

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.

ICRC

11/20/20 Meeting

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

>> Doug Clark: Good morning, as acting chair to the Advisory Committee for review of General Counsel applicants, I call this meeting to order.

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 are currently using, please visit our social media at redistrictingMichigan to find additional links.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. We have ASL interpretation available for the meeting.

If you are a member of the public watching, who would like different viewing options for the ASL interpreter on your screen, please email us at redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will provide you with additional viewing options.

And for those who would like to have -- for details on language translation services during the webinar can email us at 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 email us and we will provide you with a unique link and call-in information.

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [redistricting Michigan.org](http://redistrictingMichigan.org) for viewing at a later date. This meeting is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be made available and posted on redistrictingmichigan.org and written public comments submissions.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Tracy Weemer. Media relations director at the Department of State. Members of the media should have her contact information.

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

>> Sally: Good afternoon, everyone. Please unmute and say present when I say your name. Doug Clark.

>> Present.

>> Richard Weiss.

>> Present.

>> M.C. Rothhorn.

>> Present.

>> All members of the Advisory Committee are present.

DOUG: Thank you Sally. I will now look on a motion to approve the meeting agenda. As a reminder to the public, can you see the agenda on the website.

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

So, for the Commissioners present, do we have any comments on the agenda or a motion to approve the agenda?

M.C.: I'll move it.

>> Second.

DOUG: All in favor, raise your hand and say aye.

>> All opposed say nay.

>> Meeting agenda is approved. At this point we would like to go to public comment, do we have individuals available for public comment available today.

SALLY: Yes, we do.

DOUG: A few notes about public comment. For those of you who are going to join us for the first time, because this is a virtual meeting, members of the public needed 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 the order they signed up to address the Commission.

To those members of the public participating in public comment, please note you have no more than two minutes to address the Commission this afternoon. You can also submit your thoughts to the Commission and Department of State will provide your written thoughts to the Commission by indicating in that email you would like to submit your written comments 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 and Facebook and Twitter at redistricting MI.

And now I would like to recognize Sally Marsh, Michigan Department of State Director of special projects who will call on members of the public to address the Commission. Sally?

SALLY: Thank you acting chair. And now I would like to recognize individuals who have signed up and would like to provide live public commentary. I will call your name and our staff will unmute you.

If you are on your computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak. If you are on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. In this case I will call on you by your name. And please note that if you have audio issues, we will give you a few seconds to fix it and then move on to the next person. So, the first person in line to provide public comment is Joe Spalding. Are you there with us?

>> Mr. Spaulding: Yes, I am, Sally.

SALLY: Fantastic, you are unmuted and invited to address the Commission. You have two minutes.

>> Hi, Commission. Joe Spalding here. And quick things I wanted to say. Administrative stuff. I don't know who is responsible for the agenda on the website, but it has the communications director agenda posting twice and doesn't have this posted.

Need that fixed right away. Open meeting act. And beyond that, I just want to give one quick note on general counsel, I do a lot of opposition research with candidates in my real life. And haven't done any on -- looked at the ED candidates. That's the agenda setting role that will have impact on the way you operate when it comes to general counsel. One thing I value most in having, looking at a lawyer paid by my tax dollars with a Commission like this, is the understanding of the policy itself. The first time we're doing it in Michigan other states have done other things. Nothing quite like this. And so, it's good we got this far and shows the law was written well by Nancy Wang and I have to thank her. And she was on this before I was on the -- and keep in mind on what this law actually does and all the nuts and bolts inside is very key. And when it comes to figuring out how we're going to be interacting with the general counsel moving forward. I think those are things that are a little bit easier to smooth over. That's all I have to say about the general counsel. Thank you for your time.

SALLY: Thank you for addressing the Commission. That concludes our public comment for the moment. And I turn it back over to the acting chair. And before I do, actually, the Acting Chair I wanted to mention we're quickly solving that website issue, so thank you members of the public for finding that that's on the Department of State. And if you like we can screen share that agenda to everyone watching now and you can walk through if that's helpful.

DOUG: That would probably be helpful. Yeah.

DOUG: Thank you. In the agenda we're at New Business. And a couple of items. First is the appointment of permanent chairperson for the committee.

So, at this point... do I have any comments or recommendations from the two other Commissioners that are present? Yes, Richard.

RICHARD: I would like to make a motion that Doug Clark be our chairman.

M.C.: Second.

DOUG: I have personally no problem doing that. All in Favor raise your hand and say aye.

M.C.: Aye.

DOUG: All opposed say nay. It is approved I'll continue on as the Chairperson, and the permanent chairperson of the committee. Next item on the agenda is to discuss the hiring methods and procedures. And the first thing we want to do is discussion on the process to rank candidates. As a -- as a proposal, I have put together one method or process for discussion and approval. And then we can -- I'll talk about that, and then we can move on to any other proposals and decide how we want to move forward with this. What I basically did -- and this is one of the attachments that got sent out -- I put together a matrix to evaluate and assess each one of the candidates, so this matrix would be used for each one. And it's got 5 different columns, and a number of rows. And each of the columns represents a different aspect of this. The first one identifies the category we're assessing. And the second one, identifies a scoring mechanism for that

category. Third one is comments if you wish to. And the 4th one is a weight to the individual category. So that way that allows us to put importance on certain items that we feel are more important from a candidate's perspective, and the last one is actually a mathematical calculation of multiplying column 2 by column 4 to come up with a score from that category and eventually gets totalled up at the bottom, so everybody gets a score, and we can quantify our assessment of an individual.

And let me make a couple comments on the first column. Our requirements: And everything in this column comes off of the job posting. And only one exception, and that's the last item... and the last item gives us an overall general impression, favorable or unfavorable and comments with that. And that's a catch all, in case there were things on the job posting we thought were relevant or important. So, what I did on the first two, those are requirements. And so, the first two items in the categories are requirements. That's one being in the Michigan State Bar and the other one minimum 5 years in practice of law. And everything in italics comes off the job posting. -- for verbiage used there. And each of the other areas, and categories -- I'm not going to go through everyone one of them. Everything in the job posting is reflected here, and my thoughts on that were -- this is what is important to us as a Commission. And as a committee.

And these are the items that we brought out to the field, for candidates to apply against. And so, I thought this was an appropriate way to go ahead and continue that. So that's the basic methodology for that. What happens after that point -- yes, M.C.

M.C.: I would agree, and I like it and appreciate you sending it out for time for me to review it. I appreciate the review, but you gave me adequate time to review it, and I would love -- if we can -- depending where Richard is -- I feel good about the weight you gave it. And I tested it and used to score going through it. I feel good about it. I do believe the comments before about the idea of the constitutional statute being a requirement. That's the only thing I would add there, and give that significant weight. Because as legal counsel -- for me an oversight for me I didn't consider it going into the general council. I looked at it as a Commissioner, but the general council should have that. And I wanted to cut to the chase if it's appropriate Richard.

DOUG: Let me make a comment on that. If we add an item, and we have a total of 100%, and we put a weighting to that, like 5. We have to take 5% off some other categories.

M.C.: So, I have a suggestion, because I do think appropriately experience in federal redistricting law was 20%, and I think that was the highest percentage up there and I think that's true, and I would suggest that it should be, you know, maybe we should actually -- yeah, take from the 15's, and create another 20%. Because I do think -- we do need this -- we understand the hierarchy of law and the council needs to understand that intimately to understand that on the spot. To understand the hierarchy which is not easy. So, the 20% for VRA -- and that's good. And the highest percentage, and I

suggest that 20% or 19% [chuckling] be for the constitution. We can talk about where to take it from. But, yeah, it feels it should be weighted with that gravity.

DOUG: Are you okay with that Richard? -- before we change the weightings let's define the categories. And then we'll talk about the weightings and go from there. Because we may want to add another category.

M.C.: Okay.

DOUG: So, we'll call this... constitutional? Knowledge?

M.C.: State constitution knowledge, m-hm.

DOUG: Good point, State constitutional knowledge. And what do you want in parentheses, this was not part of the job posting.

>> So, I think we don't put anything in italics. This is where we would have to be able to assess that ourselves given what we have and suggest that we need to interview based on that. Like, it's kind of an interview question.

DOUG: Okay, that could be part of the interview as well.

M.C.: Agreed.

DOUG: The only thought I have with this, when we were 8 people on this on this assessment... that wasn't part of the job posting and that may not be in the resumes.

M.C.: I agree. That's why I said it's an oversight on my part. It's not too late. It wasn't in the job posting and do think it's an oversight and a huge matter for the general council to be intimate with. So, I suggest we remedy it.

DOUG: I think it's a good suggestion. Let's go back to one of the categories. "Michigan government experience". Why wouldn't we incorporate with that.

M.C.: I think with regard to the state candidate experience there is such a multitude of experience, councils who have litigated on behalf of municipal body. So, it feels that's an operational piece. And this is actually about governance of the state. We may be conflating something. I don't think it's the same.

DOUG: Two different categories.

M.C.: So, I think I hear you saying -- Michigan State Government Experience. So that's 15% right now. And suggest another Michigan State, governing, or governance experience.

DOUG: State constitutional knowledge.

M.C.: Yes, state constitutional knowledge.

DOUG: Separate category, not part of this one.

M.C.: Yes.

DOUG: Perfect. So, I need to get a scoring mechanism to that. And all the scoring -- you get 300 points, 200, 100 or 0. So however you want to define that... let's say the 300 points would be extensive knowledge in the Michigan State Constitution

M.C.: Yes.

DOUG: I'll write that. I'll have to modify this form, and 200 would be moderate knowledge. And so forth.

M.C.: Yeah.

DOUG: Okay. Are you okay with that Richard?

DOUG: So, another point is we have to give that a weighting, and then take... a percentage away from some of the other categories, so you suggest this is a high weighting?

>> It seems to me as it's federally mandated and the State Constitution is covering what we're doing and the RA was that percentage, that's why I suggest it should be equally there. There is hierarchy that will be complex and hard to create maps and the general council will need to help us make maps on the spot live with people in a zoom.

DOUG: Absolutely. Are you recommended 20% on this?

M.C.: I would.

DOUG: Richard what do you think about 20%.

RICHARD: You guys are a little bit better at this. I haven't had the opportunity of interviewing anybody. So, I have to rely on you and the other Commissioners on the candidates, I think it makes sense to me.

DOUG: To me... it is a very important category. So, I have no problem with the 20%, that means we have to reduce other categories. We don't have to reduce just one of them. But spread out across multiple ones if we need to. So, we need to do that. So, we need to take a look at what we got. You are suggesting taking a look at the 15%ers.

M.C.: Yes, 15%ers. Come to think of it -- I think the other way to do this is not to suggest that we create at 20%, but just that it's ranked with the VRA, and the open -- what's the -- VRA and that experience --

DOUG: Open Meetings Act.

M.C.: Yes, open meetings act. The highest. So, we take from that category and go from 20 to 15. If we're trying to get to 15% for example. That is the highest -- I'm thinking about -- there are 3, 15% categories. And we could create a 17 and a half percent and reduce it and take 5% -- I'm not sure I'm being clear.

DOUG: So, what are you saying is take 5% off of each --

M.C.: The 15%ers, and split the 20% in half, so it's 2 and a half, 2 and a half, so it's equally weighted. It being the new category we're creating would be equally weighted with the experience and federal distancing law. Awkward percentage --

DOUG: Not sure I'm following you.

M.C.: So, each of those, 3, 15% categories, and reduce each to 10%. Then we have essentially 15% we need to make up. But because -- if we want to weight the new category, the knowledge constitution equally, so we have to reduce the 20%... and split it and a half, so it's 17 and a half.

>> So, take 5% away from the 20% and apply 2 and a half % and 2 and a half %, so it's 17 and a half persons for the new category and experience of redistricting law would be 17.5%.

DOUG: I see what you are saying.

M.C.: And keep the other categories the same.

DOUG: So, you are saying -- what you are saying is take... experience and federal -- make it 17.5 and new category 17.5 and reduce those 3 others -- Michigan State government experience, and litigation experience down to 10. Okay, okay.

What I think is important is the experience of federal redistricting law, and state constitutional knowledge. That's what I think. Okay.

Um... and what about the... if we took that approach. What about the weightings on any of the other, they're all relatively small?

M.C.: The other 10% is legal analysis and research, and I think that's -- yeah, I would agree that's important.

DOUG: Okay, okay. Okay, I need to add this up real quick, unless you have done that M.C. to make sure we're at 100.

M.C.: I added that up and it's 100% yes.

DOUG: I'll check later when I modify the form. Any other comments on this approach? We're comfortable with that. I used this before, 5 years ago. It was in a non-profit type thing, a committee of 4 people and it worked well.

M.C.: I want to offer it's always difficult to quantify the qualities of people, so we have to use something to be as transparent as possible. And I guess what I'm suggesting is that it's not easy. No matter what we do

DOUG: When you read the documentation, people submit and had to map up against this, and the only advice you say to you is sometimes you have to interpret things a little bit and do the same for everyone, and some of these answers will be 0 points.

Q And that brings me to the next point. And as we were doing this... I was testing.

DOUG: I did the same thing.

M.C.: And I was trying to see, why am I choosing this person over this person. In some ways -- what I'm saying, I think I learned how I made my choices -- my biases, and I can share those with you know, so you know what my bias is in reading this. I can give a weight and number. But trying to explain to myself, why did I weigh it differently. For example, with an out of state candidate I felt if they weren't in instate. I should have equally weighted them, but my bias was for the state of Michigan and experience they had in the state of Michigan.

DOUG: I came across the same thought processes, and here is what my experience tells me from using this process before. You may look at things differently. And Richard may look at things differently and I. And that's okay. Based on the way we're doing this, as long as you consist across the 11 candidates.

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.

M.C.: What I guess I'm saying -- I was trying to understand, and I know I can explain it to you all. And I really -- I was just testing, so I think I'm going to do it again, we may get to it today. But I want to offer that I know I can explain my rationale and explain why I chose that number.

DOUG: That's what the comment section is for as well on this, to document it.

Yeah, let me explain one other item for the people on the phone that -- what we do is -- we add these up for -- there is a summary sheet on another spreadsheet, and we add these up for each of the candidates, and so I take Richard's scores for each of the 11 candidates and I put MC scores for the same 11 in the spreadsheet and put mine, and we may look at things different, as long as they are equal for the 11. That's okay. And total up for the person and then average. And then sort that down and see who floats to the top and who floats to the bottom.

Remember our objective is to make a short list. Our objective is not to choose the candidate, so this begins to sort that out in a quantifiable manner to get to that point.

M.C.: Do we want to decide on the short list what number to get down to.

DOUG: Let me make a comment on that. I've gone through this once before.

M.C.: Okay.

DOUG: And I looked at the pilot program I ran yesterday when I assessed everybody. And I saw basically the same thing: When I did this 5 years ago on a group of people -- and it was a larger population. I think it was 20 or 25 people. But what I find is that you put them in the summary sheet and sort it down, and you will have 3 or 4 float to the top, and then you are going to have some separation in the numbers. A significant separation. And you may have one person, that's maybe 10, 20 points behind, and then you will have a group of them, 10 or 20 below them as well. To kind of float to the bottom. And so, it kind of -- it really depends on how it sorts itself out on how many people, which is our second agenda item associated with this. And so, you really have to look at the numbers, and see how that sorts out. And so, I would say, reasonably, we want to go forward with this -- in my opinion, 3 or 4 people. When I did this yesterday, in the pilot program, can I tell you -- this is my only little pilot program. 3 float to the top, and one about 20 points below that, and another, and the rest of the groups were another 20 points below that person. So, I saw that same phenomenon happening. And I know it's an agenda item, but I'm not sure, that this is the meeting we want to do that at. I think we want to take a look at the numbers first.

>> Sure.

>> And that's just my opinion, based on my experience, and take a look at the numbers. If we see a significant gap, that separation in numbers, there is a good cut off point. You know? And then have discussion on some of the people that fell off of that as well.

>> Agreed.

DOUG: That's my approach toward it. So... are you good with that? Should we hold off on that decision until next time we get together?

M.C.: I'm okay with that.

DOUG: Are you okay with that Richard.

RICHARD: Sure.

DOUG: Sally?

SALLY: I want to make sure I'm clear on what you are talking about. Right now, there is only one meeting of your Advisory Committee scheduled. And so, if you are suggesting that there be another meeting where you come to a conclusion on recommendations then, you know, I would recommend you try to utilize the time today as much as possible, because of all the logistics and costs that go into every meeting.

Understanding you want to use the system, by all means you guys are absolutely in charge. But I would really try to maximize today, and not necessarily plan on another meeting, unless it's needed by the end of the session.

DOUG: We're going to do these independently... but, when I went through this and did this yesterday, it took me 2 to 3 hours, Sally.

M.C.: It took me that too.

DOUG: We won't accomplish in the hour we have.

M.C.: How are you feeling Richard.

RICHARD: I don't have as much experience, but I went through the list and trying to find out the best possible, I did pick 3 people I kind of liked. So, I'm kind of curious if you did that Doug and if you did the same thing M.C.

M.C.: I have the numbers associated with it.

DOUG: I do as well but not the new category.

RICHARD: You are more experienced than hiring. So, I'm curious who you picked.

M.C.: I would offer Richard, it's important we recognize we added a new category. So, we should probably take that into account. And I know it's -- and I think -- for me it's helpful if we understand -- because I would like to be persuaded -- like, yesterday, we did the meeting for the ED. I don't know if we were able to discuss and persuade each other, or understand how we came to it, like, oh, my gosh I didn't think of that, of course they're the right person. What I'm suggesting today, is we can understand how we came to the decisions we might help come to a consensus, and say to the colleagues, these are the reasons we shortened the list to two. Because we need to interview this person, or 4. -- I don't care, like Sally said, we're tight on time. It's an imperfect process. And the longer we drag it out, and won't save public money, and may increase fairness, but a trade-off, money, and timing, and constitutional mandate to finish at a certain time. I'm not against pushing us. And we have a system that I like Douglas, and Richard and you have used the system, and why don't we try it and why we came up with the top 3 or 2 or whatever and include that last new category, if we can.

DOUG: Sally, can I ask you a question. I understand your comment on time. If we chose to -- I would think that if we just took the system and did it independently, and came up - - and we have to come back and talk about the people, and the scores, could we get an hour attached to the new meeting you are putting on, in the front or back end? To do that?

SALLY: I think that's a possibility. I would see how far you get today. With the candidates you have, you may feel confident with what you have. But we can revisit that at the end of the meeting, and I think that's a good suggestion.

DOUG: Yeah, at the end of the meeting, I would like to do that. So, I just wanted to make sure that's a possibility. Thank you. We'll decide at the end. Okay... so, you are recommending we talk about -- I got mine ranked.

M.C.: Great, and we have a system, why don't we use the number system that we got and try to throw out the people we got -- 3 people. And Doug if you have it in a spreadsheet. And if we can see the numbers with his and my top three that might help us

DOUG: I've got it, I may have to throw it into the spreadsheet. When we get to that point, we'll take a 5-minute break and throw it into the spreadsheet.

M.C.: Sounds good.

DOUG: Okay, do you want to tell me what you came up with?

M.C.: Richard, go ahead, why don't you start? I'm going to pull mine up.

RICHARD: I based it on experience and how much time they have been practicing law. I have Monifa Gray. James Lancaster

>> Do you have numbers for them?

RICHARD: No, I didn't quite get into that part of it.

RICHARD: And Delusia Morrison, and I could have gotten into more specifics, but I based a lot of that on how long they have been practicing law and that, because I look at if you have been that long and still in business, you must not be too bad.

M.C.: And that lines up pretty much with mine too, and I can explain why I have a difference.. so, my numbers, James Lancaster: 240, and D -- 164. And Julianne, at 271.25. And that would change because of the constitution -- the category we just added. And then I had Monifa Gray 234.5.

DOUG: Let me tell you what I had. We're going to be in line.

I had Pastula, at 241. She was my high one. And Catherine K at 239.

M.C.: I wanted to interview her too.

DOUG: James Lancaster 201. And Gray at 132.

M.C.: Nice. Should we go into -- so if you all are okay with it. I did write down -- I have quick access to why I said what I said, like, my rankings.

DOUG: Okay.

M.C.: And one of the things that I recognize is one of my biases -- I have a short list of biases. I gave one already, the state of Michigan, and actually all of these are. And the people that weren't -- yeah.

And I also recognize if there was both public -- and I value both public and non-profit and for-profit legal expertise, and if I had to choose one over the other, the idea was that valued public government experience inside the government, and valued that over non-profit or for profit 51% to 49%. Both are valued. But that was a bias for me, and working in a government institution, I think that's why I chose that bias. And as far as the public servant focus in our ED in particular we said we're adding another public servant, and that leads to the idea that customer service in my -- not sure if in my mind -- public servant is different from public service. And the public is different from business experience. And we need litigators to understand and say both. And so, I'm recognizing that was part of my bias. And then, did they demonstrate enthusiasm. Was their letter that they wrote to us -- the cover letter, did they see themselves as a good fit, and how much was written and how much attention to the detail in the posting. So, there was a job description, did they reference that in some places and the constitutional law. And the coronavirus and experience, on how to operate and the Governor's executive order affected how he moved and that was something not on the sheet, but a bias I'm suggesting, if they're current and operating in this environment, if they're currently active in the field and using the -- they are using virtual stuff and trying to understand the legal implications because of it. And so that's why I had Julianne Pastula, had excellent information, and writing sample, and I liked she addressed Commissioner, via, the Secretary of State and the other person that did was James Lancaster it shows they understand the complexity in addressing us, and it felt not insignificant, and I appreciate that in the letter and others did not do that. And general counsel, so -- I'm reading James Lancaster, I mentioned Julianne the top one, but James, his experience in our shoes as a Commissioner, felt really valuable. And because he's been a council at MISHTA that is public and private. It's valuable, because we're a complex entity, and could apply very well. His experience there could apply very much. I was concerned that he didn't have any VRA experience, and I just think that Julianne who said she had VRA experience, it was based on her understanding how the districts in the city of Detroit were redistricted. And I thought, James, I think may also have within the districts, and the city of -- whatever, where he is practicing right now, he might have experience but not on the federal level. Because she didn't -- I feel like I'm talking a lot. I'll check.

DOUG: Your comments are well respected. And I came up with Julianna as my top candidate as well. What drove me toward that was her comments about her redistricting. You know? Really drove me toward that. And then, James Lancaster was my third choice, and I felt he had a good handle on things, and Catherine -- I don't have in front of me, she works for the State AG. And I thought she had some really good qualifications based on that. So those were my top 3.

M.C.: Excellent. Do we want to speak to Monifa?

DOUG: Well, what do you think Richard? She was one of your candidates.

RICHARD: What I wanted to tell you is my 4th and 5th pick was Julianne and Catherine, even though I went a whole different way of assessing the candidates, I still came up with what you came up yourselves. So...

RICHARD: We all have an agreement on Julian and Mr. Lancaster. That's the only ones we all picked the same. So, if you want to get it down to two, you know, I'm kind of open to whatever you guys think.

M.C.: That's what this time I mean thinking too.

DOUG: You are thinking two.

M.C.: Yeah, and I think what we can do if we recommend that to the colleagues, and fellow Commissioners, we have a tool that we used and each of our individual rankings these were the two that were top within the top 4, or I guess top 5 for Richard for all of us, and those two in the top 5, for each of us, makes -- we can -- yeah, we can trust that, and I think if we -- because we're doing general council and have potentially an ED who will be sitting in on the interview. We're hiring our second person with this general council and I think they're going to need to fit with the ED -- and fit where they complement each other, and James Lancaster applied. He won't about the ED. And it would be important to -- because we didn't interview him because of that bias and perception that we think is so important to maintain, our independence, and if we interview James, and if we chose James it's really important the ED balance, or that there is perception of balance, so I'm suggesting that because we haven't hired the ED we have to consider -- yeah... how we -- yeah.

DOUG: So, both of you are recommending we go forward with two people?

RICHARD: I wouldn't be against having other ones, if any of you wanted to do that. I don't have a problem with that. But we came to an agreement with at least 3 of us, and I came around a different way of coming to the conclusion. So maybe there is something -- we got it down to two.

M.C.: I would like to suggest we go to two, because with the colleagues we're going to have -- I'm surprised how well it worked yesterday to have half an hour for each candidate, and I was surprised and pleased. And don't think with the general council -- it just feels like half an hour, we need more time...

DOUG: I agree with that.

M.C.: Because we have to understand how they understand the state constitution and VRA. And I think each of these two have great written writing samples we can pass on and use those very well. But I do think we need more time, and so two people to interview over a two-hour period is better than 3 or 4 over a 2-hour period.

DOUG: So, two people, so we have more time.

M.C.: Yes, and more in depth questioning and frankly the ED if we do get that chance to get the ED in on the hiring, I think that's going to be an important fit.

DOUG: You wouldn't on the ED in on the interview process.

M.C.: It's tricky. That's timing. It feels -- my understanding of how an organizational chart works, we're a board of Commissioners and we're hiring our Executive Director. And really the Executive Director should be hiring. Because that's going to be the boss of the staff. And so, we're not the staff. And so, it does feel a little weird for us to hire this General Council. And it's not inappropriate, but to make it clear as possible and efficiency, we want the ED in place.

DOUG: I don't think we'll have the luxury on this, maybe on one of the other things.

M.C.: I agree, and don't think we have the luxury of waiting and pausing. I think it would be appropriate and awesome, but may not be able to do it.

DOUG: I think we'll get questioned on why two and not 4.

M.C.: If you want, I can write up some of the conversation, I can write up -- I do think it has to do with enough time to interview. I want 1-hour interviewees and have an hour and have them understand that each of these -- it's an important position, and they will need to work with an executive director they don't know yet. They're not working for us; a lot of complexities we feel we have to tease out in the interview.

DOUG: Okay, so before I ask for a motion on this. Are you willing to write up the notes on that? Okay. And just mail them out to Richard and myself.

M.C.: I'll do that by email. And I'll seek advice if I should do it to all the Commissioners. I'll ask Sally for all or two of us.

DOUG: My opinion is keep it in the committee and use it as talking points when we meet with them. Because this is a committee decision.

M.C.: Okay. Sally

SALLY: I'll talk with Mike Brady about this as well. But want to flag, you don't want to be emailing anything that is a conversation. So just as a reminder, but for the public watching the Commissioners don't discuss via email,

M.C.: So, we would send notes that summarize.

DOUG: Like what we discussed today.

M.C.: And that would be talking points.

DOUG: So, you do the talking points, okay.

DOUG: Are you comfortable with this Richard?

RICHARD: Sure.

DOUG: I'm comfortable, are you M.C.

M.C.: Yeah, very pleased.

DOUG: Let me ask the question before I ask for a motion. I think what I need to do is modify the assessment sheet based on what we talked about earlier, and I'll mail those out to both of you. And I won't touch the summer scoring sheet, I won't touch that, because we have done this basically through discussion. And if you want to reassess

people with a new sheet, fine, if not, we can use it as talking points as well, when we go back to the Commissioners and this is how we assess them. And we came up with concurrence on the same people, basically. And the reasons why we want to limit down to two. So, then we have more time to interview, and get more thorough with them. Yeah. And okay. Good. I'm fine with that as well, so do I have... do I hear a motion on the floor? Going forward.

M.C.: I'll move that we propose two candidates to interview for the board of Commissioners when that takes place.

RICHARD: I'll second.

DOUG: And let me amend that. And those two candidates being Lancaster and Pastula. Do I have a second on the amendment?

RICHARD: Yes.

M.C.: Third.

DOUG: All in Favor raise your hand and say aye.

>>

M.C.: Aye.

RICHARD: Aye.

DOUG: Any other items to discuss at this point.

M.C.: Not on the agenda.

DOUG: I have two deliverables. One you make on talking points to us, and no conversations associated with that, you are just going to document what I did. And have the other deliverable, and that's to modify the assessment sheet.

M.C.: And Doug and for the minutes can we restate the two finalists, I believe it's Julianne Pastula, and James Lancaster is the second one, and who we want to move forward to and recommend to Commissioners to interview.

M.C.: Is that okay Kathleen for the minutes?

>> That's good.

M.C.: Great.

DOUG: Any other items we need to discuss today? Okay... I would like to put forward to see if anybody has a motion to adjourn the meeting?

M.C.: I move to adjourn.

RICHARD: Second.

DOUG: Okay, all in favor say aye.

M.C.: Aye.

RICHARD: Aye.

DOUG: Meeting is adjourned.

M.C.: Thanks all.

DOUG: That went good.

M.C.: And we all did the prep work, right?

DOUG: Yeah, it worked out well.

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

M.C.: It really did. Really appreciate it. Have a good one.

RICHARD: Thanks.

DOUG: Sally -- is she still there.

>> Yeah, Doug I'm here.

DOUG: You will arrange -- I don't know which meeting this will go to.

Sally.

: Yeah, I will.

DOUG: That went well.

SALLY: Congrats, most efficient meeting thus far.

DOUG: Yeah... it gives us a little extra time as well. Okay, great, thank you so much.