

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

09/02/21-1300 Meeting

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

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We will bring the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 1:06 p.m.

Greetings to Ann Arbor. We are happy to be here today. There are several groups that are making this meeting possible. I would like to thank Tom Ivako, Bonnie Roberts and Logan Woods of the center for local, state and urban policy here at the University of Michigan. Ellen Werman and Nate Hall, campus election management project. Landon Meyers, campus vote project. It's gratifying that so many groups are here to assist the MICRC in engaging people in redistricting here in Michigan.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed at YouTube at [www.YouTube.com/MICHSO office/videos](http://www.YouTube.com/MICHSO_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](mailto:Redistricting@Michigan.Gov) for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

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

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

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

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

>> 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: 11 Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: You can view the agenda at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC).

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

We have a motion made by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Eid.

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.

Before we move forward with that motion, did we want to -- we had some discussion yesterday about that unfinished business to be listed but that we wanted to move it further in the agenda.

So, did we want to amend the meeting agenda to remove 5A and possibly move it down to 6D where we already have communities of interest continuing?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'll say yes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Could I have a motion to amend that fact?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I will motion to amend that fact.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Motion to amend the meeting agenda to remove item unfinished business A and combine that with Item 6D, communities of interest. A motion by Mr. Rothorn. Is that accurate summation of you motion, Commissioner Rothorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes. Thank you for your summary.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Unless there is any discussion or debate on the motion, and I actually can't see if Rhonda or Erin have their hands raised from where I'm at.

Okay, looks like they do not.

All right so let let's vote on motion to amend the meeting agenda. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay, so the motion prevails. The meeting agenda is amended as indicated to move 5A and merge it with new business 6D.

So, let's go back to our original motion, which was a motion to approve the meeting agenda, which was motioned by Commissioner Lett, seconded by Commissioner Eid. Any discussion or debate on that motion? Hearing none, let's move forward with the vote. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

All right. The motion prevails and the agenda as amended is adopted. Thank you very much, everybody.

Without objection, we will now begin public comment pertaining to agenda topics of the meeting.

Hearing no objections, we will proceed with public comment pertaining to agenda topics. Individuals who signed up and indicated that they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will be allowed to do so.

Please step forward to the nearest microphone when I call your number. You will have 20 minutes to address the Commission, I'm sorry, 20 minutes, holy cow, we would be here day and I would never hear the end of that from people in other areas where I only gave two minutes. So, two minutes to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. First in line to provide public comment is number one.

>> There we go.

It's on.

All right. Hi, everyone.

Is it back on? Good.

I'm here to talk about my community of interest, which is the Lake St. Clair community of interest.

I gave a public comment in Warren, but was not totally happy that I painted the right picture.

This is Lake St. Clair, and these are all the northeast suburbs of Detroit.

What I'm talking about are all the communities, all the cities that border Lake St. Clair through northern Wayne, Macomb and around St. Clair County.

We care about stewardship of this lake and live a different lifestyle than people inland.

This area here and here in Macomb County and southern Macomb County and in Detroit, these corridors are industrial corridors. This area here is the Mountain VanDyke corridor, coming all the way from Hamtramck and up to the Clinton River is full of auto plants, heavily industrialized. Here the Gratiot corridor that leads into downtown Detroit from Mount Clemens to downtown Detroit is an area that is a mix of aging commission and light industrial.

We have different interests. And if you cut us east-west and slice up our lakeshore, the people inland will have power to out vote us every time.

We have about 200,000 people in this area, in the Lake St. Clair community of interest.

It's a great start to a State Senate District. And one thing I want to point out that I didn't back in Warren is a very specific issue, which is the dumping of sewage into our lake.

The Federal Government, the APA said you are supposed to separate your storm and sewer drainage systems.

Most of these cities have not.

My hometown of Grosse Pointe Park has.

Of course, the cities don't suffer the consequence when there is a big rain event, and they dump their sewage in here.

People here have their beaches shut down and waterfront recreation shut down when that happens. And it's not fair that we're separated east-west as opposed to north-south. Thank you.

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

Number two?

>> Hello. I'm Ed Saunders from Ann Arbor, Michigan. I first want to thank the Commission for this heavy lift.

I know it's a big task. And I do genuinely appreciate it.

People are going to tell you a lot of things about these specific instances and input just like you just heard.

I want to draw your attention back to the forest here.

And that forest in my mind is partisan gerrymandering.

Since 2000 the party with the most ballots in Michigan won only the State House, only half the time.

So, over these last 20 years, due to partisan gerrymandering fully half the time, Michiganers got the opposite of what they voted for.

Over our state's history, this has been done by democrats and republicans when they were in power.

In 2018 the Michigan citizens fought very hard, and I fought very hard, to rectify this by overwhelmingly passing proposition two.

The majority of votes in every County, the majority of voters in every County voted for this amendment.

Because of that, the Constitution now demands that this committee draw fair districts and they must meet the specific criterion.

Districts shall not provide a disproportionate advantage to a political party.

And, further, our Constitution demands that this committee explicitly verify the partisanship fairness by, quote, using accepted measures of partisan fairness.

Therefore, I urge the committee to measure and evaluate this partisan fairness at every stage in the drawing of the maps.

There is no point in doing otherwise because the citizens and the courts will require this in the end.

So please don't waste precious time drawing maps that do not recognize an objective standard for partisan fairness such as the efficiency gap analysis. Thank you.

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

Number three.

>> Hi. My name is David B. I live in the Ann Arbor area.

And I basically wanted to stand in to remind basically the Commission, basically that voting is important.

And that, you know, if anything, it's the more voting we get, the better because voting is democracy.

That's the very definition of what democracy is.

And so, anything that you do, or we do, anybody does, that makes voting less likely or restricts voting in any kind of way is actually a very negative thing for the democracy that we all believe in.

And that's -- and as it was spoken before, gerrymandering, for political purposes, is one of the major problems with this voting because what it does is it discourages people from voting by making them feel that their vote doesn't count.

And that makes them less likely to vote, which is bad for democracy.

And so, I am encouraging the Commission to take into account the idea that any -- that when you get done with your redistricting, that it should encourage the most people to vote in the state and encourage people to feel that their vote that they have really

counts. And that it's not just going through the motions to let the same representative get back into office time after time.

We need districts that really encourage people to step up and express how they feel about their Government every time they get the opportunity to do so.

Thank you.

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

Number four.

>> Thank you very much.

As you all know, we are very familiar with the odd, weird shaped of districts throughout the United States and also here in Michigan.

And they are designed in that way to give advantages to one party or the other at one time or another.

If we can have odd shapes for that reason, we can certainly have odd shapes to produce districts that are equally balanced.

Why do we want equally balanced in our various districts? Think about that for a minute.

The candidate now has to win votes.

They are not given to him by District boundaries.

He has to talk to he or she as the candidate maybe has to talk to the people he is going to represent, convince them that he has that they subscribe to.

And brings forth the value of how volunteers can help in each District and that in itself will increase people's involvement and voter participation.

As we look forward to that, this could result in the candidate having to be more communicative, having more open sessions, having more time to spend with the individuals in these districts.

Might bring back to the candidacy some honesty, the values that we think about.

Honesty, transparency and really representation.

Thank you very much for what you do.

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

Number five.

>> Hi. My name is Don Danico and I'm a long time Ann Arbor resident.

I think the most important thing is that the districts are competitive. And, of course, other speakers have said the same.

What really is hurting this state and the nation in general is that too many people are giving up on democracy.

And by having unequal districts, people say why should I vote the outcome is already determined.

And what that leads to is what we saw on January the 6th.

People can't give up on democracy.

When they do, that's the end.

Thank you.

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

Number six.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners.

My name is Robert George. And I had the pleasure of speaking before this body at your first public hearing in Jackson, Michigan.

At that meeting I spoke about the importance of the Washtenaw, Jackson connection as a Washtenaw County parks and recreation Commissioner. And the impact that the Waterloo recreation area that covers both counties has on our natural interactions out in nature as well as the importance making sure that people have those opportunities within one District.

I also I wanted to reemphasize this point from another perspective. 11% of Jackson workers, 11%, commute into Washtenaw County for work every day. And the economic ties of the counties go beyond that when it comes to labor, when it comes to materials and shipping. You know, the connections between Washtenaw and Jackson are substantial.

And I also wanted to make the note that you could actually draw two complete State Senate districts between Washtenaw and Jackson Counties that are blockish, that respect communities of interest, that are complete and in regards to population. And that don't even have a weird look to them.

I would encourage you to explore this idea.

That is a very reasonable and a very easy thing to do between the two counties of Washtenaw and Jackson.

I also wanted to make a couple of quick points about some broader process points. When it comes to breaking cities it's critical that you explore the idea of breaking cities where it's needed because the way that voters across the state are sorted, democrats are often packed heavily into cities while republicans are more equally distributed across the state, so please explore that.

I know that Commissioner Eid has taken a lead on some of those questions. I hope the rest of the Commission can look into that.

I think it's very important. And I want to conclude by echoing the point that the party who wins the most votes statewide should win the most seats, that should be imperative for your maps. Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Can you confirm were you 6 or 7?

>> Six.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That is what I thought, just wanted to make sure, number 7.

>> Hi, just want to say after taking my mask off I already have lipstick up my nose so just ignore that.

Sorry.

So, my name is Terese from Ann Arbor Michigan. I have three points to make and one of which has already been made and that is the most important principle is one person one vote.

I will get a motion about this because I'm an advocate and I encourage people to go out and vote and learn about their candidates and learn about the issues. And when people go out and vote and their votes don't matter, it strikes at the heart of democracy.

Because it strikes at their hearts. They are heartbroken because their votes don't count. We cannot disenfranchise people in that way.

So, number one, one person, one vote.

Number two, some people have commented not here but online that rural areas should be kept intact because they have an identity as rural.

One of the greatest threats to our democracy though is the extreme polarization being driven in part by perceived differences between rural and urban residents. But, in fact, rural and urban people have more in common than not.

We need reliable broadband, affordable healthcare, accessible transportation, easy access to healthy food, a clean environment, and so much more.

So, maintaining the artificial boundaries between urban and rural areas obscures these common interests and drives further polarization. So, I hope you will blend urban and rural areas to guide us together towards solutions for the common good.

Finally, my third point is to end prison gerrymandering, please.

Counting prisoners who disproportionately who come from urban areas and as we all know are disproportionately people of color as residents of the prisons where they are disproportionately in rural areas disenfranchises the prisoners and the communities that they come from and rightfully live in.

Several states have already eliminated prison gerrymandering.

They include...never mind. I hope you will make us one of them.

Thank you so much for all your work.

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

Number eight.

>> Good afternoon, Commission. My name is James Johnson Junior, and I previously spoke with you guys in Jackson.

Just wanted to hit a couple things home. I live in Jackson County and like some of my other coworkers I've been driving to Ann Arbor for 21 years.

I would like to have a candidate that represents me at my home and my job.

I think that it's important that we make a District that makes sense, that's nonpartisan.

And I would like you guys to combine Jackson County with the western side of Ann Arbor seeings how a lot of people drive to Ann Arbor like myself. And I think it's fair to be able to be represented by the same candidate.

Thank you.



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

Number nine.

>> Hello. My name is Mike Cox. I want to thank you for your...the work that you do.

I know that the task that you have is daunting.

The main thing that I would like to see come out of this is fair and nonpartisan districts.

I reiterate what I have heard before as far as not disenfranchising the voters and letting the vote count.

I'm one of that 11% that live in Jackson and work in this area.

I've worked in this area for over 30 years.

There are definite links in between Jackson County and Washtenaw County.

I just think that, along with the speaker before me, that I would like to see my home and my work represented by the same candidates.

Thank you.

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

Number ten.

>> My name is Katherine Askew. I live near Unadilla in Linden Township, Washtenaw County, which is currently part of Congressional District 7.

A decade ago, before returning to my husband's home State of Michigan, we lived in Texas where I first became aware of the potential abuse of powers of gerrymandering. Now, being referred to as the Texas Taliban, those gerrymandered Texas districts have been weapon to strip away constitutional privileges, including endangering women's healthcare rights, access to voting and safe schools.

These are the dangers of politicians picking their voters rather than voters selecting their politicians.

Legislative districts should be based upon geography and population rather than voter demographics and prior voter preferences.

A properly configured District makes it efficient for representatives to meet their constituents in a well-defined geographic area rather than those drawn in a gerrymandered hodgepodge.

District 7 currently looks and functions like a gerrymandered Texas District.

Please redraw it as a nonpartisan example of fair Districting.

And I thank all of you very much for serving on the Commission.

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

Number 11.

Do we have a number is 11 one more time? All right. If not, we will move on to number 12.

>> Hello. My name is Gregory Fox, long time Ann Arbor resident.

I along with a few thousand hours, I put a lot of volunteer hours into this campaign and even applied to the panel, but you're the unlucky ones.

So, communities of interest are fine.

I talked it up during the campaign.

But my main motivating force, and I think that of many of the people I volunteered with, was to have our representatives reflect the overall aggregate vote across the state.

So that a party that got a clear majority of the votes statewide has a majority, say, in Lansing and representing us in Washington.

That would be success.

Another different point is your next two public meetings fall right in the Jewish high Holy days, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. I really hope the next scheduled events you will show more respects, check the calendar for the significant holidays for the various religions.

Thank you.

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

Number 12.

Sorry, I skipped number, so number 13.

I didn't have number 11, that's right. Go ahead.

>> Thank you, Commissioners, for the job you're doing and the job that you have ahead of you.

My name is Mike H.

I'm a resident of Monroe County. And one of the questions that was proposed to me when I came in by one of the Commissioners was could I help you guys distinguish what was Monroe County, whether it was a rural or suburban commuter community. As a lifelong resident of Monroe, I certainly believe we are a suburban community. I don't know the exact numbers, but I believe over 20% of Monroe County resident work in Wayne County and almost, just under 20% work in Ohio, in the Toledo area. With only 1% working in the Lenawee County area.

So, I do believe we have much more in county with the Wayne County, Down River Area and hope you take that into consideration.

Also, to keep the I-75 and 23 corridors separate.

The I-75 corridor definitely is more of the suburban manufacturing community whereas the 23 would be somewhat more the rural community.

Thank you.

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

Number 14.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners.

I like the rest of the speakers want to thank you for taking on this historical opportunity.

My name is Dan Mitten, I'm born and raised in Monroe County.

And I rise here today to talk about the community of interest also.

I have seen a lot of comments made on rural Monroe County.

It does have areas that are rural.

However, it is heavy industrial.

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

We are more in common with Wayne County than Lenawee County.

We have...most people refer to it as the Little Down River.

We talk about our City. We have the river runs through there, which is very common to the down river area and Wyandotte.

We strive to build our community like down river and have all the business they have.

We have the Lake Eerie we share with them, with all the fishing industry that goes on there.

Those are the parts of interest that I believe Monroe County represents. And I hope you take that into consideration also. Thank you.

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

Number 15.

>> Thank you, Commission.

Jerry Young, City of Monroe.

Lifelong resident.

As stated earlier, I would ask that this Commission follow the Constitution.

Partisan fairness is more important than following the City, the County lines, and making these compact districts.

Funny shapes are okay, but what is not okay is a system that does not adequately represent the people.

Monroe County is much different than Lenawee County.

It should not be in the same District.

The House District should reflect the residents of these counties.

Thank you for your time.

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

Number 16.

>> Hi. Aron S. From Macomb County.

In Macomb County the graphics of northern Macomb and southern Macomb are drastically different.

Southern Macomb is more of an inner ring of suburban area and their interests are far different than an area that is more rural and in northern Macomb County. And I would just like to see you guys take that into consideration as well as trying to, you know, make it so that things are more fair as well.

Thank you.

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

Number 17.

>> Hello. My name is Bridgett. I'm an Ann Arbor resident.

I was watching the draft mapping that was happening on September 30th when you were making Michigan House maps in the southwest corner of Michigan.

And I was concerned because it seemed as if the maps were being drawn with regard only to population of existing Townships and compactness.

One of the great things about this redistricting that we have in Michigan, this time, this year is that communities of interest are supposed to be taken into account.

It's the third criteria.

It's a head of existing boundaries, ahead of compactness.

And when I listened to the stated rationales that Commissioners were making for the maps, they were entirely along the lines make the numbers work. And the Townships were included or excluded in these districts based on population.

I did not hear the word community of interest in the whole session.

So, I am hoping that as you go forward the Commissioners will take communities of interest as seriously as the Constitution wants them to.

And I have this hope, possibly because of this agenda change, but I really would like to see the Constitution taken seriously here in the way that these Districts are made.

Thank you very much for all your hard work.

I know it's a hard job.

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

Number 18.

>> Good afternoon, Commissioners.

Damon Jacobs. I'm a lifelong resident of Washtenaw County, 40 years here in Ann Arbor. I grew up here.

The last eight and a half I've been in Ypsilanti Township.

So, I want to speak on the redistricting mapping.

As far as like Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor, I think they should be separate because of their needs and views and their overall interests are different.

I did not think so when I lived in Ann Arbor. But now I live in Ipsi, I see the difference because it's always different and basically that is what I want to say.

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

Number 19.

>> Thank you, Commissioners, for all the work you do.

I'm Roland Wong and I teach here in Ann Arbor in the program in American culture and Asian American studies.

Remember three words, keep Canton whole.

I'm speaking for the Asian American community of interest.

And Canton Township is a vital place for the Asian American population.

14.1% of the population in Canton is Asian.

8% South Asian.

It has a demographic quite different than the surrounding communities of Plymouth to the north of 5.2% Asian.

And Belleville .46% Asian. So, Canton is really a unique community of interest.

Canton's leadership at the Township level and at the Plymouth, Canton School District level reflect the rich diversity of Canton.

So, and also the Ford Road corridor reflects the diversity in its businesses and restaurants.

Significant Asian American presence in business and restaurants.

With a population of 98,659 in 2020 census, it deserves its own State House District.

And it fits neatly into a State Senate District with the communities to the north, Plymouth, Plymouth Township and congressional where I reside.

The vibrance of the community and the APA community within it is a vital element for its community of interest.

Keep Canton whole. Three words. Keep Canton whole. It's square 36 miles. The geography couldn't be any better in terms of compactness of Canton.

Keep Canton whole.

Thank you.

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

Number 20.

>> I think I get the award for being one of the youngest people in the room, but I'm honored to speak before the Commission. I'm a University of Michigan Ann Arbor student and proud Michigander for 20 years now. Gosh. And I have been voting in Clarkston, Michigan and in Ann Arbor on and off. But I want to talk about the importance of considering who and where we are voting.

As someone who votes in Clarkston, I recognize my need there because I'm a citizen who can have leverage and the part of the agenda that I may have there. And in Ann Arbor I know what the voting is going to be.

And so, understanding how to draw districts and empowering voters, young people like me to get out there, you can all make a difference. It truly makes a difference to see that my vote matters in the community I work in.

Great to support people back home, but I have my parents to vote, so I always have to encourage them.

So as a young person, looking at people coming into the State of Michigan, if they already know Ann Arbor is one way or the other, they may not be encouraged to vote. But by having a center in place to see how different demographic ideologies within the area are changed, we can have a verge of getting more political activism out there for the entire State of Michigan. Because I know we, as Ann Arbor students, serve a lot of different areas across the State of Michigan.

And we are proud to do so.

So, considering how to break up cities like Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, which are kind of democratic strongholds, understanding how we can use and leverage complex tools, which are way beyond my head. But I know and trust that you all have the ability to assess which things are going to make the best opportunities for young people like me to vote because you are making a difference that may last years down the line. And so, voters like me really do care.

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 voters like us really do care about what you do.

So, thank you for that. And we hope to consider all the different perimeters that you will consider as a Commission.

Thank you.

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

At this point we are going to move into our first round of comments for remote public comments.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote public comment to the Commission will now be allowed to do so. I will call on you and our staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak. If you are on the phone a voice will say the host will like you to speak and prompt you to press start six to unmute.

I will call on you by your name.

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

If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail us at [redistricting@michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@michigan.gov) and we will help you troubleshoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later hearing or meeting.

You will have two minutes to address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide live remote public comment is Mr. James Galant.

>> Hello. Can you hear me now?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, sir.

>> Okay. This is James Galant. I'm with the Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition.

And these are my opinions.

And I would like to remind everybody that the database, the Autobound edge and the Duchin, Moon Duchin database, the COI database is these are gig workers. I was reading in the contract, any value-added products that are generated from this exercise are the property of the State of Michigan.

And we should be getting royalties for any future sales or any kind of use of this database that we are creating, the people of the State of Michigan in real time.

And so, we need to keep that in mind to get a -- some royalties in the future. We need to make sure that we own that in the contract and get that covered.

Please ask Tom Ivako to -- I spoke to him extensively on these rules of procedure and how this works. And we did have some agreements. And he had little disagreements with me. But ask him to please make a report from his office at the University of Michigan. And to say, hey, these are the rules, Robert's Rules of Order, this is how it

works. This is how it's been working. And to get that in real time instead of waiting, you know, a couple years down the road and figure it out itself.

Also, I would like to thank the map maker, Kent, yesterday, he did not allow Commissioner Witjes to get his voting tactics approved. And he tried to say hey, I want those region lines removed from that map, but it wasn't even his turn. I was Commissioner Lange's turn. And Commissioner Lange, thank you for not letting him to bully you either and said, now, it will stay there.

But that is the problem with the configuration that is going on. Your attorney on January 30th stated to you clearly that all comments have to go through the Chair, Robert's Rules of Order you don't have personal engagement between the members.

This is why rifts happen. This is why it gets personal. And I think that is what Commissioner Witjes was trying to make.

And Commissioner Rothhorn, we need to bond. And we need to get, you know, these relationships going. And that is the bad part. Thank you.

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

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

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

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed to do so.

Please step to the microphone when I call your number. You will have two minutes to address the Commission. And please conclude your remarks when your two minutes has ended, and you hear the timer. Number one.

>> Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak a little more.

There are a couple things I forgot to mention that are important.

One is the MGGG report put my hometown of Grosse Pointe park into two clusters, one of which is very heavily aligned, extremely aligned with my community of interest, the Lake St. Clair community of interest.

That's A9 I believe.

The other one is A5 where they say the five Grosse Pointes and the east side of Detroit are a cluster. And there is some comment to that effect. But the summary of that made it sound like it's an industrial area that has a lot of unemployment. And that is true of much of the east side of Detroit.

It's not true of the Grosse Pointes.

And so, if somebody didn't know the area, I wanted to make that point, that there is a limit to what a computer algorithm can tell you.

You know, I live in a 50/50 political area that cares about our natural resources.

But, you know, we are professionals.

And I don't want anybody to get the idea that that's not what Grosse Pointe is. You know, Grosse Pointe may not be what you, you know, your idea of what Grosse Pointe is. We are more middle class than that.

But, you know, we are a lot like St. Clair Shores for example.

That is one thing.

Second thing is community of interest versus partisanship.

I live in 50/50 area. If somebody were trying to create democratic districts, they could take a big chunk of Detroit and slap Grosse Pointe, a 50/50 area on and say I've done something to help democrats out.

And that would be okay, but for the fact that it would split up my community of interest. So, there is a ranking. And it's important because this is really the entire region, I've drawn here is a 50/50 area where you can have, for example, a republican who is a conservationist.

That's why community and local interests matter more, both they should matter more in terms of policy, but they also matter more in terms of the Constitution.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you very much.

Can I ask that you stay at the microphone for one second because we did have a question from one of our Commissioners for you.

So, if you could just come back and answer Commissioner Wagner does have a. Question that she would like to ask you.

>> Yeah, absolutely. Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Hello.

Through the Chair I would like to ask a clarifying question, please.

>> Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: You had said that you had the start of a Senate District in drawing your Lake St. Clair District.

Where else would you propose we get the rest of that Senate District from? If it's not a complete District as is.

>> No. That's a great point. I was drawing a community of interest. And I've seen a couple of different ideas.

One is St. Clair River.

We share the same watershed.

And I think up until you get to actually to Port Huron it's not industrial really.

It's people who have a similar lifestyle in the fact that they are in sync with their water resource.

I understand that it wouldn't be a terribly compact area.

But basically, everything between I-94 and the water could work.

Another idea is northern Macomb County above what I've drawn here, I know their area is part of the more residential area of Macomb, not the industrial area. This one



color of green is a part of Macomb Township. This is the Clinton River that divides the industrial areas of Macomb County from more from just residential cul-de-sac. That's more suburban. In that sense it's similar. It depends. And different people have different views. And I would be happy with any of them. I would be happy taking Harper Woods, which I've drawn part of the Gratiot corridor. They share a school system with Grosse Pointes. And add Harper Woods. If you think Mount Clemens, fine. I would be happy with any of them.

I think the people who are most closely aligned with the values that I've expressed in terms of a bipartisan view of conservationism are the people in the St. Clair River Area, but I'm not wetted to that.

Does that answer your question?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: It does. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

All right, number two.

>> Hello again. Roland Wong. I teach at the University of Michigan here in Asian American studies.

I told you that I wanted you to recall three words, and that is keep Canton together.

Actually, I want you to remember six words.

And the other three words is keep Troy together.

Keep Troy together.

The Asian American community of interest argues for keeping the City of Troy together.

Troy is a vital community of interest for the Asian American population.

It's 2020 population of 87,294 is 25.6% Asian.

28% of the Troy school District population in Troy is Asian.

According to pro publica.

There is a significant presence of Chinese and Korean and south Asians within Troy.

And it's reflected in the churches, the temples, the budhwaras, the businesses and the community centers in and near Troy.

These figures and the physical presence of the APA community make Troy and its Asian American population a standout among communities in Oakland County.

Much of the Troy population would fit well into a State House District.

And with the addition of Clawson to the south and Rochester Hills to the north, it would be a unique and compact State Senate District.

Keeping Troy intact as a community of interest and as an Asian American community of interest would fit into the larger State Senate District and the Congressional District.

Keep Troy together.

It's not perfectly square like Canton.

It does take a little cut for the City of Clawson.

But essentially keep Troy together.

Thank you very much.

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

At this point we will move back to our remote public commentary.

Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote public commentary will now be provided an opportunity to do so. We will use the same process as the first round.

First in line to provide live remote commentary is Mr. James Galant.

>> Can you hear me now?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, sir, please proceed.

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

And what just happened there? Because I believe it's been said many times over and over. This is not question-and-answer time at the public podium. This is public comment time. And you just gave that guy, who is that guy? I'm just wondering how did that guy picked up to come up for a second time.

All of a sudden and you never allowed that. And this is what I was telling you about the California model.

You said you were going by some California model and did not incorporate it. And the California model, they do answer to the public in real time during the meetings.

This is old school thought.

That is your report to add that item to your agenda and that's it.

You got two responses that you can do. And you should have been doing that the whole time. And now out of the blue, I don't know how that worked. This is these statements are being clearly planted for you folks to sit back and go, hey, look at that somebody said that and will do it.

We will go to Court with all this because Commissioner Lange, it's in the transcript in January 30th, 2021, when she explained that apparently there is a side bar rule that everybody agreed upon that a member can call members of the public out of order at the podium.

And some kind of time out timer Commissioner Witjes was talking about and bring it back later and I don't know what it was.

But it was like they voted on this stuff.

But it's straw polling, that is exactly what you are doing, what you will do today.

You will start a discussion and you will straw poll to see if oh, there is support okay, boom, boom, boom, now Commissioner Witjes, I want to make a motion boom.

This is really bad.

This is really bad.

[ Too low to hear ]

The bullying and then the victim becomes another bully, then they work together, that is a bully victim situation.

One of the highest risk factors especially youth to be put in that situation like you are. Notice all the time well, yeah, oh.

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

I would like to remind everybody to please go to our public comment tool and share your comments in writing including any specific areas of the map with which you are speaking. The public comment tool is available at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC).

This concludes our public comment for this afternoon.

I would like to mention that in addition to the in person and remote public comment all e-mailed and mailed public comment provided to the Commission before each meeting and the Commissioners also review the public comment portal at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) on a regular basis.

We appreciate everybody who provides us with comment in whatever way they choose to do so. And we invite everyone to continue sharing their thoughts, comments and maps with us. Thank you very much.

I will pass it over to our Chair to continue with our agenda.

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

Commissioners, we and for those attending and listening, we are moving forward to new business, Item 6A racially polarized voting analysis with Dr. Lisa Handley along with VRA and state Constitution commentary from Mr. Bruce Adelson, Federal Compliance Consulting.

Without objection, I will ask Dr. Handley to begin.

Hearing none, Dr. Handley, please proceed and hello.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It would be good if I started with the microphone.

Hello again.

It's a pleasure to be here in Ann Arbor with the Commission.

I'm trying to figure out how to do this.

Okay, okay, can everybody see the screen and hear me? Have I figured out how to do this? Okay now have we got it. Okay.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: While we are waiting, I wanted to note for the record that Commissioner Wagner has turned off her video, but she is still present.

Thank you.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: It's a pleasure to be here again.

It looks like I've got everything running.

I'm going to start with a little refresher course about why I did the analysis and what -- before I get to what the results were.

Geez.

How do I go down? Okay, the Voting Rights Act is very important in this District drawing process.

I pulled up the redistricting criteria priority pyramid and you will see it's number two in the pyramid.

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

The first and Foremost criteria are the U.S. Constitution and Federal law and the Voting Rights Act is Federal law.

And it applies everywhere in the country including Michigan.

It prohibits any voting standard practice or procedure including a redistricting plan that results in the denial or dilution of minority voting strength.

A redistricting plan that dilutes minority voting strength is one that either cracks or packs a geographically concentrated minority group.

A top example to the left is or to the right is an example of a District, a set of districts that cracks the minority community by dividing it among four districts, five districts so that they cannot elect a minority preferred candidate in any of those districts.

The lower example on the right is an example of a District or District center that packs minority voters so that they have an impact on only one District and no impact on any of the other districts despite the fact that you could probably have drawn two districts in which they had the ability to elect communities, to elect candidates of choice.

When the Voting Rights Act was amended in 1982 to make it clear that you did not have to show that the redistrictors intended to discriminate only that the plan that they drew actually resulted in discrimination.

The Supreme Court first considered this case in 1986 in a case called Thornburg versus Jingles and had to prove three conditions in order to satisfy Section Two and get a District drawn in which they could have the ability to elect a candidate of choice.

First is that the group must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to form a majority in a single member District.

This is in essence so there was actually a remedy available.

There is a solution to the problem of how do we elect candidates of choice.

The second is that the minority group must be politically cohesive.

That is, they must vote for the same candidates.

And, third, whites must vote as a bloc to usually defeat the minority-preferred candidates.

If they were not voting as a bloc to defeat these candidates, these candidates would win, and you wouldn't need to draw a minority District.

So how do we know how the minority group is voting? How do we know how whites are voting? What you do is conduct a racial bloc voting analysis.

And my job in this particular situation is to actually carry out what's called a racial bloc voting analysis that is analyze voting patterns by race to determine if voting is polarized. If whites are voting against a cohesive minority community.

I mentioned that first of all we have, of course, a secret ballot.

We don't know the race of the voters when they cast the ballot.

So, we have to use estimation techniques.

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

And the two most standard estimation techniques are ecological regression analysis and ecological inference analysis. Ecological simply means you are using aggregate data.

What we are going to do is we are going to look at precincts rather than individuals. And we are going to look to see if there are patterns across the precincts in which the demographic composition of the precinct is related to the voting patterns of those precincts.

So, on the left we see ecological regression each precinct in the jurisdiction has been placed on the scatter plot on the basis of the percent Black turnout this is the jurisdiction in the south where we actually know turn out by race.

And the vertical axis is vote for Warnock this is an election that occurred in January of 2021 it's the race for U.S. Senate in Georgia.

This is real data in a specific County.

You can see a pattern here and the pattern is the higher the percent Black across the precincts the more votes you see for Warnock that is the estimation technique we used to determine how whites and Blacks are voting in this particular jurisdiction.

This practice, this particular technique had one disadvantage associated with it and that voting was very polarized, you would get estimates that were outside the logical bounds and would find something like 105 Blacks vote 105% of Black voters voted for Warnock. And negative 5 white voters voted for Warnock.

So, in the 1990s Professor King developed ecological inference, that you see on the right side. And this process, each precinct is actually represented by a line rather than a point using more information about the precinct to get this line. And that is all the possible combinations of Black and white votes that could have produced the result for that particular precinct as represented by a line as opposed to a point.

And then the computer generates a best guesstimate of what the actual composition of the votes for the Black candidate were, was.

So, this is the analysis that I performed in Michigan.

Now you need a few pieces of information in order to perform this.

And that is that you need to have an area that has a sufficient number of minority voters to actually estimate voting behavior by race.

I looked at eight counties.

There were several counties in the west of Michigan that had growing minority population around Grand Rapids, Muskegon County and Kent County and it turns out there was not a sufficient number of minority votes to estimate behavior voting behavior on the basis of race in those two counties.

The same is true of I looked at six counties in the east.

I was able to produce estimates for Wayne, Oakland, Genesee and Saginaw Counties, I was not able to do so for Washtenaw and Macomb Counties there was not a sufficient amount of Black turnout to estimate Black and white behavior in those two counties so

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

what I'm going to give you is the results of analysis for statewide for the entire State of Michigan and for these four counties.

Because actually what you want to do you want to do an area specific analysis because it turns out that voting patterns are different depending where you are in the state.

For example, it may be the case using the example I gave you before of the Georgia election.

Turns out that in the rural areas of Georgia the election was very polarized while in the urban area around Fulton it was much less polarized.

In fact, it wasn't polarized at all in certain areas.

So, it matters where you are in the state as to how much polarization there is and when you're drawing districts it matters what it looks like in that specific area.

The Court is quite adamant about doing a District-specific and an analysis and this is why I looked at these counties.

I looked at 13 elections there have been 13 statewide and Federal elections over the decade.

These include U.S. Senate, U.S. president, U.S. Senate, and three statewide contests, the gubernatorial contests the Attorney General and Secretary of State and the treasurer.

Four statewide contests.

Now the courts have indicated that the most probative contest to look at are contests include minority candidates.

So, you've had four contests statewide contests over the last decade that included minority candidates.

These are the most probative.

You have also listed them here.

You had the 2012 race for U.S. president.

You had a 2014 Secretary of State contest.

You had the 2018 and 2020 U.S. Senate contests.

Then you had two contests that included minority candidates as running mates.

This is the 2018 gubernatorial contest and the 2020 Presidential contest.

So, these I looked at all 13 statewide contests, but these are the most probative according to the courts.

Ordinarily I would look at statewide democratic primaries as well.

I could not look at republican primaries there is not enough minority participation in republican primaries to actually analyze voting patterns by race.

So, I look at democratic primaries.

And in this case, you've only had one statewide democratic primary.

This entire decade and that was in 2018 for Governor.

So, I looked at that contest as well.

This is what the results look like.

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

And I'm going to explain how to read this table.

Every election that I looked at for every area has a table that looks like this.

So, this is statewide.

This is the election listed here, 2018 Governor.

And here are the candidates.

Here are the parties of the candidates.

Here are the races of the candidates.

Here is the votes that they received statewide.

Now, there are actually four estimates for Black voters and there are four estimates for white voters.

I talked to you about ecological regression and mentioned the problem you have with ecological regression and there sit 104 of Black voters supporting Whitmer.

I didn't mention homogenous precinct.

This is actual these are the actual results of precincts across the state that are overwhelmingly one race.

So these are precincts across the state that are 90% or more voting age population Black in composition.

So that's how I derived the homogenous and this is actual data so looking at 90% plus precincts 90 per cent plus Black age population precincts 95.6% of those voters supported Whitmer.

There are actually two different forms of ecological inference analysis.

One is called two by two.

And that is the one that was developed in the 1990s.

It's since been refined so that I can account for differential turn out and that's what is in the last column 95.3%.

Now all of these are derived from different techniques.

You wouldn't expect them to be exactly the same, but they are all telling a very similar story and that is overwhelming Black support for Whitmer.

On the other side of this table, we will get our estimates.

I report the estimates for the white voters.

So let me see if I can get this to work.

But it's not doing this.

Okay, so we've got 41.1% in the overwhelmingly white precincts, 41.1% of the voters supported Whitmer.

The AR estimate is 38.9.

The two by two is 40.6.

And let me see and the C is 44.8% so these are estimates.

Now I forgot to mention down here the votes for office this is the percentage of voting age population that actually turned out and cast a ballot for that particular office.

So, you can see there is a difference in turn out rates.

And that is around 35% of Black voting age population turned out and cast a ballot for the Governor in 2018.

While the number was higher almost double for white voters.

This contest is racially polarized.

If Blacks voting alone had voted alone Whitmer would have been elected.

She was.

And then of course if whites voted alone, it would have been the republican candidate who was elected.

Below I have the primary for this election.

I have the gubernatorial primary of 2018.

We have the three candidates listed here.

We have they are all democrats.

We have their race.

We have the percentage of votes they received.

And you will see that this contest is also polarized.

This contest you have a plurality of the Black voters supporting Thanedar and majority of the white voters supported Whitmer.

So, this contest is also polarized.

Okay, now I did this, and you will see tables in the report that I eventually produce for every election but I'm going to show you summaries of this in a little bit.

So, over all statewide in the 13 elections that I looked at, 12 were polarized. And those elections that are most probative to the courts, that is those that included minority candidates, 6 out of the 6 were polarized in the democratic primary which there was only one it was polarized.

And I mean -- mentioned I looked at four counties and these are the results of the analysis in four counties in Genesee County we have nine of the 13 contests polarized with five of the six with minority candidates.

The democratic primary was polarized.

And Saginaw it's 11 out of 13 of the contests, six out of six of those contests with minority candidates.

And the democratic primary was polarized.

In Oakland all 13 of the general elections were polarized including the six with minority candidates but the democratic primary was not.

And finally in Wayne County where voting is less polarized you will see that 7 of the 13 contests were polarized, three of those were minority candidates and the democratic primary was polarized.

What this tells me is that voting is polarized in Michigan.

And what that means is the Voting Rights Act comes into play in districts that provide minority voters with the opportunity to elect their candidates must be drawn.

Okay, so voting is polarized.



You have to create districts if they can be created, but more importantly perhaps is that those districts that exist must be maintained.

It's important to continue to provide minority voters with the opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

So, if districts can be drawn, they should be drawn.

If districts exist and minority candidates are winning only because the districts exist, those districts must be maintained.

Those districts must be maintained in a way that gives minorities an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

But you don't just choose an arbitrary target.

You don't just say 50% voting age population is what we need to maintain these minority districts.

And it is the Supreme Court that has told us this, and Bruce gets to talk about this later. But the fact is you have to do a District specific functional analysis in each area that you are to determine what an effective minority District looks like.

No arbitrary percentages.

So how do we do a District-specific functional analysis? By functional we mean we have to look at actual voting behavior and look at election results.

By District specific I told you already we are going to look first at voting patterns not just statewide but District or broader areas like counties.

Now the first approach I'm going to discuss with you today, and that is taking the estimates of participation rates minority cohesion and white cross over from the RV B analysis I conducted and using that to calculate the percent minority population needed in a specific area for the minority preferred candidates to win a District in that area. But there's another approach that you can use that the Commissioners can use as they're drawing and that is to look at the election results of what I call bellwether elections to determine if that election had occurred within the proposed boundaries of the districts that you're creating if those minority preferred candidates would have carried those districts.

There are four bellwether contests in particular that you are going to focus on.

You will recall I said six contests include minority candidates and two of those contests the minority candidate was not the candidate preferred by minority voters.

That was in 2018 Senate and the 2020 Senate.

That was the republican John James.

So, the four bellwether contests you will be focusing on to determine if the districts you have drawn will allow minorities to elect candidates of choice will be the other four contests the 2012 presidents contest for president, the 2014 contest for treasurer, the 2018 gubernatorial contest and the 2020 Presidential contest.

And you can recompile election results and determine if the minority preferred candidates would carry the districts.

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

Now, I'm going to back and spend the rest of the time talking about the first approach. So, this table above takes what I mentioned, that is the participation rates, the degree of minority cohesion and the degree of white cross over vote for the minority preferred candidate.

And tells you how that majority preferred candidate would do in each of these in a 55% District, 50, 45, 40 and 35% Black voting age population District.

This is how this works.

This is Algebra.

Took me about a day to work out the formula and how to do it in excel but it's actually just Algebra.

What I did here is I'm going to you will remember this chart from earlier.

I'm going to take the participation rate and I'm going to use in this instance the best estimate, and that is the EI estimate that takes into account differential turnout.

So, I'm going to take 35.2% and it's going to go into this column.

That is votes cast for office.

This keeps disappearing.

This is the percentage of votes by Black voters for the minority preferred candidate.

I got that from this table.

This is the numbers, this is just 100 minus 95.3%.

This is the votes cast, votes cast by office by whites, and you will see that is up here.

Then percentage of votes for Whitmer here.

Numbers directed here.

And then a lot of Algebra to tell me what this candidate would have gotten in a District that was 55 percent.

Whitmer would have gotten 65.2 percent of the vote.

In a District that was 50% she would have gotten 62.8% of the vote.

In a District that was 45% she would have gotten 60.6.

And in a District that was 40% she would have gotten 58.5.

And in a District that was 35% she would have gotten 56.4%.

This is an important piece of information.

I want you to notice that when I go down, say the 40% Black voting age population column, the Black preferred candidate wins every contest.

This tells me that statewide it's quite possible that you do not need a majority-minority District to elect a minority preferred candidate.

Now these numbers are statewide and it's more important that we look at each County individually because as I mentioned earlier, it may be the case that numbers change depending on where you are.

So here is Saginaw County.

Same thing that the numbers come from the same place, from the racial bloc voting analysis.

Here in Saginaw County well we are not going to go down to 35% because the minority preferred candidate does not win some of these contests.

So, this is a little bit different than statewide.

Saginaw County the District is probably going to have to have a higher Black voting age population than it would be the case statewide and then it will be the case you will see in other counties.

Here is Genesee County.

Voting is a little less polarized.

We are getting more white cross over vote.

Here are the votes what we call white cross over votes is white vote for the minority preferred candidate.

And we are getting more and this is why 35% District looks like it would be effective in Genesee County.

In Oakland County, 35% is going to work.

40 percent looks like it might work.

In Wayne County where we have a lot more white crossover vote 35% might well work. I'm not advocating that you draw the districts at this amount.

I'm advocating that you keep in mind that the districts do not have to be majority-minority in composition and then you turn to the recompiled election results for what you have in any given District because it matters not only how much the area that you're drawing how high the Black participation rates are, but how much white cross over voting you might get.

So, you're going to look at each individual District as you draw it looking at the bellwether elections to make certain that the minority preferred candidates would win.

Now, I recognize that you might be surprised that despite what is a very polarized state that a District that is not majority-minority may be all that is necessary to provide minorities with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

But what I want to show you now is what are called the threshold of representation.

In the Senate there are no districts between 36 and 45%.

But every District over 48% elects a Black candidate to office and because I've done a racial bloc voting analysis on the general elections for the Senate, I can tell you these are all minority preferred candidates.

You can see that 67% of the districts over 35% elect Black preferred, Black candidates to office.

The difference is even more striking in the threshold of representation in the State House.

Every District over 35 over 36% Black and voting age population elects minority candidates to office.

And, in fact, 89% of those over 25% Black elect minority candidates to office.

And again, there are no House Districts between 37 and 48% Black.

Even though many of those would have been effective districts.

This last slide before I turn it over to Bruce is a maps of the State House and the State Senate districts because I wondered why there weren't any 35-45% Black districts and what the shapes of the districts were that were electing Blacks to office.

And I will tell you that there are some, let's see if I can go back, there are some very hacked Black districts.

We have some districts that I could not produce estimates of white voting behavior because there were virtually no whites voting in these districts.

We have State House Districts that are well -- we have three of them that are well over 90%.

And the Black preferred candidates are getting well over 90% of the vote.

Those are packed.

Doesn't like me going back.

Okay.

And those are not necessarily shaped districts.

It was not like they were creating districts that were nice little compact districts.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Doctor Handley we have a question from Commissioner Lange.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Dr. Handley I'm sorry to interrupt your presentation.

I just have a quick question.

When doing the racial bloc voting, is it only based off from African/American votes or is it based off from any other ethnicities?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: That is a good question, and I should have said that earlier on now and many jurisdictions of course you would look at other ethnicities and I would have liked to have done so in Michigan.

But it turns out there are no counties with the sufficient number of Hispanics or Asian Americans or Native Americans to do the analysis.

But, yes, typically you could and should do the analysis if there was a sufficient number of minorities to do the analysis.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Commissioner Lange does that satisfy your question?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, thank you very much.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Dr. Handley you have another question from Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Dr. Handley I'm thinking about the census data and how we have a significant population of Arab Americans in Dearborn so following up on what Dr. Or excuse me what Commissioner Lange was saying do we have any or is there any way to understand the Arab American or the Mena vote in this analysis?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: There is not because we don't have the composition of the precincts.

We don't have the Mena composition of the precincts available from the census. And I need to know the composition and I'm going to let Bruce expand on I'm just providing the factual information and Bruce gets to expand on why you might also not be doing that kind of analysis.

In fact, I am done.

I'm going to finish with this last map.

So, before I hand it over to Bruce, are there any questions specifically for me? Or should we hand it over to Bruce then you can ask us questions in concert?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Looks like you have a question from Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well first off thank you so much for the presentation. I'm sure that was quite challenging to put together in such a short amount of time. You had two counties there Genesee and Wayne County where the 35% minority population picked the minority candidate.

The majority of the time.

But for both of those counties it looked like it could possibly be even lower than 35%. Was this data tabulated maybe to 30% or 25%? To see if it or add those numbers the minority candidate was still preferred?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: Theoretically you could do that but at that point you would not have sufficient enough minority population to use the word effective minority District in that case.

And in those instances, it might well be the case that voting just wasn't polarized at all.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I have one more question.

Thank you for that answer.

So maybe Bruce will expand on this in a minute, but I mean, this says the Districts are packed.

Purposely packed.

So how do we unpack them? Is the question at hand.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I will give that to Bruce.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Good afternoon.

Well, thank you very much, Dr. Handley, for your presentation.

There are a couple points I wanted to make and in part they may address the last comment from Commissioner Eid.

I wanted to remind everybody that we've previously talk about packing.

And Dr. Handley addressed the Alabama case.

We talk about before.

And I wanted to really stress the fact that picking arbitrary numbers for minority populations is routinely regarded as unconstitutional as racial gerrymandering.

That was true in the Alabama case.

That was true in the reverse Harris case we talk about.

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, remember everything is driven by analysis and data as Dr. Handley has been talking about today.

But I did want to, so I wanted to make that reinforced point.

That minority population as Dr. Handley has established there is racially polarized voting in the State of Michigan.

She has highlighted the counties that have among the highest minority populations.

I think that is very crucial.

Very important.

Going forward for the Commission as a consideration.

But to the point about packing, remember that the if a District can be established through analysis to be able to elect candidates of choice of the minority community at let's say 40%, if you add on population to that, that the courts constitute that as packing.

Dr. Handley had talked about I think three districts that were over 90% minority population.

I have to tell you that I've been this is my third round of redistricting including my time with the justice department, the Arizona Redistricting Commission ten years ago and other work I've done in redistricting.

I have never drafted approved, endorsed a 90% plus District.

Majority District.

Majority-minority District.

So, I think that if you look at one of the other striking factors of Dr. Handley's analysis, she talked about the opportunity to elect candidates of choice, the 35, 40, 45%.

Let's assume that 45% is analyzed and considered to be a safe estimate for minorities protecting minorities opportunity to elect.

Well, let me pause and just think about what that means in relation to these districts.

That means the districts that are 90% plus majority minority have double the population they need to protect the rights of minority voters pursuant to the Voting Rights Act to elect candidates of choice.

Double the amount.

I can't say that I've looked at this and thought about this and tried to remember the hundreds of plans I've looked at from coast to coast.

I don't ever remember seeing that offhand.

So that point about packing and also cracking, very essential and are always red flags.

You have districts that are constructed when there is racially polarized voting which there is.

To give minority voters the opportunity to elect.

So, if they can elect at 45% let's say, why would you put 90%? Why would you put 80% minority population in the District? So, I'm going to leave that for further discussion.

But that was those were among the most striking aspects of Dr. Handley's work.

So, I would reiterate what we all have talk 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.

The Alabama case, Cooper versus Harris, the minority population in districts where it's already been established statewide and, in these districts, there is racially polarized voting.

You have the amount of minority population to provide minorities with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

As Dr. Handley said so that the districts are effective for minority voters.

So, as she has established, clearly 90% is not necessary to elect candidates of choice. A lower number would provide minority voters with the protection that the Voting Rights Act intends.

So, for those, those are the final comments I wanted to make in concert with Dr. Handley and as she said that I think we would be very happy to answer questions from the Commission.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you for that explanation.

So, we've got a District that's packed.

And we want to unpack it.

How do we ensure that we don't unpack it and then it becomes cracked? And therefore, we are not in compliance in the other direction? How do we ensure that? As we are doing the redistricting?

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: You will have dissegregated election results.

You will be able to recompile these results for these bellwether elections because you want to make sure, as you noted when you unpack the District, there is still at least one effective District and quite possibly there might be two effective districts once you unpack that District.

I anticipate something like that happening.

That you're able to draw two districts that elect Black preferred candidates to office.

But you look at the recompiled election results to make sure that the districts that you have drawn are effective minority districts.

So those four contests that I mentioned as bellwether contests will be in the redistricting package and as you draw, as you draw you can hit the button that will tell you how those candidates are doing in the proposed districts.

So, it's an automatic visual that is telling you if you are creating a District that will be effective or not.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: That real time approach to click on an area and see how these candidates would have performed in these areas that you're looking at is crucial. And to your point that's a great point.

I agree there is always a danger of going too far down.

But that is something we will be talking about on an ongoing basis.

I think just as you know as an academic extrapolation creating a minority District of 20% minority, I would think would not be the most advisable.

But that's something that the data you will see it.

As you move into the areas that you decide to move in to, seeing how the candidates would perform is will be not only very important it will be really striking to see how these election results change given whatever areas you go in to.

>> DR. LISA HANDLEY: I'll add that you do want to pay a lot of attention to the recompiled election results rather than estimates I'm telling you of say you know 35 or 40 or 45% because it matters again what minorities you're encompassing in the District. And a very District specific way and what whites you are encompassing so it's very important to look very specifically, very District specifically as you draw the districts of what that District will do.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Dr. Handley and Commissioner Clark and Bruce for jumping in to answer those questions and Commissioner Clark that was a good question.

I'm going to have General Counsel take the floor for a minute because she has a question for you both.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you so much Madam Chair and thank you in particular to Dr. Handley and Mr. Adelson for joining us today. Lisa's excuse me Dr. Handley's analysis and her findings and Mr. Adelson's conclusions he is able to draw from those findings will certainly impact the MICRC's critical work going forward in redistricting.

I did want to note for the benefit of the public that Dr. Handley's presentation will be available on the MICRC website.

And I wanted to also highlight that just yesterday the department of justice released guidelines related to redistricting and compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

And I was hopeful that Mr. Adelson could address that issue for the benefit of the Commission and the public.

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you very much.

That's a great question.

When I got to Ann Arbor last night, I had e-mails from a lot of people around the country saying hey Bruce did you see what the department of justice did.

So let me just go into that in a little detail.

The department of justice every ten years typically puts out some guidance about redistricting and they are focused on Section five of the Voting Rights Act.

Which required preclearance of redistricting plans in covered areas.

Michigan had two Townships that were covered by Section five, but the Supreme Court decided in the Shelby County versus Holder case I think eight years ago that the formula deciding which states are covered or which states were not was unconstitutional so Section five doesn't apply any more.



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 however, my old friends at the justice department put together guidance about vote dilution, Section Two of the Voting Rights Act as Dr. Handley has been talking about. I don't recall the justice have done this before.

One of my clients in another part of the country said Bruce is this like a shot across the bow and talking about redistricting and my answer is yes.

Just to remind everyone about these myriad requirements under the VRA.

And the Constitution.

And just I pulled up the guidance.

I just wanted to read a little bit just to kind of give you a flavor of what the Supreme Court case the Thornburg versus Gingles case that Dr. Handley talked about.

Just as an example liability under the Voting Rights Act depends on the unique actual circumstances of each case and the totality of the circumstances in the particular jurisdiction in question.

The guidance talks about a Supreme Court decision in the 70s concerning Texas called white versus register and in that case the Supreme Court found that Texas use of multi member state legislative District impermissively diluted minority voting strength.

I picked that out specifically because that issue is extremely important.

That goes to the comments before of Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Clark about what percentages is necessary to protect the opportunity to elect.

Which goes to another point.

That Justice made in the guidance that Districting plans may dilute minority voting strength by cracking or fragmenting the minority voters among several districts.

Or a bloc voting major City can routinely out vote them.

Or as we were just talking about by packing them into one or a small number of districts to minimize their influence.

So, I appreciate the question very much.

Very much on the minds of redistrictors across the country and I think justices' guidance is very well timed as a redistricting process for the most part is just beginning to pick up. And it's a reminder these requirements are significant.

It's also a reminder that the pitfalls and as my old DRJ friends like to remind everybody we are here and watching what folks are doing.

Thank you for the question.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Bruce.

General Counsel, does that satisfy your point?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Yes, thank you Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: I think Mr. Kim Brace has a question and he is attending virtually we can't see him, but I was told he has a question.

There he is.

I'm sorry.

Not virtually behind me.

>> KIM BRACE: I'm hidden behind all the monitors up here.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Feel free to do a loud whisper with I'm sorry I misunderstood Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> KIM BRACE: What I wanted to remind the Commission that you will be able to see two additional pieces of information as you draw, and you have already on the bottom of your screens when you draw you will have the racial percentages on the districts as they are being created so you will see what is the racial characteristics of the District. We will be adding on the various data sets that Lisa was talking about of the recompiled election results and they will be in additional tabs on those on the bottom of the screen so that indeed as you draw you will be able to flip over to those tabs also to look at those recompiled election results that Dr. Handley was talking about.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Kim.

Sorry I didn't notice you back there.

Any other questions Commissioners? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So if I'm reading this data correctly and please correct me if I'm wrong but it kind of gives us a lower bound of the number of minorities we can have in these counties R Saginaw Genesee Oakland and Wayne but do you have any advice in an upper bound of percentage we can get to that wouldn't be packing the District and also begs a question and it might be a more academic question if there is an upper bound and ten years ago when these maps were enacted by the state legislature how did they pass the stuff test with over 90% of the District being packed with one minority?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: So, what the data demonstrates is again as Dr. Handley indicated that the racially polarized voting in the levels at which they're packed would be addressed through this process, again Mr. Brace just noted the data that would be used.

I think it's also significant to highlight that based on the criteria in the Constitution even if there is not a significant minority population that would satisfy or require Voting Rights Act compliance, the third criteria while the discussion has been focused on communities of interest, the first clause of the third criteria is shall reflect the state's diverse population.

So, there would also be an opportunity to consider minority populations particularly the ones Dr. Handley indicated that are not present in significant numbers in counties statewide or in certain counties, pardon me.

That those would be able to be respected through the third criteria.

So again, I think utilizing the data that and the findings of Dr. Handley in conjunction with your work moving forward and the advice and counsel of Mr. Adelson with the data

layers that are built into your mapping software will put the Commission on very strong footing to address these issues.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: My question was actually the same pretty much as Anthony's, that if they are packed how did they legally pass, so that was addressed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Lange.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Questions Commissioners? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Last one I think unless another one pops into my head.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I always take a moment when no hands, I don't see hands.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Given that the census data does not account precinct wide for Middle Eastern and north African populations, how can we go like there has to be some other piece of data we have talked about the ACS2019 data and talked about communities of interest data.

But how can this Commission make sure we protect that minority group?

>> MR. BRUCE ADELSON: To that point I think as General Counsel said, with the diverse population requirement of the Constitution your communities of interest and looking at the communities that have come up for example in public hearings the public hearings concerning Dearborn and Hamtramck with the focusing on the information that's available whether it's from the ACS, the public comments, and the Commissioners' knowledge of the State of Michigan as you demonstrated it during the mapping sessions understanding where the populations are.

But you do point to a significant issue that is being discussed in the Census Bureau today.

And I think that given the information at least that I've seen in the communities of interest descriptions and the public comments, a lot of public comments in the hearing for example in Dearborn about the concentration of the people of Middle Eastern and eastern ancestries and my suggestion would be that would be a good place to start.

An ideal place to start.

That is something that again going forward we will be looking at, advising and so on.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: And, Kim?

>> KIM BRACE: Yes, Bruce is correct.

The Census Bureau does not have a current tabulation of the Mena population.

That was attempted to be done but it is not there.

But it is there for the ACS.

And if you recall in one of my presentations I did a series of maps showing you other concentrations of different groups, that is data coming from the ACS.

We can overlay that in terms of as we are drawing and at least letting you see where those concentrations are located.

We won't be able to tabulate the Mena categorization because it's not there, but we will see where they are concentrated as we are drawing.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Kim and General Counsel, I missed your hand.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Mr. Brace's follow-up to that was certainly appropriate. I wanted to circle back and answer more directly both Commissioner Eid's question and Commissioner Lange's follow-up question regarding the findings that were presented today and the significance.

I would state that those districts were not challenged in Court as to racial gerrymandering.

What did occur in Michigan was a League of Women Voters versus Benson litigation that resulted in the findings of partisan gerrymandering that based on the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Rusho* that partisan gerrymandering is not a question for the Federal courts.

So again, we had litigation in Michigan in regard to the 2010 maps, in regard to partisan gerrymandering but not to racial gerrymandering claims.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you General Counsel.

Any other final questions from Commissioners? Okay thank you to Dr. Handley and Mr. Adelson for their very informative presentation.

And we appreciate your work to not only inform the Commission but those attending and the public watching.

Without objection we will move forward to agenda item 6D and continue with the communities of interest regional consideration process.

Yesterday we completed reviewing the Upper Peninsula communities of interest. So today we will be reviewing communities of interest also known as COIs in the northeast and northwest regions of the state.

I would ask Commissioner Szetela if she would facilitate the process starting with Commissioner Curry and she can also say she doesn't want to facilitate the process.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No that is fine I would be happy to facilitate.

So, we are moving on to which region was it northeast or northwest or both?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Both and northeast and northwest.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Northeast and northwest so Commissioner Curry are you where are you Commissioner Curry.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: To your left.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: To your left.

Okay grab your glasses.

And I think we have Kent back there so Kent we are going to need you to.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One moment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I will give everybody a second to get ready.

Just to refresh everybody's recollection we are going to work through the clusters that we have in front of us for the northeast and northeast, northeast and northwest regions.

And let me get my map here.

I believe that would be looking at starting with cluster A2 would be the first place that we would start Commissioner Curry so the supporting detail with what is I'm sorry what is the question? I'm looking right now for you.

So, the supporting data for cluster A2 when I'm looking at it online it's showing up as Page 25 out of 157.

Let me see if that aligns with the actual document.

And the actual packet I have okay so in the actual document it's Page 24.

>> Madam Chair.

>> Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Are you still waiting for me?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Do you have your computer? Would that be easier.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I can see the computer right there.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Where were we at? We are on A what.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: A2 which starts with the very first one is KCNIMI District recommendation.

That should be at the top of your Page.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I thought we did those yesterday.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We did yesterday, but we only covered the portions that applied to the upper peninsula, so we are sort of giving it a second brush with respect to Northern Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I have the description of the cluster as well if you would like me to read it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: A description of the cluster. Yes, please go ahead.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Sorry to interrupt. I have a request from one of the Commissioners to raise the lights so they can see in the rear.

Thank you so much now we can discuss and read.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely, Madam Chair.

Cluster A2, title of upper Mitten east. This area is divided by a seasonal tourism based economy and agricultural.

There are a lot of outdoor recreational opportunities.

Residents regularly travel to nearby counties for goods, services and hospitals.

Concerns include a lack of nearby essential services and keeping the coastline watersheds clean.

And that description is on Page 2 of the report.

And to orient our Commissioners and our public audience, Kent, please confirm if I'm correct, the pink lines that we see on the screen, those are the District lines that the Commission has previously drawn, the draft District lines.

And the green lines, the -- all of the green lines are the cluster.

And the cluster is comprised of individual COI submissions.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me, Madam Chair. The green lines right now are called cluster area number two.

Is that where we are at.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Do you have your microphone on, Kent?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Can I be heard? Okay the green lines are cluster area two. We have five clusters in this general area.

Which Commissioner?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Are you waiting on me? For cluster A2, there are 30 -- submissions but the upper Mitten east, is there a little pointer there where we can see the upper Michigan east? Okay, this area is united by a seasonal tourism economy and agricultural.

There are a lot of outdoor recreational opportunities.

Residents regularly travel to nearby counties for goods, services and hospitals.

Their concerns have a lack of nearby essential services and keeping the coastline and watersheds clean.

So, if their concerns include a lack of nearby essential services we will see if we can get some essential services close to their area.

Which would take us to this is the tourism.

I'm having trouble with my glasses.

My computer is not working properly.

Okay.

The area of not seeing this, I can't read that little writing right there.

I'm having problems with it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You're having difficulty reading it because it's so small? I am too.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, I can't see it.

The glasses or bring something that is near me closer.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let me read it to you because I actually have it up on my screen or I can bring my computer down there if that would be easier.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: KC is north Michigan recommendation, tourism-based economy on the northwest coast of the Lower Peninsula. Healthcare, manufacturing and retail are primary industries beyond tourism.

Well-funded local Governments due to so many second homes in the area.

Similar cultural values with a mix of democrats and republicans since Charlevoix, Petoskey, Harbor Springs, and Traverse City all lean left with a rural are of leaning republican. This will be a well District with similar communities.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry, repeat that.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm speaking with Kim because I'm going to see if I can get them as close to the Charlevoix, Petoskey, and Harbor Springs, Traverse City, all lean areas of the areas leaning republican.

So, this would be a well-balanced District with similar communities.

Okay. So, on the map, we need to fill in, I can't see the numbers on there, Kim.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, as I read this one, to me the way we have drawn the map, the items this individual has stated in his comment are all present in the districts that we set up.

I don't see where we are lacking anything that he is talking about.

He is talking in some generalities of course.

But I see that those things are covered throughout this part of the region.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: So, it's covered.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

Yeah, I was going to say the same thing we only need to discuss the ones that would be impacted by these District lines.

But then again, we need to look at if we had an alternate draft proposal, draft map when we should look at those lines as well.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Sarah Reinhardt?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, thank you Commissioner Orton.

The process document that outlines the process for the Commission to review contemplates that you would start in one initial District.

In the region for today.

So that would be northeast and northwest.

So, Commissioner Curry, when it is your turn, you could pick one of those districts and examine how the pink lines the District lines interact or divide COIs.

So that's how the process contemplates examining this.

Certainly, the Commission is able to do as it wishes.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: So, to clarify Commissioner Curry you don't have to make any changes or shifts if you feel that the information provided us, provided to us from the report reflects what we have already drawn.

Does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Is that what you're saying? Because if it doesn't, I will leave it like it is.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Just as a reminder we are not actually moving lines right now.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Just logging changes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Looking at what we currently have drawn and deciding okay does this respect the COI or is it possible that we may need to make a change in the future.

And as we work through the process those thoughts are going to be recorded and then at a later point, we will look at the log and together decide to move lines.

So, we are not moving lines right now.

You are just reading the comments reading the cluster and deciding based on what is in this cluster is a line change possibly going to be necessary.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I don't think so.

I think we can leave it like it is.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Keep in mind so which item map is this right now, Kent? Is this.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I believe this is version one.

But there is two of them up there and I'm trying to sort out as to why there is two.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so I think the kind of more red one is number three and the more pinky one is probably number one based on my recollection from yesterday.

Yeah, that would be number three.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Now I see what's going on.

Okay which layer are we going to start with, a District file?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Juanita, which layer did you want to work with? We had the two that we liked from yesterday, number one and number three.

Number one broke to the west and number three broke to the east.

So, it just depends on you see on this one it comes down the east side of the coast and grabs the Huron river side and number one broke down the west side of the coast and grabbed the Traverse City Charlevoix side.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Let me see the east.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: She wants to see number three.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Number three.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Mind you I can't hardly see these numbers.

But I guess you can kind of size them up for my, Kent.

Add them up for me.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The numbers should not impact too much for you at this point Commissioner Curry.

But I understand what you're saying.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think under either one of these maps we are fine with this particular comment because either way Traverse City is kept together with the counties immediately surrounding it up to Charlevoix and Emmet and down through that area with either map.



The community of interest is kept together.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Belongs to the community of interest, when they are kept together, we will still go east.

My problem is I can't for some reason read these words.

What is that mont? I can't see the words clearly.

And my computer is not operating correctly.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry could you say that a little louder?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: What did you say Rebecca?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I just asked what you were trying to see so that maybe we could read it off for you are you just looking at the numbers?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm trying to read the words.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: The counties and the areas.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes, the names of the counties.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So, Montmorency I can't even read them.

I think it's Oscoda.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That is what I'm thinking it's not Osceola it's Osceola, Crawford. Missaukee Commissioner Curry we are all kind of the words on the screen are very small, but we are reading to you as best we can.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: The east and Roscommon and Ogemaw I know that one. I think Alpena too.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: If you guys need help, I can see them perfectly.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange take it away and help out Commissioner Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Do you want me to read them off for her, so she knows the counties starting from top to bottom?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I think that would be helpful.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: On the top next to the line, we have Cheboygan, then you go east to Presque Isle, Montmorency, Alpena, Crawford, Oscoda, Altona, Missaukee, Roscommon, Ogemaw and Iosco.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Does that help, Commissioner Curry? She was reading them off to you.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: If I can't see it, I need to see it in my own mind and my own head so I can understand what I'm doing.

I'm hearing what she is saying.

But I can't see those words, the names of those districts, the regions.

I can't see it.

It's not clear enough so I can make up my own and kind of makeup the map.

Maybe we should do that first.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I mean, I think the only thing you need to evaluate right now is the comment about the community of interest. Is it divided in any way in our

map? And it doesn't appear that it is because the counties that were mentioned in the areas mentioned in the community of interest are Charlevoix, Petoskey, Harbor Springs and Traverse City, which are all on the western side of that purple dividing line and they are all kept together.

Commissioner Lett, where is Harbor Springs on that?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Harbor Springs.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Around Traverse City, isn't it?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Or further down.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Harbor Springs is up the coastline of Grand Traverse Bay.

You will see a little sliver of peninsula, that is Old Mission Peninsula. The coastline goes up. Harbor Springs is halfway up from Traverse City maybe.

I don't see it on there particularly.

But that's where it is.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lett.

I think at this point, unless anyone disagreed, we've established that 18651 is good. And so, at this point we will move on to Commissioner Eid who is going to pick up with cluster A2 starting with 23789. And from what I'm seeing, looking through these comments, it seems like a lot of these are very similar. So, I think it may be helpful if we can kind of clump them together because a lot of them are mentioning Grand Traverse City, Leelanau, Old Mission Peninsula. I'm seeing that over and over and over again. So maybe we can kind of clump them together so we can move through them a little more efficiently. But at this point I will hand it off to Commissioner Eid and if you can pick up with Commissioner Curry left off because you have the benefit of younger eyes than the rest of us so we will let you start for us.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Of course, Madam Chair.

I've got young eyes, but I still wear glasses.

So, we are going to go to comment C639.

It's 23748.

It's titled the overall submission information, it's titled simply northern region.

And they go on to talk about a specific area being the Grand Traverse region.

This individual says that this region has people who live and work here mostly because of the values that they hold and should be grouped together with the same representation.

Do you want me to keep going or?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Commissioner Eid can you clarify for the other Commissioners what Page you are reading from?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm reading supporting data for cluster A2.

It is on Page 25.

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

>> CHAIR KELLOM: What portal link is that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What was that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The portal link, the numbers on the side which does it correspond to.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 23748.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: One directly under what Commissioner Curry just read.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Commissioner Eid, the highlighted green is 23748 the green outline is 23748.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wonderful.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Eid you can continue to go through the rest of them Eid aye okay so as far as this comment I think the lines pretty much match up with what they said as far as a Senate map goes.

We are just doing Senate.

We are not going on to house map at this moment.

Okay, then I will move on to the next comment 26704.

This comment is about the natural environment quality of life.

They go on to say that the quality of life and natural environment in northern lower Michigan, so the north part of the Lower Peninsula, people my great to northern MI largely due to loving the natural environment whether they come for a weekend or decade to stay and live up here.

The vast public purest rivers and lakes provide quality recreational opportunities, great tourism clean air, peace and quiet, clean water and wildlife providing a higher quality of life for many.

They then submitted a map and on the comments on the map say people live and come to northern MI for quality of life to enjoy the natural environment around them and have clean air and clean water and outdoor areas to recreate in.

They list fishing hunting biking skiing hiking again et cetera.

And again, I think this pretty much matches up with all of the areas that we have already done.

Really for the Senate the only question that we are going to have to decide is are we going to go left bound or right bound in upper Michigan? I believe one of the maps that we have has the eastern part of the Upper Peninsula with the left part of the Mitten and the other one has the eastern part of the Upper Peninsula with the right part of the Mitten.

The next comment is 29622.

They say they want Leelanau County and Traverse City together.

That's a rather short comment, it says Leelanau Old Mission Peninsula plus Traverse-BAY and all of the Senate proposals we have them together.

>> There is a question.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I have a question about the process.

So, I don't know if Julianne or somebody can ask me about the process we are using. But if none of these communities of interest listed in the report are being split up within our lines that we have, do we still go through and read each individual submission?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I was under the impression, no.

That we are to move on to cluster the next cluster.

But I'm going to because this is kind of a point of confusion, and I was watching yesterday and saw it happening then too.

I'm going to have Sarah Reinhardt step in and then General Counsel if she has clarifying points for the process, she can also have the floor.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: May I share my screen briefly?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Absolutely.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Great.

So, I'm going to share a very, very crude drawing of a completely fictitious District. But I think it will help illustrate the point here.

So, the red lines similar to what you are seeing in your map.

That's a District.

That you all have pretend drawn.

And these little squiggles are COI so imagine the green squiggles here are clusters.

So, this process that your staff has proposed to you all to consider COIs is when you're looking at the cluster, we will go in alphabetical order, so for example, Commissioner Eid is up right now.

So, Commissioner Eid you would start in one District.

And you would look at the district and say what lines of the District, the red lines intersect and divide COIs.

Now you will see in my little doodle here there are three COIs that are intersected.

And there's one right in the middle that's not intersected at all.

So, while it's certainly important for Commissioners to review all COIs, you may not necessarily need to have a discussion about adjusting the lines to accommodate that COI in the very center.

But you may note on the left side of the District there is a COI that is completely divided.

So, you as Commissioners may discuss, do we want to propose moving that line to the left so that we can include the COI completely? Or do we want to move that line on the left to the right so that the District to the left has the COI in it completely? Does that make sense?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: It makes complete sense to me.

What I will say though is I have respect for the process.

I think what's happening is there is a difficulty kind of moving from what we were doing to no longer accounting for population so that is what we have been seeing.

I would also suggest that we take a more group approach, both for efficiency and for the -- to respect that everyone might not want to have that individual time.

And it could put undue pressure as well as cause folks to feel they are responsible for an area when there are 13 of us.

Commissioner Lange has her hand raised.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: First thank you Ms. Reinhardt because that cleared up a lot of questions I had having that visual.

And I'm still on board with making sure that each individual Commissioner has a chance to speak.

So rather than doing the group I still like the idea of everybody taking a turn as we did when we drew the lines.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: I understand what you are saying but someone took a turn and became very uncomfortable and the focus was on them for a considerable amount of time so I want to account for that as well.

I have a question behind me, Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: It may speed things up when we are doing A2, maybe Kent could kind of highlight submissions so that we can see whether it falls within the boundaries or if it's crossing a line, because it's a little hard to tell just reading the description, then we wouldn't have to read each one.

And we can talk about the ones that do intersect.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Commissioner Orton. I would encourage Commissioner to vocalize their perspective of about what Commissioner Orton just shared. Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I was going to suggest we do that, Bring up the map we had. Kent, if we can share that again. And we can see for this particular cluster we are looking at.

So, we were on...I'm not sure if we were on map three or map one. So can you also bring up that layer for -- so you can see the different communities of interest drawn on this map.

And we...I think what we really need to do is just focus on the ones that are crossing that pink line.

So, whether we are under this map or the other map let's start with this map which is map three.

As you can see, there are a couple of the communities of interest that are crossing that line.

So, let's focus on those communities of interest and discuss those.

And so that's all within -- so let's just focus on the ones that cross the line.

Okay so like that big one crosses the line so which community of interest number is this?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: 23748 is that what I'm seeing? I'm going by where his Cursor is, and I will be patient to see if that is the right one.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so this is what number?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 26704.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: 26704 which is the entire upper Mitten.

Commissioner Eid do you have any comments about the one that he just had up?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm trying to find that number.

What number was it?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: 26704 begins with natural environment quality of life.

The one you just read.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I just read that one.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Microphone speak? Your microphone.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Both of our districts we have drawn do take off part of what is included in this proposed community of interest.

This is, okay, this is a different one that's on the screen now.

Can we put back that one that we are talking about? It was number.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: 26704 the big one, the one that covers the whole upper Mitten.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Excuse me what should be on the screen at this moment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Which?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Which COI should be on the screen at this moment?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: 26704, yes that one right there.

Please continue Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, this individual has all of Northern Michigan as a community of interest.

And we might be able to do something like this for a Congressional District, but I don't think it will be possible to accommodate a District with this many people in it for a State Senate or a State House District.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I would say even for a Congressional District this is going to be too many people.

Any additional comments? Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is this a Congressional draft map right now, the purple?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, this is one of the two Congressional maps that we discussed yesterday.

This is version three.

Version four or version one goes the other way and includes the western portion of the upper Mitten with the UP.

But either way they cut it down the middle.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So obviously we can't fit that much.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry this is Senate.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Again, Commissioners reminding you we should only be noting and paying attention to conflict so that we are logging those.

If we do not have conflicts we do need to move on.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So, this now is the two maps layered on top of each other so either way there would be a conflict with this map, but the point is do we think we could accommodate that? And would we want to change it in the future?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't see that 26704 is a conflict.

I don't see that as a conflict.

I see that as a general statement of what the northern tier counties are of Michigan that has been spoken to as quality of life, natural environment, northern lower Michigan. Everybody understands that.

So, the question is, at least they do in my mind, the question is the District Senate districts that we have drawn, do they, as a group encompass those communities of interest? And I would posit that they do.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That would be my understanding of what we are supposed to do as well.

Or not do, but my understanding of.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Our evaluation.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yep, though we can't encompass the area are we speaking have we drawn something, are we keeping the folks together and have spoken to the area and the data.

And to me it feels like we have on either side they are together and able to experience the things they described in terms of the natural environment and quality of life.

We had a hand from Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I yield back it was handled by Commissioner Lett.

I had the same thought.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Unless there are some objections and not hearing we are comfortable with this COI being accommodated in the current draft districts we have for the Senate so why don't we move on to another District or COI and see if there are any others that cross the line.

Okay that one does not cross any of the lines that we have so we can just move on from that one.

This COI similarity does not cross any lines.

This one and one map does cross the line so Commissioner Eid why don't you look at what number is this one? Kent, could you tell us what number this is what COI.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 30858 the COI is.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Schwance's Ideas on the Traverse Region. Community shares tourism, cultural, I'm sorry, tourism, educational, transportation, agricultural, fruit and wine and conservation and resources and infrastructure.

Commissioner Eid, any thoughts? Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Actually, we handled it.

I think we are looking at two different maps at the same time there.

And in one map it does not cross anything and the other one it does which can be.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can you speak a little louder Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will take my mask off there were two different District plans drawn on this map, one community of interest across one and not the other. So, I guess the potential of having multiple different maps drawn at once being placed on this map when we are discussing the communities of interest is going to cause some confusion.

So, what I would recommend is we stick next to we would keep the one up that we liked from yesterday and see if that complies with the community of interest.

And then decide from there.

Because now you can't tell if it's either one or two.

Or one and three.

And which one of those map drawings are causing the community of interest to be split.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so Kent, considering that can we -- is this layer one that we're looking at right now or layer three?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Do we want to look at one or three or two or four?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let look at one.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One, one is on the screen.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, I feel like that's divided up more than one.

Are there multiple layers on there or is that just one?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is one.

I will turn it off and turn on three.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That is three.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so that is three.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I can make one a different color if that would make things helpful.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That would be helpful, yes.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: One is now an orange, where they overlap is a dark orange.



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

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so why don't we just log that as if we are proceeding just with map number one for the Senate that we need to take into consideration COI, 38 I'm sorry 30858 for potentially cutting off part of that community of interest.

Then we can just move on.

Does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Anthony going to speak to this or not?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, I will just say that we for the log we may want to consider including Benzie County with the rest of what we draw in this area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right can we see some more COIs.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The comment with the northern portion Benzie County as you can see is west and south of Grand Traverse County and it would appear we put it down with Manistee.

The same community shares tourism educational transportation et cetera.

So, crossing out of that particular Senate District is not going to affect the COI of either the northern, the Grand Traverse area or Benzie and Manistee area.

They would be considerably the same community of interest in either area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, I agree.

I think you have Ludington below that as well which is also tourist and then Pentwater and the whole coastline is tourism.

I concur with assessment, Commissioner Lett.

All right, are you good with this COI, Commissioner Eid? So, let's look at another one, see if we see any more that have conflicting lines.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Apologies for the interruption is there a proposed line change to that particular District, or no?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: No.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I thought there was.

I thought we were just talking about possibly changing it so that Benzie County is included with the rest of whatever we draw in this region.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Do you think I said that? I'm asking did you think I said that.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That is what I thought you said.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No, my comment is that Benzie could literally fit in either one, and it's fine where it is because of Manistee can't see the other.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Ludington.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Goes down that coastline and it fits in there too.

So even though it crosses it does not hurt anything.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right Kent can you continue moving through our COIs so we can see the different green lines?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: 30970.

It does not seem to be intersected by either Districting plan.

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

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: This is 31185.

It's fairly large.

And it has many intersections.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, comment number 31185, it's titled upper north/lake, these communities represent upper north and the Lake Michigan coast.

They are demographically similar, religiously, culturally, economically and ethically.

They should form their own State Senate District.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well since that's getting down into Missaukee and Wexford, I would like to have Rhonda chime in on this.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lange do you have an opinion about whether those two counties belong up with Grand Traverse?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: You know, lake County is going to associate more with Mason.

And I can see Mason and Manistee associating and being the same.

Wexford County I would say yes it could associate with Grand Traverse to an extent.

But knowing what I know about more of the central area, I'm not so sure that that that they correlate together.

The ones that are being recommended.

Especially going up to Antrim.

That just doesn't seem cohesive or honestly it doesn't make that much sense.

So that's my input.

But everybody's community, you know, their thoughts are different.

I personally don't see that one meshing well.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I concur with Commissioner Lange's analysis.

While it does cross in to out of Grand Traverse County, I've already talked about Benzie, and Manistee I think those are okay crossing out.

I don't think crossing out with Missaukee Wexford and lake those are inappropriate.

So, the majority still of the COI is north and in Grand Traverse.

Wexford, Missaukee and Lake are a lot smaller, not as populous Counties so I would not recommend making a line change based on that COI.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Commissioner Lett.

I also wonder if we might be over population on this too for a Senate District.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, that's exactly where I was going to go.

That COI is extraordinarily large and may be running into population issues.

So, because it would be violating number one at that particular point in realistic criteria, we should not make line changes based on COI alone. And most of the items that were stated in the previous COIs are addressed right now as well with ones that we've been reviewing this afternoon.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Witjes.

Okay. So, are we...do we think there is any conflicts that require us to log the desire to make changes for the COI or are we comfortable just rejecting this COI? Commissioner Lett, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Rejecting is kind of a strong term.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: We looked at the COI and we made a determination we don't need to make any line changes based on it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I think that is probably fair.

At this time, I will hand it back to Chair Kellom because I believe we have run out of time for our afternoon session.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: We have.

We have Commissioner.

My deliberating lovelies.

So, we have moving on to agenda item 7, we have two sets of minutes to approve today.

Are there any proposed edits to the proposed minutes for August 20th or August 23rd? Hearing none may I have a motion to approve the minutes of Commission meeting held on August 20, 2021, at MSU union hall.

Motion made by Commissioner Lett is there a second? Second.

Who was the second?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: By Commissioner Witjes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Second by Commissioner Witjes all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it, the meeting on August 23, 2021, union hall motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes all in favor of improving the MICRC meeting minutes of August 23, 2021, signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

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

All opposed signify by raising your hand and saying nay.

Commissioners we do not have any staff reports today.

And moving on to the MDOS report without objection I will ask Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State if she has a report.

Hearing no objection please proceed Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No update today.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you and we receive our correspondence in advance of our meeting today and provided with the written public comments to the commission in our meeting materials.

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

Are there any announcements? Hearing no announcements as the items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business a motion to adjourn is in order may I have a motion to adjourn.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So, moved.

Is this room going to be secure?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: The question is, is the room going to be secure?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, very secure.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion for adjournment made by Commissioner Witjes.

Is there a second? Second made by Commissioner Lett.

You all switched it up all in favor of adjournment please raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed say nay.

The ayes have it the meeting is adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Thank you so much to everyone watching.

Our translators and everyone attending we really appreciate you and see you at the everything session at 5:00.