

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

MICRC

06/30/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Good morning. As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:00 a.m.

This meeting is being live streamed at 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 the link for viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Bengali and Arabic translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. E-mail us at Redistricting@Michigan.Gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at Michigan.gov.

For purpose us of the public record, this meeting is also being transcribed, and those transcriptions will be made available and posted at Michigan.gov/MICRC along with the written public comment submissions. This meeting is being transcribed and posted on Michigan.gov and MICRC along with written public submissions.

There is a comment portal that may be accessed by visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC the portal can be utilized to post maps and comments which can be viewed by Both the Commission and the public.

Members of the media who may have additional questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, our Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission. He can be reached and WoodsE3@Michigan.gov.

For the purpose of the public watching and the public record, I will now turn the Michigan Department state Staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good morning, Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name and please state the location you are attending the meeting remotely from by stating county, city, township, or village where you are attending the meeting remotely. I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present and I am attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present and I'm attending the meeting remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid? Brittini Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present and I'm attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present and attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present and attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present; attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present; attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present and I am attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissions are present and there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much, Sarah.

For the public watching you can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. And, speaking of the agenda, I would entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: So moved.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner MC Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Second made by Commissioner Dustin Witjes. And we are back to the squares so I can see folks. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

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.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

Motion carries.

Looking at item four on our agenda, review and approval of minutes, there are no minutes to approve at this time, so we are going to jump down to public comments correspondence and remarks.

Michigan Department of State staff, do we have any public comment for today?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We do we have three remote public comments and all three are present.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: All three are present.

So, without objection, we will now begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics only portion of our meeting.

Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with public comment pertaining to agenda topics.

A few reminders. Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide in-person public commentary to the Commission, in this case it's virtual, we will now be allowed to do so.

You will...Michigan Department of State staff will announce you and you will be unmuted, give a few moments for staff to unmute you.

If we don't hear from you, we will move onto the next person, but we will make sure we come back to you when everyone is done.

If you are still having issues, please do e-mail us at redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you troubleshoot so that you can participate during the next public comment period or at a later hearing or date and you will have two minutes to address the Commission.

And star six is how you unmute.

I'm now handing the floor over to Michigan Department of State staff.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Madam Chair. First up to provide public comment is Mr. James Gallant. Please give me a minute to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me, Madam Chair? Hello.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes, I can hear you.

>> Okay. My name is James Gallant with the Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. And I signed up for two public comments today. And I missed the after party in Muskegon last night after the Commission meeting.

You know, to continue our conversation, I hope you people are, you know, keeping track of here and somebody is writing this down. The biggest problem we have with this Commission you folks appear to be what you perceive to be making decisions over top of the table.

The old wink and the nod so to speak.

You know, and you have no immediate pending question with a motion second pending, and you're just moving on.

My best example of this is Mr. Brace created and submitted maps to you on the record across several meetings, during the action item on the agenda when there was no motion second pending. I'm assuming you are just going to keep doing it again today. And you are going to blow through it and laugh it off, whatever, except for this is how we document where you have been and where your discussion was and how you even got the maps to begin with.

It's like long division. You can have the right answer and maps to comply with the laws, but how you got there, if you can't show that, you fail the test with long division.

My other example is the Commission, your colleague Commissioner Lange clearly injected in the meeting and said hey, hey, hey, hey, why are we not talking about process here? How do we get off track here? And that should have been handled as a point of order, point of order. Why are we on this, talk about something else. Well, the reason is, of course, because there was no motion and second pending, okay? So then all of a sudden someone else is, we know who you are, there is two or three of them keep injecting, I have a little thing I've been working on and get that approved. And that was not the intention at all in the first place to have that discussion.

This happens all the time.

This is that facilitated dialog process. And please, the trainings, the written trainings I submitted at a public hearing is what I'm talking about. Let's talk about exactly how this works and this is how you are doing it and not compatible with the Constitution of the state.

And I believe that we will see this happen again.

It's going to happen over and over. You have Mr. Brace there again today and you will keep doing this.

And your lawyers, I think it was inappropriate for the one lawyer, the racial voting lawyer, all the sudden how we do it in another country. Well, they should not be thinking how they do it in another country. You should not even have that in your mind now. We do it here. It's not compatible with the constitution, remember, motion, second vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Gallant, your time has expired.

>> Then you would be able to fix this maybe, and I got two public comments coming.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Gallant, your two minutes has ended.

>> Thank you again.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our next public comment participant is Susan Smith.

Please allow us one moment to unmute you.

>> Hi, Susan, welcome. You may address the Commission.

>> Thank you.

Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Susan Smith, Vice President for advocacy for the League of Women Voters of Michigan.

Thank you for this opportunity to address you this morning.

I have watched most of your meetings and public hearings since last September.

This past Friday and Monday I observed meetings of the redistricting process subcommittee.

The committee discussed a number of issues, one of which was whether to start from scratch when drawing the new maps or to start with the current District maps and adjust them.

As you may know, in 2017 the League of Women Voters of Michigan was the lead Plaintiff in a lawsuit against the Secretary of State, claiming that 34 Congressional and legislative District maps were unconstitutional because of partisan gerrymandering. Expert witnesses used three methods to measure the partisan fairness of those 34 districts.

All 34 District maps pardon me failed, all three partisan fairness measures.

The case was tried in the eastern District Federal Court before a three-Judge panel. All three judges agreed that indeed the 34 maps were unconstitutional because they were the result of partisan gerrymandering.

This is a great concern to the League of Women Voters of Michigan that the MICRC would consider starting with gerrymandered maps.

We urge you to start from scratch when drawing the new maps for the U.S. Congress, the Michigan Senate, and the Michigan house.

Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our next public comment participant is Mark Payne. Please allow us a moment to unmute you, Payne.

>> Good morning, Commission.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Good morning.

>> My name is Mark Payne I'm the democracy coordinator for the Michigan league conservation of voters education fund. I would like to extend thanks to the Commission as a whole for providing the public with a transparent process thus far examples are sharing every detail of the selection process and contracts.

Also applications and hiring process and other things.

I will also especially like to thank Commissioner Witjes and Edward Woods for supporting our virtual event in May for critical insights to the members and public.

As we know it is critically important members of the public are engaged in this process and encouraged to get involved.

As the process moves forward, we ask the Commission to continue this transparency particularly when it comes to the details of mapping.

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.

A transparent approach to mapping will ensure and maintain continued public trust in the process that the Commission has taken every E effort to build over the last many months of hard work.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much for addressing the Commission.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That concludes public comment.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sarah. And thank you to everyone who gave their time today, this morning to provide commentary to the Commission.

At this time if there are no objections, we will move to unfinished business; but we don't have any unfinished business this morning.

So we will move to Item 7 on the agenda, new business.

And if there are no objections, I would like to ask Commissioner Witjes, the Chair of the redistricting process committee, to give us their or give us the committee's presentation or start that discussion.

Hearing no objection, Commissioner Witjes, you can begin your presentation.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning, my esteemed colleagues.

Okay, so as you folks are aware, on last Friday in Warren and then Monday of this week Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Eid and Lange and myself along with Election Data Services Bruce Adelson, we met to go over and obtain recommendations for the full Commission on how we are going to be handling the process of working with all of our vendors.

The way that we went about doing this was we had a bunch of questions compiled by I believe the entire Commission that was sent over to director Hammersmith.

And we were able to split those up for different processes.

I'm pulling that up now.

Direct questions for Election Data Services, direct questions regarding mapping which were probably the more important ones.

And then we had direct questions for our VRA legal counsel as well.

On Friday the only -- we did not have Bruce unfortunately we had Election Data Services and tried to hash out the questions for Election Data Services at that particular point in time and on Monday we had everybody here so we were able to go over those questions again in a much quicker fashion as well as ask direct questions in regards to Bruce processes with working with VRA, with our VRA legal process and how to get questions over to him as well.

The main goal was to come up with a couple of recommendations that we can all discuss.

At this particular point in time, I believe we came up with I think five or six different recommendations at this particular point.

I'm looking at the sheet correct.

Which we will go over one by one and then of course have the full committee discussion on it or Commission discussion on it.

One item that was brought up at one particular point is how we are going to handle communities of interest.

We felt that since it's so important on our list of things that we need to discuss that is something that we wanted all 13 people here for to do.

We did not want to come up with a recommendation on our own in regards to that.

So we have recommendations with from how to start.

We are going to start with JURGs geographic regions, our criteria.

What map are we going to draw first? Are we going to handle nesting? We also have questions directly from our VRA, which is just like any documentation that they would need, any documentation that EDS would need.

Continuing education that potentially will be needed.

Any timelines, how we get information to and from our vendors.

So and on so forth.

Lastly, we also developed Commissioner Clark developed I should say and we reviewed a flow chart for the repetitive process on how to go about our job with Districting in the future so that we have a clear way of starting at one particular point utilizing checks and balances, testing those items that we are drawing, utilizing more checks and balances and rinse and repeat over and over and over again until we have a map completed.

And that will be the last thing that we go over at this particular point in time because that is going to be something that he is going to go over.

The way I envision this happening is we are going to have we are going to go over our recommendations one by one.

I'll be kind of sort of, I guess, mini Chairing this particular piece in time and handling questions and answers.

Please feel free to interject whenever you can or whenever you want but I will have Commissioners Clark, Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Lange go over the actual recommendations as well.

And I'll facilitate the questions and answers and so on and so forth to get the process started.

So I wanted to go over what it is that we talked about, how we talked about it, asked the question, got input from our experts and our vendors.

And then came up with motions to come up with recommendations to bring to the full Commission which is why we are here today.

So with that being said I see that Commissioner Eid did get into the meeting so I'm going to have him start and he will go over the very first recommendation that we have for the Commission, which is in regarding to how and where we are starting.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The Commissioner Eid when you start can you just for the record announce where you are since we didn't get to hear that during roll call?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Good morning everyone excuse the technical difficulties took me a second to get the Wi-Fi working I'm virtually attending from Muskegon, Michigan today.

And I think I arrived at about 9:06 p.m.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: You did, yep.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so thank you Dustin.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

So the first you know, point of decision that this subcommittee came up with is whether to start from scratch or use existing maps and the decision, recommendation from the subcommittee is that we start the maps from scratch.

However, we also have a second map that is to be used just for comparison reasons. The reasoning behind this is I mean I think we all know why we want to start from scratch.

I think, you know, it's what we have heard numerous times.

In my opinion it also goes with the, you know, what was meant to happen when this Commission was created.

As far as the comparison map, the reasoning behind that was to see how the current maps will be effected by the changes in population, the changes of people moving in the past ten years to be used as a reference.

So that's the recommendation.

That all maps be started from scratch.

However, we look at the existing maps adjusted for the new census data as a comparison to them.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you much.

Rhonda put her hand up first and then Doug you can go after Rhonda.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I had something prepared for you guys for this particular recommendation, if you guys watched the meeting you know that I did not agree with this recommendation.

I'm not going to read you what I have prepared instead I'm going to talk from the heart because this one has bothered me.

I feel our job as Commissioners are to listen to everybody.

Not just organizations that are unified and grouped but even the loneliest person that took the time to give us public comment.

And I am so against not having more options.

Our Constitution does not say that we have to start from scratch.

Our Constitution does not say that we can only have one set of maps.

I am trying to be fair to everybody and put my own thoughts and feelings aside.

And I feel like the best way to be fair is compromise.

I mentioned that in our last meeting.

I see no harm in this Commission working together to do two sets of maps.

One starting from a blank slate and one starting with the current lines.

I think the miss conception is that starting with the current lines is going to make them the way that they currently are.

And I would say that is so wrong because with all of the public input we've had about communities of interest, those lines would change, they are not going to be the same but yet we've had comments where those some of the areas work for them.

They work together as communities.

So I don't see what the harm in if we are really being fair to everybody in Michigan doing two sets and putting them online for everybody to give their input on.

Who knows maybe people will change their opinion from one side to the other.

Maybe some that wanted all new maps may say hey the ones with the old lines actually look better.

We don't know.

But I think they should be given that option.

And one last thing just so you know I will be bringing this as a motion when the time comes.

But the Constitution also says that we as Commissioners have the right to draw our own maps.

And if it comes down to it, that's what I'm prepared to do.

But I would rather it be unified front and us doing it together as a team.

So I just wanted to put that out there because when I feel strongly about something you know I'm going to express myself.

So thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, we will go next with Doug and then Rebecca you are after Doug.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, just a couple comments quickly.

One relates back to our public comment from Susan.

One of the reasons we discussed this subject was because we had public comment from different individuals across the state.

Some saying start from scratch which I think the majority of them did.

But we also had some saying use the existing maps.

So we wanted to be fair to all.

And so we had that discussion.

And the recommendation we had is the one that Dustin presented a few minutes ago.

The second part of that recommendation that we are bringing forward dealing with comparing existing maps to the new maps that we start from scratch, we had that discussion and I believe one of the vendors, I don't remember if it was Kim or Bruce, indicated that it would be more efficient to do it that way.

Then we could get some good data from doing that type of comparison rather than doing maps a second set of maps from scratch.

And my third point will be going back to what Rhonda just said.

If we had the time, I would fully support what Rhonda says but I don't believe we have the time to do two full sets of maps and that we should concentrate on the maps from scratch and that we should use the vendors' recommendation of using the existing maps for comparison purposes.

From an efficiency standpoint so those are my comments and I yield back.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Rebecca and then Erin I do see your hand.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I was just going to say that I haven't heard a single comment from anyone in Southeast Michigan who thinks that the maps should be...have anything done other than be thrown in the toilet and set on fire so the problem I think is that down in Southeast Michigan the maps are so gerrymandered and I'm in one of those districts.

My community is in that snail shell that people were talking about in the meet, where it comes up and wraps around Rochester Hills and comes back in and does this curlicue there is no realistic way to tweak that map and make it comply with our obligations so I think especially down in Southeast Michigan with districts where you have in Detroit a District wrapping around and going up to Pontiac you can't tweak the maps up in the area where Rhonda is talking about where she is in Reed City then those District we might be able to tweak, that might be able to work but I think the solution there isn't to have two separate sets of maps, I think the solution is to start from scratch, reference back to the old maps and suggested by Commissioner Clark look at the districts that are there now because we did get people up in Midland hey I like my District, keep it the way it is.

There is no reason why we are not ignoring that commentary and certainly in those areas where maps are working for people, we will incorporate that feedback by looking at the old maps but I just don't want Commissioner Lange to think that we are ignoring that feedback because I don't think that is the intention.

I think the intention is to be efficient and the reality is in Southeast Michigan there is no efficient way to tweak those maps and I think ultimately if Commissioner Lange is not happy with what we are coming up, with there is the option for Commissioners to draw their own maps.

Each one of us can submit our own set of maps and do one map, we can do all three of them if we want to so I think that might be the solution but I think starting from scratch, looking back to the old map and feedback where maps are working for people is definitely the way to go.

That is my been.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you Rebecca.
Erin?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I agree with Rhonda.

I watched both committee meetings and she did put forth don't fix the gerrymandered maps she put forth fix what's gerrymandered and keep the places that people wanted intact, intact.

I don't think Southeast Michigan is encompass all of Michigan and we need to keep that in mind.

We are doing a severe injustice if we don't take our time do our due diligence and do right by everyone.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, I know Dustin you are kind of fielding this.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No, no, didn't mean to step on your toes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I would say we should keep going.

I'm glad Rhonda that you were able to express that, that we had that discussion because I think the people that did have the opinion of liking, wanting the maps to stay the same but then also tweaking them could...are heard when you vocalize that concern. And I do want to champion that. I do think because of time and because, one, in my recollection and thinking of like the notes that I was taking, the folks that wanted the lines to kind of stay the same their reasoning behind it I think will be referenced and bolstered by the other data that we are coming up, with to redraw the lines.

So again just echoing everyone else I don't think they will be left out because I think we can encompass some of the wishes to want things to stay kind of the same through us drawing from scratch.

I think that's our opportunity to take everyone into consideration, but I did see I think I saw a hand before Rhonda's but Rhonda I want to get you back in there if you want and Dustin, I'm handing it over to you to make sure we get through the other recommendations.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm kind of hearing where this is going right now.

So I want to make the motion right now so we can move on and so I know in my mind what we are moving on from.

So I move that we as a Commission submit more than one map.

We do one map starting from scratch and we do a second map starting with the old lines and accounting for gerrymandered areas and public comment and communities of interest.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I have a motion made by Commissioner Lange.

Do I have a second?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Second made by Commissioner Wagner.

Any discussion or debate on the actual motion? I have Rhonda go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can we get a roll call vote once the discussion is done too, please?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay and General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, I just had a question.

If Commissioner Lange could restate the motion, I want to make sure I captured the second part.

It sounded like she was reread -- reading it so I want to make sure it's accurate in the record.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I wasn't reading it.

So I'll do my best.

The second part of it, it was that we do a second set of maps, that have the old lines but we take into account the obvious gerrymandered part, the communities of interest and the public comment that was given and when correcting those maps or redrawing those maps to that extent.

Sorry if it's not verbatim the wording.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair I have the motion as the Commission will submit more than one map, one set of maps, one set from scratch and second set of maps that reflect the old lines take into account the former lines, communities of interest and public comment; is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And also the gerrymandered areas the obvious gerrymandered areas.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was going to say do a second set of maps with old lines taking into account gerrymandering communities of interest and public comment, that was the full part of her second one.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Motion the Commission will submit more than one set of maps, one set from scratch and a second set of maps that take into account the former lines of gerrymandered districts, community of interest and public comment. Is that accurate?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I would say yes but it wasn't my motion so that's what I heard.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That sounds about right.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, sorry about that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: There is a flurry of hands so this is the discussion or debate on the motion I assume.

Steve, Doug and Rebecca, right? Okay, I think I saw Rebecca's hand and Doug and then Steve, if I got the order wrong honor system, go in the turn that you put your little animated hand up and Anthony you are on another screen, okay.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I have a point of clarification for Rhonda because I'm not really sure she means by submit who are we submitting these to? Are you can anticipating there will be two sets of maps we will release to the public and the public hearings will be based on those two sets of maps?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Per the Constitution I believe it's in Section nine and Julianne can clarify if I'm wrong, when we do put maps, they are put online and given public comment to where the public can comment on those.

So by submit that's what I mean when they are submitted online then the public can give comment on both sets of maps.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Am I correct with that Julianne? I want to make sure I did it right.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Julianne that was my follow-up to you because I thought the Constitution said when we decide on one set of maps so my ultimate question is can we even do that can we submit two sets of maps to the public or do we have to decide on one?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So the large distinction that I want to highlight is the difference between subsection nine activities and subsection 14 activities.

So under subsection nine you're dealing with proposed draft plans.

I'm inserting the word draft, proposed plans that you're going to post to the public, receive feedback from the second set of public hearings and revise or integrate the feedback as the Commission sees fit.

Under subsection 14 you're moving into the phase of adopting final plans and that is where the 45 day public comment period is.

After publication of those plans.

So per the language in the Constitution, if those maps are adjusted and there is no restriction on number.

If those plans would be adjusted it would trigger a new publication requirement and 45 day public comment period so there is two very distinct things going on in subsection nine with draft or proposed plans that are still being that are still being amended or modified based on data, based on again public comment is going to be coming in at that, through that time, through the very end so those would be the distinctions.

Is that responsive Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, so what Rhonda is proposing is not final maps essentially.

So not when we are into the public comment period, we will throw them out on the website and possibly have to competing maps and people can comment and we ultimately settle on one map am I understanding you?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Rhonda is shaking her head.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That is what I'm saying give the public the opportunity to look at what both would look like and then we make our final decision based off from that to take to the public for the rounds.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you for that clarification.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And my hesitation Commissioner Szetela was that my understanding is that Commissioner Lange is referring to publishing multiple plans to receive public feedback on during the subsection nine activities.

My hesitation was subsection 14, I don't think it requires you to only publish one plan. It says you shall follow the following procedure in adopting a plan, before voting you shall ensure the plan is tested, before voting to adopt a plan you should provide public notice.

I don't think it restricts the Commission and again I'm big into not restricting your activities under beyond the what the Constitution requires.

Is that I don't think that that's a limiting it can only be one plan.

I think you can publish different plans to receive that public comment feedback during that 45 days.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you General Counsel.

Thank you, Rebecca, for that question.

And I think we had Doug, Steve and then Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, real quick.

I just wanted to reinforce my comment previously that the original recommendation was actually a came out of a discussion on efficiency.

How can we be more efficient in the subcommittee? And that was one of the recommendations coming.

I can't remember if it was from Kim or Bruce at that point in time.

That that would be one way and we could get a sufficient enough data to make a determination.

So and the second point I want to make and this is probably going to go to you, Julianne, the motion that's on the table uses the word gerrymandered districts.

And I don't think we should phrase it that way.

Because we are making an assumption they were gerrymandered.

Some people may not look at it like that.

And I'm definitely sure that the legislature that did the work would not look at it like that.

And I don't feel that we should make assumptions with that type of verbiage but I'll let you deal with that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

I mean, and Julianne you can clarify, but when Rhonda first said it, I think what she said was she just kind of listed gerrymandering, communities of interest and public comment. I think it's the second time when she clarified we are talking about semantics that she said gerrymandering districts.

But I'll leave that up to General Counsel.

I know we have two more questions.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So certainly part of Commissioner Clark's concern on verbiage would directly be impacted by the League of Women Voters case that we are constantly bringing up where the Federal Court did find the presence of gerrymandered districts in the State of Michigan, specific districts.

So it's not a nebulous concept of which ones were found to be by the Federal Court to be gerrymandered.

It wasn't until the U.S. Supreme Court in the Rusho case said they are gerrymandered and I'm paraphrasing obviously but that the partisan gerrymandering is non dispensiable. So racial gerrymandering, the courts will still hear those cases.

So, again, I think that's the basis of the word choice or the characterization of certain districts in Michigan, maybe not even to the naked eye that are found to be gerrymandered are based or flow from that Federal lawsuit.

So that that would be the basis for the use of that language.

But certainly you know the Commission can amend that motion if it sees fit.

But I think the Supreme Court is dealing in Rusho said the courts cannot deal with that but the record in the case certainly supports the lower Federal Court panel's conclusion.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not going to amend it and I accept your explanation.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: And Anthony? Or Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So a couple things.

I don't want anyone's words to get twisted around.

I don't think what Rhonda is saying even though I respectfully disagree with it, she's not saying she doesn't want to change lines.

She is saying she wants to use the existing maps as the starting point while doing all the other things she listed and that's not the same thing as not wanting to change lines.

So that is the first thing.

The second thing is that I want it to be clear that this motion that is currently on the table is not the recommendation of the subcommittee.

The recommendation of the subcommittee was that we have, let me just pull it up so I can get the wording right, where did it go? So the recommendation of the subcommittee that was voted 3-1 was that the maps start from scratch, however, we use the existing maps adjusted with the new census data as a comparison tool.

Now, that's what like I said that's what the subcommittee decided to bring to a recommendation for this Commission.

So I'm not sure it's the best practice before voting on that recommendation to make a new motion.

I think it would probably be better if we vote down this motion that's currently on the table and then decide what we want to do about the recommendation from the subcommittee.

If that recommendation doesn't pass, well, then I think we can revisit other options like we are doing it now.

But in my opinion, we are doing it in the wrong order.

We should vote on what the recommendation of the subcommittee was and then if it doesn't pass look at alternatives.

Not look at the alternatives first.

Which is what we are doing.

So I think what we should do is vote down this current motion and also just like as a point of order I don't know if this is an appropriate question to ask but wouldn't it be best practices to you know vote on the recommendations of the subcommittee first before looking at alternatives? Just generally speaking to keep it organized?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: So Anthony I agree.

I think part of what is happening is what this is the kind of Commission that we are.

We doesn't mean we can't change.

We love to get a subcommittee and then we love to debate with the subcommittee.

So I think you have a great point there.

And I go back to my original opinion besides the fact I would love for the hard work that the four of you all put together that we actually move through that in an efficient manner, I want to hear the rest of the recommendations and discuss it.

But I think it just goes back to what the old lines and the old maps represent.

And that's just kind of where I stand and like I'm prepared to vote that way that there was just too much hurt and pain and almost trauma when people got up there not to put that on when they were talking about their communities of interest and how what their expectation of the Commission is.

So I want us to be able to vocalize and want Rhonda and whoever when they don't agree to be able to talk about that this a larger group.

But I do think Anthony your point of if this chart and these recommendations represent good thought and good effort so I think that that should also be highlighted and taken into account and then we have Rebecca and Rhonda.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Basically sorry to interrupt I just want everyone to know this current motion is not what the recommendation of the subcommittee was.

The recommendation of the subcommittee was to start from scratch.

And leave the adjusting maps adjusted with the new census data as a comparison tool so just keep that in mind when voting, please.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: I think we understand.

And I will speak for myself I did not think Rhonda's suggestion meant she wanted to keep the old maps either.

I want to clarify that publicly.

I personally did not think that that was her opinion or what she was trying to say.

So Rebecca and then Rhonda.

I don't know.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I just think trying to do to sets of maps is excessively inefficient and we have a really tough job to do and it's going to be a lift for us to get one set of maps and get everybody to agree on it and I just think trying to do to sets of maps is just not workable and I think again the solution is for individual members if they are not comfortable to draw their own maps because we are allowed to do that and submit them to the committee or to the Commission for consideration.

And then I think that if we do do the two sets of maps, we are really ignoring the 95% of people who got up and said throw the maps in the toilet so it just concerns me we are even considering this because I know there were people who said I like the old maps, I don't think we are going to ignore that opinion.

I think we can consider that by looking at the old maps and where those people were speaking from to accommodate those requests while still starting from scratch.

I think we can do both with one set of maps and without having the additional time and inefficiency of trying to do two maps, I just think it's very inefficient and we are on a time crunch as it is and why make it worse by doing two maps.

Thank you I will yield back.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Rhonda?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay two points one last statement and then I'm done. The point that in the use one set of maps was done out of efficiency, I would have to argue with.

We weren't even discussing efficiency at that time.

The very first question that was asked was what do you think, how do you think we should do the maps and before we gathered all of the information, Commissioner Clark put forth the motion even though I said we should gather all of the information so we can make informed decisions.

So I would have to say I don't completely agree with that statement on the efficiency of it.

The second point would be to Commissioner Eid's yes, the first motion did pass to do the recommendation and it passed by a three to one recommendation because that motion was made right away again, I say.

But then when I made a second motion if you recall about the same thing that I am motioning today that was a two, two split vote so it died because we had an even number of Commissioners so I would hope that everybody will take that into consideration.

And I'm a little disheartened hearing that time is going to be the issue.

Because I brought up the issue of time before and it seems like it was blown off.

And to say that we can only do one set of maps because of time are we truly doing the best job that we can be doing for the people in Michigan? I mean, who is to say we couldn't do three maps even with new lines? I think to use the time thing and say that

we are only going to present one set of maps to the public only give them one option, it just seems ridiculous to me.

But those are my opinions.

And I will respect everybody for yours.

And let's vote on this.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, are we ready? Any further discussion? Are we ready to vote? It seems like we are.

Okay, all those in favor do we need the motion restated?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: There was a roll call vote.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Dustin.

Michigan Department of State staff, can we have you, Sarah to do a roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No." And I will call Commissioners named in alphabetical order starting with Commissioner Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: A firm, yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Dustin?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I am thinking.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I didn't know if you were frozen.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No because I was the second.

I'm going to vote no.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I have a vote of 10-3. The motion does not carry.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sarah.

And, Doug I, see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. I'd like to put a motion forward that we approve the recommendation from the subcommittee.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I have a motion Rebecca beat you to it Dustin I have a motion made by Commissioner Clark, second made by Commissioner Szetela.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? Doug? Steve?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Is the presentation done?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: We are just voting on one recommendation, we still have to make it through I believe Dustin and correct me if I'm wrong you said you had six recommendations or five? Five, okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Are we voting on them serially? Are we going to have the presentation and vote on everything? How are we doing this?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Well the recommendation was made that we kind of treat it one by one and I believe that's what Dustin laid out for us in was kind of what I was thinking. But you all can weigh in.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'll try and answer that real quick if you don't mind. So my envision was going over each recommendation one by one.

However, this was going to be the one that was going to take the longest in my personal opinion.

But the other recommendations should go relatively quickly.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would like to hear the presentation of everything that is going to be presented and then so that I know what we are voting on at the end in case something comes up, one of your recommendations makes me change my mind on one I have already voted on so I would like to hear the whole thing first, I guess.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I agree.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I hear what you are saying Commissioner Lett and Commissioner Curry.

Maybe a point of clarification.

So and Dustin this question might be for you.

I'm not so sure when I look at the chart that these decisions hinge on the other.

I think we are compiling a whole approach to mapping so it would do us justice to pick each thing apart to build how we are going to attack it as a whole.

It's not we are voting for one thing and it will impact another.

I mean, they will have an influence, but I don't think I'm not so sure that these one-time decisions that we are making are as related as what we might be thinking about in terms of our decision making but Steve, I cannot speak for you Juanita I cannot speak for you I just think this is more so speaking of our general approach how we are going to attack this thing.

So we had the motion, we had the second.

All those in favor all those in favor of the motion that's on the floor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Aye.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'd like to call for a roll call vote on this one too.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was going to say I done think people are hearing me.

Sarah, we are keeping you busy, Michigan Department of State, may we have a roll call vote, please?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no when I call your name.

I will call Commissioners' names in alphabetical order starting with Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Abstained for the reason that I don't have enough information to vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS? No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 9-3 with one abstention, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Sarah. And, as she said, the motion carries.

Now, Dustin, I am handing the floor back over to you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: You're welcome and happily putting myself on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Don't do that.

All right, so the next recommendation is where to start.

Not where well where to start part two in regards to if we want to take a regional approach or to just pick or divide and conquer basically have some people start in one area and some people start in another and come to the middle.

And also which particular map to start with.

And I believe, Doug, if you want to go on that one you can.

Or Rhonda or whomever wants to discuss it or go over the reasonings.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, well we had a long discussion on this.

But the staff from EDS and we had like three or four of them in the meeting, recommended that we don't start from the whole.

That we segment off the state.

And their methodology for segments is the JURGs which have been presented a number of meetings ago.

And I personally disagreed with the JURGs that he had put together.

But Kim had a good recommendation in that we use that as an exercise among us and each of us do our own JURGs then we have a discussion to choose one and go from there.

And John who is one of the individuals from Kim's staff recommended highly that we start and choose one of those JURGs which I will call a region.

And then we begin to develop a District in there.

And that way we are limiting our scope on what we are looking at, at the moment.

And it does not matter which JURG we start with.

We could start at in the northern part of the state or the southern part of the state or whatever.

And work our way.

And he recommended as we get one District done in that region that we do another.

And maybe another.

And then all the sudden if we get ourselves into a position where we have a lot of disagreement and we are not getting anywhere with one of the districts that we just stop and we go to another region and begin working there.

And that was his rationale in that.

And take those small pieces and then build from there.

So maybe you could read our recommendation, Dustin, and I'll go from there.

Is that possible? I don't have the spreadsheet up in front of me.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Julianne you raised your hand for a quick second.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, committee Chair, Witjes.

My notes from the committee was that the recommendation was to take a regional approach as a full Commission, so I just wanted to clarify that it was not to split the regions between Commissioners or anything like that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was saying the entire discussion of what we talked about and then to go over what we actually decided.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Okay great I just wanted to clarify that the state, that the recommendation was that the state be divided into regions and that those regions, the work would be approached by the full Commission.

And I know that the Commission also raised and discussed at length JURGs but decided upon the regional approach and the Commission deciding upon those regions was what was taken.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

And in the JURGs are the regions.

So the terms can be interchanged according to our discussion with Kim.

So that's why we chose to do it that way.

Break it into smaller pieces.

It was more manageable that way.

According to Bruce and Lisa and Kim and his staff.

And it's more manageable for us to deal with things in the state than try to do the whole thing at once.

So that's how we came to that conclusion and recommendation.

You can add anything you want Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think you hit it home with that because that is basically what I have written down.

I don't know who raised their hand, Cynthia.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Only because I saw her reach.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It was me so.

I did watch the committee meetings and I understand the explanation that the experts gave of the importance of work by region.

It makes sense.

My question or concern is that if we when we break the state into regions that we aren't stuck when we are trying to make a District, we are not stuck with just using the area in that region, you know, we should be able to cross lines and things.

And also one other thing, I really appreciated the advice I guess and I think it was John Morgan gave about not finalizing anything.

Everything is just a draft until we get done because undoubtedly, we are going to have to go back antique something that we have done to make another one work right.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I saw your hand, Rebecca.

I don't know if Doug would -- do you have something to just review or do you want me to go?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me comment on what Cynthia just said.

John said that it's perfectly acceptable to draw the districts outside of the lines of the regions in other words color outside of the lines.

He said there is no problem doing that.

The lines are not cast in stone.

It's a flexible process.

It's very fluid.

And you can't constraint yourself with that because of population reasons.

And I'm glad that Cynthia also mentioned that, yeah, nothing is finalized.

These are all drafts and we may come back and redo some of these districts as we go through the process.

We have that option to do that and change things as things go forward.

When we get into the process portion, what you will see is when we do a District, we are going to have Bruce and Kim or Kim's staff and Lisa with us and they are going to be giving us online feedback relative to does this meet the criteria for the Voting Rights Act, is this racially polarized and so forth.

That is going to be real time.

So that gets us the fluid situation of being able to change things.

And as John mentioned there is no reason you can't put some of these districts outside those regional boundaries that you are working on so I just want to make that comment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I believe next and then Anthony.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Dustin who did you call I didn't hear.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rebecca you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I would like to make a motion at this time that the Commission will divide the state into regions for the purpose of facilitating the drawing of District lines and then utilize those regions to draw the District lines.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: A motion made by Commissioner Szetela and a second made by Commissioner Clark.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think this has been said and I especially want the public to know.

I'm going to call them regions I think that is probably what we should call them going forward, you know, they are not districts.

They are not districts of any kind.

They are not set in stone.

It's just a way for us to as a Commission work together and break down the work into more manageable areas.

So we absolutely and will cross you know from one region into another as this Commission sees fit and as we go about the work.

I just don't want anyone to get too caught up over these arbitrary regions that they are making.

They are not set in stone.

It's just a way for us to break down the work and work together more efficiently.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just to support what Anthony just said, these are -- these regions will be how we look at the state.

So that's the way Kim explains it to us.

We could look at putting more region in rural areas and look at one as manufacturing areas, southeast Detroit area as another one.

And have I don't know eight or nine or ten regions and work from there, so I just want to bring that point up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Clark and Rebecca I'm going to have you restate the motion.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it was a mouthful so the motion was that the Commission will divide the State of Michigan into regions for the purpose of facilitating the drawing of District lines and then we will use those regions to draw District lines.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Say the first part again divide the State of Michigan into.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Into regions for the purpose of facilitating the drawing of lines.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: And the second part just to make sure I know it even though I know Julianne writes much faster than I.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Use the regions to draw the lines.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay I got it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Again, to assist in the drawing of lines.

I don't want to lock us in to it so I'm trying to use kind of softer language.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, Commissioners all those in favor rather than restate the motion.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Was there a second announced?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Roll call vote please.

- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Michigan Department of State staff, Sarah Reinhardt.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hello, Commissioners. Please indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No." I will call Commissioner names in alphabetical order starting with Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner, was that a, yes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, it was, Sarah.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 12-1 the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Michigan Department of State staff. Dustin, back to you.
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Another recommendation we have and this one will be short and sweet and I will just do it because it's basically just a sentence which one should we start drawing first? And it has been suggested by Election Data Services and we kind of talked about it that the State Senate is where we should start. And, yeah, I guess that's it. So any and all thoughts? Doug go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I just want to enhance the subject area on the discussion one of Kim's staff recommended we don't start with Congress, the U.S. Congress because it was too complicated.

Now we did not get into what too complicated was.

And then also the discussion was that the State House was -- had so many districts that we were better off starting with a smaller amount which is the State Senate.

And I believe that came from John.

I'm not 100% sure.

Yes.

So I just wanted to bring that point up in case you didn't hear the hearing.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: When you do it like that does that make it where you are showing preference to one other than the other?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The Senate instead of the house instead of Congress? No, that never was brought up as a point by anybody.

It was just more about what was the easiest, best way for us to start as an organization. And, you know, and get used to the process and get used to how we are going to do things.

I never heard any of that discussion at all, Juanita, or any recommendations from the consultants where that would be an issue.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rhonda, I think you put your hand up first.

Wait no maybe it was Rebecca.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Cynthia.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Cynthia go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I missed this part of the discussion.

So I'm wondering does that mean so say we start with the State Senate, we complete all of those before we start working on anything else? Is that what the committee is recommending?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I believe that would be the way to go about it.

We work on the Senate map first, get our draft then move on to whichever direction we want to go after that, which I assume it's the house and then finally move on to Congressional.

Since there is not a motion here yet, one thing I also wanted to make just we can tie this one together is in regards to nesting like you know take put all the take the -- put all the House Districts into one Senate region and all the Senate nesting them altogether so they all fit perfectly from the largest chunks down to the house and that was recommended against it because it's too mathematical to do and one state does that but I wanted to throw that out there as well and go ahead, Rhonda?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I will say although this was the recommendation I don't know if I'm 100%.

I think everyone, every possible option has its pros and cons.

Still to me because I don't know what would make the Congressional so much harder, I think with the Congressional you're dealing with a larger area, it might actually make it easier in my opinion and plus now we are dealing with an additional seat being gone from that Congressional area and I know we've had a lot of public comment about people that said they really wish that their Senators and their representatives were in the same area so they could work together to get what needs to be done for the citizens.

So I'm on the fence and just wanted to let you know that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rebecca, Doug and then Kim.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry I was on mute.

I'm going to actually move we adopt the subcommittee's recommendation to start with the drawing of the 38 State Senate districts.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Vice Chair Szetela, second made by Commissioner Clark.

We do have Kim though with a hand raise so is there any discussion or debate on the actual motion? Which Kim I anticipate this is where you could jump in possibly.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm going to drop my hand off because I was going to recommend we get Kim's input on that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Go ahead Commissioner Clark and give her the hand and Kim you have the floor.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank you Commissioner.

I just wanted to state where we were coming from with the recommendation of starting with the State Senate as opposed to the Congressional.

I would agree with Commissioner Lange the Congressional could be easier because it is a smaller number of districts.

But I think John's recommendation was that you also have to think in terms of the Congressional districts that you have to get the deviations down to zero.

And when you do that, you start playing with all sorts of little, tiny, tiny pieces and that's where the complication comes in on the Congressional.

So that's why we looked at the State Senate as kind of a happy medium between the two.

We have some deviations that we can make use of in terms of the State Senate that are larger than the Congressional.

And so that's why we kind of looked at the State Senate as the way to start.

Other point is that, yes, you could move towards finalizing a State Senate plan first before you go to the other ones.

But that's not necessarily the case.

You may get to a point where you think you're kind of comfortable with the State Senate as you're drawing, but let's see how we could deal with some of the issues on the State House and move in that direction or the Congressional.

Basically you're pretty fluid and what capabilities you have in terms of the software that we can bounce back and forth between different plans too.

So I just wanted to give you that clarification on that side.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Kim.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just one more clarification, Kim.

So are you saying that we shouldn't limit ourselves to saying that we have to do just the Senate first and then move on to a different one, that we should keep it open to possibly incorporating all of them as we go? Is that kind of what I was hearing or not hearing?

>> KIM BRACE: You have -- for clarification purposes, you do have that option depending upon how you want to go.

So we would have each of the various plan potentials that could be called up any time and say for example we are working on the State Senate what does that do in terms of the Congressional that we already approved or thought about.

We can come back and forth and see that so that you are able to collect that intelligence as you move forward and doing the State Senate for example.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Any other question or discussion.

All right thank you Kim for that clarification.

Can we have a roll call vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi, Commissioners.

For the record would anyone like to restate the motion before the vote?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I can restate it, yep. We accept the subcommittee's recommendation to start the drawing of mapping with the 38 State Senate districts.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela.

Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no when I call your name.

And I will read Commissioners' names in alphabetical order starting with Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: With unanimous support, the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sarah.

And, Dustin, I believe you have something else for us.

Oh, I'm sorry before we do that, can we take a five-minute bathroom break or do we need more than five minutes, want to come back at 10:30? 10 minutes we will be back at 10:30 if there is no objection.

[Recess]

- >> CHAIR KELLOM: All right Commissioners it's 10:30.

And we will return with Justin and the rest of the committee Chair, Dustin Witjes, excuse me and the other committee's recommendations.

Dustin, I can't see you on this first screen but I know that you are there so you can have the floor.

- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We are doing an attendance thing again or no?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That is what I was double checking and I have not gotten a response and I don't know if that is just our procedure for hearings or in person.

We don't need to do a roll call, do we?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, if you took a recess Madam Chair you need to call the session back into order.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: So I call the meeting back to order at 10:31 and Michigan Department of State staff can you please do a roll call for purposes of the public record.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly. Please say present when I call your name and indicate where you are attending the meeting remotely from. I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present and I'm attending the meeting remotely from Muskegon,

Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm present. I'm attending the meeting from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present, virtually attending from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present and attending from Detroit,

Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC

Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN:

Present attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12

Commissions are present.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Department of State staff. And now, Dustin, you now have the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The next thing we are discussing is where are we going to start.

And I believe the recommendation was that we start in Southeast Michigan.

Anyone want to offer their opinions and thoughts on that where we are starting? Go ahead, Doug.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, not necessarily where we are starting but how we go through this, one of the recommendations out of Kim was to be careful and don't paint ourselves into a corner.

Where we can't get population and certain other things that we are going to analyze, so we have to be careful about that as we go.

But I believe also one of the comments that came up from the consultants was or a recommendation was to start from the south and move up or start from the north and move down.

And that sort of thing.

So anyway I just want to throw those comments out, thanks.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Rhonda then Rebecca.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was laughing because I must have serious brain fog, I don't remember voting on that recommendation.

I'm just being honest you guys.

I don't remember, I remember conversations about where we should start but I honestly don't remember that vote so can somebody clarify for me? I truly apologize but I don't.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Julianne, Doug? Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Rebecca had her hand up before me.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No that is a general question.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Mine is the same question is I was going to say is the recommendation that we start with the geographic region to be later decided on by the Commission? Or are we.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, we were discussing Southeast Michigan.

It was not painting each other into a corner.

Yes, so and figuring out where we are starting.

I believe I'm doing most of this from memory.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: John had mentioned the discussion that didn't really matter which region you started in.

And then Kim had chimed in and said don't paint yourself into a corner as we do that. But I think as we get started with it, the process was documented, which we will go over later.

But the Commission can decide where to start.

And as I mentioned before John had said, you know, work with the District this a region, work with another one and then on a third one if you start to get stuck switch regions. So I'm not sure it matters where we start but when we decide is we can either decide now or decide as part of the process.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That sounds pretty logical.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: A lot of hands came up all at once Julianne, I'm going to have you go first.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Maybe General Counsel and Kim and then that would be what I would think.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So Madam Chair, the although the minutes have not been prepared for this body's consideration in looking through the notes from that session, I do not see a motion made relative to that recommendation.

However because of the timeline and that the Commission would be using the older population data initially and prior to receiving the updated census data it might be beneficial to start in an area where you're not expecting huge population shifts and I know that your expert in this area has his hand raised so I will certainly defer to him on that.

But as to the question to the motion I do not see one reflected in the notes from that meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay a misstatement.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, thank you, Commissioner.

I too am like Commissioner Lange had brain fart when I heard this too.

So on that side I don't know that we necessarily said southeast and I would probably upon thinking about it problem not recommend southeast because that is a more difficult area to deal with.

But I think one of the things that we did talk about in the subcommittee is to get you some experience on how the machine operates and how the software operates.

The first cut we had talked about was use deciding on what regions there are as a tool. Draw the regions and we are not drawing districts necessarily but use that as a tool to kind of get a feel for, okay, this is what you would see, this is how you could add these counties or this is how you can do these Townships and use that creation of the regions first as an exercise basically one to settle those regions if we go into the JURGs or whatever regions you want to deal with.

But use that as an exercise to get experience.

And then you could get into the individual three different plans from that side.

But I think John was also saying before is like I was that, yeah, don't paint yourself into a corner and if we start with the State Senate that lets us get into wherever we want to but I don't think we are saying don't start on one part of the state.

We are saying start drawing the regions as a test kind of thing and your recommendations had said that per se and then we can decide whatever point which regions you would want to go in to.

And I think John is with us too so if we could ask him to add his viewpoint too.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Kim, Dustin you have two more hands.

Erin and then Rebecca.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Mute sucks sometimes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: John is with us as well.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was just going to reiterate Southeast Michigan I did not recall that and starting with Senate districts would it make sense to start where Senate District one is right now and work our way so we don't confuse the public who already know what Senate District they are in.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Erin and Rebecca and Vice Chair Szetela and then Commissioner Clark.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes I thought and excuse me if I'm getting her name wrong and I thought was it doctor Lisa Handley had recommended that we actually start in the areas where there might be voting rights act issues and racially polarized voting issues so I thought her recommendation was we sort or start in those areas which will be Metro Detroit and move out from there so we don't end up in a situation where we start in the UP and move down and then get crunched in terms of how we can design the districts down there.

Am I incorrect in recalling that, Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: If I could answer that.

I think you're right Commissioner.

And generally when you do the real live redistricting cycle many times you do start with the minority areas dealing with Voting Rights Act circumstances.

The thing right now is we won't have all of the analysis that Dr. Handley will be doing and needing to do to ultimately guide you as we get into the real map crunching.

I kind of looked at this in the first parts of July and into first part of August as kind of experimenting with different ideas and playing with the system.

Software and the test data sets.

This is not the PL file that we don't get until August 16th.

But we are planning to have in the data set initially the ACS data as well as probably going to be able to get the newest Esry estimates so we can get those in within the next week and a half so that we've got some test data to play with and to be able to see.

We can generally see where movement is in terms of the state and the population but it's not finalized data like we will have on August 16th from the PL.

Certainly by the time we get the finalized data from PL then we will end up also having some analysis from Lisa, Dr. Handley, so that that can help guide then the issues on the racial bloc voting side.

And Lisa is on call too and John Morgan is on the call too.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, before I speak let me defer to John.

He is trying to make some comments based on something we discussed before.

>> John Morgan: Thank you Commissioner the only thing I would say is as kick points out and looking at using some data before the release of the PL data and you know this is part of almost a redistricting and it's good in a way that you know you done have the finalized data so you should be in a fairly relaxed posture, you know, you are testing out some ideas to see maybe if a group of counties would work together as a State Senate District if it's logical.

I showed in one map a group of counties that was technically the population for a State Senate District but I don't know as I pointed out there was a real community of interest between Escanaba and Manistee but to Kim's point just creating those regions and saying there is about six seats in this geographic area or there is about three seats in these combination of four counties.

That is a very good exercise because it helps familiarize us with the population as it stands and we know how many seats there are in a particular area.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, John, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, somebody mentioned starting up at the upper peninsula in District one.

I wanted to make everybody aware of a recommendation that Kent used and brought up the other day was that as we do districts and we number them, that we try to keep the districts in the same geographical location, the number of the District, the fiscal number and the same geographical location that they are today so we don't confuse the public. Where, you know, District one is now not down in Detroit, it's still up in the UP so I think we need to keep that in mind as we move forward.

It's a very logical and I think appropriate thing to do as we move forward, that's all.

So I just wanted to bring that up.

>> KIM BRACE: And I would also bring up four your benefit that Kent Stigall is a team member and is on the call and has his hand raised as well.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was going to call on him and at first, I didn't know exactly who he was.

>> KIM BRACE: He doesn't have a beard like I do.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for being patient and glad you are not a spy.

Go ahead.

>> Kent-Stigall: I want to reiterate what John and Kim was saying but more simplified.

The first defining the regions is going to be your first exercise in learning how to use the application.

Second will be those first districts where you're trying to put the final numbers in. It's really a learning process.

And you're going to learn how to how much time it takes and effort to adapt districts and as you proceed through the districts you are going to become much more efficient at understanding you know the limits of well if we do this you can already see where it's going to bind you.

Like even one or two islands out in the water, you have already made your maximum population, well you don't want to do that.

So wherever you start just look at it like start learning something.

So you start seeing how long it's going to take you to figure it out and then you book out much more efficient.

That is the end of it.

All I had to say.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Kent, that was valuable, Commissioner Lange and John I see your hand up and that is sunshine so you will go after Commissioner Lange if you don't mind.

>> Thanks.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just want to make a comment on the number thing. It was also discussed in the meeting that just because number one may be here that it doesn't mean we can't draw these districts and renumber them so starting with a particular number one, although I agree, there was one of the...our experts had said that it can be confusing for the public if we do renumber because they are used to their own.

But you know, the districts that they are in or the numbers associated with, but that that was an option also, that just because the number one say is in the UP doesn't necessarily mean that when it's renumbered that it couldn't be somewhere else.

But looking at both sides of the issue, I guess, just so you know, if any of you weren't in the meeting there was a discussion on both sides of that.

>> Kent-Stigall: It could be confusing for you guys because you will have 13, 14, 15 people talking. And if you are all not talking about the same geographic, precise street or road, you could be talking about the same highway, but one is in District 14 and his 14 and you are District two. And so you are going to be listening to the public, trying to translate what they are talking to without the benefit of the number.

Just keep that in mind.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Kent and thank you, Commissioner Lange and John.

>> John Morgan: Okay. The only thing wanted to add is I just wanted to directly address Commissioner Stigall's concern about drawing the voting lines districts first. There is nothing that I'm suggesting here that says we wouldn't be able to do that. Here I'm just saying that with these preliminary numbers it's actually a good time to test a few ideas out.

And then when you have the actual PL numbers, yes, what she says makes a lot of sense, where you might want to focus the efforts sooner rather than later on the areas in Metro Detroit.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.
Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: In addition to that I want to say if part of the process one of the first things I want to do once we get the data Dr. Handley is going to perform an overall analysis and identify to us what she feels are some of the problem areas. So we may want to avoid those at the beginning.

Once she identifies those or we may want to address those upfront.

We will have to decide once we get her recommendations on that.

So I thought I would just throw that in.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Vice Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: ?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I was just going to you know I'm looking right now at the current Senate map for Michigan.

And I notice that they started in Detroit.

And so the districts like 1-7 are all in Detroit and then it sort of fans out from there with the last numbers being filled in being in the Upper Peninsula.

I think it makes sense to start that way.

I know it might be more complicated.

And I'm not saying that should be the only way that we should draw it but I just think it makes sense to start in Southeast Michigan so that would kind of be my thought process.

I'm just not sure we are converging on a concept here, so I'd really like to know what the views of other Commissioners are, are we ready to make a motion and say let's decide on a region but maybe decide it later? Or do we want to actually vote on a particular region?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Sue?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I just want to emphasize that this document was a thought starter document.

It wasn't necessarily the suggestions of this committee.

It was just things to get your thoughts started.

The Commission has already decided to start and use a regional approach.

So it doesn't seem to me that we -- there needs to be any vote or any, I mean, you have already decided you are going to use a regional approach, you don't need to know what region today.

And I don't know that you need to vote on that you're going to select a region that the Commission approves because that's how you work.

So I think a lot of these are just place holders and things that needed to be thought about.

And it's more that was more of brainstorming document for the committee to use and for the Commission to see some of the questions that the committee was looking at.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sue, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was muted.

That's true.

I was able to get my notes somewhat read back in organization here.

There are only really two more recommendations that had motions on it, and I read the wrong column on it.

So I pardon for any kind of confusion I may have caused but at least it facilitated some kind of discussion on where to actually start in Michigan with what regional approach so that kind of helped.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: MC has raised his hand a couple times so I don't know if MC if you want to go first.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I was just going to try to acknowledge that you were asking for other Commissioners' input and I like the idea that it's you know that we are starting with the Senate, I like the region and I like the idea that we do have number one done in Southeast Michigan.

I do feel like I'm feeling like I'm comfortable but I also agree with what Sue said which is we don't need to make this we don't need to bind ourselves but it does feel useful like I think we are trying to start somewhere and I feel like we are trying to come together in a way like how do we start and we are creating a process and we have I know we have a flow chart coming up, so I feel like it's not a waste of time.

To discuss this and I am okay with you know starting in Southeast Michigan after listening to folks because it's number one like Erin suggested and it is potentially where we have the most experimentation and it's a region, not a District.

So I'm okay and we are going to somehow, we are going to start fresh and reference these things so it feels right to look at that region as the most difficult and then we will learn like Mr. Morgan said, John Morgan.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yeah, I think from a standpoint of it we can get that kind of broken apart and understand I think that is a good way to wet our feet at the same time I agree with our Executive Director Sue's perspective of kind of pacing ourselves.

I think John said it best and it's been kind of my view of the whole thing having a relaxed posture, one, so that we are able to do the work in a sustained way and do it well but also, Sue, that we can really pay attention and learn and experiment and not feel like even today at this moment that we have to have all the answers.

The committee did a lot of good, good, good, good work.

And I also want to sneak in I'm super proud of you all and have extreme gratitude of sifting through all of this because this chart is massive and I can only imagine.

So let's get back to the hands.

It was Rebecca and then Commissioner Clark.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, in the interest of just sort of moving us along I'm going to at this point move that we elect as a Commission to start in Southeast Michigan when we first start drawing maps.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will second that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was going to say is there a second? I have a motion made by Vice Chair Szetela, second made by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? And I see Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Wagner and then Commissioner Orton or Vallette, I don't know, but either way you will have your turn.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay just a quick comment to me really it doesn't matter.

I would prefer that we get through the training and make the decisions so we can see the complexity of what we got to do and get a better idea.

So I think there's no rush in doing this.

Maybe a few practice exercises as we go along and then make that decision.

I yield.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

And Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I just wanted to ask for clarification.

If we are starting with Senate districts, Kim, wouldn't we start with one, which would be up north? And, secondly, if we are going to start with Southeast Michigan, did I hear someone say that we did not necessarily have to number them yet? And I yield.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Wagner.

Do we have an answer? Okay go ahead, Kim.

>> KIM BRACE: To answer Commissioner's, you do have the capability of renumbering districts.

So just because in a drawing exercise you're drawing District one, that's not to say that's where District one is always going to be.

The software will let you interchange numbers and switch numbers so that decision can be made later on, even after you kind of settled on a plan, okay, now we can look at where should number one really be on that side.

We will have the existing districts and certainly as an overlay so that you can see what it is or that area, what they are calling it right now kind of a thing.

But you have got the latitude to do it any which way that you would like to do it.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Kim.

Okay, I think it was Commissioner Orton? Then Commissioner Witjes.

Commissioner Lange.

And then Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I think it's fine.

I see, it makes sense to start where the problems might be.

But I was kind of going to say what Doug said.

Just I think the exercise of us choosing the regions, making the regions that we are going to use and playing around a little bit before we actually get the data to be able to start making districts will be really instructional.

I think we will all learn a lot and maybe it would be good to make our decision after that.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay, Commissioner was it Witjes and then Lange? Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, it was me but I did see Sarah put her hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: She does she has something important to say.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioners thank you.

I just wanted to take this time to reiterate something that your General Counsel pointed out which is that when you all begin mapping, you all will be using some old population data for the State of Michigan.

And as has been pointed out to you in previous sessions, there were significant population shifts that we anticipate will occur in Southeast Michigan that will become apparent when the 2020 census or the PL data is released in August.

So as your General Counsel pointed out earlier, one potential recommendation for the Commission is to consider starting in areas that don't anticipate significant population shifts.

So it might be easier to begin in those places so you don't have to go back and redraw or reassess significantly as you realize or as the data becomes available and it shows the full extent of that population shift, thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Sarah, Dustin?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I just wanted to give my quick idea as to why I think starting in Southeast Michigan makes the most sense.

It has to do just in regards to efficiency because we know that that's going to be where the major concentration of the districts are.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Looks like our Spanish, thank you so much.

Okay go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If we start where it's more concentrated and branch out towards where things are a lot more sparse, making adjustments to the larger sparser districts in my opinion are going to be easier whereas let's say if we start in the

north and then move down that's when the whole in my opinion painting yourself into a corner comes in because if you make or you start doing that then when you realize you need to make a mistake you have to kind of unravel what you did, go fix it and move back whereas if you go to the more concentrated in my opinion you can fix all that nitty-gritty out and then go in the easier areas of the state.

But, again, just my thoughts and I will yield back.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange? Vice Chair Szetela? One moment. Michigan department of Sarah do you have something to say?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No, sorry I just forgot to put my hand down.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Commissioner Lange and then Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Sorry I was basically going to say the same thing that Sarah said probably not as eloquently.

But it does make sense to draw the areas at least starting out where there is not going to be a major population shift.

It will be easier to do those areas.

And again this is not the final census data.

So once we get that everything could change any way but I think practice wise it just might make more sense.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay thank you Commissioner Lange. Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just a little confused by Commissioner Wagner's comment because she was referencing District one as being in the upper peninsula but when I'm looking at the District map, for the State Senate it is showing districts 1-7 all being in Wayne County and districts 37 and 38 being in the upper peninsula so I want to make sure I understood what her comment was.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I think she was just using the numbers arbitrarily but I mean Commissioner Wagner might be able to clarify herself.

And this is a reminder so I can keep track if you don't have a question or a comment can you take your animated hand down? Thank you.

While we wait for Commissioner Wagner to clarify if she wants to, you don't have to, Commissioner Witjes and then we have Kent and then Juanita I see your hand too. Kent you can jump in.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My apologies I don't know why that came back up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: It's okay.

>> Kent-Stigall: Painting yourself in a corner one of the corners you can paint into is you get in a rural with vast swaths of land and low population.

Now you really are going to and we need to adjust that population.

The districts could go all apart because now there is nobody up here, you are jumping it and making it appear to be gerrymandered because you just can't find 1200 people to adapt to your District.

In an urban area or where there is high density population there is lots of population to shift a census block and pick up that many people.

So you don't want to paint your corner and be stuck out in a rural area where you don't have the population to make adjustments.

So that is another way of looking at getting painted into a corner.

That's all.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Kent.

Juanita, did you still have a hand?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

I was thinking that I agree with Sarah and Rhonda when it came to those different regions or districts.

I agree with what Sarah said.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: And I can't quote it word for word but I totally agreed with what she was saying.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, the discussion about considering population and not having to kind of, yep, we got it.

Commissioner Wagner and then Commissioner Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Just to clarify, I was talking in regards to keeping the numbers basically the same.

No matter where we start, if one is up north let's start up north.

If one is southeast let's start southeast.

Just to not confuse the public any more than they probably already will be when we finished, thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Wagner, Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I call the question and ask for a roll call vote.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: And for the purpose of our memories and the lengthy discussion can we restate the motion, please? Or the question?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, let me look back at the list of what we have got here so I get it right.

So I move that the Commission elect to begin drawing maps with the Southeast Michigan region.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Is there a second? Motion made by Vice Chair Szetela.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Your second, Madam Chair, was Commissioner Witjes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

It was such a long time back. Second made by Commissioner Witjes.

And Michigan Department of State staff, Cynthia, did you still have a question or you took your hand down?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I took my hand down because maybe this is something we can talk about at a different time.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, all right. Michigan Department of State staff, we are ready for the roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Madam Chair Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will start in alphabetical order with Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm going to vote yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was still thinking.

Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 9-4, the motion does not carry.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Michigan Department of State staff. Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like to put a motion forward to table the discussion on this item until a later date.

It's not a pressing item in my opinion.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Clark, seconded, it was a double second. It's a motion to postpone this item and seconded by Vice Chair Szetela. Any discussion or debate on the postponement motion?

And, Michigan Department of State staff, keeping in the same vein, let's have a roll call vote for that as well, please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Once more, Commissioners, please indicate support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No." And I will call names in alphabetical order starting with MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This is tabling it, did I hear it right?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Postpone, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 11-2 the motion carries.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sarah Reinhardt.

General Counsel, did you have something to bring to our attention regarding the chart?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes.

I believe, thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: You're welcome.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe the additional recommendations that the committee took on Monday need to be up lifted.

There were three.

The first being a recommendation that the full Commission conduct a to-hour training with Mr. Adelson on constitutional issues.

A subsequent motion taken at Monday's meeting was that major changes be recorded by staff and the Secretary of State kept separate from the meeting minute and in a separate place on the Commission's website.

And the last was about the motion regarding the amended flow chart be recommended to the Commission as a starting point.

I don't know if Executive Director Hammersmith had anything to add to that.

But that I believe is consistent with my notes and the Secretary of State's notes as well, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Those are the three that I had left too.

So I don't know if that helps.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just confused because I'm looking at this spreadsheet that we have about the one-time Commissioner decisions.

And I don't think we have addressed three or six yet.

Which is criteria one through seven and nesting, have we? Did I just miss that? I feel like we didn't talk about that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I don't think that we did either.

I'm not sure if it's something to act on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: The nesting there is a recommendation.

The criteria one through seven there is not an actual recommendation there and I don't know if we need to discuss it but it seems we should at least touch on the concept of nesting.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Let's hear from Executive Director Sue Hammersmith and then Commissioner Clark.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Again, this was a thought starter's document that the committee utilized in its process.

They did not discuss item number three.

They did discuss nesting and I believe Dustin was the one who mentioned that, the math makes it very difficult for that to work out, so basically it didn't seem to make any sense.

Maybe it should just say that, you know, that we don't make any recommendation in this regard.

But again these were just thought starters.

This was brainstorming to get the committee thinking about some of these things and the Commission, that would be it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: So many hands.

Commissioner Dustin, do you need to jump in?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We did not have a motion to bring a recommendation forward with regard to nesting at all whatsoever but I did bring it up earlier on the discussion on what map to start, I just saved it.

We did talk about nesting as well and it was basically brought up that it would be extremely different if not impossible to do so.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay thank you.

General Counsel, Sue, Kim and then Commissioner Clark.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

In addition to the technical and practical difficulties highlighted by the consultants relative to nesting, I would again state for the record that nesting is mentioned nowhere in the Constitution.

It's not a requirement that this Commission employ that.

It's not one of the ranked criteria that the Commission is bound to follow.

So I would strongly advise against any activity dealing with nesting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you General Counsel.

Sue?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH:

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Did you still have your hand up?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I'm finished let Kim jump in here.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Mr. Brace go ahead.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, just as a clarification, a couple of things on the nesting issue.

It is important to note that the math doesn't work out for a perfect nesting.

But that's not to say that as you're drawing maybe it would be one idea that you could utilize in one area to at least when you're looking at, say, drawing the State House districts you're drawing some of them so that they might coincide a little bit with the State Senate districts.

I'm thinking more in terms of assisting the County and town clerks to avoid split kind of circumstances that they have to deal with in terms of how the ballot gets laid out and all of that.

So you're not going to really be doing perfect nesting.

But where it makes sense, it might be worthwhile to say, okay, this line that's going to be our State Senate line we are choosing that because it's also the State House line that we were looking at or those kind of concepts.

It's not wetting something in place but it is a concept of just keep in mind as you're drawing.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Mr. Brace.
Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, based on what Kim said and what Dustin said, we didn't bring it forward as a recommendation.

I just see it as another tool that we use.

As we do the redistricting.

So we may use it here and we may not use it there.

We may have a modification, you know, where it crosses regional lines or whatever.

But it's just a tool.

And I don't really see where it needs any further discussion, it's something we can use in the future if we choose to.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Clark.
Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Just to clarify so the one-time decisions on mapping it looks like I just want to make sure we are not missing anything we have addressed 1, 2, 4 and 5 criteria or items 3 and 6 we don't have any current recommendations on so we are just going to move on to the next Section which is other matters that are one time decisions is that accurate?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No we have the three additional motions from Monday's meeting by -- to address E.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay I'm just trying to figure out where they are on the thoughts on the page or are they not?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I don't think they are on there.
Dustin, you can clarify.

I think I was trying to move the discussion so we could get back to Dustin so he can present sed Szetela right.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't believe so, no.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Witjes .

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm going to do the next one a little out of order because I think it makes the most sense and it has to do with the recommendation of how we document our changes that we are making.

So we did have a motion that was made to recommend to the full Commission that we document major changes.

And Doug will be able to speak to this a little bit more.

But it is my understanding that the way that it works is once we actually have or the motion is once we you know have our direct maps and we make public comment on it, any major changes that we make to the map needs to be documented.

And those documentations as to why we made those changes are going to be documented by staff and the Department of State.

And then those particular changes, the documents supporting those changes will be placed in a separate area on our website, not so it's not like within the meeting minutes, it's going to have its own area.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You want me to lead the discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me talk about documentation as a whole.

And when we get to the flow chart it will be indicated in the flow charts but not in the detail and we will talk about.

I looked at documentation as a four-legged stool.

One there is going to be documentation by Bruce.

And he is going to keep that in miss own repository and that is the reports and recommendations that he provides to us.

Another leg of that stool would be the documentation by Lisa.

And she would do things in the same manner as Bruce and she would have her own repository.

The third would be documentation done by Kim and his staff.

And a lot of that is done automatically.

As part of the software.

And then there is the documentation by us as the fourth leg of that stool.

Now, the documentation from us we decided that we don't want to document every little thing we do because there is going to be a lot of well let's move in line here and that line there and so forth.

Moving the lines is documented but I Kim and his staff.

And that's done I believe automatically as we go forward.

But the reason for doing or making that move is not documented by his staff.

And that's what we talk about relative to documentation by us, the MICRC.

And we need to be able to capture that.

And we decided to do it only for major changes.

And if we have any confusion over what a major change is Bruce is going to say this is a major change.

You need to document that.

You know, to protect him and protect us.

And so we decided that we don't want the 13 Commissioners involved in documenting.

And we want them involved in focusing on the redistricting.

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

And so we suggested that either the staff or the Department of State does the documentation and that we have our own separate repository for that and that would be a directory on the website.

So that's basically what we are talking about here.

Is our portion of it.

Kim's portion is done by is already defined and done by him.

Bruce is the same.

Lisa is the same.

So we are just talking about us documenting major changes and the reasons that we are making those, right, those changes.

And we are going to have to justify the reason on this.

So that's a little more detail on what we are talking about at this point.

I yield back.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: It looks like you all have a hand.

Commissioner Lange? Not you all, it's one of the committee members so Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just for clarification when he talks about like Lisa's documentation of changes, we will receive everything from her in writing.

She said she will do a very in depth report.

So all of our vendors will be presenting stuff in writing to go into our own records.

I just want to make that point clear because I know Doug was saying each one has their own repository.

I almost said suppository.

That is my funny for the day.

And make their own repository.

But we will have copies of this for our own and that was discussed in the meeting so I just wanted to clarify on that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take Lisa for example.

She may have a report and give us a recommendation.

We take a look at the report.

It's hard for us to decipher what a valid recommendation is based on the law.

She will catalog that and put that in her request and then when we are all done, we are going to have to collect that from Lisa. We are going to have to collect it from Kim. And we will have to collect it from Bruce as our historical records.

And, you know, working for the State of Michigan, so we will get it then as well.

So I believe Julianne has a point.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: She does, General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes, during the committee meeting I raised that per their contracts with the Commission all of your consultant's data are Commission records.

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.

There is one official record of the Commission kept by the Secretary of State's office per the Constitution so again the distinction we are saying is that these changes or tomorrow -- template would be part of the official record but for convenient sake listed separately on the website so people could refer back to them.

But again all of the work product is our Commission records under the contracts, so anything that was submitted during the mapping process would be immediately encapsulated in the record but all of their work product would also be part of the Commissioner's records so hopefully that is helpful.

It's a small distinction but a critical one.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you General Counsel, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would like to put a motion forward that we approve this method of documentation for what the MICRC is doing throughout the redistricting process.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Clark.

Is there a second? Second made by Commissioner Orton.

Also supported by Commissioner Lett.

I saw you.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair was that to adopt the recommendation of the committee?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, for the method of documentation, yes and to be consistent let's do a roll call vote as well.

Thank you, hi, Sarah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hey, for the public record, would any Commissioners like the motion to be restated before we vote?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The second was Commissioner Orton, General Counsel? Sorry, Sarah, to interrupt.

And the motion I was waiting for someone else to volunteer the motion is to adopt the method of documentation as laid out by the committee for the MICRC.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: You are welcome.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony? Anthony, we are not able to hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now, hello.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, that is much better.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Strange, yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'd like to return to Commissioner Wagner if she is present.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

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

With unanimous support the motion carries.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Michigan Department of State staff.

Dustin, I give you the floor for the last two recommendations.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Year welcome.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So the next recommendation that we had is not necessarily pertaining to the actual process but this is something that was brought up and highly suggested by Bruce Adelson.

He would like to have a two-hour training session-ish with us so he can go over quite a bit of information with us when it comes to the Voting Rights Act.

And have a pretty deep discussion with us relatively soon.

So I don't know if that would need any kind of, well, I guess I'll let someone else make the motion at that particular point if anyone has anything with regards to it go ahead Doug.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I will make the motion that we have our Executive Director schedule that meeting with Bruce.

I think it's beneficial to our continuing education.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Clark seconded by Vice Chair Szetela.

Is there any discussion or debate on the actual motion? I have Commissioner Wagner's hand that was up and then Commissioner Eid you will go after her.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

Are we going to afford Dr. Handley the same courtesy?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That wasn't brought up.

I'm sure if she feels that that's needed then we would do that to her as well or allow her the curtesy.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay I will handle the hands Commissioner Lange and then Kim and then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Mine is in regards to Erin's question.

I've already contacted Sue.

Dr. Handley did bring up some issues in how to decide political fairness and different things that could be used so I have reached out to executive director Hammersmith about making time for Dr. Handley to discuss these different options we have and fulfilling that criteria at the amendment.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Cynthia you no longer have a question just double checking, Mr. Brace and Vice Chair Szetela.

>> KIM BRACE: Certainly I would think that because Lisa and Bruce both deal with Voting Rights Act that she would be one that would also be online at the same time that Bruce is making his presentation and she would be free to comment, but I see that she is put her screen on so she is free to say what she wants to say.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Here you are.

Ms. Handley, do you have something you would like to say?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I feel like I pretty much said what I had to say about the Voting Rights Act.

But I didn't talk about partisan fairness and I'm a little bit worried you have not had a discussion about the possibilities of how to measure that.

And so I thought perhaps another half an hour of statistical measures of partisan gerrymandering may not excite you but maybe we should think about that.

I don't know, I would leave it up to you if you would like more discussion on the Voting Rights Act.

But my feeling is that perhaps we should think about partisan fairness.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

I think that's a more than relevant point.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you, Brittini.

Was Mr. Adelson asking, my recollection was correct he is asking for two hours, but I believed he wanted those two hours to be a you know since he is one of our lawyers and I don't know what the word is for confidentiality between, you know, a lawyer and a client.

But I believe what he was asking for was more of a closed session if my recollection is correct.

So, one, I'd like to know if that is, in fact, what he was asking for.

And then, two, about what Dr. Handley just said, yes, I mean I think we do need that.

I stated in the subcommittee meeting what we could really use is a memo that describes the different, you know, statistical measurements of partisan fairness, fairness that we have discussed in the past with you know our friends at the universities around here.

We've discussed them but we don't have as knowledgeable of an understanding of those measures as we should.

So having that would definitely be helpful.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Eid.

Vice Chair Szetela, did you still have.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No, I was just going to let you know that Dr. Handley had turned her camera on and that is all.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay thank you General Counsel and then Commissioner Clark.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair so to answer Commissioner Eid's question no it would not be a closed session.

The two-hour training would be on the constitutional criteria, the state constitutional criteria as well as the Federal criteria.

So again you've had you know it seems like years ago that we that I presented the PowerPoint on that topic.

So this would be again another touch on the state criteria requirements as well as the Federal in open session.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, General Counsel for answering Commissioner Eid's question and Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I would like to amend the motion that I put forward to include an hour of education from Lisa relative to fairness and fairness assessments she will be doing.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I second that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: An hour of.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: An hour of continuing education on fairness.

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

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay and seconded by who?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I seconded that.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Amendment made by Commissioner Clark, second by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there any discussion or debate on the amendment? Commissioner Lange and then Kim.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just need clarification.

For the time for Mr. Adelson and I see he is here so he can answer me.

We were just told it was to go over the constitutional criteria that we have to meet.

Is that in regards to just the VRA constitutional requirements? Or is that all of them?

Because as our General Counsel stated she has gone over some of them with us.

So I just want clarification on that.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: May I?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Looking at multiple screens yes Bruce.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Multiple screens can be overwhelming and as we talked initially as one of your attorneys and as the litigation expert with redistricting with as the redistricting attorney, I would like to talk about with you which I haven't had the opportunity to in detail all of the state criteria which also includes the Federal criteria. That is the U.S. Constitution.

The Voting Rights Act.

All of your state criteria.

All of that.

And also bring you some updates on what's happening in D.C. from a voting rights perspective and also some activity with the justice department.

So this is a wide ranging attorney-client open session conversation where you know, as you move forward, I can give you legal opinions and my thoughts about the requirements, how they work together.

Some updates as I said about what's happening in D.C., what the justice department is doing, what implications that may have for you.

So a wide range and put all that stuff into two hours so we can have a full attorney-client open conversation about the all of these issues.

And they are as we know they are significant, numerous, nuisanced, complex, you name it.

I also agree absolutely about having Lisa discuss political competitiveness.

I share the concern that that's something that having more income about it as early as possible is really important.

Because that's going to inform your map drawing and also your legal obligations and responsibilities.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you for that clarification.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: You're welcome.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay and then can we squeeze Commissioner Wagner in there and then Kim can I jump back to you? Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

I just want to know from Dr. Handley is an hour sufficient? Or can we afford her the time that she may need? And if so, can Doug amend his motion to make that?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I think you were going to say abundantly clear.

I would rather Doug take his motion back than stack amendments for my brain's sake. But that's just me.

Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: Can I add one piece before Lisa speaks? Because it can bear on Lisa's comment.

I had talked with John Morgan this morning.

And he requested to be able to work with Lisa on some of the political scenarios or political science pieces.

So I would want him to work with Lisa on some of that just from a staffing standpoint.

Lisa could end up doing the presentation but I just wanted to note that my thought was to pair John in with Lisa on that sort of thing.

So Lisa it's yours in terms of.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: So maybe an hour is not going to be enough.

I mean I can outline the measures for you I'm sure in half an hour.

I don't know if you want anything incredibly detailed.

But I want to leave time for questions and I want to leave time for John to have his say. So we are flexible.

Whatever you think that you need.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay I mean we trust you to determine, whatever time you think it's going to be effective and concise and not overwhelming, whatever that looks like.

And I can't speak on behalf of the Commissioners but we have a tendency to really unpack.

So things that can kind of keep us focused and structured in terms of time, I entrust the professionals to use best judgment when it comes to that.

Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Clark and then Kim and we do have a motion to amend on the floor as well.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was actually going to recommend since this we are under the category of continuing education and that is basically the job of our Executive Directors to arrange this that maybe we put this in Sue's hands to coordinate and she can coordinate with each vendor how much time they need.

Because she is going to be the one in charge of getting it on the agenda.

So maybe we should go that route before we say five hours for continued ed, just my thought.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Commissioner Lange is that a motion?

>> KIM BRACE: Can I just add one piece? Sue and I have talked about this. And initially we had talked about the I'm sorry July 8th meeting as a way that when we have training from Fred but then we also potentially added Bruce in and now we've got Lisa.

My gut would tell me that we need to separate so that Fred has one day and Bruce, Lisa and all of that kind of discussion takes place on a different day because trying to squeeze all of that in to an eight hour I think we are going to exhaust things. So just be cognizant and I know Sue is probably shooting me right now but my gut would tell me we need to separate those just from a training standpoint.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Kim Vice Chair Szetela and Commissioner Clark? You are on mute Rebecca.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. Because we are starting to back amendments on amendments on Amendments can we get a vote on the first motion then amendment and as we want to as Rhonda recommended and I agree with her on this uncap the time so our Executive Director can work with the experts to determine the length of those meetings. I think that would be helpful but let's get these motions voted on so it's clear what we are doing because I think it's starting to get really confusing.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes so, we have the motion to amend, which was the one hour with Dr. Handley. And the main motion is two hours with Bruce for continuing education. So motion to amend first.

Michigan Department of State staff, thank you so much, Sarah. Can you lend us a hand with a roll call vote? Again, the motion is to have continuing education with Dr. Handley.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly. Happy to assist.

I did want to point out that Doug did have his hand up. I didn't know if you wanted to turn to him.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.
>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I'm good.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Great. Thank you. All right, Commissioners. Please indicate your support of the amendment with a yes or a no.

I will call on you in alphabetical order starting with Rebecca Szetela.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
>> CHAIR KELLOM: I think she said yes but it cutoff.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I said, yes, I'm sorry.

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

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Is this on the times then? I'm sorry, I'm trying to follow these motions. I'm confused.

If this is on the timeframe that it's going to be then, no.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The motion, Commissioner Lange, on the table is a motion to amend the main motion to add language one hour for Dr. Handley to cover partisan fairness.

That is the motion to amend on the table.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Lange, would you restate your vote?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm still going to say, no, because there is a specific time.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 11-2 the motion carries.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Can I amend my vote?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Also my name was skipped.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: My apologies, Commissioner Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: It's okay, it's okay, there is a lot going on.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: How would you like to cast your vote?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And, Commissioner Wagner, regarding your question, I defer to your General Counsel.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Commissioner Wagner, my understanding is you would like to recast your vote; is that correct? That's correct?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, ma'am.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So it would be a motion to reconsider because the final vote was already called that the motion carried 11-2, so we could retake the vote. We need a motion to reconsider and then a reconsideration of the motion is the process.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I motion to reconsider.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Is there a second? I have a motion made by Commissioner Wagner, a second made by Commissioner Lange.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion to reconsider? Hearing none, Sarah Reinhardt, take it away with a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Certainly. Commissioners, please indicate your vote, your support of the motion to reconsider with a yes or a no.

I will go in alphabetical order starting with Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Could I get clarification on what we are voting on? Are we voting on the motion to revote? Are we voting again all over?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Voting on the motion to revote.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Revote.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: This is the motion to reconsider the previous vote. So this is not the vote to retake the previous vote.

This is just whether to consider it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, General Counsel.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittni Kellom?
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 7-6, the motion does not carry.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: So the next thing that we need to move on is the main motion as amended.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Correct.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: And, Sarah, you can go ahead with the roll call vote. The main motion is to have Bruce come in for continuing education.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Commissioners, please indicate your support with the motion with a yes or a no. I will go in alphabetical order starting with Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can I have point of clarification, please?
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel was about to clarify. Go ahead.
- >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So I think I can anticipate your question.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Me, too.
- >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So the motion on the table currently is the main motion as amended, which is to have Mr. Adelson schedule a meeting for continuing education with Mr. Adelson for two hours and an additional one hour added to that continuing education meeting for Dr. Handley to cover partisan fairness. So it's the two, the main motion as amended is the original motion of two hours for Mr. Adelson and the amendment that was approved for one hour for Dr. Handley. Thank you.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange, I apologize for being a lazy restater of the motion. Sarah Reinhardt, go ahead.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure. I will start with Erin Wagner.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm sorry, Commissioner Wagner, will you restate?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 9-4, the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Michigan Department of State.

Dustin, is there something else? I want to make sure.

I know we are getting into lengthy discussions so I apologize.

We all have been tracking a lot.

I see Commissioner Eid's hand is raised.

- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: There is but Commissioner Eid can go before me.

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: I would like to motion to direct staff to coordinate with the vendors to set up the time that they need to hold those meetings.

- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Pause for a moment.

Commissioners General Counsel, please.

- >> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly the Commissioner has the discretion and the authority to make that motion, but given the results of the prior vote, you've already directed staff to do so.

- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay then never mind.

I retract my motion.

- >> CHAIR KELLOM: No we are not going back in the woods again.

Okay, go ahead Dustin Commissioner Witjes excuse me.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thank you Madam Chair.

Lastly, is the flow chart that Commissioner Clark put together, which is a repetitive process of how we are going to handle drawing the districts and the maps.

This is an interesting flow chart.

I thought it was originally difficult to read, however, once Doug went over it with us in the meeting it actually made quite a bit of sense so at this particular point, I am just going to hand it over to him and I don't know if he is going to share his screen or not but we should all have the flow chart at this particular point in time as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Dustin.

Let me make a few comments about it before I bring it up on the screen.

And then I'll walk you through the flow chart so you have a better understanding.

The purpose of the flow chart was to give us a roadmap of the process that we will use for redistricting.

The input from this I developed the original and then got input and comments from the subcommittee as well as Bruce, as well as Lisa as well as Kim and his staff.

So some of the important things you will see as we go through it is you will see points within the process where the vendors are going to interact.

You will see comments relative to documentation being made.

We have already talked about documentation as the four-legged stool and how each consultant is going to document and how we as a Commission are going to document.

It's a repeatable process.

And once we finish with one District, we recycle through the process for the next District and the next and the next and so forth.

The original one I had put together, and I have gotten some comments from Bruce on that, had us voting at a number of different stages.

And we eliminated that from an efficiency standpoint.

And the voting by the Commission will be done at a specific point in time.

The decision there was relative to do we continue through a process where we may turn down or with the expectation that we can save time? Or do we stop at every certain point and vote on it? And we decided from Bruce's recommendations that we continue forward.

Because a lot of this is just draft work and we wanted to make it as efficient as possible.

And the other thing I want you to remember as we go through this that this process can be adjusted or enhanced at any time should we see a need for it.

So it's a starting point.

If we get through and we see it's we are missing a piece, we can add it to it.

You know, as a normal approval process in the Commission.

And I wanted you also to understand we've had a significant discussion with the vendors on this.

And gotten their input to it.

So let me share it and I want to walk you through it.

And then this is just a recommendation coming out of our subcommittee.

This is the process we use as we do redistricting.

Important, let me say one other important point about it.

It will define how we do things. And we can use this as the roadmap, but I would contend that once we do two or three districts you will never look at this thing again. It will be engrained in your brain, this is how we do the work and we will just continue doing it.

And it will serve a purpose of documenting that we are fair and we that we are doing the districts in the same process.

And it will document any document so we can use it for any purpose of whether people say we are not addressing districts fairly and we are doing them differently.

So keeping that in mind, let me bring it up.

Let me share my screen.

I will bring it up and we will walk through it.

And for those of you that have not used flow charts before, let me give you symbols of a square or rectangle or processes.

These symbols over here point you to a process that you are being linked to on a subsequent page.

And there is another process which is or another symbol which is a diamond, which is a decision point where we decide "Yes" or "No" to do something.

Okay? So let me walk you through this.

And then I will take any questions from there and then we can discuss whether we want to utilize this as we move forward.

Dr. Handley mentioned, I will talk about this one first, Dr. Handley mentioned that once she gets the data, she wants to perform an overall analysis with ideas of problem areas.

And she wants to do that before we even get started.

And doing any redistricting.

So she can identify those problem areas to us so this will take place and she will do that independently and then provide us with her recommendations on what she sees.

So as we move through the process first thing we are going to do after we give Dr. Handley's data of course is to select whether we are working on the Congress or the State Senate or the State House.

And we've already decided we are going to start with the State Senate but as we cycle through this, we are going to get done at some point with the State Senate so we will have to choose the State House or the excuse me the Congress.

And move forward with it.

Once we have done that, we are going to select one of the regions that we want to work with.

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

So let's assume we do our regions then we have seven of them out there so we are going to select if we start with region number one or region number seven or number five or whatever.

Then what we will do is identify the communities of interest for that region so we have that data available.

And we will do that in a number of ways.

One, is we have an automated, Kim can feed in the automated portion of the communities of interest and display that on our maps for us.

And then we are going to have discussion on communities of interest per public comments that we've heard.

And at some point, those discussions are going to get documented and cataloging. Remember we talked about our documentation as only being major changes or major points.

So once we have identified that for the region, then we can start drawing.

And we can -- so EDS will draw or adjust, and I say adjust because we may recycle a District through this process, and we are adjusting it and initially we are drawing it, we are going to draw a preliminary District with boundaries per the Commission and the vendor's input so they will start the discussion on that.

And EDS is going to apply the COI to the District for the Commissioner's direction.

So we are going to have somebody at in Kim's organization doing actually doing the work but we are going to direct that work and that work will then get documented.

This points us to the next page, A.

As you will see A shows up on page two.

Okay, so once we get that COI on the map so we can take a look at it and we have it in the District Dr. Handley is going to provide us with a report and recommendation.

Now it's important to note that Dr. Handley is going to be in these meetings with us.

This is going to be real time so we are not going to be waiting for it for a day or two or whatever.

She will do that in real time for us.

So she will do her analysis of the District and she will use her own tools and her own methods to do that and then in the analysis and recommendations we will be documented by her in her repository.

And they will come back to us as recommendations.

And so then we have a decision point.

Does this meet the racial polarized criteria? And of course that comes from the recommendations from Dr. Handley.

If it does not, we need to document that or she needs to document that.

And then we need to go back to point C.

Let me bring you back to point C.

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.

Which is we need to redraw or adjust the District that we are working on, okay? And then start over.

And from that point.

Because there is no use going forward if we have got a racially polarized criteria that is not being met.

So if it is met, then we have Bruce available.

He is online.

He is doing real time analysis as well.

And Bruce will provide the MICRC with his report and documentation.

The same thing that Lisa did.

So he will do his analysis of the District.

He will document that and keep that in his repository however he does that.

And then we've got another decision point.

Does this meet the VRA criteria?

If it does not then we go back to C and start all over again on that District and redo it.

And if it does then we move on to B.

Which is the next page.

The final page actually.

And if it does then we put this District scenario into our repository for consideration.

We consider it a draft until we finalize everything.

Because we may decide to go back and adjust it at some point in time based on some things we are doing with other districts.

So we have a decision point.

Is the region scenario complete? Okay, so if it's not then we go back to C again.

We continue with the region.

Yes, because again it's complete and we continue it and go back to C and we redo another District.

Okay? And within that region.

If not, we go to D.

Delta.

Which is we select another region to begin to work on the other region? Okay? If we have done the region and the scenarios are complete then we will analyze the entire region to make adjustments if necessary.

Then we have a vote and a concurrence for that entire region.

And if we don't concur then we go back to C and start again and then just districts. We finalize our documentation and put it in our repository, if we do concur.

If all the regions are complete, if they are not complete, then we go back to D and we choose another region and we start that process over and develop the districts within that region.

If we have completed all the regions within this example the State Senate, then the MICRC and the vendors are going to review the final state map for that legislative segment which is the State Senate.

Then Dr. Handley needs to perform her fairness assessment and she cannot do that until we get like the entire State Senate or the entire State House or the U.S. Congress districts put together.

So if that is acceptable, if that is not acceptable then we go back to C and make adjustments.

If it is acceptable then we as a Commission are going to concur whether or not that's complete in our judgment.

At this point and if it is not conquered on by the Commission then we go back to C and readjust districts as necessary.

And as we go through.

So it's at some point we go back and we have done it with the regions, let's say for the State Senate we go back to E.

And E is where we made the choice of, it's E, we are going to select the Congress or the house at that point and begin to work on that.

So that is the general framework that we've put together on how we are going to work. So I can take questions on this.

And I think the significant items on here are the points where we document, points where we have our vendors and consultants involved and particularly the involvement on a real time basis to give us information.

So anyway that is in a nutshell that's the documentation of the redistricting process.

And I'm going to say if we decide to utilize this, then my opinion is after the first two or three districts we are not even going to look at this again.

It will be engrained in our brain and this is the way we are operating.

I will take any comments.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark Mr. Brace you have a comment?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, Commissioner.

Good job by Doug and updating the process.

The only thing I would add is that as part of the reason for the racial bloc voting and Lisa and Bruce's involvement is really in the areas where there is an issue.

In some parts of the state it may not be an issue.

And therefore having Lisa or Bruce watching every little run in parts of the state where there is not an issue of voting rights act, it's not something that they would necessarily be involved.

What Doug has outlined is particularly for those regions where there is an issue in terms of Voting Rights Act.

So I just wanted to add that modification to what Doug has said.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: They still have to do the analysis.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, overall at the tail end yes definitely.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct, yes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much Mr. Brace.

Rhonda, I do see you have your hand up but I'm going to call on our vendor first Mr. Stigall.

>> Kent-Stigall: Along with what Kim was saying, he would have to clarify, but my concern was Dr. Handley and Dr. Adelson trying to do analysis per District.

I'm pretty sure the way that the house is going to be done is more of an area.

If you do one District in Detroit it's all the districts in an area and how they relate to each other in the house wise.

Unless it's really boldly wrong.

They are going to need to see more than just one District by itself.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And they may at some point in time they will take a look at the region or all the regions together in this chart.

In our discussion with them on Monday, they had not indicated that they had indicated they could do it by District.

But by default I think, just through the discussion, yes, but during in this process they may say we need more data, we need to look at the other Districts in the region and so we want to defer them to that point and that is fine.

And we can just continue on through the process.

Good point, Kent.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange and then General Counsel Pastula.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Maybe let General Counsel go first just in case it answers my question.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay General Counsel Pastula?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair.

I just wanted to highlight again that for a voting rights act perspective it applies the entire state.

Whether it will come into play across the entire state is Mr. Adelson and his Voting Rights Act Council's work which is as distinct from the racially polarized voting and those analysis.

So while they will intersect and inform each other's work they really are truly distinct in how they cycled through and I think that is what Commissioner Clark was trying to capture is that it has to be fluid and dynamic as we move across the state because our state is so diverse and so unique.

So, again, kind of like the how much time for Dr. Handley versus you know Mr. Adelson is kind of one of those things that it will organically happen as the Commission works through the process.

With everybody playing their distinct roles, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange, go ahead. Thank you, General Counsel Pastula.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, it wasn't -- I have a quick question because my Internet was unstable. So in your chart it's saying that we vote on each District, did I hear you right? I didn't have the visual up at the time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me go to the chart.

No.

Hold on.

We are here, we got concurrence from Lisa and concurrence from Bruce and then down to, no, once we put the districts in the repository for consideration and we don't vote until we get as a region scenario complete and then we take a concurrence at that point.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So you're saying we are voting on regions.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Because my question is we had and I'm trying to think if it was in our regular meeting or with the vendors where they said that we really want to watch when we vote because there is going to be continuous changes, there is going to be.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Continuous communities of interest coming in so on a region it just seems like the vote should come latter, why would we restrict ourselves to saying, yes, this is perfect and have more information come in and have to change it? I guess I'm looking at it and that point was made in a meeting so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't understand the question.

I mean, we have done a District and we put it in a repository.

Saying that, yeah, this is our draft for this District and this is how we think we are going to do this.

And then when we get the region complete, we have multiple districts.

Then that's when we would vote, at that point in time.

So we can change it if we need to change it.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay I just wanted clarification, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

Yeah, I mean that is how this was put together.

I mean this can be done multiple ways in multiple formats as well.

All right and the whole purpose is to get the roadmap in place so we understand interaction points and documentation points and so forth.

Does that answer your question, Rhonda?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: My question I would think there would be a natural ebb and flow to these meetings and we would not need a flow chart to figure out which way we are going.

So that was my question.

And another one is someone going to be standing there with the flow chart and say okay this is our next step, are we going to be that anal about it?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I don't think so.

I think this is a general roadmap.

If we miss something we can back up to it.

The person that is going to lead it is whoever is Chairing that segment of the meeting.

To keep us on track.

I don't see that any different than any other meeting that we do.

For example Dustin is doing it in this meeting and in our hearings Brittini or Rebecca do it so I mean they would have to make sure we are on track.

There is nothing real strict, but we should follow it.

It's a flow.

And we should do things in this letter and if we recommend that or if we decide to do it in this order and we have it documented for future use.

So let me get somebody else.

Cynthia, your comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I see Sue had her hand up.

Maybe she has something.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to call on Executive Director Hammersmith next.

Why don't you go ahead.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you I just wanted to go back to Rhonda's question and the conversations that we've had with the mapping team and they have stated repeatedly, it's a fluid process and nothing is set in stone until everything is set in stone.

So I think we are going to go to a certain point where we have consensus and then we may start working on a different region or once we get through this date Senate districts and think we have consensus in districts, we will put kind of someplace holders there, but, again, it's a very fluid process and I don't anticipate the Commission voting until they have draft maps that they are going to put out to the public.

So, again, we talked about consensus, working together, making sure we are all on the same page but not necessarily voting at many points across the way, just voting when we get to the very end of the process.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: My apologies for the interruption. This is Sarah with the Department of State.

Commissioner Clark, I interrupted your screen share so that individuals watching via live stream are able to view all Commissioners during discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is fine.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Commissioner Cynthia and Janice, which one of you? Orton? Commissioner Orton. I'm not sure which one.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was going to kind of say the same thing it says on the flow chart I think it says MICRC consensus.

To me, I was hoping that isn't a vote then it's set in stone.

Just that, yes, okay we are good with this and then we move on to the next thing.

And I also wanted to say thanks, Doug, for I can tell you spent a lot of time on that and I think it's really helpful to just have a roadmap like you said.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Even if we are not set in stone, we have someone saying now we have to move to this but it's a roadmap and I like how you pointed out that it's repeatable.

So the public can see where we are going next and oh, we are following the same thing when we are doing Detroit as when we are doing the UP and you know it's there.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I think that is important that we are doing it the same way.

Let me comment on your point about the MICRC concurrence.

Yeah, that could be we all raise our hands let's move on to the next step, you know.

Let's move on to the next District.

It doesn't have to be a formal vote where we take, you know, because you know like Kim keeps telling us, these are drafts, you know, and we may go back and adjust it so let's not waste a lot of time doing roll call votes and just say, yeah, let's raise our hand, ten of us say yeah let's move forward, let's move forward then and get it done.

I think MC had a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think it's been address the language of concurrence does not mean votes so let's just make sure those are two distinct things so we are not voting.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think we get ourselves in trouble there, we have to have a motion right before we have a vote so the language that you have in the flow chart is concurrence and if that's, yeah, I like that idea, straw poll whatever we have to say and flexibility and the documentation is useful and I'm ready to put it to I guess I don't know, I'm hesitant to put to a motion because I think we are ready and I think we need to keep moving but I feel good about it with that language clarified.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's a process flow.

Like I mentioned before we can adjust it if we see things that are not work well for us.

Or we forgotten or we need to enhance it at some point.

So we can do that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn at this point are you making a motion to adopt the recommended flow chart?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Dustin's hand so I'm hesitant to do that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Then we will move on to Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Put a motion forward that the Commission utilize the MICRC redistricting process flow chart that created by Doug as a starting point for the repetitive redistricting process.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn beat you to it. Department of State I will tap on you one more time to do a roll call vote for this one like we have done the rest of the meeting.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Szetela, I wanted to make sure there was no discussion before moving on to the vote.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry, is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, I will now hand it over to you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Okay, Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no. I will start with Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? Rhonda Lange? Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'd like to return to Commissioner Kellom if she is present.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom has stepped away and she is no longer present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry, my Internet is crazy. Can you hear me?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We are we can hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vote of 10-2, the motion passes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

All right. At this point we've been going for about two hours, so I'm going to suggest, Dustin, do you have a comment before I suggest we take a recess for ten minutes? You're on mute.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say this is going to be real fast, that concludes the actual recommendation from the actual committee. I want to make a motion to disband the committee.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can I get a second on the motion to disband the committee? Looks like Juanita Curry has raised her hand. So we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes, seconded by Commissioner Curry to disband the subcommittee. I'm not sure what the formal name of it is. Commissioner Witjes, can you help me out with the name?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Redistricting process subcommittee.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Redistricting process subcommittee. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, I will turn it over again to Department of State to take a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela. Please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a not. I will go in alphabetical order starting with Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID? Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners in favor, the motion carries.
>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right. Thank you very much. Okay, so at this point I suggest we take a ten-minute recess and convene back at I'm sorry 12:35.

[Recess]

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right, we are going to get started so it is good afternoon. As the acting Chair of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission I. Call the meeting back together at 12:36 p.m.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. Hello, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name and indicate where you are attending the meeting remotely from. I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present. I'm remotely attending the meeting from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present, and remotely attending the meeting from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present, also attending from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present, remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Also attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present, attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present, and I am attending remotely from Muskegon, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. 12 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much. Now having so completed new business agenda item 7A, we will move on to new business agenda 7B. Without objection, Executive Director Hammersmith will provide some information regarding the process to incorporate communities of interest into the mapping process. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Executive Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Certainly, I don't believe we have enough time to get into any in-depth discussion on communities of interest.

And frankly until we start seeing communities of interest on a map, I think it's going to be very hard to discuss that process.

We will schedule that out fairly quickly as something for the Commission to engage in with our mappers.

So having seeing those on the map and then starting to discuss how do we utilize that information to incorporate that into the maps.

So I would defer to a later time on that topic.

And we will definitely get some more information and some recommendations for consideration by the Commission then.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, General Counsel Pastula, do we need to have a motion to just defer that until a later discussion or can we just move on?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Your motion to postpone would be in order.

And it is not necessary to state a date certain if the Commission does not wish to do so.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, I will entertain a motion to postpone agenda item 7B.

Communities of interest process.

Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: So moved.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Second by Commissioner Clark. So we have a motion by Commissioner Rothhorn, seconded by Commissioner Clark. Rhonda, did you have a point for discussion?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do.

I think we are doing a disservice.

This has been something that we wanted to discuss for months.

And it actually would have helped with our hearings, our listening tours if we had a better definition of communities of interest.

How we are going to incorporate them into it.

And I just feel we are moving backwards by pushing it off again, but that's just my opinion, I just wanted to voice it, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any other discussion on the motion? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I want to support Rhonda's point relative to the importance of this.

And if it is being put off.

And I know we have a time constraint here today.

If it is being put off that we get it scheduled as quickly as possible.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any further discussion, Commissioner Lange? I still see your flag up.

Did you have another comment or is it just left up from your prior.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Apologies it was left up on accident.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No worries. Any further comments or discussion on the motion? All right. Seeing none, Department of State, since this has been our practice this hearing, I'm going to turn it back over to you to take a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please indicate your support for the motion with a "Yes" or "No" when I call your name. I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom? Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies, Commissioner Wagner, would you restate your vote?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 10-2, the motion carries.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much. So moving on to future agenda items, without objection our Executive Director Hammersmith will provide information on future meetings and agenda items.

Hearing no objection, please proceed Executive Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: What I would like to bring to our meeting tomorrow is a comprehensive calendar.

MDOS and MICRC staff have been working on this in conjunction with our consultants. When we have so many individuals weighing in it take as little longer to get things finalized.

But it is our intent to bring to you tomorrow detailed calendar about our future work plan, that will include the communities of interest on a date on the calendar and we will work towards making it very clear about process and how we will engage going forward.

So I'm hoping that that will create the specificity that you need moving forward in order to adjust your schedules accordingly, knowing that we are going to very quickly get into the heart of the process.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much, Executive Director Hammersmith. We will move on to announcements. Are there any announcements Commissioners need to make at this point? Okay, seeing none, without objection, Executive Director will now provide any announcements that she has.

Hearing no objections, please proceed, Executive Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I have no further announcements. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, fantastic. Seeing how the items or our agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business, a motion to adjourn is in order. May I have a motion to adjourn?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

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.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Was that Commissioner Witjes? Can I get a second? Commissioner Orton is a second motion by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Orton to adjourn. All those in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed same sign.

And, Rhonda, can you please verbally indicate because we can't.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So the motion carries by 12-0 and we will be adjourned. Everybody have a great day.

[Meeting concludes]