

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

10/01/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As Vice Chair of the Commission, we will bring the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:15 a.m.

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 Announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location.

We will 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?

Rhonda Lange?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> 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: Nine Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion as it pertains to public comment, I would request pursuant to our rules of procedure that we adopt a one minute time limit on all in person and remote public comments.

If I have a second, I will speak to it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The motion is made by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Pursuant to rules of procedure we can set our time limit at whatever we determine to be in the best interest with the increased number of basically remote public comments today the last I checked would be there were 38 which would be well over an hour time.

Yesterday it was over altogether probably close to four hours.

So that's the purpose for cutting down the time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is there any debate or discussion? Commissioner Lett or Commissioner Clark excuse me.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I unfortunately disagree with you Steve. We advised or publicized two minutes and we should stick to that today. People prepared for two minutes.

And I think we should follow that example.

And we should treat the people on going as the same way we've treated the people in the past.

Give them two minutes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I am how do I say this I agree because it is taking quite some time of where we could be mapping.

However, is there a way that we can do it so that it starts potentially next week, leaving it two minutes this week because Doug makes an excellent point that people prepared for potential two minutes of comment today?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Chair good morning to Commission and everybody viewing.

The ability for the Commission to adjust the public comment time limit in the rules would certainly you could change it as Commissioner Witjes indicated for a future date but really the adjustment would be for that meeting only.

The two-minute limit is in the rules.

And the ability to adjust that two minute is also in the rules.

So it would be for not a permanent change, it would be the temporary change for the meeting before you.

I would also remind the Commission and the viewing public that if a change is adopted it has to be applied to all the speakers at that meeting.

You can't change mid public comment and some speakers have to minutes and some speakers have one minute.

The other thing the Commission is prohibited from doing and many months since we talked to in the Commission cannot set a time limit on the total number of speakers or a total time limit on for that to occur.

So the Commission can't say well will have one hour of public comment.

But again it is completely in the Commission's discretion to adjust that time limit so long as it's applied equally to all speakers.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you General Counsel.

Secretary of State?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Yes, I just wanted to address what Commission Clark said regarding the advertisement of two minutes.

While he is correct that the two minutes is stipulated and e-mails sent to those who have signed up for public comment it also indicates that the Commission reserves the right to shorten this.

So effectively it states two minutes or less for those who have signed up for public comment, thank you.

Oh, and I also wanted to adjust for the benefit of you making this decision there are 36 individuals who have signed up for remote public comment for today's meeting, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Secretary of State.

Any other discussion? All right so we should probably do a roll call vote.

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

Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no restating the motion Commissioner Lett please let me know if I'm stating this correctly is to shorten the amount of time each individual member of the public who has signed up for public comment has from two minutes to one minute.

; is that correct? Thank you.

Again please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 7 yes to 2 no, the motion carries.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, then we are so the motion carries as Secretary of State said.

As a reminder to the public watching, we have to move to adoption of the agenda. And as a reminder you can view the agenda at [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC). I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Lett.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion?

Seeing it is moved and seconded. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The eyes prevail and the motion is adopted.

At this point we are moving on to public comment.

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

First in line for public comment is number one.

>> Good morning my name is Roslyn and I've been a resident of Troy, Michigan for 26 years.

I have to say that I'm not pleased with the map that puts Troy with multiple cities on the east side where we share no common interest.

I don't have a concern with Troy and Sterling Heights being in the same District as we share a border and Sterling Heights is home to many immigrants which ties well into Troy's diversity.

But the rest of the map going so far east and even north to Washington Township is not in the best interests of Troy.

I want Troy to be grouped with cities that are west and south of us that share many common interests.

There are many parks and recreational activities and programs that enhance daily living for all residents in this connected community group.

Troy is a very diverse community and it would make the District even stronger if you grouped us with other diverse and blended communities to the south and west who have similar priorities and will also allow the citizens of Troy to maintain a strong voice.

Thank you for doing this difficult work, it is very much needed and very much appreciated.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you very much.

Just, ma'am, you said there was a question we should group Troy with areas to the east; is that correct? Rather than to the west.

>> I had to go so fast.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I hear you.

>> So what I left out was I want Troy to be grouped with cities west and south of us such as Clawson, Berkeley, Royal Oak, Ferndale, Oak Park, Southfield, and Birmingham because we share many common interests.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that clarification.

Next in line to address the Commission is number two.

>> Hi name is Lawrence Kramer I'm a resident of Troy.  
I'd like to thank the Commission for seeing us today.  
I'm concerned about the placement of Troy within the District 6 map as it places us with outside of the majority of our community of interest.  
While Rochester, Rochester Hills to the north is certainly part of that, we are much more aligned with communities to the south and to the west of us.  
As built upon our numerous academic and athletic interactions within the educational systems as well as the numerous programs events and governance of Oakland County.  
Additionally while I'm concerned that the partisan fairness of this map will be challengeable, I trust the Commission to do their due diligence to make sure that works.  
I'd also like to urge the counsel to review the methodologies of the AFLCIO maps as they have actually used the very comprehensive method in order to try and draw them.  
Again I'd like to thank the Commission for everything that they are doing.  
All the hard work.

I know this is a difficult and thankless task, good day.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Thank you for the clapping two.

Number three, please.

>> Number four is welcome to be right behind her, please number three go ahead.

>> Good morning my name is Terry I'm a 26 year resident of Troy.

I first want to take part of my minute to thank you for all of the work and effort you are putting into this process.

We really need to focus refocus on partisan fairness.

The proposed map that is drawn for the Congressional District particularly for number six encompass Troy does not take into account any of our communities of interest.

All of our recreation, our entertainment, our services, most people go to the south and to the west of us.

Communities of Royal Oak Clawson Berkeley Birmingham and even Rochester are within our communities of interest.

I have lived, I grew up in St. Clair shores.

We have no commonality with St. Clair shows I can tell you I have not been there in decades so I thank you for your time.

Yeah okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you so much.

Number three.

Please number four and number five right behind.

>> Just hold it.

My name is Leon Jackson.

I moved the Troy in 1967. I have business interests here, raised our kids here.

And very seldom do we ever go right now I live near Dequindre the County line and seldom do we go east it's always west.

The partisan analysis is very important to me.

I think right now we have Biden over Trump is 3% and our State Representatives is minus 3%.

More gerrymandered.

I've looked at the AFLCIO maps, fair maps and I really believe that that's a good place to start and I strongly urge that we adopt something that's close to that or for Troy.

I'd like to thank you for your hard work and all the effort.

I put my name in for this but I'm glad I didn't get it seeing how hard you have to work so thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that encouragement.

Number five and then number six on deck in the batting circle.

>> Good morning my name is Lori Evans I'm a 25 year resident of Troy.

I want to thank the Commissioners for all of the work that you put into the first drafts of our District maps.

I'm here this morning actually turns out to echo what has already much of what has been said because I'm deeply concerned that the current draft Congressional districts over all but particularly the proposed Congressional District 6 for Troy does not represent our communities of interest or the criteria for partisan fairness.

We in Troy have stronger ties to our communities of interest or more with jurisdictions to the south of us.

In Oakland County.

These are communities with which we share services and entertainment and recreational venues.

In regards to community of interest I urge you to look carefully at the state maps presented by the Michigan AFLCIO.

Which represent to me the intent for redistricting to account for population changes and to live up to the Voting Rights Act precepts of equity and balance.

I've looked at most of the hundreds of maps submitted by the public and I really do believe these deserve your look.

Thank you for allowing me this time and for your efforts to provide us fair and representative maps.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number six and number seven on deck.

>> Good morning.

My name is and I live in Troy and I would like to express my concerns about Congressional District 6 tentative map.

Specifically the cities of Troy and Rochester Hills.

Being combined with ten other cities in Macomb County such as Washington Township Harris Township Mount Clemens, et cetera.

These cities and, in fact, these two owns Oakland and Macomb could not be any more different Troy and Rochester are well developed affluent densely populated cities with large diverse immigrant population.

15% to 30% of our population are immigrant.

Highly educated focused on public education and green spaces.

The rest of the City such as Mount Clemens are largely rural and majority wide population.

Also for example about 60% of adult education in Troy are college educated.

By contrast only 16% of mount Clemens is college educated.

With such Stark differences I strongly believe the voices of Troy and Rochester will be drown out with this proposed map thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Are we at number even now? All right number seven and number eight on deck please.

>> So right off you cut my time back.

I want to thank Commissioner Clark for if you are going to put out a public notice saying you will give us so much time then we get here and take the time away from you.

I don't think that's right.

Okay you should make the time for the next meeting you're going to have and let the public know you're going to do that when we come here and we are not really able to speak like we should.

But my main concern is you are taking us out of Oakland County and you now balancing us with the other Counties you are connecting us with.

So if you are going to do that you should at least try to balance it but now the way you have it you are not giving us the strength that we had as a community that we are well respected community we are concerned about our schools and we are levelheaded community and you are putting us with a community that is kind of not levelheaded.

We voted for people not politicians and now we passed that strongly now you want to take us in an area that they don't even believe that the election we just had was truthful.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number eight and number nine on deck please.

>> Wow, hi. Thank you. My name is Dena. I live in the 11th Congressional District. When I saw the proposed maps, I was confused as to why try was put with so many Macomb communities and they do not share roads or services or parks and seemed odd to me rather than lumping us with communities to the south and west.

We are very different communities.

We are so different, in fact, we elected Haley Stevens who is a moderate and the tenth elected outspoken election denier and advocate Lisa McClain.

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.

When you look at past elections you see that this proposed District is comprised of very republican Macomb County communities which would effectively cancel Troy's voice for the next ten years.

I don't want to lose my voice.

Please reconsider these maps.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number nine and number ten on deck please.

>> Good morning.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning.

>> I'm Ashley Jennings and a Troy resident.

I want to start by thanking the Commission for your hard work through this process.

Turn to partisan fairness today.

I think all Michigan voters can agree our ability to have our voice heard in Government depends on rejecting any sort of built in advantage for one party over another.

please maintain a primary focus on partisan fairness as you move forward in this process.

This was a foundational goal of proposal two and should not be after thought.

Revisit the way Troy's Congressional map has been drawn and it's clear this map does not reflect our communities of interest.

And I urge the Commission to link Troy with municipalities to our south and west, whether it's visiting parks, attending youth sports or classes, commuting, looking at places we shop or visit for entertainment. There is much more movement to and from Troy between other communities in Oakland County.

We share County Government, some municipal services and we deserve representation in Congress that will understand and be responsive to the means of this larger community thank you so much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number ten with number 11 on deck.

>> Good afternoon my name is Donald frank I live in Clawson.

I want to talk about partisan efficiency gap you will probably hear about that more later today but making sure you keep that number as close as 0 as possible going forward.

If you just look at the State Senate election from the last five examples from 2002 going on you can see both democrats and republicans receive a majority of the votes over all statewide if you add up all the democrat and republican candidates.

But each election you can see there is efficiency gap where republican from 7-20% receive more of the vote see total than vote total.

Keeping to 0 in your Congressional and legislative maps will make sure we have partisan fairness that whatever party in the state receives majority of the vote close to have people that govern in the State of Michigan.

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

It's important both sides have the opportunity and a chance to make their voice heard and does not have to win by large margins and keep it to 0 and thank you for your hard work and we appreciate you coming out today.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 11 please do we have a number 12? I believe number 11 is our final public speaker.

>> All right, my name is Emily I'm from Troy.

I strongly encourage you to consider redrawing that map so that we are not lumped in with Macomb County.

I don't see what we have in common with the likes of Peter Lucido.

I really...I helped collect signatures for this ballot initiative, hoping that we would put an end to minority majority rule.

So I'm really hoping that you reconsider putting Troy with areas of interest like my previous friends and neighbors have addressed already.

Thank you for all your work.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

And thank you for understanding.

All right now that we have finished with live in person public comment we will move 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 could 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 Edward.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For purposes of the public record, number 1, 2, 3 and 4 are not currently present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Secretary of State that means we are moving on to number 5, Anna.

>> Good morning my name is Anna I live in the City of Dearborn I was born and raised here I'm 23.

I'm here to urge you guys to continue keeping our Muslim communities of Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, and Hamtramck together.

These communities of Muslims and immigrant minorities need to stay together for so many reasons that I just don't have enough time to go over.

But I took a look at the maps from the organization M gauge and M gauge maps are where the Muslims are and I urge you to consider these maps when you are making your redistricting sorry your redistricting plans and the plan ideas for these maps again, they are from M gauge is P3644, P4107, P4108 so that is P3644, P4107, and P4108.

Thank you everyone.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission Anna. Next in line is James Gallant.

>> Hello. Thank you. This is James Gallant, Marquette. These are my opinions. And Commissioner Rothorn as the Chair, no matter how many times you call Sarah Reinhardt the Secretary of State, she is not the Secretary of State. I believe the Secretary of State is given a dereliction of duty on her part not to participate when making these decisions.

And I would like to pick up where we left off. And I believe that Mike Brady is the problem here. Mike Brady came forward with rules of procedure and then didn't follow through with them.

Now, I believe what happened here was that when the Secretary of State went to the board of canvassers in 2011 to get the election certified, and she did, and said it passed as ballot two, the proposal, the board of canvassers then did not put this Commission in the hands of Jennifer Detloff, the legislative Council administrator who is supposed to administrate it and it give back to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has no authority to run the Commission. As you see, now the staff, oh, they are not available today. You can't have a meeting. And she is a democrat.

This is partisan politics. Why would a partisan be in charge of this Commission? And you're trying to be independent.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Your one minute has been concluded. Next in line to speak is Anthony S.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe next in line is number 7, Anne Marie.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that Secretary of State Ann Marie please address the Commission when you are ready.

>> Hi, I'm sorry, did you say Anne Marie?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> Thank you for having this I'm Ann may Ray Canton Township supervisor I know the public has been spending a lot of time commenting on the need to look at partisan fairness and election results. And the General Counsel spends a lot of time defending

why it has not been done. But we are looking forward to Dr. Handley partisan assessment today and hope she preens to the Commission what we know to be true and giving unfair advantage over one party or another and glad you have time next week to adjust the partisan fairness after the presentation I expect they will need it. Hope the Commission does not get bogged down in exact phrasing of public comments and hear what we need.

Spend the time to make sure the maps are fair.

Thank you very much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Anne, Marie.

Next in line to address the Commission is Anthony S.

>> All right sorry about that.

Hey Commission.

So I think it was pretty improper for you to change the time we are allowed to speak on the same meeting that you know that went through.

I think you should have given it let it lapse a public meeting notice and Ms. Reinhardt I don't disagree with your interpretation of the language and the notice says up to two minutes it does not say two minutes or less to me that sound no more than two minutes doesn't sound any less than two minutes and furthermore you know comments were made back when a couple days ago Commissioner Witjes you were advocating not you know working overnights and stuff to not cancel any public hearings and in that exchange Commissioner Szetela then said well we are not a legislative body.

That is 100 percent false.

I'm looking at the Michigan Constitution.

This Commission is here by established as a permanent Commissioner in the legislative Branch.

So yeah, I'm not happy with what you did with public comments today.

You should let the meeting lapse between that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Jerry Walden.

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

>> Sorry, I'm Jerry Walden. I'm a physician retired family physician and spent all my life in Michigan.

Thank you for this opportunity.

My main interest is that you will balance the districts in a way that partisan gerrymandering is removed and to that end I've reviewed the AFLCIO Districting.

I think it's an excellent attempt to add fairness to our elections.

And I would hope that you will strongly consider adopting the maps.

Thank you.

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

Sarah Woolsey.

>> Hello, Commission, good morning my name is Sarah Woolsey a resident of Grand Rapids Michigan and my comments today are about the Congressional District that includes Kent County.

As the second largest City in Michigan Grand Rapids is also by far the largest City in West Michigan and it is the significant community of interest for our region.

It's the focus of our population employers healthcare, airport entertainment, 11 different universities and colleges.

And the population of Kent County is near the population needed for a full District itself with 657,000 voters.

The currently drawn District includes expansion eastward into farming Townships and Ionia County which do not share things in common with this core Metro area and core community of interest.

To be consistent with the goals of prioritizing communities of interest I encourage expanding westward to Townships that are more allied with Kent County including universities that are part of the Metro area and cities and Townships that are essentially suburbs of Grand Rapids thank you for your time and work.

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

>> Hello and good morning my name is Stephanie Williams I'm a resident a lifelong resident of Kalamazoo, Michigan.

I wanted to weigh in regarding the maps regarding where I live at which is Kalamazoo County.

The Congressional map although I'm somewhat spectacle about it going from Kalamazoo to Grand Rapids mainly because we are two totally different cities Metropolitan cities and with the wealth gap and the different interests and things that are happening, I'm afraid we may not have adequate representation from the west side of the state particularly Kalamazoo.

However, it's not the worst looking map with some tweaks with an equitable lens I think it could be doable.

I can say a lot of the maps at the state level that are being proposed in the local level for Kalamazoo County are not equitable.

They are not fair.

They do not give real access and opportunity particularly for Black and indigenous and people of color to adequately participate in the political process when it comes to voting and for running or office, I'm asking you to please consider that.

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

>> There I go.

Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

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.

>> Okay, my name is Frank Lynn I live in Grand Rapids Township. Cascade and I'm talking about the two State Senate districts.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Frank you're sounding a little muffled and it's hard to hear you.

>> Okay I'm talking about the two State Senate districts Cascade Township does not belong in a District with Benton Harbor Benton Harbor is miles away about an hour away.

Cascade should be part of the north Grand Rapids District.

It's part of the Forest Hill school system with Ada and Grand Rapids Township.

And therefore should be included with those areas.

East Grand Rapids should also be a part of the north District.

It's more like Forest Hills and Ada, so that should be put together.

To balance this out the population of rural areas in Ottawa County should be moved out of the north District.

Those are agricultural areas.

Fruitridge and Peachridge Avenue so forth and so on.

The south District would need to shift to the south and west which would include 28th Street west which is part of the Metropolitan area and would make a whole lot more sense.

So I would encourage you to readjust.

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

>> I'm Val Nicolai. It appears Oakland County has little representation both at the Senate and Congressional areas.

Oakland County is 20% of Michigan basically 20% of Michigan's GDP so this lack of some local representation could have a significant impact on the state and many of the multiple communities.

One of the other critical impacts is because of that lack of representation you may well see an Exodus of businesses from Oakland County because they rely on solid representation excuse me for employee regulatory and other concerns they have.

Also as stated on the division of some of the communities that have cross synergies what could well happen is you're going to get dual representation and it may well be conflicting dual representation so you're going to destroy a lot of that cross synergies.

So my issues basically are Oakland County representation and maintaining cross synergy within communities.

Thank you so much you guys have a grueling job.

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

Jim Peterson.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Peterson if you can unmute you are free to address the Commission.

>> Thank you very much my name is Jim Peterson I have a 50 year history of grass roots politics in Southwest Michigan and recently moved to Southwest Michigan. I want to say the variations of the maps that draw a circle around Detroit are very aggravating and discouraging.

This kind of packing is exactly why we wanted an independent nonpartisan Commission and I think you can do better there.

The recent census data shows that one in four Michiganders are nonwhite so we shouldn't have one out of 13 districts as being majority minority.

I think you can do better there.

On the other hand in Southwest Michigan I'm really encouraged by the Lake Michigan District.

It follows the shore.

Nearly identical communities and nearly identical interests would produce a great Congressional District.

Likewise the map that shows Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together two mid-size cities colleges University similar community of interest I think that is a great idea keep up the good work over here but do better in Detroit thank you.

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

>> Hello hi my name is Amara I wanted to take the time to thank the Commission for hearing comments this morning.

I'm concerned about the current proposed Congressional District 1 that divides the Muslim communities in Dearborn and Dearborn Heights from the Muslim communities in Hamtramck and Detroit.

This District also spills past 8 mile road to the north which is very different from the makeup of the rest of the District.

Muslim communities in this area have similar intersectional struggles, air pollution caused by AK Steel causing residents to develop cancer and asthma, repeated flooding due to City neglecting to provide these areas proper infrastructure, low income working class residents, lack of language access, lack of healthcare and fear of deportation. Keeping these particular communities together is going to be crucial to serving their needs.

We urge the Commission not to divide these Muslim communities.

Thank you.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For the viewing public, Carla Wagner is 15.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> Hi, my name is Carla Wagner and I'm from the Kent County area north of Grand Rapids.

I'm a real estate agent and to me it seems like we are making this way more difficult than it needs to be.

The lines drawn and using for the last ten years it seems like if the population has shifted a little bit we just have to realign or move those lines to accommodate the population.

Because we start with the census data and redistricting is to be done off the census data.

When you start talking about communities of interest, I think you could ask ten million people in Michigan and you will get ten million different answers.

I agree but as a real estate agent and my experience birds of a feather flock together if people want to be around a particular school District if they want to be near a church if they want to be by the Lake that is where they are going to move.

I don't think it is up to the Commission yourselves to pick where people are or try to draw lines according to communities of interest.

I think it's very simple.

I'm sorry thank you.

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

>> Hi I'm Dr. Eric McGrath. And thank you for taking public comment. I lived in Troy with my family for over ten years and want to echo what was said initially with the in person groups making statements.

I think that Troy being lumped in with Macomb County we share very little with that County as far as shared community and shared core values.

Specifically broad education.

And I think Troy should be moved back in with other local areas to the south and west of our City like Clawson, Royal Oak Berkeley Birmingham, Bloomfield et cetera.

And the focus should really be on the partisan fairness.

If Troy is kept in with Macomb Counties it will silence our votes and won't be heard broadly in the next elections for the next ten years and I think it looks gerrymandered to be honest with you.

Thank you.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For purposes of the public record number 17, 18 and 19 are not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was 17 and 18.

>> And 19.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And 19, okay.

Michael.

>> I'm coming, I'm coming, let's see.

Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, my name is Michael Wiese. And live in northern Commerce Township in Oakland County. I'm a 20-year resident. My comments relate to District 10 map. I've

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.

been a Michigan licensed real estate broker and commercial real estate appraiser for 40 years. I've sold and appraised real estate all over southeast Michigan, Oakland, Wayne, Macomb, Washtenaw Counties. And all over the thumb area and north to Flint and north of Flint.

I can say I'm more informed and familiar with the demographic makeup of these areas than the average constituent. I live in the north part of Commerce. Commerce Township is about 20 miles northwest of Detroit.

I'm at a loss as how Commerce Township got basically split in half.

The most recent District maps, you had the northern part of Commerce split from the southern part.

Again, the northern part of Commerce is split from Walled Lake and the south of Commerce, Commerce Township. The north part of Commerce is based on the most recent maps. We are lumped in with Flint, Flushing, Lapeer, Clio, and North Branch. And Commerce, which is a rapidly growing bedroom community of Detroit lumped in with rural Genesee and Lapeer Counties. Commerce has more in common with Farmington Hills, West Bloomfield, Novi than it does with Flint, Lapeer, Clio, Flushing, and North Branch. How did you come up with this?

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

Sean.

>> For purposes or of the public record, number 21 is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Jessie.

>> Jesse.

>> Jesse a resident here in Troy and calling to express concerns about the proposed District where Troy is essentially lumped in with Macomb County.

I think we do not share a lot of common interests with them.

I think our communities of interest lie predominately in Oakland County.

Definitely more so for communities to the west and south and I fear about the economic impact this could have on Troy.

Troy is the largest economy in Oakland County and I think it's important it stays within this community.

I ask you consider altering the map so Troy is grouped with a different set of communities.

I would just want to thank you for everything you are doing.

I know this is a hard job, you can't please everybody so thank you for doing this.

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

>> Hello?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Excuse me.

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.

As a resident of Georgetown Township in Ottawa County I want to thank you for your work.

I want to draw your attention to map 187 that was created on September 29.

Congressional District 9 is the map Georgetown in Ottawa County residents want to see adopted.

This map keeps Ottawa County whole.

Listen to the less dens like me who reside in Georgetown Township and protects the lakeshore.

The other maps try to lump my home in with Kent County.

That simply is not how we associate.

I choose to live in Georgetown because I associate with the culture community and heritage of Ottawa County which is distinctly different from Kent County.

We consider ourselves part of the lakeshore.

I'm glad to see Muskegon County and Allegan County in the same Congressional District as Ottawa County.

These counties share natural lakeshore communities of interest while sharing strong agricultural ties that bind these communities together.

Van Buren County also.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Evan Dillon.

>> Hi good morning, everyone.

My name is Evan Dillon I'm from Grand Rapids Michigan.

I just wanted to highlight how pleased I was to see the mapping of Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together in a Congressional District.

As they are truly neighboring cities just separated by 50 miles.

And for anyone who is actually from West Michigan the connectivity that exists between Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo is pretty obvious.

Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo are both centers for local Commerce and anchoring to the five largest University in the state, and share so many other common interests.

Additionally, in a state where many of our urban centers are losing population both Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo are growing and developing Metro areas as evidenced in the most recent census.

Simply put there can be no more natural alignment of two cities into one Congressional District in West Michigan than the two Cities that uniquely defined West Michigan, that is Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo. Thank you for your hard work and your time today.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Francie-Cook.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay first of all thank you so much for your efforts to say what you're doing and say you have a thankless job is a gross understatement so I applaud everyone one of you.

My name is Francie Cook I've been a resident of West Bloomfield for more than 30 years I live in an area that is terribly gerrymandered.

So I think that the elections need to reflect the wishes of the majority of the people who live here.

And that the way to accomplish that is to create maps where the party receiving the most votes in the state gets the most seats.

The fact that for the past 20 years the party winning the popular vote only three times has won the majority of seats eight times is evident that the districts have not been drawn fairly.

I really hope that you can rectify this and I thank you very much for the opportunity to give input this morning.

Thank you.

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

Anjali-Bhalerao.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, I'm a 25 year resident of Troy.

And when I saw this map, I'm really disappointed.

Even I have my own company in Troy.

And Troy should be kept as a whole in all maps because all these growing minority community like American Asian, Pacific Islander, we need a brief presentation.

And today's map I think I don't have any voice or any representation, so I really think that you should consider try keeping with other communities like other people said before, which we have a common interest, which is education and sports and other activities. So and I'm very thankful that you have taken time to arrange this meeting. And your hard work.

I appreciate really appreciate your hard work.

But you should consider try keeping as a whole.

Thank you.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not currently present and Commissioner Kellom can you tell us where you are attending remotely from.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Brandy chambers.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Hi, good morning my name is brandy chambers and I'm part of the organization Pontiac united we are here to make a public comment on the redistricting. We stand with Ramsey and Williams our position is our community would much better be served as community of interest with Oakland County communities like Auburn Hills and south of us the City of Southfield. In addition for our statement House District we have much more in common with Auburn Hills and Waterford and would like to see the change in the currently drafted State Senate map. Pontiac voters are a grouped in the rural Oakland County community. This would not give Pontiac a chance of representation in the Senate. Thank you.

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

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Hi, my name is Darlene Marian and live in the City of Pontiac.

I'm against the redistricting of Pontiac to the north.

We have nothing in common with the people going that way.

The cities of Southfield and Auburn Hills are more diverse and more welcoming to the Pontiac community.

I stand with Oakland forward.

And I let you know that I am against this redistricting and I would like for them to look a different way for the City of Pontiac.

And I thank you for the time.

I appreciate all that you do.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is Judith available? Okay.

>> Hello this is Judith-Milidrag can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> I would like you to go back to my husband he is on board and he has been saying I'm here but you're not hearing him.

Okay, if you can hear me, I would just like to say that I would -- I appreciate the fact that the Commission is diverse and made up of citizens representing both parties plus independents.

I have nothing actually new to add as far as the specifics of the boundaries of the map. I agree with the and I applaud the people who showed up in person today to be part of this process.

And those remote.

But I just want to say that I hope the Commission continues to listen and to hear the points that were made today.

And also the points that were made today and as they continue to tweak the boundaries that they will keep in mind that we need to...the electoral should not show favor from one to the other.

My husband is here as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Brian if you want to go ahead.

>> Yes, I'm here, can you see me?

>> Just go ahead.

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

>> But the thing is oh, there, can you see me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> Okay so my problem really is with the way these districts are drawn.

My view is that any time I see a zig-zag or something like that it looks like more gerrymandering.

In my view the ultimate District is four lines.

Now, where that is not possible because of population issues, you know, you can maybe add a few more.

But these are complicated.

You grouped us all in with you know Macomb County.

We should be spread to the west.

And to the north.

You should put Madison Heights back in with us.

You got them in with Detroit.

I'm really at a loss to understand how and why these borders were drawn.

It looks like more gerrymandering, which is what the citizens of the State of Michigan said we don't want any more.

So I respectfully ask you to redraw them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Uh-huh.

Okay so just go.

Okay so Kwanzel.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> My name is Kwanzel and part of an organization called Pontiac united.

I too stand with Tamika Ramsey and Williams and our position is our communities would be much better served as a part of the community of interest with Oakland County such as Auburn Hills and to the south to Southfield and in addition for State House District we have much more in common with Auburn Hills than Waterford and would like to see that change.

In the currently drafted State Senate map Pontiac voters are grouped with rural Oakland County communities.

This would not be given a chance at fair representation in the Senate.

Thank you for an opportunity to share.

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

>> Hello.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Thank you.

Norman Clement Detroit change initiative.

And I know you guys have a challenging job.

But I'm also standing with the folks who are in person with Troy and also with Oakland forward.

My concerns are District 6, 3, 4, 1, 2, all in the populated Southeast Michigan.

Looks like when you guys drew this map you went out of your way to gerrymander right this map.

You have the golf community linked to Auburn and farming town and went around William Ferndale and Madison Heights with Hamtramck Osborn Grosse Pointe and also District 4 with Troy and Clinton Township.

These communities have no communities of interest whatsoever.

And I implore you to redraw this map ASAP.

I understand the minute so hopefully after this you guys take the time and redraw these maps to the people in the community that they need to be redrawn to.

Thanks for your time you have a tough job but start from fresh guys thank you.

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

>> Hi this is Carol Taylor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> I've lived in Rochester Hills for just a couple of years so I'm not a long time resident.

But it did make me wonder what's going on when Rochester and Rochester Hills do not end up in the same Congressional District.

When I go to the library it says Rochester Hills on the building.

But it's located in downtown Rochester.

I live about three miles from downtown Rochester so you can imagine my surprise when I visited the offices of Rochester public schools and found myself not really in my own backyard but right next to it.

We share parks and it's just this is a great place to live and I urge you to use care in drawing maps so that Rochester and Rochester Hills are not divided.

We need to encourage interdependent communities.

I also want to give an amen to the people speaking about putting Pontiac with Southfield and other like communities.

Thank you.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Now, that the opportunity for in person and remote public commentary has concluded, without objection we will hear from individuals seeking to provide a second one-minute public comment.

Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with individuals seeking to provide a second public one-minute comment.

Individuals who signed up and indicated they would like to provide live, remote public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. And we will do the same process as the first round.

First in line to provide public comment is Mr. James Gallant.

>> Hello. This is James Gallant Marquette, these are my opinions.

First, I'd like to agree with the prior speaker, Anthony, that completely inappropriate you would change rules of procedure on the same day. That's wrong. It's in the rules of procedure. Three days' notice. Your attorney told you that. I believe you are going to try to do that again later with your motion to discuss, which is inappropriate, straw polling the whole time. And that will probably be dormant until the ten years and then the people then will be able make it up and figure, this is the model you're creating, right?

And I think it's completely disingenuous of Dr. Nancy Wang and Voters Not Politicians not to come forward and explain their win at the Supreme Court cross-complaint, which revived the constitutional admission that was already in the Constitution.

And, also, this is just completely inappropriate.

This is an example of what Dr. Jordan Peterson talks about. Every person has an equal amount of capacity for good and evil. You're randomly selected people. You come here, you all the sudden just band together on the outside of the rules of procedure with Dutches Witjes. And all the sudden you have all these other rules, side bar rules, that supersede what you are doing here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Mr. James Gallant.

Next in line is Anthony S.

>> Thank you, Commission, for the second minute.

I just, wow, I'm overwhelmed the amount of negative comments received about your Congressional map. And, as I've stated, it's pretty much just one draft of Congress that has been worked on.

And it no one likes it.

And not only community of interest and partisan fairness it just looks bizarre to me and I don't know if you have other drafts laying around but seems to me adjustments are made to your Congressional draft have been to the Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo Ottawa County kind of areas not anywhere in Detroit.

So I think what you're doing with this Congressional map is beating a dead horse.

I look up that definition to persist or continue far beyond any purpose interest or reason.

I've been saying for weeks this Congressional map is garbage or at least needs adjustments.

I think it's beyond salvaging put it up for consideration but put up M gauge or AFLCIO and individual maps and Eid do AI map all the above because your one Congressional map stinks and don't like Down River part of it with Macomb and part with Jackson it's ridiculous.

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

At this time we are going to move on to you guys want to take a break before we start with Dr. Handley? Is that a yeah, okay, all right, without objection we are going to take a break for ten minute so people can get up and walk around it's currently 10:22 hearing no objections we will break until 10:32 thank you very much everybody.

[ Recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I recall this Michigan of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 10:41 a.m. Would the secretary please call the roll?

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

Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please Announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Attending remotely from Wayne, County, Michigan.

Rhonda Lange?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> 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: Ten Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, Department of State.

I would like to move on to agenda 5, partisan fairness. Without objection, I will ask our expert, Dr. Lisa Handley, and, Dr. Handley, please proceed for complete maps.

- >> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay. can you hear me now? Good.

- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Hello, it's great to be back here again. I'm in awe of your hard work and know how hard this is and you guys have been working so hard at this. Now go I'm to tell you what I came here for.

First of all the first thing I was going to do and plan to do in the next hour is present some political fairness scores for some of the plans that you've drawn already.

And then it may be the case and it may not Sue and Kim are going to work this out the functionality for the software is almost ready if not ready so that we can add this to the redistricting software package so you can run the political fairness reports whenever you have a plan that you want to run it on.

This could be up and operational by the end of today or it may be that Kim gives it to you on Monday.

But it's very, very close for you to be able to do this. And John wants.

>> MR. MORGAN: I just want to add we expect the update to be fully functional in the software but we have the ability to show what Dr. Handley needs right now.

So we will be showing that momentary.

- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: And I also talked with Kim about this issue early yesterday morning again.

And he indicated that over the weekend if Commissioners are drawing plans and you want them assessed for partisan fairness if you send those shape files to him, he will do that.

So if you have something over the weekend that you want assessment on, just send that right the shape file right to Kim and he will take care of that for 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: Thank you executive director.  
Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I take it this requires another update with the MDOS, correct?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Through the Chair.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is my understanding.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: It would request DTMB downloading an updated version of the software, yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: From what I understand I myself have not seen the software report but from what I understand what you're going to see today in the excel sheets that Ryan and I created last week it will look very similar.

So that we are not wasting our time today going through these excel sheets. I think it will look very similar when it's operating in your redistricting software.

So I can't move away from the microphone.

Okay, you will recall that the Constitution says districts shall not provide disproportionate advantage to any political party.

A disproportionate advantage to a political party shall be determined using accepted measures of political -- of partisan fairness.

We've talked about this at least twice before.

And I've outlined for you the measures that are going to be incorporated into the software package that you will have access to next week.

When you update your software package.

I am going to talk about three well I'm going to talk about seats votes ratios but the three measures I talked about earlier lopsided margins mean median and the efficiency gap.

Those are the three measures plus seats votes we are going to look at.

We are going to look at this beginning with the existing Senate plan.

Because I believe that there is a Senate plan and John is going to show you the options.

>> MR. MORGAN: By existing you mean the one that the Commission has drafted?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I'm sorry, yes.

We are going to look at your draft Senate plan first because it seems clearest which plan it is that is complete and we will talk about the measures.

I want you to remember that these partisan fairness measures only take into account election results.

It does not take into account equal population.

It does not take into account any VRA concerns.

It does not take into account communities of interest.

We are just looking at election results.

And even more than that, we are looking at projected election results.

So partisan fairness measures were developed by social scientists looking for the most part at existing districts.

And looking at what the election results and those existing districts did relative to the statewide vote for example.

So you have a series of partisan gerrymandering cases in which existing Congressional districts, for example, were challenged.

And you could look at the actual Congressional election results and you could look at the state results and you can make some determinations what we are doing here is different.

What we are trying to do is guess or project what the election results will look like under the plans that you drew because of course no elections have occurred in them.

So social scientists have developed ways of determining guest mating estimating how the election results will look under your plans and I have chosen one of them.

And it's called the composite index and I'm going to have John first bring up the proposed Senate plan and then we are going to look at the composite index in the active matrix and I'm going to talk about how I did this.

It's going to be slightly different than for example if you went to plan score.

Plan score is going to do their predictive model slightly different.

The same with the prince son election lab their prediction model is going to be slightly different.

My understanding is, for example, that one of those uses just the Presidential race.

Our composite score is a little more complex than that.

Can you bring up first let's choose yes absolutely.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Because it's more complex therefore you are also suggesting it might be more accurate is that also fair to say?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Let me tell you the pluses and the minuses.

I think it's a reflection of the decade.

If you believe that the decade is trending one way or the other, then you might want to use more recent elections.

But you can do that.

We are going to put in the composite score but I will show you that any of those 13 statewide elections can be put into the program.

So and this is hypothetical.

Let's say you believe that the state is trending democrat over time and you believe that 2018 might be more accurate than a look over the entire decade.

You can choose 2018 elections.

You can choose any one of the 13 elections that's in your matrix.

In your active matrix.

That is how it will work.

I will work off of the composite score and it's looking across all 13 elections.

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 it is weighing each election cycle equally.

So because there are four examples, for elections in 2014 and four elections in 2018, each of the elections have been weighed slightly less so that each election cycle weighs the same over time.

2012, 14, 16, 18 and 20 all weigh the same in this composite score.

Again, if you believe that there is trending over time, you can choose more recent elections and run the same thing the computer will do it for you.

Okay, so this is the Senate plan.

Maybe.

John will explain.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, I want to be clear since we may be looking at multiple plans today, I want to be clear which one we are referencing.

So what I'm going to do is I'm going to show you the website where these plans have been published.

So down here on this screen this is a web browser for the my Districting website.

And we have one plan here that says complete Senate plan.

And it's reference here is 16A Senate District.

So I'm using that one.

I've imported it into my auto bound and I've given it that name and that is the plan so I'm representing it's the same one you see publicly so if we reference other plans today, I would encourage us to be clear about what we are doing so again this is the Senate plan.

It's the only one that I'm aware of that you have a complete Senate plan.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay so you can see over on the composite score. I just mentioned.

Go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was going to say what we are used to here this is the overview tab. These are the normal tabs that you have in your software.

And then all the way over we have the statewide races.

And what's different is instead of just having the statewide races, there is this composite score.

And we will talk Dr. Handley will talk about what's in this composite score here.

But these numbers are larger than for example the election results.

She will explain what that means and how it's done.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay, so this composite score will show up any time you load a plan just like the recompiled election results.

As I said we weighed this so that each election cycle makes up one fifth of the total votes here.

We need votes rather than just percentages.

So that is how we did this.

Okay, so what we're going to do today is a little bit different than what you will do.

You will be able to just go to the report function.

We are going to take this and we are going to bring it in to an excel sheet.

That will do all the calculations for us.

This is the only step you won't have to do.

He is cutting and pasting out our composite votes for the dems and the republicans and putting it into this excel sheet.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then I'm just going to save it so we have this as an excel file we can reference back to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Is there a way that we can move the Zoom stuff out of the way from the screens that are all in front of us? Thank you much.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: We put this in the first tab. I'm not really sure what your reporting function will look like.

It will calculate everything the same and may show up on a single sheet but the way we devised this excel sheet is here is our lopsided margins.

You will remember that I told you that lopsided margins are an indication of packing.

If one party is winning by much larger margins than the other party it means that those, that party has been packed into districts.

So if a District -- if in this particular example, for example, if you look at columns G and H, and column G we have the winning percentages of the districts won by democrats.

And in H we have the winning percentage of the districts won by republicans.

Those are just based on the composite score and the Senate plan that you drew.

And over to the right you will see the average winning margin.

It's two there.

The average winning margin for the democrats and for the republicans.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I just froze the top column so that's not two, it's one.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Sorry I see that okay.

So the democrats are winning on average by a margin of 64.5 and the republicans by 57.7.

This gives you a lopsided margin in favor of the republicans of 6.9%.

This means we have more packed democratic districts than republican.

And you can look down the line and you can see this.

You can see 81, 75, 84, 73, 75.

That is what is happening here.

And you can even see what districts are heavily democratic by just following the 87, the 81.7 over.

You can see that District 8 is heavily democratic.

I want to caution you, it is sometimes the case, it is often the case that districts drawn for voting rights purposes will have a higher number of democrats in them.

If that is a voting rights compliant District, it might have a higher number.

And there is not that much you can do about it.

If that's not what that is, then that's a District you might want to revisit.

Because you've packed democrats in that District.

And please ask questions as we go along.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Couldn't one make the argument that that could happen naturally based on where individuals live?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It could.

It could.

And the way that you will determine that is you will go back and you will look at that District.

And if you can't change it, you will know that and you will be able to defend it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay got it, thanks.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If I know this is just one of the three numbers that we are going to go over but all of them are using this composite score that weighs every election in the past decade equally.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do you think there would be a big change if we instead weighed more recent elections slightly with a little bit more weight than maybe like a 2010 election ten years ago?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: What we could do is we could put in for example, the 2020 Presidential race.

We could even redo the weighing system if I had some reason to believe it should be reweighed.

But I think the better way to do this is actually choose more recent elections and see what happens.

And see how it affects us.

Again when you have this tool, you can play around with it.

And make this determination.

And again we could revisit, but I have no reason to believe that the composite score should change.

But I haven't studied Michigan election results and looked at projections.

So you have this ability to choose any statewide election that you would like.

With the caveat that it has to be in the -- well all of the statewide elections are actually in the matrix so you can choose those.

And you have to have a complete plan.

This can only be done off of a complete plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So what I'm thinking about is as we arrive on Monday and we've drawn different maps and what I'm thinking about is defending our maps legally defending them and if, yeah, I guess should we agree as a Commission to do it with the whole decade? Right because it might be more defensible.

So we are when we are on Montcalm pairing our maps with each other right so we have apples to apples just with this lopsided margin test or is it reasonable to say we will somehow, yeah, we can -- should we consider that?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I have chosen the most conservative way of doing this. And this is how I have seen a number of social scientists do it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Chair.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I would again remind you, you can put in other election results.

If you put in 2020 Presidential and saw it scored quite a bit different, you could I don't know if the entire Commission would agree to this, but you could just make sure that you look at all recent elections.

This would be up to you.

We could actually I as a political scientist can also study the question.

I have not actually looked at what would happen if we put in the president.

But I mean, there is no reason we couldn't do it right now if you wanted to, to see what happened.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay I think General Counsel had a thought too is that true.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I can't see over there, I have this big screen in front of me.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Vice Chair my comment was going to be that as Dr. Handley indicated her measures and the composite score and how she has weighted them equally is the most conservative way to approach these figures. And my thought would be to encourage the Commission to defer to their expert on these matters.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you General Counsel.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Dr. Handley we should use the composite index and then if we want to do further research into partisan fairness we go down to specific elections?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I would use the composite index and I would not rely on a single election unless I had a very good reason to.

At this point I don't have any very good reason to rely on any single election.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton then I have a question after her.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So the composite meaning statewide elections in the last decade.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Including the Presidential election.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could you quickly I don't know how you do that compare that so that you would understand if taking out the most recent Presidential election makes a difference? So we could know whether we want to include all of them or not?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: No, that's not what I'm suggesting.

So the composite score will stay the way the composite score is.

What you could do is you could look at each election individually and see if it makes a difference.

So I wouldn't take something out of the composite score.

I would say you might want to look at more recent elections to see how it compares to the composite score.

And if it makes a difference.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So the choice is all or one individually?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Individually but of course you could run with the composite then you could run each of the 13 and compare them.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I understand.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So in terms of what lopsided is measuring, if I understand this correctly, it's mostly related to the fact we have in this case democratic districts where the percentage of democratic voters are very high 80%, 84%, whereas the republicans tend to be closer races so maybe 55, 60%.

So just thinking from a perspective of adjusting things if we decide to do that.

Our goal with making those adjustments should be to reduce that very high percentage for either party depending on the maps correct, so bring it down to 55, 60 versus 85 is that kind of the goal?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: With the caveat that was already pointed out by Commissioner Witjes, that is it may not be possible number one. And number two, it may be that you have a Voting Rights Act District and we do expect those to be higher. But I would certainly look and see what's happening in that District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have a constitutional ranking of criteria.

So you know Voting Rights Act, communities of interest then we get to partisan fairness. So keeping in mind those other ones are ranked higher the adjustments have to take that into account before we start adjusting but again the goal would be to bring those percentages down a little bit if we could otherwise do so taking into account 123 first, right?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I would say that is a legal question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not surprising I'm a lawyer.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So Madam Chair, the lopsided margins will direct and as you can tell from Mr. Morgan's screen, it will show you by District directly where to look.

It would look where John, the cell that is highlighted with the District that moved the 81%, that is one of the districts that the Federal Court initially held was partisan gerrymandered.

Again, before the Rucho case negated all of that.

So I think what you're going to find today in a lot of the data that I'll be able to provide to put into context what Dr. Handley is saying, those connections are going to become very evident in the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.  
Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: I just wanted to clarify, this District 8 is I think is different from the districts that were adjudicated in Court.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Morgan thank you so much, yes that is very true. I have a different thing on my screen so thank you very much for saying that. But yes, the lopsided margin test will direct the Commission where to do the analysis and see if there are adjustments that need to be made relative to the partisan composition of that particular District and we are looking at the map that the Commission has drawn for the Senate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.  
Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So let's assume we take a look at all these districts as is and we say they are acceptable based on population, you know where people live and so forth.

Is that 6.9% margin or finding acceptable at that point? And if not, what should be acceptable?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: So the courts haven't drawn any sort of bright line for any of this.

And they would never probably at least, I wouldn't, rely on a single score.

We are going to go through three scores and we are going to look at the seats votes ratio.

So no Court in my opinion but I'm not a lawyer would say oh, this is too high.

We are going to throw you out.

They are going to look at all of those measures.

And we have only four measures here.

And there are other measures out there.

I chose the four that were the easiest to put into a excel sheet and the easiest to explain.

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.

If you want to plan score, they also have the efficiency gap and the mean median difference.

But they have other scores as well like symmetry that gets a little more complex and you can't really do in an excel sheet easily.

So no Court is going to make a decision on any single score.

You can -- this is not on the far left of the far right of the distribution.

This isn't absolutely horrible but it's high.

And I would definitely encourage you to look at those districts and make sure that you can defend them if you can't change them.

But this is only looking at packing.

Right? And this is only one measure.

So maybe we -- unless you have more questions about this.

The other.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I wanted to jump in quickly and certainly the legal team agrees that with what Dr. Handley was saying.

The courts have not picked a specific fixed number that you must work towards X.

We certainly agree as well that the measures that are included match up with the constitutional requirement for broadly accepted, accepted measures certainly by the courts.

So yes, there are other measures.

But these measures are measures that we have concluded based on Court decisions that the courts look to favorably.

It is really important as Dr. Handley said to realize there is no magic number in this area which is still a relatively new area compared to like the Voting Rights Act analysis for example.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You have always consistently said to us, Dr. Handley, that we have to look at multiple measures.

And from day one you have said that to us.

It's just not looking at one type of approach.

You got to look at multiple ones.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yes, I think that's correct.

And I don't know of any Court that hasn't looked at more than one measure.

And this is for a very specific purpose.

This is for looking for packed districts.

So there are other things like the efficiency gap that look at more than that.

Okay, so let's go to the efficiency gap.

And the reason I'm going there is it's also looking at packed districts but it's also looking at cracked districts.

If you will remember it's looking at the number of wasted votes.

And those are both votes cast in excess to what is needed to win.

And losing votes.

So if you are losing a lot of districts by a little amount, that's cracking.

If you are winning districts by a large amount, that's packing.

And the efficiency gap tries to get at both of those.

So we can see columns B and C again are our composite index.

Then we are going to go over and we are going to look at in columns E and F the number of votes that were cast for the losing column. For the losing candidate.

So for example, in District 1 the republican lost.

So those are all 74, I can't see it any way all of those are wasted votes because they were cast for a losing candidate, right? So if you go over to the surplus column for H, an H those are the number of votes cast over what was needed in B to win.

So it's calculating both of those things for us.

Anything over 50% is considered surplus.

And we've done that for all 38 districts and we've added up the surplus, plus the lost votes and we've compared how the two parties fared in what are called wasted votes.

So wasted votes are surplus, plus lost votes for each party compared.

Okay, so, the percentage of wasted votes for the dems democrat is 21.98 and republicans it's 20.82 so we have efficiency gap of 8.4%.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair? So we are talking about the efficiency gap for the proposed State Senate plan that the Commission, the MICRC has drawn. And we are in complete agreement that the courts have not set a number for these -- for this measure.

What we can use is again we have the League of Women Voters versus Benson case which was a partisan gerrymandering case where the Federal Court held certain -- and I would offer that we look at them as ranges.

Just to give an idea to the Commission of what the numbers looked like in the past.

So for these Senate District and just to be clear that what -- where this information has come from is from the Federal Court's opinion that was issued April 25th of 2019.

So in that opinion the Plaintiffs, the Plaintiffs experts they had three experts and for the efficiency gap for the Senate, anything more than a negative 16.6 which was characterized as heavily partisan, and that number was looking at the 2012-2016 statewide elections only.

So again, this is a negative benchmark as how far to go.

I know we are looking at the positive number.

Unfortunately the maps that the old maps or the current maps I should say the state has all the numbers were running in the negative.

But for the efficiency gap of 8.4 that is also above the goal where the Commission would want to be.

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 we have again, it's using these metrics trying to go back in and make those adjustments to have an impact on these scores would be advisable.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: So what the efficiency gap is doing is telling us the difference.

So you -- this it depend on whether you subtract republicans from democrats or the other way around as to whether you get a negative number.

We made it easy and just tell you with this so I don't think you get any negative numbers.

I think it's just reflected that it's a republican bias.

Because it will show up different.

Like if you go to the one website it will take republicans and subtract it from the democrats and if you go to another website, it would be the opposite.

So the sign doesn't matter.

It's the difference, the size of the difference.

So as I understand what Julianne just said, that size of the difference was 16 something.

16 something.

So you're half of what was the case in the Court case, in the partisan gerrymandering Court case.

You are not at 0 but not at 16 either.

How the Court did it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Dr. Handley.

I think what I neglected to say 0 is the goal and the further from 0 on either direction is what the Commission wants to be sensitive to.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is 0 possible?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yeah, and I will let Dr. Handley qualify the 0 and put the 0 in context because that is critical.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It is possible.

It might not be possible if you have a whole lot of other criteria that you want to consider.

But mathematically it's certainly possible and there have been plans that come in near 0 however you have other concerns here to deal with.

So I'm not saying that you could do that here.

But especially, again, you have the Voting Rights Act and other things you have to consider.

But certainly lower scores are possible.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I have a follow-up question or thought to that.

So I'm thinking as we are talking about this, this is what we have been waiting for.

We are glad you are here.

So as we are talking about this, I'm trying to think in my mind then how do we use this information? It sounds like 0 would be ideal.

But we have total population, Voting Rights Act.

We have you know, our constitutional criteria our ranked 12 and 3 and have to take communities of interest into effect as well.

And then partisan fairness.

How do we do all that in a ranked order is what I'm not sure on?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Again this is probably a legal question more, but it seems to me the Constitution does prioritize for you.

And you know what comes first and what comes next.

I would try and get these numbers down, but if I found that I couldn't do it because of voting rights concerns is much you know it may be the case that I mean certainly you could defend something in Court that you said, for example, you know I can't get it to 0 because there are a lot of democrats in some of these districts that are drawn for voting rights purposes.

Now.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Excuse me, if we could just expand on that a minute. I think Commissioner Orton this is similar to what we did with the Voting Rights Act compliance.

That it's testing to see what can work and we certainly agree with you that you have ranked priority criteria.

I think it has been explained that as Dr. Handley said 0 as you said might be ideal.

But that's not a legal benchmark requirement.

So working towards the Commission's, working forward as Dr. Handley said to try to reduce the margin that is reflected on the screen will involve trial and error, compromises.

We will certainly be talking about the ranked criteria and what the priorities are.

But we certainly concur that the score can be lowered.

How far it can be lowered of course is yet to be determined.

And that's going to be of course up to the Commission.

So we will be continuing the trial and error process that we really locked into gear this week, thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay, let's go to mean median difference.

This looks at the mean of the District votes, going across all the districts, the mean vote, and the median.

If the median is lower than the mean, the party who has the median that is lower than the mean is advantaged.

It's a skewed distribution.

This is sort of a statistical rule, but what it means is that the party with the median District being lower than the mean District means it needs fewer votes to gain more seats.

So up here you see the median percentage for dems and republicans.

And you see the difference.

And it's a gap of 3.6.

Again, in favor of the republicans.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Again going back to our League of Women Voters versus Benson case just to put to provide the Commission with additional information. For the Senate the mean median difference range would be from a negative 6.1 up to 5.97.

So this number is actually within that range.

It's actually right in the middle and Mr. Adelson is correct right in the middle.

So again, that would be that information from the case.

Thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I should have John pointed out where I'm getting these scores from.

So if you look at columns F and G, we have sorted the distributes by the percentage of votes they received.

And we are just taking the median of that sort I mean the mean of course is the same.

Whichever column but you are taking the median from that sort and you're taking the mean, the District mean from all of the districts and you're comparing them.

Again, if the median is lower than the mean, that means you need fewer votes to win districts.

Any questions about this one? This is -- this and the efficiency gap I think you see on most of the websites and most of the Court cases.

These are the really common measures that you will see.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel then Commissioner Orton.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I wanted to briefly comment again the range numbers I'm provided are what the Court and experts calculated in the past and not looking at number of elections that Dr. Handley has examined.

Providing the Commission with its analysis of its maps.

Again, it's a snapshot in that period of time for elections that were looked at then.

So you're going to again that is why I'm coaching it as just to give you an idea of what the Court was saying in the past.

But it is not the hard and fast threshold for now.

Because there is different information.

And Dr. Handley has looked at a broader range and more statewide elections.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel would you mind repeating for me you said negative 6.1 through 5.17. But could you repeat of League of Women Voters and lopsided margins what they were?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, lopsided margins was not examined by the experts.

They did some symmetry calculations and other measures.

The efficiency gap was again in captured or provided as a negative 13.2.

I would note that is the lowest or the lowest negative number and went all the way up to 20% a negative 20% in some calculations but 13.2 negative 13.2 was the efficiency gap.

For 16.6 for Senate and 16.6 and that was looking at 2012 state elections almost 20% and just looking at 2014 election Dr. Handley mentioned how you can look at individual elections so you see the difference between those two numbers for looking at 2012-2016 Dr. Chen found negative 16.6.

Looking at just 2014 Dr. Warshaw concluded almost 20% negative 20% efficiency gap. Is that helpful Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton you had a question.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: For the current plan?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No the numbers I'm citing Commissioner Orton to be very clear the numbers are lifted out of 2019 Federal Court opinion in the League of Women Voters case that was challenging alleging that districts in Michigan were partisan gerrymandered.

And again we've had the Rucho case since then but I thought it would be helpful for the Commission to have an idea of what the Court held at that time as being the Federal Court held at that time is being indicative of a partisan gerrymander.

So Dr. Handley has additional score additional elections and that's what she is basing her numbers off of.

I'm just highlighting at in 2019 when this was concluded that that was what the Court concluded at that time.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can we know what the mean median score is for the current plan?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Dr. Handley has it right on the screen 3.6%.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: This is our plan.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: This is your plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The old plans we are redoing.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: From the 2010 the mean median was 5.-- according to the Court opinion the mean median difference for the Senate plan of the challenged maps was 5.97.

And the Court concluded it was quote a large pro-republican bias.

At 5.97%.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: When you have a partisan gerrymandering suit like the Michigan suit, they looked at actual election results.

So they were looking at what if the Congress was being sued, they would look at Congressional districts.

We have a composite index and I actually took I took the composite index and I did this for the existing plans and it would look slightly different than what is being described.

Because what is being described, what is being challenged in the Court cases were the actual elections for that office in those districts.

And if you're interested at some point, I can tell you the composite scores for those using the composite index what the scores were for those and I can pull those up and tell you at some point.

But different elections produce different scores so I do have those.

So the mean, the positive and the negative just depends on which party you subtract from the other party.

You are always just interested in the difference.

So the way that we have set these up, and I'm sure it will be the same in the report, is it will tell you who is being advantaged because of course like I said some social scientist will say we are going to subtract the dems from republicans and others do it a different way and don't know who is favored by the negative or positive number.

So we are just reporting the difference here.

Okay? And, in fact, I think it works differently.

So here if you have a positive number, it's to your disadvantage.

But on the efficiency gap it works the other way around.

So just pay attention to the not to the sign but to the size of the difference.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The number here represents all 38 districts.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: A summary of all 38 districts.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 3.6% representative.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

Again if you just look it's taking the average of F and giving you the average and then it's giving you the mean of F.

Of column F.

So for the mean of those 38 districts and the mean of those 38 districts.

Do they not have -- I think they have a memo that describes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: If you forget after I leave, you have a memo that describes how each of these are calculated.

And it might even be on the website I'm not sure.

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

It is on the website as well as the PowerPoint that Dr. Handley provided.

And both of those are available on the Commission's website and we will make sure to recirculate it to all Commissioners.

I wanted Dr. Handley to offer some words on if the Commission makes adjustments based on the lopsided margins measures could that impact or what impact could that have on the mean median advantage that is displayed?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: There is less of a correlation between a lopsided margin and mean median and there is lopsided margin and the efficiency gap.

So efficiency gap because you remember part of that was surplus votes.

That's half of how you calculate the efficiency gap.

So there is more of a -- there is a correlation across all of these.

But lopsided margins is more likely to see what you see with the efficiency gap than the mean median difference.

But fixing the lopsided margins will impact all of the scores.

Now the final tab I have here unless we -- unless there are more questions, sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Move ahead, yep.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Is the seats votes ratio.

So here we can see this is the composite score and it's not based on real election it's 52.3 composite score.

No, okay, so in the proposed Senate plan the dems on composite score get 52.3% of the vote and 47.4% of the seats.

So you have a proportionality balance that disfavors the dems by 4.9%.

And, of course, it would always be the mirror opposite the other party, which is why we are not going to report negatives and positives.

We will just talk about the difference.

So that is the Senate plan.

And we can look at the Congressional, a Congressional plan.

We have to look at the list and see which one you want to look at.

What we can look at more than one.

The way that we have to do this is that until you have it up on your machine, we will be pulling the plans up, taking the data from the active matrix and putting it into the excel sheets.

I suggest that we look at the Congressional plan.

A Congressional plan.

You will pick the one from the list.

We will look at a collaborative Congressional plan.

A house plan.

And then if there are additional plans that you want to look at and we have time we can look at those.

If we don't have time to look at them, you can still get them scored of course.

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.

Is that what you would like to do? Or do you have something else in mind.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can look at one of the Congressional plans which ones do you want to look at Commissioner Witjes do you have an idea?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The latest one we worked on collaboratively that had Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids together and Rhonda I'm sorry Commissioner Lange and myself we were working in that particular area getting the Counties adjusted.

I don't know I can't remember what date it is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you know what the plan number is? Let me look.

Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: One way to do this and you can do this on your own as well if you are on the website, we could quickly open the plan and you could say yes, that is the one we want to look at.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I believe it's 92921V1CD I believe that's it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Number 187.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to open this on the website so you can see it and confirm this is the one you want me to load in.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is indeed the one, yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so now I'm going to download that shape file.

Give me a moment to process that.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: While he is doing that if you have additional questions now would be a good time to ask them.

We have a little bit of time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, you know this is very useful because I think now we know the work we need to do as a Commission in order to get these numbers closer to 0.

Because you know 0 this is the only real objective measure, we have to determine what is fair because it's Court accepted.

So I think you know Commissioner Orton asked how do we do this, right? And I think what we need to do is together find a way to get this closer to 0 while still fulfilling those other requirements that we have VRA one person one vote, communities of interest, and I think there is you know we might have to get a little creative but I think there is a way to do that.

And having this data we kind of know where to look now so thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Well hopefully starting next week you can do this any time you have a completed plan that you want to look at.

You will be able to do it yourself on your software.

I apologize that it's taking so long for this to happen.

I'm so sorry that it's taken this long but on the other hand you had to actually have completed plans to run this.

You understand that this should not be run on incomplete plans.

And, in fact, the template is set up and I think the report will also be set up, you have to have the right number of districts.

Which you know you have plans and if you are tinkering with them an hour later you can put it back into it.

You have to make sure you have 38 Senate districts et cetera.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would suggest that we take a look at this

Congressional plan.

And then go to the one that Rebecca submitted with the changes.

And also the one Anthony submitted and then compare the three to get a sense of where we are at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I like that idea and it would help the public understand we have more than one Congressional plan and that I mean, yeah, and I think we need to refresh our memory and get a sense of that.

That would be helpful.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'll have that plan up in just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid I'm assuming 2B is your most recent one?

You have two on here one is 2A and one is 2B.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 2A and 2B are essentially the same map.

The only real difference is in 2A Midland is included with the Tri-City area and 2B Midland is not included in the Tri-City area.

And I put both of those out because I know that has been an area of contention that we might want to discuss as a Commission.

The one I would more like to look at is 2A.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I'm sorry, can I ask a question?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Do you have an incomplete plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They are all complete they are complete one City in and one out.

>> MR. MORGAN: I uploaded the plan from the website and the top has the correct information and also added the 187 as a reference.

So this is the plan.

It's been imported from the website.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dr. Handley are you with us for a lunch as well?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I have a 5:00 flight and a rental car to return.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so what time were you planning on leaving?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You probably know better than me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You're going to Metro so you need an hour there and an hour to check in, so at least 3:00.

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.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I'm going to be nervous.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is really pushing it.

I'm just wondering since we have you here if it might be useful most of us have ordered food.

If it might be useful to just go to 12:30 and we can sort of eat and then get you out of here by 12:30 because I'm just worried we will not be able to look at all the maps in the next 20 minutes is all I'm thinking.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You don't need me here to look at maps anymore because John will pull the maps up and you can look at the scores.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right fantastic.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I will be here until at least 2 so let's look at what we can while I'm here and I don't know if you want to map today or just look at old maps or whatever.

But you don't need me at some point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lots of things I would like to do today but thank you.

Okay Mr. Morgan.

So he is pulling the active matrix into a spreadsheet to look at; is that correct?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: About to do.

He is going to take the votes from the composite score and these columns.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Your microphone is not on.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Sorry, so he is taking the -- he brought the plan in to the GIS software and it's calculated the composite scores for him.

Now he is moving them manually over to the excel sheet.

When you have this capability in your software you will not have to do this.

But he is moving it over now to the template.

And this is identical to the other one except it's built on 13 Congressional districts as opposed to 38 Senate districts.

Which is why there are different templates.

It just has to do with the number of districts.

So here we are with the Congressional plan.

We are at the lopsided margins.

We have a slightly, well, we have an average winning margin for dems that is higher than it is for republicans.

But I see at least two districts that I would revisit.

And that would be District 1 and District 2 that are very heavily democratic.

And they might be voting rights districts.

So you might need to think about that.

[ Laughter ]

Again, you're balancing criteria.

So okay let's look at the efficiency gap.

What is going on?

>> MR. MORGAN: Taking one step back for the people on the Zoom meeting, I don't think they saw the split screen that I brought up so this is District 1 and 2 on the map. I just wanted to point that out.

And then I will move back to the spreadsheet.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You asked me if you could get closer to 0.

Wow.

Wow.

I hadn't seen that.

Okay let's look at the -- what plan, we are looking at your collaborative? And you didn't even have election results.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I was actually just going to make that point Madam Chair for VRA compliance in the districts that remember we had districts that were packed significantly packed that the Commission unpacked.

Thank you, Commissioner Lett.

So the Commissioner achieved this without looking -- because it couldn't because of the constitutional criteria achieve this without looking at election data statewide.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: This is the first time I've seen this.

This is really impressive and you did it without looking at election results.

Well done.

Okay, okay, let's go to our mean median difference.

Low.

Our seats votes ratio.

Oh, am I.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John can you go back so I can write it down? I'm just trying to create a chart to compare.

So mean median is 2 point...

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You really had no idea what you were doing?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well you know if you listen to the public we still don't.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: This is really impressive.

Aren't you pleased.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Or do you want more work?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No it feels good to hear it.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Okay, and the seats votes ratio.

If everyone is done with this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are ready.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: And look at this.

The majority party gets majority of the seats.

I don't know.

I should not express a legal opinion but a political scientist would be impressed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right.

Go to the next one.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You get to pick a house plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We want to do two more Congressional and Commissioner Eid which one did you want?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 2A.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 2A.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just for reference I want to point out that I'm going to download this from here.

It's 1882A right?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to open it and just confirm.

All right so Commissioner Eid this is what you are looking to download.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, that's correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 188, right?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: John, there is one small voting precinct that it wouldn't let me unassign.

Could you fix that real quick before running it?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, let me load it first.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I did not get a chance to present the map to the rest of the Commission yet but it was an update to the previous map I did two weeks ago and incorporated some of the feedback that y'all gave me into it to make it closer to the collaborative map so we can go over it later if y'all would like.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may this is the plan downloaded from the website brought up in Autobound edge and looks like what you wanted and wanted to look for an unassigned area?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Just on the Battle Creek area between District 6 and 7 it did that overlap thing that it does sometimes where it tried to assign it to both.

Can you just Zoom in on that real quick? Yeah, Zoom out a tad.

So that whole present part of Battle Creek that should be with 6, that whole, yeah.

Can you just actually assign the whole Township to 6? That is what I meant.

Yeah, exactly then you can run the numbers.

Perfect that is the plan.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm saving the plan with that adjustment.

Want me to put the collection into the spreadsheet.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Accepted measures of partisan fairness we are using.

>> MR. MORGAN: I uploaded it into the partisan fairness spreadsheet.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Go through the tabs here. We have a lopsided margin of 4%.

And it's District 13.

12 and 13 but especially 13 that are giving us the higher margins.

Let's look at the efficiency gap, oh, my goodness.

We are even a little bit lower we are at .5%.

And the mean median difference low 2.3%.

And finally the seats votes ratio low.

And again we get the democrats with the majority of the vote getting majority of the seats so another good plan.

In terms of the political fairness measures.

I don't know anything about anything, I'm just commenting on political fairness.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's kind of funny the lopsided margin test and the seats votes ratio were the same for the last two we looked at.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Again there are reasons why you might have lopsided margins.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John can you pull up mine and we will look at that and we will move on.

>> MR. MORGAN: Again I just want to bring up the website so we can confirm which one you want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 191.

And this one I have not partisan balanced.

So this is more VRA compliant was my focus on this one.

So I'm really looking forward to the numbers so I know how to balance it because I'm also positive there are two Districts that are really high.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to confirm this is the 191.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: With the seats votes ratio and when but even if it were the republicans that won the seat, the idea would be if they won the majority then the seats votes ratio what we are looking at is that the majority wins the most seats, correct?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yes.

So sort of a golden rule of sort of social scientists that you would want the party with the majority of the votes to get a majority of the seats.

Now in single member districts, it is quite possible for a majority of the votes to produce more than a majority of the seats.

So it's hard to get proportionality exact proportionality.

You guys got really close.

But there is a biased in single member District seats such that a majority of the votes quite often produces slightly more than a majority of the seat.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: With that I'm sorry John, the last piece is...so is there a way for us to know again because of the science behind it is there a way for us to know in the State of Michigan that there are more democrats in the state. For example, or that there are more republicans or is it only based on the districts that we draw?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: No, no, these are all based on election results. So you have the composite election results that is showing you that there are more dems than republicans.

And then you have the 13 state election statewide elections.

And you can go through each one and determine.

And so it may be the case probably it's the case in earlier elections that you had more republican votes than democratic votes? I'm not really sure.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John might.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was going to clarify based on this discussion as I understand it the numbers of the republican and democrat votes in the composite index won't change. So each plan is going to be using that same number for comparison to the ratio.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yes, until you start talking about average District size. So for example, if you're talking about an average, the mean median is the average of the District.

Not the statewide average if you see what I'm saying.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: So yes, it would change a little bit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Mean median but when you say the state is democratic or something like that, you're looking at the composite votes to come up with that number.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: What I'm saying is you look at election results so the composite score shows that over the decade the composite says you've got 52 or 53% democrat and 40 whatever it is if you can bring it up, but you also have here at the actual election results for each election.

So you could look over time and see, and I think if you go back to the earlier elections, I mean I don't who carried the state? 2012? I don't remember.

You must remember.

>> MR. MORGAN: In 2012 this were two statewide elections president and U.S. Senate and both were won by democrats risk.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: They were won by democrats maybe it's not trending and maybe you are always democrats I'm in too many states I don't know.

>> MR. MORGAN: Point out.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Useful for me to understand I think many of the public comments they were 50/50.

And if we are talking about that majority and the seats votes ratio that were just slightly over and under 50/50.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Oh, I see.

No the state is not a 50/50 state.

Is that, no, no it's not a 50/50 state.

According to the composite and at least most of the recent statewide elections, it's more than 50% democratic.

Again you have the election results.

Now from the composite thanks John from the composite you can see we've got 52.3% democrat and 47.7% republican.

This is the composite with each year counting equally.

And, again, you can put in each individual election when you have this.

We can throw in the president from 2020 and see how this works out.

I just thought that most conservative way of doing this was the composite score.

>> MR. MORGAN: Again if I may Commissioner Rothhorn, so I'm just pointing out here that vote share you see there that's not going to change because that is based exactly on those composite election results.

So it would change if you used a single election or some other composite score.

So I just want to clarify in every plan you compare that ratio is still going to be the same.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That's correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very helpful.

Thank you very much.

Is that the one?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, it's fine.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just one moment.

I have to adjust this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's not the right plan.

And we are going to it's 12:05 so we will look at that and Edward has a quick update and then we will break for lunch.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You have to load this into the machine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You ready? That's it.

>> MR. MORGAN: So this is the plan and again I just gave it the number from the website for a reference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

And this was started with our original plan but as adjustments around Metro Detroit for VRA reasons and also pulled in Muskegon into Grand Rapids.

And then, yeah, so we will see what it is.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want me to load this into partisan fairness.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It's 0.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, if you could.

>> MR. MORGAN: I loaded the information into the spreadsheet.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was expecting it to be high.

So I'm not surprised.

And specifically 1, 2 and 3 were what I was expected so that is good, it tells me what I need to work on this weekend.

And then efficiency gap.

Because it's a VRA.

Well I mean that is what happens to get the VRA.

I mean, the other maps don't have VRA levels in Detroit and this one does so that is where we are seeing the difference.

All right, can we look at seats votes ratio? So it's definitely biased.

Okay all right that is actually really helpful because like I said it helps me, I had a feeling they were going to be high like this and it just helps me figure out where I need to rebalance it.

Time out.

Okay so at this point we are going to pause, everybody is getting served their food and I know Edward did you want to without objection we will wait for an update from Edward Woods about meetings.

Please proceed Mr. Woods once you have a chance to get over there.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS:

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I move we break for lunch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well guys I think Edward wanted to give an update before the lunch break.

Edward, can you wait until after the break or? Okay, all right we have it moved and seconded well we don't need to move and second to take a recess, Dustin so can you withdraw the motion? We don't need to do a motion.

All right it is currently 12:14 without objection we will recess for lunch for one hour.

Hearing no objections we will come back at 1:15 p.m.

Thank you everybody.

[ Lunch recess ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission at 1:17 p.m.

Will you call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

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 EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Attending remotely from Wayne, County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Rhonda Lange?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> 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: Ten Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Okay, so before the break, first of all, Mr. Morgan, I request you send the spreadsheets to excepted them to executive Hammersmith so she can give them to the rest of the Commissioners the partisan balance ones we looked at if you can do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: I can do that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Secondly update for executive I'm sorry director Woods for community outreach with respect to public hearings.

Hearing no objection please proceed Mr. Woods if you are ready.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I am, thank you so much.

All right just as a recap yesterday we are provided the public hearing recommendations and talked about the Commission's purpose to draw fair maps.

With citizens input and compliance with the 7 ranked redistricting criteria.

We talked about how qualify super seeds preference and just want to give the Commission a round of applause.

Dr. Handley was just bragging about you offline again about the great work that you have done to ensure partisan fairness and that you have less to do than what the public thought you had to do.

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 will keep it an open secret Commissioner Lett but despite serial litigants and serial insurrection against democracy but we are drawing fair maps with citizen input using the 7 criteria.

We went back the Commission made some recommendations yesterday and wanted to get back to you with regards to where we are.

I did want to share with you the Detroit MA which is the designated market area represents 9 counties that includes 49% of Michigan's population.

In 2019.

When you look at the population in these nine Counties it's 4,878,900 and the total Michigan population according to U.S. Census Bureau for 2019 population estimates was 9, 987,857 and equals 49% so what you see on the screen behind you are the media markets.

Here in Michigan.

As listed in the Michigan television markets, Michigan guide.

Realizing that this is 49% of the market, I would like to suggest to the Commission that they have already voted on the 18th, 21, 25 and 26th.

That we look at doing Metro Detroit on the 19th and the 20th, the 19th, and the 20th. TCF is open on both the 19th and the 20th.

The Sheraton in Novi has the 20th available and if you wanted to consider Macomb County, they only have the 19th available.

So we Kristin has been working hard trying to track this down but I would -- am I okay?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are okay.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: So I would just like to suggest instead of the Commission doing one date on Metro Detroit I would like to suggest that they do two dates.

One being at the TCF center and I would suggest that the other one would be in Novi and so the suggestion would be to be at the TCF center on the 19 and Sheraton Detroit Novi because Sheraton is only available on the 20th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions, comments, thoughts?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, with the population and what you helped us understand I appreciate that.

And I think we, yeah, I'm feeling better today than I was yesterday.

And I feel like, yeah, we might actually, yeah, thank you.

I appreciate it and I would approve this.

I like the idea of doing it.

Sorry what I'm looking at is it's Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday the first week and Monday, Tuesday the second week.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have a nice break on Friday the weekend, yeah, I like it thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't -- while I don't think that having fewer public meetings is necessarily good, I haven't changed my mind about having giving ourselves more time regardless of we think we are further ahead today than we were yesterday. I think that's probably wishful thinking.

The other thing and I've discussed this over dinner last night with some of my fellow Commissioners and it's my feeling I don't know that it's necessarily theirs, that between now and then as has been made clear in the last few days we are definitely going to hear what people think about our maps.

We are already hearing what they think about them.

And I don't anticipate we will get anything new other than if we make changes they will talk about the changes.

So I'm not in favor of it.

I'm in favor of the Detroit one.

I know there was some suggestion.

I think you made a suggestion to do two at TCF.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Through the Chair to Commissioner Lett two at TCF they are both available on 19th or 20th but what I would like to suggest today since the Sheraton Detroit Novi is open on the 20th, we do TCF on the 19th and Sheraton Detroit Novi on the 20th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I guess that is doing better at two at TCF in my mind but I'm not for it.

I think five is enough.

They can come to TCF, they did before.

They can call in.

They can do whatever.

So not convinced.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Though you work hard on it thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would echo thanking Edward for his work but my concern is just based on the number of public comments we're receiving right now we are getting close to 60 per meeting.

And imaging we are going to be going pretty late on a number of these and to just have four days of that back to back plus traveling from Grand Rapids to Metro Detroit then to Novi then to Lansing, I'm concerned about exhaustion.

Setting in for people because it's just we are not going to end at 8:00 for these.

We all know that.

We are going to be going significantly late and you know we typically start at 1:00 and that leaves very little time for traveling and resting and I just worry about how much of a drain that's going to be particularly because we can't really gauge right it could all work

out fine and by done by 10 or 11 or go to Grand Rapids and be there at 3:00 in the morning and say wow this was such a mistake to try to do these back to back meetings. I'm just worried about just the time and how are we going to be able to do all this. And we are we going to be so tired. We can't drive from the meeting, what we are hearing, if they are so close together.

And it's a function of the schedule too.

I'm with Commissioner Lett and stick with the five I think that is more than sufficient. Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Would it matter if it was a one minute instead of a two minute comment period to you? Just curious.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I hear clearly both Commissioner Lett and Commissioner Szetela.

I think one of the things that the Commission has consistently emphasized is the amount of public input and engagement.

And I just want to make sure that just because we maybe hearing the same thing doesn't mean that voices shouldn't be heard because the opportunity to provide feedback and whether or not there is support for one position or another that's really what the public hearings are about.

So I just want to echo that just because people may say the same thing orally behind a particular map that they are given the opportunity to do so even knowing the sheer volume of public engagement I think is encouraging.

And also representative of the Commission's intentional and deliberate effort to ensure awareness and engagement in the process.

So just want to throw that out for consideration with regards to that.

Because it's enormous amount of time and commitment but being a benchmark for not just Michigan but the nation in terms of how we followed our mission in drawing fair maps with citizen input to the 7 ranked criteria so just would appreciate that consideration as you make your vote.

Either way we will execute the wishes of the Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments? Thoughts? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: As it sits right now Mr. Woods, you know we have five hearings set.

So unless Mr. Rothhorn, Commissioner Rothhorn is going to make a motion to add one, there is no vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would concur with that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't mean to limit to Commissioner Rothhorn anybody can.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm not seeing a lot of, yeah, I think we are going to leave it at five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

And just for what it's worth I think we are also building trust through this process.

We asked we want a quality product and we don't want to hurt ourselves in the process and also all aware after COVID mental health matters and how we treat ourselves matters and I appreciate that is what I'm hearing from Commissioners we need that in a priority and build trust in the priority of what we are doing for the first time with the community and hope the community hears that.

Thank you for understanding we need to care for ourselves in ways that we are doing. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Can we agree that Detroit at TCF will be on the 20th? Is that okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That works for me, yep.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Woods.

At this point I think we are going to back to Dr. Handley and her analysis.

Are you good Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, we have the information we need.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Fantastic, thank you.

So we ended with looking at some Congressional maps.

And did we want to move to a house map or Senate map go ahead Mr. Morgan if you have a thought.

>> MR. MORGAN: I would like to revisit the Senate map you did if I may.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Fantastic.

Go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so this is the it will load up here this is the completed State Senate map.

And I've loaded it back into the Autbound edge so there is the District number, the plan number, so it's the Senate plan.

But the difference is now after the software update what we can do is we can make those reports directly from the program.

So the way you do this is we go, we go to the reports and output, we click run report.

And then you have to select under the report drop down box which by the way there are a ton of reports that you can look at for compactness measures and other things.

But here we have partisan fairness.

And then two categories so what we will do is select the composite partisan index that Dr. Handley created so it's a drop down box and you start at the top and it's got all of the information that's in the various data spreadsheets.

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 you scroll all the way down and when you get to the election data here at the bottom, you want to do the data sheet that has statewide races, democrat as category A.

And then we scroll down and we look for statewide races republican for category B.

And again that is in the -- that is the data that will be in the software.

which has that composite partisan index.

And we display the report.

And then that generates the report.

So I just generated this report actively from the software and it's exactly the same information that we previously saw in the spreadsheet version.

So the functionality is there.

And I want to thank Kim Brace and Ryan for helping me through this during the lunch hour.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you very much for that.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could Mr. Morgan or someone just make a little instruction sheet for that?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, we will work on something to do for that, sure.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I wrote it down too Cynthia.

You can take a picture of what I just wrote down.

>> MR. MORGAN: Also so this report it will be saved in wherever your default library is for your plan.

So in this case this is a State Senate plan.

And mine is showing inside the plan folder for this.

It saves a copy of that.

You can save it somewhere else.

So in my case I would save it where we had those other ones and you see it starts the excel spreadsheet.

Partisan fairness on to the name of the plan so you can find and refer to it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you one more thing go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: One more thing so we did this.

That is based on the partisan index.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: We talked about the possibility and Dr. Handley I can do this if you like, I can run this on a single election if you like.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I'd be curious to see what happens, what do you guys think?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Do you have an election you are dying to see?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we do the -- [ laughter ]

Can we do the primary? We have to do it, right, so let's do the 2016 Presidential.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that is a single election.

And the difference is that you know we are not using the partisan composite.

So the numbers for the election are going to be a little different than the partisan index.

And that will show up when we run the report.

So again in case I have the report up and instead of using the partisan index, I'm going to select that specific race.

So I have to scroll down all the way towards the bottom.

And I'm looking for the statewide elections tab.

So there is the race for democrat and republican and after that you can see 2020 president and here is the 2016.

So you select statewide races Clinton which is the democrat vote for president.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To be clear you're not selecting a percent it's just democrat.

>> MR. MORGAN: Total votes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: All of this has to operate off of votes and not percentages.

>> MR. MORGAN: Now we click display and it generates a report for a single election.

Now what I want to point out here and I will turn it over to Dr. Handley here you will have different numbers for some of this, right? Am I right on this? Yes, okay this is the key point I want to point out this is dynamically determined by the vote share previously it was the vote share based on the partisan index.

Here it's the vote share based on the Presidential election.

As you know in Michigan it was a very close Presidential election.

And it was Hillary Clinton 49.9 and Donald Trump got 50.1 that is a different election than the partisan fairness election or a different total calculation statewide.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I would go across and take a look and let's see what we get for each of these.

So we still have, there is a problem, so we still have a plan that favors republicans in all of these measures with this particular contest.

But now that this is in the software, as soon as you can get it loaded on to your machine, you can, yourself, choose any elections, again, not the percentage the votes but any of the statewide elections and run this yourself.

And they did amazing job and it's exactly like you would not have known we were operating in something other than excel.

This is exactly like what it looked like before.

So we were going to look at a house race now before I had to depart.

So John is going to show the list of house races.

And if you could pick a collaborative effort first, for John to load that would be great.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wondering what do we want to look at? The one from yesterday? So then take the top one from the list, which is, yeah, 93021HD. Which one is which?

>> MR. MORGAN: We have a little bit of an issue here because we have a plan that you completed at the end of the day that was out of population alignment and you abandon that in favor of Commissioner Szetela's footprint that was then this morning was merged with the rest of the plan.

So I think that the plan you want to do is the one that you sent this morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So let's look at that one.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will load and I think I have it in my software so just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You have to choose Senate or Congress.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is no choice.

You don't have to choose.

So what I have done is brought forward the plan that was sent to me this morning.

So again the representation here is that this was the plan that you worked on, Commissioner Szetela's plan.

And what is relevant there is a House District 40 and a House District 110.

So that should tell you it's the plan you expect.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, when I imported it, I was missing the one District and I had to add a 110 there so yes that is the right plan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay with this in mind now we can run the report on this plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: So this is the report based on this plan.

And one quick reminder when you see the totals here that are very large, larger than a single election that is a good sign you have chosen the correct index.

So if you did this on your own and see the numbers are very small you might have chosen a single election.

So when you see the larger numbers it's a good sign you have chosen the index.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we look at the mean median? All right and what about the efficiency gap? Yes, I'm sorry, Kim Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Hello there everybody greetings from providence Rhode Island.

I would want to warn people that when they play with this over the weekend make sure that you're creating the right pair of candidates.

Make sure that you know you've got the D and the R from a single contest.

Don't get mixed up with the D from one contest and an R from a different contest.

That will be just crazy.

So just be cognizant as you are selecting those candidates when you go down that list that you've got the right combination of the people in the contest.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you so can we see the seats ratio?

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at the seats vote ratio.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: If we go back to the lopsided margins, I think I would always start there.

Are the low number of districts in the Detroit area?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, for the most part, yeah.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yeah, it's going to be a balancing act between voting rights and partisan fairness, but it's not an equal balance because the Voting Rights Act trumps partisan fairness.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, John, can we go back and compare this to the one before we made all those voting rights adjustments? Because I think it would be interesting to see.

This map we are looking at had significant adjustments to comply with the Voting Rights Act but there was one before it number 183 that did not have those adjustments taken into account.

I'm just curious how much if any it moved.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to download it so we are clear and it will take a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This has what people were calling the bacon strip districts.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Did you write down the scores of the other one?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I did.

>> MR. MORGAN: You said it was 183?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thanks.

Okay I'm trying to import it here and want to double check to make sure it's the correct plan.

Okay so I think that this is the plan.

I recall that this was the District 16 in the modified plan it was 40 and it appears this is similar to the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that is it.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to save this and you want me to run the report.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: One more thing I will mention when you do this over the weekend on your own you probably do not want to have other excel files open.

If you have an excel file of the same plan name it will be a conflict.

So that will be something you might run into that is an easy fix.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Looks like it's a little more lopsided.

The pre-VRA changes 9.6 versus 9.2.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you clarify which one is which?

>> MR. MORGAN: The one on the top is the one I received this morning it's labeled RASVRA version two.

The one on the bottom is 183 from the website.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 183 is the collaborative map we all worked on VRA which is the one I worked on to adjust the VRA numbers.

>> MR. MORGAN: So this is showing the mean median difference for the two plans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then here is the efficiency gap metric.

Just a moment.

And the seats vote ratio.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: If I'm looking at this right the VRA compliant one is actually producing better measures.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm surprised honestly.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You went through it fast but it also looked like it had a lower -- the efficiency gap.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it was 11.8 versus 12.7.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: And the mean median difference.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was almost identical.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It was off by a 10th of a point and the lopsided margins, no, I am surprised and pleased.

[ Laughter ]

So in this particular case making the VRA did not hurt and improved the scores all the way across the board.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay that is good to know.

All right, so Dr. Handley I know you needed to scoot out so I want to be respectful of your time so if you need to leave feel free to do so.

Are there anyone who has any questions before she goes really quickly? I know she has a plane to catch.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just a lot of gratitude.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, a lot of gratitude.

Yes, thank you for your work.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Have fun with your reports.

[ Laughter ]

You finally have them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can think of nothing more exciting than spending the weekend looking at excel sheets.

Thank you very much Dr. Handley for your work, your analysis for coming here today we really do appreciate it.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It was my pleasure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, guys, so we are going to move on to our unfinished business.

And so do we want to discuss scheduling later Commissioner Orton or do we want to discuss it now, go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I want to move that we -- I'm not sure how to phrase it move that we change the date that our personal maps are due for publication from Monday morning before the meeting starts to Wednesday night.

If I have a second, I'll speak to it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Second from Commissioner Lett please continue Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So we had originally voted to require all map personal maps to be Commission maps personal Commissioner maps to be submitted Monday morning before the meeting started so that we would have time to do everything that needed that was necessary before the public hearings but now that the public hearings have been taken out that one week postponed, then I think we have a little more time to work on our own maps.

And now that we have this information, we can use that to create better maps before they are due on Wednesday night.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To clarify your motion is to extend the deadline for individual Commissioners to submit personal maps from Monday at the beginning of the meeting till Wednesday, did you say close of meeting? At the close of meeting, that was motion made by Commissioner Orton did you second that Commissioner Lett? Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Commissioner Rothorn then Commissioner Witjes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I really like the idea because I think we will be able to collaboratively map Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Learn from that and yeah so Monday, yeah, the weekend but then also Monday and Tuesday to sort of shift and revise and I think it makes a lot of sense to me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm in favor of that too just the only thing is that, how do I say this, the update we don't have yet we don't know exactly when we will be able to get it.

That being said we can always send the maps to EDS or whomever is here for that particular day to do it.

But if I'm working on a map at let's say 9:00 at night, 10:00 at night and I e-mail it chances of it being looked at is probably 0.

Oh, all right.

>> They said they would do that in the instructions.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: We are waiting on the instructions for DTMB for this.

And then we are also waiting on DTMB to let us know when they have time available to do it.

So they have been notified that it's ready.

That is what I know at this point.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Commissioner Witjes brings up why we want to push it back and allows us to actually tweak.

So I'll call the question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is your microphone on?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No, not yet.

Given that the public hearings have moved, what would be the maximum -- how far out can we push it? If we can push it out to Friday or if we push it out to sometime the week after that, would that be something that we can just take care of right now? Or would Wednesday still be an appropriate date? I want I just want to make sure everyone has enough time or they feel they have enough time on their own and not feeling rushed for Wednesday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree with you especially if we are going to be meeting until 8:00 at night next week.

I think we should push it to the following Monday, October 11th, which is a Monday at 8:00.

That is we extended our public hearings by a week.

And that should give us -- I think that makes more sense especially if we try to work at 8:00 at night.

That is not going to give people a lot of time to personally map and not likely to have the software until Monday or Tuesday software update until Monday or Tuesday any way.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will amend the motion to make it so that it's due on Monday morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The 11th.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: October 11th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I will second that amendment.

Any discussion or debate on the amendment? And please let me know if you see Commissioner Kellom's hand up behind me because I don't have a screen in front of me.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think that is a great idea then we would as a Commission be able to evaluate those on that Monday, Tuesday at least before we go on public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree.

So let's call the question on the amendment.

Oops.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: The rule as it stands you send those to MDOS24 hours in advance in order to consider those in the meetings so if you wanted them considered on the meeting on Monday you would have to have them in that Sunday.

So they can be posted online.

Just, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And maybe even Friday so we are not asking MDOS staff to work on Sundays, if we want to consider it a business day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would rather keep it on Monday because we can discuss them on Tuesday.

I mean that is fine.

That still gives us a day or two to discuss them.

Wednesday the 13th would be sort of the drop dead date like it was before following that same plan and then again to your point then we are not asking people to be uploading stuff on Sunday.

Because no one is going to look at it over Sunday any way probably.

We are all, yeah.

All right any additional discussion? Okay so let's vote on the amendment the amendment is to amend the original motion was to extend the date to Wednesday close of business October 6.

There was an amendment to extend the date further to October 11 beginning of the meeting which would but believe 9 or 10:00 a.m. all in favor of adopting the amendment raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

Okay the amendment prevails.

And so now we have a motion as amended to move the due date for individual Commissioners to submit their plans.

To the rest of the Commission and Secretary of State Department of State to October 11th beginning of the meeting.

All in favor of that motion please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

All right so the motion prevails and our new due date is October 11 beginning of the meeting.

Executive Director Hammersmith I would really appreciate it if you would let the fellow Commissioners who are not here today know that.

Because I know they are probably going to work on maps over the weekend and we want to make sure they know they have additional time.

Thank you.

Now we will move on to unfinished business item 5A we will ask General Counsel Pastula for a draft rules of procedure.

Please proceed General Counsel.

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

Based on the request of Commissioners at the Monday meeting, I made specific revisions to the draft rules as they were presented.

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.

The original draft rules are red lined.

All of the changes in draft two the updated draft are highlighted as well as red lined.

That way it's very clear what we are talking about.

There was also a memo circulated that walked through the brief changes specifically in draft two was to Section 3.4 for vacated office, addition and deletion of language at Commissioner Lett's request.

Section 7.3 tenure at the request of Commissioner Szetela.

Addition of language recognizing a Chair or Vice Chair may resign.

Section 7.4.1 the duties of the Chairperson.

There were changes formatting changes and clarifying language regarding the Chair and active Chair.

And I did bless you I did want to highlight that in on Page 20, starting on line 9, I recommend that the clause including the Chair's right to debate vote or with respect to procedural matters be deleted as superfluous and not needed and the clause be removed and end at the word Commission.

This clause what it does is it incorporates Commissioner Orton's request regarding presence of the Chair at a meeting and also acknowledges that a Chairperson could be present at a meeting but unable to preside.

For example if they had a sore throat or some other issue that would prevent them from presiding over a meeting.

And that the Vice Chair would fill that role in those situations.

And it clarifies that the Chairperson being present at a meeting but not Chairperson, it does not impair or aggregate of the Commission and the last sentence on line 9 and 10 the last clause be struck and that the sentence end with Commission.

The other remaining changes between drafts one and two include Section 7.2.4 the language to comport with the changes made to 7.4.1.

And lastly, in sections 14.2 amendment, there was a clarification to the timing requirement.

This week the notice was provided of amendments being discussed at the Monday meeting.

And there is the three-day requirement just clarifying again that it's at which the formal action should be taken.

The other change to Section 14.2 is addition of language ratifying former Commission actions all past Commission actions that was made at the request of Commissioner Lett.

And that is found on Page 28 of the document lines 24 and 25.

The languages by adopting subsequent amendments to these rules pursuant to this Section the Commission ratifies all prior actions taken.

And I would recommend that the words by the Commission be added after prior actions taken.

That is a summary of the changes that were presented in the memo dated yesterday with the addition of the two recommended changes striking the language in 7.4.1 subpart B.

And adding the words by the Commission to the last sentence of Section 14.2.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Any comments or questions about the proposed rule changes? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move that we adopt these.

And I would also move to amend a little bit further on them.

So I don't know how you wish to...you want me to do the...my suggested language? Okay.

If you look at Page 21, if you have it on your screen, under 12, public participation under 12D, small letter A, public comment at a meeting of the Commission and as specified under section, shall be restricted to change two minutes to one minute.

And then in B the same change from two minutes to one minute.

One is for a public hearings, I believe that is B and A is for public comment at these meetings.

While we thought this morning that we would have to do it every time, it is in the rules, we can change the rules.

I would also bring to your attention C, the Commission may act to suspend the time limits as set forth in subparts A and B.

And set an alternate time limit for public comment.

So if we come to the point where we got five people and we only want to give them five minutes each we can move to change the rules and set that.

So this will give us one minute going forward unless we want to decide we want to make a change at a specific meeting.

And with that change then I would move the adoption of the rules as stated.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So General Counsel? Do I need to break that into two motions one a motion to adopt and then two a motion to amend the rules? Or what procedurally how should we proceed on that, can he do it all in one motion I guess is the question.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I would recommend that the motion to --

Commissioner Lett initiated with a motion to adopt the amendments as proposed.

And then discussed one additional amendment.

And just to clarify, earlier today when we spoke about modifying them per meeting, that was appropriate at that time because the rules that we are discussing right now are currently in effect.

Right now we are discussing amending the rules based on the notice that was provided on Monday and the discussions that the Commission has been having since Monday.

So this would change your actual rules to reflect one minute.

So if you wanted to modify the time going forward much like you did this morning, you would need the motion and what not to change.

But this is an appropriate time if you wanted to make that change permanent because the rules are open, it is an appropriate time to raise it.

So I would Madam Chair I would -- the original motion was made by Commission Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes.

The motion to amend was to modify the two minute time limit to one so it would just follow the normal course of business the motion to amend first and then the main motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I will second the motion to amend.

So we now have a motion and a second on the actual adoption then a motion and a second on the change to one minute.

Any discussion or debate on the amendments? All in favor of amending the rules, oh, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think for our public hearings we should leave those at two minutes just because the purpose of those is mainly for public comment whereas the purpose of these meetings that we are having today are more so to conduct our business.

So I'd agree with the one minute change to our regularly scheduled meetings but for the public comment or the public hearings I'd like to leave them at two minutes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn did you have a comment?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No, I'm just going to echo what Anthony said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional discussion or debate? Anything from Commission Kellom? All right then let's go ahead and vote.

All in favor, yeah, I think that is a good choice so let me restate the amendment.

The Commissioner Lett has made a motion which was seconded by me to further amend the proposed rules in Section 12DA and B to change the timeframe from two minutes down to one minute.

If you are in favor of that change, say aye.

If you are opposed say nay and Sarah Reinhardt, can you please take the role.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, but if you could say "Yes" or "No" instead of aye or nay because aye or nay sometimes sounds the same over video so thank you.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order.

Starting with Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?  
>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?  
>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?  
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?  
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?  
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?  
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vote of 8 yes to 2 no, the motion carries.  
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much at this point we are going to move on to the motion by Commissioner Lett seconded by Commissioner Witjes to approve the rules as amended including the amendment that we just did right here. Again once again we will ask for a role call yes you are in favor of adopting the rules as amended and no means you are not and I will turn it over to you Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Madam Chairs Commissioners do as your Chair said.

[ Laughter ]

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?  
>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?  
>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?  
>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?  
>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?  
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?  
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?  
>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.  
>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?  
>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: With unanimous support the motion carries.

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

All right, let me see.

Just trying to figure out where we are at.

All right, guys, so we have continued mapping and making adjustments on our agenda.

Do we want to proceed with that? I've heard some comments that we want to break early so we can spend time mapping and taking into account all these comments that we've received and we now have partisan fairness analysis do we want to do that or want to collaboratively do the maps and change the maps as they are right now?

Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, it's been a long week.

I'll just say that.

I do feel better.

And I do feel like I need to integrate a lot of what we have learned so I'm okay with -- and frankly I know personally I don't have the energy right now to collaboratively map. So if yeah, I guess that's what I'm thinking.

I know I'm going to want to pass.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Having the longest drive, I certainly would accept an early out.

But I will do whatever the Commission wishes to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Personally I'm in favor of us we are all tired.

We've got a lot to absorb.

We have a lot to do this weekend.

I think we should break.

Unless someone has a burning desire to map.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we maybe sort of orient ourselves to next week?

Sort of review of the week and next because we are in the home stretch and I think we've got I think we've got even a special Monday morning you maybe want to be there early kind of thing happening.

And I'm seeing some nodding heads.

So this was so I guess this morphed into something else but what I want to acknowledge Monday morning we do want to have a sort of coffee and there is some homemade cinnamon rolls my spouse is a wonderful baker. And we have apples from the house. And she makes a wonderful apple tart and a Quiche with wild mushrooms. We will try to make it special. And apologize for who won't be able to be there, public included.

And I do want to recognize we've had a long week.

Want to say we will start off really fresh so come early even though we start at 10.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sour-dough toast.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That includes the staff and Secretary of State staff so everyone in this room here.

And, again, because we are starting at 10:00 I'm saying this mostly please come early so we can be together and, yeah.

And then I guess we will figure it out from there.

But that seems like the most important piece.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would encourage everybody we have these different draft maps that are out there.

We know what we have all looked at, look at them over the weekend think if we want to make changes to them and think about which ones you like that way we are prepared to discuss if we need more changes on Monday and we don't like what we have and hopefully we can all get our partisan fairness software installed and start looking at that too.

I think we can be ready to rock and roll on Monday.

I think the partisan fairness results were better than we were all expecting and I think that is reassuring.

Of course as always thank you Mr. Morgan for all of your assistance thank you Sarah and Mr. Woods and General Counsel and I think we lost Mr. Adelson at this point, Sue thank everybody for your support and help.

Let's go through the rest of the items on agenda.

No new business and no minutes to approve.

There is no additional staff reports.

Sarah Reinhardt, do you have another report? Correspondence are received in advance of the meeting was provided along with written public comments in the meeting materials there is no future agenda items to discuss because we talked about those.

Any announcements.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No announcements and I would like to thank Edward for the work he has done.

We have not been especially nice to him this week.

I understand that.

He got us our lunch today and thank you Edward.

[ APPLAUSE ]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would also like to thank Commissioner Orton for being our west side of Commissioner and we heard there is no one from the west side because you are from Battle Creek and west side and highlight that and hopefully it stops the leaf that we don't have someone from the west side here.

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.

All right as the items on the agenda are completed and no further business a motion to adjourn is order may I have a motion to adjourn motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Please raise your hand and say nay.

All right. We are adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Thank you, everybody.