

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

03/25/21 12:30 pm Meeting

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

>> Brittini: Good afternoon because it's afternoon now.

As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 12:32 p.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed to YouTube.

For anyone in the public watching, who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they currently are using, please visit our social media at redistricting Michigan to find the link for either viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning and we have ASL interpretation available for this meeting.

If you are a member of the public, watching, who would like easier viewing options for the ASL interpreter on your screen, e-mail at [Redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we will provide you with additional viewing options.

Similarly, members of the public who would like to access translation services during the webinar can e-mail us at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) for details on how to access language translation services available for this meeting.

Translation services are available for both Spanish and Arabic.

Please e-mail us at [Redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we will provide you with unique link and call-in information.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should contact [Redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.gov).

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at redistricting, I think it's supposed to be [RedistrictingMichigan.org](http://RedistrictingMichigan.org) for viewing at a later date.

Excuse me.

This meeting is also being transcribed. And those transcriptions will be made available and posted on [RedistrictingMichigan.Org](http://RedistrictingMichigan.Org), along with written public comment submissions.

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

Members of the media should have his contact information.

Now we will have the roll call.

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

>> Sally: Good afternoon, everyone.

When I call your name, please unmute yourself and indicate where you are remotely attending the meeting from.

Doug Clark.

- >> Doug: Present; and I'm remotely attending from Rochester Hills, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Juanita Curry.
- >> Juanita: Present; and I'm remotely attending the meeting from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Anthony Eid.
- >> Anthony: Present; remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Brittini Kellom.
- >> Brittini: Present; and remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Rhonda Lange.
- >> Rhonda: Present, attending remotely from Reed City.
- >> Sally: Steve Lett? Cynthia Orton.
- >> Present; attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.
- >> Sally: MC Rothhorn.
- >> MC: Present; attending remotely from East Lansing, Michigan.
- >> Rebecca Szetela.
- >> Rebecca: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Janice Vallette.
- >> Janice: Present; attending remotely from Highland, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Erin Wagner.
- >> Erin: Present; attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Richard Weiss.
- >> Richard: Present; attending remotely from Saginaw, Michigan.
- >> Sally: Dustin Witjes.
- >> Dustin: Present attending remotely from Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- >> Sally: 12 of 13 Commissioners are present.

There is a quorum.

- >> Brittini: Thank you so much. Sally. And, hello, Commissioners.

Now we will move on, hey, I like a good wave, we will move on to the adoption of the agenda, assuming that we have all had time to review the agenda for today.

Yes, Doug.

>> Doug: I just want to mention that when we get down to future meetings in the future agenda items, I've got a number of items I want to discuss so it will take a few minutes.

- >> Brittini: Okay, thank you.

Anyone else have something for the adoption of the agenda?

- >> MC: I'll move it be approved.

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.

>> Brittini: Thank you. And really quickly as reminder to the public watching, you can see the agenda is posted at RedistrictingMichigan.org. And I was going to entertain a motion, but MC made the motion.

MC Rothhorn. And that motion was seconded by Doug Clark.

So it is moved and seconded that the agenda as presented for today will be adopted.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye or just raise your hand.  
and all opposed same sign.

So the ayes have it. The motion to adopt the agenda for today is passed.

And reviewing of the --- reviewing and approval of our minutes, are there any edits to the meeting minutes as we are looking over them?

Not seeing any edits for the minutes, I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes from last week's meeting.

>> Dustin: Moved.

>> Brittini: That was Dustin and seconded by Richard.

So all opposed? I mean, I'm sorry, all in favor of the minutes please indicate with a hand.

And all opposed?

The minutes are approved and reviewed.

The ayes have it.

And now let's move on. I'm making sure, Julianne, you have time to write things down.

Let's move on to public comments.

>> MC: I want to appreciate real quick in the minutes the Legal and Federal legislative update. It was nice to see that in the minutes, really appreciate the minutes taking the detail that is going into it thank you.

>> Brittini: I agree. Thank you, MC. And thank you for the person taking time to write the minutes and be diligent about it.

>> MC: I think that is Cathleen.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Cathleen. I wasn't sure and didn't want to be incorrect. Thank you MC I appreciate that.

A few notes about public comment. For those who are joining us for the first time, because this is a virtual meeting, members of the public had to sign up in advance to address the Commission.

Staff at the Department of State will unmute each member of the public for up to two minutes on a first come, first serve basis.

This means members of the public will be called on in order in which they have signed up to address the Commission.

To those members of the public participating in public comment, please note you will have no more than two minutes to address the Commission this morning or this afternoon rather.

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

And you can also submit your thoughts to the Commission and the public by e-mailing [Redistricting@Michigan.Gov](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.Gov). The Department of State will provide your written thoughts to the Commission by indicating in that e-mail that you would like to submit your written comment as public comment, it will be included in the online meeting archive for the Commission.

Public comment sign-up links are also posted on Redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook and Twitter at Redistricting Michigan.

Now, I would like to recognize Sally March, Michigan Department of State Director of Special Projects, will call on members of the public to address the Commission.

>> Sally: Thank you, Chair.

There is no live public comment today.

So we are good to move on to your next agenda item.

>> Brittini: Okay. Well, thank you and thank you for the members of the public even though there was no comments for you all diligently participating in giving us your eyes and your ears. So we will move on to the Executive Director's report.

Sue.

>> Sue: Thank you, Brittini.

>> You are welcome.

>> Sue: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

As I just want to mention on public comment the system did crash yesterday.

That the MDOS uses to process those public comments we received, so part of the comments were sent to the Commissioners immediately prior to the meeting and then the balance will be forthcoming.

But the public should know that Commissioners receive those and does read all the comments that are received, so we appreciate that.

And I appreciate the Commissioners. Thank you for your continuing service on the Commission and to our great state.

After I changed the continuing education for the end of our agenda today, we extended our time for the meeting, so I again want to apologize.

I would prefer to have that at the very end of the meeting, but I didn't feel it was fair to our presenters to make a second change to the time we were asking them to be here.

On the VRA Legal Counsel Committee that would be chaired by Commissioners Szetela with additional members, Commissioners, Eid, Clark, and Kellom. And I will be sending the proposals out to you today or first thing tomorrow morning.

Of course, this will go to all Commissioners and all are invited to sit in on the meeting, which will happen next Tuesday, the 30th, at 8:00 a.m., so it will run 8:00 to 9:30 next Tuesday.

We do have a full agenda, so I'm going to get right to the ice breaker and ask you to share the title of one of your favorite books.

And I'm going to start today with Erin. How about you starting for us?

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.

>> Erin: Anything by Ted Decker, but especially "This Present Darkness."

>> Sue: Okay, thank you.

Anthony.

>> Anthony: I'll go with the Bible.

>> Sue: Okay. Thank you.

I thought about that, also.

Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Can you guys hear me?

>> Yes.

>> Rebecca: Sorry, honestly, I read all the time and I burn through books like wildfire, but I can't honestly say there is one book or a series of books that are my favorite. So I'm going to punt on that one because I don't have a favorite.

I just read like crazy.

>> Sue: Okay, that's good.

Dustin how about you?

>> Dustin: My favorite book is titled "The Naked and the Dead" by Norman Miller. It's an excellent World War II fictitious ambition of real life things that happened to him.

>> Sue: Okay. Thank you. Juanita, how about you?

You're muted.

>> Juanita: Okay, the Bible, King James. Thank you.

>> Sue: Thank you for sharing.

Janice.

>> Janice: I am also a reader, but I have a series that I read a while ago by John Jakes. It's the "Kent Family Chronicles." And it's very good.

It starts at the beginning when the United States started and goes all the way through the Industrial Revolution. It's historical fiction.

>> Sue: Okay. Thank you.

MC.

>> MC: Favorite book, so I'm going to have to give you three.

>> Sue: Okay.

>> MC: I was a stay-at-home dad and it still is sort of my password, do you have a favorite book, the password prompts, it's "Jamberry," by Bruce Degan. It's a children's book but it's fantastic.

I love it.

Then I would go with I think James Baldwin is one of my favorites. And he's got -- I think "The Fire Next Time" is probably that one.

That also talks about he is writing to his nephew, so it's sort of a children's perspective or a young person's perspective.

And then the last book that -- I love the title and I love her writing. It's Belle Hooks, that is her pen name, but the title is called "All About Love."

>> Sue: Thank you for sharing.

Brittini, how about one of your favorites or two or three?

>> Brittini: I'm in the two or three category.

I have Belle Hooks, "All About Love" on my side table, so good job on that one, MC.

This is a hard one.

"To Kill a Mockingbird" is like my all-time classic.

And I also like any book that is about women's or children's rights or justice. So I'm constantly consuming books by educators, "The Body Keeps Score," that is about trauma and our bodies and our minds.

That is a good one.

And then "Chicka-Chicka Boom."

A childhood book about the alphabet, really learning the alphabet. But it comes with a really poppy song and I still say it in my head to this day because my mom read that to me all the time.

A told B and B told C I'll meet you to the top of C.

Really go in on "Chicka-Chicka Boom," that is a good one.

>> Sue: Thanks, Brittini. I'll practice later.

Cynthia, do you have a book or two you would like to share?

>> Cynthia: I do have a lot of favorite books, but one that might be an all-time favorite, besides the Bible, I suppose is "The Secret Garden."

I really like that one.

>> Sue: Okay, thank you for sharing.

Richard?

>> Richard: I guess I have to -- I have read quite a while ago, one was "Project Bluebook," and the other one is "Chariot of the Gods."

>> Sue: Doug, how about you?

>> Doug: I'm really into American History. And my favorite, book which is really fictional history, is "Gone with the Wind."

I think it gives us a good depiction of what the old south was like and I actually compare it to today, how we have transitioned from that.

>> Sue: Okay. Thank you.

Edward, how about you.

I think Edward might be frozen.

We will move on to Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you.

So good afternoon, Commissioners.

I will take liberty and pick an adult favorite book, is "Always Nela 18" by Neon Urich.

And my favorite children's book is "Don't Let the Pigeon Drive the Bus," so those would be my two.

>> Sue: Okay. I think Edward might have lost us.

He is probably logging back in.

So I will just go ahead and say Simon Sinek, and I love his book "Start With Why." I think that is, you know, everything that we do, we need to start with why we are doing what we are doing.

And also the last one of his I read is "Leaders Eat Last," so I love his work. I love his philosophy. And his Ted talks are great.

So that would be it for the ice breakers, and I will thank everybody. And we will turn it back to Brittini.

>> Brittini: Thank you so much, Sue, that was fun. I enjoyed hearing other people's book suggestions for sure.

So let's move on to the Michigan Department of State updates, if there are any. And, if there are, and Edward is back also, so, hi, Edward coming back.

But, Sally, would love to hear the report from the MDOS.

>> Sally: And thank you, Madam Chair. No updates today, but looking forward to seeing you all next week.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Sally.

Okay. Well, moving on to any unfinished because the first item under our unfinished business is the census data and dates for relief request to Michigan, the Supreme Court resolution. And that will be brought to us by General Counsel Pastula.

>> Julianne: Thank you, Madam Chair. And good afternoon, members of the Commission. I indicated on March 5th then the MICRC authorized the joint silence of relief of the November 1st deadline, that I would be bringing back proposed dates for extended deadlines for MICRC to include in the petition.

Today I'm presenting those proposed dates and requesting that the MICRC adopt a resolution to select either option one or option two.

These options were presented in a memorandum dated March 23rd, which is available to the public on the MICRC website.

Option one provides 61 days after receipt of the census data on September 30th. Or option two would provide 72 days after the September 30th receipt of census data. These options reflect a balanced compromise between the MICRC and the Bureau of Elections to conduct their work.

The chart included in the memorandum also sets forth the dates that correspond to extend option one and option two, all the way through the November 8th general election.

Both options require extension of the statutory candidate filing deadline for the August primary.

Option two provides the additional time to the MICRC to propose plans by shifting days allocated to the Bureau of Elections in option one.

I would also like to note that language recognizing the potential for additional delay past the September 30th anticipated release date is included in the draft petition for

relief. And the legacy data issue that was raised in the memorandum is still being analogized by staff and will be recorded separately to the MICRC in the future.

With the dismissal of the Ohio lawsuit yesterday, verification that the census Bureau still intends to release that legacy data in advance of the September 30th deadline is also needed.

This does not impact the action before the MICRC today.

To conclude my remarks, I would like to thank the MDOS legal director as well as the attorneys and the Department of the Attorney General, Civil Litigation Employment Elections Division, for their ongoing partnership.

And actually there was one other thing I wanted to highlight. During the last meeting Commissioner Rothhorn requested the time and funding for both the Arizona and the California Commissions.

The Arizona Commission and the 2010 redistricting cycle conducted their mapping between November 20th, '11 through January of 2012 and spent \$7.3 million.

In California's redistricting cycle of 2010, they performed the bulk of their mapping in the two-month period between June 10th and end of July in 2011 and their maps were adopted in August 2011. Their total budget was \$13.7 million. \$10.5 of which was state funding.

And \$3.5 of which was from the James Irvine Foundation.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm available to respond to questions and I look forward to receiving formal direction from the MICRC on the proposed dates.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Julianne. I'm going to have Rebecca facilitate the discussion and questions if you don't mind, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Not at all. Let me see.

I see Doug's hand up, so, Doug, why don't you go ahead.

>> Doug: I took some time yesterday and reviewed the dates and basically, we are talking about ten days difference between the two and to do the work we have to do. And once we get down to the filing deadline on May 14th, all the dates are static at that point.

So, based on that, we need a little more time. And, based on that, I would like to put a motion forward that we direct Julianne to pursue option two as we move forward. Under the idea that if the September 30th pushed out that our dates roll with that as well. So I'd like to put that forward as a motion.

>> Rebecca: I see Juanita's hand up.

>> Juanita: I just want to second his motion.

>> Rebecca: So we have a motion and a second.

Any additional discussion before we move forward?

I saw a few hands up.

Go ahead Anthony.



>> Anthony: I agree with the motion and have a question for Julianne. This was put together in conjunction with the Secretary of State's Office. And I just want to make sure that if we do adopt proposal or option two, they will have enough time to then turn our maps into ballots before the August primary.

>> Julianne: Thank you for that question, Commissioner Eid. And I would like to have Mike Brady respond to that question.

I did engage in conversations with MDOS and AG's Office on the dates, but I think it would be more appropriate to have Mike respond to your question.

>> Mike: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

Thank you for having me.

It's great seeing you all again.

And as Julianne noted, we did work together to review all of the different dates.

The second timeframe that the subject of the motion does provide 3 month and 20 days, which was, you know, it's significantly less than the traditional six months that Director Brader had detailed in his presentation to you a couple few weeks ago.

That said, we are committed to making sure this Commission has as much time as you need. And we are reviewing everything on our end to see how we can streamline the process both for those things that are the core responsibility of the Bureau of Elections but also the active back and forth that exists between during that timeframe, between the Bureau and the 1600 or so clerks around the state in the process of updating the QBI.

So, you know, short answer to your question, we believe we are going to do everything possible to make that date work.

And, you know, the challenge before us, and one we will have to rise to meet, but it's one we are committed to meeting.

>> Julianne: Madam Chair, I know I highlighted this in the memo and in past discussions, is that any of the deadlines, even the November 1st deadline, if the Commission has its proposed maps finalized and they are wishing to obtain public comment, nothing precludes the Commission from publishing those at the time they are ready. So after the final vote any of that additional time could be returned to the Bureau of Elections.

So while these are proposed dates, that -- if adopted I will forward on that, again, the Supreme Court can elect their and select their own dates, alternate dates. There are quite a few variables. But, certainly, the Commission has been steadfast in its desire to ensure that not only the Commission but also the Bureau of Election has the time it needs.

>> MC: I guess I would just appreciate you all did that and taking the hit so to speak and having a little extra time. And Bureau of Elections is giving us that, really appreciate that. And we will do our best to get it done quickly.

>> Brittini: Rebecca, I think you are on mute.

>> Rebecca: I'm sorry. We have a motion on the floor from Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Curry to approve option two, which was submitted to us by General Counsel Pastula.

I think we are ready to vote at this point because I don't see anybody else wanting to comment, so anyone in favor please represent you are in favor of the motion.

I see 123. Anyone opposed? Please raise your hand.

Okay, the motion passes.

Back to you, Ms. Kellom.

>> Brittini: I know. I almost wanted to say in the newsroom. Sorry. My sense of humor is entertaining you all.

So thank you, Rebecca, for handling that piece of our unfinished business.

We will now move on to public hearing locations and times.

Discussed with us -- or leading the discussion will be our Communications and Outreach Director, Mr. Edward Woods, III.

>> Edward: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I will be able to share my screen and just go over this quite quickly with you.

So give me just a moment to set that up.

>> MC: Edward, while you are doing that, I want to acknowledge that in our agenda we may have set up our -- we are about an hour ahead. And it may be because, yeah, I just wanted to acknowledge that, that it may screw up our Continuing Ed, just wanted to make sure that we, yeah, addressed that somehow before we get to that.

>> Brittini: I'm glad you raised that. I was going to let Edward go. And kind of bring Sally into the fold about because this is more than just our ten-minute break, that is after this.

I feel like an hour.

Like go to lunch or something.

Whatever, okay, Edward you have the floor.

>> Edward: Thank you so much.

I want to thank Commissioners for taking my call and sharing your availability of the dates for our public hearings discussion.

Just have to go over just a couple of things just to kind of make sure that we are all on the same page.

The logistics, when we are going out on the public hearings, we are treating this like a multi-media campaign to talk about redistricting and inform people. And so the reason why I was asking for your availability is because we have a tremendous amount of statewide partners who are willing to partner with us and schedule form -- schedule informal meetings so that we can get the word out about redistricting.

And so knowing your availability allows me to set up these meetings and to make sure we don't over book ourselves or over promise and under deliver.

So thank you for sharing that.

One of the things that we need to talk about is to set times for public hearings. As you know we want to accommodate people regardless of when they work first, second or third shift. So what would be the appropriate times? When we shared the public hearings, we took into consideration travel days, making sure we are not doing too much, and people have different schedules. And so just want to make sure when we look at the times and we are assigning the facilities that the times are accurate and correct.

So that is something that is important.

We addressed some conflicts with facilities.

A couple of the facilities that we wanted are vaccination centers and they are not able to meet on selected days, so facilities and seeing what our options are.

I'm having -- can you still hear me?

Can you hear me? Nod your head if you can hear me.

Good. I'm having Internet challenges right now.

Clarify in-person attendance for public hearings. And speaking with our legal counsel with regard to the Open Meetings Act, you have to be present for the public hearings. You cannot come in remotely unless there is a medical exception. So I just wanted to make sure people were aware of the Open Meetings Act and the requirement to actually be there if we are in-person physically at the facility.

There are some medical exceptions. And if you would like to contact our General Counsel, Julianne Pastula, she can assist with that.

Part of the reason, we talked about it before, we are trying to work with our Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs to get it scheduled and trying to do town hall forums and coffee chats and just information exchange so we are just working on some things.

I reached out to Centerville. Centerville has the largest Amish Community in the State of Michigan and just trying to touch bases with that.

We have a meeting tomorrow.

Making sure we have Native Americans included with the Michigan Department of Civil Rights.

So we have a robust list of 35 statewide organizations that we are trying to make sure we are leaving no stone unturned in terms of getting a broad perspective in addressing the communities of interest.

So I just wanted to share that with you.

Madam Chair, I would welcome a discussion just to see what times the Commissioners would feel would be the best for the public hearings, so we can accommodate people that work on different shifts would be very helpful to me before we start. You know, facilities for the most part that we have on our list have been are being held. But, obviously, I don't want to assign anything until we are all on the same page about the times for these public hearings.

So I'll turn it back to you.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Edward. I will open up the floor to any suggestions on times. Rebecca, if you don't mind leading, you can lead the discussion like we did.

>> Rebecca: Yes. That is fine. So, Commissioner Clark, I see you have your hand raised.

>> Doug: I do.

Two items.

Let me address the facilities issue first.

Facilities in some of these towns are in high demand that we have identified for the public forums.

And it kind of puts a lack of flexibility on Edward based on how we define the cities.

So I would like to suggest as a motion that we give Edward some flexibility if he cannot get a suitable facility in one of the item -- or in one of the cities that we have identified for the public forums.

And we give him the flexibility to pursue getting a facility in an adjacent town without coming back to the Commission. So I would like to put that forward as a motion and have discussion on that.

>> Rebecca: Okay. Do we have anybody willing to second that motion?

Cynthia, I see you have your hand raised, okay. So we have a motion by Doug and a second by Cynthia.

Any discussion?

No hands raised.

Okay, Commissioner Weiss, I noticed you had your hand raised. Do you have discussion on a second point?

>> Yes, after we are done with Mr. Clark's please.

>> Rebecca: Commissioner Clark, could you re-summarize that motion for me and I want to get it precisely right you want Edward the discussion on dates and times and locations without having to come back to the Commission, is that accurate?

>> Doug: Not the dates and times.

But the flexibility on the facilities themselves and he has the ability to change the location to an adjacent town.

>> Rebecca: Okay, all right, so we have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Orton with respect to giving Edward flexibility with respect to venue locations without having to return to the Commission all in favor please raise your hands.

234.

Okay, all opposed same sign.

The motion carries.

>> Richard, did you want to offer your comments at this point?

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.

>> Richard: I guess the only comment I was wondering when we are booking a venue like say Gaylord is first on the list May 4th the discussion I was thinking about time.

Now, if we book one of these venues do, we have it like for so many hours or would we have it for the day?

Which if we had it for the day that means you could have a meeting sometime in the morning and maybe one later in the afternoon to cover the different shifts of people that work.

I just wondered if that was a possibility or how is that going to work when we book a venue, thank you.

>> Edward: Sure because of our technology needs and things most of this stuff will be set up the day before.

Because we are going to have to test it and make sure it actually works.

And so we will have the facility for the day.

Is how we are looking at booking it.

In terms of doing it that way.

Because with all the technology and the you know the requirements that we have because of COVID and setting things up we will have it for the day.

I just need to make sure you know I'm giving the times right because there will be staff there making sure bathrooms are clean, sanitation takes place between breaks just a whole lot of details that are happening when we are not meeting to make sure that we comply with the guidelines in place at the time with regards to COVID.

>> Any other comments?

Juanita go ahead.

>> Juanita: Yes, I have a question.

I'm not sure where some of these meetings are but if they are over two hours away or more, do we spend the night there first?

And I know it's not -- this is just my question for the different meetings that are coming up.

If they are over two hours or three hours' drive do we spend the night how do we do that so we know.

>> Edward: You will spend the night and have meals and once I get the times you will get what is called an itinerary schedule so you know your travel dates based on your availability you will know what interviews you are doing whether they are radio, television, in person or not.

You will know the coffee chats the rotary stuff and it will be based on an itinerary and yes you will be able to stay in a hotel.

For those that you know that would like to some of you have work responsibilities, we understand that.

And may have to come back home.

But yes, that will be definitely made available to you.

>> Juanita: Thank you.

>> Rebecca: Any other comments?

Mr. Commissioner Rothhorn go ahead.

>> MC: I saw Julianne had her hand up too.

Did you need to respond to something before me Julianne?

Okay so in response to your question Edward like how do we choose these times?

I'm wondering if we can also because we've got so many partners it sounds like there is a wonderful list and wonder if the partners can say this is a working class community right so we need all three shifts covered.

I mean and so I guess what I'm saying I feel like if we could potentially ask the citizens to help us know what if there is, I'm just going to say like a four hour window but maybe it has to be eight because Thursday we will have our meetings, our regularly scheduled Commission meetings in addition to the public hearing so that feels like that is an 8 hour day potentially.

I guess what I'm suggesting it feels like I do want to be responsive to the citizens.

I don't know if there is a best way to do this.

And frankly you know I feel like I'm I don't know if I'm making a motion right now but wonder if there are suggestions or if you have that kind of information already Edward.

>> Edward: What I was looking to suggest or hoping to suggest you know in talking to the Commission and knowing the need for travel days, and trying not to back things up I was looking at 10-1 and 5-8 so it would be a 10-1 and 5-8 to accommodate people on their shifts.

You know pick up kids from school.

You know, what have you.

Mind you we are having a public comment stations and this is in reference only to our public hearings.

Just so we are on the same page.

This is in reference to the public hearings so that we can get everything set up.

It's a big production but if we did 10-1, 5-8 it will give people some flexibility, time to sleep, time to take care of their responsibilities and that would give us a six hour window.

Obviously when we are having those Commission meetings it's up to the will of the Commission but we would try to have as minimal business as possible so we can hear from the public on those Thursdays when we are out and about.

>> Brittini: Thank you Edward for those perimeters because admittedly it did feel very like a very big question in terms of how we begin to think about the time.

>> Rebecca: Anthony go ahead.

>> Anthony: I like the idea of a 10-1 and 5-8 that is a good mix of times just wondering in between those two you know sessions like the morning session and the

evening session would we what would we do, would we just be on break or would we adjourn temporarily?

How would that work?

>> Edward: Well depending what area we are in Commissioner it might be a coffee chat might be an information exchange reaching out to different groups.

Some people need rest in terms of taking care of the Commissioner or have job appointments they need to do so they can work so just trying to do that flexibility and so those that shared with me their responsibilities that would be their window you know in terms of planning their day.

In terms of what they need to accomplish.

Then those of you that are available to do the outreach we would use those times as some possibilities to there might be time for lunch during that time.

So you will get that as part of the itinerary but once again that will be set upon your various responsibilities whether they are work, school, family, personal, you know, medical, what have you.

I just want to provide a good time, that type of timeframe.

>> Rebecca: Doug, do you have your hand raised or is that left over from your last comment.

>> Doug: No I had it raised but Cynthia had her's before me.

>> Rebecca: Cynthia go ahead.

>> Cynthia: I have a question about these public hearings I think these are a good possibility of times we are talking about but I seem to remember California talking about theirs going like into the night and I seem to remember that we can't cut anyone off so once people start making public comment and goes until everyone is done so I'm thinking we can set a time but that doesn't really mean that is the time is that correct?

>> Edward: No one wants to shut anyone from making public comments.

I think the Commission will establish the perimeters you know how long will those public comments be, whether they be two minutes, three minutes, one minute, what have you in terms of doing that.

And would not want to shut anyone off from making public comments it's just trying to establish some perimeters some people may not be able to wait so we want to have our public comment station open so they can put something in the public comment tool but you are right Commissioner Orton we have to stay until we hear every last one.

>> Rebecca: Okay, go ahead Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you vice Chair.

I just wanted to highlight also that the in the Commissioner's rules that were adopted the Commission allocated two minutes for individual public comment.

Again that can be amended if necessary, prior to the start of public comment.

But if we had a very robust attendance at a meeting, we wouldn't be able to alter those times midway through public comment so not only can we not provide it we have to provide it in an equitable fashion I just wanted to highlight that.

The other note I just wanted to highlight when Edward was speaking about people needing to attend in person, the public hearings, that was again relative to the Commissioners unless there was one of the qualifying exemptions.

Members of the public will be able to attend virtually or in person.

And I think that's an important distinction again to encourage statewide participation in the process.

Thank you.

>> Rebecca: Doug why don't you go ahead with your comment.

>> Doug: I just want to give you my point of view on the times.

My personal opinion is and people may look at this as a little insensitive and do it at night and starting at 6:00 and going through the night.

If people work different shifts, they can have their spouse or neighbor or whoever come and give comments to them.

And they should not be all day for each of these public hearings I yield back.

>> Rebecca: MC.

>> MC: I wonder and I'm thinking about the question that Cynthia asked regarding going as long as we need to but I'm recognizing that we when we are doing these meetings these Zoom meetings we have a hard cutoff time because of the staff that are required and imaging contracts and I'm also is there is difference would it be different if we were on the road or would we still have the limitation in trying to respect so many of the staff that are doing this right also have lives et cetera so I'm just wondering if that is really true that we would not cut it off if there is still public comment.

Do we know or does that remain to be seen?

Because of the live stream?

And we can let that sit.

>> Sally: Thank you for the question Commissioner Rothhorn and thought I would jump in quickly to answer that so with these meetings they are regularly scheduled certain timeframe we schedule translators and other you know supportive staff based on the timeframe and it would be a public hearing that the exact amount of time is not known and we might know that we have and we think for sure it will be about three hours but it might go later that would just be something we would communicate up front with the translator and other folks who we ask to be a part of the meeting.

That's how other bodies that the Department of State and other agencies support and have done those types of things in the past and you can't cutoff public comment.

And what I would also say is although it's not ideal you could still continue the meeting if the translator is not able to stay on for any reason but we would address that any reason in booking and other things to try to minimize that as much as possible.



>> MC: That is helpful thank you and makes me feel if people need translation services, we do it in the beginning and not wait to the end and a criteria we sort of look for.

Thank you.

>> Yeah.

>> Rebecca: Any other comments?

Go ahead, Anthony.

>> Anthony: So I think Doug brought up a good point practicality and feasibility about you know what we are going to be able to do.

There are pros and continues of doing it both way and pros to having two meetings one in the morning, one in the evening. And that pro is that we will be able to accommodate more people.

The big con is it's less feasible and something we should take some time to think about.

>> Rebecca: MC.

>> MC: I was going to offer if we have a community it's best to have the evening like what I think Anthony and Doug are suggesting.

I'm not against it.

I just feel if we have communities that actually request it we could potentially have options where people think like if there are partners on the ground who can give us that kind of feedback let's be responsive and 10-1, 5-8 I know for me if I have a meeting four to six hours I'm not as responsive at the end of it and more responsive in two to three hour blocks and be able to retain the information which is I part of in the evenings it's not my best but I do appreciate what you are suggesting and willing to be responsive I suppose to the communities if they if we can make that an option, 6:00 I think is what Doug was suggesting, 6-10 for example in the evening, I will be Cooked.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead, Doug.

>> Doug: I wanted to make a comment based on cutting off the meetings.

When the Commission dealt with the irregularities put forth, they add a volume and cutoff their meeting for public comment so I think it would have to look at it from a legal perspective but I recall that happening at one point in time because of pure volume and wanted to bring that up.

I yield back.

>> Go ahead Julianne if you have something to say.

>> Julianne: I do we can't have a hard stop on meetings and there is direct case law that states you can't have a public comment period for example that would last an hour so however many people get to speak for an hour that is fine and cut it off.

It truly does have to extend out how long it takes in the past MDOS mentioned the board of canvassers public comment and I know in my past career certainly when we had budget discussions and other items gone well into the night taking public comment and a lot of the public comment was varied through the hours taken so unfortunately we

cannot restrict the allotted time for public comment and again we can legally give each individual the same amount of time to speak but we can't cutoff those wishes to speak who have not had a chance to do so.

>> Doug: What happens suggesting a meeting from 10-1 and what 5-8 or whatever what happens if the 1:00 runs for another three hours then we are sitting there for 8-10 hours?

>> Julianne: What I would say for that is yes you would be sitting there for 8-10 hours that there would be the ability to take personal comfort breaks and even if a quorum was lost during the public comment the body can still take receive public comment, they just cannot take action.

So again it would be the meeting would be extended for those three hours in order to receive that public comment.

And react if necessary.

I think Sally has stuff she wants to add to that.

But you are correct.

The meeting would be extended by that time to accommodate the members of the public.

>> Sally: Thanks Julianne and I wanted to speak to the specific meeting Doug you are mentioning the board of state canvassers meeting that happened in November of 2020 that was very long.

I can attest because myself and Sarah and others on our team actually staffed that meeting and we did not cut that meeting short.

That meeting all the board of state canvassers every one stayed who wanted comment and signed up through appropriate channels was able to speak and it really speaks to what a public body is required to do which is to hear from everyone who participates in public comment and want to participate so can a firm for you Doug and members of the public and all of the Commissioners that meeting went on as long as it needed to go on until every member of the public that wanted to speak was able to so that will be very similar to your meetings as well.

>> Juanita.

>> Juanita: With this knowledge knowing the public can go on for as long as they would like, perhaps maybe we should just consider one timeframe 5-8 and go on and on and we will be wore out after two or three weeks.

>> Brittini: I have been quiet and doing back and forth in my head what are the benefits of you know chopping it up like that.

10-8 and then the latter time.

However then we get into the question of what Doug just raised with the 1:00 and robust and participation in that earlier time.

I care about the work we do and the physical and mental stamina having traveled and being there so I'm leaning towards one time slot that is where my thinking is right now but sorry, I know I kind of hijacked the conversation and did not raise my hand.

>> Edward and Janice and then Anthony.

>> Edward: Part of the reason for the timeframe is to address our seniors and those who may have hard time getting on to your Internet as our general Council shared before and they can get on at different times but usually that 10-1 is expected to be a little bit of a slower time so we might not take that whole time but we have seniors, you have people with disabilities and those services are available, just trying to get them there.

You know, in terms of trying to make those opportunities available so that is why you see the two separate times that are being suggested.

The break people mentioned being tired and having a break in between trying to make sure we accommodate that but everything is really being done to accommodate the public and whether it's a work schedule, whether it's a disability, whether people are not wanting to be out late at night because we don't have, I don't know if you are going to have preferred times for people to come and speak you know before the Commission. But it's just really trying to accommodate you know people or citizens, residents and their various schedules so no one can say they didn't have an opportunity to speak before the Commission.

So I really wanted to highlight some of the seniors and some of the other issues in terms of doing that as well as the technology issues for those that may not have the technology.

They can call in you know during that time so they don't have to be visibly on the screen.

So we are trying to make sure we are addressing all of the issues that came before the Commission so that they have time to be a part of that.

And usually that 10-1 tends to be a little bit more flexible than the 5-8 so just providing that opportunity.

And let me be clear if 10-1 is too long we can shorten it.

Maybe it's 10-12, I don't know.

But I just want to give some type of consideration so that as we can include the widest spectrum as possible for participation.

Thank you.

>> Rebecca: Janice go ahead.

>> Janice: I understand the reasoning for you know wanting to make this available for everyone but I also think that one meeting a day should suffice.

We can fill up the other time with town forums and they are not a big deal one and not recorded but it still gives people an opportunity in that area to come and listen and speak what they want to speak at a town forum.

>> Rebecca: Okay, Anthony?

>> Anthony: I think a possible benefit to doing the two meetings that Edward originally recommended is that if we have an earlier meeting, we are likely to funnel some of the people that might take up a whole lot of time in the evening meeting from the earlier meeting which would result in us adjourning on that last meeting at an earlier time.

So we might not have to you know stay super late if we have the two meetings per day.

>> Rebecca: Okay all right I see Juanita and then Rhonda and then Erin.

So Juanita go ahead.

>> Juanita: Sure, my question is say for instance we I went to the 10 meeting, stayed throughout the ten-1, maybe the 1:00 ran over got ready for the 5-8 and lasted until about 10 or 11 probably longer but would one of us or one of the Commissioners needed to leave about 11 say for instance the meeting went past 8 or 9, could we leave?

Or do we have to stick it out?

Could anyone of us leave at any time?

It's just a question.

If we stayed all day for all the meetings.

Just a question.

>> Rebecca: I think as long as we have a quorum, we would be allowed to continue but Julianne I would like you to weigh in on that one.

>> Julianne: So, again, the body cannot -- if I understand the question correctly, it is can we have a meeting if a quorum is not met.

So the Constitution requires a quorum for meetings and public hearings which is nine or more.

So if we lost the quorum it would not be quote a meeting any longer.

And in other sidewalks public bodies are again able to receive public comments and other items but the body cannot transact any business and the benefit to the public of having their comments received by the full Commission, the public body, the quorum, is also lost so I would encourage and recommend the quorum be maintained throughout the entire meeting.

Going back again one of the comments about the split meeting or if one ran over, that you can always again take a recess or there are other mechanics of a meeting that can be used to provide some time for relief and still accommodate the volume of public comment.

But it really is almost impossible to ascertain what that volume would be until the actual meeting.

Particularly given since the public can participate in your meetings virtually or in person. So I hope that was responsive to the question.

>> Rebecca: Yeah, I think just to clarify and certainly chime in Juanita if I'm wrong I think what she was saying so we have 13 people there and maybe we are getting into 11:00 and maybe for whatever reasons one or more of our Commissioners is like I need to go rest or I need a break or I have medical issues to deal with could maybe two people leave then we still have 11 and we still have a quorum would that be acceptable if we were able to agree on you know maybe so maybe this day if it's going to go to 3:00 a.m. you two can take a break and the rest will carry on and maybe tradeoff at another meeting can we do something like that.

Is that right Juanita?

I see you nodding so I think that is what she meant.

>> Julianne: I appreciate that clarification and I believe that would be prudent way to proceed to make sure there is a quorum being maintained and provide Commissioners the opportunity to take breaks when necessary.

And with the not only the time involved in planning and attending the public hearings, but the public's interest and frankly to be good stewards of public resources we want the hearings to move forward successfully and with high participation so I think that is a wonderful idea to be able to schedule or plan for those types of breaks.

>> Rebecca: Okay thank you.

All right so we had Rhonda, Erin and also seeing Richard and Doug so Rhonda why don't you go ahead and Anthony I think I just saw your hand okay.

>> Rhonda: I'm going with what others said about the one timeframe.

I think we set the dates far enough out that people can make arrangements to get there and doing a 10, 12, 13 hour I'm the same way as what MC said after a certain time I'm not as receptive of things call it mental fatigue will set in.

So I'm looking at it in terms of a set timeframe and if we go over that timeframe, fine. But the chances of us going over if it's one set time rather than a break I think are probably lower and what the different ways they have to communicate with us like Edward said the communication station that is actually set up there telephone, what have you, I think people can make arrangements within one set timeframe to make public comment.

>> Rebecca: Thank you Rhonda.

All right, Erin.

>> Erin: I was just thinking since we want to get a hold of the first, second and third hour shifts, working class first hours are usually 6-2, second hours are usually 2-10, third hours usually run 10-8 or 10-6 why don't we schedule it to encompass all three of those hours and do 12-5 so the first hour can get there the second hour can get there and the third hour can get there and we meet all three peoples.

>> Brittni: Say that again, Erin, the time.

>> 12-5.

>> 12-5 and first second and third hour can all make time to get there.

>> Rebecca: Okay all right Richard go ahead.

>> Richard: I guess I'm trying to understand a little bit here what we need to have at least nine Commissioners there for a quorum.

And that is to do business.

But we are not really going to be doing business per se other than listening to individuals' comments of what they would like to see us do so is it that I don't want to say not important to have somebody has to leave and it would drop below the quorum would that be a problem?

Julianne, I guess that probably is to you thank you.

>> Rebecca: I see your hand Julianne go ahead.

>> Julianne: Thank you so much.

Next to the votes that the Commission takes public comment is the next critical piece of a public meeting.

So really maintaining that quorum and certainly Commissioner Curry's suggestion to for lack of a better way to frame it to schedule Commissioners for lunch breaks or other respite activities.

I think would be appropriate so that again that quorum can be maintained and that the public really gets the full benefit of having a quorum of the Commission at its meetings. The quorum requirements are to conduct meetings so if we lose the quorum then the argument could be raised that it wasn't a public hearing because there wasn't a quorum, that it was not didn't meet the requirements of a public hearing.

So that quorum really must be maintained during the public hearings and I think scheduling breaks is an appropriate way to make sure that the Commissioners' comfort is maintained and that the public's ability to address the a, a quorum is also maintained because public comment is the most critical piece and I know we are excited to engage the public and hear from them directly.

>> Rebecca: Doug, do you want to go ahead?

>> Doug: Yes.

I'd like to put a motion forward that we have one session per public hearing and that session starts at 6:00 p.m.

>> Rebecca: Okay do I have a second out there?

Dustin, I see you seconding it.

So we have a motion to have one session per day on our hearing dates that have already been established starting at you said 6:00 p.m.

Do we want to have any discussion on that motion?

>> Brittini: I'm sorry go ahead.

>> Is there a proposed ending Doug or as long as it goes?

>> Doug: As long as it goes.

I think that's what the requirement is.

>> Rebecca: Any discussion?

I saw some hands go up then they went back down, Rhonda?

>> Rhonda: I like the idea again of one time limit or one session but I think I actually like Erin's idea of 12-5 better.

There are some people that may have to travel back because of work.

And even if it goes over, I think that would make it a little more accommodating if there are Commissioners that do need to travel.

So I'm thinking that 12-5 and it covers all three shifts is a good idea.

>> Rebecca: I think Juanita I saw your hand up.

>> Juanita: Yes, I did but I'm questioning do I want to ask this but I'm just going to throw it out there.

It's kind of escaping me so come back to me on that.

>> Rebecca: Anthony I see your hand up.

>> Anthony: Doug, I'm wondering if you would accept an amendment to your motion. Instead of just voting on one time, how about we vote between two options, option A what you're proposing, 6:00 p.m. to whenever it ends, you can say like tentatively at 10:00 or whatever, you know, until public comments stop but also option B, the two tiered approach from 10-1 and then from I believe it was, was it 5-9 or was it 6-

>> 5-8.

>> Anthony: So how about if you would accept that how about we vote between those two?

>> Rebecca: I'm wondering if it might be simpler if we want to have one meeting a day or two meetings a day maybe that is a simpler way to start.

>> Anthony: That would be fine.

>> Rebecca: Juanita go ahead.

>> Juanita: If we have two meetings a day will that think be in the same town or the same locations?

>> Brittini: Yes.

>> Juanita: Okay.

>> Brittini: Not cross country road trip.

We will stay in the same area.

>> Rebecca: So we have a motion on the floor right now.

Brought by Doug and seconded by Dustin.

To propose a single meeting a day starting at 6:00 p.m. do we want to go ahead and vote on that or do we have additional discussion?

I don't see any additional discussion so do you want to go ahead and vote?

Raise your hand if you are in favor of Doug's motion to have meetings one time a day starting at 6:00 p.m. and going as long as needed.

Show of hands, please.

Dustin and Doug are in favor, all opposed please raise your hand.

Okay so the motion does not carry.

Do we have another motion related to our scheduling of the meetings?

Go ahead, Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I guess I'll make a motion I just wanted to say I like the idea of the 12-5. I think Erin said because it can capture all three groups and it ends early and if it goes over it wouldn't be so late.

So I guess a motion for that.

>> Rebecca: Do we have a second?

See all kinds of hands MC I think I saw yours first.

>> Brittini: I think MC had something to say.

>> Rebecca: Do you have something to say.

>> MC: The 12-5 piece I was listening to Edward's idea of the seniors and it also captures we could prioritize for example seniors for example, you know between the 12 not because there is no end time but the idea there is like we could potentially talk about you know 12-5 and it's not going to like if we end early it does not have to go to five but if we know there are people coming in like sometimes we may have to actually be there until 5 if we are trying to make this window of opportunity for all three shifts.

I want to acknowledge that we need somehow translator services prioritized and a senior or like the early services somehow if we can help create a criteria and not suggesting part of the motion but it's important and one of the reasons, I like the 12-5 time.

>> Rebecca: Okay, so we have a motion that has been made and I don't have a second.

Anyone in favor Rhonda.

And we have Orton and seconded by Commissioner Lange for one meeting a day 12-5 any discussion on the motion before we vote.

Anthony, I see you, okay.

Go ahead Anthony.

>> Anthony: So of the three plans that we kind of tentatively discussed so far, this would be the one that I'm least in favor in by a pretty large margin.

I think if we adopt a plan to meet from 12-5 you know we are going to lose out on everybody that works a normal 9-5 job and that's most people.

There is a reason why you know most of these city Council meetings that we are attending and these other Government meetings we are attending to provide knowledge to the public there is a meetings and there is a reason why those usually take place at 6 or 7 p.m. and that is to accommodate you know, the average person who works a normal 9-5 job and I think if we meet from 12-5 even if it runs over by a little bit, we are going to miss a lot of people.

So I would prefer either of the other two proposals to this one.

>> Rebecca: Erin I see your hand up go ahead and Juanita you are next.



>> Erin: I'm wondering was it Cynthia that proposed that motion if she would accept an amendment to go 12-7 therefore will incorporate everybody that is 9-5.

>> Rebecca: Cynthia go ahead.

>> Cynthia: You want me to respond.

I see what Anthony is saying that is a good point but I think 12-7 is too long.

That's 7 hours of us sitting there.

So I think we would have to go later like 3-7 or whatever.

I don't know.

Can I.

>> Brittini: Can you take it back.

>> Rebecca: We can just vote your motion down and put it to the floor and I do have a point of clarification for you, Julianne.

So I'm thinking of in a restaurant perspective because I used to work in a restaurant many moons ago when I was in college so if we say 12-5 and 20 people walk in the door at 5:20 for public comment, do we then hear those people?

That is where I'm a little confused or you weren't here by 5 so we don't have to hear your public comment. Do we only have to hear people who arrive before the technical end of the meeting and we might go over because we have a list of people to go through?

>> Julianne: That is an excellent question. And, again, we are celebrating and welcoming our public comment and our members of the public.

What I would recommend is that the Commission would schedule public comment times through blocks of public comment time and you can quote cutoff cards so that anyone arriving later would not be able to speak but again really the goal is to be able to hear everybody and to welcome that.

So the people I forget how many in your example vice Chair but being able to incorporate those people certainly if the meeting was still ongoing that would be something to recommend but the Commission would also have the ability to say that they you know didn't present in a timely fashion so either of those are workable.

But again I would encourage if the public has made the effort to physically attend that we try to accommodate them.

And again by structuring the blocks of public comment and then a break and so when the agenda is published that the public has an awareness of what the expectation is for their participation to be respectful of everybody's time.

>> Rebecca: Juanita go ahead.

>> Juanita: Yes, after hearing everything that all about the different times and whatever and hearing everybody's perspective on it, I'm now persuaded to go back to the 10-1 and 5-8 only it seems more reasonable.

It seems like Edward has really gave it a lot of thought concerning us that that could work even possibly better.

And then we do get a break after 1:00 between 1:00 and 5:00 and most of us get up before 10:00.

So I kind of like that now after hearing the other proposals for the different times.

>> Rebecca: Richard go ahead and Anthony you are next.

>> Richard: Juanita I think you hit it on the head after listening to the Commission it sounds like Mr. Woods 10-1 and 5-8 may work the best for everybody, thank you.

>> Rebecca: Okay, Anthony you had your hand up.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I yield my time.

>> Rebecca: Okay if there is no further discussion, we have the motion on the floor from Cynthia so why don't we go ahead and vote on and that and that motion was to have the single meeting from 12-5.

All in favor please raise your hands.

I see Rhonda.

All right all opposed same sign.

Okay the motion does not carry.

>> Brittini: I'm sorry Rebecca I gave you such a robust.

>> Rebecca: All right guys where are we at, any further motions?

How about 3-7 does that sound good to anybody.

>> Britt: I was going to propose something that started maybe at four.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead Anthony we see your hand again.

>> Anthony: I would like to make a motion between two options like I said before and I think if we vote one way or another, we can figure it out from there.

So option A is Edward's original recommendation of 10-1 and then a break and then 6-9.

It was 6-9, right.

>> Rebecca: 5-8.

>> Anthony: 5-8, so 10-1, 5-8 is option one.

And option two is Doug's motion that we put down and deciding on this will bring clarification to what is going on in regards to the meeting.

>> Rebecca: Doug's motion was 6:00 p.m. with no limit, correct.

>> Anthony: Yes.

>> Brittini: Yes.

>> Rebecca: Can we get a second on that motion?

I don't see anyone oh, Doug is, okay all right so we have a motion from Commissioner Eid, seconded by Commissioner Clark to have option one.

Which is to go with Edward's original proposal which is one meeting 10-1 and a second meeting 5-8 and option two is Commissioner Clark's proposal a meeting at 6:00 p.m. a single meeting per day and Julianne can you keep me honest and do radio voting if you are in favor.

>> Julianne: I would not recommend it vice Chair I would recommend a roll call vote if you are going between two options.

>> Can we have a roll call vote then Sally?

Can you take over for us on that?

And you would be indicating if you are option one twice a day by Edward and option two which is Doug's proposal once a day starting at 6:00.

>> Thank you, Commissioners.

All right I will be going in alphabetical order by last name starting further down on the list from previous meetings so I will start with Rhonda Lange.

>> Rhonda: Option two.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> Cynthia: Option two, I guess.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn?

>> MC: Option one.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.

>> Rebecca: Option two.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> Option two.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner.

>> Erin: Option two.

>> Sally: Richard Weiss.

>> Richard: Option one.

>> Sally: Dustin Witjes.

>> Dustin: Option two.

>> Sally: Doug Clark.

>> Doug: Option two.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Juanita: Option one.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Option one.

>> Sally: Brittini Kellom.

>> Option two.

>> Sally: I have eight in favor of option two.

>> Juanita: What is option two can you say the option.

>> Sally: Starting at 6:00 p.m.

>> Rebecca: Starting at 6:00 p.m.

So then the motion carries, correct, Julianne?

We had eight.

>> Julianne: Correct.

>> Motion carries for one meeting at 6:00 p.m. Cynthia you had a question.

>> Cynthia: I have a question so since we did that vote are, we stuck with 6:00 p.m.? I'm thinking just going to 5:00 p.m. might be a better start time if anyone has any comments on that.

>> Edward, I saw you had your hand up first then we will go to Juanita.

>> Edward: I want to make sure obviously with a public hearing the Commission can also elect to have its meetings start at that time.

So for scheduling purposes is the Commission having their weekly meeting on Thursday when we are out and about starting at 6:00?

Or do they want to have it at another time so that I'm booking the facility correctly?

>> Brittini: Maybe we should answer the first thing first which was if we want to stick to the 6:00 time and then that would give you a guide for your question of mirroring our meeting times with the public hearing does that make sense?

That is the way I heard it at least.

>> Rebecca: Juanita, sorry Edward go ahead, no.

>> Edward: Whatever time the Commission wants to start that is fine.

I just need to make sure the public hearing if it includes the meeting, I just want to make sure I got it.

Doesn't matter if it starts at 5:00 or 6:00.

>> Brittini: I just didn't want us to commit to the 6:00 time and Cynthia raised a question of if we were committing to 6:00 so that is what I was saying.

>> Edward: I know the weekly meetings we go at 10 and start at 1 and want to make sure I'm doing right but you all and that was my question, thank you.

>> Rebecca: Juanita did you want to make a comment.

>> Juanita: Yes, I was wondering too I'm okay with whatever is going on with what we are coming up, with I'm thinking is this going to fall into when it's cold because it gets dark at six and all that or we won't be there at that time, right, we won't be in the winter probably months again.

>> Rebecca: No, these are May and June so we should be nice and light.

>> Juanita: Thank you.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead, Anthony.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I think we should just leave it how we just voted it for now and kind of like what we voted on with the venues we show just keep in mind that we might need to be flexible if there is a town that Edward recommends you know might want to you know move it an hour earlier or something, we can always ask for his recommendation and get it and approve that as needed.

I think as generally speaking we just keep it the 6:00 p.m. until you know whenever we adjourn.

>> Rebecca: Rhonda, go ahead.

>> Rhonda: To that point I think the decision does need to be made is it 6:00 or are we going to address what Cynthia asked because Edward does need to coordinate this so the sooner, he knows what's going on the better.

>> Rebecca: I also have a concern with I think Edward is raising a very valid point about the Commission meetings.

If we are going to have a Commission meeting starting at 6:00 our Commissions as we are seeing right now meetings tend to go a little long if we spend three hours on a Commission meeting and have public comment at the end, we could have it until 1:00 in the morning and the better way to go would be to have the Commission meetings before maybe 4-6 and open up our public hearing for public comment just a suggestion.

>> Any further comments?

Cynthia go ahead.

>> Cynthia: I also think we shouldn't how do I say it I think the public hearings should be a set time and then our Commission meeting should be before that because otherwise we are taking up all the public comment time for the public.

>> Brittini: I think that is fair and I'm in favor of having our meetings prior to public comment, yeah.

I think that would be good for our brains but that is just me.

Doug did you have something to say?

>> Doug: Yeah, I mean I fully agree with what Rebecca has said and Cynthia has said.

But I'd like to have a break in between the two.

So I wouldn't want to have them back to back so let's say start at 1 and go to 4 and then have a two-hour break and then come back.

That gives us a chance to rest up and get something to eat and so forth.

>> Rebecca: Okay Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: If we do it that way does that mean we won't be doing public comments during our regular meeting, we will move it right now we have public comments at the beginning of our meetings so does that mean went we do that we won't do any public comment until after for the open session.

>> Brittini: Julianne.

>> Julianne: The public comment would be required during your regularly scheduled meetings in addition to any of the public hearings so that requirement would remain.

>> Rhonda: There goes my concern if we get people who want to give public comment during then is it going to be stretched out even longer too into the night if people start giving their public comment about maps during our business meeting, our Commission meeting are we going to look at the same situation we would have been looking at anyway.

>> Brittini: I think that is a tough one because I have you know I was thinking the same thing in terms of how which delay do I prefer, I guess.

That is kind of what we are looking at.

But I think Julianne spoken this earlier and Julianne please correct me if I'm wrong. If this will be the opportunity if it's a concern for enough of us to decide if we want to take that timeframe from two minutes and make it be something else, that way we can be a little bit more conservative with the time.

But I also think we should plan to be eager and patient listeners because I just anticipate there being lots of public comment, whether we devoted you know to do something with the two timeframes and a break I think we would have been sitting on our sitting parts longer in between or if we have something in the evening, we should plan to be there extensive for an extensive amount of time.

But that is my quick thought on that.

I don't know which of a Commission prefer or which one we will pick.

>> Julianne right now we have this sort of very standard structure that we follow for our meetings and we start with a roll call and approve the minutes and agenda then go into public comment.

Can we restructure and have public comments and at the end that opens up the public hearing is there a way to do that so we are not double-dipping on the public comment in one meeting?

>> Julianne: So if I understand you correctly the question is whether the regular business the regular meeting agenda can be modified to accommodate public comment at the end.

>> Yes.

>> Julianne: The hesitation I would give about that they have control over the agenda but the one of the foundational issues of public comment is that people get to tell you their thoughts prior to you acting, prior to you taking the vote so I would not recommend that.

I would recommend having the public comment germane to the agenda at that time and again blocks of public comment time for the public hearings to again this is -- I presume or I would expect that the Commission would get members of the public that just want to observe and not speak.

This is the first time any of this is happening in Michigan.

It couldn't be any more exciting that the public is able to be engaged so I really expect you will get some observers, you will get some verbal participants and it's just going to be very exciting.

So I hope that was responsive.

>> Rebecca: Yes, thank you Richard you had a comment?

>> Richard: Yeah, I just was going through the list of proposed meetings sites and it looks like 8 of the meetings that are on the list are on a Thursday.

And if my count is right four of them start at 1-4.

Just something I thought I would throw in there so you know we would have a meeting 1-4 and right away go in your public meeting shortly thereafter.

>> Rebecca: Any additional comment go ahead Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you vice Chair and definitely Commissioner raises an important point.

The meeting schedule that you adopted in January sets your meetings through the year the regular meeting agenda that can be amended by the Commission.

By majority vote and any amendments to your regular meeting schedule similar to the one that just occurred moving the April 1st the meeting during the beginning of April to March 30th you can amend your regular meeting schedule it just needs to be posted and published timing requirements set forth in the OMA.

Which again would be put on the Commission's website and available for public consumption.

>> Rebecca: MC.

>> MC: I think I would request us as a Commissions to try to if we are going to do our separate business meetings I'd like to try to do morning times to accommodate some of the disabilities or the people who need that the evening is hard for them whether that is seniors as was made you commented earlier and I feel like I try to get and be as accessible as possible and so because we are talking about this I like the 6:00 p.m. time meeting and I feel like we have to get some alternatives and this may be the best time or the best option is to say have our read scheduled meetings and keep a two hour excuse me keep the two minute limit in place.

That feels good to me for the whole thing.

Sorry.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead Anthony.

>> Anthony: I was under the impression the main course of business for these meetings is going to be taking and I don't think we will have other major regularly scheduled business at these meetings that we are holding in public.

Am I correct on that?

>> Rebecca: Sue I see you have your hand up go ahead.

>> Sue: I think the Commission is going to have to decide and you know staff will also have some input if we have items of business that need to come before the Commission certainly we would bring those forward but I do agree with Anthony that the major focus during this time period is going to be public hearings and that's you know that is what I believe the Commissioners and staff will need to focus on is gathering that public comment and making sure that anybody who wants to provide public comment has that opportunity to be engaged.

So that really should be our major focus and then if there are other businesses that we need to conduct during that timeframe certainly we can do that.

>> Anthony: So with that said and since we already voted to have one meeting instead of two meetings or at least that is what the spirit of my previous motion was, I'd like to motion that we start our regularly scheduled meetings at 5:00 p.m. on days where we have public hearings.

And then we just move it in to the public comments you know as the main course of business and go on until we need to until we adjourn.

>> Rebecca: Okay do I have a second?

Rhonda has seconded the motion.

Any discussion?

Okay seeing none let's move forward with voting on that motion.

So motion from Commissioner Eid is to start our regularly scheduled meetings at 5:00 p.m. on those Thursdays where we have public comment hearings that we will be holding and all in favor please raise your hand just to so signify.

All opposed same sign.

Okay the motion carries.

Edward go ahead, yes.

>> Edward: Thank you very much as we are scheduling I wanted to reiterate, we do have our dates but some of the facilities such as DeVos Place and others we are looking for others are COVID vaccination sites so if we were to move things around would there be a problem with the Commission?

Do we keep the dates but if we were to move the locations to accommodate some of these challenges would there be a challenge with the Commission?

All right.

>> Brittini: I think it's hard for us to know.

>> Edward: It's the same dates you have now.

>> Brittini: Yeah.

>> Edward: You might not be in the same location is what I'm saying.

>> Anthony: I thought we voted earlier we are giving you discretion to do that.

>> Edward: The vote was discretion on facility. So say hypothetically we have to move Gaylord from May 4 to May 18, that is not just moving the facility, that is also moving the date. So I just want to make sure we are all on the same page so that it's not a challenge if we were to do it.

So the dates you voted we are sticking with but it might not be the location just in case we run into some of these challenges and are not able to follow or find alternate locations.

And for am I making sense?

If not, you know please get back to me.

>> Brittini: You are.

I think the way you just said it you gave an example of a switch date instead of.

>> Switch location.



>> Brittini: You are just saying the location can change.

>> Edward: The location can change and also the date could change.

For example northern Michigan is a challenge right now because they have a vaccination site so the idea was to go to Gaylord and northern Michigan on the same week.

Since we are already up there.

So that's -- that would be something I'm referring to specifically.

What also makes that a challenge is northern Michigan actually has the AV that we need because they are a public television station versus me having to find a contractor to come and provide what we need to northern Michigan.

>> Brittini: I think for me personally it would be a case by case situation.

>> Edward: Sure obviously I would bring that back to the Commission but I just want to make sure people are aware of these COVID vaccination sites and how they have are taking priority over what we are doing.

>> Brittini: Julianne quickly.

>> Julianne: I know Commissioner Clark wanted to weigh in and for the public the Commission voted on dates and locations and the Commission just voted on times.

So again the Commission has the ability to alter that schedule going forward and it sounds from what Mr. Woods is stating that that is a distinct possibility.

And that all of that will be addressed at an open meeting of the Commission so that any adjustments will be known and be able to be publicized.

And again the regular meeting times starting at 5:00 if the regular meeting would run in to the public hearing, the public hearing would be adjourned to start when the regular meeting is concluded.

So that the way that it's structured right now is you will have that block of the regular meeting business will occur and when that is adjourned the public hearing will be called to order for the purpose of taking public comment and public testimony and receiving that information until the members of the public have had a chance to provide testimony.

I just wanted to highlight that that as the Commission is talking about modifying the schedule that was already adopted which it may do just so that the public is clear currently, we are operating on a schedule that was already adopted and if it needs to be changed that will be clearly stated in a future meeting.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Julianne.

Doug and then MC.

If I lost track of a hand please remind me.

>> Doug: Yeah, I would like to put forward a motion that we give Edward the flexibility to make the changes that he suggested.

I mean, we are in a difficult time here.

With facilities and times and dates are at a premium so I think we need to provide him that flexibility so I would put forth that motion.

>> MC: I second.

>> Brittini: MC is seconding the motion.

So all in favor of Edward having the authority, the jurisdiction to change location, I'm making sure I get it correctly the location and time as relates to the needs of the facility or as it relates to the location please signify with a raised hand.

And all opposed same sign.

By my count I had ten, okay, ten in favor, two opposed.

The motion carries.

Giving Edward the flexibility to select dates and facilities as needed for our public hearings.

>> MC: The only other thing.

>> Go ahead.

>> MC: The only other thing I recognize we proposed a budget that we the Commission have authorized and helping Edward stay within that budget is the spirit of the motion that I think we just approved is like helping him make choices on our behalf to stay in the budget that we approve because it's challenging.

>> Brittini: I would agree and just echoing that we do our best just like Julianne and Sue and Edward and MDOS is here to help us do to make our jobs easier and in a sense, we have that same sense of responsibility to use a big word for them to make it easier for them to do their jobs.

And thank you Edward.

I will take this time to extend gratitude for your patience and grace as you try to assemble all of these parts.

That I do not envy that job.

I don't.

So I really appreciate your patience in all of this.

Cynthia yes please go ahead.

>> Cynthia: I just wanted to clarify.

So the dates are not going to change, just he may have to swap around where we are meeting to accommodate all these things but we can kind of plan on the dates that we have already agreed upon, is that true, Edward?

Okay.

>> Edward: That is exactly what I needed.

Thank you.

Because.

>> Brittini: Sorry I said dates.

Go ahead Edward were you finished.

>> I wanted to confirm Commissioner Orton being correct and if something was to happen, I would come back to all you immediately but right now I want to focus on the dates that were already approved.

>> Brittini: Okay all right thank you for that clarification.

Any other questions or thoughts?

Julianne.

>> Julianne: Just briefly again going to Commissioner Orton's question.

As Mr. Woods indicated then if those changes are being made, they will be brought back to the Commission.

>> Edward: Correct.

>> Julianne: So, again, the public will be well informed of any modifications to the schedule that the Commission chooses to make.

>> Brittini: Thank you for that clarification.

And with that, that will conclude our last item in unfinished business.

We are scheduled to take a break at 2:20 and it's 2:17.

I see no issue with us digging into our break three minutes early.

So at this time at 2:17 we will take a break and convene, we will take a break.

Ten minutes.

[ Recess ]

Brittini: Everyone is back as soon as I said that.

All right, welcome back Commissioners.

I hope we all got whatever we needed to get done in our little time away from each other.

We are calling I'm calling the meeting back to order at 2:32.

So continuing on with our unfinished business, we have a continuing education presentation.

Our map practice with the Ohio map.

Mr. Matt Grossman PHD director MSU institute for and public policy social research and then Eric Guthry a demographer from the state of Michigan will be joining us so without further ado I'm going to hand it over to Mr. Grossman.

Hi and welcome and thank you for being here with us today again as usual.

>> Hi great to see you all.

I'm getting some feedback are you all hearing that or is it okay.

>> Brittini: I can't hear any feedback.

>> Matt: We will switch if we need to and Eric are you with us can you say hello?

>> Eric: Hello everyone state Demographer.

>> Matt: Great and I think I'm not sure if we have him yet but my student Wyatt Ledman who wrote the instructions and help answer questions as well so please welcome Wyatt and the first thing, I wanted to talk about is the map that Wyatt drew of some Michigan communities.

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

I know you all didn't get the chance to do that for the most part but I had some students draw some communities just to give you a sense of the kinds of things that you might see.

So this is one that Wyatt drew based on some of the kinds of things we discussed. Just to look around a little bit we can see that there is a state employee's community which is obviously centered around Lansing.

He also did a tourism economy.

One that is up here and part of the U P.

And along mostly lake Michigan.

He did one of college students that is spread out throughout the state a little bit.

One of the Kalamazoo and Battle Creek area that looks rectangular like a Metro area and another rectangular one that is basically Genesee County and one where racial or ethnic minorities are a majority of the population which is also spread out somewhat around the state.

So just a couple things I wanted to note about some of these communities they range in size.

So if you get you know you might get communities submitted that are very small or very large so these happen to range from 82000 to 1.2 million so 82000 is the Dutch ancestry one and 1.2 is the minority majority minority areas one.

And to give you a sense of the size of the districts that you're going to be thinking about Congressional districts are 706,000.

Senate districts are 260,000.

And the other districts are 90,000 that is current estimates we won't have the officials.

But to give you a sense that some of these communities would fit inside a State House district others would be much larger.

And unlike the kind of district maps that you drew these can be overlapping so of course we have the state employees around Lansing but in addition to that we have maps of majority minority population and of college students that are of course within the boundaries of high state Government employment.

So that doesn't always mean that we can easily combine them into one space or that some might be spread out and others not.

So that's just to give you an idea of the community drawing feature that some of you had a chance to play with.

I now want to turn it over to Eric to give us a sense of just what kinds of data you will have beyond those kinds of data that you see in districter.

>> Eric: Thanks Matt I'm going to try to share my screen here and hope I'm getting this right.

Let's see.

Okay you can see my presentation, right?

Okay, fantastic.

I'm just going to say too when I'm in this presentation mode I can't see the Zoom screen so if anybody has an issue or a question please give me an audio cue on that as I'm going to be working in the presentation.

So the reason I wanted to talk to you today or the reason that I think that some folks in the Commission staff wanted me to come and talk to the members today was to talk about additional data sources that we can bring in to understand these communities of interest.

When we get the PL94131 data which is the redistricting data that will be released in September and possibly in a legacy format in August. The variables you will get in the data are somewhat limited. So you are going to get very granular data down to a small geographic area for race, Hispanic origin, the race populations over 18, Hispanic population by race over 18.

And the large of course populations and also counts of housing units with vacancy status rates.

So while that is a very large data set, the variables contained within it are limited to some degree.

So I wanted to talk to you about what other data sources are available that will allow you to understand the state and to really it will allow you to fulfill your mission with the diversity of the population.

And to understand the very multiple ways that communities can be defined and the way we can see the geographic dispersion of the communities on a map and see what relative boundaries we can assign to them.

I'm going to show you a few slides on data.

The first few are going to be data I pulled on ancestry origins from the community survey and I think they are interesting then I'm going to also show you some data on employment in a particular industry because I think that relates well to an economic community of interest.

We are going to start by looking at some ancestry and the first one I want to show you is German ancestry and the reason I picked ancestry categories specifically for anybody saying they want to do redistricting on these categories I do not want to present to you variables that people might want to redistrict on because I don't want it to suggest I'm giving you ideas or telling you anything ahead of those public meetings where you will get the inputs.

So when we look at things like ancestry variables there are quite a few ways to look at it.

The first thing I want to talk to you about is sort of getting an idea of strong association versus weak association, right.

So what I've mapped out here for Ohio and also Michigan is a variable from the American community survey that looks at ancestry and I pulled out the persons that identified as being any part German.

Right.

So that the ancestry question can be is a check all that apply question.

So there are you know enumerable they could have supplied in response to the question.

But this map shows portions for people who Mark that they were any part German.

Right.

So any fractionality thereof they decided they wanted to report.

We can see that there is a very strong geographic correlation in Ohio and this northwestern section of the state.

In fact, I had to adjust my map perimeters because the concentrations of German population in this area of the Ohio is so strong, I had to increase and I had to had two more categories to the top of my map.

I think that that would be something that would be important if you were talking to a community of interest that said they had a very strong association to particular geographic area you know and if ancestry was a component of that and I know there are some and south murder roots may be advocating for some consideration.

There are ways for you to see what those geographic bounds are.

So in addition to the geographic bounds, the benefit of having data on a question where people can select multiple answers is that you do get the sense of people who have some affiliation to it and may have been one of two, three, four or any number of categories they may have selected but you can also get a sense for people that have a strong association for particular categories.

Now I chose for this first example the German ancestry because it's the most common ancestry type selected in both Ohio and Michigan.

So in Ohio we see 23.8% of persons report some German ancestry in Michigan it's 18.9.

In both states it's the highest reported actual ancestry the highest is the unclassified or not reported at 26.2 for Michigan and 24% for Ohio but the highest actual reported ancestry is German with the measures I recorded a moment ago.

So we get a sense in this dictation that there is a strong tie at least in some sense perhaps in a weaker sense because it may be one of multiple ancestries they chose. We can look at it in terms though of strong ancestor ties.

So if a person only indicated one ancestry type and that ancestry type was German this map would be the result of that.

And so we can see that there is a tightening of the geographic bounds for this group.

We can see that when we look at the portions of Ohio outside of that northwestern corner of the state, the ancestor ties move up into this rather low range.

Into this low range and this is the high end in the northwestern section.

Similar sections here in Michigan we see there are strong ancestry ties to the German ancestry.

In parts of Lansing and up into the northern Michigan.

So from an ancestry perspective and data perspective there are ways for us to differentiate between strong and weaker ties.

And these types of maps can be produced for most ancestry categories.

That exist in our nation and our state.

So if there were other groups that wanted to look at these particular disperses of the population that is entirely possible and it's something if somebody brought to you a particular group that they wanted to be considered you could also look at particular bounds and see what their relative geographic dispersion and patterns are.

Another group that has that was on the maps that excuse me that Matt showed you was one of Dutch ancestry.

And we can see that in the state of Ohio with a few exceptions there is not really any significant concentrations that ancestry in the state.

There are a few spots where it might be that into the teen or 20% range.

It's not really a major ancestry group in terms of the dispersion across the state.

There are some significant group concentrations in West Michigan for that particular ancestry group and we can also see that those ties are around Grand Rapids and Holland area.

And that they do exist in this sort of you know 60 to 80% range and some of those areas.

And the geographic units I'm using to produce these are census tracks which are two levels above the geographic bounds that you will get in the redistricting data.

You will get census blocks so these geographic units are a little bit larger but your census blocks will all nest within these census tracks.

So that's one example of the way that we can use something like the American community survey which is from where I got these data to look at specific groups in terms of both their concentration in a particular area and their dispersion across the state and I thought that that would be of particular interest because it's not really something you're going to be about to get out of the redistricting data.

Additionally it's also something you have access to right now.

You don't have to wait for the redistricting data to come out if you wanted to get a sense of what community members are telling you when you are doing your public meetings as that schedule progresses forward.

So beyond the ancestry group categories I also thought it would be beneficial to look at sort of an economic interest group.

I had to go back to my...the economist that I work with and kind of ask them what their thoughts were on this particular topic.

Because in looking at the law it's kind of vague.

Right.

And I had to read over it a few times and underline things and see what did it mean to me, how was I going to operationalize this concept and make a map for you to see an economic what could potentially or possibly be considered an economic community of interest.

I was looking at the words that popped out to me were population share, economic interests.

Right, so how am I going to map a population that shares some sort of an economic interest.

And what I thought of after consultation with folks that I work with that are economists we thought that perhaps folks that work in a common industry and a value might be interesting.

So what I pulled out were people that are 16 years and over and that are employed in the agricultural forestry hunting and fishing and mining, industries.

I could have really picked any industry.

And again nothing will suggest any particular group that the Commission should be considering.

It's more about how to use data to understand the dispersion of groups.

When we look at the folks engaged in the economic activity in this particular industry, we can see there are some strong associations in eastern Ohio.

Northeastern Ohio that might be important to focus in those areas to have their voices heard.

And there are also some less dense but also you can see a pattern of concentration in western Ohio as well.

And same thing in Michigan we can see some, oops, sorry, see some concentrations in the lower northern peninsula and also in the thumb region.

And there are these data are available again from the American community survey for many, many different types of occupations, for several different industries.

And we can get them down to a relatively small geographic, I'm not saying the geographic granularity with the PL94171 data, but still a relatively small geographic view that will allow you to get some broad understanding of what the geographic bounds for some of these communities will look like.

And, you know, I only had a few minutes to talk about it but I thought that these particular ways of looking at the state might be useful for you both in terms of preparing for your public hearings and coming back and trying to assimilate what you're getting from the public in terms of the importance of or evaluating what you're being told in terms of the communities of interest.

From those meetings.

So I think my understanding is we are going to do some questions later. But as always you are welcome to engage me with any questions they would have on the data.



>> Matt: We do have time if there are any questions about the communities that we before we start the Ohio districting simulation.

Are there questions?

Just one thing I would point out just because I know it might get confusing because we heard a couple of the voting rights panels talking about the importance of racially polarized voting, but the communities of interest and the Constitution is another part of that, that Eric put up but didn't mention it says what not, what they aren't and one of the things it says they are not is about relationships with parties and comments or political candidates so that sort of sets that off as different from some of the voting rights considerations.

I think Doug has a question.

>> Doug: I do, Matt.

And you know, this is really interesting.

Take a look at this and we can have thousands of communities of interest when we get going.

So somehow in my mind we've got to identify those that are significant and those that are less significant.

To be able to use only those that are significant.

Is there a good way of doing that based on the data that you have?

>> Matt: If you're able to define significant, then it's possible that we will be able to attach that to date.

But it's I think that might be too open ended for Eric.

>> Doug: Significant in my mind would be maybe above 50%.

You know, you had some percentages in there so let's just use that as the base line.

So how do you sort that sort of thing out?

What you are going to use and what you're not going to use?

>> Eric: I think Matt made a good point in terms of you have to somebody on the Commission has to decide what they think is significant based on the feedback.

I can certainly and anybody that any consultants you may be working with will help you understand the areas are going to be able to pull a lot of data that is going to tell, you know, be able to tell you, you know, what proportion of the total population a particular group comprises, what proportion of the population of a particular geographic area for the population comprises.

You know, what proportion of any nearly any geographic bound, you know, obviously given the constraints of the data set in terms of large geographic bounds.

That a population comprises in terms of proportionality and if it rises to what significance threshold the Commission sets, then that absolutely then that would be I'm sorry I'm babbling.

If the Commission has an idea of a particular threshold for significance, we can tell you whether a community meets that threshold.

There is no hard and fast rule for what significance means, however.

>> Matt: There are examples on the community spreadsheet my students put together for example there is a majority rule one.

Is a minority population a majority in that census track so that is a census block group so that is a possible one.

But there are others like I think another one on there was defined as where college students are above average.

Well college students are a very small part of most places so you can get above average in a place that is still mostly not college students.

So but yes either way of defining it you can get the data to evaluate.

>> Doug: Okay when we have the data and let's say we define some basic districts that we want to start with, 15 of them or 14 of them or whatever is there a way to overlay this data on to those districts?

I know all software is different but is there a way to take this data and then overlay it so you can see that you're not taking the Amish community and putting it into two districts and so forth?

>> Matt: Yeah, the mapping consultant will be able to do that.

And that is one you know basic criteria and it deeply is how my think we heard that on the panel last time how many communities are split.

So, yeah, it can certainly be done.

>> Doug: Okay I yield back.

>> Matt: All right, well I want to make sure we get a chance to look at some of your Ohio districts that you were able to submit.

So let's look at those.

So I think we received nine total, so I just want to flip through them first just so you get a sense of the variety that you all came up with.

Here is one that looked pretty blocky and pretty contiguous districts but might have you know split a Metro area right down the middle as a result of making a big block in one region of the state.

Here is another in the similar region of the state where they started but you can see it's quite a bit different.

And you notice how the sizes don't necessarily correspond to the population centers.

Then here is a good example of one small geographic district by land but one big by land but they are the same population size.

That one of you submitted.

You can see a lot of people started in this corner of Ohio but we get one that goes pretty far closer to Cincinnati and Columbus in the bottom district here.

Maybe includes a few of the Metro areas.

We have one that started in the Cincinnati area relatively small district and a relatively large district on the east side.

Another one near the bottom that sort of took a line divided it.

I noticed some people had trouble with congruity so we have a little bit of extra places marked here that wouldn't meet the contiguity criteria.

And somebody started in the middle by Columbus and two districts in Ohio and looks like the other one we saw and goes out from Columbus north word then we have one that started in Toledo in the northeast corner of the state and again you can see the relative size geographically of these districts.

Then we have one that had one big and one small district but one thing I want you to notice here although these districts are fine, they might create problems for us later. We have this big line on the side that sort of left open and would have to be connected to other districts.

So one thing what we will see in a moment is sort of the problem of the district of left over.

That is once we get to a large number drawn, we could have areas that don't maybe have that much in common but are the left over area on our map and we will see that is a fairly common problem.

Then someone late submission out of Cleveland area gave us a three districts around there that actually look somewhat similar to the opportunity Congressional districts. Two out of three of them do.

So that's the broad brush look.

I want to show you a couple things.

Oops, I'm getting blurry but a couple things to notice about your districts.

Two thirds met the congruity that is the second criteria and pretty high up on your list after Federal law.

And so most of you did but I think those that didn't might have been just might have been more of a paint brush issue but you can see that sometimes the districts went off.

I also created this sort of no holes criteria which is to say your districts might have been contiguous but created holes for other districts or like the one we saw make it very difficult to connect to other districts based on what's left.

So just over half of the districts that we submitted met that criteria.

And it looks like we had all but one of the district maps that were submitted were equal population within two percent.

That is the very top criteria that you will have to meet and that you will be able to meet. But I think that was aided.

You all were probably aided that by having that line at Districter and get that and that is basic criteria.

Other things we don't have communities of interest of Ohio but some ways we can look at breakage.

Glow down on your criteria list is the second to last one is that it reflect consideration of county, city and township boundaries so this is the average number of counties broken in your two district map.

So it was almost ten counties broken.

One of you only broke one county in your two districts one broke 17 and I did not tell you to minimize it but looking at what happens when we are kind of doing it from scratch.

But even in just drawing two districts we are often going to break quite a few boundaries and I looked at the Metropolitan statistical areas of Ohio.

And looked at the average number of those that were broken up.

And the average map of just two districts keep in mind we are drawing 15 here so you got to two so far and even in those maps most people broke up two Metropolitan areas as the census defines them.

Now you don't have to define them like the census does but it just gives you a sense of how easy it is to break up areas when we are starting with districting.

Some other criteria that we might want to think about.

We've heard about compliance with the voting rights act.

Typically we think of districts that have racially polarized voting that might be able to elect African/American candidates as being districts where we don't necessarily have a majority of the minority population but we have a large percentage.

Maybe if voters in that minority group preferred certain candidates in a primary election and also in a general election, they would have a reasonable chance of electing a member from that district.

And the lower bound of those is usually around 35%.

So most people would not say it's sort of a voting rights act design district if we were below 35% minority.

And out of all the districts submitted by Commissioners, in Ohio 0 met that simple criteria of having 35% or more minority population.

Some other things that people sometimes talk about competition is actually not in your criteria.

It just says no disproportionate advantage to a political party.

But sometimes people think about competitive districts and about 22% of your districts were within 15% in the Presidential vote.

So one candidate won by less than 15% in that district's boundaries.

So that's about a fifth.

So that means that all the others were what political scientists would think of as very unlikely to elect a candidate of one party and very likely to elect a candidate of the other party.

We also have criteria that are mentioned in your list of criteria about measures of partisan fairness.

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

And one simple way to assess that is how many total votes did you collect and how many seats did you give to each party if we assume that the Presidential winner won in that district which is a big assumption.

But there you actually by most criteria this is pretty normal.

This is actually it was about 61% republican in the state and about 68% of the districts that you drew were republican districts.

That seat to vote advantage we call it is actually pretty low.

That is pretty much what we would expect if a party won a state by 61%, we would expect them to win about 68% of the vote.

68% of the seats.

So that's a fairly normal metric that your districts met.

All right so what we are going to do now is start thinking about doing district plan together.

Your next assignment is going to be to finish your districts.

Now you don't have to start with the two you submitted but I would really like to get a 15 district map from as many of you as possible so I can send it to a lot of our panelists and have people critique those maps and they will be nice but I want you guys to hear the kinds of things you might hear from people as they are evaluating the maps.

And a 15 district we can look at partisan fairness or how many districts had the capacity to elect an African/American candidate or the likelihood.

So we will be able to assess them on the criteria if you send us a complete map.

So that is sort of the goal.

Next is we will try it together and then we will do it individually.

So I combined four people's maps to some extent.

I tried to get districts that we could combine work with together.

And so that is the one we are going to work off today anybody notice any problems with the map we are going to start with?

>> MC the lower left corner there is a city divided.

>> Matt: Yes, Cincinnati is divided.

Yep.

Now it's you know it's a large city, so it could be that that's unavoidable but that is a possibility.

I was thinking about where we are mapping now.

Remember that problem of sort of the left over area, right we drew the ones but we also have to think about what is left so one problem is we probably are going to end up starting over here by Dayton.

But I have an enclosed area here so if that enclosed area doesn't happen to equal two U.S. house seats, I'm probably going to have to eat into some of these other districts and extend them somewhere else because they are currently equal population.

The same over here we have this enclosed area we are mapping out from so what we do with one district affects the capacity for all the other districts.

So before that I want to give us a chance to talk about what it was like to you can ask questions of me of course but I want to hear what it was like when you were drawing your first two districts in Ohio.

What difficulties came up.

What did you think you were prioritizing?

Anthony.

>> Anthony: Hi and you know again thank you for all this information.

This education I think is critical to us coming up, with you know good results for the people of Michigan.

So thank you to all of our panelists today for the continuing education.

So I'm the guy that submitted the three district plan.

And you know it's funny I was not looking at any previous maps so it's interesting to me that you said it came up similar to what's currently in place.

But you know I tried to only do two.

And I wanted to start with the Cleveland area essentially and kind of work my way down to Akron Ohio and I just found it pretty much impossible to just draw two.

So that's why I ended up submitting three.

Some of the factors I was looking at were you know having such a condensed population in Cleveland versus the surrounding areas.

So that is why I gave you all three instead of two.

>> Matt: Anyone else reflection on your first try, Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: So what I noticed, well, is it was very interesting and I was really just looking at population and I was trying to look at counties, keep the counties together. But one thing I noticed and I don't know if is just a reflection of districter or how Ohio is mapped but certain places were not contiguous if I had an area it would capture these pockets that were out.

Is that.

>> Matt: Those are real manifestations of some electoral areas.

So you're mapping here in Ohio and in Michigan what we looked at is census blocks but in Ohio we are mapping precincts and so if the locality defined it such that it was a mix then sometimes it is.

So, yep, that could come up.

Other things people noticed?

Did anyone have a challenge, Doug?

>> Doug: Yeah, I started with Southeast Michigan.

Or southeast Ohio.

And I knew it was a rural area because I lived down in that area for a while.

And so when I did that, it seemed to be a lot easier than when I dealt with a large city.

So the question that came into my mind is when you start to map these, should you start with the largest cities and work down toward the rural areas or should you work in the rural area and work-up toward the bigger population areas?

And I never did come to a conclusion on that.

>> Matt: So we are probably going to do a mix.

Of course we won't all be hand drawing.

There will be some that could be drawn by algorithms.

There will be some that could be drawn to maximize some kind of statewide criteria that you set.

But, yes, I think it's very useful to figure out both very tiny lines where you have to Zoom in to see those city neighborhoods.

And the big rural spaces.

>> Doug: You mentioned algorithms what algorithms are you talking about?

>> Matt: If you submit a complete map, I'm hopeful we will be able to compare them against different kinds of maps and one way to compare is maps that were previously done, right, so we could say the maps that have already been drawn for Ohio how does yours compare in terms of race or party data.

But another way that I'm hopeful we will be able to get at is there are people who give a computer criteria and say we just want the most compact districts that meet you know that maximize this.

They maximize racial representation and lack of partisan bias.

So some ways of evaluating maps involve kind of taking a map you would draw and comparing it to hundreds that were drawn by computer.

>> Matt: Now because of the way that your criteria work I'm not necessarily recommending you will ever get to any kind of full algorithm but it is sometimes helpful to compare the maps that you all come up with, with you know ones that were trying to meet certain criteria and were done automatically.

Any other observations before we get to doing it together about drawing it yourself?

All right well one other way to think about comparing is to look at the current districts, so just to show you that real quick.

This is the current Ohio Congressional district so Ohio has the same likely problem that we have which is that they will be losing a Congressional district in this census or likely will.

And so they are going down from 16 to 15 or we are assuming that they are as we are likely to lose one as well.

This is what the current map looks like.

There are two districts that have been represented by African/American members, three and 11.

There are a total of what is that nine, what is the total?

Nine versus seven in terms of republican and democratic districts.

And there aren't that many competitive districts.

So one thing you will get back from your map that we will be able to provide you is these measures of partisan bias.

Now, the partisan fairness.

So the Constitution says using accepted measures of partisan fairness so there is sort of an assumption that we have accepted measures.

And we do have some measures.

There is going to be about the measures but the nice thing is they are easily calculated.

Here are two easy ways to look at the current map and what this says is the median versus the mean vote share in the republican vote share across these Congressional districts.

So the median is 7% higher than the mean.

And this is a way of comparing it.

Now this is not a comparison against algorithm it's a comparison against all Congressional districts across the country and says this plan is plus 7% republican by this metric of median versus the mean and it's you know here in the distribution across districts.

Another simpler way we sometimes connect is in a perfectly tied election where would we expect, how many extra seats would one party win compared to the other and so here in a perfectly tight election according to this metric in Ohio we would expect republicans to win 21% extra seats in a hypothetical perfectly tied election.

So those are measures of the current map.

And we are going to be able to give you the same kind of measures from your maps.

But just I just put these up here just so you will see even though we talk about accepted measures they don't always agree.

This looks like a more extreme map ex extreme gerrymandering by the criteria but we will give you all of them.

And we will do the same kinds of measures for other criteria.

Any questions about either the current map or anything else before we get to drawing together?

All right now we have the fun part.

Remember that -- Anthony.

>> Anthony: Hi.

Can you put that back up real quick?

On the map itself.

>> Matt: The current map.

>> Anthony: The current map for Ohio.

>> Matt: Yes.

Yep.



>> Anthony: I don't know if this strikes any of the other Commissioners this way but I should state I've never looked at how Ohio districts are drawn, we are not in Ohio. They can do their own thing of course.

But.

>> Matt: Taking over today Anthony go ahead.

>> Anthony: These are all over the place looking at district 7 there is a big U you know around district 13.

And I just you know, this looks like it's really all over the place.

And I don't know if that's the impression anyone else has.

But just looking at it, that's my first impression.

>> Matt: Yeah, so now the reasonable compactness is actually your very last criteria. So that is something that you're asked to look at but it's not necessarily the top criteria. And we did hear from the voting rights act panelists for example, that you sometimes get pretty funky districts like number 11 here that might be designed to elect an African/American candidate.

But of course people are going to look at this and they are going to think yeah there are funky looking districts and look funkier than what you produced.

They look less compact.

Any other thoughts on that?

But this was you know this was the current districts were drawn you know by the legislature, bipartisan legislature and so it's not that surprising that the outcome you know is going to score lower on those partisan fairness measures than some of your maps might end up.

All right, so we are ready.

Okay, everybody see our current map of Ohio here?

Where should we start?

We have to make 7 more districts.

Should we -- we can add some information.

So one thing we might want to show is just where the voters are so you can see there is obviously some places that are much more populated than others.

Shall we start over here since we already made a little bit of a mess of Cincinnati area?

Okay, we will go in there.

One thing that I do think most of you were good at is approaching this line.

So when given a goal we want to get to close to 769,000 you all were pretty good at that.

So let's see.

Let's put in our if you do this look already drawn districts that helps somewhat.

So let's see.

We are on nine all right so if you are blocking districts the good part is you are not breaking in my district there so it's pretty easy to get this part of the Cincinnati area.

But we might have to go in a little closer here.

We didn't get out very far.

What do you think we should do?

This is my most obvious compact district to satisfy Anthony.

But now we have to do something.

We have to either go up incorporate some of Dayton.

Excerpts.

>> Dustin: Up.

>> Matt: Dustin wants to go up.

>> Cynthia: Go up.

>> Matt: We might combine it here with some rural areas but might get some more population.

We will see how fast that goes.

So we got we went straight up so we are good on the compactness criteria and we are still at 239,000 people.

What should we do?

Should we do the excerpts around Dayton?

Should we go up here?

Any ideas?

Dustin: I think we will get in a situation where something will look funny.

I will be guessing we want to try to incorporate Laura and go up to West Kilton and up and around the green and down.

>> Matt: Maybe we are just trying to at this point just maximizing not giving ourselves problems later so we will fill in that area maybe.

>> Doug: I would agree with that, I want to try to keep Dayton as one whole area.

>> Matt: We could branch out and say what is the chance we will get two Congressional districts in this space?

Well we are going to at least try and if so, then maybe it's the Dayton we want to sort of keep together.

Was that your thought?

>> Doug: That was my thought.

I don't know what others think.

>> Matt: Okay what is that going to mean for us?

We might end up having a funky shaped district that fills in the other part.

Maybe we want to start drawing the Dayton district first.

We could do that.

That doesn't necessarily complicate life.

That could you know we know where we are here.

But maybe do we want to start in central Dayton?

And I remember you can change the brush size so if you only want to do part of Dayton that is fine but of course we are in a more concentrated area here.

So we are going to get we are already above the other district.

Should I just kind of keep going out?

>> Doug: I would go out and get the suburbs of Dayton.

>> Matt: Okay, so at some point we might get into a congruity problem but we are not there yet maybe.

Here is what somebody mentioned there is some unconnected areas so we might see that.

So let's see we could go around here.

We are doing pretty well.

>> Rebecca: Make sure you catch that area.

>> Matt: One thing you can do is highlight unassigned units.

It's not pretty and it will give me a bunch of red but that at least tells us we got this whole area.

There are not unassigned parts of the area.

So let's back up a little bit.

We are at 647 so pretty good for this district and assuming we get two districts here and could go out this area.

Do we want to do that?

>> Doug: Yeah, try that.

>> Matt: All right, now see we know a little or some of us know a little about Ohio, so we are not making anybody personally mad right now, maybe.

All right we are pretty close now.

But we might be stuck with areas that don't necessarily consider themselves.

We are getting close to spring field here so what do you think?

Should we leave this contiguous district up here?

Should we go down here some?

Are we going to get into trouble and have to redo some of this district potentially?

Hearing no grand ideas I will just kind of keep moving outward.

And see if we are able to get anybody.

We have a lot of not so populated areas here so we have not gotten that far.

But maybe I'm worried about the congruity of this district.

But could go down here somewhat.

>> Doug: I'm worried we are painting ourselves in a corner because if you go further east it's mostly rural areas as I recall.

>> Matt: We have a fairly funky shaped district here even though we started by just trying to draw the Dayton Metro area.

And we could find out that we don't have two full districts in here but let's see, let's just finish the exercise and see where we get.

All right so we are a little bit high now.

Hopefully you all experience the eraser too.

But you can also change the size of the eraser so I only want to do a couple at a time here to get down.

>> Dustin: I had an off question I noticed is there a way to like because just like with the locked districts is there something to lock it so if I'm erasing stuff and if you go near other districts it starts erasing.

>> Matt: There is not a good way to do it but the best is to put it down to one and then it will have that.

All right so we are trying to assign this.

All right, we have we have at least met the equal population criteria.

Let's see if we get lucky and we don't have to do that much to the other district.

We can take an oddly sized district all the way over here.

And thinks we will get lucky and who thinks we are going to run into a problem?

>> MC: We are going to get lucky.

But looks like there is an unassigned area on the left near Richmond.

>> Matt: We have to get that one.

Good.

All right so we have that.

We will see if MC's optimism was well founded.

Go around here.

Now we really are only trying to get equal population here.

We haven't really maximized too many other criteria here.

And let's see how big Lancaster is.

If that helps us, or not.

Well, we got pretty lucky but we have a district that's smaller than all of the others.

So what that's going to mean is we are going to have to break into our other districts at some time.

Should we do that now or later?

Should we say yes, now?

Okay, so who has an idea about how we break into the other districts should we go up in the green district and send the green district to Marion?

Okay.

>> Anthony: What if you moved like the top left portion of that bright pink district to the right?

And then made the Dayton district go a little bit more south?

>> Matt: Oh, so we could move this, oh, you mean you want to move this.

>> Anthony: Move that to the right to what you included in the Dayton district then that opens up that top left portion.

>> Matt: Move the blue district into here.

>> Anthony: Yes.

>> Matt: I'm confused how to do that the pink part without disrupting.

>> Rebecca: You have to bump everything, the gold and the teal.

>> Matt: We will go with the first idea to just get us started.

So this means we have to do some erasing so we can all right we can unlock if we want.

And allow ourselves into here then we get a more contiguous district.

But of course, we are moving that line down.

Get a smaller brush size here.

So, where are we?

We are pretty close.

All right, so we now don't have a contiguous district anymore.

Because we left out some holes there.

All right, let's see.

We want to lock the counties again or lock the already drawn districts again.

We have to get that little part of Sidney.

It's not letting me get that.

So you want to fill in the little splotches.

That must be one of those areas that someone said is connected to some outsiders or could just be an error.

It's not letting me do those.

>> Rebecca: You still have the lock drawn so is that maybe why.

>> Matt: I put the lock back on.

You are right.

All right, all right so now we have a district.

So we made we succeeded on that district now we caused ourselves a problem with the other district.

So we are going to have to do something to the green district.

Should we start with Marion here?

We will see how far that gets us.

Get pretty close here.

So all we are basically doing is maximizing congruity here and trying to get locally trying to get similarly sized districts.

Once we start adding any other criteria like maybe we don't want to break up Mansfield area then it's going to get more complicated.

All right, so, let's see, I don't know how big Norwalk.

We will see if we are able to add that or if we have to stick with rural areas here.

Looks like Norwalk is pretty big and got us a bit much but not too bad.

So we are pretty close now to equal population at least.

What would be your impressions of our district so far?

Before we try and draw these last ones?

Does it look any aesthetically better than the old one?

What problems have we had so far?

>> Cindy: I think the problem is always the you know concentration of population and trying to get around those.

Or keep them together or not keep them together.

So it's tricky.

>> Matt: Yeah, if we try to maximize and get the population deviation between the districts less than 1%, we are pretty good in terms of the basic criteria of equal population.

But that doesn't necessarily buy us that much.

We split up multiple Metro areas already.

We haven't paid a whole lot of attention to any communities just beyond the cities marked on the map.

And let's see how we are doing in terms of some of the criteria that we might use.

So we are still at the problem we have not drawn any districts that the courts would consider likely to elect an African/American or minority candidate.

Same is true let me look at the voting age population.

How about the partisan ballots?

Well, we have this is just the 2016 Presidential election so we could look at other things.

We could look at party registration there is a Senate and house election data here.

If we just said the Presidential winner is going to win these districts go ahead.

It might have been the Spanish translation.

So we have six republican districts right now.

And four democratic districts.

If we assume people would vote as they do for the presidency.

But keep in mind we have drawn some pretty close democratic districts here.

This one is very competitive.

This one is very competitive.

So in a 50/50 you know in a close national election we might get six republicans and four democrats out of these districts.

But in a not in an election where republicans won the national vote by two or three points, we might end up getting eight republicans and two democrats out of this particular configuration that we've drawn so far.

So could be that our map won't perform that well on these partisan bias measures or partisan fairness measures.

Keep in mind we were not, you know, I don't think any of us came into this with you know let's draw republican districts here.

And yet we have a map that in a decent republican year so far might give us a six-two split.

So there are obviously concentrations and one way to see that we can actually put the election data on the map.

And I'll take off the unassigned unit so you can see it better so we have a pattern that is also true in Michigan.

We have very geographically polarized voting.

That is people who vote for democratic candidates are more likely to live in the center of cities.

And outward from them.

And the people who live in rural areas are more likely to vote republican.

So that could mean that we get our republican leaning districts just by doing contiguous compact districts throughout the state without even necessarily trying.

Eric, anything jumping out to you about the districts that we've drawn so far?

>> Eric: No, I just think that the group is really honing in on the importance of recognizing that when we get into these rural areas that they don't provide a lot of population to get you up to that equal population size district so there is a lot of work you have to do around the transition areas to make stuff work.

>> Matt: So one thing I mentioned as potential criteria is the showing country boundaries so you can do that.

One of you said I forgot who that they tried to minimize counties.

It doesn't look like it was one of you that I combined their districts necessarily.

So I'm trying to take not have everything on the map at once.

So is there any way we can draw a district that minimizes county boundary crossing that's left?

Or was that going to be pretty hard?

>> MC: Matt I have a question about this.

>> Yes.

>> MC: If we focus on the counties do, we also help municipalities who are responsible for voting or like administering elections county boundaries also sort of line up with that, is that also true?

Is that one reason to sort of stick within county lines?

>> Matt: I would say the main reason it's low but it's on your list of criterion or criteria to minimize that but these are already electoral precincts so we are already mapping things that election officials are understanding.

But so they have the capacity to implement the map.

But I think you are right.

That the fewer things that you switch the more you know the less difficult it will be potentially to implement and also for voters to understand, right?

So in the Lansing area where I live east Lansing is actually in two counties so we have to get the election results from different places.

There is a small area of the school district that's not in the city this and a small area of the city that is not in the school district and that is true in many places in Michigan and in Ohio.

So we could do this.

I do think you are right though to say we are using counties because counties are on this particular district map but that doesn't mean they are the most important.

We have townships like townships and municipalities like Ohio does so we will have the capacity to do that even if it's not in districter.

>> Thank you.

>> Matt: I was going to draw minimizing county crossing but it looks difficult to execute that.

So the next task I was going to give us is to try to draw a voting rights act compliant district.

So there is polarized racially polarized voting in Ohio and Michigan by the African/American population.

So potentially the courts are going to be interested in that aspect of the -- your map.

And in Ohio just to give you a sense, you know, there are currently two what could be called voting rights act compliant or voting rights act intended districts.

And we have already drawn over one of them.

We drew over the one that is around Columbus.

So that means that we've currently allocated a lot of African/American voters to districts but we haven't built a district that the courts might consider likely to elect an African/American candidate.

So let's try to do that.

So the largest remaining African/American populations the good news is we have some here around Cleveland Akron and Youngstown so I think I showed you the current 11th district Marsha fudge's district before she became the or housing and urban development secretary is around this area right here of Cleveland.

So maybe we can go in a little bit to there and try to draw a compliant district.

Now, what do we want to think about in terms of this compliant district?

Do we want to just literally say, okay, the African/American population of Cleveland lives here so we will draw a district just in that area?

Or what would be the danger in that?

>> MC: We are not allowed to only focus on race; is that correct?

>> Matt: You are not allowed to only focus on race that is true.



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

If you were focusing on race, we would have to pay attention to the population.

If we were to put a lot of African/American voters in a district and say it was 80 to 90% African/American in a district that might be considered packing in African/American voters into one district.

Right, so the standard is you know the likelihood that racially polarized electorate, African/American may be able to elect a candidate but if we go well over that to 80% or so then we might be accused of packing in African/Americans in a single district so that yes, they will elect one African/American candidate but currently they have two.

And/or they have historically.

And so that might be a problem.

So there is I just sort of warning us that we have to worry about sort of too low and too high and why else are we doing this.

Are we just putting this in?

I guess one solution to that might be to say you know, the eastern half of Cleveland or Cleveland moving outward east might be a reasonable district.

Should we try that?

Or any other ideas?

>> MC: Let's try that.

>> Matt: All right.

MC has confidence in our abilities at least.

So, okay, so let's see.

What color are we on?

We are on this blue, colors are pretty similar.

We can show our district numbers, so we can figure out where we are.

So we just drew our tenth district.

Okay so we just drew the tenth so we are on this one.

Okay, so we are going to go into Cleveland and start drawing and there are a lot of people who live here so if we might get pretty populated pretty quickly.

We have our 11th district.

And so we are drawing a pretty small area of the map here.

We are breaking up Cleveland.

And we've already got near or already over now.

I want to go down a little bit.

We will try to take away some of the outlining areas here.

And now we are below.

So when we are drawing these large population centers, you know, every little bit is going to make a big difference.

Okay so we are at about the same population.

Well, are we happy with our district or not?

>> MC: I would be tempted to go to the edge of the county to try to you know keep the population and stay within the county.

>> Matt: So we cross that population boundary so we could fix that.

Let's do that.

Let's fix that.

Okay, so that means we could potentially move out here.

>> MC: Is there a natural feature or some reason, yeah, if we could stay east of the river for example and to the eastern edge of that county.

So I guess I'm tempted to fill into the right, you know, at the county edge.

And then eliminate from the center of the Cleveland and the center of the district.

>> Matt: These folks might consider their identity might be more tied to the city than these areas but we have another criteria of keeping the county together.

That is another one to meet.

>> MC: This is hard.

>> Matt: Let's just look real quick at what our -- what we would look like here.

This district is currently 46% African/American.

44% voting age population.

African/American.

So this is not a you know this is not an overwhelmingly African/American district.

We don't have that issue.

But you know we would be judged on the extent to which this district would be expected to -- if there is racialized polarized voting which there has been in the past then we may be open to criticism there.

But this is of course, a much more likely district to elect an African/American can't did or a candidate preferred by African/Americans than the other ones we have drawn.

Any other thoughts on this piece?

Now, do we think that we are likely to be able to draw another district that aims with this map and the darker areas here are showing you the Black African/American population.

>> MC: Matt, I think we want to hear from the communities inside that area and understand if they want to be broken up, or not.

>> Matt: The path left will be to connect the area of Akron with the area of Youngstown and that might not even work.

There is one other area over here and we might think about changing this area.

And there is going to be potential tradeoffs there.

People might not think that they have a lot in common here and here.

Yes.

>> MC: Eric, if you had to just looking at demographics are there ways you would approach this?

Dilemma we are in?

>> Eric: Well, so I mean I will start off by saying that I study Michigan.

So it's a little harder for me to give you anything precise about Ohio.

But if I were looking at these districts in terms of you know I would start with the communities of interest and build out from there but from here when we are looking at the geographies the smaller geographies are obviously going to have more population in them because that is part of the way they are built.

And you know when we look at these smaller geographies, they will tend to be more urban and tend to have higher proportions of communities of color in them so if that is a concern if your primary concern is building districts that are going to elect communities of color if you have large population centers trying to build multiple districts out from them might be beneficial but then you also have to worry about splitting and cracking and that sort of those sorts of things.

But smaller geographic units you see on the map tend to be more diverse and there are obviously more populated too.

So those might be ways to guide where you start and how you put the lines in.

>> So I don't have too much time left should we try to draw a district with a sizable African/American population?

Should we.

>> Doug: Try the Akron Youngstown scenario.

>> Matt: One thing that was brought up on the voting rights is it's about the process so part of what you are doing is try to draw districts that could elect African/Americans that is also potentially considered so let's try it so one possibility is we can take the Youngstown area and connect it to the Akron area.

Now we are probably going to need to fill in some here.

So we have what could be considered a somewhat odd, shaped district but we left ourselves a space here.

>> Dustin: Now you painted yourself in a corner.

>> Matt: Trying to get to a reasonable chance of electing African/American from that district and the answer really is, no.

This district even the funky district that I drew is about 14%.

14% African/American population in the district.

So we haven't sort of solved that particular criteria.

Yep.

And yet obviously we sacrificed some compactness and we gave ourselves a hole here so let's just finish up so we can...we can at least draw some contiguous districts.

And see what that gives us.

We are going to have to erase some, so we could potentially erase the Warren connection here.

So we have equal population at least but that does not mean we accomplished a whole lot.

Let's look out a little bit.

Now we are stuck in this kind of other areas problem.

We have this long line down where we are going to have to make a district where people might not agree with one another.

And keep in mind in all of this that the Congressional districts are likely to be sort of the easiest to draw right once we get down to 110 State House districts, we are going to have smaller geographies.

We are going to come up with some of these other problems more frequently.

All right so we got to 12 districts.

We have three more to go.

And a lot of difficulty remaining.

One thing we could look back at is the partisan indicator.

So we did manage to have a democratic district.

There are some measures of partisan fairness.

It sounds like that should be good for democrats that we say we created a district that is 80% democrat but there are some partisans of fairness say it may be a bad thing for democrats because we have potentially wasted some votes, they did not need to win this district.

So that's going to be something that comes up.

Notice we have no republican districts that are at 80% voting.

And so there are sometimes tradeoffs among the criteria.

Notice that was the district that was also created to be compliant with the voting rights act but it also potentially packed in democrats in a way that would hurt us in the partisan criteria.

All right, so you're going to be charged with actually completing your own map.

So you can learn from our collective mistakes.

And see how you do.

Please don't be afraid of this.

We are only -- we are practicing on Ohio.

We can mess up the process.

The point is to learn and to get some feedback to see what the -- what kind of feedback you get.

So I hope everybody can follow.

All you have to do is follow the instructions.

To do the two districts.

Just keep repeating that until you get to all of the 15 districts or as far as you get.

There is a premium on timing.

So if you could get this to me or Sue by the weekend then I'm more likely to be able to get you feedback.

I'm going to send it out.

There is already I guess eight or nine people who have agreed to look over the maps. That doesn't mean they will do it for all of them but I think we will get some useful criteria.

And we will also send it through some automated so I think we are going to use that same planned score website to send these through so you will at least get some partisan fairness measures.

MC.

>> MC: Would you be -- I'd like to try to use the map that we just created together.

>> Matt: Yes.

>> MC: Could you share it and I would like to try to manipulate it in addition to making my own, I'm interested using people's maps and import or use it or start with someone else's maps if a Commissioner or person wants to share, I would wonder if I can use that.

>> Matt: I will share our collective map and I will also share the full the PowerPoint is all online that I mentioned but I will make sure that it goes to each of the Commissioner's maps so you will be able to see one another's.

>> MC: You will do that through an e-mail is that the idea?

>> Matt: I can or I can post them on that website as well.

>> MC: Posting on the website is even better, cool.

>> Matt: Other questions that people feel like they can move forward with this? Or that they are going to have trouble.

>> Cynthia: I did just want to say thank you to the student who did the directions for us.

It made it so simple so I appreciate that.

>> Matt: Wyatt, any tips you want to add?

Is he still on?

He might not still be on.

I think he had a class right after this.

But we are all available to help.

So if you run into trouble on the way, and you e-mail any of us, Eric, me, or Wyatt or Sue we can pass it on then we will get back to you as soon as we can.

I would really like to see if you complete or close to complete maps from you.

As soon as possible.

If you get them by the weekend that would be great.

>> Rebecca: Thank you very much Matt and Eric for speaking to us today.

We appreciate it.

>> Matt: Any parting thoughts, Eric?

>> Eric: Just thank this group for all the hard work.

I mean, I don't think that the State of Michigan general population really realizes how much work this group is putting in and how much of an effort it's taking.

So thank you very much.

>> Rebecca: Thank you for coming.

>> Matt: Sorry the last thing is we have an opportunity to bring in some of the people who are evaluating your maps next time so if there is particular panelists you have heard from in the past you would like to review your maps, I can invite them back or if there is particular things you would like your maps to be evaluated on like you are very interested in partisan measures or voting rights act compliance I can bring back people to speak to those particular aspects of your maps.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead MC.

>> MC: Matt what I'm thinking about is how to work collaboratively.

What I think I get the idea that like I can work with other people's stuff and draw but it doesn't feel like a Google doc where I can draw collaboratively where other people are drawing and it feels more collaborative and wondering I would appreciate trying to understand how to do this collaboratively because group thinking feels better than me evaluation and going back and it's me and yeah.

>> Matt: Let's do that too.

Let's...I would like to get your...the evaluation side just so you sort of see what the complete maps, how they are evaluated and let's do that too.

I will create a Google doc and we will work from this map which I just shared and anybody can edit it.

Any of you can edit it and then save it and update the Google doc and say what you were trying to do.

And then we can -- you want to do that and we can work off the current map and try to do a collective one as well.

>> MC: That is super useful.

I did not understand how we could potentially do it but that makes a lot of sense.

>> Mat: Go ahead.

>> Rebecca: You are posting a map and draw down and amend and send back.

What I hear Commissioner Rothhorn asking is more in line with our open and transparent drawing of maps during the Commission's meetings and how that will collaboratively happen.

But could you just go through again just how the collaborative.

>> Matt: I would like everybody to try doing it themselves so we have a variety of maps that we can evaluate.

Because I think it will be very useful for you to see this map you know was rated high in partisan fairness but you know people had objections on voting rights act grounds.

You know, this map divided up local Government boundaries way more than this other map that had this advantage.

So I do want to see this process of it.

But I took MC's request as an and and so in addition to the individual maps we are going to have this map be public and a public document for each of you to be able to say I updated the map and was trying to achieve this.

>> Julianne: Perfect, thank you.

>> Rebecca: Any other comments.

>> Julianne: Just so the Commission is clear again I'm always concerned about open meeting act issues and that we don't have you know a group of Commissioners working on the same thing so again I think that Matt's suggestion that if you take the map and do your own revisions to it and then send that in while it won't be as similar to the collaborative drawing that will be engaged in the future we don't have to worry about any open meeting act issues or deliberations or discussions so thank you.

>> Matt: And both will be public the individual maps that you submit will be posted on the website and in addition to that a collaborative document that you are adding to the public will also be able to see.

>> Rebecca: Okay, all right, thank you again Matt and Eric.

We appreciate your help and we appreciate you taking your time to review our lovely maps we are going to be working on.

>> Matt: Thank you.

>> Rebecca: All right, fellow Commissioners, Brittini had to step away so I'm going to finish out the meeting for her so let's move back to our agenda.

I think we are at the point we are going into new business.

The next item on the agenda is the acronyms and glossary and Julianne or Sue I'm not sure if you want to weigh in on this.

Is this something we were taking action on and adopting these or were these for informational purposes I know MC requested that because of acronyms is this something we are moving to adopt or is this informational?

>> Sue: Information purposes and a list of acronyms if there is something you hear not on the list please point that out to me and I will be happy to add to the list.

The glossary of terms is lifted from the orientation and I just thought it might be a good time to take another look at that so the terms are used consistently and the Commissioners and the public then have opportunities to understand what those mean.

>> Rebecca: Okay, fantastic anyone have any comments or concerns around the list of acronyms?

Okay, seeing no hands raised, we will move on to the next agenda which is the job posting. I'm sorry.

>> MC: So just the one it looks like the on the website we have already got the redistricting 101.

And our MICRC Michigan.gov website and seems the important Commission documents is that where you are thinking of resting or putting it, Sue or Edward? These glossary?

I guess I was thinking how to help the people who might want this like see it and it felt like that seemed like a great place unless you all have a different place.

>> Sue: All of our meeting materials do go on the website so people can look there and we can also create a separate space for this so it would be easier to find.

>> MC: I don't think it needs to be separate there is one called important Commission documents under the, yeah, so just I think you will figure it out.

>> Edward: Redesign so you will see it.

So it's an update to our brand but you will see a revamp of information so it can be easily identifiable so thank you.

>> MC: Thank you.

>> Rebecca: Any other comments?

All right so we will move on to our next item which is the job posting for the executive assistant position.

And has everyone had a chance to look at that, are there any comments about it? Any concerns?

I am not Sue go ahead.

>> Sue: This is for your information.

And this would be a staff person hired by your staff to assist us so we can work smarter. And this position was in the budget.

It was adopted by the Commission.

But I felt that the Commission should have the job description and this information before we posted it.

>> Rebecca: MC did you have any comments and Doug I saw your hand go up as well and Anthony next.

>> Doug: I would like to put a motion forward that we approve and get it posted as soon as possible.

>> Rebecca: MC is seconding that.

Any comment or discussion?

Anthony go ahead.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I don't see how much we would be paying this person on this document.

>> Sue: It's not on the document.

We would pay according to our budget.

So it will be around \$25 an hour.

>> Rebecca: Okay any additional comments?

All right so let's move on to a vote.

So we have a motion to approve the job posting for the executive assistant position.



All in favor please raise your hand and so indicate.

Okay, and then all opposed same sign.

All right the motion carries it is adopted.

All right next item is the draft strategic plan resolution.

Sue, did you want to discuss this or was this Edward who was going to discuss this?

>> Sue: I have developed this plan with help from my fellow staff members and input also from Sally at MDOS.

This really is based on your documents.

A lot of it came from your code of conduct.

So I don't know if you want me to go through the document initially.

I have a PowerPoint if you would like to see that, I'm happy to go through point by point.

What has been drafted or if you have read it and want to ask questions that's also a way to approach this.

So let me know what your pleasure.

>> Rebecca: I have read it.

Is there anyone who hasn't read it who would like Sue to go through the presentation for us?

Or are we all pretty comfortable with what she has presented?

I see Doug and MC giving a thumbs up.

Okay, if there is any discussion or around the plan or do we just want to have someone move to adopt it Rhonda go ahead it looks like you have a hand up.

>> Rhonda: If it comes off the documents and stuff our code of conduct what exactly is this plan for that is stating everything that already out there?

What is it for?

>> Sue: I think sorry, I think the importance is to have a plan in place that guides the work of this Commission.

So your work is to work at the policy level and make sure that the overall, the overarching purpose is followed, the mission would be followed.

The goals would be adopted and then your staff would create the work plan from these goals.

So we are still building out individual goals that actions that we take every week and this will guide our work.

So we are in clear understanding of the direction that this Commission is headed.

>> Rhonda: So this is for staff.

I guess I'm asking because part of it is from the Constitution and part of it is from the code of conduct.

Stuff we have already adopted.

So I'm just trying to grasp what this is for.

Is it for public?

I mean so the public knows where we are coming from?

Or is this a plan for staff so they know, follow these particular steps or I'm just trying to wrap my head around exactly what it's for.

>> Sue: I would say it's a broad plan for the Commission.

It states your purpose.

It states your strategic goals.

And then once those are clear at the Commission level, that gives clarity to the staff as we are trying to do the day-to-day operations.

>> MC: So if I might, Rhonda, the way I understand it is any strategic plan will help the staff actually know what the plan of us, the governing body, who is responsible for oversight, then we task the Executive Director to implement this plan strategically, it's collecting the different pieces that might help put in one place so that the staff, there is more, direct accountability. And that is how I understand strategic plans in general. And I think what Sue is suggesting, it really does put it in place so the staff can implement it in a way they are not going to the Constitution and not going to the code of conduct.

It's put together in one plan if you will.

Which is you know for this particular year.

>> Rebecca: Doug, go ahead.

>> Doug: Yeah, I personally think it's an excellent management tool that we should have.

And I think it will become useful in the future particularly when we have to give presentations to people, to groups to be able to use it to explain to them the direction that we are taking.

I just want to make that comment.

>> Rebecca: Any other comments?

I am seeing none do we have a motion to adopt the strategic plan, Dustin?

Was that a comment or are you moving.

>> Dustin: I will move it.

>> Rebecca: So move. Can I get a second? So Doug it looks like you have given us a second. Okay so we have a motion to adopt the strategic plan as submitted by Sue. If you are in favor, please raise your hand to so indicate.

If you are opposed same sign.

The motion carries.

All right.

So that plan is adopted and then let me go back.

All right next item on our agenda is future meetings and agenda items.

Are there any comments about this?

About the future meetings?

Doug go ahead.

>> Doug: Yeah, my comments deal with future agenda items.

I've got a couple things here that I want to go through.

Here is one item I would like to see on a future agenda.

We received a message, I'm going to bring it up, well, it's from Henry Fleichman, he is a U of M student who has a potential software tool.

And I think that needs some discussion.

That was forwarded I believe with our materials from like last agenda.

I found that very interesting.

I found it could be significant to our work but I would like to talk a little bit more about that.

>> Rebecca: Do you want to have it added to an agenda item for next week?

>> Doug: Not necessarily next week because he is still in development so whenever is appropriate.

Whenever we have the time but I would say within the next month or so.

>> Rebecca: Sue, go ahead.

You are on mute, Sue.

>> Sue: Talking to myself.

I have replied to Henry and let him know we certainly appreciate people who look at specific criteria.

He is not necessarily looking at the criteria that the Commission has been charged with. And also, he is looking at communities of interest as ones that they identify versus communities of interest that self-identify.

But I'm happy to share with you the e-mail I sent back to him and I certainly welcome and invited him back to the point where we get it public comment if they have their tool developed, they certainly can come and share with the Commission at that time so.

>> Doug: That is great.

I felt that could be significant to our work.

Or useful to our work.

I have another well I actually have three items.

Which I kind of put in the category of processes and procedures.

So let me bring up what I felt was the more important of the three from a time perspective.

And I think some of this came out with our discussion today with Edward.

On how -- this really needed to determine in my mind how we are going to manage the standard agenda for public hearings.

As well as the processes that we are going to use in public hearings.

I don't think this is going to be run necessarily in the same way as one of our normal meetings.

We got to figure out how we will choose the people.

How we are going to organize all that.

What if we are going to give them a presentation at the beginning and what that presentation is going to be so they understand, you know, what's going on. So I think that maybe an important thing that we sit down and discuss as a group. On how we organize these public hearings. And we are down to where we have probably six weeks before our next one which means six meetings. Before our first one. Yeah.

So I think that's significant.

I think Edward has got a comment relative to that.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead Edward.

>> Edward: Yes, we will be bringing a proposal of that for your consideration in terms of the outline.

We just are doing it slowly, piece by piece.

But the Commission will have a proposal for their consideration.

>> Doug: A future agenda item.

>> Edward: Right and focus on those three purposes for the public hearing that is outlined in the Constitution.

>> Doug: Okay and is that going to be like an agenda and how the meetings are going to get run?

>> Edward: It will be a PowerPoint.

>> Doug: Okay, all right, and when do we expect that?

In the next few weeks?

>> Edward: Yes.

I'm waiting to see whether or not where we are with the meeting, whether we are in person or virtual.

But it will be the first.

>> Doug: That would make it significant, a significant difference, okay, great.

And then based on another suggestion or comment I want to make is based on the work we did with Matt today, and MC really alluded to this, right at the end, we need -- I think we need to sit down as a group or maybe as a committee and determine how we're going to work, how we are going to manage the COIs for redistricting.

This would include our interfaces with other groups as well as how we are applying the communities of interest to redistricting.

And if we are going to be limiting COI in the redistricting process.

And if we are, what the process would be to do that.

I don't see this as an immediate need because I think we need our voting rights attorney and others involved in the discussion.

But I think it's something that we need in the future as an agenda item.

So that we understand how we are going to work with all this.

And I mean we've got people out there gathering COI information today.

I think we need interface for them.

Basically what's happening is they are going to just provide this data back to us and each group is going to do it in various formats and I think we need to coordinate with them up front and figure out how we are going to do that so we can tell them what we would expect as they provide us some of this information.

I know from the public hearings that is not feasible but from like the women's is feasible from the University of Michigan and data collection I think it's feasible so I would like to see something like that as an agenda item so we can discuss that.

And then the third item I had relative to processes and procedures was and again this is not immediate need because we need to wait for EDS to get on board, we need to develop a process and procedures how we interface with EDS and drawing maps.

That is what MC got to at the end of Matt's presentation today.

And we need to develop the processes that we are going to work by and how we are going to develop them and how we are going to interface with EDS itself and any other people like the voting rights act attorney and so forth as we go through this.

So I think that needs to be an agenda item we need to discuss that.

And that's all I had.

I would like a little feedback if you feel all that is reasonable.

>> Rebecca: Thank you, Doug.

Does anyone have any feedback for Doug?

>> Dustin: I agree.

Especially when it comes to interfacing with it.

I feel like that potentially could be a group of us that could figure this out like we did subcommittee wise I imagine that would be the most efficient and then bring those thoughts to everybody just if anyone has other ideas to add to it just to make the collective think tank work a little bit easier with everything.

I would be willing to be a part of that as well.

I think that is just a good idea.

>> Doug: And I think the committee structure we used before might be good to do some of these things.

I don't know.

We will get into that discussion as we go forward so I thought these procedures and processes are significant, making sure that we can work efficiently as we move forward.

>> Rebecca: I agree and think they are all good ideas, Doug.

>> Doug: Thank you.

>> Rebecca: I especially think dealing with communities of interest is probably going to be one of our most challenging aspects because I anticipate there is going to be a lot and at some point, we are going to have to sort of put people on the scale and decide which is we are placing more emphasis on than others and it will be challenging.

>> Doug: Let's say we get in a public hearing up in Bay City and somebody says we have a community interest of such and such a people and we don't know where they are located at in Bay City or if they are on the outside of Bay City.

We need to get that type of data and that type of process down so we get that type of data and we are able to deal with.

I think Cynthia had a point.

>> Rebecca: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Doug asked for feedback I was just going to say I think those are all really good points.

Thank you for bringing them up and we should address them.

>> Doug: I have one other item, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Go ahead, you are full of ideas today.

>> Doug: I am I sat down and worked a little yesterday and sat down and put these together.

This is more of an administrative thing.

Excuse me.

I'd like on the agenda a discussion on giving the pledge of alliance before our meetings. Every one of these city Council meetings I've been to, that's one of the first things that is done.

Not only to our meetings but also public hearings so I would like that on the agenda as well, Sue.

>> Rebecca: All right anything else?

>> Doug: I yield back.

>> Rebecca: Thank you, Doug.

Anyone else have any comments, concerns, announcements?

Okay seeing none, next item on our agenda is excuse me announcements.

Are there any announcements anyone has, Sue or Ed anything?

The next item on the agenda is to adjourn.

If anyone is in favor of adjourning you want to go ahead and take a vote on it, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

>> Cynthia: I will motion to adjourn.

>> And Dustin seconded all in favor raise your hand.

All opposed raise your hands.

And the motion is adopted.

Everybody have a great day.

Good-bye guys.

Have a great day.

[ Meeting concludes at 4:21 p.m. ]