

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

01/27/22 10:00 am Meeting

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good morning, everyone, check out this cool new feature on Zoom.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Look at that. Sarah is Juanita logged in all right?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I don't see her so I will resend her the link.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sarah is going to send you the link now, talk to you soon, good-bye.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks, Sarah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: You bet, I'm going to start the live stream and anything said going forward will be seen by members of the public.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Good morning, everyone.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning, Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Haircut MC

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No, just pulled back in a ponytail.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Nice.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: This is Janice and can you hear me. I don't know why my video is not on. Can somebody help me?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: On your computer Janice is there a little switch right by the camera? For example on my computer, right by the camera at the top of the laptop there is a switch that if you flick it, it covers the camera and if you flick it back the other way it uncovers the camera. And I have eight Commissioners online right now. We have a quorum at this point

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, we ready to go, Sarah?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Ready when you are.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:00 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.

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.

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. We 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:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

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

Brittini Kellom?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present; attending remotely from Lee County, Florida.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present, attending from Lansing, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present; attending remotely from Highland, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present; attending remotely from Saginaw Township,

Saginaw Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present; attending remotely from Howell, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 10 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 Lett. Seconded by Commissioner Witjes. Is there discussion or debate on the motion?

All right, hearing none, let's go.

The agenda be adopted. Did you have a question MC? You are on mute?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I just saw Commissioner Eid's hand up so that was all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid, did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes. I'd like to add a discussion about the Chair position to new business at the bottom. So it would be new business.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Eid and then seconded by Commissioner Lange, was that you? Discussion of Chair position to 6F; is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: New business item so we have a motion and a second, a motion by Commissioner Eid and seconded by Commissioner Lange to addition of Chair position to new business agenda item 6F. Any discussion or debate on the motion? To amend?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It looks like Commissioner Vallette has a hand.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I see Commissioner Vallette. Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I want to make sure you can hear me and I don't know why my video is not working so can you hear me.

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

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay, thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For the public record, it appears Commissioner Kellom has joined us. Commissioner Kellom, could you please state where you are remotely attending from for the record?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan and good morning, everyone.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning. Okay, so we have a motion to amend the meeting agenda to add item 6F discussion of Chair position.

Is there any discussion or debate on that motion to amend? All right, seeing none we will go ahead and vote on the motion to amend.

all in favor raise your hand and
say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sarah, can you help me with the count on this? Can everybody please raise your hand back up so we can...opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, by a vote of three to...I'm sorry, other way around vote of seven to three the amendment carries.

All right, moving back to our initial motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes for the motion, is there any debate or discussion on that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe it was 8 to 3 on the previous vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry, I forgot we had one more. Thank you for that correction, Ms. Reinhardt.

Any discussion or debate on the meeting agenda as amended? All right. Hearing none, let's go ahead and vote on adoption of the meeting agenda all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed raise your hand and say nay. All right, looks like by a vote of 11 to 0 the meeting agenda is adopted.

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.

The Commission, I will call on your name and the staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the zoom app to unmute and speak. If you on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute.

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

If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail at redistricting@michigan.gov and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later hearing or meeting.

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

First in line to provide public comment is Mr. James Galant.

>> James Galant, Marquette, these are my opinions. I would as the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission to consider the controversy between us, that I

brought to you about the rules of procedure and the Commission of legislative apportionment as a reiteration of this Commission. And that the prop two, the house fiscal agency reports, can you put this on the agenda and actually review this stuff? And then decide whether or not you believe that this is a reiteration? Which then the rules of procedure, the prior rules of procedure that were approved under the Constitution back in 1963, they apply here. And this is the controversy between us.

So and the chairs and Vice Chairs you are now the bullies with the gavel. You see, where there is no law, there is the least amount of liberty. Everyone is doing whatever they want, every next Chair does what they want and they just kind of make it up. This is what is wrong in America now. We need to get back on the same Page, Roberts Rules of Order, Page 366, Line 8, okay.

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

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Good morning MICRC Commissioner, staff and soon to be departing staff, wow, yeah. I welcome the amended agenda to discuss a new Chair. Wow, I don't think that came a moment too soon. But I saw on your agenda you got a piece on there, if you are going to talk about the feature film, I think that is just great. But I'm more interested in the template that someone is going to bring up to your template for dissenting reports, should any of you be interesting in writing a dissenting report on the maps you approved. And I'm interested to see how that shakes out. You know, a template it's kind of like I don't know, it kind of harkens back to when you were voting and straw polling on the maps themselves. And we had the MDOS staff kind of influencing your votes saying you have to vote, you have to rank a map. You know, so I'm interested to see how it shakes out. And I don't think you should let your staff strong arm you into doing any certain thing or doing a certain a certain way. I do think the staff has been strong arming.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Was that the end of his time, Ms. Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: It was.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission, Mr. Skinnell. Next in line is Susan Smith. And before we get into Susan Smith, Commissioner Curry has joined the meeting. Commissioner Curry, could you indicate where you are attending the meeting remotely from?

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

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Chair, is it okay if Susan Smith goes?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, Susan, we are ready to proceed.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Susan Smith, Vice President, League of Women Voters of Michigan. The League submits the following summary of lessons learned based on the League's observations of the MICRC meetings in September 2020.

Commissioner job requirements should be clearly stated in the recruitment process and materials. Under estimation of amount of time required led to excessive absences and a perceived need to significantly increase Commissioner salaries. Amount of money budgeted for communication and outreach should be increased to allow for hiring additional staff and educating the public on the constitutional criteria.

MICRC should define communities of interest beyond what is in the Constitution. MICRC should adopt a more realistic timeline for drawing District maps. A more detailed statement will be submitted in the portal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission, Ms. Smith. Next in line is Mark Payne.

>> All right. Good morning, Commissioners. So, first, I want to thank you for all your work in the State of Michigan. My name is Mark Payne. I'm the election assistant manager for Michigan the League of Conservation of Voters. Because I have only 60 seconds, I will be submitting more detailed written comments on the public portal. Here I want to highlight the basic functions for signing up for meetings to speak such as this one to be improved. It will help interested members of the public to have a link posted at least three days before the meeting not the day. The link to sign up should be clear, inviting and easy to find as well, similar to the final maps that I want to counter on visiting the home Page of MICRC. The links posted earlier to help gain more engagement. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission, Mr. Payne. Next in line is Jay Arnold.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much. 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 Commissioners also review the public comment portal on www.Michigan.gov/MICRC on a regular basis. We appreciate everyone who provides public comment in whatever way you choose. And invite you to keep sharing your thoughts especially if you would like to share the ways the MICRC processes or procedures have been good or could have been more effective.

Next on our agenda is unfinished business 5. We do not have any unfinished business on the agenda, so without objection we can move on to new business.

Fist item on the agenda is Agenda Item 6A, vendor for lessons learned video and report. Without objection, I will ask our communications and Outreach Director, Edward Woods, III, to provide information about this agenda item.

Hearing no objection, please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela and members of the Commission. As we discussed a couple weeks ago with lessons learned and video, we went out for bid and received one bid so we worked with our contractor Good Marketing to see if they can provide that same type of service for the 49,999.99. They came back and submitted their proposal that stated that they could do it, and so their recommendation is for approval.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions or discussion points? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yep, I just want to say on my behalf, since I was not here the last meeting, that I still stand by what I had previously said. And I object to this wholeheartedly. And I just want that to be known for the public record. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lange.

Any other comments or discussion?

Commissioner Lett, I see you have a hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we accept the bid.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion by Commissioner Lett to accept the bid, which is Resolution 20220104. Do we have a second?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Second by Commissioner Kellom. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? All right, hearing none all in favor?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has her hand up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton, I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Edward, can you just kind of walk us through what you envision that being?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: The lessons learned video report, just to highlight, sure. Thank you so much, Commissioner Orton, for the opportunity. Once again it will be talking about the lessons learned from the Commission with regards to the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission process. How it started up, so the background would talk about how the proposal got started, how the Commissioners were selected. But the bulk of the report will focus on the work of the Commission since inception in September 2020 to the vote on December 28, 2021.

There will be nothing discussed with regards to pending lawsuits whatsoever. As a part of that, really speaking to the process, that the Commission did the documents, informed how it did its work. And we also would like to have suggestions, Commissioner Orton, for improvement from the public. You've heard some of those today. We are asking for suggestions for improvement and that can be considered for the future Commission or for those that would like to replicate the Michigan model.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments or questions? All right. Let's go ahead and vote. All in favor of adopting the resolution please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Rothhorn and Commissioner Vallette, can you also audibly indicate your vote?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Aye, this is Janice.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm going to say aye as Rothhorn. It looks like my connection is unstable, so I turned off my video.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, the resolution is adopted.

Moving on to Agenda Item 6B, post campaign survey. Without objection, I will ask our communication and Outreach Director Edward Woods, III, to provide information about this agenda item. Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Madam Chair. If you remember at the beginning of the Commission, we did a survey with the Glengarrif's Group for a presurvey. This is coming back to do a post survey. There is no addition to the money. This is already within the budget. We reworked the Good Marketing contract. They did not use their social media money as relates to promoting the second round of public hearings. And so the \$22,000 would come through the Good Marketing contract that the Commission has already approved as a post survey to do a compare and contrast with regards to the MICRC.

If there is any questions, I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I understand you say it's no additional money, but technically it is. You're taking from one budget money that wasn't spent to put it towards another that I don't see helps in any way, shape or form. And we are looking at a deficit on our budget. I'm sorry, I keep harping on this; but I'm just a fiscally conservative person. And when we are looking at taxpayer money, I feel it's my responsibility, and others may have different opinions, but in my opinion it's my responsibility to make sure that that money is spent well like the first survey that went out told us what we already knew. Nobody knew about us. There was no shocking moment in my opinion for that. So spending another \$22,000, I just can't justify it personally. And it's no offense against you whatsoever. I just cannot justify doing that. And I just wanted my opinion heard. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lange. Commissioner Rothhorn, then Commissioner Witjes, then Commissioner Lett.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm going to turn off my video just in case my unstable connection interrupts it again. I wanted to acknowledge it does feel like the responsible thing to do because we have already started with an I guess a base line survey because we do...and I think this is sort of documenting, right? It's not just our sort of opinions. We have social science. So it feels like the responsible thing to sort of finish this process with regard to a documentation of, right, what has shifted, how has our communications strategy worked. And with whom, right? There is 10 million people in the State of Michigan. And to sort of get a scientific sample and understand what it is that we did shift or did not shift and where we shifted feels really responsible. And like it will help not only with our lessons learned but also give the next Commission, Michiganders an understanding of what it is we did do and did not do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, MC. Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I'm going to have to agree with Commissioner Lange here. But I'm going to also add that I don't really see the point of asking a question about something that happened in the past and be like, hey, did you know that this happened? Like if we send a post awareness survey saying, hey, did you know this was going on and everyone says, no, it's not going to change anything. So it's just telling people to say, hey, have you heard about the Commission. And it's not going to really affect very much going forward in my opinion, so...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett? And then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we adopt the post Commission survey as presented by Edward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid, did you have -- I see MC is seconding that. So we have a motion by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Rothorn to approve Resolution 2022105 post campaign survey addendum for Good Marketing contract.

Commissioner Eid, it looks like you have a comment and then Commissioner Kellom. And, MC, did you have another comment or were you raising your hand to show the second? Okay, thank you. So Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just had a quick question for Communications Director Woods. Do you know if this is going to be a survey of the people already surveyed during the presurvey, the first go around? Or is this going to be a new random sample of citizens?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: My understanding it would be the presurvey from the first go around because we want to measure growth. And, you know, identify ways for improvement, that is my understanding.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It was just a quick, not an answer but a response to Commissioner Witjes' statement. I think the benefit, whether it makes anyone's mind

either way, is that they are trying to, like Mr. Woods said, they are trying to measure how to move forward in terms of better reaching audiences. So in my world pre and post surveys, I'm sure Commissioner Eid sees this all the time, so they are very necessary and do have a benefit. But it depends on the mindset of this Commission. So that was my only addition to that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Kellom. Any additional comments?

All right, so it has been moved and seconded by...moved by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn that we adopt Resolution 20220105 post campaign survey addendum to Good Marketing contract. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And, Janice, if you could verbally indicate what your vote is?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Aye. Sarah, keep me honest on this, it looks like the ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted; is that correct?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Move on to Agenda Item 6C report template for dissenting reports. Without objection, I will ask Communication Director Edward Woods to address this item. Please proceed, Mr. Edward.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: This is a suggested template and not a required template for the Commission to consider as it relates to those who have dissenting reports. By all means, each and every Commissioner is able to do and respond how they feel is appropriate. But this is it. I've been working with Sue Hammersmith and with Good Marketing with regards to this report and how this needs to be done as required by the Constitution.

But once again, this is a suggested template as stated on the document so that we can get that information within a month, so that the report could be done sometime in March. Obviously, the Commission would see the draft and would actually approve the report. But there was, at the last meeting, we wanted to give Commissioners who had dissenting reports enough time to do so. And so this was an attempt to provide a template.

Like I said, once again, it suggested it does not have to be followed. But also to provide a timeline for those dissenting reports to come to the Commission so the report can be completed.

And so the suggested timeline for that would be Friday, February 25th. .

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Rhonda, and then Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I've got an ear infection, so I think I may have misheard you. So I just want clarification. Did you just say that the Commission has to approve the dissenting report? Or did I mishear that?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No. I'm saying the draft, we have a draft report. The Commission does not approve the dissenting report.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: The dissenting report is part of the draft. The Commission needs to approve the draft, not the dissenting report. The dissenting report has to be included as part of the draft. But those who dissent do not need approval from the Commission whatsoever with regards to the report or changing the contents of the report or anything along those lines.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you. I did miss under hear, that is why I asked or misheard, that is why I asked for clarification. And I just want to say on my end I in the past I had already been in contact with General Counsel on this matter. I feel that she was the best one to give guidance towards the Constitution. And she provided me with a...kind of an outline that I could use if I chose. And that's what I will be using. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And I also may have misheard. But I believe you stated that anyone could do it. Isn't it true that the only individuals that could provide dissenting reports are the ones that voted no on the maps that were adopted?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Absolutely. Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move that the date that Edward said for submission, was it February 23rd, Edward?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Friday, February 25th.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay, I move February 25th be the date set for submission of dissenting reports so they can be included in the draft.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have a motion by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Witjes to establish February 25th, which is a Friday, as the deadline for individual Commissioners to submit dissenting reports.

Commissioner Orton?

Did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes. So those dissenting reports need to be received by that date in order to be in the final report that we will have to approve. When does that have to be done? When does the final report have to be?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We are not under a timeline with regard to the final report, Commissioner Orton. We were just trying to get it done by the end of March.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay. So there is a report that has to be done by 30 days after our vote.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is posted on the website. Our General Counsel took the lead on that, and it was posted yesterday on the website.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, so everything that needs to be in there is in there. Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes, I saw your hand go up and come down, you good? Commissioner Wagner and Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Why are we putting a timeline on the dissenting report if we are not getting the draft report ready until March?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No. The draft -- Commissioner Wagner, the draft report is being worked upon now in terms of starting that with as required in the Constitution. But they also need to format the dissenting report based on how that comes in. And, once again, they do not...the Commission is not approving that. But we have to give our graphic designer time to format it and provide a draft of the draft report to the tenth. And then you can take a look at the drafts, see if there is any changes, or what have you. And then the final report would be given to the Commission on the 24th at its next meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, Legal Counsel Pastula, I have a question. In the Constitution it says that dissenting reports can be submitted with the final report, correct? With it. So in your legal opinion, am I out of line thinking that based off from the reading of the Constitution that the dissenting report is being -- can be submitted with the final report that then they should be done at the time that the dissenting report or, pardon me, that the final report is done based off from the reading of the Constitution. Because if I'm doing something in my own format, I don't see where it needs to be reformat because a dissenting report is separate from the final report. Am I making sense?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you. Through the Chair to Commissioner Lange, and good morning to the Commission. So that the language of the Constitution in Subsection 16A, submitting a dissenting report is permissive for anyone who voted against the adopted plans. But it is required that it shall be issued with the Commission's report.

So what I'm hearing from Communications Director Woods is that it's kind of an organizational or a graphic design or some type of...and I certainly don't want to speak for Mr. Woods. He can do that himself. But, no, there is no timeframe on it. So that would be something that the Commission would be electing to do on its own accord, but just that the dissenting reports are to be included.

So, again, and I will defer to either the Executive Director or the Communications Director that are facilitating that process.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, then with that answer can I just make one comment? I don't think that it's fair for the Commission members who are not doing dissenting reports to dictate when those who are doing them have to have them in as long as they are in prior to the submission of the final report. That's our constitutional right. And I -- my opinion. That's all I'm going to say.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I hear the language, but I think it's almost nitpicky. The width just means that the dissenting report needs to be inside the final report. Looking at the date, you have a month maybe, less than a month to do a couple sentences about why you're choosing not to do the map, in whatever format that is. I think that is plenty enough time. That is all I have to say about it. I don't think it's anything to do with the Constitution. This keeps coming up, and not to defend the Commission, but we are doing the job that we are supposed to. And if you have an issue with it, that's fine. But to say that we are choosing something else or trying to ostracize, I'm in favor of that and the deadline and it should be abided by that. And thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett and Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Question. Edward, do you have any idea of what the drop dead date would be for dissenting report to be into whoever is putting this together to be included?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Sure. What they were trying to was to have a checks and balances. So by working on the report and then getting the dissenting report two weeks before they were going to put it all in one document. Making sure nothing was excluded or if something needs to be changed, it's in the report. Verification that the dissenting report as provided was listed correctly in the document. And then if there is any changes the Commission would note that on the 10th or the person who provided the dissenting report would note that on the 10th then provide a final copy to the Commission on the 24th. So that was the purpose behind it. It's more of a checks and balances to ensure what transfer happened correctly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: How much time would you like? If you don't want February 27th, I don't see a reason why we can't extend it to be later.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you, Commissioner Eid. I just would like to say that my dissenting report is not going to be two sentences. It's going to be very in depth with my own attachments to my dissenting report. It's not something that I'm taking lightly in doing. So I would appreciate the absolute most time possible, and I would have it in correlation with the final report as it is stated. It's not something I'm taking lightly. And it's not something that I'm just pulling out of thin air and on a whim.

In discussions about this, this is my chance also to explain why I dissented or voted against maps. And I think it's important that I am able to tell that and give examples of why, and that is my plan. So I plan on it being very detailed and with a lot of going back through public comments and things of that nature, and that takes time.

As you know, we received thousands of public comments. So I would like as much time as possible. But, yes, still obviously meet the constitutional deadline.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: So, Commissioner Eid, are you through the Chair, are you suggesting Monday, February 28th?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I'm not suggesting that. And I understand, Commissioner Lange, if I were doing a dissenting report, it would also be detailed. So I totally get that. But is there like a date you can give us so we can have something today? You know, do you know like approximately how much time you need to put that together so we can put some sort of timeline down on this?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: When is the final report due?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: The timeline we are working on with the contractor was provided by March 24th to the Commission. And so that was a suggested date that we talked about. But, obviously, I can go back to the contractor with another date, Commissioner Lange. And so you...if you would like to suggest Thursday, March 3rd, then I can just try to make sure they, you know, depending how many pages and document, you know, to make sure that it's in the format for the report. And we want to make sure we miss nothing that you provided, the attachments, the wording, everything. I mean, we want to verify that so when you see it on the 10th it's exactly what you submitted and there are no errors.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So that gives five extra days.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Actually six.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, I would like to know what Commissioner Wagner's opinion is on that. She also has the opportunity to view a dissent, and this is not all about me. I would like to hear her opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: My question is to Director Woods. Did you not say two weeks, but they needed two weeks to correlate the reports together and put them altogether? And with that date being March 24th, wouldn't it be better if you have a March 10th or a March 9th date, which would be two weeks from the 24th of March for final?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: On March 10th they are providing the draft report for the Commission to consider, included in the draft report are anyone who did not vote for a particular map who would like to submit a dissenting report. And so it's going to be an all in one, inclusive document. We want to -- so I wanted...

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: However, the Commission has nothing to say about our dissenting reports, whether or not they are included. So I don't see why they have to be included in the draft report as long as we get them to whoever is coordinating everything by the last date. So if they need 24 days or two weeks to correlate all the reports and put them together, why not give us until the 9th of March, which would put us two weeks from the 24th?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Well, there needs to be a checks and balances is what we were trying to do, Commissioner Wagner, to make sure that what was submitted by you did not get lost in the format, the graphs did not get changed in the format. We wanted to make sure that there was a checks and balances. So essentially what you see on the 10th should have very little changes, if any changes at all, if it was done correctly.

Yes, you are absolutely correct. There is no vote by the Commission on your dissenting report. The concern is verifying that what you provided was actually in the report and it's formatted correctly because it's one inclusive report. So it is not -- it has nothing to do with the Commission approving. It's making sure the document adequately reflect those who dissent it and the contents that are in there reflect what the Commission feels should or is appropriate.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Okay, I still don't see the need to have it in before the 9th of March.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Well, the formatting takes time. I'm not sure how many pages. I don't know how many people are going to dissent. I mean, anyone that dissented on any map has an opportunity to provide dissenting report. It's not whether or not people objected to three maps. Those who dissented on the Congressional map, those who dissented on the State Senate maps, those who dissented on the State House maps. I mean, I don't know how many reports we are going to get; but I have no idea how many pages those reports, that that will entail. And we have to give the contractor time to put it in the format, make sure, do a checks and balances to make sure nothing is missing. And then we also have to get the sign off of the person that provided the dissenting report to ensure that it's accurate. And so the idea was to provide a draft on the 10th and then vote it on the 24th so there was enough time for everyone to weigh in the appropriate spot of the report. So that's why I was suggesting if we want to move those who want to dissent to March 3rd, you know, I will go back to the contractor and see how we can make that work.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I see. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, I'm seeing more hands, so we have Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Wagner just spoke and I don't know if she had something else to say.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No. Okay, all right, so just Commissioner Kellom then.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I just want us to vote on a date honestly. I'm going to turn in a report as well. I think it's rude and inconsiderate to publishing deadlines and the structure of the report that the Commission has to turn in to turn this discussion into wanting to wait longer. We voted for those maps a long time ago. Folks knew how they were going to vote. You've had time to think about whether it's detailed, two sentences or a period as to the report. And I think we need to be respectful to Edward Woods III, our Communications and Outreach Director and the time he takes to put these things together.

Again, I'm growing tired of the continued discussion about guidelines, regarding things people were already frustrated with. It feels very inconsiderate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, guys. I think we are ready to vote on this. So, Steve, I'm sorry. Did you get a second on your initial motion for the February 25th deadline? I did not write it down. I'm not sure. General Counsel, was there a second?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: There was, Madam Chair. It was Commissioner Witjes was the second on the motion, which was to set February 25th as the date for individual Commissioners to submit their dissenting reports was the original motion language.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, thank you, General Counsel. So we have a motion and a second to set February 25th as the deadline for dissenting opinions. Commissioner Eid, did you have another comment at this point?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes. I would like to propose a friendly amendment to the motion to change it from February 27th to what was the March date you were saying, Edward? March 9.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: March 3.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: March 3.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: March 3rd.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would consider that a friendly amendment and accept it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we now have a motion that the date be March 3rd for deadline for dissenting reports to be submitted.

Commissioner Witjes, since you seconded that, are you okay? Wanted to make sure you are good with that too.

All in favor of that motion raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

And, Janice, I saw you visually indicate with a raised hand and heard you say aye.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so the motion is adopted. Let's see.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't know if I need to say something. I did not raise my hand because my screen was frozen, so I missed the vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are you an aye or a nay?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Aye. I'm going to turn off my video in case that helps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, thank you. All right, anything else? Any further discussion on this Mr. Woods? Or can we move on to the next agenda item? Good.

We will continue with New Business Agenda Item 6D, budget report for first quarter of the fiscal year. Without objection, I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to present a budget report.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Madam Chair, we had a hand raised.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I see that. Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Did we approve the draft as well?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is not up for approval because the -- it's just a suggestion. It's not something that Commissioners have to follow.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, without objection, please proceed, Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Good morning, Commissioners. I hope you are doing well today. Provided for you today was an update on the budget through the first quarter of our fiscal year, which ended on December 31st. You will note that we did receive a tiny bit of income through a FOIA deposit of \$99.70, which increased our budget ever so slightly.

As far as expenses, the salaries are at 23% of budget. You may note that travel costs seem high. Included in those travel costs are some hotel rooms from consultants. In order for them to get the state rate on their billings, they were billed through the MICRC, and the Legislative Services Bureau was unable to divide those bills between the consultants and the Commission. So I have gone through all of them. I'm waiting on a couple yet, invoices. And there is approximately \$11,000, then there will be an accounting transfer as an expense to the EDS Commissioners or Federal Compliance or consultants or Federal Compliance.

So that will reduce the travel costs. And, of course, with meeting remotely, that also will reduce our travel costs, certainly, in this quarter.

Facilities AV and security also is at about 64% of our budget. That is because of the public hearings that took place and the many meetings that were held between October 1st and December 31st of last year.

Our consultants are a little slow. We've not received any billings from EDS in this fiscal year yet. Although I've asked a few times. I believe they are working on it. Litigation counsel and the local counsel are both paid through November. They have not yet submitted the December bills. Our VRA legal counsel did submit a December bill that was paid in January. And we only have received one of the paralegal bills and

that was through November 17th for amount of \$2200. However, that was paid in the current quarter, so that line item is showing low.

The translation, we did receive the invoice for the Braille books of \$20,737.50. Again, that was paid in January and will show on the next quarterly report.

So at this point we have \$2,175,000 remaining...of funds remaining. That number, when I gave you the percent of budget, still reflects the budget, which has been provided, which indicates if all the legal expenses are indeed incurred in this fiscal year, that our budget would be a negative \$827,000.

So I would entertain any questions you might have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a hypothetical question, I guess. And it's probably going to be really, really unpopular. But since we are not mapping and we are not covering the country and/or the state or what have you, is it possible to revert back to the 25% Commissioner salaries that was initially stated in the Constitution rather than the increased cost? To save the Commission some money? I'm sorry, if that is an unpopular. That is a hypothetical. And I just wanted to know if legally or if it would be more of a pain to do something like that. Or if it's something that any of the Commissioners would even consider.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I believe the Commission sets its own salaries. That is what you did initially. You can choose to change your salaries. You also have...you will have two remaining staff for the month of March. And those contracts then will end at end of March. So those can also be considered. Again, this is the Commission's budget. I'm simply reporting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: MC?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we approved a QuickBooks expense. So I'm just thinking about like is there a way to like we are getting the spreadsheets? But I am just wondering how is that going? And we will get sort of QuickBooks updates? How is the process for our budgeting and expense? And, right, and I know it's a process because we have the Fiscal Budget Legislative Bureau, or whatever it is. So I'm just wondering, and there were categories. So can you help us understand like how this budget, how the expense is and we are tracking them and whether QuickBooks is being used and useful?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Sure. What happened is the QuickBooks numbers. And we used the same object fields that were provided. There in the second column of the budget. There is object number. So every time that I submit a bill, I include the object number where that expense goes.

Unfortunately, we had about 20 in the first quarter, expenditures, that didn't match the object. So it was like looking for needles in Haystacks.

Sarah finally, I think, gave up on trying to figure it out. And I spent a couple of days this week on it. And I got it figured out. And I know how to make the corrections and

have sent that to the LSB to do. But the person we worked with there is off for a couple weeks, also. So it may take some time to get that done.

We can get a QuickBooks report. Also, you need to know that, and that was going to be in my report, but for your information, Sarah Martinez did take a full-time job starting Monday of this week. So I found that out last week. So she has very limited availability for us. Her contract ends on January 31st. With her limited availability, I think probably it's okay just to let that contract lapse. And I will see if I can get...I will see if we can transfer the license for the QuickBooks to me, so I can also use that format. Right now I've got everything on Excel spreadsheets, that works for me, and that is how these numbers were compiled.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, you know, I think just a few meetings ago, but still think you might want to look at going to the legislature and asking for an increase in our budget. Our budget is relatively small. We've done, you know, in my opinion, at least done a good job of keeping expenditures low. I don't think we have gone crazy hiring staff. And, in fact, I think one of the things for the process in the future we will need more staff. So I think that is something we should think about, going to ask and get a report and ask the legislature to increase the budget so we can more adequately do our jobs.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I agree. And I think we need a better handle on the legal expenses. But, again, you don't know what litigation is going to be filed and what that will entail. So it would help if we had the December invoices for all of those expenses as we assess how it might look moving forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have any additional questions for our Executive Director? Nice coffee mug, Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thanks, our Executive Director.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I know. I noticed it. Go ahead, Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can I make a motion to absolutely put together some of sort of report to ask the legislature to increase the budget to be more comparable to what other Commissions from states the size relatively near Michigan have?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner, so just restating, you want a motion to approach the legislature. Who are you having to do that, are you going to have the Executive Director approach the legislature? Just trying to clarify your motion.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I do think that would fall under her job description.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so we have a motion to empower the Executive Director to approach the legislature about increasing our budget. Commissioner Rothorn and then Commissioner Lett, I'm not sure if you had your hand up or not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't want to second that mostly because we are still in transition and have some changes coming up. And I feel like the budget is, you know, I guess what I want to do is make sure that...we do have a small but mighty staff. And we are even smaller now and don't want to create more work because I think we have to deal with these changes that are coming up.

And, before we sort of add that on, we might need more; but we don't know yet. And so I guess what I'm thinking about is just making sure we as the Commission can direct our staff and make sure that we are directing them in sort of fiscally responsible and sort of appropriate ways.

So, again, it might be necessary. And I agree with you, Commissioner Eid, it may be necessary. And we had anticipated and talked about it, but, because of the changes, I'm not sure that it is yet. So I do want to make sure we are using our staff time really efficiently.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm thinking way back here when we first started, but I was under the impression that MDOS was our middleman or for speaking with the legislature. Is that no longer the case?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Sarah can chime in here. I don't believe they see themselves as a middleman. Certainly, Mike Brady has said that he would assist in reaching out to the legislature. So we will work hand in hand with MDOS.

But I think ultimately it is the responsibility of this Commission to approach the legislature when additional funds are needed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Great. At this point we have a motion, but we don't have a second. Is anyone interested in seconding that motion?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I will table the motion for a later date.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any further questions for our Executive Director? Otherwise, we are going to move on.

Okay. So we are going to continue with new business, Agenda Item 6E, potential options for further modification of rules of procedure.

Without objection, I will ask General Counsel Pastula to present information. Please proceed, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, Madam Chair. For this line item on the agenda I submitted a report to the Commission dated January 25th, that is also available online. And it outlines potential options for consideration to further modify the MICRC's rules of procedure.

Moving forward as the Commission completes its constitutionally mandated work and when judicial review of adopted plans is concluded, Subsection 18 of the Constitution will be triggered. Meaning that the Commission would need to be reconvened.

So the proposed memo puts forth two suggestions for your consideration. The first is in regard to second...remote meetings and the second is in regard to reconvening the MICRC. I kind of jumped to the second one here.

But it is to add language to add a section to reconvene the Commission should they need to be reconvened during the next decade. And that process, I utilized the process set forth in the Constitution for convening the Commission's first meeting, which is by the Secretary of State would issue the call. And at that meeting, that first reconvening meeting, similar to the first meeting of any new Commission, officers would be selected and the business would be conducted.

The Secretary of State I think is the most appropriate entity or individual to do that because they will always, there will always be a Secretary of State. And while the Commission, officer terms may expire, Commissioner eligibility may fluctuate over the course of the next ten years. Certainly, again, the Office of the Secretary of State will remain static. So that red lined language is for your consideration.

And then as to remote meetings, during the January 13th meeting, I was asked to put forward some suggested language for consideration. And that language can be found in Section 6.2, that gives the Commission the discretion to set their meetings to be either in person or remote, so that is the language before you.

I'm happy to answer any questions or modify the language, the proposed language as the Commission sees fit. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any discussions or debates? Questions? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My questions are mainly centered around the reconvening portion of the proposed rules that were sent out. And I think this is something a lot of us have been thinking about, you know, as we near what might be the end of our time as Commissioners.

To me it seems a little it seems like, you know, we are trying to have it both ways. Like we disband and we reconvene. Whereas, to me it seems like it makes more sense to best decide are we just ending permanently or are we sticking through until, I guess, I mean, I don't know how long it would be. I don't think any of us now. It might be for the full ten years. So I'm just wondering what people's thoughts are on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, Madam Chair. So the Constitution requires, states that your terms expire when your work is complete. And not...but not before any judicial review is complete. And we have two pending cases now. And without knowing the timeframe for those to get resolved, if they do get resolved, and no new cases are filed, but are filed in the future, then the Commission would need to be able to address those cases.

Again, the 2011 maps were challenged in the 2017 filing. So as the election results come in and those kinds of things, utilizing the 2020 MICRC Commission maps, there could theoretically...there is not a deadline by which to submit a legal challenge. So

theoretically, up until new maps are adopted by the subsequent Commission, this Commission could be subject to legal challenge.

I hope that is responsive, Commissioner Eid. But, again, it does not...the Commission...excuse me, the Constitution does not empower the Commission to just stay in session for the next ten years. It's when there's -- when there is either you are still doing your work or a judicial review. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn, did you have a comment?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, thanks. I like this. I think it gives us options. And it does feel like it's a fiscally responsible way to do it, to reconvene and not sort of extend this indefinitely all the way through ten years, that does not feel, yeah. So I do like the reconvene option. And, yeah, I will leave it at that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I guess my thoughts on this are once the legal challenges are all resolved, whenever that occurs, pursuant to the Constitution, then we are discharged, disbanded, however you want to say it. I'm not so sure, and I guess I don't think that we as the Commission can extend our own life. If, in fact, there is a challenge, several years after the end of litigation, it doesn't necessarily follow that the Commission would somehow necessarily be involved, if the Secretary of State, or whatever powers to be, feel that it would behoof to revive the Commission at that time for whatever purpose. And the only purpose that I could foresee would be that there would be a necessity to go back and do some more mapping, then I suppose that that could be done either through the Secretary of State perhaps. Though I'm not sure. Or through a special legislative bill to, in fact, do that.

But I guess I have a problem. I mean, I think it's a good idea. But I'm not sure that we can, that we are really on sound ground in order to do that.

I guess my other kind of joking point of view would be is it's their problem, not ours once we disband. Let them worry about it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, I sort of share the same concern that Commissioner Lett just raised. And my other concern with this language is if we are able to be reconvened, which I'm not entirely clear on whether we are, or whether we need to be, I would prefer to have it be potentially in the hands of more than one person than just the Secretary of State being empowered to reconvene the Commission.

And my thought process on that is, you know, we know there are many politicians who are in favor of the Commission. We know there are some who are not. And the Secretary of State is ultimately a political position. And what happens five years from now if we have someone who is in the office of the Secretary of State who is not a fan of the Commission and does not want to reconvene us. I would not want to put that power in the hands of one person. So I ask we consider maybe expanding this in some way to include multiple, potential options for people who can reconvene, whether that be, you know, we can write it to say any person who was a Commissioner or as of the date that

we disbanded would that have power or maybe the Governor. I mean, I would just rather have more options than all rest in the hands of one person. So that is kind of my thought on it.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think that this would probably be a good topic to set over to another meeting or two. Let us give some thought to it and see if someone had a brainstorm that maybe we could do. And that perhaps Ms. Reinhardt could check with Mr. Brady and have him get in on this also.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much. So for the benefit of the Commission, I was in consultation with Mr. Brady over this proposed language and had discussions with that office. And I certainly support the Commission's desire to address this further at a future meeting. I just wanted to make sure the Commission knew that I did work in conjunction with MDOS on these discussions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Hello. I would like to put a motion forth considering Commissioner Lange's suggestion about reducing our pay rate to the 25%. I would like to put a motion forward to do that since the majority of our work is over with. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Wagner and seconded by Commissioner Lange to reduce Commissioner pay to 25% of the Governor's salary. Any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: At this point, because we did set our rate, and I understand that our work is mostly done, but in the leadership position, and I know Commissioner Lange, right, you have said how much work you are doing. This is setting up. I think it's important to recognize that we are still relevant and we are defending maps. And we are still a body of Government for the people. And we have gotten comments that people would not even do the work that we are doing for the amount that we are doing.

So my point is I think there is a variety of opinions that we are paid too little, that we are paid too much. So I feel like it's...I just want to make sure that we -- I'm going to be in favor of keeping the amount that we have. I do think I want to set the value of the work that we are doing, the service that we provide, I want to keep it at the same amount and not say there is a product that we produce and now we're not as relevant. I think we will disband when we are not relevant. I think this time is equally important and that we are defending the decisions we made, and trying to understand all of the consequences of the decision we made.

And, you know, frankly we are each doing the work that is required of us for the amount of money that we have set ourselves, the salary we set ourselves at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Rothhorn, I tend to agree with you. I will also say we have no idea what lies ahead in terms of litigation. In terms of possibly having to travel, those of us that have been and are able to. So I know that I am not the only voice that would like to continue to be compensated for the very hard work that we've already been doing and the work that we have been doing. Especially those that are getting out of the House to do the work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of order. I'm about sick and tired of these personal attacks that are being directed at me. It's unbecoming of the rules of the procedures and the guidelines we set forth in this Commission. And I ask that the Chair reprimand the statements because it's ongoing. And it's getting a little tedious and a little put up. I can do without the personal attacks. I don't care how anybody else feels about me on this Commission. I have not bullied anybody on this Commission. I may see things that get under people's skin. But I have never bullied anybody. And I ask that the Chair put an end to it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lange. I'm not going to reprimand anybody, but I do ask that everybody be respectful of each other and your fellow Commissioners and staff. And let's try to turn the heat down a little bit on this meeting, okay?

Commissioner Eid I saw you had a hand up. Did you still have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes. I agree with what Commissioner Lange said. I think we do have some idea of what is going to happen. We are being sued in two different courts of law currently. And it's likely that you know some of us are going to get subpoenaed. Well, what is not known is how long it will take. But you know we just had a public comment earlier today suggesting that Commissioners actually get paid more, not less. So I think we are compensated adequately for the work that we do. And I would not vote in favor to reduce it at this time. Maybe at a later time if we disband then have to come back. But you know until that time I would not be supportive of this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I get a roll call vote, please?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes. So we have a motion by Commissioner Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Lange to reduce the rate of pay of Commissioners back to the original 25% that was listed in the constitutional amendment. Sarah Reinhardt, if you can run a roll call on that I would appreciate it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Point of order to end discussion with a two thirds vote. I don't know if there is further discussion but to end discussion you need a two thirds vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Nobody has their hand up, Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's go then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Honestly, we are a little out of order and we were discussing General Counsel post changes to the rules and somehow we segued back into the budget. So that's all right. But, Sarah Reinhardt, if you can go ahead on the roll call vote to repeat to reduce Commissioner's salaries back down to 25%.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No." I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order to vote starting with Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: At this point in time, no.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark? Apologies, he is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He is not here.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of two yes to ten no, the motion does not carry.

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

We will move on to the next item of the agenda at this point. I think we want some more time to think about the proposed change to the minutes so we can come back and talk about that in two weeks. And then we are going to move on to Item 6, did

someone say something? Who was that? Okay, 6F, which is discussion on Chair position. And, MC, I'm going to hand this over to you to facilitate. And I'm going to step away for about five minutes guys but I will be back.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so discussion. Discussion is open. Any Commission Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You know I was kind of careful with how I worded this motion. One of our public comments said earlier that in reference to select a new Chair and that is not what I motioned. I motioned to discuss the Chair position. And to me that is more of laying out expectations. And you know, us being candid with each other about what we expect out of whoever is going to be currently serving as our Chair and what because they have terms coming to an end soon. Or we can expect out of future chairs of this Commission. What I will ask though is that you know we try to keep this professional. Not having any personal attacks. And that keep in mind that this is you know being live streamed on YouTube. So let's have some class. Let's have some dignity with having this discussion. It's a chance for people to get their thoughts about that out in the open.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thanks for framing it, Commissioner Eid. Any other discussion? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Considering what has precipitated with this discussion, and the freshness of it, I would suggest that we may want to set this over for a two-week period to let everybody kind of consider what their thoughts may be. I really consider this a personnel matter, that would be better served. And I'm no fan of closed session but certainly in a closed session. To say that we have had a somewhat contentious meeting today would be an understatement. And I would like to see us step back, take a breath, and then come back in a couple weeks to consider what it is that we really want to do without bashing each other as Anthony has said it in a better terms than bashing.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Commissioner Lett. Any objection to tabling this or putting this in unfinished business? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you, Vice Chair Rothorn. I have given this a lot of thought for a very long time. And I have been reviewing the rules of Roberts Rules and procedures and Chapter 15. And with that being said, Mr. Vice Chair, I would like to put a motion forth to move the following resolution to censure or censure Commissioner Szetela for conduct unbecoming of a Commission and violating MICRC rules of personal conduct. Madam Chair in both her role as Vice Chair and Chair has at many times have been rude to members of the Commission. At times in my opinion has been, arrogant to members of the Commission. In my opinion she has also bullied people, not only during the mapping process but also put forth public attacks in open meetings on people's characters with no justification. For example, when she made...

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Point of order. How are we allowing this to take place?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was given the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: You are name calling in a public comment and the Commissioner is not present. You just made the acquisition and I'm not going to allow that General Counsel.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This should not be allowed, Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was given the floor. Please allow me to finish my motion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What Commissioner Kellom is raising you are talking about censuring for calling someone out and we tried to act as one Commission and because you have the floor and are naming a particular Commissioner, I think that is the sensitivity and because as Commissioner Lett also said right and Commissioner Eid said we are trying to actually like it's fresh. We have a consensus meeting and I think that is where Commissioner Kellom voice is and I would ask you to use your own discretion and say I will do this next time. Or I will figure out another way to talk about it but not.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: With all due respect, Vice Chair Rothorn, you did give me the floor, please allow me to finish my statement and my motion. That's all I'm asking. I am allowed this under our Roberts Rules of orders I am allowed this, okay? I feel that I need to say this.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So where I left off, there were open -- there were public attacks in open meetings on people's character with no justification. For example, when she made a scene about me attending remotely for health concerns, which we are not going to go there at the moment. Stating doing outreach at fairs would potentially harm this Commission but had no issues with others doing the same. During discussions about mapping when I raised my hand to make a statement.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Would someone please step in.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Excuse me, please let me.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Executive Director Hammersmith.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Please let me finish my motion.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can someone step in?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would ask as the person.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: General Counsel, am I within my guidelines to finish my motion please?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have a right to ask for a closed session if there is going to be discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No. My understanding is a Commission our meetings are to be held in open session all Commission business. That was just ruled upon by the Supreme Court. If it was a staff issue then it could be. All I'm asking for is let me finish my motion. Nobody has to agree with me. But I have the right to do my motion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And Commissioner Lange.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You do not have the right of violating the code of conduct, doing so and you are violating the code of conduct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange, you asked for General Counsel's, yeah, please, General Counsel, help us.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, Mr. Vice Chair. So what I am hearing so far is that we have a member that is making a motion to censure, which would be a motion that is used if adopted would say the body disapproves of the behavior of a member. So what I'm hearing is that a member is trying to make that motion. It's not a personnel issue. So I wouldn't see any reason or basis to go into a closed session. I think what is happening under Chapter 15 is again it's a motion to censure disapproval of behavior and it's not disciplinary procedures provided for in other areas of Roberts or constrained by the Constitution and the Commission's rules. So I'm hearing a motion to censure and the member was recognized, the member is making and that is my understanding procedurally of what is occurring right now. Unless I am misunderstanding what is happening. If it's a motion to censure for violation of code on conduct and I'm not trying to put words in anyone's mouths or take them out of someone else mouth, but that is what I'm hearing from a procedural standpoint.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Because we have the violation and code of conduct, I want to acknowledge Commissioner Lange, right, you will have the floor back. But, Commissioner Lett, please, do you have something to help us with this?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think under General Counsel's discussion there that's correct. It is a motion to censure, but that is the motion, the motion I want to make, a motion to censure. And do I have support for that and then you go into the discussion of why. So until we get to a -- that motion that the body approves, then we never get to the discussion which she is doing now, which is way beyond the motion to censure.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My understanding to the reading on Chapter 15 of Robert's Rules of Order you state the resolution of why you are censuring the motion or resolution and it lists the reasons why in that resolution. The motion is for a resolution. And the resolution must state the reasons why. Unless I misread it and if I did by all means I will stand corrected and accept that

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Counsel Pastula?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, Mr. Vice Chair. It may be beneficial at this point to see if the motion has support by way of a second so it can proceed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I second.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so I believe will you help us, Commissioner Lange, because I know that both the opposition and the sort of you have stated that you're using the Commissioner's code of conduct. And I've got it here but like help us know, right, can you help us with ABCDEFG one of those? I think the other part is right you're also not you're being asked not to proceed because of the code of conduct so there is a real challenge here.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm not sure what you're asking. But I would like to finish my statement before we get into it. As far as the code of conduct, we had a thing where we would be respectful of...

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner demonstrate honesty, integrity and professionalism.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is A.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You will be respectful when they are giving their opinions. There is something around there. I don't have them in front of me at the moment so I can't say specifically ABC or D.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, and so actively speak actively seek bipartisan and nonpartisan representation in presentations and demonstrations at community meetings. It feels there an attack on one Commissioner, the Chair. And I understand you feel like you need to share this because of censure and so and there has been a suggestion saying let's do this next in two weeks when we meet. And table it today because we've had such a contentious meeting. So I'm asking you if you are -- again, I believe that you should have the floor again. That is where we are at. And I see your hand Commissioner Eid, but I really do want to try to get back to Commissioner Lange. And really trying to help us recognize that there is real code of conduct tension here. And it's been demonstrated because of our rules of Robert's Rules of Order that Commissioner Lange should proceed or has the ability to proceed. It's just that I'm asking you, Commissioner Lange, to sort of help us as a body, right, act as one and try to actually say hey we have a tough meeting thus far. We could potentially pick this up next, time when we meet. So it's up to you. Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I appreciate that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't mean to interrupt. I just think we are completely out of order here. My original motion when we amended the agenda was not for a censorship, it was the Chair as the position.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We agree and why I asked Commissioner Lange to consider that and this is where she is at.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: There is a motion and a second on the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I finish my statement? Can I have the floor back, please?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, it's not something that I did lightly. I want you all to know that. I have personally felt bullied. And I'm sorry that people will disagree with that. But it's not only affected me, yes, I personally have felt bullied. I'm going to leave it at that. But I've also seen it towards other people on the Commission and staff in my opinion. I can no longer stand for it. I'm not suggesting that imperfect in any way, shape or form. But I have not publicly, personally attacked anybody or made comments to them as far as personal. I have made comments about things that I see that I disagree with. And I disagree with strongly. And I have been called out in Zoom messages for that. But that's on a different level.

I just -- I have not bullied anybody. And I realize by making this motion it sets me up for retaliation and I'm prepared to face the consequences of that. Because doing what you feel is right is not always easy. But turning a blind eye is wrong. And it's fine. I know there's the cum-by-ya feeling in here but if something bothers somebody for a long enough time you have to say it and when you see it it's a repeat, repeat, repeat thing then it needs to be addressed. I'm not saying I don't know Commissioner Szetela personally. I'm not saying anything about her personal character whatsoever. I'm just saying what has transpired in meetings. That's what I'm saying. How I feel that meetings have transpired over time. And I guess the right thing would have been to bring it up at the time. But things build. And build. And then other circumstances happen. And it just gets to the point when you have to say when is enough, enough. And some of you may say the shape thing about me and that is perfectly fine and I understand that. That's my motion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And your motion has been seconded for censure. So at this point I'm going to call on Commissioner Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just have a point of order. Because I don't think it was appropriate for the General Counsel to be weighing in on a legal opinion on this matter because there is I think a very obvious conflict of interest at this point when it comes to me personally. So I just want to state that for the record but otherwise I'm saying nothing else.

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Call the question.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you. So I believe we are I'm going to try to restate the motion, Commissioner Lange. You help me out please or General Counsel Pastula. I believe we have a motion to censure our Chair for the reasons stated. I'm not going to go into that. Is that accurate? Okay, and is it appropriate if we do a, you know, hand.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Roll call.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Roll call.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You're going to have to roll call because I have to abstain.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good. And, Commissioner Orton, I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we have some clarification about exactly what censure means?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is a great question. Thank you, Commissioner Orton. Who can provide that? General Counsel, please.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. As I indicated earlier, a motion to censure is strictly a motion adopted just that if adopted pardon me would be disapproval of behavior. There is no disciplinary. It's not a discipline issue or penalty or anything like that. It's strictly the body noting disapproval with a member's action if it is adopted. That is the extent of that motion in the manner in which it has been presented. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So to be clear under Robert's Rules of Order censure, strong disapproval or harsh criticism. So, just to make it, clear it's not slight disapproval, it's strong or harsh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Roll call vote. And seeing no other hands, Secretary Sarah, please help us out. Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly. Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with MC Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Szetela, can you state the reason for your abstention?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm abstaining because I have a conflict of interest because this concerns my behavior.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. By a vote of three yes to eight no, the motion does not carry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, MC if you don't mind, I will jump back in and take back over. So at this point we are going to move on to approval of minutes. Next on the agenda are minutes for the approval of the January 13th meeting held in Detroit. The draft minutes have been provided to the Commission prior to this meeting and are posted on the website. Are there any edits to the meeting minutes? Commissioner Eid, did you have some edits?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No. Just a point of order. That was not the motion that we adopted when we adopted the agenda. The motion was to discuss the position of Chair. Not any particular Chairperson. Just expectations for the Chair. And we did not have that discussion. However, I think that's far more than enough for today. And I would accept Commissioner Lett's recommendation to perhaps move that discussion to a later meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, we have a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay, the ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted.

There is one staff report today. Without objection, I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to provide her report. Please proceed, Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I just wanted to say at this time we did receive the resignation of our General Counsel yesterday. And I want the Commissioners to know that the staff will be working. The remaining staff will be working on an interim plan that we will bring back to the Commission in two weeks to ensure there is a smooth transition. And to assure that there is a plan in place for this position. Obviously, this is an important role for the Commission. If the Commission so desires, we could put notification out immediately for a General Counsel position and get that on the docket so that the Commission can determine if they want to hire a replacement person. Or if there are other options that we can seek we will be seeking all options to make sure that

the I'm work continues to get done. Obviously, the remaining staff do not have those skill sets. And we are going to work with the Commission to make sure that whatever you need and however you wish to proceed that your staff will take care of what you wish for us to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Executive Director Hammersmith. Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, I would request that the Executive Director and General Counsel and Director Woods come back to us at the next meeting with suggestions of how we could proceed. And as well as some abbreviated report of where we stand as far as what's going on in the General Counsel's office. I'm concerned that I'm not concerned that things are not in order. But I am concerned that we, as a Commission, have some idea of where it's at now. I don't know if we got, you know, if FOIA requests are coming in a torrent or if I got those all under in hand, which I know General Counsel has kept up on. So just to give us an update of where we are at and what we are looking at going forward. So I don't expect that today. But that would be something that I would hope we would be able to address next meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lett.

All right, anything else, Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I don't have anything else for today. I do want to thank General Counsel Pastula for her service that she has given over the last year. And certainly wish her the best.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. Without objection I'll ask Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State if she has a report. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> No report today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Correspondence was provided with written public comments to Commissioners in our meeting materials. Are there future agenda items Commissioners would like to be added to future agendas? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Not more than what I already suggested. But I would like to take an opportunity to say that while I haven't always agreed with General Counsel's positions and that has been rather public, I'm also appreciated the job that she has done for us. And I've expressed that to her personally. And I wanted to do it openly and wish her the best on her future endeavors. Good luck to you, General Counsel.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I also wanted to extend warmest blessings to Julianne as she moves forward and thank her for the work she has done and also wanted to apologize to the public for having to see this wonderful group have the tough conversation that we had. Hopefully we can move forward and teamwork. And not do the behavior. And we can learn to properly vocalize when we have conflict with a

coworker and those tuning in and on behalf of the group I would like to apologize because that was not our best conduct and encourage each one of us to think very carefully moving forward what about the subjects, we want to raise so hello citizens, apology from Commissioner Kellom.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Kellom. Are there any announcements? All right, as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business, a motion to adjourn is in order. May I have a motion to adjourn?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn. All in favor?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And Commissioner Weiss.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And Commissioner Weiss. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the meeting is adjourned at 11:41 p.m. I'm sorry a.m. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: See you in two weeks.