

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

10/06/21 9:00 am Meeting

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission, we will bring the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 9:04 a.m.

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

For anyone in the public watching who would prefer to watch via a different platform than they are currently using, please visit our social media at Redistricting MI to find the link for viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at Redistricting@Michigan.Gov 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: Good morning, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

Rhonda Lange?

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE:
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Cynthia Orton?

- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Charlotte,

Michigan.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 9 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. As a reminder to the public watching you can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved. Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Lett. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Seeing none we will now vote all in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed please raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

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

Individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. Please step to the nearest microphone when I call your number. You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is number one.

>> Good morning. Sarah Howard on behalf of the fair maps project. We applaud Commissioners doing their own maps for the public hearings. A range of maps should

be presented all with 0 gap on partisan fairness, that is what the Michigan Constitution requires.

We thank Commissioner Rothhorn for reminding everyone that the party with the most votes should win the most seats. And thank you for Ms. Pastula for confirming that. But the Commission's maps so far don't do that. And it does not matter the word 0% efficiency gap are not mentioned in your constitutional mandate. The plain language dictionary definition of disproportionate advantage is out of proportion. More than 0% efficiency gap is out of proportion.

Just because your maps are currently a slight improvement over the old gerrymander and validated by the Federal Court does not equal success. Commission maps currently still give republicans an unconstitutional disproportionate advantage.

As you edit the State House map for partisan fairness, it's literally impossible to accommodate every community of interest. And you can Constitutionally require and prioritize communities of interest that help achieve 0% gap.

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

>> Good morning. Good morning, Hernandez, resident, born and raised here in the City of Lansing.

Also here with the labor Council for American advancement.

I am just here to voice that we do consider partisan fairness in this process.

That we think about what this means for communities of color. And also think about what this means to our democracy in terms of, you know, the whole process of mapping and letting politicians choose who votes for them versus letting the community and the people choose who they elect in office and that represents who they are and their best interests and their communities.

So I truly have faith that this Commission will do the right thing and use that moving forward and keep that in mind, that you know we are here to be a solution and for the community's face.

Thank you.

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

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Lashaun and I want to thank you all for the hard work you are doing. I'm here for one purpose to speak on the poor people's campaign and the people who are being disenfranchised by being put into one Senate District from Lansing into East Lansing.

So what we are asking, plain and simple, is that Lansing be kept whole in one Senate District. That is why I'm here.

I'm here because Black and Brown people have been put into the or in the precincts that have been lumped in with East Lansing and Meridian Township. And we know that when you look at Shiawassee County and Clinton County, those peoples voices will be

outnumbered and unheard. So we are asking you over and over again, please keep Lansing in one Senate District.

Please keep Lansing in one Senate District.

And I'm going to use my last 16 seconds to say thank you very much for keeping Lansing in one Senate District.

I thank you for your time.

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

>> Good morning. My name is Lorenzo of Lansing, Michigan. Democracy as we know it is at stake in this country.

The entire purpose of this Commission is to ensure every voting citizen of Michigan given the opportunity to exercise their constitutional right to vote, but also to vote for a person who interest and ideals and also who believe in democracy.

Redesigning the voting Districts in Michigan are to level the playing field so that one party, we know who that is, cannot create districts that favor them and eventually control policy and funding for somebody like me.

The goal of this committee is to make sure that democracy is the goal and to make sure that gerrymandering is a thing of the past, it can never be done again in Michigan.

And Michigan can be the model for the United States.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. I just want to note for the public record that Commissioner Eid has arrived.

We are now moving on to number five.

>> Good morning. My name is Maria. I'm the chapter president for labor council advancement here in the Greater Lansing area.

Our concern is we are always out in our communities trying to educate our families and friends about issues that go on in this City.

And dividing the City that doesn't help our families here is going to hurt many people.

And we also feel that by you redistricting trying to keep us together in one spot because there's other opportunities that our neighborhoods like East Lansing, Dewitt or even as far as Charlotte, maybe not Charlotte is way out there. But we always give them information and they could use. And so I'm asking to try to have this in a good, constitutional way, that the redistricting, everybody is going to have a chance and opportunity to get information and learn more what's going on in our Lansing area.

Thank you.

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

>> Good morning, all.

My name is Maria. And I represent -- today I'm representing local 600 which has 13,000 members throughout the State of Michigan.

Now, we are looking at this and hoping that you stayed right on target being fair and making sure that we are all represented.

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

I also would like to say the same thing that both my sisters back here have mentioned and that is to keep Lansing where it's supposed to be in Lansing and not spread out into other areas.

We need to make sure that people that are heard and most of us the three people that have spoke before are interested in doing that.

My interest also is again to serve those 13,000 members that we have in the State of Michigan.

We want to make sure that this particular Commission stays on target and does not gerrymander our votes.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Was that our last one? Okay, thank you, Yvonne.

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

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

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

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

First in line to speak is Mr. James Gallant.

Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Hello, James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions. In Court we will be using the Black's Law Dictionary, not some plain that you will make up some things and use Black's Law Dictionary. And Open Meetings Acts requires reasonable public comment. And for the elderly people and the people that are trying to get along, this is not reasonable.

And Sarah Reinhardt has been repeatedly and wrongfully identified as the secretary of the MICRC.

And apparently now Yvonne is the secretary today.

And yesterday Sarah Reinhardt testified that it appears that we...she is suggesting we are in the first phase of deliberations. And then she tried to back that up a little bit like oh, well, maybe, maybe not. And she didn't really understand.

So could you please explain to us are we in this deliberation yet? You know, there is no motion. They are not even your newly formed motion to discuss, which is actually straw polling in disguise.

Now please remember, Commissioners, that you can only hide behind your staff and attorneys for so long.

In the Supreme Court, they can't understand this stuff for you.

So if you don't understand what is going on here, you're going to have to explain.

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

>> If you plead the fifth you...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anthony Skinnell.

>> Okay. Good morning, Commission.

Thank you.

You know, I first off just want to say with the amount of time you people waste you should give the public our full two minutes or not have taken away at least the second period and give us a minute and a half. Because, gosh, you people waste a lot of time. When the maps were first drawn, I didn't know if it was State Senate or U.S. Congress and took 15, 20 minutes to find Woodward Avenue. And grant it no Commissioner from Metro Detroit was present at that meeting, but it took 20 minutes to find Woodward when you were drawing the maps. And the amount of time you waste you should give us the full minute.

Moving on, I'd love to talk about how much I dislike democrat and republican parties. I think they are criminal racketeering organizations. But your ineffectual, inefficient process has left me with an issue. You disfigured my community and ignored my comments, similar comments along the lines from people from Ecorse and Trenton. So, like I said you disfigured, my community. You denigrated it. And you disassociated it in your Congress maps. And your inefficient process left only one option for us to even consider, and it's a poor option.

Number one.

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

Next in line is Judy, I always get this wrong.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Chris McLonis.

>> Good morning. Thank you for your patience. And I will start my video.

Some folks have spoken about the idea of partisan fairness. And I think a lot of redrawing needs to be done.

Part of the issue from what I've been told is that you all start out in the densely populated areas and then fan out.

And that made it more difficult the further out you went to be able to create Districts that are actually not or equal between democrats and republicans.

So that's one thing you may want to readdress that.

Also, if you're interested in looking at particular maps the one by the AFLCIO is very good.

It goes way beyond what you have all done already.

Essentially, we don't want a map that is almost a carbon copy of what we already had.

So please go back to the drawing board as much as you can.

In order to give us a map that will really make great changes for the next.

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

>> Good morning. I just want to say thank you to the Commissioners for all the hard work that they put in and the time they are spending listening to public comments.

Today I want to address specifically map 187.

As an individual who runs a company in Grand Haven, I'm in a unique position to see the benefit of keeping Ottawa and Muskegon County connected.

Our employee population where we do business, we span both communities and we see the benefit of keeping Muskegon Ottawa County interconnected.

And we see the map 187 achieves this.

And want to lend our support and say thank you for the work that was put in on this map.

Again, the lakeshore is a very special place and see the importance of keeping the lakeshore as an interconnected community at the Federal level.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Al-Owski.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

Thank you for your efforts and working towards fair representation.

And I'm concerned that your most recent partisan fairness review showed that the Senate map favors republicans by 7%, in the house map by 9%.

The residents of sparsely populated land still hold the advantage in the proposed mapping.

The advantage is retained and hardens the divisions between rural and urban residents.

We all live under the same sky. We all need clean water.

I realize you have undertaken a difficult process with significant priorities. And I respectfully ask you take this into consideration.

Thank you.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just saw your message.

Judy has joined so let's go back to number three, Judy.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, good morning, thank you all for the very hard work that you're doing.

I would ask that you -- I've seen many comments online but I have not heard discussion during the meetings and perhaps you discuss it otherwise, but the maps as a whole are something that you need to consider.

As Dr. Handley pointed out the way it's currently drawn, the efficiency gap is still too big. Democrats would have been 52% of the votes but 40%, 7% of the seats resulting in a 2018 republican majority.

The goal is supposed to be 0 because the reason the whole project was undertaken was because the party that was getting more votes was consistently underrepresented in the house and the Senate.

The Congressional districts are a little better.

Please look at the map as a whole and consider the partisan fairness when you're doing your most difficult job.

And I watch daily and I realize that it is you have a lot of things to consider.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. All right. At this point we will go back to Barb-lovan.

>> Okay, am I here yet?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, you are.

>> Okay, thank you.

I've been very optimistic about the Commission.

It's a huge undertaking doing this important work.

And I've been like I say very optimistic and excited about it until hearing there is a possibility of Livonia being divided into at least three segments.

All this is going to do in my mind is make it more confusing to the public.

It already -- we already know there is apathy anywhere you go.

And I think to add one more hurdle is just going to keep more people from voting.

And I don't like that there is an increase -- there is 7-9% more republicans in this area.

It really gives priority to the republican party and vote.

And that.

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

>> Okay, am I here?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> All right. Thank you, guys, appreciate the one minute here.

I live in Senate District 24, halfway to Eaton Rapids, six miles from anywhere.

And the current Senate map that puts my rural area in with Lansing seems pretty perplexing to me.

Lansing and East Lansing have been quote a community of interest for 150 years.

They are urban and adjacent, have shared utilities and shared transit. And somehow there's a line drawn right in the middle now that separates those and throws people like me with a completely different culture and community, it just seems inappropriate to me.

And I think someone told me yesterday that you guys had that same discussion about Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and decided or at least or are thinking about keeping them together.

So I just would appeal to you to do the right thing there and keep those communities of interest as communities of interest and not try to stick my community in with a community that doesn't have a lot in common.

So thank you for your time.

And I pray.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Katherine Schmidt.

>> Good morning. Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I would like to draw the Commission's attention to Article 4 Section 6 subsection 13 of the Michigan Constitution.

And in that Section, it addresses this issue of political fairness that so many people have been speaking to this morning. It defines a community of interest as something that may include things like shared cultural or historic characteristics or economic interests. And it says communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties.

In other words, when we think of fairness, we need to frame the conversation in a manner that makes sure that everyone, regardless of their political values or moral values or anything else has an equal voice.

What our Constitution places the emphasis on is the geographic location, that cultural, historic heritage and economics.

Those things are very important.

And rural communities have very different economic values.

Very different culture than urban communities do.

As you refine the Senate and Congressional.

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

>> Good morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning.

>> Thank you very much for taking public comment and for the work you are doing for the people of Michigan.

I come to you to ask that we keep Flint whole in the drawing of the maps for the State House.

Flint has experienced as a City a disenfranchisement with the emergency finance manager law and suffered greatly because of that.

Flint needs a dedicated voice in Lansing that knows what's going on in the City, is of the City and can fully represent everyone there.

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

I ask also that as you move forward you do consider partisan fairness as a way to promote legislative common ground and compromise.

And reject legislative extremism.

Thank you very much.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: She is number 12.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> Good morning.

I'm happy -- can you hear me?

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

>> Okay. I'm happy to see the Congressional District that includes the City of Midland with the Tri-Cities in Flint.

Similar to the proposed state District that's been drawn, State Senate District sorry. These communities are connected in so many countless ways and economically culturally and strong familial ties and share the I-75 corridor and makeup the Great Lakes region.

The proposed Tri-City Flint Congressional District creates a District that is close to 0 political bias giving voters a chance to choose politicians fairly instead of the other way around.

Thank you for your hard work and having the districts being drawn in the open with public scrutiny is enormous and vital undertaking and thank you so much.

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

>> Thank you for allowing me to speak. And yesterday I found yesterday's conversation of deliberation is disappointing. Time and again residents of Ottawa County define and detail how Ottawa County itself is a community of interest. Map 187 establishes a clear lakeshore District that keeps Ottawa County whole. And arguments that try to separate Ottawa County are not based on reality. And maps that divide Georgetown township along Cottonwood Drive directly divide a community for no reason. Maps try to reach out and draw Grand Rapids and Muskegon are dividing Ottawa County for a manufacturing community of interest. How can Georgetown Township in Ottawa County consider themselves part of the lakeshore not be, according to these maps, and maps drawn with Kalamazoo and lakeshore communities.

This is nonsensical.

Kalamazoo is not a lakeshore community. Ottawa County and Muskegon County have much more in common than Muskegon and Grand Rapids.

As you continue to deliberate, please keep Ottawa County whole.

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

>> Number 14.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> I just wanted to say a big thank you to the Commission for including the City of Midland in a Congressional District along with Bay City, Saginaw and Flint. These cities are a core of Mid-Michigan and a community of interest. Midland, I'm happy that Midland will finally be included in an area that makes economic and geographic sense. Please continue to look at partisan bias when tweaking maps. And thanks for the Commission for all the hard work they are doing. Have a good day.

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

>> Good morning. I'm Clare Ott. Thank you for your work.

I know yesterday you were working on ways that you could make the draft State House map more fair.

I've lived in Battle Creek area for 45 years and only recently moved to Kalamazoo.

It seems like Kalamazoo voters are packed into a couple of districts, not giving us a proper chance for fair representation in Lansing.

And I believe the Kalamazoo and Battle Creek area is somewhere you could take a look to achieve the State House fairness you and the people of Michigan, we the people are looking for.

Thank you for your endless work on this critical project.

Claire.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Mary Murphy number 16.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did I skip Clare-Ott? Benjamin Ratner, number 17.

>> Can you hear me?

I'm Ben Ratner. I grew up in Ann Arbor. I graduated from Engle Elementary School, Cabin Middle School and Huron High School. And although I now live in Detroit, my family still lives in Ann Arbor and I take pride calling myself a County.

I feel compelled to speak today because I volunteered my time to advocate for this Commission and proudly voted for it back in 2018.

I believe strongly that everyday people are smart enough to make these decisions and draw maps that are fair.

My recommendation to the Commission today is simple.

To avoid packing together Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti both of which contain substantial communities of color and have distinct identities, please reconsider your drawing of State Senate District 27 as it currently stands.

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

There are better ways to draw the District in the region of the state to strengthen the overall map and crucially avoid packing more than 95,000 people of color into a single District.

Thank you for your time and hard work.

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

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

>> I have.

Can you hear me now?

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

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

Muskegon County is a lakeshore community.

The City of Muskegon is a coastal community.

It even has cruise ships that dock here, bringing passengers from Canada and visitors across the globe to our shops and restaurants.

Muskegon County itself has shared economic interests with communities along the lakeshore such as Grand Haven and Holland and Ottawa County.

Map 187 is representative of the Muskegon community as a whole.

And protects the lakeshore.

Please keep the lakeshore together.

It's a community of similar interests.

Please enact map 187, District 9.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Jennifer Austin.

>> Sorry, I'm trying to start my camera but there we go can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Jennifer Austin from the City of Midland. I would like to thank the Commission for placing the City of Midland with Tri-Cities in Flint and Congressional District 11, in maps 200, 201 and 202 on the portal. I hope the Commission will keep Midland, Bay City, Saginaw and Flint in a Congressional District. These cities each have a population between 33,000 and 96,000. And Midland is not the smallest of these cities.

We all have an industrial based economy that supports small business and service industries surrounding them. No other cities north of Midland compare in size until you reach the UP. Even Mount Pleasant to the west of us is smaller by 17,000. We are urban suburban area and should have the representation that reflects that. I also ask that you continue to assess partisan fairness and create a map that is as close to 0 political bias as possible. And we deserve a map that allows the voters to select the

representatives rather than map up the map choosing our representatives for us. I would also like to thank all of you for all of the hard work you are doing and everything that you put up with in some of the hearings.

I really appreciate it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Thank you for addressing the Commission. Percy Johnson.

>> Percy.

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

>> We put you guys in place with this proposal with people not politicians.

So please continue to make this about people and not politicians.

Draw the maps up so it's an equal balance.

And it's so important that you guys remember to stay focused on making this about the people and not the politicians, keep the community balanced as much as possible.

Gary, I want to thank you for asking me to listen to Troy and other parts because it sounds like this is what you are trying to do to balance it out so we have it's not partisan favor.

So please and please go back to at least a minute and a half or two minutes.

We got people rushing, trying to get their point across and you got to remember to keep this about the people and not the politicians.

Give the people a chance to speak.

And consider looking at the AFLCIO map.

I know AFLCIO has a strong.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Number 22 and 23 are not currently present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Caroline Ross?

>> Caroline.

Good, morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning.

>> This is one reason why we need better Internet in the state.

My name is Caroline Ross. I'm from St. Louis, Gratiot County. I'm a member of UAW Local 6,000, State of Michigan employees. And active in the UAW cap and am the current statewide Chair of UAW State of Michigan retired workers.

We represent approximately 20,000 active and retired union members in all 83 Counties.

The goal of this Commission is to develop districts to provide partisan fairness.

It's imperative the current boundaries be corrected to allow the Michigan citizens fair representation and to ensure equal voting power.

It's been said Michigan is a leaning democrat state.

And yet our maps lean republican.

That to me is a disproportionate advantage.

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 imperative the current boundaries be corrected to allow fair representation and equal voting power.

In solidarity, I thank you for your time and your efforts.

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

Marlin.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have Lisa DiRado.

>> Good morning.

I'm Lisa DiRado from Northville, Michigan.

I ask you to draw fair districts.

The maps you have drawn so far clearly favor republicans across the board.

A 5.6% republican drawn Senate map isn't good enough.

You must do better.

You can't stop after the first three requirements of the Constitution.

You must push forward and aim for maps with 0 political bias too.

I know it's hard.

Consider using one of the maps submitted by citizens.

Some of those perform better.

Fair districts help both parties by minimizing the election of extremists and safe districts.

Michigan has seen a rise in extremist after ten years of gerrymandering.

Stop the cycle now.

Draw fair districts.

It's good for republicans and democrats.

It's good for Michigan.

Most importantly it's imperative for our democracy.

Thank you.

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

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> Sorry. Thank you for this opportunity to address the Commission. And thank you for your hard work.

I'm the Vice Chair of the second Congressional District of the democratic party in Muskegon.

In recent years the people of Michigan have voted statewide for the democratic party in very substantial numbers.

Having elected two democratic U.S. Senators for the last 21 years and since 2003 a democrat has held the Governor's seat for the majority of terms.

In 2018 they resoundingly elected a democratic Governor, Attorney General and Secretary of State.

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.

However, we are virtually unable to elect majorities to our State Houses and State Senate seats due to gerrymandering.

It's incumbent on the Michigan citizens Redistricting Commission to give democrats a fair chance to be elected at the state level, to represent democrats in the legislature. From what I understand and from what I can tell the most recent draft.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 28. Kate Shishkovsky.

>> I'm from Livonia and I would like to thank the Commission for all their hard work it's been doing.

But I'd like to point out again that Livonia, which is a City of less than 95,000 people, is drawn into three districts.

This puts an undue burden on the mayor, having to coordinate with various people from the house.

It promotes an undue burden on the clerk that has to make sure everybody gets the ballot they are entitled to.

And it also promotes confusion among the citizens of Livonia.

I would also like to point out that partisan fairness is has got to be an overriding principle to draw these maps.

After all that was the whole purpose of this ballot effort.

Livonia is a purple City.

Republicans and democrats like 50% each.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Donna Davidson number 29.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. We will move on to number 30, Don Wilkinson.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission.

I would like to point out that Ottawa County is a very unique community.

Communities along the lakeshore have a lot in common and several of the same concerns. We are a strong agricultural community and major manufacturing area and we are a large recreational area.

Grand Haven, Hudsonville, Georgetown and Holland and other communities all identify as lakeshore communities.

Map 187 accurately reflects this lakeshore community and should be kept whole by spanning all of Ottawa County and spanning from Muskegon County to Berrien County. District 9 and map 187 meets these standards sets forth by this Commission. Most importantly this represents a real community.

Maps designed to connect Grand Rapids to Muskegon or Holland and Kalamazoo do not represent communities with similar interests.

As the Commission moves forward, I ask the Commission to keep Ottawa County together.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Let's see we are at 31, Roberta or Bonnie.

>> Good morning my name is Roberta Urbani, a resident of Gross Isle, Michigan. We consider ourselves to be part of the broader Down River community of interest from River Rouge through Gibraltar. I'm also concerned about partisanship and the districts. Past gerrymandering resulted in crazy shapes to pack or crack neighborhoods to achieve partisan advantage.

That was raised by Voters Not Politicians as we work to pass proposal two.

However it may take drawing irregular shapes to achieve fair districts. So please do not feel compelled to stick to rectangles if irregular shapes result in fair districts.

Do not let disingenuous complaints about irregular shapes deter you.

Thank you for your hard work in this very challenging effort. And we look forward to seeing fair District maps. Thank you.

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

>> Good morning. Thank you to the Commission for your hard. Work my name is Yvette McElroy, a lifelong Detroit. And I'm here to talk about the Voting Rights Act and the proposed maps for one Congressional District and 0 Senate districts one or two of the House Districts do not support fairly the Voting Rights Act and provides no opportunity for the majority minority districts that we need to ensure that our communities are having the opportunity to vote for people that look like them and have the similar interests.

So what I'm asking is that we make sure that we are considering what we currently have in two Congressional districts and ten House Districts that have a majority and we need to have the maps drawn so we have a 50% majority in each of the districts that are drawn.

So Black people will be fairly represented.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 33, I believe.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay what about 34? 34 is good.

Adele.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Adel, a resident of Dearborn. And, again, for full disclosure, I'm a Dearborn school board member.

I'd like to first thank you for your service.

I spoke last time about gerrymandering and Hamtramck. And today I'm talking about Dearborn, my City.

First, the State House is now divided into two districts.
East of Dearborn, Greenfield lumped with Detroit and road area.
It makes total sense for this District, District 3 to end at Tireman and take Melvindale that aligns with East Dearborn in terms of population makeup. East Dearborn and Melvindale are definitely community of interest.
For the Congressional District Melvindale and neighborhoods or Dearborn from Detroit need to be added to District 2.
These areas have more in common with Dearborn than any other neighborhoods. They are heavily populated with Arab Americans. It would make total sense. And Romulus and Taylor need to be moved to Down River. And that makes sense as well.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We are on to number 35, Scott Holiday.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay 36, Chris Andrews.

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, thank you. Good morning.

Proposal two lays out a set of core values. Two big ones are community interest and fair maps.

Your job is to draw maps that honor these core values and you have to balance them. Perhaps communities of interest are twice as important as fairness.

Regardless they must both be reflected in your maps.

On Monday you made an intentional decision to give no value to partisan fairness in the Senate maps despite significant quantifiable unfair partisan advantage.

The Ann Arbor, Ypsilanti District is a classic packing of democratic voters in the Senate. 80% of the votes go to democrats.

You can unpack them and create a fairer map.

Ann Arbor community of interest makes sense for a Congressional District.

It does not make sense when it contributes to and locks in unfair maps.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Dr. I'm sorry, Reverend Doctor Steve Bland Junior.

>> Can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay. Thank you very much.

It is my joy to be able to greet each of you today and thank you for taking my opportunity for public comment.

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

I'm Reverend Steve Bland Junior and Senior Pastor of the Temple Baptist church and wish to speak to many people in Wayne County and poor and the right to vote is not about partisanship.

Central to a democracy is to protect the voice of citizens through voting.

This is about who is committed and who is impeded from that right to vote so I'm encouraging you to draw districts that protect the most disenfranchised people protected through the Voting Rights Act and wish we could encourage you for 50% of African/American particularly in those districts that are Central to our voting block so we might have fair representation and our voice on a much needed issues that will face our people.

We don't need additional hurdles.

We need better access. Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We are on to 38, Emily-Rohrbach.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Emily and I'm a City Council member in the City of Madison Heights.

Looking at all the proposed maps, I see a few glaring issues one is cities and City boundaries are carved up and broken apart all over the place and tied into Districts that have no shared resources no shared community ties and nothing that holds them together other than the number of people who live there.

Number two I look at Oakland County in particular and it's clear to me Madison Heights and Hazel Park are after thoughts and carved up to where they needed people and school and resources and community ties are with neighboring communities and a District that has one or two streets or a single neighborhood in a City won't be germane to the representatives decision making there by isolating and disenfranchising the people of the area.

I urge the Commission to more fairly draw the District lines to keep cities together.

To make the districts more fair and partisan break down and to preserve the voices of all the people in the districts.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Martin 39, Martin.

>> Martin I'm a resident of Genesee County.

In looking at your proposed map for the House District, it is really quite unfair to all the residents of Genesee County.

You've concentrated on the center of it which is where the population center of Flint is. And then the rest of the County you divided it up like a spoken a wheel.

Taken piecemeal Townships and cities and going out and directions into other Counties as far as two Counties away and maybe even one time three Counties away.

Therefore diluting the communities interest of Genesee County and that should be one of your prime criteria in deciding communities or these districts.

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 I would recommend of all of different proposals I've seen the AFLCIO proposal is the fairest one for the entire state.

And I encourage you to take a second look at that.

Thank you.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so we are...is 41 present? Adeeb.

>> Hi good morning and thank you for taking the opportunity.

My name is Adeeb, a resident of Dearborn. Arab Americans are invisible minority in the United States because they are not identified as a minority in the U.S. census.

And they do not enjoy the benefits of majority so we are in an unusual paradox and Arab American and Yemeni Americans have been the fastest growing segment in Wayne County.

As what is shown by a study that was Commissioned by Wayne County in 2009 and would like to sub this report for your record.

We hope this Commission give Arab Americans some relief and recognition and provide them with a chance for fair representation.

One way this can be done is adjusting District 3 with Melvindale with east Dearborn.

These are areas that have common interests and they are similar in demographics.

And they are aligned with other neighborhoods.

Romulus and Taylor can be moved to District 7 and they are more tied and have more interests.

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

However I would like to mention all e-mailed and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting and the Commissioners also review the public comment portal only our www.Michigan.gov/MICRC website on a regular basis.

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

Next, I would like to move on to unfinished business 5A and without objection we will go to continuing assessment of draft maps for compliance and adjustments.

Yesterday we were working on the State House District and we will start the compliance process for the collaborative state maps with Commissioner Rothhorn instructing the line drawer.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Chair Szetela.

I think we may have finished, I was sort of speaking but it was Commissioner Vallette and I think we may be on to Commissioner Weiss at this point.

But yeah, it was kind of confusing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Vallette did you finish? So we will move on to Commissioner Weiss at this point.

And just for clarity Commissioner Wagner has requested that we skip her turn at this time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss it occurs to me if I remember correctly, we were working on VRA at the Senate level excuse me the house level. And I did offer right there was a Mr. Adelson had suggested that we do that we look at drawing a minority coalition District in the west and around the Grand Rapids area to see if it was possible.

And I do have some numbers I guess what I'm trying to do is methodical as possible.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I wish you would help out on that and we looked at it yesterday and looked like it could be different.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It is difficult and I may be able to because the number in the threshold is what I think I could offer because I was able to get leaving -- if we can pull up the map it might be able to help orient the people and I can, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Sure sounds good to me take over please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes? Okay it really is -- I'm not sure I want to draw it unless you can help me understand that it's worth because it was 38.4% minority population.

And that's a coalition.

And if we needed to bump it up, we would have to borrow from the southern Grand Rapids District to make it which is at excuse me I wrote it down which was at 52%. So again the threshold of a minority or a coalition District and, yeah, that's kind of the question I suppose to you and whether we should attempt.

Do you want to speak on that? Or should we bring up the map first or?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Absolutely I was thinking about this last night and this morning.

I think that the -- certainly I'm interested in seeing what -- how this was configured but I think looking at it from several perspectives.

The 2020 census as we know showed some big changes in population in Michigan. Both in region and in demographics.

So I think that having a coalition District works to both address the state and Federal constitutions.

The District shall reflect diverse population of the state.

Issues about under the equal protection under the 14th amendment.

The issue of coalition districts at some point over the next decade perhaps being required by the Voting Rights Act.

And I think that that's something I really focused on when I was thinking about this.

That this is a ten year map.

And if the trends that we saw in the census this year continue, then they will continue to be the changes that we have seen.

So I think I'm very interested in seeing this and I think this addresses both state and Federal issues.

And the key is, is the minority population compact? So we are not reaching out like we've talked about before and the threshold numbers are different here because Dr. Handley didn't examine Kent County in part there were no homogenous precincts like Detroit for example that are approaching 100% voters of minority voters, of one race. So that's part of the challenge of dealing with specific racial bloc voting analysis by County.

So that number is really not truly applicable here.

I mean I understand that the range you're talking about I think in many ways makes sense, but I think as we've also seen let's see what the District looks like and then we can also look at election results if that is okay with you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John if you can bring it up and thank you Commissioner Weiss.

I want to keep us moving in that direction and get VRA compliance.

>> MR. MORGAN: So to clarify I took the plan that you worked on yesterday at our close of the meeting close.

And I copied it for and put today's date on it and to confirm the last move sort of in the map was this precinct here.

So that just shows that that was the most recent iteration of the map so this is what you were looking at yesterday.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, if you would bring up the proposal and again it's mostly the overlay just -- I want to see the overlay.

>> MR. MORGAN: The proposal is what?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What is the proposal? Maybe I could just draw it.

I was hoping we would look at the frame.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is okay this has not been introduced so I just wanted to know what you were referring to.

I think I know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, and I think I called it and it was sent out as 38.4 coalition minority District, right?

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I will upload that.

Just a moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: As a layer or a plan?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As a layer is the goal, yeah.

I should use the math.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Commissioner Rothorn I brought up 38.4 coalition minority District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep.

>> MR. MORGAN: The blue lines are the shape of that in this area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You got it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: My system is doing something odd but I only see 109 districts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, my intention was not to create a new plan but to resolve a VRA issue and I think there was a flaw.

It was not on purpose it's 109 it's really just this.

Nothing else is changed, all I was doing is changing.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Won't that skew the calculations for the entire map if the districts are off?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So maybe I'll explain my process.

I did just download our latest version of map.

Up you know and then manipulated these to play with the numbers and get the and I did not runny partisan fairness or anything else other than VRA then I exported it again.

And, yeah.

I guess there was a glitch and it was only 109.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay follow-up question isn't this exactly what we were trying to do with Anthony's map yesterday that we didn't allow him to do.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is attempt to try to get the VRA compliance.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well that is the same thing Anthony was trying to do yesterday but we kind of shut him down.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anthony wanted to bring his entire map but brought his shape file over to do what he is proposing so this is a little different.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay never mind.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right so and what I want to offer here is it's we have the northern I'll say we have a northwest and East Grand Rapids and southern Grand Rapids is the 78.

I did not touch those.

All I did was adjust 79 which is the southwest and 86 and I had to move into 96.

So that southern region.

And then you will see that, yeah, there is a will it'll some bumps there with so 97 was affected.

What I think I'm also trying to address Mr. Adelson it's relatively compact.

And I don't think it's you know I think it could be improved if we moved into 77.

Into meaning there is a 38.4% minority District in 79.

I'll say yeah that area, yeah that southwest area.

That is 38.4%.

And then if we go to 78, that is 52.5%.

We should just confirm that is what it is, 52.5% minority yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry so just to be clear these are the existing districts, the overlay does not show new demographic data.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes and 78 is still the existing District and like the point where 78 and 79 meet we could adjust it to bring in 40% two Districts that are minority districts.

So with that Mr. Adelson I think what I'm hoping is it worth it -- I think what you said it's worth it so we should just try it, is that true?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes.

That is generally my thought about this.

That there is no way of answering the question can it be done without trying.

And that also helps your justifications.

Because if you attempted something that doesn't work for one or more reasons it's much easier to justify that than not do something and then having to explain why.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so with that Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: John, if he changes this you can back that all out and put it back pretty easy, can you?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'm going to kind of anticipate that possibility by making a copy of the map right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you John.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: MC I would like you to actually do it and then that way we will know what we have.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And MC, I'm going to ask you to facilitate so I can look at seeing if I can help by looking at the maps because I feel that is sort of my strength

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I agree happy to do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want me to label this in any different way? Just version two or? Do you want your initials on it?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

This is not attempt.

>> MR. MORGAN: I understand okay I'll do a version one of version two.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

These things take so long and the goal was to spend time in the evening trying to experiment and see if it was even worthwhile.

So John would you -- with the districts and you have done this before for us as we filled it in.

Would you just sort of do it? Is that.

>> MR. MORGAN: I understand what you mean.

Just take a moment to start on that process.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to clarify this District here that goes south you want that as District 79?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: This District here would be a different number?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I guess I might be able to reference the numbers you had in your plan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And honestly, it's not that the numbers matter. I think it's just trying to what I was doing is working with different districts and if you do it the same way we will just trust your intuition and, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like you have a different number here.
85.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't know how that happened.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let me start on 79 then.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sometimes I think I know the software and sometimes it produces things and I don't understand it so there is no reason to make it 85 because it's on the west side and that is not the case when I was doing this.

>> MR. MORGAN: Likes like this entire Township is in with that District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One of the things I will offer I did get some public comment about in general that the Grand Rapids House Districts that were you know, not applause but they were okay except adding the Vergennes area. This does remedy that.

This keeps it more urban and less rural.

But we do have Cascade and Ada Township.

I just want to acknowledge for the public.

I recognize this is not ideal for communities of interest and it's regarding VRA it's just an attempt to try to comply with VRA.

But it does, yeah, it hurts to break up the communities and I did not go to the block level for what it's worth John, so I think it's all voting precincts.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay thanks for that information.
Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, is there an objective from a metrics standpoint we are trying to achieve?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I think what I heard from Mr. Adelson is that in order to be -- to understand that this is maybe sort of a predictive move and to comply with that number three in our constitutional criteria that the districts will reflect the diversity of the that is where we are trying to draw a diverse District that we didn't -- that Mr. Dr. Handley did not identify. And we discovered.

So I think that's the goal here is that and so we don't have a metric or a percentage as I understand.

And I think what we all recognize is that you know, an opportunity to elect District would require some threshold so I think that is what we are playing with here.

Can you turn on your microphone.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sorry trying to get one District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There is two districts here.

One District that is the southern Grand Rapids one which is 72.

And this so what I'm looking at is 79, is it 79, maybe 86.

I don't know which one we will have to see where the numbers are.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's District 79 and this is District 86 and then you took 96 which was way down here and drew it up to Lowell up here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So 38.4 is in District 86 so what I've done Commissioner Clark is added 86 so I was wrong about 79.

I guess, yeah, I misrepresented that.

The idea is that the two southern districts the two southern Grand Rapids districts so 72 and 86 so 72 I did not touch but that is sort of a 52.5% and now 86 is at 38.4.

Total minority population and so with Mr. Adelson right I think the goal right now is to say can we leave them this way or adjust between 72 and 86 in order to increase one but decrease the other to increase the opportunity to elect.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I have an overall impression of this.

I'll save that for a moment but am I correct that 86, that's the District that is 44% over all minority.

What is minority VAP?

>> MR. MORGAN: Minority VAP of all the three different groups non-Hispanic Black non-Hispanic Asian and Hispanic that's 38.4 and that is District 86.

Then the other District that Commissioner Rothorn is referencing is 79.

So turn off his labels because it's getting a little cluttered here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Morgan do you have something else to add or understand.

>> MR. MORGAN: 79 is the purple District and 86 are the two districts you altered for this purpose.

Then the wrap around District that you made changes with is 96.

And the last thing I'd point out is there is one dis-contiguity I can correct if you want me to.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss is saying yes so yes please do that. Right that one.

Thank you.

So Mr. Adelson I suppose help us get to that point where we can sort of, yeah, move on from our VRA compliance.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think we are very close to that.

I think that what the overall comment I wanted to make is I remember when we were doing this area several weeks ago.

And I remember talking to Dr. Handley about population changes in Michigan and Homogenous precincts in Wayne County and Kent County and really not having a sense of what the minority population changes might be in this part of the state.

Well, I think you discovered that.

And frankly as you had said a few minutes ago this was not -- this was an accident.

This just kind of happened.

And I noticed in the other day.

There -- you have 78 which has the about 52% minority VAP.

Now you have 86 which is about 38% minority VAP and you have 79 with almost 27% minority VAP.

So I think that these districts fit a lot of checkmarks, criteria three, the diverse populations of the state, equal protection under the Constitution.

You're not cracking minority populations.

It anticipates potential future population growth over the next decade.

And it's a new concept when you look at this part of the state compared to Wayne County.

So we can look at the election results.

The metrics we had talk about earlier really don't strictly apply here because Dr. Handley was not able to do RPV analysis weaken the election results because it's new and waiting voting pattern analysis information.

For now we can you know just get a sense from looking at the elections what the situation is.

But this is not an area unlike Wayne County for example, where minority voters particularly Black voters have a history of electing candidates of choice and looking at the metrics from Dr. Handley and looking at all the election results.

It's a little different because this population really wasn't here at least to my understanding ten years ago.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So John will you help us walk through election results.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 79 which is sorry District 79 is 5% Black.

3% Asian and 14% Hispanic.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, excellent.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 79 okay it's Biden 45%.

Trump 55.

It's Clinton 39 and Trump 61.

38 for Obama and 62 for Romney.

42 for Peters.

58 for James.

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.

Stabenow 42.

James 58.

37 for Peters.

And 63 for Land.

In 2012 Senate it's 40% for Stabenow and 60% for Hoekstra.

Whitmer is 44, Schuette is 56.

Shower is 30 and Snyder is 70.

Nessel is 39 and Leonard is 61.

That's for Attorney General.

For Attorney General 2014 28 for Totten and 72 Schuette. And Benson is 43 for Secretary of State and Lange is 57.

In 2014 Dillard is 27 and Johnson is 73.

And then for El-Sayed for Governor in the primary is 40%, 15 for Thanedar and 45 for Whitmer.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, John.

So it's not an opportunity to elect.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: No at this point no.

And I was not expecting the election results to prove out like we have seen the minority population relatively low.

We don't have information really beyond exactly what we are seeing.

I think that looking at 86 and 78 have what will be interesting to see this is not dispositive like in Wayne County.

This is completely different.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Should we go to -- do you want to look at 78 first?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I'm intrigued frankly because 86 is the District you focused and would like to see 86.

>> MR. MORGAN: 78 is the same and District 86 election results.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so in 2020 it's 57 for Biden and 43 for Trump.

Clinton 51.

Trump Clinton 52, Trump 48.

Obama is 48, Romney is 52.

Peters is 54, James is 46.

In Senate 18 it's 52 for Stabenow and 48 for James.

Peters is 47 and land is 53.

Stabenow is 50 and Hoekstra is 50.

For Governor Whitmer is 54 and Schuette is 46.

Governor 2014 shower is 38 and Snyder is 62.

For Attorney General in 2018 it's Nessel 51 and Leonard 49.

And then Totten is 38 and Schuette is 62.

And then for Secretary of State Benson 54, Lange 46.

Dillard is 36 and Johnson is 64 for Governor primary it's 40 for El-Sayed 18 for Thanedar and 42 for Whitmer.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, well looks like the more recent elections and Presidential the more recent ones looks like there is an opportunity and it's closer to 50/50.

But, yeah.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point Commissioner Rothorn and I did not want to say this yesterday but I was wondering if this would affect partisan fairness in the direction where you are going.

This is a very narrowly split District, narrowly favoring looking at the partisan affiliation at the beginning, democrats.

And it's a District where the election results for the most part are pretty close.

I agree that some of the more recent elections are -- show a potential democratic advantage.

But this District is almost the textbook definition of being even in.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: A swing District?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Let's just I'll use my term.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please I'm trying to use your terminology.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It's pretty even.

Like I said I thought about this last night.

And I wondered if you were able to draw a District like this.

If it could help on two levels, it could help diversity, race, Voting Rights Act and partisan fairness.

And it seems that it does that so we will have to see what happens when everything proves out.

But this I would I think this is I think this is a good District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right Commissioner Weiss I think yeah that is it.

That is what I did.

With what you did, sorry.

>> MR. MORGAN: With a little help.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I like it I guess what does the rest of the Commission think?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioners I think that was a question for Commissioner Weiss.

Anybody want to weigh in? Hearing no objection.

All right, so then Commissioner Weiss so I think what Mr. Adelson are we safe to move on to the next, we have VRA compliance more or less or reviewed the data.

We don't have compliance but have reviewed the data.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: You've done 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.

Due diligence.

You made an attempt which I think works.

So from my perspective I would say give it a check and move on to the next assignment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent which I believe is partisan fairness and Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are we going to use this map? And is there 110 districts in it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is 110 District.

Yeah, we did not import my faulty one.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Perfect.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we did run partisan fairness yesterday.

And for the benefit do we want to -- Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I want to see if there is an improvement.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so maybe we start with what we did yesterday and then we can compare it with this one.

So John will you help us run the partisan fairness, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay just a moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes you were also up next, in terms of turns.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm actually going to pass.

For reasons.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay understood.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Test one two.

Test one two.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Test three four.

>> MR. MORGAN: So again there is two maps.

The newer map is on the top and then the map from yesterday is on the bottom.

And there we go again so again version two up here on the top and then yesterday's date version one.

Okay?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the lopsided margin still republican lean but it's less of a lean.

Can we go to the mean median, please? So the mean median has decreased.

>> MR. MORGAN: These numbers are going to be a little bit different.

I want to point out the District median percentage is going to change any time you redraw the districts.

And then the mean will as well.

Sorry the mean doesn't change.

I'm sorry about that.

It's the District median that changes and the difference between them will change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, yes, it's helpful when you help walk us through this.

It's great.

Let's move on to the efficiency gap, please.

Still too high.

And we are moving in the right direction.

Okay, so let's do the seats votes ratio.

And I guess one more towards representative.

>> KIM BRACE: One more democratic seat.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: But we are not there yet.

So is that -- that is the, okay.

So achieving VRA compliance we did get better partisan fairness scores and I think Commissioner Clark this is where we -- this is where we are at.

We have a partisan fairness partisan fairness analysis but I think Mr. Adelson will you help us with this? How do we be methodical in this?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: There are a couple ways.

The systemic approach that the Commission established when we are looking at the VRA percentages that I would suggest that might apply here.

One of the differences though, of course, is the scores are for the plan as a whole.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: There is no VRA requires XYZ on the whole plan.

This is different.

However, I think that looking at what the Commission did with that, the Western District may indicate a partial path forward in other areas.

There may be other urban suburban areas similar to what we found in Grand Rapids where if you make some tweaks that helps you in two ways.

It helps you with let's just use it as an all encompassing VRA issue and the partisan fairness.

We saw that it did with just one District, what the changes were.

That may -- there may be other opportunities elsewhere in the state.

That is one of the things that I'd suggest and that I had discussed with General Counsel.

So a systematic approach, but keep in mind that it's a plan as a whole.

It's not a District by District analysis.

It's the plan as a whole gives you your partisan fairness scores.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Understood.

Commissioner Clark did you get enough insights or any insights to where to start next or how would you like to proceed?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I thought we were going to go down the list of districts.

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: I'm wondering.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And identify the ones we want to take a look at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We do have some Commissioners who have maybe worked on this sort of thing.

Do you want any Commissioners sort of want to help Commissioner Clark sort of which list should we use? Any insights there? Make sure we use the lopsided or, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well yesterday we looked at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right but there is districts in the lopsided that might indicate where Commissioner Clark wants to start.

That is what I was thinking. That is the list, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lopsided margins.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that is what we looked at yesterday.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have three hands in the room.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel has been waiting then Mr. Brace.

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

So the if the Commission is endeavoring to better the partisan fairness scores, then the lopsided margin test is where you will get the District by District information of the splits. Again, making the partisan fairness adjustments it's appropriate to have the data ribbon activated for the partisan data.

Otherwise you would be making the adjustments without the relevant information that you need to make those decisions.

So I wanted to highlight that again.

I said it a few times over the last few days but this is the first time you are going in partisan to look at the partisan fairness and potentially make adjustments in that arena.

So I wanted to highlight that for you.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That sounds wonderful.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Use lopsided I side said it three times.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We take a while.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No I love it, I love it.

So it would be guided by your lopsided margins which would kind of direct you what areas you might want to focus in on.

Again you can use the election data.

And I would highlight again for the record that Dr. Handley was very surprised at the Upper Peninsula so that again might be somewhere that the Commission wants to look at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right so Mr. Brace then we will turn it back to Mr. Clark or Commissioner Clark.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, the attorney of record is very correct in what she says.

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.

What normally you end up looking at is looking at those partisan scores to see what is closest to potentially change.

So you could use that to help select some of the districts out of what you have looked at to see if they could end up getting changed.

And that will impact the overall lopsided margin.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Brace and Commissioner Clark back to you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take a look at the lopsided margin report. Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the lopsided margin report and what it shows of all the democratic districts the average democratic winning margin is about 67% and the average republican winning margin is about 59% and that is where you get that difference.

So again you were to average all of the democrat wins in this column and then all of the republican wins in the other column that's where these two numbers come from and this is the comparison of those two numbers.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And so John will you help Commissioner Clark and the rest of us sort of identify what the -- where the like how do we identify -- we are looking at the list.

Where is a District that is like the most egregious? Where do we attack the most, the one that stands out the most and Commissioner Eid may have a solution here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think instead of just looking at which ones are the most the ones that are the most will be Metro Detroit ones drawn that way for VRA reasons and might be a better idea to look at the other areas outside of Metro Detroit that are high first.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Chair Szetela sorry and back to you Mr. Morgan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we are trying to reduce the lopsided margin or improve the overall fairness of the plan trying to understand.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Trying to have a methodical approach to improve the over art partisan fairness of the plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So my thought on that it would be easiest to target those areas that are close rather than those that are -- so if you are looking for something like 50.3 or 51 can we flip those to the other isle that will rebalance the plan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I went to get to Commissioner Orton first.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was going to say the same thing and also say this partisan fairness ranks below community of interest.

So if we do if we find those that are close together and we just flip it we don't have to change a lot.

We don't have to break into those communities of interest hopefully.

To flip it over.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which is why we are doing this collaborative Morgan and Commissioner Eid.

>> MR. MORGAN: General Counsel said something about looking at the UP, that there was some information about that.

I don't know if that is a place you want to start or not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is to Commissioner Clark but Commissioner Eid first and Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I agree on the communities of interest issue. I think there is one community of interest that ended up not being put in this map. And that's the lakeshore community.

That was drawn at one point in the southwest corner of the state.

There is an overlay somewhere for it.

And it is a community of interest as we all know.

And putting that and seeing if that helps or doesn't help could be a good start and we might want to check now how that area is on this test.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for all the options. Yeah, that is great.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take a look at the UP districts.

>> MR. MORGAN: Most of those will have certain numbers in common but I think you will find that there is one number that's not there which is 110.

So you have 109, 108 and 107 are the three House Districts in the UP and one District House District 106 crosses the bridge and has Emmet et cetera.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Look at 108, 7, 6 and 9

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The party ribbon I have not used it yet and do you know what to ask for there? Do you know what she was talking about? There is partisan results.

Somehow and Mr. Morgan or Mr. Brace may be able to help bring that up, is that accurate General Counsel?

>> MR. MORGAN: It's what we have been looking at before.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Vice Chair to Mr. Morgan that is correct. That is when they were practicing and learning the software in the fictional state of thumb it was activated.

As we all recall it was highly motivating where the lines were going, what the partisan data was showing.

And again as the fourth criteria being a disproportionate advantage that was not the way to proceed.

So you will, it will be familiar to you once it's pulled up.

But it looks like 106.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, so these are the four seats that you asked me to look at 106, 107, 108 and 109 and these are the characteristics.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The closest one would be, hold on, closest one to adjust would be 109.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 109 or 108? 108 looks closer.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 108.

>> KIM BRACE: 108 is already showing as a democratic one.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We want to.

>> KIM BRACE: See whether or not you can switch the other ones and they are a little bit further away.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think 109 is the smallest I mean the closest to 50% where we could start flipping things.

But that is still 7% off.

So I don't know if that is attainable.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excuse me General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Mr. Vice Chair.

And again, as I recall those two districts would be right next to each other.

So there is chances are that you would not be able to take with the 52.9% you would not be able to have a meaningful enough shift without impacting the other districts.

So we might want to go back to the list and see if there are some in more heavily populated down state areas that are very close.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, my opinion looking at this that it's just not attainable given those percentages and what the population is like up in the UP.

So yeah, so I would suggest we take a look at another area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's your turn Commissioner Clark please proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I thought that was my turn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Nice try Commissioner Clark.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Actually I do want to take my turn.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Quickly what I would suggest is going back to the Grand Rapids District model, the only reason that that popped up as an area of interest in the demographic dots, noticing the dots were concentrated the way they were, thinking that if a District could be created that would take care of several District issues, so I would suggest whether looking at things regionally or otherwise, that the dots also be activated to see if there are similar pockets that you can create a District in like you did with the Grand Rapids District.

That will help across several criteria and other measures.

So that is a suggestion, one way to proceed that may give you some clues.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Adelson Commissioner Witjes and back to Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Can we run a check for errors? I'm seeing the assigned total is less than the total population.

>> MR. MORGAN: You are correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's try that.

Eagle eye Witjes.

>> MR. MORGAN: According to the check there are no unassigned areas so there is probably discrepancy and I don't know if you feel like taking a break but it may be a good time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's to you Mr. Clark what is your pleasure.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's an hour before lunch, let's take ten minutes at the most.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are going to try to shift our lunch to 1:00 if that is okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So that is fine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's take a 15 minute break.

It's 10:51.

See you back here at 11:05.

[Recess]

I'm sorry I thought we were good as Chair of the Commission of call this meeting of Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 11:05 a.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 announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Couldn't think of a fancy word so I'm present.

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

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA:

We will continue with agenda 5A and Mr. Rothhorn if you could facilitate, I would appreciate it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark back to you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to take the lopsided margin report and identify certain districts where the margin is relatively close.

So for example 49% democratic 51% republican.

And go through the whole list and let's identify those and I will choose one and the next person can choose one and we will just cycle through those.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sounds good and I will make a list as you identify them.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay so let's cycle down through the list and keep going down and the first ones I think are all in Detroit area anyway.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Clark that is true generally but keep in mind we did jump around with a few numbers so we will want to refer to the map when we see something.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So what I will do when I see the democrats somewhere just below 50, we will identify that as one of them so 50%.

Okay so let's look at 22.

No I'm sorry, not 22, 28.

And 29 let me think if I want to do those if they are too high.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark Commissioner Orton has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 25 is very close.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't see 5.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 25.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Gentleman can one of you mute.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: But on 25 I'm looking for republican advantages.
Yeah.

So let's go back to the list.

I don't want to put 25 on the list unless somebody does so let's look at 28 and 29.

I want let's see 28, 29, okay let's see the list again.

We will just cycle the list then we will come back and I will just choose one.

>> MR. MORGAN: So again you know while we said let's look at 28 and 29 from the list, they are not actually exactly in the same place so here is 28 first so it's in Sterling Heights area.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct I'm going to deal with one at a time.
So I will choose 28 or 29 or whatever and let's go through the whole list first.
And identify them.

I'm talking about the lopsided margin list and we will just identify.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'm just getting the map ready for discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thanks, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: You talked about 28 and 29.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 28 and 29, 58 is too high.

61 is too high.

Maybe 35.

Keep going down, going down, keep going down.

And how about 60? Oh, yeah, 53 and 60.

>> MR. MORGAN: District 50 does that fit the metrics you're looking for?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct 50.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then you said 53.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

Yeah, there is another one 60 and then cycle down there is another one 70 and go on down to 76.

I think that is one of the ones we just looked at.

>> MR. MORGAN: 74, 76 is a different.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, yeah, 74 I'm sorry.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the District number is what we are looking at not the line number sorry so I think you were referring to District 74.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I was and looked at the line number instead.

Cycle down.

Keep going 51.8 and number 103.

Keep going down and I create the list off of that so that is 123456789 potential areas, okay? So I'll choose one and I will work on it and then the next person up can choose one.

So not knowing where these are I will choose number 28 the first one on the list.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we go through the numbers again I think I missed some.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 28, 29, 35, 53, 60, 50, 70, 74 and 103.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you say 50, 5-0?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes 5-0.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct where we are at 28 percentage wise.

53.1.

Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel please.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Can we also have the population thematic dots on?

That might assist the Commission.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which population African/American.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No just total population, just.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, that will come up when we look at the precincts or Townships.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So General Counsel I'm just trying to be clear because Mr. Adelson did suggest looking at theme with, I think the African/American but that's not what you're suggesting.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No I'm suggesting thank you for the clarity, I'm suggesting that when we're looking at doing these adjustments that the Commission have like the data right under the name.

So that you will be able to see what the total population is while you're doing again because these are very precise changes that the Commission is going to be endeavoring to make.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so is that reflected there it says Clinton and 100, 513 is that what you're looking for General Counsel.

>> MR. MORGAN: It will adjust when I look at the voting precincts and things like that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I just want to make sure I understand how the next, there is a tool that I guess we used in the state of thumb that I might have used that I have not used since then.

And so what I'm thinking about is do we want -- can we use that tool now? It seems that could also help Commissioner Clark as he is drawing is that true?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: To the Vice Chair to the Commission and the viewing public again, the Michigan Constitution the reason that the Commissioners did not use partisan data in drawing the maps is because competitiveness, proportionality, there are no criteria that would have permitted the Commission to do that.

The only partisan criteria is the fourth one, which is disproportionate advantage for partisan fairness measured by acceptable standards.

All acceptable measures of partisan fairness are evaluated on the statewide level.

That is why when the Commissioners were drafting the politics was taken out of it. The partisanship was taken out of it which was the intent of the constitutional amendment.

So now that the Commission has its statewide plans the Commission is endeavoring to make some adjustments to improve partisan fairness.

It's completely acceptable for the Commission to look at that data in order to make well informed decisions for those adjustments.

So in the fictional state of thumb your consultants had the ribbon at the bottom that would track.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Ribbon being in the active matrix?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No a red and blue ribbon they will pull it up and Commission can see how the changes they are making impact the political party data that's displayed.

So is that a clear -- is that a good background/context bringing us to where we are?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I appreciate that General Counsel and Commissioner Clark do you know what to ask for regarding that tool as you draw?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right now the only tool I want to see is the Black population of dots.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, and then of course the numbers for the African matrix if we need them.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are welcome to do that Commissioner Clark. But I just want to make sure we are using as many tools as we can to achieve partisan fairness and looking at partisan fairness so you are absolutely welcome to do what you are doing, I want to make sure -- I have not used this tool.

I do not know what General Counsel is talking about.

The ribbons and so forth if you don't want them up that is okay but we are looking at partisan fairness so I will just leave it at that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Got it so what I want to do is 28 we need to increase the.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: What is this ribbon thing?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what General Counsel has been trying to explain to us and I think it's a new tool we may not be familiar with.

And I think because we are unfamiliar with it, we may not even know what to ask for it. And so, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Why don't we bring it up and keep it up any way.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm not quite sure what General Counsel is talking about there are many tools and this is a new one for me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Super helpful Commissioner Clark can we just pause.

Help us General Counsel know.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So during the fictional state of thumb practice mapping there was a bar at the bottom above the active matrix it was separate from the active matrix and it said D and it was blue and the other half was red and it said R and it was tracking the -- the data is in the matrix so it was activated during the practice rounds and deactivated during the Commission's active mapping again which is completely appreciate.

We always had the intent to turn it back on at the appropriate time and now is the appropriate time.

Is that clarity.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: As you are receiving that Commissioner Orton and Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I did not have that.
I've never seen that.

Has anyone seen it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The mappers had it on the screen so the Commissioners never had it.

The mappers had it on the screen.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so mappers if I mean yeah so it sounds like General Counsel is going to try to help assist us.

Mr. Morgan please.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm not familiar with what she is suggesting.

I know we can reference the partisan data from the election results that you've been using, so that is some information.

There is also a pointer where you can click on a geography level and it will give you all of the data that's associated with it.

So it will go down every single variable so that will give you some information as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay at this point the tools that Commissioner Clark has asked for may be the best tools.

And so I'll just ask Commissioner Clark to proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's proceed.

So let's go to 25 and I want to add those two dots, yeah, I want to add right where your pointer was that end of 28.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I'm going to Zoom in a little bit so we can reference by the population of the voting precinct.

So just a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: In is the population of each precinct so if you want to make a change tell me which precinct you want me to move, please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want 4255 and 3915 over into 28.

Changing percentages.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you wanted to you can look at the tab of the statewide races and that gives you information for the District.

So at the moment that partisan index score, which is what goes into this calculation here.

So basically you could say it was 53 and with those changes and not adjusting the population, now it's 52.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay that's fine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sorry John can you do that one more time please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay. So going back to refer to the partisan fairness chart, this number here, which gives you the percent vote, this is the composite partisan index that Dr. Handley created. So you see it's 201,000 to 227. So based on those two precinct changes, the percentages are now at 48 roughly to 52.

And then when I unscreen these fields you see it's going to be some other number instead of 201,000 to sorry instead of 201 to 227 it will be something else that is going to be 4852.

So whatever these numbers are reassigning, recalculating based on the geography changes in those two precincts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks for walking us through that.

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: As we make the changes, I realize they are precincts and not a big chunk but as we making the changes should we take into account whether we are messing up communities of interest? Because this is below communities of interest.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You got it Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to deal with one variable at a time.

I want to make the changes and then let's see how it impacted the communities of interest.

Because the change in this District is going to be tough because there's not a lot of Black population.

So let's.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Isn't that going in reverse order? If you were to look at the variable in regards to fairness then going into communities of interest?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It does seem like that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I would not do that.

It makes no sense.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well but the communities -- I think it makes sense because communities of interest are pretty well set.

And so that would limit the number of changes that we would have to make.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's true but if you were to make changes disregarding communities of interest first, you're just going to have to change it back afterwards to comply with the communities of interest.

So why do it in that order?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, theoretically at least when we drew these districts, we considered communities of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We did not go down to the precinct level necessarily on communities of interest.

We did it as a District.

So we have done all that.

Now we are to the point of having to deal with partisan fairness.

That's where we are at in the process.

We did populations, number one, we packed I don't know what number two is.

Communities of interest and partisan fairness so we have to deal with partisan fairness.

If we get all that done and want to go back then and tweak our communities of interest, I think that would be appropriate.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: But we have to do one or the other at one time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I thought the objective was getting our numbers in compliance.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Commissioner Witjes and Commissioner Orton bring up the sort of priority and criteria and what Commissioner Lett is trying to address.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have a question for you General Counsel so if we considered communities of interest while we were drawing the commission maps, and now we are adjusting for partisan fairness, if we split up communities of interest would that be okay to do because we have considered communities of interest before we started messing with numbers to get partisan fairness now?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Vice Chair to Commissioner Witjes that is an excellent question and brings us back to tension and conflict with the criteria.

One of the reasons your partisan fairness measures are demonstrating the scores that they are is because the geography of Michigan and the preservation of the communities of interest.

So, yes, if you improve the partisan fairness measures, if you take steps to do that it will impact other criteria.

And that is for the Commission to decide to the extent it wants to do so, if at all.

And, again, make a clear record of why the changes are being made and in the rationale for doing so.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Since we took communities of interest into account, we can make the changes.

However, you could also make the inverse argument saying now we are taking the numbers for partisan fairness into account over communities of interest even though we considered them and making changes and changing them back, I could see that being problematic.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think this is why no one envies our task Commissioner Lett then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That's true.
We've heard a lot of discussion from the portal from public hearings regarding communities of interest.

And in my opinion, we've also heard the overriding issue of fairness, fair maps, nonpartisan, so I think that that is what I've heard all along.

Draw fair maps and that is what we are trying to do.

Unfortunately it may affect some communities of interest.

And I don't know how they will.

We just did two precincts.

I don't know if that affected them at all.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: These in my opinion these measures communities of interest and partisan fairness they are not mutually exclusive.

I don't think they create as much of a conflict as we are thinking they do.

We can kind communities of interest that are supported in this area that also bring the partisan fairness scores closer to 0.

But we've got a lot of communities of interest submissions.

Some of those are conflicting.

I think in this area some of those are conflicting and that's okay.

But since they are conflicting let's find the one that brings the number closer to 0.

Because then that would be supporting both criteria three and criteria four.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark then General Counsel.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you go to the Constitution, number three says I'm going to paraphrase it the Commission shall consider communities of interest.

So the word consider means we may or may not apply it.

In my opinion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think this is where General Counsel wants to help with that language.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We are not going to paraphrase the Constitution Commissioner Clark although I appreciate that.

The Constitutional language relative to communities of interest which is the third criteria districts shall reflect the states diverse population and communities of interest and then it goes on as we all know to give some guide rails what that is.

And what it is not.

Which is relationship with political parties incumbent or candidates.

The relevant criteria for partisan fairness which is the fourth criteria, just below communities of interest and diverse population, is districts shall not provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party a disproportionate advantage will be used with partisan fairness.

What may assist the Commission in these efforts as they are considering adjustments or how the adjustments might affect other criteria or other metrics that the Commission is tracking, is maybe have the community of interest overlay for the areas that you're looking at.

Also displayed.

Because potentially there is some areas that you could make some changes, some boundary changes that would not impact the communities of interest that you've already considered throughout this process.

As an opportunity.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you General Counsel and back to you Commissioner Clark.

Thank you for taking that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think we can only have one overlay at a time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think you are right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's continue on here and we will see if this works.

And if it doesn't then we will.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I had a thought just trying to when the map comes back up what I was thinking Commissioner Clark you were looking at the dots and sort of heading west from west to east, what you could do is I think there are dots meaning African/American population that are also further south in the District so it might not cut it off.

That may be just considering the community of interest rather than heading west excuse me rather than heading east look at the dots in the Warren area where it says Warren any way the word Warren in 25 instead of heading east head south and see if you can affect the change without totally interrupting.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My next step was going to be to move some of the non- African/American precincts out of 28 and that will increase the percentage of the African/American side.

So you know, now I look at that I'm over 7,000 people.

So I want to move out non-African/American precincts to try to increase that.

And I took that from 25 so I want to move some back into 25.

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.

Can we get the population numbers? So I got 7,000 I can move out.

And move into 25.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks like John is hovering over some precincts that may help you do that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take the top three, 1999, 2183 and 2378.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Please excuse the interruption Commissioner Clark. If Mr. Morgan could describe the or determine or provide the information for the political data for those three, oh, or just change it, is there a method in which that the Commission can have that data displayed so that it's not just trial and error that it can be a more focused and deliberative change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, as I said, there is a way to bring up a pointer that we can look at any individual piece of geography.

We could potentially display some information in the label of the precincts.

You could possibly look at some democratic and republican election results like one value for each one.

Maybe we can do the composite value.

I'm not sure.

We have not attempted this at any point.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: May I add on that.

Pick election and have the feature labeled with the republican results and democrat results.

We can have three labels per feature.

So you could have total pop, 2016 republican votes, 2016 democrat votes, or another election.

And you would see them at one time.

That's the closest you can get to it.

Down to precinct, Township and County.

That is the closest you will get to having a number to look at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: How does that sound, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, give it a try and see what it looks like.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so what single election does the Commission want me to bring up on the screen? Or we could also potentially look at other things in the database.

There is a field that says D index and R index.

I'm not sure what those are.

They may or may not be the composite partisan index.

They may be some other value.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If we are not sure what they are I don't want to use them at all.

I would prefer to wait until Bruce steps back and decide.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you're going to consider a single election you might be informed by looking at the statewide election results and see what the results of that election are. So for example we know I think from previous discussion that the Presidential election in 2016 was very close but any other any election you choose as a single election is going to have you know a result from the statewide perspective to when we look at the Governor's race in 2018 Governor Whitmer won by a certain percentage if you use the Governor's race in 2014 Governor Snyder won by a certain percentage. So if you choose a single election, you may be instructed to look at the statewide results for that election.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I heard Commissioner Clark said he wanted Mr. Adelson back in the room.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I wanted to move on to see if we can resolve this.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So what I'm focusing in on is that if the Commission is making adjustments to impact partisan fairness scores that the adjustments should be made based on the partisan data that the Commission has available to them. So Mr. Adelson will come in the room after his meeting and say -- what is the partisan data.

So I think and again you can do the trial and error method going back and forth but I think again if we could have it demonstrated relative to the changes that the Commission is attempting to make with the population also displayed, I think that would be the best way for the Commission to make those very precise changes that are necessary.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Three hands Commissioner Eid and Morgan and Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I wanted to point out we are on the house map house elections are done every two years I believe unless I'm mistaken so, please correct me if I am so would be appropriate to use any of the elections 2016, 2018, maybe not 2020 because of the precinct issues we talked about before.

But yeah, it sounds like we should bring them up and use them to try to fix this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Morgan then Mr. Lett.

>> MR. MORGAN: So at this point Commissioner Clark has made some adjustments in the population and he stopped with the two districts being back in population balance. So you could potentially run the partisan fairness now and see if it did what he wanted to do.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's do it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm going to note we could have done about three of these districts by now having argued about all this so Mr. Clark says let's do it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's get on with it and go ahead and run the partisan fairness and see where we are at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You forgot to say I yield back.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I yield back Roth Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: In this case the plan name is the same.

So I'm going to have to make a copy of the previously existing plan and now we are running, this is essentially a new plan officially you would consider this a new plan because you made changes and look at partisan fairness numbers so I need to save it not as a new plan but as a new excel sheet so you can look at it side by side so I will do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Morgan then while he is doing that Commissioners I wonder if we can sort of try to agree on the election. Commissioner Eid sort of talked about it, Mr. Morgan said we should choose election. Is there election we want to agree on when we get that data back? Go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The most recent is going to be.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The presidential, that would be the Presidential correct.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes please.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you or Mr. Chair the Commission if you pull up the election information matrix at the very beginning the first columns are the democratic republican split and that would be maybe the most straightforward without having to select an individual race.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: By each District.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: My point is if making changes in partisan that the Commission should look at partisan data at this point, which is totally appropriate no partisan gerrymander and we did not consider that drawing its plans but if they want to endeavor to make those changes so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay thank you General Counsel Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: What you have in those two first columns are composite numbers coming from all the precincts in that District across all the elections.

That gives you that overall partisan ness number from the composite side, okay? So that will give you an overall score for the decade.

Now you may think that move more democratic at the end of the decade and look at a couple of contests in 2020 or something like that but the composite number is the overall decade election results.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Brace Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: So again I'll bring that up as a label option and we can look and see what the numbers are if that makes sense one way we could potentially test this is

we could go to a District where we have a District value for example in one Senate plan you have Kalamazoo County and then we could look at the partisan index which is in our partisan fairness spreadsheet then look at the label display for that District and if they are the same then the D index R index numbers are what we think it is.

I just think that would be a check we could run during the lunch break.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Does it make sense also I mean Commissioner Clark is trying to steer in a methodical nine districts he identified and starting with 28 and wondering if we want to sort of look at election results for each of the districts record the results then move to that is that possible?

>> MR. MORGAN: That is possible and Commissioner Clark wanted me to run the partisan fairness now so I saved this as version three.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take a look at that, I don't want to take too much time writing down numbers for the other districts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looking at if we have to make adjustment and run a partisan fairness, we will have 17 or at least 9 copies.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: A lot of them aren't we.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Then we have to keep track of those and understand which one was which and I think we may I don't doesn't feel very methodical to me and feels we may create something we may not be able to wrap our heads around so I'm just trying to -- any other thoughts how we are proceeding.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at the version three and what I want to focus on change two districts 25 and 28 okay so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. MORGAN: We will look at the values for those for a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Depending what the numbers are may want to make a few other adjustments and basically the same philosophy I was using.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And what I'm hesitating to do Commissioner Clark right is creating then a copy of that plan to get it so I'm trying to figure out if there is a way, we can do it without putting the copy and running the partisan fairness each time and Mr. Morgan please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Well again each time you make a plan you would run the partisan fairness because it requires a complete plan so any time you make a change you would have to rerun the partisan fairness.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Wonder if we want to talk about a naming convention here and I'm just wondering how do we -- we as Commissioners have to understand the copies and we may be moving incrementally into you know better partisan fairness measures but we may not.

How do we keep track and recognize.

>> KIM BRACE: We have been keeping track of version one and two and that sort of thing so we understand where we are going and can trace time wise what the results are.

The issue become when you want us to save a plan so that you have got some idea that all right, we made the change here on plan between version four and version five or whatever.

So it's really keeping track of where we are version wise in order to recall from your benefit what kind of changes were implemented.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Morgan then Commissioner Clark?

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at the data adjusted Districts are on the top so District 25 the new value for that it looks like it was previous.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: John we see the select report to run screen so if you have something else on your screen.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Clark I believe was trying to adjust District 28 because that showed up here as 53% on the republican side. So what has happened in this exchange is that that has now been reduced to 51.6 and District 25 was 50.5 democratic now it's 50.7% republican.

So you've reduced the republican percentage in 28 and increased the republican percentage in 29.

>> KIM BRACE: You ended up switching a District towards the republican side.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to continue to look and look at partisan fairness scores from this point because we looked at just the two districts and did not look at the fairness scores.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What do you want to do Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The problem is there is not enough African/American population there so my only alternative is look at maybe moving something out and not into 25 and it's something that is not very heavy populated with African/Americans.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There are more than just African/Americans that vote democratic in Sterling Heights, with we have a large Asian and Chaldean community that we've had communities of interest maps submitted to us.

So I don't think it's only African/American.

We have to look at just at let's break that ribbon up and see as we make the changes what happens to the election results and you are looking at more than one specific population.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I made the changes as far north as I could. I was aware of that so what do we have John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Want me to look at the other scores at this time, yes?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Under your direction Commissioner Clark.

>> MR. MORGAN: So the lopsided margin the new version is 8.1, the previous version was 8.2.

The mean median difference was 4.4 it still seems to be 4.4.

Efficiency gap of 9.9 new version is 10.9 seats vote ratio the old one was 6.0 and new is 6.9.

>> KIM BRACE: What you are seeing in the, don't take it away what you are seeing is that flip of one seat from 51 democratic down to 50 democratic.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Based on the changes we made.

>> KIM BRACE: That's right.

>> MR. MORGAN: Trying to change District 28 the changes were made to 25 and took it from 50.1% democrat to a 50.1% republican.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We do need to have instead of racial data on the screen we need to have partisan data on the screen to make these changes. That may be the best thing we learned from this.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

If we can get it up on the screen.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is where our consultants can help us.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will bring up the values instead of on I will take away the thematic and, on the values, I can do that so let me start again with a place that at a level of geography that's logical as opposed to a precinct so a Township or a County. Is there a Township or a County that you would want me to just look at those values for that the Commission might want to consider?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark that question is to you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We are in Macomb County so let's take a look at that.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will bring up value for all of Macomb County for the partisan index if that is what we think it is.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Those values come up as 0.

Let me double check.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Changes between 28 and 25 are kind of nonproductive.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe best to revert the way it was.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Keep it the way it was.

That is where my thoughts are but let's look at this.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here is what I was saying before where you can use this pointer at any geographic level to look at all of the data that is associated with it. So for example for all of Macomb County you have the election results and you can scroll down through any election so we are talking about the Presidential election in 2020.

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

So the republican vote is 263,000 for all of Macomb County democrat vote is 223,000 for all of Macomb County.

And if I make my level, you can give all of this on a single precinct this is one way to get what you are looking at.

What we were looking for is kind of a shortcut to see if there was something that is already been calculated as a republican and democrat index for the geography and the answer is it has not been done because those calculations are made actively for each direction.

So it takes the active matrix basically takes the District population totals for all these election results and then creates the partisan index that Dr. Handley directed the software been vendor to make.

So in this case we don't have it attached to the geography it's only dynamically calculated at the District level.

So and again I'm just going to give one more example of that.

It's down here in the statewide races it's this partisan index which is a you know calculated index based on all the races Dr. Handley chose.

>> KIM BRACE: That is the composite index Dr. Handley was talking about.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Understood and so at the municipal level the Macomb County we didn't have yeah, we have totals but if we look at the districts that we have drawn we actually have right we could look at the districts that we've got the composite score and get a percentage of republican and percentage of democrat which for me is easier to read than the totals trying to do the math.

I'm tempted to stick with this.

>> MR. MORGAN: District summaries so you look at the composite score.

You also have individual election results and as I pointed out that information button I'm going to change to Townships and now when I click the Township it should come up with and probably closed the window but it should come up with the information for that Township.

It is just hidden somewhere.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's the Township but doesn't help with the whole District.

>> MR. MORGAN: It informs to General Counsel's point if you wanted partisan information on a precinct or a Township you have all this information here so you can pick whatever election you designate as relevant.

Or any of these elections so just to keep it simple for this Township I believe to confirm what it is so it's Sterling Heights Township, the entire Township is for just the Presidential 2020 election it's 38,456 for the republican candidate.

And 30,579 for the democratic candidate for that election, so that gives you information about the entire Township. And go to precinct level it will give you information in the precinct in the same way.

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: Okay, that is helpful, John.

Thank you, Commissioner Clark, or are there thoughts Commissioners? Because I think we are also trying to learn and integrate this new tool in the mapping and understand how it will help us perform a better partisan fairness, get a better partisan fairness score.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: This is not going to be helpful but I just feel this is a long process.

And I wonder if there is any fix that can be made so that we have a quicker, something quicker to look at as we go through because we have 110 districts to do just in this map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: True we are only doing nine from the list, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we could do, are there other thoughts?

Because I do have a sort of a -- Commissioner Eid, please.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I said this already a couple times today but I would suggest looking at that lakeshore area before looking at Sterling Heights and seeing if -- you can look at it solely on a communities of interest perspective and that also I don't know this for sure because I have not looked at it but I believe it would help these partisan fairness numbers as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: He adjusted some maps we saw that.

I think and we are using it Commissioner to understand it.

It's not wrong to try it.

We will see how the partisan scores go and come back to the list.

But that is one way to use your turn Commissioner Clark if you like.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is the lakeshore on this list or not?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Well we don't know yet.

Mr. Morgan were you going to, no.

>> KIM BRACE: What we can do is, Commissioner Clark, you have your master list, let's step through the map so that you can identify then the districts that you've identified and we can show that on the screen.

So that you can get a proper orientation of what districts you're looking at.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, but the problem is we use districts that border it and that gets adjusted as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is true.

Commissioner Orton may have a solution for us.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I want to make sure we change this back before we leave this area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Change it completely back to where it was.

Let's do that and let me defer over to Anthony and let Anthony take care of this, the other shore and see if we are seeing the same issues.

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: Great idea and we can acknowledge we have got the old map so to speak or the old partisan fairness and we will rerun it when you got it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just for clarity sake we are calling the previous version you adjusted in Grand Rapids as version two.

This version is version three where we adjusted in Sterling Heights now, we are going back to version two.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let's go back to that.

And let Anthony take the lead at this point.

But see I think you have more concentrated minorities down in the area we are going to. I think that is going to be the difference.

We have very limited options where we are just where we are at.

So let me yield to Anthony.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good it's still your turn Commissioner Clark but basically, I think Commissioner Clark just gave you the floor Commissioner Eid so take it away.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is it my turn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's Commissioner Clark's turn but he gave it to you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's essentially Janice's turn but I help lead it's Commissioner Clark's turn but you will lead Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The reason I ask is I'm conflicted how to use my turn when we get to it.

I think yesterday we moved on from the Congressional maps prematurely and the reason I say that is because we have two maps.

The basic collaborative map which I think has partisan fairness scores I would characterize as poor.

But then we have one that is good or that I think is good in the Congressional the collaborative Congressional map that Commissioner Witjes made changes to.

My only issue is that I like that map.

But my only issue is both of those maps don't have any changes to Metro Detroit in them.

And being from the Metro Detroit area I think some collaborative changes are necessary in that area.

I've said this for the past couple days now.

So you know I was thinking about using my turn to go to that.

However, I understand that right now we are working on the house maps.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If I can get an understanding there will be an opportunity for me to collaboratively make changes like that before we get to Friday.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is our intention and Commissioner Clark had a similar thought today and many of us, yes, we are, yes, so the answer is yes, it's not your turn it is Commissioner Clark's turn. He is just giving the floor to you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's pull up, now this is blank let's pull up the map we were just looking at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which is version two.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm now saving it as version four I'm anticipating you will make some changes to it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: One moment.

Before we proceed are you going to reference an overlay I need to bring up or just make adjustments?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm not sure which overlay but I was going to reference it but let's do it with the election data up so we have an actual you know basis for doing this without just doing trial and error.

First let's pull up the map.

And then we can find the over play, place it on there with the partisan fairness tools.

>> MR. MORGAN: What overlay or area of the state do you want to focus on.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Southwest border where Benton Harbor is.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Did we undo what we did to District 20.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We went back to version two from version three so we undid it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We create add new version now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is version four but we did respond to what Commissioner Orton said.

>> MR. MORGAN: To be clear the changes are in this so I need to revert this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Why don't we go back to the old version then?

>> MR. MORGAN: At this point it's better for me to make the changes, we are pretty clear which they are.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for the question, Commissioner Orton.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I want to go back to what we were talking about earlier and yesterday.

The systematic approach.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: So if you wouldn't mind if you could bring me up to speed on the systematic approach with partisan fairness if you are looking at the

districts that have the close margins and then zeroing in on them just so we can establish that compliance pathway.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is not the path we are taking at the moment. We do have that -- those districts and I think what we tried was using racial data to achieve partisan fairness and it did not work.

So we just undid that.

And now what I think we all need a little bit of motivation and we have a District that we did collaboratively draw before.

And Commissioner Eid is going to help us sort of look at that overlay and it's in the southwest corner of the state in 81 and 87 District 81 and 87 and maybe 88 and then we are going to try to from there after that is sort of, we will see how we look at and see we will run the whole state partisan fairness score.

Hopefully feel motivated then have lunch then.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: One step an at time.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have not quite fixed it out.

What we did tried it didn't work in our sequential methodology.

So I think we are sort of trying to do something that we do know we have done collaboratively before and see if it improves our score.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It's kind of an add on to that if we are looking at 81 and 87 in the southwest.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: How about if we look at that on the election matrix on the left hand side, the partisan margin.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid has requested that.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yeah, I think that is a great way to begin looking at any District just to get a sense of is there play here or not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay and Commissioner Eid did I represent that correctly?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes perfect.

I think that makes a lot of sense to do it that way.

So now we have just have to find the overlay we were talking about previously.

It's one of our house map our State House map overlays.

That we did so towards the beginning of the collaborative mapping process.

Quite a lot of revision here.

>> KIM BRACE: Commissioners we are working off John's machine that has a different convention for his layers than what Kent's machine has.

So I'm just trying to diagnosis the how he called it versus what Kent had called it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Understand.

Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Brace.

That looks awfully similar to what we are looking for.

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

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Step one you were looking for.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I prefer to call it a lakeshore District instead of a stair step District.

So that also would be appreciate you know.

So we will have to reconfigure a couple of these, 81, 87 and 88. So let's look at all three of these 81, 87 and 88 all three of them as currently configured are republican leaning districts.

81 has 58.48% republican, 87 has 54.09 republican.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm trying to record so go slower.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: For District 88 would be the other one is 51 -- 87 is 54.09.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Got it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We have to figure out a way to put 81 being that lakeshore District and because the other districts are losing population configuring them in a way that will make up for that loss of population.

So I think the easiest way would be to start with 81 and let's assign those areas in the overlay along the lakeshore to 81.

And unassign the areas that are not in the overlay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Unassign or move to 87?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 87, 88 it doesn't matter.

87 is connected to it so yes, I think that would be appropriate.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let me follow the outline here so this outline is a District, a lakeshore District.

So I will choose I would suggest choosing District 87 for that because we will only have to add a few Townships to it if I may.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay whatever works.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Originally this was drawn for communities of interest reasons.

I think I must have been more ready when this was drawn.

But at our hearing in Benton Harbor we heard a lot about the lakeshore community, a lot about the minority community in area and I think that is the main purpose of this was for communities of interest reason not just partisan fairness.

I'm sorry you got it now.

>> MR. MORGAN: Following the boundary the districts that are now in the plan are congruent with the lakeshore District and then it looks like the District 81.

May be different.

Let me see.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We probably need to fix population between 81 and 88. Yeah, that is exactly what we need to do.

So we are on 81 we are 10,000 high and on 88 we are 11,500 low.

So we need to normalize.

>> MR. MORGAN: Take this into 88.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think that would be appropriate.

Let's put that into 88.

Then after the populations are about even, we can look at the numbers and see if we created a District excuse me allergies that goes with the goal we are doing now.

81 needs an extra Township or two.

So let's add that north of the square on 81.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid, Watervliet they wanted to stay together put the population is highest in Watervliet when you were adjusting in terms of community of interest with Hartford.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is getting closer to, right, so as soon as that change happened it did change.

However I would like to leave that area in 88 for now because we may need to put it into 87 to make these numbers work for partisan fairness values.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Will you continue to direct Commissioner Eid please?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wonderful so now we are still about we are still about 9,000 off.

So let's take those three Townships right there, brand bridge Keller and Hamilton and put them in 81.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm going to expand the view to make sure we are not missing a District so again it's 81, 87, 88 are the ones we made changes to.

So 81 and 88 are out of alignment, okay.

Do you want all three of those?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: All three of them should get us pretty close.

That is close enough for now.

But we are going to get closer later.

Now let's look at the election data for 87 and see if it brought us closer to our goal.

>> MR. MORGAN: Look at the partisan composite score is what you want to look at.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: For all three 81, 87 and 88 and see if we are able to move one to the other side.

>> MR. MORGAN: 81, 87 and 88 so the partisan composite index for 81 is democrat 40, republican 60 for 87 it's democrat 49.5 republican 50.5, 88 is 43 democrat 57 republican.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we are getting closer on 87 in particular, which I think was expected so we are 49.46.

How can we move that, we need to examine next how we can move that to above 50% if my understanding is correct here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson, will you concur?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yeah, I think since this is a narrowly leaning with a composite score republican percentage that seeing if that can slightly change that to see what the fairness score is I agree with that.

What the other districts that Commissioner Eid referenced 81 and 88 are those also districts that there were changes to, did the composite scores change?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: They did and I recorded them started off with republican leaning and recorded the republican percentages so it was 58.4, 81 was 58.4 and moved to 60 something.

87 was 54.09 and moved to 50.5 republican advantage and 88 was 54 now it's at 57 again republican percentages.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you it sounds like the biggest change in the direction that you're looking for is in 87.

Okay thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid please proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's make some minor changes to this and see if we can make minor adjustments like VRA expert has advised.

So let's move into you see that area sort of towards the north of 87 where there is a little tongue looking thing on it, right there, let's Zoom in there and all the way in.

So let's look at the block level block level for moving population around?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't think we need major changes here but need to move this 1% so wondering if we take part of Coloma and that would both make this District, I think a better shape and we will see if that changes the numbers in a way that help us.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I appreciate the way you are walking us through it.

>> MR. MORGAN: Into 87 what Section the section here north of the village?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, north of -- do you know what add in the village and let's see how many people are in there.

>> MR. MORGAN: 1465.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: All right add that in.

>> MR. MORGAN: Democrat 49.2 republican 50.8.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Did that go up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Republican advantage increased.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's take that whole Township of Coloma, right and see what that does into 87.

So now it went down so let's undo that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There is no pointer function that would tell us what these numbers are, just for that Township by chance? Much like how there is for the racial demographics.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm not sure I understand the question.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Black voting age population up with the circles you can point to and tell you the percentage?

>> MR. MORGAN: So what I described before is what I could do is I could put a label on a precinct with a single election result comparing the republican and democrat. I could do that.

At the voting precinct level.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think that would be useful.

>> MR. MORGAN: Which election are you looking to consider?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Would it be the composite?

>> MR. MORGAN: We can't do the composite we found out the composite is calculated dynamically at the District level.

So it's not -- we don't have composite results at this level.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm a little weary of looking at any one election because I like how the composite results use multiple data points over the course of ten years. But what does the rest of the Commission think?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson has a thought on that.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn.

I agree Commissioner Eid.

I think as we've discussed and as Dr. Handley said using one election skews the outcome you are looking for because we can pick an election that skews for one part and skews another and I think it creates some complications.

So our I think our strong advice would be to rely upon the composite scores.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the process again Mr. Commissioner Eid is trying to help us with a different methodology and walking ourselves through it for the first time so I'm hearing he should just sort of continue to choose, highlight the area as he is directing Mr. Morgan to do and read the composite score that is the process we will use.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I understand that is something and that is what you all are trying now and I think that we can see what the outcome is relatively soon so we can get a sense of is this the way to go or do we need to go in another direction.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, thank you, Mr. Morgan, then Commissioner Eid.

>> MR. MORGAN: To Commissioner Eid's concerns I can use the pointer to bring up multiple elections and a long list, and not just refer to a single election if that is useful.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It is useful but I think we could be over encumbered by doing that.

So we did add to 87.

So perhaps the one village which was like what 2000 people.

>> MR. MORGAN: 1429.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So about 1500 people.

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.

What if we remove a part of it and add it either into 81 or 88 to match it and let's see if that concentrates you know the what we are doing is concentrating the democrats into a lakeshore District here so why don't we look at that.

Let's look at you see the second Township up from the border right that Township let's Zoom in on there.

>> MR. MORGAN: Township in 87.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: In 87, yes and let's go to the block level and remove we should probably look at the whole population of the Township first to see if this is even possible.

Okay it is because it has more than the 1400 people we added above.

So now let's move into the block layer and let's take off the more inland portions and see if that helps achieve the goal.

And we move those into 81.

>> MR. MORGAN: So following the outer boundary you look at taking this out or is there a specific line you want to follow?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There is not really a specific line.

We need to hit about 1400 people and I think the most inland parts right because the whole point is to have a lakeshore District and we heard in the public comment that really the lakeshore districts are not considered too far inland.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So John because I think that 1500 people you added that Township actually increased the percentage of republican lean.

What I mean is you could reduce -- you could get back to 50.5 republican leaning you are at 50.7 right now with Hartford.

You are at the block level and taking out, I wanted to offer the addition of that town, that village did not help the democratic advantage that you're seeking.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I thought it did.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It did not.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm mistaken.

So let's move back up, thank you for that, Commissioner Rothorn T let's move back up to that area where we added the village.

So maybe that whole area is not appropriate place to look to do this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Coloma increased the republican advantage by .2.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You are right. It went up to 49.45 now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right but I think your attempt to take off at the block level.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It seems to be working so let's square off that part of 81 that we just put into 87.

You want to add that all back in?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, I want keep it in 81 and I want to keep it with it and keep.

>> MR. MORGAN: Take territory out.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And into 81.

I want to do north though because we want to try to keep the more lakeshore community together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Add to 81 or 88?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 81.

We are 49.45.

Which is a pretty close number.

I would actually wonder if using a more recent election would make this number change and you know be over 50%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You would not have to do -- these blocks have not increased it at all so we could keep it whole and have a whole Township and still have the same percentage.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, that's true.

Okay well now I think that is very true so let's add that whole town back into 87.

I know we are kind of going back and forth here guys but it's hard to know which areas to.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are helping us learn something new and doing it for the first time partisan fairness so I think I speak for many of us and we appreciate it Commissioner Eid.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What if we add the whole -- again with the tongue area that I identified before, that's currently like halfway in 88 and-a-halfway in 87, what would happen if we apply the whole Township to 88? So we are 49.87% now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Almost certain that is respecting a community of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Keeping the whole Township together and keeping those two Village's within their voting precincts.

So, yeah, I think that also helps with that value as well problem is 88 now has too many people.

We can normalize that with 81 later.

So really the biggest difference is between 81 and 88.

What do we think? Are we satisfied the 49.whatever number it was or should we try to get it above 50%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That does not change our number, our seat number any way.

So take a little more off inland and go up the coast a little more.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: All right.

Let's try that.

So I guess since what we just did seemed to work, let's keep going north of there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What about that inland you know between 87 and 81, where the furthest inland.

It looks pretty suburban but might be useful, that Township.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Between 87 and 81.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Middle of 87 the most inland Township.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Talking this one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That John is hovering over you can add it or take it out and add it back and see what happens.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 1995 precinct or Township, those guys, yeah, that seems a little small for this area.

Be a whole Township.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That did it.

Possibly to makeup that population let's go to the top of 87 and maybe take a little bit more lakeshore and put it in here or do we want to do that or are we satisfied with how it looks now?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is a question to the Commissioners.

Any thoughts for Commissioner Eid? Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are a little under population on 87 now by about 4,000 people do we want to take the lakeshore and make it go a little more north because we took off some of the inland areas?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Did you get the number you want?

>> KIM BRACE: It's high.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right now the percentage is what we identified that we all want.

However, the population now is low so we need to get population from somewhere.

>> KIM BRACE: 88 more than likely.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you speak up sorry.

>> KIM BRACE: You have 88 being high, about 5,000 people.

So taking some out of 88 and putting it into 87 will balance.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Makes sense and Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: This is the same problem of Sterling Heights you don't have enough of the minority population dispersed and available to bring in.

So your only other option is to reduce the white population, but.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is when.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The problem is you are already 4,000 some down.

So I'm not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not sure there is a good way to fix it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All for extending north for 87.

How much more hacking do you want to do to Ottawa County is the question? What about going across the County line inward, inland?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see several hands Mr. Adelson and Commissioner Clark then Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn.

One point as you are trying this method the plan deviation is 11.2%.

That must be addressed.

That's way too high.

The so as you're making adjustments, attention is going to have to be paid for bringing that down.

That is way above I think what General Counsel and I are comfortable with.

Moving further.

So this is as we were talking about yesterday and before clearly there are a lot of elements that conflict.

And have competing values and issues, but that deviation as we know is number one with the V RA so just as an FYI that is something that really needs to be addressed as we are moving towards the end of the week.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark then Mr. Morgan.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you move north, you get more nonminority population and will bring your percentages flip-flop back to where it was even though you might add population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, and just in the current state where we are, we understand that District 88 is overpopulated and you're contemplating adjusting that.

But the last two moves that were made we with are taking population out of 88, sorry out of 87 into 88 and then out of 87 into 81.

So you might look to equalize between 88 and 81 and leave 87 alone.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I heard what everyone said thank you so much, it actually does help.

So let's normalize between 81 and 88 and then we can look at going north on this lakeshore District a little bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has more complexity to add.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Anthony if you try taking the little precinct, move the cursor right very left of where you were, that precinct 51, 41 -- 5141 maybe and then I don't know.

You will have to do something with population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We could try.

I think it would be hard to reconcile that population.

But I mean we can try it and might make the numbers better since it is more inland.

So let's try it and let's put that precinct that Commissioner Orton was just speaking about in 81.

>> MR. MORGAN: That was a Township, it's two precincts.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is fine now let's look at the election data.

It did help now we are up to 51.51% in District 87 but under population so first normalize between 81 and 88 just take that northeastern Township and assign it into 88.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That went two precincts maybe you can take one precinct closest to St. Joe or whatever area that is.

Put that back in 87 so it's not taking.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's see what that does to the numbers.

What did that do to the election results? So that took it actually down a little bit which is opposite direction where we want to go so hit the undo button on that.

Now look at deviation between 81 and 88.

Okay and really, it's 87 that is the main problem here, we have to add population.

So first let's go north on 87 and take up a little bit more of that lakeshore.

It probably would be easiest to use the precincts here because I don't want to take the whole Township because it will go more inland.

>> MR. MORGAN: In this case a lot of time the precincts are the same as the Township.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I see then let's go to blocks.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Why not try the Township level first.

See what I mean and if you need to go to blocks you can but maybe Casco Township is maybe a democratic place.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We can try it and put it in 87 and see what it does to the numbers.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We were 38.9% republican, I'm only doing republican.

>> MR. MORGAN: What did you want to look at?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now let's look at the election results.

So we are what did you say the last number was.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right we were 48.9 now we are at 48.6 republican leaning. So we are increasing the democratic each time.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's take the Township on top of that too.

How are we on population now? 87 still a little under.

I'd say let's just keep going north.

It seems to be working out okay.

Let's take one more Township.

We would have to take those as well because we can't make an island with that.

>> KIM BRACE: Non-contiguity.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay now let's once again look at election results and the population is okay on 87, we are at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 48.2 republican which is best so far.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now let's Zoom out because now we got some weird stuff going on here.

You know what might make sense to go from here is reconfiguring 88, 95 and 81.

Because then we won't have this like little alleyway connecting the two Townships.

We would then have to adjust 95.

How do people feel? 95 have any issue where maybe I should not be adjusting it?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well this is not really relayed to 95 since you got it well above the 50/50 maybe you can put in how you originally had it put back in what is south of St. Joe is what I think that is.

And then take off that top one.

Just to make it a little less, yeah, a little more compact.

I think those -- I think that whole Township kind of would be a community of interest with that town.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You're talking about the Township with kind of like the diagonal line between them? I could buy that.

Let's assign that back to 87 and unassign the -- first let's put the top Township back into 88 and then we will put that one in 87.

I know I said that one which is not very precise but you do know what I'm talking about so we are putting the Township back in 88.

>> MR. MORGAN: I was assuming that the last in the last Township in.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is the correct assumption okay now let's go back into 87.

Perfect.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is something to consider with this.

These are water areas but they have to be assigned somewhere.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Given it's a lakeshore District let's assign it with the District.

Now let's go to where Commissioner Orton was just speaking of.

It's that Township that looks like it's divided by exactly let's assign all that area back into 87.

And now it looks like we are going the other way and let's assign it and see what happens.

That doesn't work apparently.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you want to back out of the last one?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What it seems we have to do is how we had it before taking them out, add back in the District we put out previously. So undo the last couple of moves.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe just the two and leave the top Northwestern is that what you were going to suggest Commissioner Orton please.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Take out the last one you originally took out the 1995 then it worked out okay on here.

It is still democrat leaning but what was the population? We did not check the population.

If it's okay it's okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's check it so sign that back to 81.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then looking at the population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think I did like it better with both of those areas in 81 because it keeps the Township intact though.

It's just that Township is in 81 instead of 87.

>> MR. MORGAN: So these are the population numbers for 87, 1261 over 1.38, 81 is 18.49 under, 2.02 and 88 is 110 people.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's look at election data at this point.

So it's very, very close and looks like this did achieve the goal of getting above 50%. Let's Zoom out a little bit.

The previous configuration had what was the highest that it got to or the lowest republican because that is what you are tracking.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 48.2% meaning 51.8 would be the democratic that was the highest democratic percentage 51.8.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This might be a question for our legal team, we got it to 51% now it's at 50.5%.

These numbers are democrat voting numbers.

Is this too close how we have it right now? Should we increase it back up to 51.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is 87 aye Eid 87.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: John can you scroll down a little bit to see the matrix that 87 and 88 please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton you had something pertinent to this discussion right now.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Wondering if we could see the whole report again and see what it looks like.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is the plan and would be our suggestion and see what this is.

>> MR. MORGAN: Saved this as version four in anticipation of changes so it has a different name so if I run the partisan fairness report you can compare it the any of the other plans.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Before we run the partisan fairness report should we -- we had a configuration where we had this one the rest of that Township with the diagonal line in 81 and added one more Township to the lakeshore and that increased the democratic vote from where it's at now at 50.05 to about 51.5%.

With -- does that matter? Would that be appropriate? Or should we run the numbers now?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I appreciate the question and I think the best way to look at that is we can see what the partisan fairness score now.

I don't believe that a change to that degree when you already have the District narrowly favoring democrats, I don't think that's going to make any significance.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's run the report and get the partisan fairness number to see if it realigned.

>> KIM BRACE: While the composite gives you an overall score you might see little changes in individual years that would give you a clue that maybe things are moving one direction or another.

That would be the reason.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Brace and I think we can anticipate because we are going to run a Polsby Popper score that this is not going to be pretty not compact it will pop right out of the Polsby Popper chart.

>> MR. MORGAN: Compare to which plan? The version two, I think?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have the numbers to keep track so version two.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are you asking for help with the public.

Let's display them and looks to me that it is making that change did bring it closer to 0.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This helps the public come along with us as we are understanding what we are doing.

So the top one here and putting the most recent map version four on the top and then the version from which it came was version two.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you will you help direct?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Betterment, this is the lopsided margin test, correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That has gone 8.2 to 7.7.

Let's move on to mean median difference.

Improved 4.4% to 4.1%.

Now let's look at efficiency gap.

Improved 9.9% to 8.9%.

And now let's look at seat bias or seats to votes ratio.

So it's improved from on the previous plan where it was 51% democrat or 51 democratic seats to 59 republican seats to now 52 to 58 and that is increased the proportionality by 1% going from 6% to 5%.

Seems like with this method we are going in the right direction.

It just might take a while.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right and I think what we may want to summarize for ourselves and I'm going to suggest we take a lunch break after this but I think the summary is we are not using racial data any more to look at that. Even though that is how we did it before, we are not looking at racial data we are trying to look at the, yeah, the election results as we are doing it.

So Commissioner Eid I think walked us through how we can do that but then, yeah, and this was Commissioner Clark's turn Commissioner Clark do you want to say anything before was turn it back over to Chair Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No the only comment I have at this point this time is the amount of took to do one and we got a number of them that we want to look at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Amen, brother.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want me to runny other reports before we leave this se Szetela did you do the compactness? Just for fun do the compactness just for kicks and giggles.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which one will have the lowest score, I wonder.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well you know I think this will be more compact than some of the Detroit to districts we have actually so let's see.

>> MR. MORGAN: Because of the presence of the water you are right.

This is the report for Polsby Popper for compactness so scrolling down to the end, the least compact is still District 8 at .12, Polsby Popper most compact is .31 did you want to look at any specific districts?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 87 you said Commissioner Orton? 87.

>> MR. MORGAN: With the present of the water that is a way that it affects the compactness.

So again as long as the water blocks are included your compactness will be adjusted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So my question about the water blocks and compactness should we take those out to measure compactness is that what the courts will do? Or do they include the extra mileage into the Lake as part of the District?

>> KIM BRACE: I've seen it done both ways.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Of course.

>> KIM BRACE: For example my state of Maryland with the Bay, that will increase your perimeter tremendously as you trace that way.

So sometimes you know they divide the three mile within the Bay kind of a thing to improve your compactness score but in truthfulness, yeah, you probably would take out the water and the problem with the water though is that many times from the Census

Bureau from a generic sense of water you also have lakes and lakes also give you complications on that side.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was planning on moving my houseboat out there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Question for Bruce.

Can you interpret or could this be interpreted as we are reaching to the north to get the correct population for this District? Is this like a situation where in Muskegon and Grand Rapids.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is a great question Commissioner Clark.

Muskegon example is -- was a specific racial reach in an attempt to see if these two cities could be combine.

So I'm not getting that same sense here.

However, this is a pretty narrow District and I think that one you know one point I would certainly echo what Kim said let's look at the truth in the sense of what -- how will a Court objectively look at this.

Having an opportunity to view the land mass for compactness and using the water to alter that is not the best word to skew the compactness score, I think that that would be a point in litigation so my advice would be as John was saying if there is a way to take the water out of the equation in a sense just so we can get an idea of what the land mass is I think that would be advisable.

>> KIM BRACE: There is a way of doing that it's just assigning the water to zero and when you do contiguity and assignment, you're obviously going to have errors there. But that's all water as long as you make sure that you just get the Atlanta mass properly assigned, and you're not caring about the fish anyway.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To that point I certainly concur with that just as we did in unassigning and assigning various part of districts just to get an idea of population and otherwise.

Being able to do that here just to see how the land mass grades out I think would be helpful.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You made the point about it being a narrow District. I mean there are some points I look at it they are almost touching the sand.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point Commissioner Clark this is as I recall this is one of the more narrow districts so I think that is why I'm suggesting getting a compactness evaluation of the land area.

I think that that would be helpful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's definitely a very narrow District.

But I think we actually did you know a pretty beautiful thing here because it's an example of what I was saying before where both constitutional criteria three and four are in agree-ance with a lakeshore District that support as community of interest that

has been sent to us and it helped make the partisan fairness numbers closer to 0 and it's a great thing, we are able to find a community of interest that also supports partisan fairness values.

Compactness is lower than both of those, three and four.

So I'm wondering how you know how would that play out?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: A couple of considerations, one of them is just to bring us back to what we talk about earlier, the deviation will have to be addressed.

That is absolute out ways everything else except the Voting Rights Act.

It's too high.

And that must come down.

I prefer not to speculate about litigation possibilities and what the narrow District could mean but it is my strong suggestion that we get a compactness evaluation on the land mass because this does raise some possibilities and I think the first step is let's see what the compactness score is on the land mass and we can go from there.

>> MR. MORGAN: On the deviation again there may be an issue because it looks like the direction out of alignment is District 79 which we did not really touch in this area so we may have a geographic splinter issue so we will need to after we finish our work for the lunch break, we will rerun and rebuild the plan and see if it fixes the deviation automatically.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Morgan.

All right any other comments? So without objection we will recess for 60 minutes for lunch.

Hearing no objections it's currently 12:57 p.m. we will recess and return back at 2:00 p.m.

Thank you very much everybody.

[Lunch recess]

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Test one two ready when you are Madam Chair.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:09 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 Announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry. Juanita Curry? I think you are muted, Juanita.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. At this time we are going to continue working on our mapping process and ask my Chair MC Rothhorn to facilitate the continual refinements to the house maps.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Chair Szetela I believe we completed with Commissioner Clark and we are on to Commissioner Eid, Commissioner Eid you have the floor.

Mr. Morgan? And Rhonda has her hand up so Commissioner Clark and Lange then we will go to Mr. Morgan.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Correction wouldn't it go to Commissioner Curry?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you very much Commissioner Lange Commissioner Curry my apologies.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That is okay MC I missed what was happening this morning but I will take a shot at it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can I try to do a summary for you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You, yes, may.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are trying to do this in a systematic approach and this morning we found one way that didn't work and found a second way that may work but it takes too long.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we are trying a third approach and we started it on it by reviewing and so what we are trying to do is correct partisan fairness in our maps and the house maps and we are trying to figure out which District to identify to work on.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: At this point what I want to suggest is just the composite and the active matrix when John brings it up, we have 110 districts and what you're what we are trying to do is we have a partisan lean towards the republicans right now and sometimes those percentages are 57% or 60% republican.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are not going to address those.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we are trying to look for is 51% maybe 50% republican lean, 50.something and identify all the out of the 110 districts which ones could we actually with a little tweaks and that would happen during your turn a few tweaks can we actually help them move democratic so we have a more balanced map in terms of partisan fairness so that is the methodology is to just start with that active matrix and run through composite scores of partisan fairness and work from that and you can choose those districts.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: May I make a suggestion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Absolutely.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Who was coming after me? Eid, can I switch with the person and who did you call? Let me come after somebody else so I can see which way they are going with it so I won't disrupt anything that you guys have going.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Curry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You do not disrupt anything so to be clear but I think if you want to have Anthony go first to orient, I think that is a fine idea.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: That would be fine thank you guys.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will go to Commissioner Eid and go to Commissioner Curry at the end of Commissioner Eid's turn. Commissioner Eid you have the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That turns out well and since I'm next you can take mine and it evens out.

Okay so let's pull up the map we were just working on.

>> MR. MORGAN: We will hand off to Kent with the computer so what I will do is while he is getting the final piece set up, I'm going to bring up the spreadsheet of the version four we just ran the numbers on so you can look at that one more time.

Okay so let's for District that are close to the 50/50 margin.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Don't we have it what we went through.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The lopsided but not composite election results and we realize we have percentages there that might help us more than the lopsided margins.

Mr. Morgan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Those percentages are the same, so on the first spreadsheet it's the same thing as on the seats votes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We do have nine districts already identified 28, 29, 35, 50, 53, 60, 74 and 103 and Commissioner Clark did with us. 28, 29, 35, 50, 53, 60, 70, 74 and 103.

All of these are close to the 50% margin and lean republican I think that was what is that correct Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, that is correct. Some of them are 53 which may not be attainable but there is a number of them that are close to 50.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's look at District 28, where is that on the list.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton did you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, Doug tried that one and wasn't successful.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We worked on that before.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 28 and 29 are both kind of in the same area.

Let's look at 35.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 29 was not in the same area.

The adjacent districts of 28 were 25, 32 and 44. 29 it might be but it wasn't immediately adjacent.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, so we have two perhaps 29, 35.

>> MR. MORGAN: Do you identified the ones you want to look at. You've looked at the spreadsheet and now I'm going to turn it over to Kent to bring up the map.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Eid, one thing I need to point out before we get too far into this District 79 is still 6.4% high.

We thought at one point there was a glitch in how it was done, but after looking at background maps, that is right.

So it is significantly higher than what it's typically been used.

Okay and Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is District 79 in the Grand Rapids area, correct?

Okay what do we want to do Commissioners? Should we fix this now or focus on, fix it?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is our process absolutely.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The question is what do we do with that population? So we have to take some out and then taxi that for lack of a better word to a different District.

So let's Zoom out a little and just see what is around there.

We have seen 88 that kind of winds now because of the District we drew in 87 so there is potential to kind of combine some of those together and.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 77 is under populated by 2000 so it might absorb it and you might be able to get it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is true.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: This happened when you were working on the area MC and trying to get the coalition District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Since you know the thought process maybe you can take some of there and put it somewhere.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: But it's 76 and 77 are under populated and that is really what I would just do is try to add it to 76 and add the population that is in 79 that is over 277 and then 276.

There isn't and I think what forgive me I'm beginning to understand your actual question because we don't want to reduce the minority coalition District that was built.

Okay so yeah so, the upper portion north another Wyoming has the African/American population to create this District so maybe adding the theme Kent could help and Commissioner Eid shift things around.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So you reconfigured this to add in the African/American population in Wyoming into 79?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It may not be African/American dots.
In the northeastern Wyoming part of the District.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would suggest if we take out that bottom Township that doesn't really effect it that much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm seeing it now so I don't think that in 76, yeah, so it was 86 that it's that I carved off the eastern side of Wyoming where the after African/American population and it's whiter in the north and I tried not to touch Grandville to be clear.

But that's I don't think you have any population there that will affect the District which is a coalition District and I don't think 79 is a coalition District so I apologize it took me that long to get there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair 96 is also a little bit lower and it borders on 79 here so you have 77 and 96 if you don't want to cross the river in 96.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That helps so we are looking at 77 and we are going to add in a couple of the precincts in 79 yep that one, that one exactly. 2800 assign that to 77.

And assign the one below it also to 77.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It brought 79 down to 1.54%ov and 77 is 258 over.

Want to continue?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, how is 79 looking? It's still 1400 over roughly.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are within the range of deviation what Mr. Stigall was saying.

That was a great move.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Seeing a lot of green checkmarks so that is good.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Alternative not to take the Township but there is one below that is kind of shaped like it down at the end at the bottom of 79.

So it's so you're suggesting switching the two.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, gives you a little more population too.

I mean that is your choice but I just want to offer that as a suggestion.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That makes sense I make 79 a little bit more compact as well.

Okay, so let's put that 2793 District back in 79.

And add in the 3621 into 77.

Looks good.

Now that is taken care of where did you say we were at on 96 since we are right there?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 96 is 2.57 low, 2356 people.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That's fine for now. So we were looking at District 29, I believe is the one we are trying to find.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That's correct.

District 29.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 29 surrounds Pontiac.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Interesting, interesting, okay so it surrounds Pontiac.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: When you're looking to adjust for partisan reasons or anything you need to pay special attention to the District, you're getting ready to edit because you can swing them one way, the opposite the way you really want to do it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you pull up the spreadsheet again so we can examine District 38?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Active matrix?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Partisan fairness spreadsheet in the excel.

>> MR. MORGAN: I will bring it up real quick.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have not run it on this plan so I don't have it on this, oh, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry about that Kent will bring the spreadsheet up and probably the last thing I do after I take Kim to the airport here.

This is the spreadsheet for version four and it does not reflect obviously the changes you just made in that.

District 38.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 38 or.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looking at adjacent districts I believe.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Interestingly this District is 71% democrat.

So let's bring the map up again.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Since I can't see it, I don't know but 38 is something we did for VRA compliance.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we just get the demographics of 38 up when you get a chance? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 8 is 33.54 percentage non-Hispanic Black. 44.879 Hispanic white. So it's an overall minority represented District.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So 38 is about 71% democrat while 29 is close.

Well, what did we say 47%.

So my thought would be to try to shift some of the democratic votes over from 39 into 29 that way it keeps 38 as a democratic District and turns 29 into a democratic District.

The only problem potential problem with that is VRA considerations.

We are in Oakland County.

I believe Dr. Handley had numbers for Oakland County was around 43% or so.

So we are not really even close to that with this 33.5%.

However I mean the election results said it was 71% democratic so I'm not sure how to interpret it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn my suggestion is we avoid districts that have VRA implications.

We have a list of several other districts and some other possibilities.

So in the interest of facilitating the partisan fairness adjustments our recommendation would be to move to districts that are not in the Metro Detroit area.

And address other districts as we can.

As you recall Dr. Handley had said which is part of the assumption in the science and the industry that Voting Rights Act implicated districts particularly in urban centers with high population.

Are going to have margins that are typically larger than in other districts obviously that is Voting Rights Act and other compliance.

Our recommendation is we avoid those.

Because adjusting in those areas will just make things unnecessarily complicated.

I think that there are a lot of areas that potentially we can look at that just don't implicate these considerations, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay well let's look for 35 which is the next number on the list.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to change the colors of 35 or 110, I guess.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think that is Wayne County so Detroit area.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It is Wayne County but I don't think this District in Wayne County was one of the VRA districts and we are looking at Plymouth here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm seeing a nod from Mr. Adelson so take it away.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we are looking at 35.

But we do not want to mess with 17, 14, because those are the VRA districts.

Probably five as well just because of how it looks drawn.

So we are in the Plymouth area.

Let's bring up the election results for this District, 35.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Change so the headers don't roll up.

It makes it a little more difficult.

Okay there is 35.

35 as it sits it was 51% Biden.

49% Trump in 2020.

And in 2012 is 45% Obama.

55% Romney.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall we are just looking at performance index on the left for this time.

And can you increase the font size of the active matrix, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, is that better?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It is.

Do we need it one more or is that good enough? One more, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I did it a second time.

Is that going to work?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is great.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 48 and 53 well 47 and 53.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so we are trying to change the shape of this District a little bit to include more democratic votes so where do we go? Can we Zoom out and see more surrounding areas we have Salem and Canton.

I'd rather not go into Canton.

We've heard keep Canton whole quite a bit.

Let's look at Northville and add some precincts in Northville.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If I recorded it correctly 110, leans 53% democratic.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There is a few percentage points to play with there.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is this an area we should look at Asian population as well to try to not break that up?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If you want you can I thought that was more in the Canton area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Novi has a pretty significant Asian population too.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we have the Asian American dots theme.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'll pop it up there real quick.

Looks like Canton is predominant.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Not much in the Plymouth District we have drawn.

Okay so let's add in a few of those precincts of 110 and shift those into 35.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What Commissioner Orton or maybe pointing to is it's a Novi District with Asian population there that maybe what -- am I reading that correctly Commissioner Orton? Is that what you are trying to suggest?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: There is Asian population there and we had tried in those districts to keep you know from breaking that up.

So that was my only thought.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So maybe you want to keep looking like in District 36 for example Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't have 36 listed.

The next one I have listed is 50.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see 36 is the purple one to the west of.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I see what you are saying.

Let's go to 36 and see what difference that makes.

Yeah, let's try it.

We don't want to mess with 110.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And 36 is 53% democratic lean, if I'm reading it correct.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's add that precinct into.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The republican column here.

So republican lean.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Republican lean that is useful.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 1793 to this District add?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, let's see what that does.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We want to put it in 35.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, we want to put it in 35.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Miss fired.

35 is 47% democrat.

53% republican.

36 is 47% to 53% republican.

It moved it a few tenths.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so it's working slowly.

But it's working.

Let's they the precinct on top of the one you just added.

Yep, that one right there.

Okay let's look at the change that made.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35 is at 47, it moved it a few tenths.

So it's slightly above 47 and slightly 53% republican.

36 is now 47.24 democrat and republican is 52.76, 53%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Just a suggestion I'm curious what's the composite score for 67? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 67 is 76% democrat, 24% republican.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Undo those changes, undo the last change you just made.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Assign one of these to 35?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Assign the top part of superior Township.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right there?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right there.

We are good.

Going this way makes a lot of sense to me.

We are kind of taking the highly democratic areas of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and moving it into a little bit more of Plymouth.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: As a suggestion I agree with Commissioner Eid.

There are districts that don't have any VRA implications that like 67 probably have a good margin with partisanship that you can use in adjoining districts to adjust the partisan fairness.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Computer does not like you today, Kent.

Okay that looks to be where we were at.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 77 is back to what it was now we can move on to what was it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 35.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We will take that first.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Those two right there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The other way into 36 and top of 67.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Assign this to 35?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And then this one?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Exactly let's check the election results again.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 35 more republican at 52.33.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All the democrats are in Ann Arbor.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And District 36 is still 53% republican, 67 should be more higher democrat 76% so doing that increased the republican numbers in 35.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I know this is going to put us way over population but I'm curious to see what happened if we have all of superior Township to 35. It's that one that is in 67 right now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put all of that in 35.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's see what it will do to the percentages.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 14832 in entire.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 50% republican, 50% democrat.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: How does 67 look with 67 percentages? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 67 is underfunded and is 77% democrat.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We got public comment about Livonia and it's pretty balanced and wondering because Livonia has three districts right 35 being one of them, I wonder if you borrowed from 17 or 14 right depending which one leans. I know it's hard to understand it but wondering if that is a direction.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The reason I didn't because they are two VRA districts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that what you were going to say Commissioner Orton? So I think we are trying to find a sweet spot where we are not working too hard to try to do something that may not be possible and I'm wondering yeah Commissioner Eid I want you to direct us.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have an idea and go in Ann Arbor a bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: With 35.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: With 35.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: More of an observation these two ends of 17 and 14 I understand they are VRA districts but I mean they are the minority population doesn't seem to show up there or is that not a.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are accurate the minority population is not there. It's in Redford and Detroit so that is balancing out the rest of it, so if you take that white population off the District is going to go up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton is that what you were going to say.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We spent so many hours getting those balanced I think we should ignore or leave those alone.

But so Mr. Adelson, how do we then so the 110 and 43 they both have a significant Asian population which we were trying to preserve.

So how do we balance out these things.

We are trying to get partisan fairness.

But that is a VRA issue, right? So then what do we do?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Orton to your point I think one of the suggestions that we've been talking about is with the partisan fairness issue in District -- this is 35, that maybe helpful is you may also want to consider splitting Townships because remember 67 has a substantial democratic it's a 3-1 partisan advantage. The addition, that straight vertical line that goes up north from additions in 67 that may have been fits but I think that in achieving what you're looking at splitting Townships may be an alternative into Commissioner Orton's point I think that the priorities should be avoiding taking population from the districts and I certainly we spent a lot of time adjusting them, these are fine-tuned adjustments.

So I think there are other opportunities that don't implicate these populations.

So that is why I'm suggesting that maybe splitting Townships might be helpful.

The margin is already improved.

The partisan fairness margin.

In 35 and you have relatively little ways to go.

But not going to 110 or 17 or 14, 15, 19.

Those you all took a lot of effort in adjusting them.

And I think maintaining that balance is very important.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have an idea.

Hit the undo button on what you just did.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to skip the undo button because I don't trust it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It's my favorite button.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: When it works it's a wonderful thing add that part back in to 67.

Keep that precinct, or no?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Go to the block level.

Right there into 67 to the right of that precinct line.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Take those and put them into 35.

Yep, that is square to the right of the previous precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That area there?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think we can go one more over to the left.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is up next to the highway or the whole corner?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Below the highway is better.

So assign that go 35.

Take the split of superior Township south into Ypsilanti.

Yep, we will just make a strip into Ypsilanti.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Following that vertical line?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Following that line.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Continue down to Township.

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: Keep this line going south until we get enough of Ypsilanti to have it make a difference and be partisan fairness measures.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm just keeping the straight line you specified earlier.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are about 11,000 over population at the moment. Do you want to check your numbers now?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On 35?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

That was about 13,000 people you added in the text box there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I see it, it just changed.

We will have to take more of 67 and maybe we don't.

Let's check it now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35 at this point is 50% democrat, 50.2 and it's 49.8 republican.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay now 67 let's make sure.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 67 is still over 75% democrat.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so that worked.

Now we just have to figure out a place where to take 67 from and I have an idea, so let's go back up into 35.

I don't think it will make up for the idea but I want to continue basically I want to figure out a way to put that voting precinct that is neighboring 36 and get that into 67 while still making it so that 35 has a connection.

So let's where we have the split of 67 let's move that north until we hit 36.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area here in 35 assign it to 36.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: To 67.

67 is already in the population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: How far up do you want to go?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's go up to 36.

We can take those two that are right there as well.

The two little polygons mainly the triangle.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Should I go across here and down?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Not yet.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is rural and not picking up much population.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I mainly want to see what it did to the percentages first.

So let's look at 35.

The election data.

35 is 50.25 democrat, 49.75, basically 50/50 still.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: And how are we looking an on population for all of them right now? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35 is 11,000 over.

67 is almost 17,000 under.

36 is 1100, within 1100 people.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, if we don't want -- I mean the only thing I can think of to do would be to kind of circle it around into part of Canton but I know we don't really want to go into Canton here.

Because you know we have to get population out of 35 somewhere.

So what if we added to Canton? And went further up into Plymouth? And that way for 35 we can take it further down to Ypsilanti?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Just a suggestion looking at the demographics in Canton and I share the concern that was expressed previously.

Commissioner Orton said talked about the Asian population but there are four precincts seemingly in the middle of Canton that don't appear to have any significant Asian population.

The four right in the middle of the pink area 43.

On the northern side 2482 that series.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: They don't have a lot of Asian population in there but we are trying to take population out of 35 at the moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We don't want to dilute.

And we are certain that your numbers are -- have shifted because of the significant population in the willow run airport area in Ypsilanti, that is why it shifted right because we have that and we are not going to be able to balance that so I would I mean I think you have to create more of a narrow strip then we are reaching potentially.

So I think we've got -- part of me just wants to say okay I think we tried but I'm not sure when to say, yeah.

Chair Szetela, do you have any thoughts? I thought I heard a, no, okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Speaking to what Mr. Adelson said if these precincts happen to vote democrat and you moved them in 35 you would not have to run so far down here.

I think is what maybe Mr. Adelson was suggesting.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm so glad you said that.

I think that was the idea.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's try it then we can take off some of willow run.

The question is do they vote democrat? I don't know if they do or not.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think maybe Kent is doing it but isn't there the thing where you can select and click? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm highlighting to see how many people are there.

We can go in and look at like that is 9,000.

If you want, we can look at the one of the elections for each precinct to get an idea of what you might be getting into.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't want to look at one election.

Just add it that way it will go in the composite.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looked like it bumped it slightly you are 50.5 compared well still 50/50 but a couple of tenths.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Now we need to take of some of the willow run area so let's do that.

Let's take off those four precincts.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These right here?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Those right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, that is well that goes over quite a ways.

Maybe we don't need to move that much.

Just a moment.

Let it catch up.

35 still has to drop many.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we look at 35? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It flip-flopped.

That doesn't work for what you are trying to do.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe if you take out all of that, that is on the west, it's going to change those numbers, I think.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Which part of the west?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Superior.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That whole strip that you added in, we don't need that population now so if you put that population back in to 43 and whichever the other one was.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 67 does that sound right?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Back into 67.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If you take out population it's going to.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Are you suggesting we take put this back into 43?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What she is suggesting is add all of superior Township back into 67.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Part.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think something is going to have to go into 43.

Isn't it really low now because you took that chunk out?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Oh, yes, okay so let's first assign it to 67.

Then we can measure and look at and then add.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 43 is down 9500.

So you are saying move this into 43? Is that where we are at?

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: First let's put it into 67.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay 43 is the one short.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So now let add in first now let's look at the election results of 35 once again.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Swung heavily republican not heavily but swung.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We tried on this one.

There may be others on the list that are easier.

We could come back to trying this after.

I believe I'm hearing from Commissioner Szetela that she might have some ideas.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not ready yet but I'm working down the list.

But I think you're in an area where it's going to be very hard to achieve partisan fairness in sort of breaking up Ann Arbor.

It's just the way it is.

So I think that's what you're seeing and are struggling with.

Because yeah, it's hard to balance that area.

And there is a lot of population which makes it even harder so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What area are you looking at right now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I started with Midland then I moved to Saginaw.

And now I'm moving to Monroe.

So I'm just going through and coming up, with ideas for you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You were able to make a significant change in Monroe?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not yet I just started on Monroe.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Midland?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Midland and Saginaw.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Before we move from here shall I fix 35 to get the number back in the ballpark?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Basically undo all the changes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I want to make sure before I started pulling the trigger.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We tried.

I'd rather try and not work than not try.

So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Is this how 35 -- no, 67 didn't come up here, did it? No, it did not.

This was in 35.

All of that was in 35, correct? Or not?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think it was all in 36 actually.

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

Now 35 was it 4.42% low when we started?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That's a great question.

Commissioner Szetela, what you are working from can you help us? Do you have the map up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, what are you looking for.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: District 35 go ahead Kent please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm pretty sure we assigned this and took this out of 36 and put it in 35 so this should be correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hold on, so 35, yeah was just Plymouth and 30 what you have as 36 was can you stroll up a little bit but that looks right what you have right there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Scroll up a little please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Your question is what? Yes, that looks correct, yep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid you have the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's move to the Midland area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do you want I guess what I'm offering we were working from a list where we would go to 50 or 53 do you want to sort of acknowledge which one?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This would be 53.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 53 okay we are going to 53 and skip 50 for the moment.

50 is right there isn't it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 50 is right there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

I guess we should look at percentages for all these first.

So 50 and 53 are the two we are looking at specifically.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 50 is 48.-- 49% democrat, 51% republican.

53 is 48 and 52.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay is anyone more familiar with the area that knows how we can move 50 and 53 more into compliance?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have 31 in between so maybe we want to know what 31 is.

How does it lean? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 31 is 59% republican and the deviation on that I think is you know important to pay attention to at this point.

31 is just 500 people high.

A couple swaps could do it, I guess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Want to know how I did it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I created a District made up of Midland and Bay City.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I want to make it easy on us all are you asking Chair Szetela to direct?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks take it away.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Rather than 31 and 53 as they are currently configured, I basically created a District, I created 31 wrapping around Midland and put Midland and Bay together and that flips the District you now have a democratic and republic 31 is republican and not making changes there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you direct the process, please?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

Give me one second, I just have to reassign something here.

But yeah, if you put Midland into 53 that would be the start.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The town and the Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just the City.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 53?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange I see your hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My concern with doing that is we have we all know Midland is the area we've had conflicting, but one thing they all agreed on was keeping Midland whole.

Midland County whole whether they wanted to be with the Tri-Cities or to the west.

And they refer to that as their community of interest.

So I think breaking that up you may have some backlash as far as the community of interest part goes.

We had a lot of comments on this particular map where it sounded like both sides were content with it being kept whole in its own District.

I just wanted to put that out there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I feel we received a lot of -- from my impression Midland wants to be with the Tri-Cities which obviously is not going to apply for this map because none of the districts are big enough for that.

And I've heard a lot of people in Midland Township say they want to be with Midland City.

But my understanding from the City folk is the City folk want to be with Tri-Cities the Township folk want Midland Township and Midland together so yes, I agree there will probably be some push back but at this point we are focused on compliance so I'm just trying to hit that compliance goal.

This is one way to do it.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Community of interest is above this.

And both sides from the comment have said keep it whole.

When you go in and look at the maps there is one thing that people agreed on and that was keeping that whole especially since it does not encompass the Friday cities.

You can't get the Friday cities out of this District and one thing they said is they were happy with the District as it is being whole.

And that was coming from people that said Tri-Cities and the other.

So I'm just concerned because that ranked.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark is trying to get in too.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I fully support what Rhonda is saying.

My understanding, I've seen a lot of comments about keeping Midland and Midland Township together.

My perspective on this is on the Congressional maps it doesn't matter.

But necessarily because a lot of the Congressional things are done at a high level and national level.

But on a State Senate and a State House I think it's significant that we keep them together.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll just offer I'm going to try to get Mr. Adelson in here too but I think what we realize is we only have nine districts we identified and we had three that we could not flip.

So what I mean to say is we have an opportunity with 53 here maybe 50 right and we have to at least try like we couldn't do anything in the first three districts we identified so where we have an opportunity -- it's been slow and painful for us all and really challenging today so I feel like because we've got an opportunity here Chair Szetela has identified something that works, it feels like we have an obligation to ourselves so just try to like try it.

I mean I think we all appreciate the pain that this is doing with communities of interest. And at some point, we have to somehow achieve this partisan fairness compliance and also been hearing that unendingly.

This is one of the ways we can do it right so keep it going right.

So Chair Szetela please take us down this path.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, so it's going to look like a robot arm I'm not going to deny that so we are going to turn 31 at this point we are going to put into 31 Garfield Fraser, Beaver, Kawkawlin, those two Townships.

Okay then you are going to put Bangor in 31 and the one underneath Freeland.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange I'm being told you have your hand raised is that true.

Do you want to speak?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Apologies I forgot to put it down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No problem.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Where do I go from here Commissioner Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To the Tittabawassee underneath the one that is still pink underneath.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Sixville and Bay City.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go one block down, down, down, down, there you go yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm sorry I was focused on staying up here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, no.

All right so now we need precincts.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 3 is 5,000 high and 31 is 5,000.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just adjust a precinct or two to make them a little closer so if you can Zoom in just a bit, a little closer to Bay City.

Okay, so we are going to take off that precinct that says Williams and put that into the adjoining District.

So Williams, yep put that over.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This one that goes to 31?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, and then those two, oops that was too much.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Big Township not exactly what I want to do.

So we will get this right.

Voting precinct.

Why is it --

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A lot of dis-contiguities and it took 30 minutes to reassign them.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's in Midland and it wasn't that one.

It's in the City of Midland.

Let's just undo it and hope it does it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

So go to the right to the next precinct over, the next large one, the one right there, take that off.

Yep.

All right then those two blocks that are sort of sitting 2365 to the right 2003 can you add those back in so just over to the right.

Go to the right a little bit.

Yep.

So we want to add back in, yep, that one, the one above it.

Precinct 2003.

Uh-huh.

And then the one above it 2356.

And then you're going to take off the 1327 right above it.

And that should get us just about right.

Who is yawning over there.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Oh, my goodness, you guys heard me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we did.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm so sorry, I'm so sleepy.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, so take off that part that comes up and jogs over.

It's like 13 something right there put it into 31.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

And then I should have had you take off Auburn too so go to the left and see the little thing that is jutting.

Take that as we call them tooth off.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That goes into 31.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 31, yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now the numbers are 2.22% low for 31 and 1.54% high for 53.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have to fix some dis-continuities by I say leave it for now if that is what we want to do because they take forever because there are so many of them.

This takes us from having a District that is 51.1% republican and another District that is 58.4% republican to one that is 59.9 republican and the other one which is the Bay City Midland combination is 50.6 democratic so it flips it to democratic.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have a little bit different from yours so let's just make sure that go ahead.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Any chance that is from these little pieces are still in 31 and I don't know how many people are in there but.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is probably what is acting for the difference.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Talking a half a percent or something.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we have and moved in the general direction with 53.

And thank you Chair Szetela.

We also identified District 50 is also in this area and I believe I want to bring it back to Commissioner Eid it's your turn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just for reference I could not fix that one.

I tried.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I tried as well.

I don't think it's possible.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me I have a water block here shall I put that in 57 or 31.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 31 please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark then I want to get it back to Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We did all this work for a month and now it looks like we are just destroying it for compliance and compliance is way down the list not way down the list but the middle of the list of priorities.

And to me I mean I appreciate what Rebecca has done because we are talking compliance today.

But look at what it's done to all our work-up to this point.

It kind of hacks it up in my mind.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not disagreeing with you.

But that is what we need to do to get those balanced numbers unfortunately.

For this map at least.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I realize that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would just say it's not all of our work.

This is part of all of our work so we are completing our work moving on with it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Lett Commissioner Clark please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: One other point because it's further down on the priority list we deal with it later and it tends to take precedent over some of the things we have done before.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: When you say it do you mean partisan fairness, we are dealing with partisan fairness so keep going.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Because it's low on the priority list we have to adjust for this and it tends to disrupt the things we have done before.

That is how I'm kind of looking at it.

Yeah, I mean.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Then we moved to communities of interest.

Now we are moving to partisan fairness.

Right in the progression.

Each step we had to go back and undo our redo some of the stuff that was there before.

Yeah, now we are at the end of the process and we are tired and we don't like doing that anymore.

But it's still part of the process.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Lett and you are reminding us of this is not a linear but re cursor and back and around and around and I feel your frustration and feels like we are undoing it and anticipate it and what Commissioner Lett is reminding us, and I see Commissioner Lange's hand do you want to speak.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No, I don't agree.

I disagree with this.

This looks more gerrymandered than half the stuff the people have complained about in the previous maps.

And my question is so what happens now if we approve this and take it on the road and you get overwhelming people that say, no, that's not what we wanted.

That's not what we said our community of interest is.

Change it.

So what does that do to the partisan fairness? That is why I keep emphasizing the community of interest aspect.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Chair Szetela then Commissioner Lett.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is why we have been preparing alternate maps and there is no requirement we go before the public with one map so we have one map that took into account VRA and communities of interest and population balance and we still have that.

And now we are coming up, with alternative maps and if we go on the road and people are throwing tomatoes at us telling us they hate this map question can make a decision as a Commission to do something different.

I would not see it as black and white choice in maps because we have multiple and think we are doing due diligence trying to balance the partisan fairness then we listen to the feedback about it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well it goes back to the comment that I made previously and I'll make it again communities of interest have been well put forth before us on the portal as well as the public hearings.

And if you go back, it would be nice to take a look at this, and I haven't and I'm not going to.

But I think probably make them fair and start over and make them equal probably stronger than communities of interest.

So if the comment is looks like you are gerrymandering you guys asked us to do this. You guys asked to make it fair.

Off guys asked us to make it equal.

That is what Rebecca just did with 53.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And what we learned also in the process is that 50 that we have one more District that to Commissioners tried to create more fairness and we haven't done that so we have 1234 districts now out of nine and we have only been able to do one out of nine so far.

So the lakeshore may be problematic.

I heard Mr. Adelson say we may have some compact scores there to deal with.

So hopefully we can keep going.

But I guess Commissioner Eid I want to take it back to you.

It's your turn.

Do you want to continue or pass it to Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This was originally Commissioner Curry's turn.

Commissioner Curry you asked me to do it for you I would like to offer you that same thing that you offered me.

So if you would like to continue from here, that's perfectly fine with me.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Well, let me say this, that I agree with just about everything I've heard today and also Anthony I'm going to let you continue because I think you guys are getting more better the more you do it.

And I don't do it all the time.

So I think the ones that is really getting a hand of it is really handling it pretty good. Just like Rhonda said and Madam Chair that this and Steve this is the procedure of making these maps.

We are going to be putting them and tearing them down and putting them together. One thing we got to realize is that the people that are making these comments cannot have it all to their selves.

We have to serve a multitude of people and one or two or three or four people don't make that.

So you are doing the very best you can.

We are doing the very best we can.

That is all we can do. Turn it over to Anthony.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Well said Commissioner Curry thank you.

Before I give it back to Commissioner Eid we have Commissioner Curry, excuse me Commissioner Orton then Mr. Adelson.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I wonder before we move on from this can we run the report and see what it did to our scores.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think that is what Mr. Adelson is that what you wanted to say?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Wanted to add yes, I agree with virtually all of the comments about the juggling act, about the ranked order and the way I view the work now with compliance work is as far as partisan fairness is that we still have additional opportunities to see if that score can be adjusted to become more within the range that we are talking about.

There is no one way necessarily to do this.

Whatever is happening now is not final.

And I think I also have to stress, and I said this previously, that you have all worked very sedulously to be aware of and to do the best that you can reasonably to address communities of interest.

That's been an ongoing theme throughout the process.

So can you accommodate every community of interest? No.

It's just that it's virtually impossible.

But you have accommodated a lot of communities of interest.

And I think that's to your credit.

So this is part of an ongoing process.

Let's see what alternatives there are and then hopefully there will be choices to be made among the various adjustments.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall brought it up Commissioner Eid you have a recording of what the improvement may be for so if you can walk us through that would be great.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, so let's start with efficiency gap.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton also has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can we have the split screen so we can see what it was below.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, give me one minute to get it loaded up here.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Is this what we are going to see does that include the adjustments to the Midland area? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It does, okay, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: To be clear I think the current map has gone through right from this morning anyway the adjustments in the Grand Rapids area and I don't think then we did a number of other adjustments that we tried and didn't keep. So I think the next adjustment that we've got after the Grand Rapids one really is the Midland area; is that correct? Commissioners does that sound right? I'm seeing some nodding heads.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So I have a couple different configurations recorded. I have the configuration that was after the lakeshore District.

Well I have the original one.

Then with the configuration with the lakeshore and now this one with the lakeshore and Midland put in with Bay City.

So we are looking at efficiency gap.

Previously it was 8.9%.

Now it's down to 8.0%.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just let me -- is that right?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what he is reading.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These are both version four.

One is what I came in with and we've been working on it.

I got to make sure I'm looking at the right one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You are looking at the right one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These are both version four.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay spent so much time dealing with it.

This is what you started with; is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is the lakeshore configuration before that we were 9.9%.

So in totality we've decreased this by 2%.

Because of our work today.

That's pretty good.

To move on to mean median difference.

Okay so we started the day with this at 4.4%.

It then went down to 4.1%.

And now we are at 3.8%.

Let's move on to lopsided margins test.

We started the day at 11%.

We then moved to 7.7%.

Now we are at 7.2%.

And finally let's go to the seat vote ratio.

We started the day with 8.2%.

In favor of republicans.

Then we went to 5.0% and now we are at 4.1%.

So it looks to me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Heading in the right direction.

Mr. Adelson, please.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I thought forgive me if I was mistaken that we could isolate the Midland change.

Because I know it seems that this is including the Grand Rapids District, the lakeshore District and the Midland District so am I correct this is all three?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

And the lakeshore excuse me the change so the Grand Rapids and lakeshore are the old like the bottom on the screen, that's in there.

So the difference between the bottom and the top is Midland.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: By the numbers I'm looking at and essentially improved it by 1% by adding Midland into Bay City from the configuration we had previously.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If I could it would be helpful for me because we are trying to keep track of each change if we can see the change from that encompassed the lakeshore and Grand Rapids and then the change to Midland? It may already be here and I'm just.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No that is what Commissioner Eid was actually reading so we don't have it necessarily because it was on another computer Mr. Stigall if.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have all four versions we worked on today so it's a matter of picking that is the last one you came in with.

I can open the shape file up and look at them.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It may be quicker to go to Mr. Eid.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This was version three and it's 8.7% on lopsided.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid can you help verify.

Mr. Adelson is trying to get the chronology, is that right? And I think that's what you have captured.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I believe so.

The version that had Grand Rapids and lakeshore changes the lopsided margins test was 8.7.

The mean median difference was 4.1%.

Efficiency gap was 8.9%.

And C bias was 5% or seat bias was 5%.

For the current configuration that adds Midland to it lopsided margins test is 7.2%.

The mean median difference is 3.8%.

The efficiency gap is 8%.

And the seat bias is down to 4.1%.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent I think Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Curry asked that you continue.

How are you feeling?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I feel like I'm talking a lot.

I would be okay moving on to the next person if they are comfortable with continuing this process.

It's a long process but I mean we have gone down between 2 and 3% so it's becoming more fair.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, so Commissioner Curry would you like to try? Or should I pass it on to Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I guess I'll give it a shot.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Curry.

So I believe so the next District that we're trying to identify is either to adjust is either District 60 or District 70.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay I'm looking for 70.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we have some Commissioners who have been sort of working on the sidelines so if you have any help for Commissioner Curry so looks like yeah in the Monroe area, was that a place you could Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Saginaw is easier.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that 70 or 74.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's 24 on my map so it might be different on yours but sometimes the numbers get reassigned when you import the shape file.

So up in Saginaw.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Saginaw the 30.

Is that not VRA.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can split 30 and 56 in half and create, end up with a because right now it's one strong very strong democratic District 69%.

And if you use 56 to sort of break that up, you end up flipping one of the seats now down to 56.8%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: This was a VRA District that we tried really hard to get it as high as possible African/American vote.

And we had lots of comments from Mr. Adelson that we should keep it as good as we got it.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let's keep it because I don't want to upset the matrix.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do you want to try District 60 or 70?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't really want to try any District.

I'm enjoying not enjoying I'm watching how you guys are really doing it.

And it seems like you got a better handle on it than I do.

So I can get just as much out of it and if I see something where I can give my input I will.

But I think you should just give it to someone else

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Curry.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This may be a good place to save and make a version five and I don't know when or when we are not doing that for record keeping purposes.

I don't know.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: When we make a version it's when it's requested.

When y'all say let's make another clone and move on.

But if you think we can make a copy now and go to version five that way if you want to back up it's.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm seeing some nodding heads, yep, okay please do that Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange it would be to you.

How are you feeling?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I feeling like I'm passing.

I don't know if Commissioner Orton has done this since we can ask people to take our turn and Commissioner Orton I don't know if you have done any work on this but I would be happy to give you my turn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, I don't have anything of these numbers that we have to work on.

I have not previously worked on it.

But I'm willing to give it a shot if we want.

I don't see Steve in the room any way so he would be next right now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

So Commissioner Lange it's officially still your turn and I hear you are asking Commissioner Orton so I'm asking for permission to give her the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I give her my permission.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Jump in any time.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay this is version five today.

And that is 60 right here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's go to 70.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Around Jackson.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Actually go over to 74 because I'm familiar with that area.

So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 74 is 49% democrat and 51% republican.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Total deviation for 74 is it's down 2300 people.

72 is 155 over.

71 on this side is 586 over.

93 is a little over.

So the surrounding districts are all a little over.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: How much was 71 over? I see it, okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 71 is 586 but 74 is 2300 under.

I'll make the matrix a little bigger.

Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can I see the partisan data again? Those two rows? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 73 is 74% democrat.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we are looking I see what you are saying.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 74 is 49 and 51.

72 is 42, 58% republican and 71 is 60% republican.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, I'm just going to try something here.

And just make some guesses and see what happens.

So would you assign can I see the population again? The overview? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Precinct numbers? No the table overview.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

I want to see District 93.

If it can take some population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, it's 441 high.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay can you -- the Township that's the upper right, 1508 can you add that to 93? Actually, okay, I'll revisit that later if this works.

Maybe it needs to go in 71.

We will see.

Okay now go to the west, to the left.

And those are can we see precincts? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton there is one community of interest that the Nottawaseppi Huron Band of the Potawatomi requested Athens and Emmet in Calhoun be kept together I see Emmet but not Athens and can you help preserve that community of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm pretty sure it's down.

Can we see the Township names.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Townships.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Athens is all the way down and it may not be possible.

Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: What is the other name Athens.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Athens and Emmett are located within Calhoun County but wanted to be in one District and we did it but not in the State House so I will just let it go.

It's not contiguous with Emmet.

I was confused and thought they were contiguous.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can we go back to precincts? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: On the western boundary?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm going to look in Ross Township I believe.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This first precinct is 2614 and we come down and the next Township and it's 1900.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Go back up I think I want the upper precinct, that precinct, but before you do that can I see the what are we calling it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just the numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: The partisan numbers, those two lines so we can see if it goes up or down.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 74 is at 49.62 democrat.

So assign this as 74?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It went down .4%.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Try adding that next one though.

And just see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 49.28 now.

And it went down three or two tenths.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you undo those two, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The black hourglass is never good, is it? No.

That undo button is just a rascal.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We should try to refrain from requesting undo.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Sorry.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank goodness for saving.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: For some reason I don't know why this machine seems not to like it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, but it recovers pretty well.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It did it in a hurry and did not have to sit here waiting ten minutes for it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we are on 74.

70 might have been a little easier though.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are back to where we started.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, Anthony, do you have something?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I see Albion over there to the right.

No, not Marshall.

But Albion on the right of it, right there.

Maybe connecting that to Battle Creek since they are both cities would make a difference.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's too far though.

I mean we would have to break up Battle Creek then and that doesn't make any sense. It's a community of interest.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Down at Battle Creek on the middle on the border there I thought there was a dot there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Oh, and Commissioner.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Left over thematic.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yeah, it was right across from the word Charleston is what I thought I seen.

I wondered what that was.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe that is an indication maybe we need the theme on maybe it will help.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Would it be Hispanic or minority?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I don't know.

I'll put Hispanic.

There is some Hispanic population.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I thought I saw it by the border there

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid or Commissioner Clark please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the Black population alone not in combination.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Looks like there is a little dot there, just right there you just had your mouse on it.

But it was bigger than that before.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark please proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: One thing you may consider Cynthia is reducing the non-African/American portion of the District in 74.

So let's take the one that is the far east.

If there is an if it's a low African/American population in there, and I'm not convinced that is the right one, move some of it out.

And you don't have to move much out because you will only move half a percentage point or so.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: My next idea is to try to get to Galesburg so if we can take off the right upper Township, which we Contes that we had before putting it in 93 for now.

What I really want to do is keep those four Townships that are surrounding Battle Creek because they are really all connected with Battle Creek.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid has a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You know this area much more than I do so I will defer to you but I'm just wondering does Emmet have to be in there? Emmet has about 11,000 people and you see the dots, Albion has, it's the next place with those dots.

So if you take out Emmet, I think you go across Lee, Clarence and Sheraton and go down into Albion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let me try something first.

Can you -- I would like voting precincts and I would like to go to Charleston Township right where the 72 is.

So it looks like the whole Township.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is one big precinct.

That is one voting precinct of 1900 people.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay well first let's see the partisan numbers and see what it does and then we will add Galesburg and see what it does.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 49.62 right now.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Drum roll please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 29.62.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Add Galesburg before we undo and see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Add.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That little town right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right there.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I didn't see any number change it's only 2000 people.

It may be similar to the surrounding locality or Township.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Those are my best two guesses.
So undo well don't undo, please.
Please reassign the Township and Galesburg to 72.
Then what was the population of 74 now with that? .
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 74 right now is 3800 under.
That is with Canvas and 93.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay one more try.
Zoom in to the Marshall Township.
I'm afraid it's all one precinct as well.
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That's one -- I'm just going to select it and we can always so that is one precinct of 3100.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay.
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 70, 71 is 586 high.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay show the partisan lines and let's just assign it and see what happens.
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 49.6 and we will move it to 74.
So now 74 no it went down 4907.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we got all the -- I think we got as high as we can.
>> COMMISSIONER EID: What if you keep going and add the City of Marshall in there.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, we can try that.
Do the other side.
It looks like it did not select.
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 6100 people high now and 49.09.
So that looks like it moved the needle.
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The best we might do is under populate it taking Canvas out and it's closer.
It has not shifted the District but it's, yeah.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Will you assign those back to where they in.
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 71 I believe, yes.
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is called a voter turnout District.
>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe we are back to 74 is 3800 people under populated.
93 is almost 2000 overpopulated.
Still under 4% deviation.
>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, something is going to work with that District.
So I think we should add that Township back in to at least get the populations better Convis back into 74.
>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: .4 difference so, yeah, negotiable.
So we've asserted or confirmed that 74 is not possible.

Do you want to try 70 which was in the Jackson area? Commissioner Eid, I apologize.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I do have one more possible thing. I just hate to spend all day on this one thing but it would be a stretch. It would be like we are stretching over towards Kalamazoo.

Do we want to do that?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson is it okay to stretch for partisan fairness? Sorry that should have been a rhetorical question.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We would have to see exactly what the stretch is. The idea of stretching purely for that reason is not something that I think we would necessarily recommend.

But you know as we talked about with the robot harm metaphor that you know if you are not doing that and you have a wider gap that also wider addition that also addresses other factors, I think that would be ideal.

But it is as you said earlier it is basically a rhetorical question.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well I think it would definitely have to be a skinny arm because there is just not the population available unless we are going to break up Battle Creek, which seems to go against a higher priority.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is it okay if Commissioner Eid goes?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We don't want to break up Battle Creek but there was that population in Albion so I'm wondering and that population, if we -- let's assign Lee Clarence sorry Lee and Clarence to 74.

Now let's apply Sheridan and Albion.

Now put Emmet in 71 since that is where we took the population out of.

So what did this do to 74? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 51.39 democrat.
48.61 republican.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So my question because I don't know the area too much but I see the dots at least.

As far as the you know the area of Battle Creek goes, how connected is that part of Emmet to it?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it's very connected.

I think if we are going to reach like that it might be a little better reach to try to go the other direction.

We wouldn't have to go as far.

I'm not positive about what results we would get, but we might want to try if we are going to do a reach.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That train literally just derailed in my head.

With this particular configuration now could potentially justify connecting Emmet to that Township.

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: Athens.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Athens.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Preserving a community of interest.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Then the argument for reaching could potentially work going into Albion, I would think.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sounds like your train got back on the track.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Not really but.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And Commissioner Clark and then I think we are all due for a break.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I do too.

Bruce, I see this as another stretch, you know.

Instead of going west stretch we went tries as far east to stretch.

To get what we wanted.

And then that doesn't sit well with me.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I appreciate your comment and your question, Commissioner Clark.

I think that the -- there was an attempt to go west that not all the way west to the Kalamazoo which I think would have been with population and other considerations I think that might have been difficult.

The going to out to Albion and the way it's configured, this is different than the Muskegon attempt.

And I think that as we as I had mentioned with the change of the Midland District to see how many ways you can reduce the fairness advantage and frankly how far.

And then choose among them.

That would be my advice that these are all options.

And hopefully there are additional options that you can choose from.

And that will be part of the discussion process.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do you see this as acceptable as a stretch or not? "Yes" or "No"?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We could just go along that line too.

I could say which well I'm not going to do this but I abstain but I'm not going to say that. I think that this configuration if this were a configuration trying to reach similar to Muskegon to resolve partisan advantage just as I said with that, I would not recommend that.

I think for the time being I would put this in the these are the options.

And I think that I'm going to go with that.

That is something that we can address as we see what the greater universe of options is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton, thanks Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't like it.

To me being from the area it makes no sense to skip Marshall which is the next town and go around to get a different town.

It just you know it doesn't make sense.

But I'm only one person.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Follow-up question is Marshall, is, no, well, what I was trying to say is martially closely more in line with Battle Creek or Albion or is it its own little island since it's right in between the two?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well I hate to speak for other people, but my feeling is that it's more closely related to Albion.

Do you want me to try seeing what an arm looks like going out west? And see what the population is there?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I do.

Can we take a break first is that okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that okay Commissioners so where are we at? We are at 4:00 is that right? Okay, so let's take a ten-minute break and return at 4:10, thank you.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 4:13 p.m.

Will the secretary please call the role?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair.

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

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

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?
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from from Charlotte, Michigan.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm ubiquitously present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

- >> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. We will return back to unfinished business and Commissioner Rothhorn is going to facilitate the discussion.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It was officially Commissioner Lange's turn and yeah do you have your microphone on?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay I found a possible solution and I really don't like this but let's try.

So take us back to just the four Townships so add in Emmet and remove those to the east just four Townships right around Battle Creek.

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Convis back in 93?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, please.

Now change it to precincts please.

And take off Zoom out a little bit and we are going to go to the southeast corner and take off beetle Lake, two precincts.

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2884 and put those in 71 or does it matter?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 71 for now and we will look at the populations later.

Thank you.

Now we will have to go to the block level.

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which Township here?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, that Township.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Here, okay.
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So north a little bit.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: How do we want to get there?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could I come show you my computer and you can kind of follow that? Is that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Or just point me in the right direction.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'll be there in a second.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I got it and basically it looks like this area across the top is going to 70.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Right here 74 on there and 75 on mine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay I'm on it now.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It all has to be block level.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Get it started and holler if I do it wrong.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: There is that little, tiny piece up there.

Thank you, all the way.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, I got an idea.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it's down here.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: They are precincts and we will get it right here in a second.

So this precinct.

There is that.

That's it.

I got it.

I got it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe you can do precincts for some.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That precinct.

There it is.

I got that and that.

It's pretty close to that.

We can always change it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we are missing.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Is that a good representation? I know this has to come in.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we can go a little further to the south, a little further south, clear to the west.

To add a little more population over clear over.

Yeah, I did not add it on mine but I just wondered.

So just to get the population up.

So assign that and let's see what the population is.

Still under.

Yeah, try adding a whole precinct and see.

So 74 is good on population.

Let's back out and look at it.

That was the best I could figure out to balance the electorate.

I had to go that far, so it had to be that skinny.

So what do you think?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson then Commissioner Clark.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think it was a good attempt and I will say the same thing I told Commissioner Clark I think my...our goal is to give you options of potential districts that have an impact on the partisan fairness score and that you choose among them.

So I look at this as creating options.

If there were something that really just for many reasons suggested a that it's problematic, I would say something but I'm more focused on let's have options at this point as we are coming to the end so you can look at, discuss, and decide which ones stay and which ones not.

Again to the main point if there were something that raised a serious concern with me, I would say it.

But for now I would include this as an option.

And then you all will discuss and perhaps when I would suggest too that when you do do that, that when it comes down to deciding we have five districts, which one looks the best, that is a different conversation.

But my I think my goal is that clue have options.

And you know going into today you really didn't have the options that you now have.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton response?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If we use this option the other problem is that it creates a problem with District 72.

So we would have to reconfigure quite a bit in there because that is quite a bit of population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Clark then Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have the same comment on 72.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes please.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm just going to say that to me this makes less sense than going to Albion.

A reach is a reach no matter where you go.

And if we go to the Albion route as Commissioner Eid had it, we are not slicing and dicing two other districts.

AKA-72.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Oh, I'm going to be the unpopular person today.

How it was drawn previously, District 74 was compact, had four Townships and a slight advantage to one party.

I don't see why making it all funky like this.

I guess what I'm wondering is are there not other areas where we are not reaching so far, where we can make these numbers better without making them look so darn awful? I mean, it was compact and square and looked good.

Aren't there other areas we can look at that maybe we could fix?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's still your turn Commissioner Lange and we do have District 60, 70 and 103 and 70 is not far from here in the Jackson area so it's still your turn.

I don't know as much as you know what we have but, yeah to your point right we can try the other ones.

We have a total list of nine.

And we have completed 12345 and with 74, 6, and I think we have got one or two out of this nine that actually have worked.

So that is kind of our challenge.

We have not pushed the needle very far towards partisan fairness Commissioner Lange it's your turn and Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I would say my preference would be to put this put 74 back the way it was.

And like Mr. Adelson says we know what a couple options are here and we move on and see if we find better solutions or if we have to come back to this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I saw Commissioner Lange nodding her head and it's her turn so Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I was just going to ask her what options she was going to go with that is all.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes you wanted to say something.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just looking through the public comment portal, there are public comments that state Battle Creek and Albion should be together.

So I found one if you just search Battle Creek there is one right away that pops up and it was submitted September 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, and it is a University town, Albion.

It allows Emmet and Athens to be potentially reworked so you pointed that out Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It's drawn basically exactly like we had it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In the portal.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The one in the portal almost identical to how we had it connecting to Albion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: To allow us to keep the community of interest piece. Commissioner Lange is it your turn?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want to thank Commissioner Orton for doing that but if this is my turn my suggestion would be put it back the way it was and try in another area.

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's your turn.

Are you directing Mr. Stigall to put it back.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, Kent if you would put it back as it originally was and if it's okay with Commissioner Orton, I think we will move on to the next Commissioner.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right thank you Commissioner Lange.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Candis was part of 74 was it not.

Do we put that back or leave it where it's at?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Put it back, please.

So after Commissioner Lange we have Commissioner Lett.

It's your turn Commissioner Lange offered to Commissioner or Orton to try to adjust and she did her best so that was District 74.

That we tried. And we ended up with two options but we have not chosen either of them so we still have District 60, District 70 and District 103 on our list of nine that we generated.

So 60, 70 or 103, Mr. Adelson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: We also have others 36, 52 and 75 on a possible list

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 36, 52 and 75 is that correct General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much, Mr. Vice Chair.

When Mr. Morgan was scrolling earlier this morning, I thought I caught 36 as a potential opportunity but it was moving kind of quickly.

I was not sure if the numbers were in favor of the democrats or the republicans.

I also flagged 52 and 75 but I will note that the margins between the votes was very large in both of those districts.

It was almost 10% so I think those would be unless depending where they are in Michigan those would be much harder to adjust but 37, I did potentially flag as one.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Kent is highlighting it for us and it's 53% leaning republican.

So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 4753.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, so those, yeah, Commissioner Lett again 60, 70, 103.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: District 75 is 54 democrat, 46 republican.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Here is my comment we are getting absolutely nowhere. In order to do this, and to affect partisan fairness we are going to have to go back down into Southeast Michigan in order to obtain more democratic votes in republican areas. Now, I'm willing to do that.

If the Commission is willing to acknowledge that we can't go out state Michigan and affect this.

That's -- I mean we have proven that today.

I mean if somebody has some other brilliant idea let me know.

And I'll go there.

But so far it has not worked.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Lett, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree Steve and I don't want to go back into Detroit.

I think it's a spider's web to try to sort out again.

I think we got it as I recall the way we want it.

And so we should deal with everything outside that at this point.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Show me where to go.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson, please.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: One of the districts on our list is District 60 in Southeast Michigan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In the Monroe area.

If I'm not mistaken, we may have a Commissioner who has done some work there.

Do you want I mean I think Commissioner Lett is asking for some guidance or help so if you can assist.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm making a flat out statement to get this done we are going to have to go back into Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Have some faith it can be done.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have faith but I just don't have faith in Traverse City.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, no.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett do you want to -- are you I'm trying to be as clear as possible do you want.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: This is a collaborative process I would be tickled to death to work with Commissioner Szetela down this Detroit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Szetela Autobound edge just crashed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have an expert right here.

I'm rebooting it right now.

Just give me a second.

It just you know it seems to know when things are getting hard and it just gives up.

All right let me try to get back into what I was in.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: What is 6047, 6052, what is 6141, 165, 54, so we got some movement up there.

22 what is 22?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's look down at the Monroe area and, let me see.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I was checking the other 22, 40, 56, 61, we have some room to put in there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right let me just check my numbers make sure they are all good which I think they are.

Okay so here is what we are going to do.

Again I have different numbers than you so I'll try to make sure that I'm directing you the right way.

All right so we currently have -- we have those so okay so for District 40 what I would like you to do is we are going to go up to District 40 to work down to 60 so we are kind of working our way down. Right now we have Taylor all the way into down into brown stone Township but we will pull it sideways because it help what we need in Monroe. So I need you to go over to Romulus.

So we are going to go to Romulus and take the entire bottom portion of Romulus currently in 65 and put it in to Taylor.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Into 40 se Szetela into 40.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Grab the Township below it and also put it into 40 come down one more into Carlton.

Put that into 40.

And now we are going to follow that line so Zoom in a little bit into Carlton, a little south of Carlton and try to figure out where you are at and go back to where you were at Carlton.

Zoom out if you back out it will be a little easy and under Carlton the two precincts or actually one precinct immediately underneath select.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This precinct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The one underneath the one in 60 put that in 40.

Okay come below and grab the precinct below that one.

Yep, there is some dis-contiguities that are going to happen in here.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Is that right? Sed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Szetela yes so come down a little further.

So 4158, and 2054, and then keep going underneath 2187. 3102.

Okay that's good assign all that into 40.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have little pieces.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will come back and get them.

Zoom back out.

So now we are going to fix 60.

By first of all we are going to bring 60 up into Taylor so bring 60 up, select of that whole area that is wood haven.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The entire Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wood Haven and 33194 put that into 60 and then in Taylor we are going to grab the bottom two rows.

Taylor and bottom two rows across and put that into 60.

So go up to that next row above it because you have two tall ones and then, yeah, 2735, 1948.

So back out so I can see.

All right so we will need for make some adjustments to 65 then we will shift 61.

So 65 right now has bubble in the three Townships below that.

We will grab the next four below that including Milan so anything in 61 we will push up into 65.

So that bottom four row of Townships including Milan put that up into whatever that is 65.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 65.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, put those into 65.

Okay go down to the next row below that, do the same thing following that diagonal 5903 is the last one put them up into 65.

And so now we will add to 61.

Down in Monroe yes, the two little spots you had your cursor over.

I had to split Monroe to do this.

But again I'm just giving you guys some objects to consider and then do the 20,000 as well, yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put this in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 61.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All of that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is more than I wanted.

Can you back off the last one you did and just do the 14 then we will probably have to Zoom in closer on the next one.

Commissioner Eid?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Next part is precinct so if you go to the precinct level for 61.

All right so you're going to do the 3374, 3562, 3455 and 3428 so right above, yep.

All right and that should be balanced at this point.

And there might be one random dis-continuity at the coast there if you want to Zoom out a little bit.

You got one there too.

That looks good it grabbed it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Pieces around here

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that close? Can you Zoom out? I think we have everything balanced.

>> 7700 low is 40.

Maybe I miss -- we took away from it here.

40 is high.

7700 high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Zoom out to see what I'm missing because I must have reassigned something.

>> 16, 1800 and 65 is just 96 high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is weird because I have it drawn the same way.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 61 is 2100 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is 40 high or low.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 7700 high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where you are Bob up a precinct, a little more.

Right, take this off.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This one Steiner.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No right next to it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This and the 60.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And the one below it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And this one? No 60 is now 5468 high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's look at where can you pull out 60? Somewhere we got.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 61 is still 2100 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Take more of 40 possibly?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I'm just trying to see where the difference is between what I have on my screen and what you have.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Take some out of 60 and put in 61.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead and follow what Commissioner Lett said.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are high on 60.

We are high on 60 right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 60 is high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have room in a little room in 61.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 61 is 2100 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's put one more precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I can't tell.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will highlight it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That one, that was mine where the dis-contiguity was.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is two parts.

Do it one at a time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do the one and select the other.

That is what I had to do last time.

I knew there was a dis-contiguity there somewhere.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is what it was.

You found it.

That took large water blocks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put this back into 60.

That will make it look better and we had a little dis-contiguity right here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you fix it and put it in 61.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 61.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is certainly going to help with 0 people.

[Laughter]

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 61 is 375 people under while 60 is 3700 over, which is 4.06. 40 is 4.43 percentage high while 65 is just 96 over.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we are still a little high on 40.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 20 did you put any in 20 I think that is a VRA District or is it or.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So 65 let me look back at my map hold only to see what else I did.

Can you Zoom out and pull it up a little bit so I can see under Belleville? I want to see the County line and make sure we are on the same line.

And you said 40 is high that's right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 4.43, 60 is 4% high.

Both of these are high.

65 is even.

I don't know if 62 is in play here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go up to the line of Romulus right up there.

Because I think we are at 20.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 20 is 1800 over so it can absorb some population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Push from 40 up into 20. So just that last little 1900. Let's move that up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 40 is now 2.34% high. 20 is .12 high. 60 is 4.06% or 3700 high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So how did that change then? Now flip to the democratic district.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 60 is now 52%.

40 is 50.95 to 49.05.

I think that is all of them, right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: District 40. I saw your hand and want to make sure we get to you.

Do you want to comment on this?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are short on 22 so if you want to do that that is between 22 and 60 but you mentioned breaking up Monroe and, yeah, it did not do that, but I think this is another example of a place where community of interest and the partisan fairness go hand in hand because we have had public comments that said this part of Monroe which is on the river line and Down River and part of Down River want to be together.

So you broke it up but I think it actually supports communities of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It flips a District which is the goal.

What until you see what I did to Ann Arbor.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark then we wanted to run the partisan fairness.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree with Anthony.

Monroe stated they are not considered Down River and we extended them up north to where you could get that perception as well and splitting Monroe, I don't think was the best thing based on the reasons Anthony just gave.

The other item and I can't see the District number but the one that goes to the border, they have the border Townships I've seen comments about border counties and how they want to stick together in you know the same District and we just split that up as well.

Which is another community of interest in their minds.

So and the third point is now we have taken Taylor which is Down River District and extended it I think it's past Monroe the City of Monroe so it's pretty far south.

I'm not sure that is acceptable.

But I know the objective was to immediate the numbers.

I recognize that but I see a lot of negatives with this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have to say again I don't understand why we are breaking up communities of interest for a lower priority.

I realize we all want fair maps but it seems to conflict with each other and if it conflicts don't, we have to go with the higher? I just don't know.

It just seems wrong.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are rectifying that Michigan is a majority white state and stick with the County lines and communities of interest we got we will draw primarily partisan leaning republican leaning districts.

I think that is our struggle.

In order to get to fair we have to break up communities of interest in ways that make us deeply uncomfortable.

That's what I'm recognizing. Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I'd say more than deeply uncomfortable.

I mean I'm not happy with it.

And you know because of the way the geography is, I mean, I can see adjusting some of these.

But not the volume that we're going at right now.

And I think we got to respect the way our white and our African/American or Hispanic and Asian populations are distributed throughout the state.

Instead of trying to adjust that.

I mean I almost see it as a method of gerrymandering.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, I guess for everybody and what are we to do? Are we to draw what have been supposedly spoken to us numerous, numerous, numerous, times fair maps or are we to place a premium on a community of interest that do not allow us to do that? It seems to me and we've heard it enumerable times the reason that the amendment was passed was to get rid of the democratic republican split that allowed the republicans to control the house and Senate.

Just say it.

That is what it's for.

And if we are not going to do that well then let's add might to ourselves, we're not going to do it and quit doing this.

We will stick with what we got with communities of interest and we will have to defend it to Susan Smith and Wang and everybody else.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Lett.

I see Commissioner Lange and I want to return to Commissioner Lett because it's your turn.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The thing that we hear a lot of is what sold people on prop two was the fact that citizens would get to pick their electors and one of the ways they are doing that is through the communities of interest.

So if we are breaking up one of the main factors that many liked and I understand we have had a lot of comment about partisan fairness.

But that also is not a community of interest.

So there is a conflict and maybe it's all in the writing and that is where we are getting our problem from is the language of the Constitution.

But there is nothing we can do about that.

So I just don't like just like people in Detroit right now they are livid because of ranking breaking up community of interest.

Detroit has given us a ton of communities of interest but because of VRA a lot of those are being broken up.

So it sucks all ways around.

And I don't know how we can go about it other than sticking to what we have been doing and that is the ranked order and doing it the best we can with what we are given.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Well said Commissioner Lange and back on stack and Lange and back to Commissioner Lett because it's his turn.

The rule of laws is something we all sort of recognize and somehow it keeps our democracy a democracy.

And if we are going to pass if we are going to get the maps passed and if we want to get them done on time our legal counsel is essentially saying the consultants, we've hired are essentially saying this is the legal way to do it.

We can try to defend it otherwise but we may be putting the whole state back if we don't follow the rule of law.

And that rule of law is in the Constitution.

It is deeply uncomfortable and everyone has said it.

No one envies us.

I think we are right all being challenged to our core.

And as a body I think we are also struggling.

But I just want to acknowledge that somehow right the rule of law is what we, yeah, in this United States that is what kept us a constitutional democracy sorry so long so it feels like if we try to get these done on time at the deadline and allow all the downstream things that have to happen, we got to dig deep so it was Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Clark then again, I want to get it back to Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well first I thought that was a very eloquent thing you just said so thank you for that.

I feel a little bit more energized now.

You know I'll just say I think that the changes that Commissioner Szetela made do reflect communities of interest.

I think we have got a lot of maps that are similar to the changes she made specifically with the Down River, Monroe area.

So I think it's one of those situations where you know we have multiple conflicting communities of interest here.

So we have to choose one.

And I would rather choose the one that also makes the map more fair overall.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark and then Chair Szetela and I'd like to get it back to Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm going to save my comments for when we discuss the options thanks Roth Randy Travis Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel can you reread the constitutional language on communities of interest and not the description of what it is just the first part.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly, Madam Chair I always have it pulled up so it's easy to find.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I wait for these moments in meetings right.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I actually do.

I have several tabs open.

Under subsection 13 of the Constitution subpart C, districts shall reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest.

And then as the Chairperson's Szetela mentioned, it does go further to state what they may include but it is not limiting language and then it goes on to state what communities of interest do not include.

I'm happy to continue if you would like but you specifically said just the first sentence. Some key words and pulled out earlier in the meeting today were some of the criteria are shall reflect.

Notably the equal population is shall be.

We have other criteria that reflect consideration.

So there is some distinction there between them.

But first for communities of interest it shall reflect the state's diverse population and communities of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So then my question for you if we change first of all let's start with the basic, we have lots of communities of interest so there is no one as far as I'm concerned sacrosanct community of interest regardless of what everyone says and they think it's the one most important but we receive thousands of them.

So say for example we have a division that favors partisan interests and considers some communities of interest and not others aren't we, in fact, complying with our constitutional mandate because there is no requirement that we accommodate every community of interest isn't that accurate?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, yes that is absolutely accurate.

The ranked priority criteria in the Constitution, again give the Commission for diverse population and communities of interest latitude.

It does not direct the Commission how they are supposed to be considered, how they are supposed to be weighed, how they are supposed to be incorporated or integrated into the plans.

Same with truthfully partisan fairness a hot topic as of late.

It does not give the disproportionate advantage.

That again is something that the Commission we've provided benchmarks from past cases.

But again that is something that is up to the criteria certainly the third through the 7th give the Commission great latitude in determining how those criteria are going to be represented in the proposed maps and are the Commission as a body deciding how they are presented and I think that is another important reason to highlight why the public is so involved in this transparent process is the process gives the public the ability to provide the feedback to the Commission and as we've discussed many times

the Commission takes that information and again it has the responsibility to discern and integrate it in the manner it sees fit.

Or not at all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

I would just add that we are trying to change 7 districts here.

And we have 110 on this map.

So I don't think changing 7 districts and you know possibly protecting some communities of interest in pursuing the overall goal of complying with partisan fairness is any sort of abrogation of our duty.

I think at a minimum we should look and come up with these maps even if they are hard and look at them and decide what we want to go with.

And again we can present the original map without the partisan fairness and we can present the maps that are altered to accommodate partisan fairness and see what the public says at the public hearing but I think we should try.

Even though it's hard.

All afternoon I've been sitting here trying to redraw Districts to make them fair from a partisan perspective and it's difficult and tedious and time consuming and I want to scream sometimes but we need to try.

That is what we have been tasked with doing and no one is not saying it's a heavy lift or hard and we need to try and continue to try even though it's difficult.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Chair Szetela.

Commissioner Lett you have the floor.

If you had your microphone on you would have said please look at the results, correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would be affirmative.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Affirmative excellent so I think Mr. Stigall has put those up for us and Commissioner Eid you have walked us through it before would you be willing to do it again or Mr. Adelson? I think it may be useful with Commissioner Eid is that okay?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Absolutely.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I've been keeping track and do you want me to compare from the last iteration with lakeshore and Midland changes or compare all the way from the beginning?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Walk us through the most recent changes please.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Before these let's look at lopsided margins first. We were at 7.2% previously. Now we are 6.8%.

Let's move on to mean median difference. We were at 3.8%. Now we are at 3.5%.

Let's move on to efficiency gap.

We were at 8.0%. Now we are at 7.1%.

Finally let's look at the seats to votes ratio.

We were at 4.1%. Now we are at 3.2%.

3.2.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What we were at before?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We were at 4.1%. And I believe it was 55 to 57.

I'm sorry.

53 to 57.

Now we are at 3.2% and are at 54 to 56.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Commissioner Eid.

Mr. Adelson any comment or can we move on?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: No comments from me.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you, all right.

Commissioner Eid, please.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well and I think when you look at it, if you take if you look at the difference from where we started today, I mean, that last measure goes all the way up to 8.2%. Now we are all the way down to 3.2%. It's major. It's painful and agree with what everyone said, but it seems to be working.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have been able to do three districts out of the nine.

And, again, out of the additional 12. I guess there is 9 that we originally identified with Commissioner Clark. And then we have additional three from our General Counsel. But we've only been able to do about three of those. And, Commissioner Lett, are you finished with your turn? Do you want to try District 70 in the Jackson area? Or are there other Commissioners who said it's too difficult? Commissioner Witjes, please.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to suggest given these changes go back to Battle Creek and connect Albion and do that particular one.

That seems.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett it's your turn.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Is that going to help us?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It will.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You have done it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We did it earlier.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I was not here.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, we have done it and it did help.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I will what is the term? Yield back to Commissioner Witjes in a collaborative working with me on Albion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Lett so Commissioner Witjes it's to you and it's Commissioner Lett's turn but help us move forward.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Please accept directions from Mr. Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, if I remember correctly, it was the Township of Emmet.

Going into 72 and then those.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It was these Townships all in 74 and this went where did this go 72?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: 72 and again I feel like in regard to this particular configuration it does help us.

It does indeed keep communities of interest whole in my opinion.

And it also potentially allows for the community of interest of Emmet and Athens to be together.

So here we are doing we are killing two birds with one stone in my opinion.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Is this the 74, District 74 you're looking for.

Population is good and 72 and 71 now need to be repaired.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Which one was the one that we changed here? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 72 is high and 71 is short 11,000.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Was it the.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't think 72 and 71 were ever reconciled.

This was just evaluating 74.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Take Newton, Ferdonia, Burlington and Tekonsha and put them in 71 that might be the beginning.

We can't quite take Newton otherwise we don't have is it contiguous with Athens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Those through Townships total 4286.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: What about Burlington.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now we are up around 6243.

You want those assigned to 71?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes, please.

Question, if you take Newton out, is Leroy and Emmet contiguous based on the fact their corners are touching?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That may be a question for General Counsel or Adelson.

There was a question from Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Corners touching is that contiguous.

If I took Newton Township out.

>> MR. MORGAN: I believe it would find it being dis-contiguous but legally it may be.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We could take the corner block and make it contiguous.

Let's do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: That would definitely do it.

Put this into 71.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> Vice Chair you asked a question to General Counsel or to Mr. Adelson and we need to allow them to respond.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, they are working on it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We actually moved on to a different topic between ourselves.

So I do apologize to that we did not answer using the microphone.

The answer to Commissioner Witjes' question where joining block or joining one 50 block 2001 and 3018 just with a corner piece would not be contiguous with those corners touching.

Then I believe Commissioner Witjes moved to request that Mr. Stigall also move block 2002.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is correct yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Can you Zoom out? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That would connect 72 across.

Shall I assign that?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's do it.

You can assign that block.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If I assign this block, it will be geographically or at least by GIS standards contiguous.

Point to point I don't think we find it as contiguous.

That is clearly connected across there.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We are also looking at something more than that.

So the out is critical.

Just a little further out Mr. Stigall.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we may want to offer to we can sort of put a pin on this and work on it this evening because it does not look right but we are acknowledging there are two communities of interest we want to keep together.

Go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Take more of the Township then.

Let's you can take half of Newton for example.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please direct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Going to have to Zoom in.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't know where to go here there are three different people talking at the same time.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 2781 take the west half of 2781 and add it to 72.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have to do it at the block level because that is one precinct 2781.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Shall I do that Commissioner Witjes?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While we are waiting, we have District 70 and 103 to go today.

We are doing pretty well.

It's almost 5:00.

We almost completed our list so.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Lett, is that what you had in mind more or less or do we want to do anything else?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yeah, that is what I had in mind.

Just make it look a little better.

Dustin where does that put us now on 71 and 72? 3 down and 4 over? 71 is down and 72 is over.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: They kind of balance each other.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 72.

We could put more of 72 over there.

I'm looking at the wrong way.

We got more in here. We can put it over here, right?

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Can Commissioner Witjes please orient the legal team to you trying to achieve population? Because going up in that fashion rather than going straight across to the right could you just reorient us, please?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Repeat that again I'm kind of confused.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think can I help.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We're confused and share this.

The question is you are going up to Emmet with the population size rather than going across through these to the east.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm trying to remember what it was earlier.

And I can't quite.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I can help with.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Look at what has this done for us? Now, before we continue on.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Look at District 74 then.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: There is a lot of conversation in the room.

I just want to get a handle and help the public so let's so it is Commissioner Lett's turn.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So 74 is now 5139.

Dustin is that what we were shooting for? Okay so I would think 71 is low.

We can 72 is high.

We could take Athens and put it over there, 71.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Trying to keep Emmet and Athens together as well. Because of the Native American population MC, oh, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's the Nottawaseppi Huron Band of the Potawatomi asking consideration to keep operation hubs in Emmet and Athens together within Calhoun County, where they provide Governmental services and support and help to local community.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, how do they do that with Leroy in between? Put Athens over there in 71 and let's see what it does.

The whole Township.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Who am I listening to? I'm not being facetious.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We are both working on it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I know.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sorry, okay so that brings them into pretty good alignment acceptable any way and what is, what does that do for our numbers if anything? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 74 would not have changed.

72 doesn't matter.

71 doesn't matter.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: If we want to take a couple of precincts off the top of Athens and put them on the bottom of Leroy so they are connected with Emmet I'm willing to do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't think there are precincts there.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And that is a sarcastic remark.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett are you finished is that what I'm hearing? I hear Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So if you are already not going to keep Emmet and Athens together, I would suggest Emmet go with Marshall.

They are definitely more connected with Marshall but there is more population so you have to go on several of the lower Townships.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't have a problem with that at long as it keeps our partisan fairness where we've got it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think when Commissioner Orton was experimenting with 74 Marshall was not a heavily democratic area so it should be negotiable.

If you make that change, Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm good with that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think it's your turn Commissioner Lett do you want to direct?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You want Marshall to go to Emmet.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Emmet would go more with Marshall than way over around Kalamazoo.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We will have to pick up Newton Burlington and Athens. Okay, so put 1174 over into Marshall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just selecting these, this area and the total of this area is 12766.

And it isolates all of this from 71.

So we would have to make this somehow make this contiguous.

Is that clear? Along with the City of Marshall?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We do that, that is going to upset everything.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What Commissioner Orton is saying is put Emmet in 71.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put Emmet in 71, is that it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that right Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Emmet, Athens, Burlington and Newton and Tekonsha and see if that is enough population.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel please.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much what I heard Commissioner Lett ask is Newton not Eckford, this is what, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett you have the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Cynthia does that look right? I was thinking the bottom only.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: This is what I had in mind except not Ferdonia but I don't know if the population works out.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We are going to find out, okay, let's do that and see what we got.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 71 is 2600 high and 72 is 2600 low.

Both are less than or within 3% of ideal.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay I want to look at partisan fairness now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 38% democrat and 71 and 42% and 72.

It did not really change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The key change was in 74 where we were 51% democratic.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay and our populations are okay.

We good? We good?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are good Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would like to run the report.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I was just looking for more changes over from that side of the table.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett will you direct to run the report please.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Run the report please.
Once it comes up Anthony will you enlighten us to what we have accomplished, please?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a second, I don't think it's working because I have so many of these files open.

Probably why it's hesitating.

Try this again.

Okay the lopsided margins is 6.3%.

What was it before? Want to read this Anthony go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Before we were 6.8%, now we are at 6.3 percent.
Move for immediate median difference we were at 3.5% now we are at.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Make sure our legal team I knee you are doing a lot of different things and this is the difference with Albion you with us.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We were at 3.5% now we are at 3.4%.

For efficiency gap we were at 7.1% now we are at 6.4%.

And for the seat to votes ratio we were at 3.2%.

And now we are at 2.3% with a count of seats being 55-55.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right thank you for that Commissioner Eid and thank you Commissioner Lett.

And again I think we've completed 7 of the original nine districts we wanted to look.
Is there Mr. Adelson, sorry.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn.

The legal team recommends that we now that you have options that you will be discussing further that we move on from partisan fairness.

You still have a significant population deviation that needs attention.

So our recommendation is that to stop with partisan fairness for the moment and that we address the plan deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we me how to do that all pretty well.

All right so Commissioner Eid? Then Mr. Stigall do we need a break? Commissioner Lett then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Out of curiosity can we run a compactness? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think we can.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Would anyone be interested to hear the like from where we started to where we ended up that includes all of these changes?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Anyone want to hear that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we started with an I will try to go in the same order we were going in lopsided margins test was 11 per cent.

We brought that down to 6.3%.

The mean median difference was at 4.4%.

Now we are at 3.4%.

The efficiency gap was at 9.9%.

It is now at 6.4%.

And the seats to votes ratio was up to 8.2%.

Now it's down to 2.3%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Eid.

We are going to run the compactness score then we are going to move on from our partisan fairness measures to addressing the plan deviation, which is population based, yeah, okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do I need to read down through all of them or do you have a particular.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett you requested this do you want to really direct? Or you just want to look at the bottom? Okay we will just look at the bottom.

Okay so sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to get back up here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Polsby Popper compact is 67.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Least compact is 53 with a .09.

And Schwartzberg.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We don't need those and 53 we tried to work and I can't remember if it worked or not.

Anybody remember District 53? One of the things we worked on, that we did change, okay? All right.

So with that folks can we do you want to try to -- let's see we were with Commissioner Lett so we finished up with Commissioner Lett's turn.

Commissioner Orton, are you prepared to help us with plan deviation?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Sure.

So for State House districts, is there a deviation we need to keep it under? I know it's hard to get an actual number but.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I'm going to surprise you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay bring it on.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I think our recommendation would be around 5%.

And let's look at why.

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.

Going into the final stage after you put the draft maps out and you have public hearings there will likely be some thought about making additional alterations.

If the lower the deviation now, the more room you have to grow.

If the deviation stays in the 9% area you have virtually no leeway to make additional changes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So that would be we want to be no more up or down than 2.5% base overall.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Per District.

The overall deviation around 5% range I think we would be comfortable.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall you are bringing up the list of districts.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Sorting by deviation the highest at the top and the lowest at the bottom.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: .08 and then the high ones get down into here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall back to Commissioner Eid then back to Commissioner Orton.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, just for clarity, I thought that the overall deviation had to be within 10% and each direction had to be plus or minus 5% I think that is what we have been told in the past.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That's true.

What he told us is because we will be making adjustments later and therefore if we don't do it now and have it lower then we won't have room to grow or adjust is the reason he gave us just now.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Eid thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you back to you Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We need to compile our list of the highest and lowest districts.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm going to try to write it down for us.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have it sorted.

If you want to just look at everything that is say 4% over.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you increase the font size for just a minute? Please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: How did I do that in this? How did that go on this can you Zoom out.

Is that 60.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much I believe Commissioner Eid just referenced the 10% threshold.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We addressed it but you can address it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: 5% is what we are recommending.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So there is room to grow if we want.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do we need to Zoom in.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I wrote down 4% or more over or under whatever out of alignment so we can start there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you share those so question with each sort of make a list.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 34, 98, 51, 97, 35, 6, 57, 16, 17, and 60.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's just start with 34 and see where it is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton you have the floor.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well occur so now we have conflicting issues again. We are going to run into a problem with probably a lot of these numbers we have painstakingly tried to get them to balance.

And for VRA and so we have purposely left them high or low in population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Mr. Adelson is that not a valid reason is that also true.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: According to U.S. Supreme Court VRA compliance is a legitimate justification populations.

There are other justifications but it's well settled that VRA compliance is a legitimate rationale for populations deviations.

And I think in looking at the list it seems that I would suggest looking at districts first that are out of the VRA semicircle, circle, however you described, that they may offer the best potential.

And then we can see where we are at that point.

And if we need to go further.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so 34 I don't believe had VRA considerations. But those around it may.

So but possibly not 41.

Can we scroll down a little bit and see active matrix for 41? Okay so and the population in 41 it's under though so this will be a giant circle I guess as we go around so scroll in a little bit to the line the upper line between 34 and 41.

Is that -- is Chesterfield a City? Township? Is this the line? Oh, I see the line down there.

It's very hard to see.

We are already Chesterfield Township a little bit.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we get a look at 34's partisan vote so if it's really close, we don't have to disrupt it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Miss Orton you have the floor so if you want to respond.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We have to check that before we mess it up. We have a little wiggle room.

I don't know should we just try it for population and see if it messes it up?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: If I could just jump in briefly.

We are experiencing today a lot of the conflict and interaction among the criteria. One person one vote is nonnegotiable.

It's number one.

So if there are deviations, we have to do some serious justifications.

The VRA is easy.

That is Supreme Court spoke to that during the last redistricting cycle.

But just as an FYI, the partisan fairness, the COIs, the reflect diversity of the state are all below the number one which in this context is one person one vote.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Back to you Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay let's see, can we -- I did not write down those -- the partisan numbers.

Can I see that, those two lines just real quick? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 51 and change and 48 and change.

Well 51 and 49, not much room.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 51 is democratic and 49 is republican.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: All right if you go back to population now the overview that would be helpful.

And then we will just try it and see what happens.

So assign 2191.

I don't know if you can, yeah, there you go.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Partisan deviation 34, it moved it a couple of tenths.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay one more.

Click on the 2162 and see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 50.75, 49.5 and still 1.5 or one point.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's look at the overview.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 34 is almost ideal and 41 is 4500 down.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay can I go on and just try to fix 41?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 41 is not democratic District so I think you will have more leeway.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 47 is slightly over and 48 very slightly over.
Okay, can you scroll down a little bit so I can see 41 as well.
So scroll in a little so I can see the populations.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Township population Casco is just under 4,000.
And this is 12000 but I think that is the County.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can I see up north just a little bit by St. Clair?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Want to see precincts right there?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, precincts, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So in this precinct 3640. This precinct is 3645.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you have scroll out so I can get a picture.

Lakeshore.

Can you active matrix I want to see 48.

It's only a thousand.

Scroll back in.

Sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Where are we looking?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Scroll to the St. Clair area and I want to remind myself of the population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One precinct here and one here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay then go over to the west and south a little bit.

We will look in the next District 47.

Because that was a little higher over.

Okay, what is the.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This whole Township is 3900.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It's one precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's two precincts, one Township.

The precincts 1900 and 2000.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay take 2059 first.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That puts district 41 negative 2.74 and 47 at negative .68.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, all right, so can we go to blocks up by St. Clair?
On the shore? And I'm not familiar with this area.

So if this is a really good split right here and I shouldn't mess with it, let me know if someone knows.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is blocks and you want to be on the shore side or?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just right there, yeah, kind of where your cursor is just that kind of line that is over, can I see the population of those.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, I'm going to highlight it then you can.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was thinking just lower than that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: But we can see.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We will do them.

Not like that.

We will start down here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Not quite that much.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This water block runs all the way up and I guess the shore does too.

The shoreline runs.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, that is kind of a problem.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Somewhat like that but that is 1600 people and there are some in here, I'm sure.

We will just get it all.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That area is 1646 that is one census on the waterfront 367 people in that one strip.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, take off the farthest west, yeah that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This one?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That block, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That one actually ran down the median of a road is my guess.

Well actually that is a railroad track right away they digitized it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Then choose the blocks on each side of that.

One is yellow, one is pink.

And put those in 48.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put those in 48.

I can do that.

All these were still highlighting.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Get everything except the two I had you put back before the eight.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will Zoom in here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just that block 475 right there.

That one, yeah.

And just see what it looks like.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me get this right.

Just a moment.

Sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 41, 1.24% under, 47 is .68, 48 is .42.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Assign that little piece.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Get this little piece here.

In this census block is 19 people.

This is 108 people.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I would like both of those in with 41.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 41.

So now 41 is 1.06 low and 48 is .6 low.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay I'm good with that.

Oh, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That looks like a Township boundary.

Shall this block leave it or.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Put it in 48.

That would be good.

Thank you.

Do we want to check, what could we check to make sure we didn't mess anything up? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's see here we looked at 41, 48 and 47.

So 41 is still 60% republican.

I don't see that swinging any which way.

47 is 66 republican.

And 48 is 55.5.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: None of those were ones we were worried about except for population, so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct, and originally, we started with 34 I think, right? Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Started with 34 and it is still 50.51-49 democrat.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Good I'm fine with that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Our plan deviation did go down so thank you.

Overall plan deviation.

So thanks Cynthia.

So I'm next.

Okay, so I think the next one was 98.

Okay so let's try, thanks Kent, I've got a list here so let's see if we can Zoom into 98.

I see 97.

98.

That is around Northville; is that right? That is that little Northville.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is north of Grand Rapids.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: North of Grand Rapids.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sparta Rockford.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 99 is at is 290 over while 98 is 4300 under.

97 is another District that is probably on the list somewhere at 4.48% under.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Kent Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Before we star tweaking them let's always look at the partisan thing to make sure we are not messing that up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you but I want to record those numbers, sorry the population numbers first so I got the districts around it were 90, 98 was 4300 under so I'm going to add population to 98.

And the most immediate one was 99 and 85 and 97, correct.
97 is under.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 100 reaches.

I will change the color of 98.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is great Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Shouldn't we save? It seems like it's been a while.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What are you worried about Janice? Oh, good Rhonda has a hand up, Rhonda? Commissioner Lange, do you have a hand?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My hand is not up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay thank you.

All right so we are -- did we just save? Not yet we are changing the color then we are going to save, right? Thanks for working with us Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a minute.

Let me close this and open it back up.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We may have again a little late.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are due for a break it looks like 5:50 is what it says on the screen let's take a 15 minute break and return at 6:05, without objection we will recess until 6:05. Thank you y'all.

See you at 6:05.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 6:05 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 announce during roll call you are attending remotely and disclose your physical location.

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: In attendance.

Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. We will continue with our process of mapping and once again MC Rothhorn will facilitate so I can focus on trying to solve some problems here and also note for the record that Commissioner Eid just joined us in the room.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Chair Szetela.

I believe we were I think we left off with me if I'm not mistaken and looking at trying to save the plan Kent.

Do you want to summarize where we are at or what happened during the break? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We left off with just north of Grand Rapids with 98, with 98 being 4300 under people. And 97 being 4100 low, which is 4.48 percent.

98 is 4.7% low.

99 has a few .3 high.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is 99, yes, it is adjacent, okay.

Right looking at like the districts that have the most population to borrow is from 100 and 101. So 100 is actually through like 99, excuse me, 98 and 100 are together.

Where is 101, please?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I should point out that 92, besides 97, has actually 30,000 people, so it's really the general area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right and if we are going to correct the most egregious like yeah, the 4% and the over are yeah so, I'm going to try to pass through 101, 100 to 98.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Exactly.

Yeah.

101 will come further this way and 100 further this way and pass it on down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I established a route now I want to record the partisan election results, please.

So we can look to see if there is a democratic District we don't want to disturb or yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can save that spreadsheet and we can have it or we can just look at it and have an idea.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looking at it I'm going to record it, shouldn't take long.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 98 is 61% republican.

99 is 64% republican.

97 is 63% republican.

92 is 53.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't need 92 but 98.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 92 is a little high in population so if you move numbers out of 92 you need to pay attention.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And we don't have any democratic leaning districts. We are all sort of in the majority at this point with a republican leaning map currently. I will not adjust anything if it looks like if imaging population between 100, 101, 91 and 98 Mr. Adelson did you have a comment?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Just a question before the break I thought the plan deviation was 9.28 and now it shows over 12 in my readings.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Adelson we probably do have something off there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well some of the changes that were made obviously are not, there it is 31.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Midland area but is that the plan deviation excuse me the dis-contiguities that may be showing up as plan deviation things? Because it's.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Looks like there is one floating in the Bay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: A dis-contiguity from here to here and.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Chair Szetela I think you helped build this do you want to help correct it sed Szetela further up it looks like see that little part in the Bay that might be what's.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No population in it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So what is it saying.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 6,000, 7,000 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hum what about that pocket off on the west side of Midland.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are assigning these holes that were in 53.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Auburn you assigned Auburn, no, you take it out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was out causing it to be off.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Did I miss hit it in.

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: It's supposed to be that way 31 is under, right? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where is 57? So can you look under Midland? It does not look like Midland that is the problem it's under Midland the line between 57 and 31, right? Because 31 is under by almost 7,000 and 57 is over.

Am I reading that wrong?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No you are.

That is accurate Commissioner Eid did you have a question or a thought?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think there were dis-contiguities in 53 that were previously assigned to 31.

Looks like those dis-contiguities are no longer there.

And because they went from 31 into 53 it caused 31 to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I did not see that kind of numbers though, 2 and 3 and 9. Is there a precinct that...

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The question is do we have a previous plan to look at Commissioner Eid suggested the plan history.

But maybe.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me look at version four is that where it was done then we went into this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just don't see it being that much population but the solution is to grab part of 57.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Assigned total population are off. The unassigned area is 1 or 10,876 I don't think we have 10,000 unassigned. It should be fully assigned.

Do we need to rebuild the plan?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Maybe.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What is your assessment Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to run it and not betting on anything. But we are going to export the shape file and import it into a new plan. Because 7,000 people should be like two or three precincts or something. Visibly noticeable.

Noticeable.

But that plan did blow up.

So is that showing it's unassigned now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think.

You have to change the color of 31.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It does appear that is unassigned. So and this is where it kind of blew up when I was changing. I don't know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall in the name of efficiency if you can assign.

Looks like.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to assign those to 31 and see if the numbers are where they need to be.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is exactly what it is.

Those little pieces right there.

I will have to look at it more closely but it can't be a multi-part block.

There are a few I mean, this is odd.

All around the geography.

Let me I'm going to rebuild it.

Export this plan and bring it in and rebuild it because something is not right.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We were having problems with the plan.

It looked like a geographic or a graphical glitch that was causing errors in the plan.

So we exported it out to a shape file.

Created a new plan and when you put the shape file in it builds a whole new data set.

So it should be cleaned up and be like starting from new.

But we still have to find whatever errors were around 5331.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we were trying to get closer to that plan deviation of 9.28 or something like that, that I think we were -- that looks better.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's make sure this is all the right -- just like that, there is the little holes in there where we backed up.

And some little things to fix but the numbers are generally correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Nothing is unassigned at the bottom of the active matrix.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 6034 but that may be, well, we will see.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Ideally, we have nothing unassigned, right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are going to run this.

Sometimes I wonder if the matrix formula gets out of whack.

But so there are some unassigned.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Why don't we work through those for the moment.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The last plan was damaged and the last few things that were done it seems it lost it.

For example this Monroe area here this unassigned area did we put that in 61 or did we make a point leaving it in 60.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was in 60.

But there is something wrong with that area because it keeps unassigning in my plan too so I don't know I have the same thing.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Interesting.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What do you do in a situation like that where you recognize we need to move on or should we sort of just write it down or print screen or something like that? What would you suggest, Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well what we are going to do is we are going to move on and leave this here because that exported shape file seemed to when we brought it back in it seemed to fix it up to a point.

So let's just see what we have here.

Is that precincts we were moving?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm hearing from Chair Szetela is that even though it's assigned now it may unassign later and so it's just one of those like yeah if it's a weird area like what I'm trying to do is recognize it and trying to be efficient.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Once we get this fixed if it errors out again, we know it's done.

We will have to figure it out.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We will keep going there is nothing...okay thank you. So we will just keep going and checking for the unassigned areas then we will try to get back to District 98 and correct the deviation to the population deviation there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The significant area here.

This was 79, wasn't it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It sure looks like it, which is the yes, I do have an idea, yes, that should be 79, that's correct.

This is either 53 or 31.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks to me like 53 unless there is objections, is that 53 everyone? No, it's 31.

No it's 53.

Okay it's 53, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That looks like all of a precinct.

Never ending mysteries like yeah.

The mysteries of Midland.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is supposed to be 31 and.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, it was supposed to be 31 you are right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know why it moved it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So maybe at the block level, yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I know I previously said I thought Ann Arbor was terrible for its floating precincts but I can declare that Midland is much worse.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Mr. Stigall so we have assigned, no, we are still checking for unassigned areas, okay.

That.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That looks like it should be associated with District 31 because the water area should be associated with 31.

I see it's a pink and white District.

Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to air on this side of caution and export another copy of this so we don't have to keep.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is appreciated.

Thank you, Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 9.28 is more in the ballpark.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I have recorded.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is what I remember seeing.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we make sure there are no more unassigned areas looking at the bottom of the active matrix, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Look like 67.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Look more like 67? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 67, please, yes.

I was told about this little problem right here earlier.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, I think that is what Chair Szetela was saying.

That is the Ann Arbor area.

Lots of dis-contiguities.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 31 is all the little pieces in Midland.

We won't worry about those at this moment.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is one census block in the middle of 61.

Move that I think and then we will move back to.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I guess we are looking at plan error, trying to adjust the plan deviation so we need districts to be assigned correctly.

The plan excuse me the population at least.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Want to go back to Midland and do the little pieces?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No I just noted 31 and 53 were the areas that we wanted, that have dis-contiguities so we will just deal with it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's a very small number.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Takes a considerable amount of time.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Population wise we are a small number.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's 6:30 and we will see how long we can last.

And 98.

The plan was to move population from 101 which I think is the furthest north and west of District 98.

Thank you for changing the color.

So north and west.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is 100 and this is 99.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep, I see that thank you.

So the goal again to start with and the blue District in 101 north and west of District 98 yep so on that edge between 101 and 100 I think we are looking to transfer about oh, shoot so we want to transfer about.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 101 is 2200 high.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I want to get 98 needs 4300 so I'm trying to split the difference so I think I want to move if my math is right, I want to move 4,000 out of 101 into 100. And grab from 101, I'm going to assign that to 100, right? And assign about 4,000 because I will take another 4,000 off.

Is my math correct, Mr. Stigall?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Don't want to make 101 dive it down.

So you can take 3,000 off it or even 4,000.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's just that if I'm about 2000 off then I'm still well, yeah, all right that is about 2%.

Yeah, okay so let's look at 3,000.

We are between 3 and 4,000 we will assign on that west or the eastern edge of 101 we will assign some of those precincts there please to 100 and these are all republican leaning districts so there is not a.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do you want to do precincts or Townships?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Forgive me I want to do Townships.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These two together or those two or combinations of them.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If we stay in the south area is there anyone familiar with this area, are there places I shouldn't or yeah, are there any suggestions? I'm just going to grab from the south.

Anyone online that has opinions please let me hear your voice.

I do not see you on the screen.

But at this point what I'd like to do, yeah, so start at the northern tip just under 102 just that whole string we are looking for about 2000 people.

What did I say 2-3,000 people please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think you said 3-4.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I like.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 180, 1,000, 1400.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's do two rows of Townships.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: But it goes all the way down. I know this is 3 and 4 and. 41 is 4600 over.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: About 7,000 when we get done with this.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I just highlighted these but not assigned that is 3600.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are done, yeah, that is more than we need because the first amount was about gosh let's just do it that way.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 101 you took too much of 101 and it's down to 4.8%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Back out the last two districts or Townships rather because we want to get it to about 2000 under populated 101.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2.25%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The screen is just far enough way so if the active matrix and the font could be larger, please.

That is better.

Thank you.

Okay so now we are at with 101 we are 2000 under, correct? So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Now we will grab yes you got it that area we will grab about.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: May I suggest making 98 whole and getting the 98 right now.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So just adding to 98 we can skip a step.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then you know how much you need to shuffle.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 98 touches 100 there one District.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Make 98 about where you need it to be and that way you know how much you need to move across the area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I appreciate that and let's try that and if we can fill in the County lines there.

That would be great.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So here is 98 is 4300 under and these are the surrounding Townships and the town of Cedar springs and they are larger Townships. But there is 65.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's take Tyrone because that is 5,000. 98.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: .78.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Where we want to be and 100 now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 108, 1.08 percent.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And our plan deviation is 9.06 overall and have we done enough in this area to actually affect where we want to go? Looking at 98, 98 is at I don't think we need the election results because they are leaning republican so I think we are safe there Mr. Stigall, thank you.

98 with the population deviation so it's at 2.5.

So I'm just going to call it good here.

And.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 97 right beside it and 96 so 96, 97, 98.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's work with that then 97 is under and 101 is under.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This may be now you need to move some more population around to get it there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

So then adding from 100 so grabbing from 99? Nope.

I want to get it into 97.

If you see a path Mr. Stigall, I would appreciate it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 92 is a thousand over so you could move a thousand into 97.

95 is 2100 low so you really don't want to mess with 95.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 93 is pretty much even so right now you know you can take a thousand out of 92 and put it in 97.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is District 110 all the way in the UP? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No, 110 wasn't that moved into the Detroit area?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Came out of the U P.

56 is yeah you know a good as far as I can.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Having reviewed that Mr. Stigall do you see a path for 97 focus is 97.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Closest I could see is move a thousand out of 92, I mean you know without shuffling all over the country.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's a rural area sorry keep going.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know what the numbers are but 1700, 2700, 2400, 2400 and just 600.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see a natural spot I think Westphalia so around the Portland area Portland Westphalia there is some relationship there so to move what I'm doing and remind me I'm adding population to 97.

So I'm going to grab from 92 and assign it to 97 and am I thinking about that right? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, sir.

The more you take too much out of 92 you can make it go under.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I'm thinking about just Westphalia 2444, that Township of Westphalia.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 92 is 1.54.
97 is at 1.81.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Over all 9.0 plan deviation so that was successful.
And that area I mean because 97 was on our list.
Look at that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So was 98 and okay so I'd like to turn it over so thank you Mr. Stigall for your help with that.

Chair Szetela are you prepared to take a turn?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Tell me where to go next.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Either 51 or.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 34, 51.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 34.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 51 is around the Flint area.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Let's go to 51.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 4.58% high while 26 beside it I believe that's a maybe close to VRA District but any way it's just 368 people low. 52 is a thousand under.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Rather go to 52 then we are not messing with VRA districts so 51 is over so we need to take population into 52.

What is the population on the two little towers shooting up there, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 3800, 2900, 1900.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So if we put 3800 in, we will be 2000 over on the other District; is that right? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You will be 52 would be yeah about 2000, 20200 what is cutoff for 2.2%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Cutoff if terms of population, I think you will be all right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wondering what the number was for 2.2%.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 51 is .89 and drop the deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, trying to go for 5% deviation.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct but I don't know if you can do it all in one District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If this is 2.54 that is more than 5%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Keep on trucking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Zoom in the area we were in and go down to the block level.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just looking at the whole area 52 is 2300 high but it's neighbor 47 is 600 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You would not worry about that deviation.

Before you get down to the block level.

Anything else you want me to fix before I go home tonight? That seemed really simple.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you for that, that is great so.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Can I mention 57 is high and 52 is a little bit high. 47 is a little low, so it can hold some here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 57 is at what? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 57 is at 4.21% high.

Whereas 47 is 800 low here, 600 and some low here, 4,000 high here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It never can be simple, can it? Okay so we are going to dance our way over there so we are going to put let's look at the upper County above Lapeer so 52 is Lapeer so upper green block above the pink.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair may I suggest 47 and 49 need population. Start at the furthest one and work your way towards it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If you do all the work here for example then you have to come back and do it again.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay what do we have under 47? Can you Zoom in to the Township so I can see a population? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You said 47 is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 47 is 600 low.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 47 is 600 low.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 57 is where you are trying to get there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which is right here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Scroll up a little bit so we are going to take from 49, is that right? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think that would generally that or 52 into 47 and more 57 in here but 49 can hold some too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go up to and see where we are up to north Branch which is 35.

That is a lot to add though.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, that would put 47, 3,000 high.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's do burn side instead.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then I'm not going to tell you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You think so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's not wrong to take north Branch.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do burn side and put it in 49 well wait we are going the wrong way.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 47.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 47 yes so now 47 is good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 49 can hold 2700.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go back up to what we were trying to change which I think is 59 over.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 57 is 3800 people high. 49 is now 2700 people under.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So let's Zoom in and see what our right around Mayville. See Mayville.

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

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, all right, so a shift of 3,000 people roughly 3500.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Rich and Dayton can we shift those? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 57 into 49.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The other way.

Let's just do Fremont 3167 that is much better, I think.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what you want.

Thank you Chair Szetela.

How you feeling Commissioner Vallette.

You ready to take a turn? The smile on your face is ear to ear.

If you speak in the microphone all of us will get the benefit.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I don't know if I can do it in 15 minutes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You have five minutes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Why is that.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Because it's quarter to 7.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Are we stopping at 7:00.

The fun is over.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You have ten minutes, yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay thank you for the reminder.

So are we do you want to just wait until tomorrow or start tomorrow.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay I hear that.

I think you are getting some other appreciation, Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move to adjourn.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

Feisty.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let me just run through this formality sake.

We do not have minutes to approve.

We do not have any staff reports.

Department of State do you have any updates? Correspondence received in advance of the meeting was provided to Commissioners and their packets.

Any future agenda items or announcements? All right seeing that the business is done for the evening Commissioner Lett I would now entertain your motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Commissioner Witjes is there any debate or discussion on the motion? All right hearing no discussion all in favor of adjourning raise your hand and say aye.

Aye, opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail the meeting is adjourned at 6:47 p.m. thank you everybody.