

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

MICRC

09/02/21 5:00 pm Meeting

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

>> CHAIR KELLOM: As Chair of the Commission,
I call this meeting of the
Michigan Independent Citizens
Redistricting Commission to
order at 5:11 p.m.

Greetings here today. I personally am excited to be at U of M, a school that I gave a lot of tears and sweat to as a student. And there are several groups that are making this meeting possible. I want thank Tom Ivako, Bonnie Roberts, and Logan Woods of the Center for the local state and urban policy here at U of M. Ellen Wierman and Nate Hall, campus election engagement project. And Landom Myers, campus vote project. It's gratifying to so so many groups assisting the MICRC with engaging people in redistricting here in Michigan.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube at www.YouTube.com/MICHOS_office/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. Please E-mail us at Redistricting@Michigan.Gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of the public watching and for the public record I will now turn to

the Department of State staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good evening, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. If you are attending the meeting remotely, and unless your absence is due to military duty, please disclose your physical location by stating the County, City, Township or Village and the State from which you are attending the meeting remotely.

I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present.

Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending from Reed

City, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> 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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

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

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. As a reminder you can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

At this time I would now entertain a motion to approve this meeting's agenda.

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.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Second made by Commissioner Lett. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor raise your hand and say aye. All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

Moving forward to our public comments pertaining to agenda topics only, without objection we will now begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics portion of the meeting.

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

In-person public comment, for those of you who have signed up and indicated that you would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission, you will now be allowed to do so.

You will step to the nearest microphone when I call your number and you will have two minutes to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

There will also be a visual timer for you to see displayed.

At the end of your two minutes, after you conclude your remarks, if you feel like there is something you haven't said or you want to say more, there is a particular area on the map or in your comment that you would like to refer to, you are welcome to continue on to our public comment portal. So you don't feel your two minutes is up.

Okay, so first in line to provide public comment is number one.

And you can step to the nearest microphone, whichever is comfortable for you. Hi, number one.

>> Thank you for coming to Washtenaw County. Welcome.

I understand you have got a lot of work ahead of you as well and I'm thanking you for that.

Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti tend to get a lot of the press, and they certainly have the most population in Washtenaw County.

But about two thirds of the County is actually rural and small town.

I live out in that part of the county.

So rural that I have a pheasant that decided to nest under my farm truck this fall.

As a person who lives out there, I love it.

And I want to keep living out there.

However, I know because of my family vision that at some point when I'm no longer able to drive I'm going to have to move back to the City.

And that upsets me.

The services, the level of services out there isn't sufficient to support me in that place as I get older.

And there are lots of people like me.

It's very easy to take and draw a line around a rural area and say that's it, that's the community of interest.

But from my perspective it's helpful to have a community of interest that's diverse and a Section or a legislative group that's diverse in its community of interest.

I want politicians to have to earn my vote with their policies, not their partisanship.

And it would also give me hope that I could age in place if we have not only in Washtenaw but across the state, that kind of representation in how we draw our districts.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

Number two, please.

>> Thank you.

My name is Diane. And I've been living in Washtenaw County in Ann Arbor for 23 years.

I want to thank the Commission.

I know I applied to be in your shoes. And I look at all the work you're doing, and I know it's a complicated task. And I want to thank you, first of all, for the service you are providing to this state.

I was initially going to comment online but I thought you guys are doing all this work in person.

It's up to me just to bring...come here and say my two minutes' worth, one minute and 31 seconds worth.

So I'm doing that today.

And I come from Georgia.

And I come from a City that was an isolated island in a sea of different opinion.

And I know what packing a District means.

And it leads to the kind of urban and rural split that has led to a partisan divide not only across the country but here in Michigan.

So I know there are a lot of criteria for you to consider as you plan these maps.

But one of the most important criteria in my mind is partisan fairness.

And making sure that we don't have that kind of packing to the extent possible.

And I know that's inevitable in some places. But I want to emphasize that it doesn't mean the same number of packed republican districts and the same number of packed democratic districts.

We need to have politicians who meet in the middle and respond to our needs and listen to us.

And I want to end with one suggestion.

I'm not qualified to draw these maps.

I am trying to figure it out.

I'm going to keep trying.

But I hope that the Commission will consider when you start to narrow those down, according to the complex criteria ahead of you, that you will give us another opportunity to weigh in and give you feedback on those final...the ones that meet the constitutional tests that you have to meet.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much for taking the time to address the Commission.

And you all being the community and the public will have plenty of time to analyze, scrutinize and add feedback to the maps that we draft. And we look forward to that process that has been started already.

Number three, please.

>> Hi, I'm Susan Perkins. I'm a lecturer here at the University and also live in Ann Arbor. And I helped to write the legislation that became the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission, and I'm really proud of that.

It was a really citizens led initiative.

I just heard about it on Facebook. And I could come do a couple meetings, and that is how I got involved with it. And I don't have any special training.

But what I wanted to address is that I think that the thing that is most important in drawing the districts is the Voting Rights Act, that you're legally obligated to make sure there are minority-majority-minority districts. And in order to do that you have to look at where people live and start in those areas.

I'm concerned about starting with rural areas because most of the people are in urban areas.

That's where people who are nonwhite live. And we are going to have to deal with those issues, deal with those districts first to try to make sure that those are in keeping with the law before you move out to where people are, to rural areas where there are fewer people frankly.

And, also, as other people have mentioned, the partisan lean, I think, is really important.

You can consider the partisan lean.

And we want to make sure that districts are not wasting votes.

That they are not 80% democratic. And there here in Ann Arbor, you know, lots of people's votes don't count because it's going to go 80% democratic because it's just the City.

And not the bedroom communities around the City that are included in districts.

And I also wanted to mention that this would be a time to really deal with prison gerrymandering where people are counted where they are in jail instead of where they live.

Because those are two very different places.

So it would be an opportunity for you to give some justice to people in those situations.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much. I appreciate you taking the time to address the Commission. And the rest of us do as well, not just myself.

Number four, please.

>> Hello. Everyone my name is Alexander.

I'm a first year law student here at the University of Michigan.

I actually came to one of your meetings in Novi. So glad you could make it to me this time.

I, first of all, just want to thank you for the work that you've been doing. The districts you've drawn, the communities of interest you've managed to preserve, it's been very impressive to watch. And I can't wait to see where you continue to go, especially once you get to the Metro Detroit area.

And that brings me to my main topic today, which is a community of interest that's very close to me.

Now, I've lived in Ann Arbor for four years at this point as a student; but I lived in Clarkston, Michigan for 22 years.

For those of you who don't know, Clarkston is a relatively small town in northern Oakland County.

And when people ask me where I'm from I always say the very edge of the Detroit Metro.

Clarkston has more in common with that Detroit Metro than it does with the communities north and west of it.

When I live in Clarkston and I want to go eat or I want to go to the movies, I always go to Lake Angelos or Troy or Rochester or Pontiac. When you begin drawing Congressional districts, especially in Oakland County, I know you will have to split that County up. There is simply too many to do otherwise.

I ask that when you begin that process you only split it with Wayne and Macomb Counties because those excerpts, that Clarkston, Wald Lake, Novi, they have much more in common in that County than they do with areas in Lapeer, Genesee, Livingston Counties. So I very much look forward to seeing what you end up doing with the Congressional districts. But I do ask you preserve the Oakland County excerpts on their own.

I submitted a few plans online I hope you may take into consideration. But otherwise thank you, look forward to seeing what you draw and good luck.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for taking the time to address the Commission. Number five.

>> Hi, everybody, brought the map back.

And the reason I brought the map back is there are a few things that I noticed when I was putting this together. I was trying to reflect first my 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.

But also other areas that had some distinctions mainly because of the industrial character of some of the areas of southern Macomb County. And a lot of people think Macomb industrial auto worker, that sort of thing.

There is something else I noticed and think it's important of part of the VRA discussion you all will have. I noticed that the Gratiot corridor here that I drew, which is kind of light industrial and aging commercial, I think the African/American population here doubled in the past ten years.

I was amazed.

And I was also amazed that I don't believe they have any African/American State Representatives or state Senators in that area.

Double check me on it, but I did notice, I was shocked that it was that big of a dramatic of a difference.

And I just wanted to call your attention to it since I had it here.

I will leave this map with everyone.

There is also, I believe, in this light green zone about 17% African/American population; and a lot of that is concentrated south of 696.

It's something else I noticed.

This area is newer cul-de-sacs. And I did not look at the demographics of this. It did not strike me.

But these two areas, which, by the way, the Gratiot corridor and this sort of Van Dyke mound industrial corridor both run into Detroit. The industry, the auto factories through here run at least as far as Hamtramck, south into Detroit.

It's just food for thought and wanted to point it out because I thought of it and drew the whole map. And thank you for your time, folks. I appreciate it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much for bringing our attention and for bringing your map in and addressing the Commission.

Number six, please.

>> Good evening. I'm Janet Cannon. I'm an Ann Arbor resident. I lived out of the country for a long time and I was very excited to come back to be part of everything that's happening now because there is so much that is going to be our future, that's being decided now and not just in this process.

But it's a very exciting opportunity for you.

And I imagine a bit heavy at the same time.

So as everyone has said, thank you.

I am very concerned about some of the preliminary maps that I saw concerning this area.

I'd like to echo what Ms. Perkins said about the necessity of starting from Detroit.

And getting those obligations sort of taken care of and making things as in relation to the Voting Rights Act, that is sort of if we don't start there, everything is going to be Jim

cracked when we actually get to the intersection between the other areas and the Detroit area.

So I really hope that you will take that into consideration.

And I have been frankly worried about the preliminary maps that I've seen down here because I don't think they do respect the over writing criteria of partisan fairness. So it seems to me if that really is the number one obligation in the way the amendment is written, if they don't respect that, then there will be all the lawsuits and all of that. And it will be back to the drawing board. So I really hope that you would reexamine them in that perspective now.

I'd also like to echo really the great importance for me of prisoner votes being counted in their community of origin.

Nobody's vote should be wasted.

I take it very personally that my vote is wasted here and in so many senses.

And anyone else's.

I don't agree that either party should be able to gerrymander, which is why you are here. And I really hope that you will make sure that's an overriding criteria.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much for taking the time to address the Commission.

Number seven.

>> Yes.

>> Hi. My name is Greta Cruz. I was born and raised on the west side of the state. I'm currently a senior at the University of Michigan, studying international studies and Anthropology. I'm here as both the co-Chair and representative of the college democrats chapter here at my University.

I came to speak to the Commission today because I wanted to emphasize the importance, as others have already, of partisan fairness when drawing the new redrawn districts.

Currently what I'm seeing as republican leaning districts with, again, as already people have mentioned, democrats being packed into cities.

As a student that lives, votes, works and does everything else in the community of Ann Arbor, it's no small thing to me that I feel like my vote does not go anywhere.

By lumping the community of Ann Arbor all into one group, you are effectively marginalizing the communities that live within it.

Ypsilanti also deserves its own representation.

You ask anyone that lives on this side of the state, Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti are two distinct communities with different needs and different populations.

They deserve to be represented in both of our legislatures.

I also am concerned that the committee is over emphasizing the necessity of drawing the districts into perfect square boxes. The reality of our lives is that we were not

created in communities in perfect square boxes. We don't live in perfectly square boxes. And we won't be fairly represented by perfect square boxes. I sincerely take it into consideration that a district might look like a staircase or a pizza piece, but that might be more representative of the citizens in the area than a square.

In 2018 I joined as a Freshman and advocated hard for the legislation to enable this committee to be present today.

It's a full circle moment and a moment of hope and a moment of worries to be standing and talking to you today as a senior, as the leader of my organization. And I sincerely hope that the outcomes of this redistricting process are what we hoped for three years ago.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much for taking the time to address the Commission.

Number...so do we have a number seven or two number sixes?

Okay, it's fine, it's an amicable group.

Number eight.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners; and thank you for being here today.

My name is Allie. I'm the elected prosecuting attorney in Washtenaw County.

I'm also a lecturer at the University of Michigan law school where I teach local Government.

And I have litigated several voting rights cases in the past.

I recognize that the point of this exercise, the politicians are not supposed to draw maps but given my County position is not up for consideration, I hope any experience and familiarity with Washtenaw County and the diverse communities will be helpful to the Commission.

I want to start by echoing what so many have said already, which is to ensure fair maps and to avoid wasted votes, the City of Ann Arbor must be split. Vote packing is the most prominent feature of partisan gerrymandering. It leads to unfair maps and it leads to a legislature that does not adequately represent the preferences of Michiganders.

And on the Senate side in particular, I will note that one split that would make sense is putting western Ann Arbor and western Washtenaw County in with the County of Jackson.

That would satisfy the community of interest test particularly because many people in Jackson County, 11% I believe, actually commute to Washtenaw County for their jobs.

The second point I want to advocate for is that in both legislative chambers the eastern part of the county, the City of Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township, should have its own voice.

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

There is a pronounced divide between Ann Arbor and the western side of the county and the eastern side of Washtenaw County. It is colloquially referred to as the US-23 divide.

If you look at Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township, it has the lowest opportunity scores in the county on metrics such as health, educational, economic opportunity. And the concerns of people in that part of the County are very different than the concerns of folks in western Washtenaw.

So I hope you will take that into consideration as you draw these maps. Thank you again.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much for taking the time to address the Commission.

Number nine.

>> Hello.

And I want to start, my name is Carolyn, and I want to thank you for your service. I am proud to have been personally responsive...responsible for over a thousand of the signatures that put you in charge.

So I'm very happy you're here.

A fair map does not provide disproportionate advantage to any political party. Our Constitution requires that.

We've seen so many maps do the opposite.

I'd watched it here.

I have a sister who lives in Maryland where it's exactly the same as it has been here except in the opposite direction.

I want to ask that you measure that partisan advantage for each whole state map that you draw.

Both for the state legislative bodies and for the U.S. house.

And if what you have so far is not fair, in other words, if the lean of the probable delegation it would produce doesn't come close, but doesn't come pretty close to the lean of the historical statewide votes, then please start over from scratch.

Find a new approach.

We are counting on Michigan to stand out in the entire United States as a fair state to vote in.

Thank you for much for your service.

I know very well that it's a lot of work.

So appreciate you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much for taking the time to address the Commission.

Number ten, please.

>> All right. Can you hear me okay?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes.

>> Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ian. I'm an undergraduate student here at the University of Michigan.

I would like to describe myself as something as an amateur mapper.

I spent probably a little bit too much time trying to go through and draw my own maps. I submitted a couple in the public comments portal, but that is not what I want to talk about tonight.

Not to beat a dead horse here, but a lot of speakers have talked about partisan fairness. And I think it's very much to the detriment of the Commission's job of ensuring maps that represent communities of interest and also are partisanly fair. I'm not sure that is a real word but I'm using it.

To draw the maps without taking into account partisan data and where voters live.

I believe that it is very important to include that in the process of making maps.

It's kind of like trying to bake a cake and leaving out the sugar until the last-minute.

You've got the flour, you have the eggs, but the sugar is very important.

Second, I'd like to address some of the kind of public comments on the portal that have been specifically going after an individual Commissioner for his political views that he has expressed in the past.

And I feel like it really represents not only a bad faith attack on an individual Commissioner, but also a lack of understanding of the nuisances and intricacies on American politics.

I know for a fact based on data, publicly available data from the Secretary of State that one of the independent commissioners has voted in both the 2016 and 2020 republican primaries.

I do not question this Commissioner's independence or their ability to draw fair maps, much like I don't question the other Commissioner who has been singled out ability.

This is a collaborative body.

And individual needs will be set aside to draw fair maps.

And you will draw fair maps hopefully.

We will see.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for taking the time to address the Commission. Number 11.

>> Hello. My name is Zach, which I'm an undergrad student at the University of Michigan.

I'm here to talk about how the Commission is particularly short sighted on the partisan fairness aspect of the state legislative map.

While it's important to maintain communities of interest, it's also important to balance these communities of interest with partisan fairness.

Michigan's is a democratic leaning state that has not elected a republican Senator since 1994. And has a full row of democratic statewide officials. And it's vital to a fair map to consider both communities of interest and partisan fairness.

Only Commissioner Eid attempted to put together community of interest while having the foresight to have an evenly divided legislature.

We have already heard about an Ann Arbor Ypsilanti split. But another easy way to achieve partisan fairness in the State Senate would be to split Lansing and East Lansing. And each have their own distinct communities of interest.

Lansing and its suburbs are more the classic working class City while East Lansing focuses on higher education and a more college educated area. It also ensures the dark blue areas are not packed in the Lansing Metro. And by including these suburbs in these districts with the cities that they are connected to, it ends up not diluting rural voices in the process.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for taking the time to address the Commission. Sorry, I didn't have my microphone on.

Number 12, please.

>> Good evening, everybody.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Good evening.

>> All right. So I would like to thank you for all your previous mapping and transparency thus far.

Including improvement to the website by including a Section under the draw map tab where shape files have been shared.

My name is Mark Payne. I'm the democracy coordinator from the Michigan league of conservation of voters and education fund. And I just want to add that public mapping sessions are beneficial and the shape files of the daily drawn draft proposed maps that are on the website would significantly improve the public's ability to fully follow along in this critical process.

Being able to follow along has become all the more important given addition of new data analysis including today's VRA presentation.

In the last few days of analysis of the COI contributions and when available partisan scores to ensure that Federal requirements communities of interest and fairness are considered at the weight required by the Constitution as criteria's one, three and four. It's also important to remember that consideration of county, City and other boundary lines fall well below these three criteria and are not mandatory.

Thank you for your consideration.

Have a great day.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for taking the time to address the Commission. We appreciate.

Number 13, please.

>> Hello. My name is Adora. I'm a student at the University of Michigan. And I'm coming here unfortunately to beat the dead horse of partisan fairness that has already been spoken about before.

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

However, partisan fairness, Michigan is a swing state and is nearly 50/50 democrats to republicans. Republicans have not won a Senate election here since 1994. Or Governorship switches every few years from republican to democrat.

That really needs to be represented on the maps.

It should not be that 60% of the State Senate is republican every year even though that is not reflected on the executive or the Federal level.

I commend Commissioner Eid especially for taking this into account. And it's very clear he is putting an effort to be the best Commissioner that he can. And I want all the other Commissioners to take notes and try to take that, have that foresight when they are drawing their maps by, you know, thinking about partisan fairness, thinking about racial demographics, and thinking about that kind of thing.

So also, I want to talk about democratic geographic disadvantage.

Not to say that we are here to gerrymander for democrats, but it's true that democratic votes in Michigan are concentrated in cities, not in rural areas.

So if you draw rural with rural and City with City, you're going to end up with a democratic packed and it's going to be republican gerrymander even if it's unintentional. The Constitution in this order writes down the provision. The first is making sure the population and VRA are present. Second is contiguity. Third is communities of interest, which the Commission has done a great job of following.

The fourth is partisan fairness.

It's very important and it's very high up, it's fourth out of seven. And then fifth is no incumbent variability in County, City, Township boundaries and compactness.

COI is very subjective. And compactness should not be leaned upon to be a kind of thing.

Also, that keeping my County together is not a COI. It's simply a pack because that is just the sixth criteria.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you.

Number 14.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'm John, a real estate lawyer, formally a poverty law advocate. I live here in Ann Arbor but I emphasize not in a bubble.

I'm working today on State Senate maps.

I started with that because they are nicely blocky and tend to follow County lines, though I'm reconsidering the concept based on earlier comments.

I didn't know the process had progressed to this point. And so I'm definitely playing catch up.

When I'm drawing these maps, to tell you where I'm coming from, I have clients there, I visited, I've litigated, done business, and I actually have family ties in, for example, Hillsdale County.

My first comment is about so called commuter corridors.

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

I don't put a lot of stock in those.

Workers stream into Washtenaw County from every direction.

Maybe commercial corridors are more meaningful.

Second comment is I support my local knowledge today as I'm working on these with a census based website with economic analysis and very readable maps and charts, which I recommend.

It's called data USA.IO.

I plug in a County, compare them and discern economic communities of interest.

On the basis of my local knowledge and my poking around in these websites, western Washtenaw County belongs in a State Senate District with Jackson County in my opinion and not with Livingston if I had to choose.

Jackson County belongs with western Washtenaw and not with Hillsdale and Branch County as in the 2011 map.

The districts I drew out of Jackson and Washtenaw County is less than 5 percentage points, if I'm reading the data right, difference in 2018 can swing republican in a different year.

I do not pack or crack or wrap lines around things. And please do not consider maps that do that kind of thing.

The middle tier of southern counties I did join because they are very rural, have cross border ties with Indiana and Ohio.

That's all I have time for.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you for providing your public comment to the Commission.

At this time we are going to move to remote public comment. And after we finish remote public comment, we will allow those who have signed up to speak for a second time to speak.

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

I'll have Department of State staff unmute you. If you're a computer, not a commuter, if you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

If you're on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute.

Also, please note that you have -- if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds we will move to the next person in line and return to you after they are done speaking.

If your audio still does not work you can e-mail Redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate at a later comment period at a meeting or hearing.

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.

You will have two minutes, the same, to address the Commission. And please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

It might be more difficult to hear the timer remote, but do try to stick to the two minutes. And is there also a visual timer for those? There is, okay. So you also have the visual timer as a reminder as well.

At this time I'm going to turn the floor over to Department of State staff for our first remote public comment.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our first remote public comment is a Mr. James Galant. Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me, Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Absolutely, yes.

>> All right. This is James Galant, Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition, and these are my opinions.

And as we were discussing earlier about the approved Robert's Rules of Order and asked the prosecutor person that was out there and these lawyers who are coming up, to think of this, Page 366, line 8, it says until, quote, until a matter has been brought before the assembly in the form of a motion proposing specific action, it cannot be debated.

After which it must be seconded by another member.

That is the whole fundamental breach that is going on here.

You are starting with the discussion in order to confuse everybody.

This has been making it up on the fly.

Now, as I was saying, the vendor product here is the property of the State of Michigan.

You know, the value added property.

Remember Mr. Brace stated that this is an experimental database. And Moon Duchin said this is the experimental democracy.

And now I don't understand that.

I think that maybe you folks are acting out and exercising civil disobedience to get this experimental democracy thing that you are working on because this is specific actions and to get approved by the courts later, that is in the portal. The guy he is talking about how Dr. Handley made the decision to use the three measures and one of the efficiency gap, and that may not have been approved by the Court as stated.

Now saying that, you know, if you want any other measures, you're going to have to hire a different lawyer.

So you never did vote on that.

There is no policy.

You did not vote and approve these measures.

And, of course, the vendor said, well, hey, we all got together, we will incorporate it into the database and it's all going to be good.

All this new database.

I believe that Ms. Duchin is creating what she considers to be an experimental democracy and she is using our database to do it.

The people of the State of Michigan.

And we are going to have to protect ourselves from that or at least get some royalties in the general fund when she starts selling it.

And now I do agree with Steve Lett, very slightly, just a couple times, that we don't have to approve these recommendations.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Your allotted two minutes has ended, Mr. Galant.

At this time we will move to the second remote public comment. I'm sorry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: My apologies.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: I couldn't see, sorry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our next remote public comment participate is Kay.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> Hello.

Hi.

Hello, Commissioners. My name is Kay. I'm a student at the University of Michigan. Unfortunately I could not be in Ann Arbor today.

But I would like to start my comments by talking about community of interest process.

Particularly communities of interest requests that ask to keep Counties together. I realize that and I see that Ottawa County, if they say it is a community of interest, it's a county of 300,000 people and it's divided into two Cities, Holland and Grand Haven.

And the suburbs of Grand Rapids are much different than rural areas on the east, which are totally different.

Similarly, Clinton Township, keep Clinton County together.

Unfortunately, the northern parts are rural and southern portions of the County are cookie cutter suburbs of Lansing and East Lansing, that never really traveled to the areas in the north.

So community of interest process is highly subjective, unfortunately.

It's being used as a proxy for keeping Counties together, which is number six in the Constitution. And well after the partisan fairness considerations.

Also, I'm concerned about Commissioners talking about square districts or how nice a District looks when it is at the bottom of the priorities in the Constitution.

Number seven.

And I also worry about how very few Commissioners are concerned about creating a map that is 50/50.

I want to let the Commission know that no republican has won a Senate election since 1994.

And only one republican Presidential candidate has won since 1988.

And you have this crucial task to create a fair map and take the time to understand cracking and packing. And that you cannot just pack cities together and push suburbs into rural areas.

Thank you and I wish you the best of luck.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much, Kay, for taking the time to address the Commission.

We appreciate this.

At this time that concludes our first round of public comment for both in person and remote public comment.

At this time we will allow those individuals who have signed up for a second time, and I believe we have one person present who has signed up for a second time to speak, and as a remote public comment. And I will hand the floor back over to Michigan Department of State staff, Sarah Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our first participant in the in-person, remote public comment second round is Ian-Sadler Brown.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: My apologies.

>> That is fine. As you can tell my name is not James Galant. And I'm not going to rant to you about Robert's Rules of Order for two minutes.

So right now I'd like to draw your attention to a specific community that I would like to see maintained at the Congressional level.

It's a little bit beyond what you're doing right now.

But southeast Oakland County, specifically the areas that are formerly...that were formerly Royal Oak Township before they subdivided into a bunch of smaller municipalities. And then kind of the southern strip of Macomb, kind of around the 696 corridor area are very distinct, different than areas to the north of them.

I guess you could probably throw Troy into that mix as well.

The areas to the north of them, specifically like Shelby Township, Macomb Township, those areas are far more ex-urban. They have lower population density.

They are straight up far fewer people there. And they have very different interests and concerns.

Housing is a very big concern and housing affordability is a concern in the area.

They have more of a connection to the auto industry and kind of historically blue collar jobs.

And additional consideration that I'd like to draw the Commission's attention to is the Quindar corridor and the John R corridor, which is the dividing line between Oakland County and Macomb County and then a sub-corridor within Oakland County. Both of these areas are home to a very high population of south Asian residents.

And they are split generally evenly between maps in Heights, Troy, Warren, and Sterling Heights.

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

And I believe that it would be in the interest of keeping this community together to maintain that area at the Congressional level.

Not like it is exactly, currently; but kind of a similar southern Macomb, southern Oakland configuration.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you for taking the time to address the Commission, Ian. We appreciate that.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our next remote public participant is Mr. James Galant. Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> Can you hear me, Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes.

>> Okay, James Galant, Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition and these are my opinions.

And, yeah, we noticed that that former speaker that was not me is not concerned about the rules at all. And we should say a little prayer for those people that don't really understand and you're not following the rules and why and what this is doing to the fundamental principles of democracy in America.

Which is not your charge here.

You have to change that. It's supposed to be the Robert's Rules of Order presented to you by the Secretary of State at your orientation. It's in the materials that was provided and you never did none of it.

That is why I'm saying I believe this is active civil disobedience. And you are going to try to challenge in Court. And the people of the State of Michigan will have to pay that. That is what the guy was saying about the efficiency gap too.

That that was not really, I don't know, I'm not a lawyer but suggesting that it was not approved by the Court and some other technicality, it was side bar. And this is a way that you are just going to try to get this into Court and challenge it in Court and maybe get it approved by the Court. And all the sudden you got another one.

And it's interesting Dr. Handley had research and efficacy just specifically to the three measures that she was doing. And she can't even do any of it. She said she can't, she can only this itself. Well, you know, you don't have a policy here now.

This is what I'm talking about. If you are superseding the rules, we would like a policy. And now Ms. Reinhardt said according to the current policy, the current policy has never approved.

You fly right through it. Commissioner Witjes wants to rock it right now. When he wants to vote, when Commissioner Witjes wants to vote, then we know we got a problem.

We have to keep our good eye on that guy, okay, because they don't want to vote.

All the sudden they do. And they do that for a specific reason and try to lock this stuff in. And, yeah, this is just, yeah, this is really bad, really bad. And but Secretary of State Benson is going to have to be the one that explains this all in Court because, you know, the Attorney General will defend her. And she is the one that is under her supervision

this is all happening. And she is silent. She is MIA. She has never come to meetings. Like I said, I'm going to be looking for a recall petition for her to recall her because she has not participated in the meetings except for the first day.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Galant, your allotted two minutes has ended. That concludes our public comment this afternoon. However, I would like to mention in addition to the in-person and remote -- oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Lange, you have a hand up, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, Madam Chair.

And I hope I'm not out of line here, but I would just like to do a reminder that we are all citizens of the state and the purpose of public comment is to get feedback to the Commission regarding items on our agenda or even your community of interest and not to make remarks towards other commenters.

And I just want to make that, I want everybody to be comfortable giving whatever testimony that they give and I just want to make sure that we maintain that in these meetings, so I just wanted to say that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Lange I think that was an appropriate point of privilege.

I see nothing wrong with that.

So after the last public comment that we had that concludes our last our public comment period.

As a reminder in addition to in person and remote verbal comment all e-mailed and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting and Commissioners also review the public comment portal on our www.Michigan.gov/MICRC website on a regular basis.

So we appreciate everyone who provides public comment in whatever way you choose and we also invite you to keep sharing your thoughts communities of interest and maps. At this time we are going to move forward in the agenda.

And our meeting earlier this afternoon the Commission reviewed communities of interest also known as COIs in the northern part of the Mitten.

And we will continue this work in the northwest and northeast region.

With the I am going to get it wrong, State Senate excuse me draft districts. Commissioner.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Will you please facilitate this discussion starting with I believe we left off with Commissioner Eid but I'm not sure.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, thank you very much.

Okay so we were in the process of going through cluster A2.

And just to clarify the process because we have been sort of working out the kinks in it as we have been going we are looking at the clusters and looking at our maps and we are identifying for the two alternative Senate maps that we have been working with plan one and plan three whether any of those COI clusters conflict with the maps that we

have the draft maps we have drawn and then evaluating whether we feel there is the possibility or the need for us to evaluate moving lines at a later date so we are not moving lines right now we are just identifying those COIs that might conflict with the draft lines we have drawn.

And then evaluating whether we want to log that conflict for a review of the moving of the lines.

So I will return at this time to Commissioner Eid.

We had left off at 31185.

And we were moving on to 32977 so I would ask Mr. Stigall to help us up and continue to work down those list of COIs so we can evaluate where they fall and see where they fall against our lines.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Just to orient the public and our Commissioners and members of the public that are physically present here what you're seeing on the screen right now, the orange and pink and purple lines are overlays of districts that the Commission has created.

Draft District lines.

And the green shaded area, that is a COI.

A community of interest that has been submitted via the public comment portal.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right it looks like this is 32977 which is the next one on the map.

Which I think is substantially identical to another one we viewed but go ahead Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do you feel we need to discuss this?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm pulling it up.

Give me one second.

We kind of already had one that looked just like this earlier.

Again, Benzie County is included isn't in the exact same one we went over earlier?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think the other one went one more layer down of Townships but it's pretty much the same.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Mr. Eid there are duplicates where people sent them in multiple times it appears.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We already discussed it.

I think we can move on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Kent, can you bring up the next one 33317?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This is titled, northern MI house seats. And see my letter dated June 28, 2021, that suggests the two contiguous counties of Leelanau and Grand Traverse for an MI house seat. And it was submitted because of request dated July 19, 2021.

And under their map notes it says northern MI-US Senate seat.

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.

Seems to be in line with both or I guess all four of the State Senate proposals we have drawn.

There is a little of this that goes over the border of Grand Traverse County.

Any comments?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Lake Ann is as you can see it, is a pretty substantial lake out there but there would be no reason to change the length to pull that in.

You will go over with Benzonia which we already talked about so it would appear to be appropriate.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No additional comments Commissioner Eid.

Is there something you want to log with this?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No. I'm okay with moving on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go to the next one 55351.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Just a point of clarification, doing this whole region.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, lucky you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What was that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Lucky you.

I mean you have done quite a bit there are 30 in this cluster if you want to at this point pass the baton to someone else you are certainly welcome to do so.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have no problem running through them unless somebody else would want to take over.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I will take it.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much I would like to take this opportunity to highlight this was one of the areas that I flagged in the processing document.

That the Commission had been discussing yesterday and you might want to make further recommendations on when the rotation will occur by cluster or by District type, so I just wanted to flag that for the benefit of the Commission.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, could you repeat that? I'm not quite sure I followed you I'm sorry.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And I apologize for the interjection.

I believe where the Commission is right now is discussing rotating to a different Commissioner which is wholly appropriate.

It was just flagging that it is one of the items that I have noted in the processing document, the process document that maybe shifted based on that the Commission yesterday discussed potential shift in the manner in which it's set forth in the process document so I was just highlighting it for the benefit of the Commission.

That if there is, in fact, update that could be made to that portion of the document, we would be very happy to make that if so directed.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you for that clarification.

I do think that would be beneficial and I think that's what the Commission desires so if you could work that into the proposed draft that we have before us so we can consider it, I would appreciate it.

So our process is actually it wouldn't just jump to you Commissioner Lett, it would jump to the next person in line which would be Brittini Kellom.

So Brittini do you want to take over from where Commissioner Eid is?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Sure.

Commissioner Lett that doesn't mean because I know you are familiar with that area that you just get to set there and don't say anything.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would not want to upset our process.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The process is collaborative.

And so what is this 309 -- 33531.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The region involves Traverse City and surrounding areas that have tourism and outdoor and recreation focus.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I would also point out this is identical to swan ideas on the Traverse region that we discussed previously with Benzie Township. I can't read it. We discussed before, it was identical so we've already kind of.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I don't have anything to log any changes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let's move on to the next one 333828.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The map drawing reflects the area represented by District one of the U.S. house of representatives.

My interest in this area is to see a State of Michigan map that represents specific areas by County, school District, et cetera, so that the needs of the community remain consistent with other elected offices, IE local board of education, Township boards and national districts that are individual area information that was provided, interested in these counties as this represents my U.S. representative area, which affects how the rest of the state allocated districts are drawn.

I don't have any thoughts but I see some hands.

I don't have any initial thoughts.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: This comment seems to represent a U.S. house of representatives District or as we have been calling it a Congressional district, but I don't believe this map provided to us provides enough population for a Congressional seat. It does look pretty similar to some of the Senate maps we have drawn.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think the language is confusing because it's definitely not enough for a Congressional seat.

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 way too much for a house seat so I don't think they unintentionally referred to it as a State House seat as being.

So but it does sort of comport to a Senate seat for the state.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Just looking sorry we are just looking at the actual current maps.

This map is identical to the current Michigan Senate seat in the northern peninsula and the Upper Peninsula except for Leelanau County that is the only thing that is added in.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That would be correct and if we are considering the communities of interest with the map that we are dealing with which is the State Senate map then the community of interest is within the map that we have drawn so it appears to be appropriate.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lett.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I feel I should note a few differences between this and some of the other ones we looked at.

This one does not include Benzie County whereas the previous few have.

This map we are looking at it includes Cheboygan and both of the maps we have drawn it splits Emmet from Cheboygan.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I do see Rhonda Lange has her hand up.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I know we are talking about this cluster but I recall another public comment that said something about joining Cheboygan with I know on our one maps we kind of had Cheboygan to the east and then Emmet to the west and had it split that way.

And they had said they associate more with the two together.

So just something to keep in mind when we go back and look at our lines.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Thoughts Commissioner Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I'm not seeing anything that needs to be changed at this time. And also considering what my peers have said as well as more importantly the comment that was made so I mean I would be fine with moving on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay let's move on to the next one.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Population significantly underrepresented this is 36046 population significantly underrepresented many months of the year.

As households are secondary and primary residency is credited somewhere else.

Very seasonal and that was the end of that comment.

But the individual area of information tourism and agricultural, seasonal economy, many second home.

I'm guessing I would say property.

I don't have a -- I wouldn't see anything I would need to change here simply because you all have drawn or we have drawn something that is reflective of what this person has said.

But I yield to my other Commissioners if they have something to say or speak to this particular cluster.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The big difference obviously here is this map goes down into Benzie Manistee and Mason Counties.

However, we have considered those communities of interest, this community of interest while we split it, we have given it consideration for the coasted community of Benzie and down the coastline so I think that takes care of that.

Commissioner Lange spoke about Cheboygan and bringing it in there so it covers that. So I think with the explanation of why we are considering the Benzie Manistee Mason split that this community of interest is within our District as drawn and should remain that way.

I do not see that a line change needs to be made.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lett for the detailed analysis.

I am not seeing any additional comments.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: You can definitely tell who lives and is familiar with the area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: We can move on from that one.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I do want to note the next four comments one of them is a complete duplicate and the other three are very similar so they may have been written by the same person.

I'm not sure but we will see when we see what the actual communities of interest are but they are the next three big blocks are almost virtually or the next four.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe that this -- that is displayed was the last community of interest submitted in the portal.

And the remaining comments that are listed in the document are all districts.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: They are not COIs.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Correct.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you for that.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Some may reflect or comment about COI so it's certainly worth reading and I'm happy to pull any of them up on the public comment portal if you want to view them but they were submitted as District plans and not COIs.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Just to clarify when we see a C in front of the four digit it's a community of interest and a P just means public comment is that what that stands for?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Generally means it's a direct plan.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Plan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: C for COI and P for District.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That makes sense because I was looking at the types of listings they have and that would make sense it would go with a picture possibly that I can't see, okay.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA:

>> CHAIR KELLOM: For the purpose of the public watching and those attending or for just the public record in general, the...what we were just discussing in terms of the plans that were included and not necessarily the COIs both mention Leelanau, Grand Traverse, Benzie, Antrim and Kalkaska. So those are the areas that we've covered. And included just so we are clear we are not just pursing or skipping by them.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Check Kellom just to acknowledge too that we do have the in there Benzie it's actually in I think we have no reason to change it looking at it there is five counties they want kept together for Leelanau early childhood center and we are good with the maps as drawn.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe that that concludes cluster A2.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was going to ask you if we could move to cluster 3 but my mic was off that was for Commissioner Rothorn he would like to celebrate our progress. While we decide if we are moving on to cluster three.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Finished A2 in A2 congratulations.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We finished cluster A2 and we will move on to A3 and move on to our next Commissioner which is Commissioner Lange. And there are five submissions in A3. They are still in the same area.

And then there is one plan that was submitted, one District that was submitted so I will hand the torch over to you Commissioner Lange and I would ask once again Mr. Stigall to pull up that very first community of interest we have so she can take a look at it.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I have the description for cluster A3 if you would like me for read it rural northeast.

This region saw many submissions talking about local universities particularly central Michigan University and the recreation and transportation services and infrastructure available in the area.

And that description is on Page 2.

And the detailed information of all of the COIs comprising cluster A3 is on Page 29.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Madam secretary did you just say it includes central Michigan University?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: She did, yes.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: I'm sorry Commissioner Lange go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: It would not be there but Isabella County.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: If you look at the cluster it's huge and not in the Mitten but not in the north.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: So evening in the cluster is in green, correct?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That is the particular community of interest that was submitted if you look on MGGG report the cluster actually goes all the way down to the thumb.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That's where I got confused, I apologize.

Okay so we have our first one up 29545.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Districts that relate the people and previous Commission for the Commission. Thank you for your service. This would be one possible and compact mapping for the first Congressional District, Upper Peninsula and lower and mostly rural in character with the exception of a few larger cities such as Marquette, Escanaba, Soo Ste. Marie. Southern counties can go to another Congressional District as needed to keep districts compact. It looks like for the most part with the maps that we already did, we didn't necessarily go to the east of the state, coming out of the UP.

We could, I'm seeing like Clare, Gladwin, wait, no.

I'm looking at the wrong thing again, aren't I? Yeah.

We pretty much got those in our districts as they are now.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You done see any need to log any proposed changes?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay then let's move on to the next one.

That's interesting.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Very interesting.

Okay, we are on 3174. Inland Northern Michigan. These communities represent predominately inland Northern Michigan and share similar demography, culture, ethnicity, religion and economics and should be their own State Senate District.

I'm looking at this.

There is no, yeah, we are just going to in my opinion we should skip it.

I don't know what to say.

I'm sorry.

Yeah, I would skip this one.

I think I get what they're doing, just trying to keep everything in the center, but.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange you don't have to think of a nice way it's impossible.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We would be creating all sorts of dis-continuities and I really don't think Midland and Sault St. Marie have much in common.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Not at all.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can we move on to the next one?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Similar interests ensure didn't I already road that one?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: It's a different comment but it's very similar to the first one you looked at.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Share demographics, religion, ethnicity, culture. And are also linked by Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant by and through its public TV station. Together the communities have the appropriate population of a Congressional District.

Again, while part of it fits in within the area when you're looking at this big...in Clare, Gladwin, Midland, Isabella again, really nothing much in common with the UP. I would say we really don't need to move any lines for this particular one.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, any comments? All right, seeing none, let's move on to the next one.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe that was the last comment in the cluster. So you could move on to the next cluster which would be cluster A4.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let's go to A4 with 18 submissions. Mackinac, this cluster is made up of small towns and rural communities. And tourism is primary. Agricultural is secondary. Broadband access is an issue. And access to hospitals is a big concern.

Residents must travel to nearby counties for healthcare. And we have now moved on to Commissioner Lett. So, Commissioner Lett, can you take over cluster A4?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For the benefit of the public, the heat map of cluster A4 is on Page 3 of the report and the details for cluster A4 start on Page 31.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, it does.

Okay so we are looking at 29974.

Mary's upper and lower plan. Rural, farm, near lakes, streams rivers, tourists, livery and mining, and small business.

That looks about right to me.

They...what she is saying we've included in the plan with the communities of interest. Obviously, one is over in Emmet, Charlevoix County, which is the same description basically of this.

So I don't see any need to change any lines.

Looks like we have included them in this District already.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right let's move on to the next one.

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

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 31142 Lake Huron sunrise side.

A big sunrise side.

Counties here known as sunrise side Lake Huron coastline and demographically economically culturally, ethnically and religiously the same.

Easy for you to say.

The part that we are dealing with, what are we dealing with? Is the State Senate District just the top part Cheboygan? Or the whole pink? Now the whole brown? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: The orange there is brown is the third map, version three.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay, so it's everything in green including the white counties are in there too, correct? Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I'm sorry, this magenta color here is map three.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay.

The community of interest is contained completely within the map boundaries.

Obviously, they didn't go over to several of the interior counties so I would not move any lines.

Since we have covered their community of interest within the District already.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA:

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Vice Chair wanted to let you know Commissioner Lange has her hand raised.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I apologize.

I think I forgot to put it down from earlier.

My apologies.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Just as a note Commissioner Lange and Commissioner Wagner we can't see you on the two screens in front of us so don't think we are ignoring you and thank you Sarah Reinhardt foretells us when the hands are raised.

We can only see the maps on these screens.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: For the public record and the benefit of the public Commissioner Wagner left the meeting at 5:57.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: My apologies.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We definitely can't see her then.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: And we still can't see her.

31151.

Straits of Mackinac and the eastern UP.

The communities of interest are contained within our boundaries currently.

The description is as I previously stated quite frankly and I see no reason to change any lines and we have accommodated their community of interest.

All right if anybody has a comment just say it.

Otherwise I'm going to keep moving on.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: It does get lonely out there.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 31163.

Basically the same comment.

We have contained their community of interest with the exception of a southern portion around Arenac and the Bay.

And I do not see a reason to go down that far in that area.

So I would make no line changes on this as we have accommodated the vast majority of their community of interest where we are.

Next up is 31237.

The Sault plus it says I'm sheer a District will end up being the whole UP, well not quite.

So also northern lower but I really don't feel any connection with the western UP.

Once you added Petoskey and Traverse City, I don't feel the UP voices are heard.

Well, we have added portion of Emmet County, and probably Petoskey but she or he is getting their community of interest basically in the eastern UP for the majority probably at least half.

I would not make any changes based upon what we have done.

Community of interest has been accommodated with northern and eastern UP, I would make no changes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay, 31237.

Was that the one I just did.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That is the one you just did.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 32444 Emmet and Charlevoix.

They are pulling in Cheboygan Emmet and Charlevoix continue to share a lot of similarities have the economies that rely heavily on tourism and pride on outdoor recreation et cetera et cetera.

Little Traverse band of Odawa Indians is an important part of this community.

Kent, are we including the Cheboygan in that District? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It appears parts of Cheboygan is in 32477.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Again, I think we accommodated the community of interest and would make no changes in the lines.
32477.

What? That it? 32477.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we go back to that last one? Well, we are not really accommodating their community of interest.

I mean it's both of the maps that we've drawn I think split it because both of the splits if I'm reading these lines correctly split Emmet from Cheboygan.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Do you have a suggestion?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I would also add too, to me it's kind of odd because they are talking about Charlevoix and Emmet in the comments. And yet they've grabbed this piece of Cheboygan. I think they kind of overshot because the comment is about Charlevoix and Emmet and the little Traverse-Bay Indians and. None of those are in Cheboygan. So I kind of feel maybe this map is not entirely reflective of what the comment says.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We got.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I have to comments about this.

First of all there have been more comments about keeping those lower counties together as a community of interest with this area.

So we would have to decide which one we are going to follow if we are going to move the line over to incorporate the stuff in Cheboygan County because of population, we would have to take away from elsewhere.

Also, we have had multiple public comments that Cheboygan wants to be with the west side instead of with the east side.

But then we've had comments that wants to stay with the east side as well.

So we need to somehow figure that out.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So maybe it sounds like what you're suggesting is we log examining whether we are going to include Cheboygan with Emmet and Charlevoix or whether they would be in separate districts for the Senate map does that seem reasonable?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we will need to discuss it at some point.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We can put that in the log as something to discuss and then move on.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: 32477.

There is Cheboygan.

Did I miss pronounce it? In the practice of gerrymandering it says that's all it talks about the gerrymandering.

The community of interest they have drawn that is here is Cheboygan and I take it we actually determined that it was going to be Cheboygan County.

It's within the lines of what we have drawn.

We discussed it before.

There is no changes need to be made.

32485.

Charlevoix County.

Small towns mostly point rural significant impact on tourism.

In the area and some farming.

Fairly accurate description, lies won't our District.

We accommodated and no need for any changes.

32563.

Northern, eastern, Lower Peninsula, rural marginalized economically.

Northeastern Lower Peninsula.

Well, describes the northeastern Lower Peninsula.

We have drawn a couple districts in there.

There's no suggestion there is a statement in here regarding what might be done on a split.

I think we accommodated the northern Lower Peninsula as best we could.

I don't see a need to make a change.

32772.

Sunset side.

Appears to be within entirely within the District that we've drawn.

Don't see any reason to comment or make any change.

And that appears to be it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right, okay, so we have moved through A4. I believe.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Vice Chair.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: The next cluster that would be contained within the northwest and northeast region is cluster 28, which is pictured on Page 13, the heat map and the detail for cluster A28 is on Page 118.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So A28, 14 submissions, central mount prospect area. A combination of rural, small towns with medium sized cities. They share resources with Grand Traverse Bay area and reports of several farming communities. Next in line will be Cynthia Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just to make sure I have the right Page did you say 128?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 118.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: 118.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Excuse me for interrupting the process how do we do we want to keep going? Will we benefit from a ten-minute stretch break?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We would.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, ten minutes? Ten minutes we will stretch or go to the rest room whatever you need to do is up to you.

At this time without objection we will stand in recess until, what is it 6:50, can we just do that, it will be 6:49.

Thank you.

[Recess]

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to ore R order at 6:54 p.m. will the Secretary of State staff please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely. Madam Chair, say present when I call your name. If you are attending remotely, please announce you are attending remotely. And unless your absence is due to military duty, please disclose your physical location by stating the County, City, Township, or village and the state which you are attending. I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present; attending from Reed

City, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> 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.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much for taking roll.

At this time we will continue on.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Points of order.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, I'm sorry Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm not speaking into it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: You knew it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Per the RFP for the local counsels the questions we were asking are due to I would like to make a motion to amend the agenda so there is an option 6B under new business to have the consideration for the vendor questions for the local counsel RFP that were proposed this afternoon.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I will second that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes to amend the agenda to item 6B under new business to accommodate the new update with RFP process and second made by Commissioner Rothorn.

Is there any discussion or debate on the actual motion?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Why are we doing this?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Exactly General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much mad game Chair so the local counsel RFP that the Commissioner issued had this afternoon as the deadline to submit questions in regard to the RFP and lists responses to those questions will be posted tomorrow.

The Commission has indeed received three questions that were prepared to address using the screens for the Commission's consideration but the Commission did in fact receive three discrete questions to the local counsel RFP that should be considered.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We are being asked right now or will they be refers to the committee?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Those could be again they would need to be adopted by the proposed answers would need to be finalized and formalized by the full Commission during today's meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I guess I'm somewhat confused but that is not unusual. The committee has the subcommittee hasn't seen any of them, any responses and we are being asked to consider these right now today here?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, so through the Chair to Commission Lett yes, the questions were received this afternoon.

The responses are due to be posted tomorrow, Friday, September 3rd.

So the issue would be going through the three questions and the draft proposed answers during this meeting for the full Commission's consideration.

The vendor questions have never gone to any of the RFP committees.

They have always been dealt with before the full body.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And Commissioner Lett just to clarify these are not responses to the RFP.

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.

Rather these are questions that people who may consider responding to the RFP typically submit before a full RFP response is submitted.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Sure take the vote let's go.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it the motion is adopted to amend the agenda to include item 6B, which will address the RFP and supply the responses to the three questions that need to be done by tomorrow.

General Counsel for clarification would you like that to be done after our just looking at the time or want us to keep going.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: That is entirely up to the Commission. I believe the motion moved it to add it as 6B. And I do not believe that it would require a significant amount of the Commission's time when it is handled.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay, all right. At this time we will continue on with our discussion of the northwest and northeast regions of Michigan as it pertains to communities of interest and looking at the in depth report provided by us to understand the clusters.

At this time I will also hand the floor over to our Vice Chair, Rebecca Szetela, to continue the discussion.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Chair.

All right, we left off with Commissioner Orton and cluster A28.

So if we could just go ahead and process through these as well as we have done the other ones.

There are not too many here.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so I will continue as we have been if that is what the Commission wishes.

But I have a question and a comment first.

I think we will never get done with our work if we go at this pace.

So I have a question for perhaps legal counsel.

And this is how our process was written by staff.

However, is it necessary for us to look at and read each submission in an open meeting? The reason I ask if you want clarification, these are not all of the public comments submissions.

These are just the layer that is showing up on the heat map.

And each Commissioner has a copy of all of them and they are available on the website for everyone to read.

So I'm thinking it would just be so much more efficient if we as Commissioners knew what area we were going to be working on the following day and we could do our

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.

homework by going through them and we can each bring any that there may be issues with that cross a line and we can discuss those instead of reading each one as we come to it.

Because we only have a few weeks to complete the maps, which we have not completed yet and go through all these.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel.

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

To address Commissioner Orton's inquiry, no, it is certainly not required that you read out loud the corresponding text for the cluster overlays.

The Commission has been internalizing public comment and receiving public comment and reviewing public comment throughout this process.

As well as submissions from the portal.

Part of what I believe Executive Director Hammersmith has as quote homework for the regions and the areas of the state that the Commission is working through is, in fact, going through the COI cluster data, the public comment data and the written submissions received.

So certainly that is all consideration that Commissioners are internalizing prior to the meetings.

So if the Commission was wanting to not read aloud those submissions that would be, in fact, appropriate.

The proposed process merely calls for acclimation to the cluster being read and the description of that cluster.

So I hope that was responsive.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so does anyone have any comments? Do we want to keep the process this way and be going through each one individually or what?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange we need that because we can't see you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I wasn't sure if you could or not.

I'm not feeling this particular process.

And I kind of get what Cynthia is saying and I would probably go along with something around those lines.

There are areas that we still need to.

Now, I think though that the heat map, okay I guess what I'm thinking is maybe this process would work better in a more condensed area such as your Detroit area where we have got tons of public comment about a specific area.

But it's just very time consuming it seems like for the less populated areas when a lot of the comments are the same.

And we kind of when we drew them based off from communities of interest that stuck out in those areas, we kind of drew the maps, some of them based on it.

Some of the districts.

So I'm kind of leaning towards what Cynthia said.

And like for this particular one that's up right now we haven't even done that area yet, have we?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, so I'm not feeling the process to tell you the truth.

I get a little confused by the multiple colored lines but that's me

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: My only concern with us doing our homework is I just want to make sure we have access and the ability to look at things the same way that EDS is helping us with.

Because I don't know that I necessarily have copies of the maps that we have so far. I'm sure they are probably out there on the website but it's not something I personally looked at.

And I don't know that I would be able to be skilled enough to bring up, I'm not that comfortable with the software where I think I could put a layer on like Kent has so beautifully done and see map one versus map three and also simultaneously pull up the layers for the communities of interest.

So that will be my only concern is can we evaluate it the same way.

Here it's very obvious to be well it's not in the area we are looking at.

Let's move on.

But that's because of Mr. Stigall's skill in bringing this up and showing us the multiple lines and look and quickly evaluate it and I'm not so sure I would be able to certainly read all the comments, but to see the maps I think is helpful.

So you know maybe and you know there are solutions to that.

This is not the only solution.

A solution may be we get instructions how to do this so we can do this on our own home computers who out having the need to do it all in a public meeting.

Just my thoughts on that.

>> KIM BRACE: Madam Chair if I can add comment on that side.

Two things we are working to get the software updated so that all of you will be able to see the same thing that Kent is seeing so that you will be able to bring up individual COIs on that side it's a question of getting updated software on to your machines.

In conjunction with that I would also say that one thing that you ought to take a look at, and you can look at it now, is the spreadsheet of all these COIs that I had given to you before, that has a column of the population of each of those.

And so certainly you should be I've been tracking each one as you've been going through the COIs this afternoon, certainly knowing how many people are there or not there is an additional piece of information to help you evaluate.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: My Department of State, Sarah?

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

So the current process as it is outlined, I think what you as Commissioners have started doing is going through the COIs one by one.

Which certainly some of the COIs it's beneficial to do that.

But I would also encourage you for the sake of efficiency to also consider viewing the cluster as a whole.

And I might show you what I mean by that.

Kent, if you could, put up cluster A28.

So Commissioner Lange, you are absolutely right that much of this cluster is not even located in the regions you are examining right now.

So you can see here.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is all of A28 but we can go through them quickly and see that this one barely touches the northeast region.

That barely reaches it.

So quite a few of these COIs, this one goes well up into the northern half of Michigan.

And then we have the famous hello.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So I guess what I'm trying to say here is if you look at the cluster over all you will see a lot of COIs that are very similar.

And for example, in the last cluster that was looked at we saw a lot of community of interest submissions that were almost identical.

So rather than reviewing each of those individually, which you all have every right to do, I would encourage you to in addition to reviewing the materials in advance also take a look at these clusters as well and lean into those a bit.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay, I don't know who is first, Commissioner Eid well I'm sorry Commissioner Vallette and then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay I would like to say that I agree with Commissioner Orton.

It is taking too long.

We need to find a quicker way to do this.

And then I had a question for Mr. Base you said you're working on it but do you have a date or a timeline that when it will be available?

>> KIM BRACE: It's actually available now on the system.

It's not just installed, I mean that is what Kent is using, I'm using it.

So it is available.

We just need to get it installed on each of your machines.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Okay and do you have a date that you would like to do that?

>> KIM BRACE: Well we are trying to work with the Secretary of States or with the state DOC to figure out what's the best time to get that installed on your machines. We don't know when that is though right now. I was hoping it would happen this week.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: And Sarah he says he is working with you to get this available to us.

Do you have some kind of date that we are going to be able to get this?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So it's certainly something I can inquire about and provide to the Commission.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Go ahead Executive Director Hammersmith, please.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: We were told that this software overlay was anticipated to be ready by Monday or Tuesday.

So we didn't schedule anything yet with DTMB to actually upgrade all the software for you again, for the third time.

So as soon as we are sure it's ready, we are happy to schedule it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can we -- we are almost actually done with cluster A28, there isn't really that much in it and I think at that point we are done with these three regions that we've done.

So my suggestion is that we continue to work through these today even though I know we are not loving this process and then my further suggestion would be next week that we return to mapping.

While we await that update and then we can switch to more of the process that Commissioner Orton is suggesting where we do our homework, we review them at home, we look at the overlays and then we come back and discuss there are areas of concern with.

That will be my suggestion, just to sort of keep us moving and being efficient and continuing to move forward.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: How does that sound and feel to folks? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That sounds good to me.

I quite like the idea of going through the heat map instead of each individual comment. But I just wanted to point out while we are on the topic of this process, I agree we might want to move back to mapping next week.

This heat map is only one tool in our toolbox.

It's only one piece of the puzzle.

We also have the live, in person public comment that we you know received at each of our public hearings and at meetings like today.

So while we do that homework it's important that we look at those as well either look at your notes or go back to the YouTube channel and watch them over again or whatever you want to do.

I'm also a little worried we may have biased ourselves a little bit withdrawing the maps first.

When we went through clusters A2 and A3, and A4 and we didn't really change that much.

So either we are all really, really good at this which I know I'm not really good at it or we you know we might be biasing ourselves a little bit.

And we are focusing a lot on whether the lines, whether the lines include the community of interest.

But I think the COIs, the people who submitted them also purposely drew at them to exclude other communities but we are only focusing on what they are including so it's just another factor to consider.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I just on the point of bias, I don't necessarily think we are biasing ourselves.

I think the issue with the Upper Peninsula there is not a lot you can do with it.

It's very limited by its geography and surrounded by water and the population is limited.

And you know for the most part when we drew these districts, we already incorporated Commissioner Lange's point we already incorporated the communities of interest while we were drawing it so it's hardly sub surprising that the communities of interest submitted align with what we did because we drew the map taking those into account in the first place.

So I wouldn't necessarily say that is showing bias.

I just think it's showing that we have done a good job so far in drawing the Upper Peninsula in accordance with the public comments we already received.

Now as we start moving further down the state it gets more complicated.

Especially once we get past kind of the midline of the lower Mitten and I think it's going to get more complicated from here but I certainly I think that it's just reflective of the fact that we have limited options in the UP and we listen to what we had already heard.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: If there are no further thoughts, I'm actually going to give the floor back to Commissioner Orton.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair I wanted to point out that Commissioner Lange has had her hand raised.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange my apologies.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: No that is fine.

I think Commissioner Szetela said it perfectly.

I don't think it's a matter of bias.

I can speak for myself because I'm from that area, I think that was a big benefit being from the general area, you have Commissioner Lett who is from that area, so with reading the public comment and being from the area I think it was fairly easy in those less condensed states or less condensed counties and areas to get it right.

Now we are going to have a harder time I'm sure once we get into the more populated areas but I don't think it was bias at all.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I totally agree.

And I would -- I think it's true when we get into the more populated areas it's going to be more challenging and we need all of the data that we need, which we don't have everything yet.

And it's September 2nd.

And according to our schedule we are supposed to be done in 20 days with all the maps and everything.

This is why I'm a little nervous about the pace that we are going.

But let's proceed.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay Commissioner Orton that means that we will continue on with the discussion of COI clusters which is led by Vice Chair Szetela and you were for the purposes of everyone we were looking at the supporting data for cluster A28 and Commissioner Orton is leading that discussion.

Please proceed Commissioner Orton, please.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay so I think you just skipped this one for now because we haven't mapped the majority of this area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not sure if you heard her Kent but she said she is skipping that one for now is this the same one.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you not hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: He is on a different one 30844.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, same with this one it does not overlap enough for us to make a determination.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Commissioner Orton?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That last one could we make a note to go back and visit that one? Because the current District that is drawn within the west side, this one is closer representative of public comment that we had and how those once associate, so could we just put a note in to go back and visit this particular one when we start mapping not only that bottom one but part of it has been mapped.

And.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So my understanding is that since this overlaps other regions when we are looking at the other regions this will come up as well; is that correct?

>> KIM BRACE: This region has 645,000 people in it.

So it's rather large.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So we can move to the next one.

We will have to revisit this when we are doing the lower regions.

So it's a little confusing to me when we have both of our plans one and three up.

Can you just show one at a time, Kent? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One plan at a time.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Number one and three we are considering.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which one would you like to look at version one and three.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: She said one and three.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is just plan one or version one.

Or just version three or just version four or just version two.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we are just focusing on one and three is what I thought.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is three.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So if we look at the one that was just up, or we can look at this one first, doesn't matter.

Can you move the box so I can see? So obviously this community of interest that is drawn is too much to fit into one District so it's going to have to be split up.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Could you tell us the population on that Mr. Brace?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, it's 778,000 people.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So and also wouldn't work for a Congressional District because we have to include some of the, well, let's see, well, we don't know exactly because we have not mapped it but for the -- this is Senate.

Right? That we have our plan.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Senate is up right now and this is a proposed Congressional District.

Commissioner Lett did you have your hand up?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would just note and you may have already noticed this Commissioner Orton that the person that submitted this actually submitted it as a Congressional District.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So then we just need to wait because we have not worked on Congressional districts yet, right?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Uh-huh and I think the next one is like that as well Commissioner Orton.

I'm not sure you can read behind me and double check.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Next one, please.

>> KIM BRACE: I'm sorry area 506 is 539,000 people in this area.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay and they don't say which type of District they're talking about.

It does say.

Congressional District.

So let's save that for later.

That was the next one I'm sorry.

That's this one.

So you can go back to the last one, I'm sorry.

The numbers are hard to keep track of.

Okay so this one overlaps some of what we have done.

We are not going to be able to keep it all in one.

Because of population.

And this one doesn't say what type of District they're talking about.

So anyone have any?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: This one from my reading of it the individual is simply pointing out to us that these central Michigan counties are rural, small towns et cetera. I don't see that they are suggesting any type of District other than point to point out what that general area is.

Clearly when we get into it, we are looking at Saginaw Bay City and mill land which we have heard repeatedly is the Tri-Cities and we will have to do something with that.

So I mean I think it's just a general comment on what's there and we are going to have to work with.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Too big for a House District, it's too big for a Senate District and it would fit within a broader Congressional District.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay next one, please.

>> KIM BRACE: Has over a million people in it.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Right so that is not going to work for us.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: How many people does this have?

>> KIM BRACE: 1,020,000.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, they want it as a Congressional District so obviously way too big.

And then obviously it's cutting off the Upper Peninsula which does not have enough population on its own to form its own Congressional District so problematic on multiple counts.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So move on to the next one, please.

Okay so this one they are talking about U.S. Congressional district, can you tell us the population there?

>> KIM BRACE: This one is 755,000 and it's noted as being a U.S. Congressional District in the title.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay, well we haven't worked on Congressional yet so we will put a pin in that for when we do that.

And this one we can pick it apart and see how many laws it does not comply with. But we can just move on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We can just move on.

>> KIM BRACE: 669,000 people in it.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much Kim and hello back.

I think that is the end for Commissioner Orton because I believe the next one is a plan after that.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I have a comment for the log.

So we are going to have to come back and reexamine where we want to put that eastern part of the Upper Peninsula and we have three heat maps that all have them a little differently.

We have one that has it with going down the eastern side of the state.

One that has it going down the western side of the state and one that has it with horizontally like just I want to get the counting right. The northern part of the state with Emmet, Cheboygan, Presque Isle and Charlevoix. So I think we should put it in the log we have to examine where we put that part of the Upper Peninsula.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah, I was wondering as well when we are going to rectify that because we have drawn those districts.

We have several alternative maps for that and now we have gone through the communities of interest.

I think we have all gone through our own notes.

And you know the other communities of interest submissions that aren't on the heat map.

So when do we make a decision on that?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think we all know we are going to have to go back.

We have these two maps we are kind of liking.

I remember for whatever maps are up right now if this is three or one I can't remember I think it's three but if you all recall none of us were particularly happy with this because we were trying to cut out those rural counties in the center to keep them together but we were having population issues and then we were also trying to create up to lakeshore districts on the Huron lake said we didn't have enough population but didn't want to go to Bay City or Midland either and would definitely have to redraw some things here and like I said it was an alternative map that once we finished it we were all kind of like we don't really like it either but it has some good ideas we want to work with so I think once

we -- I think the process and the plan is we are going to continue drawing districts and then we are going to have to come back and reconcile this and file out how we divide Cheboygan and Emmet and Charlevoix and what we are doing there.

My point is I don't think anyone in their mind sees this map being anywhere final and we know there will be some line adjustments.

Back to the Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Vice Chair Szetela.

Thank you, Commissioners, for the good work on establishing the COIs in the northwest and northeast regions.

I know that that was kind of arduous and at times confusing but we are still hanging in there together.

That is the points of a process you got to work out the kinks so thank you for being patient with one another and to the staff who generously supporting us through the process.

At this time Commissioners and members watching and attending we will move to the agenda to new business.

And we are at item 6A so without objection we will move forward to agenda item 6A. Communities of interest regional consideration process.

And I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to provide information to the Commission about future direction.

Please proceed Director Hammersmith.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Agenda.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Forgot for put juvenile -- Julianne and I can do mine in future agenda items or announcements.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I made the note and everything in blue at this time we will move to the amended agenda item and that is 6B, the Commissioner responses to the RFP. General Counsel you have the floor.

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

And with the assistance of MDOS the vendor questions will be displayed as well as the proposed answers.

Again these vendor questions were received this afternoon in response to the local counsel RFP posting.

The responses are due to be posted tomorrow, Friday, September 3rd with bid proposals due to the Commission on Wednesday, September 8th by 8:00 p.m.

And it appears that the vendor questions are up.

They are not on the screen in front of me so I apologize.

I would first note that both all questions one through three are not associated with the document, the RFP itself.

They are general questions.

The first bidder question is quote when we last submitted a response to the RFP to the Commission many points were deducted from our response due to our proposed changes to some of the standard contract terms.

Would those changes be weighed in a similar manner or are there any of these standard terms subject to discussion and/or negotiation? The proposed answer response excuse me that could be amended by the Commission is all proposals timely received will be reviewed and evaluated pursuant to the issued RFP this will include but not be limited to the mandatory minimum requirements and technical evaluation criteria. Each RFP is unique as to the statement of work and services sought and will be individually evaluated based on responsiveness to that RFP.

Would the Commission like me to proceed through all three? I'm happy to respond to any questions or feedback at this time.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are these three questions coming from whom?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Excellent question Commissioner Clark.

These three questions were submitted anonymous to the bidder of the RFP as Ms. Reinhardt indicated earlier the proposals are not due until next week.

So these would be clarifying questions from potential bidders that they would like answers to.

We do not have the information and the procurement team does not have the information of who submitted them.

Aside from the solicitation manager who would not -- would not be asked and would not share that information.

So they are blind questions that were providing general responses to that will hopefully be of benefit to any potential vendor.

Madam Chair I will move to question two.

The question is we know that Baker Hostetler firm was retained as litigation counsel and this RFP is for local counsel only.

Can you explain the anticipated scope of the work for local counsel in this regard?

Would the Baker firm be lead litigation counsel and the local firm simply working with Baker to make filings and serve in other administrative capacities because we have lawyers who are licensed in Michigan? Or would local counsel have a more active role in the capacity as cocounsel to Baker? The proposed response that can be modified but I the Commission is: The MICRC has engaged experienced litigation counsel to defend the adopted redistricting plans.

The role of local counsel pursuant to the key deliverables in the RFP would be administrative in nature relative to redistricting litigation.

The role of local counsel pursuant to the key deliverables in the RFP would be more active in handling Michigan specific, non-redistricting matters such as FOIA or election law issues.

I'm happy to answer any questions or concerns on the potential response to number two.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: General Counsel it does not appear you have any responses or comments rather.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And the third question Madam Chair moving on is finally giving this is due immediately after a holiday weekend would the Commission be willing to extend the deadline for responding for a week, I assume one week to allow firms more time to provide a response? The proposed answer is the Commission has the discretion to modify the proposed deadline by majority vote.

The current proposal deadline is Wednesday, September 8th, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. eastern daylight time.

So I just noted that again if the Commission is desirous of changing that deadline it certainly has the authority to do that by majority vote.

I noted the current proposal deadline and would also highlight that the length and the content of the local counsel RFP was that was submitted under the hybrid process was significantly shorter than past RFPs.

So certainly the Commission has the discretion to modify that date if it so wishes or if not this response, I could adjust it to say that whether the Commission has will be -- will not be changing it or if it is changed then note that as well.

And the new proposal deadline if one is adopted would be posted on the Commission's website and pushed out to not only the vendors in Sigma that it was pushed out to but remember this was our hybrid RFP process so there was a list of specific e-mails and formal invitations to bid that one out.

And they would also be notified if the deadline was shifted.

Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much General Counsel. Commissioners do we have any thoughts or questions for Julianne? And Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, let me give you my opinion about the first one. I think that is standard procedure for an RFP.

So I don't see why that would be an issue at all.

The second one I think we discussed probably about a week ago when I asked you to explain the legal the local legal counsel.

And your answer is reflected here as well.

I don't see a difference.

Then the third one I don't know, I don't know if we should extend it or not because when we did this Baker Hostetler RFP when we approved that, as soon as we did that people came back and wanted the deadline extended or they wanted the ability for us to put on another RFP and we stood firm that we were going to not adjust dates.

So I would say that we keep the September 8th deadline.

Just to be consistent with what we have done in the past.

So those are my three comments on that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

And Commissioner Lett, please?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we accept the proposed answers to the three questions.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Lett is there a second? Second made by Commissioner Lange.

Is there any discussion or debate on the actual motion to accept the three responses to the RFP inquiries? Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: My only comment would be we change the verbiage on the last one that says we are not going to change the date.

Rather than it's our discretion to decide right now whether or not we change the date.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: And Madam Chair that is why I activated my microphone if the desire is not the language on the third one the Commission may want to consider amending it to while the Commission has the discretion to modify the deadline but by majority vote it declines to do so.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Amend the answer to number three to read while the Commission has the discretion to modify the proposed deadline by majority vote, the Commission chooses not to do so.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Szetela second made by Commissioner Lett.

All those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All those opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Nay.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The ayes have it and the motion carries to amend the third response to include the verbiage while at the beginning of the response.

Going back to the original motion to approve the three responses motion made by Commissioner Lett the second was made by Commissioner Lange all those in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

All those opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it the motion carries.

And three responses have been approved.

Thank you, General Counsel for raising this issue for the Commission.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair and I appreciate the accommodation and thank MD O S for their assistance with the technological issues.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All right moving on to agenda item 7 because Executive Director okay great there are no approval of minutes for today.

Moving on to staff reports we have one staff report from Executive Director sue Hammersmith.

So without objection I will allow Executive Director to have the floor.

Hearing no objection please proceed Sue?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I just wanted to indicate the next areas that the Commission would review communities of interest.

And I know there is talk about getting into the mapping process.

We went ahead of the communities of interest in the mapping process because we didn't have the software to display the communities of interest.

Now that we do, it would seem prudent to consider the communities of interest in the clusters as the lines are being drawn.

So we can do equal population, communities of interest all in one process.

So that would be my recommendation.

If we can streamline the way that we look at the communities of interest for next week, I think that would be ideal.

We can come back with recommendations.

The next clusters that we were planning to look at were west and southwest.

That again would be A28 and A32 to 36.

And then southeast and south central which we've already mapped in those two areas which you have already mapped and they would be A16-17 for southeast and south central, 19-23, 25 and 28.

Again, as Commissioner Eid indicated you would want to look also at in person and remote public comment.

You have indexed lists for that as well as the e-mailed and mailed public comment.

If we do -- if the choice of this body is to go in that direction, those would be the areas we would consider next week.

And I can certainly put that in an e-mail to you for clarification.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much Executive Director, Sue Hammersmith. The only thing I would have to that I would want to add is I ask that when there is consideration to streamline a process that there is consideration given that we are a group that tends to speak up when we have something to say.

So I know that I've talked about this so to be labor the point even more to consider an approach that is collaborative and allows those that choose not to necessarily speak every time gives them that freedom and choice to do so.

And I think honestly that would also speak to our ability to speed things up.

I just give the example earlier of Commissioner Lett and how he was able to drive that process.

Personally that felt very good to me and I didn't feel like anyone felt like he was speaking over anyone else.

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 yeah, I would I think I can comfortably speak on behalf of the Commission to say we will speak up in a collaborative way if there is something that we feel strongly about. At this time I'll move to an MDOS report if there is one.

Sarah Reinhardt please grace us with the Michigan Department of State report.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We have no updates at this time.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: And there is no report.

Okay.

Correspondence was received in advance of our meeting today and was provided along with a written public comments to the Commissions in our meeting materials.

For future agenda items it's my understanding there are no future agenda items to share at this time.

Are there any announcements? Seeing no hands raised or not hearing about any announcements as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business, a motion to adjourn is in order.

May have a motion to adjourn.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there a second? Second made by Commissioner Lett.

All those in favor of adjournment please raise your hand and say aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it and meeting the adjourned at 6:45. Thank you for everyone watching, all the people that help put this together and safe travels and be well.