

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.

MDOS ICRC Commission Council Meeting

01/07/21 1330

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

>> Steve: Good afternoon everybody I will call the ICRC commission meeting to order.

As chair of the commission, this is a Zoom webinar and is being live streamed to YouTube. For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at redistricting MI to find a link for viewing on other platforms.

Our live stream today includes 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. And we will provide you with an additional viewing option. Similarly, members of the public who would like to access translation services during the webinar can e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov for details on how to access language translation services available for this meeting. Translation services are available for both Spanish and Arabic.

Please 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 redistricting.Michigan.org for viewing at a later date. Meeting is also being transcribed and those transcription will be hosted on Michigan.org 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 at the 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' presence could we have a roll call, please?

>> Hello good afternoon everyone. Please unmute yourself and say present when I call your name, I'm going to change things up a bit this time and go in alphabetical order by last name instead of first name. So, first Douglas Clark.

>> Present.

>> Juanita Curry.

>> Present.

>> Anthony Eid.

>> Present.

>> Brittini Kellom.

>> Present.

>> Rhonda Lange.

>> Present.

>> Steve Lett.

>> Present.

>> Cynthia Orton.

>> Present.

>> MC Rothhorn.

>> Present.

>> Rebecca Szetela.

>> Present.

>> Janis Vallette.

>> Present.

>> Erin Wagner.

>> Present.

>> Richard Weiss.

>> Don't think we have Richard yet. And Dustin Witjes.

>> Present.

>> Thank you.

>> Back to you, Mr. Chair.

>> Thank you, I would also note that we have our executive directors hammer Smith present with us today. Good afternoon Sue Ann. The agenda was mailed out earlier and in looking that over are there any additions that we need to make or any corrections? MC?

>> MC: Under new business I'd like to suggest that we talk about the close up that is January 27th Zoom and I just want to see if we need to talk about that at all. It was an e-mail that was sent to us and there was a -- it's an educational opportunity around communities of interest.

>> Steve: Wouldn't that fall under schedule and agenda for January meetings?

>> MC: It could. It could. That is okay.

I'm okay with that.

>> Steve: Don't let us forget it.

>> MC: Okay.

>> Steve: Anybody else?

We did get a letter from ESRI. S letter regarding what I assume to be a mapping work. I think that I would like to put that in as A1 and at least acknowledge that and maybe discuss a little bit of it. So, if you would add that, please. Other than that, if you would approve the agenda as presented and amended raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

Okay next would be the review of the minutes. That came out. And I believe I do not have any corrections. Are there any corrections, additions or deletions to be made on the minutes from the last meeting?

Sue Ann?

>> Sue: Under new business one the second motion, the second line of that just needs corrected. It should be interview the 7 candidates for communications and outreach. So, change the of to a for and add an and between communications and outreach director in that line.

>> Steve: Okay, any other corrections?

Okay if you would approve the minutes as corrected raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

Okay, we have no public comment today. I am informed, however, just a few notes on public comment for those that are watching and who would like to make public comment in the future, because this is a virtual meeting, members of the public have to sign up in advance to address us. Staff at the department of state when this is used will unmute each member of the public for up to 90 seconds on a first come, first serve basis. This means that members of the public will be called on in the order in which they signed up to address the commission. Those members of the public participating in public comment please note if you do that you will have no more than 90 seconds to address the commission on those days when there is public comment. If you would like to submit your thoughts to the commission or participate in public comment and an upcoming session of the commission, you can e-mail the office at redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will provide you with written thoughts to the commission. Public comment, sign up links are also posted at redistricting Michigan social media pages on Facebook and Twitter at redistricting MI.

Now, we have something new. Executive director updates. Sue Ann.

>> Sue: Good afternoon everyone. It's been a busy three weeks on the job since we last met. And I have a list of 7 items to share but I will be brief today. First of all, thank you to commissioners Erin Wagner and MC Rothhorn who worked out the details of the general leg counsel hiring. We are presenting an offer letter and employment contact for Julia Ann P to be offered that general counsel position when we talk about that later today. If approved Julie Ann will officially start on Monday. after details of the offer were worked out Julie and I have met twice and volunteering as an example she provided the format for the resolutions on her agenda today and a checklist for recording the roll call votes. Or the roll call which Sally just took.

Second, at the request of the commission I created interview questions in a rubric and prescreened 7 candidates for the communications and outreach position. Thanks to commissioners we Curry and Cynthia Orton and Janis Vallette for handling the list and getting it down to 7 candidates. I provided a report which I hope you have had time to review and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have about any of the candidates.

Third, I have been approving the paying any expense reimbursement for commissioners each week and commissioner Steve Lett our chair has been approving mine. In an effort to clarify who has authority for payment of expenses, a policy is being presented to the commission for your review today. My goal is to assist you as much as possible in taking care of the day-to-day operations. While also being transparent and accountable and reporting that financial data to you. But I want to make sure that the commissioners feel very comfortable with where they are and in making sure that everything is transparent and accountable that this commission does.

Four, I'm preventing a staff organizational chart today. There has been initial conversation about commission employees and who reports to whom and I would like to continue that discussion keeping in mind that we are all on the same team. And we all work towards the same mission.

Five, Sally march, Sarah Reinhardt and Mike Brady from the Michigan department of state have been wonderful resources and have assisted me greatly in my first month of employment. So, I do want to give a shout out to those three. I'm grateful to each one of them Sarah has sent out the letters for the executive director candidates who are not selected. She arranges all the Zoom meetings and does so much more work. A lot of it behind the scenes that you don't see but she is pretty busy. Mike has provided counsel on legal issues as well as practical issues such as his suggestion to create resolutions to help assist the person taking the minutes and then to organize key motions, so we don't have to search through minutes to find them at a later time.

Sally has been arranging connections such as linking to communities of interest, assisting with continuing education, and putting the pieces together for consultant RFPs. For example, yesterday we met with Chad Basset the MDOS purchasing and expenditure manager in the office of financial services. We discussed the RFP process for consultants. And I appreciate Doug Clark for providing an initial draft which was given to Chad to review and then he has worked on a draft format for us which the department of state can utilize to put that RFP out for bid on behalf of the commission.

Sixth I want to say thanks for the opportunity to work with the commission. Although I'm making recommendations and have provided starter motions through the resolutions on your agenda, you are responsible for making the motions amendments and the approvals or not. You make the decision. So, I just want to be clear. I'm not in any way telling you what to do. I'm providing a framework for us to start with and hopefully you can take that and run with it then.

And, seven, I'm impressed with the mutual respect the civil discussion even when you disagree and acceptance of majority decision and moving forward as a commission. Your work has been intensive, and you are making grade strides. But with virtual meetings it is harder to get to know each other and continue to develop positive working relationships. If there is an interest in a brief team building time at our meetings, I will start building this into the agenda.

This concludes my report and I welcome any questions.

>> Steve: Thank you Sue Ann. Any questions for Sue Ann?

I have one. Sue Ann and I talked earlier last year or late last year, I guess. That she had been called by a person in the media for an interview and she called and asked me since she was brand new what to do and I said, well, you know, don't say anything stupid. And go ahead and give the interview. Did you give the interview? And how did it go?

>> Sue: I did give the interview. It was with a Grand Rapids online news and I wasn't even able to see it. So, I don't really know how it ended up. The concern is section 11 of the Constitution where it says we cannot talk to the -- we cannot talk to anybody except in a public meeting about redistricting matters and Rebecca, in fact, asked the same question of Mike Brady this week. He did provide some counsel in that area. Which we appreciate. I think all the commissioners probably need to be on board with talking points and guidelines if the media does contact you and either Julie Ann and/or communications and outreach person will begin working on that immediately so we have a clear sense of what we can do and what we cannot do and what those talking points should be. So, we are all speaking in one voice.

>> Steve: Very good, I think it's important that when we get requests like this that we honor them. And one of the conditions or one of the things we are trying to accomplish is to locate and talk with communities of interest and so it probably would be nice if they knew we were here. I'm certain that everybody remembers the amendment they voted for in detail and are watching with rapt attention in every meeting we have but we probably could use some more publicity.

>> Anthony had a question, Rebecca too.

>> Steve: Anthony.

>> Anthony: I like the idea of having team building or ice breaker built into the agenda especially since we have virtual meetings.

>> Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: I did get a request this week from PDS Detroit to do an interview and I did follow-up with Mike about what we can and cannot say and I did actually do that interview idea and it's supposed to air tonight at 7:30 but PBS was very cognizant of what the Constitution requirements are as well and so before we even had that interview I had a discussion with the reporter about what we were allowed to talk about and what we were not allowed to talk about and he was very respectful of that so hopefully I did not embarrass myself in my interview and hopefully I did well so but mostly he focused on why I wanted to be on the commission and you know how I felt when I was picked so he kept it very neutral.

>> Sue: I also interviewed with him and I literally read the part out of the Constitution before we started. I said before we start this, I want to read this to you so you are very clear what I can talk about and what I cannot talk about it and if I cannot talk about it, I

will tell you in the interview I'm sorry this is something we only discuss in open meetings or a public hearing.

>> Brittini: That is good to know they reached out and I have not responded.

>> Steve: They reached out to me right after the selection process. I mean like within days and I have spoken about this before and they -- it was up in Traverse City and they interviewed me and the person it is probably 10- or 15-minute interview and when I watched it on the local TV, I was on for five seconds, so I did not have a chance to say something stupid and I see Richard has joined us welcome Richard.

>> Richard: I'm on the phone at the moment, I'm still playing around.

>> Steve: You are looking really good.

>> Richard: That is really good. That is the best part. Anything else for Sue?

We are getting calls for interviews so be aware of what we can and cannot say. It's not that hard. Secretary of state update administrative Sally are you doing that?

>> Sally: Hi everyone yes and I will be super brief. You know, I think moving forward the department of state will have less and less to say and that's a good thing so just wanted to mostly provide an update to you all on your computers. I've be trying to work through with our team this week and with Sue as well, there is a statewide -- there seems to be a statewide delay with Dell laptop computers supply chain issues related to the pandemic are essentially at route for that, the cause for that. So, we are troubleshooting through a couple of different options and our colleagues at DTMB are working with us to procure what we can as fast as we can. And we have really been pressing upon everyone you know, and everyone is aware of the tight timeline you all have, and you know if you tonight get computers until March or April you know you won't have very much time to use them.

So, we think we have about ten that we can get, you know, we can get into everyone's possession as soon as possible. Obviously, that is not enough for all of you, that is not enough for all of your staff. I might suggest that you prioritize Sue and Julie Ann getting those computers. You know, she has been a real champ but the sort of technical difficulties you all have experienced which are for security reasons you know, I think I would just advocate it would be great for her to have that. So, something to put on your radar. Like I said we are working through it as we speak. To try to figure out how to get it to all of you. So, it's not for lack of trying but it's mostly due to factors as well beyond our control.

So that is one technical piece.

Another technical piece that I know some of you experienced at least today was your passwords expiring for your e-mail accounts. And so, I think some or all of you will start to experience that in the next couple of days. This happens routinely in state Government, passwords expire and force you to update it for security reasons. That said because you all don't have -- you are not within the state network you -- it will be a little trickier for all of you to update it. So, if that has happened to you already, you will

need to contact the DTMB the department of technology, management and budget client service centerline. If you don't have that number feel free to text me. I will text it to you. And they can help you trouble shoot your individual situation. I will also ask and see if there is anything, those of you whose passwords have not yet expired can do proactively from outside of the state network. But it's might just be a little clunky so a heads up on that because you are all yet again unique in the state eco system and we want to make sure that everything is secure with it and also you are getting access to your e-mails. So that's what I got. Any questions on that?

>> Steve: I have a question I guess on the computers.

>> Yeah.

>> Steve: If we -- since we have ten obviously if your computer is working which mine has been working fine with this whole process, so I certainly would not be standing first in line to get one. Do you know or does management budget have any idea or the IT people know if our computers will work with mapping?

>> Sally: So.

>> Steve: I assume they will.

>> Sally: Yeah, I'm -- I don't know the offhand answer. I can certainly ask and the other thing to know is that my understanding of most mapping software or interfaces is that you know the kind of intensity of software and hardware that your mapping consultants will need will be much more than you all would need to look at and evaluate the map yourself.

And you know you all have seen the publicly available versions of mapping software that don't take a lot for your computer to be able to run. So, I'm guessing that won't be a huge problem. But you know the thing to remember there and the reason you know that we talked about before where you know we are still trying really hard to push, to find the computers for you within the state network is for A security reasons of course. But then you know B as well the retention of documents and data. That will be so important for all of you and the legal challenges ahead. So, I see where you're going with that, I think. But I would just say it should be a short-term issue, but I think it's potentially a longer-term issue.

>> Steve: Keep us posted Sally thank you. Anything else.

>> Sally: I will, we are working on it.

>> Steve: Okay, next up general counsel hiring next steps. And I received some information. Well, I'll turn it back to you, the letter was signed by Erin, Erin?

>> Erin: MC do you want to field this since I was not -- I had a family emergency the last day and could not participate so.

>> MC: So, yes, so I can take it. The I think we -- are there questions?

Otherwise, we have that resolution that has been presented or that we would like to resolve but I want to ask if there is any -- I mean, I would -- are there.

>> Steve: Specifically, any questions on the letter?

By anybody?

Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, has Julie Ann signed the letter and returned it?

>> It has not been sent.

>> MC: We were seeking permission, so I think that is where the resolution is, and we basically want to say yes this is the offer the commission wants to extend to Julie Ann for her to sign with dates of starting et cetera.

>> Doug: I was referring to the initial letter.

>> MC: So, she has been engaged in negotiations like Sue said you know so she has been volunteering already so I think I would consider that as signature if that's what you are asking.

>> Doug: There were two -- when we hired Sue there were two letters. One initially was explain what we were offering but it was not a commitment until we brought it back to the commission and she signed that and sent that back to me. And then when we approved it, we said the formal contract letter to her for signature.

>> MC: Okay then I believe yeah go ahead, Sue.

>> Sue: I think part of the issue was the timing was very different for me because we did not even have a draft contract. But I believe the commission still approved the offer before a letter was sent and that is what we were waiting on was for the commission to approve these conditions of the employment before the letter was sent. And then our intention is to just provide the letter and the contract all at once and Julie Ann is on board. She and I have been meeting and she has been volunteering and you know there is no reason she will not accept this.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Just a quick question what is Westlaw or Nexus-Lexus as far as reimbursement just so I know what they are.

>> Steve: Legal research platforms that have various databases to look through primarily for attorneys you are looking at case law, statute law, et cetera. But they cover, you know, they cover a wide range of areas. So that is what they are.

>> Rhonda: Okay.

>> Doug: Lexis and Nexus is the standard used in most legal communities.

>> Right.

>> Doug: Yes.

>> Steve: There is the state bar if you are a member of the state bar which Julie Ann is, there is also a database that she can use for free called case maker. But it's not as robust let's put it as Westlaw or Lexis Nexus. So, we have -- anything else MC?

>> MC: We were very pleased with the negotiations. It went very well, and I think -- I just wants to acknowledge that Sue did a great job of also like making sure that the team is coming together, and I think we have seen the results of that. She has already

given the update, but I want to acknowledge that was part of with regard to Julie Ann making sure that she is part of the team already.

>> Steve: Okay, I would note unless there is something else from somebody, I would note on the contract we need to make a couple of changes in paragraph 3.1 rate of pay. We got her beginning on January 1st, 2021 and ending on January excuse me January 11th and ending on January 11th, that is 366 days. We need to change that to the 10th. That is a year.

>> Sue: Julie Ann wrote that and thought hey it's her deal she wanted it put in so maybe she is going to work that extra day for free.

>> Steve: Maybe but let's make it the 10th.

>> Sue: Okay.

>> Steve: And then the remaining term begins on the 11th.

>> Sue: 11th.

>> Steve: Not the 12th and that makes it internally consistent. So, you can kind of give her a jab and say we are reconsidering since she made that mistake. Just kidding.

>> Sue: I think she was just volunteering. We all win.

>> Steve: Okay, so MC you want to make this resolution?

>> MC: Sure, I would offer that we resolve to have it approved the offer letter dated January 7, 2021 and employment contract to Julie Ann P for the independent citizens for redistricting general counsel position upon acceptance will be effective January 11, 2021.

>> MC made the motion is there a second.

>> Brittini: Second.

>> Who said that Brittini?

>> Yes, I did.

>> Steve: All in favor of the motion raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

Any opposed, same sign?

Any opposed?

That passes unanimously. Who is going to send the letter? Erin, are you sending the stuff?

Who is doing that?

You signed it.

>> Sue: I would be the one to have the contract in my possession. I would be happy to send the offer letter on the contract which will need to be amended to Julie Ann.

>> Steve: All right very good. That meets with the committee's approval. Okay. Communications and outreach, next steps. We have some information from Sue Ann. Sue Ann would you enlighten us, please?

>> Sue: I do. I was given the task of interviewing the 7 candidates that the commission had recommended for the communications and outreach position as being

the top 7. When I went through the prescreening interviews, you can see I asked like 18 questions. We did a rapid fire and I really got a sense of who the people were and when I finished three candidates had certainly risen to the top. And interestingly enough when I did their scoring and got all done on different days, even they were all within one point of each other. So, you have I think three equally good candidates to choose from and interview and I would be happy to answer any questions you have about these candidates or any of the others.

>> MC.

>> MC: I was going to offer too that the letters we received they are writing samples and they are also the ones that struck me as sort of the most sort of tailored to our region and not, yeah, so I just appreciated that the three were the writing samples that struck me.

>> Brittini: Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I just want to bring up the point about Walter S, the individual we added last time. I personally have a concern with him. Same thing we dealt with, with Anna and James, same issue.

>> Brittini: I do as well. I honestly also I had an issue with the -- those just being the three. I think honestly there were other candidates that stood out like I made a whole -- did some research and made a whole cheat sheet for each candidate and I was interested and curious to me they were the particular particularly Mr. Score and I also want to raise a more challenging question of diversity. And I think we -- it would behoove us to start looking at hiring folks that are representative of not just an area but the State of Michigan. And diverse in their job experience and those are my thoughts and quite honestly, I think Walter sword should be eliminated and confer if anything to see an interview with Janis Edward, Andre or Andrea and Bill.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I have the same concerns with Mr. Sword. I did some online footprint on him, Twitter account that wasn't deleted. There was one that was deleted. Some of the things he says very one sided political and my concern is when you're reaching out to communities you have to have trust. The communities need to trust you. And with some of the things that were said, I myself would have a hard time trusting him to be honest. And going through the resumes I just felt that there were other people that would be better equipped in my opinion and as far as outreach goes it would be better at outreaching.

I will say for Mr. Fraylich he was not on top of my list, but I did like his writing sample that he sent in. That one I did like. But I have to agree with Doug and Brittini on Mr. Sword it's way too political for me. I would just to say that out of all the candidates we've had he has been the most political in his talkings. I looked at the radio or the talk show or Podcast or whatever it is that he produces. And it is also very one sided. And I just -- you know, all of the comments that we got from both side of the Ailes even

volunteers from voters not politicians have said when we do our hiring, they really want us to hire somebody that isn't political. Government work, not necessarily a bad thing, but somebody that is not overly political. Because they want to be able to trust them, I'm assuming. We had comments from one that said she didn't pound the pavement getting signatures to pass this proposal to have it put in the hands of somebody who is political. Not only that but in 2012 he also ran for house of representatives. So, I mean, you can't get much more political I don't think. And so, I personally would vote against having Mr. Sword move on. Thank you.

>> Steve: I guess I have a question then. And I understand your sentiment and your feelings about political, but Walter sword was one of the movers and shakers to get this amendment passed. And let's face it folks, this is a political arena. Whether we think it is or don't think it is. This is politics. And of all the ones resumes I read regarding this outreach I consider Walter sword to be head and shoulders above everybody else in experience and knowledge about the State of Michigan. The Government in the State of Michigan. And I also think that down the line we are going to run out of money. And we are going to have to go to the legislature to get more money. And Walter sword knows everybody over there. And he would be an invaluable resource to assist us in our budgetary talks with the legislature in the future. So, I think the same arguments can be made for him that were made for James Lancaster. These people have participated and with sword and both of them, Lancaster and sword, were both drivers behind us getting to where we are. And I don't think that that should disqualify him. I did not think it should have disqualified Lancaster, but I don't think it should disqualify sword from being seriously considered given his experience and knowledge.

>> Brittni: I think there are other people, Steve, that can do it without the conflict of interest and do it better honestly. I would have to sorely disagree. I think Andrea honestly, when I read all the resumes her experience soars past everyone with years of experience and concrete evidence of what she has done, working in different sectors yes she is a reporter but for this position we don't need someone -- there is a whole technicality with public relations and community outreach and being able to relate to different communities and being able to hob knob with legislation, with Government and still hold your own, still have a responsibility of assisting and supporting the commission and you know, he listed his experience but it was hard for me when I did research, news media some things I'm knit picking I want someone to be current. It's actually called digital media. What social media platforms has he managed, advertising and marketing I did not see experience with airtime and a conflict of interest. There are some other choices Janet and Edward I feel they can do the job, but I honestly feel there is one candidate, and this is not the time where we choose someone, but I think we need to be clear again I keep saying the same thing about what are the markers in which we are choosing people. And we don't owe anyone anything for helping this commission and I mean that in the most respectful way possible. We have a job to do that extends beyond

how it was started. This is where the serious work begins and when I think about what it takes to remap and all of the things that we have heard and what the difference between public relationships and community outreach and someone that can simply talk and report those are two different things. Those are two very, very different things. And I think we need to keep that in mind. And if we are talking about resumes and experience, he is not the only person that is qualified. There are other people even besides Andrea or I don't know how to pronounce her name. That exceed him honestly.

>> Sue: Andrea worked in politics pretty much her entire career working for a mayor in Cleveland and currently works for democratic congresswoman.

>> And experience working with tumultuous topics as well and I went to Google and resources for each, each of for each of these folks and again Sue I think you did a tremendous job and it's unfortunate we couldn't hear their responses for this rapid fire but if we are going again off of the resume on what they presented and how they present even the writing samples I think there are a few candidates that just really stand on top.

>> Steve: Dustin.

>> Dustin: I wanted to say like with James Lancaster we still offered him an interview and based off of Walter Sword's experience I would feel that again it's not a disqualification I agree with Steve 100% we should at least give him a chance to explain and go over what his qualifications are to be the director because in my eyes he would be the best fit and that is mine. I'm willing to look past the political affiliations here with him because it's media related. It's not really anything more than that. So, and that's my opinion.

>> Steve: Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I go back to your comment about that we are in a political arena. And I agree with that. But I think our job as we select these people is to minimize that.

>> Yep.

>> Doug: Not to eliminate it but to minimize it because I don't think we can ever eliminate it from anybody. And my opinion of Walter is that he is on the high end and I think it's not worth our time to interview him and I prefer to interview someone else. I think Rhonda.

>> Steve: Erin, Erin.

>> Erin: I'm comfortable with Sue's recommendations, they were my top three picks. I think I had Andrea on as well. But we gave Sue Ann this task to do for us and we need to be able to stand by what she has to say as our executive director.

>> Brittini: Gave the task for the committee to choose and there is someone on the list that was not on the list so.

>> Steve: Well, there is nothing that says we can't bring in whoever we want to interview, period.

>> Exactly.

>> Steve: We can scrap the whole list and send out another request for names but.

>> Brittini: That needs to be the standard then if we can bring whoever then it should be as a commission that we are making the decision. We respect Sue and she has a job to do for sure. But it is still up to us and I think we need to stop handing it off because this happened with the committee that was responsible, they came with a set of names and then someone else would suggest it and it happened again and now we are suggesting other people and it's going back to let's respect Sue. So, I'm growing tired of how we make decisions. And if we are thinking about the way we are perceived by the public at all we need to be more decisive and confident.

>> Steve: Well, I think as a commission we have the right and the responsibility to listen to everybody. And if the commission chooses to interview more than what -- whoever recommends, then that's what the commission chooses to do and that is why we have discussions and that is why we vote. Rhonda.

>> Steve: You have to unmute yourself.

>> Rhonda: I forgot, sorry. I would like to add recommend adding two people. Based off from their resumes. I would like to hear what they say in an interview. The first person is who was highest I believe on my list when we went through the initial six that were going to be interviewed and that is Janet Lebson and I just want to say for the reasons she has Government experience, not political. She gave an example in her writings of how she has experience dealing with politically controversial policies and has dealt with that in a setting a public meeting setting and she has also talked with the American Indian tribal Governments along with local, state and Federal Governments which you know we talked about diversity and this and that and I go back to public comment that we had about and there was one specifically about outreach to American Indian tribes like in the UP so I think that could be very beneficial. She said she has got experience with print, broadcast media, website content, communicating with Government, Government partners, non-Government organizations. I also looked at her community service. Which the other ones that I looked at that did community service. I mean she has volunteered at food banks. She has worked as a server at a homeless center.

Provided communication support that helped with issues with affordable housing and food gatherers which when I look at public service, I think that speaks volumes like I said last time about Julie Ann I think it speaks volumes about who the person is. And, again, I like the example that she gave of time when she was working this a contentious setting and ended up with a desired outcome and it showed respect to garner the trust of the people had the issue.

The second person that I looked at was Andrea Taylor she was toward the top of mine. Again, she has got Government experience, not political. She's got the community service. One thing that stuck out with her is just a little side thing she knows Spanish so

going into communities that speak Spanish that is very beneficial in communicating with them.

The one thing that really stuck out to me, is when she talked about public outreach and there were three factors that she brought up. And that is trust, respect and honesty and that is how you get the public, you know, to communicate with you. You have to show trust, you have to be respectful and you have to show honesty. And those words that she used really stood out to me and I would like to hear more of what she has to say in an interview. So, I would like to recommend those two people.

>> Steve: Those two or who?

>> Brittini: Janet and Andrea.

>> Janet Lebson and Andrea Taylor, did we have two Andreas?

It's Andrea Taylor.

>> Steve: All right, Anthony?

>> Anthony: So just kind of a point of order, we do have a resolution on the table currently and you know before we decide if we want to add people or not, for whatever reasons they may be, I think we should first decide if we are going to adopt the resolution that we have in front of us. Because there does seem to be different opinions on the resolution. So, I think we should first vote on this resolution and then if it does not pass, we can talk about how to proceed and if we want to add more people or not, which I mean if it does not pass that is what we will have to do, that would be the next step. But this is in front of us so I think we should consider that first.

>> Steve: I don't think anybody has made a resolution yet. I understand you are talking about this form, but this is simply a form. It has not been resolved. You can make the resolution if you want.

>> Anthony: I thought we had one in front of us for Roy and Walter S and Walter woods.

>> Rebecca: We have a draft one Sue submitted to us.

>> Steve: Sue doesn't make resolutions we make resolutions.

>> Rebecca: I think that is what he is referencing.

>> Steve: I do too.

>> That is what I'm referencing.

>> Steve: Do you want the draft resolution as the resolution?

>> Anthony: Yes, and if we decide we want it or not we can then like take into consideration those of us who want to add more people have said. I mean just to recap on how we got here.

>> Steve: You need to get a second first. Is there a second?

>> Rebecca: I will second.

>> Steve: Move and seconded now we can have the discussion go ahead Anthony.

>> Anthony: Just to recap how we got there we first had the subcommittee come up with a list of six names that were approved by us to bring in for interview. Now, what

then happened was we hired an executive director. And at our last meeting we tasked them with looking at the list and kind of narrowing it down to who they thought would be the best people to bring in for interview. Now, whether we should have done that or not, you know, I don't know who voted. I can't remember off the top of my head who voted for it. I would have to check the minutes, but we did vote on that and we did, you know, give her that task to do. Which she has done.

As far as the three candidates go, I mean I think all three of them are good. I understand the reservations about Mr. Sword. However, I want to be consistent with you know my opinion on this and it's that I want the best person and I don't think it should be disqualifying unit if we bring them in for an interview and at that point everyone decides that they want to go with someone else I think that is perfectly fine and that is how we have done it thus far. But as far as the quality of their applications, I have to agree with what Dustin had said earlier. So that's what I think. And, hey, if we reject this resolution, I think at that point we take a look at the people that you know Rhonda just said and we go from there.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I just have to make a point. When I voted to, and this is nothing Sue against you or anything, I appreciate you putting the time in, that when I voted to let Sue, you know, do the preinterviews, come back with recommendations, it was under the idea that if we didn't agree with the recommendations, we could add people, take people off or whatever. Otherwise, to be honest I wouldn't have voted for it. I would have said no, let the commission, you know, interview all of the people because I would like to have a say if there is obviously people, I had no idea who she was -- who she is going to pick.

I had people in my mind I believed would do a good job I wanted to interview prior to but then it was you know let Sue interview and do this. But when we discussed this at our last meeting it was said that we would be able to add, remove or not interview any of them. So.

>> Steve: That is where we are at right now.

>> Brittini: Resolution and if we accept it as that for the three people does that then eliminate our -- we can't make that choice.

>> Steve: Resolution and anybody can make an amendment to add names or take names away or vote it down.

>> Brittini: Why even add the extra step I don't understand that?

>> Steve: That is the way Roberts rules of orders work.

>> Brittini: Okay.

>> Sally: I thought I might hop in.

>> Steve: Right now it would appear Rhonda wants to make an amendment to add Janet and Andrea.

>> Anthony: I can second that amendment.

>> Steve: Sally.

>> Sally: Yeah, commissioners, I thought I might jump in with a clarification that I'm sure Mike would jump in and make. He had to step away briefly this hour. So, I just wanted to clarify that the sort of drafting of resolutions idea was actually you know one that Mike suggested as a way to make sure that whenever you all make a motion and make a decision and move forward that it's clear to everyone public, staff, everyone what is going on. So, it's basically the same thing as what you've been doing all along making a motion and seconding it that way, we don't have confusion after the fact about what it was that you all voted on so I just wanted to quick jump in and make the clarification because I think if Mike was here, he would make that clarification about the rules of order. And about the sort of how a motion works. The resolution is basically a motion. And that's kind of how that came to be. So, I hope that is helpful because I heard a couple of procedural questions along those lines.

>> Steve: Well, the resolution is not a resolution until it's given by somebody on this commission. And seconded. So, you can call it a resolution. You can call it a motion. It's a difference without a distinction as far as I'm concerned. And as it stands right now the resolution what it really does is it puts in paperwork form, a format form that is easier to keep track of. And people can -- and we can keep track of it by making the changes on paper, so we don't get lost in these amendments. So right now there is a motion on the floor that has been amended and I'll clarify it by keeping the same three names that are on this resolution/motion with Bill, Walter and Edward amended to add Janet and Andrea and that has been seconded.

So, are there other -- I mean the easiest way to go about it are there other names we want to interview besides these five?

Anybody raising their hand?

Brittini, you had names of people. Do you want people added?

>> Brittini: Those were the names Andrea Taylor.

>> Steve: Okay she was in the pack. She looked good to me too. Anybody else?

>> Anthony: We have five.

>> Bill Edward sword Edward woods the third, Janet I don't know what her last name is.

>> Brittini: Janet Lebson.

>> Steve: And Andrea Taylor. Okay so if you are in favor of the amended motion which is to interview those five and there is no further discussion raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

Okay, those opposed to the amended motion?

One. The amended motion passes. And assumes the original motion so as it sits right now, we will interview five people so if you are looking at your resolution add Andrea Taylor and Janet.

>> Brittini: Lebson.

>> Steve: Janet Lebson, okay.

So, I guess my next question is do we have a date to start these interviews without me looking at the calendar?

Sue Ann?

>> Sue: If we had had three, we could have interviewed them at our next meeting. That is only a two-hour meeting. That certainly is not adequate. That will push it to Thursday, January 14th, which would be a week from today if you want to do the interviews then. I don't think we have anything else scheduled on that day, any presenters or anything that we would need to reschedule.

>> Steve: How long is that meeting?

>> Sue: That is a three-hour meeting and that is all we have for the rest of the month are three-hour meetings so we already have somebody tentatively planned for the 21st of January to come work on.

>> Steve: We would rather get to them sooner than later.

>> Sue: Okay.

>> Steve: So that date was the 23rd you said.

>> Sue: Thursday, January 14th would be our next three-hour meeting. And that is in the morning from 9:00 until Noon.

>> Steve: Does that work for everybody assuming it works for those people.

>> Sue: It doesn't work for one of our candidates. I can tell you that. You know I know -- I initially asked you know, initially let them know that our tentative date was Tuesday the 12th and if that didn't work out it would be Thursday the 14th. So, for the interviews. So, the other candidates were available on the 14th so four out of the five would be available.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Is there any way that we can make the meeting longer on Tuesday?

>> Steve: Sally?

>> Sally: Yes, I think we can do that. So right now it's scheduled to be an evening meeting because we thought we would try how that works for folks' schedules so I guess it's a question for all of you in terms of would you want to -- because I think the meeting should probably be scheduled just doing quick math in my head for about four hours or 3.5 hours at least, right, Sue do you agree?

If it's five half hour interviews and then you all will need time to agree on the questions as well beforehand. So, we could start it at 4:00. I might at 4:00 or we could also extend it later into the evening. I know from the department of state side Mike Brady and I have a conflict until 4:00 or 5:00 on Tuesday. So, you know that doesn't have to determine what all of you do. But just as an FYI.

So, what would be kind of what would work best?

>> Steve: Does anybody have a problem with extending that to start at 4:00? On that -- on the 12th?

Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: My presence would be to do that begin at 4:00 and be able to do the interviews that day.

>> Steve: I have no schedule conflicts on my extremely packed calendar. Sue?

>> Sue: I'm okay.

I work for your pleasure.

>> Sally: If it starts at 4:00 everyone it would go on until about 7:30 most likely. Maybe even 8:00. And we probably would schedule it from 4:00 to 8:00 so does that work?

>> Steve: Okay, January 12th, 4:00 to 8:00 and MC brings the pizza.

>> Steve: Okay, right, so on our little form resolution that we now have, if you are keeping track of that, we have a motion and then we have the attachment and then we have a motion to amend and you would check yes and you would add, add it Andrea and Janet.

>> Sue: Her name is Andrea by the way.

>> Steve: Andrea and Janet and the motion was the main motion was by Anthony.

And I forget who seconded it.

>> Sue: Rebecca.

>> Steve: And the second then the amendment was by Rhonda and Brittini did you second that?

>> Brittini: Yes.

>> Steve: And you followed all that your form is all filled out, result was passed.

Okay, draft policy for expenses, Sue?

>> Sue: Okay, so we had a situation last week where Kelly services asked for a block group of expenses to be approved. It included expenses of mine for payroll. And I didn't know from our motion last month whether I could approve that or whether it would be necessary for Steve to approve mine. And the motion last month seemed to be very unclear. So, the minutes record it as very unclear. So, as I was looking at that, I thought maybe we could just start with a draft policy for expenses and I don't know that this is the end all and be all. We will probably have to amend it at some point. But this is what I developed so I can actually reach out and take care of a lot of the day-to-day things. So, for example this Kelly services issue my payroll had already been approved by Steve so in this block group through this policy then I could go ahead and approve that since it had been preapproved by him. But you have had time to review it. I'm happy to answer any questions. I want to make it as easy as I can for the chair and the vice chair. While we are still being transparent and responsible.

>> Steve: That doesn't mean to say we are going to become untransparent and irresponsible. Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I think having Sue approve all the expenses for the commission would be great. But her expenses I think when you go back and take a look at the

Sarbanes Oxley Act that Congress passed you don't want the same person approving their own expenses so we would I think continue to have you and Brittini as we had determined before to approve Sue's so that we can bypass that situation. That is my comment toward that.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Doug.

>> Sue: That is in the policy and once those are approved for example if Kelly services has a block group that would include me that has already been approved by Steve can I then go ahead and approve that?

>> Doug: I would say that would be acceptable.

>> Sue: That is what I was trying to explain in the second paragraph. So, it was very clear. It was something that they had already approved that piece of it, and I would just approve the block then subsequently.

>> Steve: Any other questions on the resolution/motion which is in front of you on those?

I looked those over. I can tell you the way it's been working Sue and sending -- I get her timesheet from Kelly services Monday or Tuesday, whenever, and I approve one hour like everybody else gets one hour. And I also get her -- if she submits expenses, I get those either from Kelly or her and I approve those. And we also get any other purchases that come through such as the computers and the phones et cetera. So that's what is happening on the ground right now. Seems to be working. I seem to be getting two, I get one from Sue and I get one from Kelly for the same thing so we can do that.

Any other discussion?

If not, I would appreciate someone making a motion that these be adopted as the directive policy on expenses and approvals.

>> Dustin: So, moved.

>> Steve: Dustin and a second.

>> Brittini: Doug, Doug raised his hand.

>> Steve: All in favor raise your hand.

[Hands raised]

Thank you. Any opposed?

Same sign. Passes.

All right, just as a thought on this, we are all working from home. I go through about a ream of copy paper a month printing out, maybe that will slow down, I don't know, and I don't know what everybody is doing on expenses, but I have not seen a lot of expenses come through to be reimbursed. But I certainly would not be opposed if the commission were not opposed if you are buying copy paper, printer ink, supplies that would normally be available to you in an office setting that we should be reimbursed for those upon proper submission of receipts. Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I personally you were saying you don't know what everybody else is doing I'm keeping my receipts but because I am an independent contractor, own my

own business anyway I will not be asking for reimbursement. I will be using anything for this commission as a tax write-off so.

>> Steve: We thank the IRS on your behalf.

>> Rhonda: Well, I'm just going to save the state some money on doing my part.

>> Steve: Any other thoughts on that?

From anybody, yeah, Anthony.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I think supplies are pretty easily justifiable considering you know we are in this situation where we have to work from home for the time being.

>> Steve: Okay I'm just going to -- MC.

>> MC: A shout out to my employer who is actually supporting me and helping me print stuff so wanted to give a shout out to the MSU student housing cooperative.

>> Better be careful they find out you are doing that they will probably take away your ream of copy paper.

>> MC: My boss has supported it that is what I mean explicitly said.

>> Steve: It's not unreasonable and seems to be the gist of the discussion here if you are buying lots of extra stuff submit a receipt and ask for reimbursement.

Okay, next.

>> Brittini: Sue has her hand up.

>> Sorry Sue.

>> Sue: If you want to send those receipts to me, I can approve them. So, you submit them through your Kelly services website with the receipts and actually you don't have to send them to me. Send them to Kelly and then they send them to me for approval and you know you will get paid in the week that you submit them.

>> Steve: You have to figure out how to do that.

>> Sue: You have to take a picture go on JPG and I'm not sure if a PDF works, but they want a JPG or some other form so just take a picture of your receipt and attach it to your report, your expense report with Kelly and they will send them to me to approve then.

>> Steve: Very good. New business, drafts, staff, organizational chart.

>> Cynthia: I have a question about that.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: Sue, was the issue ever resolved about reimbursement for things that happened before our December 14th start date?

>> Sue: The issue was resolved as you can't submit any receipts for reimbursement prior to that date. So simply present a receipt for reimbursement now and you know it will be covered. So that was what the decision was that was made. We paid it out for one commissioner. Submit it with a Google map and we will count your mileage and it's \$57.5 per mile I believe is the reimbursement rate so.

>> Cynthia: Thank you.

>> Sue: Uh-huh.

>> Steve: I make the most money. I live the furthest away. Okay.

>> Brittini: Thank you, Steve.

>> Steve: Draft organizational chart. That is pretty easy you start with Sue and go straight down. We got three people. I guess we are on top. Commission is on top. Go ahead, Sue.

>> MC: I want to acknowledge I like the line Sue between the commission directly to Julie Ann, and next to you I thought it was significant.

>> Sue: Your legal counsel will have to work closely with you and even though she is a direct to me and we are working on all the things together and we are you know she will be attending meetings and will be working on the things you wants her to work on so I just wanted to acknowledge that and my question was do you want the same kind of error with the communications and outreach director or is that something that can be my responsibility and I'm open for discussion and like I said earlier we are all on the same team we are going to pull together for the mission and achieve the same goals. It's however you want this to look and how you want to work if Julie Ann and communications will be direct reports to you then that is a different chart Doug Rhonda.

>> I had a question with Sue Ann how it would work with communications and if they are doing up a press release, do they submit it to you and give it to us for approval or are they just kind of out there in the wind?

How does it work? I have not had a communications director so I'm asking to get an idea how this works.

>> According to the contract I'm not allowed to submit a press release without your expressed approval it's going to be pretty unwieldy if we are having a couple meetings one or two meetings every week we will have to plan well and not have emergency communications to go out or have a process in place if there was an emergency communication for emergency Zoom meeting for the chair to be able to approve an interim. You know we have not settled how we handle communication and spokesperson and those kind of things so that is something we need to talk about definitely.

>> I don't want to feel so much is on you and the chair and the cochair and don't want it to be the rest of us the other 11 people being left out of the loop too and I think we all would definitely like to have a say in some things and how it works and press releases if they have to be approved every press release approved by the commission itself.

>> Sue: That was the only thing in my contract so I guess I could post on social media every day and do a lot of other things that would not require express approval. So, you know again I think it's something we need to talk about.

>> Okay.

>> Steve: One other things as an aside to kind of keep in mind Sue and Rhonda and everybody else is if you are going to have a press release you will have some method by which to have what would most typically be called executive committee take a look

and approve it has to be in an open meeting so we are going to have to come up with something that is not as unwieldy but I think we need to get the communications and outreach director on board first before we have that discussion.

>> Sue: Yeah, that would be good.

>> Steve: Doug, you had something.

>> Doug: Kind of a knit would it benefit us to put the commissioner's names on the org chart and specify Steve as the chair and Brittini as the assistant chair?

>> Steve: It's fine with me, I'm not asking for it. I guess my opinion is that we are all equal. I just happen to be the guy with the baton in my hand leading you guys in some reasonable discussion so I'm not arguing for that at all, Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: This might be completely off topic too but something I thought about with the new year and I'm not trying to move away from the topic at hand, I'm just because of the topic at hand, back in September, October when we voted for chair and vice chair, we put an expiration date kind of of the 31st of December to see if we were going to continue on with that. So, should we not just for a matter of public thing get that on the calendar or on somewhere in there to see if we could continue on that way?

Yeah, the motion that was put out when we proved it do the chair and vice chair to the end of the year and see how it goes and revisit and reorganize and do whatever so should that be something we should look at too and have on the agenda in the future? I say that because there are a lot of papers being signed as far as chair, vice chair, this and then and if there is a change it could throw up a little bit of a whoo-ha.

>> Brittini: I have not got a chance to sign anything.

>> Sue: The motion I read was exactly six months from the date of selecting the chair. The chair and the structure would be reassessed. That date is March 18th. It's on my calendar.

>> Rhonda: I apologize.

>> Sue: That's okay there was lots of discussion.

>> Rhonda: Okay I apologize.

>> Sue: But it is on my calendar.

>> Steve: Doug was first.

>> Doug: I was going to bring up the same thing Sue brought up, so we are covered.

>> MC.

>> MC: The reason I would suggest we don't do or highlight two commissioners I like the public precision we are a commission and one united commission and that could be a benefit to and, yeah, that is why I would suggest not doing that.

>> Doug: Okay I just brought that up.

>> MC: I think what you do very well is also helping us delegate right and there is because there is accountability right, one commission it's hard to have accountability so I think that is the dance we are doing, and I think that is what Sue was talking about we

need to have a discussion, so I appreciate the thought. That is why I just wanted to share that piece.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> If you don't put my name and Brittini's name it makes it hard to find us and send nasty e-mails. The way you have it the general counsel reporting to you and us I would think the communications and outreach director would be coequal with you three I think the position is going to be extremely important especially when we get into communities of interest and outreach et cetera. And I don't know if it makes a difference quite frankly but MC.

>> MC: I'm thinking about what Rhonda said which is like how do the rest of us get involved and I think there is some in relationship to the organizational chart there are several of us I think who like being more involved and I'm asking myself should we try to have a like a personnel committee who doesn't make decisions but is there for advisory and not what Steve and Brittini are doing for the commission but being that again I'm making stuff up but feel in order to have a discussion and to get the rest of us involved and feel like, yeah, it feels like we need to do something that allows some formation and I don't know if it needs to be part of the organizational chart I'm not suggesting that. The idea subcommittees are the commission and open under open board committees act and not saying committees and deeper organizational chart we are still the commission but have more of us involved for those people who want to volunteer, those commissioners who want to volunteer to be that emergency response you know so you created an I'm thinking in my head how are we going to do that and it would be a shame if it was only Sue excuse me Brittini and Steve who are able to like we are only able to help you resolve that. If we had more people involved, I feel like I'm talking too much, and I see Dustin's hand up.

>> Dustin.

>> Dustin: That in my mind goes right in the field of you are overcomplicating things if we do that. When it comes to things where we would need volunteers to do something it's a question we can ask and people who want to volunteer they can choose to do so and do things within the subcommittee. There is no real reason to have another committee to assign committees. It does not really make much sense in my mind so I would not reinvent the wheel where it's not needed.

>> Steve: Once we get into probably February when it appears that and we will have plenty of work for everybody to do. And you may rue the day you brought that up, MC. No, I think as we get more people on board and going to expand, I'm sure we will hire more than three people because there is going to be a lot of work to do pretty soon. Any other discussion on organizational chart?

It's there as an example to look at and you know we will continue to deal with it as we go. I don't see it needs to be formalized Sue any way right at this stage of the game, do you?

>> Sue: It certainly doesn't have to be. I wanted a little bit of discussion where we are and how we can move forward, and do you want me to draw an arrow from Julie Ann from the commission and the communication person also is that what the will of the commission is?

>> Steve: That was kind of my thought and I don't know what everybody else is thinking does that sound like a good idea "Yes" or "No."

>> MC: I'm hesitant we are 13 people and if we want to act as a commission, we make votes and all stand behind votes. What I'm suggesting our staff I don't want them to get to potentially give mixed messages because we have a direct line to the person and the direct line to Julie Ann feels important because of the counsel and she may need to be here with us at these meetings but no I don't intend but feel like if I need something as a staff person I go to Sue if it's involved and if it's related to something Julie Ann might give. But what I'm suggesting is that direct line is only in relationship to for meetings for the future. If we go through the executive director there is a benefit that the staff receives, I know that sometimes yeah, we each have direct access to other people but it's through Sue because there is a buffer there and there is a wait and I want to acknowledge that but feels it may be important as we have a bigger staff and quick turn around and multiple voices in the staff's ear could be problematic.

>> Steve: Let me suggest that we take this on to the future meeting. Get the on board and give it some more thought. It's nothing we have to approve today. And quite frankly it's nothing you can't change down the line any way. Moving on did everyone guilty the SRI letter, have a chance to look at it?

Anybody have any thoughts about it?

>> Doug: We are talking about the mapping soft square.

>> Redistricting software training support independent citizens redistricting commission.

>> Doug: Here is my thoughts on it. Eventually we will go out with an RFP so we can evaluate other companies' proposals. If we move forward with this prior to the RFP and we are given advantage to a certain company. So that is something I think we need to run by our purchasing person. And I really think, and I don't really care what he says. I think it's something we should hold back on. And not that it would not benefit us but it's not fair to the others and I think we want to make an equal playing field for all those that have an interest in the contract. So that was my thoughts toward it that it's thanks but no thanks we will deal with it through the RFP.

>> Part of the RFP process and I don't know what the state's process is and Sue may want to jump on it and RFP would be vendors coming to us and presenting to us what they offer.

>> Right.

>> And what the price is and how they are going to do the work. And if we move forward with this, we are giving unfair advantage to somebody and really we are

opening the door for them to complain to the state and some potential legal action against the state in my mind.

>> Steve: Anthony did you have something?

>> Anthony: I took a look at it and completely agree with what Doug said. You know I'm glad they reached out to us and when it comes time to issue the RFP they may want to apply if they are watching this, I'm sure they are, when it comes time to put in the RFP, I hope they apply, and we can then evaluate them and everybody else who applies as well.

>> Steve: Well, they certainly were not the first before we ever had a meeting, I got one from somebody. Intriguing they reached out and said they are willing to come in and tell you what they got. You are right Doug others will be there too. We need to start looking at those places.

>> Doug: I'm sorry and Sue met with a purchasing agent I believe you talked to him and.

>> Sue: Yes, we met with them.

>> Doug: One of the things he is going to do take statement of work and what we are looking for and he is going to wrap all these terms and conditions around it, to protect the state. So, and it's maybe you can expand on that a little more Sue.

>> Sue: Your document ended up as a 44-page draft but what is important for us is to get the scope of work that we want very clear and very detailed so when we get exactly what we are asking for so that is our job is to make sure that we are asking for what we really need.

>> Doug: Correct and he wraps all the terms and conditions like how they get paid, what happens if they default, all that other legal garbage.

>> Steve: Rebecca said to make sure to put in there a clause if we get sued, they don't get paid.

All right, schedule and agenda for January meetings.

>> Doug: Steve can we back up for a second?

>> Steve: We sure can.

>> Doug: About the letter that came from this company. I think somebody should give them feedback in a letter or whatever and explain to them that thank them and explain to them we will deal with it through the RFP process.

>> Sue: Yes.

>> I will be happy to do that.

>> Just to have a closed loop on the whole conversation okay thanks.

>> Upcoming meetings on the 12th, 14th, 21st and the 28th and the 30th. Does everybody agree with that?

>> The 12th we are interviewing so that takes care of the 12th. The 14th, Sue, did you say we had something set on the 14th already?

>> Sue: I don't believe we do. But we are in conversations this week and next with several different groups, so we've got some people we are talking to about communities of interest. We want to talk a lot about the mapping software and what the specifications are that we are going to need for that to think about also budget we don't have adopted budget for the commission and probably want to look at that and I reached out to the appropriate people and DTMB and I asked for a comprehensive report so I can wrap around what is being spent and what needs to be spent and again our budget is much less than was planned when the Constitution was planned and we have to seek from the legislature or outside sources so we need to get the RFPs out figure out what the consultants will cost and it will be a big part of the cost and go forward from there.

>> Have you thought about what kind of staff we will need?

>> Steve: I have not, and I have to look at what we have spent and what we are spending and what are our fixed costs, and the estimates are pretty high. And I don't know for some of the consultants they are pretty big expenses.

>> Steve: They do it once every ten years so.

>> Sue: Right.

>> Steve: What about going further ahead 21, 28 and 30 same thing we are looking at filling those in or do we have specifics right now?

>> Sue: On the 21st I believe Rob Serber is going to come back and talk to us about mapping and mapping software and specifications and.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Sue: In that regard. So, I think he is on board for that. And again, we really need to look at some strategic planning or at least a calendar planning of what needs to be done by when so we can meet all these deadlines that are ahead of us. They are going to come pretty quickly.

>> Steve: Probably would be a good idea if you are going to sit down to do that to ship a calendar out to everybody, a master calendar.

>> Sue: Uh-huh.

>> Steve: With those specific dates. I mean we know November 1st is there but obviously you got to back down before then.

>> Sue: Yeah, back to September 17th for that 45-day period so, yeah, it will be here before we know it.

>> Doug: I think in one of the meetings in January we want to address the RFPs.

>> Sue: Uh-huh.

>> Doug: My suggestion on that I think as I recall I had put together a draft of three separate ones and we may need a fourth or a fifth. I'm not sure. But I would suggest that maybe we deal with committees for each one of them. And then the committees can define the statement of work and bring it back to the commission. That's the conversation I'd like to have in one of the meetings. If that is the approach we want to take.

>> Steve: We can do that Sue will put that on agenda item for us.

>> Doug: I think the sooner the better on this.

>> Sue: Yes.

>> Doug: The whole RFP process is very time consuming.

>> Steve: The other thing that is going to sneak up on us in a hurry is these community meetings all over the state and I think I mean I guess it's my opinion and maybe I don't know the Mike is back or not, but I think those are -- we are going to have to figure out how to do those in person somehow. So.

>> Doug: Yeah.

>> Steve: I mean I can't see us reasonably saying I'm just picking Hamtramck because everyone picks on Hamtramck, we will do Hamtramck by Zoom. Cynthia had her hand up.

>> And MC.

>> Cynthia: I would be interested to know as things stand right now how long are we approved or mandated to have Zoom meetings?

Have our meetings virtually?

When does that end as of right now?

>> Steve: I thought it was through March.

>> Sue: Through March.

>> Steve: Through March.

>> Sally: Everyone sorry I wanted to quick jump in on that I looked it up just to verify. And Mike just texted he is back by the way. And but it is it's March 30th.

>> Steve: I thought I was right on that. Thank you for agreeing, Mike. MC and Anthony. I picked Anthony and MC you talked a lot today so Anthony.

>> Anthony: I agree we definitely need to start thinking about like what those meetings are going to look like. Hopefully things get better in the next couple months but in case they don't, it's something we should start thinking about. The Constitution does say we have to have those meetings and I'm not sure if doing them over Zoom count as having them across the state in communities of interest. So that is something to look at and to help us and MC mentioned this earlier we did get that correspondence from Thomas Evako of close up. I had a really good detailed 25-page report attached to it that goes over you know some stuff about communities of interest that I recommend each one of us reads. They are having a webinar about it on January 27th. I believe that is being rescheduled. So, I don't know if we want him back in again in January or perhaps February, but we should at least read that report that was attached to it.

>> Steve: Sally.

>> Sally: Just quickly on that point Anthony, I reached out to see what the format of the webinar is because as you all know you have strict guidelines around what kind of things you can actually attend, if it's an educational thing you are just watching that is kind of a different story. And so, he did describe it will likely be a webinar where

members of the public can just watch. I think some people can participate you know by submitting questions in writing, but you know I'm sure Julie Ann will have more to say on this, but I think that is the kind of thing you probably would be able to still watch and do because you know you can do whatever you would like on your own time as long as you are not discussing.

And then also the point you raise you know he mentioned that it would be pushed back until February and you know they are hoping there will be more information by February, and I think other organizations as well on how you all will want to collect communities of interest and other idea, you know and other submissions from the public. So that they can help inform the public further so I think it sort of underscores that State of Michigan is certainly watching all of you and excited to hear how they can participate. So, it's really exciting but I just wanted to affirm yes, it is delayed and it's likely something you will all be able to watch.

>> Steve: Anthony did we get a copy of the 25-page report you're talking about or is it available somewhere?

>> Anthony: In his correspondence he has a PDF and has a hyperlink inside the PDF that links to the full report.

>> Steve: Can you send that to me the hyperlink?

>> Sally: I would also note I believe that same report as well as other reports were included in your binder of materials that same link back in September, so it should be the same. But I'm, you know, just wanted to note for all of you guys. If you have read that, you have read it.

>> Steve: Okay MC?

>> MC: I wanted to acknowledge Sarah Reinhardt she posted in the close-up report that Anthony mentioned, and everything has been said that I wanted to say so thank you all.

>> Steve: Mike Brady there you are. Question.

>> Can Mike: Good afternoon.

>> Steve: What are we under the same restrictions having these community meetings as having our commission meetings?

And the reason I ask that we don't have in-person meetings in the community until after the end of March, we are going to have a big problem.

>> Mike: Good afternoon happy new year. I appreciate the question. I believe there are 15 meetings that are referenced, I think ten of them are referenced section eight and the language there again just to you know ground ourselves in the constitutional language and as a refresher for folks watching at home, other than all of us watching at home so it says before commissioners draft a plan commission shall hold at least ten public hearings throughout the state for purpose of informing the public about the redistricting process so certainly a lot of very good reasons why having some of you

have spoken about already the value of having meetings that are actually out in person in the public to expand who is able to access the meeting and what not.

And I think Anthony noted regardless of whether you had a meeting in person or whether you are, you know, whether you are doing it virtually there is an obligation in the Constitution to record in a broadcast the meeting you have. So, if there was no COVID and you were definitely if we were in person today there is no COVID in an alternative world and then you know you are planning your ten meetings before coming up, with a map and a plan, those would all have to have cameras there. That is something the department of state says before and I'm sure we would be able to assist with that again and it would have to be broadcast because that is a specific requirement in the Constitution. So, I say that to say no matter what you have to broadcast. You have to have a virtual and option for people to engage but an option for people to observe and to take in what you are doing at those meetings. So that is first and foremost right there in the Constitution.

This other question in terms of are we allowed to have a meeting that is in person, yes, you can. Even right now if you wanted to. The law that was enacted by the legislature and signed by the Governor gives public bodies and this is again in the open meetings act gives public bodies the choice, the ability to have an open meeting and consistent with the open meetings acts requirements virtually. It does not mandate that people do it virtually. I think most public bodies are for obvious reasons but it's not a mandate, it's a choice. That under the current legislation which again is the second time this has been you know put out there, that goes until March 30th as Steve has already noted.

Might it be extended again? It might be. It might not be. I have no idea. And I think you know it's a good idea for this commission to be mindful and to be ready for whatever might happen. Whether it is extended again or whether it's not extended again. So, if I think I'm looking at again section 8 and the question of 10 public hearings. And so, it may be a question of what is a public hearing and in the time of COVID, right now, you know, is it a public hearing I don't know. I certainly appreciate and I have already reached out to Julie Ann and we are connecting next week to talk about this and so many other things and I know Sue has been this contact with Julie Ann as well and ultimately there will be some questions there I'm reluctant to kind of shoot from the hip on right now and say to one of the questions that was put to me whether or not a virtual meeting could satisfy the requirement to have ten public hearings throughout the state for the purpose of informing the public about et cetera, et cetera. I don't think we have to answer that question today. I'm not going to answer the question today. I'm actually your lawyer. But I have thoughts on it. I think you know at the very least to be say you are right to be thinking about that, you are right to be planning for it either way and that is to say even if the law the open meetings act law has changed to allow you to continue to meet virtually some of you I have already

heard you kind of offer that there are other rationale for why you might want to meet in person and then stream it and broadcast it virtually as required by the Constitution.

If you're not allowed to and I will simplify that the open meetings act requirement because you have two layers the open meetings act the other being the Constitution. There a lot going on there. I hope it's helpful Rhonda I'm looking at you to see if that makes sense and you know other folks if people have questions and sorry it's not super straight forward but maybe you are not surprised because once again this as being a commission a lot of the stuff is not super straight forward.

>> Steve: I guess I think it's straightforward. If we decide we want to have a person in an open meeting, we can do that. The question then becomes of the.

>> Mike: That is correct.

>> Steve: Of us, the commission, I guess the question is how comfortable are each individual participating in an open meeting. We did have one open meeting and it was spread out and it worked fine. So, I think that is something that we should -- that I would like everybody to think about and we will discuss it further in the next one or two meetings. Number one. And number two, my next question to Mike is I don't think the whole commission I don't read in the amendment that the whole commission has to be at that community meeting. Now maybe I should ask Julie Ann that if she is listening. Julie Ann there is your first question after you sign your contract.

>> Mike: I'm sure she is watching right now. Hello Julie Ann. And certainly, will have opinions about this. For whatever it's worth what I'm looking at when it says the commission shall hold at least ten public hearings and then I don't know. That strikes me as at least at this moment and again I appreciate her wise legal counsel and we will get other perspectives as well the idea of splicing a public hearing from the commission of the other definition of a public meeting for the commission and demands for quorum, you are absolutely right it does not need to be 13 it never needs to be all 13 but the idea of one or two or a sub quorum number can go out and hear from the community but who is hearing from the community not the commission. The commission doesn't exist until there are nine of you present so I think that is I think it's a step too far but again I'm not your lawyer and Julie Ann will certainly is watching this and will have an opportunity to weigh in and provide you this on legal counsel that you deserve.

Steve to your question and to clarify if you want to have a meeting in person, the law allows you to do that. And if you can get your quorum there then I think that is direct. What I think is less direct is if you don't want to have a meeting in person you want to do it virtually then depending on whether it's happening before March 30th or after March 30th, I think that is a little less direct and that would be a distinct question you can put to Julie Ann if this commission ultimately decides to attempt and satisfy these ten hearings on these ten public hearings in a virtual way.

>> Steve: I don't think we have to have a quorum at the ten meetings because I don't anticipate that we are making decisions at those meetings where we are hearing from the community to determine what potential communities of interest there are out there.

>> Mike: The idea of whether making decisions or deliberating which includes discussion, that would be something that is an obligation under the open meetings act. The reference for the ten public hearings is something that exists in the Constitution. And the definition of quorum for this commission being nine and then being made up of a certain way that's defined in the Constitution not in the open meetings act so again not going to shoot from the hip. Not your lawyer. Appreciate the question. We will definitely add it to the list of things I will be going over with Julie Ann and I think these are all good questions for you to be raising. But I do think separately the idea that some sub quorum group, I'm just speaking I suppose if it's possible, you know, as a citizen, that I can show up at the one in my neighborhood and talk about my community of interest and that you know only three of you are going to be there.

>> Yeah, definitely.

>> Mike: I don't know if that is the intent of the voters but a perspective.

>> Steve: On the flip side the side A of that or side B of that record is we can do more -- we can accomplish more meetings with fewer people out and about.

>> Mike: Ten has always been a minimum not a max ten is a floor and not a ceiling and frankly as big as the state is you should aim for more than ten any way because we are Michigan. You know we all deserve that and that is a good thing. Perhaps saying too much.

>> Steve: There is yeah Michigan is a big state and iron mountain is a hell of a long way away. At any rate think it over. And I'm sure our general counsel once she signs her contact will have an enlighten on this very interesting question.

>> Mike: No doubt.

>> Steve: Okay, any other -- we are at the end of the.

>> Brittini: I have something, but Sally has a hand up.

>> Steve: Sure.

>> Sally: I was just going to mention on that last point I think if you all might enjoy looking at how the California commission back in 2011 handled some of these things. They had I think some 30 something if you all recall when they talked about meetings and some were attending other meetings in pairs that were politically balanced. So, they could reach even more than what their minimum was and so Steve to your point maybe that is the way to think about it as well as how to go even you know far beyond with the capacity that you all have.

>> Steve: The other thing that they had is they were able to have subcommittees less than quorums and they didn't make decisions. They were a little looser than what we are able to be. But Brittini did you have something?

>> Brittini: Yeah, it's not related to the discussion, it's kind of like a final, a final thought, I was just thinking of our discussions when it comes to hiring and conflict of interest, so I honestly wanted to pose it to Mike or Sally and maybe create a moment next meeting to figure out who fact checks in terms of what is constituted as a conflict of interest. And who is in charge of like our ethical, our ethics. Because it's not outlined in the Constitution. And it has come up. And I think as we move forward that is something that we need to be clear on. And if we decide to move in any direction that is fine, but I would like there to be a clear understanding so that we don't have to have these polite and professional tips and we can hire people in the vein they should be. That is my thought. And I don't know if Mike or Sally you have anything to say. I know folks probably want to take advantage of us being done before 4:00 and I know this is not a conversation that can take place in the remaining time, but I do think it's worth the discussion.

>> Steve: We got time if you want to discuss it right now, we are open for it.

>> Brittini: I don't have the answer. It would have to come from like a Julie Ann or Mike Brady or Sally Marsh who works so hard for us already.

>> Steve: Sally.

>> Sally: Hi everyone. Yeah, absolutely happy to touch on some of those questions. Now, I'm sure also Sue has thoughts on that. But you know I think what Mike and I could certainly do is provide, you know, provide perspective on how issues of sort of personal versus private lives and conflict of interests are handled throughout state Government since I know all of you are in some capacity new to this kind of world so we can provide perspective on that and kind of how the ethical guidelines are treated in other departments, other areas of the Government. And you know also you know offer our opinion. I'm sure also Sue and Julie Ann have thoughts along these lines as well in terms of how you can be objective in what you all are thinking of. I also mention that you all did vote on a code of conduct as well. So, would be happy to talk about all of these things, you know, especially at the next meeting but certainly today too. You know we are happy to talk about it. And provide our thoughts and opinion.

>> Steve: I will say that Brittini, that without having a formalized plan of looking at social media, looking at donation records et cetera, I think the commission has done a pretty good job. I mean people have taken the roll on, Rhonda would be the chairperson of that subcommittee. That we've gotten this worked out somewhat. I understand, you know, a desire to maybe formalize it, but also consider that we probably just on the verge of making the three major hires that we are going to do, and the rest are going to come below that probably won't be as controversial as these three. So, I would think that in the future maybe that will be a lesson of interest than they have been for these three hires which are obviously the major players that we are going to be dealing with and the public is going to be dealing with.

>> Brittini: Yeah, that is why it's important to me. You know, it's an elephant in the room. We had two folks that had a close tie to how the commission was formed. So, my question specifically is: Is that okay?

And I want an answer from -- I want an informed answer. So, Mike, Sally you have some guidance on that, that would be great. Is it you know, do you all typically hire folks that are closely tied to the way departments are formed?

Run?

Designed?

Et cetera?

Because I think that is something, I could be on an island by myself and that is fine, I'm brave. I think that is something we need to think closely about rather than continue to offer spaces for folks that could specifically and more poignantly be eliminated right off the bat because it's a conflict of interest.

>> Steve: I think that is a reasonable question. So, when whoever is sending that contract to Julie Ann include that question with it. Anything else?

I don't have anything more. Dustin.

>> Dustin: I have a quick question. I keep getting text messages from Kelly services saying that we are eligible for benefits. So, this is a question on if it's going to incur any other costs to us because of my understanding was we didn't have benefits.

>> Steve: Julie Ann is shaking her head vigorously and not in an up and down motion.

>> Sue: We do not have benefits, none of us have benefits. They are being cents out in error, and they apologized but I don't know. There is something automatic in the system that keeps generating those. So, no, no employees or commissioners are eligible for benefits from Kelly services. Also, I wanted to mention on Julie Ann you know she was part of the ethics commission from the city of Detroit so I'm sure she has some good resources there.

>> Brittini: Okay thank you.

>> I was looking forward to some whole life insurance. Oh, well.

>> You get to do three things you get to send in your hour every week, you get to get your check every week and you get to send in an expense report every now and then. That's it. Rebecca you were waving your hand there for a second.

>> Rebecca: I reached out to them because I specifically asked that question do, we have benefits because I wanted to know if we had 401(k) options available and I was told no and the next day I was getting e-mails about benefits and they just told me no what is this.

>> Steve: Once they sign you up the computer is going to send you everything they got. Easy as that. Doesn't mean you can't put them in your IRA. Anything else? Yeah Anthony.

>> Anthony: So, I have a little something. You know, we all -- and I don't mean this to be -- I don't want this to be a political, if you will, speech, you all know I'm one of the independents on this commission, but I couldn't help but think about, you know, all 13 of you yesterday while I was watching the news. Pretty much all day. And you know, I was saddened by what happened yesterday in our country. And I think it really kind of hit home for the type of work that we are doing. And I hope the people of Michigan know that, and I think I speak for all 13 of us and Sue when I say this, we are all working to make sure this is a free and fair process you know so that our state can continue to have free and fair elections. And, yeah, yesterday just hit me kind of hard so I want you all to know I was thinking about you yesterday.

>> Brittini: Same Anthony and why my brain is turning what is right and how are we being representative, how are we being fair.

>> Steve: Fortunately for us there is a couple things. Number one, everything we do is broadcast on YouTube. Put in the archives and transcripts are made. And, secondly, we are not using voting machines. Sometimes you catch a break, do you know what? This is called community building here, folks. Anybody else?

Erin, you have been quiet.

>> Erin.

>> Steve: What do you got for us?

>> Erin: Nothing to say.

>> Juanita, we have not heard from you today. You are muted.

>> Brittini: To say something Rebecca has her hand raised after Juanita speaks.

>> Juanita: I'm saying I'm taking it all in and that is all. Just taking it in and listening so I can kind of captivate everything everyone is saying.

>> Steve: Brittini who did you say.

>> Rebecca and then Doug.

>> Rebecca: Reflecting on yesterday this is something my husband who is very much a private person and in some ways is not thrilled I'm on the commission because of that you know we've had a lot of discussions about this and I think even if we are fair and transparent the unfortunate reality being in a very public position means that we will be potentially subject to criticism and possibly protests and possibly whatever that might be and so I just think that for us as a family that is something we have thought about carefully. And have taken additional precautions to make sure that we are safe in the event something does go wrong because you can behave in a completely up right and fair manner and still have someone think you have done something wrong and show up at your front porch screaming at your kids while you are in a committee meeting so I think it's something to be mindful of and we are unfortunately in a very divided political time and I think that is very unfortunate and you know it's just something that weighs heavily on my mind.

>> Steve: Thank you. I think it probably weighs on everybody's mind especially after yesterday. Janis what do you have for us?

>> Don't forget about Doug, Steve.

>> Janis: I'm good and really don't have anything to say right now like Juanita I've just been listening and trying to process everything, so I got nothing.

>> Steve: What did you say Brittini MC?

>> No, Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, I just wanted to complement or little group that did the hiring for the general counsel. I think they did a very good job. And I think it's representative of the work that we do as a group so thank you very much.

>> Brittini: Thank you I agree.

>> Steve: I agree with the people that have worked on these subcommittees have done. You men and person and service. Who have I missed? Richard, we have not heard, and you are here with all your splendor and glory on TV.

>> I'm sitting back and listening and trying to take it all in also. I threatened it with a hammer, and it let me on finally.

>> You will get one of the first computers to take care of that.

>> It would not let me sign on. I don't think it is the computer and it must be the link I'm not sure.

>> Steve: You heard the talk about the password. They probably kicked your password off.

>> Richard: I played around and did a couple different things, and it came on and Sarah had talked to me about it and said it had to do with sometimes you just got to let it work and then it will you know log on and I just let it sit there and finally it did so.

>> Steve: I do a lot of Zoom meetings not just with this group, I do a lot of other Zoom meetings and sometimes you got to let it do its thing for a while.

>> Okay.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Two or three times.

>> Rhonda: You just made me think since Sally said they thinks they can get ten computers right away and obviously Sue and Julie Ann would need one can we just maybe pick out the other commissioners that might need one right away?

Like you said Richard and I know Juanita has had issues with her computer a lot too and kind of get that list to them so they know once those come in here, they go to because I will wait on mine, I have no problem waiting on mine.

>> Steve: We can work on doing that. Yeah, I mean that was three are going out right away obviously so to the executive director, the attorney and the communications person they will get them.

>> Rhonda: Since we have an hour left of time can we pick out some commissioners that need them more than others, so Sally has a list of top priorities maybe?

>> Steve: Sue would do the list now.

>> Rhonda: Sue yes, I'm sorry.

>> Steve: Certainly, Richard would be one.

>> Juanita.

>> Steve: Juanita you had issues with your computer.

>> All the time.

>> Steve: So, Juanita would be one. Who else wants one?

>> Dustin.

>> Steve: Dustin, okay, that is three.

>> I'll put my hat in the ring. I can wait but I need to separate. I need to separate things that are going on for my sanity.

>> Steve: Is this your home or your background Brittini?

>> Brittini: This is my home today.

>> Looks nice.

>> Snazzy thank you.

>> Steve: So that is four and 7 we got three left who wants one?

Rebecca?

Two left.

>> Janis.

>> Steve: One left. Come on, speak up.

>> Cynthia: Well, I will take one if there is an extra but I'm not in a hurry.

>> Steve: We will see and maybe some will crash before we get them, we have one spare we will deal with when we get them. Hopefully we will get them all at the same time. Who knows? Mine seems to be working fine and like I said I use them on all kinds of other things so. All right, anything else?

I say we like everybody else you couldn't help but watch what was going on yesterday in Washington. And since that was all that was on TV. Unless you went to Roku. And it's some of the I guess my comments are somewhat on some of the comments you heard was how could these people get through and where were the police and nobody expected this and I'm sitting there thinking you didn't expect this?

You have thousands of people coming into D.C. for the expressed purpose of objecting to the count and you didn't expect there to be trouble and you don't have enough security there?

Some heads are going to roll. You watch. Some heads are going to roll from security.

>> Rebecca: It's unfortunate for those police officers who were there who were very much not having adequate resources to defend themselves. And had to retreat. And they should have. So that they would not have been more badly injured. It was a very unfortunate position for them to be put in. They never should have been put in that position in the first place, they should have had more people there to help.

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

>> This girl that got shot 14-year Air Force veteran by a capitol police officer that is so tragic on so many levels because she is, well, fortunately and unfortunately, she is the only one that got shot and then you got how many hundreds of people storming the capitol anyway. You know, that just makes no sense to me. But then there is a lot of things that don't make sense to me.

>> Rebecca: It certainly does not accomplish anything because at the end of the day they didn't really stop anything so it's just unfortunate.

>> Steve: Are we done?

>> I think so.

>> Steve: Motion.

>> Brittini: So moved.

>> Motion to adjourn.

>> Seconded by.

>> Juanita: I second.

>> All in favor shut your computers off and we will see you on the 12th. It's been wonderful people. Thank you. Thank you, staff. Have a good afternoon.

[Meeting concludes]