

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

10/11/21 10:00 am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission, we will bring the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:03 a.m. I apologize for my voice I had a cold this weekend.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube at Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel.

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 Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at [Redistricting@Michigan.Gov](mailto: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](http://Michigan.gov).

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) for viewing at a later date and this meeting also is being transcribed and those closed captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) along with the written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC), this 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 questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, our Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission at [WoodsE3@Michigan.gov](mailto:WoodsE3@Michigan.gov) or 517-331-6309.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good morning, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Calling on alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 10 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

All right, as a reminder to the public watching, you can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved. Motion made by Commissioner Lett. Seconded by Rothhorn. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Seeing none we will now vote all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Without objection we will now begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics portion of our meeting. Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with the public comment pertaining to agenda topics.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so.

Please step to the nearest microphone when I call your number. You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is number one.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Sarah Howard. I'm the attorney for the AFLCIO fair maps project.

We want you to succeed in drawing fair maps. You're not there yet. 100% of your state legislative maps disproportionately favor the same political party.

That should alarm you.

The seat count is misleading you because you are basing your seat count on a 53% democratic environment.

Nudging districts from being 3.1% more republican in the state as a whole to being 2.9% more republican in the state as a whole is not enough.

You have to unpack lopsided democratic districts that do not implicate the VRA.

On the VRA we still fear your VRA districts, especially in the State House, would be likely to elect suburban white candidates and not Black candidates from Detroit or Flint.

Please revisit your VRA analysis to ensure that the Black Michiganders can have true representation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number two.

>> Good morning. I'm Crystal Boyd and I'm Sarah Howard's legal assistant.

We continue to believe you should not judge the State Senate map using Presidential year results.

We continue to believe you should weigh 2012 election results less than you do 2020 election results.

Your current methodology does not take partisan trends in account. You should use a composite score and not one election, but that composite score should give more recent elections greater weight.

Please make each districts complete political data available on the my Districting site like the census data.

And, finally, we ask you to follow for at least, oh, sorry, we ask you to allow for at least two minutes of public comment at your public hearings. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. .

Number three.

>> Hello, Commissioners. My name is Robert and live in Ada Township in Kent County.

My comments today are about proposed State Senate District 24 in northern areas of Kent County, around Grand Rapids.

This is in the recent map number 226 drawn by you, the Commissioners.

My wife and I moved to Grand Rapids area in 1988.

In 33 years that we have lived in Kent County, we have only been to Coopersville and Allendale in Ottawa County only three times.

I shop regularly at the Cascade Meijer and also the Meijer next to east Beltline in Grand Rapids Township.

My wife is in her 14th year of full-time employment at Calvin University, which is on the East Beltline on the east side of Grand Rapids.

I urge the Commissioners to remove the Townships in Ottawa County from the proposed State Senate District 24.

And replace them with Cascade Township and East Grand Rapids City, which are our communities of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

>> Thank you, Commissioners.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Number four.

>> Hello. I'm from Flint, Michigan, and happy to be in front of the Commission. I'm a 29-year-old African/American and Hispanic male. And I know it's important you have Black elected officials that is why the act is there.

It's partisan fairness that allows Black voices in the legislature to be heard. Black officials need a fair shot at more than being elected. They need a fair shot at power. In my whole life there has only been one Black committee Chair in the Michigan Senate. In fact, in the last 38 years, there has been one Black committee chair in the Michigan Senate, that is because other maps were not fair.

Please make a fair map so my people have a seat at the table and power to do something. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number five.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Robert George from Ann Arbor. I also serve as a Washtenaw County parks and recreations Commissioner. I come before you today to comment on state District 27, which is the same configuration all three of the collaborative State Senate draft maps you have recently been working on. It is a C-shaped Central Washtenaw County District. I'm opposed to this district because it unfairly unpacks Washtenaw County voters in a District that averaged 80% democratic support over the last several election cycles. This district has been the most commandant State Senate District of any of the maps with over 110 negative comments and only five positive ones. Washtenaw residents urge you to fix this District.

When looking at improving partisan fairness, fixing this district would move the measures closer to zero. It is an easy fix, adding Scio Township, Saline, and a portion of Ann Arbor west of Main Street to the existing Jackson, Western Washtenaw County District would allow you to respect communities of interest, unpack Washtenaw county voters and improve partisan fairness metrics.

I've also provided a letter to your staff, signed by eight Ann Arbor Council members and two members of the County Commission who represent Ann Arbor asking you to split Ann Arbor like you split the Cities Lansing and Grand Rapids in the State Senate.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. .

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.

We have finished with in-person public comment and we will go to remote public comment.

So individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide live, remote public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. I will call on your name and our staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

If you are on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call on you by your name.

If you experience technical or audio issues and we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking. If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later hearing or meeting.

You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is Mr. James Gallant. Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Wanted to note for the record that Commissioner Wagner is present.

She was experiencing audio issues earlier during roll call.

Commissioner Wagner can you unmute yourself and let us know where you are attending remotely from?

Commissioner Wagner, I see you are present; but looks like you are still experiencing audio issues. So I will work with you offline to resolve those.

Mr. Gallant, please allow us one moment to unmute you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I will note that Commissioner Eid has arrived and is present as well.

>> James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions.

For the Commissioners here, please consider formal proceedings to remove Commissioners involved in the extreme breach of the rules of procedure last Friday, Rule number 4.10.3, suspension of the rules, Commissioner Szetela, Rothhorn, Witjes, Lett, and Ms. Reinhardt.

Witjes accused Szetela of making unilateral decisions and then did not object to trigger a vote. Then they took a break and he came back with some fancy parliamentary maneuver to suspend the rules. And except for the suspend the rules and he made a combination motion. So all these people work together to breach the Constitution and the rules to say two thirds vote to suspend the rules. And yet it was only 5-4 instead of 6-3, and that is why we need Secretary of State Benson here.

She is the secretary without a vote. She is supposed to be making these decisions about parliamentary procedures, what the rules are, and what the vote is. And this is the problem.

With all these people should be removed. Please have a special meeting to remove these people immediately.

I believe Commissioner Witjes is a...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Lamar.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We will move on to number three Anthony Skinnell.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

Firstly, I want to say we need a lot more than a minute to tell you people how badly you fubared. But time sake why don't you draw districts like this, Congressional for Detroit? Makes a hell of a lot more sense to me. The configuration you have been running with was initially drawn on September 16 by Commissioner Clark and the younger man from the software vendor. And it took you guys 20 minutes or 15 to find Woodward Avenue. And that is your consideration.

Commissioner Orton thinks these collaborative maps are sacrosanct. I think scattershot is more like it.

Appreciate Commissioner Eid's attempt to give us potential CD1 District residents an option. But all he really did was switch out Warren for Taylor. That is a distinction without a difference. You thought we didn't notice.

I know you guys are just collecting a paycheck. You are trying to look good. It's the United States Congress. It's not going to make a difference anyway. They are all bought off by multi-national conglomerates. But why not at least try something like this for esthetic purposes. You might think I'm crazy, but I think that your body of work has been drawn lazily.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission, Mr. Skinnell. Robert.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present. And I also want to acknowledge Commissioner Wagner's audio issues seem to have been resolved. Commissioner Wagner, can you tell us where you are attending remotely from?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes. I'm present; attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dorian Gardener, number five.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If you can hear us, if you unmute yourself, you are free to address the Commission.

>> It appears Dorian may be experiencing audio issues. I recommend we move on to the next participant and can return to them later.

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 SZETELA: Let's move on to Todd Perkins.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Number 6 and 7 are not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lots of people out today.

All right, so we will move on to number eight, Connie Orr.

>> Good morning. I'm Connie Orr of Northville, Michigan, a retiree from Ford Motor Company.

These are my opinions.

We want fair maps.

Prop two included 7 requirements in the Michigan Constitution.

Number one, are of equal population as mandated by the United States Constitution and comply with the Voting Rights Act and other Federal laws.

Two, our geographically contiguous.

Three, reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest.

Four, do not provide a disproportion advantage to any political party.

Five, do not favor or disfavor incumbent elected official or a candidate.

Six, reflect reconsideration of County, City and Township boundaries.

And 7, are reasonably compact.

Please draw fair districts.

It's good for republicans and democrats.

It's good for.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Nate Falling.

>> Falling.

>> Hello. Hope everyone is doing well today. I'm Nate Falling and live in Kentwood, Michigan in Congressional District 2.

Since the last redistricting, I have lived in incredibly gerrymandered District.

For those of you who don't know, Kentwood is essentially is the most point in the southwest wisp in Congressional District number two.

I have lived my entire voting life in a voting District that was specifically designed to hold my vote.

I come here today to ask the Commission to uphold democracy and not move forward with Congressional districts that are specifically designed to favor one party or the other.

The reason for this is not only to protect franchises of voting citizens like myself, but also to uphold the overwhelming support of Michigan 2018 proposal two.

Thank you for your time.

And I hope you take this into consideration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Joe Bush, number 12.

>> Hello. Well, thank you, Commission, for giving me a few opportunities.

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

I'm Joe Bush, the water resources Commissioner, also a drain Commissioner of Ottawa County, that is why I preside in Ottawa.

I want to talk about a few things that why we need to keep map 201. And it's crucial to Ottawa County based on the watersheds. We have the Grand River. We have Lake Michigan. We have the shoreline. And we have dredging. We have the infrastructure issues going on.

Ottawa County is by far probably one of the largest and fastest growing counties in the last ten years according to census reports. And I think we need to keep it whole. I also think we need to keep Georgetown Township a part of Ottawa County because that is who we are. And it's our makeup. And Ottawa County has been recognized as a place where everybody belongs.

We have multiple people moving in.

We have jobs. And we have a great resource of information and living capabilities here. And I appreciate your time this morning.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is Kurtis Fernandez.

>> Hello. Kurtis Fernandez.

Hello, API vote, Michigan.

I'm talking to you all today to ask the Commission to please place Precinct 14 in Novi with District 110 instead of where it currently resides in District 36.

This precinct has a significant API community.

And there are fears their voices may not be heard if they are kept with District 36.

As is the current plan.

On the other hand, the precinct is placed with District 110 that can be part of a coalition, so their interests are better served.

I hope that the Commission considers this proposal so that we ensure that precinct 14 has a voice and that voice is heard.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Kate Shishkovsky.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Kate, you are unmuted and free to address the Commission.

Kate, we cannot hear you.

Kate, we still can't hear you.

Let's move on to the next participant. And, Kate, I'll message you in the chat to try to resolve your issues.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. Next is Nick, number 17, Ciaramitaro.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.



>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Nick Ciaramitaro and I'm a registered voter in Roseville and Macomb County.

Throughout this millennium the Michigan legislative composition and Congressional composition has not represented the popular vote majority of Michigan voters as measured by the partisan vote for legislative and Congressional seats statewide.

That is one of the main reasons the people of the state voted by a substantial majority to create the citizen level Commission.

And required agreement by members of both parties as well as people without partisan affiliation to agree on the next plans.

I urge you not to accept in I plan that continues that likelihood and to work towards plans that are fair and equitable for all.

Thank you very much for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Jennifer Austin.

>> Hello. I'm Jennifer Austin from the City of Midland. I want to thank the Commission for their hard work weighing the different guidelines for creating our new legislative maps. Balancing the importance of keeping COIs together, what constitutes a COI, demands for Counties and cities to remain whole is not easy.

I have drawn several maps myself throughout this process and recognize the difficult job you have. Not every county will remain whole. Not every city will stay in its County. And some cities will have to be split because partisan fairness outweighs all.

The state has a split electorate with a slight advantage for the democrats, and yet we've experienced more than three decades of minority rule.

This has to change.

The maps should have equal numbers of safe democrat and republican seats and as many districts as possible with 0 political bias. We need representatives that work together for the people, not for their extreme base or their party. So split Counties, Break up COIs, put Cities in two Districts, but only do this where it's absolutely necessary to ensure fair maps. And if that means the City of Midland and Bay City reside in a House District that looks like a bone, then so be it.

Fair maps for the state supersede our own personal interests.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

Next in line is.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Looks like Kate's audio issues have been resolved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, Kate, go ahead.

That is number 16.

We will go back.

>> Hi, this is Kate from Livonia.

Speaking again here today, I first of all would like to thank the Commissioners for all your hard work.

And, again, I would like to bring up the issue of partisan fairness.

Just like the previous speaker, I know you work very hard on these maps.

You are getting a little closer but you're not there yet.

It's very, very important to make sure people are represented fairly.

The maps thus far give a disproportion advantage to republicans and all these districts.

And again, I've spoken before regarding splitting the Livonia into multiple districts for the house.

And the difficulty it would be for the City to handle these particularly for the mayor in reaching out to representatives and the clerk at election time.

I thank you for allowing me to speak today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Ms. Handy.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Lacracha Handy, a resident of Flint Township in Genesee County.

Partisan fairness is a community of interest and we need to keep that in mind. That is why the people in Michigan voted for the proposal that created the Commission.

Last I checked, the State House, State Senate and Congressional maps appear to be favoring the republicans.

Maps should be fair and reflect our state's diverse population.

We need maps with no political bias.

Even a little bit is too much.

I urge the Commission to not move any maps forward that will give republicans an unfair advantage.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Curtis Lyons.

>> Curtis.

Good morning, Commissioners. Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Yes. My name is Curtis Lyons. I'm a league organizer for the nonprofit. And I have a simple request of the Commission this morning.

It's just asking that we consider holding an additional public hearing in the Metro Detroit area.

My understanding on the 20th of this month is when we have the one hearing at the TCF Center.

I think it will be overwhelming and crowded and may be taxing to you all. And I'd like to request that you guys consider holding an additional meeting in the Metro Detroit area be it like Southfield, Livonia, somewhere elsewhere where more citizens can come for the majority of citizens are in this Metro Detroit area in the State of Michigan.

That is my request and thank you for this time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Evelyn.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Evelyn, you are now unmuted and free to address the Commission.

>> My name is Evelyn from Detroit, Michigan. And would like to ask the Commission to hold more hearings because the way the map is designed it will eliminate so many African/Americans from being able to vote.

So I just feel that the Commission needs to have more hearings so that so many people won't be cut out of the vote in the State of Michigan.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Dorian Thompson.

>> Dorian.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Good morning. Over the past few weeks I followed the Commission where it is concerned. And dispute voices saying keep Ottawa County together only one of the five Congressional maps does this.

This is a shame and here is an example why. Port Sheldon is less than ten miles from Holland and is in the same Congressional District.

Instead, Arenac County on Lake Huron which over 200 miles away and takes around 3.5 hours to reach.

In fact, I would have to drive to two, potentially three Congressional districts to reach what I started in.

It's not compact or not a community of interest.

Let's put it another way. I could drive to Detroit and I would have a shorter distance and a faster trip than going from Port Sheldon in Ottawa County to Arenac County. This is not a population density issue. It's a poorly drawn map that carves up community. Map 201 solves this problem by keeping compact and keeping the lakeshore whole and keeping Ottawa County together.

I urge you to listen to the residents and keep Ottawa County whole.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line to speak is Ratna Rao.

>> Hi, Commissioners, Ratna.

Hi, Commissioners my name is Ratna. And thanks for all the hard work you're doing. I come to you not just as a citizen of Novi Michigan but also organizer for south Asian group.

I have three points that I would like to make here with regards to the State House that I belong to.

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.

Please don't split up the Asian American community in Novi by moving precinct 14 out of the District 110. Even better would be to keep Novi whole. We are a community of interest. And it does not make any sense to me to split up a City and in a State House District.

Lastly, please balance the maps for partisan fairness.

I know this is a challenge, but we are all looking up to you to do this.

So thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Randy B, number 25.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have Dr. Mozip.

>> Good morning.

Good morning, Commissioners. And thank you for the opportunity.

Immigrant communities are considered communities of interest. And we hope this Commission take them seriously in consideration when drawing District maps.

Arab Americans have been part of the southeast of Michigan for generations.

And they deserve to have a chance for a fair representation.

Communities from Hamtramck to Dearborn Heights including southeast of Detroit and Melvindale and Dearborn deserve to have a Federal representation. Arab Americans share historical culture and economical and other bounds that the communities need to be linked together to be able to be part of public policy discussions.

These communities have been ignored for a long time and they don't have any other recourse to gain fair representation besides this Commission.

It's time to give them a fair chance for representation and we hope this Commission will do the right thing and link them together.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Jen Eyer is next.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Jen Eyer, a member of the Ann Arbor City Council.

And thank you for your service first of all.

As a member of the Ann Arbor City Council, I have a duty to represent my constituents to the best of my ability and to promote the interests of my City and, you know, my County at large.

Providing basic services such as maintaining a reliable water supply, ensuring safe transit systems and encouraging investment in our City is a core responsibility for me. However, several of these objectives have been impaired over the last decade because of the packed nature of legislative districts and the effect to diminish our representation in Lansing.

In particular the State Senate districts the election results in the last two State Senate elections that occurred under the current maps the results in District 18 the District

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.

representing Ann Arbor and surrounding communities yielded outcomes where the winning candidate won by average margin of nearly 50%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Judy Daubenmier.

>> Hi, my name is Judy Daubenmier.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

And thank you for your service.

I'm here today to ask you to consider holding more hearings in the Metro Detroit area. Metro Detroit has about 40% of the population in the State of Michigan.

And right now you only have one hearing in that area.

I would expect that's going to be a very crowded hearing and that you could expect to be there very late into the evening.

I think this would impact your ability to pay attention to all the comments that you'll be receiving.

I think it would be much better if you would hold a hearing in additional hearing in another part of Southeast Michigan such as Novi, so that the one hearing won't go on a long time. You will be much fresher if you are able to listen to speakers at a couple hearings rather than one great, big, long one.

And I think this would be fairer to the people of Southeast Michigan who are after all...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 31, Lee Greden.

>> Good morning. I support the draft Congressional map that is circulating online that unites Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo.

That map balances communities of interest and partisan fairness.

Unfortunately, the draft State Senate map does not achieve partisan fairness.

Here in Washtenaw County, please follow the recommendations of our local elected officials that were sent to you last week and unpack State Senate District 27, which is the Z-shaped District.

It's an 80-20 democratic District that unfairly packs democratic voters together.

Communities of interest can still be respected by uniting western Ann Arbor with Townships to west and north and eastern Ann Arbor in a separate District with eastern Townships.

Finally, the draft State House maps that are circulating are an improvement; but I again urge you to follow the recommendations of Washtenaw's local elected officials. And eastern Ann Arbor should be one house and western Ann Arbor should be combined with Townships to the west and north.

Townships to the south of Ann Arbor including Pittsfield should be in a separate House District.

Thank you for your service.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Cynthia Davis.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: It looks like Cynthia may have left the meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, we will move on to Adel-Mozip, 34.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Joan Long.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Joan if you can unmute yourself, you are free to address the Commission.

It appears Joan may be experiencing.

>> I have it. Can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, I'll be brief.

My name is Joan Long. I'm a lifetime resident of the greater Grand Rapids area and my comments today are regarding Senate map 226.

I think that Cascade Township and East Grand Rapids need to be included in north Kent County District Senate map.

These communities of interest align more closely with north Kent County. And I thank you for your time and your dedication to this procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Ken Willcut.

>> Good morning. You have me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> All right. I'd just like to make a little point. Kalamazoo City should be divided into two House Districts, east and west.

The west side of the City is more suburban, aligns more with Ostemo Township and with the other western suburbs. And also contains a university who have students that live in student housing out in the Ostemo Township area.

The east side of the City is more diverse and would do better being paired with Parchment, Cooper and Comstock, which are all in many ways closely aligned with Kalamazoo City themselves.

This would unpack the City as well as create an opportunity for minority representation in the eastern Kalamazoo District that currently and is rarely achieved because of the west side of the City dominating the elections here.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Carolyn Ballard.

>> Good morning. Are you able to hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we are.

>> My name is Carolyn Ballard and I've been a resident of Battle Creek, Michigan for 30 plus years.

I would like to thank the Commission for their hard work thus far in trying to draw fair maps that keep communities of interest in mind.

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.

In a reference to the State House map, I would definitely support putting Battle Creek with Albion. And these communities of interest typically come together on a variety of occasions through church affiliation, special programs, jobs, et cetera.

So this pairing definitely makes sense.

Please keep in mind that it is difficult for us when changes are being made to maps merely to satisfy political agendas over community needs.

So, again, I thank you for your hard work and please continue your efforts in trying to draw fair maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Judy Maiga.

>> Hi. Good morning, Commission. Thank you very much for all of the hard work that you've been doing.

The maps that you have posted recently are definitely an improvement but there is still much to be improved on in terms of partisan fairness.

I echo the comments of others requesting more hearings in the Metro Detroit area.

I would also ask that you unpack Ann Arbor, Senate District 27.

There is a large democratic vote that is packed into that area.

Shape should be your last consideration in my opinion.

I believe it is lowest on the list.

If you have partisan fairness and communities of interest combined, which is no easy task, then if the shape is off, that is the least of our worries.

It's more important that partisan fairness be met.

I also ask that you extend the comment period.

This is too important of an issue to limit it to one minute.

And thank you very much for all of your hard work.

Please consider the AFLCIO fair maps project.

They are a great resource.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Our last commenter this morning.

>> Good morning. I'm referencing the State House maps.

Oh, shoot.

Am I visible and audible to you? I'm getting weird messages here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can hear you, yes.

>> Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can't see you, but I can hear you.

>> Okay. We will go with that.

I'm referencing the State House maps.

In Metro Detroit each County operates differently and has different needs and interests and that should be considered before you split cities into more than one County. St.

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.

Clair Shores groups with the Grosse Points and Wayne County is one of those examples. So is Warren in District 10.

You split us in four districts, one so narrow and long it goes almost to the Detroit River in Detroit.

Why would we be like in these narrow little strips? It also may serve to dilute the votes of Detroiters doing that.

My biggest concern though is to ensure that the party that gets the most votes wins elections.

The maps must not be partisan.

Michigan voted to end partisan gerrymandering. Please make that a priority.

Thank you for your work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission.

This concludes our public comment for this morning.

However, I'd like to mention that all e-mail and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting. And Commissioners also review the public comment portal on our [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) website on a regular basis.

We appreciate everyone who provides public comment in whatever way you choose and invite you to keep sharing your thoughts communities of interests and maps.

Next, we are going to move on to unfinished business agenda item 5A and without objection we will continue to work through our compliance analysis and deliberations. Commissioner Lett and then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, Madam Chair, I would like to make a motion to extend the time for our individual Commissioners to file their plans to this Thursday morning at the 10:00 a.m.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion to extent the time for individual Commissioners to submit their proposed direction maps until Thursday at 10 a.m. do I have a second? Seconded by Commissioner Weiss is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none let's vote and the motion is to extent timeline for individual Commissioners to submit their District maps.

To Thursday at 10 a.m. all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The motion is adopted and individual Commissioners have until Thursday at 10 a.m. to submit maps Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would like to reconsider our vote on Friday on maps, we voted on one map I believe from Commissioner Witjes to include a Senate map. I would like to just reconsider that.

Take another vote on it and I believe that I was a yes vote on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Were you a yes or were you a no? You were a no. So I think Commissioner Clark did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I was a yes.



And I was going to submit the same motion as Steve did.

I think it's imperative we revisit it.

We were missing four Commissioners.

And that is one of the reasons.

And the other is part of that original motion we decided to suspend our process to make this happen.

And I think it was not in our best interest to do that and we should follow the same process as we do for all the other maps and be consistent.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we have a motion by Commissioner Clark seconded by Commissioner Lett.

To reconsidering that vote? Or are we General Counsel were you weighing in here?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you yes good morning to the Commission. So, yes, Commissioner Clark was on the prevailing side, so it's an appropriate motion. Was that map sent to CSS for publication? Commissioner Clark that is a question for I'm sorry I should have been clear through the Chair to MDOS.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, it has been.

However, the public the legal description application has not been made public yet. So even though it has been sent it could be remedied.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so General Counsel I'm just clarifying so we are just reconsidering that vote which is what the motion is that accurate? We are revoting on the same thing is that correct?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: It's a two-step process.

The first would be the motion to reconsider the vote and if that is adopted then the second vote would be on the original motion language which I have in front of me. And that vote would be retaken if the motion to reconsider is adopted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion to reconsider the vote on Friday to approve the Senate map and bring it to public hearings motioned by Commissioner Clark and seconded by Commissioner Lett is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All right, if you are in favor of reconsidering that original vote, this is again the vote on the motion to reconsider, all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

So we have three nays and we have nine ayes is that accurate? Can we do a roll call? Ms. Reinhardt please do a roll call vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

My understanding is the current motion on the floor is to reconsider the previous vote which the motion was to suspend the process and carry forward 10-8-21V1SD forward for consideration at public hearings.

Is that accurate?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

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

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order.

Starting with Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> 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: 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: By a vote of nine yes and three no the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay back to you Commissioner Clark.

Did you want to make a motion to revote on that Senate map? Or do we want to wait until later and follow and do them all at the same time?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair you just adopted a motion to reconsider so the vote must be retaken.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we will retake the original motion.

Do we need to restate.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So the original motion was to suspend the process and adopt the Senate map and if someone could reread that number for me.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The full motion is to suspend the process document for Senate plan 10-8-21V1SD published for the second round of hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And to clarify, if Commissioner votes no against this, it doesn't mean you can't later vote yes.

It's whether we want to adopt that Senate map at this time to go to public hearing; is that correct?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: What is happening right now Madam Chair you are retaking Friday's vote for the motion that was brought forward on Friday which was just voted to be reconsidered so the reconsideration of the motion to suspend the process document and publish Senate plan 10-8-21V1SD for the second round of public hearings is what is being voted on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just wanted clarification and I see your hand up Commissioner Lange.

If you vote no you don't want to suspend the process to adopt the map later in the day the if we revisit and consider how much we will take you can change your vote on that and I wanted to be clear that is accurate.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct the vote is Friday's vote and proper to make another motion later in the day if some other action were to be taken today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If this vote is to see if that map is going to go forward would it be possible to have that popped up on the screen real quick just so we can see what was approved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Kent can you pull up that map for Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Orton you had a comment.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So if we are revisiting the vote because we didn't think we should vote early and we want to vote on them all at the same time then why aren't we waiting to vote on it when we vote on all the others?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think in General Counsel you can weigh in I think her point is that we voted to reconsider that original motion so we have to reconsider it because that is the vote so we can vote no on this and then in an hour come back and decide what Senate maps we are taking is that accurate General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Or vote yes and move it forward but because you already adopted your motion to reconsider the reconsideration has to occur.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair exactly which plan? I want to make sure I bring the correct one up.

I'm going to share on the screen just to make sure we get this correct.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The plan number is 10-8-21V1SD.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The one I have on the screen, 100821VHD.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's a Senate map.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's a Senate map.

That is where.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It says second round of public hearings right next to it so that is the right one, ten, right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, so let's see here, this one right there is it. And is there a particular place we want to look at?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange please feel free to direct Mr. Stigall if there are particular things you want to look at.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just wanted an overview of the entire map so if you can kind of span out.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, I'll just move around a little bit so people can see. I'll just try to move slow enough.

Grand Rapids is split.

Lansing.

All of Kalamazoo.

Trying to just point out the highlights.

This is dividing line between three and 29.

Battle Creek is up this way.

It's hard to see but this is 12 and this is 28.

Ypsilanti.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Northern Michigan, too, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want to go all the way up to the UP?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Most all the UP is in 38 except for the most southeast part.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

I'm good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think this is a good map.

I think it's the best one we got so far for the Senate.

But I'd like so later I'm going to be voting yes to take it into the next round of public comment.

But I think right now what we are voting on is if we should suspend the rules and do it in a different way than what our process document says.

Which we've already approved previously.

So, yeah, I think we should vote no on this now but later when we get to voting on all of the maps vote yes on it then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments? I concur with Commissioner Eid I would like us to consider the Senate map at the same time and not do things piecemeal and follow the process and pick the number of maps we will take and selecting them rather than doing them one off and giving a slot to something we might look at later and be like hum we should have done something differently.

All right if there is no further discussion or debate all in favor, I'm going to ask for a roll call again Ms. Reinhardt.

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

To restate the motion the motion that is before the Commission is whether or not or sorry the motion that is before the Commission is to suspend the process and advance 10-8-21V1SD forward for consideration at public hearings.

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?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> 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: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of one yes to 11 no, the motion does not carry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So moving on microphone.

Thank you.

Any other motions before we move on to our unfinished business? Okay, so at this point we have 11 maps that were put on the shelf on Friday.

And we need to discuss I think we have two issue we need to discuss.

One the first issue is how many of each maps are we going to bring? And then based on that we need to decide which maps we want to bring to the public hearings.

So that is sort of the point we are at right now.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I thought about this and I would recommend that we bring no more than five in each of the categories to the public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay and then Commissioner Lange I'm sorry I know you weren't here on Friday.

So I did pull one of your maps that I knew you had worked on, your house map. I believe it was 100821 version 2HD which is where you moved Midland so I did throe that into the pool for you.

Did you also have because you weren't here on Friday did you also have any additional Senate or Congressional maps that you wanted put into our pool to consider?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: There is a Congressional that's been receiving a lot of public comment that I would like considered but I'm not sure if it's fully to the criteria. But that was the map 187.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe we have that in our pool. Do we have it in there? 201.

But I think 187 was before that change was made.

It's the same as 187? Okay so it looks like we already have that pulled in.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And what number is it now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 201, 100521VCDDW and it's listed as plan number 201 if you are on the mapping website and portal and Mr. Stigall did you have a comment? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No I was going to say I can bring it up was it a Senate or house plan?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's a Congressional.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Any of these plans somebody has questions about we will just bring it up on the screen if you want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we have seen a lot of comments about and I think they were our two original Congressional maps 180 and 187.

And people keep referring to them as that.

It might be good if we kind of tag them as that because they have different numbers now.

But it would save a lot of time when we are trying to figure out which map is which.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, I agree with that.

Sound advice.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I just wanted to say I agree with Doug's assessment to how many maps we should bring.

In regards to each type. Five of each type plus any individuals that Commissioners want to bring forward on their own.

So I want to make that a motion actually I want to have it be up to five maps of each type or of each plan type plus the Commissioners' individual plans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't believe we need to include the individual Commissioners plan because we have no say on that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Are those mostly for semantics.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to clarify Rhonda I'm looking at both the plans right now and does seem there is a difference.

It looks 187 does not have Midland City in with the other areas whereas the plan we were referring to as 201 does have Midland City so I think those are differ plans.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Then I would like for consideration map 187.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, so we have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Witjes could you restate your motion Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will take one piece out I move the amount of plans we move forward is up to five of each plan type.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, do we have a second? Thank you, Commissioner Clark. So at this point we have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Witjes to allow us to bring up to five plans of each type.

So up to five Congressional, up to five State House and five State Senate and was seconded by Commissioner Clark any discussion or debate on the motion? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Is that five collaborative maps?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Just wanted to clarify and assuming you are anticipating you want to bring in a map or Cynthia wants to or Janice wants to those are in addition to the five.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For the public record I would note that Commissioner Kellom has now joined the meeting. Can you please specify where you are dialing in from?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: From Wayne County.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid did you have a comment and we have a motion and a second.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And five is a little much to be honest.

Our staff recommended three.

We are saying five.

You know I would be okay with four.

And I would be okay with five too.

I'm just wondering if you know do we think five is too much considering the plans that we have? Maybe we should deliberate on them a little bit now and take the best four that we have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well, I think it's up to.

So for right now for the Senate we only pulled up three Senate and I think three house. So that is already at three.

It's the Congressional and we don't have to do -- I think it's a good you know ballpark. We don't have to do five Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, that was my point.

The motion was up to five.

So it's not going to exceed five so we could have three or two or one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, Commissioner Lett? I'm sorry Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I think five is reasonable especially with the public comment that we've received about people saying give us more options when we initially just had one Congressional.

We were hearing that that was just not enough options for them.

So I think five is definitely reasonable.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Commissioner Lett is that a hand?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Call the question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Call the question do with we want to do a roll call on this or do we just want to vote? Let's do a hand vote.

It's motioned and seconded by Witjes and Clark to allow five maps per District type all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted so we will select up to five of each type.

Okay, so where do we want to move to next? We can start moving through our maps with starting with I wrote them down in order we went through them Senate house and Congressional does anyone want to start in a particular place? Ms. Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For clarification, Commissioner Lange, did you identify additional map you would like to be included in maps going forward to public hearings? Or was that a map that is already included?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It was not included.

So it was map 187.

I'm sorry I don't know the.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The date is 9-29-21V1CD.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Is that a Congressional.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is a Congressional map, yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So now it's the point of bringing motions forward to figure out which five we want to bring of each type correct? Szetela se yes and where are we going to start Senate, Congressional house.

I feel Senate and house are easier because we don't have five we identified.



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.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Point of order.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are at break time.

I know I was just being alerted to that hearing no objection it's currently 11:15 we will take a recess for ten minutes so that people can get up and move around.

Hearing no objections we are in recess until 11:20.

Thank you.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right as Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 11:43 a.m. Will the secretary please call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name.

One moment we are experiencing technical audio issues in house.

Just one moment.

Test one two.

Test one two.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Sarah, we can hear you and I don't know who you are testing one, two to though.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We still working on it? Do you have your Zoom open?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Test one two.

Test one two.

Test one two.

Test one two.

There we go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right we good?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Ready to go thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely, Madam Chair. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely as well as your physical location.

I will call on you in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita, I think you may be muted.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm not muted.

Can you hear me now?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We are experiencing audio issues with you Juanita, I will message you in the chat to try to resolve that.

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: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

I can also hear Commissioner Curry.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: One moment please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I think Sarah has figured it out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Toi is saying she can hear Juanita and Brittini was just trying to speak and I could see her speak.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We cannot hear the virtual people in this room for the people who are viewing online.

Who can hear the Commissioners speaking, we cannot.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And Commissioner Lange and Curry can you give your thumbs up if you can hear us speaking.

Thank you.

So they can hear us, we just can't hear them.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry can you say where you are attending remotely from.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I'm present and attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you for your patience. everyone.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

Erin, can you hear us?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I can and present and attending from Charlotte Michigan, remotely.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Our vendor and staff are working hard to put together some information to help us analyze the maps that we have already said on Friday we wanted to move forward with plus the additional one from Commissioner Lange and while they continue to work on that rather than us to continue to wait, we are going to move on to new items on the agenda or different items on the agenda so we can be efficient with our time.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I say we move to agenda 8 so our Executive Director can discuss public hearing guidelines and the mapping process and procedures. And amend the agenda I apologize.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To amend the agenda to allow the Executive Director to present on the MICRC public hearing guidelines.

Can I get a second? Seconded by Commissioner Eid.

So we have a motion and a second to amend the meeting agenda to add an item under 8A to allow the Executive Director to present on the MICRC public hearing guidelines, is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none let's go ahead and vote all in favor of amending the meeting agenda please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

So at this point we're going to quickly approve our meeting minutes that we have.

Then we will move on to that agenda item 8.

So without objection we will move forward to approving the minutes that were sent to the Commission with the agenda.

May I have a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the Commission meeting held in Detroit Michigan on September 28.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Rothorn.

All in favor of approving the meeting minutes from September 28 meeting in Detroit Michigan please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted.

At this point we will move on to staff reports Executive Director without objection I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to provide a report.

Please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you very much and good morning, everyone.

There were two documents that I sent very late last night actually early this morning including the public hearing guidelines and the mapping process and procedures. These have been in staff review until yesterday and I moved along the edits that we received.

I sent you the red line version which was virtually impossible to read.

And also a clean copy has been provided.

There are a few things that will change so let's start with the public hearing guidelines.

This document was revised from the original document to put the categories for public hearing in so it makes sense and it flows a little better.

So first of all about public hearing access.

So we have the Zoom webinar and the dial in information, so anybody can access the meetings.

Of course the meetings are on YouTube via live stream.

And any member of the public who is interested can go back and also replay any message.

Any meeting of the Commission.

Whether it's a public hearing or a regular Commission meeting.

All public comments are recorded in meetings.

So anybody giving live public comment we have a verbal record of all those comments, that's retained online.

People can also give their public comments in person.

And that could be either at a meeting or public hearing.

And they can access those via the meeting notices.

And then lastly there is closed caption and ASL, Spanish and Arabic translation services provided for people to participate in the meetings.

And if people need other accommodations for any language barriers or disabilities, they can e-mail Ms. Reinhardt at Michigan.gov or contact her via phone and that information is in all of the meeting notices.

Under public hearing, de quorum again we want to lift the subsection 11 where Commissioners, staff, attorneys and consultants are prohibited from discussing redistricting matters with members of the public unless that communication occurs in writing or during public comment at an open meeting.

So we want to make sure that the Commissioners I think have heard this enough, they remember, but the general public may not necessarily know that.

So you know to stop them if they start providing information about mapping.

We will have to follow COVID protocols for all the facilities.

So if there is a mask order or they want to take temperatures, again, those are in the COVID protocols.

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.

Seating may be limited, due to seats being spaced out.

However, our communications and Outreach Director has certainly booked as large of venues as possible for the public hearings so we can accommodate as many people as possible.

Also no oversized banners signs blow horns or similar devices.

Most of the facilities prohibit those anyway.

So then the next Section is on the actual public comment participation.

So first we will conduct the in person public comment.

And in the order of people signing up to comment at the meetings.

We will close that sign up at 7:00 p.m. each day of the public hearing.

And then the Chairperson calls on the participants just like they do now in all of our meetings by the speaking order number to approach the microphone and provide their comment.

The remote public comment will follow the in-person.

And again they have to sign up in advance via through the meeting notice.

There is the link there and they will close that at 3:00 the days of the public hearings because we want to make sure there is adequate time for the Michigan Department of State to notify the people how to get into the Zoom meeting.

And to provide the remote public comment.

And of course you know there is a public comment portal members of the public can utilize that any time.

It's accessible 24/7 on the website.

And also there's public comment on the maps.

So the people can go to any Districting plan and again they go to our website to access those plans that the Commission has discussed.

And those that will be put forward for publishing.

Lastly, the public comment procedure we talked a little bit about order but in-person first and remote subsequently.

The speaking time again will be set for up to one minute per your rules of procedure. One of the things we added was that if a Commissioner -- if a somebody making public comment wishes to talk about a specific map, that we would allow time for that map to be brought up on the screen so everybody could see before that one minute public comment period would begin.

We are going to ask speakers to indicate which map they're speaking about. Because sometimes it's hard to figure out if it's a State Senate, State House or Congressional District where they are making their comments.

So we want to make sure that public commenters are asked to do that.

And then there will not really be discussion during the public comment period, again we will accept the public comment, if there are questions or clarification is needed

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.

Commissioners certainly can ask somebody making public comment to clarify especially a geographical location if you are unsure of that.

Personal conduct we won't accept personal and pertinent or slanderous remarks and if people become disruptive the Chairperson may take action.

Any questions on public hearing guidelines? I apologize if these came to you without a lot of time for consideration.

Hopefully those brief comments explain this draft and I would entertain any questions you might have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's not really a question per se.

I mean I like the document here so far.

But I do want to address a situation in regards to time.

I think one minute may be a little too short, two minutes may be a little too long so for the public comment, for the second round of hearing I wanted to see if there is thoughts in regards to having to be 90 seconds as opposed to one minute? But something to think about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree.

I don't think one minute is enough.

I think 90 seconds is certainly better than one minute.

I would recommend that we go back to the two minutes that the first round of public hearings had.

I think it was good that we reduced the public comment time allotment for these meetings while we are -- because these meetings the primary purpose is get through the agenda, get our work done, submit the best possible maps for those rounds of public hearings but the main purpose of the public hearings is to hear from the public. So I say we should go back to two minutes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I think what we have done, in fact, in these last few weeks is experimented with how much time it takes for people to inform us of their point. And I think at least from my observation one minute is enough time it's not overly but it's enough time to make their point without a lot of extracurricular comments.

So I think we have through our experimentation here shown that one minute is sufficient.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm leaning towards the two minutes.

A lot of people have never given public testimony before.

And they have been coached and you find a lot of them what they do is first start out by thanking us which takes away their time.

My other concern is if we run across adults who may have disabilities such as speech impediments that's not exactly fair to cut the time because it may take them a little bit longer to say what they need to say.

So that's all I've got.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

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

And thank you to Commissioner Lange for again raising that critical issue.

For members of the public and our guests that require accommodations, would be granted accommodations similar, an example would be the translation that Ms. Reinhardt was able to facilitate live at a meeting just a short time ago.

So that individual was of course accommodated with additional time.

So it would be the time limit, the base time limit would be applicable to all the speakers not requiring that type of an accommodation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom? Then Commissioner Clark?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I'll just keep it short.

My comment was a combination of kind of what Commissioner Lett said and Commissioner Lange.

I think a minute and 30 seconds honestly is long enough just thinking of our past public hearings and the public comment period we have during our meeting it seems by the time folks introduce themselves, say thank you, and kind of get over their nerves they can quickly talk about a map and I think the minute and 30 second timeframe will encourage people to be to the point especially with this round and kind of being used to things even if we have a newcomer I think a minute and 30 seconds is plenty enough time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to put a motion forward to change the time for the public hearings to two minutes per person.

And retain the one minute for comments at our meetings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So you want the public hearing to be 1.5 minutes, 90 seconds.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Two minutes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, two minutes.

Sorry, I misunderstood you.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The time set forward in your amended rules of procedure is one minute.

So the wording for the motion would be to change the time for the public hearing public comment to two minutes.

That would be a temporary change just for the public hearings which if I understand Commissioner Clark correctly that was his goal.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have a second?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Rhonda.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Rhonda we have a second from Commissioner Lange.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It seems like more people want 90 seconds than two minutes and I think I just said I wanted two minutes but I would be okay with 90 seconds so how about we amend the motion to be 90 seconds instead of two minutes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we have a motion to amend the motion.

But to 90 seconds by Commissioner Eid seconded by Commissioner Witjes is there any discussion or debate on the amendments? All right hearing none let's go ahead with -- I'm sorry Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just want to mention the reason I suggested two minutes in the motion was because we are going to be looking at maps and it's just going to take a little more time to do that.

And when the individual points out these things.

So I just want to make that point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would imagine the time it takes for election data services to bring up the map is not going to be counted against the individual speaking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I was not referring to bringing up the map.

I was referring to when they start identifying certain areas on the map that this is going to take more time for us to focus on it as well as them to explain it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right any further discussion or debate on the amendment?

At this point we have a motion to amend the primary motion to change the time from two minutes down to a minute and a half, 90 seconds.

All in favor of the amendment please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have one, two nays that was Erin? Erin and Rhonda.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: It was.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you do that? So we have three nays and ten ayes.

So the amendment prevails.

All right so let's move forward to the initial motion which is the motion as amended to allow 1.5 minutes of speaking time at the public hearings. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion as amended? All right, in favor of the motion to change the



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.

speaking time from our public hearing guidelines document from one minute to 1.5 minutes raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

By a vote of 13-0 the ayes prevail.

And the amendment is adopted.

All right Sue did you have anything else? On this document?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I'm complete with this document we also have the amended mapping process and procedures.

That Commissioner Witjes had mentioned in his original motion.

If we could spend a little time on those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Okay, if we look through the amended 10.10 version of the mapping process and procedures, the first three pages had little change. When you get to the fourth Page, we started changing some of the dates down at the bottom of the Page.

So, for example, October 11-15 EDS is developing maps and data for us in the center for shared solutions is developing the legal plans for publishing the draft proposed maps.

Assuming that those draft proposed maps are approved today.

And then those maps would be published for viewing and for the public comment hearings.

On the following Page the public hearing dates were changed to coincide with the five approved public hearings approved by this Commission.

On the public hearing days it is the intent to have the first hour-and-a-half for a Commission meeting.

Sorry I have a frog.

And especially on the second through the fifth public hearings then we will have time to reflect on what we heard in the previous public hearing in those meetings and create a log that can be utilized during the subsequent deliberations after the public hearings.

So deliberations are scheduled then for Wednesday-Friday October 27-29.

This is the schedule you just approved on Friday.

And adding a meeting on Saturday, October 30th, and then the following full week would be utilized for deliberations also.

So by Friday November 5th the Commission could vote on proposed draft maps. Subsequently there is about a week for EDS and the center for shared solutions to produce the maps and the legal descriptions.

And by Sunday, November 14th, it is anticipated that all that would be published and upon that publishing then the 45-day period of public comment would begin.

During the public comment you approve four meetings biweekly in November and December.

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.

December 29th would be the final day of that 45 day public comment period.

Actually 46th day.

And then that's when this Commission would actually vote on the maps to be approved with the 2D, democrat and 2 republican votes required and majority vote to publish the maps.

Any questions up until this point?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just want to make sure that the Commission meeting before the hearing is from 1:30-2:30 and Commission hearing starts at 2:30 do I read that correctly with a break from 3:30-5?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes, we will start taking public comment typically at 2:30 or if for example if our first meeting doesn't require that full time, we can start taking public comment as soon as the business portion of the Commission's agenda is complete.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so we will move from meeting to hearing without sort of a break.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Seamlessly up until the 3:30.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think I understand thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Vice Chair if I may just clarify.

The -- I believe calling a meeting versus a hearing may be incorrect.

So the whole meeting is -- the whole event starting at 1:00 and going to 8:00 is the public hearing.

But until 2:30 the Commission will conduct its business with public comment for the hearing beginning at 2:30.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Does that clarify.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Again it's one noticed hearing.

There is not two separate notices.

It's one event that has a recess from 3:30-5:00.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional questions or comments? All right anything else you wanted to present on this Sue or do you need a motion to adopt these changes?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Looking really quickly through the pages.

[ Off mic ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Microphone, please.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Mostly we wanted to get our timing to coincide properly in this document with our most recent changes that were made on Friday.

So I would entertain any other questions you might have about this document.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, well, anything else to report on Executive Director or are you finished with your report?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I'm finished.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, so I'm going to just move to approve the mapping process and procedures version 10.10.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I have a question for Sue.

On this, what is that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Lett seconded the motion.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The question for Sue is on Page 11.

When we start talking about voting, says round one voting says the Commissioners will choose their most preferred map by voting for each draft collaborative map.

Is this talking about what we're going to move up for the hearings? Because I think we would say "Yes" or "No" for each map not choose our best one.

Because it's a function of whether it's appropriate to move it or not.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: It's a ranked voting process.

So I think this document was created under the assumption that there would be a lot more collaborative maps put forth.

And Commissioners would have to whittle those down to a manageable number.

At the present time you have voted to put forward up to five maps.

You have six that you're considering.

But the ranked voting process, the round one is unnecessary.

So you would go to the round two and vote in that manner.

So you would have the number of -- you would have five votes for the six maps.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The verbiage says choose your most preferred maps.

So maps, that would be multiple maps we could choose as Commissioners.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is the way I interpret.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Absolutely.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm good, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Wouldn't it be easier just to amend what we voted up, up to six maps, so we don't have to do ranked voting anything at this particular point? Once this motion for this is done, we change instead of up to five up to six then we are basically bringing everything that we have and we don't have to deal with the ranked voting criteria of our process at all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I have two thoughts on that.

First this doesn't specify a specific number.

Our motion earlier did.

So that would be reconsidering that motion to now make it six.

I think would be the proper process because this doesn't actually say a certain number. But yes, we certainly could do that.

Or just make a new motion honestly.

I don't know that we would need to reconsider it.

I don't know if we could because I think that vote might have been unanimous.

I don't think we can reconsider and we can just do a new motion.

But yes, I agree with Commissioner Clark that this process that we have on here is maybe not going to apply as nicely to what we have.

So my suggestion to Commissioner Clark if you want to amend it you can propose an amendment P or go with it as proposed and recognize that round one is not going to apply because we don't have more maps except for that number six for Congressional. So Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just before we vote on this document, I wonder if we could go over Page 14 quickly to talk about the adoption of final maps because I have not had time to read over it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I'll note for Commissioner Orton and the group's benefit that that language, that is the constitutional language just extracted from the Constitution verbatim.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, that is fine. I just wanted to make sure there wasn't something in there I didn't know.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right so we have a motion, I believe, by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Lett.

To adopt the updated mapping process and procedures version 10.10.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Seeing none all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

All right, the ayes prevail and the amended mapping process and procedures version 10.10 has been adopted.

All right, sorry? Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right so now to make the process of the voting the next part easy when we bring them forward, I make a motion.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I'm so sorry if Commissioner Witjes is moving on to the live public comment guidelines document.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, he is not.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: There were additional things on that document.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to make a motion to.

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 SZETELA: To the six.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: To bring up to six maps of each man type forward to the second round of public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That might be a little premature because we haven't had any discussion on what we're going to do.

So we could have people say I want to see X number of map and we could be up to 7 or 8 or 9 or 10.

Unlikely but we might want to wait and consider what we are looking at when we get ready to take those votes.

We can always suspend the rules to accommodate extra maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's true.

In light of that will you maintain that motion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will withdraw.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so, I'm going to do the correspondence future agenda items and announcements and save MDOS updates to later correspondence received in advance of the meeting is provided to Commissioners in our meeting materials. Future agenda items does anyone have any future agenda items at this time? All right does anyone have any announcements? All right so Michigan Department of State looks like we still need a little bit more time so we were due to break for lunch at 1:00 but we are going to break earlier to give MDOS to work on the data they are compiling for us.

It's 12:18 we will go into recess for 60 minutes without objection, hearing no objections we will recess until 1:20 p.m.

Thank you, everybody.

[ Lunch recess ]

....

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:42 p.m.

Will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely. disclose during roll call you are attending remotely as well as your physical location.

I'll call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

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.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much, Ms. Reinhardt.

So we are moving back to unfinished business agenda item 5A which is continuing our compliance analysis and deliberations and the point that we left off is we were waiting for the compliance analysis tracking document to be completed so that we could open that up.

Kent, do you have that available on your computer? You do.

So Sarah Reinhardt if you could share that for everybody and then our process is we've already decided we can bring up to five per category so personal Congressional and house and Senate and we will decide which maps we will present to the public at the public hearings.

And this analysis we have here can help guide our decision making.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Madam Chair Commissioners the analysis you see before you is a compilation of varied scores from all of the plans that you have approved for consideration here today.

Including this one at the bottom.

That was recently added.

Now I want to be clear that these are not scores that connect with all of your criteria.

But only some of them as they are labeled.

Including partisan fairness, population deviation, compactness and the VA Ps.

As you can see on the end here.

Sorry the code name column as I was pulling this together it occurred to me that it might not be quite so easy for members of the public to approach a microphone during a public hearing saying I prefer 10-7-21-RSBK so I tried to come up with a names that were not ranking.

So I filled in the names of trees that are native to Michigan but of course if the Commission has other ideas perfectly willing to entertain those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where is the beach tree? That is all I have to say.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: It's right here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Row six.

Beach tree.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I did make sure to include Peach trees as a nod to Commissioner Weiss.

So this is where all of the data is compiled.

And then you will see along the bottom kind of color coded here State Senate is in blue. Each plan is broken out into its own Page with additional details and overall scores including partisan fairness.

Compactness.

Overall population deviation.

Additional considerations that will have to go through during presentations here today.

As well as information on each individual District.

I've placed conditional formatting under the direction of your VRA attorney to highlight for you every VAP that exceeds 40%.

So you will just see that highlighted.

And this is true of every plan.

So you'll see going through the remainder of them House Districts are highlighted with yellow tabs and indicated with yellow at the top.

Same format so that they are easily comparable on this information here consistent is highlighted.

Now you will notice that COIs and diverse communities is left blank.

That may be something that as we are presenting if you wanted to highlight for the districts what considerations were made there, I can also look through the record and add additional information there as well.

I thought it might be helpful to have a column there for adding that information if you share it while presenting.

And then finally scrolling over here are each of the Congressional plans marked in green.

For you all to review.

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 the individual pages have just a bit more detail than the comparative the comparison tab at the very front.

But this is where you can go to kind of quickly at a glance see some of the scores of the plans.

I've e-mailed this document to each one of you.

If you need help navigating it feel free to raise a hand and I'll come over and help you find whatever you are looking for.

And if any of you have any additional data you would like to be added to this, please let me know and I'm happy to do so.

I hope this is a useful tool for each of you during today's plan presentations.

Are there any questions?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If anyone is remote and have a question would you let me know because I can't currently see you on the screen.

All right, so then how would we like to proceed? Commissioners, do we want to look at each plan? I know I feel like we spent a lot of time with these plans and know them well.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Question, I would have are we looking starting with the Congressional plans?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think the process document is Senate then house then Congressional.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I guess my question would be are there any other is that true plans that anybody wants to look at in addition to the three that we have here?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We -- I was hoping to make one small change to where West Bloomfield and/or charred Lake are on the collaborative Senate map.

I don't know if now would be the appropriate time to do that or maybe it is.

I guess it depends what everyone else thinks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think I would suggest we are going to be making changes to these maps so I don't think it's the right time to do it because we already have the scores and what we are doing is getting ready for the public hearings and therefore we are going through a legal process.

There are changes that we are going to be making and it feels like it's after the public hearing process.

Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments? Okay so then back to my initial question is do we want to bring up each one of these maps and make a decision on approving it? Okay, so Kent can we start with the Senate maps and so the first one on our list is the ten 0421 which is map 199 on our portal.



So 100421V2SD.

And it correspondences to 199 on the portal so it's 100421V2SD so that is it right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there anything in particular anyone wants to look at on this map up close? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, this is the map that Dustin talked about last week that he wanted to promote, is that true?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, no, that is not, no.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is the 08 map this is the 04, October 4 versus October 8, October 8 is the one Dustin wanted to do.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Big question I have how does this differ between the other two maps?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Because I don't think we have the comparisons on the screen but this one does perform the worst of the three.

And I think as we what I'm thinking the only reason I would suggest taking it off is because I think we are going to get I'm trying to help the public know what we are actually considering and the idea that we would still consider this as low as it is I think we included it because it's our base.

it's the base that we worked from.

But again it performs in terms of partisan fairness low enough I'm thinking of taking it off again to help the public know what we will consider and what we won't.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: When you say it performs lower than the other two, you're talking about a metric standpoint, you're not talking from a COI standpoint or any of those items.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct because I think the other two versions use the same, right, it works from that base of the COI.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, they started from that base.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I would say that we should bring it either way because people could potentially look and say I like the idea of this particular District or this particular area if you were to translate this piece from this map even though it scored the lowest out of the three and put it here and see what happens.

I mean they could do that any way because the plans are going to be online for you. But something as a printout would be nice.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was just thinking when we are comparing these numbers that we have on the spreadsheet I think population deviation we know how to fix that.

We just haven't, like on Friday Anthony spent quite a bit of time picking one of them but we have not done that to all of them so I think we should take that with a grain of salt because we know we can fix it eventually.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Well since we have three State Senate maps, I would be okay with bringing all three forward since we voted we could do up to five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would agree with that comment.

But I guess my question would be on the one that we're looking at on the screen, is there any reason we shouldn't bring it to the public hearings?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mean to me the reason not to bring this one forward is because the other two in this process document are both better from a partisan fairness standpoint and a population deviation standpoint.

And those other two maps code named cherry and Spruce, they are you know those are very close.

So, yeah, that would be the only reason I could think of not to bring it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was just trying to refresh my memory what we changed on this map and if I remember correctly what we changed is we altered the VRA levels on the map.

This was the initial map we did and then we had the guidance from Dr. Handley and Mr. Adelson to press down those VRA numbers.

If you look on this there are some that are 47.7, 42%, 40.3% so VRA numbers on this map are higher and the other two maps we brought the VRA numbers down to the levels recommended by our counsel in those areas.

And Dr. Handley.

So that's my recollection of what the differences between those maps.

If there is someone who has a different recollection you know please chime in.

But I'm pretty sure that was the difference we started out with a map with higher VRA levels and brought it down and that is what created the other maps.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Commissioner Eid keeping in mind we can make adjustments to these maps, in fact, and come up with an entirely new map before we have our final vote, so I think the process here is to provide the public with alternatives to speak to at the public hearings.

And I would think that not having heard other than your comment regarding not bringing this one forward I would be bringing this one forward.

That's my motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was just going to second it.

All right motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes to bring forward plan 100421 version 2SD also correspondingly known as 199 forward to our public hearings.

Is there discussion or debate on the motion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just want to offer the code name Elm.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I didn't get all the code names to code name Elm.

So we have Elm.

Cherry.

Is there any discussion debate? Go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Do they have to be voted on by roll call?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't think so.

I don't see why.

All right, all in favor of advancing this plan code name Elm 199.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Chair Szetela my hand was raised.

I had to step out.

They are doing work so excuse the outside noise any who I just wanted to say and I realize we are going to vote any way but I wanted to say that I agree with Commissioner Rothorn's assessment or thought that we should be looking at this process a little wholistic.

It is our job to bring alternatives to the public.

However I think our deeper job to bring the best alternatives.

And if we have gone you know the trouble of having an analysis and for the portion then we do take that into account and provide the best alternatives to the public. I think that is also a nod to efficiency as well.

That is my short comment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you very much Commissioner Kellom.

All right let's go ahead and vote.

All in favor of bringing this map forward please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

So we have by a vote of 12 ayes to one nay, the plan will be brought forward.

All right let's move on to the next one and Kent can you bring up the next map? That would be 100721SDRSABK.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair before we move on from this map, I do have just a few questions for the Commission to complete the form.

Consideration number one did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map? I see Commissioner Rothorn shaking his head.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider County City and Township boundaries when drafting this proposed map.

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 SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Was this map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All right that's all I have we can move on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's move on to the next map which is 07 or so  
0721SDRASBAK.

That is it.

Okay, code name cherry.

All right so if I remember correctly this map was had adjustments for VRA and further adjustments for partisan balance.

Any comments or questions on this map? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have the same question is there any reason we should not advance it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't see any Commissioner Kellom did you have your hand raised or was that from the last comment?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: It's from the last one.

I will take it down sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

I don't see any hands.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Hearing none I make a moment to advance this map to the public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Lett to advance code name cherry 1010721RSBK also known as 220 on our portal.

To the public hearings seconded by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the plan will be presented to the public.

Next on our list, questions, I'm going to jump ahead again.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That's okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider County City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. You may proceed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, next on our list is code name Spruce.

Known publicly on the portal as 226.

Plan number 100821V1SD.

Did you bring that up? Looks like we got it up.

So again this had further adjustments by Commissioner Orton I believe for partisan fairness is that accurate? For population.

Okay so for population.

So it's very similar to the prior one it just had some adjustments for population.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Again are there any reasons anybody has not to bring this map forward?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: If not I move we bring it forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Notice how we all looked at you Commissioner Witjes like yes.

All right we have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Lett to bring forward plan Spruce also known as 226 on our portal.

Code name 100821V1SD to the public hearing.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none let's go ahead and vote all in favor of allowing this map to be brought to the public hearings raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and this map will be presented to the at the public hearings. we will now move on to the house.

Questions I always skip the questions.

Sorry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drawing this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider City County and Township boundaries when drafting this proposed map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Is this map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: This thought came into my head and I don't want to forget it.

Is there any way for us to put the code names for the maps that we're approving on the portal so that they can see that instead of just the name? So they have a chance to start giving comments by referring to those instead of just the numbers.

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.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Witjes, I'm not certain that we can edit the names on the portals without changing the plan, which would disconnect the comments. That's really the issue with modifying things that have been posted but I can look into it if we can put it like as a tag or something but I hesitate to mod anything on the portal.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you edit as a remark like you did with one of the other plans or would that also change it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well, I don't know of a way to edit that without deleting it and reloading it.

So the answer is, no, because it disconnects the comments so we will be careful about that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would just now we voted on all three of those is there anybody who wants to consider adding another one to the Senate seats?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Woods, I see you have a comment.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yeah, we will have the code names will be on a different Section of the website.

So as you approve what is being considered everyone will go to a different Section on the website with the code name so they will know exactly what that is.

So it won't be a problem.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry, thank you.

All right at this point we are going to move on to the house maps.

Starting with Peach.

Which is also known as 228 on the portal.

So it's 100821V2HD.

Let's bring that one up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have one of the house plans already up if you would like to review this one first.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Looks like oak so let's go with that one instead since you already have it up.

So oak is plan number 229 on our portal.

So this is 100821V1HD.

That we have open and available for comment.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, anybody know offhand what the difference is between version one and Peach version two?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If I remember correctly, version one was the initial Commission map.

Version two was the changes that Commissioner Lange made up in the Midland area where she or maybe this is her, yeah, this is her changes so version one is her changes, version two has Midland in with Bay and Saginaw.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see it has District 74 with Kalamazoo and Albion do they both have them together.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Battle Creek and Albion.

I think maybe it's just this one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That may be another difference and I couldn't remember so this is version one which is oak.

This is oak, okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Version one is oak also known as 229 on the portal for people who are following on the portal.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think all three of these have Battle Creek with Albion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They might I think that sounds correct, yeah.

All right Commissioner Lett or Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to move that we bring this up for the hearings.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motioned by Commissioner Clark to present plan number oak code name oak 229100821V1HD before the public hearings to bring that to the public hearing is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the plan will be brought to public hearing.

All right Kent which one do you want to go to next you going to V2.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry questions.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm going to mix up the order this time.

Was the map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider County, City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, is this version two is open.

Can we see down by the Battle Creek Albion area to see yes so that is the same. And then if you scroll back up towards Midland that would be helpful, I think to everybody.

Okay so this is the one that has Midland with Bay City.

Is this, yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, it is.

And the colors.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So this map is code name Peach.

Number 228.

Also known as 100821V2HD.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair do the other plans have this 87 in it? I think that may be.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The first one did.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think they all do.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Again is there any reason we should not bring this forward to the public hearings? And if not then I would move that they be -- this one be advances to the public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so a motion by Commissioner Lett to advance code name Peach 228, 1008V2HD to the public hearings is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Seconded by Commissioner Clark.

All right all in favor of advancing this plan to the public hearings please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

All right the ayes prevail and the plan will be advanced to public hearings.

Sarah Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Was this map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider County, City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right we are going to move on to Pine.

Which is 100821V1HDRAS.

So yep, right there.

And it is identified as 227 on the portal.



And I'll preempt Commissioner Lett so he doesn't have to.

Is there anyone who has objections to bringing this plan forward to public hearings or any reasons why we should not bring this plan forward to public hearings?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we bring it forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes to bring forward plan Pine 227100821V1HDRAS to the public hearings for presentation to the public.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted and that plan will advance to public hearings.

Sarah Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commissioner consider County City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Is this map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: As we approved the three house maps here to bring forward, do we have another house map that we could potentially bring forward that does not combine Battle Creek with Albion and/or have that long skinny District on the west coast, District 87? I can't remember, so if anyone has an idea, just a thought.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So my individual map will not have that see saw District. So the one that I already presented that is an individual map does not have that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Battle Creek alien.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe it does have Battle Creek Albion together though. So all right, Commissioner Witjes? Did you want to make a motion about the Congressional maps? You had indicated previously that you had some desire to allow the number of maps to be six.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Oh, yes, I did.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I thought you were going to motion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'd like to make a motion that the max number of Congressional maps actually let me reword that.

Do it retroactively to make a motion that the maximum number of plans for each plan type be increased to six from five.

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 SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes to increase the number of plans we can bring up to six from five, seconded by Commissioner Lett.

I see Commissioner Lange has her hand up as well did you have a separate issue or a comment about Commissioner Witjes' motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Actually it was a comment about his previous statement.

I believe map 215 has District 87 the way it was in Battle Creek if you want to take a look.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 215.

Okay, so we have a motion on the floor.

So let's take care of that first then we can go back and look at that because we have a pending motion so we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes to increase the number of proposed maps per District up to six.

Seconded by Commissioner Lett.

Is there any debate or discussion on that motion? Hearing none let's go ahead and vote.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm seeing two maps here birch and cedar and they have the same data all across for every metric.

Are these different maps?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So yes.

One is Commissioner Clark's map I believe.

Wait.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm referring to birch and cedar.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Birch and cedar.

They are different birch is the one I did and I made changes in Oakland County to improve the partisan balance so there are minor changes and I believe it was District 2 and 3.

So we were about to vote on the motion before the floor.

All in favor of increasing the number of proposed maps to bring before the public hearings to six please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

So by a vote of 11 to two the motion carries so we can now bring up to six.

Yep, Commissioner Lett.

All right so we have a request from Commissioner Lange to open up house plan 215, which is, let me look on my list here 100621V2HD corrected.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What is the code name on that one?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It doesn't have a code name because she is requesting. It's a new one, yeah.

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.

She is requesting that we look at it because it doesn't have that Battle Creek Albion was it Albion combination and also doesn't have that zig-zag District.

It's got really big deviation though.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If there is no changes to be made to this map, I move that we move map 10621V2HD forward for public hearings with the code name beach.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I love beach trees what can I say.

We have a motion made by Commissioner Witjes to move house map 215, 100621V2HD with the code name beach before public hearing.

Do we have a second? Commissioner Weiss.

So we have a motion and a second.

All in favor of advancing map or any discussion or debate on the motion?

Commissioner Lett go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That gives us seven now, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This would be the fourth house map.

This is a house map.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: State, is that what we're talking about?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No not yet.

This is a house map.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe this is from the portal plan 215.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe that this map doesn't have the fairness measures or anything run yet.

So the Commission might want to take care of that order of business prior to voting.

You might want to table this and have a look and have Mr. Adelson has arrived we are very happy to have him back with us in Michigan.

But again filling in just that tracking form and running those partisan fairness measures for this map and again for the Congressional 187 that was also brought forward today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This map initially was the one that I had changed initially I want to say with the Midland.

And then after that when there were changes made to Battle Creek and the other area, so I believe it made like a .4% on the partisan fairness.

A deviation from what it was originally when it had the long narrow area.

Don't quote me on it.

But I'm pretty sure it was like a .4% or something like that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Kent if you could go ahead and run that right now the partisan fairness that would be helpful.

Commissioner Lett did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Just looking at the map the plan deviation is extremely high at 11.2.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'd like to also mention we have not spent much time really doing any plan deviation other than one plan.

I mean just to be fair about it, we didn't really work on it.

We only had done it to one plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I see the lopsided margins are 8.2 can we look at the mean median? Mean median is 4.4.

What is the efficiency gap? 9.9.

And then the last one which would be the seats votes.

So it's very republican leaning too.

6% proportionality bias.

51-59.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well even though it scores quite high on the partisan fairness measures again I think it would be good to bring forward for the fact the public can be like I like this idea for these particular districts can you see if you can incorporate this into plan XY or Z.

So I mean, I'm done never mind.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I understand your thought process but feel people can do that by looking at the portal right now because it's already out there.

I worry about bringing a map that's not compliant and this does not appear to be compliant just based on the efficiency gap and everything.

The deviation is high and we can fix later but overall it looks like this map is going to need a lot of work.

Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And that was my thought is like I think we didn't work on this one.

We worked on like we worked on this one and that you know that zig-zag the west coast and Albion Battle Creek helped us move the efficiency gap.

We did work on this one and which led us to the other ones to get the numbers down. Yeah.

So I'm just -- that is why I think we left this one, yeah, and moved on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would suggest that if one of the Commissioners wants this map included that they take it, get it in compliance and submit it as an independent map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would concur with that.  
Commissioner or General Counsel.

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

Certainly building upon Commissioner Clark's suggestion that individual Commissioner could adopt make amendments and put this forward as one of their individual submissions, we would recommend that if this map was going to be moved forward that the Commission take some time now and make some adjustments to it if it intends to move it forward.

I would not recommend moving it forward in the current state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I withdraw my motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right so we will remove that from consideration at this point.

All right, so at this point we will move on to Congressional.

And I think we're going to start with the first one on the list which is code name apple. Which I'm trying to find out what that corresponds to so apple is 201 on our portal. 100521V1CDDW.

So I think it was, yep, right there.

So this map does combine Midland with the Tri-City area.

So that's one of the distinctions between some of these maps are whether Midland is in or out of the Tri-City area.

So just so that helps orient people.

Does anyone have any objections to bringing this map forward?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I would just offer too this is also where the west coast is in like the Ottawa County.

We heard so much from Ottawa County that this is also that, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Configuration.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Configuration and I think I can't remember if it's this may be it may be Midland that is the difference between 187.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe it is yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which is willow and apple the difference may be, yeah, okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we advance this map forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Lett to advance map apple 201100521V1CDDW.

Do we have a second? Seconded by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All in favor of advancing map apple 201100521V1CDDW please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and this plan will be moved forward to public hearing.

Next on the list is code name birch.

Which is plan 230 out on the portal.

100821V1CDRAS.

Yes, and I'm sorry Sarah we had questions for you with that.

Did you have questions with us for the Congressional map we just approved?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For the previous map, apple, code name apple, did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider County City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Is this map reasonably compact.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right and by unanimous consent unless there is objection, we are withdrawing Dustin's motion to advance map 215 beach which was the house map we just talked about.

Just want that to be clear for the record.

All right, so moving on to what we now have up on the screen, which is birch, 230100821V1CDRAS, is there any reason that any Commission has for not bringing this map forward? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I think I voiced my concerns the other day about this one.

My opinion on this is that the changes that were made to produce this map and very well not intentionally to me it reflects a partisan gerrymander.

You changed the person that did this changed the District one of the districts from 49.something democratic to 55% something democratic.

And that is just excessive in my mind.

And that just brings forth or the wrong message.

And then in addition to that, a nonminority District was moved into ten which is like a 60% nonminority population.

So I think it brings the wrong message forward.

And then I don't think that we should move this up at this point.

I yield.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move that we bring this -- move this map forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion made by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Witjes to advance map birch 230100821V1CDRAS. Commissioner Lange? I see you have your hand raised.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just had a question regarding Commissioner Clark's statement.

You're saying that the part about moving into a non- -- what was the second part I guess that you said? Not the part about the potential gerrymander but what were you saying about the second part?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, there was a District that was nonminority District that got moved into District ten that is like 60% nonminority before it got moved. Somewhere around those numbers.

So basically what you are doing is taking a nonminority District away from another District and moving it into heavily populated nonminority District. Which causes changes in the numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: But I guess my question is, is it taking away any votes from the minority population by doing this? I'm trying to understand what you're saying.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I think the reason it got moved in was to balance something that got moved out in another area.

I believe that was the philosophy but the District that went from 49%, it was democratic to an over 55% democratic and that is just to me it's excessive.

I would be perfectly happy if it was 51 or 52 but 55, I thought was an indication of gerrymandering from a partisan standpoint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why isn't District ten which is currently 60% republican a gerrymander?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Why.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why isn't District ten that is currently 60%.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: District ten is all rural that is why and didn't have much of a choice on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The point is the reason these changes were made were to improve the efficiency gap which is now down to .7 from 1.3 and to improve the mean median margin which also dropped by 2.2.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand that.

That was the purpose.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was to create partisan fairness.

It's not creating a gerrymander.

I mean we have lots of Districts that have.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We can look at it two different ways, I guess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's not a gerrymander just because you are balancing partisan fairness.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My concern was the excessive change on that one District.

You know, it's over 5% and to me that was.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well and that also came from moving we had areas of Highland and Milford that were pulled up into the thumb, that were put back down to the Counties that they are in and that is why that change occurred was putting those communities of interest closer together.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is my opinion and I just wanted to share it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid? And then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My recollection of this map was a little different.

I thought that it was done for a communities of interest reason at bringing Milford and its surrounding Townships back in with the rest of southern Oakland County rather than Milford in particular going up with the thumb.

And I quite like that configuration quite a bit better.

And as Commissioner Szetela stated, it also brought the partisan fairness numbers closer to 0.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I just wanted to clarify especially after Commissioner Clark's statement was in the map that Bruce and I think General Counsel spoke about after Commissioner Clark had that concern? Is that my recollection that we then verified that was factual? I think I remember Commissioner Rothhorn being concerned that if that was said that we should check to see if that were, in fact, true and it wasn't.

But I want to be sure if this was the map that I remember that conversation being about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel were you listening? General Counsel? General Counsel? Commissioner Kellom had a question.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We were listening and very impressed with Commissioner Kellom's memory.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I have a very good memory because I remember you two stepping in but I just wanted to be sure.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much for up lifting that question again. We did address it when Commissioner Clark first raised those concerns and as Mr. Excuse me Ms. Reinhardt was displaying the tracking data for it, the partisan fairness measures score very well on this plan.

And the compliance measures were considered and checked out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Seeing no other discussion we have a motion on the floor to advance birch 230100821CDRAS for consideration of public hearing raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Nay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: By a vote of 12 aye one nay the plan will be moved forward to public hearing.

At this point we will move on to cedar which is 1008.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Questions.



>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry I'm just going to do this all afternoon.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: One moment.

Was this map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider County City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right we are now moving on to cedar.

Which is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I loaded 100821V1.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that V1CD.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, ma'am.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is cedar 231 on the portal 100821V1CD.

Is there any reason why this plan should not be advanced? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So which one is this? This looks exactly the same to me as the previous one.

It has the same changes to Oakland County and I still see -- I still see Midland being with Bay City here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It had to have been changed or it wouldn't....

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know what the differences are.

Are the tables the exact same is that what you're saying? Let me look at it.

I don't know.

No I mean I guess it's possible I imported the wrong shape file when I was rebuilding everything.

Maybe I imported the same one twice.

Let me look at it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: These are two different ones because the population deviation is different between, wait a minute.

Hold on.

This is between birch and cedar.

Hold on a second.

No, they are different.

Birch and cedar are different.

Birch is .12% population deviation.

Wait what is going on here.

Hold on a minute.

No I'm sorry.

Birch is .26% population deviation.

Cedar is .15% deviation according to the spreadsheet.

Mine says .26 and this says .125.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mine says .26 for both of them.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't know how mine is different.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know honestly.

Like I know I drew the one RAS map and I don't know if maybe we just got the wrong map loaded in the portal for the one of them.

I'm just not sure honestly.

I'm not seeing any obvious differences between the two of them.

Anyone see anything? They are the same.

They are the same.

Well that makes it easy.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me see what we got.

Plan number what.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The second one is 231.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is 231?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And when I opened them both up there it's the same plan.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's the same plan as what is here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's the same plan, yeah. 231 and 230 are the same plan.

Like I've compared like multiple points of reference, Bay City, Detroit, even that little dig out near Jackson like it's all the same.

It's all the same.

So I'm guessing we just have a duplicate.

Which brings me to the question was there another plan that someone was thinking of other than this one that we wanted to advance? Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: My memory I think we were trying to advance the base we were working from as well as anything that was changed and I think this one may have been thought of as the base.

That is the only.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One is just CD from October 8 and I'm going to bring those in and see what we have.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Evidently what we exported on that day let me see one more minute.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I pulled up my shape file over the ten 08CD one and I don't see any changes so I think they are duplicate maps.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Did we do that? Is that the way it's supposed to be.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could have been an oversight or having problems with the software but it appears to be a duplicate.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we withdraw this one subject to it being able to be returned if someone should find a difference and are made to reconsider.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that makes sense let's move on to the next item on our list.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We are moving cedar is that the one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Cedar, correct.

All right next on the list is code name Maple.

100721V1CDDC which is known as 219 out on our portal.

Does anyone know any reasons why we should not advance this particular map?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move that we advance this map to the public hearings.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You want to see it first? I think Commissioner Orton wants to see it first.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Actually it just shut down.

I didn't do it on purpose.

It just closed.

Is there any particular place the Commissioner wants to look?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are not seeing it yet, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is a little bit better possibly are you seeing this map now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me just explain this because I did the last change to this map.

It was a collaborative map.

I took it and I wanted to increase the partisan fairness on it.

And I made some changes over in the Oakland County area such as putting Birmingham with Troy and Clawson with Troy and that sort of thing and it knocked the partisan fairness down to numbers equivalent to what Dustin had done and also what Anthony had done as well.

So all three of those are kind of equivalent from a metric standpoint hence the change that was made.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Without putting Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together, without putting Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, Szetela se you get the same metrics.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is the map I started with and I did not touch that part of it and moved it over into Oakland to get the metrics better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Commissioner Orton, you are still examining? Are you good? Okay, did we -- all right, if there are no further comments about this, I would entertain a motion to bring forward map Maple 219100721V1CDDC to our public hearings.

Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I just have one question here.  
One question.

I'm looking at the paper that we have in front of us and I'm comparing what is on the screen.

And the compactness scores we have 5 for the most compact I believe that is the first number.

And then six is the second number on the sheet it says one.

Does that make a difference?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where are you seeing that at?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: On the sheet we were passed out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Looking at the full by District one.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: It says largest.

Am I looking.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me that is the highest and the lowest deviation districts that is not the compactness.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Just wanted to be sure.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's not the compactness.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so do we have a motion at this point to move forward Maple 219100721V1CDDC? Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: You had a motion, it was made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we do have a motion already I wasn't sure.

All right any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none all in favor of advancing map Maple 219100721V is CDDC, if you want to vote aye? Or opposed vote nay.  
The ayes have it.

Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt, for reminding me.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Returning to map Maple, was this map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidates for office when drafting this draft proposed map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

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: Did the Commission consider County, City and Townships boundaries when drawing this draft proposed map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right now we are going to move on to Juniper 218 on the portal 100721V1CDAE.

Is there any reason this map should not be brought forth to the public hearing. Seeing no comments I would entertain a motion.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think this is an excellent map and should be brought forward.

I think Anthony did a real good job on this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It wasn't a motion but I will make the motion and second it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Clark to advance map Juniper 218100721V1CDAE to public hearing any discussion or debate on the motion? Seconded by Commissioner Lett.

All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Plan Juniper 218100721V1CDAE will advance to public hearing. We have one more willow.

Questions, I'll get it right eventually.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: One more chance, okay, was the map reasonably compact?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did the Commission consider incumbent elected officials or any candidate for office when drafting this draft proposed map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Did you consider Township City and Township boundaries when drafting this draft proposed map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

Willow 18792921 version 1CD.

And this map varies from the other ones because Midland City is combined with Midland Township I believe.

Yep, it's just Midland, that Midland is with Midland Township instead of being with the Tri-Cities.

Is there any reason why this map should not be brought forward for public hearing? Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good afternoon we were competing with each other so you can press the microphone first.

We have a concern the deviation here is the highest we have seen on a Congressional map.

It's over 1%.

So this would need substantial remedial work to bring that deviation down and then move it forward.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well I understand that that's true.

It still doesn't change the fact that these are not the final, final, final and that we certainly would realize that that if this were going to be considered for our final vote, in the 45-day comment period that we would have to make substantial changes in it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Lett we agree with that.

I think just as General Counsel said earlier about the map with 11.2 deviation that if maps that have such a noncompliant deviation are brought forward for the public to comment on and the public favors a particular map or parts of a particular map that have such a significant compliance issue that may raise other concerns so.

We are saying that to be consistent with what we had said previously.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange and actually I think Commissioner Witjes you were first so Commissioner Witjes then Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: With that piece of information should we say what we did earlier if this is a map that someone wants to potentially change, we can have that be an individual map where they would work on the population deviation?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that would be consistent Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This is the last one the one I asked to brick forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And I asked to bring that forward for the community of interest because we have multiple maps that split up Midland that put Midland with the Tri-Cities so this was kind of to do both you know, so there is choices so people can choice their opinions on both.

So that's my only concern.

And believe me I'm trying to do a map that has that.

I just don't know if it's going to be possible.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just for your knowledge, Rhonda, I have submitted an independent Congressional map that has Midland and Midland Township combined. And that bone from Midland to Bay City is gone in that map.

So it combines Midland Township and Midland and I think I believe it's also got the four Counties just north of Midland Township in it as well.

So I just want to let you know that is forthcoming when we do the independent ones.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that Congressional map or Senate map just to clarify? I stumped you didn't I.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No it was actually a house map that I submitted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I take that back, Rhonda.

Thank you for mentioning that.

It was a house map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yep, regardless of my prior comments to our expert, I agree with Commissioner Witjes and follow our prior precedent on bringing forward a map that's out of compliance that someone wants to bring it.

And make it in compliance so my motion here would be not to forward this map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'll second that motion by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes to not advance map willow 187, 92921V1CD.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the that particular plan will not advance.

Are there any additional plans we want to consider for advancement at this time? We completed our list of those that have gone through the compliance check over the weekend.

Is there anything else we want to consider advancing? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just wonder the cedar and birch issue, were we able to tell that is exactly the same plan? Or do we still need to figure that out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It appears to be exactly the same plan and we tabled it in the event someone wants to look closer but like I said I pulled up cedar and put my overlay for mine on top of it and I don't see any differences.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: To the Commission and Chair I am going to look to see if there is back up or where we exported a plan with the same name in somewhere and uploading it to the website yeah, a mistake was made.

But I'm going to see what I can find.

If I don't find anything, I would say they are the same.

Maybe one was copied and never edited and we left for the day, I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so I think that actually concludes our unfinished business for the day.

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 we now have until Thursday to submit individual maps so we are not going to do individual Commissioner maps presentations today so people have more time to do that.

Michigan Department of State that is the next item on our agenda do you have any updates for us?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I do not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't believe we adopted the public hearing guidelines earlier.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought we had a motion on it.

Am I wrong? Executive Director?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I think on the public hearing guidelines we were so busy amending those to change the amount of time for public comment that we may have failed to adopt the guidelines themselves.

And subsequently General Counsel has noted a couple things that may need corrected on those anyway.

So maybe it was a happy accident.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Does General Counsel I thought we adopted them with the amendment of the 92nd I thought that was our discussion. We amended it 92nds and adopted it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No the motion.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: If we didn't, I move we adopt them with the 90 seconds.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I swore we adopted them too because I specifically remember reading off the public hearing guidelines when I was reciting the motion so I swore we adopted them and thought we did two of them.

We did the hearing guidelines then we brought in the mapping process and procedures as well, the changes to that.

But.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's not recorded.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you mean it's not recorded.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right now the staff are telling us we don't have it or don't have it recorded.

That is what I'm hearing the staff are saying we don't have it recorded right now so it would be useful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Looking at this, we definitely did an amendment then a motion. A motion with amendment.

Let's just move it again but we will have to amend it again so.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair the motions I had were to amend the public hearing time.

For public comment at a public hearing time made by Commissioner Clark.



That was then amended.

Both of those were voted on and then I have logged in to adopt the mapping process document after executive Hammersmith went through the changes.

And as far as the changes to -- so I do not have a motion logged for the public comment guidelines, document.

And the two I think there is only two changes that would be two recommendations for addition of language.

It's only two words.

So those would be appropriate to walk on because I believe the other changes that the Executive Director is referring to deals with the public hearing.

Public comment public hearing time.

Which the Commission has already adopted so staff can make those changes without further direction from the Commission.

But the two changes that I noted in my edits to the document over the weekend were adding the word Bengali to the translation paragraph and at the last bullet point on the document to match up with the state statute to insert the word actually in front of committed when we are speaking about breaches of the peace at public meetings.

Those are the only two items I had flagged.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so it's your recollection that we already -- it's your recollection that we already amended this to 90 seconds though so we do not need to do that secondarily.

Okay commission Eid do you have a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I have a question before making that motion though. It also says the public sign up period is to close at 7:00 p.m. on the day of each public hearing.

Are we sticking with that time at 7:00 p.m.? We had previously when we changed our public meeting time, we moved it to 6:00 p.m. because the end time of the public hearings also moved up by an hour.

So do we want to keep it at 7:00, do we want to move it to 6:00? What are we thinking? I'd rather leave it at 7:00.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would qualify it as on site because we indicated before that anybody that is going to remote in it has a 3:00 deadline.

I think there is two deadlines for signing up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Executive Director?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: That is in the in person public comment Section. What had happened was originally we had that at 7 when we shifted our start time for public hearings from 6:00 to 5:00 then we moved the public comment sign up deadline to 7:00 p.m.

So that would be consistent with starting with the 5:00 again after our recess for the second round of public hearings.

But the Commission can do as it wishes either 6:00 or 7:00.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I will motion to adopt the public hearing guidelines with the addition of the word Bengali in the accessibility Section so it will read close caption and ALS Spanish Bengali and Arabic translation services will be provided and also add the word actually in the last paragraph so that paragraph reads any meeting attendee who at the discretion of the Chairperson for breach of peace actually committed at the meeting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have a second? Commissioner Lett? So we have a motion to adopt the MICRC public hearing guidelines and as amended as proposed by Commissioner Eid adding the word Bengali under the accessibility paragraph on Page one and adding the word actually on the very last paragraph on Page three that was seconded by Commissioner Lett.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none all in favor of adopting the MICRC public hearing guidelines please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

All right at this point we have concluded except for Michigan Department of State updates do we have any today? Sarah Reinhardt? And then Mr. Woods, I thought you had a point of privilege that you wanted to talk about thank you Mr. Woods.

It's also my understanding that we intended to cancel tomorrow's meeting.

Is that accurate? That we were going to cancel it? Ms. Reinhardt, do we need or General Counsel do we need a motion on that if we are cancelling tomorrow's meeting?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair yes and the notice of cancellation would need to be posted as soon as possible if that is the committee's desire.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we have...we would cancel because we don't have any business, is that...do we have business?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We don't have any business so we could do our own maps and thinking if that is the case then we and what I'm concerned about is that we also set a Thursday deadline for ourselves for individual maps.

If we do have tomorrow what I'm thinking about is our Monday public hearing and trying to figure out like I don't want to rush us.

I think we need time but I'm just wondering I was planning on working tomorrow.

Should we consider not working excuse me do we need to keep our Thursday deadline? I see Commissioner Lange's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If you want my opinion, please cancel that meeting for tomorrow so we can have time to finish the map if we want to submit them.

That is just my personal preference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Strong on behalf of individuals to work on the maps tomorrow and want the time to work on individual maps so we can get them done and would encourage any Commissioner working on an individual map to the extent you are able get them in as soon as possible because we are trying to reduce the pressure on DTMB to get those maps converted and uploaded.

So I know the deadline is Thursday if you can get them in sooner that is fantastic and I think us not having a meeting tomorrow will make that more achievable for those people who want to submit individual maps.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Making sure 10:00 a.m. Thursday I think is the deadline.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that is the deadline.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I share the same I don't know the word right now and I lost my train of thought.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Were you going to make a motion potentially to cancel our motion tomorrow.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Motion to cancel the meeting tomorrow and post as soon as possible.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Second by Commissioner Lett or do you is a comment.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second and a discussion that we may have to move Monday's meeting public meeting where do we stand on that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: My understanding is we because we were able to get through what we got through today that is not going to be necessary but go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I would have a different thought on that but you have a pending motion on the table to cancel tomorrow's meeting so it might be appropriate to take that vote and move on to the Monday public hearing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there any discussion or debate on the motion to cancel tomorrow's hearing? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So are we going to be meeting again this might not be necessary but it's a question will we meet between now and our public hearings for individual Commissioner submissions?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No I don't believe so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Submissions will go on the website and we can all look at them on our own time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Seeing no further hands let's go ahead and vote on the motion to cancel tomorrow's meeting all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The motion is adopted.

I Juanita Curry I did not hear you respond and I did not I can't see you so I'm not sure if you are currently so we will just move on so I would take that as a vote of moving on General Counsel go ahead with what you were going to talk about.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair so the issue is again dealing with the publication requirements under the Constitution which requires the maps to be published, all the data used for drawing those maps as well as the legal description map.

One of those one of the deliverables the Commission is relying on another state agency and by the deadline being Thursday which was necessary to move the deadline would make publication by Monday nearly impossible to fulfill.

And then none of the public who are coming to the meeting on Monday would have the benefit of those items to be published.

So the recommendation is to shift the Monday public hearing only and I would let Ms. Reinhardt supplement that understanding.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And just as a reminder the publication of these maps while it is certainly helpful and a good and right thing to do it's also a legal requirement for you all to hold a public hearing.

By Monday it's unlikely these things will be posted given the turnaround time from Thursday and so you could not legally hold a public hearing on Monday without the posting of these materials.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I think I'm asking Commissioners who do intend to submit a map I heard Thursday was necessary but we just shifted and cancelled the meeting tomorrow so what I'm wondering is if it's for example like is Wednesday too soon for example can Commissioners who want to submit individual maps should we keep it Thursday? I'm worried about the idea we have people who intent to show up on Monday at a public hearing.

It's noticed.

It's there.

We keep shifting things and just worried about our yeah like making too many changes and it's important to make these changes if we are going to do it but we should make it today if we are going to do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If the maps are in on Wednesday, then we wouldn't have to cancel or move the Grand Rapids hearing?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is a great question is that possible Secretary of State? Who could answer the question?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I would say it's our position and strong recommendation that Commissioners allow until Thursday for individuals to submit their maps.

And then allow that external department of the state that additional time including Monday and Tuesday of next week.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you have another comment? Your hand was up then it came down.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm wondering if we can hear from Mr. Woods like what our options then for moving the Grand Rapids hearing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Woods, director Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Well as you know I work at the pleasure of the Commission so it's really what does the Commission want? And you know that is what we are here for so whatever the Commission desires to do we will make the arrangements to make that happen.

But it really goes to actually what the Commission wants.

And that's always been my position in the past as relates to second round of public hearings and it will remain the same. But we can get to yes.

Let me just say that in terms of what the Commission want to make that happen and make sure we are legally compliant but like I said whatever the Commission wants.

But just so we are clear we do have a signed contract in place just so we are very clear about that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Woods.

Mr. Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Anyone object to making the due date tomorrow at 9:00 a.m.?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry what did he say?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Asked if there was an objection.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No what I'm saying is there -- the due date for individual maps can we make it tomorrow at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We cannot, that is okay.

We cannot accomplish that unfortunately.

Or accommodate that.

I'm wondering if we can do something with more flexibility that if the maps can possibly be submitted by the end of the day tomorrow then potentially, we could proceed with public hearings and if not then we move the one on Monday but I don't want to put undue pressure on particular Commissioners to debt that done and if that is not going to be possible.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wondering if we could build in some flexibility.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Even with that timeframe the outside agency departments would not have sufficient time to turn around those maps for posting prior to the Monday public hearing and you cannot have a public hearing if you did not meet the constitutional requirements.

So that is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought they needed three days though.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: If it's Thursday, Friday, Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just said Tuesday not Thursday.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Tuesday? Having the -- I would strongly advise against only extending it 24 hours.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you help us understand why.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The catastrophic software issues that some Commissioners have experienced and have been unable to draw maps, they need the time to draw maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right I understand but I'm just saying if an individual Commissioner can get their map in first thing Wednesday morning and everybody has their maps in first thing Wednesday morning let's say 8 p.m. on Wednesday can we proceed with the public hearing that gives them the free days they told us what they needed.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Commissioner can only have the public hearing if the public requirements are met so again, we were told a minimum of three days for that, so that was what was built into the schedule.

So if you shift Tuesday to any other day if you shift Tuesday to Wednesday then Friday shifts to Monday.

So that you would not be able to have the public hearing on Monday or you would have the public hearing if you don't modify the public hearing date today then everyone will show up for a public hearing that the Commission might not be able to hold.

Those are your options.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right but my request is for more flexibility so what I'm saying to you is we already voted and approved that Commissioners will have until 10:00 a.m. on Thursday to get their maps done.

What I'm envisioning and what I'm suggesting is that we know everybody is going to have all day tomorrow to work on maps. We know people will have this evening to work on maps.

My hope is that will be enough time for the people who need that additional time, that potentially they could have their maps done by the end of the day Tuesday.

If we are in that situation where they are done with their maps and submitting them, I would hate to cancel a public hearing that we have already noticed and already done advertisements for if we are able to accomplish that.

If we can't accomplish that then I think basically what I'm saying is like a springing motion that triggers if that goal cannot be accomplished then the hearing is cancelled by an automatic action if the individual Commissioners cannot submit their maps.

Us taking action today where it's a springing motion that if individuals are able to get their maps done by Tuesday evening, let's even say 10:00 at night if you can get it by 10:00 and send to DTMB so they have it sitting in their mailbox first thing Wednesday morning, and that situation the hearing would not be cancelled.

Because we are really talking about two maps potentially.

That should be more the rest of us can get stuff in earlier.

But that's kind of what I'm envisions can we have the flexibility and accomplish an internal deadline if Commissioners cannot meet it that is great then automatically Wednesday that hearing gets cancelled and reschedule at a later day.

If the accomplishes can accomplish that fantastic then we can move forward with our already noticed hearing so that is just what I'm looking for the most flexibility and Commissioner Lange I see you have your hand raised.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If anybody's flexible it's me.

But some have had more issues than others.

And there is I think an issue of that of the Constitution that says each member can and if a member can't through no fault of their own have the maps done in time, I'm kind of on the fence.

I mean I think every Commissioner that wants to will do what they have to do to get them done as soon as possible.

I also think some Commissioners are further behind through no fault of their own.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That again the Commission, the first step is the Commissioners have decided that Thursday at 10:00 a.m. is the deadline.

And that even if that is shifted earlier, it is highly unlikely that will be enough time to publish.

And, again, the Commissioners have a right under the Constitution to be able to draw the maps.

That's the first gate way to get to.

Then the submission.

Then the publication, then the posting of the public hearings.

So it is an outside agency so we do not control their workflow.

We cannot expedite their workflow.

We cannot do any of those types of things.

So we are talking about legal requirements in order to be able to hold a public hearing and I certainly acknowledge that it was scheduled.

But again, there were other modifications that came up to the Commission's schedule which naturally would necessitate downstream changes to the Commission's schedule and unfortunately Monday's public hearing is one of them.

Initially we were concerned about the Wednesday public hearing as well.

So I actually say just shifting Monday is a positive as positive to what may have been necessary given recent developments.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: My Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you and just acknowledging I think what the Commission is feeling, disappointment at it being less than ideal to have to reschedule the upcoming public hearing.

However, comparatively to the other outcome compared to rescheduling the hearing today with the week's notice if come next Monday we are unable to get the maps posted in the way that constitutionally complies we would have to cancel the hearing the day of. Which is far less than ideal compared to what we are talking about right now.

So just keep that in mind.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So my understanding is we are waiting on a software update. When are we going to get that update? Can anyone answer that question? Kent, I'm not meaning to look at you because I know you don't control.

You just work for EDS.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Reality of it is we don't even do the updates we don't do the installs.

It is done by, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: DTMB.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's my up understanding they have the necessary materials at this moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So I don't know if anyone else in the room knows that this has been scheduled for them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Executive Director?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I can add that Kim thought it would be available by the end of the day but that was the last I was told.

So I'm unsure if it's available or not yet available.

Also one thing I wanted to raise is we don't feel that the days for deliberations can be shortened.

So that means if the public hearing in Grand Rapids on Monday is cancelled and rescheduled it would have to be on either Friday, Saturday or Sunday October 22, 23 or 24th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Brace I saw you just joined in.  
Good afternoon.



>> KIM BRACE: Good afternoon I've been watching you all day.

That is all right.

I will state that we have talked with Fred and he identified again last night that the upgrade is available on his website with the upgrade capabilities through each of the softwares.

What we have, I have gone ahead and updated my system and I've been running it all day today.

It's working okay.

So I think it's there.

Kent has not because we wanted to keep his machine dealing with what we've got today.

But I believe that it's there, it's available.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have a software wear update available.

What is the website it's available at and how can we access that through auto bond edge if we can on our own.

>> KIM BRACE: With Autobound edge you can end up doing the upgrade, the software itself.

Now, I don't know if they are allowing you to do that.

But that is part of what the capability is with the software.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we might have to go through DTMB.

So have you heard anything back from them Executive Director about when we can schedule this up grade.

Can we do them tomorrow morning?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Wayne called me this morning and we talked about current situation that we are in.

I think as soon as we would have the instructions for the upload, for the upgrade, we can get those scheduled.

Especially for those individual Commissioners that are submitting maps.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'd like to motion for a ten-minute recess.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay we have a motion and a second for a ten-minute recess.

All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

Nay.

I have no idea what the vote on that was but let's just go ahead and take a recess for ten minutes.

It's 3:27 we will be back at 3:40.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 3:51 p.m.

Will the secretary please call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please say present when I call your name.

If you are attending today's meeting remotely. please disclose during roll call you are attending remotely as well as where you are attending from.

I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: All Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Ms. Reinhardt, we will go back to where we were at and having some discussion about potentially moving the date of the Grand Rapids hearing in order to accommodate the processing that needs to occur with individual Commissioner maps that are going to be due on Thursday of this week.

Mr. Woods do you have an update for us in terms of timing of the ability to reschedule that Grand Rapids hearing?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you we have first we booked with the Amway and it's a family of hotels and the ambassador ballroom is available on Tuesday, the 19th, it is not available Friday the 22nd or Saturday the 23rd.

But available on the 24th.

The Paintlin is available on the 22nd but it's a much smaller space.

Because to accommodate our set up.

And so we could go into the Paintlin if we wanted to do on the 22 of October which would be a Friday.

I did ask to see if there was availability elsewhere but because we signed the contract specifically with the Amway, we have a 2400 hit and so it's whether or not they would be willing to transfer that to one of their other properties without penalty is what we're working on right now.

But in terms of availability for the ambassador ballroom that we have on the 18th the only date that it's available is the 19th and the 24th.

There is a smaller room available on the 22nd but that would be tight knowing that our set up that we need for these public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you help us in terms of what I'm trying to imagine is right because we do have such limited number of hearings right, I think we can anticipate more people so when you say tight do we have 100 people or less or is it tight like 50 people or less? What is tight? Help me understand just like a ballpark number.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: The good news is Chase Creative is here.

So we can also Matt can speak to some of the things.

I know the Paintlin room.

The problem is it's just really the set up.

You don't have this right here is going to eat a lot of space.

So there is no -- there is no mask requirement, there is no social distancing.

And so normal set up is 300 with us doing our set up Matt you say about 100? We can probably get a hundred.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sounds like a hundred or less but not a hundred or more.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: 100 or 150 can be in the room and doesn't mean people can't wait outside but giving the Commission clarity about how much space we are working with.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you that is helpful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is for the Friday, right? Is that smaller room.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And you said the Sunday is the ballroom we were supposed to be in on Monday, is that right?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is available Monday the 18th, Tuesday the 19th and Sunday the 24th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Tuesday the 19th and then 24th repeat the dates for me, please.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: 18, 19th and 24th is correct, October 18 is the date that we currently have scheduled.

19th would be that Tuesday.

And then Sunday would be the 24th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The 24th, okay.  
Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm thinking about Commissioners is that if we do look at Sunday, that's the day before we are in Gaylord. And I think what I'm aware of is that we are going to start these meetings at 1:00 and we don't know when they are going to end.

We have a limited amount and I think I'm just thinking about our capacity to sort of move and I don't know that we will have time to check into a hotel.

Right? To get to the next day so we are starting in Detroit and going to Lansing on the 20th excuse me we are starting on the 20th at this point.

In Detroit then we will go to Lansing.

We don't know yet where Grand Rapids will be. But the idea it's either Friday or Tuesday or Sunday so if we start on Tuesday, I'm a little nervous frankly because we are not sure, yeah, I feel we should push it back to Friday.

Which is a smaller room.

But I'm not advocating for Sunday because I do think right that is another yeah then we are leaving from well, Grand Rapids to Gaylord, I don't know.

It's three days either way.

It's either Detroit, Lansing, Grand Rapids or it's right three days in a row or it's Grand Rapids, Gaylord, Flint three days in a row but that would be Sunday, Monday, Tuesday right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And I think another thing to consider there is a cramped room on Friday versus more space on Sunday.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And more space like 200 plus kind of accommodations is that kind of the when you think more space?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Ambassador holds a thousand theatre and Paintlin holds 300 with nothing in there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thinking about Sunday if it was a Sunday hearing you may actually get more people to show up because a lot of people don't work on Sunday so they wouldn't have to rearrange their work schedule.

So that could be a plus also.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would also echo in the Grand Rapids area a lot of things are closed on Sundays.

So again it could create more availability for people to come to hearings.

Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The last thing I will say if we do it on a Sunday then we would be going 8 days it would be Sunday the 24th, Monday the 25th, we would be doing hearings 26 we are doing hearings and the next day we start with our deliberations and we are scheduled to go through Saturday of that week.

So what I mean we already do long weeks but that would be a very long week.

So it's just I raise this only to say like I feel like for me the Friday is not the best fit because it's a smaller room.

And it feels like that maybe for me anyway like the best of the, yeah, worst options frankly sed Szetela best of the worst options.

Yeah, I'm just concerned about turning our hearing into a super spreader that honestly with it being that small of a room.

But I mean, that being said, like I don't really know what other options we have, I'll be honest with you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are there strong feelings Commissioners? It feels like it's Friday or Sunday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Looking at the calendar and the options my preference would be Friday.

It's not ideal to the smaller room.

But for what it's worth that is my preference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Was that a Friday Commissioner Lett?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think I'm for Friday also.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's get a motion on a vote going guys.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I make a motion that we vote, can we just roll call and we say Friday or Sunday? Does that work? Okay Friday I make a motion that we vote on Friday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not that we vote on Friday.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Not that we vote on Friday but we vote on that our public hearing will be moved to Friday the 22nd.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A motion by Commissioner Orton move to the 22nd.  
Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion?  
Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I'm waiting to hear back from the hotel so there is a possibility that the Marriott ballroom might be open so I just want to know for flexibility purposes if we can get a larger room within the properties, I don't know what has to be done so I'll defer to General Counsel to have that flexibility.  
Because right now we are scheduled to be at the Amway hotel.  
And if we can go to one of their other properties that would provide the flexibility to have more space so we could have what we need.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe the Marriott is right across the street.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: It's a walkway so it's not an issue it's just I don't want to be boxed in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.  
Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Since we are voting on the Friday date are you talking about that room might be a possibility for that Friday date? Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have a motion to move the hearing date to Friday the 22nd.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

All right, did we want to do a second motion to give Edward the flexibility to put us wherever he needs to that has the best fit for our facilities? Motion made by Commissioner Lett.

Seconded by Commissioner Witjes all in favor or is there any discussion or debate on the motion? So we have a motion by Commissioner Lett to give our director Woods discretion to change facilities if needed to allow us to have additional space room you know better set up for that Friday hearing.

Seconded by Commissioner Witjes all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

All right the ayes prevail.

So we are moving it to that Friday.

And director Woods has the direction to possibly change hotels if he needs to do so.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner, could we get an audible indication of your vote for both motions?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I voted aye.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For both motions?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, ma'am.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you very much.

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 SZETELA: All right is there anything else on our agenda to discuss today guys? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you state the time for the individual Commissioners.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To submit their maps is Thursday at 10:00 a.m.

And we should be getting a software update hopefully tomorrow.

Commissioner Lett? Yeah, we have a motion by Commissioner Lett to adjourn we have a second by Commissioner Witjes all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The meeting is adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Thank you, everybody.