

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

10/08/21 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 Www.Michigan.gov/MICRC 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 disclose your physical location as well. I will call on you in alphabetical order. Starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present. Attending remotely from Rochester Hills.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending 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?

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. 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. My name is Joseph Davis 4953 West Stole Road, Lansing 48906; but I'm actually a resident of Watertown Township for nearly 25 years. And I want to thank the efforts of the committee on the Senate side but I'm concerned about the House District positions.

I have for a long time had a concern of having representation that reflected my relationship with the Greater Lansing area.

I work for Lansing board of water and light for 17 years and currently employed by the national brotherhood of electrical workers and have statewide regional access to many communities.

But in my living in water town I feel I have not been served at the state level for reputation.

In 2004 we had a major flooding incident.

I was not able to get any assistance myself and my wife.

But our neighbors in Grand Ledge were thank you.

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

>> Hi, everyone, my name is Nathaniel Bills. I came from Waverly, a suburb of Lansing. And first I would like to thank the Commission for taking on this task. It's a long process and at times difficult.

I'd also like to say I think the way the Greater Lansing area was split in half in the State Senate map, is a good way to ensure partisan fairness in those districts and the map overall without doing too much to divide the communities in the Greater Lansing area.

I'd also like to say that places like Waverly and Dewitt have more in common with places like Lansing and East Lansing than rural areas surrounding us.

We have quite strong economic ties to both Lansing and East Lansing with folks commuting to work there, MSU is quite nearby as well as folks frequenting businesses throughout the entire area.

Thank you.

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

>> Good morning and thanks for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jeremy, a nonprofit manager here and I live in Delta and have been here about a decade and want to echo something that speaker before me just said.

I think the way you currently have the State Senate map here in the Greater Lansing area balances the community of interest and making a fair map and say thank you for that.

I thought it was very different from the current gerrymander we have.

For the State House, I live in Delta now but at one point I lived in Okemos and Meridan as a student and adult and given the size of Lansing and communities of interest there should be more house seats in the Greater Lansing area not less.

Maybe four right now but maybe five in a new version.

Particularly like Okemos and Meridan are separate from Lansing and are separate from North and South Lansing and from Delta Township I have my own separate community.

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

Number four.

>> Good morning and thank you for taking the time to listen to comments.

My name is John and I lived in Lansing for about 11 years now.

Most of my career has been in website design which means I spent considerable time working with folks in just about every part of the City and Greater Lansing area and the surrounding counties that you can imagine.

I just sorry my glasses, I will skip that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can pull your mask down while you are speaking.

It actually makes it easier for our translators to read your lips and see what you are saying.

>> When it comes to the State House districts, I want to say I think it would be really wise to have the north Lansing and Lansing Township share a District.

The folks that I've met and worked with across those areas all share a community and work and influence each other daily.

It's been so clear to me how those communities are built into each other as I've worked with many of them throughout my life in the City in this town I love so much.

Thank you for your time again and for the work you have chosen to take on to benefit all of us.

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

>> Good morning my name is Mark.

And I'm from East Lansing Michigan.

I'd like to say this morning my minute that I think you have a wonderful job.

I've watched you over the last year as you have come together as Commissioners and in the last three months put together maps and your skills in mapping have been very impressive.

Specifically as far as some of the maps that you have drawn with regard to Mid-Michigan, I would say that the State Senate map is very good, I think for the first time we will have in the Mid-Michigan area two state Senators to represent the Lansing area.

I think that's a wonderful idea.

With regard to the Congressional map, again, I think you have done a great job with that.

It seems to be a very fair map.

And for both parties.

And whoever will win the election will have to be a center candidate because they are going to have to defend their position with both republicans and democrats.

Thank you.

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

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Sarah Howard and I represent the AFLCIO's fair maps project. We continue to be concerned about the low BVAP in your VRA districts. In principle we are open to the idea that BVAP as low as 35 or 40% could be enough to elect the Black communities candidate of choice.

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

In practice however, we are worried that the District you have drawn could result in white suburbs electing white candidates who are not preferred by Black Detroit especially if Detroit continues its tradition of running multiple candidates for office. Please check the prime election turn out history in those districts.

It's very possible your districts may pass the test.

But it's also possible that some of them will show a 35% Black District as having a 70% white primary electorate and that should be avoided.

We thank you for your work on the Commission.

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

Number seven.

>> Hi. Good morning. I'm Krista Boyd and I'm Sarah Howard's legal assistant. You are doing the right thing by sorry, by trying to get to partisan fairness.

Your path towards partisan fairness so far has been moving swing districts from favoring republicans to favoring democrat that helped a little with partisan fairness numbers.

What you need to do now is focus on unpacking democratic vote swings in Greater Lansing you eliminated a competitive seat from 2011 gerrymander that is going backwards.

Look at the lopsided margin tests the districts with high democratic margins that are not VRA districts are the ones you should look at unpacking to get to partisan fairness.

In your current draft, democrats need 53 of the vote just to win half the seats.

If republicans had to win 53% of the vote to get half the seats, would you call those fair maps? And what do you think public comment would look like? Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. I believe that was our last 7, okay, all right just want to make sure.

All right, at this point we will move to the remote public comment.

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

I'm sorry.

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 provide public comment is, I will pull my list back up Dr. Armstrong hall.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will move on to Anthony Skinnell.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. Thank you so much. Anthony, Wayne County.

I could express my distaste for some of the procedural personalities that were there yesterday.

Pervading the proceedings but now you have options plural options that is a significant change in the atmosphere.

You gave the people or some of us what we wanted.

Doesn't matter to me if it's a collaborative map or individual one.

If it undergoes more than a few adjustments before the Commission no matter what whose base or a blank slate or something someone totally drew up on their own or a District R submission for that matter it's a collaborative map.

If it underwent more than a few adjustments before the Commission. Speaking of which what is the point of District R.org submission for us the public if you have not pulled up any of the public submissions and examined it as the submission and not taken from the maps or none of our submissions have under gown Bruce Adelson's analysis what is the future so we are driving an if issuer price steering wheel?

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

James Gallant.

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

And I would like to thank the honesty of a couple of Commissioners yesterday.

And particularly the one who clearly stated that they were confused and did not understand where we are at, where we are going.

Brain freeze time. Brain freeze time. And, you know, there is an unknown past that.

And that is why that is avoided to yet to stop.

And I also thank Commissioner Clark for voicing his agreement with me that there are way too...there's four or five people dominating these procedures. And, you know, any ad hoc committees outside. I think these four or five people are going to lunch together and doing it all, then you all are just go back and figure it out.

But I think the confusion is the responsibility and for that, the legal team and Secretary of State Benson. And they're responsible for this confusion because they have not collectively reoriented the Commission on the new rules of procedure. You have all new rules of procedure. You're supposed to have orientation and educational opportunity.

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

Robert Dindoffer.

>> Hello. Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, great.

So listen I'm from Grosse Pointe Park, part of the Lake St. Clair community of interest we are a lakeshore suburb you all had taken our testimony and the testimony of folks from all around the Lake into account.

And created a State Senate District that basically perfectly reflected what we wanted.

And you know gave us an ability to have a voice in Lansing.

It was basically a 50/50 District.

If you wanted to shave a couple points off of it to make it 51-49 the other way that's fine.

You could have done that.

You had a process going but at the end of the day and I'm not certain you know if it's final but it looked like you took my hometown of Grosse Pointe Park off of the lakeshore and another half of the lakeshore off in the Township and basically cut us into three.

It was really disappointing and I hope you will reconsider you know partisanship is not a reason to cut up communities especially when you can just shave a couple points and find a way to do it, thanks.

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

>> Good morning. I'm from Mattawan and I just want to say thank you so much for all of your hard work.

But I do want to say over the last three days I've been really concerned when Voters Not Politicians was on the ballot it overwhelmingly passed but we were promised that the Commission would focus on communities of interest.

We all submitted a lot of public comment on what our communities looked like and we were promised that we would not have crazy looking gerrymandered districts and now over the last couple of days I'm just really concerned that it feels like the partisanship is become the most important criteria when that was promised that would be fourth.

So I want to thank you for your work but I'm also really concerned and think it would erode the trust of voters if we come back the first around or first time we have this and the maps are really crazy like you saw the robot arm in Midland and Bay City.

So thank you so much for your work.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Taleah Greve.

>> Good morning. My name is Taleah-Greve and I live in Muskegon County. And Muskegon, Grand Haven, and Holland have a community of interest at the Federal level and we have a major harbor a state park and similar watershed that have been cleaned up using Federal dollars.

The lakeshore communities are tied together through manufacturing up and down the U.S. 31 corridor.

Our communities are major suppliers in specialized components from automotive to aerospace. I ask that you pair Muskegon County and Ottawa County at the Federal

level like they are in proposed map 187, 196 and 201. Muskegon is a lakeshore community and forms a community of interest that runs down the shore of Lake Michigan. Placing Muskegon with Grand Rapids diminishes our voice in Muskegon and our neighboring communities an afterthought and second class City. Communities of interest should be a priority and kept whole in considering Congressional District. So I urge you to keep Muskegon, Ottawa, and the lakeshore together.

Thank you so much for the work that you do.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present. And actually we had one more person sign up for in person public comment as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can move to the in person comment number eight.

>> Hello, my name is Yasha. I'm from Lansing.

Specifically the south side and I just wanted to take a moment for the opportunity to speak here before you and leave some testimony as to where I believe that the current drafts are.

I appreciate the efforts made on the Senate map.

They take a lot of things into consideration.

And I appreciate the way that Lansing is split there.

But in terms of the house maps, they seem to be going into a direction that is not so pleasant to me.

I think that we need to keep in mind to take political fairness and that test into consideration at every point we draw the maps.

But you guys draw the maps.

Thank you for your efforts on that.

But if you could take a revision and see if Lansing can't be split into four or five Directors that would be much appreciated.

Thank you for your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. At this point we will move back to remote public commentary with Ivan-Diaz, number nine.

>> Hello.

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

>> Hi, my name is Ivan-Diaz and want to thank the Commission quickly.

You are getting comments from people who well are not the nicest.

Any way today I'm talking to you guys about District on the house map for the state districts.

Map 79 and 78.

I actually grew up in the Wyoming Grand Rapids District.

Our area.

Specifically in the Godfrey Lee District.

If you guys notice because I have a moment here District 79 there has been well, we have been lumped in together with Byron Center for a long time and diminishes our ability to be looked at accurately and north Wyoming is heavy Latino District and have much more in common with the District 78 than 79.

So I was hoping you can try and see if north Wyoming can be put into the 78th District. And looking forward to speaking to you guys when you are here in Grand Rapids. Thank you for your time.

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

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you.

>> My name is pat Nelson and live in Grand Haven Michigan and I want to thank the Commissioner for the process to create fair maps in Michigan.

I was a volunteer for Voters Not Politicians and I devoted many hours to collect signatures on the Commission.

There is a lot of criteria to take in account creating the maps but do not lose sight of forest through the trees and many think you should concentrate on COI and it's important but not the only criteria and the overall goal to create fair maps should not be lost in the process.

The voters overwhelmingly supported prop two because we want map that don't favor one political party over the other and have partisan fairness.

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

Next in line is Franklin.

>> Thank you I don't have a question at this time Szetela sed you don't have a question.

Did you want to make a public comment?

>> At this time I was listening for.

Can you hear me okay.

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

>> Okay, just I know I'm speaking on behalf of the Albion Battle Creek area.

I don't think if I heard much of anything or conversation on those areas.

Again this is Franklin from Battle Creek, Michigan.

Thank you.

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

>> Hello.

My name is Rich Thrush, a long time resident of Grand Rapids. As currently drawn there are two Senate Districts in the Grand Rapids area in Kent County.

Following our suggestions to resolve some issues with these districts to make them meet the criteria for District development Cascade Township needs to be placed into the north District East Grand Rapids City needs to move from the south to the north and the four Ottawa County Townships should be removed from the north.

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.

This will vastly improve collection of Lake areas forming two communities of interest, one primarily minority south District and one in the north.

These changes minimize the disenfranchisement of 53 voters in the 530 population area and reduce the democratic packing that is currently in the south District.

Both districts would lean democratic as all of the surrounding areas are republican.

I will submit my comments in a map to better explain these suggestions.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Lillie, number 12.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Hi, yes, I am Lillie-Schulting near Kentwood near Grand Rapids.

I would first like to thank the Commission for all of the work that you have been doing.

We really appreciate how you have taken on the hard task of unpacking the all the details and ensuring fair representation for the people of the state.

I would also like to speak about my support for combining Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo together in the same Congressional District.

They are both beautiful, growing cities in west my.

So we would appreciate having representation.

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

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dave Branson.

>> Thank you for the tune to speak with you today one of the Commission's top priorities should be recognizing respecting and prioritizing communities of interest that is what voters asked for in 2018.

Frost forward it 2021 I can't really but express my frustration that the Commission continues to work on a base map that divides my community of interest into three Congressional districts.

Literally hundreds of people from Ottawa County have made their wishes known to this Commission between petitions, comments on the portal and public comment like I am today.

Our request is simple please keep Ottawa County whole.

As a resident of Georgetown Township I associate with the lakeshore.

Georgetown, Jamestown, and Hudsonville have so much more in common with Holland than they do in Grand Rapids in terms of culture, economic ties, and overall way of life.

These decisions will have a significant impact on our communities for the next decade.

Please keep Ottawa County whole.

As we continue to grow and prosper together in the future.

Thank you.

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

>> Hi, good morning. My name is Mandy Grewal from Pittsfield Township. I'm here to request that you add Pittsfield Township in the western Washtenaw and Jackson District for State Senate with Scio and Saline. I have lived in Pittsfield for 30 plus years and seen the dramatic changes that take place in the community and the expansive demographic growth in the most recent census of 2020 our community grew by 13% which is the second largest growth rate in Washtenaw County.

Historically Pittsfield Township has been lumped to communities to the north and east but with these changing demographics and the high rate of growth the population in Pittsfield Township I feel we need a more significant and a larger voice in Lansing for Pittsfield Township and I feel it would be best accomplished by putting Pittsfield Township into the western Washtenaw District along with Scio and Saline in the Jackson District so thank you so much.

I appreciate your time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is number 17, Luke Dehann.

>> Good morning can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Good morning. My name is Luke Dehann from Ottawa County .

I'm a fourth generation blueberry farmer on the lakeshore over here.

While most of this focus has been on larger populations and cities, I'd like to talk about farming agricultural.

In a time when outside pressure is hitting Michigan agricultural, we need a unified voice in Washington and kind of directly speaking about the U.S. Congress redistricting maps. Agricultural must be considered a community of interest.

Maps such as 200 that divide Ottawa County into three separate Congressional districts weakens our voices as farmers growers and producers.

A map like 187 which is much more inclusive represents Ottawa County, it keeps it whole and spans Muskegon to Berrien County.

This map is superior because it keeps agricultural areas along the lakeshore together this includes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 18 Susan Miller.

>> Hi.

Is it my turn Susan Miller.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it is.

>> Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Good morning Ms. Miller.

>> I want to speak to the issue of partisan fairness.

I have been concerned at times that the focus on communities of interest while valid and important is over shadowing attention to partisan fairness.

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

This concerned me for a number of reasons.

One being the great difficulty making a valid determination of a community of interest.

I have an example of that difficulty.

I have lived in Ann Arbor since 1969.

When I listen from home to the Commissioners' comments on how Ann Arbor should be directed in relation to surrounding communities, I disagreed with some of what I heard.

I don't want to give my point of view on what communities Ann Arbor should or shouldn't be grouped with.

My point is that a community of interest is not ultimately determinable in any secure way.

But varies with the point of view of the particular community member, maybe rooted in that person's sub community and political priorities even at times rooted in unjust historical.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 19, Abby Clark.

>> Good morning, Commission.

I just wanted to start by thanking you for how hard you're obviously working, especially this week.

Putting in really long hours and obviously really wrestling with the Voting Rights Act, communities of interest and partisan fairness and trying to balance those competing interests.

It's obviously really hard work.

And we see how hard you are working on it.

I would just suggest maybe looking at smaller cities like mine to do more of the unpacking there.

Detroit is now kind of cut up into ribbons in the State House map.

And I understand why you're doing that.

And it's for some really good reasons but you might have to do less to Detroit if you considered doing more unpacking in Grand Rapids, Ann Arbor, Lansing, Kalamazoo.

Also I just wanted to mention you said that the versions of the maps are confusing yesterday.

They are confusing for all of us.

It would be great if you clarified with what is posted online which are like legitimate versions being.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 20, Christy.

>> Hi there, thank you so much.

I just want to echo the comments that have lifted up the hard work that the Commission is doing on balancing all these competing interests.

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 really difficult to pull all of this together and address communities of interest and partisanship.

I vote in Harper Woods precinct five and it would be really important to my area to make sure that we are not included with a State Senate District that reaches all the way up the shoreline of Lake St. Clair.

Please look at this again. Consider putting Harper Woods in with Eastpointe and Roseville.

It's much more representative District in that kind of configuration.

I also encourage you to look at breaking up the Grosse Pointes.

Let's not reinforce that old racist boundary and instead make the districts that are more fair and represent how this area is changing.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Sorry. Mahindra. Number 21.

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

>> Can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay I'm a resident of Troy for over 20 years.

I want to thank you for your hard work.

My comment is about the Congressional District 6 and it's unfairness to Americans.

Indian Americans in Troy like myself share their heritage and have so much in common with communities in Bloomfield Hills Farmington Hills and Novi.

The Indian American community in Troy has strong connection to the commercial zone on Farmington Hills for shopping and dining.

Indian American in the corridor from Troy to Novi attend the same Sunday school.

The parents of these kids have a strong relationship and connection to each other.

I feel it's unfair to put Troy with communities in Macomb County with whom we do not have community connection.

I'm hoping Troy will be united with Bloomfield and Farmington and Novi.

Thank you so much for the work you do.

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

>> Good morning can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> While I'm a lifelong resident of Ottawa County I'm proud to represent my community here with you today.

Grand Valley State University have blossomed beyond a few buildings and corn field the identity is an agricultural community.

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

That identity is directly tied to the neighboring communities of Hudsonville Georgetown Borculo and Polkton and Robinson. And they are split in three all being next to one another in Ottawa County the village of Borculo is cut in half. And Allendale has more in common than Hudsonville and Grand Rapids do.

My message to you is this please keep Ottawa County whole.

There is no logical reason to split three to split Ottawa County three times at the Federal level.

Moving forward adopt 187 which is a collaborative map that represents Ottawa County as well as the agricultural past present and future, please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. We are now on to number 23 or 24, 23 is not here.

Delwar-Ansar.

>> Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, start my video.

Okay, hello.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hello we can hear you.

>> My name is Delwar-Ansar from Warren City.

I went to Detroit and Warren hearing and in June.

And it is very disappointing after I saw the updated map on the website.

We had 30 people were there.

And we said same thing.

We have been Hamtramck and to Warren and want them same altogether but unfortunately what I see in the map Hamtramck is not part of the -- our House District and also Senate District.

It's very disappointing.

Warren side is left out and you added Madison Heights.

So we want to see like all of our community together from Hamtramck to Warren.

Especially in house District we are not there.

And thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Okay, so Dr. Armstrong Hall.

>> There we do hello.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Hello.

>> Good morning I just the job you're doing is spectacular.

And it's hard, hard job.

A couple years ago I was delegate at the national education association and had a new business about gerrymandering and how deleterious it was to our election efforts.

And it passed 10,000 teachers across the United States wanted gerrymandering to be fixed and you're fixing it.

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 good for you.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. All right next in line is Kevin Grim number 25.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We will move on to 27.

Shadal is here, which is an e-mail address, Shahadat.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We can see you and hear you if you would like to address the Commission.

>> Good morning, everyone and thank you for the time to speak to me today.

I want to talk about the Commission.

We are feeling like for Hamtramck and Warren District 8, we don't see on the map drawing for Hamtramck in same Warren and Hamtramck.

So I want to request you that we have to add Hamtramck, Warren same thing.

I'm from Warren City.

And I am from Macomb County my name is Shahadat and thank you for everybody.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Number 27.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Chris Andrews.

>> Hi, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Good morning I want fair State House districts in the Lansing region.

The current map packs democrats into three districts.

It is far worse than the 2011 intentionally gerrymandered map.

There are many ways to fix this.

The simplest might to return Delta Township Eaton County's largest community into eat on and create an eat on center District.

Another way would be to divide the Lansing region into five or six seats with large population hubs.

Delta Township, Lansing, East Lansing, Meridian and Delhi Township whole.

You could also bring in the suburban areas of Dewitt and Bath from Clinton County.

Commission Rothorn knows this area well.

I'm sure he could come up with fair districts.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Last in line is number 29, Abduhlakem Alsadah, I can't say it today, I'm sorry.

>> Abduhlakem-Alsadah.

Hello good morning, Commissioners.

Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you very much. Good morning, Commissioners thank you for the opportunity.

And thank you for your great public service.

My name is Abdulhakem. I'm an educator and healthcare and human services provider and speak here on behalf of the Indian American major organization and signed a letter and sent it to you in public comment W2162 we are one of the fastest growing in Michigan and around the country and yet we have absolutely no representation whatsoever.

So we would ask you directly with unanimous voice and support to keep Hamtramck and House District 4 as one.

And VRA compliant Congressional District that connects our communities in Hamtramck Dearborn, Dearborn Heights through Detroit, Melvindale, and Dearborn.

Our needs is great.

And our request, we appreciate you.

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

That concludes our public comment for this morning.

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

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

At this point we are going to move on to unfinished business.

Agenda item 5A.

And without objection we will return to continuing assessment of draft maps for compliance and adjustments as well as taking steps to begin deliberations.

All right hearing no objections we are going to move forward with that. But before we do so I did watch the meeting yesterday and I did have a question and point of clarification for our General Counsel because it seemed that at the end of the meeting there was some confusion about submitting individual maps, you know, can those be considered for bringing to public hearings, can Commissioners do one and then another later and I'm just wondering if you had a chance to look into that and provide some clarification.

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

And thank you for the question, Madam Chairperson.

So the questions that I'm trying to I was trying to jot down notes.

The first was and the easiest to address is the individual submission, individual Commissioner's submission of maps.

Pardon me, please.

The Commission voted that individual maps would be due Monday, October 11th before the start of the meeting.

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.

Those would be maps that individual Commissioners are putting forward outside of the collaborative process, whether those maps use any portions or parts of the collaborative maps as a base.

These would be maps that individual Commissioners are putting forward which they have the right to do so under the Constitution.

The Commissioners, individual Commissioners also have an opportunity to put forward individual maps after the second round of public hearings during the voting process. And that's covered in subsection 14CI.

The way those plans, those individual submissions are handled is different between subsection 9 and subsection 14 but they both represent independent opportunities for Commissioners under the Constitution.

Shifting over to collaborative maps and there was again much discussion on this topic yesterday, the collaborative plans are the plans that Commissioners drew as a body during its meetings that the public has been watching and providing feedback on during the process either through live or remote public comment or through the public comment port M.

Some of those collaborative maps have also had amendments made by either individual Commissioners or collectively.

I think it depends on which plan is being spoken of.

So as I understood the conversation yesterday, the Commission was discussing whether to consider the collaborative plans with individual modifications, again, that to me is a separate category within the collaborative plans.

That when we are speaking of collaborative plans, we are truly speaking of those plans that were drafted by the full Commission.

Is that helpful Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No it's not.

And the reason why I say no is because there isn't a single map that the whole Commission did.

We took turns and each individual Commissioner made individual changes.

You know maybe it's population, maybe it's drawing an entirely new District.

So I'm not understanding the line of demarcation between us having a map and creating a clone and someone making a change to me that would now be a collaborative District because it occurred during an open meeting.

Versus you know I guess I'm just not understanding the line of demarcation and I want clarification on that.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I appreciate that question and I think that was a lot of the conversation yesterday that was happening between your colleagues during the meeting yesterday.

The very good news is I honestly don't believe that that distinction will be relevant moving forward.

The Commission has a number of plans that will be -- that will be formally voted on whether to be published or not or put forward for the -- to be published to move forward and receive feedback during the public comment periods during the public hearings. So regardless of the manner in which that particular plan manifested during a public meeting, the full Commission will be able to determine its fate through voting on moving forward.

And the Commission, the Commission has that ability and it's in its mapping process. Is that more helpful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To further dig down so we all understand regardless if it's an individual or collaborative map or if we have not figured out what it is on Monday or Tuesday, we can choose to bring those maps on the public hearings? Or is that not true with respect to individual maps I am just trying to understand.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is the clarification the only clarification I would make in your statement is individual maps under subsection 11 are not consider by the full Commission.

So on Monday the Commissioners who wish to present individual maps, again, that have the compliance analysis completed with them to their colleagues, those maps do not need to be voted on.

The Constitution gives the Commissioners the ability to do that.

For the collaborative maps, and, again, I'm using collaborative on the broad umbrella of drawn in public meetings, collectively.

So I know some people recognize nuisances underneath that umbrella but for the sake of the conversation on what will be voted on, any of those collaborative plans, whether adjustments were made or incorporations were made brought forward by individual Commissioners, those are all in the -- on the shelf with the collaborative plans.

Those will be voted on.

Not plans strictly brought forward by individual Commissioners.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I think there was a point in there where I think it clarified for me.

And that point is individual maps don't get voted on, individual Commissioners submit them and sub linked with proposed maps the same as the collaborative maps.

Okay so I think that is helpful.

And makes sense.

So we are ultimately going to pick one two, three, whatever we decide maps, vote on them, those are the maps that we as a Commission are saying we are publishing but individual Commissioners can then also submit their own maps which will also be on that second tab of you know, whatever it's called right now I think it's draft maps or proposed draft maps as well is that accurate?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just wanted to make sure.

I was having some confusion about what happens with those individual maps and that is helpful and that clarifies that.

Okay that is what I needed to know thank you very much.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Following up with that, there is a second step that we talked about yesterday that General Counsel and I had some confusion on. And that is on Monday any Commissioner who wants to submit a map, their own individual map can do so pursuant to the amendment, goes through the public hearing process.

Then at the end of that, you are also able to submit a second map.

Just like the Commission after the input can do another map with revisions.

After that, however, you can only put forward one map.

You don't get two shots.

Does that make sense? Just like the Commission can change, update its maps that have gone out, an individual Commissioner can do that and submit another map or keep that map.

But you only get one not two forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Only one Congressional, one house, one Senate that is what you mean.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yesterday I think what Commissioner Lett was suggesting yesterday is under subsection 14 under the final adoption of map it had to be the same map under subsection nine and completely independent sessions so if we submitted by Monday's deadline it gets published and receive feedback, they would be able to modify that plan and be able to make any adjustments based on again feedback in the portal wherever the Commissioner obtained that feedback and then submit that again.

If it goes into that process under subsection 14.

So they would have the ability to either use that plan or if you don't submit a plan under subsection nine and you decide under subsection 14 you would like to, you still preserve that right and that authority to do so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And those subsection 14 plans will be due date obviously not Monday that is subsection nine.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: For clarity and where we are is subsection nine Commissioners get to submit plans going into the public hearing so those plans can be published to the -- published as well under subsection 14, that is when the Commission is moving into adopting final plans.

So the Commission has not set any dates for that and that process is only triggered if the Commission does not adopt a plan for each District type, majority vote, with two of each selection pool comprising that majority vote.

So the subsection 14 plans are triggered later in the process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, can you clarify on that point too? I kind of lost you subsection 14 plans are individual plans and then at some point after the public hearings we are going to have deliberations and determinations and potentially votes and at that point we can vote on collaborative or individual maps is that what I'm understanding? Or is that a no?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No.

And again we are not talking about where we are now.

So in the future under subsection 14 when the Commission is going to be adopting a plan, they have to ensure it is tested.

They have to publish it, all the proposed plans for 45 day public comment and when it comes time to vote the voting to adopt a plan requires majority vote with two Commissioners from each selection pool.

So that would be to democrat affiliating, two republican affiliating, and two non-affiliating independent referred to that selection pool as independent members.

If no plan receives that majority vote with the 222 break down within that majority vote, then a process is triggered by which plans will be adopted.

And that process is where individual Commissioners will be able to submit their own plans.

The Constitution goes through it step by step so but the first step of the vote is an attempt to get the -- is to get the majority vote.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair to give you an idea what the timeline looks like here, so this is where we are at here obviously the week of October 4th. So going into the public hearings the week of the 18th and the 25th individual Commissioners would be able to put forth their own maps for the public to see and comment on during this time period.

Going into November, after your next round of deliberations, this is when the 45 days of public comment begins.

And then what your General Counsel is referring to would be in this area here is the ability potentially for Commissioners to put forth additional maps.

Is that accurate General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Again, the provisions and I'm speaking for those who want to follow along it's subsection 14C states the final decision is the vote on a District type plan majority vote 22 and 2 if no plan satisfies this requirement, the Commission shall use the following procedure to adopt a plan for that type of District.

And then it goes into that process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't think that is your question.

I think your question is what plans get to the -- into that 45-day comment period.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep exactly.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

You are going to -- you can submit a plan Monday.

All 13 of us could submit a plan Monday and that would go through the public hearings that are coming up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Once that gets back, then the Commission, on a collaborative plans that have been on the road show can make changes.

Also, all 13 individual plans if there were, they could make changes.

But only one plan from the 13 individuals can go forward.

Both plans, if you made changes both plans can't go forward.

You can only put one plan forward.

If you don't make any changes, that same plan goes forward.

If you make a change, then you have to pick.

I mean you could say I'm going to put the original forward or I'm going to put the amended one forward but you only have one to go forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Then you get down to the voting she is talking about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, that's a lot of words when three lawyers are speaking.

So just I think Steve basically clarified it but each Commissioner could put forth a plan for each of the different types Monday.

They can keep that plan or modify that plan and have that go into the public hearings.

Then can they submit a different plan or that same plan as their one map for the final vote after the 45 days of -- got it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll just say thank you to all of you.

That helped me a great deal too.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, with that clarification let's get back to business.

I just wanted to make sure everybody understood because I saw a lot of questions and I frankly was confused as well.

So do you guys want to take a break for five minutes? Hearing no objections let's break for ten minutes.

It's currently 10:08 hearing no objection.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: We've only been at it an hour.

Just my objection but if nobody does.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we are going to have to vote Rhonda.

That is fine we just already had one person leave the room and other people want to use the rest room.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'll motion to take a short ten-minute break.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Eid and seconded by Commissioner Lett to take a ten minute break is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none let's vote all in favor of taking a ten-minute break please raise your hand and say aye. Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

So we have one nay the ayes prevail.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Clark can you indicate your vote please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My vote is nay, no.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have two nays is that correct? All right so the ayes prevail and we will recess until 10:20 p.m. or 10:20 a.m.

Thank you.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission at 10:20 a.m. will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

And I'm attending this morning or today's meeting remotely from Rochester Hills.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> 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?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

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 VALLETTE: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 10 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

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

We will return to unfinished business agenda item 5A I believe Commissioner Lange has a turn if she wishes to change the maps did you want to start with house, Congressional or Senate?

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: House please.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you pull up the house map for Commissioner Lange? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, Chair.

So what I did or I thought I had and to get started I made a -- just a moment I made a copy of yesterday's work.

And I just made it a few minutes ago.

So I'm going to change the name of this and give it today's date if that makes sense and start the work on it.

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So this will be a clone then.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, ma'am so we can keep our sequence going as to how I think this is the right naming convention.

This is a copy of 10-07.

So Commissioner Lange where would you like to start?

- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would like to go up to the Midland area, please.

And I thought long and hard on this and it says shall abide by the following in order of priority and communities of interest outweigh the partisan fairness.

So with that said, I'm going to undo the arm that is stretching from Bay City to Midland.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a moment I'm going to get the names of the Townships so I can better keep track of what we are doing here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: While you do that, Commissioner Orton, did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Before we make changes can we review the partisan fairness and majors we are looking at so we can see what our changes do?

- >> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Well I have those if you would like them.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: With this current map?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, so this is the latest version of the house map that we stopped working on yesterday morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Stigall?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If it's the will of the Chair I can bring up yesterday's partisan or run it now and save it and we can look at it as we go.

Just in the background, if it would be slicker.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's run it real quick and doesn't take but a minute.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anthony once that report is up if you can compare it and read it off on your spreadsheet that would be helpful.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This shall be the starting point but not necessarily the ending point of where we want to go with it.

So I will save this and then with a different name.

And we can continue and we can lay them side by side if we so choose.

The lopsided margins on this plan it should match up to what Anthony has 6.3% lopsided margin.

Mean median difference is 3.4%.

Efficiency gap of 6.4%.

And seats are 55-55.

That is where we are at right here, right now.

I'm going to save this plan with the spreadsheet with a different name and we can run it on the plan as it's edited and you will have them side by side if you so choose.

Does that meet, satisfy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, if you can please do that and Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we also make note of the plan deviation and can we run compactness as well? Just so we have everything to compare? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We will back up here and run the compactness.

And what I'm going to do now is save it as a PDF so it's a little easier to read and it's up. Well, if I get this straight, I will save it as a PDF.

And it's going to be and we will put it in the same folder as this is the current plan that we are editing.

I will put it in the same folder. I'm going to give it just a -- so this will be the first one and it will be in the work plan so when we run it again, we will come right back to the same place.

I'm going to go open up the PDF so we can Zoom in and out and actually read it.

And that's the PDF report.

So we can look at them at the same time.

And I understand we have just been really studying the first Polsby Popper.

And this is the most compact .65 District 83.

Least compact is .1 District 53.

So this report is saved, you know, in the same plan folder and it's number one.

So we can run this at any time.

And give it a different name.

As many iterations as you so desire.

When it's the will of the Chair I will move on to the plan itself.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is fantastic are you satisfied? Commissioner Orton is satisfied so....

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now we have the partisan and the compactness scores for this plan before any edits, saved in this plan's folder.

We can go and get it at any time because it has a unique name and will not be over written.

Commissioner Lange? I'm ready to make do whatever you desire.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay I have two questions.

One may make it go faster is it possible do we have an overlay of what this area looked like prior to the change being made that stretched the arm from Midland to Bay City?

Because if we had that overlay it would make it go a lot faster.

But if not.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe I can get it pretty quickly if you want to just give me one minute, I can answer that question.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just while he is working just as a comment it said the least compact District was 53 and that happens to be this District.

Just thought I would point that out.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And while he is looking can I let everybody know what I'm doing here.

I went back through the communities of interest.

And I didn't even hit the tip of the iceberg on comments on Midland. But we have W6075, W6087, W5377, C3082, C4677, W4675, W568.

We had the public hearings from May 25th with speaker 10, 11, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 34, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 54, 58, 73 all giving comments. And that is not even all of them.

There were other ones that gave similar comments but talking more so about Congressional District.

We have comments that have been recently done on maps from Laura, Kevin, William, Kristine, Lynn, Katherine, Sarah, Cathleen, and Jill.

So and like I said this is just touching the tip of the iceberg.

So I do think it is a community of interest.

And that's why I'm doing the changes that I'm doing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So could you clarify what you are saying the community of interest is.

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 LANGE: Midland the Midland County as a whole and the watershed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now this is the version four, the one with the Midland in it was version six from the day before.

So is this the plan? I mean there is more because there is a version five, there is a version three.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That looks like it Kent from my memory.

I know how Midland was.

I just wasn't sure about the Bay City area but that does look like it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Here is another one.

I want to see if it is any different.

It may be identical, if that is the case, we are definitely on the right track here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I'm torn, I think the changes that you're going to make I think I pretty much know what will happen you but what you said while I was thinking.

I took the wrong antihistamine this morning and all sorts of trying to stay awake.

So all the written comments and everything in regards to Midland and Midland County staying together, I'm torn with.

Part of me does think that Midland and Bay City belong together but I understand where you are going with regards to community of interest standpoint.

However what I find alarming and I can't take this with a whole box of salt is that there has also been public comment stating in the portal that has been written that that particular community of interest being suggested on the house level has been a spam person trying to protect his seat.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Moolenaar.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: And my response to that is I can almost guaranty that these people that came May 25th and spoke to us in person were not influenced even if there was a campaign, it probably was recently.

And I'm going to use discernment here because we had the same comment about AFLCIO maps from a lady that said that she was a former union member and was getting the same thing even telling them what to say.

So this is where we have to use discernment.

And by what the people have given us comment in person.

And I'm not going to discount because one person said that there's a potential thing what people have already said.

Do you understand what I'm saying? We are going to get that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm sorry I did not mean to talk over you.

I do and taking with a box of salt not just a grain of salt but it was said.

I just wanted to bring that up.

But I lean both ways.

I see your point of view and I see the point of view with Midland going over to Bay City.

I just wanted to make that statement.

But feel free to continue.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say it's Rhonda's turn.

If this is what she wants to do with her map, then we can allow her to do that and we should allow her to do it.

And we can debate whether we want to move this map forward on Monday or Tuesday or whatever day we do it.

But I say just let her make her changes and, you know, it's a clone and let her make her changes and see what it does.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was not trying to sway her in any way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree about the public comment in particular. We received abundant comment about Midland wanting to be with the Tri-Cities. So there are definitely a lot of comments out there one way or another.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: We received public comment that from people that wanted the Tri-Cities that said that they were good with the whole County being in one District for on this level.

I think most of the obviously the Tri-Cities would be Senate District.

Because you can't get the Tri-Cities in a House District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Absolutely.

So please continue instructing Kent on what you want him to do.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Kent everything that is in 57 that shows as 53 and 31 I want to add that back into 57.

So all of the pinks on the right please add those back into 57.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay the plan we are looking at here are the districts outlined.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: In blue 57 it does not appear was ever edited.

I may be wrong.

We can back up and go further back in time.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No I looked at it wrong, I'm sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay we are good we got 31 over here and 53 here or is it the other way around or does it matter?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: 31 is correct just add the Section of 53 inside of there to 31.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And then all of this to 53, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, but there are a couple little spots.

You can see them in the pink next to Midland that actually go with Midland.

It's part of Midland but other than that the rest.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We will come back and get them.

I wanted to do the big areas.

I don't have to do anything two or three times.

So we will get going here.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe that incorporates the blue and the filled in color areas that they align with each other, then we are done with it.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: There is a little other Section you see where it says Midland 160 and there is a little rectangle above it too.

Those two go with 31.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay in previous plans they did not and were in 53 but that doesn't mean we can't put them over here now.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Let's put them over there now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, so at this point we have the two districts the deviations and numbers are right here.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay so that caused it to go too high.

For what they were looking at.

Okay put those back in 53.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Rhonda when you added them even though it did not affect our overall plan deviation score and we are still at the same.

So if you really want to keep them in there.

It's not affecting our overall plan deviation is not affected.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay Kent sorry one last time put them back in with 31.

My apologies.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: As long as we need to do it to get it right.

Okay happy with that.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm happy with that.

That is the only change.

There is other changes I would look at but I'm only going to do one change on my turn so that's all I've got.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Lange, this water block here, shall I assign that to 53?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is just left over, okay.

Okay I believe that's complete.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Just a couple thoughts.

First, I'm glad that we let Commissioner Lange make the changes that she wants on this collaborative map because it's her turn and we can determine later you know how many we want to bring forward.

But I think it's very good we let her do that.

Without having a whole bunch of smoke about it like the last few days.

My opinion on the District is that we've had public comments for do you know what actually I can't say my opinion yet because we have not run the numbers so we should probably do that first.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Kent, can you rerun this plan with run the report the partisan fairness so we can take a look at it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can do it right now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And the compactness as well.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this is the new plan.

I can bring up the old plan and lay it beside it unless somebody has the numbers. Either way you want to do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Anthony do you have the numbers and want to read them off?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Go ahead Anthony, I'll just click through it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so these are the numbers for the changes that Commissioner Lange made on this map.

Previously we were at a 6.4% sorry we were 6.3% lopsided margins test.

We are now at a 6.8%.

Let's move on to mean median difference.

Previously we were at 3.4%.

Now we are at 3.8%.

So move on to efficiency gap previously we were at 6.4%.

Now we are at 7.4%.

Let's move on to the seats to votes ratio.

Previously we were at 2.3%.

With a 50/50 split.

Now we are at 3.2% with a 54 democrat seat and a 56 republican seats.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Eid.

All right so next Commissioner in line to have a turn is Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I would like to see the Senate map that we were working on early yesterday.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This was the plan.

This was went over yesterday.

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.

This was the plan when it was posted online and looked at online by Commissioner member, it had an irregularity in it and it was fixed online and then copied back down. So I'm going to open this up.

It should be identical.

Left off yesterday on this plan.

We were doing the partisan adjustments in this area.

Between five and seven.

We can do like we did yesterday.

Copy, paste all the deviations into a spreadsheet, sort them and see where we are at again.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I know which District I want to work on.

First of all I would like to say 7 was left partially changed.

I think the numbers still work like we didn't throw anything way out of balance but we may want to put it like it was before it was partially change and Anthony do you want to say something first?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I wanted to clarify I previously said the previous house map was 50 democratic seats versus 50 republican seats.

That was a percentage the percentage was 50/50.

The seats were 55 democrat to 55 republican.

And that changed to 54 democrat to 56 republican.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for that clarification, Mr. Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So which reminds me before I want to work on 14 because we left it out of balance.

I don't think we meant to do that.

So before I do that, can we do the same thing? Run a report and keep that so that we can compare, make sure we don't do something we don't want to do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right here.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Sorry?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think also if with we are reverting things back, do we want to make this a clone? That is what we have been doing so Kent if you can make a clone a new version that way if we are not happy.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So what I will do is run all these reports, leave it, make a copy of it and that way they will all be in the right folder, separate and unique.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is the partisan fairness features.

I don't know if anybody's jotting these down but we will be starting.

I'm going to rename this to a current name.

So we have 4.5% lopsided.

Mean median 2.8.

Efficiency gap 3.2.

Seats votes 20dem, democrat, 18 republican.

Okay?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to leave that name as is, just the way, well, we will see.

So now we will run the compactness.

Not that compactness analysis generated.

And we will just go down here.

So the most compact is .66 District 21.

Least compact at .21 is District 17.

.66 for 21, .21 for 17.

I'm going to save this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel? General Counsel quick question.

Did Moon or anyone else give us a range about what's reasonably compact? I know we have that for Dr. Handley but do we have something like that? To me the numbers don't really mean very much to me because I don't know what is reasonably compact and what is not reasonably compact.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is an excellent question Madam Chair.

So for the compactness measures, the let me just not look at my notes for the compactness measures the closer you get to one is more compact.

And the closer you get to 0 is the least compact.

So you want to get -- that is how you want to approach that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is where we repaired it.

So it's just this plan with that one little repair in it.

So now I'm going to copy it.

And give that a long name and starting today.

It would be V1SD I'm going to open the plan which we created which is a duplicate of yesterday's work.

So my question is do we want to make the list of the District deviations and differences?

And sort them out like we did yesterday?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think right now I would just like to bring District 14 into deviation -- into the accepted deviation.

So if you would Zoom in to the line between north, the northern border.

And put it on precincts, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These are the democrat, republican votes for the 2016 Presidential election I believe.

We can double check it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay I don't think that -- let's see 14.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can just use them for reference if nothing else to identify.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So will you assign -- from number two, to number 14 will you assign that oh, do you know what could we have the total population instead? Because that is I think helpful.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, that is the precinct number and total population.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Add that one 3482.

Thank you.

And then from District 18 can you add that one? You are reading my mind.

Then a little further down when you're able to go a little bit south.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Can I turn off the precinct label?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If I could see the population that would be helpful.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It just confuses everything there.

Okay, easier to read for me any way.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Slide down a little bit more, a little more.

I thought I found one that had a population of 18 into 14 of 2173 but I'm not seeing it.

Okay stay right there.

Go up just slightly and from 11 to 14 but I think 11 was one that we were, there was something about 11 that we need to be careful of.

But it does not seem to be a VRA District.

Anyway those first two, the 2489 yes, those two would you add them to 14?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't have any memory of 11.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe it wasn't -- then can you go up slowly so I can find the District or the precinct in District 18.

A little bit more.

More.

Okay well we need let's see, okay, let's move the 1820 that's right up at the very top of the screen.

That's in two.

There might be a better precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will leave it highlighted for right now and you can point.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Cynthia, sorry, District 11 did not have a significant Black age voting population, right?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Go down a little more.

I must have written down the wrong number.

Instead of what you highlighted highlight the bottom one 3180.

It will take us a little under on 18.

And I wanted to get in the deviation we were.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Should I assign it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay so now we are looking at .73% low for 14 or 1900 people. 1.71 low for 18.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, will you undo that last change? I see something better and I think, Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I really don't think we should be splitting up West Bloomfield and/or charred Lake from Sylvan Lake and Keego Harbor. I understand you are trying to bring the plan deviation down but I would recommend looking somewhere else maybe in District 2 or maybe since Farmington Hills is already split up, maybe over there.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So this is the same argument I've had over and over that we should not be splitting up communities of interest to do these things. But that's what we have been doing and no one cared the communities I was talking about so we have to move things over.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's your map Commissioner Orton so make the changes you want to change and if people don't like it their voice is their vote to not bring this forward so.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay scroll down just a little bit. You were right at it.

Right there, wait, stop, it keeps moving.

Right at the top of the screen right now.

The 1195 and the one right above it.

Would you move those in.

And there may be other plays we better move but.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: For 14 it's .83 low while 18 is 1.6 low. 16 is 2.63.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't know if it helps or not.

I'm trying to determine other places that might achieve the same goal.

And I think instead of those two districts or precincts the one in Waterford might be better so that 39 that 3698 I think that would be preferable.

Or the 4104 I think that also would be preferable.

Just it's your map.

I'm just trying to give you changes I think might help and be preferable.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay what about that, yeah, that one that actually the cursor is on right now, is that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That would be preferable to the two you previously took.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Would you switch those last two take off and add that one? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I wanted to point out I agree with what Anthony just said.

I think we are better off working from Waterford over if we possibly can.

That accomplishes the objective.

And try to keep Sylvan Lake and Keego harbor and so forth together.

Is really a balance of a COI as well as getting deviation correct.

So I think this works better.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That works for the deviation from those.

Could we Zoom out so we can just kind of see the shape and just the whole District.

Is there anything else that anyone sees that shouldn't have been moved in there?

Looks good, okay, if I could make one more small change.

It's to District between 20 and 21.

Which is Kalamazoo.

If we can just take off two precincts it will bring those populations into better alignment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Adelson.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I wanted to point out it's a revised 14.

BVAP the Black voting age population came down about a point and a half.

I don't necessarily think that that's dispositive.

But I just wanted to point out that several of these districts are delicately balanced as far as minority population.

And while typically a point and a half won't necessarily matter.

Just as an FYI as the as adjustments are being made, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was trying to be careful of that.

I thought that the Black voting age population in that District was higher than what we had been advised.

In the first place.

So I thought that that still kept it well within.

Is that not true?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Orton I agree with that.

This is more just FYI in general that there may I be districts where the population is lower than here.

As I recall, the population was around 46%, 45.9, so it's more of an FYI rather than a specific concern about the revised District 14.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton to your point 42-43ish% was what we were advised in Oakland County area.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

Do you want to look at election data for how it's changed?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Looking at what is on the screen I think the election data are good.

As I explained.

This is more just an FYI.

I understand issues about addressing the population deviation.

It's just something to keep in mind going forward particularly in districts where the voting age population is lower than it is in this District.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay if we can move over to the Kalamazoo area 20 and 21.

And where it sticks out right there that one, yeah, if you could Zoom in on that.

And on precincts can you move the left two precincts into 20? And from living in that area I believe that this is a good community of interest change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's a good plan deviation change too.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Oh, so my only other comment is I wonder if we want to go into 7 and kind of undo the partial changes that were made.

I think it was just left that way, not on purpose.

So I don't know if somebody wants to tackle that but.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Would you help us? I think you were helping Commissioner Kellom at the time.

You might remember some of the changes.

It's still your turn.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Sure.

I'm not sure I remember.

I wonder if there is an overlay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think we can -- I know we can fine one that will give us good direction.

Just a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I know basically we added on the bottom and took from the top.

While he is looking for that I will just say in looking at the plan deviation, the population deviation I think these districts where it says largest up there 4 and 17 and many of the top ones are the VRA districts that we tried so hard to change.

So I really don't think we can change the plan deviation much.

Without reworking all those.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looking for 10-04 folder we downloaded yesterday to start the plan.

I will download it now to make sure.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I did, actually I have a question.

What is your objective with District 7, Cynthia?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well I think we had it the way we originally intended it when we were taking communities of interest and everything in account and made it and the districts around it the way we wanted.

And yesterday when we were attempting to change it a little bit that when Kent's program crashed and we took the break.

When we came back, we never went back to it.

So I think it was left undone.

And.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: All you want to do is revert it back.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: To where it was.

Okay you don't want to try to make it more partisan fair?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe we should.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Revert back.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Maybe we should run the report before we change anything and see.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I was thinking adding from six down at the bottom into seven and increasing the partisan fairness, if that actually does that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That is what we were attempting what Brittini was attempting yesterday and didn't seem to be working.

So I believe in this partial attempt I believe we may have split up more communities. So we might either want to go more or less.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, we did and went down and added Grosse Pointe park.

I'm not sure but we did that yesterday okay.

I just wanted to know what the objective was, thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Stigall?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: My recollection and we can do the overlay is with a significant amount of changes in here, we lowered the republican percentage from like 50.7 or 8 down to 50.42.

And we are getting to the point of trying to figure out if it was even possible to get this you know basically drop it another whole percentage or 7-10ths that is where it was left off and moved on to the next plan.

So the question is do you continue with this idea trying to get this lower? Leave it like it is? Or back it up? But whatever you choose Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Did you want to have partisan fairness run first?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Let's do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Eid may have the previous numbers from before you started on this plan.

Would you like to read them?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure, so I think this was a good idea to run these because I quite like the changes you made as it brought the population deviation down.

Previously the lopsided margins test was at 4.5% and it is still at 4.5%.

The mean median difference was at 2.2% now it's 2.7%.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I had 2.8% previously.

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It went down from 2.8 to 2.7.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is what I have as well.

The decimal was off and it was rounding somehow 2.8% to 2.7%.

And then did you also have 3.4% previously?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: For the efficiency gap.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I had 3.2.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay really? Maybe I noted these down wrong.

I think you have it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can open it right back up and we can do that if it would make everybody more comfortable pop in there and look at it 3.2 on this plan for efficiency gap.

And .3% positionally bias.

Seats 2018 democrat.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, and looks like I think that, yeah, that is the same so that is unchanged.

So we did have small improvements, yeah.

In the right direction.

So only with the mean median from 2.8 to 2.6.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now I can go in and look up that other file.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Lopsided was 4.5 and it stayed the same.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is where we started right here remember I saved it right in there.

And wait a second, I couldn't find it, just a moment, I know why because it's in a different folder name.

It is in.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark do you have your hand raised?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do.

The numbers we are looking at when I looked at seven, it ended up to be 50.1 democrat 49.9 republican.

Which I think is the direction that we wanted to go.

So is this the original with those numbers? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this is at the top is Commissioner Orton's, it's a plan with her edits in it.

This is before she started.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Lopsided margins remained the same 4.5, 4.5.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The mean median difference, let me pop up here and change this one, mean median difference was 2.8 went to 2.7 as Commissioner Rothhorn had pointed out.

Efficiency gap is 3.2 previously it was 3.2.

This plan is still rounded to 3.2.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Seats to votes, seats to votes, let me go to seats to votes, so the seats to votes the proportionality stayed the same.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go back to the first one the lopsided margin.

So if we -- if, yeah, on the original plan, on number 7, if we revert back to how it was like Cynthia is trying to do or wanted to do and we get an and we flip it from a republican to a democrat and I think that's, yeah, just barely but it flips.

So I think the direction that Cynthia is taking to get it back to how it originally was is the right thing to do.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: With that Commissioner Orton? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me may I add something tells me something is not right about that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: They are looking the same numbers.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That District was democrat and I just wonder if that is the error in the precinct when we were uploading there was a precinct that appeared to be assigned but actually wasn't.

And it did not show up until we tried to do edits on it.

The Commissioner downloaded it and realized there is something not there.

So I just wondering if this is -- we can open this plan up, go in there and actually check for some errors and see if that doesn't show up because that is not what it was yesterday.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's let Cynthia go forward with getting it back to where she wants it then we will think about it and take a look at it would be good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think maybe it's a good idea to check for errors and rebuild the plan just to make sure that it's -- I mean if this is throwing our numbers off it does not help anything.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, I think we shall do that.

There's something.

Just a moment.

I'm going to assign that to 14.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This says 50.42 in this index so this is the part.

So let's go look at the statewide.

Statewide it is more democrat.

So that's the difference between looking at that index for just these races.

And the index for looking at all statewide races.

You see democrats are actually winning that District.

So, in fact, it is a democrat District according to all statewide races.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That is with the partial changes that we made? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can someone who is more familiar with the area look at the concurrent configuration and see if we are splitting up some communities unnecessarily that we really should keep together.

I don't know like Grosse Pointe park area.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can watch these numbers here to get a very detailed result.

But you can see it out of 800,000 votes for each party over 800 there is only roughly 3,000 separating them.

So it literally a 50/50 in my opinion observation.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If no one sees any changes that we really should make then I think we should leave it as is because the numbers are good.

I'm sure we will hear if peep want it differ.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid then Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You helped the numbers and brought the population deviation down so I think that is great.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I just want with the partisan fairness because we are getting the seats votes ratio that looks like it's actually reflective of the poll with such a low .3, like it feels but I also recognize the efficiency gap is not quite 0.

So wonder if there are any experts that can help us.

I know we need sort of composites and we need multiple margins. But I'm struggling with do we need to get to one measure close to 0? Do we need to sort of keep trying to get the efficiency gap to 0? Can we look at the seats votes ratio like what we got here which is so close? .3%.

Right and it does reflect the majority of the population which is democratic is electing majority of the seats with such a low margin I'm tempted to say we have done a good job but no efficiency gap and heard from people it should be close to 0 so I'm really struggling can you help please?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is that?

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Efficiency gap was I think at 3.2.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct so thank you Mr. Vice Chair.

So the efficiency gap being at 0, again, a lot of the very passionate public comment was for everything to be equal.

That is not what your constitutional language is.

Now, the seats to votes ratio, again, as Dr. Handley said, the rule for the seats to vote ratio is that the party that wins majority of seats should be represented or excuse me, that wins majority of votes should be reflected as winning majority of seats.

You have a map where it's evenly split, which is also appropriate.

A small gap is also appropriate in the favor of the party that would win that has won the most votes in prior elections.

So in the State of Michigan here today that would be the democrats.

The seat to vote if it changed particularly when the gap is that small, it would reflect a change in the voting pattern of the state.

That is the goal of that.

Your other measures are not required to be 0.

They are not required to be equal.

It is that they shall not provide a disproportionate advantage.

And I know that we received further guidance from Dr. Handley on those measures and those ranges and for the efficiency gap, specifically.

The range was let me pull up.

One moment it's loading for the efficiency gap, the creators of the efficiency gap and I'm looking at slide number 7 from Dr. Handley's presentation, the creators of the measure argued that the 8% threshold above which that the 8% threshold was what should be considered unconstitutional and then in another series of cases a separate expert had testified that 7% or higher should be considered legally significant.

So again the guidepost there 8% certainly would be the recommendation and then if 7% we would look at what the other measures demonstrated.

But there is nothing in any of the guiding principles in the Constitution that mandate 0% or equal or any of those things.

I did want to acknowledge again that that was heavily advocated for in public comment.

But it was also heavily advocated for that the Commission draw competitive districts throughout the process which does not align with the Constitution.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you I realize you said this multiple times to us and I really appreciate.

I think I'm finally getting it thank you thank you thank you for the repetition.

I mean I feel like wow, wow, and that is our Senate and we are pretty good.

Wow.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: We were complementing the numbers earlier this week.

Very impressive.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, Commissioner Rothhorn my opinion is I agree with everything that you said.

Each one of these measures have pros and cons to them.

They are mathematical measures that are made and each one of them has a pro and con.

For example lopsided margins test that one especially we are not going to be able to get it to 0 because of how we have drawn some of the VRA districts to be compliant.

But you know to me and this is just my opinion the seats to votes ratio is probably I don't want to say the most important but that is the one I kind of key on and that looks okay and all the other numbers are close enough to 0 for me to be comfortable with.

So I think this is a good map.

I could get behind it and yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so are you done with your turn or did you want to change another map?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I yield back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The only thing I really want to do on this map is just to you know I want to and I need more data.

I need to have that voter turnout data so I'm going to wait until we get the voter turnout and try to build a cushion in District 17 in particular and trying to respect what Commissioner Curry was offering earlier.

So I'm until I have that data, I'm going to say we are good.

I like it.

So I have no changes.

This is the Senate, sorry, so the house I just don't have it.

I have been focusing on facilitation y'all to be clear and I just don't have it.

So my mapping mind is not, I'm not there.

I'm feeling emotional sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It sound like we are within our deviations and everyone seemed pretty happy with this.

So my suggestion is that when we put this one on the shelf or wherever we are putting it that we name it something so that this was our last day and everything came into consideration and that we were happy with it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is maybe how I would use my turn.

Let's just name this one.

Mr. Stigall, I think you helped us, I can't remember you and John are so wonderful to all of us so I'm just thinking there was a way that we made it complete.

Or we tried to name, that probably was with John, huh? The Commissioner Witjes may have a -- Commissioner Witjes may have an idea.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Senate draft candidate one.

That simple.

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

It does not jive with our naming convention, but I mean we can have the naming convention then we put in the long or short name say it one more time.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Senate draft candidate one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Senate draft candidate one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm not involved in the actual naming.

But as far as candidate I don't know that needs to be in there.

If you want to just do Senate plan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think Commissioner Witjes what he is trying to do is help we got public comment today and we all need something more than what is current like our naming convention is not helping us stay as organized as we would like to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I thoroughly agree with that.

And I think so you shall or should make it more unique as you funnel down to your work your primary work plans but however y'all want to do it define it and we will implement it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is what I'm going to try to do with my turn I see Commissioner Orton and want to recognize the secretary, please.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it's great if you do that with your turn.

I was thinking maybe just in the long name or the tag one of the other places maybe we could put whatever we are going to put...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just put her initials and clear she worked on it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: All I did was change population like we have been doing on our turn so it's not mine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see three hands should I facilitate.

You want to facilitate? Sarah Reinhardt and Mr. Stigall wanted to get in.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: One thing the Commission might consider is once you determine which maps will go forward into public hearings, you could rename them at that time to distinguish them.

That's all I have, thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, what I want to make cheer is the plan name that's here when we put it up to my Districting it's going to show up there so we -- it's not just what is going to be on paper or what is on our screens but it's going to be with what the world sees online.

The complete in the comments or remarks area was to show that this is a complete statewide plan.

We worked and the public want to know which one for the entire state.

Now we are at that next level.

And I think this needs when y'all have you know this is called a base.

Once you have that base plan give it a unique identifier that moves it to the next level, however because we got remarks.

We got comments.

We got plan names.

We got tags we can include.

And that has to mesh with my Districting all the way down to the desktop.

So get somebody unique and clear is my point.

Unlike what I just went through.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I just don't think -- I think we are making the naming way too complicated.

Just this is the first one we are somewhat in consensus on, something we want to vote on.

So Senate draft one or candidate because we could have multiple candidates that we want to potentially bring forward.

That solves the problem and don't need to put a date on it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Instead of candidate what if we say draft proposed because we have not used that and has been our language up to now in the mapping process draft proposed does that sound right?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is fine something to distinguish with how it has been put on that is why I put candidate if you want draft proposed Senate plan go ahead or proposed Senate plan one go ahead.

It should not be taking a whole lot of time to figure out a name for our convention.

We are spending way too much time on this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Like I said we are swirling over a name.

Just follow our naming convention please.

And I understand you feel there is a consensus but we have quite a few Senate plans.

And I wouldn't prefer this one over any of the other Congressional ones or collaborative ones we have done to this point because I have not looked carefully and compared them.

I just don't want to create the impression that somehow this is what we are going with when there is 13 people on the Commission who might have different opinions on that.

That is my concern.

I would rather stick with our naming convention at this point because we are going to deliberate over what plans we want to move forward on.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Because we did not nail this down from day one there is massive confusion on going because it was never a real concern. You're literally doing a build drafting and doing substitute and doing amendments and amendment to a substitute. Different people are downloading them and changing them and then a couple weeks go by and it's well which one is the plan that we collaborated on? And I mean we don't EDS or myself we don't define that. You guys do.

And I understand what Commissioner Witjes says and I think you know definitely when you -- the plans you take on the road will have significance.

It will start like a new series like the drafts.

But you're going to end up with Senate draft proposal one version one, version two AE version 6, DC, I don't know but I just want to have a path to keeping these versions straight.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn and Commissioner Clark.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I just want to say yeah so what I'm hearing it's not going to be as simple as we like to be so I will work with staff and try to figure out something.

My turn is over and I'm just going to try to help us think through some different options and look at our mapping process and come back later.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: May I have the floor?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, go ahead Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You know I think we have a comment field.

Keep the name the same and we have a comment field and we have a comment field and I don't know if it's called comment or whatever it is say candidate for hearings.

And so we know that we've got one that we feel is a decent candidate and at least it's marked that way.

So we can refer back to it quickly.

I think we have this one.

I think we may have -- we have I this I three or four Congressional ones from yesterday. And that way we don't lose them in the mass with no identifier at all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right I have a suggestion.

Kent, you do the mapping, upload it, download it do you have a suggestion that would take care of this problem? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have not studied every single comment, remark, field. But I can do that.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I want you to come up with a name that makes sense that we can find it again and be able to access it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can work on that and I will be glad to lay it out because the way it's going to work here is the current plan name then it would become this or something when y'all pass it or take it on the road.

Then it just steps down with versions or amendments or however you want to do it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: How about we do this can you put a like a star or an asterisks can you put that at the end of SD that way it's a visual representation that this was one that some Commissioners were interested as possibly being the one? Can we do that? Does that work for everybody? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That would be the start.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So let's just do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I wrote this plan down as a note and we will put something in there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That would be a unilateral decision at this point what is the difference between me saying changing it to be draft Senate map one or whatever I said with candidate but then you said now we will just put a star behind it. I don't think that is appropriate.

And we are spending way too much time on mundane stuff.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Agree so just leave it the way it is for now.

So what? I know I saw Commissioner Lange is leaving in 25 minutes, she sent me, and see her nodding her head so at this point without objection we are going to take a ten-minute break because once she leaves we will be down to nine and won't be able to take a break without losing quorum it's currently 11:35 a.m. let's take a ten minute break so everyone can take care of their personal needs and we will come back at 11:45 unless I hear some objections to that.

All right let's come back at 11:45 everyone.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay as Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 11:50 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 disclose your physical location as well.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present. From Rochester Hills.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 9 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Given the Senate map we were just working on complies to as far as I can tell and based off of our legal opinions from our counsels that we have I move that we publish this latest map and vote that we bring this on to our second round of public hearings.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel, did you have a comment on that? Or Ms. Reinhardt.

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

Just for clarity, Commissioner Witjes you're referring to the plan that was just amended prior to the break, correct? And Ms. Reinhardt might have.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you General Counsel.

So the Commission can certainly vote as it wishes.

However, I would note that the next step in your process once you are done making edits on maps is to determine the total number of collaborative maps that you want to bring through.

And then once that determination has been made, a vote for all of the collaborative maps would occur.

But with that said of course the Commission has the authority to adjust the process as it sees fit.

But that is the outline of the current process that the Commission has adopted, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

So we have it moved and seconded to can you restate that for me Dustin, please?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That we and I believe this is the one here that we vote to publish State Senate map named 10821V1SD and have that be one of the collaborative maps that we bring forward for our second round of public hearings.

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

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well you know, I like the map.
And when we do decide to vote on it, I'll vote in favor to put it through.
But I got to be honest I don't think this is the right time to do it.
We only have nine Commissioners here now and my understanding from yesterday was that we wait until Monday or Tuesday to do this just so that you know more people could have an opinion.

I do think it's important to decide how many collaborative maps we want to take first.
And yeah, I just don't think it's necessary to take the vote at this particular time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Eid.

I would concur with that.

I feel like it's premature.

I feel we have not had a chance to study the map at all because the changes were just made and yes we could see some of them online but I would want to look at it, compare it, and run the metrics on it, compare it to the other plans that we have, look at communities of interest that might have been changed before we get to that point particularly if we are you know I would hate to approve a plan today and then on Monday have us say we can only take two then we've got five other plans we want to look at.

I just don't want to lock it in.

We still have people drawing.

We have not gone through all of the list.

I just think it's premature.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, you said you want to be able to look and see what changes about the changes that were made.

But we changed a few precincts to equal out population which is what we have been doing all along.

This is the total collaborative map we have only worked on in public meetings together.

No one has done anything to it besides that.

So we've seen the changes all along.

And we created it.

With all of the requirements in account, in the right order.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right I still want to compare it.

I think that is doing your due diligence to compare to what else we have out there before locking us into one plan which we might look at it over the weekend or maybe have other Commissioners you know make additional changes today that we like better. I just think when we are in the middle of mapping, I think it's premature to decide on one map.

Any additional Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, regardless of which way we voted today it's not locking us into anything.

The only thing this would do if it was voted up would be put it in the mix.

It's not preventing us from voting ten other maps into the mix.

However I do think that with only nine Commissioners here, we are just opening ourselves up to have some of the Commissioners who aren't here voicing their concern that we are doing something nefarious behind their back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would agree with that as well.

Any other comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a comment Commissioner.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would like to amend the motion to include the four districts we identified as candidates in the Congressional maps that we identified yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So for clarification purposes, Mr. Clark, Dustin was moving to adopt a Senate map, so I'm a little confused as to what you're referring to with Congressional districts.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We worked on Congressional districts yesterday. And identified four we thought we could move forward.

If you want to handle Senate separate from the Congressional, I'm fine with that too. I mean if we are going to move maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So General Counsel is indicating that would not be a proper amendment.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay I will withdraw it, I will withdraw it.

Why is it not proper?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you for the question, Commissioner Clark through the Chair.

The motion on the table is to adopt the Senate plan excuse me is to the motion on the table is to put the Senate plan that Commissioner Witjes identified 10-8-21V1SD through to publication and consideration for the second round of public hearings. And I believe your motion to amend would be to add on the four Congressional plans to that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That would be a separate topic altogether.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: A separate motion altogether.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct.

And, again, to echo Ms. Reinhardt, the mapping process document has the Commission considering both the collaborative and the alternate plans and maybe that would also help with our verbiage on what to call them, the collaborative plans and the alternate plans.

But again the motion would just be a standalone motion Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm going to just acknowledge that I do I am tempted to vote on this because I do think the public needs as much notice as possible before we go into the public hearings.

So I appreciate the sense of urgency and I think what Commissioner Lett said and others repeated is that we need to have as many Commissioners here as possible just to make sure we as we understand we the Commissioners understanding our process we need to be as, yeah, build as much trust as possible with each other as well as the public.

So yes, I want to get it out to the public as much as possible so they can review it but we need to all be here and we are not able to be, we only have nine today so I'm not going to vote for it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Again, the motion would just recognizing again that it is not in alignment with the process document.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The Commission can choose to move forward can noting that this would be suspending the mapping process that is set forth in the document approved on September 7th.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments? I think we are ready to vote on this, Ms. Reinhardt I'm going to ask for a roll call on this.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair and Commissioner Witjes I'm going to restate the motion and see if it is in alignment with what you motion the motion is to suspend the process document for deliberations and proceed with approving the plan 10-8-21V1SD moving it forward for consideration during public hearings.

Is that accurate? Thank you.

Commissioners, please indicate your support of the motion with a "Yes" or "No" I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes Dustin Witjes? Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: A vote of 5-4 the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right moving forward Commission Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would like to motion we designate Tuesday, October 12th as the date we are going to follow our rules of procedure and vote on how many collaborative maps we are going to bring forward and subsequently vote on the maps we are going to take forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Do you want to state it and during discussion Szetela se so we have a motion from Commissioner Eid to determine on Tuesday of next week which number the number of maps we're bringing forward and which maps we are bringing to the public hearing and it was seconded by Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So yesterday we kind of had this discussion and we were advised by our staff that we should not determine a certain day and bring them forth when they are ready so they can be worked on and put out to the public so I don't understand why that would be in his to just put a certain date on it when we were advised not to.

But also, I lost my other thought.

I think maybe we need to go into the next part of the process and decide how many we are going to take or that we are going to take them all, whatever so we can move forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid, did you have a follow-up?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I just want to respond to that.

I think the pros out way the cons and gives notice to us the Commissioners to you know make sure you're here on Tuesday so we are all ready to vote and have a you know have a vote with more than nine Commissioners.

And it also goes with the order of the process that we have already approved to determine the number of collaborative maps before we just actually decide on any particular collaborative map.

So you know I know it puts a date on it but I think having that date is better than not having that date then it's going to save us time also today and Monday when it comes to working on the collaborative maps and presenting the individual maps, so I think it also makes sense from an efficiency standpoint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have one more question.

General Counsel could you explain the voting? Like as we are voting on these maps to take into the public hearings, it just needs a majority? With a quorum present.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct through the Chair to Commissioner Orton yes. So to determine the number of proposed maps and I am on Page ten of the process document so to answer your question, yes, to decide on the number of proposed plans and select which plans would be brought forward, published in, and brought in the second round of public hearings it's majority vote.

There is nothing in the Constitution that puts any other this is an internal document that the Commission has devised so yes, it is a straight majority vote as far as the break down.

I did want to just briefly take a moment and my comments yesterday were that I believe the suggestion was to set the date for the date to vote for Monday.

Or there were times being suggested and that.

And my comments were that the Commission has through Tuesday and to not limit itself in that regard.

So certainly the Commission has the discretion and the authority over its affairs to set whatever date and time it likes.

My recommendation was that it not limit that.

Of course recognizing the downstream activities but I just wanted to make that comment and either I or Ms. Reinhardt or Ms. Hammersmith Executive Director Hammersmith can walk through again that process on the number of maps and the maps that the Commission needs thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.

Any additional comments? All right let's go ahead and vote Ms. Reinhardt can you call a roll call again.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair I'm going to restate the motion and let me know if it's accurate the motion is to designate Tuesday, October 12th as the date for determining the number of draft proposed maps that will be carried forward into the public hearings.

As well as voting on which maps.

Is that accurate?

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: That is correct.

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

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC hot around?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 4 yes to 5 no, the motion fails.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt.

All right so at this point we are going to go back to mapping.

MC you did not want to have a turn, correct, or you were passing on your turn so you could facilitate.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: My turn was to try to get the naming convention but I'm going to come back later so yes, I'm done with my turn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right so that makes it my turn.

So I have a couple of proposed changes to the differ maps and I'm going to make them boom, boom, boom, real quick.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair, may I ask or my impression is this plan that I've highlighted is not to be modified from here on out? Because it's going public, right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: At this point yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So if we do anything to this plan, we will make a copy of it and then start editing, correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, because this plan, let me right it down 100821 version 1SD State Senate.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I put a tag on there as reference to don't touch it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so yes so, we are not actually going to start with that map so don't worry about it for right now.

What I want to start with is the Congressional map which was Doug's.

Which I think is actually that one right there.

Let me look at the name.

On our portal it's number 219.

And I think I see it right there.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The name on the map I believe is 10-07-21 version 1C, DC.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Congressional 1002211C, DC is the one I want to open up. I want to open it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Make a copy of it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Make a clone.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's make a copy of it because it's been posted.

I don't know why it says that.

We are going to change that right now.

I put that on the house plan.

We will look into that.

Okay Commissioner where are we going to start?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you bring in the shape file from my plan that is posted out on the website as well plan 224.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think I downloaded that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 10072021CDRAS.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 1007.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 10072021CDRAS.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me download it.

I thought I had it and done it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 224 on the website.

Yes, that top one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay Commissioner here is your plan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So did you just import that over? What he had? I'm sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe so.

Is it not? Okay I'm going to bring in that shape file.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you could just bring the shape file on to his plan so we can see variations.

That is what I'm looking for.

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I request again before we work on any that we run the reports so that we can see what we changed.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that would be very helpful.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is the plan I downloaded.

Do we need to look at this again? It's identical or appears to be.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: To Doug's plan? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is the original plan.

Did you bring in the shape file of my plan? Or.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, that is what that is supposed to be.

Let's look at it online.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: They should be identical because there were some variations.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to look at it online Szetela sed maybe the wrong one is loaded up.

So number 224, uploaded early this morning.

This is different isn't it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't have answers to any of these questions that I know are deserving questions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This is bringing in Doug's plan and rewriting it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I download it again and wonder if I hit import only or something odd, I don't know.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I just want to see mine as a shape file on top of his plan, yeah. I would like to note for the record that Commissioner Kellom has joined for purposes of the public record Commissioner Kellom can you state your location where you are remote from.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Absolutely attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

What is going on? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know you all saw me download it.

I was looking at it.

I just don't know.

[Laughter]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You what? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This base map you're looking at is not the changes that Commissioner Clark made yesterday.

It is just the same as your map.

So it's the base map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We need the base map.

We need Commissioner Clark's base map.

So if you could close this, because this is my map, I think.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It reads 100621V1CDwith Commissioner Clark's initials. Yes.

That one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No which one did you say?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That one DC, Doug Clark.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, the 07 one yes that is the up with we want to open.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I swear I thought that was it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's all right.

It's been a long week.

Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will overlay what we downloaded multiple times.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, so do we need to save this as a different plan before we do anything, I think? Or do we....

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me go back.

Excuse me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't want to mess up what Commissioner Clark did.

I think it has to be the DC one we have to make a copy of.

Then we will just name it 100821 version 1.

We can just put the RAS at the end.

And make a copy.

Okay so that looks like what I want to do.

As you see there is no changes to one and two but slight adjustments between 3, 10 and 6.

So I want to assign it following my line for those three districts.

So the parts that are currently from 6 that are in 10 right now I want to assign into 10. Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So, yeah, I just wonder while he is making the changes in each area if you could explain the reason.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I really like Doug's map.

I think it's really good and gets us closer to partisan fairness without having to do the Grand Rapids Kalamazoo.

But my concern with Doug's map was the one precinct he flipped is 50.1% democratic. Which to me is so close to the margin as to effectively not really be balanced.

And so by making these minor changes along these lines it creates a stronger democratic District that is 55.6%.

And over all reduces, let me look at my numbers here, it keeps the seat bias the same but reduces the efficiency gap by .1.

It reduces the lopsided margin a little bit too.

So it's just to make it a little bit more solid than what Doug has without making too many major changes.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: But don't we want them to be close?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We want them to be close but 50 point 1 is like so close as to not really balance out the seats to votes ratio.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One of the things that was brought up was the thumb area and the Metro Detroit area.

I can't tell right now.

Is District ten I think is that area.

Does your map address that at all?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What am I addressing?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The idea that the thumb is so rural in the Metro Detroit regions I feel like all of our Congressional maps actually none of our Congressional maps are alternatives that address that.

I'm just wondering if yours addresses that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Trying to keep the thumb more rural?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Or keep Metro Detroit more with Metro Detroit, less with.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It does to the extent possible because this is more of the eastern end of the suburbs but the reality is the thumb doesn't have enough population by itself for the Congressional District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would agree with that.

I mean we got to put the thumb somewhere.

And it does not really go with anywhere else.

So I think the northern Oakland County suburbs are probably the best place for it.

If we had a 14th District, I think that would be a perfect place for it.

But we only have 13.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I'm a little confused.

This is a lot of changes.

So is this your map? Or you're wanting to put this forth as a collaborative map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Not a lot of changes three Districts out of 13 but yes this will be a collaborative map.

Did you run it before you ran it? I'm not sure with the confusion you can reopen.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think we have the numbers from Doug's, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We do.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I've got them if you need them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you change the color between 10 and 3 to make sure we have that as signed properly at that upper edge? I feel like.
Okay thank you.

Yes, so with this rather than the thumb dipping down to Milford we put Milford with the you know kind of West Bloomfield Pontiac area which I think it's a little bit more closely tied to.

All right I think that is it.

Can you run first of all save it.

Second of all can you check for plan errors to make sure there are not any unassigned areas.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Check what? Excuse me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Check for plan errors, discontinuities.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Are we going to run the report?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Please run the report, yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay here we are.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you.

So it doesn't change much on the margin so they are both 4.1 for lopsided margins. They are both I believe if we look at the mean median, mine is 2.2 and I believe Doug's is 2.7 so there is a little improvement there.

I see Anthony nodding his head.

In terms of the efficiency gap, this plan is a little lower at .7.

Doug's was .8.

And in terms of the balance the proportionality balance is the same but if you notice the difference in District 5 and 6 where Doug's for 6 was 50.1, this is if you go to the lopsided margins, it's a little easier to see on that Page thank you, this is instead of that District 6 being 50.1 it's now 55.8.

And the thumb District has bumped up a little bit more republican.

So we now have you know a little bit more balance of a District.

And performs a little better.

All right Commissioner Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I'm sorry, I missed did you move Milford out away from the other Townships that it was with?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Milford currently was going up in the thumb.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Well, I agree Milford doesn't belong in the thumb. But it belongs the Townships. It was with Highland and White Lake.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It is still with Highland and White Lake instead of going up with the thumb it goes with three which I think actually makes more sense.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay sorry I missed it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that actually makes more sense than going all the way to the thumb.

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 VALLETTE: It really doesn't belong with the thumb.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Who has his hand up Doug, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me say a few comments.

Here is my perception of what just happened Rebecca.

We have taken an almost 50/50% District and slanted it towards the democrats of 55-46 I think it was, something like that.

Then we added more to 10 which is already a republican District.

Significantly.

Which is not going to change anything really.

So I see this as more supporting the democrats and less supporting the republicans in the move.

Given what we looked at yesterday, I would support Anthony's map more than I would support this one.

And just for the reasons I just talked about.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay Commissioner Eid did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: A couple comments.

So we should remember that competitiveness, 50/50 is not one of the constitutional requirements.

And this does drop the efficiency gap closer to 0.

That's really the only number that changed.

It went from .8 which are in Commissioner Clark's edits and my own edits to the base draft.

And the base draft was all the way at 8.7.

So we have a couple that are at .8 but this one brings it down to .7.

While having the other numbers be the same.

So that is more in the direction that we are supposed to go.

I quite like these changes.

I think that having a way to put Milford with the rest of Oakland County without going up to the thumb is preferable.

I with was trying to figure out a way to do it myself but couldn't.

Probably because I put Southfield into District 2.

Which I still think is something we should explore.

But overall, yeah, I like what you did.

I think it really makes sense for Oakland County.

The only thing is Southfield and Troy.

But you know we are going to have to sacrifice and compromise somewhere.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioner Rothorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Doug, what I heard what you said.

But I don't -- and I know you are expressing a feeling or you know trying to use the numbers but I'm still looking at the lopsided margins here and seeing it still looks like we

are still at a republican leaning District, right, that what Rebecca did, did not shift it towards the democrats in a significant way.

It's still republican leaning.

So I guess help me understand more of what you are saying.

I think it is important to understand right our feelings as well as the numbers.

So help me understand what you were saying.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's not feelings but perception I'm looking at.

Look at District 6.

I mean it was almost 50% for both parties, which to me and I know we are looking at this statistically and not from the map perspective alone.

But it was a significant change.

It's like 5% over 5% difference in change.

And then you ended up adding republican seats to District that is highly republican.

So I see that as a method of increasing the democrats' position in.

I know the seats are the same.

I see that.

But, yeah, look at 6 and.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm challenged by right I hear that's your perception.

But I'm not seeing it showing up in the actual numbers.

And I'm struggling to try to make sure I'm using the experts are giving us.

Wonder if we can have our experts walk us through and whatever Mr. Commissioner Clark's perception is, is accurate, that would help me, please.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct and I think Cynthia mentioned the same concern earlier as I recall.

But yeah, let's do that.

Let's have them walk us through.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay at the bottom spreadsheet is Commissioner Doug Clark's districts 5 and 6.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: At the top is Commissioner Szetela's.

District 5 and Commissioner's Szetela is 50.6% democrat.

And Commissioner Clark's District 5 is 50.6.

In District 6 in Commissioner Szetela's District 6 is 55.8.

District 6 in Commissioner Clark's plan is 50.1.

In District 7 they are both the same 61.2.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ten would be the next one where there would be a change.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me Szetela sed ten is the next District there will be a change.

Everything else is the same.

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: I will lay them up there and you can look at them for what it's worth.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you can read off ten because I can't see the bottom.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm trying to get them up and it's really not efficient.

So 8, 9 are the same.

10 is 61.3.

10 is 61.3.

11 is 54.9, 54.9, 57.2, so the only differences are in fact 5 and 6.

Percentage differential change.

And actually it's only six.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's only 6.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: District 6.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's what improves the efficiency gap.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just wanted to mention my concerns.

I mean this is Rebecca's map.

So I mean, it's you know she has got every right to change these things, I guess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's not my map.

If what Commissioner Orton just did with the Senate map is a collaborative map then this is a collaborative map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree with you 100.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm getting fed up, can I talk, Doug? I'm getting fed up with certain rules apply to some Commissioners and not to others.

If we are going to follow a process keep it consistent if what she did is a collaborative map mine is a collaborative map it's in a public hearing and you are giving your opinion and it's not my personal map.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's your changes to the collaborative map.

I agree and did not mean to infer otherwise Rebecca.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Here is we took things away from ten and added to ten did we not?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Took Milford.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is why the percentages are in line.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Milford and Highland and moved them in with 3.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Good, I yield back, yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So it's important for me as I try to assess all the different options, we have I'm trying to make sure we are moving in a direction that does work towards partisan fairness.

What I think Commissioner Szetela did was move us in the direction of partisan fairness.

And my memory of the last time that yeah can we look at the seats votes ratio, the comparison please? It felt it was one of the things I understood that the best.

It's the same.

Interesting.

So it's really just the efficiency.

So it's not, okay, so there were pieces when, okay, so it's just the efficiency gap.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Diminish Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree it is more partisanly fair because the efficiency gap is close to 0 but it's .1%.

The main thing is a community of interest reason because it keeps more of the southern Oakland County you know that is closer to Detroit more together than the other parts than like both my adjustment that I made yesterday that had Milford with the thumb. And I think as who said it earlier? That they wanted it was someone on that side of the table I'm not sure exactly.

I think it was Commissioner Vallette who agreed that Milford should be more so with the rest of Oakland County than the thumb area.

And you know that's I'm just saying I tried to do that but I couldn't fix it out on my edits so I like this plan from a communities of interest standpoint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to echo what Anthony said but he beat me to it.

You did to things you respected community of interest boundaries here.

And you also improved the partisan fairness.

So three and four adjusted with these in my opinion what would be minor changes to the collaborative map actually worked out very well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Witjes.

Can we move on from this map?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I was just looking for the plan deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's .26.

I'm sorry Mr. Stigall? And you got the plan deviation General Counsel? Okay can we save this, please it then we will move on to the house.

So the house plan I'm looking for is 217 which is the ten 0721V1HD.

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.

Yep, that is it so can we open that up and if you have -- go ahead, why don't you do that please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Copying this correct?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Copy that and make a clone.

And again if you can title it 100821V1HDRAS.

Okay now we will do the same process pulling in a shape file from plan 214.

And then 214 under the State House, that one right there.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just have a question about the base.

Is this the base that we started on this morning? Or the base that has the changes that Commissioner Lange made earlier today?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: This does not have Commissioner Lange's changes.

So before we do anything else I want to run the partisan fairness report on this plan.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

We are running the partisan fairness on the base plan that is 10721V1HD?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Plan 217.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is where you are currently at with it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Lopsided 6.3.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 6.3 is lopsided.

The mean median MMD is 3.4.

Efficiency gap is 6.4.

Seats votes ratio is 55-55.

Minus 2.3 for the democrats.

2.3 for the republicans.

50/50%.

55-55 seats.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you.

So let's go into the plan.

And I want to Zoom in to District 69, 68, 67 that whole area there.

And we are going to start with District 70 so go a little to the left.

It's Jackson, yeah, so a little bit to the left.

Okay so we are going to just take those areas all the way to Chelsea and put them in Jackson so assign into 70.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Follow the red boundaries and this is 70, 66, okay I'll start there.

If I miss something or just stop me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Wrong District so that should be 66 if you are doing that first that should be, yeah, that should be 66.

I had to do it at the block level? There we go? Once he gets done I will.

Because I'm going to need to direct here in a second.

So I will warn you that this area has some weird geography so once we assign everything we might have to go back through and reassign things.

Particularly.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The precinct boundary and the Township boundary is there. I think that is why we were getting errors just now so.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is okay to leave it the way it is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's following your current and I see oddities down in here graphics.

So that appears to be 70.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Now that total top portion that is sitting there in pink will be 69.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is all 69.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All 69.

You might have to Zoom into Dexter to see where the line sits 66 didn't want to go. That is good.

Can we Zoom back out? That one precinct or one Township didn't assign for some reason.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Where is this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Look back to where you are and there is one 66 sitting there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, I don't know how it got there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You had it selected, there is something with the geography in this area that it's a little weird.

For some of these I had to go at the block level and assign them.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will make note of this and get something figured out over the within about -- this is the kind of stuff that is probably causing the system crashes at times.

So the next area is Ann Arbor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, so you should have everything you want in there.

Now that portion of Ann Arbor will go into 66.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So clear this out.

I'm going to change the color so I can see them better.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Keep assigning that area of Ann Arbor into 66 and then again you will have to go to the block level for those little weird precincts.

Still one stuck in there.

Can you get that one after you get in the C-shaped one down below? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner where do you speak? Right there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Right there, there it is.

Thank you for saving.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to actually export it as well.

So we don't have to.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Continue to work with and now we will go to District 68 and we are going to assign those areas that used to be in 66 into 68.

Yep.

And if you could put those areas into 67 that are currently in 68.

Are there dis-contiguities there? So go ahead.

Yep, and put that into 65.

And that area that is green right now will go up into 36.

All right and if you could Zoom out, I think that is it.

Can we look at the difference between 1, 10 and 35 and see if there is a disparity there?

Because I see a difference in the line so 35 has what population right now? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do you want to make the change?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I want to see what the populations are because there were other tweaks 35 is under and 110 is all right so we can just leave that for right now.

Can you Zoom out a little bit? Yeah, there is a big deviation from somewhere.

So here's what I want you to do.

I want you to save it and rebuild the plan because if it does the same thing it did for me, we are going to lose a District in Saline which will fix that error.

So can you do that for me, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Absolutely.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are going to break for lunch and run the analysis then we will break for lunch.

So let's look down where Saline is.

So if you can Zoom out a bit.

Yep.

See.

That's where my plan deviation is coming from.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Like I said I'm going to make notes of these and see if we can get this done.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I had to run it a couple times but if you go to the block level and reassign those it will include them.

I don't know why it's doing that.

But it's just something with that area.

And it looks like we may have a little unassigned in Dexter so we will have to check that too.

Go to the blocks and pick up the areas and we will run the reports and see the difference.

That will be very helpful.

Can you check Dexter just above there? Just it's in the green.

That upper bump up.

I could see that, yep.

So that is 66.

Can you put them into 66? Thank you.

Can we Zoom out and make sure everything stayed this time and save it? And then if it did then let's run that report and see if this made any improvement.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is the only one.

You got 68 here does that look familiar?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, yeah.

And there needs to be some work on the deviation but I'm not super worried about that right now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Still open.

It could not delete it and start a new one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I have that problem all the time.

Just rerun it.

Once you close it you can just rerun it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Because it deletes the previous one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And replaces it, yep, the prior was 6.3 so that is an improvement.

3.1 down from 3.4.

Down from 6.4.

[Mr. Stigall is off mic]

We can't hear him.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is down from 2.3 on the prior plan and instead of having a 55-55 balance, it's now proportional to the approximately to the vote share.

Not quite perfect but better than it was.

All right.

All right any comments? Are we ready to break for lunch?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks for helping us with the house.

The house was the hardest one, there are so many districts and yeah thanks for making, yeah, a big push.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, you know I think this is another example of where.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you fix that, Kent? Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Blissfield all by itself there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just put it in -- well, can you Zoom out? I'd rather you just put it into 62 because, yeah, I just put it into 62 because just ignore my red lines and go with what the rest of the map is.

I'm sorry Commissioner Eid go ahead I'm sorry I did not mean to cut you off.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think this is another example where these changes support both communities of interest and makes an overall more fair map. I think we have given Ann Arbor which is the population center in that area more of a voice and I also think it supports the communities of interest that have been said to us, that have said that part of Washtenaw County should be with Ann Arbor. When we were at the United States of Michigan, I heard a lot of comments that said that. So yeah, I think it supports it and it is op the partisan fairness measurement the best map we've had so far.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Witjes. Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm thinking about the communities of color and the Asian communities and some of the dots and that would help me sort of put a final sort of like yep this is great kind of improvement on it. But yeah, I'm happy with, yeah. And again thank you.

It's also been, yeah, it's Friday and we've got you know an option that feels like we moved in the right direction so thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right if you can save this, please, Kent, hearing no objections it's 1:04 p.m. we were supposed to break for lunch at 1:00 so we are going to take our lunch break, hearing no objections we will recess for 60 minutes and be back at 2:05 p.m. Thank you very much.

[Lunch recess]

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Kellom if you can hear me can I get an audio test from you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I can hear you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I recall this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:10 p.m. Secretary could you please call the roll.

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

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present; attending remotely from Rochester Hills.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present from Wayne County, Michigan. Rhonda Lange?

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

Present.

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

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you I finished with changes to the house map and I believe at this point I'm done so I finished my turn so we move on to the next person in line who is Janice Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I'm going to pass my turn.

I don't know what adjustments need to be made.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So Janice I wonder so what I think we are doing is so I want to encourage you here is what I'm asking if you could consider.

Help us know where we all are.

Right, I think what we have to do is we have to figure out right are we.

So you can ask some questions maybe.

I don't know but does that make sense? I heard you say you want to pass because you don't know...maybe you are saying I don't want to make any changes.

Like Commissioner Lett did.

Do you want to talk into the microphone? You don't want to but please do.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I really don't know what needs to be done.

Are we still doing population or partisan fairness? What are we doing?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can do what you think needs to be done and if you don't think anything needs to be done the perfectly acceptable answer like Commissioner Lett said today, I don't have anything I want to change unless you think don't feel like you have to change something if you don't want to.

Today is the day to do it.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I think there are probably things to be changed but I don't know where they would be so I will pass.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

So that brings us to Richard Weiss Commissioner Wagner is unavailable today so we will go to Mr. Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Thank you Madam Chair I guess the only thing I want to comment I understand the changes that Commissioner Lange made.

Obviously, I didn't like it either, but it works.

She actually made the numbers worse.

So that's all I really have to say as far as that I really don't see any changes I would like to make personally at this time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you very much.

Mr. Weiss, Commissioner Witjes we are moving on to you.

It's your turn Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm on the same Page with Commissioner Lett. I don't see any changes to make at this particular point in time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, Commissioner Clark, is there anything you would like to change?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me mention this.

Yesterday we were looking at the house plan.

And we had identified a number of districts on the spreadsheet that we're going to take a look at to try to reduce the plan deviation.

And we got through part of the list.

And then another piece of it we identified as districts we couldn't touch because they were VRA districts.

I would like to go back to that list take a look at it and then just quickly, I will choose one of the districts and look at it and if that doesn't look feasible, we will just move on to the others.

There are three, six, I have eight districts that we from that list that we did not look at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we are back to the house is that what I understand?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct that is what we were working on to get the plan deviation down.

That was the objective yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I just made some changes to the house plan do you want to work with our original plan or do you want to work with the plan I changed?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to go the original plan because that is what we were working on yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 100821 version 1HD; is that correct Kent that was the first one? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That plan was made this morning.

It was a copy.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 1007 plan sed Szetela okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 100821 is a copy of 100721.

Somebody did some changes to this plan this morning.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That was Commissioner Lange.

She changed the Midland base.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Midland base.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I believe it's the one you just had your cursor on, wasn't it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

I will make a copy of that.

Correct? And edit from there.

Okay give me a minute one minute.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: When you get an opportunity bring that spreadsheet up too.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

I intend -- we will make a new spreadsheet in case it doesn't no longer exists.

We will see.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The one we highlighted things in red because they are VRA.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, a long, long time ago.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yesterday, not that far.

I just want to close the loop on this.

That is why I want to take a look at this.

That's all.

And it may not be anything we can do.

I don't know.

As I recall the plan deviation was still pretty high and it's difficult to get down because of the VRA.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think we will have to recreate that spreadsheet.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, that's fine.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, just a moment.

A couple minutes here.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We sorted this down by percentage.

And then we were going from everything below I think 4% or maybe it was 3.5% and taking a look at that.

That is what our list consisted of yesterday.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We had highlighted the VRA Districts.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which I think all three of these are.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct I think they are too.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 616 and 17 I'm just going to give them a shade of color here so we can know to avoid them.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Looks like we got through all of those that were greater than 4% yesterday.

Wait, they are sorted, yeah.

So.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know what the goal is, but all of these are 2% or higher in deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let's take the 3% and higher.

And take a look at those.

As I recall the problem, we had yesterday was we made changes in the plan deviation just didn't significantly change at all.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That's my memory too Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, so we will take a look at a couple.

And if we are experiencing the same thing maybe we will decide if we got to leave it or what, you know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And Commissioner Clark this is where one of the things I think when as we were walking through yesterday as Brittini was helping us with the changes, there were a lot in the house one of the things is we slowed down around Saginaw do you remember that and it was District 4.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think that was one of the districts that was.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't think I'm using her map.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: No, no, no. But remember it made me uncomfortable those changes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Like the ones around Flint.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right so what I'm saying that may be where we have to go into some pretty uncomfortable areas.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We may not want to do that.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: May not want to do this in the map and it was done so we do have sort of like let's say a more uncomfortable map and we have this one.

So I wanted to acknowledge -- and when we did it Mr. Adelson said hey this doesn't what is it dispositive.

I can't remember if that is the right word to use but it's not bad, it's not good.

It's just okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's do a little bit of due diligence and see if it's worth our time.

And you know if not we will move on to the next person, then I guess.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Clark how or where do you want to start?

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What is on the bottom of the spreadsheet.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: District 21 which is a VRA District.

You guys tell me if it is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is accurate we have 6, 16, 17 and 21 are VRA districts.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I got the other three flagged.

I will have this.

The next one on the list is 19.

It's Garden City, Westland.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Then it goes into Plymouth or.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35 there we can change the colors.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And I think with this one Commissioner Clark, 19 and 43 there was a balance trying to keep right we weren't able to keep Canton whole but this does preserve the Asian American population.

So balance of 43 and 19 would be I think it's the 43 area that would be important to recognize.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I believe that is where the Asian population was, down in the southern part of Canton Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No, the opposite Commissioner Clark.

The part that's 43 is where the Asian population is.

And I'm pretty sure if we put the dots on you could go a little further westerly into depending on what 43 is at.

Oh, they are a bit under.

You could go a little bit further westerly and you would still be in the area of Canton that does not have a high population of Asian Americans but I would put the dots on to make sure that is accurate.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's put the dots on and then after that let's put on the population that have the democrat and republican numbers on the 2016 election.

Yeah, thanks for your help there, Rebecca.

See I'm not convinced at the moment we are going to be able to make any dig difference in the plan deviation.

See if I go west on 19, I'm eating into that population even though it's small amounts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What about the area that Kent is hovering over? It doesn't seem there is significant Asian population there.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Up near 35?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, right there.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's take a look at 2016 election what the republican democrat switch was.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right, just a moment.

We can only do one of these things at a time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can we do it for 43 and 19? All combined? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can only look at one election at a time.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I only want one election.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Or we can look at it over here is that what you're suggesting? There's 19 overall and there is 43 overall.

Both are 43 is well they are both very high democrat and on this metric table.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So more than likely we are going to be moving democrat to democrat and not making much change.

Can you get the numbers up? For each precinct? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You would be making a plan in the plan deviation not the partisanship.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think that is where.

Is that not right what you all were looking at the overall? Population deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, we are looking at the plan deviation yesterday that is what this was all about, trying to get that down.

Bruce had indicated it's too high now but these VRA districts is driving that to happen.

So let's just take a look at 19 and so what is going to drive the plan deviation down? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It basically would be if you could put population into 19 while keeping a District that you drive it from for example let's look at 35.

I don't know.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's look at 35, 20.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You may look at 65.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 65.

Let's look at those three and make a determination if it's worth moving forward with.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: District 65 borders 19, 35 I think this may be getting into.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't want to touch 14.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then you have this right here so you're getting down to a District that is particularly high.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah 20 doesn't fit that category.

What is 35 and 65? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 65 is .12.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: It doesn't fit that category either.

Let's go to 35.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35 is .49 here is 33.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Those are kind of -- I'd have to start getting -- I have to go to a District outside those and start moving things around.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Here is 33 up there.

That is pushing 3%.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 2000 where is 33 and.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss did you have feedback to offer Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Commissioner Clark I was just looking at the map there and I do believe Kent was in the area. He showed us in District 19 is where you want to add. You might be able to take a few from 20 if you could blow that up, Kent, please. Right where the 19 is one of those two districts obviously 20 isn't that much over. But maybe it would help balance out a little bit one of those two or just portions of those two Townships.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Where is 20 at right now?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Right next door there.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No I mean number wise.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I think it's 111 above.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 111 so we are going to move a few and see if there is any impact at all.

So where, right there in the two -- go back to where your pointer was.

Yeah, so take the two that are up against 19.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This precinct has population of 2000.

This precinct has a population of 1800.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now the minority population of 20 is also 46%.

I don't know what -- I don't know the race or background or culture of that minority.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's just move those two and see if the plan deviation moves at all.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Why don't you just do one at a time first because that is quite a bit of population or even a portion of it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right just take one of them.

Choose the top one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I threw the top one over there.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That did not change the plan deviation it was 8.44 and it still is.

Just for that and add the one below it then we can always back this off.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And District -- the reason why it didn't is District 20 went further away from 0 to 19, got closer to it.

So you are see saw.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Kind of a wash.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These districts are either even or under.

You would have to be working really with where there is extra population.

And that is kind of why if you do a little tiny change in here you eat the population in here you can't use it up here.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

So let's back off that change.

And let's go one more District and see if we letting ourselves in the same situation.

What is the next District on that excel list after you back that off? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, I'm going to Zoom in and make sure it's gone.

It is.

19 is back to where it was.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, yep.

So let's take a look.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The next one above 19 was 73.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's look at 73.

I don't know where that is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL:

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Kalamazoo okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Look at 72.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's look at those two.

72 is minus 2000, 73 is positive 3,000.

And what is 80? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 80 is negative 1400.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, let us just to see what happens.

Let's move the southern southeastern District or precinct, southeastern keep going down to 73, down, down, southeastern, yeah.

That one.

Oops.

And let's move it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which one? I'm going to put the names up there so we can see what we are talking about.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Please do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What are we moving?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 72 so but see that is Portage but less just move it and see what happens.

No it's outside it's not Portage.

Southeast corner of Kalamazoo there is a precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right here?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: What is the population there? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let me back up.

That is a Township.

I will go to precincts.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, on the precinct level.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That precinct contains 2300 people.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Move that to 72 let's see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 72 .3 low and 73 is .96 high.

I mean it did matter and may not be showing up yet.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Did not show in the plan deviation.

That is what we are looking at.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 80 is still low.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there a spot where there is another 2000, we can move into 80 or 1400 we can move into 80 and maybe where the airport is let's say. From 73 the airport is down southeast.

What is the population on that? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The population collectively is 2450.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want something smaller.

What about the one next to it what is the population on the precinct to the west? Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL:

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: A bigger precinct.

Maybe not.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is a large area.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let's back that off.

Take the airport one and move that to 80 let's see what happens.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You are just moving the problem but we will check it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think it will too.

I just want to do some due diligence on this concept.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Basically it doesn't really -- actually I moved too much.

Look how far the airport precinct goes all the way up into here.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Even when you move too much the plan deviation didn't change.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is because it just moved it from the percentages from one side of the aisle to the other side of the line.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay let's back off all those changes.

So what I'm seeing, and I'd like to get some opinions, is that unless you want to review all these districts, I don't think we are going to significantly change the plan deviation at this point.

Any comments on that?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I think basically in order to reduce the plan deviation we have to be able to reduce the districts that show up there as the largest deviation.

And until we can decrease those, even if we make little changes in other districts, it's not going to change.

So those are VAA -- VRA districts that we worked so hard on.

So I just think we have to accept.

I mean we may be able to make some improvements but I don't think we will be able to change the plan deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree.

I think 21 was a VRA District too.

We just didn't color it yet.

But yeah, I mean we looked at two of them and they were the two highest that are not VRA districts.

We are not making any impact on the plan deviation at all.

So I suggest that we not pursue that at any point forward.

And I don't know Bruce may want to comment on the implications of that.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Yes, Commissioner Clark, I think that adjusting population deviations can always be challenging and it's not necessarily the most exciting work in redistricting.

And I think as we talk about, as we said yesterday, I think that the legal team is okay with advancing plans that have an 8.4 deviation.

And then looking to address them later on after the second round of public hearings.

So you know a couple of, you know, just cautionary notes.

Under populating districts is recognized as a legitimate state justification for compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

The deviation is not above 10% even though 10% is not a necessary guaranty of anything.

It's something the Supreme Court always pays attention to.

So you come in with a 12, 11, 13% deviation that is going to get their attention.

I think we are comfortable for now if the Commission so decides to move forward with plans that have deviations as we have been seeing that are other than the Congressional.

That are under 9% and it's something that we can address after the second round of public hearings if you and the Commission decide to do so.

Does that help?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I appreciate that very much.

Yes.

So my recommendation to the Commission is that we don't pursue it any more at this point.

I don't think even if we did make some changes, I don't think they are going to be significant.

And that we move on to other things to make our time more efficient.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, Kent, did I know you have been trying to get in for a few minutes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was going to state the obvious.

If you don't -- that is 4.12, that is 4.32 forget the negative.

Add the highest and the lowest together what does that come up to? That is your deviation because you're doing the overall deviation and not the mean or the average. So you could play around 3-2, 3-5 if I'm not mistaken it's always going to be 8.44.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Because those are the highest.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The ground level and the ceiling.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you go back to the map to show where 16, 7 and 6 are because I think 17 is Dearborn and I just want to look one more time. 17 where is 16? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It was.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 16 is east of 17.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 17, 16 and 6.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The tall skinny one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 17, 16 is in here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 16 is over by 3700.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And 17.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 17 is over.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 6 is the floor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which is way over there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is the floor.

If I remember right well any way that is the floor is 16 and 17 are the ceilings or the top.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We did not want to touch those from our conversation yesterday.

Where was 21 again?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's right in next to 16.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is one of those districts we don't want to touch either so.

I would recommend we just move on and don't worry about that unless you have some ideas.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say I feel like all of those districts we know where the African/American population is and so if we adjust along that line, we are not making changes to the VRA levels because you know one precinct versus another in that strip right south of 8 mile it's basically the same population.

So I mean I certainly do think that it is fixable.

The harder issue is how do you get over to six because you have to pop from 21 to 18 to yeah like shuffle and it's achievable because the populations are so concentrated.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to echo what Commissioner Clark was saying if I remember right these districts from the Detroit river in land were carefully crafted with VRA in mind.

So if we were to start messing with that, we could be opening up another can of worms trying to get the districts that are drawn into Detroit area to be in compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

Am I missing something here?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm looking at four and six.

Now four is 3%.

Six is minus 4-3 and they happen to be side by side.

Right here.

Now, I don't know but you may be able to move some around and you know just like right here.

And keep your VRA percentage pretty much the same.

I mean I guess one might tilt up a little bit and one tilt down a little bit.

I don't know.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Will we end up with the same phenomenon we just had? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No, sir because if you raise this, if you bring that up to four, then the differential is minus four then the high will be 4.12 together that is 8.12.

So in this instance you have a high District and a low District side by side.

And you could make a significant drop.

These were both closer to 0, it would drop it whole percentage points at a time, if I'm looking at this correctly.

For example, and I'm just going to do it.

I'm not saying you should do this.

But to see it in action, okay? Of course we got to pay attention to percentages.

I'm not suggesting anybody do this but I wanted to just show it briefly.

So six is low.

We are going to move some in there.

I'm going to assign an entire precinct this one, this one.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If we're going to do something like this in one of these districts, I think we should look at all of the stats that we have on them before we decide to do something like that.

Partisan fairness, everything.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We did drop it didn't we.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: What we did we have to pay attention to all the details of doing that.

But because this went down 1.4%, this went down some, you dropped it .4 at one time one move.

But of course it goes back to studying the grand scheme of events.

So I'm just going to put that back, undo it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Bruce, do you think that is significant enough to make a difference? To pursue it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Clark I was curious what the number had been before the switch so let's see that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's .6.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I don't believe the deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 41.24 versus 46.02.

Can you do it again? Kent so we can see.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Shifted .6% and it went down .6 and the other went up similarly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did the higher or do you remember? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are going to do it right now.

So we swapped roughly .6.

And down to point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 41.24 went down to 40.62.

And the 46.02 went up to 46.64 so slight deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I would add to that if I may Madam Chair that the .40 drop in deviation is pretty good for just one swap.

I certainly agree with that that there are ways to get at this.

I think that our -- our only thought for now speaking for the legal team is if the Commission has other priority items that the Commission wants to proceed to other issues that you know we are okay for now, but I think as we recognize this, we will have to address this later.

And the amount of the change is small.

And to be completely throw everything on the table there are parts of the country where a .5 decrease in Black VAP could be extremely significant in a negative way.

But this is a downtown Detroit District.

This is a District that where it's heavily democratic, all the elections show significant margins and while to Kent's admonition looking at the numbers change.

I do think there is some room for minor adjustments in these areas to affect the deviation similarly.

This is not an out County area.

It's not a border area.

It's the populations are pretty robust.

So I think there are additional opportunities here if the Commissioner chooses to go in that direction, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So let's save this.

And I will yield back and let the next person deal with what they want to change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, yes, hey Mr. Brace I see your hand is raised and you appear to be in transit.

So did you want to comment?

>> KIM BRACE: Yeah.

I would, thank you for letting me in.

I've been listening to you guys.

If you look at that District 4, and inside of it is much more white.

And if you look at the deviation, District 4 is high.

So if you start peeling off whites from the northern side, it will bring back up your minority percentages in District 4.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Brace.

So Commissioner Clark you are done with your turn?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, we saved those changes, did we not, Kent? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

I mean it's there.

It's that one precinct.

That is the only change in this plan.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is fine, yep.

Okay, I yield back Rebecca.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So Commissioner Eid, did you want to try to continue to tackle this or do you want to work on something else?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I was going to do something else but since we are on here, I guess I can continue this.

So which -- is this the...I have a question is this the map you had made changes on Commissioner Szetela beforehand?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well I would like to move to that map.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so Kent can you save and close this map and reopen the other one that I made changes to.

And Commissioner Witjes, did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If memory serves me right four and six were ones I was working on last or earlier this week or last week trying to make the changes.

I think it might have been Tuesday.

For VRA compliance on the house.

I think that was me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So it's all your fault.

Whatever the problem is it's all your fault.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'll move on to the previous plan.

I believe this is the plan that Commissioner Szetela brought forth this morning with edits or made edits in.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's use that one.

I'd like to make that edits to this one because thus far it's you know it has, it does excuse me I'm having trouble talking today.

It both supports communities of interest and has the best partisan fairness data numbers.

So I think this would be appropriate.

So what changes were made to get it down to 8.04 instead of 8.44? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The way this deviation is, you take the highest deviation and the lowest deviation and add them together.

And you can change the numbers in between there all you want but it's always going to stay 8.44.

So what we did looking at District 4 and 6 fairly quickly we recognized that that's pretty high, that is the furthest that exists and moving a precinct from four to six it really closed the gap because it brought 4.32 down to like 3.89 or something.

That is a whole .4 moving one precinct.

That is what was done.

It was that precinct right here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay can you add that into four? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You might be able to do the same thing here.

So to do the same thing we will move that into six.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall is also next to the plan deviation where it says largest does that refer to District 6 in the top right corner plan deviation 8.44 District 6 the largest.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Six is the lowest deviation minus 4.32.

The highest is 16.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you that is all I wanted.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 16 is way over here so we would have a difficult time getting data.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you got it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: From there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's make that corresponding change between six and four that Commissioner Clark essentially made on the other version of this map.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Move one precinct into six and it's going to drop it .4 at one time.

And you know there is more north of here that could have not the exact same but similar in the sense this one little precinct splits the locality and is in District Four.

Or maybe you would move something else into six.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's move that one you were just hovering over into six.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I should point out now moving here is not going to move wait a second it was .4.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: It was .4 now it's 8.17.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: With that change it's different it was 8.04 in the other plan now it's 8.17.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yeah, but you got to remember this is Commissioner Szetela's plan that has changes in other places.

Because if you look now 68 is the floor.

So you know it shifted a little bit.

But 68 is still, for example, still pretty far out there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we made a positive change so let's save first.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Changes between four and six this is not going to move.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right I mean I think it will still move it just won't move that much because four is still over and six is still under.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I understand that would change your mean or your average but it doesn't change your extremes or totals.

The extremes are from the highest deviation to the lowest.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Look at 68 then.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Stigall your microphone is not on.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can do something similar but not saying you should, you can bring 405 up and without.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I see.

Can we -- while I'm doing that though can you pull up the partisan fairness data for 68 and 67? No, no. I mean, sorry, the election results that have the composite percentage.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Anthony, in this area I'm really aware that we identified an Asian population but we are also aware of an African/American population. So, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Taking all that in consideration you might be able to -- I think the key to it you have to look at the whole thing.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The numbers are both highly democratic so I think moving a few precincts would be okay and being cognizant and 67 has more of the this is the Asian theme we are looking at, correct? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No, sir this is the African/American. I can turn on the Asian.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, let's just look at it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, this is total population.

So, you know, for example, just throwing it out there, 67 is high and 68 is low.

You could theoretically move an Asian precinct, Asian populated precinct into a District where many other Asian precincts are if you so choose.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You read my mind and exactly what I was going to say. See the two precincts with dots in them move to 68.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Quick eyeball 2700 people 4,000.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The one with the higher density which I believe was the top one.

Let's move that into 16.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That was 18% so we will move that over to 68.

Now you see your deviations are dropping because 68 the lowest deviation is now only 1.07 low.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wonderful now let's look at 21.

It is VRA46.37% Black voting age population.

I think that is about the lowest we could have got it in this area which is why it looks that way.

What is around it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 16 is right beside it and that is the new high and that is the high.

And 21 is the low.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can somebody make note of these two population numbers for me, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have to keep in mind.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 16 is 3778 and what is the other one we are looking at 21? Negative 3580.

Let me grab VRA numbers real quick 46.71.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 37, 46.37.

16 is 42.54.

Now, to further look at what we are doing 17 which is right beside 16, it's going to probably be your next high precinct when you drop this down.

So you could really make a deviation change if it was possible to have the necessary necessary data and you could move these from 21 to 16 and 17 kind of at the same time.

Then you could really change your overall plan deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What is five at right now? Can we also see five? I think that strip that comes down is part of five.

16 and then I think but I think in the middle is five.

I think five comes down between 16 and 17.

I think that is five.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The colors are very close.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You are right and we will change this.

I'm going to change 17.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Two districts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I mean if we could see what five is too because that might further help the situation.

So 17 is 3768.

Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, ma'am, no, I'm here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Did you have a question or comment?

>> KIM BRACE: No, I'm sorry I forgot to lower my hand.

Sorry about that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay no worries.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Good call whoever spotted number five because I certainly didn't.

So five is a little low.

So basically if you could work in this area I don't know if it's possible to do what you need to do.

We are not moving 18.

>> Eid 21 to 16 to 5 more or less.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 17 is also high so you can give population out of 17 possibly.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 17 is not connected.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Nine is high too.

Nine is 3,000 over as well.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's take these one at a time and focus on 21 and 16 first because that is the largest deviation.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: African/American overlaying the dots here.

21 needs population and 16 could stand to give up some.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right okay let me look at this map and just think for a second on what precincts would be best to take.

Can you actually move north a tad? That bottom so on the screen right now, you passed it so move back south.

Okay the precinct that is within this triangle that we've made here yeah so you can move the cursor up on the screen, yep, that one.

One low, one lower, one up, yes that precinct can we look at that precinct? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So to get the information on that precinct I'm just going to click on it, it highlights 861 people in there.

And 9.5, 95% of the people well there are the numbers right in front of you.

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

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's try assigning that into that is already in 16.

So try assigning that in 21.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You got your percentages but it doesn't mean it's going to...

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Quite a bit closer and did not do that much change to the Black voting age population.

Can we Zoom out to see both the districts 16 and 21 in their entirety? Okay this helps. Okay can you Zoom in.

Let's Zoom in so yeah right where the 16 icon is, okay so that changed now, okay, do you see that District that's on the right that is kind of sticking out a little bit more? That one? Let's look at that precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Precinct has a thousand people in it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's assign that to 21.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Anthony do you mind as you are working that Kent put the overlay on it and did not want to disturb your process.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That does not interfere at all.

Let's look at it.

That is very helpful.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I'm just quietly thinking so that is it and those are my noisy blinds because my window is open and I will go back on mute.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Kellom.

I was just thinking the same thing.

No, not about noisy blinds.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We added that to 21 what does that do to the population numbers I'm sorry the demographic numbers are specifically what I want to be looking at while doing this.

So we increased one of them a little bit and I believe 16 we've lowered a little bit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

So 16 was 42.54 and it's now 41.48 so a small change but still within the target for that area.

And then 21 was 46.37.

I'm sorry was 46.37 and it's now 47.39 so about a 1 percentage point change.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay and the deviation between 16 and 21 has improved.

And the overall plan deviation has improved as well.

Okay so now let's look at 19 versus 17.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks like we didn't get the neighborhood overlay, we were not able to do it?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There it is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Further north thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If you are modifying these districts to get your overall deviation lower, you can look at without affecting your racial demographics or more so you move precincts that are like 13.9% minority or 96% minority.

That way the numbers may not move in whole percentage points.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay I kind of like that idea.

Let's Zoom in.

Do you see that triangle neighborhood, that is right there, those two triangle neighborhoods? They are right there.

That is the one we originally went from 16-21 on.

Let's assign that neighborhood back to 16 and then look at changing it a little bit more in the northern areas.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And these are two precincts.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't want the precinct.

I just want the neighborhood.

So the neighborhood outline.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now we are at a block level movement.

So that is the green so we can come right down here and get this neighborhood, correct?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay those numbers are back to pretty much what we had had previously.

Let's move north as you suggested.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's a possibility and a different way of looking at it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I quite like that way better.

So do you see these precincts here that jut to the right of 16? Yes, those precincts. Put those of those into 21.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to highlight them and you can evaluate what you want to do with it.

Let me get it to precincts and see what it looks like.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Not all of that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 2000 and we shifted 2300.

21 could pick up that 16 could easily give it up.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's try it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can always put it back.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Always bring out the erasers.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is your deviations this still stayed at 43 rather than dropping.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 16 is still a little over and 21 is still a little under.

Let's look at the metrics.

We have 43% for 16 and 45% for 21.

So I actually think it improved on both of them because it dropped them.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 16 was at 42.54 now it's at 43.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It was just a half a percentage.

My point being you did not lower 16 precinct and you only lowered 21, what? 4, 5-10ths or something.

Using round numbers 5-10ths maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are still about 13-1400 people of a difference between 16 and 17.

Now the largest differences between 19 and 17.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And I believe there again 17, 17 is in play.

And 17 is you know quite high.

Quick eyeball on five and it could, yeah, there is different ways of doing it but there they are.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's look at the border between 17 and 5.

I don't want to move across the Township border but we have this border that's already within the Townships on the left and right side between 17 and 5.

How does 14 look here as well? 14 is pretty good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 14 there again it could take moving the right data you know.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Bring in a little more.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Lower 17 without making significant over all affected change to 14.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I was going to say five also has an Asian population about 10% so if you can get the dots in there for the theme and.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay do you see that neighborhood that we currently will split between 17 and 14? That neighborhood? What if we were to put that whole neighborhood into 14? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well just do it and see what happens.

Somebody paying attention to our numbers like 45 for 14, 46.1 and 16 right or 5.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You're sorry we are moving from five to which one?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Moving from 14 to 17.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 14 to 17.

17, 44.73-BVAP.

Five no sorry.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 14 is 46.17.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Recorded got it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's assign that neighborhood that we currently have split all into 14.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will use the blocks and click on it and see what happens. So no I don't.

I can actually put that into 7 into 14.

Is this what I'm doing? I'm putting this into 14.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Blocks.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Use blocks.

Get right up next, to the highway.

These are I think Zoom in to get these.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's finish because we put extra in 14 so let's move one part of 17 into 14 that is on the top right, top left, and the top right.

On the bottom left there is a part that should be in 17.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So we need to put this into 14 and this into 17.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Exactly.

So now 14 is a little high.

17 is right about right.

We have one less neighborhood split.

Did the population deviation go up or down when I made that change.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 7.5 so a little low.

It went down.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wonderful.

Since 17 needs more and 14 is a little overpopulated let's complete that neighborhood as well.

Putting it into 17.

Let's see where we are at for 14 and 17 in regards to the BVAP.

14 changed to 47.91 and 42.90.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 17 went from 44.73 to 42.90 so I think still within the range and from 46.17 in District 14 to 47. so an increase.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Increase.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: One and three quarters.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do we think about that? Is that acceptable?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, just keep going.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And I would echo that.

That it's a good direction and the changes and the BVAP are not really measurable.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I have a quick question for Kent I was noticing as we go through this, we have District 11 and 10.

They are fairly close one is negative and one is a positive would that make much difference in the plan deviation if you were for equal them and square them up so they were pretty close to 0 each or? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No it would not change the overall deviations because the total deviation, those fall in between the two ends.

At some point when you get down to it 3.44 or 3.26 and 2.66 might be the high and low then you match them up and you can drop it down.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That is what I was trying to understand what you are saying.

I think I have it now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Just a moment, my machine is not responding.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Once it does respond let's save.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: A moment ago 19 is the new low and 14 is overpopulated. So if you did not move 14 to 19 there again the deviations would move. If it fits in the overall scheme of what you're trying to achieve.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While we are waiting 14 is over 3,000, 19 is under 3,000.

And there is a significant Black voting age population in 14, but not in 19.

And so yeah because it increased the Black voting age population increased 14.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What I would like to do it in a way that also preserves the Arab Americans in 19 as well in Dearborn Heights.

No we are not in Dearborn Heights never mind.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In 19 there is a minority 33% 33.5% minority. But I don't know if that is a coalition at this point.

And I don't think we can confirm or disaffirm it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Absolutely I think we can confirm through analysis the numbers suggest that but that is all they do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Brace, could you mute, please? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We are halfway back.

I do want to you know look at this to make sure everything that has been done is done. I'll share my plan on the screen.

The plan is back up here and I'm going to just do a quick rebuild the plan.

Just looking briefly at it and the numbers most accurately.

That is the last change up there that I recall.

There is 14 you know picking up some of 17.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Looks like it all saved so that is good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I hit close the plan and it actually did close it then it messed up so now we are at the 14, 19.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: On 17 there was a part that hung off when we did the neighborhood change on the top, yep on the top right neighborhood that is assigned to 14.

Yep, if you Zoom in on there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That right 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.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Zoom in a little more, right there that little overhang.
Got a little hang nail.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That should go in 14.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, 14.

Okay now let's move on to the next area we were talking between 14 and 19.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 35 is a little bit low and 14 has 3283 while 19 is the exact same percentage.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 35 is a little low.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 1.8 so it's under 2% low.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do you see that square, yep, let's put that into 35.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looks better but not a big number.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Looks a little better at least.

I will take it.

We are pretty much looking at the edges of 14 and 19 and seeing what we can move into 14.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's not forget it would be possible to move some of 35 down here and 14 to 35 but what thematic map would you want to overlay, is there a population you want to be aware of?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No over law for overall minority population that combines all of them, is there? Let's get a look at both of them.

Put the Asian American and look at the African/American so we can at least get an idea and we will go from there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Third would be the Hispanic.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you let look at all three of them.

[Off mic]

Asian as defined in the census data is down in this area.

A little bit in 19.

And then you know, up more in 110 a little bit in 5.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so let's look at Hispanic population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then we can do the Hispanic population which seems to be more to the east.

Does that make sense to everybody?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Makes sense to me and let's look at the African/American population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Obviously, this is significant.

19 is 20 percent non-Hispanic and these precincts are not greater than or 10% or greater African/American.

You can still look at the exact number.

1200, Black combined, 50 out of 1200.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What is 14 per percentage of Black VAP? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 48.28 and if you move these precincts into here it will probably increase.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If we take the top two precincts.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These two.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are adding to 14, correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: No, sir we are removing from 14.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so let's add those three into 19.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 4853.

This is a significant number.

And it is probably going to cause this non-Hispanic Black population to increase.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Instead of all three let's just try one of them.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Those two are 2757.

Which is getting there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid you do have Black population in the southern most portion of 14 to the right of 19 and so if you added those precincts, you might, yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Or you could even where it's 35, I mean, you could even take like all of this so you add more.

I don't know I'm just throwing ideas out there.

Many ways to do this.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do you see the area that is on top of 15 on top of the purple.

You got those three precincts there? That is 8,000 and for now this is a lot of people I know but let's assign that to 19.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This one precinct is 2226.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's assign that to 19.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 19 is almost ideal, 1.15%.

14 is .4%.

And your new low District is 27 and 62 is the new high.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The African/American, the Black voting population is almost 50%, I mean, 49% so.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can undo it.
4909.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What do you think, Mr. Adelson?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I just undid it so we will see it in a second.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Overall deviation went down .12%.

The changes that are being made have nothing to do with race.

Race is not predominating these decisions you are trying to equalize your population deviation.

So if decisions were being made to if race was the primary consideration without having anything to do with the V RA, that is another issue.

But that's not what is happening.

It's deviation related.

So I think that that is a positive change.

Because it did bring the deviation down .12 and it's even possible because other Commissioners are on a roll can deviation you may get below 7%.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is certainly what I would like to do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: My question is put that back in there.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Put that back into 19.

Now we got to look at 27, going down the list.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 62 because that is the high one.

And you would have the same effect looking at its neighbors if you can drop that down one whole point, then that is going to get pretty close to going up, well depends it will go down.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 65 is over as well.

Can't really go in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 65 is right here.

So if you move population from 62 to 63 and 65 to 61 the numbers are coming down deviation numbers are coming down.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we put up the voting results the election results because I think we drew 65 or 61, one of those ways for a purpose.

No not really so 65.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I actually drew that whole area.

So definitely look.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so the only one we got to look out for is 65 but there is a little bit of cushion there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You could possibly raise the number, you won't necessarily lower it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm not too concerned about raising or lowering it that much.

I just don't want to flip it because that will affect the other partisan fairness values so okay, we need to move a little bit of 62 into 63 and then 65 into 62.

So let's add that bottom precinct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is already in 63.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The one above that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And that encompass Hudson so looking at 1500 and 24 so now you are looking 3900 if you move both of these over here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's do it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which is a pretty really high number.

You will be just shifting the high really it will go higher and go over 3.92.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Why don't you try the City Morenci in the southwest corner there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That little City.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What is that population?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't really -- let's do both of them the City and Township that it's in.

Let's see if that is lower than the City and the Township.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm just going to select them then you can do what you want with the information.

So combine that is 3400 so that would make this District go over 3500 which is right back to 3.92.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Deselect that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is similar.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's go a little north.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 3900.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Deselect that as well.

Let's go to the other end up top 63 exactly.

What about that one? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 2400 and more in line with what you might want to do.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's assign that to 63.

It's too high and looks like we will have to split something here.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will undo that.

62 could pass to 61 but 65 has to pass somewhere, excuse me.

Anyway.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'd like to do these one at a time just so everyone can follow along and we can all get input from other Commissioners as well.

So we need to you just said we could add a little bit into 62 from 61.

Correct.

The other one do you see the Township that is broken up now in 61.

Yeah, that Township right there.

See the bottom part of it? Right, that square how many people are in that square? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Total 720 people.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What if you include the City? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is a total of 3200 so you are.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is not going to help either.

Any ideas fellow Commissioners?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I feel like we have been here in this area, trying to figure this out before.

And it seems like I think Commissioner Clark was trying it.

I have a memory of others.

But I guess I think because we are here again it seems like the block level or yeah or.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why not take Hudson and put it with 63 just the little City of Hudson it's 2400, 15, it's that little bubble looks like a cloud.

Just if you put that in.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's look at it.

Let's try putting that in 63.

Okay good call 7.26 it's going even lower.

Okay the next biggest difference is between 27 and 36.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have something to fix before we leave.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Fix it now.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is your 36.

And surrounding districts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is 67 over? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 67 is just down 200.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay we can even those out a little bit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go down to that border of Ypsilanti.

That should be willow run that juts up right there willow run neighborhood.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So Zoom in that precinct over there, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This precinct I'm circling here?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Add it to 67.

Too many people.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we look at the population? Maybe you can take off one of the ones immediately adjacent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 3800.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That's 3800.

The one to the left of it how much is that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I think this is all one but I will select it.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: A precinct to the left of the one that is currently highlighted so to the right of that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Little guy 3151 people.

Zoom out a bit.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which precinct?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Precinct to the left yeah that one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That little guy.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is already in 67.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Who has more people.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That has 3100.

That has 3800.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What about the one in between.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 259.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, the one to the left let's assign back to 36.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It went down from .26 to .24.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Making progress, slow and painful but we are making progress.

This was drawn I believe for partisan fairness purposes. So can we look at election results and make sure that did not change with 36?

I don't think it did, but let's just make sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Your battery is low.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Hum.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is in this metric and you will have to look at the grand scheme of things.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Go back to where we were at.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The republicans had more votes in all statewide elections.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is consistent with that area.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Salem South Lyon.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: You changed this today that is what the result was?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wonderful.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You might be able to shift in that border in Novi up there or something you may be able to shift a little more if you want to reduce 36 a bit.

Up to you it's 3.2%.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Right now it's 27 and 65.

We will get there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 27 and 65.

So where is that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we are back here.

65 is high.

Is 67 high now or is it low? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Even or .56 high.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's bring in a little bit of 65 into 67.

What do we think about that, Commissioners? I have one thumbs up.

Okay the question is what parts of 65 do we want to add to 67? We only need to add about 2000 people or so.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: This is the Ypsilanti area and it is the willow run airport for example.

But that is actually I like that it was -- I would not add the airport.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Earlier you said you like the two airports.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, I think it could be an economic community of interest.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We are adding.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 65.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 267.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Decrease population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why not into 68? 68 is actually low.

I'm just confused.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Look at that we can go into 68 let's do that.

That is better.

So what theme do we have on right now? African/American.

Okay, do you see right above 67, so to the left, and then you see those two precincts right above it? No right above where we are.

Yeah, those two precincts.

Let's look at both of those.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I thought we were removing population from 65.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We decided to instead of 65, 67 we are looking at 67 to 68.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is not what I was suggesting.

65 to 68.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So no 67, 65 to 68.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There is a precinct right off of Saline that has about 2000 people that you should be able to shift.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is that the precinct you're speaking of?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's assign that to 68.

And we are below 7%.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can keep doing this.

It's just a matter of 73 was visited earlier.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do you all think do you want me to keep going or should I pass to the next person.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would love it if you could get it down to five and you are making progress so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You can do this on every man.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can call it quits too it's up to you.

I don't want you to feel you have to keep going.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We are making progress and wondering if anybody else has any bigger change to make because we are kind of just making this map into like the best possible map.

But if there is any other larger configuration change if anyone has one.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just looking at it 27-52 the offset is pretty much, well, I believe you would be able to lower it not necessarily significantly.

But 27 into 52 making changes and at that point it will be pretty low on the deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So the only person who has not had a turn today is Commissioner Kellom.

So maybe we want to check in with her to see if she has plans for big changes or if she is comfortable with you continuing that.

That might be respectful of her.

Because I think this is definitely worthwhile and if she wants to make big changes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: No, keep going I was just going to say.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Otherwise we have done the full rotation today so I say keep going.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: In terms of our compliance I think what we are doing is working on a house plan and we have two at this point and we now have right so we are done for the week after this.

Then we can go home and we do our maps and we arrive on Monday morning and we go, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No pressure to be timely there Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, you know, it would be nice to get us out for the weekend too.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To your point Commissioner Rothhorn the compliance orientation you know today has really been for the most part on the deviation.

So the deviation is clearly moved in a positive direction.

But I understand that you have record keeping and forms that are pending, so I think it's important to keep those in mind as well as all the requirements that are needed for publication.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is my point.

We can keep sort of doing this but I'd love the idea of also sort of getting an it feels like we need to experience what is the next step is so we know how to do this and think you are doing great Commissioner Eid but let's put a pin in it and know how to do it if we need to come back to it but let's do the next thing which is helps us know what happens Monday.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To that point Commissioner Rothhorn General Counsel and I agree that there has been great progress. And there will be great progress subsequently.

But I think going to see what the next phase that must be completed I think that is an excellent idea.

We think it's an excellent idea.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So, Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was going to agree with what has been said.

Because this deviation you know how to bring it down and bring it down quickly.

And it's not by nibbling in the middle.

You trim it off the ends and can do it on every single plan and there is really no stopping.

It's more about getting exhausted and saying look you know we are splitting hairs three ways.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there anything currently on this plan in the red.

Can you scroll up and down for me? Because we brought them all down, right so 27 is the lowest.

Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Basically really you are under you are 3.5 or under either direction.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, so are we moving on?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So that is I suppose Commissioner Eid that would, yeah, do you want to help us move in that direction?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What needs to be done next? I don't know you know my time is at the will of the Commission.

How do we want it to be used?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We need a guide.

Is there a guide for us?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What I will say right now we have about three or four Congressional maps that are I think are really good.

They all are in compliance and have very close partisan fairness values.

We voted already to publish one Senate map.

And this map that we're looking at now is the most compliant and the most partisanly fair and has the lowest plan deviation.

So that's where I see that we are at currently.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm hearing calls for a break we have been at it for almost two hours so hearing no objection let's take a ten-minute break it's currently 3:50 p.m. hearing no objection we are in recess until 4:00 p.m.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are we...ready? As Chair -- she is right here.

Do we still have Brittini okay as Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 4:04 p.m. Will the secretary please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

Commissioners, please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present. Participating from Rochester Hills.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

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

Rhonda Lange?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

And there is a quorum.

We wrapped up the mapping for the day and will move on to assessment portion.

And I think some discussion of what will happen on Monday so I'm going to hand it over to Vice Chair Rothhorn to facilitate that discussion.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Chair Szetela.

So Commissioners, I think we had sort of a presentation on what as when we present our personal maps on Monday, that inventory we are supposed to fill out does that sound familiar to everybody the spreadsheet does that sound familiar? So the goal for today the rest of the day today is just do that with the maps we have run compliance on that we sort of looked at the compliance data and do the same thing and then that will wrap us up for the day.

That is the goal.

And again I think what I'm hoping will happen is we will get a good sense of how to do it ourselves this weekend and be that much more read on Monday.

Does that feel like a good use of time for everybody? .

[Off mic]

So Commissioner Lett and then yeah lots of hands in the room go ahead Commissioner Lett first.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, that the goals and reports can't be done from the computer?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel and Sarah Reinhardt.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Mr. Vice Chair that is an excellent question Commissioner Lett.

What staff will need is for the Commissioners to identify which maps they would like the information to be logged in for.

So that your mapping, the mapping team can make sure that those reports are generated for those maps and available to the Commission on Monday and then staff can make sure that those spreadsheets are available for the Commissioners on Monday and you will be that much further ahead in your work.

So if the Commissioner could go down the list, I call it the list Page much to Mr. Stigall's consternation and identify and have that Commission discussion and identification then, yes, we can run the reports on those maps that are selected by the Commission.

Just identifying maps, not you know this is just identifying what maps have had the compliance analysis so they can be tracked and which maps the Commission would like the additional the information for on Monday.

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

Commissioner Witjes did you have anything? Great Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: What your General Counsel is exactly what I was going to say we need your help, Steve.

There is a lot of maps out there.

So just point us in the right direction thanks.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we are not doing is filling out each one but we are identifying as Commissioners which ones we do want to move forward.

Do we want to start with the State Senate? Do we want to start what do you think Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is simple the one that we just voted on to publish is one that we should have the paperwork done for.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right so okay and let's just officially name it. No we have it named do we need to do anything more so that staff can proceed with that inventory? At this point.

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: General Counsel please.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Not for the map that has already been suggested to be published but I believe miss Reinhardt has additional information to convey.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The question for the Commission is again asking the Commission during an open meeting walking through those considerations and that document.

Not the statistical data portion.

But if I'm reading the room properly, is that what the Commission might want to do is identify those maps.

We will log in the statistical data then work through those considerations on Monday.

And the considerations being it can be much more specific.

The considerations again the entire compliance tracking form tracks the Constitution.

So it would be the considerations would be relative to criteria five, six, five and six, the rest appear to be and the COIs so those types of questions I think can be answered but I the Commission.

And the Commission can do that today.

The Commission could do that on Monday.

It's at the discretion of the Commission.

But again identifying those maps is critical.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay and I'm hearing, yeah, so I think we will try to not -- we will do that on Monday and figure out and answer all the questions on Monday. And today we are going to identify the maps.

So are we happy with our one State Senate map? We are bringing that forward.

Are there others? These are not for vote.

It's just to fill out paperwork so on Monday that we can compare apples to apples right each inventory is filled out, okay.

Commissioner Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there anything we want to compare that Senate map to? A draft, anything, I'm just asking.

I don't have anything in mind.

I'm just wondering.

Go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That is the one earlier today we were working on and looked at and seemed happy with.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed.

Is there another one we want to compare it to that is what Commissioner Szetela is asking.

Is there anyone and again we do not have to evaluate these.

If we just have one, we have one.

So be it.

But then we don't have a choice so to speak and are moving one forward and many times over the right we've talked about it's okay to have lots of options so this is the time we have that list and this is the time to sort of try to understand for ourselves and for the public what are the pros and cons of each of the things that we have create in the past that we are yeah essentially comparing to the one we do like and want to publish.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I think it's just the one for this.

We were still going to have choices for like individual maps but as far as the collaborative choices.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Without objection we will move on to the house. General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I believe that the one that Commissioner Kellom walked through yesterday was put through compliance.

I believe there were several that went through the compliance methodology.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead Commissioner Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So my understanding is that Cynthia's map worked off of those changes is that accurate? Or did you not?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: At this point I'm very confused about that's why I was asking about the name thing earlier.

I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why don't we pull in that one too.

So pull in the one that Brittini worked on 100721SDRASBK and have that evaluated too and we can look at it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, now I'm getting a little RASBK is a duplicate of this file.

There's no difference between these at all.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is correct.

We did add it but it's a duplicate map.

And where we ran the -- and again Commissioners all we are doing is saying we want to be able to evaluate them.

We are not making a judgment like this is what we want to bring for barred to the public hearings this is not about we are not even talking about voting at this point.

It's just so we can compare and excuse me the public can also compare Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just collaborative maps.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It has to be 10721RASBK, because technically 1062021RAS is not a collaborative map.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Go ahead, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much. That is absolutely correct, Commissioner Witjes, that is alternate maps pursuant to your procedures that it was modified by a Commissioner as an alternate. None of us in this room right now are talking about individual Commissioner maps. But the function of this is identifying which plans had the compliance criteria so that the full set of information can be brought forward to the Commission on Monday.

And what I would note is that if there were I know there has already been one selected for publication.

But to the extent that there are differences between for example the one that we were just discussing, the RAS map, if there are differences between those two, then providing then having the option to provide those to the public and have the public tell you we like this option better, we like that option better or information, that's one way the Commission could consider it.

The Commission can of course select one or more maps to their choosing but that is all we need today is to identify which ones had compliance tracking that the Commission would like that information for, for Monday.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Very good I think we are identifying two that had compliance tracking.

And that we will just evaluate on Monday.

Okay, Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have strictly a question for my understanding. This plan I have highlighted, it was tagged as first collaborative complete plan. I think that meant statewide.

I mean I'm just trying to figure out where we are -- I know that one.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So this was I think we have begun to refer to it as sort of a base plan does that sound accurate Commissioners? A base plan is that right we were working from.

Do we feel we need to bring the base plan forward or do we feel we modified it and bring it forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I will make it easy and say we put that in for Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: The base plan.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 0421 version two.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We put in RASBK duplicate in for Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And that is three.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Three Senate that we will evaluate on Monday.

And, yeah, now let's are we ready to move on to the house or should we move to Congressional? Or house?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think we have three house maps.

We have the one that Rhonda worked on this morning.

We have the one that Doug worked on for a little bit.

And then we have the one that Anthony worked on.

So to me those are the three right there.

Boom, boom, boom.

If someone else has other suggestions certainly throw them out there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Actual names as they are sitting there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you help us Mr. Stigall with the names we worked on today? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We worked on these two or these three today these three 100821V2HD.

I mean they are on the screen there 100821V1.

HD.

And then Commissioner Szetela sponsored is 100821, those are the three that were worked on today.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would request those three be checked out for Monday, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Lett.

I see Commissioner Clark's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I will pass.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Clark.

Any other house maps we want to bring forward to Monday to have review? Okay, let's move on to the Congressional, please.

Thanks for your help with this Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Today because we got the dates is that first plan and the third plan.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would request the first and the third plan be moved. Are there any other anybody wants.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark has one.

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

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm trying to see these.

What looks like Commissioner Clark go first.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark do you have yours ready?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I'd like to suggest that we do the ten 0721V1CDAE anti also had one, yeah, number two.

10721 versus 1CD, DC and Dustin had one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where is the Dustin Witjes one?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Could you repeat the last one that you read.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 100721V1CDDC.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: DCD as in dog.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Delta Charlie.

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: Doug Clark, yeah.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, you got it.

So yeah, those three I would like to put on the list.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Could you repeat that Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sure let me get them.

10-07-21V1CDAE.

And then you got the first one that I did 100721V1CDDC, Delta Charlie.

And further down the list is Dustin's.

I'd like to get that one on as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't see Dustin's on here.

So it had a DW at the end, right?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I don't see it on this list but maybe you just -- maybe you were not here one of those days Kent so maybe you don't have it.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Is it 197.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I thought it was 187, I think.

I don't know.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Somebody possibly go in there and look at it to identify it for the administration?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So it was 187 but then you updated it during a collaborative process so it is now 201.

It says 10-05-21V1CDD as in Dustin W as in Witjes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we have five at this point Commissioner Clark you have your hand?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I'm done.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, are there any other Congressional maps we want to bring forward? We have five.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just to confirm 100821V1CDRAS.

100721V1CDDC.

100821V1CD.

100721V1CDAE.

And then 100521V1CDDW.

Is that what everybody has got?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Affirmative.

That concludes our portion of the next phase.

So we know what we are -- what we will do we know what we will do on Monday.

Commissioner Clark you have your hand raised.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do can we get a list e-mailed to us of those districts? The Senate and the house and the Congressional?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's probably, I wonder so instead of an e-mail I wonder part of this is helping the public walk along with us.

So I wonder because we are going to be considering these what can we do on the website or wherever, yeah, how do we help -- how can we help the public also follow along with this Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I realize if I go in there and modify what is online in any way, we lose basically you have to delete it and replace it.

And when you delete the plan online, and put it out there, exact same plan with a different remarks and name the comments get disconnected and that draws a lot of negative attention.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Agreed General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Mr. Chair and a very important thing that Mr. Stigall highlighted.

One request your staff is working on with your mapping consultant is to have the tab for the separate Page so it's very clear to the public what plans are being talked about and which plans are being questioned and more importantly which plans are published and being brought forward so we have those things also being worked on as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Chair Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I had a conversation with Edward Woods about that very thing, about putting links to what we are considering.

The framework is already set up on our web page. You can click on it, but there is nothing populated there.

I think our staff can coordinate making this list available.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What I'm hoping, Commissioner Clark, is that would sort of allow you also just like the public to see the list so to speak and just we can over the weekend just click on those, is that sort of expected this weekend? Will we -- is that exported sort of today staff? Or is that something -- should we try to comply with Commissioner Clark's request of an e-mail? Or is it something we can actually expect will be available tonight or tomorrow on the website what do you think? Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: The answer is I don't know.

So we can send out a list in the interim.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Sarah Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you given it's about 4:30 on a Friday and our staff helps to update and maintain the website, we can certainly make best effort to make sure this information gets posted as quickly as possible.

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.

Most likely it would be Monday morning.

But I -- we can absolutely send out an e-mail to Commissioners in the interim indicating what maps have been -- will be considered next week.

And once this information to complete this excel spreadsheet is also compiled, we will circulate that with you all as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Much appreciated.

I would try to acknowledge if there is any way to get that e-mail, no the website thing we will have to we will work with the e-mail.

Chair Szetela I'm going to turn it back over to you.

I think we completed that portion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So once we vote on these, on another Monday or Tuesday, are those ones that we vote on going to go on a different tab is what I'm hearing? On the website?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay do we have any other unfinished business to discuss? Anyone, anyone? I think everybody is tired.

Yes.

So let's move on our agenda.

We have no meeting minutes to approve at this time.

Without objection I would ask Executive Director sue Hammersmith to provide a report. Please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: The information I was hoping to provide is not yet ready.

So I will defer until next time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you without objection I will ask Sarah Reinhardt from Michigan Department of State if she has a report.

Hearing no objection please proceed Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry I always jump in there.

Very briefly I just want to go over the process again and what we can expect to occur on Monday.

So we just or you all just breezed through this Section here map adjustments.

So when we come back on Monday, you all will first determine the number of draft proposed maps, those are the collaborative maps you will bring forward.

We now know how many are up for consideration.

So you all can collectively choose to have that number or less brought forward to the public hearings.

After that there will be the review of draft maps.

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

The excel spreadsheets will all be filled out with the scores for various maps as well as individual presentations.

For collaborative maps, those will be presented by your Chair and/or and Co or Vice Chair.

And right now the process indicates you will go in order of District type.

So for example, all of the house maps including collaborative and individual maps would be presented at the same time.

Or you can choose to do that differently if you want to.

I actually believe your Executive Director may intend for individual maps to be presented in the afternoon if I'm correct.

So sounds like maybe we are departing just a little bit but that is perfectly fine.

Just wanted to clarify that the maps will be presented prior to any voting should it take place, which is the next step here.

Commissioners, if you are submitting individual draft plans just remember that those are due to be e-mailed to myself, your staff and EDS with an indication that you wish to put those forth as an individual map for consideration during the public hearings.

And we do request that you submit it with that completed excel spreadsheet.

And it will make things a lot easier on us if you don't fill it out, we will likely fill it out for you.

So make sure you're reaching out to consultants to coordinate on getting those scores if you have not already.

And that's all I have.

Are there any other questions on this? Prior to next week?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton is that a hand? Okay.

I saw you move out of the corner of my eye.

All right correspondence received in advance of today's meeting was provided along with written public comments to Commissioners in our meeting materials.

It's my understanding there are no future agenda items to share at this time are there any announcements? Hearing none as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business a motion to adjourn is in order can I have a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner motion by commissioned Rothhorn and seconded by Commissioner Witjes all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail the meeting is adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Good work, everybody.