

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

10/29/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As Vice Chair of the Michigan, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:03 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

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 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.

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available at 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 along with the written public comment submissions.

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting 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 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: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and where you are physically attending from. I 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?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

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

You can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved. Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Lett is there discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none it is moved and seconded all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail the motion is adopted.

Without objection we will now move on to public comment pertaining to agenda topics portion of our meeting.

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

Do we have any in person public comment? Okay, so we will move directly to remote public comment.

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

I will call your name and our staff will unmute you.

If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

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 are on the phone a voice will say the host would like you to speak and press star six to unmute.

I will call on you by your name or last four digits of your phone number.

If you experience technical or audio issues or do not hear from you 3-5 seconds we will move on to the next person in line and return to you after they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work e-mail at redistricting@Michigan.gov we will help you trouble shoot.

You will have one minute to address the Commission and please conclude when you hear the timer, first in line to provide public comment is Tim Wilcot.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we have number two, all right so number two Ian Robinson.

>> Good morning can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Okay, thanks.

Good morning my name is Ian as president of the Huron labor federation I speak for approximately 18,000 workers and their families in Jackson and Washtenaw Counties. Please draw a State Senate map that unpacks the City of Ann Arbor and puts western Ann Arbor with western Washtenaw and Jackson County in a compact District that keeps our COIs together.

Dozens and dozens of people have asked for this.

From May to October and different versions appear in the AFLCIO maps, the promote the vote maps, and many individuals submissions including P6603.

Which is based on your cherry map.

With small edits.

Please make this change.

It helps you on criteria three, four, six and seven all at once.

Eid and Szetela's maps try to do this but neither is perfect.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Let's move on to number three Jeremy.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Jeremy.

I'm a nurse with the University of Michigan professional nurses Council.

Before I was a nurse I worked as a farm hand in western Washtenaw and Jackson Counties.

And I have a family in Parma and Waterloo and at the University of Michigan we have 6200 nurses in our workforce and many of them commute from this region and all along the Jackson and I-94 corridor and also work with a lot of patients from all after that economic corridor.

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.

Multiple U of M programs and affiliates have partnerships with various community and health agencies in Jackson County.

And Jackson.

And if an economic cluster of thousands of nurses and our patients and families are in a community of interest, I really don't know what is.

We deserve representation so I'd like to encourage you to draw Senate District that includes western Ann Arbor and Jackson together. It would be much better for the COIs and would help your map be fairer to both parties.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number four, John Fitzgerald.

>> Good morning. My name is John Fitzgerald a resident of Wyoming Michigan and member of the Wyoming Council a nonpartisan body.

I'm speaking to the House Districting in West Michigan.

In the proposed maps Wyoming a City of almost 77,000 persons is split in two separate House Districts and unfortunate and unfair outcome for the residents of Wyoming.

Wyoming needs to be captured in a District to provide the best possible opportunity for a representative to emerge from the City.

To achieve the necessary geographic compactness partisan fairness and minority representation a natural House District would include the precincts from Wyoming and Grand Rapids to include a primarily excuse me and minority representation a natural House District would include precincts from the City of Grand Rapids to include primarily Hispanic precincts in west southwest Grand Rapids along Wyoming's northern border and Grandville corridor with a strong House District with minority majority representation.

I encourage you to review the suggested changes and I thank you very much for your commitment to the process.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for your comments.

We will move on to number six, Micha Perkins.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Vice Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I believe I misspoke it's number Micha Perkins; is that correct?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Go ahead Sarah sorry.

My suggestion was just to log for the record the time of arrival for the Commissioners present.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for noticing that and I apologize.

So we have two Commissioners that have joined us I believe, anymore, can we Chair Szetela and Commissioner Eid would you each log your time? Was it 9:13.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do we need anything more or me saying it or do they need to say present?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Vice Chair they are noting for the record they have joined us.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you very much.

>> Good morning can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can hear you.

>> My name is Micah from the City of Grand Rapids and Kent County.

I have tweaks to the State House map.

And west of the Grand River House District made up of Grand Rapids Walker and Grandville.

These areas are a clear community of interest.

They are all Metro 6 cities.

They share the Grand River and will want a representative to will expand the parks.

We have Catholic and polish heritage and home of west Catholic high school and overlap in public school districts with southern Walker and Grandville and Grand Rapids and northern Walker and Kenowa School District.

Add most of downtown Grand Rapids and that makes the most sense as it would combine downtown Grand Valley State University campuses.

Thank you for your time and your hard work, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number six Tim Allen.

>> Good morning.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning.

>> Thanks for letting us speak.

My suggestion is that the Commission should keep State Senate districts similar to what they are right now.

I used to live in heritage hill and it's a cool neighborhood, full of historic homes that should stay together in any plan moving forward.

Losing all that historic architecture would be a tragedy to the area.

Proposed District 75 does not make a whole lot of sense to me.

You are pulling Grand Rapids Township from its forest school District.

Hills.

Forrest Hills school District in Ada and Cascade and weakening that community of interest.

And proposed House District 76 I would suggest needs to suggest the City of Walker with Alpine Township as they make up the Kenowa Hills School District. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number eight James Gallant.

>> Hello James Gallant Marquette these are my opinions.

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 this Commission is allegedly started your deliberations on the agenda you have as unfinished business.

Just deliberations.

And Commissioner Lett has now suggested that we are on the final, final, final decisions, three finals, and eventually I guess you are going to have to swing back around to get a plain final decision right.

I believe the League of Women Voters and others may have been coordinating miss information effort where making a motion stops the discussion instead of the Robert's Rules of Order requiring a motion starts discussion.

That I believe in the community people are being misinformed about that.

I believe the Secretary of State has overstepped her authority where the MCL 168.486 which requires the language of the Constitution to be directed to the director of management and budget Julia Dale and please get that verified by her.

You got my FOIA from the Secretary of State department of state so please refer this to your attorneys get a report of recommendation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number nine Anthony Skinnell.

>> Good morning, Commission.

Thank you for some of you having recognized the efforts I've put in for map submissions for Congress, P7210.

If Detroit must be split two ways for Congress, I think you know, the version I've shown you would be a little more consistent with the boundaries and directions of our City Council districts.

The Western District you know I'm interested in.

For you to draw would also be more consistent with the Rouge river watershed.

Check this out I had a feeling the two Detroit Congressional districts would be slightly more consistent with UAW regions 1 and 1A believe that or not.

I appreciate the due diligence you guys have put on neighborhoods yesterday.

And to that effect please take note of some jagged edge boundaries if you consider you know my map.

And, yeah, I don't know I just appreciate it.

Please carry on, thanks.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number ten Ryan Letts.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Ryan Letts I'm a Kent County resident for my entire life.

I was born and raised in Rockford.

On the southeast side on a farm.

I moved to the City at 18.

Lived in different parts of the County and the City.

Throughout my life.

I've also worked throughout my life in the County of Kent and in the City of Grand Rapids.

I wanted to talk today about the State House maps and the greater Grand Rapids area. I was there July 1 in Grand Rapids and heard comments to the State House maps and want to reiterate what I heard at that point.

One thing I was going to talk about would have been the Wyoming community.

I think John Fitzgerald. Speaker four did a great job with that.

I would urge East Grand Rapids the City of Kentwood extending out to the airport be considered a community of interest.

Geographically compact.

And slated for a house seat.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 11 Karen S.

>> Hi folks thanks for hearing me out again I'm concern S.

I live in Cascade Township.

I heard that you may be considering putting Cascade Township in a state map with a State Senate map with Grand Rapids Metro.

That's very exciting to me.

It shows me you're listening and I appreciate that.

I would like you to consider putting Cascade Township in a State House map as well because we need representation in both the house and the Senate for the state.

And as all our tax dollars go to the Grand Rapids Metro area.

We are right next to Kentwood.

We have the airport.

And we all have Grand Rapids addresses.

So we are a suburban urban area of Grand Rapids.

So please consider us both for the State House as well as the State Senate and thank you for listening. You're doing a great job you are awesome, God bless.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for the appreciations really appreciate that. Number one joined us Ken Wilcot and return to 12 after Mr. Wilcot, number one Mr. Wilcot.

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

>> Okay thank you.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

I would just like to speak on house maps and Kalamazoo City.

It is not one community.

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 is one would be better served the community to be split between an eastern District and would be more diverse and include Comstock and Parchment and the Black communities in the City.

And a Western District with the college campuses student housing and suburbs in Oshtemo and Alamo with much of Kalamazoo Township.

This would not only make the unpacking of the Kalamazoo City.

It would make two house seats more competitive for both republican and democrats.

Thank you for your time.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to address the Commission.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 12, Katherine D.

>> Daligga.

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

>> Thanks.

My name is Katherine.

I'm a lifelong resident of Michigan and a 23 year resident of Washtenaw County.

Now in Ypsilanti City.

I'd like you to please focus on two fundamentally important principles.

First partisan fairness and second maintaining if not improving on the number of majority minority districts and progress on standard metrics and be bold in unpacking previously concentrated democratic strongholds to equalize all voters capacity to influence the outcome of an election.

My own thinking has evolved in this regard thanks in part to the maps proposed by Commissioners Eid and Szetela.

Thus as an Ypsilanti City resident I would like Ypsilanti and Township to be together.

To be in different State House and Senate districts from Ann Arbor even if we are in the same Congressional District which for that matter to me is not an absolute necessity.

Thank you very much all for your hard work and for your dedication to this project.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Number 13, Kelly Mitchell.

>> Hello.

Thank you.

I'm proposing that you keep the State Senate District of Grand Rapids the same and not move the line from Fulton to Wealthy Street.

Dividing Wealthy Street would split the neighborhood association of heritage hill and east town into two districts.

Secondly the House District 76 map that is being proposed that includes the City of Walker and many different neighborhoods within the City of Grand Rapids Alpine, centered downtown with connection of west grand and east town.

All these neighborhoods are different from one another and don't form a community of interest.

The City of Walker is drawn with Alpine Township for the current State House District. And it will remain the same because both of these areas share Kenowa school District. Lastly house 75 which includes East Grand Rapids, Grand Rapids Township northeast Grand Rapids and several other precincts in southern Plainfield Township.

This map interferes with several communities of interest.

Grand Rapids Township forms a community of interest with Ada and Cascade Townships.

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

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Awesome.

My name is good morning, Commissioners my name is Chris and I'm a resident of Wyoming in Kent County.

We know from the testimony you all received during the public hearings last week and the week before that Kent County State House plan still needs some work.

I saw a plan that was recently sub submitted for the Grand Rapids Metro area IDP7083. It fits the intentions of your original State House drafts and gets you closer to achieving partisan fairness statewide and keeping the six cities together including more urban Townships to help the districts reach their target population specifically this map would include Ada Cascade Plainfield and Grand Rapids Townships as part of the extended Metro.

By doing this it keeps the airport with the Metro unites the Hispanic community in Grand Rapids and Wyoming and makes the districts more balanced over all from a partisan perspective and making changes to the State House map I ask you use P7083.

Thank you so much for your time and I appreciate all the work you have been doing these past several months.

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

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> This is Kurtis with API vote Michigan.

We just wanted to follow-up on two of the initiatives that we have been chasing.

I know that the Commission has done a lot of great work.

So we are here to continue to make sure that we push forward with some of the changes we have been requesting.

With respect to the State Senate or I'm sorry the State House districts, again please make sure that we include precinct 95.

In Detroit.

And move that from District 10 to State House District 2.

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.

To make sure that we give Bangla Town a voice with respect to representation.

Please review the State Senate maps in Troy or the State Senate map.

We want to make sure that the AAPI community and Troy is not disenfranchised so please consider including Sterling Heights more so where there is an Asian community.

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

>> Hello Jennifer Austin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Jennifer can I stop you? After you use your one minute can you stay on for a second? I actually have a follow-up question for you so don't jump off at one minute.

>> Hello Jennifer Austin City of Midland.

I wanted to let the Commission I and many people from Midland and Tri-Cities appreciate the important work you are doing.

I believe the Commission has partisan fairness and the best interests of Michigan at heart.

The maps are not ready yet but I have faith in the process and also in the people who have undertaken this mission.

I'm especially grateful for the Tri-City drawn for Midland Bay and Saginaw there is 3-4% difference in the lean and it's not negotiable and the District is winnable by any party.

I'm looking forward to the candidates that will run in this election because the best candidate will have to prove themselves to voters and that is the best outcome for the Tri-Cities.

I'm a democrat but not asking for safe blue districts.

We want to have a chance, districts with near 0 political bias will boost voter turnout and engagement and bring more people to the table so all voices are heard.

And that is the goal of this isn't it to make the voices of Michiganders heard.

Thank you so much for making that possible.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so my follow-up question for you is in a previous hearing you had mentioned that you had specifically tabulated and calculated the comments related to Midland and that you had analyzed that it was I think 60% in favor being with the Tri-Cities.

I'm wondering if you have that analysis and if you would feel comfortable sending it to us.

>> I can definitely do that.

So I don't know if that was at the last time because I've done this twice.

So the most recent tabulation was the one I talked about in Gaylord maybe.

I don't remember now.

Yeah, I can sent you that.

The Google document is that what you're looking for?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, just the data.

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.

Because I think it would be helpful and inform our decision making because you have already done the tabulation.

You can send it to redistricting@Michigan.gov and they can send it on to us.

>> Okay awesome.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right number 19 Jennifer Fairfield.

>> Good morning my name is Jennifer Fairfield I'm a resident of bridge water Township in the far southwest corner of Washtenaw County.

I want to first sincerely thank the Commissioners for their work in this very tedious process.

I am here today with a request with regard to the State Senate maps.

I understand from your discussion yesterday that you are open to considering unpacking Washtenaw County.

And I'm here to encourage you to do just that.

Specifically I would like to encourage you to unpack Ann Arbor and include portions of western Ann Arbor in a District with western Washtenaw County. And Jackson County. As a way to improve the fairness of the maps.

Several of the individual Commissioners have presented maps that do unpack the area. And while I do not feel that any of them is absolutely perfect, I look forward to seeing that idea implemented into the maps you are working on.

Thank you again for your work on this project.

And for giving me the time to address you.

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

>> Yes, hello I'm a resident of East Grand Rapids and as such I've been keeping my eye on Kent County and the great work you've been doing there.

One tweak I was really hoping you would consider is right now East Grand Rapids is with Grand Rapids.

And my hope instead is you would lump us in with Kentwood.

This would create a District composed of the two Metro six cities in the southeastern and eastern part of the cities we share transit water and sewer garbage cities and same form of Government.

We are strong supporters of public schools.

Then from there I would hope you would add Cascade Township which includes the Ford airport which is vital to the Metro region and its businesses and therefore I think it should be with someone with strong Metro ties.

There are not really farms in Cascade not as much as they used to be any more so I do not feel it should be considered with rural Township.

Grand Rapids is divided in post and Kentwood east and Cascade you have the suburban east House District thank you.

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

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

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

>> It appears Lyle may be experiencing audio difficulties.

I would recommend we move on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right it appears that Lyle V is either not on or having technical difficulties so we will move on to Carlos Sanchez number 24.

>> Okay good morning.

My name is Carlos Sanchez a resident of the City of Grand Rapids.

I'm the director of the Latino business and economic development center.

I've been the Executive Director of both the Hispanic chamber and center.

But I'm speaking for myself as a longtime leader in the Kent County Hispanic community right now.

You have an opportunity to create a State House District that has the highest concentration of Hispanics in Kent County.

You can do this while keeping other communities of interest intact.

Much of the Hispanic community lives on Grandville avenue and will be renamed in southwest Grand Rapids and northern Wyoming.

Hispanics are spread throughout the rest of Wyoming I ask you that to form a District made up of all of Wyoming and add the most Hispanic precincts of Grand Rapids.

Which are 15, 22 and 16.

This District would be 30% Hispanic so our voice will be finally heard.

We make up 11% of entire County.

And want a representative in Lansing who will work with.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Sanchez? Never mind.

If you could, I wanted to ask him to repeat the street names.

I did not catch them.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Precincts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He said Some Street names first.

I got the precincts.

>> I'm sorry again Grandville avenue soon to be renamed Chavez in southwestern Grand Rapids and northern Wyoming.

The Hispanic precincts are 15, 22 and 16.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right number 25 Richard Williamson.

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.

>> Good morning I'm Richard from Grandville and Kent County and thank you for understanding and addressing -- in the course of Townships.

The latest Senate discussions reflect the understanding of the area and your house maps are getting closer.

I have changes to the maps to improve communities of interest.

District R63361 fits in the greater GR border outline you have already drawn but makes better sense for communities.

Keep Central near majority African/American in the center and I have four Directors in it. Move East Grand Rapids with Kentwood.

They are the two southeastern six and add Cascade as a suburban of Ford airport.

In the northeast have Ada with GR and you have a forest Hill Centered GR ward two.

In the southwest keep Wyoming together and add a few nearby GR precincts in the northeast keep west side GR and Walker District but add Grandville.

All these communities have overlapping school districts and commercial districts.

Thank you again for listening.

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

>> Hello.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hello.

>> Is it my turn to speak.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it is.

>> Okay, my name is Cory King and live in Kalamazoo.

I know there are calls for creating three districts instead of two for the City of Kalamazoo or Kalamazoo County.

And I posted on the portal a map showing how you could draw three State House districts that map is IDP7173.

And the area around western Michigan University's campus can be combined with K college and northwestern Kalamazoo County for one District and the other District can be the northern and eastern sides of the City of Kalamazoo along with eastern side of Kalamazoo County and that could be a state District of its own.

The western eastern parts of Kalamazoo County have different communities of interest and different concerns and therefore needs two separate State House representatives.

Then the southwest portion of the County could include Portage could be a House District of its own including Antwerp and Van Buren County.

Thank you for listening to my comments and the great work you are doing so far.

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

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> Awesome thank you so much.

My name is Robert George a Washtenaw County parks and recreation Commissioner.

I wanted to speak briefly on the conservation of unpacking of the County of Washtenaw.

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 I mentioned at the Flint hearing, the individual Commissioner maps do a great job of this.

Commissioner Lange's map that takes Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township down into Monroe. And Commissioner Eid's map that takes the northeastern corner of the County.

And the northern Section of Ann Arbor north into Novi.

That brings the other strong tech and communication area that is an area is very heavily office buildings and so forth.

And then Commissioner Szetela's western Washtenaw and mostly City of Ann Arbor into Jackson.

Very good way to divide the City of Ann Arbor there are two good ways you can divide the City north of the Huron river.

Which includes most of the AAPI population in the City of Ann Arbor.

Then you can divide on the west side.

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

>> Good morning, Commissioners, my name is Yousif from Troy nice to speak with you P7997 is my map.

I base this map on cherry.

Sterling Heights is not COI with Detroit.

In my map Sterling Heights Troy and parts of Rochester Hills are in one District as they should be.

I also took two neighborhoods one from Troy and one from Sterling Heights included in the same District as Hamtramck and put them back with Troy and Sterling Heights.

Sterling Heights is one of the most populated communities in Michigan and unite us on the east side of Sterling Heights.

AAPI vote asked more Sterling heights to be with Troy.

I agree P997 does that thank you for listening and I will continue to pray for each one of you Commissioners.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Numbers 29 and 30 are not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 29 and 30.

Robert Dindoffer.

>> Hello, can you her me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Great hey I wanted to thank you guys for your work that you did on the Lake St. Clair State Senate District yesterday adding my hometown of gross point park back in. Very much appreciated.

I wanted to let you know you can complete the lakeshore by adding Ira Township and two precincts from clay Township that are on the Lake.

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.

Without doing anything else, because District 25 is overpopulated.

And District 7 is under populated.

If you just move those you don't have to do anything else and you completed the lakeshore.

Second, tweak I would request is the Jefferson Chalmers neighborhood in Detroit as opposed to the Moross-Morang because Jefferson Chalmers is on the river front and fits with the COI better than Moross-Morang.

Add the rest of clay and Algonac back in and take new haven out of the District and it would be an even swap.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Last commenter is Shardae Chambers.

>> Good morning. Can you guys hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay perfect.

It's a pleasure to be with you guys again.

I'm Shardae from Kalamazoo County I'm calling this morning as before when we were in Grand Rapids and when you guys were in Flint just to let you guys know that Kalamazoo County does not want to be pushed further west with the maps.

We have been pushed with the lakeshore and do not share the same interest and drown out with our current Congressman.

And I would just prefer if you guys do not push us west, we would be better going back to Calhoun County if you could fix that that would be amazing.

I will say I do like your State House seat 73 that is my District.

That is my area.

The only thing I would say if you could add in Parchment because they do share the same interests as the City of Kalamazoo and Kalamazoo Township.

Because we share the same water and share some of the same supplies so if you add Parchment that would be an awesome because the state could represent them instead of rural where they do not fit and thank you for your service and praying you will make the best of it.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. That concludes our public comment for this morning.

However I'd mention all mailed and e-mailed comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting and we review the public comment portal on our 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 interest and maps.

So at this point we are going to return to our agenda items deliberations regarding proposed map carries over from yesterday's agenda.

Without objection the Commission will continue deliberations.

All right so yesterday.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, I made a new copy of it with today's date.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to address a subject once John brings the map up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could you repeat that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like to address a subject once the map is up.

It's up.

It's relative to the Detroit area.

I'd like to take a look at District 7.

And I'd like to complete the lakeshore on it.

So I think the appropriate thing to do is to bring up the Spruce map and lay it on top of that.

Or and I will show you exactly what I'm talking about.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark we did get that public comment.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's exactly I think the last individual or previous one to him discussed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I guess what I'm saying you might not even need the overlay. You might just want to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It will be helpful so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: For people online that might be watching or whatever.

I mean we are pretty familiar with it.

We've had some discussion on this previously.

And I went back and I looked at the other Senate maps last night.

And the Spruce map identifies this as the approach that I feel we should take.

Anthony's individual map did the same.

Then there was one other that had this configuration that I'm going to talk about.

So it's a pretty wide accepted approach.

And I think it reinforces the communities of interest up in the anchor Bay Area.

So if you take a look at this, the area from new Baltimore around anchor Bay, yeah, that one there.

I think that should be rolled into 7.

Okay to complete the lakeshore District.

Lakeshore District as I see it is there is the lakeshore District in the thumb which that area is currently with.

But the thumb is very agricultural.

And it's more tourist oriented.

And this area people live there.

It's not as tourist area.

So I think it's more associated with District 7 as it goes south to the Detroit river, okay?

So I would encourage us to take this Section of 25, as the individual who just talked about this.

And incorporate that into 7.

And complete the lakeshore District coming down Lake St. Clair.

They have a lot of things in common.

There is a lot of flooding in the area.

Significant problem for them.

We don't hear about that up in the thumb area.

And I know they have a bridge problem up in the anchor Bay Area too that needs some attention.

So I would like to see us do that.

And we will get comments from other people go ahead.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So the reason why I did this is because it creates more balanced districts.

And I don't really think that tip of the Bay there has much in common with Grosse Pointe or St. Clair shores or mount Clemens or new Baltimore.

They are very rural up there, nowhere as densely populated as the other areas.

And I think what the man was referring to is grabbing a few precincts not even the whole thing.

Because marine City is not a heavily populated area at all.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 3 precincts there I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have to Zoom in more.

John, can you Zoom in more? And can we also see the -- can you change the matrixes to Directors in view so we can see the populations on those two districts?

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I like the idea when it was shown in other maps there was positive feedback on that.

So I would be all for doing it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There was also positive feedback on doing it this way too.

As I said like the cherry map has the most comments out of any map that we have 400 plus comments in favor of the map.

Plus all the hundreds of comments we received at the public hearings in favor of this map.

With this configuration.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: But the comments on the map are generic to the entire state not just this specific area.

So and I thought this from living relatively close to the area I thought this area was more appropriately associated with the south.

I think we need population in 7 any way do we not? Yeah, it's down almost 5,000 people.

So I think it's the right thing to do.

Let's get some comments.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It sounds like you don't like it.

But it sounds like several Commissioners do.

So let's try it and see what happens.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well before we do that, we need to run a partisan fairness report and save that so that we can see the difference that's going to make in changing that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We did not do that on all the other changes you did yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No one asked for it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No one asked for it so I'm asking for it.

Why is that a problem to ask for it analysis so we can see the effect of the changes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's not a problem but are we going to do this with every change we make if we are we do it with every change we make.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If no one is asking for it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need to be consistent can I get in here I see Commissioner Lange too.

I think what we are trying to do we have contentious decisions and things we are not going to agree.

I think what we are trying to do here is somehow recognize a process and that not one of us is going to drive it all.

So I think what right, with the like somehow let's just see if there is a way because I think what other Commissioners are asking for some consistency.

And I appreciate what you're saying if we are not asking for it but we each also want to expedite the process.

So I think we may not have asked for it because we were trying to get into a rhythm.

So what I want to suggest somehow each change partisan fairness is also evaluated after the whole map.

So there is going to be other changes that might address it.

I'm just saying all I want to do is say I appreciate that this cherry map is super like it's the best partisan fairness.

That is why we are using it.

I think we are trying to recognize communities of interest and trying to recognize all the things we wanted to do and started with yes.

This is also a community piece and maybe we don't need the whole thing.

I guess what I mean there is the ideas in the map.

And there is ideas from the people that are conflicting.

We have to give ourselves a process and so to have some consistency.

I'm not against having partisan fairness but it's not consistent with what we did yesterday and it's Friday and have a lot more maps to do and acknowledge we have to begin to trust each other a little bit more and understand how we are going to move forward together with these contentious decisions.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If we look at the partisan fairness numbers and let's say they go up a little bit, okay, rather than down, which I know you are focused on driving them down.

But that's okay.

Because when we talked to Bruce yesterday, he said it's okay for that sort of thing to happen as long as you can document it and justify it.

And the justification I think is that this is the Lake St. Clair shoreline.

It's not the Port Huron or the Huron Lake Huron shoreline up north.

So I think it's more appropriate to do it that way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So what you just said is we have to document. And so I'm asking.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Asking to document, run the report.

And then run a second report so we can see what the change was.

You're saying I don't want to look at the data.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The second report is no good to you until we make the changes in the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can see individual District what the change is.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We talked about.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam Chair can we please take a vote on whether or not the Commission wants to try this change so we don't waste time debating back and forth at this point? I think that might be the best process to take.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anthony did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, a couple comments first off while I do like this cherry map it's not the most partisan fair one.

We have two individual Commissioner maps that are much more partisan fair than this map.

Interestingly one of those Commissioner maps individual maps does have 25 with 7.

That area that Commissioner Clark is talking about.

And when you take that map in the whole with all its other changes it's a more partisan fair map than this map.

Also Commissioner Szetela's map does not have that change.

And it's also a more partisanly fair map than this map.

I guess what I'm saying is I don't think it makes much sense to look at one small change as far as the partisan fairness numbers go.

Because it's the whole map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And I mean, but if the Commissioner wants to look at it, I think we should look at it.

We just have to keep in mind that it's the whole map.

We change 25 we add population in 25 that is going to have to go somewhere after.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The population from 25 will go to 7 which is short 5,000 people.

We may or may not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think 25 is under.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That is why we should try it and see what happens.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not the other way around.

Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Noting for the record that Commissioner Kellom has joined.

Commissioner Kellom could you let us know where you are attending remotely from.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Absolutely. Good morning, everybody. I'm attending remotely from Wayne, County Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would look at the changes, not including marine City I think marine City would go up, it's on the St. Clair river.

So it's more associated with the north.

But the other the 4967, the 8446 and the I'm not sure about the 4196 but the 8446 and 4967 I think would be appropriate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is adding 12000 people.

So now you've got District 7 that is going to be over by 8,000 people.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's down 5,000 right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are adding 12 as you are adding almost 13.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, we will have to figure out where to take it from.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is where we want to recognize the costs of making the changes.

I think that is what I'm hearing, right.

And that is right, that is right there is ways to do it so maybe we take less.

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 try to do the best we can preserving communities and understanding we are right, there is no one right way to do it but the process we take to do it together feels like the part that I feel like we need to focus on how we do this together so we feel like, okay, right we are not, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Why don't we just try it.

We can undo what we do but let's try it.

And let's just try it with the precincts.

We were someone else worked it out for us.

You know, we try the precincts.

We don't have to take that whole Section like he said.

We don't want marine City in there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are the precincts?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 4967 and 8446.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But that is too much.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: True.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I'm saying that is too much so do Anchorville and Fair Haven.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we try it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can try it but you're going to be you're not going to change the map on it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well then maybe we go back down south.

Let's try it, John.

Let's see what it looks like and we can always go back down south and look at the Grosse Pointe area and maybe move that back into Detroit too.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so take this 4967.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: The 8646?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

We have to take that don't we.

>> MR. MORGAN: You would look at making.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We don't have to.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go to the block level and let's eliminate some of that.

Because what I want to do is keep the communities that are on Lake St. Clair and anchor Bay is part of Lake St. Clair.

Associated with those to the south.

>> MR. MORGAN: I took that precinct out.

Does that accomplish what you wanted?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So are we? We are over 6,000 which is 2.3%.

Yeah, we are still within what we need to be within.

And then we don't have to make any further adjustments if necessary.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you reverse it so we can look at the Hispanic and Black voting age population and then put it back in? For 7.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so do you want me to undo what I just did.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Undo and you can redo it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right now with it it's 23 minority percentage.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 15%.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is the District 7 number.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, looking at 7.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Chair Szetela I have a question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sure go ahead Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can someone quickly state since I'm just now joining what this kind of back and forth is?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark wants to include the rest of the Bay in with District 7.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He says it's necessary for a lakeshore District.

So what is it?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's not too much.

16%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Put it back.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Put it back.

I think I want to make some other changes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: To get the number down.

Minority population is pretty high.

The minority population is pretty high for that area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's not a VRA District but no.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That one and the next one down, okay, now what I want to do is where that City is 41 just above that I want to change that to green.

Lime green, not the other.

I don't know if the other is gray or green.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is where you were before we reversed the changes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct, I believe so.

About 6,000, yeah.

So that keeps the lakeshore together.

The Lake St. Clair lakeshore.

Yeah.

And I look at the population and yeah, it's over it's 6,000.

But I look at the percentage is .3% over.

Which I think is in line.

Yeah, that is what I want to propose and I think we should do.

I think it keeps the community of interest of Lake St. Clair issues together.

All the way down to the Detroit river.

And this is some significant issues that they all have to deal with.

And the same issues that they are dealing with south of the Detroit river for the flooding and that.

And we've put them together.

To make this happen.

So, yeah, that is what I want to propose.

And get comments from the others.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm looking at is again I'm focused on process and I do -- I like this and feels like a good compromise and feels like we did not change the numbers too much.

It feels we are listening to people and getting closer to something.

What I'm looking at though is also like the 25 is now our largest population deviation so what I'm thinking about in terms of process whenever we make a change like this let's just note if that I'm looking at the right hand corner, the orange block, so what I'm thinking is now the 25 is out of whack it's also the one that is going to make our plan deviation we will remediate it the most.

So if we can because we adjusted 7 let's also just try to say okay, how are we going to fix 25 while we are here.

We just changed it and thinking of process when we did this.

We did this yesterday too.

It's looking at if we make a change and one of the districts around it pops up and we can affect our plan deviation let's address it.

The second thing I'd like to do is suggest somehow because we do need to look at partisan fairness because we did not look at it yesterday and we are trying to talk about how we do that today.

Let's just make like somehow let's just you know say when do we look at it? How are we going to monitor ourselves? And recognize somehow, we need to be aware of it as we make changes.

If we make too many changes all at once we won't be able to understand if we are going forward or, yeah, how do we do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton? Then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Two things.

Right where John's cursor is right where the screen is District two is low by about the same amount that District 25 is high.

So or the other way around.

No District 2 is low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They are both low.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay sorry, it's hard to see the negative on here.

But okay so that doesn't solve that problem.

But I thought that we I don't know if we said this out loud but I thought what we were doing yesterday was making all these little changes that people saw and then looking at partisan fairness.

Because the changes we are making are mostly for population, VRA if it's included and communities of interest.

And then we look at partisan fairness.

If we have to make some tweaks we do.

But without messing up the things that are higher than partisan fairness.

Right now we have really good numbers.

We have good plan deviation.

We started out with good partisan fairness numbers.

So let's just make the little changes and look.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well I think that when you don't have a base line looking is it's a false exercise because if you don't know how what you did changed something how can you evaluate whether it affected it.

So well look, you can't say it was that change that made the difference.

So whatever.

It's done now Mr. Adelson.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We know what map we started with.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Nobody ran partisan fairness on this yesterday so we don't know.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And you can do it today.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We changed.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We changed yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We change things and when people ask for data, we ran reports.

When people asked to look at VRA when people asked to look at the different numbers, we looked at we ran those reports and we looked at them.

So you know I don't understand the distinction.

But whatever.

If you guys this is what you want to go with fine.

I stated my objections.

I thought we should have ran partisan fairness before you changed it and you didn't want to do it.

That is fine moving on.

Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Madam Chair.

I wanted to make a quick comment about deviation.

With the deviations with 6,000 over in 7 and just as an example 3488 under in 6 please keep in mind the overall deviation which is still under five.

So that, yes, the District 7 is 6200 over but that really did not affect the overall deviation. And I would suggest that just moving forward you always keep your eye on that overall deviation.

And if that is not changing dramatically, then whether something is 62 over or 3500 under for the time being really doesn't affect the overall deviation.

You're well within what the Supreme Court has decided about one person, one vote. So I just wanted to mention that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say below 2.5 one way or the other it's not increasing us above the point where it's unacceptable and currently it's 2.35 and it's fine and within deviation General Counsel do you have a comment?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Good morning to the Commission.

I wanted to again highlight in the mapping process document starting on Page 14 under number 5 for draft proposed map adjustments.

There is a process set forth that again I know that both myself and other staff have highlighted.

And MDOS as well the Commission is free to modify as it sees fit.

But there is that guiding document that may also assist the Commission in these efforts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We are spending too much time arguing about whether or not we ought to do a partisan fairness so here is what I'm moving we do a partisan fairness right now.

That will set a base line right now today.

And as we make changes, I'm going to move to check the partisan fairness on the whole state each time we do it.

So I'm moving for partisan fairness check on the state now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom did you have a comment? I see you have your hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Myself and Commissioner Wagner had our hand up. Before the motion was on the floor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry Commissioner Wagner can you go ahead then Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I just wondered since we are over here in this area any way and run a partisan fairness, can we do what Mr. Dindoffer suggested this morning about Jefferson Chalmers and Moross-Morang.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is what I was going to say and concerned with Detroit being with the new Baltimore area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Brittini Kellom did you have additional comment on the motion or was it just about.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It was literally what Commissioner Wagner said. I was going to suggest that swap. And thank you for using my first and last name because I love that combo. So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So General Counsel we have a motion and second on the floor.

Do we need to resolve that before we look at this other issue that's been brought up?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, yes. You have a motion moved by Commissioner Lett and seconded I believe by Commissioner Weiss.

The motion on the floor is to move that a partisan fairness check be done on the map now.

And as a base line and that it will be checked with all partisan fairness will be a check will be with all future changes.

That is the motion on the floor.

It should be resolved before business proceeds.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Run partisan fairness every time we change anything? Anything?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I may be making that motion throughout the day but we are not going to argue about running partisan fairness partisan fairness.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We decided we are not doing it.

>> We cannot hear all of the conversation that is happening in the room. I only hear Chair Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You don't have your microphone on, Steve. Commissioner Wagner did you have another comment or was your hand still up from before?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: My apologies.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'd like to amend the motion.

To instead say that we run partisan fairness numbers when a Commission requests it. That way we won't get bogged down in making like checking it every single time we make a small change.

And I think that gets to where Commissioner Lett wants in his motion anyway.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair the motion that was moved and seconded hadn't been restated by the Chair.

So if there is a desire to modify it by the maker they can do so.

So if the Commission would like to modify that motion, it is -- or having it withdrawn and a new motion stated, that would be fine.

Or as Anthony excuse me Commissioner Eid indicated to amend it to only have -- to not have the future check in with all future changes as part of that.

Or you can divide the question because it can be divided into do a partisan fairness check on the map now to set a base line and to vote on whether partisan fairness checks will be run on all future changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So what would you like to do?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't want it on all future changes because we were doing minor changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is your mic on?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

We were doing minor changes in neighborhoods.

And Doing Street line so we don't need to do that.

I think Anthony's suggestion is good.

So I would withdraw my motion and let Anthony do it.

I think we need to do a base line right now.

Get that out of the way.

And then move forward with when we start making bigger changes have a request for a check.

And no debate.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair given Commissioner Lett's expressed desire I would recommend that the Commission proceed with Commissioner Eid's motion to amend the original motion and Commissioner Eid can restate that motion and it was seconded by Commissioner Witjes so that would be the most expedient and clean way to proceed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I'm sorry, I'm confused at this point as to what.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So Madam Chair we had the original motion by Commission Lett seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

And that motion had two parts to do a partisan fairness check on the map presently, to set that as a base line.

The second half of the original motion was to run a partisan fairness check on all future changes to the maps.

And Commissioner Eid had a motion to amend to strike out the second part of the first of the original motion.

So to amend the motion to only require a partisan fairness check on the map now to set a base line and to strike out the second part requiring a partisan fairness check on all future changes.

Commissioner Eid's motion was seconded by Commissioner Witjes.

So at this time Madam Chair it would be appropriate to open debate and discussion on the motion to amend to strike the second part of the original motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay is there any discussion or debate on the motion to amend? All right hearing none let's go ahead and vote on motion to amend and to clarify this is allowing a partisan fairness check when a Commissioner requests.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

Okay the amendment to the motion prevails.

So at this point we are voting on the motion as amended which is to run a partisan fairness check right now and then also to run partisan fairness checks upon Commissioner request.

Because that is the amendment, right? I see you nodding.

Is that? Yeah.

Okay.

All right all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

I'm sorry is there debate or discussion on the motion before I take a vote?

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Again, I think it's a good motion.

I think it gets us to a good compromise on you know, what we want.

I think we just have to be careful at the same time.

Because again for -- the reason I don't have a big stake in this area in particular is because we already demonstrated we have two individual maps that have the different configuration for this area that both support communities of interest.

And do a better job of getting us partisan fairness.

So there are a lot of things to keep in mind when running the data.

But with that said I think it's a good idea to do whenever an individual Commission thinks it's appropriate.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So the motion was to strike the second part, that the motions would be made for the partisan fairness checks as they come up.

So if a Commission wants a partisan fairness check run at a certain time that motion or that request it does not necessarily have to be a motion, that request would be made at that time.

So the motion to amend just struck out the future partisan fairness checks.

It just required a base line check now.

Was that the substance of.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No he was amending to say the partisan fairness is at when a Commission requests it.

When a Commission requests it.

Yeah.

Okay.

My only comment on this we spent 20 minutes discussing something when it would have taken us three seconds to run a report and move on it's absurd all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and we requested that Commissioners can request partisan fairness hurray.

John, can you run the partisan fairness based on the changes, not the original, Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a comment.

There is no need to be snarky and you're being snarky.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Excuse me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm the Chair and you are calling me snarky, whatever.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm sorry to speak out of turn, point of privilege .

We observed several behaviors verbal and not verbal and call out one for the other.

This is high tension and trying to make decisions.

Let's not take anything personal and we can't keep wasting time.

Let's try to all have some dequorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Kellom. Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: I just want to point out here every time we run a partisan fairness the way the program works is it runs it on the name of the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: So what I'm going to have to do is I'm going to have to run it and then save it as another document so I just want to point that out so it will have the same plan name but I will probably put something like a time stamp on it or something like that so we can check the state of the map at different times.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Or maybe just call this base line because it's supposed to be a base line.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well generally I would keep it consistent with the name of the plan rather than any other designator.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so then you want to do a time stamp.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's what I'm recommending.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay go ahead.

No.

This is not legitimate base line.

This is not for me.

>> MR. MORGAN: I gave it a time stamp and the name I'm using is origin of the plan and today's date.

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.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I may the seats votes ratio seems to be the one, I'm monitoring the most.

I don't need to see anything other than seats votes ratio.

I don't know how the Commissioners feel but I'm okay jumping straight to that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want me to go through all the other tabs?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They all go together.

So I think we should look at the seats to votes ratio changes as the efficiency gap changes.

And they all kind of change as the efficiency gap changes.

It gets lower the seats votes ratio changes so let's look at all of them.

Originally the map as we had it come out the second round of public hearings before we made the changes yesterday it was at 4.5%.

Lopsided margin.

2.2% on the mean median difference.

3.4% on the efficiency gap.

And the seats to votes ratio was 20 democratic to 18 republican.

With 0.3% bias.

Now that doesn't include the changes that were made yesterday evening.

But let's.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think Mr. Morgan he is asking you to click on the tabs.

So we have the 4.5.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is the same.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the lopsided margin.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the mean median.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 2.2 also the same.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is the efficiency gap.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 3.2.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That has gone down a little bit from 3.4%.

But there is no way at this point for us to know if that is due to the Detroit changes that Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Curry made yesterday or the changes that Commissioner Clark made today.

Let's go to the next one.

Okay and this is also the same 0.3 percent with a 20 to 18 ratio.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you Madam Chair.

Yes so, my opinion is the change that's proposed really reinforces our COI area.

And it does not impact the numbers at all.

Factoring in also what.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Again.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What happened yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We did not do what I asked so I don't know that that's true or not.

So if you're trying to reassure me in some way.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not, I'm making a comment to the public and to the Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You guys done want to look at partisan fairness let's not. What I was asked for we didn't do.

So we've done something else so can we just unless there is continued discussion on this can we move on and continue working on the map?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Why don't you take a vote and get through with it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There is nothing to vote on.

Let's unless there is continued comments on the partisan fairness you have the basis proposed base line.

Let's move on.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay stop bringing it up.

[Laughter]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so is there anything else we want to change? Commissioner Kellom I know that there was and Commissioner Wagner there was something with Detroit with Jefferson Chalmers is that what it was?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I see it, Jefferson Chalmers.

John is it possible if you can change the colors between 6 and 7 just it's a little hard for me to see.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

That is much easier to see.

So we have why isn't eight showing up on our districts in view?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 8 is over there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I see it thank you, thank you, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Want somebody else to read it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you mean? Well I'm just going to read off the numbers is all so 7 right now is 6,000 over.

8 is 3200 under.

And 6 is 3,000 under.

Kind of the thought process was pulling out Jefferson Chalmers.

What is it that you wanted to do Commissioner Kellom?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Adding Jefferson Chalmers to 7 and Moross-Morang in 6 that is swapping in the public comment if I got it correct is that correct Commissioner Wagner and Commissioner Kellom.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you want to leave or MC to do it?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's fine for MC to do it and you articulated what I said and I don't have to take ownership of the swap.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead John.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will point out here this is the boundary of the other plan. So starting with Jefferson Chalmers sorry starting with these neighborhoods into 6.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm just curious what is the rationale the person gave for wanting to make this change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Jefferson Chalmers area is more of a coastal I think he said a coastal community.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It's part of the gold coast.

>> MR. MORGAN: That goes in 6 and start with Jefferson Chalmers into 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct, thank you.

Okay.

>>

>> MR. MORGAN: That reflects the change you requested.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are all set. Thank you.

And I'm wondering so if that is it, and so within deviation one of my memories is we have not quite finished that what Mr. Stigall highlighted for us yesterday, that idea that, yeah, Highland Park, right the actual municipal boundary actually divides houses. And so we may want to look at that before we leave the Detroit area and other things we may have forgotten.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Honestly for that one that is the municipal boundary, that is where it is.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That is the real boundary.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They are well accustomed the precinct clerks as to what house is in what area.

It's not a point of confusion because Highland Park is a separate municipality from Detroit.

So I don't think that is a change we need to dig in to.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And I would agree it's the City inside of a City.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

It's just not needed.

It's weird but it's not needed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm okay with that, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right are we -- anything else in the Detroit proper area?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is there anything else on the list from yesterday?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have things for Detroit Metro but Detroit itself.

On the list from yesterday we have API concerns around Novi which I'm not sure affect the Senate map or not.

And then also and there was a comment today that lifted this up again Troy Rochester Hills API as well.

So we have those two areas to look at Metro Detroit from an API perspective.

If we can kind of go out to Novi first and take a look because I'm not sure if it's this map. I feel it might be the house map they were talking about for that particular area.

So can we if you go to the left outside of Livonia west.

That's where we are going to get to Novi.

Okay so Novi is together on this map so that is not the concern on this map.

So that is a house map concern.

House map.

So can we go up to Troy which is currently in blue number 16.

Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I think what we are going to have to decide because the changes are going to meld into Oakland County.

Especially Novi is what are we going to do with Ann Arbor? Because if we change Ann Arbor it's probably Ann Arbor and Novi are close to each other.

We've had we've seen two configurations.

One that brings Novi into it.

The other that does your north and south split which I think also works and does not bring Novi into it.

Do we want to do that now? Because it's going to affect Novi or do we want to just do this and then go to there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to come to Ann Arbor last.

So and I don't know that that's necessarily going to affect Novi but I think in terms of the specific comment about API for Novi it is not implicated for this map.

Because Novi is together and it's the house map where we have is precincts and Novi split up.

So we don't need to worry about that specific thing here.

That does not mean we might not make changes later.

So all right so 16 there were some comments about the Sikh community in Troy and Rochester Hills and Sterling Heights.

And so I think we kind of need to look at that just Asian American in general.

Because Sikh would fall under Asian American in the census.

But I think the complication here is John can you pull up the map so we can see a little bit more south? Because Troy is the southern part of District 16.

Yes.

So they want to bring in more of Sterling Heights.

I'm wondering if there is a particular concentration north or south for Sterling Heights. And you know, can you scroll down to District 6 on the matrix so we can see what the API is now in 6 and then look at so in 6 the API is 3, 3.65.

3.95 sorry.

Misreading.

And then 16 it is 15.

Quite a difference.

15.87.

And then 8 is Bangla Town and that is 9.64.

Okay so can we Zoom in to the border between Sterling Heights and Troy? And put on the thematic dots for Asian and see if we can see if maybe there is a different way to draw that line to keep communities together.

There is something we missed.

So just that precinct there.

What are the percentages you have it sat at now? 14%.

So if I remember correctly because that is 14% that is actually going to bring down our percentage is that accurate? Was that a yep to me or? Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: In District 8 you are trying to add it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Add it in 16 it's not going to improve the numbers.

But it will add more community members then.

>> MR. MORGAN: Generally speaking yes you could trade out other population to change the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Just a suggestion, so first off, I'm not sure the Sikh community identifies as Asian American.

I'm not sure they put that on the census.

The Sikh community is not too different from the Chaldean community and actually it matches the areas match up pretty well with being you know Troy Rochester Hills Sterling Heights West Bloomfield Farmington Hills.

They might, I'm just not sure that they do.

But if we can look at the top of 16, the northern areas, does this go into Oakland Township? Yeah, it does.

That might be an area to look at moving and taking Oakland Township out of it and instead including more of Shelby and a little bit more of Sterling Heights.

You can put Utica in 16 and you take out Oakland and put more of Shelby in there.

How we have the dots right now they match up pretty well.

Yeah, we can go down too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I thought we were quite careful in this area. We were trying to keep together...Commissioner Clark it would be helpful if we have a map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Taking Oakland Township I would take the northern part of Oakland Township.

It's very less populated.

And the southern part of it is really integrated in the Rochester Hills.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If we had a map one of the things, I wrote down from the Chaldean commenter in Grand Rapids, and again like our map the portal does not work as well as I would like for me.

Maybe others can find it but 68370 or 2 I'm not sure if it was a 3 or 2683 or 68270 does that sound accurate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Chaldean? Not the Sikh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The Sikh representative in Detroit did not give us a map.

Because you were asking for a map because of Commissioner Eid's comments that is why I'm sharing that.

Because there was a reference to a plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For Chaldean.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not Sikh.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct and I don't know if it's house or Senate.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we sure it's this map the concern is about, is it possible it was a house map? That is what I'm kind of wondering.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, you got it we may be okay here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel like we drew this very specifically to keep together the AAPI community.

And what? Yeah, okay so let's just move on from here.

Because I don't think this is an issue for this map.

Because looking at the numbers I think unless anybody disagrees, I think this shows pretty clearly that this map is doing what they ask.

Okay.

All right so Ann Arbor and then Anthony did you have something about West Bloomfield too? Like what was.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, at the Detroit hearing especially during the virtual public comment we heard from people from West Bloomfield and/or charred Lake Sylvan Lake referencing the Chaldean community of interest there.

The Jewish community of interest there, and they brought up that they don't want that area to be with the northern part of Oakland County.

Waterford, independence Township, Springfield Holly and would rather be basically with either District 9 or 11 as we have it drawn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we pull the map over so I can see what he is talking about? Pull it so nine, there we go.

You're talking about District 18.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes District 18.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Repeat what you just said.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: See that with the Township of West Bloomfield and Orchard Lake the square on the south right corner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where Sylvan Lake and Keego Harbor are.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: All of those essentially.

It's my strong opinion that they should be with either 11 or 9 somehow.

Now that takes some reconfiguring but then if you do that you can also make a better 18 by putting all of the northern Oakland County Townships together.

Any thoughts on that? I know Janice is from the area as well.

It's a bigger change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So you want to put Orchard Lake West Bloomfield down with Novi-ish, Farmington-Ish and then do what with the rest of 18?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Then you move up on 18.

You include the rest of Oakland County with 18.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: But why would you want to push that down?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Orchard Lake West Bloomfield.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Cultural communities do not extend to Oakland County.

They are situated in Orchard Lake West Bloomfield and Walled Lake Commerce but do not go up into independence or Highland or White Lake or Waterford.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I feel that is what honestly the main along with splitting up Ann Arbor on my individual map it has that change.

And it is one that I feel very strongly about.

In fact, I feel so strongly about it that if we make that change on this collaborative map it is likely that I would retract my individual map.

So I hope we take into account.

We can pull up the shape overlay perhaps.

And look at it if that is what the Commission chooses.

But again it goes back to Ann Arbor.

Because if we split Ann Arbor there is probably a way to do it where it brings in all of these Oakland County Townships as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I agree with Commissioner Eid.

I think that those upper northern communities would be better with the other ones.

I agree with what he is saying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton I'm sorry Commissioner Kellom then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Anthony, Commissioner Eid, excuse me, can you just clarify what change you're suggesting again? I just -- repeat it quickly.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, the main change is changing West Bloomfield Orchard Lake Keego Harbor and Sylvan late instead of District 18 either with District 11 or District 9 in some configuration.

And then to make up for that population difference that we are taking out of 18 to push 18 up in the rest of Oakland County so include rose and Springfield and all of those areas.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we Zoom out a little bit? And then Commissioner Orton? Zoom in one more step not quite so far.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Are you saying Orchard Lake Bloomfield Hills associated to the west or south of it rather than Bloomfield hills to the east of it?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm saying it associates more with the southern portion. And 11 or 9.

I don't think we can really go into Bloomfield Hills because we have that wall District of 14 that includes Southfield up to Pontiac and I don't think we should change that. I think that works out pretty well.

The reason why we put West Bloomfield and/or charred Lake in 18 in the beginning was because of that change in 14 that we made and kind of got thrown into 18 because of that.

So I think again it would be better somehow with either 11 or 9.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm hearing Commissioner Vallette say that is also a good idea.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is it possible that we could map that out and so we can visually take a look at what you're talking about? I got the gist of it but not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think what he is saying if we put his map on as a shape layer we can see it, right is that what you are saying.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We can do it that way that is fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: My only concern with that I would not want to put that into 9. If you put it in 9, we are taking a VRA District and probably make it not a VRA District. But if you put it into 11 then you push 11 up further to go into 18 and how far down does 11 go? Yeah.

I'm not sure it's going to be an even swap.

But I feel like what you are saying and Ann Arbor is true.

If we are going to redo Ann Arbor, I think we probably need to do that first.

And then because what I'm thinking with Ann Arbor and how if we split that how we would make changes we probably do need to do that first.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's put the overlay on and see what it looks like.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we take off that other overlay that is on now, John?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you Zoom out a bit? Is that the overlay on the green outline?

>> MR. MORGAN: I put it in the green outline.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It looks like what I did was make because of the Ann Arbor split putting the northern portion, the northeast end portion of Ann Arbor up to Novi, that frees up a District of West Bloomfield Farmington Hills and Commerce.

And then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are dipping into.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Dipping in 9 and 9 goes to 10 and Canton is included in the Ann Arbor District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I personally think the better way would be to put it into 11 like as you propose.

Make a northern Ann Arbor District coming up, and grabbing superior and I don't know that we would need the South Lyon but the part of Brighton that was talked about in public hearings and that would allow you not to have dip into District 9.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is fine.

I don't have a preference there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You what?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Brighton does not want to be with Ann Arbor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Again COIs are who want to be with not who you don't want to be with.

We had the guy come and speak multiple times people in Ann Arbor asked to be split up and people said yes Ann Arbor Brighton does make sense because of the -- if you remember he was talking about how many people work in Ann Arbor live in Brighton because of the cost of living in Brighton and then also the you know the freeway was expanded specifically to allow that commute.

We have that flex lane in that area for that reason because there is so much traffic back and forth go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If you were to bring Livingston County down south into Washtenaw, I would not go much more than the first four Townships.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's it.

I would not go into the City.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I think you do, bring in the Townships around Brighton, pull them down, leave the rest of Livingston alone.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No I'm saying if you need to expand Livingston County into Washtenaw County, I would grab the top four Townships of Washtenaw County and do it that way.

That is the only way to really do it.

Because that is going to be the more rural area of Washtenaw County.

I would not include Brighton with Ann Arbor City.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is what is there.

Look at 31 it goes down into just the top part of 29.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You have all of Livingston County.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You have Livingston whole and 31 does not go into 29.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It does if you follow the green outline.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm sorry I was looking I'm sorry.

That would be okay.

That would be fine.

Because that's going to be the area that is going to be going one to Dexter going through Hell, going through.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Going through hell.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And areas south of Pickney in by opinion would align with Livingston County.

But that is like the limit where I would put it right there.

I don't like the fact it's going down into Washtenaw County at all but if you had to do it, that would be a fair compromise for it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel that would really kind of drown out any balance you have you have the whole of Livingston balancing out the four Washtenaw County areas. I would not want to do that because then there is no point because you are not accomplishing the split of Ann Arbor that is kind of the goal.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The deficiency gap was 1% so I don't know if it was because of that or some of the other things on the map.

We can try it and run the numbers and see or we can -- I just want Orchard Lake and West Bloomfield to be somewhere else. However we achieve that, that is up to the Commission but that is my you know that is my strong opinion.

That needs to be somehow either with Farmington Hills Novi Commerce and that way we can as Commissioner Vallette said as well we can then have the northern Oakland County Townships be together as well.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Lots of Commissioners seem to be good with this configuration but you said it does not accomplish the goal what is the goal?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To divide Ann Arbor.

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 ORTON: It divides Ann Arbor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Look at the changes you have to make and putting West Bloomfield with 9.

That configuration isn't going to work.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the goal then I think what is the goal here? Like what I'm hearing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To divide up Ann Arbor.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While preserving other communities of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Preserving other communities of interest and not breaking into the VRA District.

So if you have to break in the VRA District then that is creating a whole host of other changes because we would have to reposition all of that.

Like I don't think moving West Bloomfield down in 11 is bad.

But it's yeah, it's just -- I mean again I think it all comes down to how you split up Ann Arbor.

I think we have to look at Ann Arbor first.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree we should look at Ann Arbor first.

But the 9 I have on my individual map that has these changes still has it as a VRA District.

It has it as 36.56% BVAP and overall minority of 48.48.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is because you then went into ten and you know it's like this whole Cascade of changes.

Yeah, this whole Cascade of changes to move one community based on personal like you want it there.

West Bloomfield asked to stay together which we did.

So Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I just have a question.

Why do we want to split up Ann Arbor? I remember previous conversations where Dustin wanted to keep Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti together.

So why aren't we taking that approach?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because go ahead Commissioner Rothorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One reason I think is important it's about being consistent also.

We have split other cities.

And it's notable that we haven't split that one. And that is one reason for me.

Anyway.

To try to be as consistent as possible.

The second reason I think is because there is a significant area or the Asian population there that I remember Bruce, we noticed it.

And it was trying to say can we have a representative District so that was the other reason to try.

Again first consistency second because of the Asian population in particular.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Senate districts were so big that I don't know if they would have an impact in that.

That's the problem.

In the house they would. But the Senate is different.

I just want to question it because I remember what Dustin always wanted to have Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor together and not split them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's not what I want, that is what I've heard.

But there is arguments for and against it.

I mean I can see both sides of the story keeping Ann Arbor whole fine.

Splitting Ypsilanti from it also works.

It's perfectly fine.

But I do want to say that I wouldn't say for the sake of consistency split up a City.

Because then you just said that what we are doing is we are splitting up cities.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I hear that thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well what I would say on that point I do this there is a consistency argument there.

If you look at the top ten cities in Michigan every other City splits it.

Coupled with that the hundreds of comments we received on the portal from people in Ann Arbor saying please split up Ann Arbor.

So it's not just it was put together again this gets into the point I'm making with Commissioner Eid it was kept together at the instance of Commissioners, myself included.

So I was part of that who said no keep Ann Arbor together and is that fair and are we treating everyone equitably when we are taking that position because there is no reason to keep Ann Arbor together and lots of reasons to split it including Ypsilanti and southern Ann Arbor have a higher African/American community.

We can create an opportunity to elect District if we have them separated off from the rest of Ann Arbor.

We have the Asian population in north Ann Arbor which we can pull up in a District and create opportunity there.

There is lots of reasons to split it up.

Lots of comments asking us to do that.

Lots of comments from Jackson and western Ann Arbor wanting to be together and we can sort of accomplish all of those goals if we look at splitting up Ann Arbor.

Commissioner Kellom? And then Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I had to move around things a little bit.
I actually do support Commissioner Eid's change.
I had to scoot closer to my screen because I think we could do some further tweaking in the Metro Detroit area.
And it would not extend up so far.
I did also hear and make notes of the comments about some of the northern suburbs.
So in the effort, again, to improve and show that we are listening, I would say that I'm a fan of what he suggested.
And also, it was a long time ago.
But going to middle school and high school in that area and kind of knowing the area I think it makes sense.
I don't think it's his personal gripe or change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Wagner I hear you have your hand up too.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, thank you Madam Chair.

I was just going to say even this morning we heard public testimony about putting western Ann Arbor with Jackson County and Washtenaw in the Senate District.
So that would be something we may want to look at right now.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I just wanted to say Commissioner Orton had her hand up and she was acknowledged by you before like the five last people spoke before you spoke.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have no idea now.

A lot of water under the bridge.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Make something up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are almost at 11:00.

How about we motion to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We don't need a motion.

We don't need a motion.

10:56 and supposed to take a break at 11:00 so without objection we will recess until 11:10.

Hearing no objections we are in recess until 11:10.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 11:13 a.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: Yes, Madam Chair.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending

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 meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and where you are physically attending from.

Unless your absence is due to military duty announce your physical location discussing the City Township or village where you are.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

Juanita Curry.

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

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

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

Rhonda Lange?

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

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

Erin Wagner?

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

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: 13 Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Talking about potential changes to the Ann Arbor area.

Commissioner Eid, did you want I'm sorry what Commissioner Orton? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: When it comes to Ann Arbor, we've had lots keep Ypsilanti with, separate.

But there is also public comment on the portal that talks about it being a coordinated effort by a democratic group with specific instructions it's saying.

So I don't know if that is something we want to look into.

We've talked about the politicalness before.

And is it something that we want to look into to make sure that if are they new comments are they legit or not legit.

This is where I always have the issue it gets harder the more public comment, we get to know which ones are genuine and which ones aren't.

So I don't know if that is something that should even be addressed or what.

I know I split it in my map.

I just don't know.

This is where I'm having an and struggling internally, I guess I would say with making these changes because I know it's going to affect people for ten years.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I appreciate that, but you also basically just described a City of Midland in the opposite direction.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could you clarify a little bit more Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You say the split of Midland has political gaining on the democratic side and one can make the argument that keeping Midland with Midland County and north is a republican thing they are doing.

So that's all.

We have to take the comments into consideration no matter where they come from.

It's all in context.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Witjes.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It would be useful information but I don't see where we could even determine that or how we could even determine the influence by others.

So I think it's a subject we should move on from.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

Okay so there has been proposed by Commission Eid making some changes to the Ann Arbor area.

Is it the will of the Commission that we make those changes? Or let him you know start to make those changes? Do we want to do that? Go ahead Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, I think we should take a look at that.

That's been a contention contentious area right along.

And I think let's make those changes and then this would be an appropriate time to take another look at the metrics on the state after we do those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we have our base line.

For partisan fairness.

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

Do we want to as we've done in the past, do we want to have this saved and then create a copy? Commissioner Orton is that what you were going to say.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Since these are bigger changes, we should make a copy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan can you save this plan and then make a copy of it and we will have Mr. Eid start to make those changes on the copy?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay that will take just a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I made a copy and I'm referring to this as version two for right now to separate it from version one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We are not seeing your screen, so you might have to share it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's go to Ann Arbor Z area.

And so are there any preferences how this gets split up? There are two versions that have it split.

And I think both do a good job.

We heard some public comment this morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One of the things I was hearing is that there was concern around with District 10 and the way, right, when if we move it into, yeah, the District 10 has a large Asian, is it an Asian population? In Canton and that was a.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Canton has a large Asian population, yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: But the District 10 that's what I was listening for Commissioner Szetela.

There was a concern around 10.

If we move 9 up even though it's a VRA District in Commissioner Eid's map 10 would be affected so I think that is what I was thinking.

I'm trying to lift up that concern.

And then in responding to your question like how do we draw it.

If we can avoid changing 10.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you look right now 10 is 34.9% minority.

That does not include the Arab population in the Canton area as well.

We have a significant population.

So I think I would treat that, you know, it's basically a VRA District.

So I would try not to mess with it if we can avoid it.

But beyond that, any other thoughts on how to divide Ann Arbor?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: For me there was the Asian community and understanding where those the Asian population is, that was a primary, yeah.

That is what I think we got counsel on.

That is why I thought, yeah, and again it's a Senate District so it may not make as much impact, I understand that as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you want Mr. Morgan to put on thematic dots? Would that help?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan can you put on the Asian thematic dots for the map?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On 12 right now, what is the minority population? It's 27.88 if I'm reading it correctly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can't see.
25.29.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On District 12.

>> MR. MORGAN: Title minority population voting age is 25.29.
It's 13.3% African/American on District 12.

Is that the District you wanted?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I was just curious.
Because on this alternate configuration.

On this other configuration if you put Canton with Ypsilanti and Belleville it gets you an-I have a 39.02 minority population.

However, Commissioner Szetela is right.

If we make these changes, the Asian population is split between what would be that Canton Ypsilanti District versus what we have now that has Canton with Westland. So there is a number of factors to consider here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you do Canton Sumpter and Ypsilanti? So Sumpter is that little part of 11.

It doesn't have much population.

But that might work.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You probably could.

Let's start with Ann Arbor though because everything is going to go from Ann Arbor. Can we all agree on that?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: How do we want to just split Ann Arbor? Go with a north south split? We had an overlay up that had it split up, the northeast side was popped up and we can bring up the other configuration that has more of a straight up north-south split.

Let's bring up both of those configuration and see what the Commission likes more.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There was a commenter today who specifically said cut north along Huron river.

And then cut east-west along Main Street.

So that is another thought too.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is that what the individual submission?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know.

It was very specific comment today saying cut north along Huron river and keep the Asian population.

Otherwise split east-west.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, we are seeing the dots though and it seems like the Asian population is quite spread out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The biggest dot is north.

We can see that.

Let's try that.

So we have District 27.

Here.

>> MR. MORGAN: You asked me to load some overlays, which specific plans did you want to overlay?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we just have loaded for now the two individual submission overlays?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

And by two which two do you mean? There were three submissions.

I'm sorry there were three submissions by individual Commissioners.

So which two.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's have all three loaded up in there in case we want to turn any of them on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, boy.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So they all split it up a little differently.

But they all split it up, so that is a similarity.

So that is good.

Let's turn those off for now and we can refer to them when you know, the Commission chooses.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to change the coloration on them so we can distinguish them.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wonderful.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the red line is from Commissioner Szetela.

The green line is Commissioner Eid.

And the blue line is Commissioner Lange's map.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we find the Huron river? I think it most closely aligns with the green line here.

>> MR. MORGAN: The river feature here is the Huron river.

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: Can you put back on the green line? I want to see which parts of that match up and which parts don't.

It looks like halfway follows it.

Then it goes into the City.

Okay, so where do we want to put the top half of Ann Arbor? Do we want to put it into 11? Into 10? Into because we have 10, 29, 11, 27 and 31 above it I believe.

Yeah.

31 is up there.

So we are trying to break up this Z.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: May I make a suggestion.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Please do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Since you wanted to put that area of 18 into 11, why don't you put that into 11.

And then you can see how much extra space you have in 11.

That might guide some of your decision making.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: All right let's do that.

So let's go up back up to 18.

The West Bloomfield Keego Orchard Lake, Sylvan Lake.

Let's put that into 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: All of West Bloomfield Orchard Lake Keego Harbor Sylvan Lake.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, those four.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's move back down to Ann Arbor Z area.

Okay so for we are going to use 29 that we currently have as the total of, yeah, 29 right there.

So we are going to use that to try to get in Scio.

You see this is hard because unless you adopt like the -- all of the configuration changes and splitting up Ann Arbor is a pretty big change.

We essentially have to make a new District here in this area somewhere.

Whether that be 11 or and I'm trying not to mess with 10 or 9 because of the population concerns that we addressed there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, yeah.

I mean this is always the problem.

But you just have to go in a circle.

You either do three or four districts, however many, go in a circle and see if it's worth it. See if the change off is worth it at the end.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so you were contemplating Scio into 29 or something else?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, looks like Scio is on 29 on this overlay so let's do that.

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

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Scio and the bottom part of Ann Arbor there that is below the river.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want Scio and this part of Ann Arbor into 29?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

Including the Township down here?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah.

Then we will evaluate and we will see what everyone thinks at the end, I guess.

>> MR. MORGAN: Saline as well?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, saline as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Saline and remember Milan.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I remember Milan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We like to be fancy with our names in Michigan.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Oh, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I know it may be counter intuitive but we learned from

Commissioner Szetela before this area if you use voting precincts you may want to do it at the block level.

What you are doing is great so far so don't listen to me.

Never mind.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm just taking them one at a time.

I understand there is issues here.

Yes, that is weird.

So I would suggest that we save and reopen the program.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just want to make a comment.

We've heard a number of comments throughout the last year relative to keeping colleges together.

But this area has got so many different schools, Concordia, eastern, Washtenaw community college, Ann Arbor which is integrated throughout the City.

I don't think we can do that.

But I wanted to make that known to the public as we go through here.

I think this is just one area where it's very, very difficult to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom, did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I did, but Commissioner Eid I think went in a different direction.

So I'm just kind of watching now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What was your direction? Just curiosity.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm not sure.

I was thinking of pushing -- I mean, so what is happening now, just let me wait and see if I have a thought.

Because I don't know.

But I was thinking of going into District 31 and making it kind of like a little bit more of a Lego strip and including Scio Township.

So just wait.

I'll wait to see what you're crafting.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm wondering if there is a more efficient way to do this. Because we have configuration that we are essentially making on a different map. And we have a different type of split on a different map. Instead of putting those changes on a cherry map might it be better to pull up the maps and look at them and figuring out which one we like better?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would say, no.

I see what you're saying, yes take the map and look at it that way but won't take into account the changes we made already today.

So it would basically be a moot point unfortunately because that would be nice.

If we could bring in and import that particular District sure we can do that but then you have to fix all the ones that were overlapped and you will cause even more work I would think.

>> MR. MORGAN: What I'm going to try to do is get most of the line in you want and I'm going to export this as a shape file so I can bring it in as a new plan and see if it resolves these potential discrepancies.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: John this is Kent.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hi Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Can you try reselecting the number up there or have you already done that? I just don't know why.

>> MR. MORGAN: I know.

There is a problem here.

But like I said I want to just get to a shape file and then I will offload it and reimport it and see if that will resolve it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can just do the rebuild and compress sequence as well. I don't know if one is quicker than the other though.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm hoping this will be reliable.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Hope is a good thing.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Rebecca.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: This is not a motion, this is a suggestion since John is having so much problem.

And we are supposed to go to lunch from 1-2 we may want to consider doing 12-1 to allow him to work on the program and we can come back from lunch and then move forward instead of just sitting here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You don't enjoy our company is that what you're saying Mr. Lett? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think John needs to eat as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will find time for food.

I like cold pizza.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we want to do that? Do we want to take a break? Or is there...yeah.

Any discussion or objections on that? All right so it's 10 I'm sorry Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to clarify would you like me to continue working as suggested, to finish out that line and then stop, yes?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is what the Commission would desire.

Did you have a comment Mr. Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I want to take care of your needs too John.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: John I'm thinking that Commissioner Eid's may want to use the centerline of that river all the way rather than that little.

>> MR. MORGAN: I understand but I will do as directed first and then make changes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right without objection it is currently 11:50.

We are going to recess until 1:00.

Hearing no objections we are in recess until 1:00.

Thank you.

[Lunch recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 1:02 p.m.

Will 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 disclose you are attending remotely and where you are physically attending from.

I 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?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present. Attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.
Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. Before we get back to where we were we did have some discussion earlier in the week about the schedule for next week.

And so specifically about the start time.

So if everybody has their agenda from a prior day, we had Commissioner meetings Monday November 1 from 10-7.

Tuesday November 2 from 9-7.

Wednesday November 3 from 10-7.

Thursday November 4 from 9-7.

And then Friday November 5th from 9-7 so we actually haven't approved that yet.

So if we are -- if that schedule is accepting, I think Wednesday need a motion to approve that so our staff can actually start making reservations.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I move to approve this schedule.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Orton and seconded by Commissioner Clark.

Too late MC.

All in favor of approving the schedule for next week wait I'm sorry.

Discussion or debate on the motion?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I want to get a feel of how everyone feels about something here before or even if I need to make an amendment.

Based on the speed that we are going through this yesterday and today, is 7:00 p.m. too short? Or is that not late enough to potentially go? Because I'm wondering if we need to extend that more either to 8 or 9 potentially.

Because what I don't want to have happen is us getting to Friday and saying oh, we still have more to do or even Thursday or technically even Wednesday saying we are not going to be able to get everything done that we want.

I want to get people's thoughts and opinions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: How late can we stay in the room? And can we just work later or does it have to be noticed for the hours and then we can finish earlier?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can go until 9:00.

And it would have to be noticed I believe, right?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Part of the scheduling as well as to make sure that our closed captioning and interpreters.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can't hear you for some reason.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Am I on? Part of the scheduling as well as to make sure our closed captioning and interpreters are also available to make sure that the meeting is acceptable.

So when we have an end time, we usually let our interpreters know plus about 30 minutes in case we go over a little bit.

But if we were to go beyond that then we wouldn't have that accessibility.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I make a motion for the end time for 9:00 knowing we can end earlier.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion to Commissioner Witjes to amend you said 9:00 p.m.? Seconded by Commissioner Rothorn is there any discussion or debate on the motion.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I oppose that.

And the reason I oppose it is if we have a 7:00 p.m. stop time that puts a time limit on us.

And gives us some incentive to do a little bit quicker work.

Than what we've been doing.

And so I would oppose that.

I think leave a stop time of 7:00.

We are not taking a dinner break.

And by 9:00 I'll probably be dead.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sue?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I don't want to kill any Commissioners that is for sure.

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 appreciate you and all your work.

But if you go until 9:00 at night then you probably will have to take an hour dinner breakout of there.

Which you only get an hour more.

And you've already decided to forgo an earlier dinner and work until 7:00.

So just so you know.

I mean we would have to do that in the schedule.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any other comments on the amendment? I personally would not be able to stay until 9:00, I would have to leave so you would lose at least one person.

All right, all in favor of Commissioner Witjes' amendment to the primary motion which is to extend the end time until 9:00 p.m. seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn if you are in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Are you an aye? You didn't raise your hand.

I didn't see online.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

I believe the nays prevail so the amendment does not carry.

So going back to the primary motion which is Monday, let me make this easier Monday and Wednesday from 10-7.

Tuesday, Thursday, Friday from 9:00-7:00.

Any additional discussion or debate on that primary motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 9-10 why on Wednesday I understand on Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we changing rooms? Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay just curious.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's for the AV.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

All right the ayes prevail and the schedule is adopted.

All right.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have another motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move that we from for today that we operate on, operate, we consider Ann Arbor from 1:10-2:10 then we move to Midland from 2:10-3:10 then we move to Grand Rapids from 3:10-4:10.

That sets a time limit that we are to move us along, gives us a goal to reach.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you repeat the times for me Ann Arbor 1:10.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 1:10 so an hour, 1:10-2:10, 2:10-3:10.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mid land and Grand Rapids.

Seconded by Commissioner Eid a motion by Commissioner Lett to basically put some benchmarks around our working time for particular areas.

One hour per Section Ann Arbor Midland and Grand Rapids starting at 1:10-2:10 for Ann Arbor 2:10-3:10 for Midland.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Anyone online because I cannot see Commissioner Lange and Wagner, any comments there?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: None for me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All in favor or opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail.

So the motion is adopted.

So let's get to it.

I think we are going to back to Anthony who has a question? Sarah Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For the initial vote for amendment to extend to 9 p.m. Commissioner Vallette can you say what your vote was?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I vote yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe it was Orton, Vallette and Witjes were the three yeses. That is right, you didn't raise your hand.

You said it but you didn't raise your hand.

Okay, so Mr. Morgan can we bring back up the map where it was at? Mr. Eid, you were proceeding through the Ann Arbor area trying to make some changes there so please continue to direct Mr. Morgan.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So try to be efficient during this and I think that the split in the Eid individual Senate map has too many changes to happen and we would be here all day if we were to do that.

So instead I think I was able to figure out a way that met all of the goals we are trying to accomplish using the split that is on Commissioner Szetela's map.

So let's pull back for a second, pull up the cherry map that we saved before we started making those changes with the green line.

Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You want version one?

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to rename this as version three, that should work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, makes sense.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm trying to see if I'm in the Zoom meeting.

Just a moment.

So this is a copy of the version one.

I renamed it version three.

Then you want me to bring up the Szetela shape file, the overlay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This also just to be noted is not going to make any significant change to District 9 or 10, I think it only changes one tiny precinct in 9. But what I heard earlier was that the Commission wanted to keep those the same.

For VRA and minority based reasons.

So...this is the layer for Commissioner Szetela's plan.

Okay so let's make those changes to districts 27 and 29.

That follow the outline of that layer.

We are going to have one probably that's 27 be the northern portion and 29 be the southern portion.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 29 is here and you want to put this entire southern portion into 29?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, it doesn't matter which one is which. We need one to be 27, one to be 29.

Whichever way is easier for you to facilitate that change.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Once we are done with Ann Arbor it gets a lot speedier because we can go to Townships mainly.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is geography issues here so I'm taking my time with it. But working quickly.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to go ahead and save this and reimport it because there is probably a geography problem.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: A triangle to the west a little bit more southwest corner and looked like there was unassigned or something.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just move the decimal point is all. And it's 4.6 we would be fine.

HSP is State House plan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Shape file

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Eid or Madam Chair while we are saving down here could you provide any additional justification for the change to this District?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are making a few changes here. These changes are for the following reasons.

We are making two districts out of Ann Arbor.

Part of that is for community of interest reasons.

We've heard communities of interest ranging from Jackson to Ann Arbor.

And we've also heard people that say they want Ann Arbor to be split in order to have more representation.

And what this will end up doing is also having a better configuration for Oakland County. The changes I mentioned earlier including West Bloomfield Orchard Lake with the more southern parts and being able to recombine some of the northern parts of Oakland County.

It does that also bringing down the partisan fairness numbers to be closer to 0.

So supports both criteria three and criteria four.

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 probably criteria six as well.

As far as maintaining municipality and County lines.

>> MR. MORGAN: I saved the plan, brought it back in and looks like it's following the line.

Do you want to run a contiguity check?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, we will do that at the end.

Let's follow the line on 27 as well over west.

I believe 29 there are some changes westward as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: You want these Townships of Washtenaw County into 27?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Eagle eye Orton.

>> MR. MORGAN: So continuing all the Townships?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Exactly.

Top on the left do you see Marshall over there, that little part of 29 that is jutting out.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Put that into 3.

Okay now let's go eastbound.

Do you see that one Township? That is in red in District 30? Yep, let's put that into 29.

Okay and then further eastward superior and Salem Counties.

Yeah Townships, thank you, not Counties.

>> MR. MORGAN: You wanted superior and Salem into 27 or 29?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 29.

Okay let's move up to 18.

Okay Zoom in on Lyon and South Lyon there on the bottom left.

Move those into 18.

And then West Bloomfield, Orchard Lake, Keego Harbor, Sylvan Lake into 11.

Go left go Commerce Township.

We will go to the precinct level.

The right side of it.

The eastward side.

That is, yep, so the northern part of it, those right precincts, let's add those to 11.

>> MR. MORGAN: Population 3107?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: North of that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Adding those to 11?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Adding those to 11.

At 2696.

Let me get my population numbers up.

2966, 2939, 2968.

Okay and then Wixom let's assign that to 18.

And 18 needs a little bit more around that area.

Do you see that one block shape that we made? Yep.

Let's assign that to 18.

And then 2169.

No you were right.

You had the right view.

A little lower.

Yeah 2619 right at the edge there, south.

A little more south.

There you go.

2619.

3169.

3515.

1708.

And 2836.

Okay let's Zoom out a little bit.

We are going to go a little bit north, north of Highland.

So you see rose and Springfield so assign those to 18.

And Grove land as well into 18.

Right there.

And then the little part that is sticking out in independence Township, exactly, right there, yeah, that voting precinct let's change it from 2 into 18.

Okay can you move south slightly? A little bit more into Farmington Hills.

The one precinct in District 9 that is sticking a little further north than the rest of them, exactly, that one, put that into 11.

That is the one change on 9 that is being made that one precinct I was talking about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well that is the mostly white area.

So it's not going to reduce the VRA numbers.

It will actually bump them up a bit and should be okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now 31.

We are going to add Dexter Webster and Northfield into 31.

This keeps Livingston County whole but adds a few more Counties to make up for the population difference between 29 and 31.

>> MR. MORGAN: Dexter Webster and Northfield.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are those the ones you suggested earlier?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, if you needed to go south into Washtenaw County, adding those northern most Townships of Washtenaw County with Livingston would be okay.

The other configuration that I could potentially see which we can look at later if you choose to would be to take the three that basically formed the triangle there.

So, sorry, the three Townships that are to the east.

I'm sorry west.

So that would be the one that's the corner of District 30, the one directly south of that.
Then the one that moved over to the east.

Instead of those three.

Or the Northfield Township in lieu of Northfield Township since that one is going to have the most population and those three would potentially add up to make it better.

But that would be an okay configuration as it stands.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't want to make Livingston County too upset.

This is the general gist of it.

I know the population deviation went higher.

We can figure out a way to fix that.

And I didn't have enough time on lunch quite to do that.

But I believe we can just by messing with a couple of the districts in 18.

But I think now with this type of configuration with Ann Arbor split and the Oakland County area I think being much preferable to what we had before.

I think this would be a good time to run the partisan fairness numbers and see if we are on the right track.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Before you do that, I'm wondering if you see that I think it's that one area of Novi that is currently so 11 is over.

I'm just wondering if we can make Novi whole or that is not Novi, that is Wixom.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Novi is whole on here.

Being with West Bloomfield Orchard Lake Sylvan Lake Northville and Plymouth.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: How much is your population over in 18? I'm looking here, 8,000.

So you need to take off 2000 approximately to bring it down below 2.5.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You can probably go in District 2.

And figure something out with District 2 I believe.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where is 2.

Oh, yeah, okay.

What about that area of Holly where the Holly recreation is, how much is there? That upper yellow one.

Right there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Grove land Szetela se Grove land if you put that in 2.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would be fine with that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would alleviate your issue there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Maybe Commissioner Vallette would have an opinion on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Try to fix it now if we can.

>> MR. MORGAN: Grove land into 2?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

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: Uh-huh.

It's a little high but not horrible so 18 is good, two is the one that is now a touch off.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The good thing is that it's adjacent to 16 which is the other side.

So I think we will be able to fix it.

And I think, yeah, do you want to try to help us understand if we like this and want to move forward? In terms of facilitating?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, just wondering can we look at 16 really quick and see if there is a tweak, we can make there to get the plan deviation back down? Can we do something with that border right there? So 16 has 6,000 too many.

And two is 8,000 under.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I recall Commissioner Clark earlier today was talking about the northern Section of Oakland Township.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You want to move that into two does that make sense Commissioner Clark for 16?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would suggest that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's look up there.

Because that solves the plan deviation.

So right there Oakland that northern let's try that northern precinct and see how much is there.

Yeah, move that up to two and we will see what that does.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would even go lower if you want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We may be able to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Trying to look at The Street names.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So that gets our plan deviation back to where it should be so that is good.

Would you do more?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think we can.

I'm trying to see where Lakeville is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 16 is currently 3,000 over.

And two is well now it's 5,000 under so you can't add too much more to it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: When you said Lakeville was that A Street?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: In Oakland Township.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is it a Township or what do you want from John?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's an actual Lake is what I would use as the border.

So that is where I see the significant difference between urban and rural type of things. So yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John can you see if you can find something called Lake view?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can you make 16 bigger Oakland Township? Drop down if you could.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where is it in comparison to bald mountain does that help? Bald mountain recreation center is in the corner, where is it in comparison to that?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think no I think we are down as low as we should go. We can go lower if we have to. And.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You don't have to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If I had the power to do it I would do it on the west side up top where the blue is, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't think we have to because we have it balanced again and Lake Orion and Oxford, we got a lot of public comments about that. Can we go back to the Ann Arbor area to see what other changes were impacted.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, and in the Ann Arbor area in particular do you remember Commissioner Szetela as you were drawing this, is this does this preserve the Asian community do we know? Or was it not possible to preserve it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The northern part has more Asian community and parts of superior Township so that is putting them together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Just for my reference superior is to the east.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: In between Canton and Ann Arbor is superior Township.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It is a long District west to east so we have to preserve Asian community in District 29.

And 5.8 thanks for highlighting do we have 22% minority District and 27 is the one that is above it and that is almost 30%.

Okay, and we do have Jackson in here so there is minority community in Jackson but it's probably more African/American.

But we just don't know that right now, right? Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Comments.

What I think Anthony did up in the Novi area and north of there, I think is a good move. I really support that.

My concern with the changes is Ann Arbor from Ann Arbor west and there is we are going all the way from Ann Arbor to Marshall.

And we did that because we split Ann Arbor.

Okay, but we split it east-west.

We could have gone and split Washtenaw County but that would have kept Ann Arbor and the Ypsilanti whole.

Okay, and then kept the rural area to the west.

However, this change on the Ann Arbor west is I believe is beneficial to Ann Arbor and not Jackson.

I think Jackson's points of view is even from the initial hearing is, yeah, we will go into Washtenaw County we associate with them but only the western part.

And then the other concern I have is how far this thing goes to the west, all the way to Marshall.

I think it's excessive.

But it takes a lot of the rural areas and lumps them into the Ann Arbor areas.

Both the districts both 27 and 29 and so that was a concern to me.

If we could cut it off at the somehow like where Washtenaw County line is and I'd be happy with it.

Because I think Jackson and Marshall and those areas are much, much different than Ann Arbor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So John can you Zoom out a little bit so we can see the districts on the bottom 26 and 28? I think they are similarly pretty long as well.

I don't think this is disproportionate to, you know, in terms of compactness.

Just in terms of the length.

I mean if you look at 26 it's pretty long too.

Yeah, it's quite a bit longer actually.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes then Mr. Adelson you had a comment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I think District 29 is acceptable.

Along with District 27 with Jackson going into Ann Arbor.

My only concern is the part of Ann Arbor that is being taken and put into Lansing because I want to say the pieces that we are grabbing from Ann Arbor are the more affluent ones.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For which one?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: For District 29.

That is going to be the Barton Hills area and so on and so forth.

So I don't know if that, well, frankly monetary status to me means nothing.

But when it comes to this.

But exactly because I have none.

But we may want to look at that and see if we either don't go as far over on the northern side of Ann Arbor or try to grab like a Moon shaped crescent kind of a thing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Can we look at the matrix and the partisan fairness?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

I just wanted to point out that the -- John, could we see the demographics for 27 and 29 please?

>> MR. MORGAN: In the previous configuration or this configuration?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: This one just moving down there, the chart.

Thank you.

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

My recollection was that the Ann Arbor as a whole at about 12% Asian VAP, now that number by itself is not going to be sufficient to typically elect or have an opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

The -- that number is effectively halved in the two districts.

The adjoining Townships that have added in that I did not see that they had a significant Asian population.

So this is more an FYI.

The number wasn't large enough by itself to elect.

But as you know I'm always cautious in a situation like that when you divide a minority group.

Now the largest concentrations as I recall were in north Ann Arbor. But there was also population in the southern part of the City too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to make sure that you saw the message that Commissioner Wagner is with us now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner can you identify where you are dialing in remote from?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Remotely attending from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange for letting us know.

Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'll hold mine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I'd like to go back to a comment that I made before earlier today.

Relative to splitting Ann Arbor.

And I know some of the people have indicated they want it split for two districts.

But if we did an instead of doing this, we did a north-south split in Washtenaw County and kept Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti together then we could keep the urban rural separated.

That is contrary to what you came in to split Ann Arbor but I offer this as another solution to this.

I just don't feel comfortable with the whole Jackson and Marshall area being rural.

Jackson the City is not.

And I don't see where it really fits in with the interests of Ann Arbor.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Eid and then I have a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, we are deliberating on the change without knowing the numbers.

So first thing we need to run the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Run the numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Second, I have a question for our VRA expert because 27 and 19 did not have that population needed as you indicated, would that be preferable then what I had started to originally do in splitting up 9 and 10? Because the reason I took this type of configuration because I did not want to touch 9 or 10 due to those minority considerations.

Because nine and ten do have that population.

See what I'm saying?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner that is a great question.

Each one has its own challenges and its own I guess do and don't. And it's different and Dr. Handley's analysis addresses black voting power, ability to elect in Wayne County and not in Asian voting strength in the Ann Arbor area.

So there are several considerations.

With also with the Asian community, even though their population wasn't high enough to control an election to be a majority or even a plurality, the potential maybe to have an influence District where you can have some influence on the outcome of an election.

I can't speak to the electoral patterns in Ann Arbor.

So 12% arguably you have more influence than 5% but I couldn't tell you based on data who votes for whom.

That is different in Wayne County where we have the data for that.

So that to me is the distinction.

Also with nine you have an ability to elect, opportunity to elect clear District based on analysis.

Ann Arbor as it was originally configured would be at best an influenced District.

Then I also raise the point too when you do divide a minority community that is always something to be alert to in the decision making.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay can we go ahead and run that for us, Mr. Morgan?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I did make note of the original numbers.

Before we made these changes as it was originally saved in version one.

It was 4.5 for lopsided margin test 2.2 for mean median difference, 3.2 for efficiency gap and a seats to votes ratio of 20-18.

With a bias of 0.3%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Favor the democrats and the rest are republican leaning is that correct? Lopsided and we cannot hear you.

Efficiency gap and republican.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is what we have.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 28, 29.

>> Can you turn on your microphone? Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't have my mic on I'm sorry.

I thought it was 27 and 29.

So 68 and 57.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's go through the numbers.

Lopsided margin test.

I didn't see that one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 3.4

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's gone from 4.5 to 3.4 favoring republican.

Mean median difference is gone from 2.2 to 1.1 in favor of republicans.

2.2 to 1.1.

Efficiency gap went from 3.2 to 0.6% favoring republicans.

And the last one so we went from 20dem and 18R to 21dem and 17R.

And the bias increased from 0.3% democratic to 2.9% democratic.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I want to look at the swing on that too.

So can you close it out and I will have you rerun it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, just a second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Your purpose is to look at the Delta.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to look at the change of how it swings.

Like how stable it is.

>> MR. MORGAN: What did you want me to run?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Close that because we will rerun the report but for the 2020 Presidential and we will run it for the 2016 Presidential and just see what happens with the numbers when we look at those two Presidential elections, how much does it swing. We can do 2012 those are the three Presidential elections that we have.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN:

>> MR. MORGAN: For the State Senate plan?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, the same plan you are in just rerun the report.

>> MR. MORGAN: With Presidential elections.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Start with 2020 we will look at that then look at 2016 and then we can look at 2012 as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you help us know because this is the first time, I'm seeing this and it may be helpful let us know what you are analyzing and yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I've had some discussions with Dr. Handley about this and there will be more follow-up on it.

But our totals are weighted average of the elections then when you dive down into individual elections for plans so we have plans right now particularly for the Congressional where the metrics look about the same.

So the mean median efficiency gap they are all .6, .7 mean median is 2.something but then when you look at individual elections you see some of the plans have huge swings. So that's what I'm looking for is so instead of doing yeah Biden versus Trump to see how much does this map swing.

That gives you just a little bit more information about the stability of the plan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What you are saying also Dr. Handley was saying this is a good idea is that true?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right when you are comparing different plans to dig into the lower level it's something you can consider looking at as well.

It's just another point of data to look at and say okay, you know, because like I said particularly for the Congressional that was something I was looking into.

Because our Congressional plans are so close and yet there is some that have very significant swings year to year.

So this is 2020.

Presidential, right? So this is lopsided margin.

>> MR. MORGAN: 2020 election for one election.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For one election 2.9 republican.

Can we see mean median? 0.8.

Republican we look at the efficiency 2.3.

Republican and then let's look at the seats votes.

And then Commissioner Eid go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well I was going to say if you want to go down this route then I think you are probably going to do this, we should look at 2016 as well because a different party won each of those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Those are the two I think are most because they show a swing. So, yeah, that is exactly what I want to do.

I want to look again so we got that.

So we can close this.

We have it.

And then rerun it.

For 2016 Clinton versus Trump.

And then we are going to see some different numbers.

Yeah, Bruce do you have any thoughts looking in the election years versus going with the composite?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think to your point Commissioner, if you are looking at one election with a democratic nominee won and another election with a republican nominee won you could get that comparative sense of difference.

And then compare that to the -- the overall analysis that Dr. Handley did using all of the elections.

So I think using two elections like that is you get a much more accurate sample than just picking one election with one outcome.

Two elections with different outcomes I think is better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And what I think Commissioner Szetela is trying to help us understand is that there is a stability that we have because we have ten years of election data and so we have a stable.

But when we look into the individual more than one individual race, right we see swings. And so the I'm just trying to understand the stability factor.

Like why don't we just look at the one all ten years, right and understand okay we are good.

We have to look at the other ones to understand if there is more of a swing with more current numbers.

And that, yeah, help me unpack this.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Picking two elections with different outcomes. I heard comments at some of the public hearings just pick one election. Pick like 2020.

Well 2020 the democrat won so you are already going to have some degree of bias. But then if you are looking at two elections where one the republican nominee won, one the democratic nominee won that is much more efficient I think as Dr. Handley explained than just taking one at a time.

Because that is something I think we have been consistent about too.

That shows bias that is in isolation.

Using her approach of looking at all the elections and picking two where the outcomes were different that just gives you additional potentially additional information.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It sounds like the swing you're looking for right is if it's a large swing then we see instability that we don't see with a very stable ten years of election.

Is that right? So we are getting more data right.

So the swing is what we are looking for.

Right to make sure we get a more stability District.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think between those two elections that there is that potential.

But I think for us it's more it's fairer in that you're not just skewing it by picking one election with one outcome.

You are picking two elections with different outcomes.

One for each party.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The District that we have drawn or the whole state map we have drawn we might, okay, this helps you understand like the variance or the swings that we see helps us choose a more stable set of maps instead of districts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: How I think of it I used to teach college classes so think of it from being back in school and how your grades work.

So maybe you've got four students who have Bs and then but when you dig into that and you look and you've got one student who is consistently a B student one who has A

and Cs one has all As and a terrible grade maybe they got in a car accident and missed a test and you have one an AB and C.

You can't Judge a map just looking at a single number but when you look at other numbers you can evaluate especially when we try to compare maps how do the happens compare.

So looking into the 2020 versus the 2016 these are two elections with very different results.

If you have a map that is swinging wildly to me that is a less reliable map than a map that I would expect some swings but like two to 3% swing one way or another.

Or within our margin of what we are looking for say up to five.

To me that's a more trustworthy accurate map than one that is going 0-11.

So that's what I'm looking for is that swing because to me it helps me understand the plan.

Like I would expect more republican bias in the 2016 election because Trump won that year and there was a wave of republican votes.

And then 2020 was the opposite.

So same thing with Obama in 2012 I would expect there to be less republican bias and more democratic swing in that.

So I expect some bias.

But what I'm looking for are things where there is significant bias that I wouldn't expect because that tells me there is an issue with the under lying plan.

Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

I'm happy to come in on this discussion.

It is an important discussion.

And it's something that we've always tended to look at and why we try to put in as much data as possible.

Because in politics and in elections you do see the changes that take place.

Certainly over this past decade and by looking at the individual contests, which is how we've set this up so that you can do that, you've got the ultimate flexibility.

We've created the composite score so that we kind of take individual bias out.

But we give you the capability of looking at the individual ones and be able to run the comparisons and see how it looks.

So I think this will give you the ultimate, what is the wide variety of what we might see.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Brace.

Can we see Mr. Morgan those last numbers you ran and go ahead Mr. Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We are at the order of the day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 1.9 lopsided margin this is 2016, yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mean median 2.1 republican.

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.

Efficiency gap is 3.5.

Republican.

Seats vote is 18.

20.

In favor of republican with a negative 2.5 bias for democrat.

So that is exactly what I'm talking about the swing.

So just to wrap up so we can move on so when you look at the overall for the lopsided margin, version three, the composite is 3.4 republican.

When you look at the 2020, it goes 2.9 republican.

For the 2016 it goes 1.9 republican.

Mean median it goes 1.1 republican for the composite.

To .8 for the 2020 Presidential.

Then up to 2.1 for the 2016.

So for the efficiency gap we have 0.6.

For the composite.

2.3 for the 2020.

Again leaning republican.

3.5 leaning republican for 2016.

And then in the seats votes we see that swing where we have 2117 for the composite but if you look at 2020 it's 2018 then if you look at 2016 it's 1820.

So there is swings but they are still within the 5% that we talked about earlier.

Go ahead Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I mean what is most striking to me comparing those two elections is in the election where republicans won, they won the most seats 20-18. The election where the democrats won, they won the most seats and it was the same ratio 20-18.

I'm kind of surprised it's 20-18 given the composite score.

So that is surprising to me actually.

But it works and on both elections, it seems like you know the party that won the most votes wins the most seats.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Not jumping the gun here but we are going to Midland next right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Going to Midland.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: This map is Midland City with the Tri-Cities, or no?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I believe it is.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You want to handle Midland Dustin?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't.

[Laughter]

My thought was if this wasn't the -- if this wasn't the case, and Midland wasn't in with the Tri-Cities, well, wait a minute this is house right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is Senate.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Oh, what am I missing here? Oh, it is with the Tri-Cities.

So my only -- never mind.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Moving right along.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Moving right along.

Okay so we have exceeded our time on Ann Arbor.

We are moving on to Midland.

Per our motion earlier.

Thoughts, concerns, discussions around Midland? Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Of course you guys know I'm going to because I've spoken on many, many times and I'll still comes down to the argument of is it, isn't it a community of interest.

And I know we have differing opinions.

And I am being empathetic to the people that gave comments at our first Midland back in May and out of the 75 people that gave public testimony there, 39 came in person and said that they did not want this.

They either wanted Midland to go with Gladwin or go to the west or they wanted the County whole.

And there has been a lot of discussion about whether or not that particular arrangement is political or not.

And I think any Commissioner that knows me in any way over the last year knows that I do digging on everything.

I've done digging on hires.

I do digging on everything.

So that's what I've done.

And I can tell you I went to the Midland republican's Facebook Twitter and did a little digging there.

And while they did put out a call to action against Bruce Adelson, sorry Bruce, I didn't see any for giving comments about the maps.

It was actually quite quiet other than there was a post agreeing with something that was said at one of the hearings.

I did the same.

Because I'm trying to look at it from all sides.

I did the same for the Midland democratic party.

And it was not the same and actually I was surprised to find out that Ms. Austin that you asked for the information from today is actually the Chair of the democratic Midland party.

Which I did not know.

She did say she was a democrat and she was very honest about that.

But upon looking more into it, there was a call to action.

And I'm not discounting the people very well may feel this way, but it makes it harder for me to say this is the right thing to do when there is a call to action.

Just for an example, for the oak maps suggested comments this map does not achieve a fair map with as close to 0 political bias as possible.

I would suggest you create the Midland House District like it's drawn in the Pine map.

There is several of these telling people what to say.

And as we went through the hearings and as I read public comment, I do see a repetitiveness of the same words, the same phrases and everything.

So that's when I said I have a hard time separating not necessarily separating but knowing what is political and what isn't.

And my opinion, I'm just going to leave it at that.

One more thing we did have a handout too from the last Gaylord public hearing and I'm assuming and I don't know who it came from but speaker 46 and I guess it was trying to say these are the people that are for it.

But as I started looking where these comments came from there is comments from Ann Arbor Traverse City, Arenac, East Lansing St. Clair bad Axe areas that are not actually Midland.

So here is my concern.

I want to do what is right for Midland.

And in a true community of interest.

And I feel for the people.

And, yes, they had Bill Schuette speak to a former politicians, three years out of office.

But I also don't think that Bill Schuette has staff members I know that was said and I could be wrong I don't know Bill Schuette.

But what I'm saying is I'm going to stress it again.

When the people stood in front of us at that first public hearing and actually some of the ones after that and some of them again with tears in their eyes, I find it hard to believe I'm not going to cry over politics.

I don't care really at this point.

They are horrible on both sides half the time.

But if I experienced something serious and if I'm trying to do what I feel is going to be in my best interest and my communities I'm going to feel that in my heart and speak from it and that is what I felt about the people especially the first hearing.

I feel these people came at that first hearing in May.

This was new.

This was in the majority of them like I said out of the 75 and some of the other ones and from Saginaw who said they did not want to be with Midland at that very same hearing.

There was one that said Bay City was their community of interest for the watershed.

And Commissioner Szetela I apologize because I had read that one and then I said you said the other day and I got it mixed up.

I apologize the other day and let me apologize again for miss speaking.

I just want to put that out there in that I am not okay with this configuration.

And I think we should adjust it.

That's all I've got.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Witjes and then Commissioner Clark did you also have your hand up at some point? Or were you just.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I hear that too.

But here is one thing that I've been struggling with when it comes how to handle Midland.

We have heard all throughout Michigan wherever we were rural, rural urban, urban keep separate.

Putting Midland City in with Midland County makes it or Midland City Midland Township going up to Gladwin takes that consistency we have been doing of doing our best to keep rural rural and urban urban doing that everywhere in the State of Michigan except for Midland.

So that's one thing that I'm having a real hard time dealing with.

And when it comes down to flooding and all that and, yeah, I feel for the individuals.

But where do the rivers end up? They end up in Bay City and Saginaw.

That's where it ends up.

Yes, I mean Midland was in the way.

And had some flooding but I mean for saying that there is that one reason for another for taking Midland going north because of a flooding event that happens one every thousand years or so when Dams breaking, I don't buy that as a community of interest one bit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark then Commissioner Lett then Commissioner Orton.

Then I think Commissioner Lange has her hand up again.

He is next so do you want to let her go or?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I wanted to respond to Dustin.

I see what you're saying.

But I do think that is what we just did with Ann Arbor and Jackson put them with you know urban and rural together and stretched it out to encompass both and we have done it both ways.

In order to solve this problem that there has been so much input on both sides, we can go back to the idea of we give different things in different maps.

This is the Senate map.

What are we going to do in the Senate map?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Doug did you have a comment still?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I did.

This is the most controversial area that we are going to deal with.

Even the public, well, we will say that when we get to Grand Rapids.

Public comment seems to be split.

Okay, I mean, there is an analysis that Jennifer gave us or sent to us today.

And that supports the Tri-City type of map.

And we get a lot of input from the Midland people.

That supports the combination of the two.

So I think we need to come to a compromise on how we are going to deal with the Senate perspective and then even maybe even a house perspective. So maybe the solution is keep the Senate map like this and the house map we take the approach that Midland and Midland Township are together.

And that is a compromise. It is split between both houses of the legislature.

And I mean we will sit here and talk about this for another 50 minutes and we are going to be the same place we are at today because of this.

So I would suggest we discuss that type of approach.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Who is next?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm next.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Steve, Rhonda, you and then I have a comment too.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think this configuration with Midland, Saginaw Bay City the Tri-Cities I mean I've been a resident of Michigan for 70 some years.

And I've always it's always been Midland Saginaw Bay City.

It's always been that.

Now I don't live there.

I grant you that.

So there are certainly smarter people up there, there are smarter people in this room than me.

But the people that have spoken and I'm looking at the compilation that we have gotten in on the portal that was provided to us by supposedly the Chair of the democratic party, that's correct.

She has every right to do that.

Bill Schuette has every right to come in two or three times and pitch his story.

A call to action I believe I've heard somewhere that, that deserves no less weight than anybody else's comments.

So we have here the fact that we, as a Commission, have asked for input in personal hearings that we had.

We had what 16 to start with and then five more.

And we got a number of comments from there.

But we've got many more comments on the portal.

And we pushed it.

We have asked repeatedly every meeting that we have we ask for comments on the portal.

And so that's got to be worth something.

The statistics that I guess her name is Jennifer came up with is there is 80% positive for the Tri-Cities.

And she breaks it down.

And I went back and looked at the where how they came in.

And they come in all the way from back in May to up to, to date.

So this is -- and I'll give you, you know, a lot of them that we see you know they say the same thing.

No question about it.

What we've seen that with everybody.

And so my point being we need to give credence to the people that take the time whether it's cut and paste or whether it's come out with Bill Schuette and his group or Jennifer and her group, I mean we've had 30 Indians show up at two of our meetings. Doesn't mean they deserve any less weigh than anybody else. Same thing here.

I think this map looks good.

It's compact.

It is we can't see number 1 on there, where is -- I think the numbers are pretty good.

I don't see any reason not to adopt this in the configuration that it is for the Senate District.

House District maybe a different question.

But those are the reasons that I think that this map is a good one and should give it serious consideration.

I don't see any changes that we need to make.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Rhonda?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

Steve, I agree with a lot of your comments.

I'm just going to point out too that on my map I did do a compromise.

Because we've had a lot of comment from Saginaw too saying that Saginaw wanted to be kept whole and by themselves.

So my compromise was to give a little bit to each District while I did not go completely to the west as some of the Midland ones wanted, I did join them with Bay City.

While also taking into consideration comment from Arenac that said they wanted to be included with Bay City.

So if there is a discussion about compromise, I think that the map that I drew for that area actually is a compromise.

And I want to go back to another one of our criteria again even though it's lower on our levels we have to do we do have the criteria of taking into account top municipalities Township, County et cetera and we are breaking up three Counties when we could technically have Saginaw whole and get their own representation.

We could have Arenac Bay City and Midland and Gladwin I believe was the configuration in mind where they are basically kept whole which I think would make a lot of them happy not to be split up.

I think that was another big concern.

You are taking Midland out of the County seat out of the County when you're doing this. And that was another concern.

So I'm opposed to this one.

But, again, I'll be quiet now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: A couple things and do it in reverse order here.

When it comes to County seats and the Counties, we are not changing local politics. So the County seat is still going to be the County seat in the County for local Government.

So that's not going to change.

Midland and Midland Township are the ones I'm most concerned with going in with the Tri-City area.

The rest of Midland County can go north.

So then but I do like Commissioner Clark's idea and statements stating that when it comes to Congressional and Senate the Tri-Cities in my opinion should be together. But how since the districts are smaller, we can send those further north into the flood plains.

So that the individuals in the Midland area have more representation in that particular area.

I don't see how having two or maybe even three representatives that could be going into that County would do any harm.

I think it would be doing good and then if we have to split up a County to do that three ways so that there are three representatives on the house level for the Midland Gladwin area, that is in my opinion that is a good thing and that is how I would prefer to see it go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so my thoughts are I like this map too.

I agree with everything Steve said.

I particularly like this because it takes a little bit more of the Townships around Midland City and puts them together which was, we had received some feedback on that particular point for this particular map.

They wanted to see the Townships.

Then I totally agree with Commissioner Clark's suggestion that we address this in the house map and put Midland and Midland Township together in the house map and you know that will give them one option where they are together and then in this one, they are with the Tri-Cities.

I think that makes a lot of sense and I think it's a good idea.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I think it's a good compromise as long as we guaranty that to happen, I'm fine with it.

I think it's important like Dustin said that we will get more representation in that area where the flood plains starts.

And that's where the root cause of this whole thing is.

So we need the representation to get that stopped.

And yeah, Bay City and Saginaw are the take the brunt of it.

But nobody likes it on the flood plain.

So I would propose that we compromise that way.

Midland Township and Midland on the house is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Together.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Together and this map gets taken care of and we beat it by 40 minutes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid has a comment so he can throw a monkey in the whole situation.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Not yet.

I was going to ask if we could run a report on the number of County splits that this map has.

Because we haven't examined that.

I don't think that this map splits up Counties any more than any other map.

But if we want to check that we might want to.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: For the whole state and Senate.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: For this one and the configuration that has Midland the other way.

Let's if the argument is county splits let's compare the two.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I know you were out and stepped in we are sort of coalescing around this concept for this map we are leaving this in this configuration then for the house map we will put Midland City of mid land Township in their own House District. I think that is sort of what people are thinking.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And that District may be expanded based on population to the west and the north.

But, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes and Commissioner Lange has objections to that she doesn't like the configuration and she stated that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Last thing I'm going to say here another reason why I prefer to have multiple representatives in one area.

I'm not an engineer.

I don't live underneath a Dam.

I don't think I ever want to live underneath a Dam.

But in my mind if there was more representation in that particular area, maybe those Dams wouldn't have failed.

That's my -- maybe a political opinion of mine.

But I like I fail to see how having more representation in an area is a bad thing.

We could eventually maybe hopefully knock on wood stop it from happening again in the future by having more representation in that particular area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange Commissioner Kellom Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Weiss and I'm writing that down because that is a lot of people.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was just going to ask, it was just said this is the configuration we are going with and we might compromise on the House Districts. So I'm just curious are we taking a vote on that? Or is that just what they are saying because obviously as you said I object.

So my vote would be no.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't think we are consistent with our prior practice we are not really taking votes on issues like this.

We are sort of reaching a consensus and moving forward.

Understanding that you object.

But I think the majority of the people on the Commission are in favor of that configuration it seems like based on the nods in the room.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Just a comment we have not adopted this map.

We are just working on this map.

We will be back at it Monday.

At some point we are going to have to take a vote on it.

But I think what we've done so far is to simply work through some issues and then move on to the next issue if that helps you, Rhonda.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So I have an I guess a general question and a concern even like the wording that is being used because I think even Commissioner Clark said if you promise we will make a compromise on that I as a Commissioner cannot make a promise or compromise, I will do the best depending on the

circumstances so we are acquiescing for one individual when we should do our best job is making me a little nervous.

I know some people might think that is not what is happening but it sounds like we are trying to massage folks miserable spots and this is not what we are supposed to be doing.

If we make a compromise, we think that is the right thing to do not because we are trying to satisfy someone's temporary discomfort.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Point taken Commissioner Kellom.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I yield.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And then Commissioner Weiss who has been very quiet during this conversation even though he is from the Saginaw area has a comment, everybody listen.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right I listened to all your talk.

I find it very interesting.

Yes, I am from Saginaw but I do not just represent Saginaw.

I'm supposed to represent the whole state.

So I do have some comments.

I believe Commissioner Clark made a very good point. On this map.

And then spreading in the house map break it down that way.

I've never all the years I've lived there it's always been Tri-Cities.

And I've got pretty close to same amount of time as Commissioner Lett.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You are older.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Shhh don't tell everybody.

So I guess my opinion would but I like the Tri-City thing.

Leave it that way.

But if we are going to go with this map, I think it works.

And a Congressional.

I do like the idea taking the house map and then setting it up that way.

That gives and Commissioner Witjes your idea to me more representation is better.

We got to shoot for four more I don't know.

Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you Commissioner Weiss.

General Counsel did you have a comment?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair and certainly I acknowledge your statement about the consistency and how the Commission has been perceiving. And just for clarification that this in the prior mapping sessions when this sort of situation arose the process document spoke to creating alternative or alternate drafts excuse me.

So the mapping process document again at Page 14 of consensus can't be reached during this stage, a vote can be taken or again the Commission while we don't have alternate maps at this stage there are the Commission does have the ability to put forward more than one proposed map per District so that could also be an option. But I did want to highlight both the language in the process document for your benefit and also bring up the option that the Commission also has to put forward a number of proposals if it so chooses.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What I was going to say a second ago is I also agree with Commissioner Clark.

I think there is a way to compromise on this Midland issue with the House Districts and still on top of that still make that map more fair.

It would involve probably looking at Lansing or somewhere else.

But there is a way to do that.

We just have to come up with it.

Like how we did for the Ann Arbor area now.

But I would agree. I think that could be a way going forward.

And you know, based on what General Counsel just said, you know we have a little bit more time in this area.

Assigned to us.

If Commissioner Lange would like to make a clone and you know reconfigure it and check the numbers, you know we can examine that.

But I agree I like this map quite a bit how it's currently configured.

This is the same one we ran the numbers on before I left, right? Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you want to make an alternate map?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I made a whole alternate map so I guess it's really not necessary.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, then we will move on.

Is there any more discussion about Midland? Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was not sure if Commissioner Curry wanted to comment her hand went up a couple times.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry did you have a comment? The mouse was a form of a hand.

Did you have a comment Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think it was something else, thanks John but I don't think it was my hand.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just looking out for you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Every once this a while when the mouse floats over there it looks like a hand but it's not the same.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Then I move my direction in the house so you probably see anything around here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so we are supposed to take a break at I think, well, 3:00 is normally when we break do you want to do ten minutes now and come back or? Yeah, so then we can go into Grand Rapids. Yep so, it's currently 2:40.

Without objection we will recess I'm going to say 15 minutes because we always do 15 minutes any way so hearing no objections, we will come back at 2:55.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:59 p.m. will 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 disclose you are attending remotely and where you are physically attending from.

I 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?

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present. Attending remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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 WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

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

We are continuing on working through the maps and shifting over to the Grand Rapids area.

So if we can shift over to Grand Rapids and who would like to lead this? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Not to lead it but before we do that since we've been talking about the different metrics and looked at the different elections, I wonder if we could have Mr. Adelson talk to us about Lisa Handley's advice or the information, she gave us.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Commissioner I would be happy to. The metrics that are being used like the efficiency gap and lopsided margins for example, these are methods that have been used in Court.

They have been endorsed by the courts.

They are recognized by the courts.

These are methods that they are accustomed to using.

There are many methods to evaluate, this is partisan fairness and in some states competitiveness.

These are the methods that Dr. Handley selected as you know.

These are methods that are widely accepted.

They are not controversial.

They are not revolutionary.

They are not untried.

Each metric gives you a different number and result which amounts to eventually looking at the margin to see if that is consistent with the conclusions of Dr. Handley about the where the predominant of the vote is in the State of Michigan today.

Looking at her analysis involved three elections rather than one.

One election tends to skew the result depending on who the winner is of the Presidential election. So at the end of the day from our perspective, the looking at the four metrics, looking at the string of elections to quote Mr. Morgan is consistent.

This is consistent analysis across the board.

Using a string of elections is more consistent than just cherry picking and using one.

That partisan bodies may do political may do because they are naturally trying to skew the result in a partisan way.

This is not a partisan body.

It's not an elected body.

It's not a legislature, it's not a political party.

So looking at things from our perspective in a way that are defensible, that is consistent, those are the most advisable.

The decisions about how what particular efficiency gap or lopsided margin the Commission chooses as a body to accept as far as maps are concerned of course is a Commission decision.

If there were a margin in any map that was inconsistent, that was an out liar, I'm not going to throw numbers out but something that would be obvious on site to all of us, that is something that we would advise against doing.

But picking what -- however far you think the efficiency gap should go and how however many, what you think the seat margin should be is a Commission decision.

Based on the partisan fairness analysis and we are certainly here to answer any questions about numbers going forward.

But that's going to be very important discussion over the next week.

Does that help?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

So you're saying using the string if that is what we are calling of elections, the group of elections that Dr. Handley gave us to use in our analysis is what we should be doing.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Well that is the most defensible.

I think you can pick different elections like Commissioner Szetela 2020, 2016 to get additional metric or additional bit of information.

Which having additional information I think can typically be a good thing.

But as far as making decisions, rather than picking as I said one election as your bellwether one election as your benchmark is not as defensible as going through those consistent elections where we have this, this and this.

So not just taking one snapshot out of time in one year.

That's a more of a best practice, more of a defensible position to take in deciding based on the breath of the analysis and the election.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: To dive in deeper the Ann Arbor when we did do that analysis one of the things that Commissioner Eid lifted up was that in the seats vote ratio in particular between 2020 and 2016 there was a flip, right.

And so I think if I'm hearing you correctly right that is additional information that helps us understand the districts we have drawn are with that configuration not just the Ann Arbor but the whole state map what we looked at helped us see we have proportional

and a relatively balanced map with the change we made with Ann Arbor is that accurate? Meaning what Commissioner Eid lifted up.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think to your point it's an additional data point, additional point of information that you can take as far as you want to take it. But it still is going to come down to the nitty-gritty decision how far do you go. How far in choosing maps, what is the seat differentiation, what is the efficiency gap difference that the body decides is the map you wish to approve or move forward. So as you know there are a lot of numbers. And there are the efficiency gap goes one way. The seat margin goes another way.

The discussion, the informed discussion of, well, but how low should we go. Or how what should this percentage be that is for discussion and debate.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If we are able to maintain all of the other constitutional criteria is closer to 0 on those numbers better?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Loaded question.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I wish you were a student in one of my classes.

We would have a lot of fun.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 11 years yesterday maybe I will add a couple more.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I'm not going to say taking things you know, out of whether it's out of context or just taking a snapshot in a way.

That I I'm not going to say one is better or not.

That the -- you have four tests that you are using.

And it's up to you in your discussions to decide which one is better perhaps.

And how far do you go? How far is what you consider the body considers individual Commissioners decide is the best.

Or one is better than the other.

But that's not for me to say.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well if it's up to us to decide it's certainly in my opinion that closer to 0 while maintaining the communities of interest and all of our other criteria is more fair.

That's what the numbers say.

Even on that last map.

In my opinion.

Three of the four numbers still were republican leaning but all of them were closer to 0.

That is a decision for all of us as our esteemed counsel just told us.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Order of the day.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Order of the day we are at Grand Rapids, 3:10.

So can we head on down to Grand Rapids? Have fun, folks.

Well I mean I think the one request was move the one District to Wealthy Street.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would like our western Commissioner Cynthia Orton to help was this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: She is not a true western Commission according to some people.

Did you hear that one woman say that after? She is like the real westerners.

Yeah, I shouldn't be picking on that poor woman.

She can't defend herself but I'm just teasing, no offense to the person who made that comment.

I'm just teasing.

Commissioner Orton? And actually Commissioner Lange as I will also note e-mailed us she is also a West Michigander because Reed City is also on the west as is Commissioner Lett.

I mean so we have multiple west coast people.

Just not from Grand Rapids.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: A seat at the table.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: John I don't see the map.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was going to ask a question on the map.

At this point we have three maps we have the original map we started with this morning.

We have the second map version two which was abandoned then there is the version three which is the one you most recently looked at with the changes in Ann Arbor.

So which of those three maps do you want me to bring up?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So, well, it seems that we are making progress here.

So is everyone good with version three with all the changes in Ann Arbor?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Then let's pull that one up.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay just to be clear I have the other maps saved if somebody needs to go back to any of those.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I believe the major change that we wanted to make here was the change to Wealthy Street.

But I think MC maybe has the most clear notes on that.

I'm not familiar with where exactly that is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I do know where Wealthy Street is.

Yep.

And it is in east town.

I don't know so I think that I think that is more likely the it's also the house map.

So Wealthy Street one the house map is most affected.

Wealthy Street, yeah.

This one here I think we may be okay where we are with the Senate.

This is about Ada.

It's switching and we have Allendale and not wrong and that is GVSU and not information from the college campuses that GVSU was split.

And again I think that is in Allendale.

So if we potentially move that back into Ottawa County and keep Ottawa County more whole, right sort of like just move Coopersville and Allendale into 22, then Ada and Cascade on the eastern side I think that may be where we want to focus and Wealthy Street was more related to the House District.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I understand.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to go over our list to orient.

So one was moved Senate map Fulton to wealthy.

So you're saying not in this map?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We can.

It's just I think the first road first part is the Counties.

Excuse me the Townships.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Then Ada Cascade with Grand Rapids.

And then the other comment we got was about southwest Grand Rapids and northern Wyoming being together but I think that might have been the house map.

Does that sound familiar to anybody? Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to reference the work we did yesterday when we reviewed all the Senate plans, I think Commissioner Lange's Senate plan in this area had some ideas you were thinking were useful in some of these Township movements if you wanted to see that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, will you bring that up as an overlay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, my notes from the hearing was that Fulton change Fulton to wealthy on the Senate map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what mine says too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Forgive me I don't mean to say not true but that is the hardest one to do and we will get what I mean is I think there is more block level changes.

I just wanted to, yeah, so yes, we can go to the block level and start changing it there.

It just feels like we may have -- it's going to be harder to adjust the Township level.

The bigger to smaller.

Start big and go small.

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 CLARK: I had some confusion over that requirement because in July when beginning of July when we were in Grand Rapids, we talked to a number of people in the minority area and they indicated Fulton Street was the break point.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We agree.

My notes on the reason that Wealthy Street lines up with a District that excuse me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wards.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Wards that does not mean I think it's the right thing to do.

I'm just going to say that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We will get into that.

You are looking at your list right now. So Byron City is concerned they were split but I don't think they are split in the Senate.

I had the lakeshore District taking south part of that and go north to Saginaw.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Saginaw?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not Saginaw? Hum?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Saugatuck.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I can't read my own writing yes Saugatuck.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where is oh, I see.

So Ada is in with Grand Rapids and Cascade we are trying to.

So maybe bring that up and adjust more on the western edge? Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to just say I agree with Commissioner Rothorn.

Correct me if I'm wrong but I believe wards are used to like local representation for is Council like City Council in my opinion that is beyond our scope.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right whatever line we draw is not changing the local, right.

I'm more concerned about the southwest Grand Rapids north of Wyoming because of Hispanic community of interest.

But I'm not sure if we already have that covered.

We might.

I don't know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We do.

That is the excuse me the house map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

So we are really just focusing on that Cascade, trying to move it up.

And I'm wondering if doing that we put more back into Ottawa that is keeping Ottawa more together.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The thought is we need to put Cascade Township in with 23?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is going to be hard honestly.

I think it's 24.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So it's 24 they want.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I forgot that it was in District 3.

And that is one of the reasons they particularly were didn't want it because it's such of an urban and very rural District and 3 but that is a lot of cycling to population to try to rectify it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: But like Rebecca said like Chair Szetela said, it might help keep more of Ottawa County whole.

So maybe it's worth a try.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I'm thinking.

Pull up from three and bring in more from Ottawa and then you have a little underneath you can put into 22 and pull back from 3.

It's just boom, boom, boom, four changes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm so glad you see it.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: John could you start, Zoom in just a little bit with Cascade Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson did you have a comment?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Two quick mentions keeping in mind with District 23 that is the coalition District that you created.

So because this is a new phenomenon in this part of the state, there is less data than we would have in Wayne County.

So I would recommend being really keeping a close eye on it and I certainly will as well as the minority VAP particularly the two largest groups the Black VAP and Hispanic VAP.

One other point I wanted to make, I know that you mentioned earlier about splitting college campuses.

I think this issue is less true in Michigan.

But of course I defer to you.

Splitting college campuses in other states particularly states that have historically Black colleges and universities has been a source of great contention.

There have been a lot of lawsuits DOJ activity about vote dilution and other forms of discrimination.

So I don't know that that necessarily applies here.

But I just wanted to mention that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And before you change anything I'm just quickly writing down these statistics so we have them. Looking at 23, 24, and 3 right now.

22 are you thinking? I'm done.

Thank you.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Are there changes that we are considering making in here?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was waiting for her to write.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was writing numbers before we start moving things around. Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So would you assign Cascade Township to District 24? And then scroll out a little bit so I can see the area.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Cynthia may I say something.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes please.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Someone I think even on yesterday that say they would rather that we kept Grandville, Kentwood and Cascade together. I don't know if you heard that or whatever or if it makes any sense.

But it was one of the comments that we got yesterday.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think the concern there is that we worked really hard to build a coalition District with 23 and that the concern is that we would have to pull off parts of population counts.

Do we have -- Mr. Morgan would you mind again changing the color on 20 so I can see it a little better? It's just very close to 23 and it's hard to Judge where the line is.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay let's give some of the western side of District 24 back to Ottawa County.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay not doing what Commissioner Curry wanted to try?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, we can't add that population in because we were trying to keep those voting age population minority numbers where they were. That would add a lot of population in.

And change that.

Is that your understanding?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, and potentially dilute that voting age population.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah.

So I think the other thing we heard, if that is not an option, the other thing we heard is Ada and Cascade with Grand Rapids and can put them with the other part of Grand Rapids.

>> MR. MORGAN: You just added 19,000 to 24.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Allendale here looks like 26,000.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So what do people think? Allendale or the more northern part into 22? Which? I don't know that area so even though I am I do live on the west side of the state.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is Allendale the original home of Grand Valley State and now have campuses in Grand Rapids? So many light of that I would try to keep Allendale with Grand Rapids and maybe go north.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can we Zoom in a little bit, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: 3 and 24 are the ones that are out of balance so you're contemplating circling back around to 3 instead of going from 24 into 3.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Oh, yes, that is what I'm thinking.
And avoiding 23 if possible.

Unless there is a different idea.

Okay so the -- those top two, that is okay let me just look at the populations a moment. Can you scroll down just a little bit, John? Assign Allendale for now just so I can see the numbers.

>> MR. MORGAN: To 22?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It seems like it fits with Georgetown too.
Like it doesn't seem wrong.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so, all right, we've heard a lot about not taking James town out of Ottawa County.

The next place is down, yeah, is down here in fill more.

But there is not a lot of population down there unless we go into the City.

That would be splitting that City.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Holland is already split along a Township line so that is something to consider too.

That it already does have some splits, just geographically.

So if you don't want to move James town then hold land people may not like that but just a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: MC is this the area where there was a small portion on the lakeshore that wanted to stay with.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct it's in Lake town Township.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: They wanted to stay with Lake Macatawa.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Give me some help here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Holland and fill more right that Township, that's 10,000.

And then you could take Lake town.

Take both of those and that is almost 15, 16,000 and you can just like it's 280 people in that little to keep Macatawa together and consider taking the rest of Holland depending how much more you need.

Add it into 20, yeah then Holland is together with Saugatuck so the Lake town areas so it's not ideal.

It's just not -- I think it's not wrong.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't feel it's ideal.

Zoom out a little bit.

What if we did go the other direction because we really did not give hardly anything back to Ottawa County.

It might not be worth that switch.

But if we circle around the other way through 33 to 3.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I like that idea.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Don't undo because we know that is an issue but can we put it back how it was and just try that for a minute? I know our time is ticking, Steve.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are putting just to you are putting Allendale back to 24 just for John's purposes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay that is done so now you would take something out of 24 going towards 33 or 3?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Going towards 33.

The yes, the upper Township.

And you can take off the layer.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON:

Zoom out a little so I can see 3 and Zoom in to the bottom portion of 33.

And I want to take those bottom Townships.

>> MR. MORGAN: Odessa Campbell and Boston.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Do those three first, please.

Okay so 33 is lightly higher than we want still.

So there is Vergennes or Berlin but that is not around anything.

Try Vergennes I seem to remember something about Vergennes, but I don't remember what it was.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There were comments it was a growing suburb of Grand Rapids and it's apparently a quite wealthy area that is what I remember.

It was quite wealthy suburbs of Grand Rapids so they might not love that fit.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will say the fluency in my mind I could be wrong it doesn't really quite matter because I don't care if you have millions of dollars or ten cents to your name you still have a vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not saying it doesn't matter because they are affluent but a suburb of Grand Rapids.

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: Community of interest kind of thing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't know about community of interest but it's upscale developments from people who clearly work in Grand Rapids I'm guessing.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We can't keep it with Grand Rapids so it has to not be with them.

Okay, so that is well within our population deviation.

We didn't mess with 23.

So unless somebody has an issue with that, I think that is good.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is all the changes you want to make?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Is that all the changes you want to make? Then I would ask that we run the numbers, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, and I'm looking at the VAP really quick too just to see if there were changes there.

I mean, they are really like insignificant like .03.

And that was 20.

Yeah, no, no significant changes.

Mr. Morgan can you run the partisan fairness?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I have 3.4 for this one so no change in the lopsided margin but wondering Commissioner Orton do you want to continue to walk us through.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 3.4 for lopsided margin 1.1 was the mean median.

So 1.1, yep.

0.6 was the efficiency gap.

Yep, didn't change.

2117.

The 2.3 democratic bias.

Yep.

Didn't change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 2.9, so little of a change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 2.9 what was it before.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 2.3.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry I misspoke.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's not 2.3.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 2.9.

So no change.

Yep, stick a fork in it.

All right so that was the Cascade that we fixed.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Grand Rapids.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

And then do we want to do anything with Wealthy Street or do we just want to leave it the way it is? I'm personally inclined to leave it but any other thoughts?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Can we see Wealthy Street on the map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Bring it up.

I will show you right where it is if you want to Zoom in.

It's right here.

This line right here.

So we take that.

[Off mic]

A couple blocks.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Lots of population, a couple blocks and lots of population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I say.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: What is the communities of interest up in there?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think if we put the dots on, the theme, the African/American theme I think we will see that I mean we drew this with the idea that there were there is African/American and Hispanic population in here.

So I think that community of interest was less a known community of interest and more sort of recognizing a demographic that was between north and south.

And so I hope that answers the question.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I say keep it as is.

Again, wards and all that and I think we drew this specifically for reasons.

And I think it should stay as is personally.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I do believe we can try to be more responsive in the House Districts rather than in the Senate even though we were specifically requested to do it in the Senate.

I think the other piece that is most important is East Grand Rapids is whole and I believe Kentwood is also whole but and Wyoming these are all sort of municipal pieces that I think you know might answer that question of communities of interest.

We have whole communities and one community that is not necessarily represented the Grand Rapids which, yeah has more population than not more.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: As I really, they wanted a north-south split didn't they.

And we did that as I recall.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Especially looking at it I recall it even better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And we specifically last time there was requests for Fulton Street as the divide which is where we drew it last time based on the comments we had received at the time.

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: There was one today on the comment.

Leave it where it is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

I remember that.

Okay, any thoughts, comments? Commissioner Orton? I saw your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is there anything left on the list or can we take a look.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Southwest Grand Rapids and northern Wyoming but I believe that was a house concern because they are together in this map.

And then not for this map Grand Rapids Kalamazoo was a discussion point but that was Congressional and not for this obviously.

What else do we got? That's it for this area.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we Zoom out and kind of see maybe not the whole thing at once.

But, yeah, go down to the bottom.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There was a comment about Parchment with Kalamazoo and I don't know if that impacts this map or not.

It might have been a house map.

I see Kalamazoo so Parchment.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Parchment is with Kalamazoo.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is not an issue with this map.

It's the house map.

Yeah.

We had some comments about the UP.

Did we address Sheboygan west rather than east Ross common Benzie have we gone to Gaylord yet? I feel it's been a long day.

We looked at it and said we didn't need to.

Yeah, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Can I see the UP real quick? And Zoom in to the Sault St. Marie area.

These particular County splits I know I brought them up.

Do we want to potentially look at these here? Or keep them as is? I am on the fence either way.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I believe one of the reasons we did this there was a large population of native indigenous populations in Sault St. Marie and we headed west to Traverse City area with District 37.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So then that was my recollection as well.

The only concern I have there between 38 and 37 then is that one Township that's really long that juts into 37.

I can't remember why that was left out.

That little square.

If you were to Zoom in John right where your mouse is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That long one.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: See that rectangle.

I wonder if it would make more sense to connect that one little box on the block level to not have you know, it puzzle piece on itself.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Precinct that is the size of the precinct I think, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Block level if we made block level and square that off.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is the block.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Is it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think so.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's Zoom way on in.

The Townships.

Let's see.

It could very well be the block.

I can't remember.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

No, there is blocks there.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So wondering if we should follow like the road or whatever those two are, I can't tell, I zoomed in too far.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is I-75, right.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Wonder if we should follow that up to connect it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you still have your map? Of Native Americans? That is up to the will of everyone that is just a suggestion I had.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark or Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm guest that and heard from the U P because they are so sparsely the area as far as population is very sparse and to take it down to the block level is going to cause havoc on the precinct level in itself, I think.

So I understand splits have to be made for the Counties because of population.

But if we could not in these rural areas take it down to the block level, I think they would appreciate that even more.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: What is the population of just that Township?

>> MR. MORGAN: It's about 6,000.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So that won't work, it would be.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we are okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's fine.

I'm fine with it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Everything else is house everything else I have.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do contiguity or some of the.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Check for that.

>> MR. MORGAN: You sure you want to open that box? Here we go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Save first and check for plan, errors.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My notes show we have not looked at Lansing yet.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have split the house into five, yeah house.

So there is nothing else really for Lansing.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Lansing.

It's not too bad.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here is the number 7 discontinuity.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Someone needs to tell you what to do I will tell you.

Put those two in 28, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I wanted to jump in on risk of you throwing your shoes at me and say for the record that I'm still uncomfortable with new Baltimore being included with Detroit and I think we need to find another solution there.

So you don't want new Baltimore with Detroit is that what you said?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I do not.

I want it to be switched back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: The plan as configured there is none of Detroit in District 7.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought there was a little bit.

We can go back and look.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is right there is one Section on the river, that's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Jefferson Chalmers.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, there is just that one of Detroit.

No other part of Detroit is in the District.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay and when you all are figuring this part out can we at some point go to District 17?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Put that in 27, please.

31, please.

27, please.

31.

Is it having a problem, I think.

>> MR. MORGAN: There might be.

Working on it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just for clarity I put it in 29 if that is all right.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I saw you doing that.

That is good is there an issue with that little.

>> MR. MORGAN: There might be.

I can try to take that back out.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe when you rebuild the plan or whatever you think.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: When we finish this portion up can we go back and have some further discussion on the Ann Arbor area and how far west it goes? I'm not concerned about the Novi part or Ann Arbor but it's the large extension, lengthy extension to the west.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think Commissioner Kellom wants to look at that area of Detroit first.

But after that we can go to that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, yeah, that is fine, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm not sure it's going to resolve easily so I think for the moment it might be better to put that in 29.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay I'll make the executive decision we will put that triangle in 29 in the inside piece and you can try to resolve it at some point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We could just leave it.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to save this and also going to create a shape file of it so I can upload it again later if we need to.

Commissioner Kellom wanted to look at District 17, sorry go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think Commissioner Rothhorn just was mumbling to himself that there is this shows 500 or 5400 people unassigned.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is right and it did not show that moments ago.

So again I think I need to reupload this from the shape file.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So while John works on that and trying to get the plan recovered why don't we take a five or ten minute break? Looking at you Steve because you are always the break man.

Without objection it's currently 3:55.

We will recess until 4:05.

Hearing no objections we are in recess until 4:05.

[Recess]

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As Vice Chair of the Commission I call this meeting back to order at 4:13.

Would the secretary please call the roll?

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: present.

Rhonda Lange?

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

Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

I will return to Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. So Mr. Morgan I asked you to bring back up the version one map that we had this morning.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just a moment I did recover the map you were working on so I have that and now you want me to bring up the version one?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will do this and we will come back to you with your changes and we want to run the analysis.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No worries.

I'm not in a rush.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Madam Chair what are we running the analysis on?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Rerunning for partisan analysis for 2020 and 2016 so we have the same numbers for version three and we will go back to version three again so Brittini can make her changes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just for comparison.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the one you want to look at before you made changes this morning?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which was version one.

Yeah, that was the right one yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: The one before the Ann Arbor changes is version one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

So version one has that change up near the new Baltimore area but otherwise there is no other changes in it other than the changes we did yesterday obviously.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay this should be the correct plan.

So there's no change this Ann Arbor.

But there is the lakeshore change in District 7.

So I believe this is the correct plan.

And what did row want me to run please?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I want you to run the partisan fairness partisan fairness for the 2020 Presidential election and we will write down the numbers and we will do the same thing for 2016.

Then we will go back to the other version.

It's further up.

Yep, there it is by Biden and Trump.

I mean, yeah, close like we made changes to it yesterday.

So and then Doug made a change this morning.

So it just doesn't have like the Ann Arbor and Grand Rapids changes.

And honestly Ann Arbor is what really changes things around so.

So 4.1 lopsided margin what is the mean median? 1.5.

Okay.

What is efficiency.

4.9 big change there.

19-19.

Negative 1.4D.

And then 1.4 republican.

So can you close that out? We don't necessarily have to save it and just run it again for 2016.

So Clinton versus Trump.

Lopsided margin is 3.2 still leaning republican.

Mean median is 3.3.

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.

Leaning republican.

Efficiency 6.2.

Leaning republican.

And seats vote is 17-21.

Negative 5.1 bias, okay.

So we went from a map that looked great.

So 4.5 I wouldn't and shouldn't say that because people online will screen 4.5 republican for the lopsided margin.

And then it had 2.2 republican lean mean median, 3.2 efficiency gap and seats vote ratio of 20-18 with a .3 democratic lean.

When you run it for 2020 it goes from 4.5 lopsided margins down to 4.1.

The mean median goes from 2.2 to 1.5.

The efficiency gap increases from 3.2 to 4.9.

And the seats vote ratio breaks evenly 19-19 which is actually biased against democrats 1.4%.

If you go to 2016, we see even more radical changes.

So it goes I shouldn't say radical that is probably not the right word more changes goes 4.5 all the way to 3.2 lopsided margins so that seems more favorable but the mean median goes 2.2 to 3.3.

In the efficiency gap goes from 3.2 to 6.2.

And then the seats votes switch from 2018 democratic to republican.

To 17 democrat to 21 republican which is a negative 5.1 bias for democrats.

So that is what I'm talking about with the swing.

That when you look at the composite .3D, that is not the whole story.

You kind of got to look deeper.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Does it reflect so 2020 was the election where there were more democrats no excuse me 2020 yeah more democrats and 2016 was more republicans.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: When we looked at the Ann Arbor District like there was a correlation what is the correlation here?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So when you have the original map does not split Ann Arbor. So the version one that I just read to you does not split Ann Arbor and has seats votes ratio of 20-18 with a .03 democratic lean so very small democratic lean.

The version three has a 21-17 seats vote for the composite.

And a 2.9 democratic lean. But when you run it for the 2020 Presidential election the seat vote for 2020 is 20dem, 18 republican and the year where Trump was elected 2016 it shifts 18-20.

And the efficiency gap never goes above 3.5.

So there is less variability in that version 3 map with Ann Arbor being split.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I think to sum it up which is what I think what Commissioner Rothhorn was asking for, before the Ann Arbor changes, when on the Senate maps if you ran the 2016 numbers, republicans won on 17-21 margin was that what it was, 2016.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 2016 for which one?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 2016.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which map?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Version one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Version one 2016 republicans won 21 seats to 17 democratic seats.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Which is the election they won all be it by a very small margin.

In 2020 where the democratic candidate won by a large margin a larger margin than in 2016, they did not win the most seats with version one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was tied 19-19.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Verse once we made the Ann Arbor changes 20-18 flipped based on which party won the most votes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, and then 2016 it flipped again based on which party won the most votes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Does that help answer your question?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The answer is yes but I still have this nagging sort of I know these political numbers can be manipulated, right.

I think we are looking at these because these are the most recent ones and are included in our composite election results and Dr. Handley said use the composite.

The reason we are breaking these two out is because they are more recent and help us understand the composite.

And in a nuanced way.

Is that fair to say? Mr. Adelson? Like we are looking for a nuisances here that is not and the courts will not uphold this so I think what we have to decide is how we are going to make this decision.

Ann Arbor is not, yeah, like we have to understand it.

We will keep Ann Arbor split the way we are or not?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: As we come down to the end of the day and on Friday and the end of the week, yes, I mean I agree.

I think that these decisions are ultimately up to you.

And as you said with the consistency of the composite election results.

That seeing that consistency -- tool are defensible and then deciding which -- how far do you want to go.

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.

Why do you want to stress? What for the Commission as a whole is your answer to the criterion? But all of these just like when we were looking at it it's not the same thing but analog is looking at additional election results.

They may not provide any significant information or insight.

It's just an additional data point that may or may not be helpful.

And that is for you know for you all to determine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: And also, I would just point out you were looking at State Senate plan and if I'm not mistaken the State Senate is up in the gubernatorial elections.

They are up in 18 and 14 but they were not up in 16 and 20.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so unless someone else wants to run something more I think we can close this and let Commissioner Kellom work on the Detroit area she is thinking of and Commissioner Clark if we have time, we will get to you as well.

Commissioner Lange did you have a comment? I see her, yep.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, I just had a real quick and I apologize Commissioner Kellom.

I had a real quick question for John on the statement that he just made about the Senate and the gubernatorial.

So they just did these based off from Presidential elections.

Are you kind of saying that we should be looking at the Governor races when doing this? Or Senate maps?

>> MR. MORGAN: I wasn't saying you should do that.

I was just pointing out that you looked at two elections that were Presidential year and not off year.

There is still you know there is still evaluating election results for the Presidential election race on the map.

You could also do that on other races such as Governor or Attorney General if you wanted to.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Could I ask then and I'm not going to ask for it right now because it's Commissioner Kellom's turn but John at the end could you maybe do that and then present that to me next week? Show me maybe at the beginning of our session if the Commission doesn't mind what the Governor races would have looked like just as a comparison?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we can close this and go back to version three.

You already have it up.

You are so on the ball and already in the Detroit area.

So Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So can we see the matrix for 7 and so we can see the VA P in the area.

>> MR. MORGAN: 17 was Commissioner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 7 was it 17 or 7.

>> MR. MORGAN: She wanted to look at 17 I thought.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: That too but we can look at 7 first.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want the neighborhoods on or not?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: No, I don't think so.

Thank you for asking though, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so 7 or 17 first, you said 7.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 7.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we scroll up on the active matrix so we can see? Thank you.

13.38, 1.3, 2.4.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So what I was thinking.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thinking about moving the Detroit neighborhood out of 7 or something different.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Maybe we can include Algonac or something else that is up there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that would be adding it to 8 or 6?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let me see what the numbers are.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I can't tell you until I see.

>> MR. MORGAN: 8 is under populated and as it stands now 7 is also under populated by a little bit.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay so let's swap it out.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to put the neighborhoods on just for clarity sake.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I appreciate that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are going into 8 right.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, unassigning from 7, moving that portion into 8.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Go ahead John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just for clarity between 8-7 so 8 the population is 2300 over.

And then 7 is 7,000 under.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay let's add that area of either like Algonac or clay I think that is what is up there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Like this area here?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes to 7.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we know what the population is of that before you do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's about 4,000.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: That takes care of 7 but you might have to make adjustment to 25 if you wanted to.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is happening in 25?

>> MR. MORGAN: You need more population.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: You might look at 7 or 2 are adjacent.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I would take, Brittini I would suggest taking New Haven, which is in 7, move it to 2 and then move something out of 2 over to 25 to take care of.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Richmond maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Two is down in population as well though, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, but if you do what you just suggested, so take new haven and then pull Richmond whichever way it needs to go does that work?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: John, we can try that. Let's use new haven.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the problem is if you put new haven into two and take Lenox out of two then this will be an orphan.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: It was just your word choice that made me giggle.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is fine.

It was meant to be a little funny.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You can also move new haven if you move Lenox to 25.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is the population of two?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is the problem it's negative but it's only 1.9%.

>> MR. MORGAN: Other areas over here you have 16 or 18 that have a little surplus. So if you're looking for additional population there are 18 and 16 are over. Or five I think is not under by very much.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: 18 and 16 are over?

>> MR. MORGAN: By just a little bit, yeah.

So if you wanted to fix 25 first then 2 would be off and then you could look at resolving 2.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay can we try that then?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that would mean putting Lenox into 25, I think.

Does that sound right?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, I'm only hesitating because I don't know that area of Michigan but we can try it and if it doesn't work then it doesn't work.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like it took the portion of new haven as well.

And now District two is off by 11,000, 25 is on the money 7 is under 2.5%.

So again if you wanted to you would have 16 or 18 are surplus and you already have some splits in Oakland Township and the Township north of Waterford.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Maybe let's shave a little off the top of 16 and put that into 2.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say that is what we did earlier.

We are reversing what we did earlier.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: If someone has another suggestion.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's not reversing it would be taking a little more.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Continuing.

>> MR. MORGAN: Or if you wanted to take a piece of independence which is already split.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I consider taking all of Oakland Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would be too much wouldn't it be?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: How much, yeah, because I don't know.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: So then let's go to independence.

Let's go up -- let's get out of that and you said it's already.

>> MR. MORGAN: You look at this area over here if you wanted to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellum earlier Commissioner Clark was trying to bring in more of 16 up into 2 so that might be a good place to be too.

I think that is what they are saying.

>> MR. MORGAN: You could also do a bit of both if you wanted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do a bit of both.

>> MR. MORGAN: Because 18 and 16 is over and 2 is under by 11,000.

So you need to.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Okay yeah let's try to pick from both sides if we can then.

Let's try that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Let's start with 16,000.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I was just undoing that.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: You are fine.

>> MR. MORGAN: That one was, okay?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLUM: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Put that one in.

And that will adjust the numbers a little bit.

So Chair it's 8500 and take one more from 18 you will probably be where you want to be is that okay.

>> Can we take more from 16.

>> MR. MORGAN: You could.

>> That little odd shape.

>> MR. MORGAN: I think you got what you needed.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The other District I wanted to look at is District 17.

And I was thinking Commissioners of adding a little of Melvindale into 19.

To increase some of our metrics in the Metro Detroit area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which metrics.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are you trying to increase?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The BVAP.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: In 19?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So by dropping 17 down a little, I think we could get even better metrics in the Metro Detroit area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So.

>> MR. MORGAN: You mean taking the deviation lower? By taking out some of Melvindale and putting it in 19?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think that is what I'm saying.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, yeah, can we get the Hispanic thematic dots put up?

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just looking at the non-Hispanic Black voting age population for District 14, did that skyrocket now in the mid-40s somehow magically.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think it was like that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So 19 is currently 24% and 17 is a tad shy but that is also the primary Hispanic District we were trying to get the Latino community.

So I'm sorry John can you bring up the Hispanic thematic for me? And the red are the neighborhood lines is that correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What map is this the Senate?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: We are still in Senate Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay I had to step away for a few minutes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm happy to tell you where we are.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry can you let us know where you are attending remotely from.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Same old place Detroit.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I need to move.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Commissioner Kellom you are suggesting moving 17 further south in order to increase the BVAP and to make up for that population including Melvindale and part of Melvindale in 19 is that what you're trying to do?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Trying to increase the BVAP in 17, is that right? Am I understanding that correctly.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

If you pull part of Taylor sure you can.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want me to move some of the population in Melvindale or somewhere else or are we waiting for other discussion?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I'm sorry John what were you asking me.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want me to move population from Melvindale into 19 or are we waiting for other discussion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that moving Hispanic there is an area of Allen Park that doesn't have a high Hispanic population right where the name is and maybe that would be a better choice so you are not pulling Hispanic population out but you are reducing and changing the balance with that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Kellom do you want me to try this then look at the numbers?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah, we can do that.

And if they are not what we are hoping for, we can try Allen Park.

But my initial thought was Melvindale.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Question for you Brittini, what is the objective of the changes?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: So it's kind of in line with what myself and Commissioner Curry were doing earlier.

Or yesterday.

Just to make sure that there is a communal voice and folks can be represented in the way that they choose.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Before you make that change that Commissioner Kellom wants can you click on the dot that at the very bottom of District 19, so we can see the Hispanic percentage there, the 1922? Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I did not write that down before we switched it.

>> MR. MORGAN: I took three precincts out and that seemed to be quite a bit of population.

Do you want me to take one of those back?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Say it again.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure so I took three precincts out and then that makes 17, 4% under so shall I undo the last one?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: That leaves 17 negative 2.9.

Do you want me to take back another one of those or? Or trade.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Or do what?

>> MR. MORGAN: Or do you want to exchange population like go ahead and do that then take something in to 17 somewhere else to balance it.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Pull 13 from 17 so yeah you can do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: From 13 or 8.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Uh-huh.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, 13 is slightly under populated.

8 is -- sorry 8 is overpopulated by 2300.

13 is under populated by 2400.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't think we want to mess with 8.

I think we worked really hard to get that just right, didn't we? So maybe back to 19 because I think 19 is over a little.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If there is a way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not thrilled with pulling Melvindale out of 17 just because we received so many public comments from the Hispanic community about keeping Melvindale Lincoln Park with southwest Detroit as a community of interest. And so I feel like there is other places to look to balance that don't require us dipping into that population.

That is just my thought.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay that is fair Chair Szetela.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Kellom if you are looking at taking population from a different District you have 8 and 13 next door.

So put Melvindale back the way it was?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay that is fair.

We can do that and then let's look at pulling from one of those other two districts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I'm just trying to understand again so you are trying to increase the BVAP in 17, right? Am I understanding that correctly?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And just over all this is a part of me trying to continue to tweak to make Detroit the Metro Detroit better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm just wondering if you considered looking at like putting part of Taylor up into Dearborn.

Allen Park I mentioned before.

Because then you are not like I said diving into that Hispanic community.

And you are taking white people away so to speak.

>> MR. MORGAN: Or you were looking at the data of 13.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Where is the Hispanic community.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All those dots.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: The big orange dots you see Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is three blocks from my house.

I don't see them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Don't take in the wrong way but don't let perfect get in the way of good.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay just to be quite frank we spent a lot of time really digging into areas.

And I know that this is taking some time but I want to make sure Metro Detroit and Detroit is honored in the same way we hammered at way for instance at Cascade or however long, okay? So I want us to just make you know not perfect but the best that we can do.

So in the essence of time because I know Commissioner Clark had something as well, we can reverse all the switches that I was thinking about and move on to him.

Because I'm still a team player.

But I do just want to be honest to say that I was still concerned about what I was seeing and wanted to make the changes.

The one I made in 7 makes me happier and not just about being a Detroiter and listening so I just wanted to elevate those concerns so that we are thinking about them.

That's all.

But I did not take the wrong way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would encourage you to finish what you are doing because there are other areas, I'm saying I don't want to split the Latino community.

There are other areas you can look to that I think will accomplish what you want to accomplish without doing that.

So why do it.

But I would certainly encourage you to finish doing what you are doing.

You have waited patiently for your turn.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This doesn't just have to be me so if there are other ways of doing it let's talk it out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid and Mr. Morgan has a comment.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I see what you're trying to do.

You could go pull in more of Taylor into 19.

However, we also don't want to dilute the Arab American votes if we do that, we will have to look at those election results to make sure it does not change too much from where it's at now.

You know I understand the Melvindale preference and I like it where it is.

But if we had to move something if we moved that, there are Arab Americans there too.

So you know, it's just which community do we.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you think about Allen Park.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Allen Park would work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have part of Allen Park in with 19 and we received public comments from if you remember in Dearborn a long, long time ago, in a Galaxy far away, from a group of teachers who were specifically asking us to include Melvindale and Allen Park in Dearborn.

So just.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would agree with that.

I've been talking about adding Melvindale in particular to 19 for a while now.

But it doesn't really matter to me.

We have to check election results after and should probably check them now and compare them to after and make sure we are not diluting that election group too much because we don't have the thematic dots on here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: To Commissioner Kellom's concerns if you were to look at District 8 or 13 you could probably move a little bit of African/American population from either of those districts into 17.

Without really affecting the balance of those districts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 8 is 42%.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Probably 5 too but that is higher up. For the sake of me you can put the neighborhood labels.

That is going to get crazy but I think 13 is right there so I can pull some of 13 into 17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is the VBAP on 13 can we see that Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: You want to look at 13.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just the BVAP numbers because they were not showing up.

So 41.02.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, so 8 is 42.09 non-Hispanic Black. And then 13 is 41.02.

And this is the border of 13 and 17. So you do have the Grand River neighborhood that was split if that is of interest.

Or in District 8 there is Woodbridge and some other areas on the border of 17.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Woodbridge should stay with the whole Wayne state area.

That is a very tight community.

And the Wayne state police responds in 30 seconds in that area.

So just let that be over there.

Maybe Dexter and Finkle into 17.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

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

Commissioner Curry if you have any thoughts, I welcome them and any other Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree with what you said about Woodbridge Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yeah.

How are we now? My computer has a delay I noticed so I don't want to assume.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 17 non-Hispanic Black is 34.5. Hispanic is 17.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is that area was that Dexter and Schoolcraft that was right next door if you go south a little.

>> MR. MORGAN: Davidson Schoolcraft.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: That would take the African/American percentage to 34.7.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: What is that little jig saw?

>> MR. MORGAN: That area.

Do you want the northwest community? Because the neighborhood is split here.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Commissioner Curry do you know much about the northwest community? I would say don't split it if you don't have to.

>> MR. MORGAN: So add it in to 17.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I just don't know enough about that specific area over there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I know a lot about Melvindale, southwest Detroit, River Rouge.

Lincoln Park.

Ecorse.

Northwest.

Detroit.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: This specific area northwest community where he is hovering right here.

Can you Zoom in and maybe give me some streets, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure.

Okay so it's just north of the Interstate here.

Schoolcraft Street, Davidson Street are the cross streets.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think that is fine.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Schoolcraft and David son should be somewhat together.

>> MR. MORGAN: Black voting age population has gone up to 35% now.

There is one neighborhood here that split Pilgrim village if you were to just take these portions out it would help you on the deviation a little bit for 13.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes, John that is what I was going to suggest.

So can you please unassign those areas?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure.

To clarify that brings deviation of 13 under 2.5% so that was positive in that direction and brought the African/American population percentage up to 35 now in District 17.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right can we save, please?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And then Commissioner Kellom I think we are out of time for today.

So we can come back to this on Monday if you want to make more changes.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Okay I'm fine for right now.

My apologies Commissioner Clark.

I'm sorry, not sorry.

But, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Nothing to apologize for.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No problem.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I do have a question.

Are we uploading these maps on to the portal as we have been doing? Or.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yesterday we kind of ended with a technical glitch so we did not.

But if you like I would say that there are two plans from today or three if you want to include the abandon plan.

Okay so we would upload version one and three, I think.

If you like.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is three, right, I see the 4:00 p.m.

Yes, if you could do that, that would be helpful for everybody because I'm sure members of the public will want to look at it Commissioner Orton then Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it's confusing if we upload things we moved on from.

So just the one and while we are working on it it's still kind of confusing but.

>> MR. MORGAN: I guess the version one was before the Ann Arbor changes and I think there was some interest in preserving that.

So that reflected what you did in the morning.

But before the changes if you like I can upload both of those.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Latest, I don't know about greatest but.

Okay, Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If Commissioner Kellom is satisfied with those satisfied before we adjourn can we just run the numbers real quick and see if they changed them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Partisan fairness, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I doubt they changed very much.

But just to make sure.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay you want the partisan fairness for this with all of the changes that we made today.

Okay these are the numbers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 3.3.

6.2, not good changes.

Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That changed a lot, yeah.

Is this the right one? Are we looking at the right thing.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will double check.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I feel like that is the 2016 old map.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'll run it again.

And.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The version one map but who knows.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think you have to click on partisan fairness.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Partisan fairness, there you go.

I've done this too many times.

>> MR. MORGAN: There may be an issue it's going to run the same report under the same name.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

You got to close the other one.

4.6.

Lopsided margin.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Increase from 3.4.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> MR. MORGAN: I can tell you what happened if you want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is all right.

We don't need to know.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So with the mean median.

1.2.

Okay.

1.2.

The old one what was it, 1.1.

Efficiency is 3.4.

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: It was .6.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And the seats votes, yep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It was 2.9.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And if we, yeah, so if you look at District 7, the changes of taking out Detroit flipped District 7 to a republican District which is what the change is coming from.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you took less of the area on the Algoma or whatever it is it would change it back and change all your metrics.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: For what it's worth 7 is like 49, 50 like yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Reverse that and make it 50-49 and the metrics.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was 51.1 before.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do we think? Those changes seemed to make the numbers worse.

Do we maybe want to keep the Detroit change that was made in 13 and 7 but revert the changes made in District 7 or what does everyone think?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's come back on Monday and talk about it then because we are over time at this point.

All right, that concludes our deliberations for today.

We don't have any minutes to approve I don't believe.

And no staff reports.

Correspondence received in advance of the meeting is included in the Commissioner's meeting materials.

Future agenda items.

Announcements.

As items on the agenda are completed a motion to adjourn is in order motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett is there any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed say nay.

The motion carries and the meeting is adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Thank you.