

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

09/28/21 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 9:05 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

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish and Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting. Please E-mail us at Redistricting@Michigan.Gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at Michigan.gov.

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

There is also a public comment portal that may be accessed by visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC, this portal can be utilized to post maps and comments which can be viewed by both the Commission and the public.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to Edward Woods III, our Communications and Outreach Director for the Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov or 517-331-6309.

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

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

We will start with Doug Clark.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

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

Michigan.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 10 Commissioners are present. And there is a

quorum.

>> VICE 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 Sue here? There you are. So I believe there were some proposals for some changes on the agenda as it was posted last night.

So I am going to make a motion to amend the agenda.

Before we move to vote on it so the first item that I was going to move is under unfinished business A we have direct mail contract that Edward Woods III discussed last week or discussed yesterday it seems like last week. So I want to move that unfinished business item 5A down to the staff report for the communications and Outreach Director under 8C so I would move to make that amendment.

And if someone so inclined to second it.

Did you second 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: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. We have a motion to amend the meeting agenda to move item 5A down to 8C communications and Outreach Director staff report.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Let's go ahead and vote on the amendment and voting on the amendment not the agenda and to move mail contract discussion down to staff reports where it would regularly be.

In favor raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

So it looks like we have one nay so the ayes prevail and the amendment is adopted.

The second amendment was to add on under 6 Section 6 new business an item which will be 6B.

To approve the I think it's Fink Bressack interview questions so we are going to make that our actually let's make that 6A and then move the current 6A to B.

So the motion is to add approve Fink Bressack interview questions to item 6A and make the current 6A, 6B, if someone would be so kind as to second that motion.

Thank you, Commissioner Lett.

So we have a second amendment to move to add a new agenda item under new business make it A, approve the interview questions and then the current A will become B is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none let's vote on the amendment in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay, the motion carries.

And the agenda is amended.

So at this point is there any debate or discussion on the agenda as amended? All right, hearing none let's go ahead and approve the agenda approval of the meeting agenda as amended.

All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. All opposed please raise your hand and say nay. One nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted. Thank you very much everybody.

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 two minutes to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to address the Commission is number one.

Taroon, I think it's Agerwall.

>> Hello, can you hear me? Is the mic working.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's pretty quiet. Is the microphone on? Can you tap it? Tap the microphone with your finger.

It's on, all right.

>> Hello.

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

>> Hi, guys. Good morning. My name is Taroon and I'm basically here to talk about Hamtramck and Dearborn, Dearborn area.

I grew up in Hamtramck, close to east Detroit.

And I graduated from University of Michigan Dearborn. So I urge you to really keep Dearborn and Dearborn Heights area separate from Detroit and Hamtramck area separate from Detroit when you are redrawing the maps and everything with integrity. And I really just wanted to say you guys are doing amazing job. Thank you for the hard work you are doing.

It's very exhausting and I'm sure things will just keep moving.

So that's it, thank you.

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

Next in line is Colleen.

>> Hi. Good morning.

My name is Colleen. I live in Brownstown Township. I really appreciate the hard work the Commission has been doing and I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I think that Down River should be a single District that includes municipalities of Wayne, Romulus, Taylor, Wyandotte, Huron Township, Brownstown Township, Birmingham, Wood Haven, Trenton, Grasio, Flat Rock, Rock of Gibraltar, Ash Township and Berlin Township as well as the Huron watershed and Wayne and Monroe Counties. These would likely be an extremely and partisan fair District.

Thank you.

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

Kyle S.

>> Hello.

My name is Kyle. I'm a lifelong Michigander, born and raised in Warren.

So I'm currently a community organizer in that community.

I just want to say I really appreciate all the hard work that the Redistricting Commission is doing to redraw our District maps.

I know the work can be very sophisticated and tiresome.

I just wanted to comment on the City of Warren and how it should be redrawn.

I think Warren should not be divided into multiple State House districts like it currently is. People living in Warren should have their own voice since it's the third largest City in Michigan.

And Warren is also home to important employers such as General Motors, the U.S. Army and Stellantis. So I believe that Warren should be its own House District.

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

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

Ray Ann.

>> Testing this is good, okay.

Good morning.

Ray Ann, resident of Ann Arbor, Michigan, Washtenaw County.

As a result of proposal 182 Michigan Constitution says districts shall not provide a disproportionate advantage to any political party.

To accomplish this you Commissioners may find situations where you will draw some districts with safe seats.

However, the rest of the districts must balance out the map to create one that is fair regardless of geometric shape excuse me or City and County lines.

My own map drawing of districts while this particular outcome may not be practical, I urge you to indulge your creativity and do not waste votes or favor one party over another.

Generally speaking, more objective here is that the party that gets the most statewide votes wins the most seats in the state legislative chambers.

In preparing to make a statement I had the application for each of you.

And it's fair and impartial and balanced in 7 of 13 applications.

Other key maps were MICRC as an independent body.

Okay, thank you.

Oh, talk too close.

Okay.

Independent body, the desire to empower underserved communities, no more gerrymandering and focusing on opportunities for future voters.

I'm sure that the task ahead of you has taken much time patient and careful listening and learning God speed as you move forward.

You volunteered to be a Commissioner on this Commission. Now that you are Commissioners, you are being paid to achieve to the best of your ability fair and balanced maps for the State of Michigan.

Michigananders expect and deserve fair districts.

Thank you for your time and attention.

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

Rhonda, was your concern about hearing issues? Okay. Thank you.

Next in line is Christine Rogers.

>> Thank you.

Hello. My name is Christine Rogers.

I live in the City of Saline in Washtenaw County.

When you are determining how to draw the redistricting maps of Michigan, I believe it's absolutely essential that you consider partisan fairness and be willing to split cities and Counties in order to fairly represent all the voters in Michigan.

Michigan is neither a blue state nor a red state.

Michigan is a purple state.

It is time that the redistricting map reflects this so that both parties have an equal chance of gaining the majority in the State House and the State Senate.

This will lead to more moderate candidates, compromise when determining policy, and less extremism.

Thank you for your time and attention.

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

Caesar.

>> Yes, okay.

I'm having a hard time reading this name.

I believe it's Milo.

Pass as well.

Mr. McUrn.

Okay, Tony P, pass.

And I believe it's Andrea Hunter?

>> Good morning, everyone.

My name is Andrea Hunter. And those names before me are steel workers. I guess they came here and signed up and didn't know to speak.

We all are steel workers here.

I'm the president of United Steel Workers Local 1299. Our locale is located in Ecorse, Michigan.

There steel workers of Great Lake Steel have been there for decades.

We want to address the fact that our community, our taxpayers and our community chose to live there, chose to work there and they chose to be in a multi-racial, multi-cultural industrial belt.

We like to keep the Detroit and the Down River cities together.

In the Congressional District including southwest Detroit is going into the Down River instead of crossing 8 Mile.

Because southwest Detroit Down River like River Rouge and Ecorse, we are together as one family and we want to stay that way.

Because we have like interests and similarities.

Being an industrial part of southwest Detroit, and down in the Down River Areas, our interests in political, I will say concerns are different, okay. And we have healthcare concerns, working in factories and working different things. Across what is beautiful about Michigan is that we are all diverse in our service to our communities.

And in an industrial world I can say the same because of similarities with our retirees, with our youth, with our school is like.

That is why it's very imperative we stay that way so in Congress.

In the Senate and District 8, I see that Madison Heights is with south Detroit and Madison Heights concerns. And being in another County, they have a different background as far as work that is different than the southwest Detroit of industrial. That should be considered.

I look at the Senate House District one.

And that area east of market should not be separated from this.

It's a part of Detroit.

And thank you.

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

Now that has concluded our in person public commentary for the moment so at this point, we will move on to -- we got more, okay.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just a second.

So looks like we have Anthony S.

>> All right. Hello. Thank you, Commission. Good morning. Today is September 28th. Cool. So yesterday my comments were cut from Zoom, so I will restate this. But I accidentally said it's the Michigan Constitution that -- yesterday I accidentally said it was the Michigan Constitution that defines major parties and limits us to two in the state. But it's not, public act 261 of 1995, which means it should be even easier to change it and get rid of this duopoly I call it. And everyone knows what it is. So, yeah, I mean if we can get rid of these two major parties and their definition. Yeah, I mean, if we can get rid of these two major parties and their definition. I mean, yeah, the argument is that people vote for them, but maybe it's kind of a self-enforcing status quo, especially given how many of the two major parties are on this Commission. It's almost half the people who are registered don't vote, approaching half a million of the voting age population are registered, might be a, you know, there is a hint, maybe an idea as to why or some of the idea.

You know, I'm happy to see on the agenda discussion of the process by which you intend to determine in the political maps under public consideration that will be on the website.

Happy that is on the agenda today. I do think those things should be kind of voted on. And I don't know who is making the decisions.

I mean, like I said I've been watching the things every day, but it's like who is making this decision.

So I hope a vote comes up for that kind of thing.

So, okay, I got a problem you know with the public comment process and the sign up for it.

There is a link, then you sign up when you come here but the public meeting notice doesn't say you have to do it on the link if you are doing it in person.

I don't know, it could be clarified and especially the language in the public meeting about it, I would appreciate it.

I think the mailing idea is good that you were talking about yesterday.

It sounds like a good idea to me.

You know, as the districts get bigger, we got State House, State Senate and Congressional, the considerations of the specificities and who doesn't what to be with who, I think those are going to diminish when it gets bigger in size.

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

Next in line is Felicia Banks.

>> Good day.

My name is Felicia Banks.

I am a fourth generation Detroiter.

I am a community organizer.

And I'd like to start by saying I've been following this Commission mostly silently for the last five months so I'd like to take this time to say thank you.

You have demonstrated that you understand the purpose for which you are created.

And you have done this job with integrity thus far.

My community of interest, why I'm here today, is the downtown Detroit area.

Mostly spanning from the warehouse District to what is known as the border of Mexican town all along the river front.

This area is the largest consolidation of wealth in the City of Detroit.

And while that gives me both pride, it also is pause for concern.

I am concerned that the consolidation of wealth that is within the downtown Detroit area will have its own Congressional representative and therefore not answer to the citizens that are within the City of Detroit.

I request this Commission to evaluate that and to move the Congressional borders into the east and west portion of Detroit including the residents of the City of Detroit.

We are grateful for the work that you have done.

I thank you for having including me in this conversation.

And again please with all that is going on stay safe.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Ms. Banks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a follow-up question for you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think I heard you say you are suggesting the downtown neighborhood be split. And I don't think Woodward doesn't necessarily splits downtown; is that correct.

>> That is correct.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If you could submit a map or help us know where to split.

If you understand where those consolidations are or where it makes sense to split the neighborhood, that would be very helpful.

>> I will do just that. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

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

Mary Ann Fontana.

>> Should I just leave it like that? Is that good? Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would pull it down a little more, like tilt it toward you. There you go. It's better.

You can probably just tilt it.

>> Is that good now, is that better?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is better.

>> Hi, everyone. Thank you so much. And thank you to all of you volunteered for this job and, you know, I've been working diligently at it and I really appreciate that.

My main reason for coming today, first of all, I'm Mary Ann Fontana. I live in Huntington Woods in the 9th Congressional District.

Kind of two points I want to make.

First of all, that I know that it's been said here just a little bit of time that I've been here.

And I've been to some other meetings and listened to some of the meetings virtually.

That you all understand your purpose. All of this started with a group called Voters Not Politicians.

And the concept is that we the people get to choose our politicians.

So the fact that you can draw the fairest possible maps is obviously the main goal here.

And I know that only number four on the criteria is about not giving advantage to a political party.

And it seems that the way that our state is configured that we do have big areas where we have more concentration of one party or the other.

So I frankly don't even know how you can attain the fairest, but I hope you will do your due diligence and please try to make it as fair as humanly possible.

The other thing is that I live in the 9th Congressional.

And in my District, there is a lot of gerrymandering that had gone on.

But one of the things that I hope you will also consider is that there are a ring of suburbs that just border Detroit include quite a few cities and we have a lot more in common.

And shared interests than some of the areas further north because the 9th is split between Macomb and Oakland County. So those suburbs that border Detroit along the southern border are really important to consider together.

Thank you.

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

We have one more.

Go ahead, ma'am.

>> Good morning.

My name is Mia.

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

I was born and raised on the northwest side of Detroit.

Michigan, one of the most integral cities in this entire state.

I've also lived on the east side of Detroit and I've lived downtown.

No matter where I've been, what remains everlasting is the City of Detroit needs consistent representatives to stand for racial equity.

Health and life stability for families.

We vote because we demand more of those things in order to have a fair and flourishing quality of life for generations to come.

Thank you for all the work that you have done to draw fair maps for Michigan.

And your dedicated concentration on the City that is still my home.

I can't say it enough it is imperative that we have fair representation when it comes to our legislature.

We need you all to consider and utilize the resources that you all have.

To do better comparison when it comes to mapping out our districts, consider the culture.

And the needs of the people on the City, low wage earners, blue collar workers, these people have been here their entire lives. And ripping apart districts can be devastating for us.

Moving forward.

You all are able to get on track.

May I suggest that you utilize these next few days to truly connect to Detroit and the importance of our districts.

You know, when you are really mapping out the City, use those borders as starting points, consider main roads like 8 mile, Woodward, freeways like I-96, John C Lodge, start there.

We really need a complete analysis.

You could further evaluate more nonpartisan organizations maps out there.

There is a lot to consider in order to do this in the most fair and just way.

And I'm not sure if you thoroughly read those comments on your website, but there are a lot of great ideas there.

Please hear Detroiters in this.

Thank you.

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

Do we have any more in person? Okay, thank you very much.

At this point we will move to remote public commentary.

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

If you are on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and

prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call on you by your name.

If you experience technical or audio issues and we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking. If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail redistricting@Michigan.gov 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 two minutes to address the Commission, please.

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

>> Can you hear me now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> Yes, thank you.

James Gallant, Marquette, these are my opinions.

And I would like to agree with the other member, the other public commenter, and I applaud the Voters Not Politicians effort to get this amendment because this is what we needed.

Because what this means, we can revive an inactive Commission we already had in the Constitution,

The Commission on legislative apportionment. And then it just added affiliated members and that's what makes it independent.

It's not just republicans and democrats.

And to the other guy who was talking about the two party system.

We need to verify whether these folks on this Commission actually are voting members of the democratic party and voting members of the republican party.

That was never really figured out.

Now, to consider your amendment of the rules of procedure, that -- where did that come from? It appeared that your attorney just kind of said, well, I was listening to you and she was listening to you and she just kind of said you were making recommendations.

She created it.

It did not come from the Commission.

The business is not coming from the Commission, asking for this stuff.

It just comes your way from them and making it up on the fly.

This is very interesting, this motion to discuss.

That contravenes not only the rules but it contravenes the fundamentally principles of parliamentary law in America. Because the rules surrounding straw polling can clearly violate the rights of the members. And I already said that. I quoted it to you, okay?

And Page 366 of Roberts Rules, line nine, no debate before a motion.

Okay, you get to go into committee of a whole and do that.

You can discuss it all day long in committee of the whole and weeks and weeks and months and months and committee of the whole you can already have that.

And interesting that Commissioner Szetela should be concerned because it seems like somebody wants to remove some officers here, and that would be Commissioner Szetela.

I want her removed, too.

But, you know, this seems to be like, what I heard was somebody talking about how you want to set some rules for the future iteration that is going to happen. But you won't respect the prior iteration of this Commission.

But you want to set for the future.

It's called the people's foundation in Michigan.

It's Ms. Fahay, she said they want to change the rules and reboot the system.

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

>> Democratic party doing this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Next in line is Linda Levy.

>> I'm Linda Levy, a resident of Farmington Hills, Michigan.

I am wanting to say that it's very important that we make fairness the best guideline to follow in this process.

The party that gets the most votes statewide should get the most seats.

Your maps must do that to be fair.

In the past 20 years, one party has won the popular vote for the State House only three times.

But has won the majority of seats eight times.

This is not fair.

And it must be addressed to satisfy the voters who want Michigan's elections to reflect the wishes of the majority of the citizens.

That is why the Michigan voters voted, to create this Commission.

Thank you so much for your time and your energy and for listening to public comments.

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

Mari Rymar.

>> Hello. My name is Mari Rymar. I've lived in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti for about 22 years.

My family has lived in Southeast Michigan since my great grandparents emigrated from Poland to Hamtramck.

I would like to thank the Commission for all their hard work.

This is such an important undertaking and a huge responsibility.

And I know it's a difficult task to balance all the requirements while keeping in mind all the public feedback.

Excuse me.

And we do now have the chance to draw the maps fairly.

To improve our democracy and give all communities more of a voice.

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

So I want to thank the Commission for keeping this always in mind as you draw our maps.

And I also think the City of Ypsilanti and Washtenaw County should have its own State Senate seat. Ipsi has its a unique population, which is distinct from that of Ann Arbor and deserves representation in the State Senate.

We can do this either by making the District Ypsilanti and eastern Ann Arbor or have Ipsi share the District with parts of Canton or Belleville or I heard someone say Ipsi, Monroe and Lenawee.

So please consider giving Ipsi a working class community of color more representation. Thank you.

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

It looks like the next few in line are not present.

Is that correct? So Bob King, Art Reyes, Mark Payne, looking for Wendy.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe they are present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so let's go to Bob King.

>> Okay. Thank you very much.

I appreciate the hard work and dedication of this Commission.

You volunteered for a very difficult job and very important job.

I think the single most important criteria is partisan fairness statewide.

And in order to achieve partisan fairness statewide I think you have to take some communities from Ann Arbor living in Ann Arbor from Washtenaw County. And I think that votes have to be unpacked in both Washtenaw and Ann Arbor in order to achieve statewide partisan fairness.

In the house I think that Ann Arbor should be split into multiple districts in support of the AFLCIO maps that have been submitted.

I should have said at the beginning I'm a long time auto workers, member of UAW, retired after 44 years. And now at the faculty of University of Michigan AFT of Michigan and lecture employee organization.

In the Senate I think that Washtenaw County needs to be unpacked.

Western Washtenaw should be with Jackson County.

The bulk of Ann Arbor could go into northeast Washtenaw County in one -- with northeast Washtenaw County in one District.

Then Ypsilanti and Belleville could be with Monroe.

So to achieve partisan fairness statewide, which I think is, to me, the single highest priority to hold our elected officials accountable that they have to be in competitive districts or competitive statewide, we need to unpack these districts.

Thank you very much for your time.

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

Art Reyes.

>> Good morning. My name is Art Reyes. I'm a lifelong resident of Genesee County and born and bred Michigander.

The reason for my call today and every time I get the opportunity to speak, I thank you for the work that you're doing and that will continue today.

I know that this is extremely difficult work.

Taking into consideration the full geography of Michigan, the diversity of our citizenry and the voters.

But what I want to talk to you about today is I'm going to ask you to please not divide the City of Flint in the State House District.

The City of Flint has had so much happen to them.

They have been disenfranchised by the emergency manager act, gone through the water crisis which has greatly diminished any confidence in our Government.

And it's important that the City of Flint and its residents realize that they have a voice, a dedicated full time voice in the legislature that can speak for them.

Flint is the County seat for Genesee County and it's vital and important for economic development, for cultural development.

The cultural center in the City of Flint is a gem of Michigan.

And for their voices to be diluted I believe is an injustice and continued injustice considering what they had to go through for the last several years.

I'm a resident of Grand Blanc Township, but I work in the City of Flint for General Motors. And I spend a great deal of time representing residents in the City of Flint. And I want to see that our votes for a more fair representative Government work to that goal. So please do not divide the City of Flint.

Thank you very much and have a wonderful day.

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

At this point we will move on to Mark Payne.

>> Hello. Can everybody hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> All right. Thank you. Good morning. My name is Mark Payne. And I would like to first thank you all for your work and careful consideration of Detroit and the Metro area. Detroit is the largest City in Michigan in terms of population.

I'm a resident of the district Linwood neighborhood in Detroit.

I have seen submissions to your portal that have drawn up to six State Senate Voting Rights Act districts.

I urge you to take a look at the portal and reflect on these submissions.

I also encourage you to consider complete results from primaries that includes the State house, State Senate, and gubernatorial races in addition to election results that have been considered thus far as you decide where a coalition district can be constructed.

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

I also ask you to consider shared experiences as you draw the VRA districts. And as you draw Detroit and Detroit Metro area State House districts.

And the voting patterns are also needed and should be applied.

VRA districts must establish the opportunity to elect the candidate of choice regardless of political party.

Just because careful consideration of primary results of the State House, State Senate and Congressional and other voter participation, especially in Detroit and surrounding Metro areas.

Lastly, consider freeways and main roads as borders, when possible, makes it easier for citizens to organize themselves.

A great example of this is the border of the western side of District 2, that is border on Livernois. I also understand that precinct boundaries may allow districts not only to be contiguous and easier to describe and organize on the block levels.

Thank you.

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

At this point we are going to pause our remote public commentary because we do have one more person who arrived in person. So, ma'am, you can please approach the microphone and speak. Yes, you.

>> Good morning.

Can you hear me? My name is Henrietta and I'm a long, long resident of Detroit Michigan.

And I was hoping that when redistricting, the map that you would consider, the lower class citizens of Detroit east, side, west side, areas that have been gentrified and school closings and areas hit hard by disadvantages.

And so when you are talking about remapping the City of Detroit, are we inclusive to these voters of these areas to make sure they are also included in getting representation when redistricting the map, when you are in the House District and talking about Senate and all the people who will be representatives of Detroit. Please make sure you are considering these voters as well.

Thank you.

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

At this point we will go to Wendy Sellers.

You are good.

Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> Great, thank you.

I'm Wendy Sellers. And I'm a lifelong Michigander. And I currently live in northwest Grand Rapids.

I first of all want to thank you so much for your extensive work on redistricting.

I'm so grateful for the inclusive approach that I see you taking.

And I know you're well aware of the importance of creating unbiased maps that ensure fair voting that will reflect the will of the voters of Michigan.

So thank you.

I have three short comments.

One, thank you for unpacking the Grand Rapids voters for a fair State House District. That reflects the Grand Rapids area.

Secondly, unfortunately the Senate maps were not done as well.

I'm asking you to take another look at the Senate maps with partisan fairness in mind.

And, third, please make sure you work to ensure that Kent County has the ability to be represented fairly in the Senate.

Thank you so much for your work and for listening to my testimony.

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

Molly Sweeney.

>> Good morning, Commissioners.

And, again, like everyone said, thank you so much for all of your hard work as Michigan citizens to do this incredibly important task on behalf of our state.

And I am a resident of northwest Detroit.

And I'm here to encourage the Commission to make sure these new maps are drawn with partisan fairness.

As a Detroit resident who is majority represented by democrats in the state, I have become more increasingly concerned with the gerrymandering of our districts, especially as a person who deeply cares about education.

An example of how what our maps are not drawn fairly it shows up in our daily lives as after speaking this week to a democratic representative on our education committee, he told me that the democrats in Michigan in the education committee have only been able to get five bills through that Commission in the last five years.

That means residents of majority democratic represented places have only been able to have our interests represented five times through that committee because of the partisan unfairness.

So when we are thinking about our children, when we are thinking about politics in the state, I encourage you to continue to think about all of our interests, especially our young people and make sure that these maps are drawn with partisan fairness.

Thank you so much.

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

Number 12 is, Rich Thrush.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Cindy.

>> Good morning. Thank you so much for your time.

And I wanted to thank the entire committee as well for all of the amazing work that you guys have already put into this process.

It's amazing process that we have been following very closely.

And have been trying to get our community involved because it's -- we are paving the way for future generations so I wanted to thank you for that.

My name is Cindy Gamboa. And I live in southwest Detroit. And I wanted to thank you guys for keeping our community of interest together.

The community of interest that I'm talking about includes southwest Detroit, 48217 zip code, included in that map,

And the Down River communities.

Our community consists of multi-generation immigrants, Latin-X people, low income folks dealing with a variety of environmental, health and social conditions.

We have shared cultures, shared values and so much more.

And splitting our community we know what has diluted our voices in so many different ways. So I wanted to thank you.

In addition to thanking you for keeping our community of interest intact, I wanted to express the need for partisan fairness in our maps so that we have fair representation for everyone across the State of Michigan.

So the issues that really matter to us are brought up and are given the attention that it deserves.

So thank you very much for your time today.

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

Nikki.

>> Hello. Can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay, my name is Nikki Becerra. I'm a resident of southwest Detroit. And I've been a resident here for the last 23 years.

I wanted to first and foremost again to reiterate mine and Cindy, thank you so much for all your work.

We have been closely following you and we greatly appreciate the drafted map, keeping our communities of interest together.

I also wanted to come here and, again, reiterate the importance of partisan fairness. I really want to make sure that statewide we are represented as a state.

I agree with the purple comment, the purple comment. It's not blue or red. It's purple. So I think it needs to be there.

Thank you so much.

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

Dorothy Munson.

>> Good morning.

Can you hear me?

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

That was Sarah.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We can hear you, but it's a little faint. So can you speak up a bit?

>> I would be happy to. I'm Dorothy Munson. I'm representing proactive here. And I've lived in Kent County my entire life.

We would like to thank you for your commitment and your efforts to make this a fair, professional and just process.

Our commitments are to improve the State Senate map and to address balance in our community.

Cascade Township needs to be part of the north District. And we talked about Cascade Township being important because of the airport. And it really is an integral part of the Metro Detroit area.

East Grand Rapids also needs to move to the north District.

These areas have a commonality of communities of interest and they are similar in economic composition.

They are both affluent middle class areas.

To balance this, we need to move -- we could move the four Townships that are in the eastern part of Ottawa County, could be kept in Ottawa County District, and that would really, does relate to the lakeshore, which is an area that is unique to itself.

To balance these moves we need to have -- the south District would need to expand to further south and/or west into the Grand Rapids Metro area to makeup the population change in the north.

You've really done a wonderful job so far.

And I'm impressed with the professional and efforts you put forth.

Thank you for doing such a huge effort.

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

Oscar.

>> Good morning. My name is Oscar Castaneda. And I want to thank the Commission because last Friday I was here and asking you to have the shape files of the draft districts posted on the website.

In the same Friday they were posted.

It might be a coincidence because many of us were asking the shape files to be released but we really appreciate the exercise of trying to achieve openness all the time.

So with the sense of trust that is growing on me because we feel we are being listened and coming here to echo the comments that other people made already and now we really need to thrive for partisan equality in the districts.

And make sure that it's fairness in the system.

We need partisan fairness in the districts.

Thank you very much for listening to our comments and looking forward to seeing exercise in the final districts. Thank you very much.

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

Mike Hewitt.

>> Yes. Good morning. Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you. My name is Mike Hewitt. I was born in Pontiac, Michigan. And as a single father I moved my four daughters to Ottawa County in 1998.

I did so because of the united atmosphere that Ottawa County provided for my daughters, all four of them later graduated from the Grand Haven High School.

The things that concern me about the maps we are seeing at least in western Michigan first off and not disrespect intended but I don't see anybody from the Commission that is from West Michigan and I think that is not afforded this Commission with a solid view of what goes on.

And I will use as an example.

The Latin American united for progress organization often referred to as LAUP. They don't do their organization, their annual gatherings separate they do it with the Dutch folks in Holland Michigan.

It's a united front.

So you got Tulip time and you got the LAUP festival going on, that is Ottawa County. That is the reason I moved from Pontiac to Ottawa County in 1998.

By the way it's Agra based not manufactured base.

So when I look at the population shift that's taking place, it causes a greater Congressional representation to be needed so we go from three to six and somehow magic math has allowed that increase to cause the primary between two popular legislatures and you go how in the heck did you make that stretch? The other thing is specifically to the point that I'm trying to make with the united community Ottawa doesn't need to be broken up in three parts and Holland has absolutely nothing culturally to do can Kalamazoo.

Nothing against Kalamazoo they are just a very different communities.

Ottawa is a whole and to try to break it up and cause listen that does not serve anybody.

Thank you very much.

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

Cynthia Davis.

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

>> Can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay perfect.

Thank you.

My name is Cynthia Davis. I'm a resident of Hudsonville in Ottawa County.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak.

That's a wonderful democratic process.

With deep concern I'm asking that you reconsider dividing Ottawa County into three Congressional districts.

The approach of the Commission to design District maps has been a new definition of communities of interest.

However, Ottawa County has been historically and agricultural community of interest.

As the fastest growing County in Michigan with the fastest growing Township in Michigan, democrats or demographics for communities of interest in Ottawa County are changing rapidly.

I think it is important to remember that no community of interest exists as an island. Every community of interest is inextricably tied to another community of interest. For example, the agricultural community can be tied to the tourism community and orchards often have festivities for tourists. The agricultural is tied to the trucking industry, a part of business community of interest.

The list could go on.

When there is a disruption in the supply chain all communities of interest feel the pain. Communities of interest are a tangled web. And as we have seen during the pandemic when one community of interest is affected, all of the communities of interest are affected.

We need to keep intact the diverse communities of interest in Ottawa County to ensure that citizens are represented equally.

When redistricting is focused on one community of interest, it constitutes forming a voting block rather than a melting pot, which is the cornerstone of democracy.

The melting pot has a shared vision for the future of Ottawa County, that shared vision has made Ottawa County a wonderful place to live, work and raise a family.

Other Counties have been kept intact.

Please, please keep Ottawa County whole and therefore united and working effectively.

Thank you.

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

We are now on to Dennis.

>> Good morning. Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, it's a little quiet, so if you could speak a little louder that would be helpful.

>> Can you hear me now?

- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can hear you.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you hear me now? Yes.
- >> Hello, can you hear me?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, we can hear you.
- >> You can hear me?
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes.
- >> You can, okay.

Thank you.

My line didn't unmute.

Good morning. My name is Dennis.

I'm a lifelong resident of the City of Midland.

First of all, thank you each of you for your service as Commissioners as well as the opportunity to private citizen to provide public comment and input.

I hope that you're aware that map number 146 is gone on your website as well as any comments.

I do not understand where a map 146 went on your website.

As well as my comments and many other like positive comments.

The map is now number 179.

I would like to know who changed the map number as well as what happened to my documented comments which is a matter of public record.

I'm concerned that my comments as well as others may not have been listened to and/or documented.

To be very honest how can the Commissioners expect the citizens to have any trust in this format if we are not being made aware of these changes? I did not see any documentation on this Page that informs me that these changes have been made as well as any reasoning to that.

To everyone that I have spoken to in this process, it has been confusing and not easy to navigate.

This shouldn't be the case.

You do have our e-mail address that is required to post a comment.

There should be a way that we should be notified that maps have been changed and we maybe have to make new comments.

I did not make a copy of my comments on 146 so I had to write up new ones for map 147.

There should be some IT software that could reload comments back into the portal and to corresponding maps.

The next question is I may be the only person that is aware of this new map as the life positive responses I did not see any other comments as of late last night.

I still believe that this map is the best representation, I'm speaking of map 146 which is now 179.

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

I believe that this map is still the best representation for the City of Midland and Midland County.

And in all due respect.

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

Next in line is Elizabeth Scott.

>> Unmute.

Good morning. Can you hear me?

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

>> Thank you.

Good morning, I'm Elizabeth Scott and I'm a fifth generation voter from Midland.

I would like the Commission to explain why the web portal with all the map contents has changed again.

This time the Congressional map 146 that I and many others said we liked is no longer even there.

It has been renumbered to map 179 without our consent without informing us of the change that took place or why it took place.

And then on top of all that all of our comments favorable likes have disappeared, which you know, is completely unethical.

That map 146 was renumbered and all of our comments were deleted.

So, once again, I ask you to respect my voice and the voices of those who have made their voices heard.

The City of Midland and the Counties of Midland Clare Gladwin and Isabella are in a deep watershed area.

We have flooding problems that due to our land mass will never go away.

Last year alone we had a catastrophic flood where over 800 residential homes were either affected or destroyed.

Businesses were ruined and will never come back.

The overpass was completely destroyed by the force of the flood.

We have to remain whole for flood declaration and flood management.

Therefore, map 179 is the best Congressional map for Midland County, and map 171 is the best map for State House for to keep Midland whole and connect us to these other Counties.

Maps 170, 165, 164, 180, are completely unacceptable because it cuts us apart and it keeps us from helping each other with this very important problem.

Thank you.

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

Dirk Mayhu.

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

>> It appears Dirk may be experiencing some technical difficulties, so we can move on to our next participant and return to him.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right. At this point we will move to Nicholas.

>> Hello, can you hear me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Okay. Great. Hello. Thank you.

I'm here to talk about why Ottawa County should be kept as a whole.

Having only lived in Ottawa County for a little over a year now I've been able to experience firsthand what an amazing community it holds with the highest populated growth in the state in 2020 census it's importance is being seen statewide.

Ottawa County holds the name as one of the most agriculturally diverse Counties in the United States whether it's blueberries, celery or many other plants, the importance to agricultural is visible nationwide. Ottawa County is also home to two of the most visited parks in the state, whether you are going to have a picnic with your friends or family at the Grand Haven State Park or take a walk through the Holland State Park, both of these beautiful locations that would make Ottawa County unique.

As a college student attending Grand Valley State University, located in Ottawa County, mental health is talked about frequently. With the rise of mental illness due to COVID-19, especially with college students, there are ways to seek assistance in the County to help you and others around you. With its services located in Grand Haven, Holland and Hudsonville, many students and adults likewise are able to seek advice and comfort from its facilities.

Keeping Ottawa County as one District would continue its positive growth economically, agriculturally and socially.

Thank you.

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

Jason.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have Sam? He is on the list twice, but he wasn't there the first time around.

Okay. All right. At this point we have concluded our first round of public comment.

So we will move on to the second round of public comment.

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

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

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

Please step to the microphone when I call your name you will have two minutes to address the Commission, please conclude your remarks when the two minute timer has ended.

First in line is Anthony S.

>> Hello, Commission. Thank you for the second opportunity. And I know you have been working hard on these maps, especially the state legislative ones because there are quite a few districts than the 13th Congressional. But I hate to be honest, I think they are garbage and started over, at least in the Detroit area, which is where I have been paying attention to.

I could go and give you all my reasons for that, but even just the most simple one, you split like Redford or Livonia, or whatever, three, four ways, it's just ridiculous on its face.

But, all right, so I think you totally need to start over the state legislative.

My thoughts generally that there is a gentleman earlier who said keep Hamtramck separate from Detroit.

Well, obviously you can't do that in any of the districts. It doesn't have the population and keep Dearborn separate from Detroit.

I totally disagree with that. They have an enormous border. Their border crosses the same road several times over. I don't think you should keep Dearborn and Detroit separate from each other or Hamtramck and Detroit separate from each other on any map whatsoever.

And then the individual earlier, she was worried about downtown getting its own representative. At least for Congress I drew a map that seems to resolve that.

I split downtown two ways pretty much right around Woodward. And to me that would seem to accommodate the other lady's idea who is keep witness the suburbs, the cities that surround Detroit. And then the steel worker who said, you know, please don't mix Down River and southwest places with like east side above 8 mile, that kind of thing. I drew Congressional map that would split the City of Detroit three ways and give 35% minority representation on each one. And east, northwest, southwest I think it's a good thing. But you guys have to talk about Congressional for quite a few days. So I will probably make those comments again. Thanks.

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

Individuals who signed up and indicated they would like to provide live public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so we will use the same process as the first round. First in line to provide public comment is Mr. James Gallant please wait for our staff to unmute you.

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

And I'd like to continue our discussion about the rules of procedure and the fairness. You know, people keep talking about political fairness. I'm talking about fairness. And I'm going to be the self-described fairest person involved in this entire process because there is a couple rules, just do that, okay, just do that. And you folks fought

and wasting time the whole time about how not wanting to vote, not wanting to do this, and change the rules and stuff.

But I think the due diligence for you amending these rules of procedure, what you are going through right now, it would be to hire a registered parliamentarian to review it. And one thing missing from the recommendations are the actual passages in Robert's Rules of Order so you have an informed consent. Do you really want to change that from what it is now? Because you don't know what it is right now.

I believe this comes down to this part in your rules of procedure where it says any other rules approved by this Commission.

You know, the rules, in this these written rules, but any other rules. So your rules of procedure link on your website directs you to the what, the mapping process of procedures. You're calling for procedures rules. You're saying the procedures have rules. And Commissioner Witjes and Hammersmith both said the rules.

The rules of the procedure. You see, this is how they are changing the words. And just trying to change the words.

This motion to discuss, this is just a rose is a rose, you know, by any other name.

This is straw polling.

The bullies want to straw poll and manipulate the people's emotions and everything, get them to change their words and stress them out and have them surrender. And then make the motion after they negotiated the motion.

This is abuse.

I believe Commissioner Kellom is being abused.

She is a self-identified trauma survivor.

I don't know what anybody else, you understand what that means.

But I as a person who has looked into that and I do not have an A score of 0, that is serious.

And I believe that's why she is not participating.

I don't think she can take it.

I don't think she can take the stress of this of what you are doing to her by not following the rules, so please.

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

This concludes our public comment for this morning. However, I'd like to mention that all e-mail and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting.

And Commissioners also review the public comment portal on our www.Michigan.gov/MICRC 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 our unfinished business agenda item 5A. Which is continuing the process of reconciling the draft State House districts.

I believe yesterday we had left off with Commissioner Clark.

And we were about to proceed to Commissioner Eid.

However we do now have Commissioner Curry here so we will start with Commissioner Curry this morning.

So Commissioner Curry you will direct the map drawers.

And Kent and John which one of you is John is going to be taking the pen today and helping you with that.

So please direct John with respect to drawing the map.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And John if we can open up the map where we were yesterday, that would be wonderful.

>> MR. MORGAN: I have the map that was worked on yesterday.

I have a fresh copy of that.

And let me just share my screen.

Okay the last District number numerically was 93 and it looks like it was here on the north side of Lansing.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Juanita would you like a little orientation? How are you feeling this morning?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: If you can give me a brief.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Brief summary of what we did yesterday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do you have your microphone on? I can barely hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, it's on.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe John you can sort of I think we have red and blue and Secretary of State has a thought.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, hi Commissioners.

So any Commissioner using a microphone I recommend that you try to stay at least 8-12" away from it.

When you get too close it comes across the live stream kind of garbled so allow some space between you and the microphone thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's hard because it does not feel like we actually hear each other in the room so it feels there is a disproportionate, yeah.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Try 8" or more in the microphone otherwise it comes across garbled so at least 8-12" from the microphone.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

Okay, Juanita and they will help us and red lines around Ionia on the screen.

The red lines and the blue lines both indicate districts we have drawn in the past.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What we are doing I suppose the process we are going through right now and when John said we finished 93, you can see you know as we drew that together we did go over the blue lines.

Right? So it's but when we drew 90, 91 and 92 we stayed relatively within the lines.

So I guess the orientation I want to offer is yeah draw the next District 94.

Go look, yeah, I would suggest you stay in this same area and you can use the blue or the red as guidelines but they are not right they are not the only shape that you can draw.

Does that help?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Somewhat.

>> MR. MORGAN: , in fact, let me turn the lines off for a moment so you can see without any lines.

You can just see the territory that is unassigned, okay?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay so we are really doing the Clinton area.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's right so the last District it looks like it's all of Clinton County and two Townships and a village here in Eaton County.

So, again, there is a portion of Eaton County is available.

Barry, Ionia in this area or you could look at a totally different area if you want to.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I want to stick close to where you guys left off at.

But I'm not familiar with Eaton or Ionia County that much.

So anybody that is familiar can.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Fortunately we have Commissioner Wagner with us today who is from the area.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Help guide me on this Commissioner Wagner, can you hear me.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, Commissioner Curry I can.

It looks like you want to start with that lower half there where he is with Mason.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: So we don't man lock ourselves.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay that will be good.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: And then head west.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry I'm just I clicked on an area so we are talking here about Mason.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Names to me, I don't recall them that well.

But any how we need at least our population is what? 91.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yeah, these will be just the beginning.

There is plenty more population you will need.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, well, we will start with Mason since it has at least 8,000 in it.

Let's go to Vevay.

Aurelius.

And that is Eaton Rapids, can we put that with that? What is my population, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Sure, so just with that it's 25,000.

And then there's we are right up to the area around Charlotte.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, all right, give me Eaton.

I think I need to go up.

Windsor.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like Windsor is split so give me a moment to shift to voting precincts.

Okay so that was the balance of the Township.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay 67,000.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hang on here.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Pottersville and then...

>> MR. MORGAN: All right, now you are about 40,000, 42000 so you are about almost halfway there.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, I guess we will keep going and keep it relatively rectangular.

Let's do Charlotte.

Are you still with me Commissioner Wagner? How do I look?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, I am Commissioner Curry you are doing fine.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let's do Charlotte and Carmel and Chester.

Probably Kalamo.

Do Kalamo.

>> MR. MORGAN: I took Vermontville in and I think you wanted to do that but didn't say.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like there is a little bit of the Township down here that has been split.

So let's look at that and see.

I could be wrong.

No it's not split.

This is just the software has a little.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Looks like software.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, so this is Bellevue.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: How many 31,000.

>> MR. MORGAN: 31, yeah 31,000.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let's do Bellevue.

>> MR. MORGAN: Bellevue and then there are a couple of Townships to the north.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay let's go there.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm just going to Zoom out so you can see that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay yes let's go there, John.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so at this point you're 26,000 off.

And then let's just put the Counties on so you can see where you are and take a moment and see where you want to go from here.

So you have Barry which is here and Ionia which is here.

Or you know if you wanted to adjust from some of the other districts you could do that as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let's go across and do Barry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I'll put on the Townships.

So the total County population was 60 some thousand so you want to get all of the County.

You will get a portion of it.

So on the border, let me Zoom back out just a little.

So you have Woodland, Castleton, Maple Grove, and Assyria and are all on the border.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay let's do those.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Commissioner Wagner you still with me?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I am and you are doing fine and Barry and Eaton share a health department so you are still fine.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, what is it looking like now John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Now you need 17,000 and again you could look at going north or you could continue going west.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I want to continue going west.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let's do Hastings and Baltimore and Carlton.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay and I think there will be one Township south that I didn't get in this.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY:

>> MR. MORGAN: Johnston.

That will put you pretty close to ideal population.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I will leave it there right now.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is about 259.

And then I'm going to Zoom in on the District so you can see what you got.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: It looks pretty rectangular, nothing else.

And I believe they are contiguous because they are all kind of next to each other.

And the population, Sarah seems pretty good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Already Sarah you all set? All right thank you very much Commissioner Curry at this point we will move on to Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: John, I'm going to have you go north, keep going. I'm going to go up to the Mecosta County area.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, okay, Mecosta is 40,000.

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: I will have you grab Mecosta, Osceola and what is left of Clare.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, I have to shift to the Townships so hang on a second. So the balance of Clare.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes. Okay yeah that is the County line great.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Then the four Townships to the east of lake County. So the four that are butting up to Osceola County.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is 139 over with almost .15 deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That works.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It does thanks Commissioner Lange. We are moving on to anything from the Department of State? You have a thumbs up. Well done.

We are going to come back to Commissioner Lett who would normally be next but we will move to Cynthia to Commissioner Orton at the moment and we will come back to Commissioner Lett after Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, John, I don't want to get boxed in so the southernmost unassigned area.

>> MR. MORGAN: You have two Townships of Van Buren a lot of Allegan and half of Barry and the south side of Kent.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: If you would fill the Townships Van Buren Allegan and Barry.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: For population.

This is completely off topic but I think that green is Fred's favorite color.

>> MR. MORGAN: You need 33,000 sorry you are 33,000 over with all of that. So you can undo all of that and just take portions of it?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Are you able to select and see the population?

>> MR. MORGAN: I can Zoom in and see.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay yeah Zoom into the Townships I'm wondering about those Townships in Barry County.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, so 13, 19, 23, 26, 30, 33, 34, it's pretty close to what you want if you took all of that out.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay take all that out, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, okay so that is down by 2700 at that point.

And this is the County line.

I don't know if you want to reorient north, south or keep it like that.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Zoom out a little bit so I can see the area.

I'm inclined to leave it like this unless somebody has a different opinion and I don't see any opinions of that so I'm good with that, does the Secretary of State have any questions?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, hi Commissioner Orton could you describe what communities of interest you considered when drawing this area?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you Zoom in a little bit so I can see the Township names, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you mean Zoom in or Zoom out?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Zoom in so I can see the Township names.

>> MR. MORGAN: Roger.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I just feel like well I was doing it for population, that is why I included those lower Townships in a different County but I feel like the remainder of Allegan or of.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's Allegan, yeah Allegan is, oh, sorry Van Buren, two Townships.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Van Buren I used to live there I should know.

I feel like the rural areas in that County are a community of interest.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Orton.

Commissioner Lett we are back to you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 94 and 96.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> MR. MORGAN: This is the area of Barry County that is approximately 35,000 people or 32 maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Zoom out just a little bit.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry that is just under, oops, I did too much.

I was on the County layer.

All right.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The Townships north.

>> MR. MORGAN: Lower tier of Kent.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can you make sure your mic is on when you are talking.

>> MR. MORGAN: Sorry you said eight, four Townships.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Eight, all the way across.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay, here?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: All right.

So that is over by quite a bit.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay, it's over by 29,000.

There is a lot of population in this area.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay unassign the eastern five.

Pull your matrix down.

I want to see what is 87, how much is in 87.

>> MR. MORGAN: So 87 is down 3200 and at the moment you are over by 15,000.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Zoom out just a little bit.

Pull your matrix down.

I want to see 80.

So we've got 65,000.

Zoom over.

Okay unassign the eastern I think it's four Townships then 97.

>> MR. MORGAN: So that is within 2 percent 1300 people over.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Zoom out.

Okay I'll leave it there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Department of State any questions?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioner Lett.

Could you describe what communities of interest you considered while drawing this.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I can't understand you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Can you describe what communities of interest you considered while drawing this District?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The information we are E severed from MGGG as well as the comment from the public hearings and the Townships that comprise the District.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you at this point we will move on to Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks, John, we are going to continue where Commissioner Lett left off so that the next sort of L-shaped District I guess with 98 starting at the bottom of that, yeah, I guess that's Barry County or maybe it's Ionia I can't remember but.

>> MR. MORGAN: That is Barry so you want four Townships in Barry?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Correct and then we will.

>> MR. MORGAN: Let me put the County names on here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

And this is a rural area in Barry.

So I'm tempted to go to Ionia into the Ionia area, so and we want to make it contiguous so we will just sort of take the, yeah.

Oh, and do you know what, yes, John, would you put on the lines so we could, gosh, I don't know if that is going to help us here but yes it would be nice to have the shape files, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay, yep, so let's fill in that blue space with Ionia.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so all of Ionia County as a starting point.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: And Township here at least.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. MORGAN: So you are short about 10,000 so brown and Lowell would be close, sorry, yeah, 10,000.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, and one of the things I remember was that public comment in Grand Rapids where Lowell was not associated did not want to be associated with the Grand Rapids area and I think that meant a more rural area so I'm pleased with this.

See if we can add the -- the City or the village I guess of Lowell, please.

And just go a little bit over.

And we will call it good, if we are not too far over.

Okay we are not too far over.

We are significantly under in a couple districts, so this is not too far off.

And we've got the shape that we drew before, relatively preserved.

Yeah.

I'm going to call that a District.

I will call it 98.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm just curious, can we scroll into Lowell? Because it looked like there was one little spec that might be associated that was not taken in with it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Along the river there.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I guess it was.

My eyes are bad, it looks like it was counted.

Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right thanks Commissioner Lange.

Back to you, Chair Szetela.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Department of State any questions?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: High Commissioner Rothorn.

Could you describe what communities of interest you considered when drawing this?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The community I suppose is the rural community of -- that is within Ionia and Barry.

And then recognizing that that village of Lowell had given us public comment to I think remain in a rural area rather than a suburban or an urban area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not loving these two fingers we have coming down for 97 and 98.

And can you put on the populations for the Townships for me? Because I specifically want to look at that pink Township just below 97.

Because I'm just wondering if we can sort of readjust things.

So that is 7,000 and Wayland is 11,000.

Can you go down to the bottom of that District, those two lower districts? Yep, what are those Townships? The two blue ones? So what I would like you to do is I would like you to put those two currently blue Prairieville, Orangeville into 96.

And then go back up to that Township right there and put that into 97 along with the little town below it, I think it's Wayville or Wayland.

So 97 is 6,000 over and 96 is under.

What is that last little Township? Yankee springs so let's move that from 97 to 96.

So we have kind of a more compact with the higher populations closer up.

All right, I think that is a little better.

And then what do we think about 94 versus 98? Would it make more sense? And Erin please weigh in on this to include, move those southern three Townships into 94 and then take the top off of 98? Or move the southern portions of 98, right, into 94 and take the top off of 94 then we don't have this odd little line coming down.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: She is nodding her head.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: She is nodding so why don't we try that and see.

>> MR. MORGAN: What I will do is put all of these into 94 first then we will take out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: That will overpopulate it probably by about 15,000.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we look at the Townships on the top to see what the population is? So go ahead and add those to 98.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Before you do that take a look at the west no east side of 94.

Because you have got those that might fit in to Okemos, 90 and 91.

That is the Lansing area.

Much more metropolis than Hastings and Potterville.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What are you suggesting I'm not following you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: These two eastern Townships consider putting them into 90 and 91.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go ahead and try that take the District below 91 that brown one Aurelius and put it into 91 then we will do the same thing with Mason and Vevay, Erin, what do you think about that?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Honestly, I would only include the City of Mason. Everything else is pretty rural.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's only do Mason then into 90.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'm just going to say real quick here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is always a good choice for our program.

>> MR. MORGAN: When things start running slower and sometimes it's just the connectivity issues.

Okay so we are talking about Mason into 90?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, then Aurelius into 91.

>> MR. MORGAN: What about Vevay?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just leave that for now but put Aurelius into 91.

And then, yeah, what do we have -- what is the population for 59 or 72? Either one.

So 72 is high.

59.

Is a little low.

So let's go ahead and put that Vevay into 59.

Where are we at for 94, are we still over on 94? So 94 is good.

59 is good.

91 and 90 are good, I think, no?

>> MR. MORGAN: 90 is not good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 90 is way over, okay.

So can you Zoom in a little bit along the border between 93 and 59? So 59.

So 90.

Any thoughts anybody? So can you Zoom into 90 a little closer? Yeah, I just don't see how to make that work, being in there like that.

Go ahead Mr. Morgan you look like you have a suggestion.

>> MR. MORGAN: Mason in 59 you could take it off the top.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm thinking we have to.

So put Mason back to 59.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So at this point, yeah, like because 59 stretches all the way to the Flint, yeah, the Flint suburbs and Mason is just that, yeah, I'm tempted to leave 94, yeah, keep Aurelius the way it was because it does feel like it's too much of a stretch for Owosso.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go back and reverse what we did for Mason and I can walk you through it.

So go back down below Lansing.

So we are going to put Mason and Aurelius and Vevay back into 94.

So now 94 is over by 14,000, yep, so let's go back to 98, 94.

So those top four Townships put them into 98.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay do you want to start.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Irving Carlton, wood land and Sunfield.

So 94 is better.

Yeah, so let's, can you Zoom out a bit? I think I'm going to grab Rutland and put it up there but I just want to look better.

Yeah, let's put Rutland up into 98.

All right and let's see and go to the top of 98 because we may need to take something off there.

Okay, can you Zoom in a little bit to the top of 98? All right, no more to the top so I can just see the top Townships up there.

Should I just leave it? Or should I take some out? I'm kind of inclined to just leave it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I see Rhonda is shaking her head too to leave it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm inclined to leave it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's leave it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right can you Zoom back out a little further so you can see the three that I adjusted? Yeah, I think that is a little bit more compact districts and for 97 you're putting those more suburban areas together rather than having them broken across districts which is what I was trying to do.

And then getting rid of those two kind of hypes that were heading down which I thought were kind of odd and putting the northeast part very far away from the southwest.

So all right, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, we made a lot of little changes here question was Mason originally in 94 and Szetela se it was originally in 94.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Curry drew that and originally in 94.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We were trying to rebalance 94 to make it a little better.

Okay so I think that's my turn.

So I will let it go on to Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay, I'm going to take that area between 87 and 98.

And then the blue square above that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Oh, well, he will change it.

See he is nice.

[Laughter]

>> MR. MORGAN: I think the software was designed by Kermit the frog.

[Laughter]

I chose poorly.

I'm just getting the blocks that were missed here.

Okay so this is 9300 over at the moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Richard Commissioner Weiss I didn't see your hand up over there.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, I'm on here.

Okay, yeah, I have a good thought.

I was looking if you go down John to the bottom of that direction right there, that bottom block, if you put that into 87, I think that will balance 87 out a little bit and it may help also into 99.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay let's do that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Putting this Township into 87?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, that balances the numbers a little better but that Township that you just added to 87 to me doesn't fit with 87 because the other parts of 87 are really suburbs.

So Grand Rapids.

Ada is.

And down to the south.

So I don't know how well that fits.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The specific, one of the public comments we got Commissioner Clark was that Lowell and the, yeah, that Lowell Township did not want to be part of it.

But I think Vergennes was okay with being the suburban area of Grand Rapids.

That's my memory of the public comment.

>> MR. MORGAN: And Commissioner Vallette did you want to take Oakfield out which would be about the right amount.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Would you repeat that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Take Oakfield out which would be about the right amount.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yeah, let's take it out for now.

It will put me under.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Before the changes were made, I was going to suggest taking out Sparta.

Sparta is kind of a rural area in that area and that would have given you the 9,000 that you were over and put you close to perfect on that particular one.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Commissioner Lange you're saying that Oakfield would go better than Sparta, in that area?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No, before the other changes were made like the bottom one that was just put with the other one, had you removed Sparta that would have put your numbers pretty much where they needed to be and Sparta is kind of a rural area that would probably associate better with the additional areas that you have to draw like the Cedar springs, Greenville and go into that.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: So, John, when you are able to, can you back out a little? So you're saying that area between 87 and 89 should go back in and we should take Sparta out?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That would have been my recommendation. But the last District that you added I don't know anything about that particular one.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay and I'm not familiar with this area. So John, can we do that?

>> MR. MORGAN: So you want to undo adding Vergennes. I thought you added that to balance the population out so undo that?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

I think that area right between in the red box between 87 and 98 originally, I had added that.

And then can I see the populations? Right okay and then if we take Sparta out.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You didn't have a comment Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I didn't put my hand down.

Sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Do I have any other comments on this? John, can I see the matrix for this area? Thank you.

Okay I'm good with this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Department of State are you good?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Could you describe the communities of interest you considered in this area?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Microphone, please.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: It's kind of like a suburban area and it's a District we had drawn before but that bottom area was left and I almost had to add it to this or another District.

So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right thank you very much.

At this point.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Could we take a break.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Let's take a five minute break everybody and without objection.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: It's longer than five minutes down there and back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, okay, okay.

Okay Commissioner Clark and then.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Before we take a break on 87 and 98 could we make one of them not green? And.

>> MR. MORGAN: I'll take care of that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any color.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Without objection we will recess for ten minutes.

And it's currently 11:07 a.m.

Let's plan on coming back at 11:20, so it will be a 13-minute break.

Thank you very much everyone.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 11:24 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
We will start with Doug Clark.

- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

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

Michigan.

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you we wrapped up with Commissioner Vallette and during the break Commissioner Vallette wanted to revisit her map then to Commissioner Wagner and we will let her look at her map again then we will move on to Commissioner Wagner.

- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: John, I wanted to look at 99.
- >> MR. MORGAN: Give me just a second, please.
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: What did he say? Of course.

Okay I wanted to put that Sparta area back in.

- >> MR. MORGAN: Okay go 99?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Then I wanted to put that one Township that between 87 and 98 into 87.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so that is Vergennes into 87?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Then 99 is over by a little bit, by quite a bit, 4500.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, Commissioner, Janice, what is the rationale behind the change?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: [Off mic]

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Your microphone.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Sorry, I think that it's more compact this way. And then as we go north, you know, it's not -- it won't be as chopped up.

And.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I'm still concerned about the Township we put in 87.

And it's relevance whether it's relevant to be in with the Townships that are around Grand Rapids area.

But your call.

Okay thanks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think if you took Oakfield out, Oakfield Township then the numbers would be okay then you can look at the whole thing.

I'm wondering are we seeing lines of the districts that we previously drew?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes, the blue lines are the districts that were previously drawn and the red lines are as well.

Let me turn off the red line for a moment.

All right, let me just adjust this a little bit.

Yeah so, the blue outline is a previously drawn District, so you would be looking at taking one Township and putting it in unassigned then this blue line plus the unassigned you might have to make a slight adjustment.

Oakfield, okay.

Okay so you are under 2% deviation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I guess start with Oakfield.

And let's grab everything left in that area above that District.

>> MR. MORGAN: You wanted Oakfield Township and Montcalm or something else?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, and probably those four Townships above 99 as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so since we are selecting by County let me try Montcalm and see if it's everything or, yeah, so that is what we expected. So that's 66,000.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: And Commissioner Lange if you would weigh in and let me know how this is going since you're up from that area.

>> MR. MORGAN: So without Tyrone Township which is 5,000 people you are right on the population.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: What do you think Commissioner Lange with Tyrone Township?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: How many are in Tyrone Township?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Looked like 5,000 something.

>> MR. MORGAN: 5,000.

Sorry I just clicked it in.

Hang on.

We will see.

Yeah, I think that was too much.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Would it go better with Branch above it?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It really has no choice but to go there the way they are drawn.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Right.

>> MR. MORGAN: It was too much for that District, but District 100 is right on the money on population.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Then I guess I would leave it there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a couple hands in the room, so we have Commissioner Weiss and then Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right Erin just to make it kind of simple and balance out you could take that Township and put it into 99, which I think would make it putting it where it has to go as far as population, whether it's a good fit I guess I can't say, I'm not familiar with the area.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Where is 99 in numbers, John?

>> MR. MORGAN: 99 is to the south so put 5,000 in 99, it would be over by a little bit, but you might be able to adjust this 3500 Township into 100 and then they would both balance out, I think.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Let's go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: Try that, okay, so one moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: John did you accidentally take two down to 99?

>> MR. MORGAN: No, I don't think so.

I took the one down here that was 3800.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

So now your 100 is over by 4,000 people and your 99 is under by 251.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: What is the Township right above 99 next to Tyrone? The one to your right.

>> MR. MORGAN: So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Solam, 6496 people.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I guess let's take that out and that will put us roughly.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Take it out of 100 and put it into 99?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, please not put it into 99.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Just take it out of 100.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want to go back and just take Tyrone out?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I like those numbers better but I don't know how well Tyrone goes with the Montcalm and everything.

Originally, I would leave Tyrone and tie it into the ones to the north.

So, yes, let's switch it back.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

And I really looked for Montcalm for COIs and someone correct me if the I'm wrong but I didn't find any.

I just know it's rural up there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: One suggestion may be to put is it Tyrone back in and take one of the northwestern Townships and 100 out, that is somewhere around 3,000 people.

Yeah, let's take a look at those populations.

So Tyrone was what 6,000 people.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 5,000.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 5,000 let's go a little further north.

And, yeah, let's see what.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Here son is 3,000.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Take out, Reynolds out and Tyrone and it would be a wash, and Pearson out and Tyrone in and you lose 2000 people.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I would just do the Tyrone for Reynolds.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is just an alternative you can think about.

>> MR. MORGAN: So Commissioner Wagner just leave it as is?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Rhonda, what do you think? I'm unfamiliar with Howard City.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Howard City is rural too.

I would just leave it at this point.

I think Tyrone could fit in with grant just fine.

Grant is a fairly rural area also.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Then I'm good.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions Department of State staff are saying they are good.

Thank you very much Commissioner Wagner.

We will move on to actually we have to move on to our questions.

So let's stop mapping for now.

And we are going to move on to new business which is 6A which is approve the Fink Bressack interview questions so everybody should have received those in their packet. And hold on.

I'm just going to who was going to present on the interview questions the head of the subcommittee that did this? Sue? Julianne drafted them so General Counsel without objections I'd like for you to present the interview questions.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If no objections.

Please proceed General Counsel.

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

Before the Commission are draft interview questions for local counsel.

There are six proposed questions.

Consistent with the past questions that have been promulgated, it's, again, time, the experience to service to the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. There is a question on objective nonpartisan advice which is also consistent through all the interview questions.

There is a specific question on working with litigation counsel.

And again the -- in the past I know for litigation counsel I believe the Commission had over ten questions that were very specific on how to handle certain redistricting topics. For local counsel, again, RFP was crafted to ensure that any of the candidates that came before the Commission would have the relevant experience in Michigan election law, Michigan Freedom of Information Act. Michigan Open Meetings Act.

And so that is why the questions are significantly fewer.

But as in the past, I welcome any questions about the questions.

And the Commission in the past has modified them, added to them, divided them up, so I await any further direction from the Commission.

And I did bring printed copies so again similar to litigation counsel interview, that way the individuals coming before you would be able to have a written copy before them to assist everybody in the process.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are there any questions or modifications to the proposed questions we have? All right General Counsel do we need to have a motion to adopt these questions or?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, in the past that has been how the Commission has operated.

And again if you would like to if the committee, I think generally in the past the committee divided up the questions between the members to present.

Or however the Commission wished to proceed at this time with this vendor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, if there are no proposed changes at this time, I would entertain a motion to adopt these local counsel interview questions draft dated September 27, 2021, motion by Witjes and second by Curry. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none, let's go ahead and vote all in favor of adopting the MICRC questions draft dated September 27, 2021, raise your hand and say aye. All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the draft questions are adopted.

Okay, that was quick and easy.

So let's go back to mapping.

So we have 20 more minutes to do mapping, so let's continue with mapping.

I was worried it would take longer and sometimes things don't take long.

So we will return to mapping with Commissioner Weiss.

Do we need a time out because we lost John?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Draw and he closed it up, so I can't get in it.

Oh, yeah.

I'm not getting into that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: If you have a minute here you might want to decide who is going to ask which questions.

Typically the committee members do that so through the Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say Steve was Chair.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Commissioner Curry and Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Witjes were all on the committee.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett do you want to divvy up your questions?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Doug do you want to take some of them too?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark do you want to take questions three and four?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which ones three and four?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What about five and six.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Juanita.

You okay with that Juanita? You want to take question five and six?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay all right that was easy.

So here comes -- at this point we will go back to mapping with Commissioner Weiss. And we have about 15 more minutes before our lunch break so let's see what we can accomplish.

What Juanita? Who is doing them? Commissioner Lett.

So Commissioner Lett is doing one and two, Doug will do three and four and you are going to do five and six.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay I brought the map back up.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right John do the blue square we had previously drawn, which is Newaygo and lake Townships or Counties, please.

The rest of those, yeah.

Put that altogether.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Leaving off the four that are to the right there at the top in lake.

>> MR. MORGAN: There is a good chance this one Township will probably balance.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That's what I'm thinking.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yep, so probably what happened this was not a complete District.

It may have been a partial District that was drawn at the time.

Because it's 27,000 light.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: All right, right to the left of 101 let's start taking some of them Townships from the bottom, yes, right there.

And working our way up.

>> MR. MORGAN: In Muskegon or Oceana.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: The cursor on those two.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Then we will just work our way up until we get close to our totals.

>> MR. MORGAN: So you want more of Muskegon groups?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Actually I would like to keep to the right and keep the lakeshore together hopefully.

So just take the next two or three up, take the one off that was just in there on the L.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay let me just back out and show you the populations.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay so I took back that one Township so you are 21,000.

But let's just look at the Counties for a moment.

Okay, so you need 21,000.

All of Oceana is 26 so if you take a portion of it you take almost all of it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm going crazy over here I'm looking at Wexford County. And I know that goes somewhat with lake County. And I actually did a sample draft map where it had all of Newaygo that part of Lake and Wexford County in it, made one District.

And that way it keeps the lakeshore whole.

You would have enough to actually do an entire lakeshore District with Oceana, Mason and Manistee and part of Benzie. That way you would get the whole lakeshore. This is an area where they had a lot of beach erosion, tourism, plus you have a lot of orchards within like the Mason County, Oceana County.

So just a suggestion.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Try that.

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to sort of layout the variables here, so all of Wexford would be too much with these two Townships.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Take those two off, yeah.

>> MR. MORGAN: I believe we can go back and adjust.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Is this what you were talking about Commissioner Lange? Thank you.

So looks like we are all set.

So let's put that in there.

See where we get to?

>> MR. MORGAN: So it will probably be too much so you can look at taking a few Townships off or something.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Go that route.

>> MR. MORGAN: It may be the original blue line.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Suggestions what to take off to the left or to the right?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Can we see what the population is?

>> MR. MORGAN: You need about 6,000 so that is 2733.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Looks like we should just take them all off.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: What was the population in the one Township that was left over on the bottom?

>> MR. MORGAN: It was 5,000.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Here.

So were you suggesting putting that like into 86 and taking one off of 86 or something like that? Because there is still open space here in Muskegon.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That is up to Commissioner Weiss. I just know when the three were added on my map, it came out to like 92,718, those three particular Counties; but it was without that little Section.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: How many is in that area right there?

>> MR. MORGAN: 5,000 and this other one here, that is big that is 10,000, 11,000.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Weiss that District is not far over it's 1.85% so I don't think that small amount is creating a huge issue.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I mean I'm kind of satisfied with the numbers. I mean obviously we had drawn part of that District before. So we've took into consideration all the communities of interest stuff so I'm assuming I like the number, so I guess I'm satisfied if anybody else has any better ideas, have at it. I can give you my eraser.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Department of State is good so Dustin we have five minutes left and you are known for very, very good, precise District. Do you want to do a precise District or wait until after the break?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We will do my best. And if it goes past five minutes, we will stop and pick up.

We are going to do the lakeshore.

>> MR. MORGAN: Starting in Muskegon. That will be considerable population so let's get that first.

>> MR. MORGAN: It's just orange and orange. Okay so that looks like about 18,000, a little more. There we go 24,000.

So that is almost equal to Oceana.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The entire County. All of Mason.

Yep, right there those four that is I believe where we drew it last time or close enough and we will see how close it gets us and call it a day. Communities of interest this would be the lakeshore communities we have been hearing so much about while we were in on our listening tour. And we are good on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Nicely done Commissioner Witjes that was a three-minute District.

That was amazing.

All right, hearing no objections, or without objection we will now recess for 60 minutes. Hearing no objections we will stand in recess until 1:00.

Thank you everybody.

[Lunch recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: For the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 1:05 p.m. will the secretary please call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair. Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please disclose your physical location as well. We will start with Doug Clark.

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: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

All right, without objection we will move to new business interview with Fink Bressack. Hearing no objection I'm inviting David Fink to make a brief presentation followed by questions.

Mr. Fink, please proceed.

>> MR. FINK: Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here and meet with all of you.

I can't tell you how impressed I am with your commitment.

I've watched some of your meetings online.

And yet you come back.

I have to say it is quite a commitment that you've made.

When they talk about public service this is public service with emphasis on the service and you deserve a great congratulations and thank you for that.

And that's not just me kissing ass.

I do that in Court.

I don't have to do that here, I hope.

I've always -- I've been interested in redistricting for a ridiculously long time.

I first learned about it in 1968 when I was a 15-year-old volunteer in a Congressional campaign, in the old 18th Congressional District back when Michigan had 19 Congressional districts.

That's some time ago.

And at that time I learned about some redistricting and was fascinated by the way that the frankly the partisan edges that people would get on what were otherwise apparently objectives criteria.

And I just found it fascinating.

So, again, thank you so much for giving us the opportunity to speak to you.

I will be brief because I notice that your questions which we were given, this is like being on jeopardy but somebody slipped us the questions in advance.

But we only got them just as we came in.

So I'm working on that.

But I think a lot of the things I was planning to say in the opening I'm probably going to address some of the questions there and if they do, I will just repeat myself because that is what I do.

No not really.

Okay, so we do a lot of different kinds of legal work and don't always get to pick we do.

The work comes to you.

You don't get to reach out and say I want to do that or I want to do that.

This is a unique opportunity and one that is exciting for us.

Because this is exactly what we want to do with our lives.

This is the reason we became lawyers.

My father was a doctor.

I didn't go into law to make a living.

I was the black sheep of the family.

I went into law because I really was fascinated by the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and obsessed with trying to find ways that we could make a positive difference in our careers whatever those may be.

I'm proud my son and delighted and lucky that my son decided to follow and join me.

So let me tell you about who we are.

And why we think it would be particularly we hope advantageous to the Commission to work with us.

We are a 100% Michigan law firm.

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

All of our employees are Michigan attorneys and we do work almost exclusively in Michigan.

We are brought into cases sometimes in other cases and we do some work in other states.

But the vast majority of our work is done here.

And we are litigation firm.

As those of you who and some of you are lawyers and have some experience with that and know, but there are a lot of different kinds of lawyers, not all lawyers litigate.

We litigate.

We don't provide counsel in most circumstances.

Exceptional circumstances where we have done a lot of, we have been involved for a long time and we know something specific or something valuable that we can offer.

We will clients will look to us for advice but for the most part clients look to us after the battle has started or know there is going to be a battle and want Gladiators and go to Court and fight for them for what they want whatever it might be.

For the goal they want to achieve.

And we built a litigation practice that focuses completely on what does the client want.

What is in the client's best interest.

Doesn't always mean taking a case all the way.

It doesn't always mean every case has to go all the way very often we will be halfway through the case and figure out a solution that can work for everybody.

And we want to do that.

Our goal is not to take everything to the finish line.

Our goal is to take it to our client's finish line whatever that might be.

So we are litigators.

We are very comfortable in the Michigan courts, in all of the courts in Michigan.

I'm sure there are some Counties we have not been in but we are in the circuit courts, we are in the Court of claims we are in the Court of Appeals we are in the Michigan Supreme Court.

And really all the courts and all the Federal courts in Michigan.

We will come back to that in a little bit in answer to some of the questions here so I won't repeat myself.

We also because of the nature of our practice and you've seen the response to the RFP so I think you know this already and that is our practice has been focused on Government representation and public issues for a long, long time.

It's not all we do.

But it's very important part of our practice.

When I graduated from law school, I made the decision that rather than to go to a big law firm in New York or a big law firm in Detroit I would try to find a way I could do something in the public interest in some kind of public service.

And for a series of odd reasons I won't bore you with I ended up going to the work of the law department for the City of Detroit in 1977.

I stayed there for a relatively short period.

And from then until today I have always with the exception of a short period when I was working for Governor Granholm, I always had some legal work for the City of Detroit.

And other municipalities Hamtramck and represented Wayne County of course.

And the issues that arise in that type of litigation, in those types of cases, in the cases of almost all been litigation work, whether that was representing the City of Detroit or Wayne County or any other public entity.

And the issues tend to be Michigan centric issues.

I noticed of course from the RFP Freedom of Information Act.

Open Meetings Act.

The Michigan Constitution.

We litigated questions of the statutory enactments that have or have not been proceeded consistent with the Michigan constitution.

We are one of the few law firms that has succeeded in having a Michigan statute invalidated in Federal Court because of all things of a violation of the title object clause.

Title object clause is something we have in the Michigan Constitution so comment you talk to people from other states you can prove you know something they never heard of. So there are a lot of Michigan specific things.

I did not mention this and should have and that is immunity, the way governmental immunity works in Michigan and that has gone through a long and tortured history to get to where we are today whether you are talking legislative enactments or various interpretations.

But we have litigated multiple issues involving governmental immunity which almost undoubtedly will come up in some of the cases we are dealing with.

By the way we also litigated against the very people you can anticipate well no you can be guaranteed will be coming back here.

Coming to you in Court.

They already have.

The case that was filed in the original case filed in the Michigan Supreme Court was file by an attorney drew Patterson who we litigated against more than once.

Frankly we have gotten sanctions against him.

Which are still being litigated.

But we know what he will do.

We know where he will come.

He had a case and I don't know if I mentioned in the RFP response, we had a case he was in Federal Court and couldn't use the Freedom of Information Act so instead he dredged up a theory that the state Constitution gives you a right to all books and

records and therefore the state Constitution gave him a right to bootstrap that into the Freedom of Information Act and to demand documents.

Now he had lost that in Federal Court.

But he brought it back again.

In front of the same Judge.

Who had already ruled against him on it.

But that's how you get sanctioned.

Anyway, so we've got experience but we also have another special experience and I realize I'm using a lot of time and I will go quickly and talk fast.

We do a tremendous amount of local counsel work.

Very few firms brag about that.

Very few firms will tell you we are local counsel.

But we are a small litigation firm.

We are very flexible.

And as a result we have worked with countless firms around the country who have litigation in Michigan and sometimes we serve a classic legal counsel role where they used to say you were just a bag carrier because you would show up and stand next to the national counsel it's not that way anymore.

We have circumstances where we are local counsel and somebody else does the strategy and files and does most of the work and we do the final filing of something.

Most of what we do though is more intense than that.

We are dealing with local counsel and giving real advice to these firms that don't practice in Michigan regularly. We let them know how to deal with the special circumstances in the various courts and we help them with whatever it is their client needs and they need in the most cost effective manner.

So I don't know of any firm I think that has is as both a strong independent firm but also does as much outside counsel work as we have done and as we continue to do.

Finally, I would say this, while we are a relatively small firm with six, six lawyers, we are very flexible and able to Marshall our resources quickly for major litigation.

Best example, you've all heard about because it's all over our response, and got a little bit of press, we were the litigators who handled all of the City of Detroit election litigation.

Starting in November of 2020.

And we went from 0 involvement in that case to handling nine different cases in as many courts in literally a matter of a couple of weeks.

Never missed a beat.

On time.

We got the things done we needed to get done.

And we got good results and we got good feedback from what we had done.

Now, in that case, in those election cases during that short period of time the few weeks, some of it is still continuing with sanctions but most of it ended in early January we were in circuit Court, Court of claims, Michigan Court of Appeals, Michigan Supreme Court, Western District of Michigan Federal Court, eastern District of Michigan Federal Court, six circuit Court of Appeals one short trip to the Federal circuit because somebody filed something wrong and two petitions for writs of certain in the United States Supreme Court and we responded to each and every one of those things and did it in a timely and effective way by finding by Marshalling our resources and yes we worked a little more than 40 hours a week during that time but were efficient and got the job done.

So I think we can respond to what you need but the most important thing I should have said at the outset and will say now I don't know what you need, you will have to decide that.

As this goes forward, you will let us know what role you want us to play.

It's easy for me to say that I think I can we can do some things better than national counsel.

But we are not competing with national counsel.

We are working with national counsel.

We will help them be more efficient for you and in some instances, you may decide it makes sense for us to do some things with or without their involvement.

Obviously, they would have to have knowledge of what we are doing but a judgment call you can make.

Shall we come to the questions?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett do you want to lead the questions?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sure.

We always try to Judge the people we interview if they know how to turn the mic on.

>> That is why I brought my son my partner Nate.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So how -- you probably have answered most of this quite frankly, I think you answered all of them quite frankly.

How will your experience help us in state and Federal courts?

>> I did not address it quite directly and I'm glad that is a good question.

The advantage you have with a firm like ours is we've been in all these courtrooms.

We probably have been in front of every Judge we are going to end up being that any case is going to come in front of.

And what you learn when you practice, not just in Michigan in any state is what you learn is there are local rules, some of which you can just read online but there are also local traditions, local procedures practices of the Judges that you need to know the Judges.

And there are no judges that we can anticipate being in front of that we won't have some kind of knowledge of the way that they run their courtrooms.

What they want.

And it's not right and wrong.

It's just different from one Judge to another.

Now you can ask other people, if you go to a Court and you don't know what's going on you can ask somebody.

But the actual experience of having been there is so much more valuable and so much more likely to help.

So we can help Baker and Hostetler if something is assigned and judges in eastern District of Michigan have procedures dramatically different and certain types of requests made, we don't worry about filing, we file a response but we know how the Judge is going to handle it.

Then there are other circumstances is made and they say that is nonsense and no, no, that Judge will do that.

So we can be very helpful that way.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That really goes into the second question was if you are selected to serve as local counsel how will that benefit us? I think you've really answered that unless you have something else to add to it.

>> Not really the question as I heard it initially it relates to public sector clients and that really is a distinction between people who represent private clients, people who represent public sector clients.

There is very specific defenses and issues that arrive with public sector clients that don't arrive with the private sector clients and that is you are a public sector client and that will apply.

Also there are plenty of lawyers who don't know how to represent a board, who don't know how to represent a Commission because they are used to one person gives advice and tells them what to do.

We have been in politics with a small P but my politics have a capital P also but politics with a small P there is responsibilities to everyone on the Commission.

There is responsibilities and you have to know when it is appropriate and when it's not appropriate to walk the tightrope.

I would add this our experience representing private clients also makes a difference because we are not just a firm that is only represented one municipality or another.

We have represented large we have represented New York stock exchange companies and represented medium sized companies and represented individual businesspeople and there is a lot of different types of litigation and some could come up here.

The most valuable experience we have had is with the public sector.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And this setting pursuant to the Constitutional amendment Michigan Supreme Court has original jurisdiction.

How do you see that working since evidently there aren't have many rules or procedures for this process?

>> Well let me give you a two-part answer to that.

First, I don't know.

Second, the Supreme Court as you know has said they are going to make rules.

It might have been nice if that happened a few weeks ago but the Supreme Court has said they will make rules because they realized when they saw the case and maybe they realized it before, I don't want to be unfair because I have a lot of respect and tremendous respect for this Supreme Court.

There have been some courts in the past where some of the Judges were rather more political than legal.

This is a terrific deliberative body we have in Lansing today.

And they realized that there are some gaps.

There are always going to be gaps in any kind of legislation.

But when you have this type of voter approved legislation, there are certain to be gaps and there is a gig gap so I don't know.

I will tell you this, in the Trump I call it the Trump election litigation, we did have to deal with an attempt to bring an original case in the Supreme Court.

I mean we know how that works because it's possible it can be done.

But they don't have any rules yet.

For what to do here.

So we're going to follow that closely.

And by the way we are going to stay in touch with the clerks up there assuming we get this work and checking in regularly because their job is not to confuse you.

They are not playing games up there.

They want a rationale consistent process that makes sense so you can talk to the clerks and the case managers and they will tell you what to do, they will tell us what to do I should say.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Doug?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: [Off mic]

Welcome gentleman.

It's great to have you with us this afternoon.

I've got to questions for you.

First one is without providing confidential details please share both the challenge and a success from a past local counsel relationship.

>> MR FINK: I'm hesitating because I'm trying to deal with a confidential issue and make sure that I don't divulge anything wrong.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We don't want you to.

>> MR FINK: Very recently, we had some success with a very much local counsel-type position.

It was a trademark infringement case.

A lawyer who we did not know from New York contacted us.

He had a case pending in front of a Judge in eastern District of Michigan.

He needed to defend that case.

He asked us for guidance.

We talked to him.

I happened to be in New York for a wedding.

A few days after he had they retained us.

I called him and I said hey let's get together.

We will sit down and talk about the case.

And he said no, that is not really how I see your role.

I said, okay, let's not get together.

And instead what happened there was we gave him advice.

We told him how to deal with the Court, how to communicate with the Court.

We helped with his pleadings because there are a lot of ins and outs when you deal with the actual filing of things and thank God somebody younger than me knows how to do it at all hours of the day and night and just yesterday, we got a very, very good result for the client.

In which the District Judge ruled in his favor.

And I was never in that courtroom.

I'm not sure he was either I think it was all done on the pleadings but that is your classic local counsel.

There is another situation with local counsel where some of you may be aware of and have been aware of the auto parts antitrust litigation, price fixing.

There was a massive price fixing conspiracy.

I can say that because dozens of people plead guilty to Federal charges of price fixing involving auto parts.

And it gave rise to the largest investigation in the history of the United States justice department of antitrust in over 3 billion in fines but it also gave rise to massive civil litigation.

Class actions.

In that case we were called and asked if we could be local counsel for a group of four law firms from around the country who were bringing actions.

We said sure we would be happy to carry their bags for them and do what they wanted.

In the end I think it's fair to say if you asked anybody involved in that litigation, we became essentially coequal partners with the other firms.

They were the first among equals but that litigation lasted from 2011 until today some of it is still pending.

But very I'm not sure a day goes by we don't file something in that case.

Working closely with them.

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

So we have had tremendous experience and good fortune as local counsel in various different roles.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you the second question I have the public must have a high level of trust and confidence in your firm to provide objective nonpartisan advice to our organization.

How can you provide that assurance?

>> MR FINK: At one level I'm probably the last person to ask because of course I'm going to tell you I'm going to give you the best possible advice.

No, I'm going to come here and tell you I'm going to give you bad advice but you really should hire.

But I can tell you first of all we did provide some references to a few clients that we have who are in varying different roles.

The best way I could describe or talk about it is my job, our job is to provide accurate, not partisan, accurate advice.

Because whether you win or lose in your litigation, you set the policy.

I don't set the policy.

You set the policy for what you have done.

Whether you win or lose in that litigation doesn't determine, is not based on whether you are red or blue.

Whether you are republican or a democrat it's based on the law.

And we need to be able and we are able I believe to be objective about the law and objective about who the Judges are.

Some courts you will find a slightly different twist.

But my job is to win for you.

Now when I say that winning isn't always going forward.

I could say yeah you are going to win, but it's going to be a pure victory and end up losing later and we will give you that kind of advice.

We have to be very objective.

Think about it if you are and I'm sure you have thought about it even if you were partisan and I was partisan the last thing you want from me is partisan advice.

Because lots of people will tell you what they want the facts to be or what they wish the law was.

That won't get you anywhere.

I'll tell you what we have seen the facts are.

What we seen the law is.

And what we don't know.

Because in this area if somebody tells you know contractually what the Supreme Court is going to do with this case you don't want them because they don't know what they are talking about.

Because the Supreme Court doesn't know what it wants to do with the case until the facts are developed and somebody comes to them.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

We are a nonpartisan group.

100%.

We very seldom discuss republican, democrat or whatever.

And our expectation is that the people that work for us as consultants, as attorneys provide that same attitude towards that.

So thank you.

We've got two more questions and Commissioner Curry is going to ask those.

>> MR FINK: I'm glad to hear the last comment you made because this is what this is a about. And why it's on the ballot citizens not politicians. That is what it's about. And I don't mean to speak for the actual politics of it.

But that is what this is about.

If you become a partisan body that by one vote makes some decisions, shame on all of us and it's a loss to the state we will never get back.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Already I'd like to say good afternoon and we welcome you here.

My name is Juanita Curry.

One of the Commissioners.

And my question to you is: How would you view the local counsel's role when working with litigation counsels retained by the MICRC?

>> MR FINK: Thank you Commissioner.

I appreciate the question and I hesitate, well, I've been candidate all day I guess I will continue to be candidate.

I view our role as very expansive but you have to decide what our role is.

I don't decide what our role is.

We can just do whatever it is that Baker Hostetler needs.

They want us to file a pleading in the middle of the night we can file a pleading in the middle of the night or show up in Court when they can't do it.

But I hope the role is more expansive in a few ways and I mentioned before there are some Michigan specific laws and Michigan specific issues that it just makes no sense to me to not use a Michigan law firm with experience in the area to address those issues.

You don't just read it on a sheet of paper, know what the law is.

These things there are all kinds of nuisances some of them are strange.

I won't take your time with them but some nuisances go back to people in the Attorney General's Office 45 years ago and what their opinions were.

But you know that practicing for a long time in Michigan.

That is one.

Number two I see a lot of ways that this can be handled more efficiently for you.

Depending on what gets filed.

If it's a single case in the Supreme Court with a single global issue about the what was passed you know the ballot proposal, if it's that simple, okay, maybe it can all be done out of Washington D.C. by a lawyer who sits and studies.

But I don't think that's what it's going to be.

I think you will be multiple courts.

I think you will have multiple kinds of challenges.

And I actually believe that some of those challenges, you or your Executive Director and your counsel may well decide that certain challenges can best be handled by local counsel.

Not by national counsel.

And we will keep them informed of what we are doing but I think there are certainly circumstances where somebody is going to say you do it.

Now, while that is my view, I don't make that decision.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I would like to ask a question about something you said you said you see us being in front of multiple courts but the Michigan Supreme Court has original jurisdiction over us, doesn't that mean every case goes before only them?

>> MR FINK: If only life were like that.

You are correct.

You read it correctly.

But I'm prepared to bet some part of the cost of my granddaughter's college education that there will be at least one Federal case filed.

The legislation can say you've got to come here.

The Court can say you got to come here but that is state Court.

somebody is going to argue.

There is no reason for it.

I have though reason to think anything wrong has happened but I think it's you have every reason to believe that there will be a lot of choices.

And I will go to the Trump litigation only because when I say Trump, Trump election not about Trump but election.

I go to the post Biden Trump election litigation.

Here is what we saw.

First the case was filed in the Court of claims.

Court of claims made a decision saying they should have added and included the City of Detroit as a Defendant.

The next cases were filed by different people in first in Wayne County circuit Court.

Then cases filed in the Western District of Michigan.

Somebody apparently thought they would get a Judge they wanted to get but they didn't get the Judge they wanted to get and won't go in details and it's clear they did not so they dismissed the case and filed a new case in the eastern District of Michigan and filed a new case of original jurisdiction in the state Supreme Court.

Meanwhile two cases get filed in the United States Supreme Court.

So the shorter answer to your question is: No.

I'm pretty certain that there will be cases filed in more than one Court but if they are not congratulations, you will save a lot of money and I'll find another way to fund my granddaughter's education.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you I'm obviously not a lawyer so all the lawyers laughed at me but that is okay I did not understand.

>> MR FINK: To be clear we were not laughing at you because we are laughing at the circumstances because if you don't laugh you will cry.

It was a good question.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You asked the question for me so thank you for asking it.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Are there any more questions from the Commissioners? Okay my next question to you first of all can you identify your name for me, please.

>> MR FINK: I'm sorry I thought everybody knew me.
I'm David Fink, FINK, and with me at the table is.

>> Nate Fink.

>> MR FINK: Not just my son but my law partner and practiced long enough he can get along without me but thank God he doesn't.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay I just wanted to hear you pronounce your name. Okay my last question to you is could you please identify how our General Counsel and your firm can work together to reduce costs and minimize potential redundancy?

>> MR: FINK: A good question why are you bringing in another litigation firm, you got a litigation firm.

And the answer is working with your General Counsel and your Executive Director, this is a balancing act in which multiple counsel can actually save you money but only if you're hands on and careful about it.

Because as I said earlier, I give you a great example.

Let's say they're in Federal Court, I know hopefully they won't be but let's say there is a case that is brought in Federal Court.

And the Federal Judge wants to have a quick status conference.

Well, you could pay somebody from Baker Hostetler to fly into Michigan, stay overnight, spend a full day or assuming we are not doing it by Zoom, we can be in and out of that Court in an hour.

So the actual concrete savings can be very, very significant.

Now, you don't want to be penny wise and pound foolish you don't say hey you do every other motion and we will do every other motion.

It's got to be done efficiently.

But another good example is if something is filed that we've seen before, and we have, an awful lot of these things and we've argued whether it's in the state Supreme Court or elsewhere, we will be able to help you even if all that happens is Baker Hostetler says show us what you filed and we will work we will take it from there.

But we can show them things that can make them help them be more efficient.

And my experience generally with national counsel, I have not worked with Baker Hostetler but they have a good reputation and my experience has been that national counsel likes to take advantage of a positive opportunity to do something more efficiently, to show the client, I can say we will only do what you want us to do because we are here to serve you.

Any good law firm has got to say that.

They need to be doing that so Baker Hostetler should see opportunities and say here is something let's have Fink Bressack do it.

And if we are reading every pleading they are reading and sitting in our separate corners and each learning things if I start to see that kind of duplication and redundancy, I will discuss it with your General Counsel and Executive Director to make sure we are not the problem.

We came too far to try to be part of this solution.

I don't want this to be the point at which people say well, those Fink guys used to be really good for public but now they came along and ripped off the Redistricting Commission to make a few bucks.

That's not healthy.

It's not good and it's not our future.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, that's all of my questions.

I suppose any want to piggyback on the question?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional questions? Commissioner Lett did you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm going to give Mr. Fink in the second Chair an opportunity to address the Commission.

>> NATE FINK: Thank you Commissioner Lett.

I appreciate the opportunity.

I echo pretty much everything my dad said and if you give us the opportunity, I think the Commission's work has been outstanding thus far and it would be a tremendous honor to be able to represent you.

And if we need to go to Court, as my dad said, I do want to say I personally as the other attorneys in our office have extensive experience in the state and Federal courts and as I said it would be an honor to be able to represent you.

And I'm happy to take any additional questions.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

I have nothing further.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you, Mr. Fink.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, if we have no additional questions, Mr. Fink and Mr. Fink we would thank you for your time and coming to speak to us.

And we really appreciate having you come here today and I think at this point we will excuse you so that we can deliberate.

>> MR FINK: Thank you very much.

Do you want us to sit by the door.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: If you sit and stare it would provide some comic relief for us.

No, you don't need to wait.

You are certainly welcome to wait if you choose to but you don't need to.

>> I didn't hear what you said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You don't need to wait in the hallway.

>> We could have our family out there like American Idol.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> We are going to Hollywood.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: State phone or regular phone.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sue?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Juanita's microphone is still on.

Okay, all right, thoughts, comments, questions? Commissioner Clark?

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

Since they are going to be working with Baker Hostetler have you had conversations with Baker Hostetler relative to this law firm and their working relationship they need to have with local counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Clark, that's an excellent question.

No, I have not spoken to Baker Hostetler.

Their contract is executed but we are still finalizing the engagement letter.

I have another meeting with them tomorrow with the procurement staff just as I indicated to Mr. Fink and Mr. Fink that they would be hearing from the procurement office in regard to next steps, not directly from anyone on the MICRC.

So no I have not had that direct conversation.

But what I will say is again we can't anticipate what is coming our way or what or where it will happen or what it will look like.

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.

But certainly a team of with local counsel and litigation counsel particularly since no one on the litigation counsel key personnel is licensed in Michigan is a critical piece of your legal team puzzle as I see it.

Does that respond to your concern?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, yeah, it does to a part.

I would expect Baker Hostetler to give a thumbs up to it before we hired somebody.

I know we are the ones hiring, but they are the ones that have to work with them.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Clark I would not recommend that at all.

This is a Commission discussion.

The Commission put out an RFP for what specific skills it was looking for relative to local counsel.

Again, these were all professionals.

As an attorney we are protecting our licenses.

So with everything we do.

And no I would foresee no problem or no challenge whatsoever in a professional working relationship between those firms at all.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I believe this question is to attorney Julianne.

Or General Counsel.

I'm just curious, do we have a limit for this particular litigation these attorneys? Or can they just set their own price with no limit? I'd like to know how that goes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That's an excellent question, Commissioner Curry.

So the pricing schedule was part of their RFP response.

I'm pulling that up so I don't misquote anything which would be a terrible thing to do.

The pricing range for and it's an hourly rate, again, as the Commission is unable to determine what the needs will be moving forward for local counsel and for litigation counsel quite frankly, the range, the hourly rate ranges from \$290 an hour for an associate to \$480 an hour for a managing partner.

And the middle tier is \$380 an hour and the contract is not to exceed \$250,000 inclusive of travel.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: So with that last remark, then we are kind of limited to what kind of services we are getting.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Curry.

No, I would not see it as a limitation.

I think the way that the Commission has approached this is that for budgeting purposes the original contract amount is \$250,000.

If there is little need for local counsel, then that would be reflected in their billing statements and invoices, which I review and approve and forward on to the Executive Director for payment.

As with Mr. Adelson's invoices.

So all of that is verified.

If there was significant need for local counsel, then and it would the contract amount would need to have funds added to it potentially or something like that so I would not see it as a restriction to the Commission at all.

It's more of a reasonable original contract amount.

Again with the unknowns of not knowing what is in the future.

And I should note that both Mr. Adelson's contract as well as Baker Hostetler's have not to exceed limits associated with them.

So they are not open ended as to funding.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay, one more question.

Before I lose my thought.

Are we getting the best of the \$250,000 range? Or are we are there bet -- better people out there that charge a little bit more?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Curry, certainly the Commission let an RFP and received responses to that RFP.

I'm not going to give any personal opinions.

But it's for the Commission to decide the responsiveness of the firm that presented today to the Commission in regard to what the RFP requested.

Which again was based on the identified needs of the Commission.

So that would be a decision for the Commission to make.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Well you know he said that sometimes this litigation goes on four years.

And I was just wondering how did that really work on the inside with the Commissioners. Do we keep them, I guess we would have to keep them for years.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Well certainly through the Chair to Commissioner Curry, again, certainly the Commission has the ability to modify contractual relationships for a variety of reasons.

I would also highlight that the Commissioners' terms of service are up either when the maps are adopted or the conclusion of litigation.

So the Commission will be here right with your litigation counsel and potentially your local counsel.

Mr. Adelson is laughing because he anticipates being gone by then.

But certainly, the Commissioners will also be still serving as Commissioners in that capacity until the conclusion of any litigation.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you counsel woman.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I have a question.

But first Julianne could you reexplain to us, clarify for us I know you've already told us this once but your role as General Counsel with all the other legal counsel that we will be working with on our behalf.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly, through the Chair to Commissioner Orton, your question on the courts was also an excellent question.

And this is another excellent question.

So the Commission hired me as the General Counsel with a specific you were looking for specific skills and responsibilities in that posting.

And so my job is to be responsive to the Commission, to protect the Commission and to coordinate your legal team, which also represents the Commission and has the Commission's best interests.

Again, as a focus.

So my role is to in working and receiving direction from the Commission coordinating your legal services.

Is it something that would make more sense for Fink Bressack the venter who presented today I thought the example that Mr. Fink provided was very useful or is it truly something that Baker Hostetler would require their involvement.

And again we wouldn't know the answers to those questions until we are presented with a question.

And I think one key thing for my role is those relationships and building those relationships and having those open communications, not only between your legal team but serving as that point of contact between your legal team and the Commission itself.

So that we are making sure that there is no miscommunication among the legal team.

And no misinterpretation of what the Commission's goals are and what their objectives are and certainly designing the best legal strategy in which to achieve those goals.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you I appreciate that clarification.

So my real question then, if I can ask you, you may not want to answer but considering all that, do you feel confident that you could work with them? Or that this law firm would be a good fit for the Commission?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So through the Chair to Commissioner Orton similar to my response to Commissioner Curry I leave those decisions up to the Commission. Certainly they responded to the RFP.

And the Commission has all that information in front of them.

And I can assure you that I can work with just as I said with any other time you directed that question at me in regard to any staffing or hiring decisions.

I look forward to working with whomever the Commission selects through that process.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes and then Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, so given the advice of our counsel that we have that we need a local counsel and that we did the RFP and being on the committee

that reviewed the three RFP and now reviewing Fink Bressack I want to put a motion forward we adopt them as counsel.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion to retain Fink Bressack and actually to approve resolution 20210906 extend local counsel contract.

Do we have a second? Commissioner Rothhorn has seconded.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Commissioner Curry, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm trying to let this sink in a few minutes before I make a decision because he was talking stuff that I would probably talk.

And I really didn't grasp a whole lot of good information from him.

So I'm trying to let whatever he said sink in a little bit more before I make my decision.

But of course I can be overruled.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay any other comments? Or discussion? So I personally as an attorney liked them.

I think they are competent.

I think we do need to have local counsel.

Because the simple reality is Baker Hostetler being outside counsel, outside the state there are going to be situations where number one it doesn't make sense to pay them to do things like respond to FOIA requests.

Number two I anticipate we are going to be receiving injunction requests if any litigation that we get and we need someone boots on the ground here who can get in quickly and respond to that and that requires local counsel.

Third point is that our General Counsel is in more of a role to manage the different attorneys we have on the outside.

And we certainly could choose to not have local counsel but then that means she needs to do all that.

And I think that Julianne has more important things she needs to work on than responding to FOIA requests and responding to injunctions so I think she really needs given what we are expecting in terms of an on slot of litigation I think she is going to need that as cyst answer because she is one person, she can't do everything by herself.

I'm strongly in favor of hiring them.

I think their reputation is very good in the legal community.

They have the Government experience.

They are litigators.

Which is what we need.

We need litigation counsel.

We don't need contract counsel like me.

So we do need litigators and I think it would be a good hire for us and I'm strongly in favor of it.

Steve what do you think? Juanita wants to know your opinion as another lawyer.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well, a good attorney knows the facts and the law.

A great attorney knows the Judge.

These guys know the Judges.

It's a little facetious but it's true.

What they said.

We know the local courts.

We know the local judges.

We know the unwritten local rules.

And that would be of great assistance to Hostetler.

So I didn't hear anything that they said that would cause me any concern.

So I'm certainly in favor of extending an offer to them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange you had your hand up then it came down did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, I probably have an unpopular comment. I personally didn't care for them.

I think he had a great personality.

He definitely talked like he knows the law and stuff.

But I don't like how within an interview he almost berated other attorneys.

And made comments about Supreme Court justices.

I just find that I mean those are his personal opinions.

And everybody is entitled to their personal opinions.

But that really put me off.

So I just I think especially sitting in an interview-type situation I didn't care for it.

And those are just my personal thoughts though.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lange. Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I definitely think we need local counsel. I don't question that at all.

And litigators as part of that.

However, I saw a difference with Baker Hostetler and this legal firm.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Clark I apologize for the interruption can you maintain agent 8" between you and the microphone?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Step back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's creating feedback.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: The one thing I saw that I didn't feel comfortable with, I thought there was a difference between the two law firms.

Professionalism.

He was more jovial.

And so forth.

And Baker Hostetler is to the facts.

Well prepared.

Well prepared.

And that puts a question in my mind is this the right counsel to get? So I you'll back.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Dustin, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, I personally liked the fact they came off as personable.

I feel like one Baker Hostetler is a DC firm so I expect them to be a little more professional but especially father-son firm like this coming to us, acting and speaking the way they did.

I have though problem with it.

That seems more, I don't know, in line with the people that I like to see in a lawyerish typesetting.

Secondly, given the how we have done this in the past with all hires, I do request a roll call vote on this as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, I guess I was at a disadvantage because I never heard the first one due to my absence I imagine.

But I wished I had of heard the first ones because you all have such high regards for them.

But that's why it's so important to talk to these lawyers around here, to see who they would really select.

Because they are lawyers.

But that's all I have to say on that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so at this point I forgot who made the motion.

Dustin Witjes, you made the motion who seconded Commissioner Rothhorn we have a motion on the table by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn to approve resolution 20210906 to extent the local counsel contract.

We are going to take a vote and I'm requesting a roll call vote from the Department of State staff.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please say "Yes" or "No" to indicate your support of the motion.

I will call on Commissioners' names in alphabetical order starting with Commissioner Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC hot around?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I'm sorry Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I would say yes contingent on these brilliant lawyers we have with us.

[Laughter]

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 8 yes to 3 no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: One second.

Just let me check something.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair the requirements set forth in subsection 12 of the Constitution are filled by the vote.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I was just checking and I thought it was.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I read your mind.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right also wow I'm getting feedback.

That better? All right well I'm hearing an echo and I'm going to proceed with the echo. So the ayes prevail the motion is adopted and so I will leave it to our General Counsel to proceed with setting that contract up to the appropriate step.

At this point we will return back to mapping.

So let me see my list.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I was.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was muted.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: The microphone but not the speakers.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that better? All right, so we're going to return to mapping.

We were still reconciling the District maps.

I believe, if I'm remembering correctly, we are with Commissioner Clark. And you will direct Mr. Stigall about where to draw the lines so if you could bring up that map that would be very appreciated.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: While he is bringing up the map let me explain what I'm going to do.

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

We are moving ourselves up in the Mitten.

And what I want to do is allow us more flexibility to be able to add and subtract districts and Townships and whatever.

So I'm going to start in the U P and come down.

That gives us the flexibility to make adjustments going north or going south if we need to.

So I think it's more flexible P a pressure.

So I'm going to start with the UP.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay I just highlighted the area that has yet to be assigned. So everybody could just kind of see what you got left on the table.

I'm going to start up in the very top.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Was that 725,000, is that right? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 725,573, 7.92 so almost 8.

I had 9 here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 7.9. So almost 8 districts. 7.92.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: But this here has nine.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So I like the fact you're going to be starting in the UP. It is possible, I just can't remember how, but it is possible to draw three districts in the UP that encompass the entirety of the UP that does not go down into the Lower Peninsula.

I don't know if we want to spend some time trying to explore that option.

But just know that it is possible to do so.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Here is what I was suggesting.

I think we had this subject yesterday about adjustments.

We will do this, get a map in place and then have that as an alternative map.

You good with that Dustin? Okay, so if you don't mind, I'd just like to handle the whole UP because we have gone through this before.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Stigall? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The reason I summed it up 7.92 districts then we take 8 divide it into the 725, 573 and leaves each District would need to be 90,696.

To use up all the population there.

So kind of keep that in mind.

Because the plans that y'all drew previously if you look that one little County, all this area was moved over into 60.

That's why it's 7.92.

And not -- it's 8 rather than 9.

Does that make sense?

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

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It does can you repeat that target then is 90,696.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 696.

I don't want to get up to the UP and.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Could you repeat the numbers.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 90,696.

You have 8 districts left to draw.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 103-110. You have 8 Districts, divided into 725,573, leaves you 9696. It can go up and down, but that is the new target.

Is that the right word?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, that is why I wanted to start up north and come down to give us flexibility in adjusting if we have to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Want to start at 110 and come down?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Start in the northwest corner.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do we want to start at digit 110 or 103.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I would start at 110.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, that is fine.

It doesn't matter.

We've done these districts before so it's going to be a matter of sense checking them, I believe.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, so are I'm ready when you are.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Clark did you hear him.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He is ready when you are.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He is ready.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Farthest northwest District.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Assign these and start drawing?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I want to be clear.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He is what? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we can start with 110 up at the UP if that is what you were waiting for.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: He was just waiting for him to tell him when to start drawing.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now I'm going to change to Townships to get part of this County.

That District is 90,788.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay could you scroll up to make sure we got it?

Good.

Yeah, I'm good with that.

Do you want me to continue on with the UP? Since.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's do the next District that we had done previously.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 109.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

That will be 109.

Okay for the moment we will leave that as is.

Steve?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Can we go up to the area between 110 and 109, the little jagged area? When I did Zoom meetings up in those areas, it was very clear that the Townships did not want to be split.

And I would like to see if we have done that anywhere.

Since we have some extra people to work with, we could adjust them if we can.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't think we have split, we did split some Townships, yes.

We didn't split any precincts.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My recollection is the people on the east side of that Bay there had to drive around the Bay to be able to vote.

That was one of the comments I remember.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: There was one area that wanted to be back with Marquette rather than over with Baraga or maybe it was Baraga didn't want to be there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was the western community wanted to be with Marquette. I can't remember the exact name of the community what is immediately western to Marquette wanted to be with Marquette.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And Kent maybe you were just selecting Townships you didn't use precincts when you were selecting those? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We split Counties but we did not split any Townships.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay we can come back and adjust some of these the question need to.

Let's do the next one.

I think we are in good shape so far.

If we have to make some adjustments we will.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So we will have to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't want to include that there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't understand that is in the water.

Is there an island in there? Any way we will figure it out when we get there.

There is an island there so I think we have to get water a block to get that if I remember correctly.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let's get that because there is an island out there as well.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: To get it broke up correctly we got to do blocks.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: These are little census blocks we have to pick up pretty much individually.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm pretty sure they are water, parts of the Bay and river.

But they will show up as unassigned space when you do your analysis at the end.

Okay that seems to be for the most part.

We may have some show up.

There is some more.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, there is a couple more.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Has to be done at some point.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let's Zoom out and see where we are at.

Okay so let's get the next one.

And this one will be significant because it goes down into the Mitten.

Did that one go down the Mitten or not or one start at the other end of the bridge? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Need to Zoom in here these little islands and pieces.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Include those.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Individually.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe that goes down in the Mitten on the western shore.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I need to assign all this area to make it a finished plan.

It takes just a few minutes.

I have to go into the block level.

To get it done or it won't get done.

I'm going to leave these pieces unassigned I'm good with it and when you complete the plan go through it all at one time rather than holding everything up.

Would that work better.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It will be tedious getting the islands and water blocks.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: 107 goes down into the, yes, in the Mitten, top of the Mitten.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark this is where we had our General Counsel is actually sort of making sure we have the bridge included.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I know we agreed but I'm thinking how narrow that connection is and that it may be worth just sort of adding that other triangle on the other side.

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: Assign this and Zoom in, in this area.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Assign that to 107, yeah.

And I don't believe the other District goes up north, does it? The one on the other side of the bridge?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It does.

The eastern.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which side of the bridge?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I think if you Zoom in, Kent, I think we did determine that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, it did.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right where we are barely getting it but that is the idea it's so narrow that it may be worth trying to get Mackinaw City or just adding that Township of Mackinaw City and Mackinac.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So that is a separate District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: To add it to 107.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Add to 107.

See where we are at in 107, we are right in the ballpark.

I don't think we should go down that far.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I don't want to split a Township up just to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No I don't either.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is the Mackinac Township.

Is this what y'all are speaking to?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, you got it.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let's include it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put that in 107?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, we will see what happens.

So it's only what 500 people? Okay, so let's take a look at the numbers for 107-110.

Just the raw total population numbers at first.

So 1,000, we are about 2000 down.

Yeah.

Yeah, we are about 2000 short.

But I think that is okay.

Anyway the reason I wanted to do this is so that when we got down into the top of the Mitten, we have some flexibility if we needed to start shifting some of the Townships around.

So I want to leave it like this and then we can move forward.

Yeah, that should be part of 107, Kent, and that water.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This little water block go into 107, right?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

Any questions? Good, okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

Commissioner Lett, did you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Are we I know we talked about the area up around Marquette where the people wanted to be included with the Marquette, did we get them taken care of?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That is a, yes?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

All right, Commissioner Curry took a break.

Okay, all right, we will move on to Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are really quiet Rhonda.

Can you speak up a bit.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, that's better.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I will use my loud voice.

Let's go under 107 or actually, sorry, right next to 107 let's pick up that.

Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That area Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That will be 106.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Go ahead and assign it to 106, yes, please.

Take the next one next to it.

I don't have the County up there.

So I apologize.

Just keep working your way up the Alpena area on the shoreline.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This pink boundary is the boundary of districts y'all drove and created in the past.

Do you want to include everything inside that District?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Thank you.

And this is the continuing to finish up the District that has been previously drawn.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, those four Townships right there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 106 as drawn is at 90,875.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay when I drew, I know when I did number 60, District 60 I took some out of what was already drawn.

Can we highlight that and just kind of see what the number is for that? How much it's going to be effected.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 60, 60 is right here.

It's 3.3% or 3,000 or 3.3% under ideal.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, okay, if anybody else wants to hit the next one I won't take multiple turns.

I was just curious because I know I cut what was drawn in a previous map short by adding to 60.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I would say just keep going with the next District, Commissioner Lange.

I mean we are letting people do multiple districts because we are kind of following old maps so feel free if you want to do the next area and it's your area so you know how to balance it best.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Can you start taking what is left of the previously done District and fill that in as 105.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This area I'm moving the cursor in?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, ma'am.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Then pick up Missaukee Township and the parts of Wexford County that are unassigned.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So this District is 26,000 short.

Which one of these Counties did you say to assign?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Missaukee.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Missaukee.

Now it's 11,000 over the target deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay and the four Townships of Wexford County that are unassigned so to the west those four Townships.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Those four right here?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Correct.

Okay so I have to go into the next top one, those two Townships for Springfield and Garfield.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Springfield and Garfield.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So the District now as drawn is 737 under.

The target deviation 90,875.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You mean 4,000 under? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 105 I'm sorry.
440.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Let's leave it there right now because I know we have community of interest with Traverse City and I want to make sure that that's drawn in so we don't get boxed in.

So I will let somebody else take the reins from here on out.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Lange.

Secretary of State any questions?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hi Commissioner Lange.

Can you describe why you added these areas to this particular District and what communities of interest you considered?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: These areas are going to be your rural northern areas. You're going to be looking at agricultural.

Missaukee was combined with the remaining four districts of Wexford because I do know that they have the Missaukee, Wexford ISD. So that could be community of interest and taking into account the remaining districts that need to be drawn and what population is left.

We have to make sure that we don't box ourselves in.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. And can you say that again, the Missaukee, Wexford.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Missaukee Wexford ISD intermediate school District, so they kind of share.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Got it. Thank you so much.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thanks. Commissioner Lange. Commissioner Lett, I believe we are on to you.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This District or just this area?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The whole District.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: As I recall Steve we got into a discussion, and I'm not sure this is the exact area.

A discussion on some peninsula that was partially to a City to the west or to the east. And then partially towards Traverse City area, maybe the one in the white.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It was.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm good then.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: District 104 is sitting on 754 people high.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay, take the District immediately to the east and let's see how many is in there.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You want to call that 103 or just add it in? Create a new District.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 103 is fine.

We haven't used it.

Not very many people.

Well, let's take what is left and see what's in there.

So we can figure out where we are at.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL:

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: Your mic is not on Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Let's see what District number we are on because I know we 103 is up there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is all we got left.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 0.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Last one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So there is no more districts to draw.

Or did we skip one somewhere? Did we skip a number.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We didn't skip a number.

The amount of population with those, with 103 and the remainder of 103 although it's not contiguous at this particular point there is enough for one particular District.

So if you add those white blocks there or the Townships to 103 you are going to be fine then we will need to figure out how we are going to change the districts around there so 104, 105 to make 103 contiguous if you like the idea of a District that is surrounding Traverse City on all sides like that.

Looks good.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to change the color of 103 so it's more easily identified.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We have to make these two contiguous 103 I would consider taking the southeast corner of 104 and maybe the northwest corner of 105 and that would -- I don't know what that does number wise.

But it's one possible alternative.

We should probably look at the numbers before we start switching.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: How many as he said the southeast Township.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That Township right here?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 500 people, 468 people.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And 26 up here, so that is 33,000.

And move over to the west and how many are in the top, the northwest Townships in 103?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 4200.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So if we switch out Plat and Almira with union and white water, that would balance out pretty close.

Let's try that.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes did you have an idea.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: At the apex of the corners there can we just find the 0 population block and add it in and make it contiguous so we have a creek that the person has to swim across to get between the two places he is represented.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I like to make them look a little better than a creek.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A creek.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I mean, I know where it's at, it's right there.

It's 4,000 people short.

I mean relative to the other districts.

So 103 is now just 190 people high 104 is 1.98% or 1814 people high.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 105 is low.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Relative to the other surrounding areas.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Look at the Townships on the east, southeast of 103 and let's see what population Ken cannot I will zoom in and see what you got.

I can highlight them and get the numbers.

1300, 1700.

20 some hundred maybe.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well if we wanted to do something with the population, we could take those Townships and put them this 105, which would raise that level.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 6,000, 7.4.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Extra Township, Barcelona, that one right there.

We don't want to split it.

They would take exception.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Leave that in 103?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The highlighted areas?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

Okay, I'll leave it there.

What do you want?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes did you have a comment or suggestion?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, I mean, the 105 the little section of Wexford the four Townships that are jutting out right there, is there anything that we can do there to put that into something else so that 105 isn't being extended between 103 and 101?

And if you need to you could take one of the -- some of the Orange, Oliver or Boardman and put them in 105 potentially if that needs to happen.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Looks pretty good.

105 is a little high.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 103 is 2.3% high.

105 is 7% low.

Then the other districts in the area.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Steve, if you take Mancelona and put it in 105, what would it do? I know we didn't want to split.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The whole County? Township?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Mancelona Township.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you have a suggestion?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I know it's right there.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want to wait.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put Mancelona in 105.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I didn't do that because I didn't want to split the Township.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Reminder to Commissioners and consultants not to speak over each other.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Put Mancelona in 105.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Cutoff the pink lines so we have a better vision.

We have stuff to fix.

Identified as a District so we are better.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, that L-shaped 103 does seem to capture around that Traverse City area, which is such a big hub, isn't it?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And the fact it's 103.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's 103.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 2.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 103 District that L-shaped District it seems, yeah, I'm pleased with the way it turned out.

I do think it represents sort of a, yeah, ex urban area around Traverse City.

I know Commissioner Lange talked about how many rural areas actually use Traverse City to for all sorts of things but it just feels like it's, yeah.

I like it.

Well done.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Happy dance.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to say.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Chair Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This may be a good time go through here and cleanup these unassigned little blocks and everything.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That would be a great idea but please save first.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I was going to say I'm going to find them and Zoom in and somebody tell me where to go.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Not where to go, just tell me where to put the blocks.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Where to put the blocks.

[Laughter]

[Off mic]

So Commissioner Rothhorn I will direct you to direct Kent when he gets a discontinuity tell him what District to put it in, please.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right, I can do that.

Thank you for checking for dis-contiguities, absolutely.

Commissioner Lange do you have your hand up? Please.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to know do we still have the overlay then at our disposal of the previously drawn ones? I'm just going to be honest I'm looking at Northern Michigan and those all those areas and the population is so dispersed that I see a lot of splitting of Counties and stuff going on that I think could be drawn more compact personally.

But I was just curious if the overlay that they're using that showed the previously, we have access to that, don't we?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is correct.

Kent, can you help us where we would find the overlays and what Commissioner Lange's question was is the overlays, we were using prior to this reconciled map, those would be available at is it at my District at this point? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If they are not, they will be or should be.

And I mean we have them all contained and backed up.

They are readily available.

And I think I put them all, they are all house plans so they would be out there by date.

If there is one not out there then I will get it out there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Does that help Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It does.

I'm saying like for our use, are those the files that we've gotten sent like Sue sent us files in the past of our day's work is that how we would get those on our computer? Or is it automatically in the program?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Kent can you help answer that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: From what I heard, unless Suann or somebody has sent you the shape files from let's say weeks ago at that time, the best place to get it would go to my Districting and download the shape file.

If it's not there, it needs to be there.

And I'll get them posted.

Because all the house plans that we or y'all have drawn should be out there.

But the earliest ones with were not as well organized naming convention.

But obviously we got them and can post them.

Does that cover it?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange did you have anything else? That is a helpful question because I think it will help the public as well.

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

Okay, any other, okay, so Kent, I think you and I are checking for dis-contiguities at this point.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Right here that highlighted area is a water block that at one time was part of District 4.

District 9 was made, so we can check the population pretty sure it's going to be 0.

So all this territory surrounding it is District 9.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Let's assign it to District 9, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There are some more pieces, there is a bunch of them right there.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Each is assigned to 4 should be assigned to 9, please.

And acknowledging that 1, 2 and 3 have no dis-contiguities.

Which is great.

So we are just cleaning up District 4.

Assigning it to District 9 or that portion.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And this came from these water blocks for whatever reason the Census Bureau had them assigned to adjoining present we put into District 4.

So these got left out.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is good clarification thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Then these little pieces get left out.

My suspect are the water blocks are in one precinct but this land mass area is in another precinct.

So it kind of forces it to be an error.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep, we will just put those in 9 again, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Pretty typical to have this very thing around water areas and islands.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Kent is fighting islands.

Actually go in District 9 also.

That is a sliver of a water block, isn't it? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It could be.

Is that a roadway coming across? Or a power line? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL:

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: A fairy crossing.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Sugar island so Down River and Grosse Ile.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And for some reason it's either not doing it or it doesn't like or doesn't show up.

I did it but it kept it highlighted.

Okay.

Next.

That is the major part of the District.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Wow so we are on to District 57 excellent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So 57 in the edits, that little area got -- so that little dot right there is labeled as 57 and it's surrounded by 56.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, I remember this was we intentionally put this into 56.

The other Commissioners remember that? Okay I'm seeing some nodding heads, okay. Patience is the name of the game, right? You are doing great.

[Laughter]

He said it's not his strong suit.

So District 57 still.

The first 56 have no dis-contiguities at this point.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm hoping it closes before it loses the changes we made.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: People take care of their needs because we do have 10.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have ten so only one person can leave.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: While we are waiting, we are discussing just acknowledging that Commissioners as you need to take care of a break please do. We do have quorum and we are able to do that.

But we would like to keep going rather than take a break.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And I would say one at a time because we only have ten so we can have one person at a time leave the room.

Actually we do have 11 so we can have two leave at a time so Commissioner Clark is currently taking a break so another person could leave and take a break if they wanted to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I do think some of those errors they pop up most frequently when we do blocks and the block file is significantly larger than anything else. It's hundreds of thousands of records.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know if it has anything to do with it but it's suspicious activity.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So what would your suggestion? Should we just repeat this? Do it again.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do it again, yes, that is what we have to do.

I'm going to go to the plan.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Kent, oh, yeah, let's try the plan history, absolutely.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yep.

So it will get back to where that last little sliver was.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Absolutely.

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.

Does it help if we save it each time or is it one of those things? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It really wouldn't matter.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It really wouldn't matter.

Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is a little 49 inside of 19.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 40 or 19 inside of 49 perhaps.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The brown is 19.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The brown is 19 and the highlighted District is 49? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we should assign it to 19, please.

Should we check and see if there is population? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Well, that is what I was labeling.

No, that is block, no population.

We will put that in 19.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: You have to turn on your mic.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is a block with two people in it and it's sitting inside of District 51.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right so it should be 51, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So I went to the next error which was in this block has one person in it.

This census block has 0 in it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is the one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Labeled as 57.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Schwartz creek and we tried it before.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 59 or 56?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 56, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And it went to the next one.

We have a couple things that is unassigned and that is assigned to the wrong District.

That is unassigned as well.

So that is a water block.

So it's a matter of -- here is a 65 kind of.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right.

Commissioners unless I hear from you looks like it should be 82.

So help me if you object, please let me know, but yeah, I'm just going to ask him to assign it to 82.

So hearing no objections let's just do that, Kent, please.

Did we move on? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I have to go find it.

All right.

This is unassigned.

Each time we select something and it jumps to the next one I lose where I am at.

So this is 62.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay so how should we proceed, Kent? Or should I direct you to assign it? Or is that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Assign it to 62?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Jumps to the next one and that is the whole District so this should be a part of a District.

That is 0 population block.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have a suggestion, forgive me if this would be out in left field but if a District, if you are looking for these particular areas in regards to either unassigned areas or areas that are dis-contiguous and there is only one District to choose, why don't we just like for example what we see on the screen adjacent District 69 is the only one to choose out of the particular items that the system thinks it should be in.

Why don't we just have our mapper do those automatically without them constantly asking where it's supposed to go because there is only one choice anyway and it will go quicker anyway.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I will be the person who monitors.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 69 and somebody say yes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yep, and I will continue.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will call it out and somebody say "Yes" or "No."

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel? So there was a proposal for these tiny dis-contiguities where there is only one option so what we have on the screen is 69 clearly the option should be put it into 69, Commissioner Witjes is suggesting that we just allow the map drawers to just do it automatically.

If there is only one option.

Is that acceptable? Or would you rather us to say assign it to 69, assign it to 70.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly Madam Chair I apologize Doug for taking your seat Commissioner Clark for taking your certain.

Certainly and I believe your mapping consultants have expressed in the past that as signing those types of unassigned areas is something they could easily do when they are completely surrounded by another District.

But for example, the if the block 10 I think that is 1-2 that kind of could go either way and I understand that is not an assigned area I'm just using it as an example that that might be something that the consultant would want guidance on.

But certainly I think it would be a reasonable request if the majority of the Commission agreed for unassigned areas that are completely surrounded by the same District that those would be assigned.

That is an option.

Or the Commission can proceed with directing them individually.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So with that suggestion, are there any objections to that suggestion from Commissioner Witjes? Hearing no objections, Kent, please proceed.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, that highlighted block is going into 69.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So back to where we were earlier this is unassigned and this might be one you want to call it's 65, this is 82 all around.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, we do want to put these into 82.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All of this area, I'm going to highlight it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Including that little census block down in there?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Put all of that into 82?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

It looks like there was a little red.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That would go into 82?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to assign this to 82.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, I think we have been there before.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to close this out and come back in because it's saying missing geography and I have no explanation for it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Export this plan as a shape file so we can bring it back in if something goes wrong.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Come on.

This is the area.

It's really broken up.

It might explain why we are getting some weirdness to it.

So let's just start right here.

You can see 65 is dis-contiguous to this 65.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I do.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is 13 people.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And we are on the west side of the state I believe; is that right?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

This is.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Dowagiac so we are in the southwest.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looks like we are going to have you know at least this one to deal with.

And that census block contains 13 people.

This census block contains 446.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: And it just seems like 82.

So that yeah that 65.

Yes, 82, please.

Also 82 please you will have to do one at a time.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All of these into 82?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Previously discussed area.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Also into 82.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Also into 82 as previously discussed?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, thank you.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This looks like it should probably go in 70.

It's 0 population.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please and again as Commissioner Witjes suggested if it does say under the recommended correction under that adjacent District if that is the only one feel free to just do it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm just going to mention it as I do it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I understand.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So if I do something wrong somebody can.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I will respond.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We are in District 69 here so we want to assign it to 69, please, yes? Ann Arbor area.

Because there is going to be a lot here, do we want to go slow ap be patient or what is your -- just keep going until it crashes, right? But it's not going to crash.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I want everybody to know I did not design or write this software.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: But you work well with us with it.

Thank you, Kent, for helping us with it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: But if it does work well, I did help with it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We kind of knew we were going to run into this.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is the big beast.

We got a little small piece up here.

And that is it should be 108 and that too because 107 is predominately down here.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So 108, please, uh-huh.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is where we have to assign the island and we need to assign this water block.

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

Looks like it's going to be 108.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It automatically scrolled us down.

I knew it was right there.

So now there is no dis-contiguities, we checked for unassigned areas look at that, all these little Tiny little blocks.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: If there is a recommended correction and one choice, please assign it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We have two census could go 89 or 84.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Looks like it should go to 89.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 89 it is.

Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Border.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is actual 7 people in that block and 11 in that block.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 74 looks like the most appropriate.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: There is two of them and it will do one and it will go to the next one or I thought it was but any way.

Here is another example of ten people.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is in 75 please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 75.

That looks wholly inside of 75.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It does.

Okay so let's stay with District 1, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay, District 1.

1?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, and District 2.

And that looks like 67.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 67?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This looks like a series of blocks along the waterfront.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: What is the population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's just water.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Water right.

Looks like it would fit easiest in 13 but it is.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This part could be in 13 as long as there is no population and maybe the southern part.

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is 6.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Appearances more than anything.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, let's do it that way.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 13 for this part.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

And then that block that is grayed out just north of that, did you see that? .

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is another one.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Also into 13.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: This bottom half has not been assigned.

This part right here, the bottom half of it, this has not been assigned.

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So let's assign that to six, please.

That looks like 19.

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 19?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 19, yes.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: That's still more of this laker Bay.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Right is that one census block or multiple? .
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's three.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Appearances again what I'd like to do is assign the

upper, yeah, those two, to the 19.

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay.

It actually can make a difference when they run compactness analysis.

It smooths up the lines rather than taking them out.

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So the southern one into 13, please.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 7 people here.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: 56 please.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: Looks like a Township boundary right through there.

56?

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes, please.

And that will be 76, please.

That will be 102, yep.

And that is water block again, isn't it? .

- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will Zoom out so you can get a better visual.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Well I'm going to need some help her Commissioners is this 57 or 31? Anyone I guess if you have a strong feeling raise your hand.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm going to Zoom in a little bit.
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Okay no strong.
- >> MR. KENT STIGALL: 0 block here is in 57.

You could put them, they are 0 you could put them both in 31.

- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I heard another Commissioner say 57 so I'm just going to go with that please, 57, yes.

Okay.

And we are in the water again here and is that in terms of compactness scores is that a 58? I'm guessing 58.

Let's go with 58.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The eyeball test it looks even, straight line.

Must be a sliver in there somewhere.

And that is tiny.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: That is a tiny sliver.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: When that kind of tiny sliver shows up it's a digitizing digital error at the census.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Never understood why we have empty water blocks.

Why couldn't this all be one? I don't know.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So many mysteries to solve.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It's better than it was ten years ago.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Glad to hear that.

I'm glad the software leads us to these anomalies.

Did you see that.

There are no unassigned areas in the plan.

This is where we do the happy dance, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes says save it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's being saved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can I get a save?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: All right so I believe we are done with all three maps, draft proposed maps.

And there is a thought or a comment, Secretary of State? Did you have a thought or a comment?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I don't want to cross the party.

So I believe for your Congressional districts you still have to resolve the variants.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So let's continue because this is for the house, we should do that for the Congressional and then also check the Senate just to be sure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: What do you mean by the variants for dis-continuities, unassigned areas or population? Population for the Congressional.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: The Congressional is not quite resolved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me Madam Chair I would like to build this plan, save it and then I will open up your Congressional work.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I was also going to suggest we take a ten-minute break so that everyone can take care of personal needs.

And then I actually believe the Congressional is probably going to be a longer conversation because we actually have four Congressional plans that we have sitting out there right now.

So all right so right now without objection we will take a recess for 13 minutes, it's currently 3:37 p.m.

We will come back at 3:50, thank you Commissioner Rothhorn, my brain is fried.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order at 3:52 p.m.

So we were -- we have a little bit of time before we have to move to other agenda items so go ahead.

I'm sorry call roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, please Announce during roll call you are attending remotely and where you are attending from. We will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

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 WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 11 Commissioners are present. And there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. We finished up with Commissioner Lett on the house map and moving on to Commissioner Orton. Did you want to make any changes to the house map? Or are you comfortable going to the Congressional maps? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We can go on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we can go on to the Congressional maps did you pull up the first version? I think the plan is we have got four versions version one, two, three and four I think the plan is to pull them up and reconcile population because we didn't have evenly balanced populations on the map. So Kent if you could bring up version one and then Commissioner Orton you can direct Kent.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, of course. There is four statewide completed plans on the website and it's these top four.

So here is version the first one done.

That day we are going to start there, right?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Which version are we starting on V1.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I don't know if it's V1 but it's one.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can someone remind me the four versions.

I did not realize we had four versions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we have ones that include Midland, one that does not include Midland, one that reaches out to Grand Rapids.

And then I think there was the original one we were starting with.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: V there is the fourth one I do know is Grand Rapids here that stair stepped up to Muskegon.

That was the last iteration.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And version three is the one that just had Midland City pulled in.

And.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: This is version one and we are just trying to get down to equal population.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, so Mr. Brace apparently is on the Zoom and has his hand up as well so Mr. Grace did you have a comment?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, I wanted to point out for your benefit what Kent has gone through in terms of trying to fix little pockets.

It is something that Fred and I have found in the Michigan data set.

And so you do need to be a little bit careful when you're assigning Townships or precincts.

There are some little pockets along the edges of precincts where the precinct has come into a different town even though the heart of it is over in the other town.

So it's causing some of these little pockets that Kent was fixing but just be cognizant of that when you're drawing and as well as fixing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Brace.

So Cynthia, just looking at these maps really quickly I'm refreshing my memory of what these were. The version one is the version where we did not have Flint with Saginaw and Bay City.

Version two was where we did have Flint with Bay City and Saginaw but not with Midland.

Version three has the little bit of Midland City put in.

And then version four has Midland City out.

But Grand Rapids included.

Muskegon I'm sorry not Grand Rapids.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: If the Commissioners like each one of these plans are on my Districting site so if you want to pop in there and refresh you can go through and look at whichever you want and then.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is exactly what I was doing.

Looking at them there to remember what we did.

Version one is Flint is not included with Bay City and Saginaw.

Version two is, let me look back, is Flint included with Bay City and Saginaw but not Midland version three is Flint, Bay City Saginaw and the City of Midland and then version four is Bay City, Flint, Saginaw, no Midland but then that little jog over to Muskegon if that helps you.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So it seems like we could pair it down to three versions because the one with Grand Rapids and Muskegon is the same as one of -- there is two that are the same.

As far as the Flint, Bay City, Saginaw areas go.

I'm just thinking we could pair it down to three instead of four if those are the ones we want to propose.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So yes and no.

So there is a Flint version with Saginaw, Bay City.

A Flint version with Saginaw Bay City Midland City.

There is a version with no Flint with Saginaw and Bay City.

And then there is the Flint Saginaw Bay with the Muskegon outreach.

Does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No we could change one of the.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think the starting point to you want Flint with Bay City and Saginaw if you are yes on that then versions two, three and four all have that configuration with some other changes.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So what are we doing here? Are we taking all four of these versions and trying to get the population, right? Or I just don't know our procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are we doing the population right or are we selecting the maps we want to bring forward?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think at this point our intention is to balance the populations to get them as close to 0 as possible.

And we have four versions of the map that we can do that on.

So it's just do we want to do it on all four? I think we can just do it on all four so.

But it's up to you.

It's your turn.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, it just seems like it would be -- take a long time to do it on all four but if we can consolidate if most of the map is the same, then we don't have to redo that same thing over and over and over.

I don't know.

It's confusing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I mean do you want to discuss including Flint with Saginaw Bay and decide if we want to do that? And then discuss Midland? Because that would be a way to narrow it down.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Sure, do people want to discuss that? I see some nods.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: We have to at some point.

Yeah.

This is where the work gets real when we have to duplicate or feels like duplication.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I agree with that.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I mean I look at the population and it looks really in good shape on the Congressional one.

And so I'm not sure we have to adjust anything at this point.

I mean they are allow deviations and all relatively in good shape within the range.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Stigall.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Would it be helpful everybody looked at this for a couple minutes I will bring the next one up for a couple minute and the third one for a couple minutes and the fourth one and would that help?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is helpful.

>> MR. MORGAN: If I may.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan go ahead.

>> MR. MORGAN: John Morgan.

Once you do decide you want to go down to a one person deviation that is a process that takes a little bit of time and I think you want to see how it is done.

It may be possible for you to direct somebody to do it for you like one of us.

But that is a process where you basically hold each District steady and you make that individual District go to exactly one person.

And then you look at the next adjacent, you don't have the option to trade back and forth at that point.

So it's a process.

It takes a little bit of time to do it.

But it's something that you probably will want to consider any way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I would like to hear General Counsel and perhaps Mr. Adelson weigh in on according to what we have on our active matrix we are within the deviation.

But should we be down to one person? Please tell us.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel or Mr. Adelson? Whichever.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: With deviations as you know the Congressional maps have the deviations have to be as small as possible.

And the Supreme Court hasn't said of course what that means.

Looking at the percentages of your deviations they are all under of course 1%.

You have a .02, .04, .12.

.21.

And they are already pretty low.

I understand wanting to see if you can achieve greater, less of a deviation.

And I understand we are just talking about deviations right now.

So I certainly can understand that.

And my general thought is as low as you can create the deviations, I think that's always good with the Congressional maps.

Since the districts are so large and one person one vote requirement the Supreme Court applies almost literally.

But not literally in the sense that the deviation has to be one person.

You know, you're already pretty good.

But if there are some districts that where you have like the first District, you have about 2400 people.

And the difference and then you have District 3 is almost 4,000.

To me that would be if you're looking to reduce the deviations further, those might be places to look at where the population is higher than like for example the 143 in District 7.

But I think so my advice is see if you can reasonably lower the deviations more.

They do not have to literally be 0 or 1%.

But see if you can lower them more.

And as I said I understand you're only dealing with the deviations now.

Does that help?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So my next question is like our mapping consultants have said it takes some time to do this.

Is this something we should take time with to do now or wait until after analysis is done?

We may need to change quite a bit.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That is a great point.

I would suggest spending some time now because just to see like with the District the three for example with the 4,000 people, how difficult it is or how easy it is to reduce that further.

You may also want to try to do that more in the districts like District 12 that don't really implicate the voting rights ability to elect requirements because of the demographics.

I think that might be even a better idea.

So there will be things that we are looking at, we will be looking at elsewhere.

I really don't anticipate doing that in 12 for example.

So I think that might be something that's worthwhile for now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: Just to follow-up on that I think the idea of you know moving closer on a few districts in deviation now makes some sense but that process if you choose to go down to like one person, that's what I'm saying takes a little bit of additional time and at that point you are really truly fixing the districts.

What I mean by fixing is really locking them in.

So if you think you're going to be making I don't know other changes and you probably will, then you know you might hold off on that last step, if you even go to that last step.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And to take Mr. Morgan's point I agree with him.

I think that from a legal basis you're not required to go to one person.

I understand there are different considerations, temptations, that is a good one.

But you're not legally required to go to one.

And frankly I have not with the districts I've worked on Congressional, I have not seen that.

But I think the key point here is, yeah, there will be other changes.

So if you were inclined to go to one person, that is not something I agree that I would recommend doing now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So I'm thinking now about our public comment tour. And that maybe we do that after the public comment tour.

I know we have deliberations coming up, this week.

And I'm trying to understand if we should think, yeah, like I guess I'm looking for and I think this is where Cynthia is going with this line of questioning.

How do we use our time this week, right.

And today we have less than an hour left.

Help us take the next step that seems logical with analysis, with partisan fairness with something so that we can, right, knowing we have the public hearings coming up, and we will changing maps et cetera, I think, yeah is that the line of questioning you are sort of headed down Cynthia?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, kind of just how do we best use our time and not do something that we're just going to have to redo later after things change.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I'm just wondering if it wouldn't be productive to narrow down not necessarily the maps but what we want to do.

Like we have a map with Flint by itself.

We have a map with Flint with the Bay Cities.

Do we want to discuss that and narrow it down? I think we can probably eliminate one or two maps.

And narrow the focus just by resolving that issue. Do we want Midland to be in with the Tri-Cities do we not want Midland in with the Tri-Cities.

Commissioner Lett I thought I saw a hand.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

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

So as far as the work to be done prior to deliberations and prior to the Commission adopting the proposed draft maps to take into the second round of public hearings, those maps it's critical that they also comply with the constitutional criteria.

So I concur with Mr. Adelson.

The sooner you make those efforts the better those maps will be going in the public hearings and after the second round of public hearings when the Commission has another opportunity to make modifications to the maps, based on additional data, based on public comment, based on the portal, based on all the manners in which the Commission receives feedback and information to inform its work, those modifications will be having at that time.

And then the final proposed maps will be adopted but I the Commission for posting which trigger a 45 day public comment period.

I wanted to make sure for the benefit of the viewing public, again, that the second public hearings do not trigger the 45 days.

That is after this process.

So I want to be clear about that.

And I also wanted to urge the Commission to make the changes that they can, again, sooner rather than later so going in the second round of public hearings and I also agree with Mr. Adelson it does not have to be down to an individual person.

But that narrowing those deviations would be beneficial at this time.

And partisan fairness we are expecting Dr. Handley to join the Commission on Friday. So that we will be before you on that date.

So as you're moving through the analysis and what I would term the compliance work, now that you have completed plans is critical at this time.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So you're saying the compliance work, so that's all the analysis that has to happen to make sure we are in compliance with the guidelines, the Constitution.

So that won't happen until Friday?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Orton, and I apologize if I was unclear, you have been doing that since you started drawing maps. What this is an opportunity to look at a statewide plan and to run a partisan fairness measure which again can only be measured according to the constitutional language on a statewide basis and to also examine the interactions between the districts, the population it truly is the time to go through your constitutional criteria on a more wholistic statewide level than what you have been doing which is working your way through the districts and reconciling the plans that you drafted in the past collectively. Is that helpful? Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah so, I guess my final question is: Then do any of our consultants, lawyers see anything wrong with any of the districts we've drawn that would say you need to look at this again before we get it to lower deviation?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I can offer those things can happen simultaneously and be addressed.

And I would invite Mr. Adelson to lend his voice to that question as well.

And also highlight for the Chair that Ms. Reinhardt did have her hand up.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange has her hand up and I think she is trying to alert me.

So Commissioner Lange did you want to go ahead?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, this back and forth, honestly is confusing me. If we have four Congressional maps right now before we start making changes to four it seems like time wise and efficiency wise it would be smart to narrow them down to the ones.

Then my question would be we have maps that were also submitted by Commissioners and I know this is all supposed to be part of the deliberation process.

But in essence of time shouldn't we kind of be narrowing those down now before we start making adjustments to other stuff? So we don't run out of time?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Excellent questions Commissioner Lange excellent questions.

That is what we are, yeah, wrestling with.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And if I could add on to what General Counsel Pastula was saying with the maps, whole maps, then we can start doing in a way what we started to do yesterday when Commissioner Rothorn and I were talking about the questions I think on one of the Western Districts about try this, this is a possibility. And it's something that if you decide not to do it, then that, you know, requires, may require certain justifications.

So typically in my experience when you're at this stage, and you are dealing with the dis-contiguities and other anomalies and deciding what maps to put together and combine is also the final check run through discussion, compliance evaluation before deliberation and before voting on moving forward with your draft maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So it's Cynthia's turn so what would you like to do?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I think we should star by taking these four versions and choosing two, make two out of that we can present or that we can deliberate on.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That seems reasonable to me.

So then the question is how do you want to go about that? I mean I think the easy question is do you want Flint with Bay City or not? That immediately eliminates one map so or it keeps one map depending or we can do an alternative where one is and one is not.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think that would be a good idea to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Microphone we can't hear you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What do Bay City and Flint have in common, what is their contiguous things they have in common?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So we received a lot of public comment asking that Flint be put in with Saginaw and Bay City rather they being put out sort of with more of the rural areas because the feeling was, I believe what was expressed is that it was.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: If that is what they want.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Help me with my words here, Cynthia.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree we received a lot of public comment once this was put out on the website and people looked at it from Flint, they should be part of Bay City, Saginaw.

But I did not see a whole lot of commence from the Bay City people saying hey we want Flint.

Okay? And Saginaw the same.

And Midland the same.

They look at themselves as Tri-Counties.

So I think as we do maps, we should submit the proposal with Flint alone and then another map with some variation of Flint with Saginaw and Bay City.

And Midland probably.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Maybe we look at the VRA compliance.

So this is District ten we are looking at.

And just look at you know and try to you know understand it, at that data level too like which District whether it's 10 or not, sort of helps comply.

This is the compliance time, right? And so we would just have to run, okay, so if hopefully it would be a District 10 in the other versions, but you know I guess I will write down you know those numbers.

And look at you know the District that was drawn you know with including Bay City.

That is sort of a data way to go about it.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Rothorn we are going to be looking at the Flint District, could we Zoom in on the District please?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: And Kent could you make the active matrix a little larger? Could you make the active matrix a little larger? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We can download the active matrix in a spreadsheet and just e-mail them all to you through Suann if that would help.

Takes about 30 seconds.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is anyone interested in that? Did you hear what Kent said? He could e-mail through Suann the active matrix to us in a spreadsheet so that we can see it easier ourselves as we go along.

Of course it will change if we change anything.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yeah, I think the visual is helpful for me so to see only the spreadsheets would be challenging for me.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Excuse me so with this District, this District only has Flint.

And you had there are other maps that have Flint Saginaw and Bay City.

Do you have a map with Flint and Saginaw? Is it Flint, Flint Saginaw Bay City and Midland? Is there -- what I'm getting at is that Flint and Saginaw have a significant Black population.

So this map has one City.

There is another City in 11 that has a significant Black population.

So to me in just looking at this, having the eastern part of ten, those are rural Counties, so the Black population is most likely lower.

And the ability to elect in these areas is most likely lower than in Flint.

So rather than you know when you are looking at population you have captured population in rural areas in 10 and 11.

And married them with large urban centers in those -- that part of the state that have large Black populations.

So as we saw when we were doing the as I recall the House District and the general Flint area the surrounding area, the population is very different.

So the more you add population, that is significantly nonminority then you run the potential of diluting the minority population.

So there is -- there are alternatives to ten in just looking at the map that do not dilute ostensibly the same way 10 does.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Ten is Flint? Commissioner Lange I'm sorry go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You guys are on this discussion now, so I'll wait until you finish this discussion and then go because I don't want to get off on something else when you're discussing a specific topic now.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you show us a different version that has Flint Saginaw and Bay City together.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: They have a preview so we have to close this back up and see what we have.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Please do that.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: All right this is version one.

That was version one.

We will just go to two and I don't know if we can see it in this little.

I will have to open it up.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Do that, please.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And I think four, that is never a good sign, just a moment.

[Off mic]

It does appear that this District 11 contains the City of Flint and picks up Saginaw but not Midland and the Bay Area.

That's District 11.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay thank you.

So those numbers are slightly more balanced so Mr. Adelson, what is your?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: I agree it is more balanced with Flint and Saginaw.

I'd like to see what the -- is that District 11? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: And there is another alternative that includes Bay City; is that correct? .

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: No, sir this does, that is Bay City right there.

So what is highlighted is not VA pop.

It's all the Townships that are greater than 10%.

Black.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Mr. Adelson I think it may be Midland we added is that right Commissioners was Midland the alternative? Was that added to 11, or no? Was that in the Senate District or the house.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No we had an alternative Congressional with Midland City being put in.

Just the City not the Township surrounding it into 11.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Do you see Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Commissioner Lange go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want to say when we drew this District, we actually had Mr. Adelson look at both sets of maps and Mr. Adelson said this one was the better as far as compliance goes if that helps.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good memory too Rhonda.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Excuse me that is the one we're seeing now? If I could just give a little context to that.

Once you get out of these cities in this part of Michigan the Counties are very rural. Having Counties that have nonminority or heavy nonminority populations can dilute minority vote.

So I think here marrying Flint, Saginaw and I saw Bay City those are the largest cities on that, in this part of the geography.

The issue with Midland similarly to what I think we had talked about last week, Midland although it is a City and it has more minority population than an average rural County in this part of the state, does not have the same level of minority population as Flint and Saginaw.

Now I couldn't tell you if adding this would help or not.

It might be beneficial just to if Midland can be flagged to see if it changes the numbers in a positive direction.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Kent I think that is probably version three.

Could you pull that up.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I remember correctly that was done.

I will bring up the third version.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: And yeah, just to make things less clear we did receive during the meeting we added Midland and we took Midland out and your analysis at the time was that adding Midland actually diluted some African/American vote. However, we did receive some public comment basically saying that Midland by itself wouldn't have that effect and we should actually take it I believe it's called Tuscola to the east in there because that is very rural, very, you know, very white and so there was some comments

to that effect that leaving Tuscola in and then adding Midland if we took out Tuscola, we wouldn't necessarily see that dilutive effect and still keep the Tri-Cities together which is something to consider.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: It's possible but as you know the challenge with Congressional districts is they are so big. You need a lot of population.

There aren't any cities of 3, 4, 500,000 in this part of the state.

So you will need to include rural districts because you need them to get the population balance sed Szetela Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm acknowledging we have under populated it too. Right, it is not as it's not the most under pop laid but that is an effort to also reduce dilution or I suppose keep it balanced.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Commissioner Rothhorn to you are right on the money point.

I think that since the deviation is small, it's .23, so we are not talking about a 3 or 4% deviation.

I think that as you move forward that would be a perfect example of justification.

To make clear to the public and for the record that you're doing this to reduce the dilutive effect on the three largest minority populations in this District.

So I think that would line up very well and it's a great example of clear justification to explain why you're doing that.

And, again, the deviation is small.

So if it were 3 or 4% deviation, that would be more of a concern.

But it's under .3 so explain why it's at .23 I think I agree.

I think you are absolutely right.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Shall I bring up V3, version three?

>> Whispering, you get 14.80 because it keeps them the same.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So it appears 11 is light but this area was take end out of 11 compared to version two and this was added in.

Generally speaking, I think.

Should I make this a little darker or is that good?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think it's okay since the other ones around it are darker.

Can we see it on the active matrix?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Part of me is thinking about sort of that is why I want, yeah, I'm just thinking about what if we could actually keep them in whole and have Midland in there? Right which is one of the things we've heard from the public comment. I'm thinking I wonder if we can sort of like reconcile things here and take Tuscola out for example and keep Midland in.

And then I know that would be almost a complete redraw and I know we are at 4:30 right now.

But I just wanted to offer that there are ways and I think, yeah, maybe we just want to remember, yeah, somehow, it's not just about the City of Midland here but right the public comment we got was keep Midland whole.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I did just submit a map in that does just that.

That we can look at tomorrow.

But I did actually add in all of Midland, take off some of Tuscola it did take a lot of adjustments throughout because you sort of had to rebalance the population so that is something we can look at tomorrow if people are interested in it.

So I did do that because again the public comment we were hearing was we were hearing from people in Midland City they wanted to be with Bay and Saginaw.

And we were also hearing from people around Midland City and the Township that they wanted to be with Midland so I think that sort of accomplishes both goals.

Of keeping Midland Township, Midland and the Tri-Cities together.

Without diluting the African/American or the Hispanic population.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm going to disagree on that one.

We did get the comments about that, but we also got a lot of comments from Midland City and Midland County about wanting to be kept to the west because of the watershed issues, the Tittabawassee and everything, so that's why the compromised District was up there.

Actually we just had public comment today about it.

The people that spoke and said that their comments were no longer there, they have gone back in and put their comments and that's what it is.

Is that they would like to be kept, they were actually giving approval for map, the map that got changed where they said it was 176, I believe from 146 or whatever the number was at the beginning.

That was the map that they were talking about, that kept Midland with that area.

So I'm looking at it in terms of I think we compromised on the Senate District when we did this but I think there needs to be some compromise here.

As far as Midland goes.

Because we got half, we've had people talk about the 88,000 acres of farms that are there.

And to put them with the Tri-Cities, which they don't even half of them don't consider themselves the Tri-Cities anymore which we've heard in public comment.

So I think out of all the areas this is the one, this is the hill that I would stand on, just saying.

I think we're going to have to come up with some kind of compromise.

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. BRUCE ADELSON: Excuse me I wanted to point out that in the District 11 that's on the screen now that includes Kent this includes Midland, correct? District 11? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is where they cut, they removed this area from 11.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: And include it in Midland.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Okay, well in looking at the Black population in this District, the change is like .4%.

It's really not, it's not big.

Plus interestingly the population deviation here is lower than in the other version that was on the screen.

And I think that the -- it's not really surprising that the differences are not that great because Midland is not a minority majority minority City or minority plurality City.

Remember we looked at the election returns, the election returns did not work out with Midland. I'm not suggesting including it or not.

But this is just a good example of to see that this does not change the Black population very much.

A .4 change at this level of per cent is likely not going to be dispositive.

So because the population is small.

When I think maybe instructive too, we can look at what the election returns are just to get a sense of how the District does.

But I think between the alternative we looked at a moment ago and this one, the Black population doesn't really change that much.

So there is not any significant difference just in that narrow area.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I'm not sure where we go from here.

Like tomorrow we can look at your one you submitted, once the other Commissioners have submitted it, I guess.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Where do we go from here? Do we make a decision on what we think we want to propose.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Can we eliminate one.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can we eliminate one? I think Commissioner Clark wanted to present one with Flint.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is that what you want to do.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, he said that earlier with Flint separate.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Absolutely.

I don't see why we couldn't go with three.

But here is the problem that I see.

To get the public hearing comments our public hearing is going to be in Flint so we kind of know based on the other day all the Flint comments we will hear them again and we

may not get as much representation from Bay City Midland and Saginaw at that hearing.

So and we have no public hearings second public hearing up in the Bay City area. So because of that we may get a stronger public, stronger public comments that Flint should be with that.

And who knows that is not necessarily the Bay City, Saginaw perspective.

I'd like to hear from Richard on this because he lives up in that area.

Do you think we should bring it two or three maps? Or how many?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Thank you.

I've been sitting here listening.

I guess I'm not sure which way to go.

I do like the idea of more maps.

I've met many comments keep Midland out of it.

I've read many comments keep Midland with the Tri-Cities.

I've read many comments about Flint did not want to be in with the Tri-Cities.

And I've read comments that they do.

So I guess we have to decide what we want.

Now, we have at least three maps, I'm not sure what the fourth one is.

Maybe this is a good choice.

We have one right now with Midland in.

The previous one has Flint by itself.

The other one I'm not sure.

I don't remember.

What does the fourth one look like, can you bring that up quick? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can bring that up that was Grand Rapids with the arm going out to Muskegon and I think it's a copy of three and we can look at it quit.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: There were two maps with Flint, Saginaw and Bay together. One that has this Muskegon jog and the other that doesn't.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I want to try to highlight Mr. Adelson's words that for Commissioner Clark in particular like you do have to justify the VRA analysis.

And we as a Commission have to justify the VRA analysis that dilutes the Black population's vote if we choose not to have the combined Flint and Saginaw.

We have to justify it.

And so and I'm uncomfortable with that.

I don't think we have a right to stand on.

Because we have an alternative and we proposed it so.

What I'm saying that is the point we have to make hard decisions.

And we have to be comply with the law.

And that's the first priority.

And so if I understand you correctly Mr. Adelson that is our challenge, if we choose to go with that other District, we have seen it dilutes the Black population's vote. Do you see Cynthia's hand?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Then I have a question about that then but Mr. Adelson is conferring.

I'll wait.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Midland doesn't matter, Flint, Saginaw or just Flint.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, okay.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: It's almost 4:40.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is why I was going to break.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Adelson, so the populations that I wrote down in the three different versions, it went from when Flint was alone 10.28% Black population. And then the highest that it got, which is this version, I believe, is 13 well 13.96 was the highest one.

So that is 3%.

Is that -- and it's still very much lower than the threshold for opportunity to elect District. We still need to consider it and get it as high as we possibly can in every District?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: No.

Getting -- doing redistricting you are trying to get a minority population as high as you can is not what I would recommend.

Because that brings up racial predomination issues.

It's tacking to Dr. Handley's analysis and also in this example if you have a District with one District with Flint and Congressional District, one District with Saginaw, those cities in that part of the state have the largest Black population.

So given that the population surrounding these cities is largely rural and largely nonminority, if you have two districts with two cities that have 45-50% minority but they are in separate districts, then the percentage of the Black population in each one will be relatively lower and also more diluted.

So my suggestion as with in other places.

If you have an ability, if you have an opportunity to create a District where you are not dividing minority populations when you don't have to, or you have an ability to create a District within the appropriate deviation or you're not reaching out to grab a distinct minority population but the shape of the District is pretty consistent with the average District that is created, my recommendation is to look at that.

Because otherwise you are isolating too large minority populations.

That is not something that I would typically recommend.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton? Anything else to add?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Once again, I don't know where to go from here.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That is okay because we are out of time for mapping today so you don't need to go anywhere.

Okay, all right so at this point we are going to move on to the next item on our agenda which is approval of the minutes from we have a few meetings here.

So without objection we will proceed to the approval of minutes from September 15, okay so we are going to do these one at a time September 15, September 16 which has two meetings, and September 20th.

Are there any proposed edits to any of the draft map or draft minutes that have been provided? Okay seeing none, so may I have a motion to approve the meetings of the minutes held in East Lansing Michigan on September 15, 2021?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Rothhorn.

Is there actually all in favor of approving the meeting minutes from the meeting September 15, 2021, please signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

May I have approval of the first meeting Alan lent Dale on September 16, 2021, motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm not doing it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Second by Commissioner Vallette.

All in favor of approving the MICRC minutes from the first meeting September 16, 2021, significant signify by raising your hands and saying aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted.

May I have a motion to approve the minutes of the second meeting held in all den Dale Michigan on September 16, 2021.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Vallette.

All in favor of approving the meeting minutes from the second meeting September 16, 2021, signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

May have a motion to approve the minutes held in East Lansing Michigan on September 20, 2021.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Vallette.

All in favor of approving the meeting minutes from September 20, 2021, signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Without objection I'd like to ask our communication and Outreach Director there you are Edward Woods III to provide a report.

Please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS:

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Oh, boy.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Test can you hear me? Okay I just need a minute.

I deleted an e-mail that will actually put me on so hold on just a second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Why don't we check with MDOS. Do you have any updates?

Okay, I will also say that correspondence received in advance of our meeting today was provided along with written public comments for the Commissioners in our meeting materials.

Does anyone have any announcements? Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Just a couple of things the meeting on Friday has been confirmed by Edward we will be able to meet at the hotel where we are staying, which is the Detroit Marriott Troy, so Commissioners can be there Wednesday night and Thursday night.

And for the Thursday meeting at Oakland University meetings and then also for the Friday meeting that will be held right at the hotel.

This is a new meeting.

So it would need to be approved.

And we would need to set a time for that meeting also on Friday.

And Dr. Handley will be with us that day.

So that will be an important meeting.

Are there suggestions for the time?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I move that we plan that meeting.

And I would suggest 9-5.

And then if we need, if we are ready to end early, we can but that will be our last meeting before the second round of public hearings I believe so we should give ourselves as much time as we can.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes and no.

So we may have I was going to discuss this in future agenda items we will likely have meetings Monday and Tuesday of next week.

Depending on what happens this week.

But sort of the discussion with staff about where we are at is our goal if anybody has alternative maps have them submitted by tomorrow to discuss Wednesday and Thursday of this week the maps reconciled on like we were starting to do today and have Dr. Handley analyze them and present that to us on Friday and then Monday and

Tuesday we need to decide which maps we are actually going to be submitting for the public hearings for review the draft maps.

And that needs to be done by Tuesday end of day so that the Department of State and the staff can actually post those meetings in time for the public hearings.

So we may have to go into Monday and Tuesday of next week depending on where we are at.

Especially because we may need to adjust partisan balance based on Dr. Handley's report which we are not getting until Friday and may not have time to finish that.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I'd like to have one change based on what you said.

Alternative maps can we get another day or two before we submit them?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sue where are you over there? I think the concern is you need to submit them 24 hours before and then it takes time to get them posted.

So I mean you could do them on Thursday but then it just makes it hard for Dr. Handley to analyze them because she might not have that in time for Friday.

That is the only thought.

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So would Wednesday night be the cutoff of when we can submit them.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Executive Director?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: The maps need to be submitted a day in advance so they can be posted on the website and the other Commissioners also would have an opportunity to look at those ahead of time so 24 hours and then Dr. Handley will need some time also to look at those.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So what the last time we can submit them?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Ideally Wednesday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is there like a particular time 5:00, 10:00? Not until midnight? So let's say close of business.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: If it's after 5:00 they can't be posted until the next day because we rely on MDOS staff to post everything.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So by 5:00 Wednesday.

Yes, I do see Dustin and I see Rhonda.

Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, I would caution using the word cutoff.

There is -- we have the right as a Commission to turn in our maps whenever we want. We don't need to have our personal ones addressed by anybody or anyone to have anyone analyze 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.

We have one that is already done that way. If I want to work on one even next week, that I could potentially want to bring along on the road with me to as a proposed draft for people to comment on.

I can do that.

It's not something that it is contingent on Dr. Handley or anyone looking at.

So I mean not that I'm going to make big, drastic changes but I would not use the word cutoff because we have the right to do that as a Commission.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Well we do have timeframes we have to comply with in terms of what has to be released publicly that is what is driving that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Correct but if we are not going on our listening tour the second public hearing around until October 11.

I could say I want to submit one next week and it would still be fine.

It doesn't have to be in this week.

And even if we are on the road and I say I was working on something based on comments, I could do it and submit it 24 hours in advance and say here is another map I drew even when we are on the road.

There is no real deadline except for the fact we have to submit it to EDS and the Secretary of State and our staff 24 hours before we can bring it up so it can be posted.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That's not accurate from my understanding from staff.

That the who is posted they alternately need three days to post the map is what we were told.

Because they also have to put in it's not just the map it's also the data underlying your map and go ahead Department of State staff my understanding was next Tuesday close of business was when the cutoff was to submit maps before in advance of the public hearing.

I'm not saying you can't submit it later but in terms of the schedule we are receiving from the Department of State we really need to have those maps in by Tuesday so that they can actually put them out there in advance of the public hearings because they do require that three day lead time.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair I'm going to jump in because we are going to slow it way down.

So the mapping process that the Commission adopted has the final maps being final proposed draft maps for publication for the public hearings being adopted tomorrow.

We are discussing with the volume of work left need ed still to be done on not only selecting which plans the Commission wants to bring forward but the compliance activities and compliance analysis that needs to move forward.

So cutting or going a little bit outside of the schedule and kind of cutting into that publication timeframe that we talked about when the mapping process was being proposed and discussed by the Commission.

So that entails posting the data used to draft the maps on a data portal.

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.

Publishing the proposed maps.

And publishing the legal description which is also a map that meets certain requirements that are set forth in the Constitution and under a relevant statute in the State of Michigan.

The collaborative Commission maps are separate and apart from the individual Commissioner maps which Commissioner Witjes was just referencing.

I would like to distinguish that the timing needed the 24 hour period was for your alternate draft maps that were going through your drafting and your collaborative work cycle.

These maps are individual Commissioner maps to be published and discussed on or available for the public to comment on your second round of public hearings.

Those would also need to have to be published, to have the legal description map drawn and all of those other things so I think we are trying to balance or to the extent that it can be done not having 20 maps go over to the vendor on the same day that need to be turned around so fast.

That's the first so the only other clarification I wanted to make was that, no, you would not be able to advance an independent map during that process because it needs to be it needs to meet those posting requirements so it's slightly different from the individual maps you have been bringing forward to date.

But, again, those -- the individual or independent Commissioner maps are completely separate and apart from the collaborative maps so hopefully that distinction was helpful. Again the timing in which we need to be able to take the proposed draft maps that the Commission has adopted for publication for the second round of public hearings and have those maps meet the constitutional publication criteria will take days.

Not a couple days.

At least three to four days potentially even longer depending on the number of maps and the workflow.

So I just wanted to make that distinction again.

That there is two kind of two separate things going and we are trying to spread that work out as much as we can.

That was part of our effort.

And I don't know if MDOS had something to add to that.

But I did want to highlight that distinction.

And I'm sorry the compliance analysis with the criteria will again need to be performed on all of the maps.

Mr. Adelson is available to the individual Commissioners and when Dr. Handley presents her partisan fairness measures and how to interpret those results and empower the Commission to use those tools and the software moving forward, then that will also be something that the Commission can work into their analysis.

But, again, the compliance criteria and analysis is going to be a significant undertaking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sarah Reinhardt did you have something to add?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I was really just going to say what your General Counsel said.

Commissioner Witjes is correct that for Commissioners to submit an alternative map for review of the Commission up to this point while you guys are drafting really just requires that a day in advance.

But going into the public hearings any Commissioner that wants to put forth a map for review of the public during public hearings for them to comment on and consider as a potential map for you all to adopt, that requires kind of a different threshold which includes as your General Counsel said the analysis that your collaborative maps will be undergoing which requires time and also it requires submission in advance because they have to be turned into like the legal description map and other criteria for publication prior to the hearings.

So, yeah, just kind of restating what your General Counsel said.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much that was helpful, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Hopefully smokes I feel like we go around in circles.

I have a clear understanding and then I don't.

So I'm just going to do it three questions did I not just hear you say Rebecca that next Tuesday would be the absolute latest? Prior to the long explanations.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: So I think for maps that you want the public to see and to be considered at publish hearings for comment, yes.

That I think is my understanding from General Counsel and Department of State is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Was that correct I'm sorry I cut you off.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Is that correct Tuesday maps they want to be considered by the public at public hearings?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Next week.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I think the answer to that question is that Tuesday would be the day to maintain the current schedule of public hearings.

Depending on the work of the Commission in drafting these final adjustments, doing the compliance analysis, work of the individual Commissioners for those that elect to submit individual maps, individual proposed plans, that's what is driving the timeframe.

So I think I hear the goal of the Commission is to maintain the current public hearings schedule which would require the by probably Tuesday I think would be a safe estimation to have the publication and the downstream activities that need to be done accomplished.

But, again, what drives this process is the Commission's process of drafting of maps.

So I would just offer that as the answer of and of course acknowledging Commissioner Witjes' comments also about cutoffs.

That the mapping work is what is driving the process and the timing.
And the time constraints that the Commission is put under because of the census delay.
But for maintaining the current schedule of public hearings, yes, Tuesday would be an appropriate date to aim for.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, so can I just make a motion that if anybody wants to submit a map for public review to go through these hearings that we have them submitted by Monday, the beginning of no later than the beginning of our meeting only Monday.

I say this motion because we just finished up our House Districts.

So now that we have a complete map and each one, we may want to evaluate antique changes on our own.

We may like certain parts or not.

It will give us the weekend to evaluate and if we do choose to do it especially with our meeting schedule as it is right now, that would give us time to actually submit those by Monday and still give our vendors a week to evaluate those.

Does that seem fair? I guess that is my motion any way.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: That seems fair. Do we have a second?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: A motion on the floor by Commissioner Lange to require that. Did you give a time on it or just Monday? By the end of the day.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: By the beginning of the meeting I think is what you said.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would say the beginning of the meeting.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: On Monday.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioners who want their maps to be submitted to the public for submission and consideration of the hearing must be submitted beginning of the meeting only Monday and seconded by Commissioner Rothorn is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Beginning.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So we have the weekend.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye.
All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

So we have one nay.

The ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

All right, Edward, do you want to come back to you?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I do.

Thank you very much for your patience.

I'm sorry can you hear me? Secretary of State? I just want to make sure I'm loud.

Can you hear me?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay thank you.

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

I want to share some brief information just to make sure we are on the same Page. Multi-channel marketing from the SAS institute and just want to share this with you multi-channel is the practice of interacting with customers using a combination of indirect and direct communication channels website retail store mail or catalogs direct mail e-mail mobile et cetera and enabling customers to take action in response preferably to buy products or service.

Using the channel of their choice in the most simplistic terms multi-channel marketing is all about choice.

On the platform when we were doing the communications and outreach plan that we voted for in May consisted of ads billboards editorials e-mails events, Facebook fact sheet fact frequently asked questions, info graphic, Instagram, mail, direct mail, presentations, press, text alerts, Twitter, videos, website and YouTube.

Direct mail was added as a part of our discussion on the recommendation of Commissioner Wagner.

Communication and outreach plan was approved on April 15, 2021, was revised May 6, 2021. It includes direct mail to reach those without Internet access especially in rural areas. We had a difficult time as you know in finding a household list and received a customized one that was customized because no one had a list.

I also reached out to Commissioners and no one could find a list that had households without Internet access.

The criteria that was used to develop the customized list was low probability of having a smartphone, low property of e-mail and no household of all residents, once again, all residents, under the age of 26.

Direct mail campaign.

According to USPS market research insight 54% of people surveyed tried a new product or business in the six month period in 2020 because they received a mail piece. Five secrets to boost any direct mail campaign the District mail campaign data list is critical use creative tiff with design, choose a reputable printing business and make your offer stand out and include a personal call to action.

13 reasons why direct mail is not dead it's 29% return on investment, direct mail works great with digital marketing strategy, direct mail is easier to target than you might think. Direct mail is trackable.

It's less common.

Therefore it makes it more unique how many received a letter in the mail versus getting an e-mail.

Direct mail gives a feeling of romance and tangible in terms of call to action and undivided attention because it's less. It increases brand awareness. And it's available for all age groups. And it's creative.

This comes from Neo-Patel, a blogger that deals with direct mail and digital marketing advertising that you can sign up for his blogs.

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

We are looking at rural Counties in Michigan in particular. We looked at the certificate of need as provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health in terms of these different rural Counties. And these were the rural Counties: Alcona, Alger, Aranac, Antrim, Baraga, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Clare, Crawford, Emmet, Gladwin, Gogebic, Hensdale, Huron, Iosco Island, Lake, Luce, Mackinac, Manistee, Mason, Montcalm, Mont Marie, Oceana, Ogemaw, Ontonagon, Osceola, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon, Sanilac, Schoolcraft, and Tuscola.

And as you know Commissioner Lange went out to some of these rural areas to increase awareness during these County fairs in each of the Counties she went to is represented in this rural list.

We talked about Down River in terms of looking at these are the communities of Down River in terms of Brownstown Township, Ecorse City, Flat Rock City, Gibraltar City, Grosse Isle Township, Huron Township, Lincoln Park City, Melvindale City, River Rouge City, Riverview City, Rockwood City, Southgate City, Trenton City, Wood Haven city and Wyandotte City.

I believe it was Commissioner Rothorn expressed to see what we could do in the Down River Area with regards to the postcards pause of a lack of Internet access and just realizing that all people in some of our nonrural areas also have challenges with regards to the Internet and need to be informed.

When we look at the bid that we received from united mail it has a total of 145900 households it can serve when I did the rural Counties it was roughly 184,000 so I took 70% of that and it came down to 127,052 households and then for the Down River I'm proposing that we do 18,847 households.

For a total of 145,900 households which is the bid that we received from united mail that I'm recommending that we go with.

Eagle mailing would have been great, they are having challenges with getting paper. And so that's why I'm recommending united.

Here is the resolution resolved that the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission here by contract not to exceed 49,999.99 to effectuate a direct mail campaign to rural areas in the Down River Area within the State of Michigan with united mail for outreach to households without Internet access prior to the second round of public hearings in accordance with the policy for approval of expenses adopted on January 7, 2001.

And per swayed into the budget adopted on March 11, 2001, as well as the resolution to approve direct mail campaign, the MICRC authorizes Executive Director to executed the direct mail campaign contract on behalf of the MICRC.

So once again we are trying to multiply our efforts to make sure that people are aware of the Michigan's new redistricting process and how they can engage.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Is it clear you were I think I want to be clear you're still believe that this is timely, this is and it sounds like it dovetails the direct mail paper

campaign dovetails with the multimedia and other things to help attract the people to the last part of our process.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We are partnering with United Way of Southwest Michigan with 211 so people have language barriers and don't speak English they can be able to know more about that because we are also trying to drive public comment which is the same thing that we did with regards to the first round of our hearing as well.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: So for clarification what I hear you saying is that the direct mail piece will have a telephone number so the direct mail piece will not say please respond by mail, the direct mail piece will say we need your input call us.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: 211.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Call 211 and there will be translation services.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Translations and they can take care of that sorry if I wasn't clear.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So I infer from this you are asking us to reconsider what we voted on yesterday.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Absolutely.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay if we do pursue that, how do you measure success in this endeavor?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: We will get a report from the United Way how many calls they got as a result of the postcard and I can provide that report to the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: But only on phone calls, there is no I don't think there is any other way to gather metrics.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I think that would be the most efficient way from a process standpoint because we do want to measure the effectiveness.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, I think it's based on this information if we want to reconsider, we need a motion and move forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Are you making a motion Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I am not.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we adopt the resolution if I have a second, I'll speak to it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think for the reasons that Edward has stated, we approve him doing this some time ago.

If I was our intent not to follow through with it, we shouldn't have approved it to start with.

Now that he has done the work and come in and with a timely bid at a reasonable price, I guess I don't know about direct mail but it seems to be reasonable, and it as we discussed yesterday the having the mailing go out close to the time that the meetings will be going on would be the most opportune time.

Therefore I believe that this would be in order to approve.

We are not reconsidering anything from yesterday because we didn't approve or disapprove anything yesterday.

The motion failed so we are here today to determine the original which was are we going to go forward with it?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange then Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Again, I'm just going to speak for my area.

Some of the areas that were on there I understand you're saying the push to get people to the meetings, the hearings.

I don't see that happening in my area.

Honestly.

I think the premise for the mail outs that was done and suggested months ago was to inform people about the process so they could.

We've got hearings that are, say for Counties in my area, the hearings are two hours, to an hour and a half away.

So I really don't see people getting this flyer last-minute and showing up to the hearings. And I'm just being honest.

Maybe they will call, maybe they won't.

But I think the idea when it was suggested months ago was to inform the people that we are here so they could follow the process.

Now we are towards the end of the process and I still feel that the money could be allocated for something else that would more better inform but that's my opinion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's up to you Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'll just offer as we were debating this yesterday, I said I was on the fence. And what's happened for me the whole process this whole year we have been together I keep learning and marketing is the thing I know least but Edward help me understand was that he understands that this is not too late.

Or too little.

It actually might be the right time.

So what I mean to say for me because of that what he gave me helped me sort of say, yes, this is I'm going to trust that this is the right time and I think that and the other piece for me is like everything that we do when it's outreach related and public engagement, I think it's sort of we cover our butt a little bit more.

I think when we do our outreach and it's not just rubber standing and not meaningless outreach but when we do this, I think we help ourselves say we did everything we could and again I was on the fence because I thought it might be a little bit too late.

My understanding now is that it's about phone calls and it's going to be, yeah, Edward is my marketing expert and I learned a lot and that is where I'm at.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark then Mr. Woods.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I agree with you MC.

And the further explanation today really helped.

And I have the utmost confidence and respect for add Edward and the work he has done and the way he has led us on the communications path so I'm willing to support him in this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I just want you to know they don't necessarily have to come to the public hearing they can call and get assistance.

We sign people up remotely where people can call on the phone.

Or they can go on virtual just like it happened during the first round of public hearings. So let's just make sure we are driving this public comment whether it's in person or remotely and they do provide assistance with regards to helping people sign up and making sure that every voice is heard.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry did you have a comment too?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You know, just as I took my hat off to those who went to school and got their law degrees and whatever degree that you got, I went to school for communication and journalism. And I know what works and getting things out to the public it works and you wouldn't hear of products if they didn't bring it to your door. So whatever it takes to support and make all of us look good in marketing whatever he is doing a fine job.

That can't stop now.

We are trying to get this thing done.

My comments.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right let's go ahead and take a vote and Department of State because this was close yesterday, I'm going to ask for a roll call vote so we have a motion by Commissioner Lett seconded by Commissioner Witjes to adopt the resolution presented by Mr. Woods so a vote on this yes, we will be in favor of the resolution.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners please indicate your support of the motion with a yes or a no when I call your name.

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: With a vote of 9 yes to two no, the motion carries.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much, Department of State staff. Before we all go, we started with Cynthia starting with a motion for Friday.

You've got more stuff, oh, boy, okay so I'm just wondering if we need to get that motion approved today Executive Director, I'm assuming you want us to approve Cynthia had started to make a motion then we got we did not hear a second so do we want to do that right now or? Okay so your motion was to start at from 9-5, right? 9-5 on Friday with the possibility that we can leave early if we wrap stuff up.

All in favor of that motion please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail so the motion on Friday will be from 9-5.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair I didn't see our remote attendees.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I can't see them.

I didn't hear anybody say nay.

Commissioner Wagner were you an aye or a nay?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I was an aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Aye that is what I thought and didn't hear them say nay so Edward let's go back to you and wanted to get that resolved before it dropped off our agenda.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Just want to share with the Commission our locations. We have locations and the times we are in the process of getting contracts signed and getting everything set up.

Dort center Flint are tree top resorts October 12, Northern Michigan and Marquette on the 14th.

The following week is still the same.

October 18 Amway Grand Plaza hotel.

The 19th still the same Radisson Plaza.

Thursday October 21st the Lansing center.

Macomb is same.

Here is a change.

Schoolcraft college we had it and then they told us we didn't have it anymore and they didn't offer explanation.

I did ask for one.

And I'm still waiting for a call back.

But I don't want to waste around so Sheraton in Novi is available and not too far from where we are going so that is a change but then the TCF center in Detroit is the same.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I have a question.

Since you said contracts are in the process of being signed, is there any way that these that we could push back a week to what we had originally talked about? I'm just saying we are really rushed with the compliance analysis and the map drawing, so I'm just wondering if we could have a little more time because the map drawing is our major thing.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I would have to defer to our Executive Director because of the timelines that we are trying to get things complete.

Obviously, we can always go back and ask but these dates are hard to come by.

October is a fall convention month so that is usually so we are very fortunate to actually have these dates because usually a lot of Falcon vent shuns take place in October.

Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: The timeline that has been built is tight and after the public hearings there is six business days the Friday and the following week for deliberations for any changes to your maps.

So if you bump the second round of public hearings a week later, you're bumping into that week you were going to do deliberations and then the final vote on proposed maps is scheduled for November 5th which initiates that 45 day period of public comment.

After the maps are produced by EDS again and CSS, they have to have time to produce those, to publish those so it's a very tight timeline and I don't know where we can find an extra week in it.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: May I offer that this is one of those challenging pieces but it sound like we have to decide and so let's sit on it tonight.

We have the information that Director Hammersmith just gave us right how tight it is and I think we have to decide.

It sounds like we as a Commission have to decide sort of plan A and plan B and let's take it up tomorrow morning.

And I guess be prepared to sort of like talk about it like talk about the pros and cons and what we are willing to what sort of stress we are willing to put ourselves under.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Keep in mind that we are going to end up in Court.

And so we need to look as good as we can that we were as timely as we could be given the constraints of the census and what we have been trying to accomplish.

So if we come along and say well, we are going to push it back a week, that is not going to look good in Court.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I understand that.

But I also feel the most important task that we are tasked with is to draw fair maps.

And I feel like we should give it all we can.

Which we are already on a super tight timeline.

I just feel like that's the one place maybe we shouldn't scrimp is time drawing and deliberating over the maps.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, quick comment.

This is really this decision is really based on time or quality product.

And we have to choose between the one of the two I would prefer to be late a week and get the quality product out.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Briefly I wanted to remind the timing the Commission is currently under the timeframe and the proposed schedule was adopted by the Commission so that is a consideration.

And I could not have said it better than Commissioner Orton where when you're in Court you are going to want the work product of fair maps to carry you through, to success.

In the courtroom the Commission as of September 17th should have the proposed maps posted and because of the constitutional requirements it was anticipated that that was not going to happen.

So, again, the timing is already an issue.

Being sensitive to the downstream Bureau of election activities the qualified voter file the candidate nominating petitions all of those stresses as well but in the present time where the Commission is now the focus is -- has to be on the map, the map process, the map criteria.

And all of those kinds of things.

So those were the comments that I would again like to offer for consideration, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

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 WITJES: Given the time that everything that we don't consider is automatically unfinished business for the next day I move to adjourn.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: I second that.

We have a motion to adjourn by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by myself all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed say nay.

We adjourn at 5:25.

See you tomorrow guys.