

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

08/19/21 12:00 pm Meeting

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

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: As Vice Chair of the Commission I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 12:13 p.m.

This Zoom webinar is live streamed at YouTube at [www.YouTube.com/MICHSOSoffice/videos](http://www.YouTube.com/MICHSOSoffice/videos).

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

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

People with disabilities or needing other specific accommodations should also contact Redistricting at [Michigan.gov](http://Michigan.gov).

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

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

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

For the purpose of the public watching and the public record, I will now turn the Michigan Department state Staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hello, Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely state and unless absence is due to military duty, please disclose your physical location by stating the county, city, township, or village where you are attending the meeting remotely. I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

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

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. You can view the agenda at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC).

I will now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

Motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none it is moved and seconded that we adopt the meeting agenda.

All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed please raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and it is adopted.

We will now begin the agenda topics of the meeting.

We have both in-person and remote public comments today.

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

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.

Commission. Please conclude when you hear the timer. And first in line to provide public comment is number one.

You are now invited to address the Commission.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners.

Thank you for this opportunity to address the Commission.

I'm Susan Smith, Vice President for advocacy for the League of Women Voters of Michigan, a nonpartisan organization.

As you know the Commission invites two types of public comments, both of them legitimate expressions by the public.

One type of public comment relates to proposed maps and written testimony especially as they relate to communities of interest.

The Commission has encouraged members of the public to submit their maps and written testimony via the public comment portal on the MICRC website. A second type of public comment relates to agenda items. These comments have been welcome by the Commission since it began meeting last September.

Originally these written public comments about agenda items could be e-mailed to the Commission.

Now, however, the public notice of the Commission's meeting instructs the public to submit written comments via the public comment portal.

As a result, unless a Commissioner happens to review the contents of the portal, immediately prior to the Commission meeting, he or she won't see the written comments pertaining to the agenda item until after the meeting is over.

The league requests that public notice of the Commission's meeting be changed back to instructing the public to submit their written comments concerning agenda items via an e-mail to the Commission rather than through the portal.

Such a change would allow Commissioners to read them in a timely manner before considering the agenda item during the meeting.

Thank you for your consideration.

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

At this time number two can approach the podium or approach the microphone and speak.

>> Good afternoon. I think I'm number three, but I think Susan signed up for two spots, so thank you for your time.

My name is Joseph.

I'm a Lansing resident.

I've been following your work very, very closely.

And I thank you for your service to the State of Michigan.

I want to talk a little bit about partisan fairness.

I think that is a huge aspect of what you are tasked 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.

For example, we are in the Greater Lansing area right now and you know we are in State Senate District 23. And the other state District is 24. One is a very safe republican seat. One is a very safe democratic seat, but it's not truly representative of the Greater Lansing Area.

So, you know, I would rather have one safe seat and then one competitive district rather than two safe seats.

I think competition will allow us as a state to have real dialog and real, you know, real change when it comes to who is representing us in Lansing.

And, you know, again, I really want to stress the point that partisan fairness is a must. You know, we don't want to give advantage to one party over the other.

We want to make sure that, you know, we are playing the game as far as we can. And I really appreciate you all coming to East Lansing. And, again, I appreciate your time and the task at hand, so thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Just confirming, we don't have a number two out there. If we do, please approach. Otherwise, I'm going to move on to number four. I just want to make sure I'm not skipping somebody.

>> Hello. Good afternoon. My name is [inaudible]. I have the pleasure to meet some of you personally. I'm here in two capacities. One is because I live really close to here. And, second, because I work in Detroit. And it's the grass roots organizing community in Detroit.

I want to mention three things I really care today.

I'm happy because I'm here.

Some bad news for you, I will be here tomorrow again and testifying again with some other areas and we are planning to bring more people tomorrow.

This was kind of last notice for us. And greetings. One is we are really worried about big organizations coming to bring full sets of districts served to you.

We feel this is not right.

We look at some of those big projects. And who gets the big projects? The ones who have big money right? We with grass roots don't have a lot of money. So we are working in our community of interest.

I think that this is what we understand and we know how it works.

We don't believe that this big organization with the big mouth of State of Michigan knows what is happening inside of southwest Detroit and southwest of Lansing.

So I just want to make this point that we really care about it.

The second point is we have two communities of interest in the portal. If you want to write it down, I will be happy #Greater Lansing #Southwest Detroit. And they are the consensus of our community.

We talk a lot about creating the communities of interest. And we believe they represent our needs.

Especially the one in Southwest Detroit. We are very proud of it because it's not only the work of the Latino organization and also, we work in conjunction with communities and Pacific Islander communities. So that area represents what the most of the communities in the Southwest Detroit believe in.

Thank you very much.

See you tomorrow.

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

Number five?

>> There you are.

I could not see you behind the big TV.

>> Great columns.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, you are welcome to address the Commission.

>> The name is Juan and I'm representing lead of Michigan.

It's a statewide organization.

It's a nonprofit.

And we have a chapter here in Lansing so we have been working closely with Oscar and the immigrants of Greater Lansing. And so we are looking at our Hispanic population as a community of interest.

And so we try to look at the maps I really understand the challenge you all are going to have.

It's unbelievable.

And I'm glad you have it, not me.

You know, it's going to be difficult.

But what we have created over time, and over time I'm talking at least the last 50 some odd years, is collaboration, partnerships with other ethnic populations in the Greater Lansing area.

If we were to be carved out into other districts and into other places, we would lose a half a century of work that has been done by our parents and our grandparents.

We really believe that we have a good working community.

We can go back a couple of generations of people that have been working together on public policy issues that affect us either in a positive or a negative way.

We create collaborations to try to make a significant change.

And so the one that affects us right now the worst is the Congressional District eight. That is really badly put together.

And we would like to see, as you tackle that issue, is to try and bring it closer together so the community of interest populations can really work together to make a positive impact.

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

And, again, as I said before, make it a competitive of ideas, you know, come to us with ideas of what you would like to do.

Don't just come in with a label of a party, that what you are.

I think that is what really makes a strong community, a strong Michigan.

And so we will be submitting our comments this afternoon.

And so we will be also writing to our hash tag will be #Greater Lansing. Thank you very much for your attention.

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

Number six?

>> Hi. I'm David Hopkinson. I'm from East Lansing. And I was one of the leaders of Voters Not Politician in the region.

Our region represented five counties various political stripes. Ingham was the second highest support for the proposal in the state, and our region was the highest.

And I think that represents something to you that a variety of people support the work you're doing. And the reason most people were shocked when they decided to support proposal two was, they didn't understand how it's done now and when they realized now it is done now, they couldn't believe it.

So we would represent that this area particularly Lansing has been divided over the years. It's very frustrating for people when they feel like the impact of their vote is not fully represented and so we would recommend the region that centers around Lansing be considered a District.

Thanks.

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

Now that the first opportunity for in-person comment has ended, 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 two-minute, in-person comment. And I believe that is you, Ms. Smith

>> Yes, thank you again, Commissioners.

The following is a statement from a number of organizations that work to engage Michiganders in the redistricting process and the Commission's work.

We strongly support the Commission in this important process, including mobilizing public engagement and comment.

The Commission faces a challenging task of navigating new territory as the first independent map drawing body in our state.

The MICRC was designed to be independent from politicians, not from citizens.

As custodians of the state's voter approved redistricting process, the Commission has a duty to take citizens' concerns seriously and the debate them transparently.

Instead, last week the public watched as the Commission largely dismissed citizen input and then proceeded to hire a litigation firm less than an hour after interviewing them,

A major departure from the Commission's previous hires.

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.

Some Commissioners said they were disregarding public comments, not on the merits of the argument but on the quantity of submissions.

Let's be clear. Individual citizens organizing together to take collective action is not illegitimate.

In fact, we have been asked time and again to engage our networks and members in this process.

It's unacceptable to then have the voices of the people we engage to be dismissed as they were last week.

As you begin drawing our state maps, you will be faced with extraordinarily tough decisions.

The Commission should evaluate each public comment on its own merits based on the comment of the submission to preserve trust in the Commission and ensure a fair and transparent process.

Thank you.

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

We will now move on to our remote public comment. Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live are remote commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. I will call your name and our staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted to unmute yourself and speak. If you are on the phone, a voice will say the host would like you to speak and press star to unmute. I will call on your by either your name or the last four digits of your phone number. Also, if you experience technical or audio issues or if we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and return to you after they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work, you can email at [redistrictive@michigan.gov](mailto:redistrictive@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 conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is Susan Waldrop.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair, for the purposes of the public record, Susan is not present.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

We will move on then to number two, which is Mr. James Galant.

>> Can you hear me, Madam Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I can hear you but you sound a little muted so you might want to move closer to your speaker.

>> How is that?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That's much better.

>> Okay, thank you. My name is James Galant. I'm with the Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. And these are my opinions. And I believe that this Commission's current, willful disregard for your approved rules of procedure and specifically the Robert's Rules of Order requirement, it's one question at a time. By you consistently opening business items by discussion, assigning the floor for discussion before there is a motion that is seconded, I believe that offends our Constitution and offends your oath of office that you took. And a written directive from you, from Secretary of State Benson, she is just a secretary without a vote, dated September 17, 2020. And she said you must follow Robert's Rules of Order. And yet you don't have a copy of the book and nobody has it any way.

I believe your current exercise and experimental democracy.

It appears to be a blend of Stanford University systems model with a consensus building deliberative democracy and facilitated dialog all mixed up into one neat iteration and does not resemble the process that was provided to you by the people of the State of Michigan, which is Robert's Rules of Order, that is the fundamental principles of parliamentary law in America. Is that everyone has a right to know the question you are going to discuss, that is the main thing.

Your attorney said that you could be sued for the process. Now, I found this quote. And this is a favorite of mine now. Criticism is deliberation, is a potentially, it allows the most [inaudible] display the decision in their favor much as you have seen here. And this criticism has been made since the liberty of democracy rose in ancient happened that long ago.

So the Harvard business review found a study that 90% of value added collaborative products are done by 3-5% of employees. And that is what is happening. People specialize in this facilitated dialog and everybody rubber stamps it on the way. Well, you folks...

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission, Mr. Galant. And we will now move on to Connie Cook.

>> Hello, Commissioners.

My name is Connie Cook and I'm calling from my home in Glen Arbor in Northern Michigan.

I spoke to you last week, so you may remember me.

I told you then that I appreciated your traveling all over the state and was very glad that you had said repeatedly how much you value public comments.

The reason I asked to speak again today is that last week your actions did not match your words.

I think I counted ten people who made public comments at the beginning of that meeting.

I only recognized two of those people.



I think that all ten of us suggested you create a pool of candidates for the litigation counsel position rather than rushing to hire the only applicant.

We all have similar concerns expressed in different ways and for different reasons.

So it was discouraging to have someone say afterwards that we all coordinated remarks.

We didn't.

And it was discouraging to hear someone suggest that we were just puppets, mouthing the words of some organization.

We weren't.

And it was even more discouraging to have one Commissioner immediately move to have you proceed with the hire even though there was no hurry at all.

His quick motion meant that there was almost no discussion of these ten comments, just a dismissal of them as irrelevant.

So today I want to urge you to treat public comments with more respect in the future.

If you want public comments, please take time to consider them.

Thank you.

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

At this point we will move on to individuals who have signed up and indicated that they would like to provide a second remote public commentary.

We will follow the same process as we used in the first round.

First in line to provide a second remote public commentary is Mr. James Galant.

>> Can you hear me, Madam Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes. I can hear you, Mr. Galant.

>> James Galant, Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. And due to commenters, a couple of those commenters were just talking about and they seem to think that, yeah, man, all we got to get is 20, 30 people to say the same thing and all of a sudden that is ruled by consensus, that is what we are going by.

Next generation of whoever shows up, that is not how it works in America.

This is Constitution and democracy that [inaudible] it has been done before and limited democracy, which is just that lady just talked about that.

And said the making of the motion stopped, no, no. I think you people misunderstood.

And I think most people in Michigan misunderstood.

The motion starts the deliberation.

It does not stop it.

The basic understanding of the Commissioners has not been fully informed by your attorney as to your legal requirements here.

As it, you know, that's what happens.

You make the motion before there is a motion and seconded, that is one question at a time thing.

I believe what you are doing here is dumb. I believe this isn't pure democracy you are trying to create here. And I believe it's acts of civil disobedience much like Rosa Parks did except she was offending an unjust [inaudible] law and not the Constitution of State and Federal Government. And that is exactly what you are doing here. And say we are not going to do that. Even when you have a resolution, you have resolution on the agenda today, and presented with a resolution yet you still start a discussion when it should be a motion to approve the resolution as presented, is the requirement of the Chair.

The Chair is required when the time on the agenda comes to immediately entertain a motion for the approval of the next item.

These agenda items are supposed to be framed in a question.

All of this is reviewed, discussion, blah, blah, blah, no specific question, that is the problem here.

Thank you.

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

That concludes our public comment for this afternoon.

I would also like to mention that all e-mailed and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting and Commissioners also review the public comment portal at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) website on a regular basis. So we appreciate everybody who provides public comment in whichever way you choose to do it, whether it's remote or whether it's in person or whether it's via the portal.

We invite you to continue to share your thoughts, communities of interest and your maps.

Without objection I would like to move forward to unfinished business and ask Executive Director Hammersmith to provide information on agenda Item 5A, which is mapping process and mapping meetings.

Hearing no objection, please proceed, Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk with the Commission this morning about a mapping process that your staff developed over -- more than two full days this week, since your last meeting.

So we took what we had in place and we started to strengthen that with a process that will help you move forward.

But before I get too deep into that, I want to offer a couple thanks.

First of all, you all realize, and I hope the public realizes that the census released legacy data last Thursday, the day of our last meeting, that data was untabulated.

So EDS and their team, especially I want to give Kudos to Ryan Taylor who I know at least two nights this week was working at 3:00 a.m. So I do want to thank them for their heavy lift of trying to get this data, the data tables built.

So, indeed, those could be loaded on your computers.

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.

At the same time Fred Hejazi from City Edge was making sure everything went well with a new software version that he had created and that everything could be coordinated and then in comes DTMB with an awesome team that figured out very well how to get those downloads to you this week prior to this meeting.

So Wayne Foster, Jake Scott and Gerad-Kempanan worked tirelessly as a team, first of all, to make sure all this got loaded on your computers in a way that worked well.

EDS and City Gate were testing and retesting and making sure everything worked well.

So I can't say enough about all these people who worked together to make sure that you have the software on your computers today.

Only a few days after that legacy data came out.

So kudos to that team.

So your staff also Edward, Julianne and I worked with Sarah Reinhardt almost all the days on Monday and Tuesday to work on a mapping processing considerations document that was sent to you on Tuesday for discussion and consideration today.

We started with a table of contents.

Page numbers, so you can find things in this document.

You can read that.

I know.

And appendix of supporting documents.

We also developed a list of key terms on page two.

You probably notice they are not in alphabetical order.

I know that would bothersome people like me sometimes.

But they are in three basic groupings one is on communities of interest.

The other is in consideration of criteria one.

And our Michigan Constitution.

And the last grouping is of mapping terms.

Because at different stages there are different terms for the mapping.

So very briefly communities of interest is the definition that is exactly in the Michigan Constitution.

The communities of interest may include but shall not be limited to populations that share cultural or historical characteristics or economic interests, communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties incumbents or political candidates.

So that is lifted directly from the Michigan Constitution.

We felt it was helpful to consider communities of interest in two ways.

One, those that had been proposed because there have been many presented to this Commission, well over 400 at this point in time, and, secondly to have a final COI.

So for example there may be communities that are overlaid on top of each other and you figure out that is only one community of interest but you receive several comments in regards to that community of interest.

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 as part of the process the Commission will consider the communities of interest that have been presented and then you will have to make that determination of which will be the final communities of interest that will be used in the mapping process and there is a lot more process to come in the document which you have read, I'm sure.

The second grouping refers to criteria one.

It involves the racially polarized voting.

So where there are significant minority populations, racially polarized voting analysis should be conducted prior to ensure proposed redistricting plans, do not fragment, sub merge or unnecessarily pack a geographically concentrated minority population which would violate Section Two of the VRA, that is called illegal vote dilution.

We are very fortunate that we have Dr. Lisa Handley on our team with EDS to look at and provide an analysis of that area before the mapping starts in any areas where this should be a consideration.

Secondly, the voting rights act of 1965 aimed to overcome legal barriers at state and local levels that prevented historically marginalized groups from exercising their right to vote as guaranteed under the 15th amendment in the U.S. Constitution.

It applies to redistricting, to prevent states and localities from drawing districts that deny underrepresented minority groups a chance to elect a candidate of their choice.

By Federal law they are protected groups and include African/Americans, Hispanic, Native American and Alaskan natives and all District maps must comply with the Voting Rights Act and protected groups may also encompass minority language and national origin.

So key issues that must be addressed before any mapping is done in areas of our states where people would be impacted.

Lastly there is a whole grouping of mapping terms.

So District maps are the maps of the electoral districts that when assembled comprise a complete redistricting plan for the state.

For each type of District so we know in our state Michigan has 38 Senate districts and 110 State House districts.

And after this last census we know now that there are 13 U.S. Congressional districts in our state for which this Commission will be drawing the lines.

Draft maps are defined as those that will be the initial maps drafted prior to the public hearing.

So there will be lots of draft maps.

Up until that point in time.

So just consider that drafts are drafts.

There is nothing final about them.

They are there on the table for consideration by this Commission.

And for comment by the public.

An alternative draft is a draft map put forth for consideration by an individual Commissioner during that draft map period.

And we will talk a little bit more about that later.

Draft proposed maps then are the ones that this Commission will approve for display. So those will be the maps that will be presented, that will be available for the public hearings and there may be two or three different sets for each type of District that this Commission will put forth to get public comment on.

Eventually we are going to get to proposed maps.

And those will be the maps that have been approved and published that will initiate the 45-day period of public comment.

So these maps would be voted on for final approval after that 45 day period ends.

And any changes after that would require an additional publication and initiate another 45 day period of public comment.

Lastly, we hope to get to this point by December 30th, final maps.

And these will be the maps that are approved by a final vote of this Commission.

And that those require at least two Commissioners from each affiliation, so two affiliated with the democratic party, two affiliated with the republican party, and two not affiliated with either party and sometimes known as independents but could be a member of a different party will have to vote to approve these maps and they become law 60 days after publication.

So those are the key terms.

But we found ourselves as staff like using different mapping terms and wanted to make sure that we had a consistent language that we all were using as we draft maps, so hopefully those will be helpful.

At this point I want to take a breath, stop and ask if you have questions.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Never mind, I yield back.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, first, I got to say great work.

Suann and everybody else who helped with creating this document. It's a very well organized document and I especially like how the terms are defined, which is important not only to me but I'm sure to everyone in the public watching.

I just have one question as it relates to the...I want to make sure my terms is right now, as it relates to the proposed maps for 45 day public comments.

And it's on page 14 and 15 of this document.

If anyone is following along with me.

So when we get to this point in the process, and we have put out the maps for public comment in this 45 day public window, at that point if we decide to make a change to it based on those public comments, we would have to start that 45-day window over again?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Do you want to take that? Julianne will take that just to confirm.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, that is guided by subsection 14, subpart B. The distinction is very clear. We move from the map drafting process to the publication of maps before the public hearings that the public will be able to provide feedback on.

And the feedback that is incorporated and the Commission's work during that public hearing process will result in those proposed maps for publication.

And you are absolutely correct that the Constitution would require if those are changed that those changed maps modified maps be published and the period would start again.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Mr. Brace had a comment.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, Commissioners, thank you very much.

I would also want to complement Sue for her efforts.

Most definitely she and I talked many times on this document and went over different terms.

She has been able to Chris like a lots what we talked about so I appreciate and comment her also on that side, thank you, crystalize.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So I have a comment/question on the mapping schedule and noticed our kind of initial draft was we were going to do the State House and then I think we're going to move on. I got that backwards. State Senate, then State House and then Congressional. But I noticed this is all kind of jumbled up. Can you explain the thought process behind why we are now doing Senate house, Senate house, then Congressional, then going back to Senate house? Just give us thoughts on that.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I would be happy to do that.

I paused for questions, and I did not quit.

I'm sorry if I was unclear. So if you bear with me and help me to go through this document, walk with me. It's page four. We will be there real quick.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, sure.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: So moving along to the constitutional mapping criteria in rank order. These are the ones in the Michigan Constitution. You've heard them time and time again.

I don't know if the public watching necessarily has.

So I'm going to go through them very briefly.

So number one is District should be of equal population as mandated by the U.S. Constitution and shall comply with the voting rights act and other Federal laws.

So this is the first step in the flow chart that has been developed for the mapping process.

That is in the appendix. And we will get to that in a bit. But that is why we need the RVP analysis, RPV analysis and the VRA assessment before mapping in areas of Michigan that may be impacted.

And Dr. Handley specifically pointed out Detroit, Saginaw, Flint and Grand Rapids were large areas where we should make sure that we have that assessment done before we would begin mapping in those areas.

Second is the District shall be geographically contiguous. And third shall reflect the State's diverse population communities of interest, which we have already defined.

Fourth is the no disproportionate advantage to a political party.

And, fifth, not favor or disfavor an incumbent elected official.

Seven, six, consider county, City and Township boundaries and seven is reasonably compact.

At the bottom of page three are the numbers Kim assured you, you would have memorized.

I don't know. I still have to look them at from time to time when I'm ask.

There they are in a reference point. So you know the equal number is the ideal District sizes. And then the range for State Senate and State House can be plus or minus 5% either way. And for Congressional Districts, that very tight, it's .5% either way.

So just bear that in mind as we go along.

We are going to need to know those numbers.

And if not, you know where to find them.

Any questions on that page?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I noticed this earlier, but I did not want to jump ahead because I'm imagining this is going to be published. So the District size and deviations, the one of the seven on the Congressional line for District size are transposed, should be 771,000, not 717,000.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you for the typo. And thank you for letting us know there is a Scribner's error. We will fix that.

Very good catch.

Our eyes were a little blurry when we got done.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Brace.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, my eyes were very blurry at that point in time too.

I would note that while we have noted the .5% deviation, half of percent in terms of the Congressional side of things.

Many states have gone for absolute quality in terms of District numbers.

So you may ultimately look towards, and this is something for discussion as well as legal citizens, looking at even getting tighter than that margin.

So I just wanted to make that point.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Go ahead, Executive Director.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you.

Moving on to page four.

As you can all see the schedule was changed.

We have the constitutional criteria that we are looking at.

We had the flow chart we were looking at.

We also realized that the Commission asked to start with the State Senate districts and try to draw all those districts first before we moved onto State House and Congressional.

That made sense.

But it would have stopped the mapping process.

And we didn't feel we had the luxury of the time to stop the process.

Or to have to go back to districts to try to make educated guesses and then have to go back and redo those districts.

That was not time efficient either.

So that is the reason for the change.

And Dr. Handley said in one of our meetings this week, well when you've got the communities of interest already plotted on the map doesn't it make sense to move from State Senate to State House districts? So, again, that is a consideration that we can use, that may make your job easier as you are moving from one to the other.

So we will just have to keep that numbers chart up front and center and you know I would entertain any questions on that.

And the other thing we tried to do is keep the region of mapping in collaboration with cities where we might be traveling especially as we move to college campuses.

So when we are in Traverse City they may not care much about Detroit.

And Detroit may not care much about the UP as far as the mapping process.

We want to engage the people and the area we are in.

In talking about their District even though we realize that anybody can make public comment any time for any District.

But we've seen the prevalence when we have done the public hearings of mostly people from those areas making public comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Could you explain what you mean by stopping the process? I'm not sure I'm following you.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Sure. Julianne is going to help out with that question.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

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

So, to build on that, Executive Director Hammersmith is stating, the situation, with the census delay and the census results, the legacy format and the processing that EDS has undertaken. Dr. Handley isn't just looking at the census data.

It's new census data in conjunction with past elections.

So in order for her to conduct her analysis of the state, she needs those data sets to be able to provide her analysis, which, in turn, Mr. Adelson will use for his VRA compliance



analysis as we are working -- excuse me, as the Commission is working through the mapping process.

So the new proposed schedule reflects that we are working through the areas that we don't anticipate Dr. Handley's analysis flagging and that once her analysis is presented, which on the calendar is listed as Thursday, September 2nd, in Ann Arbor, that the -- those results and that data will be available to the Commission so that when they move into those areas, the Commission will have that information at its disposal for its consideration when we are in those communities and the Commission is getting questions on what is there polarized voting in this area? And that way the Commission will have that information prior to beginning mapping those areas.

So that is why the restructure as the Executive Director indicated and as Kim alluded to as well, Mr. Brace alluded to as well, that is why the restructuring occurred of the District type as the Commission moves around the state.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Clark? And then Mr. Brace after or do you want to go first Mr. Brace? Why don't you go ahead because it might clarify his question.

>> KIM BRACE: I was the one that pointed you towards the State Senate doing that first.

And part of the goal there was looking to complete an entire plan.

So that you understood and I was concerned that you know you may be working in this part of the state but by the time you get on State Senate down to the rest of the state or the other half of the state, the other corner of the state, you suddenly run out of population.

Or you have too much down there.

And you got to go back and forth.

That is a mechanism that actually takes place in redistricting.

So you see that when you attempt to draw a single plan.

Now I recognize that we with the delay of census and everything else that was kind of a goal.

But we've kind of had to rearrange with all of this.

But I will remind you of that as we go through each region and each area that we may have to come back again in terms of by the time we get to the rest of the state and the area, it may be out of whack by that time.

So just keep that in mind.

That was the reason why I had suggested try to get a full plan done.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I'm sorry refresh, Kent Sigall.

>> I just want to remind the Commission you're not tied to the regions real tight. I don't know, you are those boundaries are just reference boundaries for doing the redistricting.

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

As long as you keep the districts balanced like if you do a District 3% higher and you do one 3% lower by the time you get across the state your numbers will keep matching up. But if you start stacking districts up at .3% high when you get to the other side of the state, they are all going to have to be 3% low.

Which will imbalance the districts shifts across the state.

So keep your -- keep part of the state balance with your plus and minus deviations

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I was -- when I took a look at this, I felt it was going to be difficult to operate in this way.

And I like the original plan.

I like the original plan better of just doing the State Senate across the state and then the house across the state and then the Congressional districts.

I'd like to put two other options on the table.

And get Kim's and Kent's and John's and Bruce's opinions on that.

One would be to do a hybrid approach.

Which in my opinion would be start off like this.

But once Bruce and Lisa have completed their work then we would revert back to the original plan, which is complete all the State Senate districts, complete all the House Districts and then the Congressional districts.

The other option that I want to put forward is that we don't do any redistricting starting Friday, August 20th.

And that while Bruce and Lisa are performing the analysis that they have to do, we concentrate on the COI for all of the ten regions.

It's because it's just not what we got from Lisa or I'm sorry from Moon that got transported over into your system.

We had 16 public hearings which some of that material may not be in there.

So do that.

Because we have to do it any way.

Get that put in place.

And then that would be in place when we start doing redistricting.

And the advantages of that approach, as I see it is, it gives your organization, Kim, more time to get the data ready and whatever you have to do on the systems side.

It gives Bruce and Lisa -- [ no audio ]

Impact the time to do the work because we are getting all the COI work done up front.

So that's two options that I'd like to get discussed as we move forward.

Personally I prefer the second option of the two.

But I need the experts' advice on that.

>> KIM BRACE: Well, I recognize both of the scenarios that you have laid out.

Sometimes I would tend to agree wholeheartedly.

Other times I see some conflict some places.

But I do tend to agree in terms of the communities of interest things.

We have been working closely to try to get Moon's data in.

And working with Fred in terms of some new ideas on how to deal with that.

He's trying to program some of that stuff now.

I can share with you tomorrow some of the concepts that we are working on.

I'm not sure that he would have those concepts implemented into the software yet tomorrow.

But it may very well be.

We are hoping for the first part of next week.

But certainly letting you, starting to see some of the communities of interest because we've been looking at them too and how we could deal with them.

How we can show them.

Or what kind of things show together.

Moon has some concepts on her side that are informative and interesting.

Sometimes I'm not sure that they are totally going to work.

But at least some of them are some ideas.

But I think we kind of look towards kind of a combination of her ideas and some of our implementations that we are seeking to really put in place in terms of what Fred has been working on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Rhonda has her hand up, Commissioner Lange do you have your hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No it was earlier and Doug's mic cut out and we were not able to hear him but it came back in so I'm good.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So what approach would you recommend at this point? You know, I mean, you know you have gone through this before.

And I expect that we will hit these road bumps often as we go through the process.

Like I mentioned, my opinion is that I'd rather not do any line drawing until we get the COI data together and we can take that approach but others may not feel that way.

And they feel they want to start the mapping as soon as possible.

>> KIM BRACE: Sue had some questions also or some comments and I will add a couple of things too.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I'm going to let Sarah she has her hand waving and has been working with Moon on communities of interest and I'm sure that is what she wants to comment on, I can read her mind.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead miss Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Executive Director Hammersmith.

One thing I wanted to point out to Commissioner Clark's suggestions, I certainly appreciate the creative approach that you suggested.

And absolutely this is an option that the Commission may consider.

But regarding the suggestion of considering all communities of interest up front to allow your consultants to work on the data that they are providing.

One thing that I would point out to the Commission is that with the current schedule it would involve assessing communities of interest at every meeting on an ongoing basis. Your communities of interest, they are not due at any certain time.

You will be receiving them throughout the entire process.

And while you could certainly consider structuring your schedule in such a way you would evaluate and determine final COIs to use our new vocabulary term it would mean that when you get to deliberations you would have a whole new crop of communities of interest that have accumulated prior to September 1st through September 22nd to reassess and redefine.

So just wanted to bring that up whereas with the mapping schedule that lays before you it would be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I agree with you, Sarah but once we do districts, those comments can still come in.

So when do you stop reassessing the COI? That is a point.

It has to be an endpoint.

Right now all our conversations have been that there is no endpoint.

I'll let our legal counsel discuss that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you very much Madam Chair so the endpoint for COIs and as far as input on the drafting process for the proposed would oxygen when those proposed maps are being adopted after the second round of public hearings.

The proposed maps that will be adopted and published to trigger the 45 day period. So that would be the natural, I think, way in which the communities of interest as part of the mapping process would be concluded.

As to the Commissioner Clark's suggestion, the first option, which, again, the Commission may consider the -- I would give you the information that as staff when we were having those conversations on how to try to preserve moving by types of districts, that was when we ran into the work stoppage.

Where the Commission would get to an area where it didn't have the information, the critical information needed to proceed in a meaningful fashion in that area.

And that it would not be able to move forward.

So again that is why the District types were stacked in the manner in which they were to avoid any work stoppage.

Being sensitive to the timing restrictions that the Commission has due to the census delay.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So as I understand it it's after the second round of hearings is when the input stops on the community of interest.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, to Commissioner Clark's point I think the information and the public comment may always be provided. But that the Commission should encourage members of the public to provide their feedback on the draft maps that are being promulgated during the mapping process. The maps that are published in advance of the second round of public hearings for public comment and feedback and then that would have the -- give the Commission the most time to work with and incorporate that data being presented by members of the community.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We will still have a constant flow of these comments coming in?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct and if the Commission again should choose to make modifications to the maps during the 45 day period republication and renote of that 45 days would need to occur.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We will have to revisit all of this any way after those 45 days.

And that's -- go ahead, Kim.

>> KIM BRACE: I would just say also in terms of the COIs as I said we've taken some looks at those.

And I think that might help you on some of that if we conceivably tomorrow start looking at some of that to help you, you know, understand what we are seeing and what they can be used for or not used for.

Because there is a whole wide variety of stuff.

And we are trying to get a good cross Section to figure out, you know, how we could make use of it, how you can make use of it, all of that.

But I'd like to kind of present that to you in terms of that.

Because I think that will help you at least understand.

We are in a stage of shifting, moving every day on this side.

And that's part of the reason why I have so much gray hair on that side.

So I apologize in that regard.

But.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Brace.

Commissioner Lange you have been being very patient please go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a question for Mr. Brace, professional map drawing question.

Considering we are all new people at this, we have never done this, and looking at what's proposed, would it not be more difficult to incorporate all three types of districts at one time compared to just one? What are the downfalls of doing it that way? In your professional opinion?

>> KIM BRACE: Well certainly from the standpoint of I think Lisa has a point in terms of you're in this part of the state and you've talked about what people have said COI as it relates to State Senate for example but how does that impact the State House. You know, in that same area so there is some point in terms of that where if you did all the State Senate first to get the advantage of seeing what happens when you get to the end, but you know then you are having to retrace over the COIs again when you're going through the State House.

Now, there will be different dimensions of it that won't show up in the State Senate but it will in the State House or vice versa.

So you will see advantages and disadvantages both ways.

And there really is no magic bullet in terms of this.

The key on redistricting is to be flexible.

And understand that there are changing circumstances just as, you know, last Thursday brought a whole big change of circumstances of now we have data you know.

I've been sharing with you estimates and all of that to kind of get things prepared.

Well, now I'm going to show you this afternoon what the real data is looking like on that side.

So it is a shifting and moving circumstances these days.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: My apologies for the interruption. Just for the record, Commissioner Wagner is still present. She had to turn off her video due to unstable Internet, but she is still present.

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

Do you have a follow-up?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes. As far as Doug's recommendation on the second one, the second recommendation about the communities of interest, I don't see that as such a bad idea.

I know the community of interest talk has been brought up as far back as December about how the Commission will work with the communities of interest, determining what communities of interest, how do they hold weight, do they conflict with others and I don't see that as a bad thing because I don't feel that that issue and concern that the Commissioner had was ever resolved.

I know we had one meeting where we discussed it for like 30 minutes to an hour.

But there was never any real steps taken.

So I really like that idea of doing it and getting it in play.

But I guess I'm open to what everybody else says too.

So that's all I've got.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Sorry so you don't want to say something first? Okay I was actually going to suggest because I do think that we are in the middle of a presentation and I think the schedule is like important but I'm thinking like the process

that will go during each meeting might help us or help me understand so like I said I'm just wondering if you continued with the presentation, it might help me understand how to you know think through some of these other alternative dates.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Executive Director.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: All right, I did want to mention that before this meeting, Moon sent a report.  
It's a draft report.

So I've not had a chance to look at it yet but what she wanted to do is work on those emergency COIs.

So when you look at the heat map of the COIs you can see different areas where there are many that are layered on top of each other and she really wanted to look at that and provide some suggestions of how those might all be the same COI or what those boundaries might look like.

So she is willing to do that work ahead of our mapping meetings so each region would have more information from her.

So I just wanted to make sure that Commissioners knew about that.

>> KIM BRACE: Yeah, I had gotten the same thing that Sue mentioned from Moon this morning.

And she's got some interesting points and that sort of thing.

So there is clearly kind of an emerging of a bunch of different things in terms of COIs that may mean or may make it worthwhile for you to focus on for a couple of hours at some point in the next several days, you know, even first part of next week or whatever, I also recognize that Sue is sitting there saying we got to move forward with map drawing.

And you know all of that sort of thing.

So I know her very well now too in that regard.

So but there is some overarching stuff that we are starting to see on the communities of interest side of things.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Executive Director do you want to continue with your presentation?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you.

So I'm going to jump past the schedule.

You've kind of seen it several times as to how this will be laid out.

Public hearings again are planned to start the week of October 11th and run for three weeks and there would be nine public hearings.

I will note that added from last week is Wednesday, October 20th in Kalamazoo per the Commission's request.

So I'm going to move forward more into process.

So per MC's Commissioner Rothhorn's suggestion.

So if you would like to move to page six, prior to mapping sessions.

So there is lots of homework involved here as you well know.

You started on the west side.

I apologize for that.

When we knew that we didn't have the adequate step one in our process to work in that area.

I apologize that I started you down the road but you will use it later so keep that thought.

So prior to every mapping session Commissioners should be reviewing and researching and taking notes on public comment.

So you are going to look at the constitutional criteria.

You're going to consider all the communities of interest.

From public comment, from all types of public comment.

Review any of the ACS or Esry data that Mr. Brace has provided for us and then familiarize yourself with the geography.

So I don't know how good of a geography student you are for the State of Michigan.

But I don't know that we all know every corner.

So, again, you know to kind of look at the natural features, to look at the highways, to look at those types of things.

If Commissioners wish to draw their own maps in these regions, you certainly may. But again remember that this is an open process.

That maps will be drawn in open meetings.

If you have something that you would like to share for Mr. Brace to present at a meeting, we are going to ask you to send that to MDOS and MICRC staff a day ahead to make sure he has that data overlay to utilize in a meeting.

Again these maps have to be publicly posted so as the Commission is working, the public needs to be able to see what you're working on.

So if the maps are publicly posted ahead of time, then they can take a look.

Again, the Constitution requires you to draw maps in open meetings.

So I think you need to decide what kind of process you want to use.

Every Commissioner can draw their own maps if they want to.

But in the end, it needs to be a collaborative process in an open meeting where you make the decisions on where the lines will be drawn.

And, you know, you may choose when you are in a region to create two or three different sets of maps based on what you have heard, based on the public comment and the communities of interest that you've determined.

So within the mapping sessions, again, we are waiting racially polarized voting analyst is waiting the data that she needs.

Some of that data is in your data set, just the population information.

She needs additional information to do her work.

So at the beginning of a mapping session we will have the Chair announce the region and District type being discussed for the public record, which makes 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.

EDS would open and display the mapping software, show the region being discussed with the communities of interest overlaid on that.

And the Chair would also let the public know where we are working when we come back from breaks.

So first well after the VRA and the RPV analysis, a review of the communities of interest and the process.

So those will be discussed.

And there is a whole process for that.

So we will get to that.

But hoping we can find consensus on where communities of interest lie.

Some of the public comment will be different.

Some of the maps will be different that you received for communities of interest.

So as long as you can figure out as a Commission where you want those plotted on a map, we are proposing something named F for final.

And then a number and the naming convention.

So you won't have maybe 20 of the same map in the same area.

It's very hard to see on a map.

But you may have a final one that is that region that has been clearly detailed by the people who made public comment to us so.

Even after COIs again consultation with the RPV and VRA consultants.

They will be with us throughout this entire process, making sure that everything that's done is needed, all the information that needs to be considered is considered.

And remember the repository that all the major decisions and rationale will be cataloged.

So as decisions are made, even recommendations, I mean we won't make final decisions until the end but as we move through and decide that we like this draft of a map, we are going to hold that thought.

We will get together the rationale for that so when we go back to version, you know, one we will remember what was done and why it was done.

If Commissioners want to draw individual maps, certainly they may make an individual presentation on the map they draw.

And, again, it's just that one day prior.

Due at 24 hours prior to a meeting if at all possible.

If we get, if we have drawn a District in a meeting and you're like I really don't think that is the way we should be going, I've seen communities of interest and seen other data that shows we should be doing something different, you have a strong feeling then by all means draft a map.

Submit it ahead of time so it can be discussed in the next meeting.

So it's a fluid process.

It will be always, always moving.

Things will be shifting.

Moving on to page eight.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can I ask a question.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Sure.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We don't have any time built in the schedule at all for people to do prep work we have Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday meetings and you're saying we should be reviewing COIs before the meeting so when are we going to do that? I would like to see a schedule where we have Monday for prep work then we map Tuesday, Wednesday and maybe we have Thursday to do more prep work or maybe have half day meetings.

But I don't realistically see looking at the schedule we will have time after being in a meeting from 10-5, eat dinner go back to if we are in a hotel room and travel to have any significant time to give any considered thought to COIs.

I think we are just going to be winging it because there is no time to prep.

We need time to prep.

If you want to have us review things ahead of time, we need that time built into the schedule as well rather than just having and I know you didn't put times on these meetings but I'm just concerned that we've got a really compressed schedule and no time to do the homework.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Noted, yes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just in response, I've been kind of loud about in the whole time this is what we have been hired to do.

And that is what weekends are for.

So we are going to have to be doing these maps then we can do our personal stuff and do our research and do our homework when we are not in a public meeting.

We can do that on the weekends.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Well I think that is your personal choice.

I mean to me that's an arbitrary self-imposed requirement.

Sure we could work 80 hours a week to get something done or we can say let's spend a little more time and do it more deliberately and slow our role so to speak rather than try to cram a bunch in.

My personal experience being a litigator and working 100 hour weeks that kind of work results in shoddy workmanship every time, every time and I see Kim and John nodding over there.

But I want to make sure we are being attentive to the public comments and that is the root of the concern.

If we don't have time to look at those public comments, then we're not considering them.

We are not deliberating on them.

We are ignoring them.

And it would be a tragedy to this process to not have that time.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: There are a couple things happening with public comments.

Last evening document number 20, which if you got to it, is an index of the written, the e-mailed and written public comment that we have received that our executive assistant put together for you if there was any geographical reference in that.

So counties, Townships, cities, that is one index.

The work that Moon is doing with the communities of interest to help summarize the public comment tool, that will be another resource for you.

Sarah Martinez our executive assistant will move on to regular meetings and do the same sort of index she has done for the written and e-mailed public comment.

So we are doing our best to provide resources for you in order to be able to incorporate that information rather than you reading every piece of public comment that has been received since the inception of the Commission starting now.

And I see Sarah's hand.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead Ms. Reinhardt.

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

Just wanted to provide additional context to your comments Commissioner Szetela and Commissioner Witjes as well.

I think that you know of course there are there is preparation that will need to be done for every session to refresh yourself on public comment and communities of interest.

But I would also argue that the Commission has been preparing for this essentially since you were seated.

You've reviewed public comment all along the way up until this point.

You've sat through many public hearings where members of the public come and testified before you about what it is they want done in their communities.

So many of these themes that you will be revisiting when you review public comment are not foreign to you.

You are very intimately familiar with them.

And unfortunately the reality with the delayed census means that our time that we have here is very compressed.

And the timeline as it is laid out is very conscious of the filing deadline which we had Jonathan Brader with the Bureau of Elections to present to you a few months ago.

And telling you all about the update to the qualified voter file which under normal circumstances I believe he stated it takes six months for them to complete.

But as you can see on this timeline, they will have not even a fraction of that time so unfortunately just because of the delayed census the reality is that there is not enough time for this process to really be expanded beyond what you see before you, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think that Ms. Reinhardt brings up a great point and you know for me it kind of goes back to that 45-day window of public -- of the 45-day window that the public will have to comment on whatever maps we propose.

So we need to make sure we get that proposal right.

We shouldn't be going back and having to edit it three, four, five times and resetting the 45-day window because if that happens then you know our partners at the Department of State are not going to be able to you know turn those maps into ballots.

So, you know, it's not optimal we have the timeline that we have.

But that is what we got.

I think we just got to move forward and you know do the best we can under these circumstances.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: MC?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Can we -- because I really hear what you're suggesting Rebecca we don't want to have shoddy workmanship.

I wonder if we can walk through this but if we can agree on this process and understand what we are going through I wonder if there are ways that we as Commissioners can help each other or figure out ways to yeah like yeah, I'm not sure how to talk about it.

But I feel like breaking it up or not breaking it up because I know we can't we don't want to have I'm not talking about subcommittees.

I'm talking how do we help each other, how do we communicate with each other so that we can make sure that every public comment is justified and that we are not breaking down the work.

Because it's going to become stressful, I think we all know that and what you are getting at Commissioner Szetela.

We are not going to make good decisions.

We are not going to remember if we are breaking down.

So somehow helping each other, yeah, but without try not to be too wordy but I feel maybe we do have the perimeters we have and we have to somehow, yeah, get through it together as best we can.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right I will hand it back to you Executive Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Also we have not determined time for meetings yet.

So and in some ways, we don't know how long is it going to take to map a District? How long is it going to take you know in this region, you know, maybe we can blow through some areas a little more quickly.

Maybe some not so quickly depending on what we see.

So.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I would suggest the less prepared people are the longer the process is going to take.

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

If people are coming in prepared and they already have something in their minds I think it will go a lot faster than if people are trying to look at things during the meeting that is my concern.

We can be more efficient if we build this prep time.

Like even on our Monday meetings we normally don't start those until Noon that is prep time.

But I don't want to see the schedule come out where we are meeting 9-5 every single day because I don't think that is efficient and I don't think we are going to get a good quality product out of that at all.

I mean that is just my suggestion.

Like I said you have not set the times yet so something to consider maybe Monday and Wednesday build in prep time so we have a little time to sit and think about things.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you, appreciate that.

Okay I'm going to move to page ten.

Deliberations of draft proposed maps for public hearings so this occurs the last week in September.

So, again, research and review.

The Commissioners will on their own time review, research and take notes on the collaborative maps and any additional public comment that has come in since those were drafted.

Additional alternative maps can certainly look at those also.

Then, again, some deliberation sessions that week.

So this is where you, you know, may have five or six plans and want to get it down to two or three to present for public hearings.

Whatever this Commission decides is the most appropriate number to put out or the most appropriate maps to put out for the public to respond to.

So in those sessions there will be map adjustments.

The Commission will have to determine the number of proposed maps.

Review all the draft maps that are out there at that point in time.

And then we suggested a voting process on page 11 whereof all these maps each Commissioner could vote on the number of proposed maps plus two.

So for example, you say we want to put out three State House maps for consideration by the public especially during the public hearings.

Then you would get five votes for all the maps in the hopper.

And from that then there would a round two of voting where the maps would be selected again just to confirm that, would be agreed upon.

And each Commissioner would vote for three of their most preferred maps if the number was three.

So let's say we want to put out three state maps everybody gets three votes.

And we would look at a voting process for that.

So just food for thought again.

Moving to page.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies for the interruption I wanted to note that Commissioner Lange has her hand up thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: As far as the voting, this is on the collaborative votes, correct? The ones that the Commission does as a whole, not individual maps if they so choose to do them; is that correct?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: These would be any maps on the table for consideration, so it could be a map from an individual Commissioner or it could be any of the maps drawn in the collaborative process. So, again, there may be ten maps in the hopper for State House.

You would have to whittle it down.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: To be presented to the public again, I guess I'm getting confused with that one part of the Constitution where it says if we cannot come to an agreement then each Commissioner can submit a set of their own maps for consideration and we would vote on them at that time.

Well, if that is the case, if, if Commissioners are going to do their own maps, shouldn't they all of those maps that potentially could be voted on be presented to the public at the same time? Do you understand what I'm saying?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel is going to weigh in.

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

That is an excellent question Commissioner Lange.

So there are multiple opportunities in the Constitution for individual Commissioners to submit their individual plans.

The first is in subsection nine.

Where this is prior to the second round of public hearings.

So during this draft mapping process, when the collaborative maps are being created by the Commission as a body, again, that's the mandate in the Constitution.

Is that the Commission create the maps.

So there is no requirement that individual Commissioners create any maps.

The choice and the option and the authorization for that is first found again in subsection nine where those can be proposed for consideration.

I believe the Section that Commissioner Lange is referring to is under subsection 14.

When we move to the vote if there is not a majority vote as set forward in the Constitution.

And the alternate process for adoption of maps comes forward.

That is another opportunity for individual Commissioners if they so choose to submit one map for each District type.

So there is a distinction between the two.

Again without knowing how many collaborative maps, how many alternate draft maps that the Commission an individual Commissioner would choose to submit it's difficult to speculate on numbers.

But hopefully that gives you an idea of the distinction between those two areas and the Constitution where that option is presented.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So just to clarify further, in theory individual Commissioner could submit their map as part of sort of the present drafting period. And maybe their map gets voted down and then we all end up not agreeing on a map, they could submit that map or a different map, am I understanding that correctly?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Correct Madam Chair.

So the scenario would be or I would also offer your colleagues would coop your alternate draft map as the preferred map and it would make it into that voting cycle that the Executive Director just outlined where the field would be narrowed to -- in a voting fashion the field would be narrowed to the maps that are actually published to go in to the second round of public hearings.

So, yes, there is another opportunity for individual Commissioners to submit their individual maps if they so choose.

And, again, an option that could also happen is that their maps could be cooped by the body.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, if we have let's say four maps and we have to choose one to bring forward, I would recommend that we use the ranked choice voting method that we previously used in selecting certain things.

So, in other words, all the Commissioners vote on the four, drop the lowest and we vote on the three, drop the lowest and then vote for the final.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think, and Rhonda can correct me if I'm wrong but I think Rhonda is getting to the point of I don't like any of your maps, then I can submit my own map and that's going to go out on the road show.

; is that correct counsel?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is certainly an option that the Commission can pursue.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think that is an option by amendment that an individual can pursue.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I would add the individually created maps will need to go through the same analysis process as the collaborative maps that are being created by the body.

So compliance with the criteria, the reflecting the communities of interest as incorporated by the Commission and that.

But, yes, Commissioner through the shared Commissioner yes that is correct.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: If I may Madam Chair apologies in addition to what General Counsel Pastula just said, the Constitution requires that prior to public hearings when maps our draft proposed maps are published for the public during the hearings they require the publishing of the map, the data and a legal description for each draft that's proposed or put forth for public comment.

And I just want to kind of go into a little bit of detail about what that is.

It's a lengthy, time consuming process for each map.

Now, we've allotted here an amount of time that we believe, based on conversations with your staff and with your consultants, is acceptable to produce those legal descriptions that accompany those maps.

But just want to make sure that the Commission is aware that in increase in the volume of maps produced for public hearings would also mean an equal amount of increase in the volume of data and legal descriptions that would need to accompany those.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt.  
Commissioner Lett? Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't disagree with anything that's been said here. I think the point being that if an individual Commission is not satisfied with what maps are being put forth, they do have the right under the amendment to put forth their own map.

They have to comply with everything else that the Commission has to comply with in order to do that though.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I do need some clarification and Executive Director General Counsel either one of you can provide this.

So with respect to maps that we've received on the portal, do we at any point need to vote on those as well as part of this deliberation process? Or is that something like maybe an individual Commissioner if there is one, they particularly liked could bring forward for consideration? Because I know like for example, we just received two very detailed sets of maps from two different organizations.

I mean are we do we have to vote on those? Or are they just submitted and if we like them, we can move them forward so I just want to know what the process is.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair that is an excellent question as well.

The mapping process document before you contemplates that those would be considered during the evaluation and incorporation of public comment.

And the mapping, the maps that are submitted by the public.

Whether those be communities of interest maps, District maps, statewide maps, regional maps, whatever is submitted by a member of the public.



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

So the proposed process would have those being considered and discussed by Commissioners during that prep, prep time when you are discussing the mapping in the area that you're in on that date.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

All right Executive Director?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Okay, I'm going to move forward then to page 12 of this document public hearings and debriefings.

There is a list of the public hearings.

Again, you would look at each area and look at the certainly look at the comment, the public comment received prior to the public hearing for that area.

Even though some of the comments may be outside of where we are.

Listen and note during the meetings.

Again these public hearings will be listening tours.

If public comment participants wish to share their maps, we are going to ask for their map ID on the portal.

So then EDS will have a list of those and they will be able to bring them up in the meeting so people attending those public hearings can see those.

At this point too Commissioners will have an opportunity to ask a question.

So if you're unclear where something is on the map you are going to want to ask if you feel that's a community of interest that should be put on a map, you're going to want to know where the lines for that community of interest lie.

So that would be a very important thing that you might want to ask.

And then we would build time into unfinished business of the next meeting to make sure that we had a short list of what was heard in that public hearing.

And what you might consider changing later when you get back to the next round of deliberations.

So I'm going to move right to page 14, which is that deliberations.

So there is a very short window allowed there for deliberations on the proposed maps that would be put forth.

Ahead of that 45-day period of public comment.

So, again, it involves determining the number of proposed maps you want to put forward.

Review the draft proposed maps.

Vote on them.

And then review the final communities of interest.

They will always be there for us to look at.

And then draft any adjustments that you might want to make to those maps that you put out prior.

So at that point the Commission would have to vote by a majority vote as to which maps would be put out for public comment.

So again it doesn't have to be one for each type of District you can put out two or three different maps at that point if you so choose for each type of District.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So let's see if I got this right.

So it's going to take some time for our experts that we've hired to get all of the legal description and everything ready during that time and Ms. Reinhardt said that we've been given an or into the calendar has been put a certain amount of time for that. How many maps is that considering? Like how I'm wondering what you were thinking as far as how many maps can be done within that time period?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Please proceed General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I apologize for jumping in Commissioner Orton the staff did not have consultation with the consultants.

We did not discuss any number of maps.

It will be at least three.

And we did not have any considerations or discussion of what that number is.

Staff is committed to providing the required information for the number that the Commission adopts.

And, again, like all of the timeframes that are set forth in this proposed schedule, they are subject to shift.

Things could happen sooner.

Things might take a couple days longer.

I mean it's just such a dynamic process that that would be my response to that.

But, no, there were no number of maps discussed.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So if we choose to put forth four of each type for instance, we might run longer on time.

It might not be able to be done in time.

I'm just wondering.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I think going back to the discussion that was just occurring earlier is much like the Commissioners themselves, staff and your consultants will make every effort, the requirements are clear in the Constitution what needs to be done.

So that is what will be done as expeditiously as possible so that the public has the benefit of the information as soon as possible.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn did you have a comment? Or Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: The only thing that I would mainly comment upon is your comments and desires to have legal descriptions of districts.

Those are not easy.

They are not easy to create.

There is some automations that have gone on in terms of some of that.

But there's a lot of proofing of that sort of thing.

So thinking that you might want to have legal descriptions of every District combinations or whatever, you're talking about a long time period for that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel are we required to have a legal description? When with talk about legal description when I think of legal description, I think of meets and bounds is that what we're talking about?

>> KIM BRACE: That's what I'm talking about which is what.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: It's not meets and bounds.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank God for our sake and theirs as well.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is Sarah Reinhardt with the Department of State but to answer your question Commissioner Szetela it's a constitutional requirement for several stages that a legal description be supplied for everyone, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Kent did you have a question or comment?

>> Kent: My question about the legal description meets and bounds or were they a census block list contained in each District suffice as a description? I know in some states they are doing that.

And they just list a box for each District.

And the census block number as the early description of the District.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: No, again, this has already been analyzed and apparently it was not shared with our mapping consultants.

No, it's not a meets and bounds.

There is a map that was published in the prior redistricting cycle for to meet this requirement that you're referring to and utilizing.

So it's not the standard for individuals watching when you purchase real property and the meets and bounds about what your boundaries are pursuant to a land survey that is not what this is referring to.

So and, again, that would be consistent with how this data has been provided in the past to be useful and to useful to the public, to the Commission and also to the clerks and the downstream individuals working in this issue as well as the candidates themselves on what description they will be in.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.

All right I think we are back to you, Sue?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Okay, moving on to page 16 then the adoption of the final maps.

This is scheduled for December 30th.

That is why the schedule is so compressed that this vote will happen before the end of the year.

In order to assist the board of elections in starting their process.

So on December 30th we will hold a meeting.

And the rules are in the Constitution basically.

So the plans have to be tested before any are put forward.

The Commission has to provide the public notice which has been done for 45 days and then there is a final decision.

And this is the point that requires the two votes from each representatives of each party and two votes from a nonaffiliated party person.

And then if you can't agree, then steps one, two and three in the little letters under C would describe the plan and that is where individual Commissioners can then also put forth a map at that point in time.

But I have the up most confidence that this body will be able to come to agreement on final plans.

So just saying.

I know you can do it.

I want to move right in to then the appendix really quickly.

The redistricting process you're going to notice on page two looks differently.

You asked last week, Commissioner Clark, to draft a chart for you to use in considering communities of interest.

In early conversation we were struggling because a lot of the questions in the process document which I believe follows this were not necessarily yes-or-no questions.

So it's difficult with an either or how to create a process flow chart.

So MC also helped with this process.

And this is the process that we felt we could bring forward as far as a flow chart.

So first of all, there is discussion of communities of interest from all public comment sources.

So the letters that are mailed, the e-mails, the verbal public comments, the public comment tool are all considered when we talk about communities of interest.

So first we look at do these comments adequately describe the community of interest? If you can't figure out what they're talking about or where you're talking about, then you can refer that back to staff to try to get more information.

But that would be the only thing that could be done you can't make it up.

If the comments adequately describes the COI, you can ask does the data confirm the COI description.

So does the data complement what is being talked about here.

If it's 180 degrees something isn't right so if it doesn't confirm, then it goes back to trying to get more information.

If it's yes then the question asked would be are communities of interest boundaries sufficient to keep the COI intact.

So it can't be you know my COI is the State of Michigan.

Well, yeah, those boundaries are intact but it's not going to work for mapping purposes.

If you can get a yes to that last question or all three of those questions, then there is consideration for putting that as one of those final COIs on the map that we talked about.

And if there is inaccurate or insufficient information, you may just move that to a repository where it could be considered later or further clarification is provided or found. But if you can't consider it, if you don't have adequate information to consider it, it will just have to be set aside.

So that's what was inserted into a smaller block that I think originally just said discussion of COI.

So that describes the process a little more.

And maybe Doug or MC have additional comments on that that they would like to share.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I think that was a satisfactory explanation.

The red is going to be changed back to blue.

I did that as red because those are the things we added.

And the green referenced the document that Sue originally had done.

And those three green blocks are going to go away too as well.

You know, if this gets approved.

So that's the only comments I got.

MC, do you have any?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, all right carry on.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Thank you so on page 21 is the original communities of interest and public comment process and considerations document. And we felt it was important to leave this in as a resource because there are some questions you can't put on a flow chart.

I mean, it's not always "Yes" or "No."

Sometimes there are different considerations so I will leave this to you to look at.

But for example, when you get in to step one, when you make the first assessment do comments submissions describing this community of interest agree or conflict.

That is not something you can put into a flow chart.

A flow chart has to have a yes-or-no answer to move forward or backwards.

So anyway those are things for consideration.

As a supplemental data agree or conflict? So we wanted to leave this intact so it was there as a reference for you.

On page 23, mapping software guidelines regarding a quorum.

During the mapping process it's very important that there is no quorum created outside of an open meeting.

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

As you well know.

Or a constructive quorum by you sharing with someone who shares with someone who shares with someone and eventually you have a quorum.

So you all know that.

It's just here to remind you.

That intentional sharing should probably not be done.

It should be brought forth to the whole body if you are creating something.

So then the whole body can have the consideration and the discussion in the open meeting.

You can't modify another Commissioner's map.

However, you can clone a map and make it distinguishable by creating a new name for it.

So realize that's something that could be done.

And we will provide for you a naming process in order to do that.

You can take a map off the public comment portal and start with that draft.

And put your initials on it just to say you started with that and you edited in these ways based on the public comment you heard.

Again it's a free flowing, moving process.

Just have to make sure that you don't or you're not importing maps on the portal that somebody gave you when you were at some meeting.

Anything that gets put into the mapping software from an outside source should go to EDS and then this Commission should decide whether they want to consider that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange has a question if it's all right if I interrupt you at this point.

Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I don't have a question but got a message in the chat Erin her video is off because of unstable Internet but she has a question.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you Chair and Commissioner Lange.

Suann, I do have a question.

You mentioned insufficient or inaccurate documentation would move to the not enough information repository.

And my question is: How will the public have access to that? So how will they know they need to provide more information on a map they submit if it's been moved to that repository?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: If it was inadequate information or insufficient information staff would reach out to them.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Okay.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: And ask for additional information.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Wagner.  
Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Okay, the next document provided for you is the ten regional plan with all the counties so another geography lesson for all of us. But, again, we worked at a county level when the regions were drawn so EDS, Kim, Mr. Brace provided that for us so we can see what counties will be considering when we start to work in a region.

Again, knowing that those are regions, those are not mapping districts, but those are regions simply to help the work along and lines surely will be drawn inside and outside of those regions as you go along.

Lastly, there are, well, not last, I think I'm almost there though there are two documents just for reference points.

One on consensus and one on getting to guests.

It's a great book on negotiation which I think might help you work together.

I'd love to do a presentation on that.

However, we have not had enough time in a meeting yet to do so.

So maybe someday I will get to that.

And the last document is called significant line drawing decisions.

And this is where we are in the repository creating a living document.

With major changes that you make along the way to your process.

So that's it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

I can tell a lot of work went into this.

I know you spent a lot of time on that.

Are there think additional questions for our Executive Director? At this time I would entertain a motion to adopt the resolution 20210806, approve the MICRC mapping process and procedures, if someone is so willing.

>> Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Erin, feel free to speak up if you have something to say because I can't see if you have your hand raised.

All right, seeing none, let's go ahead and move ahead with our vote on the motion to adopt resolution 20210806, approve MICRC mapping process and procedures.

If you are in favor, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Nay.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner, could you verbally indicate what your vote was?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I voted aye.

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 SZETELA: So by a vote of 10-2, the ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted.

At this point we are a little behind schedule.

We are at 2:06. Do we want to take a break at this time for 15 minutes or do we want to proceed? Without objection, we will take a recess for 15 minutes at this time.

It is currently 2:06 p.m. so without objection we will recess for 15 minutes.

Hearing no objections, we will recess until 2:20.

Thank you.

[ Recess ]

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I call the meeting of the MICRC back to order at 2:22 p.m. For the purposes of the public watching and record I will turn to Department of State staff to make note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Hello, Commissioners.

Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely state and unless absence is due to military duty, please disclose your physical location by stating the county, city, township, or village where you are attending the meeting remotely.

I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.  
Richard Weiss?



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 WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

Sarah I'll return to Juanita Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you, Commissioner Curry.

12 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

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

We will move to new business 6A.

Our General Counsel has not yet returned from the break, so we will move on to the next item, which is new business item 6B, communications and outreach action items. Edward Woods, III. Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Mr. Woods, I apologize for interrupting. Can you ensure your microphone is on.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: There we go. Last week we talked about the direct mail campaign. We just need approval to elicit informal bids for our mail service for the direct mail campaign.

If there is any questions, I can take them at this time.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions? If there are no questions, I would entertain a motion to approve 20210812, approval for informal bids for direct mail.

>> So moved.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Clark. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none, let's go ahead with our vote. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Opposed, raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and 20210812 is adopted.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies for the interruption again, Madam Chair. I would just request Commissioner Wagner clarify her vote verbally.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner, did you vote "Yes" or "No"?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, I voted, yes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. Appreciate it. The next one as you know we are coming up, on our second round of public hearings, and so we are, want to solicit our promotional consultants to help with media and engagement in our second round of public hearings and so we are doing the same process as before.

One will focus on Southeast Michigan.

Then the other will focus on the rest of the state.

And just so that we are clear, most of this money will be coming out of the new budget, not the current budget because, as you know, the new budget starts October 1st.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Edward, are the bids going to be open to everybody or are you contacting the PR firms that you had before?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Everyone.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments or questions for Edward about that proposal? At this time I would entertain a motion to approve resolution 20210813, approve issuance of bid requests for promotional consultants.

>> So moved.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: MC, did you have a question? Motion made by Commissioner Rothhorn and seconded by Commissioner Curry. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, we have a motion made by Commissioner Rothhorn; seconded by Commissioner Curry to approve resolution or adopt resolution 20210813, approve issuance of bid requests for promotional consultants. If you are in favor, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: If you are opposed, please your hand and say nay. And, Commissioner Wagner, if you could please indicate your vote.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I voted aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: The ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted.

Handing it back to you Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

In light of the Commission's approval, we want to do outstanding job of promoting our second round of public hearings so we want to start in mid-September. This is another one where the bulk of the money will start after October 1st.

But we need to get on the media schedule.

Being a Government entity, we are able to take advantage of the Government program through the Michigan Association of Broadcasters, the Michigan Press Association, and the New Michigan Media.

And so I'm seeking approval for media buys for the second round of public hearings.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much, Mr. Woods.

Any question for Mr. Woods? If not, I would entertain a motion to approve resolution 20210814, approve media buys for public hearings.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none, let's go ahead with our vote. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Opposed, there you go, thank you, Commissioner Wagner. All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted, so that is 20210814.

Back to you, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes, and the last one I have is dealing with translation services.

The state has a contract that they have already done for translation services for 250 words or less.

It's 11 cents, I'm sorry, for 250 words or less it's \$28 per page.

If it's more than 250 words on a page, it's 11 cents per word.

For non-Spanish it's 14 cents per word if it's more than 250 words per page or \$35.

This has been properly bided out through the State's RFP process. And we are able to join that rate with regards to translation that we may need to do.

And so I'm seeking approval for contract resolution services as outlined in resolution 2021815.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much, Mr. Woods. Commissioner Lange, did you have a question?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just for my clarification, what are they translating? I'm sorry but...

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: They would translate our promotional materials, anything we have as needed, so it's in Spanish and it can be in Bengali, what have you. We just wanted to have the option to have translation services and promotional materials specifically as it relates to the upcoming second around of public hearings or any other thing that might be informational to explain Michigan's new redistricting process.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional questions? All right. Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to approve resolution 20210815, approve contract for translation services.

Is that you? Motion made by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Witjes. So we have a motion and a second to approve resolution 20210815, approve contract for translation services. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move ahead with our vote. If you are in favor, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Wagner. If you are opposed, please raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the motions passes. The resolution is adopted.

Thank you very much.

Anything else?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you so much. Appreciate it. And I think I will give you about 15 minutes back.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We are going to bop back up into our agenda to go to 6A, General Counsel action items. If there are no objections, I will ask General Counsel, Julianne Pastula, to cover agenda Item 6A items 1-3.

Hearing no objection, please proceed.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. The first item listed on that portion of the agenda under new business is proposed revisions to the procurement guidelines that the Commission adopted in February of this year.

The proposals -- the proposed changes are to add a hybrid request for proposal process for expert witness or legal services in excess of \$50,000.

This would not replace the RFP process that's also listed.

It would just merely be another option for the Commission.

And I'll detail that with more -- I'll provide greater details on that in a second.

The other changes under request for proposals, under Section 5A, Subpart 7. In dealing with the main request for proposal process, the details have been provided about what staff evaluation process consists of and how staff conducts their review prior to turning all of that information over to the entire Commission.

So we thought that detail was helpful.

And that was at the suggestion of Ms. Reinhardt. So we definitely appreciated that feedback.

The bids, moving onto the informal, three bid process where the Commission would require three informal bids, consistent with the resolutions just adopted for direct mail and promotional consultants that Mr. Woods will be engaging in, there is clarification that the Executive Director is required to solicit additional bids to receive a minimum of three bids.

Or provide a written statement as to the efforts made to obtain additional bids and why those efforts were unsuccessful.

In a moment we will talk about the paralegal procurement contract and that was an instance where the bidding did not meet those thresholds.

Lastly, excuse me, not lastly, but also, again, inserting that review process undertaken before staff so that the details are set forth on how that is approached. And then the addition again of a hybrid process for expert witness or legal services \$50,000 and above is adding subpart D.

This subpart mirrors the RFP process set forth in subpart A.

The hybrid RFP would be posted for a minimum of ten days instead of 17.

It would require that the RFP be forwarded to a minimum of four potential vendors directly in addition to being posted and pushed out in the Sigma system of the state procurement.

So it would not supplant the competitive bid process.

It would just require that the potential -- the RFP be pushed out to at least four potential vendors for their considerations.

And they would reply similar to any other individual or entity.

The bidder questions are maintained, the evaluation process is maintained, and the vote is all maintained.

Again, the only addition is that it would be pushed out again to select vendors, Commissioners could select those vendors, could suggest those vendors as well and the minimum would be forward.

There is no maximum.

So those would be the modifications that I would propose and final to the award or final decision Section, the suggested language that the contract activities cannot start until the final resolution is adopted by the MICRC.

And all of the contract documentation has been fully executed.

And the MICRC can suspend any requirement in these procedures except for those contained in Sections D and E for specific solicitations upon majority vote.

So those would be the proposed amendments for your consideration. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions or comments?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I have a question.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead, Erin.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

Julianne, for those vendors that these will be pushed out to, is there a pool that we draw from or how does that transpire?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That's an excellent question, Commissioner Wagner.

The pool it would depend on what the services would be.

Again for an expert witness service what is the service that the Commission is in need of seeking to support their efforts.

For legal services is there a discrete area of law that's needed? And those vendors would be identified based on the services needed by the Commission.

Again, the Sigma system by the state pushes it out to all of the vendors listed under very broad headings.

So that would also be utilized as well as the posting on the MICRC website.

So those individual vendors or potential vendors would be identified by the services needed and move forward from that point.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional questions? If there are no additional questions, I would entertain a motion to adopt resolution 20210809, approve draft revised procurement guidelines.

Motion made by Commission Lett.

Second by Commissioner Rothhorn.

Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move ahead with our vote. All in favor of adopting resolution 20210809, approve draft revised procurement guidelines, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed please raise your hand and say nay. And I note for the record that Commissioner Wagner affirmatively responded aye. The motion carries, the resolution is adopted.

Thank you very much.

Moving on to local counsel RFP General Counsel?

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

Before you for consideration is the key deliverables for an RFP for the Commission to consider engaging local counsel.

So last week the Commission engaged litigation counsel to handle the challenges to the redistricting maps and other redistricting litigation that might arise during the Commission's work.

The Commission has engaged in out of state firm.

So this request is to identify local counsel that can be of service to the Commission for Michigan for items that would come up under Michigan law, specifically election law, our open meetings laws, our freedom of information laws where Baker Hostetler eminently qualified in redistricting, I think for them to get up to speed on the Michigan-specific laws that again do not impact redistricting.

This would be a kind of a middle tier of your legal team that this would be a prudent way to move forward and, in a way, to, again, assist, be a part of the legal team to assist our work moving forward.

The RFP for P deliverable one asks for a minimum of three cases.

Again, the Commission has already selected litigation counsel.

So this would get to just demonstrating that they do, in fact, go to Court.

Which is what we would need.

And the experience in Michigan election law and Government law experience.

Key deliverable two is consistent in identifying the key personnel.

And key deliverable three is again the critical conflict disclosures and political contribution disclosures and lobbying work if any by the entity bidding.

Again, the disclosures do not preclude consideration so we make sure to always include that disclaimer.

But, again, this is envisioned to be where matters are not appropriately handled by myself individually, but that do not necessarily rise to the level of needing Baker Hostetler to step in and represent us on our behalf for specifically Michigan issues. So I'm open to answer any questions the Commission may have.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Is Baker Hostetler going to require local counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: They can -- yes, they can get -- I can PHV them in and technically you could do, but I wouldn't recommend that.

So, no, that certainly, you know, when analyzing the options, having local counsel for them to coordinate with would be the easiest solution.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: What is PHV?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: It would enable a person who is not licensed to be able to pro hoc vice to come in and practice.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Oh, that explains it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So there is an RFP for local counsel.

I spared the Commission the analysis that went in to advancing the suggestion and the proposal to engage the counsel but that is a key portion of it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If we had chosen litigation counsel that resided in Michigan, would this hire be necessary?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Through the Chair to Commissioner Eid, I think that would depend on the firm that would have submitted a bid to that proposal and where their expertise lied and where their strengths were.

The litigation proposal was focused, not focused but it rightfully had a focus on redistricting litigation experience because that will fill the need of the Commission. But so it would be entirely dependent on the response received, what type of experience they had.

I know for VRA counsel there were some vendors that had election law experience and other types of experience that would have been useful to the Commission in those respects.

So it's always driven by the bid received.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Commissioner Eid, the other thing that you would want to consider is the type of questions that we may use the local counsel for.

We don't need to be paying 900 or a thousand an hour for some Washington D.C. silk stalking lawyer to come in here and do some local work.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional questions?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: There is nothing wrong with silk stockings by the way.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

Seeing no other questions, at this time I would entertain a motion to approve resolution 20210810, approve local counsel RFP.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, if the motion could clearly reflect if the Commission would like to engage in the RFP process, the more traditional RFP process

that we are -- we have utilized in the past or the brand-new hybrid process that the Commission just voted to adopt.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead, Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: My understanding of the hybrid process or maybe the advantage is because we have had slim response or slim responses. So if you believe, I guess I'm hoping that you will help us understand if you do believe that we may also have slim response and therefore we should use the hybrid? Or I guess I'm not sure if there is an advantage or disadvantage but help us, please.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

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

So I would always expect and hope for bid responses to the Commission's proposals. The hybrid process, again, has a shortened timeframe for a response.

So it moves a bit faster.

And, again, it would require documentation of which outreach was done, what vendors it was sent to.

So I know that for the litigation counsel RFP for example, that was pushed out and sent via e-mail to all of the firms that applied for the VRA counsel solicitation that resulted in the hiring of Federal Compliance Consulting, Federal Compliance Consulting and Mr. Adelson. So all of the firms who applied to that posting received the litigation counsel posting.

So the hybrid process moves faster and allow us to direct the RFP to individual vendors. So that would be the difference.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would like to make that motion and suggest we use the hybrid process.

So resolution 2021.08.10 using the hybrid process, I move that we adopt it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I was just going to ask for a second. So we have a motion made by Rothhorn and seconded by Commissioner Lett to amend resolution 20210810 to approve local counsel and will used the newly adopted hybrid policy. All in -- any discussion or debate on the motion to amend the resolution? Commissioner Clark?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, could you define the hybrid process one more time?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: The hybrid process, I'm going to pull it up that, way I do not -- the hybrid process mimics the RFP process exactly except for the timeframe to reply, the posting, excuse me, is posted on the website for a minimum of ten days. So the posting time is shortened from 17 days in the RFP process to ten-days in the hybrid process.

The hybrid process is forwarded by electronic transmission as a formal invitation to bid, to a minimum of four potential vendors.



On the written recommendation of your General Counsel, individual Commissioners may recommend names to be considered.

And the MICRC approves the issuance of the invitations to bid by majority vote.

So the vendors will also come back before the Commission.

So that is the key distinction, Commissioner Clark, between the two processes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, I just listened to you but you got to forgive me because sometimes I absorb information slowly. So what you are saying is the hybrid you basically pick who it goes to and a regular RFP it goes out to a wide variety. Is that what I'm hearing? I just want to make sure I'm hearing things correctly.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes. So the hybrid process, Commissioner Lange, will also go out to the public, will also be pushed out through the Sigma system and will also be posted on the MICRC website.

It mirrors the RFP process in that manner.

The way that it's distinct is the shorter posting time on the website of ten days and critically that formal invitation to bids are pushed out to individual vendors.

Those vendors are selected by the Commission.

So I would bring names to the Commission to do that.

And the Commission, Commissioners, individual Commissioners may suggest. In this case it would be legal firms within the State of Michigan would be the requirement, that would practice in the area of public corporation, Government law, public sector law preferably.

And those after being decided on by the Commission, not by me, I just promulgate the list for the Commission's consideration, the Commission would make the vote of what firms to send out.

But again the more the merrier, right? For being able to solicit potential vendors.

I hope -- did that clarify? For you?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: She is nodding, yes.

Any additional questions or comments? Okay. At this point we are going to be voting on the motion by MC Rothhorn to amend the resolution to specify that we use the hybrid process. So all in favor of the motion to amend the resolution please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed? Thank you, Commissioner Wagner.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

Okay, so the ayes prevail.

And the motion to amend the resolution is adopted.

So at this point I would entertain a motion to adopt the resolution 20210810, approve local counsel RFP as amended.

Motion made by Commissioner Lett, approved by Commissioner Witjes. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move ahead with our vote. All in favor of adopting resolution 20210810, approve local counsel RFP as amended, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner? Was that an aye Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Yes, it was.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the resolution as amended is adopted.

General Counsel?

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

The final piece of the legal puzzle today is before you a proposed contract with Robert Half Government, which is for the paralegal procurement that the Commission, again, issued twice.

They expressed an interest in bidding; but, again, without the three bids, it would have -- there was not a process to consider that type of a scenario.

The Commission has resolved that issue in the guidelines today.

But here is the standard Government contract that would reflect paralegal services on a part-time basis just through the end of December.

And part-time basis would be 15-20 hours per week.

And this would be direct assistance for General Counsel in reviewing particularly the FOIA request and the volume of documents that are being processed through that to assist in other work that direct work that the Commission is requesting where, again, we don't need litigation counsel or we don't need the services of local counsel.

So the pay range for these services are 50-75 an hour.

The contract was amended to reflect that the MICRC is self-insured and to accommodate for remote work by the individual.

And Exhibit B sets forth in greater detail the proposed services that would be asked of the individual should this -- should the Commission decide to move forward in this manner.

And I can answer any questions for the Commission.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: There is an incredible amount of work that is before us. And this will be a great support to our General Counsel. So it just seems like we need to -- I'll just move that we, yeah, I will just move that we adopt resolution 2021.08.11.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So we have a motion by Commissioner Rothorn to adopt resolution 20210811, approve paralegal contract. Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move

forward with our vote. All in favor of adopting resolution 20210811, approve paralegal contract, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Opposed, raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I have nothing further. Thank you very much for your consideration and your support with these additional resources to support the critical work of the Commission.

And I just wanted to take this opportunity, because I will not have a staff update later, to again thank everyone who participated in the mapping process work, in particular Ms. Reinhardt from MDOS.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

All right. At this time we are going to move to the next agenda item. Since we have already taken a recess, we are not going to take another one.

I know I'm such a slave driver. So we are going to move on to 6G which is new business item 6G review of census data. Without objection I will ask Mr. Kim Brace for Election Data Services to present this agenda item.

Hearing no objections, please proceed, Mr. Brace.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. And I'm happy to note that we are back on time.

We are starting right at 3:00 as the agenda says, so that is very good.

I have a whole bunch of things and so I need to check with Sarah to make sure that you're going to be able to see what I'm seeing.

I need to share my screen.

Am I correct? Yep, okay, so minimize those and maximize.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: While you're working on that I just want to note our Chair is not available today and that as the Vice Chair in the event I have to step out of the room I would like to appoint Commissioner Clark to act as acting Chair in the event I have to leave the room for any reason.

Please proceed Mr. Brace.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank you very much.

I want to talk with you about the 2020 census results that we received last Thursday. As has been noted already we have done a lot of processing and getting things together both for your computers as well as ours and I wanted to show you some of the results of what we have been seeing so far.

Today's talk I want to talk to you about the PL94-171 release that happened last week. I want to talk some about the overall population movement that we are seeing within the state and the impact that has on the counties and the regions in the state. And more importantly the impact that it has on districts.

And the various districts that we have.

And then I'm going to talk with you some about the demographic results that we are seeing on that side.

So first off, and this is where I'm going to end up shifting back and forth, but I think I can end up doing, yep, I want to see all right I have a spreadsheet I want to show you. If you recall, we have done before a question in terms of population change.

And we have produced a spreadsheet that looks at some of that change.

This spreadsheet which I've sent to everyone here so that you have those and are out on the website, has multiple tabs within them.

And so first off looking at the county tab and this shows us the population that the Bureau is now reporting for 2020 but most importantly we have on this exhibit we have the top part of the spreadsheet shows the regions that you all have adopted.

And then the counties underneath that.

But we are utilizing the regions that you've looked at and adopted.

And so what we have, the top part gives us some interesting clues on what's happening in the state.

You will see on the right hand side there is two decades worth of change.

That we are showing here.

And it's useful to compare the two to see what is going on.

So for example, the northwest region, ten years ago grew 5.87%.

But this decade from 2010-2020 grew by only 4.33.

So there has been some deadening of population movement.

We are seeing this in the state and elsewhere around the country.

Clearly people haven't moved as much or grown as much as what they had previous decades.

You take a look at southeast.

Ten years ago that was 5.9% increase.

This time it's only 4.25% increase.

So you can see some of this change.

Now, you end up seeing in Metro Detroit a significant change that is taking place.

Last decade it was losing population, 4.4%.

This decade it's actually gained 2.2%.

So there is some shifting going on, on this side.

And I'm going to show you some maps that shows all this thing.

But then you look at, for example, the west coast.

Ten years ago it was an increase of 4.9%.

This decade it increased 7.1%.

So the west coast has seen a boom.

And seen an increase.

And you can end up seeing that on the maps that I'm going to show you.

So, let's see here, maps that I have.

I have lots of stuff here.

Shut that one down so I can go find it again.

I apologize.

Let's see.

Okay, here is the map of our regions.

And we are seeing what I was just going over with you in terms of the regions.

I will Zoom out a little bit more.

You see on the left hand side is the population numbers that change.

And the right hand side is the percent change.

And so graphically what you're seeing and what we are seeing on the data is this shifting from the eastern part of the state to the western part of the state.

And the Bureau documents that but we are seeing an increase in the southern part of the state.

Including in Detroit Metro.

Certainly we got 85,000 more people in Detroit Metro than what we had before.

So there is a shift there.

The UP has lost, obviously.

And all the northeast, east central and the east have all lost.

That's going to shift where we are looking at in terms of districts.

So it's important to look at this sort of change that is taking place on that side.

And all of these tables and maps are in the presentations as well as the data tables that we have up there.

What we end up seeing, we can see, yeah, there is my county change.

So we can see this indeed when we look at the individual counties.

And see the shift that's going on within the state.

It's a little bit more detailed to see.

You see where the change has happened even up in the UP.

And where it's not the entire UP.

In fact, Hopeton County ended up gaining a little bit from ten years ago.

But there is significant changes in other parts of the county, up in the UP.

And this does impact how we look at drawing up there on that side.

You see then within the state itself, down state, you see the change that's going on in Wayne versus Suburban Metro on that side and that is significant to take a look at and be aware of.

So it's shifting population and increasing and decreasing population that are all impacting what we are going to be looking at and experiencing as we draw on that side. So I wanted to give you some clues on what we are seeing on that, in that regard.

And, okay, I think that's -- so what we have then is we have going back to this table, we have seen not only the regional areas but county by county population change. And all of that data is there.

And, in fact, we have split out some areas like what we did in our previous meetings with you.

So you can see the various pieces and the change that's taken Mace.

So the county summary tab in this spreadsheet that has been sent to everyone and is up on the website kind of gives you an overview of what you're looking at.

But we are also concerned in terms of the State House and State Senate.

So if we look back at my PowerPoint, again, well, if I only followed the PowerPoint, I apologize, let's see.

I had it embedded into the PowerPoint.

I apologize.

Let's see here.

Okay, there we go.

So we've got the regions and the counties as I mentioned.

But we also then have how we look in terms of State Senate and State House.

And that impacts on the allocation of the legislative districts.

Between the two chambers.

Now, what you see here similar to what I had shown you before is how many seats could logically go in to in this instance the regions? And this is on State Senate seats. So what we are seeing is that a third of a seat is likely to be gained by the west.

The west area of the state.

Not a lot of change in terms of State Senate, but what you end up seeing is you see a little bit more significance when you go down to the county level.

And which counties would be likely to be gaining the potentials of legislative seats.

And which regions and where in those counties, in each region.

So you can begin seeing, again, the gray scales are where they have been losing population.

And all case of seats.

While the orange and the yellowish is where they have been gaining.

So, again, this shifting going from the east, going to the west.

That is happening in the state.

You see this again in the State House data.

Also so in the State House the western region is gaining almost a whole seat in State House over in the western part of the state.

That's the most significant change.

You're seeing by looking down at those lower levels you are seeing the importance of the shift that is going on.

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

It's not going to have that much of an impact on Congressional, a little bit of influence on State Senate, but the bigger influence will be in the State House.

So it's something for you to keep in mind as we are looking at all this data.

You see more so in terms of at the county level.

In the same way.

And where within the state and I'm sorry within the west region of the state where that shift is happening.

It's happening in, my eyesight has gone bad I'm sorry in Kent and Ottawa counties in looking at that on the west side.

And you certainly see in Saginaw the influence of the loss there in Flint, in that regard.

So this is going to end up changing how we end up looking at the state and thinking in terms of the state.

And so I wanted to first off let you raise questions on this before I continue on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions? All right please, there you go, Mr. Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So looking at these maps would it be correct to say that two important areas we have to look at are the Grand Rapids area and the suburbs of Metro Detroit? It looks like that's where a lot of people may have shifted to in the last ten years.

>> KIM BRACE: I would agree with you.

Metro Detroit, it's not only Metro Detroit but it's some spill over in southeast also on that side.

So, yeah, there is going to be a lot more work that we need to do on that side, in those two areas, I agree with you.

Other questions?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I hope this question doesn't sound silly, but the politicians that are over these regions and cities and everything.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry I apologize for interrupting would you speak more directly into the mic, please?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I was losing my thought, the politicians that are right now over these places that are getting shifted or not shifted but whatever will they -- how are they going to still keep their amount, they won't keep their amounted area, will they?

>> KIM BRACE: I'm going to show you that this a second, that is a good preview. Any other questions on this information? No, okay.

Okay, so the next subject is your subject, good question on that side.

So the issue here is I need to issue a disclaimer on here.

You need to note that I know the Commission has already indicated that you want to start with a blank slate.

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

And not the current districts, I understand that.

But in doing redistricting you do at least take a look at what the existing districts are.

And so that's what we are going to be doing now.

But I recognize as I say you're going to end up starting from a blank slate.

The other disclaimer that I want to say is that nothing here should be misconstrued as setting a target for individual districts.

And that's related to not only the composition and the shape of the districts but it's also in terms of the racial mix that I'm going to share with you.

So it should not be viewed as any kind of target or what should be done in terms of seats on that regard.

That's going to be the subject of Bruce's analysis, Lisa's analysis, all of that, that will help dictate that in terms of the districts, so I don't want to preface this.

This is just the facts of what the data is showing.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much and just to complement what Mr. Brace is saying on the disclaimer page most appropriately is to highlight again when we move into the minority population data statewide and what the census demonstrated for that, again, for redistricting purposes race cannot be a predominant factor so there are so many other considerations this how the data is used both by Lisa and Bruce going forward.

So again we are just receiving this data as were the census has indicated the minority population currently resides or as of April 1st, 2020.

So that would be the addition to the disclaimer I would make again that caution about racial predominance as used as a factor in redistricting and the problems that that would create.

So we are just here to receive the information.

>> KIM BRACE: Correct.

So let me go back to the spreadsheet that we have here.

And we have a spreadsheet that is actually we have two spreadsheets here.

One is called the SDU, that's for the upper District.

The upper chamber, the State Senate districts, okay? That's the way the Census Bureau refers to State Senate in the lower chamber is the State House.

So just adopted the description from the Census Bureau's standpoint and you look at them at State Senate, State House.

So what we have here is we can see as it relates to in this instance this is the lower chap Bertha I mentioned to you, the State House.

On the deviations, we are showing the populations for each and every State House District in this table.



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

And the deviation tab of this spreadsheet shows you for each individual District what is the target.

We know for State House 91,612.

I told you, you will remember these numbers.

But we show the total persons, what is the Census Bureau reporting in that area that forms these districts? These districts of what they were in the past decade.

Okay? And what we see most importantly is that indeed for the State House, you have a total deviation of 49.25%.

If you remember, the courts have said that we need to keep this under 10%.

So already I know from this data that you're out of whack.

The state legislature is out of whack and there has to be some change.

Just from a one person, one vote standpoint.

So it's important to recognize that and we can end up seeing through this data table whose the highest and who is the lowest.

What makes up that 49% on that side.

But each of the districts contribute something to that whole mix in how you can look at it. Indeed what your biggest difference is, is State House District 34 at minus 27% and State House District 38 at plus 22%.

That's what forms those big margins, okay? A lot of the other districts aren't that significantly different.

You know, they are within the 5% you know plus or minus.

The thing to keep in mind in redistricting is for all those members or legislatures that fall under that 5%, they are going to all tell you oh, I don't need to change.

I'm fine.

You know, you don't need to change my District at all.

Well, that's not really the case.

Because when you look at the kinds of shifts that we are seeing across the state, people are going to end up shifting, you know, you can't sit there as everything shifts around you basically.

So keep that in mind as you're doing your own drawing.

That you're going to end up shifting a bunch of different circumstances.

So from the State House you've got that kind of a change.

And from the upper chamber, the State Senate, your deviation is 25.7% deviation.

State Senate is going to have to change too.

On that side.

So you end up having some basic information on this deviation tab of these two spreadsheets for you to make use of and make understand.

Now, what we have done is try to help you out.

And that is via some maps.

Let me bounce back over to the spreadsheet, to my PowerPoint.

Here is State Senate.

Okay, for these are the districts and what the deviations are for State Senate, from the ideal population of 265,193.

Can you see this?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We just lost the TV screen right in front of us which is why everybody is sitting here.

>> KIM BRACE: Looking like what is going on

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: The screen went out so we are signaling over there that it went out.

Now it's back up.

>> KIM BRACE: Okay good.

So here is the State Senate districts.

And the districts themselves.

Keep in mind what this is telling us is the gray areas are the ones that are losing population.

The pink areas are where it's gaining population.

These are the individual districts, okay? And we've got both this is the raw number change.

So the biggest decrease is at 37,000 people in a District.

The biggest increase is 31,000 increase.

You can see that in terms of overall deviations.

So what you're seeing also here is how this is going to impact the legislative boundaries on that.

And particularly, for example, up in the UP, you see the bigger loss in District 38.

And less of a loss in 37.

Coming down and across the Bay.

That's going to have an impact.

Not as much so on the State Senate, but it will be there.

But I'll show you what it really does in terms of the State House.

But you can see across the state where the losses have occurred really halfway up and all the rest of the way.

Well, down, since Grand Rapids and south basically, that's where your gains have been except down in those District 16 and 17.

You know that is lost too down along the border with Ohio.

So you've got this dynamic going on.

And it is impacting down in Wayne County.

In Detroit, on the far right hand side.

So that you've got significant loss down along the river.

And the gains are happening outside of that area.

So what's going to end up happening for when you're looking at drawing districts, that will impact how you're going to draw those districts on that side.

As this shift needs to take into account.

You really see this even more so, well, this is the deviation.

I'm sorry not deviation.

Yeah, deviation for my deal.

You can end up seeing how all of that upper part of the state is all under populated.

And needs to now expand to add more people.

That's the key.

>> So we need to add people in those places.

>> KIM BRACE: That's right and where do you get them?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Over.

>> KIM BRACE: The below part of the state so there is this shift under populated districts in the north are going to have to grow to get people from where the people are now.

And that is a significant factor that needs to be, one, recognized as well as that's the data.

You know, we can't sugar coat it on that side but that is what the data is telling us.

So we see this in terms of State House.

But as I mentioned you see it even more so on State House, I am sorry not on State Senate.

This is State House.

And so here I know you don't like the District shapes, okay, I understand that, yes, I'm aware of that.

But you look at the UP, the U P has got all this loss up there in 110, 109, 108 but you get over to 107 and they have got some gain over there.

So all three of these districts in UP are going to have to go in to 107.

Probably come down across.

You've already got 107 coming across the bridge any way so it's going to contract a little bit because those three districts up there will gobble up part of 107 and then 107 is going to have to come further down into the main part of the state.

That's the kind of concept that you're talking about.

So you need to understand where these shifts are happening and what that's going to do in terms of how you draw the districts.

And so this is where when we looked at this data to see what the existing districts are, we have been talking about counties and townships and everything else but you really see this even more dramatically when you look at the districts that you've got on that side.

So it is important to recognize that.

Now, you see down in Wayne where that loss is happening in terms of the State House districts down there.

In Wayne and Detroit.

You can see where it's predominately up in the upper part of Wayne.

Not in the certainly not in the western side of Wayne.

On that side.

So it's a microcosm of the state and it's happening the same way in Wayne this that regard so you're going to end up having to shift districts within Wayne.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Curry could you turn on your microphone, please?

>> KIM BRACE: I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: When we are adding, I know we are just adding them there but they don't literally move.

>> KIM BRACE: No, that is correct.

What you are doing is adding territory.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Territory okay.

>> KIM BRACE: The people that live in that territory but you are not moving them themselves.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right.

>> KIM BRACE: You are just taking those districts so that those areas are going to be represented by somebody new.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: Okay, that is the key.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: It's not, no, we are not moving people.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I didn't think so that is why I said it was a silly question but no questions are very.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Hands going up around the room and Mr. Adelson and Mr. Morgan wanted to comment so go ahead.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair, and everyone it's a pleasure being with you again and when we are talking about deviation population deviation all of that can get pretty intimidating and confusing but I just want to remind you of a couple of things with Congressional districts, the population deviation has to be basically zero or as close to zero as possible.

That is a U.S. constitutional mandate.

Supreme Court in various cases involving state legislative districts said we still want to see the deviation as low as possible but you do have leeway up to 10%.

But what is important 10% is not a guaranty.

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.

Just because you're 9.99% and below doesn't mean you're bulletproof, does not mean you have no liability or your plan cannot be challenged successfully.

The trick is, the key is explaining the rationale why.

The Supreme Court as you know in the last redistricting cycle said compliance with the Voting Rights Act is a compelling interest, that is an explanation that is considered value -- valid and no worries.

So that goes to what we discussed over the summer of the importance of having a regard.

-- record.

If you have a record of a certain deviation explaining why.

So please keep that in mind.

I know these numbers can get already my eyes are swimming with all the percentages but remember shorthand you have more leeway with the state districts than with Congressional.

Congressional is basically zero difference.

To the degree you have, deviations at the state level, you have to say why.

So that is basically what I wanted to say.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much, John?

>> From a map point of view and to personify and these are districts and when you think of different areas of the state you might think they are hungry like the Districts in the UP you have three districts side by side that are all under populated and because it's an endpoint there is though where to go.

So like Kim was saying with the 110, 109 and 108 they have to eat into 107 there is just no other way to do it unless you were to collapse a seat and literally move it away.

But that is really unlikely up there because there is still plenty of population.

So you know some districts are hungry.

Some Districts are full.

They have extra population.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Just out of curiosity is there any thought process when we are doing these lines and drawing these lines about sort of padding under on districts where population is shifting? And maybe padding up an area on areas moving away from?

>> KIM BRACE: You can.

You need to be a little bit careful on that because as Bruce will tell you, the state of Georgia got their hands slapped because it was a partisan unders and overs on that side so you got to be careful that you don't get caught in that kind of a trap in that regard.

So but that is the main caveat to be cognizant on that side

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Kent.

>> Be careful stacking districts in a region because that will -- you're in essence shifting more districts to the other part of the state. And if you stay in 5% in the UP and come on down, and when you get near the end, for everyone that is over 5% it has to be one under or 3% over, 2, 1.5% under. But you can shift and steer districts around the state simply by manipulating the pluses and the minus.

>> KIM BRACE: As Bruce was talking before, I had the raw number difference for the districts.

Now I'm showing you the percent difference.

So you can see that you know, the districts in the darkest gray are from 10% under populated to 27% under populated.

And you know that's particularly in Wayne on some of those.

And so you end up seeing from a percent wise what you're playing with and what is possible or not possible.

So it's important to understand both dynamics because it will show you a little bit different dimensions to the equation and the problem you have on that side.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think Commissioner Clark has a question before we move on.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do I think population is going to drive these districts. So it's going to make applying the communities of interest a lot more difficult. A lot.

>> KIM BRACE: Exactly, yes.

I agree with you.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

>> KIM BRACE: Because basically, you know, as Julianne will tell you, population kind of controls everything.

Yes, there is other criteria's; but they are second fiddle to total pop.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So does that infer that we're going to have to minimize the communities of interest, do our best to apply them?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Commissioner Clark so I will jump in on that one. I think when you look at the constitutional ranked criteria, again, we are looking at one and two the first two criteria and then the third being diverse population and communities of interest.

So when the Commission is engaged in its mapping work and the prep work and looking at those community of interest overlays in addition to.

So I see it as building the data that the Commission is going to be reacting to and considering when it's drawing its lines and talking about line drawing.

So I would view it as another data layer.

And, again, it's the third criteria.

So I think obviously it has to meet the population standards, but the way that those particularly the top three criteria interact is going to guide kind of the work for the rest of your considerations.

And, again, the only bad decision is the decision with no data. So the more data that the Commission has in an area, the better decisions it will be able to make.

And the communities of interest and the diverse population that's reflected in and I know we are getting there, Kim, I always want to jump ahead, I know we are getting there but when you start seeing the next series of maps, it's going to be, it's going to be yet another data layer, another layer of consideration and discussion.

So I would view it not as we will focus more on the population.

I think the communities of interest will inform actually that discussion as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: You have to concentrate on the population because of the deviation requirements you get from the Federal Government.

So I mean that is why I see applying the communities of interest as difficult because it's not only the population, it's also the VRA requirements.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which we could draw these maps and have a concentration of African/Americans in a certain area and Bruce is going to say no, no, you can't do that.

And; isn't that right, Bruce? And then you may have the opposite where you have African/American community and you split them into four districts, which is another no-no.

>> And I think that is what you know I know it's like the first day of school.

You're anticipating school all summer and you wonder about it then you go to school and you get your assignment and meet your teacher or teachers and then it all comes home to you.

All of this is part of the process.

So there is nothing here that is unusual.

There is nothing here that is like oh, my God what is going to happen.

However, I think it is to your point and to what Julianne was saying the diverse populations will impact with the Voting Rights Act requirements.

The equal population requirements also intersect with the voting rights act and diverse population and community of interest as well.

We heard from one of the speakers this morning that all of them may not come together but the great balancing act in a way with redistricting is following the criteria the way they are set out, balancing the numbers in the best way that you can.

And I know that you know in Arizona about ten years ago we made some specific decisions about how to get there.

But it is challenge as you point out.

This is we are first day of school.

We got our assignment.

This is the actual data.

We don't have to speculate.

>> If I may comment on that and support what Bruce was saying it's like the first day of school.

There is a lot of information here.

But we will get used to the new District structure very quickly.

You're going to see you know as we go through this it seems like there is a lot of change, there is, but then once you start the process of drawing for 2020 you will get used to what the new rubric is for the District structures.

>> KIM BRACE: Right, okay, so from ideal District sizes for the State Senate and more importantly the State House, you can see some of the dimensions of what you're going to be challenged with on that side.

And then there is the next one.

The racial side of things.

Julianne tees that up beautifully on that side.

Let me go back a step so that everybody gets familiar again with what we had seen before.

And what the Census Bureau has and the data that it has.

Move this thing out of the way.

What in 2010 and in 2020 the Census Bureau looks at two fundamental questions.

First of all, it's the question of are you Hispanic or not? And, if you are, maybe there are some sub-categories in how you are. But there is a second question that asks the person's race.

And it's important to keep those two distinctions apart but I'll show you how we combine them.

But from the Census Bureau's standpoint they are asking two fundamental questions on what is your Hispanicness, your origin and then what is your race.

You notice on the race in 2010 they give you some categories, sub-categories for the race which is what was important.

But what they also did then for 2020, they did a little bit different.

They changed, they still kept two questions.

They did Hispanic, "Yes" or "No"? And they did some sub groupings on the Hispanic side of things.

But they also gave you a box, a set of boxes where you could fill in.

And this was the major thing that they discovered in 2020.

Is there is a lot of people that were filling in the box.

We were giving a little bit more information.

We have some of that.

We don't have all of it.



But it has changed some of the dimensions of the racial data that we're looking at.  
And I'll show you how.

From the race question, that second question, they gave a lot more examples of things.

So for the white population, were you Lebanese, Egyptian, German, Irish, English? Those were examples that weren't there in 2010 but it did get people to start thinking of those.

And starting to fill in the ancestor.

And fill in those boxes with some additional pieces of information.

That did have an impact on the data set.

So part of what the Bureau is telling people now is be cognizant of this shift of basically methodology that has taken place in these past ten years.

That may explain some of the shifts that we are being reported out.

It may be just the methodology of what the people are interacting with the questionnaire versus hey, there is more African/Americans here.

Or there are more Asian population.

It's a combination of, yes, there is more.

But it's also the mention of how they were answering it.

And I'll show you some of the impacts of that.

Keep in mind that this time you can markup to six choices.

So that has an impact and that is led to more people saying I'm multi race.

Certainly as we have you know, African/American husband marrying a white wife the kids are all you know both races in that regard.

And so that's had a dimension on this whole thing.

And I'll show you how that has impacted in Michigan.

If you remember from our discussions before, I talked about the different ways of looking at race.

And this was just a slide of what we had done before.

But there are different ways of looking at race and they fall into three major categories.

And we will be using those categories for all of what we are seeing and all of the spreadsheets that you will see as you draw.

So it's important for you to be cognizant once again of what these dimensions are.

The three major components are answering race alone with just that race.

They could say "Yes" or "No" in terms of the Hispanics but the race alone is an important distinction.

On the opposite side, there is the race combination or combo or max.

That is where you are maybe Black, you were maybe Asian, you were maybe a bunch of different things.

And it's the question is where are those numbers counted? In the max, they are count on all the different races.

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

In the alone it's just when they answered the question of just one race.

Okay? So you keep in mind that the alone numbers are going to be probably on the low side.

You know, this percent African/Americans alone.

But if you look at the combo side, you'll pick up all those combinations because if you remember this chart, you've got this call on the alone of two or more races.

You see that on this dimension.

On that side.

So that two or more races is what allows you to come up to 100%.

But it's a category there.

It's two or more.

In order to dissipate that two or more you look at the combo or the max.

So you can see here the two or more when you get down to max is zero because I've distributed all those two or more over to the other racial groups that they answer.

So the max gives you the highest percent of a racial group.

And so what you have is this dichotomy and this dimension of racial answers that's important to keep in mind whether or not it's the minimum, the alone or it's the maximum.

And you will have advocacy groups advocating differently.

African/Americans will say we need to look at combo as opposed to alone.

Because I want to make sure that those 2.9% in this example get distributed to my community or my racial group.

So you're going to see a lot of people coming in and saying, hey, use the combo numbers.

The important dimension of that is when you use the combo numbers and you look at all of the races together it's going to add up to more than 100%.

And you see that in this old stuff.

This was 2010 data.

I'm going to show you 2020 in a second but I want to make sure you understand this, the concept.

The potential middle ground is what the Federal Government has done.

And said.

That is the OMB numbers.

And the OMB numbers get you closer to 100%.

It actually puts you a little bit below 100%.

You can see that.

It's in this example and it's 99.28%.

But when you look at the racial or the OMB data, it gets you maybe a little bit closer to where things are.

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

The OMB was basically saying that you count anybody in who answered any race in combination as that race.

But when you got multiple races and you got races including the white you don't count them as the white.

So the OMB kind of deadens the number a little bit from the max numbers you will get but it's above the alone categories, okay? So this dimension is important to realize.

That dimension carries forward in the total population, the top part of this table.

But also in the voting age population.

The bottom part of this table.

And you will see on -- as you start drawing these spreadsheets are part of what's embedded within the active matrix you will be seeing.

These are the various spreadsheet numbers and let me show you.

This is Michigan's PL data.

I apologize for the smallness of the numbers.

There is a lot of numbers and it's hard to show everything.

It is part of what's in the PowerPoint.

You will be able to Zoom in to it and see more.

And it's part of the spreadsheets that we've created and given to you.

But you can see that the sheet number is there on the left hand side and that's the sheet numbers that are on the active matrix that you have.

So active matrix table or tab one versus 1.

A, both of those are the alone categories.

With one being not looking at Hispanics.

And 1A looking at Hispanics.

So you can see here in the State of Michigan, you know, what impact it has when you look at and adding the dimensions of Hispanic.

Those are racial categories.

The Hispanic, the Bureau doesn't recognize it as a racial category.

But by their cross tabulations, you can end up adding it in.

But by adding it in and having the Hispanic showing up in that table, what you have to do is you need to take the Hispanics out of the Blacks, out of the Asians, out of the whites, out of all the other races so that things add to 100% just like that other example that I showed you before.

What we find is that the A categorizations, the 1A, the 2A, the 3A, that's alone, combo is number 2.

And OMB is number 3.

But the A designations for each of those is probably closer to what you want to look at because that gives you the Hispanic data.

If you only look at the raw number table, it's not including that Hispanic as a grouping.

Now, when you get down to the combo then we do show that.

But you can see some of the dimensions.

Keep in mind that the 2s, 2 alone or 2 in combination, the 2A will give you that maximum number for the racial data.

So if you look at, in fact, the difference between for the African/American population in the state, these are state numbers, for the alone for African/American is 13.66 in table one.

13.48 in table two because we are keeping -- we are putting in the Hispanic numbers. We are taking the Hispanics out of the African/American.

It brings down the African/American population.

But the two data in tables two and 2A bring that up to the max of what there would be.

So African/Americans are 15.3% statewide and if you take into account the Hispanic it's 14.9.

It's bigger than those 13% that you saw on the alone.

So and that is the important distinction to recognize on that side.

And the OMB as I said brings you kind of closer to the midpoint of both of those. So this all this data is actually going to be there as you draw but it's also part of the spreadsheets that we have given you.

So let me see here.

As a way of helping you, I've also put together an analysis and compilation of what is the ones and the twos and the threes so with all of that description is there in this document that is part of what we put up on your website and sent to each of you so that that gives you the additional information that gives you a little bit more explanation than what I have just given you in terms of the alones and the combos and the OMB, okay? So but those dimensions are important to keep in mind because you need to understand where people are talking to you from.

This is going to be an important dimension as we start looking into individual districts and what percent you're going to put into them and all of that in terms of the racial stuff. So understanding what data it is that you're describing or you're talking about, it's important for us to understand what you're talking about and understanding and making sure we see what data tables you're looking at.

Okay? So if you remember when we talked about the state of thumb and sending me the spreadsheets, that is the dimensions that we want to headache sure that we capture and understand of what you are drawing in that regard.

But this document will help you on that side.

We have also looked at where there are racial concentrations.

And I didn't have time to put them in to this PowerPoint because Ryan sent me this document as I was sitting here so we have been hard at work trying to get you more information on that side.

One of the ways we ended up doing is looking at a way that we analyze the racial data from a graphical standpoint and this is what we call majority, minority maps.

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

That is not to say this is what you need to have, a minority, that is not what I'm saying at all so remember that disclaimer that we have given to you, Julianne gives me the thumbs up, yes, indeed.

This is just what the data is showing you and generated graphically a way of looking at all the racial groups at one time on a map.

And so this is at the census tract level.

What is the white population and non-Hispanic white is in yellow.

The deeper color is majority white while the lighter yellow is plurality white, okay, so any yellow is where it's mainly white, either plurality or majority.

On the African/American that's the red shapes.

And any African/American census tracts that are majority African/American, non-Hispanic African/American or in red and we give you some break points in terms of that.

Of where there is 75% or more African/American versus 50-74%.

A little bit of colorization change in terms of the solid red.

And for the predominant where predominance is there for the African/American, what it is in terms of predominant without being a majority and different categorization.

So you see that data on the left hand side the way we are categorizing this data for the purposes of mapping.

Hispanic shows up in purple.

Asian shows up in green.

Native American there is not a lot.

But it's a cyan color on that side, yep.

There is up in the UP there is a predominant Native American up there on that side.

So that data is being able to be shown graphically here.

Down at the tract level.

And we have the inset to the right showing the Wayne area.

And you can see where there is concentrations African/American again is in red.

Hispanic is in purple.

And there is not a lot of the other racial groups down here but you can start seeing where those concentrations are.

That is important to recognize one as you ultimately start drawing but certainly of understanding the dimensions of where these racial categorizations and racial groups are within the state on that state.

We tend to like this kind of a map because it lets us see it all at once.

But we also look at and we haven't had time to draw or make those up but we are making them up tonight so tomorrow I will probably give you some more colored maps to look at.

But we look at the each of the individual races themselves so where is the concentrations of African/American, yeah, we can see here the predominant or majority but let's look at the gradations for each of the racial groups.

And that gives you an added dimension of what we are seeing in the data.

So it's not only the majority areas which is what this is here but tomorrow you will end up seeing, well, all right where are the African/Americans? We are seeing already the majority of these but where are they in the 40-50 or the 30 to 40 or 20 to 30, understanding the dementias of where the racial groups are, are potentially important on that side, yes

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange did you have your hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I did.

And it wasn't a major question.

I'm just trying to look on here and for Kent County it looks like there could be potentially two colors according to your map but it's very small and can't see it and I was curious what the two colors were.

>> KIM BRACE: I was going to do this because I knew somebody would be asking for it and we will show more of these and you can start seeing if we Zoom down into this area you can end up seeing where some of these concentrations are so in Kent you've got both some Hispanic and African/American.

In Grand Rapids.

You can start seeing that.

And what we will be showing you tomorrow is again where some of these are.

We are trying to show it in a larger sense now.

But we will be able to Zoom down in.

And you will be able to see some of this yourself on your computer system.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Other than the Norm, what are we looking for? Why is it so important to know where these people are?

>> KIM BRACE: You are looking at where there is concentrations.

From the standpoint of making sure you're not splitting those concentrations.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: But you are also as Bruce will tell you you're not concentrating them.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> KIM BRACE: You have the worry always of splitting and concentrating.

You got to find that Norm someplace.

It's not always the same for each racial group, it's not always the same for different part of the state but it's trying to find that median between those two.

One to keep you out of Court.

On that side.

But more importantly to provide the kind of representation that you want to do.

>> Excuse me if I can jump on, I want to add on to what Kim is saying and remember we talked about in some redistricting the redistricting body was just saying we need 55% minority District or 65%.

That was not based on analysis.

And one Supreme Court case the Supreme Court said they made a mistake of law assuming that they population that had a certain artificial threshold was needed and that goes into what Kim was talking about and what we've talked about previously about packing and cracking.

So you don't just create let's create a 75% majority minority District.

No, you need analysis and the data first and the seeing the concentrations as Kim was illustrating really focuses on the importance of not breaking up minority populations artificially and seeing them as communities of interest or Voting Rights Act protected as you move forward in creating districts, thank you.

>> KIM BRACE: I think the other thing that is important, these are maps that have just come off the printer in essence.

Lisa has not even seen all of these.

So she is probably sitting in Bethesda saying God Almighty I got to look at more areas. Maybe.

I don't know.

But we wanted to see where there were some concentrations on that side.

So, yeah, she may be coming back and saying it's not just four areas we need to look at it may be a couple more or something like that so that is an important dimension to keep in mind.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We are thinking of starting with south central District based on this map we may be able to start without a polarized voting.

>> KIM BRACE: Well from south central that is around Lansing on that side. It may be that some of that red has been covered over but the word south or something like that so let's take a look tomorrow when we do this other dimension of race.

On that side which is why I'm going to lead with that tomorrow morning.

But, yes, potentially we don't have to be that concerned about it and we will see where there is concentration.

As I told Ryan today it's not only concentration big enough to create a seat but it could be concentrations enough that you don't want to split them apart into two seats where they are not enough to create one but they could have kind of an influence maybe but if you divide them up then you're deadening that influence in that regard.

It's really a whole bunch of different factors that come into play.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I know some of the places that we went a lot of people said they didn't want to be split up and they were not that large.

>> KIM BRACE: Right.

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: So what do we do for that?

>> KIM BRACE: Well, that is partly what we are going to use for communities of interest in looking at what they're saying in terms of their area, their community on that side and seeing what that is.

Part of what we are going to try to do with Moon's data and community of interest is add to it, she has got about 13, 14 different things that she is keeping track of.

We are going to add this racial dimensions to that.

So you will ultimate will have that data for the communities of interest.

What is the population of each of these communities of interest? What is the racial mix in each community of interest? It's that bringing together you know, both Moon's data as well as the population our data to kind of give you that added dimension of things you need to be cognizant of.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair I wanted to sacrum in for the benefit of the Commission and the public.

Commissioner Rothhorn's question was excellent about starting the map in south central.

So what the schedule and the approach that the Commission is taking has done is in the areas that we started where we do not anticipate RPV analysis to demonstrate an issue that's where we are starting.

All of the areas will be undertaken.

So Dr. Handley has her analysis is statewide.

And then based on remember earlier I was saying it's the racial data that we are looking at now where the racial the minority populations live plus the election results.

Because we are trying to determine where if there is racial bloc voting and the ability to elect candidates of choice and segue into Bruce's important work.

So her analysis, if there is an area that has mapped, that is identified, that area will be addressed.

Now whether it's one of the anticipated areas or if it's a something that the Commission or your consultants were not expecting it will be addressed.

The Commission is very clear that it's going back, this is part of complying with Federal law and it will be considered.

It's just the effort was made to go into those areas where it's not anticipated to occur.

So I hope that was helpful.

Again, for that racial bloc voting analysis to guide that conversation.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.

Back to you Mr. Brace.

>> KIM BRACE: All right, I know what I need to do.

And the final piece of this equation.



I talked about the deviation tab but each of the racial composition tabs are here too for the districts.

So you have in tab one the population race alone is there and it has all of the racial groups showing up in each of the districts so you can end up starting to see not only the population of those districts but the racial composition of those districts.

Both in pop alone or combo or OMB.

So facts four, five and six which I did not have time to put on that other one, though it's the voting age population, repeating that pattern from the pop stuff that I did to voting age population.

And understanding the dimensions of that is important.

So when you look at these spreadsheets and these tables, you know, we had previously looked at counties or you know that sort of stuff.

You have got the districts to be cognizant of.

So having that data is all here also.

So I have unloaded a heck of a lot of stuff on you guys I recognize but it's all important information as we've talked about.

Where, what, when, how do you want to do it on that side.

So with that I turn it back over, I don't know if I'm nine minutes early, darn.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We are ahead of schedule.

>> KIM BRACE: Yes

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Rocking through I wanted to make sure there were no additional questions before we move on.

Go ahead Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: When the actual census data is released when next month I think, September.

>> KIM BRACE: Well this is actual census data.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: True what I was going to ask is that easier to look at than the tables we have now in front of us or is it about the same?

>> KIM BRACE: It's about the same.

The Bureau is part of what they will be doing for the September 30 release is putting together their tables.

On how they looking at it.

And actually I meant to show you one other piece of things.

If I go to this is, is it sharing? Okay not yet, I'm sorry.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: There you go.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank you, there.

This is the table of the census information this is on the Census Bureau website and it has a lot of real interesting information to it and what they have let you do is look at either the race or the Hispanic origin question.

Remember they look at them separately.

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

And so their tables are set up that way on that side as opposed to combining it but they have capabilities of looking at any of these ways of looking at the race.

So African/American alone, African/American in combination.

They are picking up those one table and the twos tables by looking at the alone information or the comboed information.

In that same way that we have adopted for a long time.

But they also let you see maps and maps by total population or Hispanic or non-Hispanic just looking at the Hispanic equation and any of these data items, so I had is the two or more races whereas the two or more races I just flipped over to Alabama but this has all the different states in it but certainly you can go and focus in on with this information down for the State of Michigan.

So, you know, if you don't like the way I've categorized things there is another dimension and this is what the Census Bureau does.

But this is what the September 30 release will be more focused on.

Their way of looking at it.

But they will be releasing at the same time on that same CD that data set that we are doing right now.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Any additional questions? All right thank you very much, Mr. Brace we will now move on to the next item on our agenda which is review and approve of minutes from the August 12, 2021 Commission meeting I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the August 12, 2021 Commission meeting posted at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Seconded by Commissioner Lett is there any debate or discussion on the motion?

Hearing none we will now vote on the motion to adopt the minutes from the August 12, 2021 Commission meeting all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Thank you, Commissioner Wagner.

All opposed please raise your hand and say they.

The motion prevails and is adopted.

And the staff reports there are no reports from Executive Director or legal counsel so I will ask our communications and Outreach Director Edward Woods the third to provide his report this afternoon.

Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you.

Can everyone hear me.

Great one of the things we are really looking at as you know with our strategic plan is built on fairness awareness answer transparency and engagement.

We really want to with fairness through our new mapping presentation that is going out that you are doing and want to thank you for that.

I received some great feedback and also, we are also using our redistricting pamphlet or flier front and back and people are enjoying that and we are leaving it there with them.

I really want to thank Commissioner Orton because she went out to west Grand Rapids and they are now going to deliver our flyer to folk in there that are what challenged with communications with regards to that and by doing the translation we will also be able to provide it in Spanish so really want to recognize Commissioner Orton's effort to ensure fairness and making sure that people have the information they need.

So let's just give her a round of applause.

[ APPLAUSE ]

And so that is why translation is so important.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't know why you are singling me out here but we are all doing our part, I'm sure.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Don't worry there is a whole list coming.

This is one of the rare times where we have actually had everybody participate so we can give everybody a shout out and so I just wanted to thank her.

We also had Commission Vallette, Commissioner Weiss and Commissioner Rothorn who were out and about in Bay City.

And doing the mapping presentation.

I just really want to give them a shout out so we are not just singling you out you have to let me finish my report and then everybody hopefully will hear their names so can we give them a round of applause? [ APPLAUSE ]

Last night Commissioner Eid and Rothorn were in Sterling Heights, Michigan.

The Asian Pacific islander Americans have been doing a good job reaching out and thank them and we have another presentation scheduled August 30 in the Metro Detroit area we are working on and reaching out and doing our part with regards to that and thank Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Rothorn with regard to that.

And then believe it or not we had our math whiz kid Commissioner Witjes and I got a beautiful note from Commissioner Witjes and doing a math presentation for Dearborn and talking about they are so excited about the dynamic duo of Witjes and Eid coming to the classroom for the University of Dearborn so want to give them a round of applause.

And then Commissioner Szetela you know Commissioner Szetela that look oh, my goodness are you going to sue me? As we all know in my e-mail we did nonverbal communications and we realized that facial expressions do matter so we just want to make sure for the sake of the public that we are all concerned about facial expressions as well as tone of voice and then actually the words because our expressions is tongue and cheek but the way we look, the way we respond will tell whether or not we really want an open and transparent process.

And I think one of the concerns that came up in our statewide communications and outreach meeting you heard the statement that was made by Sue Smith was either way you know we are here helping you, we are participating, but if we are participating and engaging it's okay to agree to disagree.

But sometimes your facial expressions might give out the wrong impression that you may want to give, communicating with the public or whether it's a person and so the reason why I highlighted the e-mail smiles and MICRC clips was just a friendly reminder because you know this is a lot of work.

And people are coming for the first time to participate in a new redistricting process where they had no opportunity to participate before and then they get to know you and do you know what these are regular citizens just like me.

They struggle and I can identify them and like the idea they can interact with you but want to make sure if they disagree with you that it's not going to further it's not going to how do I want to say this nicely it won't hamper their efforts or be a barrier in terms of public engagement and soliciting comments in the future.

So I think we have a robust Commission that is engaged and concerned about hearing from everyone.

And I think we have a public that wants to make sure that their voice is heard and so the way we do that through fairness and transparency will go a long way in terms of engagement of our public hearings but also at our upcoming presentations.

So I just really want to thank you for digging in and doing the work and being engaged because it would not be successful without you and so with that, I want to give Doug and Steve who continue to do interviews as well as Juanita, I want to thank Commissioner Lange who is continuing to do outreach.

She was just at another fair this past week.

And then Commissioner Wagner when she is available being part of the process as well.

So and Commissioner Kellom this her absence so go 13 for 13 is a great way to bat a thousand so hopefully we will continue to do that.

So give all of yourself a round of applause.

[ APPLAUSE ]

And then we got a great team led by dynamic director Executive Director Sue Hammersmith, our General Counsel, Julianne Pastula, along with MDOS staff who is always willing to come this and help. And that is greatly appreciated because when you are looking at communications and outreach and set up, no one can do anything by themselves.

And so if you think that, that is a complete and total failure to think anyone can do anything by themselves. It's always a team effort and just want to thank and acknowledge them as well and can we give them a round of applause?

[ APPLAUSE ]

And so when we really talk about fairness we talked about the rolls of residents, we really also want to share the process with the mapping process and people are now starting to ask, well, how are we going to ensure fairness when we adopt the maps and by telling them it will be two affiliate are democrats, two affiliate independents, two affiliate republicans or I should say two independents who do not identify with democrat or republicans makes a difference. And because you know it and hear it, let's not make assumption that the public knows and they hear it.

So right now it's going to start getting tight and people are going to start asking these questions about fairness. They are going to start asking questions about lobbying and undue influence because they have seen it happen before.

As you know our general counsel did an excellent presentation on Subsection 11 with regard to that.

I would encourage you to continue to refer to that, but we really want to not just articulate fairness, but we also want to show fairness inside it.

That is something that I can make a difference.

As relates to awareness, you will be seeing a social media campaign that will be utilizing the hash tags show up, speak up.

Show up, speak up.

And draw fair maps.

So you will be seeing that.

We will be utilizing testimonials from our first round of public hearings where we have some vignettes from people across the state so we can get people geared up and ready for our second round of public hearings so our goal is to have a four-week build up to the second round of public hearings so people are aware, they are coming out and they are asking questions. So we want to make sure that we are doing that.

Going along the lines with our General Counsel in Subsection 11 we are going to stop all town hall meetings effective September 30s, September 30th we will stop those.

We have some on the schedule.

We will honor those.

I know Commissioner Szetela we scheduled you for a rotary presentation.

We will honor that but other than that September 30th that is it.

We will be drawing people to the public hearings with the issuing of the RFPs just so you're aware.

Those will solely be for media relations and driving people to public hearings.

So you will not be asked to do presentations but you will probably be asked to do interviews to get people to come to the public hearings so I just want to share that with you that on that process.

We are looking to do a mapping week.

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.

A mapping week now that you approved the process and the schedule, thank you very much.

August 30th-September 3rd we are looking to do a mapping week promotion on social media, trying to get people to draw maps, ask questions and make referrals with regards to that process.

And then as you already know we have our University tours kicking off in two weeks.

Kicking off in two weeks at the University of Michigan.

We will provide you with some detail in about a week.

So you know where you're staying.

What classes or anything if you are doing presentations whether it's virtual or in person.

And that same lineup will be established at the University of Michigan, it will be established at Ferris State on the 9th, the 16th Grand Valley State University the 23rd and central Michigan University and the 30th so you will have an itinerary and that is be doing done to do awareness and targeted generation Z and millennial but it's also open to the community at large.

You will be meeting in the morning.

You will be taking a break and meeting at night as well.

So I wanted to make sure you're aware with where we are with regards to awareness.

With regard to transparency one of the things we really want to do is to cite how public comments are integrated in the mapping process.

If you look at the public comments and some of the feedback when you are doing your maps and you have that information, if you could share that as a part of that, I think that will go a long way with regards to public confidence when you're sharing your maps or presenting your maps or drawing your maps in our discussion.

Sharing what you heard from the public hearings, sharing what you heard from the public comments those are the type of things that build confidence and will encourage more people to participate in our second round of public hearings to ensure we have the best citizen input plan in the country because I believe we are going to be a model.

I believe we are going to be a model for the country.

I think people are going to study this process.

And it all goes to practice, practice, practice.

So just wanted to share that with you.

Working with MDOS and DTMB to enhance the website to make it user friendly.

So that we can have translation, Google translation so people can identify in their language, make it a little bit more so we are not going to other websites to integrate it so you can see a calendar and things instead of going to other calendars and everything is right there because we believe the website is open 24/7, 365.2 days in a year so if we get them to use that as a reference it will always be available for doing that.

Then we want to provide advance notice for our mapping schedule so people know where we are to start drawing people to the days if they want to come in remote or in person but it's something we really want to do for transparency.

Engagement we are looking at our public comment portal stations.

Really want to talk about our public portal stations when it comes to our town hall meetings that we have left on the books.

But also at our second round of public hearings.

We want to have public comment portal stations so people can come in.

We were doing that the first time.

We were concerned about COVID but now we will have that library and try to set up those public comment portals so whether people can come in for five minutes or they can do that or if they can stay to make their comments in person, they can do that as well.

So that will be a different aspect of our public hearings.

That we are looking at doing but we will make some adjustments and changes with regards to how we are doing our public hearings and that will also include a different security that we will undertake for the public hearings as well.

We want to do some targeted efforts you know in terms of marketing.

You know we addressed some of the rural populations, we are doing some vignettes and that will come forth for you at a later date and some of the other things. I just wanted to share that with you at this time.

I want to move the community organizer I want to table that for tomorrow or next week but I do want to talk about the event contract.

The event contract is for less than 5,000.

Last time you remember we used Taylor design to do that.

We want to have the same type of contract but it will be a little bit different in that this person will really be regulated to just negotiating the contract for the facilities.

They will be transferring the registration responsibilities to Sarah Martinez.

If you remember we ran out of funds on this existing contract and so what we are trying to do is find ways not to run out of funds so we kind of changed the scope where they are basically just helping us set up the contracts, ensure payment but they will not be present at the meeting.

And so as a result we will also save costs that we won't have expenses such as meals and mileage as well.

But yet we will get how can I say the nitty-gritty stuff that is done with regards to the nine facilities.

You know, eight of them agreed to provide discounts because we used them in the first round of public hearings and the one in Kalamazoo we will have to negotiate.

But we really want to move ahead and get that done.

And so an open and complete openness and transparency.

We are recommending Taylor Design but just wanted you to know the difference in the scope.

Because it's less than \$5,000 but also with the backdrop and knowledge of knowing that we did use her previously for the first round of public hearings.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies for the interruption. This is Sarah Reinhardt with the Department of State. And I want to note for the record Commissioner Lange had to turn off her camera, but she is still present.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you for that.

At this time, Madam Chair, I would like to entertain a motion to authorize the Executive Director to engage into a contract with Taylor Design to assist with the event planning for the second round of public hearings.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That is the one less than 5,000.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is correct.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You do not need a motion.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Wanted to be transparent and General Counsel to make sure this is done correctly.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Is that correct, General Counsel? We do not need a motion on this?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair, thank you so much. So the concerns in discussing, I know initially when the first contract term had expired Executive Director Woods was seeking was opened to other individuals filling that role.

And the Commission and Mr. Woods has indicated now with the refined scope that Kristin Taylor would be invited to rejoin the Commission in this different role.

The Commission can do a motion.

The concern is from my perspective is that the under 5,000 that we have two under five thousands to the same vendor. So I think that is what the discussions that Communications Director Woods and I had is that although the scope is different and the duties are more refined and focused strictly on facility coordination and negotiation, that if the Commission so desired to make it a formal vote to move forward with the same individual as previously that that could be accomplished.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Is that a motion Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we retain Taylor's services.

She did an excellent job for us.

Before.

And I'm assuming she would do an excellent job this time.

So that is the motion

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes to approve a contract with the previous event planner that we had use, Kristin Taylor, for less than \$5,000. Is there any debate or discussion on the



motion? Hearing none let's vote. All in favor to approve the contract, please raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All opposed please raise your hand and say nay. If Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Wagner could verbally indicate that, I would appreciate it.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: This is Commissioner Wagner. Aye.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange and Wagner voted aye and the motion is adopted and the contract with event planner less than \$5,000 is approved.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That's all I have. Thank you very much

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much. The next item on our agenda is MDOS updates, but it's my understanding we don't have any updates today.

So we will move on to correspondence. Correspondence received in advance of our meeting today was provided along with written public comments to the Commissioners in our meeting materials.

Moving on to our next agenda item, we have future agenda items. Without objection, I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to share about future agenda items. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Director Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Again, we are in the mapping phase starting tomorrow.

So be ready.

Look at the southwest and south central regions, review that public comment overnight so you are thinking about the geography of that region.

The public comments and we can start to begin plotting communities of interest in those areas.

And working on those maps. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

Are there any announcements? 9:00 tomorrow Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes, the meeting tomorrow is scheduled from 9-3. I also wanted to let this Commission know that there are three Commissioners who will be absent tomorrow, that brings us down to ten.

So if anyone is going to be absent and they have not notified MICRC and MDOS staff please do so, so we can make sure we can have a meeting and we will be careful about people leaving the room to keep a quorum tomorrow so thank you

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much. Any additional announcements? Hearing none, as all the items on agenda are completed and we have no further business a motion to adjourn is in order.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes, seconded by 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.

Any debate or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move forward with our vote. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange said aye. Commissioner Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I said aye as well

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much. ALL opposed please raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail and the motion prevails and the motion is adjourned at 4:36 p.m. Thank you very much everybody.