

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

07/20/23 10:00am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR CLARK: As Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:05 a.m.

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

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

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations may 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.

This meeting also is being transcribed and those closed captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on the Michigan.gov/MICRC website and 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, Executive Director for the Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov or 517-331-6309.

For the public watching and the public record I will turn to the department of state staff 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 and state the county, City Township or village which you are attending, I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> CHAIR CLARK: I'm present; attending remotely from Huntington Beach, California.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present, Good morning, everyone. Virtually attending

today from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present attending from Detroit, Michigan.

Rhonda Lange?

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

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present; attending from Petoskey, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Present; attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning. Attending remotely from

Lansing, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Present attending remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

Janice Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present. Attending remotely from beautiful Black Lake in Onaway Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

Richard Weiss?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present; attending remotely from Tuscola, Illinois.

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

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

As a reminder to the public watching, You can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

The current agenda has had a change to it. And I personally would like to move that the agenda be amended and to remove the Article in which is 6A Commissioner employment inquiry. That has been taken care of. As the Commissioner Eid and Michigan division of Michigan voices has mutually departed ways. And he is no longer employed at that site. So all in favor.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can we take discussion before we start voting?

>> CHAIR CLARK: I'm sorry I did not see your hand Rebecca.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So the issue has not been resolved. Yes, she is no longer employed by Michigan voices however there is still a question about whether there was a violation of the code of conduct and whether there was a violation of the

conflict of interest policy to the extent he did not disclose the potential conflict so the issue is absolutely not resolved. There has been no finding that there was no conflict of interest and you know my purpose with asking for this agenda item in the first place was to look under code of conduct and conflict of interest which are still open and outstanding and we still need to make a determination on.

>> CHAIR CLARK: I put the motion forward. Is there a second to the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Second by Commissioner Lett. Okay, all in favor.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: One thing for me Commissioner.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Clark yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We got a memo from Edward the other day that I will pull it up.

>> CHAIR CLARK: This is a discussion on whether it should be on the agenda or not Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would like to respond to the comments that were just made because they were made publicly. There was a determination made by the lawyers and Edward and that determination said there was though conflict of interest and there was never a conflict of interest so that is what it said. But you know I would be in support of removing this from the agenda.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: May I respond?

>> CHAIR CLARK: You will second that item? I believe it's already seconded by Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I move for it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Chair can I respond to the statement.

>> CHAIR CLARK: You can respond to that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: It's absolutely false that was not a determination from our attorneys. It was a determination from an investigation conducted by Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Lett and Edward Woods that they submitted that, prepared that document. There has not been a determination by the Commission. The only person who can decide whether there is a violation of the conflict of interest is the Commission itself by a vote of all the Commissioners. So the fact that that document was prepared by two members of the Commission is not a determination by the Commission that there was a violation of the conflict of interest rules or that there was not a violation of conflict of interest rules. It's a recommendation from two members of the Commission and not a determination that there was no conflict of interest. So the statements that Anthony Eid just made were completely false. It's not accurate. The Commission has not taken a vote on whether there was a conflict of interest or not and so there has been no determination.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Szetela. Commissioner Lett, you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes. This is really a point of order. The motion in front of the Commission is to whether or not to remove the item from the agenda. We have seemed to dissolve into a discussion regarding the substance and we are not at that point. And therefore those comments are out of order by both Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Eid. And I would request we call the question.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay, let's take a vote on whether or not to remove the item from the agenda. I will ask the Secretary of State to do a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Chair, just a point of order.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: When the question is called it does require a vote from the Commission to end the discussion.

>> CHAIR CLARK: I'm sorry I couldn't hear you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: When a question is called and it's requested to end discussion it does require a vote from the Commission with a two thirds majority to end discussion.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay two thirds majority.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes and that would be nine Commissioners.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay that is fine can we take the roll call vote, please?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Let's specify what I and they mean please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure so the motion before the Commission is to end debate and vote on the motion, the main motion and it requires a two third majority. A vote of yes is to end discussion and a vote of no is to not end discussion or debate or continue discussion or debate. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with MC Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> ERIN WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss? No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> CHAIR WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry I skipped Brittini. I will record your vote, Ms. Lange. Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vote of nine yes to four know the vote meets the two thirds threshold and the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR CLARK: The motion has carried. The ayes have it. Returning to the main motion to approve the meeting agenda as amended, all in favor raise your hand and say aye
- Aye.
- >> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can we take a roll call on this one? Sorry.
- >> CHAIR CLARK: All opposed raise your hand and say nay.
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Ms. Szetela asked for a roll call vote on that.
- >> CHAIR CLARK: I'm sorry, I did not hear you. Commissioner Szetela, can we have another roll call vote, please? The Department of State?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly, Mr. Chair. The motion before the Commission is to remove item 6A from new business, that is Commissioner employment inquiry. A vote of yes would be to remove the item from the agenda. A vote of no would be to keep the item on the agenda. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> CHAIR WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> CHAIR CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> MC ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of eight yes to five no the motion carries.

>> CHAIR CLARK: The ayes have it then. The ayes prevail. The motion is adopted.

And the agenda has been modified and adopted

Let's move on to public comments. Without objection we will begin public comment pertaining to agenda items, agenda topics portion of our meeting.

Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with the public comment.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Chair? I apologize for the interruption I just want to clarify. Was the original motion to add an item to the agenda and approve the agenda? Or was the original motion simply to add an item which was my understanding in which case there would need to be an initial motion to approve the agenda as amended.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay, is there a motion to approve the agenda?

>> CHAIR WITJES: So moved.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: I thought we moved to take something off the agenda then approve it.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Once it's off we have to approve the full agenda, so Commissioner Witjes' motion to approve the agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Let's take a roll call vote. Go ahead, Department of State.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid has his hand up Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I did not see you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We took two votes just now my understanding one was to remove it from the agenda and one is to approve the agenda where am I getting it wrong.

>> CHAIR CLARK: We did not have motion to approve the agenda.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The first was and second was remove 6A from the agenda. Now the agenda needs to be voted as approved and a roll call vote has been requested so I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order. A yes vote is to approve

the agenda. A no vote is to not approve the agenda. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> CHAIR WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vote of nine yes to four no the motion carries.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. The ayes prevail. The agenda is adopted. Let's move on to public comments.

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

Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with the public comment.

I will call our 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 wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute or call on you by name or the last four digits of your phone number. Also please note that if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for three to five seconds we will move to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking. If your audio still does not work you can e-mail

redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you trouble shoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later meeting. You will have two minutes to address the Commission. First in line today was James Galant. He is the only speaker we have. Please allow a minute for staff to unmute you Mr. Galant.

>> We just saw very clearly how you folks are not going through the rules because you approved the amendment first. And this is like how the consensus making process does not work in America. You made the amendment first and then you made the motion. So that amendment is now null and void because it came before the motion. And now this is exactly what our issue has been, that are going to be in front of the Supreme Court now, the meetings act violations. The Robert's Rules of Order is a direct interpretation of the House of Representatives which creates some of this for our state and local Governments at the Federal level between us. And that is why Robert's Rules of Order is required.

Now, it says one question at a time. But, no, you have multiple questions, multiple processes, and proposals at a time. That is the problem. Under our Constitution one question at a time and you have to make a motion first.

Now, Roberts and Carl Marx were working out their own societies, Carl Marx in his communist manifesto is directly related to your consensus making process that you created. It's in my public comment. It's on Wikipedia. And it says this is directly from the communist manifesto and socialism. This is why your oath of office says you are going to follow this Constitution, which does not allow that. And it says the consensus making process is in a direct alternative to Robert's Rules of Order. And you were instructed by Mike Brady to follow Robert's Rules of Order before the Secretary of State convened this meeting. I think the Secretary of State is absolutely implementing socialist and communist and Marxist principles in a democrat society. She is doing the same thing at the canvassing board, which just a couple days ago they voted they had to elect three members. But the Constitution said there shall be no majority of either party on any canvassing board. Yet they are doing it anyway under the supervision of Secretary Benson. So Secretary Benson is going to have to answer to the Supreme Court about the violations. Every time.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Thank you for your comment, Mr. Galant. That concludes our public comment. Please feel free to e-mail public comments to the Commission at redistricting@Michigan.gov we appreciate everyone who offers public comment in whatever way you choose and invite you to keep sharing your thoughts especially if you would like to share ways that the Commission does business.

Next is unfinished business and next on the agenda is unfinished business the 5A the AG case. Without objection I will ask legal liaison Steve Lett and Nate Fink from Fink Bressack to present this item. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Commissioner Lett and Mr. Fink. Go ahead, Steve.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Several of us attended the hearing in Kalamazoo. Cynthia was there. Rebecca was there for most of it. Nate was there. I was there. Who am I missing? Oh, yeah, MC was there, how can I forget.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: And Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The Judge was a three-Judge panel. Two men and one lady. One Judge and Nate, what was -- I don't know these Judge's names I'm sorry and they are not on the pleadings.

>> Judge Maloney and Judge Kathledge and Judge Neff.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And Judge Kathledge was the youngest Judge and most inquiring of the three judges. They came out and announced they would provide 45 minutes for argument. Presentation by each side to be used in any way that the side chose so they could spend all 45 minutes presenting their case with no rebuttal but each side reserved some time for rebuttal. Most of the time was spent with each side presenting what they felt to be their strongest case and then responding to the other side's argument.

The Judges at the end did add four minutes to each side for kind of a summation, which was taken by each side. The sides presented were well done. It was obvious to me that the preparation was extensive, well-rehearsed. They were able to answer any of the questions that the Judges asked. And at the end the Judge says we will get an order out when we get it out. So there's no timeframe for them to get their order out. One interesting question by Judge Neff, that was the lady judge, was what would a trial look like? And I kind of thought that was an interesting question. A trial would look like a trial. But each side said well you know we are going to have, you know, three or four expert witnesses. We are going to call other nonexpert witnesses. And that was basically about it. She did say well is this going to be a battle of the experts? And certainly that is going to be a great degree of it. However, whatever Commissioners would testify as well as what other citizens would testify, would make an interesting trial for some of us.

I don't have any particular points. The brief, probably if you don't want to read the thousands of pages that had been produced, the Commissioners replied brief and support of motion for summary judgment is pretty succinct. And if you haven't read that and want to have a pretty good classic comic version of what is going on, that would be a good one to read. It summarizes all the points very well.

Having said that, Nate, please add yours.

>> NATE-FINK: Good morning everyone and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak with you. I think you are legal liaison Mr. Lett did a nice job summarizing the hearing from last week. I really don't have a lot to add. We don't really know when the Court will rule. But we suspect that it should be at this point hopefully within the next few weeks. I believe that the Court is cognizant of the fact that if ultimately there would have to be some kind of redrawing I think they would hope to have that able to be done in

advance of the 2024 election but that is getting way ahead of ourselves right now. And as Commissioner Lett noted, Judge Neff asked the question what a trial might look like and of course Judge Neff tried many, many cases as having sat on the bench for many years, but this is a unique circumstance in many respects. And I suspect she had not sat on a three-Judge panel that heard a trial. And so she, you know, inquiring as to what it might look like. And we will have to see when the Court rules if hopefully the Court will grant the Commission's motion for summary judgment and dismiss the case. But if not and any part of the case remains, then a trial will be scheduled as soon as possible. There after obviously there will be a lot of coordination required with three judges and lawyers and witnesses and all that. But it's possible that could be scheduled as early as later this fall, perhaps early next year. Again if the Court doesn't grant the motion, the Commission's motion for summary judgment. Or the Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. So but like I said Commissioner Lett I think summed it up well. Happy to answer any questions that anybody might have.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Nate. Commissioner Szetela, you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I'm wondering typically at this point in proceedings when you have motions and getting ready to potentially go to trial parties typically evaluate should we go to trial, should we try to settle or engage in settlement discussions I'm wondering if we gave thought to that if we should consider whether we want to proceed with trial or whether we can work out a resolution with the Plaintiffs. It seems like we haven't had that discussion. And I think it's probably a worthwhile discussion to have. And frankly we could probably do that in a closed session because it is pending litigation. But just kind of want to throw that idea out there in case someone is interested in it.

trials are expensive and it's taxpayer efficiency question.

>> NATE-FINK: I don't know if that is a question to me or throwing it out to the group. Obviously that gets directly into litigation strategy so if there were to be some kind of discussion that the Commission wanted to have about that, I would strongly advise doing that in a closed session. As it stands at this moment of course we are waiting for the Court to rule on summary judgment. And there will be plenty of time to have litigation strategy discussions if necessary. And lead up to that but certainly after that and before a trial might be set.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Nate. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to say I thought that the whole team did a wonderful job last week. I think, you know, y'all are working as hard as you can to try to defend the work that we collaboratively did together. So I very much appreciate that.

During the process you all asked me to write a declaration in defense of some of our work. I know there have been some questions on like what went into that or why you

guys asked me to do that or what it helps with so I was wondering if you could talk about that a little bit.

>> NATE-FINK: Of course and I should not assume you all are understanding the nuisances of the different stages we are at. We are at the summary judgment stage where we are trying to persuade the Court there is not a question of material fact that is in dispute and rather the Court should grant judgment in our favor and determine that the maps were appropriate and did not violate the law as the Plaintiffs have alleged.

So to support that the legal team in this respect primarily led by the Baker folks who of course are the lead litigation counsel determined that it would be appropriate to include a declaration from a Commissioner describing and addressing some of the points that have been raised. And describing the process that the Commission went through. And why the Commission believes that the maps are appropriate. And legal and comply with the law. And it's important to rely on a Commissioner who has a good recollection of that process and who can articulate the reasons that the Commission made its various decisions as it relates to the map drawing process.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: One of the things they are looking for and is that they interviewed Baker interviewed all of us prior to filing the motion, prior to asking Anthony to do a declaration or an affidavit. And what they were looking for, what any attorney looks for is somebody that is a good historian, can remember what went on. And someone who is well spoken. And can present the facts that they want to bring out in a logical, cogent process.

Additionally you have to have an affidavit to support your motion. You just can't say we ought to win and here is why. You have to have somebody that is going to recite some of the facts to support the motion. And both sides have done that several times. So that's kind of the process that they are looking for. Doesn't mean that you weren't or another Commissioner couldn't have done just as well but Baker looked at that and felt Anthony was the one they wanted to use so they did.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any thoughts?

>> NATE-FINK: If there are specific questions about litigation strategy that Commissioners have, as I indicated before as it related to the discussion about possible resolution or other issues I do think it would be appropriate to have a closed session if that is something that the Commission wants to have. I don't think in light of the fact there is this pending litigation that it's ideal for the Commissioners to be having a, you know, too broad of a discussion as it relates to litigation strategy. And, you know, I'm certain that the legal team would be happy to have a closed session, if that is something that is desired. I'm not suggesting it's something that you necessarily would want to do. But if there are additional questions about you know, why a particular strategy was used or that sort of thing, I do think in light of the fact that it's a pending case that a closed session would be the appropriate forum for that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Nate. Are there any other comments on the subject? Okay, I can't see the people on the phone. Janice, Rhonda or Juanita, do you have comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: This .

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I have no comments.

>> Rhonda?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have no comments.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Juanita?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Unfinished business 5B fiscal 24 budget appreciation. Without objection I will ask MICRC Executive Director Edward Woods III to present this item. Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you so much, Commissioner Clark. Good morning Commissioners. It's good to see everyone here. We are going to just go over our budget appreciation for fiscal year 24. As you know we were included in the 24 budget. And we just want to thank our stars, our five stars of Senator Sarah Anthony the Chairperson of the Senate appropriations and Angela Witwer Chair of House appropriations committee. Senator Jeremy moss who is a staffer who knew Commissioner Rothhorn who gave some great advice. Mr. Chris Harkins, the budget director for the State of Michigan and Mr. Mike Brady with MDOS. So we were funded at the constitutional amount as required. And just want to say thank you. So we do not have to go through that and process that we went through last year. And once again want to thank Commissioner Cynthia Orton and MC Rothhorn for their time knocking on doors, passing out postcards. And then passing out our frequently asked questions. To make sure everyone was clear with regards to the process. And so just once again want to say thank you that we are in the budget. And if Commissioner Orton or Rothhorn or any other Commissioner wants to share anything at this time, please feel free to do so.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You have the floor Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for leading us and making it easy. Cynthia and I appreciated the opportunity so thank you for leading us and making it easy.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Rothhorn. Are there any other comments on this subject? A fine job was done by those individuals.

Next on our agenda is unfinished business item number 5C fiscal 23 financial report for May. Without objection -- excuse me Commissioner Curry, you have a comment? On our agenda is item number 5C fiscal year 23 financial report for May. Without objection I will ask MICRC Executive Director Edward Woods III to present this item. Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. At our last meeting we provided the extents for May. We didn't have a full financial report but now we do have a full financial report

for May 2023. And I just want you to know this is inclusive of everything that we have at the time. Travel costs were at a minimum. We have our standard facilities. Our meeting costs which is 690, which is basically closed caption and sign language interpretation, tela communication is our phone. Our technologies basically our computers. Staff salaries. You have a copy of the county maps for May. You have the litigation Council. Local counsel with regards to that. And then we have our VRA counsel. And our professional services which deals with the finances. So you see that in our Commissioner pay and office supplies so just wanted you to have an accurate report as relates for May our total expenses was 258,282.31. That is our report for May. If there is any questions Commissioner Clark I can take them at this time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any questions from the Commissioners? Seeing none do I have one from Janice?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No, I'm sorry I don't have a question.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: How about Rhonda?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No questions.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Juanita? Apparently Juanita doesn't have a question.

We will move on to our next agenda item, which is Juanita, yes? Do you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, no question.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay thank you let's move on to our next agenda item which is 5D state computer updates. Without objection I will ask MICRC Executive Director Woods to present this item. Having no objection, please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: All right, thank you. On the screen you see the state computer update. As you know we are an Independent Commission but we get our computers and everything through the department of technology, management and budget. And we coordinate that through MDOS Michigan Department of State. Just want to give a shout out to Kim Metsger for all he does knowingly and unknowingly behind the scenes in regards to technology. It's important and cannot stress it enough that we log in with the V PN and make sure that we are logged in, our computers are up to date for patches. This is approved security performance or fix a bug or issue or updates. It keeps computers running smoothly and lower vulnerabilities and updates for the Microsoft Office suite as well. Really want to stress the importance. Don't want to sound like a broken record time and time again to make sure that our computers are updated so that we can do our part as long as everyone else who is a member of state Government to prevent any cyber-attacks to our system. So if you could really assist by signing into the VPN at least once every other week and doing the required updates it would be greatly appreciated. So that we could do our part as a larger part of state Government to ensure that we do not contribute in any way shape or form to any cyber security issues. If there are any questions I can take them at this time.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Mr. Woods. Did you have a question Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Edward I have gone to the site and done it per your request. Is there any way to tell if it's doing anything? I don't seem to get it. It just sits there and it finally comes down and the countdown runs down and says "Yes" or "No" and you do yes. So is something happening? Will we notice it?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is exactly correct once you hit yes you are done. Sorry Commissioner Weiss does it give you a big star for a job well done.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Thank you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: And few thanking you automatically but that is how it works.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I was curious.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Mr. Metzger is kind enough to send something every week or every other week if someone has not done it to get that done so just want to share it with you. But if you don't hear from me it means you are in the good club. We just need you to update as quickly as possible so thank you for staying updated and appreciate the help and the question.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Did you have a comment, Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, I'm just having more problems after problems with this computer and it wants to work and then it won't let me make capital letters. I just talked to Gus, one of the technicians down there. And they don't -- they are not giving me too much advice of how to do it. You have to really go in.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Curry I can help you out with that after the meeting so we can get that resolved.

>> CHAIR CLARK: We will do that offline, okay? Anybody else have any comments on this? Okay, we have that is the end of the unfinished business. So now we move on I'm sorry, any comments?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Curry you need to go on mute.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Curry, if you are not -- if you are not speaking put yourself on mute, please.

Okay, next on the agenda is new business. Let's move on to our agenda item on new business which is 6B. Core values discussion. Without objection I will ask Commissioner Rhonda Lange to present this item. Commissioner Lange put this item on the agenda. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you Commissioner Clark. Just full disclosure when I requested this agenda item, it was specifically for transparency. That was the agenda item. It was suggested that I put core values. But the thing I want to talk about is transparency.

Before I do this, there has been a lot of things that have happened within this last month. So I just want to real quick discuss just read real quick our Commissioner code

of conduct. A, Commissioners shall demonstrate honesty, integrity and professionalism. Part of B Commissioner shall put the responsibility and integrity of the Commission above personal or political gain. C, at the end of our code of conduct when it refers to lobbying no Commissioner will publicly oppose or support specific valid initiatives or legislative bills beyond those related to the work of the Commission. Whether that be via social media, post interviews, public meeting, et cetera. H, Commissioners shall maintain transparency and process and procedures so to instill public confidence in the Commission and the redistricting process. I can understand how the public feels right now because I am questioning transparency. And I had a big thing all prepared, but what I would like to do at this time is I know that there are a couple Commissioners that have questions and concerns. And I asked for a ten-minute allotment so what I would like to do, if that is okay, I would like to give Commissioner Weiss two minutes of my time that's remaining. And then I would like to give Commissioner Szetela the remaining time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is acceptable and no difference than raising your hand as long as we stay on subject. That is all I ask.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The subject is transparency. So, yes. This is on subject.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's talk about the subject of transparency as it relates to code of conduct. That is fine. We want to start with Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, I had a couple questions that I wanted to ask but I'm not so sure since this particular item may have been removed from the agenda. But it was on a phone call that I had asked one of our Commissioners about the position that he had taken. So my question would be for the lawyer, Mr. Fink, obviously our other lawyer is not here. So I guess I just want to make sure that this is all right to do this, ask this question. Anybody have any comments on that?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I believe that any questions we as a Commission are bound to be transparent and all discussions have to happen in the public eye. And if it is not a legal question regarding a Court case then it needs to be done in the public.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Okay my question then to Mr. Fink obviously, our other lawyer is not here is that at any point in time did Mr. Eid contact you or your office about his taking this job and whether it would be a conflict of interest?

>> NATE-FINK: First of all you said the other lawyer, you're talking about I didn't know who you were referring to.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: The other lawyer Baker Hostetler and wanted to ask them the same question but I don't have the ability. They are not here. So my question to you is at any point in time did Mr. Eid, Commissioner Eid contact you about taking this job?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Can I interrupt you a minute? Commissioner Lett you have a comment relative to this?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a point of order. We removed the employment inquiry regarding Commissioner Eid from the agenda. The stated purpose of this conversation is transparency. And while I certainly respect Commissioner Weiss and his question, it really goes to Eid's employment and not necessarily transparency. So I think it's out of order.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct. And I would concur with you, Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of order.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: If it's out of order that is fine I just want to make sure we are following the rules here.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Chair?

>> CHAIR CLARK: I had a comment, do you have another one Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of order, please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This was giving my time to discuss transparency and how our core values relate. Now, there is a question about demonstrating honesty and integrity. The number one thing on our Commissioner code of conduct. So this does relate to transparency. I'm sorry if you don't like the content of what the question is being asked. But it does relate to transparency and our code of conduct, which was the agenda item.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My opinion, Mr. Lett's opinion is that we are not going to pinpoint or crucify a Commissioner publicly like this. And we will just move forward off that subject. It was taken off the agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Excuse me, I guess we are going to have to have a vote on that. Because it was approved. The agenda was approved. So to say you're going to move on and move this agenda item off is not correct.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I didn't say I was going to move this agenda item off. I said the agenda item of Commissioner employment inquiries was moved out.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This goes to transparency and if there was a lie that was told. It goes against our Commissioner code of conduct.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: What is the problem with simply answering the question? Just answer the question. What is the problem. Answer the question.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Ms. Szetela take the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would like to take the floor.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I have the floor right now Commissioner Eid. Another question I would like answered was there a severance for Commissioner Eid leaving?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I apologize, Mr. Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Commissioner Szetela.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I apologize for the interruption I just wanted to raise the point that what it sounded like Commissioner Lange was suggesting was a motion to appeal the Chair's decision. So just for reference when a point of order is made, that point of order is determined by the Chair. And that the Chair's decision on the point of order stands. Unless the decision of the Chair is appealed, which it sounds like is what Commissioner Lange was doing. Commissioner Lange, am I correct?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You are correct, thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I will second the motion.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So the motion to appeal requires a second. And the question would be shall the decision of the Chair be sustained. "Yes" or "No"? Was that the motion that you were making, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That is.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay take a roll call vote, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Give me one moment.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Ms. Reinhardt someone has come in and I'm not sure they are using my name but they can change it to their name with the Commissioner to see whether or not they are present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So this vote only requires a majority, not a two thirds. So I believe that the motion came from Commissioner Lange and seconded by Commissioner Szetela. And the motion or the topic being appealed was whether or not the subject being discussed falls under the transparency agenda item. Is that accurate, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Correct.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Okay, all right so the question is.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Orton has a question before we vote.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Maybe you are already going to do this Sarah but I want clarification of what our vote actually is.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The decision of the Chair was that, that topic shall not be discussed under the agenda item discussion of transparency. So the question being asked before the Commission is shall the decision of the Chair be sustained. So a vote of yes would support the Chair's decision that the subject should not be discussed. A vote of no would be a disagreement with the Chair's decision. The Chair also is not allowed to vote in the decision as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: The actual item is core values discussion, not necessarily transparency only. So I think this absolutely falls under that.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Commissioner Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Commissioner Szetela has a comment as well.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Not right now. Let's go ahead and vote on this.

- >> CHAIR CLARK: Do you still have a comment? Apparently not. Okay go ahead.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Kellom had a comment.
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: If we can clarify again what the vote was. Because it broke up on my end.
- >> CHAIR CLARK: Ms. Reinhardt can you tell us.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Starting from the beginning there was a discussion of the employment status of Commissioner Eid. Commissioner Lett made a point of order that that item was removed from the agenda and should not be discussed. And Mr. Chairperson agreed and ruled in favor of that point of order. And Commissioner Lett appealed that decision. So a vote of yes would support the Chair's decision to not allow discussion of that item. A vote of, no, would be to overturn the Chair's decision.
- >> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That was appealed by Commissioner Lange.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes I'm sorry Commissioner Lange. Is that clear, Commissioner Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Absolutely. Thank you.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure. Okay, all right I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> CHAIR WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of eight to four the Chair's decision is sustained.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay do I still get the rest of my time for the subject matter?

>> CHAIR CLARK: You do, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like to give the next time I apologize Commissioner Weiss you were not able to get an open and transparent answer to your question. I would like to give the next time to Commissioner Szetela, please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay Commissioner Szetela you have the floor.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I just want to say that there is so much that has happened here today that is so disturbing. We have a Chair who is trying to shut down conversations that he doesn't like and trying to control speech of other Commissioners. Rather than allowing an open airing and discussion of matters that are concern to at least four or five of the Commissioners on this Commission who want to talk about it. The fact we are being denied an opportunity to talk about issues that are of concern to us that are relevant to redistricting, that are relevant to the public is just deeply disturbing to me. I'm frankly disgusted with this Commission today. I'm disgusted to say I'm a part of it. I think that there is a cover up going on to protect Commissioner Eid from his own behavior and his own bad choices and I think it's completely and utterly inappropriate. If you think you are going to silence me you are wrong because I will get off here and talking to the press and sharing my conflict of interest presentation I intended to present today. My code of conduct presentation I intended to present today and the public will see it and the press will be releasing it so it's still shared so you accomplished absolutely nothing other than selling our integrity and making us look like a bunch of clowns.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Szetela. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I just wanted to quickly say that this behavior is disgusting to use Commissioner Szetela's word. This is embarrassing. If there is a personal gripe regarding a Commissioner and I'm not going to tiptoe around the issue regarding Commissioner Eid then there is ample opportunity to phone him and air that grievance privately. This is not the platform to do this. If we are going to be up in arms about issues we should have done it about the maps. So this transference of energy whatever this attitude is gravely inappropriate for this platform. And there needs to be some sort of other point of order. Not about silencing it's about appropriateness. Even the raising of tones and back and forth and going over the Chair. Let's remember code of conduct. It's unfortunate we don't have a sergeant of arms but we are not going to find a subversive that we voted not to discuss. It's not about a cover up and I will speak on behalf of myself you don't get to use the strong Woods or language for labeling people for yourself Commissioner Szetela and we are in live meetings and

grandparents and professionals on the meeting and this is not the platform to do so. So again this discussion and anything related to it including slander should be closed.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you very much, Commissioner Kellom. Commissioner Szetela you have another comment?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yeah I don't think if we are throwing out legal terms you should throw out slander you don't understand what it means.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Please stop.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not going to stop. I have the Chair of this Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Point of order.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Let's have some order, Commissioner Szetela has got the floor. Go ahead Commissioner Szetela. You are on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: She is not going to have the floor if she is talking about me directly.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm talking about Chair Clark and when I ask and have the Chair calling me twice or three times over the next couple of weeks to ask me to remove an agenda item so it's not considered by the public or to put it into a closed meeting so that we can conceal what's going on, that is a cover up. And that is exactly what happened here. From the date that I asked for this agenda item until today I have been repeatedly contacted by both our Executive Director and the Chair of this Commission and asked to remove this agenda item. Before Anthony Eid even withdrew from working for Michigan voices so there was an attempt to hide this and conceal it and cover it up from the very beginning. So I can say that because that is what happened. I received repeated calls. And the fact that now Rhonda wants to talk about transparency and she is being shouted down and told she can't even talk about what she wants to talk about, again, it's very disturbing. It's very disturbing that there is an earth to hide the situation. And no one wants to talk about it. Over frankly I practiced law for 20 plus years as a business attorney where I sit in on board meetings and advise board of directors and served on two different boards as a director myself. Conflict of interest inquiries are typically minor occurrences where somebody is identifying something, there is a meeting on it, there is vote on it and it's over and done with. And the fact that this is turning into such a bruhaha over a simple policy and procedure that should be handled professionally and investigated. And, frankly, at the end of the day, based on how people are voted, even if he had not left Michigan Voices, the Commission probably would have said there was no conflict. But the fact that we are event trying to prevent that inquiry from even happening, it's not appropriate. It's not what we are required to do under the Constitution. And the fact that people are turning this into some kind of personal fight rather than following policies, it's just gross. It's gross. I'm done.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela. Ms. Reinhardt, do you have a comment, please?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. I understand that this agenda item, many of the Commissioners have strong opinions. But I just want to remind Commissioners about a few Roberts rules requirements for discussion. And some of your policies and procedure requirements for de quorum so first a Commissioner may only speak when they are given the floor by the Chair and must speak through the Chair. Second whenever a point of order is made, a point of order is allowed to interrupt discussion on going to point out when there is a violation of the rules. And it must be acknowledged. Third, your policy and procedures in the decorum Section outlines that Commissioners should refrain from outbursts. And I believe that is all that I wanted to share. So just keep this in mind as we continue the discussion. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you very much.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I apologize. When the Commissioner is done speaking, may I have a turn?

>> CHAIR CLARK: You have the floor, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No you called on Commissioner Curry. So please let her speak first and I would like to speak.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I didn't call on Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I thought you did I apologize.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I would like to speak.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Go ahead and speak.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: I have the floor?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you. I'm very disillusioned by what I'm hearing today. How, you know, we have the voting rights, we have to vote on everything. And because the voting did not go in your favor I don't think anybody should be so upset. You cannot say that you're not upset because we can hear it in the voices. You know how you talk when you're upset and you're upset. And I this I you need to leave this matter alone. We only go by the votes. We are not acting like a bunch of clowns at least I'm not. Nobody has called me to try to refer me to say no or to agree to anything. And I think that you're insinuating the wrong things. We've been conducting in the way it's supposed to go from day one. I don't think we should make an exception today. I think it's asinine to put us in the same category you are in. Who is in denial of what is going on today. We are voting what we feel in our heart is right. And we have that right. And I voted that I did not want to go any further with this. And if the votes go through they go through and you ought to be grown enough to accept what's going on today and let's leave this matter alone. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Curry. Commissioner Lange you had a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do. Commissioner Szetela and I, it's no secret, have had quite the turbulent I guess we will call it turbulent interaction between each other throughout our time on this Commission. We don't always see eye to eye. However, I do respect her on this subject. I respect where she is coming from because I believe that my honesty and integrity is in question. I did also receive a phone call from the Chair saying he was going to be working to get this taken off from the agenda. And he was calling several people, which I did say at that time are you polling to see which way the votes will go. And he said, no, that he was just calling certain people. So I do have concerns about transparency. I have had concerns about transparency through this whole process. As I put in my dissent letter about calls being made between Commissioners outside of open meetings. So this is no surprise that I would put this on especially considering what I've been researching lately.

It is what it is. If this Commission wants to vote down, that's fine. That's fine. We can close this discussion. But, no, there are other ways where our voices will be heard. Because we can request other things and I am 100% in favor of that. Because not only have the actions and the information I found out and the lack of transparency that I found out affect my honesty and integrity, I honestly think it affects the honesty and integrity of everybody on this Commission. And I really think people need to stop and look at the facts and not just try and be public perception. Because the public perception right now is that we are hiding stuff in dark corners. If you want to truly do a service to this public, when they are paying our money, our paychecks, then you need to be 100% transparent and reveal the good, the bad and the ugly along with the good. So that's all I've got. We can move on to the next agenda item because I truly feel at this point this discussion isn't going to go anywhere anyway. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: May I say something?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm really appalled what is going on. I'm tired of being put in the same category of whoever is doing all this talking. I'm not feeling the same way you are feeling and I have not talked to anybody about changing a vote or voting for a certain thing. I have not gotten into it. I very seldom talk outside of this meeting that we have. So do not when you make your accusations do not put everybody in it. Because everybody is not in it. I'm doing what is according to the way we are supposed to do this according to our rules. And that's what I'm doing. And I have a right to my own opinion. As you do. And I think that you all stop and making everyone seem like clowns and making everybody think they are hiding something. I am not hiding anything. And I want that clear. And stop adding me to your names of everybody doing stuff. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you for your comment, Commissioner Curry. Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I also echo what Commissioner Curry said. And I think we should be very careful about conveniently, I'll say it another way, the whole issue here for myself personally is that like Commissioner Curry said we voted, apparently there were feelings about that vote. So there was speaking of a plan, there was a subversive way used to bully and this has happened before on other issues. But now it's coming out, everything comes to a head, to bully that issue back on the table including folks that have had prior relationships. I understand that people can get along whenever they choose and we can mature and all that. But this is not the platform to take up personal issues. If there was an issue with the Chair, you call the Chair. If there is an issue with Commissioner Eid you call Commissioner Eid. The use of a public platform is to paint a different picture and because this is a Commission it does not broad brush folks that don't belong in the issue into the issue. So I've always been a part of this Commission or a part of this Commission as someone with integrity. And I think we ought to be very careful particularly certain individuals saying things happen in the dark. There are a number of situations that happen on the Commission that should have never happened. And they involve people that were speaking. So think of this as a Commission we need to just move on.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Very Wednesday said Commissioner Kellom. Commissioner Szetela, you have one more comment?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I don't appreciate the characterization that people are bullying. I think that gets thrown out on this Commission a lot. And I also don't appreciate the characterization that the concerns of Erin and Commissioner Lange and myself and Commissioner Weiss are somehow personality issues. You want to cast it that way because I think it makes it easier for some people but it's not a personality issue. It's not a personality conflict it's an issue of noncompliance with the code of conduct and the conflict of interest policies and the variety of different policies that we have that we all voted for and agreed we were going to comply with. I do not appreciate having that characterized as a personality conflict. It's not a personality conflict it's compliance with the rules is what we are asking for.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Wagner you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, I do. I resent the fact that everybody thinks this is a personal attack against Anthony. It's not. At least I know for a fact on my part. I was extremely concerned at the last meeting that all of our honesty and integrity has been questioned. Not only that, but the gentleman from the Chamber of Commerce that Edward forwarded us his comment basically asked were we all on the take or were we for sale is how I took that. And my honesty and integrity means more to me and to the people in Michigan than this whole argument. And it's not a personal attack. And I would like to see it addressed.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Wagner. I don't think any of us are on the take or for sale at all. I don't think it's ever been that case. Commissioner Kellom, you still have your hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes and I will say this and this is a risky comment right and I'm not disrespecting folks' feelings or the work that was done but there was not this much passion for the maps we drew and understanding and working together. So again I did not mention it was a personality issue. What I'm saying is it's a level of professionalism. And if we are going to be passionate about something let's be passionate about the business at hand. There are folks that we could call to discuss conduct, transparency, et cetera. We didn't want to mention these words. We did not want to be labor the subject and, in fact, we are still talking about an agenda item that was removed so let's stop. Let's just cut it, please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any other comments?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I have one.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I want to be very clear that when people place an agenda item and it gets removed against their wishes people are going to be passionate about that. Because it certainly feels like whether you agree or not because you're not on the side of the people being silenced, whether you personally feel that that's offensive is really frankly kind of irrelevant. The people who are being silenced have a right to be passionate about the fact that they are being silenced. And I can't think of another time honestly and keep in mind not only did I Chair for six months I also took over as Chair for many months Brittini when you were not available at meetings. And I can't remember a single time where we removed an agenda item to prevent discussion on something where other people who had added it wanted to continue to discuss it. So that is what I'm passionate about. And frankly I was very passionate about the maps too but I don't remember an incident where we were silencing people who were trying to draw things on the maps and said no you can't speak. You cannot speak. I did not use my Chair to do that. I let people speak. I have a right to be upset about the fact that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Point of order Mr. Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The discussion here has gone way beyond transparency.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Way beyond even talking about Commissioner Eid. And it's now dissolved into personal attacks, recriminations by all people I suggest Mr. Chair you move the agenda forward.

>> CHAIR CLARK: We will move the agenda forward.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I second it.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Those that have their hand up I will not call on any of you. Which is Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Lett. Do we need to take a vote on that?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It won't happen again Commissioner Szetela I know I'm speaking out of turn but that won't happen again. You won't be able to silence me again. It's on you where I have been silenced so Commissioner Szetela. Go ahead Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I will keep my comments really short.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do we have a second to move the agenda forward.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I made a motion to second it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Commissioner Curry seconded it and let's make a roll call vote, please, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Mr. Chair. Commissioners, please state your support of the motion with a yes or a no when I call on you. I will call on you in alphabetical order starting with Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I'm sorry I don't remember what we are voting on.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: To move the agenda forward.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> CHAIR WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Could you repeat the question, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The motion was whether to move on to the next agenda item.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Definitely yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No on principle.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I thought I said yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vote of 11 yes to two no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR CLARK: We have a motion that is carried and we will move on to the next agenda item which is item 6C process for calling special meetings. Without objection I will ask Commissioner Rhonda Lange to present. Hearing no objection please proceed, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you, Commissioner Clark. I put forth an agenda item to change how we do a special meeting. Without bringing up the topic, recently it was requested, I know for a fact by four Commissioners that we call a special meeting when there was concerns from the public about things that were going on. We were denied that fact. We were denied the opportunity to call a special meeting where things could have been discussed due to our rules of procedure stating that only the Chair, the Executive Director or the Vice Chair could call a special meeting.

I have a problem with that because if you think about it four Commissioners did say that they would like one e-mail sent. And I'm sorry I'm losing my train of thought so forgive me. And basically we were denied a special meeting to address things. I don't think that is right when this Commission when we started out with a Chair and Vice Chair it was solely expressed and it even expresses it in our rules that the Chair was basically to facilitate meetings and the Vice Chair to facilitate meetings and any other administrative duties that the Commission felt relevant for the Chair to handle.

The fact that basically a third of the Commission wanted a special meeting and were denied that opportunity I don't think is right. So I think in all fairness that if two Commissioners request a special meeting since we are all supposed to have equal voices on this Commission, then it should be allowed for a special meeting to be.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Lange would you like to put forward a motion to that?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I put forward that we approve the writing or the rule change as written, that states that a special meeting can be called by the Chair, Vice Chair, Executive Director or two members of the Commission.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay, Ms. Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Per I'm sorry I did not mean to interrupt a motion. Please continue. I will make my comment during discussion.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay Commissioner Szetela you had a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I second.

>> CHAIR CLARK: You second. Okay the motion was brought forward by Commissioner Lange and approved by Commissioner Szetela. Let me make a

comment because I was involved in turning down the special meeting. And I'll give you the reasons why.

First of all, I felt that the special meeting had to be done on an urgent request for some item of urgency. I did not see that here. Or it was not explained to me.

Second of all we needed time to do research, which Commissioner Lett, Edward Woods and I myself did. And, third, I was looking out for the money. We are getting close and tight on the budget. And I saw no reason to not wait for two more weeks. Actually it was three. One was the big holiday week or the weekend for the summer. I did not see any reason why we shouldn't wait to have the opportunity to do those things. So that was my logic behind it. Ms. Reinhardt you have a comment?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Executive Director Woods, I know you are sharing the screen but if you don't mind I would like to share a piece of the Commission's current rules of procedure on the screen regarding amendments to the rules and procedures.

>> CHAIR CLARK: That would be good. Then Commissioner Witjes I have a comment for you after this.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Section 14.2 is about amendments making amendments to rules of procedure which is what Commissioner Lange is proposing. And there is an avenue for the Commission to amend the rules of procedure. However prior notice of the change must be given three days in advance before the Commission can take action. And to my knowledge there was not a notice provided three days in advance prior to this meeting. Therefore action could not be taken at this meeting. But would have to be taken at the next meeting on this motion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Witjes?

>> CHAIR WITJES: Yeah, I was actually just about to say that exact same comment that Sarah brought up. But one thing that if we want to talk about changing the rules of procedure for calling a special meeting I would not necessarily be against doing so. But I would bring up at the next meeting when they are actually discussing this potential rule change instead of two it becomes three, one from each, one from democratic, one from republican party and one from the independent affiliations. So we could discuss that at our next meeting, however.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Mr. Chair?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Yes Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: May I respond to Commissioner Witjes, what he just said?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That was put in front of me, Commissioner Witjes. However, as I stated, there were four people on the Commission that I know of for a fact that wanted a special meeting. And there was not one from a certain party. So, again it

kind of goes a third of the Commission felt the need for a special meeting. But yet because there was not one person from the other and I think if you put it that way it jeopardizes having a quorum and finding out if there is others that agree and you wouldn't want to do anything that goes against our rules of procedure. So that's why I stated two that is why there is no round Robin, there is no polling trying to get to the one, one and one. So that was my thinking behind that. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And my thoughts were behind the money as well. These extra meetings cost us money. And I don't think we are at a luxury at this point in time to be able to afford that unless it's a real emergency. Such as, for example, we are instructed to redraw maps. That sort of thing. So that was my thoughts behind it. Apparently we have to wait until next meeting to address this. Commissioner Woods we want to make sure it's on the agenda. And let me go back to.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Wagner has her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I keep conveniently getting passed over.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sometimes it's hard to see the hand in the corner.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: What I was going to say was geez now I forgot. It took so dang long. I usually make notes. And speaking of that, sorry, hush you guys. And speaking to what Sarah brought up about three days' notice we did get the agenda which has the process for calling special meetings as an agenda item on Tuesday. And I think it would qualify for three days' notice. Mine says Tuesday.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Clark, can I speak a little bit to this?

>> CHAIR CLARK: Go ahead.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I'm very comfortable being the executive director for the Commission. Thank you for the up great to Commissioner. But I appreciate that. But first and foremost when Commissioner Lange asked for this agenda item, she just wanted to present it. She was well aware that there would be a discussion time for consideration. And not to be voted. But just to have that out there. With regards to that. Commissioner Lange, if I'm wrong please let me know but that was my understanding.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You are wrong.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay my apologies.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I apologize Mr. Woods that's not correct that is why I wanted it in writing so the Commission could review it prior to this meeting, that is why I wanted it out as soon as possible. And in writing. But that's okay. I can understand how it could have gotten misconstrued. Thank you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: My apologies to you. I know you wanted to have a transparent discussion with regards to that. So with regards to next item, so, Commissioner Clark, that will be on the next agenda item for the Commission's consideration.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Woods. And Commissioner Witjes?

>> CHAIR WITJES: Well, I just want to bring up the fact that every single time we made a proposed change to our rules we followed this particular procedure. We want to do it in an open meeting and at the next meeting it's discussed.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For consistency sake that is how we need to proceed with it.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Any other comments, Commissioner Witjes?

>> CHAIR WITJES: No, no, no.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Ms. Reinhardt has her hand up.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Miss Reinhardt I have a question for you for the next meeting do we need the exact proposal that could be presented as part of the handout or can that be developed as we go through the discussion?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I can certainly confirm that. I believe that your Executive Director has posted a recommended edit to the rules of procedure and the presentation which is publicly posted. I believe it was publicly posted yesterday.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Thank you so much. I just wanted clarification. Any more comments on that subject?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes. So technically the motion was made and seconded. So it is still currently open. I would recommend for the Commission is to postpone the motion until the next meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Chair Clark I will withdraw my motion at this time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You will, okay, the motion is withdrawn.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Put it on the next meeting agenda.

>> CHAIR CLARK: Okay that motion. Any other comments on the subject? Okay we will talk about it next meeting.

Next on the agenda is item 6D fiscal year 23 financial report for June. Without objection I will ask our Executive Director to present. Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Clark. Let me get my screen together. This is a report for June. At this time the only thing we are missing is the technology Internet purchases through the state. That has averaged out at 99.20 per month. But that's usually billed 30 days after. So it's usually not included. It's usually a month delay. And I know that EDS is working to submit their bill for the month of June. Consequently for the month of June we spent \$190, 822.10 from I'm sorry Ms. Reinhardt do you have a question? I see your hand up.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No, sorry I will lower my hand.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We spent 190822.10. If there is any questions I can take them at this time. I should note that Baker Hostetler had a summer recess. So therefore they did not work June 23 to the 30th. As relates to our work. So just wanted to make sure that you're aware of that as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you very much, Mr. Woods. Any comments? At this point before we move on to our next subject, which is approval of the minutes, I'd like to turn the meeting over to Vice Chair, Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, so the next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes for June 15th. The draft minutes have been provided to the Commission before this meeting and are posted on the website. Are there any edits to these minutes? Seeing none, oh, Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was just going to motion to accept them as drafted.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Okay, we have a motion do we have a second? Commissioner Weiss seconds it. Okay, so all in favor raise your hand and say aye..

Aye.

Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Nay.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Okay, the ayes prevail. The minutes are approved. Okay then the next agenda item is approval of the revised minutes. These drafts have been provided to the Commission before this meeting and posted on the website. And these are just the changes that were made from minutes that we have already approved. Just small little changes. I think, Sarah Reinhardt do you have a presentation about that?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, I believe Executive Director Woods was going to share that for you all.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Okay, thank you, Executive Director, Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: All right. Ms. Reinhardt are you going to speak or would you wish me to speak?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm happy to share. So during the process of your legal team reviewing website materials, there were a couple typos that were found in some of the minutes that they recommended be corrected to correctly reflect the record. Certainly apologize for any errors in minutes. However, it is a human process. So we are glad to go back and make those corrections for you.

These 13 meetings are the meetings that reflect the minutes that require corrections, that were voted as approved.

So these are the corrections that are made, that I would recommend that the Commission vote to make. And I will pause here for a moment to let you all read through these. And if you have any questions please let me know.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I just want to say, sorry Mr. Chair, I see Commissioner Witjes also has his hand.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Witjes, go ahead or Commissioner Rothhorn do you still want to say something or is that what you're saying?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I do want to say something and then I will follow Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Since these are just Scribner's errors that require a simple correction can they be covered by a blanket motion?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I have potential language for that if it uses or if it pleases the Commission. So go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: My section is why don't we give everyone a moment to look through these and then you may make the motion, Commissioner Rothorn.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: There is one more Page that covers the remaining minutes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I spoke too soon.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Did we see the second Page?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes I put all four pages up. I can go back. This was the first one. And here was the second one. And then once again all of these minutes were e-mailed to you for your consideration as well. The presentation that Ms. Reinhardt did is just to summarize it for the public so they can see. And you can see everything at once instead of going minute by minute by minute or minutes by minutes by minutes.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Thank you. Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I will say it was very helpful to have this presentation and understand the Scribner's errors that Mr. Witjes said. And they are human errors that need to be corrected so I did want to try to put together a motion and this is what I got. Move to amend these 13, I think there are 13 previously adopted meeting minutes with corrections as presented to replace the prior approved minutes and I can read those if that is important for the motion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Question Sarah Reinhardt or whoever do we need to read each of the dates or is this sufficient?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I think that this should be sufficient unless you would like to.

>> CHAIR ROTHORN: Because I mentioned 13 and again I'm trying to expedite us that is all.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Motion made by Commissioner Rothorn and seconded by Commissioner Witjes. All in favor raise your hand and say aye..

Aye.

Any opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: The ayes prevail and the minutes are approved.

Next we have Executive Director report without objection I will ask Executive Director Woods to provide his report. Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. Commissioner Orton.

Okay, here are some highlights, 8600 increase of 11% for the previous month and the bulk of the people are looking at if final District maps followed by District maps by county. Obviously our biggest downloads our viewership comes from Michigan followed by Virginia, Ohio, Illinois and New York. I sent a Commission lessons learned report so I want to share with regards to that information so you have it. There is a lot of things that we might want to consider with regards to or oral interviews you are doing for the archives, that you might be able to glean from that report.

Our Commission attendance rate every quarter I update that is 93%. 9 Commissioners are at 95% or better. And we have two Commissioners in the 100% club. And Commissioner Steve Lett and Commissioner Richard Weiss. So far we've done 288 presentations. This is including interviews and outreach. As it relates to that as well.

And then the next thing coming up, that we have will be archiving. Conducting interview of records available from the MICRC website. The State of Michigan is doing that through web capture. I will archive it, what they are doing to make sure all the pages and updates what have you if people want to come in or on line they can be able to capture the work and documents of the Commission by capturing that off the web site. There will be interviews for the archives at the University of Michigan. They will be conducted by Michigan State University, University of Michigan, Voters Not Politicians. You will receive the requestions before the interviews. They will do it in August. You have the opportunity to speak for yourself. Not the Commission as a whole but your experiences as relates to yourself and how you feel. And as always participation is optional. Participation is optional. So just kind of wanted to share that with you as well with regards to the archiving in terms of working with Commissioner Clark on that.

Considerable of time has been spent over the last month or so dealing with, you know, various things as it comes up by the Commission. I just want to thank each and every one of you. I've heard a lot from you over these last month or so. And the commitment to the mission and doing the maps and the passion, I can attest that I've experienced and witnessed from each and every one of you as Commissioners. And so just want to commend the passion, commend the energy and the dedication as we, you know, try to complete this process by defending the maps.

A lot of respect for you guys and what you are doing and how you feel. And how we move forward and process because there just has been a lot of great things that this Commission has done. We are still getting asked questions for best practices. Getting asked questions for things. And so as we navigate through our challenges, let's not forget what kept us together throughout these last almost three years. And that's just a commitment to respect each other whether we agree or disagree for the betterment of the whole. So once again thank you so much for this opportunity. And the ability to give this report.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Thank you, Director Woods. I believe we have a legal liaison report. Steve, do you have more?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes. I had a couple of things one of the cases that was out there in North Carolina was the Moore versus Harper case. That was recently decided that was the independent state legislature question. I know some of you were interested in that. The Supreme Court ruled 6 to 3 that the state legislatures were susceptible to Court review on drawing of districts, the three judges that three judges would have dismissed on mootness that the question was no longer triable. And those were Thomas Gorsuch and Alito. So the six that decided that the Court still had a role to play was kind of an interesting mash up of the cases. Another case that there are a number of cases that are coming up, if you are watching the news in which states are now having to redistrict. And if you look at those within or with a close eye you will see that those are cases in which the minority districts have been severely restricted. One I can think of they went from two or three minority districts to one. And that didn't pass muster. So there are a number of cases like that which are now having to be redrawn and most of the time there have been some rather obvious, errors, violations of voting rights act.

Another voting case, in other words the ability to vote came in up in Florida. And it had to do with IDs, early voting, mail in voting, drop boxes, et cetera. Federal Judge in Florida issued a permanent injunction at this stage of the case, which is highly unusual. Most would have been...most usually it would have been a temporary injunction. And then had a hearing on the case. This Judge issued a permanent injunction with a 300 Page opinion. And the Court found that for the past 20 years Florida had repeatedly sought to make voting tougher for Black voters. He evidently did not like what the legislature had done there. And stopped Florida from doing what they were doing. There are a number of states that are trying to pass this type of legislation which makes it harder for voters to vote, claiming that it makes it safer and makes the outcome more reliable.

Michigan if you have been following the legislation has not been following that practice, have been making it more convenient for voters. And so that is kind of what is going on across the nation.

I will take any questions if you have them. But that is it for my report.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Any questions for Commissioner Lett? Okay thank you, Commissioner Lett.

So without objection I will ask Mike Brady or Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State if they have an update. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Mr. Brady or Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you madam Commissioners update your computers and log in regularly. The Executive Director is very generous in availability to

assist with any computer issues you might be experiencing. Thank you very much, that's all I have.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt. Correspondence was received in advance of our meeting along with written public comments to the Commissioners. Are there any agenda items Commissioners would like to have added to future agendas? Besides what we've already discussed in the meeting? Seeing none, are there any announcements?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have a question.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is the inquiry report that was said it was going to be posted on our website?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes the inquiry report will be posted on the website as well as the corrected minutes presentation. Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well I recommend everybody reads that whether it be on this Commission or in the media, I think it speaks for itself. And I listened to a lot of things that was said about me today. The actual unprofessional thing that's been going on is the behavior.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Point of order, please. This is not appropriate topic. We need to stop now.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was going to say what we need to do is.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: There is a point of order so we have to vote on it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Point of order.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Point of order the outcome of point of order is actually determined by the Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Exactly.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And does not require a vote.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Okay.

So I'm going to okay I'm not sure how to do this but I'm going to say we can have these discussions offline between individuals. The inquiry report will be posted on our website. So as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair? Can I.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: A motion to adjourn is in order.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I speak before we adjourn I have a question and I don't know if attorneys are still there or if the State of Michigan can answer for me but I just have a quick question if I may.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No it does not relate to much of anything. Just a quick question for Secretary of State's office I believe.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Is that okay?

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: You may.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you very much Madam Chair. Madam secretary I have a question. And I know I've done this in the past when there has been votes that I did not agree with, I presented public comment to you to put out to the public regarding those votes. And you've graciously done that so the public can understand my point of view. My question is if I were to submit another one, would that still be the case?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So you're asking if you can submit like a written statement?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: A written statement, yes.

Just a breakdown of...honestly it would just be a breakdown of my time on the Commission. I feel that it's important. And I don't want to drag anything out. And I don't want to be a hypocrite. So I want to be transparent with everybody. So I would like to sit down and write a letter to the public and I'm asking if I do that if you will post it for me for the public?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, absolutely. That is consistent with what we've done with Commissioner statements in the past. So we would certainly accommodate that for you, Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you very much. And thank you Commission for letting me ask the question. Please know this is strictly I've lost too much sleep over the last two and a half years so this is strictly to give me peace of mind. And to back up the words that I say in the meeting. I mean to disrespect to anybody. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we adjourn.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> VICE CHAIR ORTON: Motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes to adjourn. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

Any opposed raise your hand and say nay. The meeting is adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

>> CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Madam Chair and Commissioner Clark, too.

>> See you later.

(Hearing concludes.)