

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

01/30/21 Meeting

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

Steve: Good morning.

I'd like to welcome everyone here meeting on the Zoom and out in the Ether watching us. I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed to YouTube. For anyone in the publish watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform and that you are currently using, please visit our social media at redistricting MI to find a link for other platforms. Our live stream today included closed captioning.

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, please e-mail us 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 access 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 and we will provide you with a unique link and call in information.

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [redistrictingmi.org](http://redistrictingmi.org) for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be available and posted on [redistricting Michigan.org](http://redistricting Michigan.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 Anita Kiersnowski, Press Secretary, Department of State.

Members of the media should have her contact information.

For 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, will you please call the roll?

>> Sally: Good morning, Commissioners.

And when I call your name, please unmute yourself and say present and where you are remotely attending this meeting from.

Doug Clark.

>> Present and I'm currently located in Rochester Hills, Michigan.

>> Juanita Curry.

>> Juanita Curry and I am presently located in Detroit, Michigan.

- >> Anthony Eid.
- >> Present Oakland county, Michigan.
- >> Brittini Kellom.
- >> Rhonda Lange.
- >> Present attending from Reed City.
- >> Steve Lett.
- >> Present and I am attending from Lee county, Florida.
- >> Cynthia Orton.
- >> I'm attending from Battle Creek, Michigan.
- >> MC Rothhorn.
- >> Present, I'm attending from Lansing Michigan.
- >> Thanks MC, Rebecca Szetela.
- >> Present and attending remotely from Canton, Michigan.
- >> Janice Vallette.
- >> Present attending in Hyland, Michigan.
- >> Erin Wagner.
- >> Present attending from Eaton county, Michigan.
- >> Richard Weiss.
- >> Present attending from Saginaw, Michigan.
- >> Dustin Witjes.
- >> Present attending from Ypsilanti, Michigan.
- >> There is a quorum present.
- >> Steve: Thank you, Sally.

A quorum being present we can move forward with our business.

Next on the agenda which was provided prior to the meeting and posted will be the adoption of the agenda.

Does anyone have anything to add or any corrections to make?

Okay, we are going to have one addition nine and make it D it's going to be a resolution catch up.

We were slightly remiss at our last meeting on going through the resolutions, so we will catch those up.

Other than that, I believe the other things will be covered as they -- people come up.

With that, if you would adopt the agenda as presented and amended raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

All opposed the same sign.

Cynthia you are opposing?

No?

- >> Cynthia: You're a little delayed on mine maybe.
- >> Steve: You're good with the agenda.
- >> Cynthia: I'm good with it.

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.

>> Steve: Okay adopted unanimously we will review and look to approve the minutes, are there any changes, additions, deletions or corrections?

Doug?

>> Doug: I saw one item down on the bottom on page four and you reference a motion and you said supported by Curry it should be commissioner Curry.

>> Steve: Okay, I will make and note that change.  
Please everybody note that change on their minutes.

Any others, Doug?

Anybody else?

All right if you would approve the minutes as presented please raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

Opposed the same sign.

They are adopted.

It's my understanding we do not have public comment today.

However, for future reference, I will note the process so that anybody watching that has not happened to watch previously and heard my speech, we will make it again.

Because this is a virtual meeting members of the public have 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 in which they 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 whenever you are signed up.

At the two minute point we will conclude the public comment.

Excuse me at the finish of those who participate we will conclude the public comment.

If you would like to submit your thoughts to the Commission or participate in public comment in an upcoming session of the Commission, you may e-mail our office at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we will provide your written thoughts to the Commission.

Public sign up links are also posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages, on Facebook and Twitter at [redistricting mi](http://redistricting.mi).

Now, is there any correspondence which we need to deal with today?

Sue?

>> Sue: We have no specific correspondence to address and the public comments were sent out ahead of time, so you've got those.

>> Steve: Any of the Commissioners have any comments?

Anthony?

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.

>> Anthony: First I just I'd like to thank everyone who has written us so far especially when the comments are on, you know, the actual input that the public has about how the maps should be drawn.

We are reading those.

And all of us are definitely going to take them into consideration.

We did have one request for I think Sue and MC to join a Zoom call of some sort.

>> Sue: Yes, and I would like to address that.

But I would prefer to have Edward on board and if I can hold that until next week, I want him on board and recommendations and policy in place and so we can you know get rolling down the proper path initially.

And not veer.

There was also a request in public comments for somebody to volunteer with us.

And we will see if there is a way that we can engage somebody in volunteering to help further the work of the Commission.

There are many groups out there that want to support us.

And I think we can find a way for him to get involved.

>> Steve: Anything else, Anthony?

Okay, any other Commissioners have comments on any of the correspondence read or along those lines?

I would second Anthony's comment.

We do, in fact, read the correspondence that we get through e-mails as well as if you mail it in.

And some of the comments have gone to people's preferences for what -- how the lines, how the district should be drawn.

And rest assured that as part of the constitutional amendment, keeping districts compact and regular lines are a part of that amendment along with about 7 other things.

So it's not only that.

But it certainly is one thing we will be looking at.

But we appreciate those comments.

Okay, executive director's report, Sue.

>> Sue: Good morning.

Thanks to the Commissioners for your hard work and the progress we are making.

We are doing well.

I've provided for your review today the revised regular meeting calendar.

And also a 2020 timeline interview that maybe we can spend a few minutes on.

You've also received resolution 2021-0107 for the voting rights act legal counsel RFP that you approved on Thursday.

We will ask Chair Lett to sign this so we can continue to index the important items of business.

The RFP was posted yesterday.

Thanks to Chad Basset of Michigan Department of State who has been so helpful regarding the technical aspects of these RFPs.

So we really appreciate his assistance to us.

When he put the mapping RFP out, he did send it out to over 400 vendors, so we are hoping that we can find some good bids that will really serve this Commission.

There is also another resolution today.

It's 2021-108 and that will provide the framework for approving the rules of procedure should you confirm Julianne second draft of approval after your continued review today. You also received the 26 questions vendor questions that we received on mapping and we will have those to review.

The question of having an office for employees has come up a few times.

And I just want you to be aware that yesterday there was a bulletin issued to state employees asking them to work at home until at least May first.

So while I don't believe that we are bound by this, I'm just letting you know what the State of Michigan is doing.

Also, we talked a little bit about our last meeting at equipment.

And per our legal counsel we are a little bit ahead of the policy that she would like to create.

So I would like to ask your permission to consider that at our next meeting.

And then, lastly, we had a question last week from commissioner Lange about a random selection process described in the Constitution if the Commissioners can't reach agreement on the maps that are drawn for the Congressional representatives and for state and for the state Senate and representatives.

So I thought maybe a little more description may be helpful and I reached out to the Michigan Department of State and the first comment was well we hope it doesn't come down to this and I don't either and I believe and trust in the group we can reach a consensus on mapping but if for some reason it shouldn't there is a provision in the Constitution for this random selection.

The Department of State has performed several random selections including the process that went from over 9,000 applications to the 13 Commissioners that are a part of this Commission.

So they do understand how to do the random selection process.

They indicated they would use three primary criteria.

First it would be random.

There would be no extra weight or preference given to any map.

Per the language in the Constitution.

And there are methods and software that can enable them to do this.

So that will produce random results.

So these tools would be utilized.

Second, a commitment to transparency.

Any random selection would use a live stream process.

And the public could then see what was happening in real time with this Commission.

And, third, independence.

They would use an independent accounting firm to do the random selection.

And reassure the public that the process was random and then independent also.

So those are the main criteria that they would use if it ever got to that point.

Does anybody have any additional questions in regards to this?

Okay, seeing none, I'm going to move right into our quick ice breaker this morning.

My question today is: Where were you born?

And where did you grow up?

So I see Doug is in my first corner.

I'm going to have him go first.

>> Doug: Yeah, this is Doug.

I was born in Connecticut and I grew up in many different places.

I probably lived in about ten different states.

>> Sally: Whoa.

>> Doug: Over time so I really can't call one home but ended up coming out of high school in a small town in Ohio.

>> Sally: How about you, Janice?

>> Janice: I was born in Detroit.

I lived in Detroit until I was about ten.

And then my parents moved out here to Hyland township and this is where I've been ever since.

So my kids have been here.

We are all here.

So my husband is here.

So he grew up here so.

>> Sue: Okay thank you, MC.

>> MC: I was born in Ann Arbor and was raised there, went to school.

I spent about five years of my life in Germany.

But that is probably the only other place I have been in, significant place, yeah.

>> Sue: Thank you, how about Cynthia?

>> Cynthia: I was born and grew up in Oregon.

And in all different areas in Oregon.

>> Sue: Okay, Steve, how about you?

>> Steve: I was born in Lansing.

And grew up there.

And have lived most of my life there.

I practiced my law practice is there.

My wife and I went to the same high school.

And we did not meet until after high school.

We had a very small graduating class 700 of our closest friends graduated at the same time.

So that's it.

I traveled a lot.

Was in Korea in the Army.

So I've seen some of the world.

>> Sue: Okay, how about you Dustin?

>> Dustin: I was born in Detroit.

And then I moved to Europe as a kid.

I lived in the Netherlands for about six years and I came back to Michigan and I lived in Howell ever since.

And then moved to Ypsilanti when I went to college.

>> Sue: Thank you.

How about you Anthony?

>> Anthony: I was born at Beaumont in royal Oak and grew up in west bloom field and a Michigan lifer and still here.

The Morse time I spent away from Michigan is only about a month and a half in a research fellowship that I did in Tampa.

But besides that I've been here.

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

>> Juanita: .

>> Steve: Juanita, you have to take yourself off mute.

>> Juanita: Okay, good, I was born in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

And we lived there until I was about 7 and we moved to Detroit, Michigan, where I've been a resident ever since.

>> Sue: Thank you Juanita.

Rebecca, how about you?

>> Rebecca: Born in Dearborn and raised in Dearborn.

>> Sue: Okay Richard?

>> Richard: Born in Saginaw pretty much lived in Saginaw except for two years of service in Alabama.

>> Sue: Okay Rhonda how about you?

>> Rhonda: Born and grew up in Michigan.

>> Sue: Okay, thank you.

Erin?

>> Erin: Born in Battle Creek, grew up in Hastings, Nashville and Charlotte.

>> Sue: Okay and I think I have gotten all the Commissioners, Julianne would you like to share Brittini I see you came on I asked the Commissioners where they were born and grew up and Brittini what about you?

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.

>> Brittni: I was born in south field Michigan in providence hospital when it was called providence and I think it's called Ascension or something now. And then I pretty much was a native Detroiter and lived in California for a while, about two years.

And then I came back for some school at the University of Michigan Ann Arbor.

>> Sue: Thank you for sharing.

Okay Julianne we will jump to you now.

>> Julianne: I was born and reared in Detroit.

Had a lot of opportunity to travel and live other places, but definitely a Michigander and a Detroiter at heart.

>> Sue: All right, thank you everyone for sharing.

I was born in the very middle of the mitten in a small town called Alma and I lived there until I was 17 and went off to college so I'm just a small town girl.

So thank you for sharing this morning.

Please know that I have an open virtual office door.

So please feel free to reach out any time.

>> Anthony: Thank you to those of you who have served.

>> Steve: Got to ask me what I did before you get too thankful.

Any questions for Sue from anybody?

All right, Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you, Steve.

Today we will be going through the second draft of the rules.

Hopefully I was able to capture the Commission's thoughts and feedback at our last meeting so we will be addressing that and I've also received some additional suggestions that I'll be bringing forward during our discussion later in this meeting.

We will be working on some policies to bring before you next Thursday and like Sue my door virtually is open.

E-mail, phone, whatever is most convenient for you.

Thank you.

>> Steve: Any questions for our esteemed counsel?

Okay, old business?

State department update.

>> Good morning Sally.

>> Sally: Hi everyone.

I will be really brief but I wanted to just provide a little bit more information about setting up your computers which has started and I think we will continue with some of you.

But just wanted to mention two things.

One is that because you all are unique within state Government and we've tried to turn around these computers as fast as possible, there might be miscommunication between the person who meets with you to set up your computer and yourself.



So just two things I want to make sure you all know so when you meet with the field service representative that you are confident that you're doing the right thing.

One is that your computer should be set up with your information right so even if the work order that is inside of the computer says another commissioner's name your computer is meant for you.

That's because of the quick turn around and the prioritization we have done to make sure that the people who need the computers most and fastest are the ones who are getting it first.

And then if there is any questions about what's called a VPN which is basically how you connect your computer remotely into the state network, just know that I am working with our security team to figure out how to do that for all of you and kind of there are some technical pieces that need to be sorted through.

So if the field services representative the person setting up your computer says you need a VPN, says one you need one for your computer yes, it's coming but let's set up the computer without it in the meantime and that way you will get your computer all set up.

So just know those two things.

And of course, if you have any issues especially you know, as you are trying to get your computer set up, you know, don't hesitate to call me or of course Sue to make sure that we can get it all set up for you.

So that's all I've got.

I don't know if anyone has any questions.

>> Steve: Any questions for Sally?

Ongoing computer saga.

>> Sally: Indeed.

>> Steve: All right, the edited regular meeting calendar and key dates, Sue.

>> Sue: So per your request we did switch the meeting calendar so every other meeting goes from morning to afternoon and back again.

So this is the edited calendar.

These are all Thursdays.

These are regular meetings.

Understand that as we get much busier, we will probably have to add more.

We likely will have to add more, we will, this is our date for -- these are our dates for the year.

So any questions about that?

Is this the will of the Commission at this point?

>> Steve: Has everybody had a chance to look at the calendar and are there any questions or comments?

If not, we will take a vote to adopt it as the calendar.

Juanita?

I think I see your hand up.

>> Steve: You turned yourself back off.

There you go.

>> Juanita: I think I have the right calendar but my calendar I suppose is saying we are still going different times on this calendar.

I think I have another one though.

Let me see.

So in other words, the meetings for February will all be at what time?

>> Steve: They go back and forth.

9, 1, 9, 1.

>> Juanita: I have that then I'm good.

>> Steve: Updated 2021 in the bottom right hand corner.

>> Juanita: Got it yes.

>> Steve: Any other questions from anybody?

>> MC: Just confirming they are all Thursdays except the two in December.

>> Sue: Yes, we changed the Veterans Day and Thanksgiving and we backed those two days to Tuesday.

>> Steve: Okay, we will approve this calendar at least for the current time raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

Opposed the same sign.

Okay, we have adopted the calendar for February through December so far.

Subject to any changes we need to make.

Key dates.

Sue you want to run through these with us, please?

>> Sue: Sure.

Just so you have a sense, I tried to build out of what I think we should be doing at various times so we can make sure that we can get all this work done.

In February and March, we are working on the consultant presentations, and answering the -- answering VRA questions.

That will happen next week.

During April, we hope to begin some more public outreach and communication.

We will get ready for our public hearings Edward may want to pilot one or two public hearings just to see how they go and do any course corrections before we get deep into corrections.

And then in May and June hold our public hearings.

Probably we will set a compressed time slot during that time.

We probably won't be going out for six weeks every week.

But, again, Edward will help guide us through that when he gets on board on Monday.

And after we have those ten or more initial public meetings, we will begin mapping plans.

So that starts probably around the first of July.

We will use -- we will be getting some census data.

Now they are telling us that April first census data will probably be coming closer to April 30th and our July 1st census data will probably be likely closer to the end of July. So we are going to have to do mapping plans with the information that we have. And then when the census does provide data, our mappers will have to overlay that work and on to our maps.

After we have those initial maps, then we again have to have five more public hearings.

We are tentatively planning those for August.

And then we will get in to the second phase of the mapping.

Whereby we will try to create final maps by September 17th.

So those can go out for the 45 days of public comment.

And then our final maps are supposed to be adopted by the Commission on November 1st.

So this is a broad overview of what we will be doing.

There is a lot more details to be filled in later.

But I hope that gives you a sense of the road that we need to go down and what we need to accomplish by certain points in order to get the work of the Commission done.

Questions?

>> Steve: Anthony.

>> Anthony: Thank you, Sue.

I think you just made a very important point because the census data is, you know being delayed it's going to be really important for us if you want to successfully do the work in the timeline that we have to do it, we are all going to need to become familiar with the map drawing process before the data actually comes out for this 2020 census.

So as you said, we are probably going to have to use the data from the last census.

And then once we can then -- if we all become familiar with the process, hopefully by the time this new census comes out we can have a relatively quick turnaround in adjusting our data from 2010-2020.

So I'm just wondering how everybody else feels about doing that.

>> Steve: I don't think there is any question that you know we are going to have to start drawing maps before we have the final numbers and add I mean in my vision would be that you know, we can get, you know, the rough outline of the maps down and then tweak them when we have the actual numbers.

Otherwise, we are never going to make it.

>> Sue: There is also the American community data survey.

And there are estimates for 2019.

That are available to us.

So that is another resource that we can use.

I think our mappers are going to know a lot of these resources and the mapping resources that we can get that the data from our state that our state continues to collect a wide amount of data.

So you will look as you look at the vendor questions for the mapping RFP, you will see some of these things cited in some of these questions asked.

But we will have to be ready.

So we are going to do everything to facilitate that this Commission is ready.

Including we are going to do some continuing education coming up, fairly quickly that will be some mapping practice.

Practice to look at how maps are drawn.

We will look at the criteria and how those can be overlaid.

And some of those areas that this Commission will really need to be familiar with, so when we get that last-minute push everybody will be ready.

>> Steve: Julianne.

>> Julianne: Yes, thank you, Steve.

I just wanted to build on what Sue was saying.

The April first date will be the reapportionment the number of district data.

And July is the expected date for the actual numbers.

And the distribution of people so that will all fold in nicely with the outline that Sue has prepared.

>> Steve: We can be sure of one thing with this outline Sue it's going to change.

>> Sue: It likely will.

But there are wide ranges so I hope we can keep in the ranges.

>> Steve: Julianne I have a question.

It's anticipated we are going to lose one Congressional seat, maybe two.

Is that going to affect the state reps?

>> Julianne: It may.

If you would like I can do some background research on that and bring you back a better answer next Thursday.

>> Steve: That was one question or one comment.

I guess it was a question.

In correspondence I read.

If we were -- if that was going to happen and I must confess I don't know how the state sets the or the Senate, state representative districts or the Senate representative districts.

So I guess we ought to know that, Sue.

>> Sue: Mike is telling me that the state representatives and the state Senators are set in our state Constitution, so those numbers will not change.

>> Steve: That is what I was hoping for.

>> Julianne: Yes 38 in time.

>> Steve: Good I suspected that was the answer but didn't know for sure.

Okay, any other questions for Sue on the key dates?

>> Anthony: Could you state those numbers one more time for each part of the Michigan legislature?

>> Sue: I think it's 38 and 145.

Mike, can you correct me on that if I'm wrong?

>> Sue: Mike says he can send a link to the state legislature for us.

>> Sally: I just did a quick Google. There are 110 Michigan representatives and 38 Senate districts.

>> Steve: That does not mean the district boundaries are going to change for everybody.

So we are not -- we won't be able to go back in and say, okay, Senate and reps boundaries stay the same.

They are going to change.

Okay, anything else?

Equipment purchase policy.

Is that you, Julianne?

>> Julianne: .

>> Steve: Or Sue?

>> Julianne: I'm happy.

It was on the agenda for today and I know it was brought up at the meeting on Thursday so we will have something for the Commission to react to at the next meeting on Thursday.

>> Steve: Okay, I guess I have a question.

Juanita doesn't have a printer and we would like to get her a printer.

Can we do that?

And make the policy at least for her printer that it's state property just like her computer and her phone?

>> Julianne: That is what we will be working through in the next coming days for you.

>> Steve: So that is a maybe?

>> Julianne: Yes, that is a maybe.

We are going to iron out those details, Steve.

>> Steve: All right, resolution catch up, do we only have the one that I need to sign, Sue?

>> Sue: .

>> Steve: Which is the voting rights legal counsel.

>> Sue: Yes, the one that the Commissioners approved last Thursday, that is the only one that needs to be signed.

>> Steve: I filled that in based upon the minutes.

Do you want me to send that one to you?

Or do you just want me to sign it, date it and send it to you for typing.

>> Sue: Sign it and date it and send it to me.

>> Steve: Okay, you will need to send me another one.

I'll do it after we get through with the meeting because I filled it in.

Okay, we have a break but it's too early for the break we are so quick but I put break in there so I don't forget.

Old business continued.

Rules of procedure, second draft.

Julianne.

>> Julianne: Excellent, thank you and I have a very brief PowerPoint.

The last slide deck I know was extremely long.

To get through all the different sections.

This slide deck is only ten slides what I would like to do is highlight the changes that are referenced and captured in the current document and then I did receive some additional suggestions and I would like to work through those after we cover what the Commission has already requested the changes the Commissioners have already requested.

Next slide, please.

So again we will have a discussion today to ensure that what the Commissioners wanted as far as text is adequately represented.

If necessary, we will provide an updated draft with any new changes and repeat those steps.

Next slide.

The changes represented in sections 1-4 I added the definition of types of districts. And I lifted that out of the Constitution.

On section 4.10 we are on page 6 I added the language such other rules adopted by the Commission.

And please, please interrupt me and jump in if you have a question or would like further edits.

Next slide.

As to meetings, this is the clarifying language as to closed sessions. And it clearly states what shall be put on the record and/or the notice if it's for a future closed session.

Being the purpose, the date and time, the results of the roll call, and the reasons for calling the closed session.

Next slide, please.

The order of business and agenda on page 11, these changes were made to the agenda preparation section.

We inserted a break and the suggested placement was between unfinished and new business.

Next slide, please.

For section 9.0 on voting there was considerable discussion about abstentions. So the proposed modifications and I apologize for the amount of text that's on this slide. It's identical and lifted right out of draft two of the rules.

Separating between subparts A and B very clearly that the first deals with conflicts of interest.

Expressly prohibiting participation and discussion, deliberation and voting.

That if desired general counsel can provide an opinion, but that the existence of a conflict can only be decided by majority vote of the Commission.

Was there any additional comments or revisions to this language that anyone would like to see?

Okay I will move on to the next slide and we can always go back obviously.

On this would be subpart B where we were discussing abstaining for lack of sufficient information about the issue to be decided.

Most of that section was struck out.

And I added if a member abstains, they shall state for the record the intention of abstaining and the reason for not doing so prior to the vote and very clearly stating the member shall not be restricted or prohibiting from participating in a discussion or debate on that issue.

And I added on the next slide subpart C, which would cover both abstaining due to a conflict or abstention due to lack of information.

That if a member abstains a roll call vote will be triggered.

And then the reason for the abstention shall be entered into the minutes of the meeting at which the vote is taken and be part of the official record.

And I put that as subpart C because it needs to apply to both of the reasons for -- both of the permissible abstention reasons.

And I hope does that I hope address the Commission's concerns and adequately captures our discussion?

Next slide, please.

>> Dustin: I don't know if this matters or not but two slides ago there is a second B so the abstaining member shall then or shall be not be restricted or prohibited.

I don't know if that needs -- I don't know if that was a copy and paste from what you were writing or not.

>> Julianne: No, thank you Dustin.

That was the track changes and then the language that I added.

But I see exactly what you're talking about.

Okay, thankfully in the rules it doesn't have that.

Okay, thank you, I'll make sure it doesn't.

In the final draft.

All right, in clarification there was a clarification made in section 9.2 manner of voting. I expanded the text regarding a written ballot distinguished from a secret ballot and again prohibiting the taking of secret ballots.

As to the written ballots the results shall be announced, to be entered in the minutes of the meeting and then the actual ballots shall also become part of the official record.

Next slide.

Those were the revisions that were discussed by the Commission at Thursday's meeting.

Were there any additional questions or comments on those revisions?

I noted Dustin's to be careful for that extra B.

In subpart B.

Was there any other changes or revisions that I could make to that language?

>> Doug: Actually this is a question relative to this.

We talk about abstaining but when I see our U.S. Congress vote, some people vote abstained other than yes and no.

Some people vote abstained.

Some people vote present and we don't reference present and I don't understand the difference between the two.

>> Steve: I don't think there is a difference quite frankly.

I don't know why -- well, I can guess as to why and the Federal Government that a rep or a Senator would want to say present than you know they are present for the vote, so if it's a tight race they can say I was present for all these votes instead of off goofing off playing golf.

That is just a supposition on my part.

>> Doug: I don't know the difference.

>> Steve: I mean the effect is the same.

>> Doug: Yeah, that was always my opinion.

>> Steve: So any other discussion on the rules of procedure now as updated?

So we have them in front of us.

We would.

>> Julianne: Mr. Chair.

>> Yes.

>> Julianne: So and I apologize, the voting presents counts towards the quorum that is the benefit.

So in Congress.

But here you have to have your quorum of nine to conduct business.

So, again, the -- there is a distinction but I don't recommend it would be very useful to the Commission going forward in its business.

>> Steve: Okay.



>> Julianne: And if I could I did receive some additional feedback from Anthony. And if we could just briefly go through those, the first.

>> Sure.

>> Julianne: Thank you the first suggestion is on page three in section 2.4 adoption of rules of procedure.

The suggestion was to reference for amended, the amendment procedure or new rules just to add in a clause to reference 14.0 of these rules which is where the amendment procedures are located.

On the same page under membership, section 3.2 eligibility, that language is lifted out of the Constitution but in subpart D the suggestion was to add a reference to section 3.4 of these rules which is where vacancy is addressed.

And that language also nears the Constitution, so it would just be an internal cross reference between the rule sections.

On page six, there was a suggestion for section 4.8, restrictions on communications with the public to add a definition for redistricting matters.

To reflect the actual map drawing process results, any redistricting matters on the activities of redistricting.

And distinguish them for opinions requested from the public or information that the Commission would be requesting to receive from the public.

On page seven.

>> Steve: Wait, do you have -- how is that going to read, I guess?

>> Julianne: I would actually if the Commission was interested in that edit, I would circulate proposed language for the Commission to react to.

>> Steve: All right, go ahead.

>> Julianne: On page seven, section 6.1.2, just to add where it references type of district because we are so far away from the definition by that point to just add in and clarify state Senate state house and U.S. Congressional.

And lastly, there was a suggestion on page 15 under section 12.4 the current language to add to the current language that any member could raise an objection with a speaker's remarks and request that the Chair rule that person out of order.

So I think the current language is that the Chair -- the Chair -- this is referring to public speakers so this is during public comment the added language would just note that if one of the Commissioners found the remarks to be slanderous or objectionable or offensive that the commissioner could raise that with the Chair and ask the Chair to take action.

And the last suggestion for discussion that was raised with me was the potential to establish attendance policy and include it in the rules.

>> Steve: Of what policy?

>> Julianne: Attendance policy as far as numbers of meetings missed. And there is quite a bit that can be discussed under that heading.

So it would be recognizing that the appointment is a privilege and that attendance and participation and preparation is a duty and a responsibility of each member and then, again, if this is something that the Commission desired, establishing what in your opinion would be the number of absences, is there a distinction between excused and unexcused, what would the timeframe be that those absences would need to occur in. What steps would the Commission take if there was a member that met those timeframes.

And also importantly what would the exceptions be for that.

Because obviously there are unavoidable or uncontrollable events that happen that an absence would be certainly justified.

So that was another topic that was raised with me that I wanted to share with the Commission and get the benefit of your discussion on what, if any, of those additional suggestions you would like to adopt.

>> Steve: I will leave it up to the Commissioners.

Do we want to discuss these now?

Or do we want to get them in writing before us and discuss them at the next meeting? Some of these and I feel are a little weighty other than and some of them are just not so weighty.

But Brittini, will you help us here?

Convene us.

>> Brittini: Sure, Dustin has his hand raised so I acknowledge him.

>> Dustin: Yeah, so my opinion on the whole attendance policy thing is it's not needed.

We've all basically been here barring small things where we couldn't or if we had to leave halfway through.

I think that just extra language that is not something we need to worry about at this particular time.

>> Brittini: Anthony and then Doug.

>> Anthony: So thank you Julianne for going over all of that.

Most of those I had submitted are you know pretty basic references.

I think the two things that might need a little bit of discussion are the points about any one of us being able to petition the Chair if someone from the public is being offensive instead of only the Chair being able to do that.

And I submitted that comment just because you know we are a diverse group and you know, race, gender, age, a whole bunch of different ways and what one person might find offensive you know could be different than what a different person finds offensive. So I think the ability for any one of us to bring up that point might be a good one to have.

And the second thing I think that might need discussion is that whole attendance policy thing.

I don't think any of us have -- I don't think it would really apply to any of us.

We had a couple people miss you know a meeting here and there, but this I suggested it more for, you know, in case a scenario were to happen in the future perhaps, you know, on the next Commission, if there is a next Commission, hopefully there is, but you know, where someone takes the job, you know, simply to click a check and then never showing up to the meetings at all.

While it's not a likely scenario, I could foresee it happening.

I've been a part of, you know, boards and committees where, you know, people take the job and then like literally just don't show up.

So I just want to make it clear.

I don't think it relates to any of us.

I think everyone here has been you know doing a great job.

But it's just more so to protect ourselves in the future.

>> Steve: Just as an aside I think Julianne may make the same comment we don't adopt the rules for the next Commission.

Each Commission will adopt their own rules of procedure.

>> Anthony: For sure I agree but I think that they probably will use the rules that we adopt as a.

>> Brittini: Template.

>> Anthony: As a reference, as a template and I think we need to keep in mind since we are the first people doing this, we really have to be aware that we are setting you know the framework for future Commissions not only in Michigan but you know, other states are doing this now.

And you know there is a lot of talk about redistricting Commissions all across the country.

>> Brittini: Thank you Anthony Doug and Rhonda and Julianne unless Julianne you need to scoot in after, yeah.

>> Julianne: I apologize, yes, thank you Brittini.

No I just wanted to clarify that the rules you are setting are for the body, for the Commission, for these are the words that you always hear me using so they will be in effect for the next Commission.

And that body, its membership whoever those individuals may be during the next iteration of the Commission could either do nothing and just have the rules that you're adopting now or as they are amended throughout this cycle or they could adopt new rules, amend them whatever they want to do.

But these will carry through as the Commission's rules regardless of membership.

>> Brittini: Thank you Julianne.

Doug and then Rhonda and then Dustin.

>> Doug: Yeah, I just wanted to say that I thought that all the changes were reasonable.

And the only one that really needs discussion is the attendance.

But given what Julianne has just said, I guess I would support including that type of language within this since it's going to be used in the future.

So I just wanted to make that comment.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Doug.

Rhonda and Dustin.

>> Rhonda: My hand was raised but Julianne did answer the question.

That's what the question was about if other Commissions set their own rules.

As far as the attendance I think we are all adults and I don't feel it to be necessary that we have to have an attendance policy.

Everybody has their own situations of things that happen and I think we need to be understanding of that.

Especially right now when we are living in a time with COVID and different scenarios.

Things happen.

And I would hate to see anybody being pun -- punished for a reason that is out of their hands and I understand what you saying about setting guidelines for things that are acceptable you know as far as being missed but if somebody comes down ill and has to midst meetings because they are sick should they be penalized for that?

I don't think so personally.

So that's just my opinion on the attendance.

>> Brittini: If I'm remembering correctly and someone can step in if I'm not there is phrasing in the code of conduct that addresses our need to fulfill the job, you know, to the best of our ability with good efforts so I think that is addressed in that way and I'm thankful for Julianne providing clarification and does that apply now or when does that get addressed.

Dustin did you still have thoughts or are you okay?

>> Dustin: I was going to say two things I agree with Rhonda and we took an oath of office to do this to the best of our ability.

I like everyone here is honored to be here.

Like we like we are all adults.

We have you know, done this for a couple months now.

People missed if they needed to but they always come back and they always try to or always will provide their thoughts and opinions in any meeting that we do even if they had to miss something and they usually do their due diligence before they come to the next one to review what they would have potentially missed.

Secondly, I also think that us adopting rules for future Commissions is kind of autocratic.

They should be able to be able to do that on their own just like we are.

Every ten years.

What we are doing now could be very different ten years from now.

There is no way to know what they're going to want to be doing and how they want to handle themselves for the next Commission that's going to be redrawing the district lines in Michigan.

And us taking any kind of step to either well I don't want to say restrict but do anything that would, could be perceived as setting rules and guidelines for people that are coming after us is wrong and we should not do that.

>> Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I do agree with Anthony about the -- his suggestion that any of us can bring up to the Chair if we feel that someone who is providing public comment should be stopped or whatever.

That way if Steve happens to be zoning out and someone else catches something then I think that would be good.

And attendance I feel like we don't need to have rules just to have rules.

I feel like we all are honored like Dustin said and taking it very seriously and if we need to miss then we need to miss.

But personally I don't think that would be an issue.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Cynthia.

Are there any other thoughts about or suggestions, Anthony I appreciate you taking the time to kind of sort through and make some thoughtful edits.

Yes, Steve.

>> Steve: The amendment does speak to a commissioner basically not doing their job.

And that is under section.

>> Brittini: I think we raised that, you are right, it's in there.

>> Steve: It talks about misconduct in office or inability to discharge the duties and how you would eliminate that person vote them out so even if you set an attendance policy you would still have to follow the amendment on how to remove them.

So you said if you miss ten sessions, you are out.

Well you're not automatically out but you would have to follow the amendment.

I tend to agree that we are all adults and we are here because we want to be here.

Not because we have to be here.

So I don't see the need.

There is a process in the amendment to deal with that if it becomes a problem.

>> Brittini: Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you, Brittini.

So again Steve correctly referenced in that policy will need to be set as far as what the notice and opportunity to be heard and what that internal process would look like for a variety of reasons, for failing to uphold the duty.

The attendance policy could be referenced in that.

It could be a separate section if that was the will of the body or not included at all if that is the will of the body.

But I did want to reference back again that the rules that are set are operational organization structural rules so when the next Commission comes in, they can look at those, they can follow the officer's structure and choose to change it.

They will be empowered to do whatever they want with those -- with the rules that you adopt.

So I don't think they will be restricted by them.

I think it will be a starting point that they can either accept or reject all or part of whatever the work product is.

But, again, the rules I would encourage the Commission and I think you are viewing the rules as being written for yourselves, for the operation of this Commission.

And in trying to be mindful of issues that might arise so I appreciate the discussion.

>> Brittini: Thank you.

I can say I have a strong opinion either way.

I think in some ways not to belittle the point but it's a matter of semantics because I think the portion of the amendment that we raised earlier for the next Commission I think folks would have in mind that attendance would fall in that category so I don't know if it's something that could be, I don't know what language Julianne that is why we have you for that part.

But like some sort of phrasing in parentheses that like IE or an example or something like that.

Either way I think the next Commission like us will spend time doing exactly what we are doing now to decide if the frameworks are something that they want to keep or improve or throw out completely.

I think Anthony had a hand.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I was just going to say so how about you know Julianne how about we move forward without the attendance stuff and you know put in the rest.

And go from there.

>> Steve: Is that a motion?

>> Anthony: I don't know if it needs to be.

There is no.

>> Steve: It has to be a motion to adopt these so.

>> Brittini: It has to go in writing first and then we would adopt it after.

>> Anthony: There were other edits that Julianne referenced earlier in this second draft that we were sent.

>> Julianne: That's correct so the Commission could request an updated draft to react to particularly with the redistricting matters definition.

But it would be appropriate to make a motion to adopt the edits proposed aside from the attendance policy.

That would be appropriate motion.

And I also wanted to clarify just to make sure that I'm being clear, Anthony's suggestion was that any commissioner could raise an objection regarding remarks made at public comment.

In the way that I would suggest including that would be that any member may raise for the Chair to deal with.

Because again the Chair is the presiding officer and everything flows through the Chair. So I think that might be confusing during the meeting if individual members are trying to call for those types of actions.

But that I think that the suggestion is a very strong one in that the language that any member can be empowered to raise it with the Chair and the Chair would make a ruling on it.

And, again, if then the majority of the Commissioners disagree with the Chair's ruling, they can appeal that, that ruling and that can go forward and that manner and be dealt with in a parliamentary fashion, but I would not recommend the body adopt language that says that individual members can call a public speaker out of order.

Or curtail their time.

That is generally a traditional function of the Chair.

>> Brittini: Thank you Julianne.

Dustin.

>> Dustin: There we go my only argument to that is we were very clear on the start that the Chair was just here to facilitate meetings, make sure we are on schedule and not any additional powers of any kind were given to the Chair or vice Chair.

And in my opinion that is doing just that.

Given the ability for just one particular person to call someone out of order and only that person to do so, that would be a right given to the person at that point.

And that would go against the fact that what we have decided as a whole body is not the case for the person who is the chairperson.

So, yes, I would think that anyone here could say that the person is out of order at that particular point.

Stop it and then put the person in time out so to speak and then go to the next person and then bring them back if he wants to particularly continue speaking.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Dustin.

Any thoughts on that?

Rhonda, yes, share.

>> Rhonda: I this I Dustin has a great point.

When we voted you know we are a Commission of one.

I understand keeping order at a meeting and what have you.

But what we see is what might offense one person may not offense another.

We spoke about this.

So I like the comments that Dustin made about being able to call it out as you know, as a commissioner.

As somebody who has equal power within the Commission.

I agree.

I guess that's all I want to say.

But I understand the whole hierarchy of it of trying to maintain and having the focus on one person.

But I completely agree with Dustin I guess is what I'm saying.

>> Brittini: Thank you Rhonda.

Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Yeah, I have the same thoughts as Rhonda.

I understand the need to keep order and in some sort of hierarchy in that way in our meetings.

But I also agree, we did say that the Chair was just to keep the meetings moving along with no extra power.

So I don't know what the solution is but.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Cynthia.

I don't know if there is something that we agree on what that looks like for us to raise individual concerns.

You know, when that comes up.

But I think Anthony originally when he raised the suggestion, I think there was some accuracy and you know validity about us being individuals and meaning to express our, hum, discomfort or dislike maybe for some things that might be out of order during those times.

Julianne.

>> Julianne: Yes, thank you.

I think I can offer some assistance of that hopefully will capture the discussion.

If the language made and again, we don't have the language right we just have what we are verbally talking about.

So would the Commission like to see language where any member -- if a member raises it the Chair shall address it?

That that would be acceptable.

And I also wanted to highlight and acknowledge Dustin's comments.

I know I was recently brought on board but I have watched the former meetings and I would like to highlight that throughout the rules traditionally more general functions of the Chair were not reflected in your initial draft rules for that reason to be sensitive to that.

And thankfully Rebecca caught the general counsel one that slipped by my best efforts there.

But we were able to correct that.



But I did take that sentiment that the Commission expressed early on in their meetings and carried it through.

So hopefully changing this language to requiring the Chair to act and that there be a discussion and a decision if any member raises that.

But, again, the flow of the meetings and that I think that's a duty of the Chair that we cannot escape from does that sound like an easier ball of what the Commission is trying to get towards?

That the any member could raise it and that it would have to be -- that there would have to be an action taken on it?

>> MC: I like the word the Chair shall address it that feels.

>> Julianne: And I would recommend a draft three so that everyone can see language, can react to further language.

Maybe Commissioners will have another thought in this iteration as you read through the rules yet another time for items.

I welcome the suggestions and the discussion to capture what the Commission is desiring in this document.

>> Steve: If everybody would agree with that, to have the suggestions that we have been made, several of which are -- seem to be agreeable with everybody and then the ones that have some discussion around them to be brought back before us.

Obviously, we don't have to go back through the ones that we seem to have agreed on, that are red lined in this iteration.

But we can discuss the new ones as they come back.

If that would be a process that everyone can agree on raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

Opposed the same sign.

Okay, Julianne, update it and we will bring back proposed rules three.

>> Julianne: Thank you very much.

>> Steve: What else do you have for us on that, anything?

>> Julianne: No, not at this time.

I'll have that prepared in advance of your next meeting.

>> Steve: Thank you.

Next, we are in to answers to bidders for line drawing.

Who is handling MC?

>> MC: May I suggest we take a break?

>> Steve: I was just going to get to that.

>> MC: Sorry for jumping.

>> Steve: First I was going to ask who is handling that?

The answer is Sue?

You are.

And I'm assuming that this is going to be a little longer process than well I would have assumed it would be longer than the rules but those turned out to be a little longer so let's take a break.

It's 11:12.

Make it 11:25.

See you all back then.

[ Recess ]

.  
>> Steve: Okay we got everybody back?

Not yet.

Okay it looks like we've got everybody.

So answers to bidders for line drawers, Sue.

>> Sue: Okay, you heard at our last meeting we had no questions, and that was I don't know, Noon.

And by 3, 3:30 when that deadline came there were 26 questions.

So I took -- I made a draft for you to look at rather than starting from scratch on answering these questions.

Sally helped me with them also so she was involved with editing the answers.

And I guess I would open the floor for discussion.

I don't know if you want to go over every question or if you have already read these and you simply have a few questions or a few areas you feel may need some clarification.

>> Steve: Brittini do you want to lead this, please.

>> Brittini: I was switching between screens.

So I don't know rock paper scissors Doug or Anthony had their hand first.

>> Go ahead Anthony.

>> You had yours up first, Doug.

>> Doug: Can I ask one general question first, Sue?

How many bidders do we have at this point?

>> Sue: I don't know.

>> Doug: Okay, all right.

>> Sue: I mean I don't know that we will know until these answers are posted and we actually get the proposals.

>> Doug: Okay, you don't know how many bidders sent in questions though.

>> Sue: No.

>> Doug: Okay all right.

My first question is on number -- do you want to go one by one?

Or do you want to randomly do this?

.  
>> Sue: That is up to this Commission.

>> Doug: I will just start off random then.

I had a question on number three.

On the response.

It's on the last part of the response.

If in person public hearings would be held, we would expect the consultant to attend unless the contractor can demonstrate effective participation virtually, I don't understand in my mind how we could do both have in person and virtual going on at the same time for the contractor to be able to do that.

>> Sue: Well, if we are able to have in-person meetings they will be live.

And I believe there would be a vehicle whereby a map drawer could be presenting in that meeting.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Sue: I'm thinking about the cost here.

Because the travel costs are going to be really extensive.

>> Doug: Oh, yeah.

>> Sue: If there is a way for them to do this through technology and maybe Edward is better at answering this one than me but if there is a way for them to do the job virtually without having to be there, then I think we should ask him to show us that.

>> Doug: Okay, I agree.

I agree.

But we are not asking them to show us how they would do it here.

We are just saying if they can.

>> Steve: I thought one of the requirements were they would have to be able to do this virtually as well as in person if that were the thing because.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Steve: We are going to have those meetings when they are in person, they are also going to be virtual for everybody out in the Ether.

>> Doug: Yeah, okay.

I mean it's really a technical thing to get put in place.

So as long as we got somebody who can handle it.

I had a question on number four not a question but a comment.

If we allow people to do hourly rate pricing, which I know we talked about, you know we are talking about in the 2022, I mean, that is very difficult for us to budget.

But if we want to fix price going into 2022, it's very difficult for us to define what we expect of them and for how long and for them to give us a fixed price.

So I mean, it's just a tradeoff of how we want to handle that.

And I would expect that the hourly rate pricing at that point is probably going to be minimal.

For redistricting purposes.

We are going to be documentation of what we did and so forth.

That's just a comment.

Number nine I had, yes.

>> Steve: Let me have a comment there.

Keep in mind probably if it goes in to 2022, it's going to be on litigation and they will be called on to give expert testimony, which I would expect there would be an increased rate for testifying, Julianne may have an opinion on that having dealt within the Detroit arena.

>> Julianne: Yes.

They would generally incorporate that as part of their fee schedule because we've asked for that, that that might be a potential for of what their duties would be so that would be something we would be looking for in their fee schedule.

If it were to change and then if it weren't then we would have an argument that it would be that set rate.

>> Doug: Okay.

I understand.

Number nine, what other mapping software will be used by the ICRC?

And in the case there will be other mapping software utilized to gather public comment however specific details are not known.

But are they really interested in what software we use to gather the comment?

Or are they really interested in the data?

If there is going to be other data? Rather than.

>> Sue: I would hope they are interested in the data.

So and being able to then accept any data that might be provided in a format that would be different than theirs.

Being able to integrate that data.

>> Doug: Yeah, and we are talking -- we are not talking about software though.

>> Sue: Well, there may be other mapping software.

I mean, there are other groups out there that are going to reach out to communities of interest.

They are talking about using a software called representable to gather information from people to be able to provide to the Commission. So there is other software out there. Not that we will be using that as the software for mapping so again they are going to have to be able to integrate whatever format comes to them.

>> Doug: All right, we are not going to expect them to utilize other soft wear.

We are just -- it's the interface.

It's the input of that software into the redistricting software that they have.

>> Sue: Exactly.

Is this unclear do you think?

>> Doug: Well, in my mind it was a little because otherwise I wouldn't have asked the question.

>> Sue: Okay.

>> Doug: Yeah.

>> Sue: Yeah, I mean, I think that the contractor will be able to integrate other data. So I think that's what we are asking them to do is like no matter what format this comes in if it comes from another piece of software, we want them to be able to integrate that data into their mapping software.

We have no intention of creating our own mapping software.

>> Doug: You can always write programs to reformat data so it can integrate into their software.

Which they would have to do.

>> Sue: Yeah.

>> Doug: Okay.

Number 13, I had a question.

It says that the CSS files for county, city, township precinct anvil boundaries do not overlay the census geography, who is responsible for rectifying the differences?

I don't understand.

We can't do that.

We don't have the knowledge.

Or the tools.

The question is do they have the knowledge and the tools to be able to do something like this?

You know?

>> Sue: That is a good question.

>> Doug: I don't know.

To me this could be an issue.

>> Steve: I think that is what we are hiring them for, Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I don't know what their expectations are of what the data is that is going to be given to them.

But you're right I mean that is what we are hiring them for to get this thing redistricted and I guess that would be a subset of that.

Okay, I'm good with that.

>> Sue: We do have state data that we will provide to the contractor so there is a lot of state data and some of it is listed in these questions but there a lot of state data that is available to them.

And I think those resources are there.

>> Doug: Okay, number 16, I don't understand what a shape file is.

Is that boundaries of a community of interest?

Is that.

>> Sue: That is what I assumed it to be.

>> Doug: Yeah, okay.

Where do we get the term or they provided the term shape files, yeah, okay.

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.

>> Steve: It would be like that Indian group out in Arizona that was in the middle of one district and followed the river to the other district that they were part of.

>> Doug: Yeah.

>> Brittini: That is what I was thinking Sally.

>> Doug: That is my understanding too.

>> Brittini: Can I pause you for five a couple of seconds to get Sally in here thank you.

>> Sally: Really quickly on the shape file question because the different file types can get confusing.

Shape files generally are just types of files that link the data to geography.

So the literal think it's a shape right not just a data point, right, so it's not just an excel spreadsheet it's actually linking it to the geography.

So when you talk about GIS that is talking about shape files.

When you are talking about basically census data tracks that is shape files because the data is geographically tied if that helps.

So it includes community of interest but it's actually a broader kind of technical term that this contractor should know and be able to utilize.

That is kind of the main type of file that they should be able to use.

>> Doug: Yeah, I mean they are asking the question using the term shape file.

>> Sally: Yep.

>> Brittini: Thank you so much, Sally.

That was helpful.

>> Doug: That was, yeah.

My last comment is on number 26.

Can you get a list of bidders.

And the reason I ask this is sometimes two bidders want a partner.

So they want to know who is interested in doing the work.

And sometimes they want to go alone on it.

And so I don't know if it's prudent for us to release it, if it's legal for us to release it ahead of time or not.

>> Sue: When I received this list of questions that is the only one that Chad Basset from MDOS had answered so I'm assuming that is a pretty stringent policy among the state RFPs that they don't release anything.

I mean my assumption is if I was a bidder and I felt I wanted to partner with somebody who might be bidding I would reach out to them and say hey we are really good at this part.

We know you are really good at this subset, could we partner on this RFP and do it together?

So you know, I think for privacy purposes and confidentiality we really have to.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Sue: Again this is the one that Chad answered for us so that was the easy one, no.

>> Doug: I buy it and Chad has reviewed the answers.

>> Sue: He has reviewed, he reviewed the questions.

He sent a blank list of questions to me with 26 number 26 answered.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Sue: I'm not sure who Sally might have forwarded these to and I know she looked at them and may have gotten help from other MDOS or DTMB people who we have been working with to say are these reasonable assumptions as we move forward.

So I'm relying on Sally.

She is popping in right here.

>> Sally: Yeah, so Commissioners, Chad Basset was able to answer the one technical kind of process-related question on this list, which is where his expertise lies. And then he really looked to Sue mainly to fill in all of the rest of the questions are all about content, right?

And so that's really the distinction here, right, he was able to provide that sort of process related piece.

But the content is really up to all of you, right, to help inform the bidders on really what you're envisioning so I don't know if that is helpful.

>> Doug: It is.

Let me turn it over to Anthony he had some questions.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Doug.

>> Anthony: So my questions are about numbers five and six.

And they both kind of relate to the same thing.

Asking if Commissioners will be the ones running the software or if the contractor will be. And I agree that the contractor will be the primary person running the software but I don't want this to completely be in the hands of the contractor even so far as, you know, them doing what you know the Commission guides them to do.

I still want the ability to be able to go in myself and you know play around with it.

And you know really like get in the weeds on this.

You know, just to keep everything transparent.

So the answers to these questions are a little -- they don't really reflect that.

>> Brittini: Go ahead MC and Dustin then I saw a hand Rhonda to Doug did I see your hand.

>> MC: On number five in particular I guess I wanted to make sure what further you need because it does say what would additional costs considerations be needed if a commissioner or Commission staff were to request software and data access for individual use.

I guess the you need more than that that is the clarification I need from you.

Because I think it's been addressed and I just want to make sure if you feel like something more in number five the answer to number five, yeah, what do you think needs to be investigated further.

>> Anthony: Do you think that is clear?

I don't know if it is, or not.

>> MC: I think the answer is it's further clarification.

I think we are responding and saying hey what do you all need, if you are not providing access to us basically like what further costs are there for individual access.

So I guess what I read in the response that we are offering is enough for me if you're not sure that that's enough, that's yeah, I feel it's enough for me because it's further clarification.

>> Brittini: Dustin.

>> Dustin: I think MC is right here.

It's like there is no question that we are going to be wanting access to go in and look at the maps ourselves and potentially make our own draft changes to bring to a meeting that we do personally, personally and I think question five answers that because they are saying that if that is the case there is going to be an additional cost to -- for us being able to do so which would make sense because it's a licensing issue at that point.

>> Brittini: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: My question was the same along Anthony's about the individuals doing it. And then on number seven, we are asked about how many workstations and therefore software licenses.

It says ICR staff only need to be able to share the maps provided by the contractor. But if we are working on them ourselves would there need to be additional licenses? I don't know how the licensing works so that would be my question.

I know there has been comments and in other meetings about doing individual ones so that I would have a question with then.

>> Brittini: Dustin and then Doug.

>> Dustin: I would manage that all of us, there is not just going to be well there could potentially be a blanket license for all of us to log in to or use the software but I would imagine that that wouldn't be the case.

And that all of us would have to have a license so that we can use it on our own computers and machines to look at them.

Yes, they do have to be transparent with the maps and provide them to us.

But the we want to be able to play around with them, we would need individual licenses would be my guess.

Just because I work for a software company and that's the case with companies that we work with.

Every person that needs access to the software needs to have their own license and that is paid for.



>> Brittini: Thank you, Dustin.

Doug, did you still yep go ahead.

>> Doug: Yeah, I think the answer to this question really gets down to when we do redistricting are, we going to do it from a centralized process?

Or decentralized among all of us?

Decentralizing meaning each of us would have the ability to do mapping.

And centralized would be more so where they would do the mapping and we would provide input to changes.

So I'm not sure we really decided on which approach we are going to use.

And we may not have enough information to understand that yet at this point either.

But I would think that's the first thing that we would need to decide as a group.

And then that would follow through on the answers.

And then one other quick comment about software licensing.

Generally it's done through a machine.

So web based would be good.

Better approach because that would eliminate some of the costs I would assume.

Any way I want to bring up the centralized versus the decentralized processing.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Doug.

>> Doug: Yes.

>> Brittini: Dustin.

>> Dustin: I would imagine that either decentralized or centralized would work.

I mean, if we are doing it ourselves, we could tinker with the maps inside software we would get but as long as we are not you know working with each other outside of a meeting and saying you know what do you think about this, then there wouldn't be a problem.

Whereas if it would be centralized then we would all have to be at the same spot using the same thing I would imagine or the same computer.

>> Brittini: Julianne.

>> Julianne.

>> Thank you.

>> You're welcome.

>> Julianne: I don't have an answer to Dustin's question.

What I did want to highlight is for the RFP purposes nor the for the bidders they will give functionality and pricing information for you to consider.

So while Doug's question is a critical discussion about how the Commission is going to approach its work whether you're doing individual tinkering to use your word or having because all the discussions between the Commission proper are going to happen at the open meeting.

But I think that the way that the RFP and I think what this answer is trying to get to is that we want the bidder to tell the Commission how that is going to look if you select that bidder.

So some of these larger, broader, internal Commission questions I think will be brought to light when you're responding and reacting to the vendors and the bidder responses. If that is helpful.

>> Brittini: That makes sense because that is kind of it leaves the gate open to be detailed and share more depending on how you know the proposal is.

Steve, go ahead.

>> Steve: As it relates to are we going to do this as one committee? One Commission and have one plan?

Or can we have independent plans?

Clearly the amendment contemplates that you can have an independent plan.

If you look at the voting process, it talks about the Commission adopting one plan and if they can't do that then there is a whole list of things on how you can present your own plan.

So each -- we can have 13 plans.

There is no question about that.

That is contemplated by the amendment.

If that answers your question, Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I thought that that situation resulted only if we couldn't come to an agreement, then individual plans would be submitted.

>> Steve: Correct, but there is nothing that prevents an individual from going out and doing their own thing.

If you can get -- in other words, if you have ten Commissioners vote for the plan, two, two and two and ten total then if there is three that don't want that plan, well that's too bad because they got out voted by the ten.

But if you don't have ten, then everybody can commit or submit their own plan.

>> Doug: Yeah, but I mean trying to sort out 13 different plans.

>> Steve: I didn't say it was a good idea.

>> Doug: I know, yeah, I know.

So I mean that is why I brought up the point do we want to do this from a central perspective or from a decentralized perspective.

But I think I believe it was Brittini that brought up the point or maybe Julianne that the vendor responses are going to tell us how they want to operate.

You know.

>> Steve: Yeah, but I think we at least my opinion is that as a Commission we want to be able as each individual commissioner to have access to these programs so that we can go in and say, well, if we made this little change here, this little change there, what would that look like.

I think we have to have that ability.

And then you know bring it to the Commission and say you know I looked at this, I think this would be better and people and then everybody can look at it.

>> Doug: Yeah, okay.

>> Brittini: Sue has a hand up.

And has something to say but Sue I want you to go ahead.

>> Sue: There may be a distinction between running this software and then ability to give input.

So one of the things we've talked about is could there be a public interface where you could go in and not necessarily make maps or maps of the whole state.

But where you could go in and say I believe that this area should be changed like this.

So I think that would be the ideal world that there would be some sort of cloud-based software where the general public could give their input on maps to make the public comment so much easier if they are giving us their recommendations through that system.

And Commissioners then could also use this same.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Sue, Dustin go ahead.

>> Dustin: That makes sense too like if we say, hey, can you, you know, draw this line here two blocks down and see how it would look and then you know submit a map to us.

However, someone I mean like myself, I would like to you know, see it myself without having to go through a middle person and say okay I want to just move this here one block over to see how that looks.

And then move it back or save a draft.

And then be able to bring that draft to us or to them saying now I was able to do this.

Does this make more sense?

Without just saying, hey, can you do this, because me saying can you do this is open to interpretation by whomever would be utilizing and making the changes that I was suggest in a text.

>> Brittini: That makes sense and I get the sense we want to be able to go in and toggle and get a feel for it ourselves.

But I do understand what Doug is saying.

I think his is a more specific question like logistic like literally how is that going to work in terms of is that part -- is there like a template created first and then we are kind of more centrally saying these are suggestions like is there a discussion and Doug correct me if I'm miss interpreting your words but that is what I'm kind of hearing like a hierarchy of how that editing process goes so it's not just like a flood of suggestions from the public a flood of 13 people going in and doing their own thing on top of the software and the you know the process of the vendor.

Good, okay I heard you right, okay.

Rhonda.

I think I saw another hand so I apologize and then Julianne.

>> Rhonda: So my question just back on track, pulling it back in, more or less a "Yes" or "No," we are talking about each person doing theirs.

So my question is: If each person drew their own, would that affect the bid?

So in the questions, is it addressed enough to where they -- when they are doing their bid, they know that there is the potential that this could happen?

So they include that in their bid?

I guess that's my concern.

I know we are talking centralized, decentralized my question is about the bid process itself.

Is that enough information for the people doing the bids to make an informed decision on their bid about the potential of us doing our own?

>> Brittini: It looks like the second question or the second question excuse me the second sentences 5, 6, 7 and 8 kind of touch on those answers rather.

Giving options with the requirements, what would that look like for the Commission.

That's my interpretation.

I could be incorrect.

I know that Julianne had something to say.

I don't know if she still has a point and then Sue.

I'm trying I get a feel you all are wanting to chime in right after something is said so.

>> Julianne: I will actually defer to Sue.

Rhonda actually we are switching Rhonda.

Earlier I answered your question before you asked it now you raised what I was going to raise that again it's getting to what would it be to not have that what would it be to have that, those different pricing.

And I know we are getting more into the workflow with the consultant issue.

But and this might be what Sue was going to say is that we've got the consultant presentation on interacting with the consultants from the California Commissioners I believe is coming up, in February.

Sue will correct me if I'm wrong.

But, again, the process question versus the numbers question is I think the Commission wants what I'm hearing is that they want as many options as possible with not only the vendor software but to know what would be publicly available as well.

>> Brittini: Sue, go ahead.

>> Sue: Yes, the California Commissioners will be with us on February 18th and I think they can answer a lot of the questions about process.

So I would go back to Rhonda's question.

If the Commissioners feel that these vendor question/answers are adequate at this time, I think number five clearly states that we would like in the proposals the accommodation

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.

for Commissioners or Commission staff to request software and data access for individual use.

Again, this will likely be cloud based.

That was from our presentation with Rob Surber when he explained how mapping software has aged and gotten up to the 21st century in 2020 here now that that's very typical these days.

So if your concerns are addressed basically in the questions, then we can, you know, we can work on other questions that you might require answers to.

But happy to answer anything that you might have to answer.

The process, the logistics we can figure that out later.

Again, if we are going to use centralized versus decentralized making of maps or if we want to do both.

Really focus on a centralized process but give individual Commissioners that option to draw maps if they want to draw maps.

I think this offers those options and when you see the bids the prices will reflect the level of service so you have to determine the level of service that you are going to want.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Sue.

Any other thoughts?

I always wait the full 30 seconds, go ahead, Doug.

Doug, you are on mute.

>> Doug: Sorry, I'd like to put a motion forward that if this is acceptable to us that we submit these as our responses to the RFP vendors.

>> Brittini: We got two peace signs and two seconds from Rhonda and Dustin.

>> Steve: Any other discussion on the motion or on the answers?

Seeing none, all in favor of the answers as we have them raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

All opposed the same sign.

Okay, that one passes.

Two timelines for RPF process.

>> Brittini: Sue has a hand up.

>> Steve: Who.

>> Brittini: Sue.

>> Steve: Sue.

>> Sue: Just so you know then, this will move along the process according to the timelines that have been set.

So these bidder questions will be posted on Monday through the online vendor system and also go then on the redistricting Michigan website.

So anybody who wishes to bid will have these answers.

>> Steve: Thank you.

Timelines for RFP process on VRA.

>> Sue: I will jump in here also.

So we have for example, we have those deadlines are, let's see my VRA one here.

So the deadline to submit a bid is February 17th.

So last meeting we set up a committee to look at those proposals after staff has had a chance to review them.

That review process is pretty time consuming and lengthy.

So I would recommend on our timelines we allow up to February 15th for that initial review.

And then on February 18th we could at least report to the Commission.

If we have time to get in, I'm not sure we do, because these are so lengthy and there is so much detail, I'm thinking we probably will have to wait until sometime after the February 18th meeting for the subcommittee then to review those proposals.

And bring back a recommendation on February 25th and then that would bump presentations for the voting rights act legal counsel to March 4th.

We want to give those bidders probably about a week to prepare a presentation to this Commission after the recommendations are brought from the committee.

So do those timelines sound okay especially to the committee?

That would be involved.

They would be reviewing between the February 18th and 25th meeting.

So a meeting time would have to be set.

And MDOS staff are recommending maybe a two-hour meeting if the bulk of the work has been done and those proposals come to you in pretty good order and rank order and the reasons for that rank order.

Make sense?

>> Steve: I have a question for Julianne.

Voting rights act attorney is it your opinion they are going to be involved in a little later timeframe than the map drawing people?

In other words, this isn't as time sensitive to get this person on board as it is with the map people?

>> Julianne: What I would say is while they are both critical pieces to the work, and to accomplishing the work, the voting rights act attorney they could be doing educational or continuing education things in the interim and that but it's entirely up to the Commission.

I would also note for all of the experts that the Commission is looking to hire, they are in very high demand because everybody is trying to accomplish this work.

So I would definitely encourage the Commission to move as quickly as possible, to get the appropriate vendor and the right vendor that meets your needs on board as soon as possible.

But there will always be work to do.

That is guaranteed.

>> Steve: I was watching jeopardy last night and the champions of voting rights act attorney so maybe we can get him.

>> Doug: He sounds like a pretty sharp guy.  
I saw the same program.

>> Steve: I just don't want to -- I just don't want us to cut ourselves short here in the voting rights act attorney is certainly going to be an important part.  
But drawing -- he is not going to draw maps.  
He is going to answer our questions whether or not we are doing it legal.  
Sue.

>> Sue: And I just want to point out we are relying on MDOS staff who have other jobs besides the Commission to put a great deal of time into this.  
Chad estimated four to six hours per application that's considered.  
So we are relying on them.  
So if we have to adjust, we will.  
We will do our best to utilize their time wisely.  
But, again, it is a lengthy process to review them.  
And we will get that done as quickly as possible.

>> Steve: All right.

>> Doug: Steve could we have Sue review those dates again?

>> Steve: Sure.

>> Sue: Okay, so the VRA proposal is due on Wednesday, February 17th.  
So that's when we have the person.  
I'm hoping that within about ten days we can get those reviews done so by the 15th the internal review I'll call that would happen.  
Then on the February 18th we would bring information to the Commission as a whole.  
And between February 18th and the meeting on the 25th, we would schedule that subcommittee meeting.  
So then the four subcommittee members could go over those proposals.  
Of course all Commissioners can see all proposals if they want to.  
We don't know how many there will be or we can bring you the top five or ten or two or three.  
I think we rely on the subcommittee to look at as many as they wanted to.  
And then bring a recommendation back to this body.  
And those certainly would be provided.  
And then the following week, if we bring the recommendation back on the 25th, then on March 4th we would have presentations from bidders.  
So they would then come to the Commission and answer any of your questions about their proposals.

>> Doug: Sue you mentioned that the VRA is due back on the 17th but you then mentioned something that is going to start on the 15th?

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.

>> Sue: .

>> Doug: I don't understand the sequence.

>> Sue: Maybe I didn't do that very well.

The proposal deadline is February 17th.

We need about two days to, oh, geez.

I think I really messed that up, didn't I?

So I would say we need about ten days until February 24th or let's just go 22nd.

That will give us a full week.

And it may take longer than that.

It may take two weeks, it may take ten days.

Yeah, I guess I don't see that happening until maybe the 25th if they are due the 17th.

The 25th to even into March. So, yeah, back up the bus.

I think I was looking at mapping numbers.

Mapping dates.

Which we haven't talked about those dates and we also did not talk about a subcommittee.

>> Doug: Okay so the VRA is due on the 17th.

>> Sue: Yes.

>> Doug: Purchasing is going to filter those out.

>> Sue: Right.

>> Doug: How long is that going to take.

>> About ten days.

>> After that it goes to the subcommittee.

>> Sue: That is the 28th and probably try to get that in between that meeting and March 4th.

>> Doug: So March 4 you would want the recommendations from the subcommittee.

>> Sue: Right, on March 4 then we can do the interviews the following week.

I apologize.

I had my.

>> Doug: That's okay.

>> Sue: I was mixing RFPs.

>> Brittini: Doug, are you okay on that.

>> Doug: I'm good I just wanted to make sure I understood the dates.

>> Brittini: Okay great thank you, Sue for that clarification.

Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: You guys are going to think I'm crazy but I'm a little lost here.

What VRAs with we talking about?

Are we talking about the voting rights or not VRAs the RFP the voting rights or the mapping with these dates?

I'm a little lost.



Sorry but.

>> Steve: Voting rights act, voting right dates we are talking about right now voting rights.

>> Rhonda: The committee was for the voting rights act.

>> Brittini: Uh-huh.

>> Rhonda: That is where I was lost, now I'm found.

>> Brittini: We have been doing a lot of RFP talk.

>> Steve: A lot of dates around.

>> Brittini: Sue and Doug.

>> Sue: This Commission did not establish the same process for mapping as you did for the VRA, RFP.

So you know, that one went by.

So if you indeed want a subcommittee to review the mapping RFPs we will have to go back and add that subcommittee and add that into the schedule.

>> Brittini: Thank you Sue for that catch.

Doug did you still have something.

>> Doug: No.

>> Brittini: That was it.

>> Yes.

>> Brittini: Rhonda go ahead.

>> Rhonda: I'm assuming I was a little off last meeting and in all honesty when we were voting for the Commission or the subcommittee, I thought we were voting for the subcommittee for the mapping.

So that's where my confusion comes in.

I didn't realize we were talking about cocounsel or VRA.

So my bad.

Had an off day but I'm good.

>> Brittini Doug go ahead.

>> Doug: Since we don't have a subcommittee for the redistricting, I think we need one.

I think we have to confronted with the same thing with the RFPs.

Any comments on that.

>> Brittini: Any thoughts, yeah, besides me?

Opening up the floor.

>> Doug: Otherwise how do we evaluate?

Purchasing is going to say let's say there is 20 of them, 20 of them to come into this meeting with.

Do we really want to do it that way or do we want to do it the way we have been doing things?

>> Brittini: Cynthia and Anthony.

>> Cynthia: We should follow the pattern we have set.

>> Juanita: I do too.

>> Steve: Any volunteers.

Dustin volunteering MC is volunteering.

>> Anthony: .

>> Go ahead Anthony and I don't know if MC was volunteering, I think he had a thought but.

>> Anthony: I have a thought but MC if you have one you can go ahead.

>> No go ahead.

>> Anthony: We created the subcommittee for the voting rights act counsel.

And we did not do one for the going over the RFPs for the mapping software.

I thought that was purposeful.

So how about before we decide if we want to create a subcommittee for that, let's go over the process as it stands now.

So everybody understands it.

>> Steve: Which process?

We are mixing our metaphors here.

>> Brittini: I think he is talking about mapping, what the process would be.

>> Anthony: I believe the process that we established last meeting was that our staff was going to go over it and bring us recommendations which is why you know Sue had that week to ten day spot in the timeline for them to do that.

>> Brittini: Sue go ahead.

>> Sue: So when the committee discussed mapping and the process, they did not discuss creating a subcommittee.

Subsequently when we discussed the voting rights act proposal, we discussed adding a subcommittee.

So initially the staff, in conjunction with MDOS, would review the proposals, would take them to the subcommittee in a ranked order for further review and then they would bring a recommendation back to this Commission.

For a recommend -- then the Commission would figure out who they want to give presentations to the Commission at the following meeting.

So that's the process I believe that we adopted.

>> MC: Or the voting rights act.

>> Sue: The voting rights act but we did not develop a similar process for the mapping, for the mapping I think the, you know, if you do nothing for the mapping, then the mapping would -- the recommendations would come to this Commission on who to have presentations from.

And the Commission would roll with those.

If you want to create a subcommittee like you did for mapping, we will insert that into the process.

>> Brittini: MC and then Doug.

>> MC: Sue and I think everyone, what I'm thinking about is making sure that we do use our time as well as our resources efficiently.

If it's 2200 each time we call meetings, right, the proposal for the RFP, the voting rights act proposal, that I think has -- has been how we have done it up to now and we interviewed our staff.

And I guess the question is: Does that feel like it's a good use of staff time as well as our time?

I know it's up to us but I'm just thinking about the way that we use our time and our budget it feels like I want to make sure we are making decisions and increasing our efficiency and not increasing our spending so to speak.

Because of the processes that we may or may not have set up.

>> Brittini: That makes sense MC, Doug and then Dustin.

>> Doug: I just want to say I think we should stay consistent on the things that we do. And I think it's a mistake if we start to vary from it because then we are going to get everything mixed up and not consistent and I think we had a good program.

We had an equal number of republicans, democrats and nonpartisans in each one of these committees which kind of cut the workload of the 13 down to three or four people on the committees.

I thought that was the better approach and I think that is what we should do for the redistricting as well.

>> Brittini: Thank you Doug.

Dustin.

>> Dustin: I was going to basically mirror what Doug just said.

We had no idea a meeting cost 2200 until the last meeting that we had so changing them based off of that and changing how you know we handle and how we have been handling things of such nature would seem kind of odd at that particular point.

We do need to stay consistent with how we have been handling this.

>> Brittini: Okay, Sue.

>> Sue: I just want to confirm that the meeting cost is 2200 per hour of the meeting.

>> Dustin: I thought I said that I'm sorry.

>> Sue: So, no, that is for three hours.

That is for three hours.

I apologize.

It is a three-hour cost.

Just so you know that.

But I think by utilizing staff ahead of time to do the heavy lifting, then when we come to subcommittee meetings such as this, then we can streamline those because some of that prework has already been done and that information will be provided.

Again, the Commissioners can choose whether to use that or not.

You make the decisions.

But at least we will get some of the bulk of the work out of the way.

So Commissioners don't have to spend three or four or five meetings just reviewing RFPs and, you know, and that's it.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Sue.

Doug.

>> Doug: I just want to make a comment on the cost.

Yeah, I mean 2200's a large amount, but that's the cost of doing business.

And if that's what we need to do and spend to make this successful then we need to do it.

And, you know, we will deal with if we run out of money, we will deal with that later.

But I want to make sure that we spend money prudently, but we also have the money there to do the job as we intended to do.

So given that, I would like to put a motion on the floor that we create a subcommittee for the redistricting RFP.

>> Steve: MC support.

>> Doug: We need to determine who is going to be on that.

>> Doug: Do we have volunteers?

We can wrap it all up in one motion.

>> Brittini: Dustin, Erin, Cynthia, no.

>> Steve: Volunteering Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Erin is going to she is a republican and if we are keeping it one, one and one I'm fine with that.

But maybe we should switch it up and make sure somebody that is not currently on one does it.

Like Steve, being an attorney maybe you should be on this one also just you have experience with RFPs maybe.

>> Steve: Well I'm a neutral.

I've kind of stayed away but you know we don't have any other volunteers of somebody who has not done it yet I don't have a problem doing it but who do we have so far?

Dustin.

>> Brittini: Erin, I think that's really those are the two because I think Cynthia put her hand down when she saw Erin.

>> Steve: Okay, so that is one, one, we need a neutral if you want me that is fine.

MC what about you.

>> MC: I'm noticing you are on both RFP and committees and wondering I think you are a democrat.

>> Steve: Who me.

>> MC: Dustin.

>> Steve: We have one and one.

>> MC: Right and Dustin is on the other RFP committee so I guess I'm just asking Dustin if you would be willing to switch out or allow another democrat to be on.

>> Dustin: Sure.

I can do that.

I would prefer the one with software out of every single one of them because I work for a software company.

So but that is my preference.

>> MC: Sure and so we are talking right now about the one you are most interested in, correct?

So we will keep the motion clean and back up later does that sound good.

>> Steve: Yeah.

>> MC: Okay.

>> Steve: If nobody else wants it I will go on a neutral I will volunteer as a neutral but I will happily remove myself if someone else is just dying to do it.

>> MC: I want to acknowledge again this is where Doug's commissioner member responsibilities is really useful.

Thank you.

>> Steve: All right, Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, we need to get a Chair for this committee.

>> Dustin: How about Steve.

>> Steve: I vote Dustin.

He is the expert.

>> Anthony: Just a point of order we had not approved it yet.

>> Steve: I know we are putting it together as one big package approval and if we want to argue about it before we vote we can.

Right now the motion would be that we set up a subcommittee as we have in the past, that they consist of Dustin, Erin and myself and Dustin will be the convening chairperson.

If there is any discussion?

Not hearing any, that motion has been made and seconded.

All in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

All opposed the same sign.

There we go.

.

>> Brittini: I think Julianne has something.

>> Steve: She doesn't have a vote.

>> Brittini: No I think she has a thought or something to share, Mr. Steve.

>> Julianne: I would like to help you vote.

If the Commission would like I would like to help you vote to amend the subcommittee for the VRA Council.

If you would like to vote to remove Dustin to replace with an alternate democrat, that would be -- this would be a great time to get that done.

>> Steve: That was going to be my next suggestion thank you.

>> Julianne: Perfect.

>> Steve: Doug.

>> Doug: On the VRA committee we already have four people, two democrats.

>> Brittini: Okay.

>> Doug: Hold on.

Only one I'm sorry one democrat.

We already have four people.

I don't know if we want to bring it down to three or and switch out one of the nonpartisan people for a democrat, however.

>> Steve: We need a democrat.

>> Doug: If Dustin is coming off, we need a democrat.

>> Brittini: Anthony has a hand raised.

>> Anthony: Yeah, just want to make sure everyone is on the same page.

So just now we passed a motion for Dustin, Erin and Steve to be on the redistricting mapping RFP.

Is that correct?

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Anthony: Those three people, okay.

>> Steve: We need a volunteer to replace Dustin.

>> MC: I wanted to just maybe acknowledge that maybe the people as one of our democrats I'm okay with the three people who are there without a democrat being represented I'm okay with that.

I think Dustin is not okay with that.

And Rhonda is not okay with that so never mind.

>> Dustin: Consistency purposes that is it.

>> MC: Yeah, I guess I don't have a strong feeling about being on it so but I will volunteer.

But I would you know I think there is other democrats that would also represent us very well.

>> Steve: So we have for Julianne's instructions we are going to move to remove Dustin and to substitute in right now MC who is the only volunteer.

Are there other volunteers?

Or are there other nominations?

Somebody can nominate somebody.

We don't have to have all volunteers.

Doug.

>> Doug: I just wanted to point out there is I don't know who the democrats are, Juanita, Brittini, MC, and Dustin.

I think I got them all.

So Dustin is not going to be on it because we are pulling him off.

So that leaves the other three.

>> MC: Juanita, would you accept my nomination of you?

>> Brittini: You are on mute but I think she is nodding saying I accept.

>> Juanita: Yes, I will accept.

It's just that I thought somebody that was more knowledgeable would like that.

But we.

>> Brittini: We are all in the same boat, learning together.

>> Dustin: MC were you part of a subcommittee at any point already or not?

You were.

I didn't know I forgot.

So I was just curious.

>> Doug: Let me interject for a minute.

Juanita has been on one, two committees.

She chaired one of them.

MC has been on one, two committees.

Chaired none of them.

And Brittini is the vice Chair.

And part of the invoice review and approval and has not been on any others.

>> Steve: Rhonda you had your hand up for a long time.

>> Rhonda: I was going to ask Brittini is there anything work wise that would keep you from volunteering for a committee since you have not been on one?

>> Brittini.

>> Rhonda: I know you have a busy schedule that is why I asked that particular question.

>> Brittini: I do and I like to give space for other folks to get involved.

I don't know if I have an interest in being on the committee so much as I have an interest in being a part of like the discussion and thinking it through.

Does that make sense?

If it doesn't, I apologize but that is my thought on it.

I like being on that end of it.

I was sort of interested in the software but I wasn't pulled to it very strongly.

So I don't know.

Not directly opposed but I'm also genuinely not interested in that subcommittee.

>> Rhonda: I would like to nominate Brittini.

You've made comments on other ones too how everyone should take their turn and learn from it.

If it's not a conflict I think you should take your turn and learn just saying.

>> Brittini: Okay, I just believe in being involved in things that I'm passionate in, that's all.

>> Juanita: Thank you.

>> Steve: You now have been nominated are you refusing the nomination or are you throwing your hat in the ring?

>> Brittini: I will throw think hat in the ring.

>> Steve: So we have you and Juanita.

>> Juanita: How do I get out of it.

>> Steve: There is nothing preventing you from withdrawing are you in or out Juanita?

>> Juanita: I'm in I guess and I thought Brittini was taking my place.

>> Brittini: Brittini is silent.

>> Steve: MC are you in or out?

You are out.

All right, so we have two nominees for replacing Dustin on the VRA committee.

Juanita Curry and Brittini Kellom, all in favor of Juanita raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

Three, I see three, four.

All right.

Four.

Am I wrong?

>> MC: I saw six.

>> Julianne: I have a different count Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Julianne you are the official counter what is it.

>> Julianne: I saw six hands raised and another option is to do a roll.

But I saw six as well.

>> Rebecca: Are we voting for one or the other or are we voting for both? I'm a little confused.

>> Steve: One or the other.

Were you unclear?

>> Rebecca: I was unclear.

>> Steve: We can revote.

>> Dustin: I request roll call.

>> Steve: Obviously we need to do a roll call Sally.

>> Sally: Hello Commissioners.

So.

>> Steve: Okay this is the vote for Juanita, go.



>> Sally: I will go in reverse alphabetical order by last name.

Dustin Witjes.

>> Nope.

>> Sally: Richard Weiss.

>> No.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner.

>> No.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> No.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.

>> No.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> No.

>> Sally: Steve Lett.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Rhonda Lange.

>> No.

>> Sally: Brittini Kellom.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Really sorry who is this for?

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> No.

>> Sally: Doug Clark.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: I have five yeses and eight nos.

>> Julianne: Sally, I have yeses as MC, Steve, Rhonda, Brittini, Anthony and Doug.

>> Sally: Rhonda.

>> Julianne: Excuse me I apologize.

>> Sally: Okay.

>> Anthony: Can I say something super quick I'm a little confused.

We have Juanita and Brittini volunteering for this but both of them have voted no for themselves.

So if y'all would rather someone else do it let's just say that and then you know we can have someone else do it.

I don't want anyone to feel pressured to do something they don't feel confident in doing.

>> Brittini: It's not that serious for me.

It's not a matter of confidence or any of that.

>> Anthony: I don't want anybody pressured because it's kind of strange to me that people are voting no for themselves.

If that makes sense.

>> Juanita: I voted no for myself because I've already been on a couple of things, so I just wanted someone else to get a chance to taste it.

>> Steve: Well since we can have abstentions, we need to take another vote.

The second vote will be for Brittini.

Go ahead.

>> Sally: Commissioners are you ready for vote.

>> Steve: You are voting for Brittini, is there any question who you are voting for?

Okay go.

>> Sally: This time I will go in alphabetical order by last name Doug Clark.

>> No.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Voting on Brittini, yes.

>> Sally: Anthony Eid.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Brittini Kellom.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Rhonda Lange.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Steve Lett.

>> No.

>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: MC Rothhorn.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.

>> No.

>> Sally: Janice Vallette.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Erin Wagner.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Richard Weiss.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: Dustin Witjes.

>> Yes.

>> Sally: So I have ten yeses and three nos.

>> Steve: I think we had some vote changes but that is okay.

Brittini you are it.

>> Brittini: I noticed that too, Steve, yeah, okay, all right.

>> Steve: Do you have an acceptance speech prepared?

>> Brittini: No.

>> Steve: All right, so the VRA committee is Brittini.

Who else?

>> Doug: It's Brittini.

>> Steve: I know it's Rebecca.

>> Anthony Rebecca and myself.

>> Steve: Did we choose a chairperson the time before?

>> Doug: Chairperson was Rebecca.

>> Yep.

>> Steve: Do we need to revote on that Julianne?

>> Julianne: No.

You would just -- the you did the vote for replacing Dustin with Brittini and the Chair would remain the same.

>> Steve: All right.

Doug, who is the fourth one?

I got Brittini, Rebecca, Doug and.

>> Julianne: Anthony.

>> Steve: Thank you.

Well, that was fun.

>> Brittini: Sue has a hand.

>> Steve: Sue.

>> Sue: Things are happening rather quickly here and I'm not sure but did we vote for a Chair?

In the mapping committee.

>> Steve: Mapping committee.

>> Brittini: Dustin is the Chair.

>> Sue: Okay thank you.

>> Brittini: You are welcome.

>> Steve: I think we are squared away now but don't hold me to that.

Are we up to upcoming meeting agendas?

Topics?

I believe we are.

Sue.

>> Sue: .

>> Steve: Anthony I'll take you first.

>> Anthony: Real quick for the RFP for the mapping software subcommittee, are you all going to follow the same system for lack of a better word that was put in place for the VRAs?

>> Steve: Well, tell me what that means to you.

>> Anthony: Well, for the VRA subcommittee we basically said that first the staff will go through them and create a recommendation, bring it to the subcommittee then the subcommittee will go over it further and bring the rest of the Commission the recommendation.

>> Steve: That's my understanding of what we have decided to keep it the same as we have done in the past and so, yes.

>> Anthony: Just making sure.

>> Steve: Okay, okay, Sue.

>> Sue: Upcoming at the next meeting I will bring you proposed schedules so each of these subcommittees have a timeframe in which they will plan to meet.

So that I will bring you.

There will be a third draft of the rules of procedure.

That Julianne will amend based on the conversation today.

We will have bidder questions for the VRA legal counsel to go over, those are due in between time.

We will have Edward Woods, III, our new community outreach staff or communications and outreach director on board.

So let me get his title right. So he will be on board with us next week.

He starts on Monday.

We are happy about that.

And hope to give him a little bit of time on the agenda to start talking to you about some of the things he wants to work on in his initial days and weeks, so those are the things that I have on my list.

I would ask if there is anything else that Commissioners may have.

>> Steve: Okay, Richard.

>> Richard: I just want to question here, I guess.

We discussed this procedures rules of procedure and we talked about section 12 about the personal slanderous remarks.

Anywhere in here I guess I haven't seen it, if we have a public meeting, would it be wise to read the rules at the meeting first to the public that's there and then so they know what the rules are?

And if so, could we put that in there maybe?

>> Steve: When you say rules, what are you.

>> Richard: You have your public participation and then you have addressing the Commission manners of addressing the Commission and personal and slanderous remarks, will the public know what those are?

So should they be read ahead of time before public comment is taken?

>> Steve: Well I think they should be.

I don't know Julianne.

>> Richard: I don't know if it's in here.

>> Steve: I think that would be something we would develop as the meetings go along.

Just like I read the public comment now.

>> Right.

>> Steve: Stuff like that.

I think would be what we would follow at least it would be my assuming I'm chairman that is what I would be doing.

Telling the public how to behave themselves.

>> Right.

>> Steve: At the get go.

>> Richard: Right.

>> Steve: Anybody else got anything for the agenda?

Erin.

>> Erin: One last thing I had was we were going to address the equipment purchasing policy at the next meeting.

>> Steve: Right, yes.

If you have -- as you go along the you think of something that you would like to be considered for the agenda, send it to Sue.

E-mail it to her.

Our next meeting February 4th at 9:00 a.m.

Sue nod your head.

That's right.

Okay, anything further for the good of the group?

MC.

>> MC: There is this the next big thing webinar that is from close up, there is a they are calling it the next big thing webinar and has a lot to do with committees of interest and it's February 25th if you have not signed up or if you are not sure what I'm talking about there is an I guess it's something that we were asked to do and I can put it on the agenda for next time but if you are wear of it February 25th it's at 7:00 p.m. it's a webinar and it's about communities of interest and close up is trying to help and get communities of interest involved and spread the word so it's just something we could plug.

>> Steve: Let's put it on the next agenda so we don't forget it.

>> MC: Okay.

>> Steve: Okay, all right, are we -- somebody want to make a motion to adjourn?

Rhonda is making the motion.

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.

Juanita seconded the motion.

I don't have any cute thing to get us out of here so we are adjourned.

Have a good weekend everybody.

We will see you on February 4th, 9:00.

Good-bye everybody.

[ Meeting concludes 12:41 p.m. ]