looking at the language as each Commissioner has the option to not only submit a plan, a proposed plan to be voted on in ranked choice but also that that selection be reflected in the random selection process.

So you might have a plan that as it moves through the three stages of voting did not garner a majority vote in the first tier of the majority vote process but that based on support from Commissioners would succeed in the ranked choice vote process.

If those plans, if a plan wouldn't succeed in that process, then the random selection process including up to 13 tiles or 13 options for each District type would best reflect

what the will of the body is and the measure of support for each individual proposed plan as submitted.

So it more accurately reflects the ranking that the body is doing by submitting those identified plans.

Is that responsive, I hope?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I just don't see how that correlates it to being a random selection at that point it's a weighted average and it's not random.

It's not random if you have five of one tile put in and one of another.

That is no longer random because you have weighted the results.

This is no longer a fair result.

I mean we did not get to put in five entries of our name when they did the random selection to select us as Commissioners why do you get to put in five versions of the orange plan at what is supposedly a random selection, that is no longer random.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's still random it's random based upon which of us as 13 Commissioners have the constitutional power to be able to do by allowing us to submit a plan under Section 14.

So if let's say hypothetically, five of us, the number that you used, wants a plan, it should be weighted like that because five of those Commissioners want that plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But then that is not random, then that is not random.

If five people can sway the results it's no longer random.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much under sub section 14 it's each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan.

So again this is the discretionary identification that I referred to earlier.

So moving into the ranked choice voting process, each Commissioner has the ability to identify a proposed plan.

Those plans go through the ranked choice voting process.

The Constitution states that if no plan meets the requirements, and if no plan meets the requirements for the ranked choice voting process, the Secretary of State and again the secretary has identified a third-party vendor that would conduct the random selection process.

But the Constitution states shall randomly select the final plan from among all submitted plans pursuant to and it refers back to the Section that allows each Commissioner to select a proposed plan or identify a proposed plan.

So that would be the reference to that language.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm familiar with the Constitution.

I just don't understand why we are treating plans that are identical as being separate choices if they are identical.

If there is five oranges it's the same plan it's one plan.

It's not five separate plans so it should be counted as one.

I mean end of the day I don't think we will ever get to this point any way but I don't think that is a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution.

Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, this also goes back a little bit to some of the options that are laid before you.

Distinguishing between maps submissions that are the same but that are distinct submissions.

And so to what you just said Madam Chair, while the maps themselves, the base maps or plans maybe the same or identical, they are distinct submissions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Witjes and then again Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Curry, Commissioner Wagner, and who am I missing Commissioner Kellom I cannot see you on the screen so please verbally indicate. I don't mean to ignore you if you have your hand up Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: One thing to think about pure mathematical here random means in the selection process, not what you're actually pulling out of the hat. So the fact that someone goes in and pulls a piece of paper out of a hat doesn't change the fact that that was a random selection.

It could have four black marbles and three green ones a random is going in and grabbing one not the contents of the pool you are actually pulling from.

So it's still technically I mean it's not technically it is a random selection.

You can't dictate what goes, what the selection is from because then it's even if it's a weight like there is five of one and one of the other, the act of going in and grabbing one itself is the definition of random.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Randomness is irrelevant.

Because each Commissioner under 14 whatever it is I says each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District to the full Commissioner for consideration.

And that's what you have to pick from when you get down to the secretary picking.

So each Commissioner you will be 13 and they could all be the same 13 obviously you would have election at that point in time.

So you're assuming that it's not.

But randomness is not the key.

The key is that each Commissioner has the ability to put in a plan.

That's the key.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right any further comments? So I'm assuming you need us to decide on the three options that were presented, is that, okay can you put them back

on and explain for everybody? Just kind of like a quick run through do you have a summary screen.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No but I can really quickly breeze through it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm just going to share it from the screen if that is okay.

Okay so again option one is each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan for each type of District.

And this is the option where each Commissioner identifies the plan name by banana-name.

And then all of those options are listed on the ballot.

So we have banana-Pam, banana Stanley orange Jim, orange Michael and those plans are voted on.

Option two is similar to option one except instead of listing all of the plan names only the first distinct map submission will appear on the ballot.

Commissioner Witjes I see your hand is raised.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For afterwards.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I see, thank you.

So you see here Pam submits the banana-Pam and Stanley also submits banana-Stanley but his plan is not listed on the ballot because Pam was first.

But both plans would go into random selection.

And here is the ballot for that.

And then the final option being that each Commissioner may submit one proposed plan and more than one Commissioner may submit the same plan but each plan will only be voted on once.

And the secretary will record which Commissioner submits what plan.

And those submissions will all enter the random selection and the ballot looks like this.

There's no distinguishing between names.

It's only the name of the plan.

Names of Commissioners I mean.

And those are the three options.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say I move to accept option three.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I second that as a motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay a motion made by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Lett.

To accept option three is there any discussion or debate on the motion? So under all three options just to clarify there is multiple tiles per plan submitted so we are putting our thumbs on the scale for all three options.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

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: For all three options each Commissioner gets to select a plan to go in the random selection process, yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right.

Again Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Wagner, Commissioner Curry and Commissioner Kellom do you have any comments? I can't see if you guys do.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No comment from me right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have a motion and second, motion by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Lett to adopt option three.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

And those of you online I'm going to need you to verbally indicate.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was Wagner.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That was Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner can you indicate?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: This is Commissioner Wagner, aye.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And we have Curry is Commissioner Curry on.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I don't believe she rejoined.

Let me double check.

Commissioner Curry, can you hear us? I don't believe she is present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

All right opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Nay.

All right the motion is adopted by a vote of 11-no I'm sorry 10-2.

10-2.

All right, is there anything else on this process document that we need to go over?

General Counsel, Executive Director, Ms. Reinhardt? We are moving on to because we already approved it.

We are moving on to the actually do you know what we are actually ready for lunch is that right? Okay so at this point it is 1:20 we are going to recess to take lunch for 30 minutes is that correct? Without objection we will stand in recess until 1:50 p.m.

[Lunch recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:01 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and as well as your physical location you are attending from.

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 call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm present, attending remotely from

Detroit Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County,

Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending remotely from

Reed City, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from

Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

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

At this point we will move on to the next item on the agenda 2B I'm sorry 5B2 final report from the racially polarized voting analyst Dr. Handley is unable to present today however if anyone has questions regarding her report, please ask Mr. Adelson VRA legal counsel or General Counsel may be able to answer those.

I think we already discussed a lot of this already so I don't know if anyone has further questions.

Commissioners Wagner and Lange I can't see you so if you have questions and Commissioner Kellom please let me know otherwise we will just move on to the next agenda item.

Okay all right let's move on to the next agenda item.

Unfinished business agenda item 5B3 individual map assessment by VRA legal counsel Mr. Adelson I see you son the screen is with us via Zoom without objection we will have him provide assessment when the individual Commissioners present maps under new business 6A to date there has been no VRA legal input regarding maps in an open MICRC meeting so nothing for you to do right at this second but thank you for being on and present.

Next, we are going to move on to our legal counsel discussion and without objection Commissioners will have an opportunity to ask General Counsel Pastula to provide with new business if they have any questions for her.

Do we have any questions for our General Counsel at this point? All right seeing none we will move on to review of the proposed maps.

So new business tech agenda 6A without objection and per the final vote process document the Chair will present the collaborative maps followed by the individual maps followed by Commissioner who drafted the plan and will be presented in alphabetical order as follows Congressional collaborative and individual maps, State Senate collaborative maps then individual maps State House collaborative and then individual maps.

And we are going to thank Kent Stigall and John Morgan from EDS who will display each map as presented and Kent or John I'm not sure who is driving first.

Okay so Mr. Morgan if you could bring up for our Congressional maps.

And I actually don't have a list in front of me I believe apple we have apple too.

Hold on let me get a list up guys, let me get a list.

Let me pull up the list I have in front of me.

So if you can pull up the apple Congressional map that would be helpful. We will do Apple, Birch and Chestnut, and Commissioner Lange and then my map.

Okay so.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the map how do you want to review?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I was just going to generally discuss this and comparison to the other maps we have.

So this map the Apple map and the Birch map are both built on the same platform.

In terms of the Metro Detroit area the Lansing area.

Basically everything except the Grand Rapids area so this map has that Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo combination.

And then it keeps the lakeshore District intact with Ottawa County intact.

But otherwise this is the same as the Birch map in terms of the remainder of the state.

Does anyone have anything else they want to add that I'm missing? Okay, would it be helpful to pull up an overlay of the Birch or do we just want to go on to the Birch I can't hear you Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Pull up the maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As we go, okay, so does anyone have questions or comments about the Apple? If not, we will move on to the Birch.

Mr. Morgan, if you can bring up the Birch, I would appreciate it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As you can see this map has the same configuration for the eastern side of the state 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 6 are all the same.

The biggest difference between the Apple map and the Birch map is the configuration around Grand Rapids with the Apple having Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids together. The Birch having Grand Rapids isolated from Kalamazoo and Kalamazoo being in a separate District and then once we move into the Chestnut, we will see there are further changes in this area as well.

But the majority of this map and the majority of the Apple are the same with the exception of that Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids combination.

All right let's go on to the Chestnut unless there is questions, go ahead Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It gives us an opportunity to review it and take a look at the different options we had in front of us.

The Apple was an option.

Going south.

And in the Birch expands the Grand Rapids area.

So and I think we are going to see one more of the Chestnut.

And it will give the public an opportunity to see the different options that we reviewed and the thought processes that went into it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Okay so if we could bring up the Chestnut.

Okay, the Chestnut has quite a few differences. So number one and number two are very similar but once we get down do Grand Rapids Chestnut has Grand Rapids and Muskegon in a single District whereas the Birch and the Apple had Grand Rapids and Muskegon separate.

If we scroll down a little bit into District 4, we can see that District 4 includes Battle Creek and Kalamazoo together.

Whereas the Birch and Apple do not have Battle Creek and Kalamazoo together.

Because of that change District 5 is a little bit of a different configuration as well.

It does have Jackson County whole whereas the Birch and the Apple have the eastern portion of Jackson County in with Ann Arbor.

In addition for District 8 Midland, the Chestnut carries out some Townships around Midland further and further up the Bay than the Birch or the Apple.

And it also removes Tuscola is that how you say it County which is right where John is circling there and puts it in District 9-inch stead of District 8.

Then if we can Zoom in the Metro Detroit area, I think that would be helpful as well.

So I believe District 6 is largely the same with the exception of a South Lyon area.

Because I believe in the Birch and the Apple District 6 includes that little bit of Jackson County.

But in the Oakland County and Detroit and Macomb configuration are quite a bit different.

Are you adding a shape file so we can see.

>> MR. MORGAN: Turning off the voting presents.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

I'll wait until you finish.

Just makes it a little easier to see.

If you remember from the version the Apple District 11 with the Birch and Apple includes Southfield and also includes portions of Novi and over into South Lyon Highland and Milford and includes those all into a District 11.

Whereas the Chestnut takes Southfield and puts it in a District with Wayne County.

And then also takes South Lyon and portions of Milford and puts them into a Lansing District.

And then it also brings down Sterling I'm sorry Rochester into District 10 with Sterling Heights which is a distinction from the Birch it does not do that.

Lastly if we look at the Detroit area the Chestnut goes a little further down into Wayne County on the southern border where it goes in Taylor and part of Romulus and part of Westland and puts that in with the Detroit District and the Birch carried up northerly through 8 mile and went into part of Macomb County and a little bit of Oakland County to pull in that Bengali community we had tried to include.

So quite a few differences around the Metro Detroit area in the Chestnut versus the Birch and the Apple.

All right at this point I will hand it over to Commissioner Lange to present her map.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay mine was based off one of the collaborative maps, it was Birch.

I did not change anything in the Detroit area.

Most of my changes were made in Northern Michigan.

I did change the Midland area to represent the alternative voices that were heard in regards to that area.

I made sure that Ottawa County was left whole because we had a large amount that wanted Ottawa County whole while also keeping Grand Rapids whole to give them representation.

And a Congressional map as a whole.

There were some others, if you can go Arenac County expressed how they relate more to the Bay Area.

So I included them.

Number 8, District 8.

And basically a lot of the input we heard from Northern Michigan was try to keep the Counties whole because they are rural, they are so -- their population is so spread out that they didn't want any unnecessary splits so I to the best of my ability looking at it I think that accomplishes it.

Where there is only an all of Northern Michigan there is only one Township and one County which I believe we had similar on some of the other maps.

So that's it in a nutshell.

It was more or less taking and trying to combine different public input on communities of interest into one map.

That's it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange.

If you could bring up the Szetela.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

We need Bruce.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: My suggestion was going to be that particularly for the individual and certainly for the collaborative as well if the Commissioner chooses but the individual maps to run through the 7 criteria to again create that record.

And I think Commissioner Lange's summary of going through those changes and the basis for those changes was excellent.

But again walking through the individual maps the criteria should also occur.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay would you like Ms. Reinhardt to do that or? There you are.

Or how do you want us to handle that General Counsel? So VRA would be number one.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct.

And I think again similar to the collaborative maps that were how that process kind of unfolded in a meeting it would be just again starting with the first criteria and going through each one starting with the equal population analysis and VRA.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so just to clarify we are basically obviously Bruce is going to weigh in on his portion but from that point forward it's going down the questions and asking are they geographically contiguous, did you consider communities of interest. Got it.

Mr. Adelson, would you like to provide an analysis of Commissioner Lange's individual Congressional map?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Sure thank you.

I think to start with the plan deviation is clearly within constitutional guidelines.

It's something the Supreme Court has reaffirmed time after time, it's a .25 deviation so that would satisfy the one person, one vote requirement.

And look at the recombined election results for Detroit that is 13, 12, let's start with 13 and 12.

Look at the bellwether elections, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Starting with District 12 which is a portion of Detroit and many of the western Wayne towns.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so District 12 is 74% for Biden, 26 for Trump.

73 for Clinton, 27 for Trump.

And then 77 for Obama.

23 for Romney.

For the U.S. Senate it's Peters 75.

James 25.

Stabenow 73.

James 27.

Senate 14 is Peters 78.

And land 22.

And then Stabenow 81, Hoekstra 19 and in 2012.

For Governor 74 for Whitmer.

26 for Schuette.

And 2014 it's 69 for Schauer and 31 for Snyder.

For Attorney General it's Nessel 72.

And Leonard 28.

And then Totten is 69 and Schuette in 14 is 31.

Secretary of State Benson 75.

Lange is 25.

And then Dillard is 67.

And 33 for Johnston.

And then the gubernatorial primary El-Sayed is 32.

26 for Thanedar and 24 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To reiterate something Dr. Handley has in her report of the importance of the 2014 Dillard Secretary of State election because it involves the minority candidate running statewide against a white candidate that is why it's a bellwether election and I think in her analysis she and I agree with her that she really emphasized its importance.

All the elections that have been presented the recompiled election results prove out here as far as showing this to be an opportunity to elect District and minority voters

clearly have had, would have success based on the recompiled election results given District reconfiguration and El-Sayed primary result as I recall El-Sayed can we go back to that, please, John? Yeah, El-Sayed is he doesn't win the District out right.

He comes in second.

With Whitmer winning.

And this is just as with all the Detroit districts there is going to be a significant cross over support from white voters in democratic elections.

Also you may recall this is the election where Dr. Handley concluded that Black voting behavior is not cohesive.

That depending on different areas of the certainly of Wayne County but other places too, Black voters did not always support the same candidate.

So why don't we look at now District 13, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: So District 13 is a portion of Detroit.

A little bit of Macomb County and Oakland County.

Warren Township.

And then down to Taylor and Wayne County.

So District 13 was 74% for Biden.

26 for Trump.

Clinton 75, Trump 25.

In 2012 Obama 80 and Romney 20.

The U.S. Senate was Peters 74.

And James 26.

73 for Stabenow.

And 27 for James in 2018.

And in 2014 it was 80 for Peters and 20 for land.

And then Stabenow 84 and 16 for Hoekstra.

For Governor is 75 Whitmer.

And 25 Schuette.

Governor 14 is 71 for Schauer and 29 for Snyder.

Attorney General Nessel 73.

Leonard 27.

Totten, 72.

Schuette 28.

In 2014.

And Secretary of State is Benson 75.

Lange 25.

Dillard 70.

Johnson 30.

And then for the gubernatorial primary in 2018, it's 32 for El-Sayed, 27 for Thanedar and 41 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: The results are very similar to what they show in Detroit as far as the estimated performance for minority preferred candidates being elected and certainly a Black preferred candidates being elected across the board.

So thank you.

Are there other districts that have portions of Detroit?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, 12 and 13.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just 12 and 13.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Could we also please look at the District that has Flint?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is eight.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want the election results for 8?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I don't think we need to go all the way through, John. If you bear with me and go to the right, we can skip I'm most interested in the Dillard election just to see what that showed.

I think that is 2014.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

There it is.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, that is in 8.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's 53 for Dillard.

And 47 for Johnson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good thank you.

The reason I was curious about that certainly Flint is a majority minority City.

And I would suggest that as you go through in your discussion process is also looking at how the -- is there any significant differences in the election results among the individual plans? I mean and I know as we had talked about before winning is the key.

The margin is, electoral margin is smaller than Detroit districts because it's a function of population.

You're going to have more people Black population is smaller here.

But I did want to just get a sense of whether District 8 would elect using in the metric of looking at the Dillard election.

So thank you.

And going west if we could, John.

The Grand Rapids area District.

That's District 3.

Yeah, can we look at the population for District 3 and then look at the election results again, please? Let's look at the Dillard election, please.

So this is District 3.

>> MR. MORGAN: Dillard is 34 and Johnson 66.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Looking at that just out of curiosity the minority population here is much smaller than in the Detroit area districts.

But I know we have looked at this area of the state previously with the state legislative plan.

So I was curious to see what the Dillard results would reveal.

I don't expect, I'm not viewing this as an opportunity to elect District the way the Detroit area districts are.

I was just curious about the Dillard results particularly as we looked at them in District 8. So the two Detroit area districts as I said they do show based on the recompiled election results minority candidates of choice from the Black community had an opportunity to prevail.

They prevail pretty handily across the board in the bellwether election.

Those are my primary thoughts.

Are there any questions about that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, my question is geared towards Rhonda rather than Bruce.

When you started this map, and I may have missed this before you may have said it, when you started that did you do it from a blank map or did you copy in an existing map and modify it?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It was done off from Birch.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional questions? Okay, so Commissioner Lange I'm going to go through the questions that Ms. Reinhardt had asked previously when we were doing maps and if you can just answer.

So we've already covered one which is equal population and Voting Rights Act compliance.

Are the districts geographically contiguous.

I need you to answer, Rhonda.

You are on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Do the districts reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the districts provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the districts favor or disfavor an incumbent elected official or candidate.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do they reflect County, City and Township boundaries.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Absolutely.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are the districts reasonably compact?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

Any other comments about Commissioner Lange's map? Okay at this point I think we can move on to my Congressional map, Szetela.

Okay so there are two changes on the map and this is based off the Birch map and majority of the state is the same, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 5 are all the same District 4, 3 and 2 are changed because I tried to combine or merry the Chestnut and the Birch together with respect to how they treat Muskegon.

So this has a Muskegon, Grand Rapids District.

It's a little bit different than what is in the Chestnut because the Chestnut cuts off the northern part of Muskegon and I included it and the Chestnut goes further down into the Grand Haven area which is south of where the line comes across in Ottawa separation between Ottawa Township and Muskegon Township but otherwise the intone shun -- intention was to combine Grand Rapids and Muskegon.

The other change is further up between District 1 and 2 near the top of the Mitten.

I adjusted the border here in response to comments we had received from the Ottawa Indian tribe where they submitted maps to us that had shown the line being drawn this way between 1 and 2 to be reflective of the regional areas, they have to live in to receive services.

However I will note that since the time that I redid this map that same group has come forward and said they support the Birch map.

So I'm not sure this change was necessary.

But that is the only changes I made in the map just to give us the option of Muskegon and to address the concerns from the tribal members we had received.

Mr. Adelson do you want to do your analysis?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If I could start first with a couple of questions.

The Detroit districts you said those are unchanged from the base map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, so at the base map was that a collaborative map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Was that a what?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: A collaborative.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it's the Birch map.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So let's look at District 3, please.

So you said that with District 3 the change is that north in the northwest is bringing Muskegon in with Grand Rapids, is that am I correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, yes and the reason for that is we received comments from Muskegon saying that they wanted to be included with Grand Rapids rather than being put up into the rural areas that encompass the rest of District 2.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay thank you.

Could you Zoom into 3.

I'm just curious about the communities some of Grand Rapids that are included in the District.

Oh, I see.

Okay, great.

Thank you.

Let's look at the election results, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: For District 3?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want all of them or just one in particular?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's see the Obama-Romney so that is 2012 Oregon Obama 47 and 53.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: 2020 Biden beats Trump almost 53-47% is that correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: That's right.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's move to the right, please.

The and I see the U.S. Senate in 20.

The James-Peters so Peters has about 50% just under 50% and James is a little over 50%.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay let's move to the right again, please.

Okay, let's go to Dillard, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Dillard 36, Johnson 64.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, and one more.

Let's look at the El-Sayed too as well.

The gubernatorial.

>> MR. MORGAN: 39 for El-Sayed 16 for Thanedar and 44 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Great thank you.

I was just curious about that to see how this District may perform given the inclusion of Muskegon with Grand Rapids.

It is interesting because this is not something as we saw in the Detroit area districts, all the districts prove out a certain way.

So this is not a traditional minority opportunity District.

The minority percentages are relatively low and as you know that the Dr. Handley's analysis in the with eastern part of the state was somewhat -- could not be as robust as in the Detroit area just because of the make I'm of the precincts and the population of the precincts.

But I'm just wondering if, and this is just a rhetorical, if the minority population changes which I expect it will.

If this has opportunity to elect capacity beyond what we are seeing today.

But that is just the surmise in my thinking out loud.

So thank you for showing that.

I understand that the Detroit districts have not changed from the collaborative map.

This was the only change that really represents any potential VRA issues.

So and the population deviation again is within the Supreme Court's view of permissible one person, one vote.

So I think for me for now I think that's it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Adelson.

I'm going to ask Commissioner Rothhorn to facilitate the questions.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right so we have done the first one districts shall be of equal population.

Districts shall be geographically contiguous are they contiguous.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Does your map reflect the state's the diverse population and community of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Disproportionate to any political party.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Your districts and your maps favor or disfavor an incumbent or elected official or candidate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Your map and districts do they reflect County and City and Township boundaries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are your districts reasonably compact.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right I think that is it for our Congressional.

So we will move on to the Senate review at this point and we are going to start with the cherry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So to orient everybody all of our cherry maps are the same with the distinction of the Ann Arbor area.

So districts 14 and 15 and maybe to some extent 22 are shifted around from map to map.

So we have the cherry the Linden and the Palm and the same outside of the Ann Arbor and have variations in the Ann Arbor area.

So with this particular map which is the cherry, we have a northern, southern Ann Arbor districts that extend east to west basically along a north-south border with one following the 94 corridor and the southern one also following that same corridor but not over the

freeway itself so that distinguishes the Ann Arbor area and I will point out this particular configuration includes Albion in with Ann Arbor instead of having it in with Battle Creek and so we had specifically received some comments about Albion wanting to be in with a more urban area due to minority population in Albion.

So that would be how I would describe the cherry.

Does anyone have comments or questions or anything that I failed to point out that you want to point out? All right let's move on to the Linden.

Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe it's worth noting we had one consistent public comment that says it keeps the resource Waterloo recreation area whole.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

Okay so the Linden if we go back to that Ann Arbor area, we see instead of having two districts 14 and 15 that are sort of stacked on top of each other like pancakes we have sort of a thicker area R around Jackson with most of Jackson kept together and the northwestern part of Ann Arbor and then the southwestern part of Ann Arbor with Ypsilanti is placed together in a District that extends a little bit southeasterly to Monroe County so that the alteration the Ann Arbor area.

And District 22 rises up more than it did previously and some changes around there as a result of the change in the Ann Arbor District so that is the primary difference between these two.

Any questions or comments? Okay and let's go ahead and let's open up the Palm so we can see the difference there.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much so I'm referring to the Commissioner's final vote procedure.

And I know we are doing the Commission is engaged in doing its presentations and overview of plans right now.

The way that the Commission contemplated doing it is moving through each District type individually so I just wanted to highlight that for the benefit of the Commission. That the overview and then moving on to the discussion so I just wanted to highlight that I think the order in which it's being done there might be it might not be adhering directly to what you have adopted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I understand what you're saying.

We had in the process document I believe it says we will present and then discuss and present and then discuss.

And do we want to do that? Or do we want to go through them and discuss later?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Follow the document.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are halfway through it's kind of weird.

Let's go back to the Congressional and we can discuss the Congressional.

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.

Comments, thoughts? Views? Cheerleading for your plan? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, in my opinion I think the Chestnut plan is the one we should adopt.

I see it as kind of a compromise between all of the plans that we have.

For example, you know we have Ottawa County and Apple it's not split at all.

And Birch it's split twice.

Chestnut there is a compromise and only split once with part of it going in the lower District and the other half going in the Grand Rapids-Muskegon District.

Likewise I see a compromise in Midland County.

And this map almost all of Midland is kept whole except for a few sparsely populated Townships that only have about 9500 people in them total.

Which is less than some single precincts in the more populated areas of the state.

And I see that as a compromise because most of that County is kept whole.

And finally I think the next biggest difference is the BVAP is a little bit higher on districts 12 and 13 in Metro Detroit.

They are at about I believe they are, I will find it out now, they are about 45 and 43.8%.

Which are just a couple of percentage points higher on Birch and Apple configuration.

And finally I think while it wasn't made to be this way, I would end up shaking out is it also has more competitive districts than Apple or Birch.

So I think it's the best one.

I think that is what we should adopt.

And I also like Commissioner Szetela's individual map.

And I also like Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional discussion? Rhonda, I can't see you Commissioner Wagner I can't see you, miss Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Per the Commission's adopted final vote procedure, if you're entering into step two for U.S. Congressional, the first step or step 2A states a motion will be made that each Commission shall state the top plans under consideration and then proceed into discussion after disclosure of your top two favorite plans.

Did you hear me okay? Do you want to repeat it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for the reminder I would entertain a motion for Commissioners to state their top two favorites among the Congressional plans. Motion made by Commissioner Eid and seconded by Commissioner Witjes is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none let's vote we have a motion by Eid and seconded by Commissioner Witjes to request that Commissioners identify their top two favorite Congressional plans all in favor please raise your hands and say aye.

Opposed raise your hands and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange.

I think that might have been Commissioner Wagner as well.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry can you disclose what your vote was?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You're on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I voted for yeah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Commissioner Curry and Commissioner Kellom can you let us know what way you voted as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: She said yeah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I didn't see that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For the record Commissioner Kellom is now in person in the room with us so we no longer need her to verbally indicate.

Okay the motion is adopted.

I know we had said alphabetical order is it okay if I just go rounds the table? So let's start with Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Number one Chestnut, number two Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My first preference would be Chestnut.

My second preference would be Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My first choice excuse me is Chestnut and my second one would be Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I have but one choice.

Only one choice.

And that is Chestnut.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I likewise have one choice Chestnut.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies for the interruptions Weiss and Lett but the motion was to disclose your top two.

So if you do have a second, I would encourage you to disclose that at this time.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Chestnut.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Too many mics on.

First Birch, second Chestnut.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And I am Birch and Chestnut.

Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Kellom requested I skip her and come back around so Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Birch and Chestnut.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Chestnut and Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If I'm being 100% honest none of them.

I'm just being honest.

I think they need work.

And I find errors with all of them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we accept that, no, you have to.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies Commissioner Lange because the motion was to disclose your top two favorite or preferred.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't have a preferred.

I do not have a preferred map.

Fine.

I'm going to go Palm and Lange.

Wait that is Senate.

Okay, Apple and Lange.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You do have a Congressional map Commissioner Lange so Apple and Lange.

Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I'm going to choose Birch and Chestnut.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I had to remember which device I was on.

Like Commissioner Lange I don't like any of them but since that is not a glorified answer on this Commission I will also go with Apple and Lange.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you very much.

And back to Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Chestnut and Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right so we have gone through everybody at this point.

Is there something else I need to do at this point, miss Reinhardt? I'm sorry.

Let's continue with the discussion.

Any additional comments? Commissioner Witjes did you have a comment?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The next subpart under this step two is discussing each published plan for the District type under consideration in alphabetical order.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Commissioner Wagner has her hand up too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I have one question.

Are we actually voting for maps at this point? Because I thought we were going to readdress, okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, we are not voting at this point, identifying the top two favorite maps and move into a discussion.

And per our planned document we are supposed to do it in alphabetical order so starting with collaboratives that would be in Apple.

Is there any discussion or debate on the Apple?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner for your reference, in the voting procedure document, the final vote procedure we are moving into 2B which the Commission will discuss each published plan for the District type under consideration in alphabetical order.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not seeing any hands on the Apple.

Okay, do you want to talk about the Birch, any comments about the Birch? Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I think the reason I'm choosing Birch is because there has been in the southeast Michigan area it's the most populated area. And I guess concerned about the way that and recognizing that Grand Rapids is our second most populated City.

But with I believe Detroit and then I think Warren and Sterling Heights it has the top four cities are the most populated area and I think Birch treats that area that the communities of interest that are preserved or the community of interest that we heard from during our process are most reflected in that Birch map.

I recognize that it's not perfect as many have said.

But that is why because it's the most populated area that has the most communities of interest, the most diverse communities of interest preserved that is why I'm leaning towards Birch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm basing my decision I know we are talking about Birch here for a good second but going to hit two birds with one stone.

I'm taking my own personal beliefs here out of almost everything we are doing when coming to voting. There has been an overwhelmingly positive response to Chestnut. More so than Birch.

So that would be the reason why I put Chestnut above Birch however both maps are decent.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, and I'd like to talk about Birch and Chestnut together.

The reason I selected Chestnut was I felt it had more swing districts that depending who the candidates are I could go republican or democrat and that is one of the things we

heard from the public a lot, they used the word competitiveness and I just associated that word with the way Anthony configured this.

So I think that's a very positive thing and something the public talked about quite a bit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, I agree with Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Witjes.

Clearly the sentiment from the public was for Chestnut.

Really without many reservations at all as I recall.

And it seems I recall that people would say you know Birch looks good but Chestnut looks better.

And number two I think our deliberations as we develop Birch and develop Chestnut, I think we made the corrections to the Birch that provided us with Chestnut and therefore I believe that is the one that should be voted in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so I have some comments on this.

I think in terms of the public comment it's been frankly equal and actually favors the Birch and that was something I believe Chris Andrews mentioned today that when you tally that 67% of the comments related to the Birch are positive 55% of the comments related to Chestnut are so I think the Birch actually has more favorable comments. I think the Chestnut in particular it wasn't something that we drew as a collaborative map.

It was something this Commissioner Eid did on his own and adopting it and making it a collaborative map.

Unlike the Birch where we did draw it in live meetings and discussed at length what we were doing and why we were doing it we never had that sort of background with the Chestnut and I think you see that reflected the in the communities of interest on the two maps because for the Birch we have particular configurations particularly Detroit and Oakland County where we have you know little jut outs here and there and done with a deliberate purple and we went through the communities of interest.

We were specifically discussing the Bengali and Asian and Chaldean, the Hispanic communities, the Arab and Muslim in Dearborn in particular and really trying to preserve those communities of interest and we ended up with the lines we drew.

Where I feel the Chestnut disease not preserve those communities of interest in the same way and I think from a defensibility perspective that makes it difficult to go in and say Yeah, we considered the Bengali in Birch we carved out its own District for it yet we completely threw that in the dumpster when it came to Chestnut.

If it was important for us to incorporate in the Birch it should have been incorporated in the Chestnut as well and a big weakness with the plan.

I feel that is a big weakness that a lot of people have identified with the Chestnut in particular including outside entities that have looked at both maps.

Have consistently rated the Chestnut as being the lowest on communities of interest in terms of taking those into account.

And I think that is concerning because we have the Birch which does well with communities of interest.

We have the Apple which does well with the communities of interest then we have the third ranked which is the Chestnut.

So I think if you are looking at all things being equal which they mostly are because the public impression of it is equal if slightly favoring Birch and we have different metrics we are looking at.

Whether it be population, whether it be efficiency gap, whether it be mean median.

They are pretty equal.

And so the big differentiating factor for me is the COIs and we have one map that I think does a really good job of respecting the COIs and in addition to that was well documented as to why we were doing that.

And very open to the public then we have another map that frankly I think compromises COIs.

In favor of competitiveness which is not even one of our constitutional criteria.

Nowhere in our constitutional criteria is competitiveness and I'm sure our General Counsel will jump in on that point so that is not something we should be considering as a factor.

And when people are asking us to consider that they are asking us to deviate from the 7 ranked criteria we are supposed to be following.

So I think they are both good maps.

It's not going to kill me either way if we adopt one or the other but I definitely think in terms of complying with our constitutional mandate I think the Birch is superior.

And I would encourage everybody to think about that and consider whether we want to make sure that we are going with the map with better COIs versus the map that is more competitive.

Commissioner Witjes I think you had your hand up first then Commissioner Eid.

I'm sorry can we let Commissioner Curry go first thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I just want to reply that I agree with Madam Chair in her response to the Birch map.

I agree wholeheartedly with that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Curry.

Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Between the two I think communities of interest are represented both quite well in the Birch and the Chestnut map.

That being said when it came to percentages that were brought up today in public comment by the individual from Haslett I'm wondering if he went on to the actual public

comment not the portal but the website with the proposed maps where you can place the pins.

I'm taking it in account when we actually had our first maps to that we published and all of our public comments hearings we went on the next five plus everything that we've heard in our public meetings that we had every two weeks Chestnut is indeed superior out of the two in regards to what the public has said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: A couple things.

One I just want to point out that the Detroit configuration that is in Chestnut was also in map Juniper that went on the second round of public comments which was a collaborative map and we came back and selected this map and made it a collaborative map on Chestnut based on what Commissioners said was the preferred Detroit configuration.

So that is the first thing.

Second, just looking at how people said their preferences, there were 7 preferences, 7 first place preferences for Chestnut.

And four for Birch.

And out of those for Chestnut there were more than -- there were two independents two republicans and one democrat and just wanted to point that out.

Finally I think the independent analysis actually shows the opposite.

I think independent analysis are good tools we should use but most of the ones I read specifically IPPSR report from MSU preferred the Chestnut map.

I looked at other things, the Princeton gerrymander project, which has the maps as A's, which are good.

And 538 also has them all being the same.

So I think from an independent analysis standpoint they are all pretty good all three of them.

As far as community of interest goes, I think the Chestnut map is better in supporting communities of interest because the biggest community of interest here is the you know the minority community in Detroit.

And the BVAP being higher I think it does a better job of having that community of interest being represented.

While we have the Bengali community of interest represented very well in other versions of maps.

You know we said all along that not everybody is going to get every single thing they want in every map but I think it's a good compromise.

There are other pluses to as far as Oakland and Troy is included with the Oakland County District which is something that at Oakland University the community made very clear to us, they want to be in with most of Oakland County.

There are negatives though, you know.

It's not a perfect map.

I don't like how Chestnut has upper Oakland County.

I think the Birch map is superior to Chestnut in that regard.

But overall looking at all things in totality, I prefer Chestnut and going by what most people said 7 people said Chestnut was their preference.

So I'm wondering if we can get any wiggle room, maybe have somebody change their mind so we can come to consensus something like that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This is why I have a problem of listing the top two it's like a round Robin and I don't think that this is how we should do it.

I don't think we should be forced to say which ones we are.

And put somebody on the spot saying oh, well, 7 Commissioners think this one is the way to go so we just need to swing the last one.

That is round Robin in my opinion and I don't like it.

I just want to put that out there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for your comment, Commissioner Lange.

So I do want to address the MSU report because I did read that in full like I read everything.

And the primary reason why MSU tipped in favor of Chestnut is because number one they are of the opinion that we are required to have 50% BVAP in order to have voting rights compliance and they favored Chestnut because it has a slightly higher BVAP in District 12 and 13 so to me I disregard that entirely because I trust the expert opinion of Mr. Adelson and he what's said we do not have to have 50% so the fact they are favoring one map over another because it has a slightly higher BVAP when that is not what we are supposed to be -- that is not a goal we are trying to achieve, I disregarded that analysis entirely.

Otherwise their analysis was there was no difference between the Birch and Chestnut they were functionally the same in terms of every factor they looked at.

All right, I feel like we talked about Birch and Chestnut so do we want to talk about I think Lange would be next on the list.

Any discussion, comments about Lange? And anything about Szetela? Did you have a comment Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was going to say I like the Szetela version.

It would rank after Chestnut and Birch because I think the collaborative maps should be ranked first but just generally speaking, I think I saw what you are trying to do.

I saw you did a good job of trying to put together the best parts of both maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so let's go back to our.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go to Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I liked the Lange map and represented some of the areas that I think needed more representation than they have had.

I think she did a decent job on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay this is okay so we just discussed the Congressional maps now we are going to move on to Senate then the house basically do the same thing.

Does that make sense? Now we actually discussed the Congressional map, wouldn't it make more sense to go through the voting process now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think Ms. Reinhardt wants to chime in and General Counsel probably wanted to chime in too.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, Commissioner Witjes that is how what the voting plan contemplates is that we will go through all of the steps for each plan sequentially and then move on to the next District type.

So first we would go through all the steps for U.S. Congressional and then move on to the next set, which I believe is State Senate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to clarify going through all the steps you are saying voting at this point.

Okay that is what I understood.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: There was the topic of potentially making changes to the maps.

At the beginning that said we would be coming back to after discussion.

So when do we come back to that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm going to make a motion right now that we do not make any changes to the maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that all maps or just these Congressional maps?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Vallette to oh, gosh, how do I want to say this not make any changes to the map I guess, any maps, just any District type maps any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: My hand has been up a while this is Commissioner Wagner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can't see you.

Please go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you I also wanted to get back to actually amending the maps because as everyone on the Commission is aware I've got a letter of demand out there.

And thank you for whoever linked it to bridge Michigan.

That was much appreciated.

But this is where we are having a problem is this all pertains to round one voting.

My letter pertains to round two voting.

We are being pressured into accepting a plan that we may not concur with.

And my problem is I was prohibited from actually submitting a plan because I contracted diabetes and could not see to tell anyone to draw or anything.

That's why I passed when we had Detroit because I could not see to do it.

So I have effectively had my rights as a Commissioner taken away to not be able to submit any plan whatsoever to this Commission.

And I'm being pressured into accepting a plan or plans I do not concur with.

And at that point it's taking away every Commissioner's right who wanted to submit anything at this point and thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Wagner.

Any additional comments about the voting General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, thank you Madam Chair.

So I might suggest as a part of step two your discussion before the vote that the compliance chart tracking that is available on the Commission's website that also be examined and that data referenced as well as part of your discussion before voting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry could you repeat that? I was answering a question at the same time go ahead.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That I would suggest that as part of your step two as part of the Commission's step two discussion before the vote that the compliance tracking chart that is available on the Commission's website as far as partisan fairness and compactness scores be referenced and it magically appears from Ms. Reinhardt as.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So before we talk about this, we do have a motion that's been seconded and restated on the floor.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Let's vote on the motion so we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Vallette to that we are no longer going to amend maps.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I ask for a roll call vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to ask for the same thing.

Roll call vote, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Are we ready to proceed with the roll call vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No."

Once again, the motion is to not edit any of the current maps further.

Is that accurately captured.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That would be correct so voting yes means it would be fixed.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you again please indicate your support of the motion of a "Yes" or "No" and I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> 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: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 9 yes to 4 no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

All right, so can we get that chart back up again so I can -- do you need me to read it into the record or?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair and I apologize for making that observation while there was a motion pending.

My mind was on compliance.

So I think really again having that information available to this is taken directly from the Commission's website that is posted.

I would note that the if the public accesses it, the tabs at the bottom, the Palm State Senate plan and Szetela State Senate plan that go individually those districts have been renumbered consistent with the Commission's process.

But the numbers on this summary comparison chart are accurate.

So just for those Congressional plans it demonstrates the partisan fairness scores so whatever method the Commission would find best to incorporate it into their discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay anyone have any comments? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

I would note just for the record that all of this information that we are now viewing on the screens are items that we have looked at repeatedly over the period of time that we have been developing these maps so there is nothing new there.

So other than simply being something to look at, at the present time.

All of this information has been considered prior to today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, and I believe this version of this was first produced after our initial round of maps as well.

So it has as we have changed maps, we updated it as we.

All right any additional discussion? I think we might actually be ready to vote at this point now that Commissioner Witjes has returned.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move that we adopt the Chestnut map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is not our procedure.

Motion to take a roll call vote to adopt a plan then we state our preference.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or that too.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we get a second.

Motion by Commissioner Lett to go to step three of our Commission final vote procedure which is roll call vote to adopt a plan of the District type under consideration which is Congressional.

And it was seconded by Commissioner Witjes.

At this point each Commissioner will cast a vote stating the name of the plan they wish to vote for out of the published plans of the Congressional type.

So once again we are going to have a roll call on this obviously.

Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, when called upon, please state the name of the U.S. Congressional plan that you would like to vote for.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Chestnut.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Chestnut.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Chestnut.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Birch.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Chestnut.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? .
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Chestnut.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Lange.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Chestnut.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Chestnut.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Birch.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Birch.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Chestnut.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Lange.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Please allow us one moment to tally the votes.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: They got it, yeah, they got it.

Chestnut.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The U.S. Congressional plan adopted but I the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission is Chestnut.

[Applause]

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: All right let's roll it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right one down.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm sharing the results of the vote on the screen right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Congratulations everybody.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You can see that chest shut achieved a score of 8 total votes and reached the affiliation requirements with two R, two D and two non-or four nonaffiliated.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Take a break.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You want to take a five or ten minute break? Ten minute break.

Okay without objection it's 3:15, we will take a recess until 3:25.

Actually let's just say 3:30 because we never make it back in ten minutes so without hearing objection we will stand in recess until 3:30 p.m.

Thank you.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 3:30 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and as well as your physical location you are attending from.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm present, attending remotely from Detroit Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

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

Okay, we are going through the process and continue with the process we were proceeding with before and go to the Senate I talked about the cherry and Linden and pulling up the Palm to look at that and to sort of reorient everybody the cherry and Linden and Palm are identical with exception of the Ann Arbor area so the cherry has those top and bottom districts 14 and 15 the Linden has a more Dow shape with a biggest Northwest.

And then we were about to look at the Palm as well so once we get the Palm up.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do you want me for talk through this one or give comments or.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, I can talk through it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Get in the detailing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Like I said this is the same everywhere else except Ann Arbor area and if we scroll into the Ann Arbor area, we can see this has Ann Arbor together in one District with Ypsilanti.

District 17.

And then it has Jackson County the reminder of Washtenaw County and a little bit I think of Hillsdale County underneath put together as well.

So that is the distinctions between those three maps is the different configuration palm has Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and it has Ann Arbor split in cherry one or another one is more of a north-south and the other is more of a northwest-southeast.

All right at this point we will move on to the individual maps and I would ask Commissioner Kellom to present and discuss her individual map.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Sure.

Okay mine is pretty simple and straightforward.

Can you all hear me? I will remove my mask it's fine.

It's simple and straightforward.

I used Linden and then of course my concentration was to make some adjustments in the Detroit area because I felt that our Senate maps could have had some different configurations.

So I basically concentrated as I've said before in numerous of our meetings on keeping communities together.

Mainly I kept communities for the most part below the 8 mile line.

I used the neighborhoods we had discussed considering southwest Detroit.

The northwest area, the Fitzgerald community.

The areas of LBGTQIA and used the neighborhoods and kept them together and focused on our public comment where the concern was around representation and keeping observing Detroit's compactness and communities and rich history.

So I think that is a fair description of the changes that I made for the Kellom Senate map.

But basically, yes, I did not change anything else in the Linden map just refocusing on the Detroit and Metro Detroit area and of course as we go west for my map there are some changes that had to be made because I concentrated on Detroit proper.

Kind of expanding and adding some districts in that area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

Mr. Adelson did you want to conduct the voting rights analysis of this map.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It's my pleasure thank you.

Commissioner Kellom a couple of questions I wanted to ask if that is okay.

You said that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Repeat it again Bruce I'm sorry okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is okay, in fact, I'm already into it.

So I won't repeat it.

I wanted to be sure that I understood what you said, that the changes in the Detroit District that you -- that had a community of interest focus am I correct about that? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Could you explain a little bit more about what that means, please? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, Bruce, I feel I have explained this many of times.

But so we know that Detroit has a high population of African/American Black people. And they also have they have talked about they being the residents of Detroit have also talked about the Bengali community.

They talked about we've heard from the Arab community.

We've heard from the areas of Latino community.

So Detroit is an area where though it's a predominately bloc community we have other ethnicities and communities of interest.

It's also besides those, those various ethnicities it's also a place that has tons and tons of neighborhoods.

Different that are identifiable on the map.

So those communities have expressed wanting to together for instance if you look at District 1, the Grosse Pointe, Grosse Pointe park, Grosse Pointe Woods that is a community that is diverse in effect it has of course Black and white and also has

neighborhoods like east English village and neighborhoods the points and the farms and the parks together.

So thinking about the public comment that we've heard expressing you know how those different folks get along, the lakeshore communities, those are things that I kept in mind just using this one District as an example.

When I was looking at the City of Detroit and looking to see how that could play out moving in the suburbs and what would make sense in terms of drawing the lines.

Does that answer your question or do you want me to use another example?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is perfect.

That really is what I wanted point out.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Populous and compact and I think the districts that I drew while not perfect, excuse me, while not perfect, make a good attempt at mirroring or marrying the geography of the City as well as the folks that live there.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Great thank you.

So why don't we look at the recompiled election results, please.

And let's start with District 1.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay District 1 as drawn is Biden 76.

Trump is 24.

Clinton is 75.

Trump 25.

Obama is 77.

And Romney 23.

For Senate 75 for Peters, 25 for James Stabenow is 72 and 28 in 2018, 2014 is Peters 75, land 25.

Stabenow is 80 and Hoekstra is 20.

For Governor 74 Whitmer, 26 Schuette.

Schauer is 65, Snyder is 35.

For Attorney General 72 Nessel, 28 Leonard.

Totten, 67, Schuette 33.

And then for Secretary of State Benson 74, Lange 26.

Dillard 64 and Johnson 36.

And then for Governor primary El-Sayed 34 Thanedar 24 and Whitmer 42.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

This District based on the recompiled election results show pretty strong support for minority candidates of choice particularly in the bellwether elections.

So let's go John can we do I think we are going to be doing 4, 5 and 6 too.

So let's start numerically and let's start with 4.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay 4.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 4 is 78 Biden 22 Trump.

80 for Clinton.

20 for Trump.

86 for Obama 14 for Romney.

For U.S. Senate Peters is 78 and James is 22.

Stabenow is 77.

And James is sorry 78 and 22 for James in 18.

Peters in 14 is 87 and land is 13.

Stabenow is 89 and 11 for Hoekstra.

For Governor it's 79 for Whitmer.

21 for Schuette.

Schauer is 80 and Snyder is 20.

For Attorney General Nessel is 78.

And Leonard is 22.

Totten is 80 and Schuette is 20.

For Secretary of State 80 for Benson, 20 for Lange.

Dillard 79, and Johnson 21.

And then for the Governor primary 26 for El-Sayed, 32 for Thanedar and 41, 42 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay great thank you.

Let's go to excuse me to the 6 please I'm sorry to 5 my mistake to 5 and John, let's start with the Biden Trump in 2020, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Say again start with what?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: No right where you are, I think out of jump over a couple elections if that is okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure so Biden is 68 and Trump is 32.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's go to Obama-Romney please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Obama 77, Romney 23.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Peters, James?

>> MR. MORGAN: Peters 68 and James 32.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay thank you.

So let's do Stabenow James please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Stabenow in 18 is 68 and James is 32.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And let's go to yes where you are now for Governor.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so Whitmer is 70 and Schuette is 30.

In 2018.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And to the right, please.

Let's move one to the right.

My right to Schauer.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so moving on to Governor in 2014 is Schauer is 69 and Snyder is 31.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Now let's go to Dillard, please in 2014.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay in 2014 Secretary of State is Dillard 68.

And Johnson 32.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, and let's look at El-Sayed as well too please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Governor in 2018 primary is El-Sayed is 31.

Thanedar is 26.

And Whitmer is 43.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

Let's go to 6, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Next District 6.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Biden and Trump in 20.

>> MR. MORGAN: Biden is 85 in 2020.

And Trump is 15.

>> MR. MORGAN: Obama-Romney please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Obama is 88 and 12 for Romney.

>> MR. MORGAN: Peters and James.

>> MR. MORGAN: Peters is 85 James is 15.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's go to the right, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: In 2018 Stabenow is 84 and James is 16.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And the next one Peters please.

>> MR. MORGAN: In 2014 Peters 87, and land is 13.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's go to the next gubernatorial then do Dillard, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so the 2018 gubernatorial Whitmer is 85.

And Schuette is 15.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And Dillard.

>> MR. MORGAN: Secretary of State 2014 Dillard is 80.

Johnson is 20.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay and El-Sayed, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: El-Sayed is 39.

28 for Thanedar and 33 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, so in this District, so El-Sayed wins and I think as I recall that the concentration there or the effort there just looking at the map was Dearborn as I think this is the -- this shows a pretty significant about 7% advantage for El-Sayed and with all the districts we are seeing all the bellwether elections prove out for the minority preferred candidates pretty consistently and the margins are very solid. I think the only other Detroit District that I'm thinking about for now is let's look at 7, please.

And I should say Detroit area District 7 and we will start with Biden.

>> MR. MORGAN:

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So that is to the left.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 7 Biden is 74.

And Romney is 26 sorry Trump is 26.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Now Obama please Obama-Romney.

>> MR. MORGAN: Obama is 78 and Romney is 22.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Peters James in 20.

>> MR. MORGAN: U.S. Senate 2020 Peters is 75 and 25 for James.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And the Stabenow race.

>> MR. MORGAN: Stabenow 75, James 25 in 2018.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay so let's go gubernatorial I think that the next one.

>> MR. MORGAN: Gubernatorial 76 Whitmer and Schuette is 24.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Dillard and El-Sayed please.

>> MR. MORGAN: For Secretary of State Dillard is 69 and James is Johnson is 31 and then for Governor primary El-Sayed 33, 27 for Thanedar and 41 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, thank you.

So the Detroit districts all are showing very consistent results from the recompiled election analysis that the minority preferred candidates win pretty strongly and that is including all the bellwether elections and the elections Dr. Handley included in her report.

Commissioner Kellom, are there other Detroit area districts that well actually let's look, John, if we could at the minority population for the districts.

And I see the District.

And could you go up, please, John, I'm curious where Flint is and what District Flint is. Just a little more north, yeah.

Yeah, right there.

27.

Could we look at that too, John, the election results? And I think we can look at fewer for this District, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure I think it's the same configuration as one of the other maps in this area exactly.

I believe there were no changes in this area am I right, MC?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is based on Linden, correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Same as Linden and no change.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So Commissioner Kellom, are there other districts that changed on this map that have a large minority population? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Majority in the Detroit area but look at districts 3 and then maybe 9, but other than that the focus of it would be the Detroit area.

And I'm just thinking of the Chaldean and some other populations in those two communities of interest excuse me in those two districts.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Other than that no.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So 3 and on would be the districts you would recommend.

3 okay minority population in 3 or let's look at John let's look at the election results for 3, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 3 is 70% non-Hispanic white.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: And 9 is 81% non-Hispanic white.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: 3 might give us some indicators.

Well let's see where we go after we look at 3.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to look at 3, okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yeah, thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so District 3 is 56 Biden, 44 Trump.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Obama.

>> MR. MORGAN: 61, Romney 39.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay Peters.

>> MR. MORGAN: Peters is in 2020 is 58.

And James is 42.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay so let's move over the next couple and go to the next gubernatorial, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Whitmer is 62 and Schuette is 38.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay and Dillard and then El-Sayed.

>> MR. MORGAN: Dillard is 50, Johnson is 50 and then El-Sayed is 32 and Thanedar is 17, Whitmer 51.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay thank you.

So the only difference here in looking at the bellwether elections is that Dillard narrowly loses to Johnson.

Can we, yeah, okay.

And let's look just skip down quickly to 9, please, John, and let's see what the Dillard elections show.

>> MR. MORGAN: The Dillard election in 9.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Dillard 37 and Johnson 63.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay thank you.

So I think what certainly the results in 3 show, 3 minority population as John has pointed out earlier is really relatively low but this is a District where there is opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

The except for the narrow Dillard loss the minority candidates of choice prevail here.

So although this is not the type of District the same population as District 4 for example, or where the election results all prove out for the minority candidates of choice, this is a

District that is seemingly does provide some opportunity to elect significant opportunity to elect for minority communities.

So it seems like Commissioner Kellom it seems like we have looked at the Detroit districts and those are the ones that you indicated were the source of the primary changes in this map.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You're correct, Bruce.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay so I think the Detroit districts all consistently show strong opportunity to elect based on the recompiled election results.

The districts like 3 which are not they are not even minority plurality show also significant opportunity to elect and tracks with Dr. Handley's analysis about white course over voting and there being significant populations of likely white voters in primary elections although as we talked about earlier as you know there are there is a real dearth of legally significant primary elections to examine.

So I think that unless there was something else for now, I think I'm good with the election analysis.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Thank you, Bruce.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so I think we are good with our criteria number one equal population and Voting Rights Act compliance so Commissioner Kellom are your districts for your map geographically contiguous.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do they reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Due the map provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It does not better not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does it favor or disfavor incumbent elected official or candidate.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: City and Township boundaries.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are your districts reasonably compact.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The plan is 4.27 which is within specifications and we will move on to Commissioner Lange for her to present her map.

I'm sorry Mr. Adelson.

You're on mute.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you I just wanted to mention briefly to throw out for the Commission's consideration in reviewing the individual maps and we did this for

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 collaborative maps, do you want to also put up the partisan fairness score to as part of the analysis and comparison?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We actually have that on the spreadsheet that we posted at the end.

So we will cover that, yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay great thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Lange? Take it away.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, as soon as I see the map.

I can tell you starting out until I can see the map that it was based off from Linden.

I basically moved Linden on to a map and then adjusted certain areas.

Again you will see that Northern Michigan is more compact.

I did not split up the Counties which is what they asked for repeatedly.

The UP has minimal splits within the Counties which is what they asked for also.

I went to Ottawa County and kept Ottawa County whole except for part of Holland which as you know Holland and Allegan County and Ottawa County knowing people that live in the region it's more common for them to associate with Allegan County.

So I did split it off to where the majority of Holland was in Allegan County.

I did do some changes to the Grand Rapids area on an off note real quick I want to thank Kent.

He was a God send.

I don't know if you're aware but I had some issues again with mapping and Kent helped me out in a time crunch so thank you Kent for that.

Grand Rapids I split up.

Their population is so high you have to.

And I included in each one both 30 and 29, Ada and Cascade they wanted to be included with Grand Rapids and not rural areas.

So that was done in there.

I also changed what I consider Central Michigan to be more compact where it doesn't go halfway down the state, which would include Osceola, Mecosta and such and made a change on Midland regarding the Tittabawassee watershed.

And Detroit I left the way it was presented in the Linden map.

So there were absolutely no changes made there.

The only thing if I had a down fall for my map that I regret is it was my intent to make changes to Jackson County and to be honest I can't tell you if I made those changes.

My maps did not upload as I did them.

And my back up was cleared.

I don't know how that happened.

I guess I'm not as, tech savvy as I thought.

My downfall I personally would not have done the split with Jackson County in with Ann Arbor and I would have respected that community of interest.

Other than that, the maps are pretty much the same as the Linden.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson did you want to handle step one?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, thank you.

And the plan deviation I will note that is within one person, one vote juris prudence and we can go west and look at districts 30 and 29.

Can you provide some information about where you made the dividing line between 30 and 29 and what your process was?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I will be completely honest with you, Bruce, the original maps I submitted I'm not positive that the lines are exactly where I had them.

I tried to use like the river and certain roads in Grand Rapids to draw them.

But, again, I had a glitch.

And so these I hate to say it the Grand Rapids area was done a little more on the fly off from memory.

So they may not be exact.

But my thought was to try and follow not only the rivers but the roads.

And was hoping that they were as close, there was another map where it was collaborative, that the Commission did where it split it into and added Cascade and I was hoping it was as close to that as possible.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

I'm certainly sorry about the technological glitches at the end of the day Commissioner Lange.

I think none of us are as technically adept as we like to think we are.

I know that is true for me.

John, can we look at District 29, please, the recompiled election results?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We won't look I don't think we will need to look at as many as we did in the Detroit area.

But I am curious about the District given the overall minority of VAP.

>> MR. MORGAN: For Biden it's 60 percent for Trump it's 40.

Obama 52, Romney 48.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: For Senate 2020 Peters 56, James 44.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Stabenow.

>> MR. MORGAN: Stabenow in 18 is 56 and 44 for James.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay and let's go to the next gubernatorial and then

Dillard, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Whitmer 58 for Governor.

42 for Schuette.

And then for Secretary of State is Dillard is 39 and Johnson is 61.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

I think that this District because the minority VAP is relatively low but it does as you see with the recompiled election results there are some opportunity to elect possibilities here.

I think that there may be as time moves on and elections are held that may prove out even more than the recompiled results are showing.

So that is something I wanted to look at.

And then to illustrate this is a 39% minority VAP District.

So there are some possibilities that appear now and that may continue as elections are held.

That was my really my only comment or question here is based on what Commissioner Lange said about the not making changes through the Detroit area.

So thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Adelson, Rhonda I have a couple questions for you so are your districts geographically contiguous.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the districts reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the districts provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the districts favor or disfavor any incumbent elected official or candidate.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: City County and Township boundaries.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are they reasonably compact.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are done with the Lange and can move on to the Szetela. And John are you pulling it up? Can you put the overlay on for the Linden, the shape file on top of it and go in the City of Detroit area?

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to look in Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If we can Zoom in between District 1 and 3.

If you can Zoom in on the Central line there and go up a little further north.

Okay, so my change to this map is super easy and you can see it right there.

All I did is adjust the line between 1 and 3 and the reason I did that is I know 35% is our threshold for City of Detroit but we only had 35.03BVAP in District 1 which is just like so razor thin and wanted to increase it moving neighborhoods from 1 to 3 because District 3 in the Linden had 42% and District 1 had 35.03 so I just readjusted that one line.

And that increased the BVAP to 35.84 which is not a huge increase but a little higher than it was and reduces the BVAP in District 3 to 41.41.

So that is the only change in this map was just to adjust that little boundary.

You can see where there is a little more yellow and down by the river front more river front is put in District 3 to sort of balance it out and that is it.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Based off Linden correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 100% Linden except that line.

Bruce did you want to analyze this?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Sure.

So let's look at the election results for 1 and 3, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so District 1 is 70% for Biden.

30% for Trump.

81% for Obama and 19% for Romney.

Peters 71, James 29.

Stabenow 72, James 28.

For Governor Whitmer is 74, Schuette is 26 or sorry, yeah, yeah.

73-27 we will see, yep, and then for secretary of state Dillard 72 and Johnson 28.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay thank you.

Let's look at the 3, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: For District 3 Biden is 78.

Trump is 22.

Obama 84, Romney 16.

Peters 79, James 21.

Stabenow 78, James 22.

Whitmer 80 and Schuette 20.

Dillard 76, Johnson 24.

El-Sayed is 37 for Governor, 26 for Thanedar and 36 for Whitmer.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, can we look at, thank you, John can you go back and look at population numbers for 1 and 3, please.

Okay, I mean these districts show across the board performance and recompiled election results for 1 and 3 for candidates of choice, robust margins.

And all the bellwether elections check out.

So that in addition to the deviation being right where Supreme Court likes it to see.

So I think that that's -- so I'm good for now with this map.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Adelson.

Commissioner Rothhorn could you facilitate asking questions.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I will do that so our districts are of equal population as mandated by the U.S. Constitution.

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: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are they geographically contiguous.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Reflect the diverse population and community of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Provide a disproportionate disadvantage to any political party.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Favor or disfavor elected official or can't did.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Reflect City Township and County boundaries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are your districts reasonably compact.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, they are.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: At this point we have discussed the plans and our next step in the process would be for a motion for each Commissioner to state their first and second most preferred Senate plan.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett to have each Commissioner state their first and second most preferred Senate plan.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none let's go ahead and vote all in favor of the motion to have Commissioners state their first and second most preferred Senate map say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

By a vote of 11-2 the ayes prevail.

And the motion is adopted.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry can you indicate your vote for the record?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let me hear the question again, yes.

Let me hear the again question, the vote again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The motion was for each Commissioner to state their first and second most preferred State Senate map.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I agree.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: She is an aye.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is for discussion purposes only, this is not the official vote.

It's just for discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right I say aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A vote of 11-2 the motion is adopted.

So at this point I'm going to follow the same process and go around the table starting with Commissioner Witjes and have everybody state their first and second preferred plan.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Based on public comments received during the 45 day public comments period and hearing one in my opinion is Linden seconded by Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I like Linden and the Kellom map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Number one is Palm and number two is Linden.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I have only one choice again, sorry to be difficult but it's Linden.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Weiss apologies but the motion was for each Commissioner to state their top two choices.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I will go with Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Linden and Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Linden and Kellom.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I will go with Linden and Szetela.

Economic Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Kellom and Linden.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Linden and Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Linden and Kellom.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay then we have Commission Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Lange and Palm.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lange and Palm.

Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, Kellom and Linden.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Kellom and Linden.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Lange and Kellom.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lange and Kellom.

Okay any discussion or debate on the plan starting with alphabetical order, which would be the cherry.

Any discussion on the cherry map? Okay what about the Linden? And I'm not quite going in alphabetical order sorry what about the Kellom, so Kellom is next in alphabetical order? Thoughts, comments, discussions? Commissioner Eid did you have your hand up? Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Eid go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I like the Kellom map.

I think it would be my second choice after Linden.

I especially like the changes in Wayne County and Metro Detroit.

The only thing I don't really like too much about it is some of Oakland and Farmington Hills and Pontiac and West Bloomfield District are but besides that I think it's a really good attempt and I think it works quite well for Wayne County.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I also really enjoy the Linden map but I think the Kellom map does the best job of observing what we have heard in the City of Detroit and elsewhere just in terms of representation.

So I think even thinking about our inability to change maps at this point I think if we were going to have like a best foot forward to show that we were listening and not to say we weren't because I know someone is going to raise their hand we were listening, these are the maps, that is not what I'm implying.

But really doing a good job to honor the City of Detroit because they have this has been an overwhelming debate, not just with us but the media and just everywhere.

I think that map does the best job.

It continues the conversation with Linden I think in a more wholistic and equitable way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any comments about Commissioner Lange's map?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to say I feel Northern Michigan was given the short end of the stick in process.

And I feel that my map add quickly represents the areas of Northern Michigan, which were in my opinion kind of blown right through.

So if nothing else at least I know that I did what I felt was best for my area of the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments about the Lange plan? Any comments about the Linden plan? Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay so again with the same argument that I had or statements I had for the Congressional is that Linden map has gotten overwhelming support.

That being said, I'm a big firm believer in the collaborative process that we all went through.

We all worked on these together.

So Linden would be my number one choice on that reason alone.

Now that being said, number 1.9 on the list is Szetela number two would be Kellom. The only difference is that the Szetela map has a real slight switch to change the BVAP which is fine.

It was basically a collaborative map.

I know I'm kind of going all over the place here but those three are my basic top two with Linden being number one only for the fact that it is collaborative and that is the one that the public has been saying is the best during the public hearings as well as during the public comment period in all the meetings that we've had.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, any more comments about the Linden? Any comments about the Palm? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Excuse me I've got a couple comments to make on it. Personally, I don't feel that during the public comments that it's been represented very well.

Mostly from a negative standpoint.

And I don't see it that way so I wanted to explain how I look at it.

Today we had a comment that said Palm has an unacceptable republican bias.

And I don't necessarily agree with that.

Then we had another comment that says don't choose Palm which is extremely unfair but never says how unfair it is.

So what I did with Palm, it came from the cherry map.

It's a replication of the cherry map.

And then I just changed the Ann Arbor-Jackson area.

And I did that where I took the first exit past the M14-I94 corridor intersection and I went west.

And everything west of that which would be the western part of Washtenaw County and the western and the entire Jackson County was one District.

And everything to the east of that was the other District.

So there is two.

And the reason I did that because I culturally see a big difference between Ann Arbor itself and Jackson County and Jackson.

And I go back to our very first hearing which was in Jackson, and I consistently heard we associate ourselves with the western half of Washtenaw County and Jackson County.

And that came across pretty strong.

I think somehow that is part of that has gotten forgotten over this period of time.

Now, I will admit that of those three collaborative maps for this Senate District or districts they are the metrics are higher.

But they are still within the scope of what Dr. Handley talked about on October 1st, but they are higher and admit that.

But I did not look at it completely that way.

I looked at it from the perspective of communities of interest.

Because I saw such a diversity between the City of Ann Arbor, which is and the rest of Washtenaw County and Jackson County.

Which really got into the argument about the rural urban split.

And I took a look at the communities of interest.

I saw that as a key for Jackson County.

And to keep Ann Arbor together as one unit, one of the things that came across occasionally through the hearings throughout the state was the education community want to be kept together.

You take a look at Ann Arbor itself, and you've got Washtenaw community college, Concordia, eastern Michigan, Ypsilanti.

And of course university of Michigan.

So.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Clark can you make sure you are speaking directly into the microphone.

When you turn your head it's difficult to hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry, couldn't hear me.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Can you make sure you are speaking directly in the microphone when you turn your head it's difficult to hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay sorry.

So I looked at it from that perspective and then I during the holidays I happened to be looking through the AFLCIO map.

And on Page 165 and 167 on their booklet they've got the Jackson County District almost exactly as I had configured it here.

And the Ann Arbor part they did different.

A little different.

They didn't include Ypsilanti and they went down south into the Counties that border Ohio to get the rest of their population.

But they did make mention on Page 167 the difference culturally between Ann Arbor area and Jackson and Jackson County area.

So that is specifically noted on the AFLCIO documents.

Also went to the institute for public policy and social research at MSU and they published some information for us.

In there they quote the Princeton gerrymandering policy in some areas of the document. But in this specific area they used a different metric than we have used.

But and I won't get into what that is.

But the statement they make is under proposed plan Palm democrats candidates win one seat more than under the average map.

Which is within the normal range.

Not an out liar.

But after proposed plan cherry version two or plan Linden they won two more seats and under the average plan.

So I think when people make these comments that are unacceptable, they probably look at it from a democratic-republican standpoint.

And I looked at it from more of a community of interest standpoint where Jackson County could get represented based on their communities of interest and Ann Arbor which is a whole different environment gets represented on theirs.

So that was the reason I put that map together.

I think it's fairer for the Jackson people and gives them the representation that they deserve.

And given their values and their way of life and I think it does the same for Ann Arbor.

So those are my comments.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments about the Palm plan? Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My only rebuttal to that is what I stated earlier is that of taking all my personal beliefs out of the drawing process and honestly Palm doesn't come close in regards to what the general public believed or wanted to have us adopt as a plan.

I understand what you did and why you did.

So and I know your heart was in the right place for doing it.

And but unfortunately for me, I'm looking at just a total number of comments that says Linden as opposed to anything else.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just looked at it as another alternative because we need to represent all the people in Michigan and alternatives that would benefit them and so forth.

And that is the reason I put that together.

And I've heard the same thing that you have heard.

That the Linden map comes up more often and when the Palm map comes up it's usually from a negative perspective.

Yep.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right any comments about the Szetela map? Okay at this point I would entertain a motion we vote for a State Senate plan to adopt stating one preferred.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair apologies prior to voting for consistency I would just like to share the compliance tracker with the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry Commissioner, people talking to me on other ends of the table we had a request for a break before we vote but we do have a motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett.

Can we just you just need a ten-minute break or? What time is it? Can we General Counsel is it okay for us to break once we have a motion and a second just for a recess for a few minutes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Just lay it on the table Madam Chair actually a proper use for the first time this year.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wait say that again.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Lay the motion on the table and pick it back up when you are ready.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's 4:27 hearing no objections we will recess for ten minutes and come back at 4:37 hearing no objections we are in recess until 4:37.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 4:38 p.m. Will the secretary please call the roll.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm present, attending remotely from Detroit Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

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

Okay, we had a motion by Commissioner Witjes, seconded by Commissioner Lett to have Commissioners vote for a Senate plan by stating their preferred plan and we are going to do a roll call vote on this of course.

So any further discussion or debate on the motion? Okay Ms. Reinhardt can we go ahead and call that roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please indicate the plan that you are voting for, for Michigan State Senate by stating the name of the plan.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Richard Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: By overwhelming support during the 45 day public comment period I will vote for Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Sorry, I'm going to vote for Kellom's map.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Kellom.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Lange.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Linden.

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: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Linden.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Lange.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Please allow us one moment to tally the score.

The State Senate plan adopted but I the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission is Linden.

[Applause]

I will now share the tallies of the vote.

Linden received nine votes as you can see totaled here and it received two R votes, two D and five N.

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

At this points we will move on to our House Districts.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair there is not a problem with the vote count.

But what we are examining was coming out of recess.

So just if you will be patient one moment.

So Madam Chair thank you for your patience the procedural issue again there was not a problem with the vote count.

The issue was that when you came back from break the motion on the table was to take the vote for the State Senate plan.

It was a two-step process when you took your vote for the Congressional.

So what ended up happening is that the Commission went directly into the vote for the plan which I just wanted to highlight it.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We did an I vote a hand raised vote before we went to recess.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe I can only I can't speak for the secretary's records but I know that I don't have any vote log before it was laid on the table in order to go to recess.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It wasn't.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we ratify the vote as taken procedurally.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motioned by Commissioner Lett, geez, motioned by Commission Lett seconded by Commissioner Witjes to ratify the vote as taken. Any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Does that satisfy the procedural?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, Madam Chair and again there is no issue with the vote as all as taken and the Commission moving forward expressed interest in taking the vote so that with the ratification is sufficient thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's move on to analysis of the house plans following the alphabetical order we are going to start with the Hickory.

Kent if you could please pull up the Hickory and looks like you already have it ready to go.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is Hickory.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So this is probably going to be a little backwards but the you remember we worked on the Pine first and with the Pine we made changes to Flint, Lansing, Grand Rapids.

And then we made Commissioner Kellom did the Magnolia with changes to the Detroit and the Hickory is a merging of the plan and has Commissioner Kellom to the Metro Detroit area and also includes the Pine's changes to Grand Rapids, Lansing, and the Flint area.

So this is a consolidation of those two maps together.

And if we can just if you put up the shape files for the Magnolia and the Pine you will see they overlap like the Pine overlaps on the west coast and then the Magnolia overlaps on the Detroit area.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair I have the plans available.

I can just turn them on at the request whichever one.

We get all three at the same time it gets a little blurry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Does anyone want to see overlays.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Any certain area or.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you can put on the Magnolia and go in the Detroit area it would be helpful because it shows the same as the Magnolia in that area and this matches the Magnolia and this is the Magnolia map for that entire area.

Then if you Zoom out and you go over to Battle Creek area this is where you will start to see differences.

Actually let's go up to Grand Rapids because I thought maybe it was Grand Rapids.

Where are our changes on here? I thought it was Grand Rapids.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looking at Hickory with Magnolia overlay, okay.

Was there a change in Flint? Did I see.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I think there is Flint.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In District 70?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that a change there?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't think so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Maybe I have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel like this is not the right overlay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I wonder if that is not the right Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Short version Pine was the outside of Detroit changes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 21 and 19 there are some changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which one did you just turn on? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right here there it is.

It's the yeah, it's the Ann Arbor see the blue line right here.

All of this would be 48 and the Magnolia plan.

And then this up through here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Then can we put the Pine on so we can see what the Pine is? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And the Pine is pretty much like Hickory.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No the spine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's quite different in Detroit.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Pine and Magnolia in Detroit but you can see the color changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We had Pine with changes outside of Detroit and Magnolia and Hickory is a blending of those plans together.

Any questions about Hickory? Do we want to go to Magnolia? Let's take a look at Magnolia.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay so Magnolia was based on the Pine version I believe it is version 3 before the changes outside of Detroit and it made changes to Metro Detroit area and a lot of the districts along there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair we can turn on Hickory and Pine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'd put on the Pine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And then Zoom into Metro Detroit and you see the differences between the Pine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes frequently.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Pretty significant changes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One all this, all of it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Bleeds on up into Oakland and Macomb.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, and then if we go up to Flint, can we look at the Flint area? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Grosse Pointe.

Yes, it's all, it's all around Detroit is significant.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Whole Metro Detroit area.

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.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can see it here and doesn't really stop until you get up around, yeah, more towards above Oakland.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, any questions or comments about Magnolia? All right let's go on to the Pine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Pine V5, correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Pine V5, yes .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: With Pine is the difference with Albion and Battle Creek difference.

Which one do you want to load?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would lay the h Hickory, no, the Hickory blends it doesn't it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Hickory has Albion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Albion Battle Creek change we made in response to public comments.

And then obviously Detroit is very different.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And Hickory has lots of changes in there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, uh-huh.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: But it also has to Albion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

So the Pine is the original before we changed Hickory or before we changed Albion. All right any questions about the Pine? I feel like we are all very familiar with these maps.

All right can we go to the Szetela and then if you can put the Hickory overlay on it, I think that would probably be the most helpful.

Okay so the changes I made to this map if you look around Grand Rapids you can see what I did here is I reverted Grand Rapids back to our original Grand Rapids and made some changes where Kent was just circling in the balance between Kalamazoo how Kalamazoo is broken up based on COI comments.

If you scroll over to Ann Arbor area, so see the changes in Ann Arbor, Grand Rapids are going back to our original Ann Arbor configuration that we had.

If you remember we had a discussion about wealthy and Fulton and all of that.

If you go down to Ann Arbor, you can see there is some adjustment in the lines for 46 and 33.

Where those are moved around and that was done for partisan balance purposes.

And then if you go up to Flint, this again was our original Flint configuration where we had it split north and south to get two VRA districts and reverted that in Hickory back to a single District so this is going back to our original Flint District that we had.

And then if we scroll up to Midland and Bay City you will see that I also reverted Midland and Bay City back to being together.

So again, this was so basically the whole concept behind this map was putting in ideas we had considered before so they would be in front of the public during the 45 day public comments period and we could potentially consider them if we wanted to.

The only thing that is kind of unique to my map is the Saginaw area because Saginaw area we have it in one single District.

And this change is what changes and improves the partisan metrics on this map is the change in Saginaw.

If you split Saginaw in two you have two democrat districts which tilts the partisan balance on a map that was leaning republican to more of an equal map.

And that really comes down to the Saginaw.

You could leave everything else the way it was on Hickory and change Saginaw and it's going to improve the partisan fairness.

But we had significant discussions about Saginaw when we built it because we were trying to create a VRA District.

But we couldn't because there just isn't enough minority population in that area so we ended up I believe under the original Hickory map with a population of about 30% minority.

Which given the at least Lisa Handley's analysis it's not an opportunity to elect District in that part of the state.

So, yeah, so Dr. Adelson I will hand it over to you to look at the VRA analysis.

I'm sorry, I made you a doctor, Mr. Adelson, Dr. Handley, Mr. Adelson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: This map was built on which collaborative map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Pine 3 was the original map before we made the changes in Pine 5 so but the only significant difference is Saginaw.

That is where it differs, that is not in any of our collaborative maps.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If I could ask about Saginaw how did you determine how to split Saginaw?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was basically just following population and balance.

We look at -- Kent can we look at the demographics please for 94 and 93? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Can you read that Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I can that's good.

Thank you.

Can we go back down to -- also let's go down to Flint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't have the original.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Just a little south.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just storm reference Bruce the original BVAP for District 94 was 31.92%.

And District 94 in District 93 it was 4.2%.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay thank you.

Okay let's go to Flint, please.

Yes, thank you.

So Flint excuse me is in this map is or is not divided?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So it's divided north and south and this was what was originally in the Pine 3 and it should be two districts I believe just around 30 percentage BVAP then we changed that in response to public comment saying they wanted one consolidated Flint District but then we were getting further comments basically saying they didn't like that.

Some people wanted us to go back to having it be two districts.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, so excuse me in this configuration Flint, the Flint is 69 and 70?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, thank you.

Okay, Kent, can we look at the election results for 69 and 70, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay 69 has Biden at 68% while 70 is at 72% Biden.

Trump was 31 in 69, 31%.

28% in 70.

Clinton had 71% in 69.

And 72% in 70.

While Trump had 29 and 27%.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's go next to the Obama-Romney please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Obama in District 69 had 78.5%.

Romney had 21.5.

And 69.

In District 70 it was 79% Obama and 20% Romney, 21% Romney.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I see Peters James, please, the next one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 70 and 30, 73 and 24.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And Stabenow-James, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 71% Stabenow.

28% James. 75% Stabenow and 25 James.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Go to the next gubernatorial election, Whitmer, right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So Whitmer had 74% in District 69.

Schuette had 26% in 69.

District 70 was 77% Whitmer.

And 23% Schuette.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's move to Dillard, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay Dillard was 74%, Johnson was 26% in District 69.

District 70 is 75% Dillard and 25% Johnson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Excuse me thank you.

Let's go down to the Detroit districts, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Szetela, did you say earlier that there were no changes to the Detroit area districts in your map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I didn't change anything in Detroit.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, so the -- did you change in west in the Grand Rapids District?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, the Grand Rapids I did change.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay so let's take a look at that, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So the red lines are the boundaries of the Hickory plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The difference is 80 and 82 were fairly significantly changed.

83 and 84 and 81.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: How about can we look at the election results for 80 and 83, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 79 here.

We can go back.

Want to look at the overview or the election data?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: The election data for I think it is 80 and 83.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 80 and 83.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 80, District 80 voted 57% for Biden in 20.

And 43% for Trump in 20.

Obama, they voted 49.27 while voting 50.-- 51% for Romney in District 80.

District 83 voted 46% for Biden, 54% for Trump in 20.

While Obama had 38.5% to run Romney's 61.5%.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay let's go to the next gubernatorial, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: In the Governor's race of 2018, District 80 voted 55% for Whitmer.

45% for Schuette.

And District 83 voted 44% Whitmer and 55% Schuette.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And let's go to Dillard, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Dillard, yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 80 was I'm sorry, I'm losing my place 37% for Dillard.

And 63% for Johnson.

While 83 was 27.5% Dillard and 72% Johnson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay one other thing if we can go back and there are a couple things, I'd like to look at for 82, please.

We won't need to look, yeah, we won't need to look at as many.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want to look at what now I'm sorry.

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.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Go back a couple of elections for 82 let's look at Biden and Trump, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, so 82 was 76% Biden and 23, 24% Trump in 20. While voting 70% Obama and 30% Romney.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay and I'm sorry and James and Peters, please, next.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So, yeah, District 82 was 72% for Peters while voting 27% for James in 20.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Can we go back to the demographics, please for the election? So for 80 and 82.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 80 and 82.

So 80 was 61% non-Hispanic white.

No this is 80.

80 is 61% non-Hispanic white.

14% non-Hispanic Black.

82 is 47% non-Hispanic white and 26% non-Hispanic Black.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, thank you.

And okay, so the Detroit districts have not been changed.

I'm going to stay in Flint for a moment the population deviation is within Supreme Court preference.

The West Michigan districts do show some opportunity to elect.

These are not majority minority VAP districts as you know Dr. Handley's analysis because of the population and configuration of the precincts could not be as definitive as she was in the Detroit area.

Going back to the Flint District I do have a concern about the District being split because the BVAP number as I recall in the two districts is now under 40%.

That is under the threshold.

I shouldn't say threshold.

That is under the recommendation Dr. Handley had included in her September analysis and in her report.

So that would be a reservation that I have on this map concerning primarily the two districts in Flint.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Adelson.

I'm sorry, you need your list, don't you?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we have the final questions are to Commissioner Szetela.

Districts are your districts of equal population of the U.S. Constitution.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do your districts are they geographically contiguous.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are your districts do they reflect the state's diverse population and community of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Disproportionate advantage to my political party?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Favor or disfavor elected official or incumbent.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Township City and County boundaries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are your districts reasonably compact.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

All right so we covered all of the four plans we have for the house.

At this point we can I would entertain a motion for Commissioners to state their top two favored published plans for the District type under consideration.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none all in favor of the motion to have each Commissioner state their top two favored published plans for the House Districts raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners Lange and Wagner can you indicate your vote audibly please.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Nay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner? Can you restate that?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So the motion is adopted at this point we will follow the same process as before having each Commissioner state their second and first most preferred State House plan.

Starting with Commissioner Witjes and going around the table.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Hickory, Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: First of all I'd say I don't like any of the house maps but because of all the comments that I read, listened to I will choose Hickory and then I will choose Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would say Hickory and Szetela.

Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I agree with Commissioner Weiss.

I'm feeling a little deflated about our choices but with all of that said Hickory would be my first choice and all this sucks and Magnolia would be my second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Hickory and Magnolia.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Again none of them but because I have to pick Magnolia and Pine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Magnolia and Pine as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right at this point now we sort of have an idea where people are feeling we can go back and discuss one by one any comments, questions, feedback on Hickory Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Based on the overwhelming support I move that we take the vote for the house map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn to proceed with the vote on the State House map. Commissioner Clark did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I think that we should follow the process and be consistent.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So I would like to table the motion and go through the rest of the process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry? I was going to say we can just vote against the motion we have a motion and a second at this point.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will just withdraw it then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any comments or questions about Hickory? Any comments or questions about Magnolia? Dustin.

Any comments or questions about Pine? All right any comments or questions about Szetela? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I want to talk about the Szetela map.

We had a lengthy conversation about Midland and Midland County at one point in time and we came to the agreement that on a Senate and Congressional maps Midland the City of Midland would be split from Midland County and on the house maps on all the house maps Midland City would be with Midland County.

And this map does not reflect that, so I guess my request is that you withdraw it from consideration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why would I withdraw? That is my constitutional right to submit a map and why would I withdraw it?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's your obligation to follow through on your commitments.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, it's not.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well I disagree with that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not withdrawing my map.

And like I said, my reasoning behind this map is because I knew going into the 45 day comment period that we had problems with the Hickory map.

And we have heard abundant public comment there are problems with the Hickory map and using it for consideration. And if you don't want to use it, I'm not going to cry and go home but wanted a more fair and partisan balance which I did which I feel is my constitutional obligation to do so.

If you don't like it that is fantastic and that is your opinion but I'm not going to withdraw it.

Moving on.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is fine.

I accept that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And I will before we move on to the vote can we bring up the chart, please? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want to make a comment on that same thing.

I agree.

You have the constitutional right.

But I also recall in a meeting where Doug wanted to make changes on one of the maps and you basically bullied him saying no, that was not the agreement and if you do that, I'm going to submit my map and then in turn you did it.

So I just want to point that out that, again, consistency.

I think Doug, I think that there was a communication amongst the Commissioners there and I do feel it was broke.

But I do agree with you also Commissioner Szetela.

You are absolutely right.

It is your constitutional right to submit maps just as any Commissioner's constitutional right.

But I can understand Doug's argument.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange.
Commissioner Kellom? .

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I spoken this when it came up so I don't know if this warrants lip service but it's ridiculous that we would be openly discussing this quote unquote communication when basically it was like a deal.

I said it then and I'm saying it again we should not as Commissioners be saying if we did this on this map, we are going to do that on this other map.

That is ridiculous because as it stands, we are not covered Detroit at all.

So if we are going by what is fair let's just cut that conversation.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I suggest we move on and just vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, please.

Okay, so at this point we have a motion to vote.

Is that correct? I'm totally lost on where we are.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did we actually there was discussion, I opened it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sorry I withdrew my motion so I make a motion now we vote for the State House plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made to vote on the State House maps, seconded by Commissioner Lett, original motion was by Commissioner Witjes for the record.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? All right, so to clarify we are taking a vote on whether we are going to vote.

This is not the vote.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hands and say nay.

Before we move to the next stage which is voting can we bring up the chart so we are being consistent? Sarah Reinhardt?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Do you see her, what are you eating up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Excuse me, I thought I was off.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now she is off.

All right Sarah Reinhardt can you bring that back up again? We lost it again for some reason.

At this point I would entertain do we need to do separate motion General Counsel help me here?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No Madam Chair I would do it consistently.

Yes, it would be a roll call vote where members of the Commission call out their vote for the plan with which they would like to vote on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Sarah Reinhardt can you run that process, please?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

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.

Commissioners, please indicate what plan you would like to vote for, for State Senate to adopt by stating the name of the plan? I apologize State House.

I'll restate, Commissioners, please state the name of the plan you would like to vote for to adopt for State House.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Dustin Witjes?

- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? .
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Magnolia.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Pine.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Hickory.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Please allow us one moment to tally the score.

The State House plan adopted by the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission is Hickory.

[Applause]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, guys.

I don't know what to do with myself now because I was expecting this to take us the next two days.

So congratulations everybody.

We have made it through that 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.

We didn't have people running out of the room crying or killing each other which I think is a vast improvement over some other Independent Commissions so congratulations to everyone.

Deed well done.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair apologies quickly I just wanted to show the score sheet for the votes and Hickory received 11 votes two R votes two D votes and five votes from nonaffiliated Commissioners.

Sorry four D votes and five nonaffiliated.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you we will move on to the next item on the agenda which is new business agenda item 6C dates for 2022 meetings and proposed are at the end of the agenda and proposed locations through March I have a motion to adopt for the 2022 meetings.

Motion made by commission 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.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: By a vote of I believe that was 12-11 that the ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

12-1 I'm sorry 12-11 it's getting late.

Next on our agenda is new business agenda item 6D extend Robert hath contract with paralegal through March 31, 2022, at no added cost without objection I will ask our General Counsel Julianne Pastula to cover this agenda item, please proceed Ms. Pastula.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair and congratulations to the Commission on this historic day and your history votes and the Robert half for the par logical a new PO needs to be issued according to procurement the previous contract was issued in, in the previous budget year.

So that is why it's being presented as a new PO.

It would just be an extension of time.

The paralegal rate is set at hourly for part time services so there is no way it could go over the amount that was originally scheduled for the contract, which was a maximum of 49, 999.99.

The paralegal has been assisting the Commission for since September now, the end of September.

And extending the contract to through 3-31 would match up with the expiration dates of the staff contracts as well.

And I'm available to answer any questions.

But again there are no funds being added to the contract.

This is just time only.

Bless you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions or comments, Commissioner Clark it looks like you have one.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So if we don't go to Court and we don't need a paralegal we can cancel the contract? It's got a cancellation clause?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly, any of the contracts that the Commission has entered into have the ability to cancel.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Move adoption of the amendment extension.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Resolution 2021-1206 Robert hath Government purchase order is that what you're moving to adopt.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm seconding it that we adopt resolution 2021-1206.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion to approve 2021-1206 Robert half Government for paralegal services extension of time only.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted.

Moving on to new business agenda item 6E remote attendance after December 31st.

Okay so as I'm sure General Counsel has advised you the ability to have remote attendance is no longer going to be valid under the Open Meetings Act after December 31, 2021.

So as of the end of this week you will no longer be able to remotely attend it's not authorized so we could make changes to allow remote attendance so I wanted to bring that up in case anyone wants to do that especially as we are moving into the winter. I know Steve you are coming from often far away and Cynthia you are coming from Battle Creek which has potential issues.

It's something to consider and don't have to do it but wanted to throw it out there in case we wanted to change the policy Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I would just like clarification.

Is that just our policy? I thought we were told at the very beginning of this that we had to comply with the Open Meetings Act and that is a requirement of that.

So clarification, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

Yes, to date the Commission has been, bless you as well Ms. Reinhardt, adhering to those provisions.

But as it's been established that the Commission is setting its own rules and so this would be an appropriate change should the Commission wish to adopt it.

I sent proposed language to the Chairperson as she requested it.

And I don't know if that language, if you had a chance to review it yet.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have not.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And so certainly to circulate the proposed language any changes to the rules would need at least a three day in advance notification for that language.

And what would be changed.

But certainly if the Commission made this amendment corresponding edits would also need to be made to your remote attendance policy.

The open meeting act goes after December 31st only remote attendance for purposes of active military duty, so even after 12-31 remote attendance for medical prior medical conditions or existing medical conditions would not apply.

So it would be hopefully that is responsive Commissioner Orton.

It is under the Commission's prerogative to make those changes should it choose.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move that we amend our policy to allow for remote attendance after December 31st pursuant to the suggested language which will be posted appropriately for three days.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks like Commissioner Curry was seconding.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry were you seconding? Yes, okay we have a motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Curry to allow remote attendance after December 31, 2021, is there any discussion or debate on the motion.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much and just to clarify again under the rule us the proposed language needs to be posted and circulated.

So I will distribute that language, the draft language to the full Commission, we will post it on the website and as in the past it will have the red lined so the Commission can see the proposed changes and then take that action at the appropriate time, the next time it convenes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay any discussion or debate, Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, we have several Commissioners with health concerns and I think we should try to make accommodations for them.

And if meeting virtually helps that, that I think we should do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is my question will January 13th allow those Commissioners to meet virtually or do we have to take the action on January 13 so we will all need to be present on January 13? I think that is my only question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That's an excellent question Commissioner Rothhorn. Again, the prior notice requirement hasn't been satisfied to take that action today. However, we will have everything posted and the Commission can act on that at the next meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So just so I understand that for the next meeting on January 13th when we make changes everybody has to basically be in person, there is no remote attendance? Unless they are in the military.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Or don't show up.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If you don't get a quorum then we can't vote on it any way so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, okay, all right, let's go ahead and vote on that motion to amend our policies to allow remote attendance after December 31, 2021, all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I thought we can't vote on that today until January 13.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And thank you Madam Chair that was my clarifying statement so what I will do based on the Commission saying this is something that the Commission is desirous I will post the language so the prior notice is satisfied. So yes, Commissioner Eid you are correct technically you can't take the motion to amend it today based on the language to amend the rules. However, what you're doing is directing General Counsel to prepare the language as a body.

Again, the only reason I prepared the language and sent it along to Madam Chair is that, that was an individual request.

And so that is why that was done.

But what I'm hearing today by the motion that is still pending is that the full Commission is interested in proceeding in that manner and to prepare and circulate that language for the full Commission to weigh in on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Deny.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we need to clarify anything for the record or are we good? With the vote that we just had, do we need to clarify anything with that vote?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you all right next on the agenda are the minutes for approval from the December 16 meeting held in Detroit and have been provided to the Commission prior to meeting and posted on the website.

Are there any edits to the meeting minutes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Move to adopt.

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: Motion by Commissioner Witjes to adopt the meeting minutes seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn any debate or discussion on the motion? All in favor of adopting the meeting minutes from the meeting held on December 16, 2021, in Detroit please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

All right the ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted.

At this point we will move on to staff reports and without objection I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to provide her report.

Please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I will be short and sweet.

Congratulations and thank you.

You worked really hard and I can't tell you how impressed I am with this body.

That you have adopted maps and you worked so hard to get to this point.

So thank you, thank you for working together so well and doing a great job on behalf of the State of Michigan.

And its residents.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Executive Director.

Without objection I'll ask General Counsel Pastula to provide her report.

Please proceed General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

And again just to echo the Executive Director Hammersmith's comments congratulations on this historic day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Without objection we will ask communications and Outreach Director Edward Woods the third to provide his report.

Please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Congratulations to each and every one of you.

You have proven the nay-sayers wrong and knocked off the serial insurrectionists and done it in great style and listening to so many different people.

I can't recall any public hearing process where that included remote as well as in person attendance and the hours that this Commission has spent listening to people all across the state is a yeoman's efforts no one can say the prior process was more engaging than this one.

Kudos to each and every one of you happy new year to each and every one of you and look forward to seeing you January 13.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Woods without objection we are going to ask Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State if she has a report.

Please proceed Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioners.

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.

On behalf of the Michigan Department of State thank you for all your hard work and the many hours that you've put into creating these maps and sincerest congratulations to each and every one of you and I'll echo what your communications director said and have a great new year.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt.

Corresponds received in advance of our meeting today was provided with written public comments to the Commissioners in meeting materials are there any thing that Commissioners would like to put on the next agenda.

I'm hearing silence.

Any announcements, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm feeling a little anticlimactic today.

You know we did it and it really is a history defining day.

We've adopted fair maps that are fair to both parties and fair to the people of Michigan.

And you know, that's a big deal.

I think because of the work that we've done processes like this shows that it can work.

On a personal note I just wanted to thank everyone around this table and the Commissioners attending virtually and the staff attending virtually.

I really have learned from each and every one of you around this table and I think I have become a better person throughout this process.

And I will take those lessons with me going forward.

So just want to say thanks to all of you for that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Eid.

As the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission, oh, sorry Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yesterday was Cynthia's birthday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Happy birthday.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Happy birthday Cynthia.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For your birthday you get new redistricting plans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As the items Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For the final time this year I move to adjourn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: May I have a second? Seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the meeting is adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Congratulations, everybody.