

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

09/07/21 12:00 pm Meeting

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

>> CHAIR KELLUM: As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 12:01 p.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube.

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 Michigan to find the link for viewing on YouTube.

Our live stream today includes closed captioning. Closed captioning, ASL interpretation, and Spanish, Arabic and Bengali translation services will be provided for effective participation in this meeting.

Email us at redistricting@Michigan.gov for additional viewing options or details on accessing language translation services for this meeting.

People with disabilities needing other specific accommodations should also contact redistricting@Michigan.gov. This meeting is being recorded and will be available at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC -- excuse me -- for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed and those closed caption transcripts will be made available and posted on Michigan.gov/MICRC along with written Public Comment submissions.

There is also a Public Comment portal that may be accessed by visiting Michigan.gov/MICRC.

This portal can be utilized to post maps and comments which can be viewed by both the Commission and the public.

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

For the purposes of the public watching and the public record, I will turn to Department of State Staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Hello Commissioners, please say present when I call your name.

If you're attending the meeting remotely, please announce during roll call that you are attending remotely. And unless absence is due to military duty, please announce your physical location by stating the county, city, township, or village and the state from which you are attending.

I'll start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

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

- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Present
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange.
- >> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present, attending remotely from Reed City, Michigan
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett.
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton.
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: M.C. Rothhorn.
- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela.
- >> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present, attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette.
- >> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner.
- >> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss.
- >> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes.
- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much, Ms. Reinhardt.

As a reminder of the public watching as we move to the next part of our agenda which is the Adoption of the Agenda, you can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC.

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

- >> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: So moved.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Rothhorn.
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Second.
- >> CHAIR KELLOM: Second made by Commissioner Orton.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? All in favor of adopting the agenda, please raise your hand and say "Aye."

All opposed raise your hand and say "Nay."

The Ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

Without objection, we'll now move to begin the Public Comment Pertaining to Agenda Topics portion of our meeting.

And hearing no objection, we'll now proceed with Public Comment Pertaining to Agenda Topics.

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

Those individuals who have signed up and have indicated that they would like to provide in person public commentary to the Commission will now be able could so. You'll step to the nearest microphone when you hear your number called, and you'll have two minutes when you address the Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

There will also be a visual timer for you to help keep track of your time during your comment.

First in line to provide Public Comment is number one.

>> DAN WALLAHAN: Hi. Dan Wallahan. Uh Genoa Township, Livingston County, Michigan.

I've been watching the draft maps and some of the previous comments in regard to some and I would like to reiterate what I have said before.

Please keeping Livingston County together.

It is our Community of Interest.

Sometimes Communities of Interests are the same as county boundaries. Sometimes they're not.

In this case, it is for us.

It's our number one request and we're watching the maps to -- hopefully that happens.

I've heard some comments about cracking and unpacking cities.

I think we need -- as a Commission you need to be very careful on especially cracking areas.

That's how we had -- the 2011 gerrymander was due to cracking.

My current State Senate District 22nd, it cracks Washtenaw County and puts Scio Township in with Livingston County District, and it's not fair to them and I hope it doesn't happen in either direction for us to avoid a gerrymander that leads to polarization.

One of the things -- we don't want to be with Washtenaw County here up in Livingston County is because of -- I would say the type of values in each community.

It's not even about R or D.

It's about the types of Rs and types of Ds and types of Independants it's oil and water for us.

We'll work with many folks in other -- like I say, in other Districts, wherever we're placed, and some areas are going to appeal to multiple areas and we hope you all keep that in mind.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you so much for taking the time to provide comment to the Commission this afternoon.

At this time we only have one in-person Public Comment for today's meeting pertaining to go agenda topics.

But we do have for remote Public Comment with one person requesting to speak a second time.

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

I will turn the floor over to Michigan Department of State Staff to facilitate our remote Public Comment. But if you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak.

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

The Department of State will call on you by name. And note that if you experience technical or audio issues and we don't hear from you for three to five seconds, we'll move onto the next person in line and then we'll return to you after that person is done speaking.

If your audio still does not work, you can email redistricting@Michigan.gov and we'll help you troubleshoot so you can participate during the next Public Comment period at a later meeting or hearing.

You'll have two minutes to address the C Commission.

Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

You'll have a visual timer as well.

Michigan Department of State Staff, please facilitate our remote Public Comment.

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

Our first Public Comment remote participant is a Mr. James Galant.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> MR. JAMES GALANT: Can you hear me, Madame Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes, Mr. Galant, I can.

>> MR. JAMES GALANT: All right. This is James Galant with Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition and these are my opinions.

And I have -- my research -- I've just recently found that a House fiscal agency report dated October 16th, 2018, concerning Proposition 2.

It states, "If approved, Proposition 2 would primarily amend Article 4 by changing the composition of the Commission charged with redistricting following the census."

Now it also says, quote, "In its order granting borders" -- not politicians, crossed in plain- - " the Supreme Court found the amendment would merely change the method by which Commissioners would be chosen and add unaffiliated voters to the, albeit inactive, Commission described in the Constitution currently."

That would be the Michigan Commission on Apportionment.

Which was disbanded in two thousand -- in, uh, 1980.

It was disbanded because of the -- the amendment that said their, their processes, their formula was unconstitutional.

Not the structure.

The formula.

So this is the Commission that was already in the Constitution.

It's still in the Constitution.

And this was got -- this was supposed to be sent to the legislative council.

They're the ones that Jennifer Detra lost. And Mike Brady testified that he spoke to her on how to do this, except -- the Secretary of State didn't -- after the vote, dependent that Proposition 2 passed, did not transfer it to the legislative council -- which, that's a legislative branch.

It says it's housed in the legislature, not housed in the executive branch.

The Secretary of State refused to do that and she assigned her own Staff.

The Constitution says the secretary of state will provide technical services and that the Commission will hire your own Staff --

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Galant --

>> MR. JAMES GALANT: The Secretary of State woefully appointed the Staff to this Commission --

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Galant.

Your allotted two minutes has ended.

Thank you so much for addressing the Commission.

We do have a second in-person Public Comment so we're going to return to in-person Public Comment for our second person to speak and then we'll return to remote.

>> MR. ARHAM RAZAHR: All right.

Good morning, everybody or good afternoon.

I drove up here from Dearborn today.

My name is Arham Razahr.

I'm an Arab American .

I'm also an attorney and a professor -- an adjunct professor of law at the Detroit Mercy Law School.

I'm here to talk about the Arab American community and especially Dearborn.

The State House Districts -- currently the State House District, District 15, is all of the City of Dearborn, but as you know, the Census numbers came out and Dearborn is about 109,00 people now while the State House District is about 91,500 people.

So what I am here to urge you to do is to make sure that -- obvious -- hopefully, that the District 15, or whatever District you end up calling it, is still entirely composed of the City of Dearborn.

But of course you'll have to cut out some parts of Dearborn to fit the numbers.

And I'm here to urge you to make sure that you cut out the parts of Dearborn that are not the Arab American neighborhoods so that it can remain an Arab America majority District.

I looked at the AFL Fair Maps and that map looks pretty good for State House District 15.

But, again, this is something I teach at the University of Detroit Mercy School of Law and I've been studying census issues, in particular to Arab American populations, for many years now.

So I would urge you to -- I think the State -- the AFL Fair Map is a good map.

But, please, whatever you do, when you're looking at State House District 15 or whatever one includes mostly the City of Dearborn is that East Dearborn -- which is going to be east of south -- as you might know, Dearborn is basically cut by Southfield freeway down the middle.

East Dearborn is where -- is about 90 or 95% Arab. One of the challenges that you're going to have -- and I urge you to -- uh, talk to people like me who have studied this stuff.

One of the challenges you're going to have is that Arab Americans don't have a box on the census form and we're counted as white.

And we're not really white fundamentally, or really -- I teach the whole, you know thing about that.

But we're not white.

And politically, obviously.

So you're not going to have card numbers in front of you like you might with the African American or Latino population.

So please listen to people like me when we tell you East Dearborn is where our community mostly is.

We have some in West Dearborn.

So whatever you do, please keep those 91 and a half thousand people with East Dearborn and much of West Dearborn.

The AFL Fair Map looks like a good map to me.

[timing bell ringing

All right.

Thanks.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: We appreciate you taking the time to address the Commission this afternoon.

At this time we'll return to our remote Public Comment. Michigan Department of State Staff, Sarah Reinhardt, please facilitate that.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Our next remote Public Comment participant is Lisa Jevens.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> MS. JEVENS: Hi; my name is Lisa Jevens.

This is my second time addressing the Commission, but I understand that you were working on maps today for the western side of Michigan -- southwestern.

And that is where my testimony related to.

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

I want to give you the number of my submission which includes a map and the description of the problem.

C9, 73 is what it is and it's also under my name.

The reason that I wrote in the first place is that we have a house in old cottage community called Macatawa Park and this is on a peninsula that lies between Lake Michigan and Lake Macatawa, south of the Holland Channel.

And for decades this peninsula has been cut in half with, um, along the county line, township line, Congressional and State House District lines.

So for some odd reason I think they just followed the county lines when's they did our, our political districts.

But I would urge you to look at my map and see that it's, it's not a good idea to cut our community in half and there's really no reason for it and if you could put us all together in one, it would be great.

We have affinity to other lakefront communities that run up and down the lakefront, south of us such as Saugatuck and the communities along that coast of Michigan.

And so the tip of our community should not be connected to those in the north.

It just doesn't make any sense.

And like I said, if you look at the map, you'll see what I'm talking about.

C973 was code -- the idea on my submission.

Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to address the Commission.

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

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Our next remote Public Comment participant is Sarah Lally.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> SARAH LALLY: Hi there. Can you hear me okay?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes. Hi, Sara.

>> SARAH LALLY: Excellent. Thank you so much.

Hi, everybody. My name is Sarah Lally.

I'm an ICU nurse at Michigan Medicine in Ann Arbor.

I also work at Eastern Michigan University Center for Health Disparities, Innovations, and Studies, and I am a grateful volunteer with APIA Goal to do multiple community outreach things.

So I'm asking the Commission today to please take into consideration all of the constitutional requirements when you're looking at these maps and when you're drawing these maps.

A lot of the outreach we do is in the metro Detroit area.

In Macomb, Oakland.

Wayne Counties and we know that this is, like, the highest concentration of where people live in Michigan.

And really take some extra time, please, to take a look at these Communities of Interest because this is, like, the most diverse area in the state and a lot of the people that are living in these areas, they don't have access to this process.

Even though we think they do, this is public information.

It's accessible on the internet but really through the work that we do, we've learned that so many of these Communities of Interest, language is a bigger barrier than all of us are aware of it and really deserves some extra time, thought, and interest that these communities stay together and it's up to us to really advocate for them because they have a lot of different challenges when it comes to being engage in this process.

And so, please, take some extra time to look into these areas and dig a little bit deeper and hear the interest of the community.

Because, again, you know, a lot of these people, they don't have the same access and they don't have easy access like we think that they do.

It's up to us to help them and to make this fair for everyone.

So thank you so much for your time and for letting me talk to you today.

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

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Our next remote Public Comment participant is Evan Dillon.

Please allow us a moment to unmute you.

>> MR. EVAN DILLON: Hi. First, I just wanted to thank the Commissioners for their time today and all of their efforts in helping to create a more representative democracy here in Michigan.

It's clear to me from the preliminary maps drawn for Grand Rapids and west Michigan that this Commission has made an effort to follow the 7 guiding principles when drawing those maps and did so in the order drawn out in the State Constitution.

As a lifelong resident of Grand Rapids I'm especially pleased in what seems to be a true consideration for Communities of Interest when drawing the maps here in West Michigan.

I wanted to thank you all for that.

But my interest in fairness and equity in voting is not limited to my home city.

I implore this Commission to please give itself more time and consideration when drawing the maps for the Detroit Metro area.

Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb are three of the most populous counties in the state and thus deserve more time to draw the lines as they will represent the most Districts.

Additionally, extra time has got to be given to the time Detroit Metro area because this is the area, like I said before with the most voters.

And it's also going to have the most public comments and the most Community of Interest submissions and all of those submissions and all of those comments deserve to be carefully considered.

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.

Once again, I want to thank you all for the time to speak today and for your work on this Commission.

Thank you.

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

We appreciate you providing your perspective.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That concludes the first round of our remote Public Comment.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Sarah Rhinehart.

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

I don't believe we have any second in-person Public Comment but we do have a second live remote Public Comment.

We will have the same process as the first round.

So the first in line to provide a second remote Public Comment is James Galant.

And you are now invited to address the Commission. Michigan Department of State Staff, please let me know if you're able to connect.

>> JAMES GALANT: Can you hear me now?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes Mr. Galant we can hear you.

>> JAMES GALANT: This is James Galant, Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition and this is my opinion.

As I was saying -- State archives and they've identified the records through the Commission on apportionment from the 1980 rules and procedures from that Commission.

They disbanded the Commission and this amendment fired the Commission back up. A little different compositions, different criteria, but it stated that it's already in the Constitution.

This is a just a name change.

You don't just get to make up your own and not run for any -- have any rules for three months and then just make stuff up -- that's not appropriate.

I believe that Secretary of State Joyce Benson has hijacked a legislative Commission and is holding y'all in hostage in the executive branch of state government.

Stating that you -- her orientation materials provided to you on the first day in September 2020 stated that you must follow Robert's Rules of Order.

That's because that's the status of the Constitution's Commission under the supervision of Jennifer Belloff-- the legislative administrator, the law revision Commission and all these other commissions -- those are legislative commissions.

This is housed in the legislature.

This is wrong.

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

I don't know how you ever –how anybody ever did this, but the Secretary of State -- in the Constitution, when I was reading it, it says she shall provide technical services. That's it.

Not staffing.

It says clearly that this Commission shall hire the Staff and that Staff shall be supervised by this, this, uh -- the legislative council administrator, Jennifer Belloff.

And this is where they are going around with this and saving the archives and they've been sending them to me and I'll be publishing them on the website and I'll be getting the to you folks.

I don't know of anybody really wants to change this back and make sure the people standing there on following the rules, this is how we got to get them input.

This is the full --

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Mr. Gallant.

Your allotted time is over.

That concludes our Public Comment this afternoon.

However, I would like to mention that all emailed and mailed Public Comment is provided total Commission before each meeting and the Commissioners review the Public Comment portal Michigan.gov/MICRC on a regular basis.

We appreciate everyone who provides a Public Comment in any way you choose and we encourage you to continue to provide thoughts and comments and maps.

Agenda I5A Mapping Process and Procedures and without objection, ask Executive Director Hammersmith if shell share.

Hearing no objection, please proceed, Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUE HAMMERSMITH: Good afternoon, everyone.

Thank you to the Commissioners for your continuing work on the mapping process and for continuing to be flexible and adjust our process as we learn together.

What was sent yesterday was a Mapping Process and Procedures version 9.6, reflecting yesterday's date.

We gave you the red lined version so it was easy to see what changes has been made. One of the things that happened was the schedule was updated.

We've been moving around because we both had to wait for the racially polarized voting analysis and then also for Mr. Adelson from Federal Compliance to ensure compliance with the Voting Rights Act in conjunction with that.

Because of that, we really needed to wait and map in the Detroit metro areas as well as sag gnaw and flint.

So those locations having placed lower down on the list so we can continue our work. Also with this proposal, we are -- and then moving into Congressional and lastly State House Districts.

On page four is an updated schedule that reflects what has been done.

And the proposed work moving forward.

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 also deleted the COI process document and incorporated that into the larger document so we moved a separate document regarding COIs and incorporated that and incorporated into the process all the COI reviews.

The Commissioners will be doing that on their own time between meetings.

I realize that's a lot of work to go through the COIs -- Communities of Interest -- but there simply is not enough meeting time to go through all of those in meetings either. Again, that's on your own.

Certainly, to be brought into the mapping process so when you see areas that need to be addressed, so we're not splitting Communities of Interest, Commissioners need to bring those up in the meeting.

Also the artisan famous review was added into the deliberation sessions.

I know there's been some discussion about when is the best time to make that assessment and the best time is when there are statewide maps, redraft maps so then you can determine if there's partisan fairness in a whole map versus a portion of a map. Also references to regions was deleted.

I think it's time to move past the regions and we heard that loud and clear from the Commissioners that this served their purpose initially to get the work started. But it's time to move past those lines that were these fictitious lines that were drawn on the map just to work with because at this point we have separate maps created for regions that are now overlapping into other regions and that needs to be reconciled and it was recommended that that's where the work starlight's to in reconciling the regions where you can see where you drew adjacent regions and they spilled over into each other and to try to make sure that you can then make a cohesive statewide map or maps.

You may want more than one version of the State Senate maps.

But we hope to get through that process yet this week to get the Senate map drafts to a point where we feel they can be utilized by the public for reviewing during the Public Comment process.

And I think I would ask if there are any questions? I don't know that this document needs to be adopted today.

I think it's something that we're going to try and make sure it's useful.

Again, we're all learning as we go on process and trying to make it work as effectively with efficiency as possible, maintaining the Constitutional criteria.

So questions?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Commissioners, any questions for Executive Director Sue? And Commissioner Rothhorn, please assist me with any in person hands that I might miss. Myself or Vice Chair Szetela might miss.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm happy to help.

No one has their hands up right now.

I do have a thought.

I'm considering the comments we heard about the Detroit area and the irony of this that we've been waiting for this and then we have one day in the Detroit area for the COIs for the Senate map for this week.

That's my understanding is that, right? We were talking about trying to finish the Senate map this week.

Did I get that correct? And we would have that one day with LA Delson? If I'm incorrect, that's fine.

That's a question.

>> MS. SUE HAMMERSMITH: You are correct.

If that work does not get finished then it spills over into the next workday.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And we need time to do -- thank you.

>> MS. SUE HAMMERSMITH: Part of the issue is as you are aware Mr. Adelson is Jewish and he's celebrating the Jewish Holy days this week and next week and he's unavailable for the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: My question was whether we need a Friday? I would rather than just wait until Monday, frankly, next week to work on it there instead of trying to add a day this week.

>> MS. SUE HAMMERSMITH: If we do need to add a couple of Fridays, certainly that is a position and those tentative days are on the calendar.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: In other questions.

No other hands are raised right now, Chair Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.

Sue, did you have anything else for our Mapping Process and Procedures?

>> MS. SUE HAMMERSMITH: Certainly if people have questions, suggestions, comments -- you know, we're all one team.

So let's work together and make it work and get the job done.

Thanks.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Sue and thank you Commissioners for recognizing this is a process we're trying to hammer out and made to promote and increase our effectiveness as we're mapping.

At this point we're going to move forward to New Business 6A.

Except for Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Saginaw and general see Counties.

Without objection, I would like the Commissioners with reconciling the state Districts that have been drawn across the state except for the Detroit metro area and the east central areas.

As you know we've drawn maps with separate consideration in each area allowing for overlaps and now we need to look for line map switches.

We need to wait for Thursday for drafting -- above Counties.

Where our legal counsel will be able to attend and comply with federal and state law.

Commissioners, does it make sense to start with northernmost regions and work our way south across the state? And if we want to do that, we'll start where we left off the last meeting which would be Commissioner Orton.

We left off with Commissioner Orton and we'll start with Commissioner Rothhorn is what I meant to say.

The question on the floor is does it make sense to start with the northernmost regions and make our way south across the state to our regions.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm reading and hearing a number of yeses.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.

So as we said, we left off with Commissioner Orton and I'll ask Commissioner Rothhorn to start this afternoon.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

So to start, should I -- and we're not doing clusters.

We're looking at maps, correct? Are we trying to sort of reconcile the different maps that we have at this point and so Kent or John, are you able to put the -- let's see, maybe of number of maps? I feel like we had version one and version three.

>> So I would say you're talking about looking at the most recent Senate maps that you did in the west Region, right? And then are you talking about the north instead?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I believe, so and I see Commissioner Orton has her hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think we just said we'll start in the north.

>> Okay so like you were alluding to, there are multiple plans in that area.

So one of the issues is we could try to merge the plans together and there's even a function that says merge areas that do not overlap and it sounds good.

The problem is since we used a numbering system that went from one, two, three, in each Region it's going to combine the numbers even if they're not overlapping.

If you have a District one in the UP and District one in the west, they're going to put them together and you're going to have a District that's exactly two Districts.

That's a great function down the road and you're able to have different numbers.

>> KENT: But they're not clicked in as Districts, but we know the boundaries as layers are the Districts you drafted earlier.

You have three different plans and I will basically start with the blank map and then you can look at those three different Districts, the layers of them.

You can pick one and I can load it in quickly and you can see where they conflict.

I can load in all the other layers if you want to do that.

In other words, each Region I can load two or three plans -- one, two, or three plans that you drew in each Region and we can look at all of them together, a subsection of them together.

Like you said, if we just want to start in the north then we would have three.

As you recall, there were three drafts?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: There were four but I remember versions one and three were the most common and I'm seeing nodding heads around the table here.

>> KENT: I would definitely appeal to the collective memory of the group and also notes to make sure that we're accounting for all of the areas that you were referring to. So I don't know -- let me share the Zoom screen for the moment.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: While you're doing that, John. I'm wondering because we do have an intention to get as far as we can with our Senate maps this week.

What I heard you say having multiple numbered map with the number one -- when we started this process, we were going to reference the old maps.

We're starting with fresh maps and we've done that.

We were referencing the old maps and --

>> KENT: Some numerical continuity.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm thinking about the wisdom of that.

>> KENT: One to seven are in Wayne and the end of the scale UP has 38 and 37 and you can start with the book ends and understand that you're going to have some conflict somewhere in the process.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yeah, and it sounds like if we're going to try to merge or do a service for ourselves -- I'm looking for your input.

Would that be helpful at this stage?

>> KENT: It would be helpful to consider renumbering them in a new plan and moving forward -- if you've got two versions of District 38, you're basically saying that they're going to be two versions of District 38.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Chair Kellom, Commissioner Orton has her hand raised.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, Commissioner Orton and then, Commissioners, we have a little bit of business to take care of.

We have to go back before we dive in.

Go ahead Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay.

I'm wondering -- I think I understand what you're saying, John, about the numbers. Would it be possible or helpful if you and would it be okay if -- if it didn't necessarily happen in our meeting but if you just went and renumbered the Districts on the different plan so that then could we see amendment all better on one map without there being layers?

>> I would say that is a second step.

I would say the first step is just looking at them as layers.

And you know that way you can see which areas overlap.

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

For example, you may have a District -- let's just say a District ten is in the Lansing area and you have another District that substantially overlaps with another District from another Region.

So do you name both of those ten? Do I name one ten and one 10A? I couldn't name it 10A.

I would have to name it some other numerical District so you're going to have a deconfliction issue right away just by having areas that overlap.

However, when we go back to the idea of having -- remember I talked about in these regions we have a general idea of about how many Districts are in the Region? If we have a general idea that there are three Districts in the UP then they can about 38, 37, 36 and they're just slightly different versions of the same number and in other areas you have five Districts and we can say they're basically going to be 11 to 15 or something like that and then one or two Districts are left that don't quite fit into the box and we can talk about how to handle those Districts.

I can do that.

I would say that's a good second step that I can work on a break.

Yeah.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, Commissioner Orton.

Commissioner Lange and then.

>> Madame Chair, I apologize for the interruption but to briefly respond to Commissioner Orton's concern.

I do agree with -- Commissioner Orton that that would be appropriate to direct Commission consultants to do.

Specifically, the renumbering of Districts to merge the plans that the Commission has already drafts.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you, General Counsel.

Commissioner Lange? I'm sorry.

Who was that speaking? John?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

Commission language should go.

I can hold.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Commissioner Lange, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I want to make sure I have this do you want straight.

I was under the assumption that we were going to start with new maps, use the different maps that we've drawn as a reference point because I know there were some areas where we were considering making adjustments.

So I just want to make sure I'm on the same page of the entire Commission of exactly how we're doing it.

If we're doing overlays or a whole new map that's cohesive working our way down and using the other ones we used as a reference point or exactly how we're doing it.

I'm just a very ABC and I want to make sure I understand.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: For what it's worth since it's my turn, I think that's exactly what I'm trying to explore, Rhonda.

At this point I would not try to create a new map.

I would merge and use what we have and through the process, during my turn, at least, try to figure out which version or make adjustments so that we have a Senate District in the north and with the understanding the numbering is not going to be quite ideal but what you suggested, Rhonda, is how I anticipate using my turn.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, Commissioners, I'm sorry to put a little pin in this parking lot of our draft mapping and our thoughts about reconciliation.

We're going to come walk to it.

I was notified that because of our mapping processes and procedures have a schedule attached -- if we're going to approve it because it is a schedule and obviously involves more than the 13 of us.

So if there are concrete thoughts about that discussion or a motion to approve the process and procedures as presented by Executive Director Hammersmith, this would be a necessary time for that.

General Counsel, please do advise if there are any other additional thought inside Commissioner Curry, I'm not sure if you're wanting to say something but you're unmuted just in case you don't know.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: You cannot start your video because they stopped it. That's what is on here Commissioner Curry?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has a hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Orton? Thank you, Commissioner Rothorn, if we vote on this and adopt it, we've learned up to this point there needs to be continual process improvement and we may want to change again.

What if we don't complete an area that we have on the schedule that we're going to complete that day? We would have to revote on a new schedule?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madame Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Please, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

I'm sure all of the Commissioners share that question and concern.

The process itself is dynamic as we've experienced from the beginning.

But for areas, specific areas in the schedule that are not completed on the assigned day that would go to Unfinished Business on the following meeting and the Commission would be working on those items in the proposed order.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: With that explanation I'll just -- I'll just move that we adopt the process as presented.

I don't know if we have a resolution or anything that we have language for.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Not that I'm aware of, Commissioner Rothorn.

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

I think it was just -- I think what you've done is fine.

I have a motion made by Commissioner Rothhorn to adopt the mapping process and procedure as presented by Executive Director Hammersmith, edited mapping process and procedure.

Is there a second?

>> Second, I didn't hear you.

It was muffled with second Commissioner Witjes.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Commissioner Witjes.

A second with Commissioner Witjes.

Is there a discussion for the editing maps and process procedure?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid has a hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Has there been a decision on how many of amendments of the map we want to bring forth?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Per the process document the decision that will be made during the deliberations after your collaborative map is complete.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Rothhorn, thank you Commissioner Eid.

Any other succession questions or concern? All right.

All of those in favor the adopting the process and procedure, please raise your hand and say Aye.

I ask that you turn on the microphone so that I can hear Aye.

Aye [in unison].

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All opposed, Nay.

The ayes have it and our mapping process and procedure that be approved.

Thank you, Commissioners.

For those that may have been joining our meeting and those watching and attending, we are going to move back to New Business and we were beginning our discussion with Commissioner Rothhorn in trying to hash out the northernmost regions and working our way south across the state towards the last areas that we'll map.

So Commissioner Rothhorn, you have the floor again.

And Vice Chair Szetela, please feel free to facilitate this conversation, though I'm not sure it will need much facilitation.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: All right.

Is it okay if I go?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Absolutely.

Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: So John or Kent, if you can bring up the maps and I think you'll just try to state the rationale.

I think we're starting in the north because it's the furthest and safest from the -- the first Region of the Senate so we're just trying to consolidate our maps up in the UP and head south as much as we can.

>> What I would like to do is I've loaded Districts -- this is version one and I have the other three versions and I suggest we bring those in as layers so we can look at them. I can load in each one individually as a plan but I would say look at the layers and I don't know whether you're going to proceed with one version or another version but I have all four.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: One of the things John that we did is look at COIs and we primarily used version one and three and I'm getting some thumbs up. If we can at this time, John.

Just put up one and three and we'll choose between those, please.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: For calculator time trying to bring up the ones. I have the date on these and it's possible there's a file I don't have right in front of me and if something comes up, we'll find that file and it will be out there. I'm going to put up version three now.

So it overlays as a layer and it will default to red and I think I can probably under the layer manager, give it labels -- let's see.

So under the layer properties we're going to put the District number and then let's see. Okay.

All right so the way this is going to work for the moment is that the District numbers that are color coordinated with the Districts are the version one.

And then the red numerals and the red outline are version three.

And you can see that in this case the thematically coordinated number one and the red outline are congruent as far as I can tell here.

Let me change the properties of the layer so it's more visible.

I'm going to over exaggerate this for a moment.

So in this case when I look at it, it shows that the red line boundary is the same as the purple District.

So that District is not conflicting between one and three and your District two, the green version is the District that's already in the plan but the red version is your alternate version, which is version three.

And I believe there are only three Districts in the version three.

There's a version two and a version four.

So at this point there's only two in the version three.

Two Districts that are the red boundaries.

You want to add the other layers so you can see them before you make a suggestion?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes, please.

Weight.

Sorry.

You're offering the second version?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Just version one and three are okay with me.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Let me remove that one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: The reason I'm doing on this is we're slowly building consensus in what we're working with and we have slowly decide that one and three are the best versions at this point so to go back I feel it would be a reopening. Unless I hear an objection from another Commissioner, I'm going to say one and three is where we're at.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: One is loaded.

Three is the overlay.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Three is the overlay and what we're seeing as red.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Red is the overlay and the colored Districts are the Districts in the plan from version one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Right.

So I'm tempted to -- I think the upper peninsula we can agree on.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: District one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Correct.

We looked at the population of the tribes in the area and we saw this would be not a bad split of the COI.

There was a northern coast, superior coast and a Michigan coast and the holding of the tribes in my memory was why we made a decision to split it along the County for the Senate map.

Version one.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: The District in one and three are the same.

It's congruent.

What I would suggest at this point is you're in the process of functionally you're creating a new plan.

You are -- because you've got version one.

You've got version three.

And you're about to suggest that you sake this District that is in -- it's the same in both plans and you say let's take that and move that forward.

So we should potentially take this time and now renumber that as District 38.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

Whatever is most efficient.

What I'm trying to do is use my turn and get a clean consensus, if you will.

The Second District in the UP feels like where we need to potentially have more discussion but the first one feels like it's a.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So, again, the version in this first plan is numbered one.

I'm going to renumber it to 38.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm okay with that.

Thank you.

And I see -- is it okay if I help facilitate, Vice Chair?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Absolute -- oh.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I can't remember who was delegated to that.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Yes, please.

Because I can't see the hands in the room.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think I see two hands? Commissioner Orton and Director Hammersmith? Is that true? No.

Just Commissioner Orton.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Go ahead, Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you for renumbering that.

Can we lock that then, then, as we move on?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

You can lock it.

At this point that's probably fine.

There may come a point where you lock something and forget that you locked it and need to unlock it but for right now that seems like a good idea.

I'll do that if you would like.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think we're trying to figure out how we do that and let try locking.

Commissioner Eid.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I agree with what Commissioner Rothorn said.

It's a good District we all had a hand in coming to that census.

It is a little short on people and it's right on the borderline of what is acceptable or not. Do we want to make a District with that amount of variance?

>> You're asking my opinion? I would say at this stage it's not a problem at all.

It's not a one for one.

You don't then have to draw a District that's having to be positive 4.2.

You can draw many, many Districts that sort of balance that deviation.

This is not a problem at all.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thanks for that question, yeah.

And I'm wondering in terms of process -- I'm wondering do we need rationale at this point or should I hand it over? What do we want to do?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: This is Sarah Reinhardt with the Department of State. From my perspective, with this particular District it doesn't seem like you made changes or adjustments but if you do make a change or adjustment to a District, you've redrawn or if you need a completely new District then I need rationale for that.

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Can you scroll up on the active matrix so we can see the numbers on that?

>> One moment.

There's a utility that I can use to show the current District only.

That's not what I wanted.

One moment.

The program did what it's supposed to do but not what I wanted it to do.

Okay.

So that's the information on just that District.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Go ahead, Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So, I think this is good for right now.

But in general, I just wanted to say out loud, I think probably we all are thinking this.

I would really like on all the Districts to be as close to zero deviation as possible.

But I remember we really struggled with how to -- where to draw that line because it was a large and string shape of the Townships or precincts even.

I think this one is good but going forward it would be great if we can get close deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'll offer the other piece that was in my head.

I'm not sure if I should continue my turn but I was thinking about how much comment we got about adding Sheboygan and that would balance it and it's UP related and in my head that was a rationale but I also heard from John that we don't have to balance it immediately.

I'm not we added to that idea but that would, again, sort of speaks to.

Yeah.

And I'm not sure exactly which one we take it from, honestly.

And I'm looking for -- I'm-in-law sure if my turn is over or if I should keep going or? I see Commissioner Clark has his hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Thank you.

Again what Sarah Reinhardt provided for you, if you have adjustments, you are welcome to make the adjustments.

You don't have to feel you have to change something for the fact of changing it, be if that makes any sense to you.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah.

I request on a spread sheet at the -- is it possible to get the political data as well?

Percent Democrat and percent Republican as well.

That would be help.

When we get to District three, I have a question.

>> At this point that information is not he loaded easily in the matrix and are you instructing me to find that.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I am but if it's going to be time consuming, do it at a break.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

In response to Commissioner Clark's question, when the District was mapping in the state of thumb, the political data as distinct from partisan fairness -- again, partisan fairness evaluated on a statewide basis -- complete Congressional plans and statewide plans -- partisan data is a part of the data that Commissioner Clark is requesting at this point.

In the fictional state of thumb what was occurring was the Commission was -- had ribbon going at the bottom with that data and was extraordinarily focused on that data. So while the Commission has been integrating the Communities of Interest and leaning toward the minority data in Compliance with the minority rights act, that data as Mr. Morgan has indicated correctly has not been activated.

I would also note that political competitiveness is not a criteria in the State of Michigan. Again.

Political competitiveness is not a criteria in the State of Michigan.

Excuse me.

Partisan fairness.

Algorithms that are going to be run on the statewide plans is a constitutional criteria that we have in the State of Michigan.

That is why the mapping has been moving forward in the manner that it has been and I hope that information was helpful to the Commission.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you General Counsel Commissioner Rothhorn, are you satisfied with the turn that you took?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yeah.

I think the answer is yes and I would love to do the second one if -- like, to make that second, like to move Sheboygan over.

I see Commissioner Orton.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Orton, go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So as we're making these decisions, we can remember what some of the Communities of Interest are that have been told us such as the community of Sheboygan.

We are still waiting to see the Community of Interest overlays so we might need to see that to help make some of these decisions as we get further.

>> If that's a question to me, I believe we can bring up the Community of Interest overlays to some extent.

I believe they're available in this area.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So on Thursday we were having a discussion and Kim was asked for that kind of heat map to be able to be visible for us to see.

I don't see him on the meeting.

I don't know if he's here.

But I'm wondering if we have that or if that's just going to be.

>> So I can bring up some portion of the Communities of Interest.

I think that's the way you displayed some of those on Thursday.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Okay.

>> Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Director Hammersmith has her hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

Executive Director Hammersmith, please proceed?

>> MS. SUE HAMMERSMITH: Thank you Chair Kellom.

So the Commission knows we had a meeting with Kim Brace about the COIs and we will know when we'll have the information available and he is hoping to have it today.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you, Sue.

>> Am I able to refer total information that you already had on Thursday? Executive Director Hammersmith said I can refer to the information I had on Thursday and I'll bring those up as a layer.

I think this is information you've seen before.

>> It's the same area clusters we've been looking at previously.

Area one and area two clusters.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm not against putting the layer on, because we've done this and we've made a change, we have a change log.

I'm wondering if now is the time to bring the change log to see in what we wanted to remind ourselves to do.

Is that appropriate or is there.

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: We can do that.

This is Mustafa with the Department of State.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

Can you do that? How would that look?

>> Give me one moment.

I'll get back to you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Commissioner Lett has his hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lett can proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Thank you.

I would like to make a suggestion.

The process of acknowledging people with a hand up is cumbersome.

I would ask that we designate Commissioner Rothorn to lead the discussion because he can see the five of you on the TV and he can see all of us.

And, therefore, we wouldn't have to go back through Commissioner Kellom.

My suggestion is we appoint Commissioner Rothhorn for this process.

I guess that's a motion.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madame Chair, I would suggest a slight modification of language that Commissioner Rothhorn would facilitate this discussion unless the intent was clear, to have him function as the Chair for the meeting, I would of course withdraw my comment.

But if the intent was to have Commissioner Rothhorn facilitate the discussion around these issues that would be my discussion.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The idea is that somebody here is going to call on people.

Now, if that's facilitating or temporarily chairing, I'll leave that up to your discretion, counsel.

You can have your pick.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly, Madame Chair. It's always at the discretion of the Commission.

What I'm hearing is for the ease of conducting this part of the agenda a motion move that Commissioner Rothhorn facilitate the discussion.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That was my intent.

I wasn't aware of how formal that would need to be.

I did ask Commissioner Rothhorn to assist because I was feeling ill today.

I have no objection to that.

The motion was to Commissioner Rothhorn facilitate conversation for the purposes of our mapping process and the areas of reconciliation that be made by Commissioner Lett.

Is there a second?

>> I second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Second made by Commissioner Clark.

Any discussion or debate on the motion?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This is to call on people? Please specify I heard Steve say virtual and in person?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: What I heard was there was a concern with obviously there is a Chair and Vice Chair who are virtual at the moment and we need someone in person to facilitate this conversation when folks have hands raised because we have a different level of vision.

Commissioner Rothhorn will solely be calling on people so that this process happens a little bit more productively.

As opposed to him telling me and people moving through me to be acknowledged.

Does that make sense, Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes.

But the question is, the virtual too, then is it everybody? He's going to be watching for the virtual and the in person, correct?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yep.

You don't have to hear my voice at all to confuse things.

All of those in favor please raise your hand and an Aye.

Aye.

All of those opposed please raise your hand and say Nay.

The Aye Ayes have it.

Commissioner Rothhorn, please proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Mustafa has a hand raised.

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: Thank you.

I would just like to report to you the proposed line adjustment you made last week.

There was on one and it was include Sheboygan in the same Senate District for discussion.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

How are we looking, John?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: What I have here on my screen and for discussion purposes, we have two of these -- we've been referring to them sometimes as clusters and I know that's a shorthand and may refer to something else but I've added the A1 and A2 so there's several Communities of Interest overlays within this A1.

So when I look at A1, I may have multiple -- yeah.

Okay.

One moment.

Let me just -- I'm going to bring this up again.

So when I bring up the A1 first, I bring it up, load the layer, and now it defaults to red.

I'm just going to quickly change that to blue so there's a contrast.

This is not the area where you're talking about with Sheboygan.

This is an example of multiple Communities of Interest and in the software, they've added the functionality so I can go within A1.

So all of these are considered within the same cluster which is A1.

I have a feature selector where it will show me based on the plan ID.

Two, three, four, five, six, seven.

There are seven specific COIs within this A1 and I can use this feature here to show each one individually.

I continue to one of them which is this section here.

I can Zoom to a different one.

Which is that.

It's outlined in blue.

So it's the whole north shore including Chippewa.

I can show this one which is Menominee, Delta, and School craft.

This one is the western Section.

These are the ones that are all within that same cluster.

All right? So that's how that works.

You see I'm zooming around and isolating each one individually.

I'm going to hide that A1 and I'm going to show you the A2.

And this A2 should be the area that you're talking about with Sheboygan and Emmet -- Cheboygan and Emmett and I'll do the visibility in blue for contrast.

Okay.

So now you can see there's a lot of crisscross here.

And this is what you're used to with overlapping Communities of Interest.

And now I'm going to use that functionality to isolate each one.

So that's the feature selector in the software and the plan ID is what gives you each individual one.

So I can click on this one here and you can say, no, that's not the one I was looking for and I'll click on the next one and you can tell me if you're talking about the one that references Emmett and Cheboygan.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: The one I want to look at includes Cheboygan.

This one is useful because it's the whole -- sorry.

One up.

Nope.

I think we're good there.

And we have gone through this.

I just want to recognize that we have gone through this.

This one is the whole sort of upper tip of the mitten, so I'm acknowledging that we are going to split this.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: There may be others as well but this is one of them.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm trying to figure out we made a note in our log to add or discuss Cheboygan.

There are one or two to split the County but we do have Public Comment that the whole County is the shoreline and the whole County wanted to be included.

There is two here.

I guess it was 33828 and 36046.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: That's right.

That's one example of something you were talking about and this one is a little different.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Right.

And so I see Commissioner Witjes with.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to make a suggestion to add Cheboygan and take out -- it will offset.

>> What you're contemplating is using the filled District to the one that's filled in green and not the red outline which is in your other conflicting plan where you have a District that's more to the east? It's Mackinac, Chippewa and eastern Counties and in green and make an addition which is what Commissioner Witjes suggested.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think we're also working -- one of the things we're trying to do is not create a whole map.

We're merging version one and three and I think this green two is in version one. Is that also accurate?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: That's accurate.

That's in version one and as I said, that's the one in the system as a District as opposed to a layer.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Go ahead, Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I recall comment that's Cheboygan is more associated with the east coast and what Dustin just suggested pushes it in with the Counties on the west side.

So I think that's conflicting from what I heard people say from Cheboygan.

Not necessarily what the automated COI --

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We have had conflicting comments will Cheboygan. We have had some that said it goes with the east and we have had some saying it goes with the west.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: It feels like whatever we do at this situation will inform how we resolve other conflicts so it feels useful to navigate it, and whether we split it or not, yes.

John? Please.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: At this point you're deconflicting within the same Region as opposed to deconflicting the regional drafts that you did.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Say that one more time?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: These are alternate District footprints within the same Region.

You have version one and three whereas you're contemplating deconflicting between regions which you haven't gotten to yet.

Does that make sense you have two different versions within the same Region.

So you're talking about that and at a later point may have one plan in one Region and one plan in another that overlap.

So in that case you would be deconflicting Districts between regions which you haven't done yet.

You're not doing that yet.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

Everybody else? Okay.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Just to be clear as far as the regions go and we're not using them as the overlay but this is the UP and also the northeast and northwest. So there were three regions encompassed in this version of version one and version three essentially.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Agreed.

And the reason I'm proceeding with this.

I want this to be the end of my turn after this but what I want to do is use the change log. We said we want to look at this.

I do think we have Community of Interest that we're trying to resolve but we have populations as a first criteria and communities ever interest as a third criteria.

We have to be contiguous and the idea that we need to connect the upper and the lower peninsula at this point.

That we don't have -- sorry.

The last piece is that there's the tribes.

There was a piece about the tribes that felt important to me and the way that I looked at this time was trying to understand where the tribes are and not wanting to break up the tribes was that I looked at District.

In District there was a tribal government and it was in Cheboygan too but not the whole County.

In wanting to have this discussion, it's not a submitted COI.

The tribes, right? We haven't been able to understand exactly where they are.

You had it highlighted, John.

It sort of split Cheboygan and I wanted to understand where the split was or why the County was split that way.

25579.

I think it was a 33828.

Nope.

36046.

Yeah.

Trying to understand why -- yeah.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I'm going to look up the text field which is associated with this which might have information.

This is pre-submitted information.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm thinking about demographics, John. If we can get the non-Hispanic, white native population? I think that's the right.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So let's see.

I don't know if you want me to read this?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm happy to do that.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So it's not one highlighted.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Right.

This one didn't help me in terms of what -- yeah.

Why they drew the -- split the County.

Commissioner Lett do you have a question or comment?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I have a comment and I think Cynthia may have some information on this.

In my recollection in reading or hearing from Cheboygan was that they primarily did not go east because major population centers are in Charlevoix and Petoskey because of the hospitals and the -- et cetera -- am I wrong in that?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: That's what I recall too and they said this was a lot of association with Mackinaw City and Island.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And they use the bridge and easy pass to go over the bridge frequently.

I think we're splitting it if we keep them here with Cheboygan.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Especially if they want to go on the UP, they have to use the bridge.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Noted.

John is there any way you can help me why -- I appreciate you bringing up the description but that didn't help me understand the squiggly line.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I'm not sure if it's available here because these are consolidation of the text files.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: There were maps Kim Brace gave us early on with consensus data that shows pockets of native tribes and can that be an overlay, by chance? Can we have maps about that?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: That would be a separate step.

I do recall this part of our discussion so I'm recalling this for your benefit.

Two different discussions -- one being on the tribal boundaries and others and the other were concentrations of Native American population which was a separate issue where you might look at areas that have some of the population within them and not strictly on the tribal lands.

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: This is Mustafa Rasheed with the Department of State. If you con -- next to the COI you're referring to in the individual area Section northwest lower tourist and agriculture tourist economy -- not reflecting the true size of the population and that was submitted.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: 36046, that one?

>> MUSTAFA RASHEED: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: What I remember when we had the native population pulled up a couple of weeks ago or whenever that was, what comes to mind is it was different parts of the UP around Sue Saint Marie and the Emmett Township and in this case, we wouldn't be disturbing that.

>> There's no mention of this corresponding to any Native American populations. It was a different COI.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I recall the discussion on the Native Americans -- the map showed where their concentration was but it wasn't a very significant concentration taken into consideration recognized agreed.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Not a lot of population.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: What I was looking at in District was the reservation.

I was trying to minimize the amount of the disturbance of the reservation.

At this point I don't know.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Something else it also shows was that there was a greater population density on the east side of the state rather than the west side of the state. So what I keep coming back to is why have we decided today to put the eastern part of the UP along with the western side of the -- of northern Michigan instead of the eastern side if they both have a higher density of population of that community.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Which community?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: The Native American community.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Your memory is that the eastern side has a higher Native American population?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Than the western side.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I thought it was the exact opposite and I see a question or answer.

Commissioner Szetela has her hand raised?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: It's the opposite.

Emmett County is or where the native population is because that's where the Little Bay tribe is and there's more in Lenawee.

The eastern edge has a high population of Native Americans and that's where you have the Chippawa tribe and Emmett is where the native population is and then virtually none when you get to Cheboygan.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can we put that map up? I might be mistaken and I would like to know if I can.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I can share it.

John is that okay? You have your screen shared right now so I'm going to -- there we go.

Can you guys see that?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes, we can.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: To that's non-Hispanic native population.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: This is the map I was thinking about, Rebecca.

Thank you, this is great.

At this point adding Cheboygan to the tip of the mitt and the Second District -- trying to adjust the maps of version one and version three and trying to adjust them and I guess I'm just going to suggest that we take the whole County rather than a portion of it.

I don't have a reason to divide it and, again, it's because of the Public Comment and I do like the idea that Commissioner Witjes had of removing Kalkaska which is to keep the population together.

But I want to acknowledge that this is significantly adjusting version one or version three and, um, I guess I'll take a risk and say that's what I want to do and figure out how that works.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so we're back to adding Cheboygan County to the District two that's on the screen is what you're talking about?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes, but District two is not on the screen.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I'll share the screen again.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Before we do that let me go back to what Steve mentioned.

The people that use the hospitals and shopping on the west side.

I see Kalkaska in the same position over in Traverse City.

It's the same argument.

You're proposing taking Cheboygan and moving it to the screen and moving Kalkaska over to the orange.

It's the same argument so why make the change?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: The reason is it's -- the number of people in Kalkaska who have given Public Comment are not as high as people in Cheboygan. There's more of a shoreline feel and I like the idea we're not splitting the City of Mackinac.

There's a number of people with the shoreline feeling and that's the reason.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll buy.

MR. STPHAO: That.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Any other comments? We're working on version one and adjusting that, please.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Cheboygan County.

I'm going to show multiple Districts here.

I'm going to do the current and adjacent Districts.

Okay.

So because we have such a, a numerical between District two and District 38, I brought up the data view so you only see those two Districts.

So at the moment you see the population of District 38 and District 2 and at this point after we make this change, if you like it, you would probably consider renumbering it to 37.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

Thank you.

Committer Szetela, you're off mute.

Do you have something you want to share?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: No.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so again if you put all of Cheboygan in District 2, you're over by 10% and you're talking about teak Kalkaska out.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Correct.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so that District two would be over by 3.45 and the District 38 is under by 4.22 and to Commissioner Witjes' point between the twenty three, they're closer to a zero population balance.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I would like to leave at that time.

Do we need any rationale.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: We number for purposes of moving forward to 37.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm okay with that and I'm seeing thumbs up around the room.

Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I also want to mention because the blue line we have drawn for the Community of Interest -- to me it seems like we're taking more area of what would be encompassing of the blue line by adding Cheboygan and add be Kalkaska and I feel like we would be --

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you for that rationale.

Department of State were you able to capture that? Thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: One question that I have -- what was the COI number?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: There were two we were discussing.

Let me show them both so there's less consideration.

This is the one with the jagged boundary.

36046.

We have to find that other one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think it was the one above it.

33828.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Maybe.

Let me see.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Got it.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And so Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Just to add to those, there have been a lot of Public Comments on the portal just in the last week or maybe two weeks stating that as well. Just for the notes.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

It was the one above 33828 which has Cheboygan as you described.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Excellent.

Thank you.

So my turn is officially over.

Who is after Rothorn? Szetela maybe? How are you feeling Vice Chair Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry.

I was having problems getting off of mute.

I've had better moments.

Can you guys hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes.

Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: All right so just to confirm, the red line is the alternate map that we were drawing; is that right?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: That is correct.

We're calling it version three and now at this point we've -- we have 38 and 37 and this plan are filled in.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay but they're, like, way hinky on population.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Well, you've got -- again, in the version one plan we have a District four, three, and five.

And that's right.

The five is way off.

And -- one moment.

Yeah.

Four pretty close.

And three as drawn, three is fine.

But as we discussed before, drawing three this way, I seem to recall that Commissioner Lett wasn't satisfied with this version of District four when it was drawn.

I think.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

So what I want to do is adjust the borders between 37 and 38 so there is a little less deviation than they have right now.

So the way I want to do that is assign -- because it's oh 37 is over and 38 is under.

So I want to assign some from 37 back to 38.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes has his hand raised.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have a question of why that would be necessary as we're taking the population difference and it's basically bringing it down to close to -- not zero but we have one that's over and one that's under and it's equaling and balancing itself out.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We're within 2,000.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We're 2,000 off.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm seeing on my screen that we're over by 9,037 and under by 11,038 which is correct but if you add the two together the combined difference is 2,000.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Why not balance it out so there's not a large difference?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Because we can do that farther south.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: How?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: You're going to be able to push the districts now on the top and it will have a trickledown effect Commissioner Lange and Orton. Commissioner Lange first.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry I want to give everybody a heads up I just got a severe thunderstorm.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can you guys hear her?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I believe she was trying to say they just got a notice of a severe storm warning and evidenced by this k issue I think that's what Commissioner Lange was trying to tell us that her connection would be unpredictable/unstable and that is my best guess.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: That's what we're going to take.

Thank you, Commissioner Lange, if you can hear us that's what we're going to take it as.

Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: We left it this way when we originally made it because we were trying to keep the Native American population together as well as the shapes of these Townships and precincts made it very difficult to split and keep contiguous. So that's my recollection.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay but this map that we have right now is still carving off a significant portion of Schoolcraft so I don't know why you wouldn't balance it now. It doesn't make any sense to me that we're going to pick it up later.

We have two Districts next to each other that aren't balanced and there's no other place to pick it up and why about get them closer? Worth Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have a feeling it's definitely going across the Schoolcraft line.

Schoolcraft is whole in District 38.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We're not cutting off --

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Schoolcraft has a significant Indian population so you've already split it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: But Schoolcraft County is whole in District 38 so we're not splitting schoolcraft up at all.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not suggesting we should.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay so where are you looking to move? We fixed it and now we're going to go back and make more problems to me.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let me show you what I wanted to do and then maybe it will make sense.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

>> Just to remind our mapper, I think we log District 38.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I was going to say that but you're one step ahead of me. We had locked District 38 and we looked at District 37 and now we're revisiting District 38 and 37.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Right. Commissioner Szetela, take it away.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Unlock it first.

Unlock it first, obviously.

Oh it's still unlocked.

Okay.

So go to Mackinac.

Are the blue lines Townships?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: For example in Mackinac County -- all of the prosecute sinks --

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can you take those four -- actually, I think it's five.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So there's three and then you want these additional?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yep.

Could you just show the backs where it shows what the population is.

When you do the select box how it shows population numbers?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Select these.

It may not work.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You already assigned it.

It may not work.

Sorry.

Okay.

And then if you move into.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So if you move into the next County over and grab the upper bay, and the rural Counties underneath it, I want to see how much closer we can get to have them more balanced? Bay Mills and Chippewa and White Fish and whatever is underneath it.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Do you want this northern one White Fish first?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Select all of those because there's pretty well population. Yep.

That one, that one.

The one immediately below where you're at just to the left.

Right there.

And then the one just stepped below that.

Okay.

So now we're below 2% and then 37 -- I think you have to do that by blocks because it's tie today a wedge on the eastern side.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So you want me to assign the water --

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yep, the water.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not sure it won't let you reassign.

I don't know.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Sometimes working at the block level this is a problem that will come up.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let's say we know that's going into 38.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN more gone: Let me try the utility and see if I can assign it because it will show up a noncontiguous area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Noncontiguous.

Yeah.

>> So this is going to create another problem because the islands now in the water have to go manually adjusted.

I remember this being a difficulty before and I think this is one of the reasons why you looked at going a different way previously.

So now the discontinuities are showing the islands that would be associated with District 38 and I have to select the water area here.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: But once you select that water area, wouldn't that island be included any way or does it go farther down?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: As it stands now the island area is associated with District 38 so you have to choose which District the uninhabited island would be in and then there's an issue we discussed before about the islands being contiguous to the County they're contained in but since you split the County have to go in and contemplate each individual island, each individual water block.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so it's just that little island. Is there another one?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

There's at least two more islands we've seen before in this area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can you click on them so I can see where they're at.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So there's one that's assigned to District 38 as it stands now.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: What's the next one?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: The other one is here.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can you scroll out? Yep.

Zoom out.

Okay.

So they're right off of those two -- so then take those two back out.

Put them back to 32.

They were originally 37.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So you're contemplating keeping those islands with 37 instead of 38?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You're saying we can't reassign them to 38 because they're in the water.

Am I understanding correctly?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: They are assigned to 38.

It's the water that's in 37.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: What's the water tied to? That's what I'm trying to understand.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Probably a water block or several water blocks and we would have at that take a like at the hypothetical water boundaries.

In this case you would think of taking a portion of the water boundaries or island blocks into District 38 so that the islands are contiguous in terms of this plan.

So for example this water block is assigned to 38.

We would assign that to 38 potentially and then the surrounding water blocks, unless there's a conflict with the water block areas that creates a further discongruity.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You can reassign this one; is that right.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Depending on how it affects the other Districts.

I can try that.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so that one island we now have a small water who can that connects to the uninhabited island.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay but the next doesn't look like you have something similar; is that right?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so that water block appeared to take in a coastal boundary that is probably tied to a certain amount of distance from the coastline.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay and then it looks like that created a few more discontinuities.

Can you check it again? Look at the little guys.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Now there's 17.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can you select those and change them to 38 and see if that gets rid of the last one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has her hand raised.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Since these are zero population could we clean it up later and make a decision on our District?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: What do you think Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I don't have a problem with that.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I'm not concern that it will work.

It may work.

But I can't say whether at no time work in the manner we say it will work.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: The goal is to get closer to population because there's zeros.

More or less we have a rough number you can use to continue your experiment?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Right the point was to get 38 more full, so we have room in 37 in the lower penance to add and subtract if we need to.

Rather than having 10,000 shy in 38 and, you know, that was the point was just balancing more so that we're in a little more solid footing moving down because we're having to need it more farther down.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay and how are you feeling -- go ahead.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: So can you zoom out a second, John, so I can see kind of where we're at? Okay.

Zoom out a little more.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark has his hand raised to.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand your objective, Rebecca but we still have a difference of 2,000 which is what we started can.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: It was 10,000.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Commissioner Clark is correct.

The cumulative.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: The cumulative, yeah.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: We were already in compliance and now we broke up more things to get closer to zero.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: And that's a bad thing because?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: It doesn't matter.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: You don't think it matters.

I would rather have them be closer to together so we're closer to one person, one vote.

You may not think that matters.

I wouldn't have had us do it if I didn't think it mattered.

So we can agree to disagree that one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: The rationale to One Person One Vote is a reasonable rationale and we're making effort for that at this point and Commissioner Lange is back.

Welcome back.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Can we scroll into three and four a little bit.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Which way?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Zoom in so I can see better.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I'll zoom into District 37 first.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

And again the red lines are the alternative plan, right.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Yes.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: And the colored are -- I think this is plan three?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I can turn off the red lines for a moment if that helps.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: If you could, that would be helpful.

Okay.

And then we for four, that's the one where we're quite a bit under.

So can you -- yep.

Do what you're doing.

Number three we're under.

Number four we're under.

Could you put the labels back on for Counties? What would everyone think about pulling more from the center into four and making that part of that shoreline District? Anyone have any thoughts on that?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid and Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: From here with the change of having Cheboygan with and the rest of the western part of the state, I think if you combined three and four but took out Midland and Bay, that might be the only way to make the population work because right now three and four are both -- oh, actually three is okay.

But four is way short.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Uh-huh.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Four is not short.

Four is over.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Four is over.

Three is under.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What am I looking at that's way under?

Oh, five.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: It was left incomplete.

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton gave a thumbs up.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I was identifying that four was under.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: We're trying to create two shoreline Districts and we don't have the population for it.

The one on the Huron side, if you pull into Bay City, you're separating Saginaw.

If you pull off day city and Midland and Saginaw and fold in -- and Alpina into those central counties, I don't know.

I think that might make more sense than the way we have it.

This is what Steve wasn't happy with before.

We don't really have the population to make that coastal District without pulling from the center or getting into the bay area.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Agreed and I remember that you're doing it in the house Districts -- trying to attempt the shoreline District in the house Districts seems to make more sense to try to do it in the Senate District.

We did do it in 37.

We've got sort of that -- or that was the rationale with adding Cheboygan and taking out Sha -- it's more difficult to do shoreline at the house level and keep the population couldn't ambiguity and respecting COIs here at the Senate seems like an important way to go.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Let's try this.

District four, done.

Can we take off Midland and Bay Counties.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Commissioner Szetela, you're moving onto another District?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, unless someone else -- well, we can let someone else have their turn, actually, if you want.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Are you satisfied Commissioner Szetela?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm satisfied-ish.

I wouldn't say I'm satisfied but I'm satisfied-ish.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

Please note the ish in the log.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: [Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: [Laughter]

Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I would like to request a break before we move on.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Hearing no objections and a little bit of auditory praise, I will -- and I see our director secretary of state, Sarah?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yeah.

Just for the record, Commissioner or Chairperson Kellom had to restart her computer so she is not currently on.

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

Then hearing no objection, I believe we can recess for 10, 15 minutes.

For 15 minutes which means we will be back here at 2:20, please test, test.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I call this meeting of the Michigan Citizen's Redistricting Commission back to order at 2:20 p.m.

Will Michigan Department of State please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Certainly.

Please state you're attending remotely by disclosing locate.

Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Anthony Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Brittini Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present, attending remotely from Reed County Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Rhonda Lange.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Steve Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Cynthia Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: M.C. Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Rebecca Szetela.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Janice Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Erin Wagner.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present.

>> Sorry, Commissioner Wagner go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Attending remotely from -- Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Richard Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Dustin Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.

>> MS. SARAH RINEHARDT: Eleven Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you so much.

Go ahead, General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I apologize if Vice Chair Szetela can share location for public record.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry about that.

Attending --

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I believe Vice Chair Szetela had finished her turn and Commissioner Rothhorn was continuing the facilitation of this part of the mapping process and as reconciling with Mackinac area that's we've already drawn and I believe the next Commissioner -- Commissioner Rothhorn, correct me if I'm wrong, would be Janice Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We have Commissioner Clark would like to speak.

Sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thanks.

I want to go back to what Rebecca had proposed for the UP.

I felt by looking at that, that my preference would be the original.

Prior to the modifications and the reasons being that all of a sudden, we began splitting up Counties up north, up in the UP.

And that is one of the criteria that we have to consider is keeping the Counties together and the cities together and so forth.

And population wise, it was kind of a net zero as far as the differences between the two scenarios.

So I just wanted to for the record say that my preference is to go back to the original.

I yield.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I also prefer the original, mostly because when we did it the first time, we looked at the Native American population and felt that that was good. I do like it to be less deviation, but it seemed like we did that for a reason and I felt comfortable with that.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Can we bring those back up so we know what we're looking at.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I need just a moment.

I'm backing up what we've done so far.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

And I'll just offer one of the reasons I thought it was useful to go through what Commissioner Szetela was going to was I do think we are -- part of me knows that we should be parting in the Detroit Southwest Michigan area.

There is a lot of population and complexity, the more closely we are up on top here in the top, the closer we are to zero, that was my understand being and correct me if I'm wrong Commissioner Szetela -- the closer we are to zero at the top the more likely we are to be at zero closer to the bottom -- I mean the Detroit area.

We're hampered by not having this data available to us.

We are trying to use our time well and we have a certain number of days, so we're trying to use today and tomorrow to produce these Senate maps but we're not able to start where we potentially have a lot of deviation that we can expect so you're trying to get closer to zero where we have a population that's easy to change.

Is that an accurate reflection or am I just making stuff.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Are you asking me to speak MC?

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I'm not super concerned beside splitting up Counties. That's one of the last criteria we have and One Person One Vote is well before that and is a first criteria.

I think it's difficult to go through 38 Districts and have to go back up and adjust.

I would rather get the top ones balanced rather than coming back and redrawing every single District line and I think that makes sense but whatever.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Those are the comments I've had before when we've had concern about deviation and this is my personal style of work -- I would rather correct something in the moment when we have the opportunity as opposed -- especially, since we have a significant work to do and we'll have to redo many things, I would rather not redo something if we can help it and as well with the concern for the Detroit Metro area.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I would just add to that that there just seems to be this ongoing focus on not breaking up the Township or municipality, that isn't even a requirement.

There's a suggestion on six that we consider Township lines, but it's so low down on our list it should not be a driving factor.

It seems like we keep wanting to revert that that as a driving factor and it didn't make sense to me because it's not a high priority at all.

It's not a priority to begin with, because it's not a constitutional criteria.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Commissioner Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I agree it's not a constitutional area.

The way I look at it, it is a requirement coming out of the Public Hearings that we have. We hear a lot about keeping cities and counties and look at it as a COI issue and not a constitutional issue.

When I look at our original map of the UP and the one you drew, the difference in population is net zero between the two maps.

About 2,000 difference in one map and about 2,000 in the other.

So I don't see where we adjusted the total population for this area of the state to help us when we get further south.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: While I still have power, I'm going to say the same thing that Doug just said.

We've had a locality of Public Comment when referring to their Communities of Interest that have said their Township is and their County is and I do think that to some extent

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 do have to take that into consideration to maintain that as much as possible for the areas they said that time secondly, I'm getting worried again.

Kind of like Cynthia stated last week, even with this updated process, we're taking way too long in my opinion and I know we're trying to be thorough, but we've basically done two Districts in the time that we've been on and I'm concerned with this process and how slowly it's going.

So just wanted to voice that.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thanks, Commissioner Lange.

All right.

We're going to leave it there and Commissioner -- let's see.

It would be is it Weiss? Wagner? No.

Vallette.

Apologizes.

Commissioner Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: I would like to gain more understanding of this and continue to observe so I'm passing.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Vallette.

Now we're moving onto Commissioner Weiss.

No.

Wagner; is that right?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes, Commissioner Rothorn. Commissioner Wagner is next.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: It is right, however I have major internet issues and I am not tracking -- my Zoom keeps locking up so I would be passing because it won't make any sense for me to add to this when I don't see an accurate picture.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you, Commissioner Wagner.

Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I guess my question is do you have your pencils and erasers still?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange has her hand raised.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm sorry.

Can someone tell me what the 37 in the corner of 38 is so I'm clear on what's going on with the map?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'll do my best.

That was the adjustment from Commissioner Szetela in order to get closer to the One Person One Vote and try to get the population for District 38 closer to the, I guess the zero deviation.

Is that --

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That works.

Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Uh-huh.

Pencils and erasers are ready, Commissioner Weiss.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: To be clear.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: There is a District three and four in the plan as a basis to adjust from or make a new District.

Whatever you would like.

Weiss, I guess I would like to try to fix District four if possible.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: District four is over by about 14,000 and these are the Counties in it.

Presque 13, Alpena, 28, Alcona 10.

>> Commissioner Weiss: Let's take out Midland first and see what happens.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I'm going to unassign Midland from District four.

>> Committer Weiss: Yes.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: And now it's down by 69,000.

>> Commissioner Weiss.

How about if we take Tuscola County and add that in there? It's in the thumb there.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay.

Sure.

Spark Commissioner Weiss.

It looks like we're down a little bit yet.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: 15,000.

>> Commissioner Weiss: What about if we go into Huron County and start picking uptown ships next to Tuscola there starting at the west side.

And then take it right up the coast.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Up towards Port Austin?

>> Commissioner Weiss: Yes.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so.

>> Commissioner Weiss: Let's take in Windsor and Brookfield.

How about if we go straight up there total -- yes, right there.

Add them in.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Let's come down to the next row of four there.

Straight up.

Yes.

To the left there.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: You're under by about 6,000.

Grant and Oliver would be the next two?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes, and then go straight up.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark has a question or comment.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Richard?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Taking this approach we're locking ourselves in the thumb.

There's limited population in the thumb and the thumb looks at itself as its own entity. One of the suggestions I have is merge three and four and take that bottom row on three out and get rid of Bay City and Midland, the high population areas and see if you can create one District out of those two.

That's just a suggestion.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm seeing some nodding heads around the room.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yeah.

Let's give that a try.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So the summary from Commissioner Clark were take out the portions of the thumb and in addition take out Bay County?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: That's what you were talking about isn't it, Doug?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Bay County and Midland.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Midland was all right out.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: And even the County above Bay and the four in the orange below, the bottom four in three.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Commissioner Eid's hand and then Commissioner Lange.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's just my suggestion, Richard.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so I took those out for the moment.

So now you're looking at three as drawn as on the money and portion of four is only 35% of the District so you were contemplating taking out the lower tier.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct and add the Counties along the upper lake shore.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange is trying to get in here.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: This is my Region and this is my area.

If you're combining three and four, they have nothing in common with the shorelines on either side of the state and we've actually had Public Comment about the areas such as Claire Gladwin, Mecosta, Isabella, Midland, Misaki and keeping those in and we've had Public Comments and conversation -- the water sheet and Pine River and Muskegon river which flow into that and I think we need to take into account that also.

I'm just telling you, you're going to have unhappy people if you combine three and four and that comes from somebody who lives in this area and has read, although limited, the input in there.

It's getting so far out of the way.

I would try and keep those central, central, if you can.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thanks Commissioner Lange.

I see John's hand and I know Commissioner Eid wanted to jump in here too.
John.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: If you roll back to the original configuration that included Midland and Bay, that District wasn't far off.

If you move back for the purposes of thinking about it again you might find you can move one County or a portion of the County between three and four rather than add to four as much as you did.

That's just an option.

>> Are you suggesting going back and putting Bay and Midland back in general?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Reverting to your original starting point and then if you wanted to combine three and four or not combine three and four, you'll at least be starting from the same place.

So just to bring things back to where you were and then take a fresh approach or make an adjustment.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton has her hand up but I know Commissioner Eid also wanted to get in.
Identity.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: My issue is four is it's close to what we have in place and we had specific comment to someone from Midland and said you know Presque Isle is over a hundred miles north to me and I don't know how wise it would be to have a District that goes all the way from Presque Isle down to the Bay and Midland and we heard comments of Bay being more similar to Saginaw and I don't like the idea of going into the thumb.

So I would be more in favor of taking some off of the bottom of three, Lake Counties and all the ones -- taking that out and just adding the right side of the state to it.

Um, but I hear what Commissioner Lange is saying too, in that they might not have as much in common with each other.

So I'm just kind of wrestling between those, you know? That might be something we're able to address more in the house Districts.

The problem we're running into is because of the geography of Michigan it's going to be hard to recognize all of these.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton and Commissioner Szetela.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I agree when doghouse Districts it may be better to include some of the Communities of Interest.

I want today ask Commissioner Lange, I guess, because like Commissioner Eid said, due to the geography, we can't keep the whole middle group together and we have nowhere to go on the outside.

What about -- I remember the Public Comments about some of these Counties, but I don't remember about Montgomery, Muscoda and the one below it? I can't read it.

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Oguma.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Would those with what is currently in District four be possible?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Ogemaw with District four would definitely make more sense if that's what you're asking, as far as joining those with District four.

Yes, that would make more sense.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: What about adding Otsego into that mix Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: That might be more of a Commissioner Lett question. That's getting up in his area so I'm not completely familiar with Otsego.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: I have to try something here.

Zoom in on Midland County a little bit and taking a look at the four Townships above that.

That are right next to District three.

In.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: District four is over by 14,000 and taking away from District four.

>> And adding them to three.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Or leave them unassigned and not adding to three or if you're talking about these and adding to three.

>> Yes, see what their population is there.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: 4,000 plus 3,000 is 7,000 and that will split the difference and bring you to 3% over on four.

>> Let's try that.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: While you're doing that, John, let me make a comment.

As we move forward south, particularly on the east side of the state, all of a sudden, we hit the industrial area.

Midland, Bay City, Saginaw.

Almost immediately from rural to industrial and I remember when we were in Midland, we got a lot of fortunate comment to see keep Midland and Bay City and Saginaw together and I do remember that and what bothers me the most is the split from rural to industrial. That's the second industrial area in the state, the biggest one being down in Detroit.

I just want to throw that out.

>> Looks like we followed deviation.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: That's right 2% over in District four and it's only half a percentage over 1,300 in District three.

>> Unless someone has suggestions, I guess I would leave it that way.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm just going to come back to what other people have said, Richard.

Anthony and Doug said it having Midland and Prescott together.

Adding the top Counties in three and two, four moving to Midland area because of what Doug just said and trying that, may be the quote unquote better idea.

I don't know if it's better but feels like it might represent better.

>> The top Section of District four, that County -- how many is in that County?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: About 12,000, if you're talking about Pres.

>> If we were to add that to three? Sound like a good idea?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: That wasn't my suggestion.

>> Where would you like me to put it?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Sorry.

What I was trying to do, Richard, was summarize some of the comment that's Anthony and Doug both said and I think Rhonda.

Rhonda, do you want to try to summarize it? Is that why your hand is up? Along I was going to make a suggestion.

I would suggest possibly adding to District 3 Mecosta, Isabella, and Grestie and we had Public Comment about that and taking off ones that are close to Lake Shore like you were considering.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Taking off Otsego and --

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm not sure what the population deviation would be by doing that and my other input in it is when you're getting into the Bay Midland Saginaw - we had repeat Public Comment about them but we had Public Comment about keeping Midland County with the Midland one and we have conflicting input and as this sits with four, you're leaving out Saginaw.

I don't necessarily know the answer.

I would add some of those top ones in three to four and I would add some of the southern ones underneath three to three.

That would be my suggestion.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Go ahead, Richard, if you want.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I'm thinking.

I know I have seen comments and I went through some of mine and there was people wanting Midland to be by itself and not bay and Saginaw and then I see other comments with not three altogether.

I'm not sure what I want to do here.

How about some help?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSINER EID: What you could do here and we kind of reflected this in the house map a little bit adequate with the County of Grand Traverse is it does kind of get into 37.

We've heard a big difference between the north part of grand Traverse than the southern part of grand Travers that associates more with what we have in District three. It is split be that County but we can go a little bit into grand Travers and to make up for that population, put a little bit more of 37 along Benzie possibly and that way you could - you might not have to get into Midland at all.

I don't know.

This is a tough one.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Richard, you were asking for help. And Rhonda, yeah, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just to let you guys know, the Public Comment about the watersheds for this area, I did a little bit of research on it.

Particular rivers that were mentioned was Muskegon River and all attributed to - Mecosta, Isabella-- Claire and Osceola and I mean if you look at that Community of Interest, again, that's moving it farther down.

So grown that helps but I'm kind of add amount about that Section three I just feels goes too high and you need to add some into four.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I hear what you're saying Commissioner Lange. But another thing we can did is put three with four and have a District five that includes - Osceola and Newago and Montcalm -- I don't think it's going to work on population -- it would work.

There is enough population to put three with four and then make a District five or whatever we're calling it.

It would be 35 at that point.

You can put -- and Montcalm in its own drift that would respect the watershed areas you were speaking of.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't think District four should go that far south. Try taking O -- Midland and grab ones from three and put it into four.

Ogemaw and Muscoda.

And put that in four and take away the bottom ones Bay and Midland and one that Harts and Arenac I can't see.

Arenac.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss, you're asking for help. Is that okay?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Go for it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I don't think that District should go that far south.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Commissioner Witjes are you making suggestions on behalf of Commissioner Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Go ahead, Dustin.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I guess I have the go ahead.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Talking about these three counties and adding four from three.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yep.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay so now four is overpopulated by about 40,000.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So let's get rid of Arenac Bay and Midland Counties.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Okay.

That will be considerably more but I understand what you're doing.

Let's do one at a time here.

Midland and that will also take that tier of Counties out of three.

Tier of Townships out of three as well.

So that's just with Midland and you still have Bay in the District four and now it's under populated in District four, including Bay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay.

Continue to take those Bay and Arenac out.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Bay out and Arenac.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Anyone having any thoughts about taking District four and moving it into three going to the Southwest? This might be one for you to come in at Rhonda.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: When you say to the Southwest, what are you talking? Gladwin?

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Sounds like basically combining three and four again.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Combining three and four and taking the northern Districts of -- let's be so, the top three.

Crawford and the two that are one to the north and one to the west of Crawford.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I would say go into Kalkaska.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I would say try that but I would caution going too far south because the areas are so different.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's what I was trying to do.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: The northern I can see but I'm not from that area so I couldn't say completely what those areas are like but it would make more.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: So as Otsego and Crawford and Ros Common?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: And Kalkaska.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: At this point District four needs 90,000 people.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There are 33, 15, 23, there are about 90,000 if you have weather conditions burg and Missaukee and weather conditions Ford.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Commissioner Richards are you wanting me to take?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Arenac is closer.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Now you may look at Arenac because you're 21,000 off, but if you put that in you would be close.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That would be a way to work with Bay and Midland and Saginaw County as well.

>> MR. JOHN MORGAN: Here is the population of four and three is only 35% of a populated District now and five is a partial District.

>> I like that much better.

It makes more sense. We just have to fix three and five then.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And this is where I think Commissioner Lange's - you know, yeah.

How do we keep three, that rural center, yeah.

That's where we're challenged, right? And I see Rebecca -- I keep.

I'm just going to call you Rebecca.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: That's okay.

I was going to say for this Senate map maybe we can't because the populations are not there.

Maybe we can't get a rural District for the Senate.

We're trying really hard to make something fit, but I don't know that it's going to fit.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Wouldn't Osceola and Clare and -- my understanding is those are rural and we could do those if you want a rural District and I think that's what we have now and I think that's what it's going to come -- probably what's going to come next.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I wonder if it's time to cap it off with Commissioner Weiss and move it on.

Do we need rationale?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I have a couple of questions for you.

As you engage in editing these into their final draft state, I'll have more questions.

Commissioner Weiss and Witjes, could you provide changes in terms of the shape we see? I did not like District four to start with because it did go down too far south.

Did you say tin suggested it looks better and different and the only thing is whether we have trouble now trying to fix District three up.

Just looking at my notes and talking about Isabella and that and I think it was Commissioner Eid that said something about adding those in.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Witjes, do you have additional information?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I do not.

I echo what Commissioner Weiss said.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: How did you consider COIs when adjusting this District?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Well I guess I didn't get a whole lot other than I understand rural areas and keeping them in and then the shoreline, not going too far south.

I guess that's about all I can come up with on that.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I may have for you there, Commissioner Weiss, if you would like.

I'm almost certain when we were looking at the UP and discuss Cheboygan there was a COI that was a District and cut us off.

It was one of the bottom two and it looks like in cluster A2.

And even A3 but when we looked at cluster A2 I'm almost certain it cut off at that line and that may help provide a rationale there if I'm correct, at the bottom of the --

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you and my final question relates to the same criteria.

Constitutional criteria, how did you take the state's diverse populations into account into this District?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I guess it I would look at it, it's more the upper peninsula, farmer area.

Coastline.

A little bit different than being in Saginaw, Midland, and Bay area.

Different type of a rural area.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Are we good, Sarah?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: General Counsel, do you have any additional clarification?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you.

Yes.

So I know when we're speaking, the Commission has been considers COIs throughout the process and discussing them.

Throughout this process.

I did want to again distinguish between the third criteria, Communities of Interest, and the characteristics that they show.

I know the topic of City, County Township boundaries particularly for larger political boundaries like counties, that much of the public heard is keep the County together as distinguished comment about bonds the community shares and different things like that. I would encourage the Commission to view them absented additional supporting data supporting the designation of the community interests that those criteria be manifested separately as they are in the constitutional criteria list.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think we are good and I saw Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just to add to that to it might help you Sarah. From a COI perspective one of the things we constantly heard was keep Midland Bay City Saginaw together. So I look at that as a COI either it may or may not be written in the tool. And we adhere to that by doing the District this way. The other comment I had was from the previous question, we originally started going down the coastline trying to keep the coastline intact. But what we saw was happening is we got too far into the thumb and the thumb is more or less a region of its own. And so we backed off of that. And took another approach. So those two comments to help you out.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton then Eid then General Counsel?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn. I know that the distinction again on the as far as the diverse population of the state is as distinct from communities of interest and those diverse populations self identifying or being identified again by the racial or census data or the ACS data and other data that the Commission has in front of them would again be separate and distinct from both the communities of interest as well as compliance with the Voting Rights Act. Again I know in Ann Arbor I mentioned that you may have minority communities whose numbers are not sufficient or who do not necessarily the numbers are not sufficient enough for a racial bloc voting analysis that was performed by Dr. Handley. But that they are present in that community and could be maintained under the third criteria.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you General Counsel Commissioner Orton then Commissioner Eid.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: So two things. The comment I was going to make just to support the use of communities of interest for the record is we have had a lot of comments about the sunrise coast which I assume is that right there that we did. Keeping that together. But what General Counsel just said brings up a good point that I thought this weekend as I was contemplating this I thought maybe we should have a discussion about or at least I just need clarification I guess in the third criteria when it says to reflect the diverse population it sound like General Counsel you're saying that that is racial. I wasn't thinking of diverse population as racial. I was thinking of it as farming and lakeshore and things like that.

So what is it? Or do we decide?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Certainly the Commission decides.

It can be racial.

Again, as long as race is not the predominant factor in redistricting.

Either under a voting rights analysis or a community of interest analysis.

It could be kind of by virtue of location as you were indicating, you know, center, state, farming community versus the shoreline community.

Not versus it's not the word that I meant to select.

As distinguished from ashore line community of interest.

So hopefully that's helpful.

It can be a minority community, again, I think there are some that Dr. Handley found that there were no Hispanic or Asian populations that were sufficient in number to under take a bloc racial bloc voting analysis so those communities as they are apparent in your data you can take that under consideration with all the other factors that you're taking into consideration.

Just not would be the primary driving factor.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: It's the speed limit but not the driver
Commissioner Lett and I did say Commissioner Eid first then Commissioner Lett unless you have a direct.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would caution against confusing population with geography.

So if you're talking about urban to me that's geography.

You're talking about rural that's geography.

If you are talking about farmers, that's a population.

You are talking about City dwellers that is a population.

If you are talking about polish that is a population.

So diverse population is the people in the state, not to be confused with different geographical areas which obviously we are taking into consideration now when we are drawing the counties and using Townships, et cetera, those are all geographical if that is helpful.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.
Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So two things to clarify my understanding.
The first is I would like us to have a larger discussion on the first thing that General Counsel said about what communities of interest are and aren't as it pertains to counties versus townships.
Because I think she made a great point and please correct me I do not want to put words in your mouth but you know when people came to us and said yeah my specific Township has these values and are similar to this Township that could be a community of interest.

But I'm not sure if just saying my whole county is a community of interest, you know, meets the criteria that's been established.

So I think and I think it would be helpful if we had a discussion about that.

Because it's something that we keep coming back to over and over.

And the second thing is do we have to justify diversity when we are working in a part of the state that honestly doesn't have that much diversity? I think that is a little kind of an elephant in the room here.

You look at District 4 and look at most of northern Michigan I mean it's you can look out 3, 4 and 5 it's 91% white, 93% white and 88% white so there isn't much diversity up there unfortunately and I think that's just how it is.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Commissioner Lange and Chair Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Let's get back to the diversity.

We just heard that diversity is not necessarily race.

So to sit there and say there is not a diverse population within Northern Michigan I think some people may take that a little offensively.

Diversity can be so many different things.

It's not just -- based on race.

It was just said it can be a farm community, it can be diverse.

Our job is to define what is diverse but to say there is no diversity in the area because 96% is white that is a little shallow.

I think we need to voice things a little bit better.

And I'm not trying to start a thing.

But I think when we look -- diversity could be LGBTQ.

So I mean, I think we need to be a little more open minded when it comes to the category of diversity.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett and Chair Kellom had her hand up first.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I won't be labor the point Commissioner Lange said what I was essentially going to say in line of the conversation of what defines diversity and will also respond to what was said earlier regarding a Township, not necessarily or a County not necessarily being a community of interest.

And I think what folks in the community are trying to say is that there is a concentration of a similar interest in which they live, which speaking to Commissioner Lange and I's point of diversity, that makes them develop a sense of community that they want to protect.

So I think it's our job because we can't expect the public to know the lingo to use.

They are never going to catch up, we can't catch up to some of the things we have to learn.

So it's our job to do the research to see why these groups of people are calling this Township or this County a community of interest.

To that point, I would also caution us just because we hear the word urban and rural we also know that sometimes those labels can be context for other things.

So I just think that we have to think critically about some of these labels.

But not over do the conversation to the point where we are scared to make justifications and to that point I just wanted a clarification to make sure I'm tracking.

I believe that Sarah Reinhardt asked Commissioner Weiss a question regarding diverse populations in this District and I'm just trying to track how we have got to a discussion of our individual definitions of diversity just in the essence of time just to make sure I have an understanding of what this conversation is.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair person would it be helpful if I repeated the question?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes I thought the question was directed to either one or two people not to say everyone can't answer just asking.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sure, the question was: How did you consider reflection of the state's diverse populations, how did you take that into account when drawing this District?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Okay yes I understood correctly.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I don't disagree that there are more than what's listed on this matrix of white, Black, Asian, Hispanic and minority.

But I will go to our map drawers and say how can we drill down to see what's other, quote, communities of interest are out there that are not listed on this matrix.

>> I believe the information you are looking for is in the ACS American community survey so this may be a point you have heard but let me repeat this.

Originally the census had a long form and a short form so you actually had to answer all these questions if you were the one out of one hundred people or I don't remember I think it was one out of a hundred they had to answer all the long form questions which included information about ethnicity.

You know, do you have German heritage, do you have in the case of western Michigan we've heard a lot of discussion or a little bit about Dutch heritage being significant in western Michigan.

That is contained in the American community survey.

The change was the census decided to get that information using a sample survey where they use survey data you know, statistics to capture the same kind of information about the population.

So the ACS data can provide the ethnicity information and that is contained in this ACS data.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Do we have access to that? .

>> MR. MORGAN: My understanding is we do have access to that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So the question becomes how are we going to use it?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And this is where I think we are trying to wrap up Commissioner Weiss's piece and we will move on.

I don't know through the discussion have had -- have we captured enough detail to sort of create a justification? Getting a nodding head.

All right.

And I think that question that Commissioner Lett just offered is an excellent one for us to ponder, John? .

>> MR. MORGAN: Consistent with renumbering District 38 and 37 you might want to renumber this as District 36 if we are counting backwards.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Weiss, how do you feel about that?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I don't think that is a problem. I think we can redistrict as we go down the numbers.

I mean I'm looking at the old map and that's kind of what you know from the Senate and it's kind of where they started.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you Mr. Morgan. Put the pencils and erasers away right Mr. Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Not yet.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: All right tell us when you are ready.

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: I'm not the only one that may need the erasers.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We may be moving on to Mr. Witjes, I'm jumping around between Mr. And Commissioner and you all forgive me and just thank you for responding.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like it's stuck for just a moment.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Take your time.

Elevator privileges.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Just for the benefit of the viewing public it looks like Mr. Morgan is experiencing some computer issues so I think his computer froze up a little bit so we are just waiting for that to resolve and we will resume.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Without, well, should we take a five-minute break or are we okay? We got it.

We are all set.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay Commissioner Witjes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: There seems to be a problem with District 36.

I think Arenac was supposed to be in there.

>> MR. MORGAN: That's correct thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Nice catch.

>> MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

Okay.

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

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Flipped a coin and I lost, so I'm going with number three here.

So District 3 so Rhonda if you see anything that doesn't make sense feel free to let me know.

Can you grab the.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Witjes can you speak up just a bit.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I will take my mask off that usually helps.

Can you take Newaygo, Mecosta and Isabella Counties please and add that to three?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: In terms of diversity, Isabella has a large Indian reservation area.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Now I think we will start adding Townships underneath Mecosta so let's grab the right I'm sorry the leftmost four of Montcalm and then can you go back to the numbers here?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Dustin because one of the public comments we got was because of the Indian reservation Montcalm and Gratiot and central Michigan University was one of the places that sort of united it.

And had been a service area so to speak working together.

And so Newaygo and Oceana Commissioner Lange said are similar and lake County is associates more with the western Sunset District.

So that rural District maybe this maybe where you want to try to make that.

And I see Commissioner Lange's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was going to make a comment about Newaygo and says it does associate with Oceana.

I just in our portal recently there has been one that talked about Newaygo in Muskegon County associating together also.

So I'm kind of conflicted on that one.

And another question I wanted to ask is we received all of this comment about Midland basically the Bay Tri-Cities.

But we also received a lot of comment about keeping rural Midland with more rural areas.

I'm almost wondering I don't split, I try not to split as little as possible but it's necessary. If they are specifically talking about the City of Midland and Bay City and Saginaw, the specific cities there is probably enough there for District.

I'm wondering if we could cut Midland City out and add it to three, that way you're keeping your one that stuck out to me so much is like Wixom and Sanford talking about them still recovering from the flood and their District working together economically to recover from that.

So I'm trying to think of how you can incorporate what we heard from half the people at the public hearings and then the other half of the people.

Kind of like a compromise.

I wanted to know what the Commission's thoughts would be on that.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Well, let's try that.

If we were to take Newaygo and Gratiot and let's see where we end up and also the top four on the left of Montcalm. So all of Newaygo and the four I added in Montcalm, let's take those away.

>> MR. MORGAN: Hopefully just an undo command or two.

Okay that reflects where you were before Newaygo and part of Montcalm.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Perfect.

Let's grab the four, I'm sorry, the eight Townships that are to the west of Midland.

Yep, those four.

Sorry those eight.

All right Zoom out a little bit for me.

Let's grab Gratiot County directly to the south.

Okay so now we are 8,000 short.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Let's fill in the top little bit of Bay.

>> MR. MORGAN: Bay not Midland?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No, we are going to go Bay first.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, just a comment and Rhonda you may be able to help with this.

By doing this, we just set up Newaygo County to get associated with Kent County if you look at it otherwise you are blocking yourself in.

So if you don't agree with that happening, then we best revisit this.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We have to finish the shoreline District either so it could be associated with the shoreline.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: If you take Gibson Township, mount forest Penconning and Penconning Township let's see where we are at there.

Actually.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Dustin, can I recommend Gadsby Township because part of the Tittabawassee River there and we heard about the river or the watershed?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That works. And hoping mills...I wonder if we could leave Penconning out for now and include it with Bay and with Midland.

>> MR. MORGAN: So take out these towns of Bay?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: What do you think? .

>> MR. MORGAN: See what it looks like.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES:

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Did you hear the question Dustin?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No I did not.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want me to take out the three Townships?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm thinking.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I don't know if this helps you at all Dustin but I would suggest maybe taking lake out of it and then you can continue doing what you're doing. We heard from some of the other Commissioners that lake and Newaygo and Oceana might be able to go in that incomplete shoreline one and that might make what you are doing easier with population.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm at 610.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Rhonda, what is your opinion on lake? I don't see that lake goes to the cost -- coast.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Lake can go either way.

There are some areas once you get over towards the County line between Mason and lake they kind of go hand in hand.

But then again same thing can be said for Osceola County.

I have lake County literally a half mile down the road I think it is.

So it's very rural.

As far as like their main economics it's more of a tourist type thing secondary homes, cabins, things of that nature so I could see in that aspect it going with Mason County because Mason County with the shoreline you have a lot of secondary homes and they rely heavily on tourists.

Lake County is kind of the same.

But yet in the same aspect those that live there year around could relate to Osceola County so you could split it either way.

You can go Mason with lake or Osceola and think it would be a good fit either way for those.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think I'm going to leave this as is with the three at the top of Bay County for the same reason that we added a little bit of Midland.

I drive through that particular area when I tend to go to my cabin and it seems to be as soon as you get a little north of Bay City you are in the Woods.

So I think this is good for now.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I just want to ask Dustin when we are looking at shoreline now, would that one little Township that rides directly on the shoreline, would that be better associated with the next District that's drawn? Because it is a shoreline and they might have special you know like a lot of the other people on the shoreline talked about erosion of the beaches and stuff and they have kind of their own special being on the shore?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, that would make sense.

If we take that one little jut out, Penconning and I guess add the one in the lower left there.

Penconning and Penconning City.

I will take those out.

>> MR. MORGAN: You are within 1% right now with let's see these two Townships of Bay.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Right there.

Oh, no, I was going to keep that as is.

That should be fine.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I only have one question remaining that I didn't record enough detail on.

And that is how did you take into account reflection of the state's diverse populations when drawing this District?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES:

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Well one thing it pertains to lake County lake County has historically and currently a very heavily African/American resort community.

So we kept that together.

We did not split lake County.

And we kept lake Osceola, Clare, Gladwin, Mecosta, Isabella Midland and Gratiot looking for the rural populations on those.

Those would be the things that I would see and certainly Commissioner Witjes has his own opinion.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Works for me.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: There is a large Indian reservation in Isabella.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That is true and did you say Isabella then Gratiot.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We did not add Montcalm and I don't know about the reservation not the population but the reservation status in Montcalm but I do know the reservation in Isabella is significant.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Okay, with a team effort, does that team effort between us three kind of answer that question? Because I'm still having a real hard time trying to figure out how to answer that by myself.

>> CHAIR KELLUM: You can add Algae blooms and injection well z because there was a concern for natural resources with Isabella no Mecosta Clare and Gratiot so Dustin you have tons of justification if you want that too.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thumbs up over here thank you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry Commissioner Kellom what you mentioned was that submitted as a COI?

>> CHAIR KELLUM: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Okay because I usually ask the questions as distinct questions about COIs and diverse populations but I will add that as well to the COI.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That is what I was saying earlier.

Sometimes a COI comment can speak to the diversity in the area if that makes sense to you and the rest of the Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: The other thing to consider a community of interest in Mecosta, that's where Nestle is pulling out all the water from the County.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Actually Commissioner Lett they are pulling it out of Osceola over by Everett but their factory is in Mecosta County.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: All right, is there rationale ready? And Commissioner Witjes you are satisfied? All right, another satisfied-ish.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No, I flipped a coin, I was either going to go with five or three so I'm fine with this.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Would you like me to renumber this?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: While Mr. Morgan is renumbering that I just wanted to restate the questions I will be asking about the districts so that you can kind of think about them as we are going and I'll try to record as much as I can while you're drawing or reviewing districts.

So the first one is the classic why did you start where you started or why did you go where you went, why does the digit look the way it does or why did you make those changes.

So the second question would be how did you take communities of interest into account? And then also how did you take into account reflection of the state's diverse populations when drawing this District? Thanks.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thanks for that heads up.

We are on to Commissioner Clark once we have the redistrict or the District renumbered, the draft District I should say.

And Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: So let's take a look at number five.

And let's add Muskegon County to that and make it see what the number looks like. And I think it's going to be pretty close.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes it will, it will be very close.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That supports the whole lakeshore down through Muskegon.

And that was a big issue when we were in Muskegon.

So five is 9,000 over.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes and if you look at the cumulative deviation which you were considering earlier.

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

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: But then we still need to take into consideration the community of interest of Newaygo and Oceana County.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We do but let's take Newaygo for example, that is 50,000 people.

And then you take a look at Muskegon that is 175,000.

So I think the more logical thing is to follow the coast at this point.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: But we could look at diversity excuse me racial diversity in particular.

I think we have a significant population in Muskegon that may.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think it's south of the City.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Exactly the whole County may be different than taking portions of it with Newaygo and I see Commissioner Witjes' hand too.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I changed my mind.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay Commissioner Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Changed my mind.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I mean this is probably one of the few areas where we can have a Senate District represent the lake.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm not sure that Benzie to Muskegon.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I take that back you see it in Leelanau and see it on 36.

I take that statement back.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I agree with you.

I would agree that Muskegon up to Benzie would be fine as a Senate District based on the lakeshore.

I could think of just a couple of like tourist cities on the lakeshore that are going to be in this particular District here.

Muskegon being one.

Ludington.

I think Pentwater is over there.

So.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Within the Muskegon area?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: No keep going up north.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is all in that District.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: There is going to be a lot of tourist type of towns on the lakeshore from Muskegon County all the way up to Benzie.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Correct so I would like to keep this as is.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I think your question that you sort of asked yourself was where does Newaygo go. Is that also did I hear that correctly?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is why I brought that up when we were doing number 35.

You know, it's maybe one of those funny looking districts when you keep the rest of the rural areas together, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay and so before we call it good, I am just wondering if Rebecca, thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Wondering if John can change the view so we can see where we are at.

There we go, that is what I was looking for.

So this is five that we're looking at? What it's currently numbered? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes, just a moment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

I just couldn't see the statistics the way it was displayed.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I collapsed the data view so that it shows only the Districts that are drawn so far.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So we have.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I would make a suggestion though to get it closer to 0 deviation the right most three little L of Muskegon County, I would potentially take those out.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's unassign them at the moment.

Yeah I don't have a problem with that.

Guess you probably will need the population when we deal with Newaygo.

Yeah, now it's more reflective of the coast.

I agree Dustin.

So that leaves us still over by 2000.

Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: John? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: So would you like me to renumber this District?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, please.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Questions that Sarah is going to ask.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't remember the questions Sarah is going to ask you have to ask me one by one.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely so why did you make some of the changes that you made here?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I made the change because we had a District already there and it was under populated.

And the next District or next I'm sorry, next Township that was further south filled that void and kept us well almost perfect as far as numbers go.

So it was most logical thing to do.

And then it also supported the COI that we have heard.

All the public comments we have heard about having the lakeshore represented.

And this was one or this was an opportunity to have that done in the Senate.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And the final question how did you take into account reflection of the state's diverse populations?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well to me the diverse population was the lakeshore people and the values that the people living along the lake have compared to those living inland.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Sorry I mean within the District.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, within this District?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Boy, I could need a little help on this.

I mean basically what we were doing is focusing in on the people living along the lake and their economic concerns on the lakeshore, on the lakeshore community.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I see Commissioner Lange nodding her head.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: I will help you out a little Doug as far as diversity you have a wide range of people with different economics.

You have orchard farmers.

You have your industrial areas Mason County also.

You have your lakeshore areas, Muskegon County has their population, their African/American population living within it.

I think there is a broad base of diversity within those counties.

Manistee I'm not 100% positive but I think you might also have some Native American there is a reservation but there is a Native American tribal community within Manistee County also.

So I think you kind of got the diversity covered from economics to ethnicity covered.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you Rhonda.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay, so after Commissioner Clark we have Commissioner Eid I believe.

Is that true? Curry.

I apologize.

Yes, Commissioner Curry are you with us? Okay Mr. Morgan?

>> MR. MORGAN: So earlier I showed or talked about the idea of showing layers from previous regions that you've already done some work in.

This might be a good time to either take a short break to regroup or to show some of those layers.

Because now you are looking at going into either the west or the south central.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Excellent and we are scheduled to take a break or stop this mapping session at 4:40 so we have about an hour.

So the suggestion was to take a break to regroup.

Let's take ten minutes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I would like to see those overlays, I'm probably going to go to south central.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: I will bring the overlays up during the break.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Wonderful we are 3:48 and let's take ten minutes and come back at I guess it's 3:50 and we will come back at 4:00, please.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I call the meeting of the Michigan independent citizens redistricting back to order at 4:02 p.m.

Will MDOS please call the roll.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely Madam Chair.

Commissioners please say present when I call your name.

As usual if you are attending remotely please disclose your physical location and that you are attending remotely when I call your name.

I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK:

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Juanita Curry.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID:

Present.

Brittini Kellom?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Present.

Attending remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

Rhonda Lange?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE:

Present; attending from Reed City, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT:

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

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.

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?

Present attending we remotely from Wayne County Michigan.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE:

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin

Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER:

Present; attending remotely from
Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS:

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT:

Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES:

Present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: 12

Commissioners are present.

And there is a quorum.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt we are continuing on with new business and we are working through draft mapping reconciling the State Senate districts.

We left off with Commissioner aye and we will continue with him which is next in line for draft mapping.

So Commissioner Rothhorn, continue facilitating this part of the discussion and thank you so much for spearheading this.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: You are very welcome.

Thank you.

Commissioner Eid take it away.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we are at the areas where we already had different proposals earlier so EDS was going to display those overlays for us.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Okay so I have three overlays to show.

So here is one.

So this reflects some of the area that was in the central and south central.

This is the foot print of the areas that you had drawn previously.

And I will add another one.

And that's in blue.

This area in green is an area that you've drawn in the west area.

Including Grand Rapids.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That one is a little defunct now because of what we did today.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: That's right.

And now the red line is a different slightly different configuration than the west region. It just was in the extra District here.

So I just have those on.

And you are the districts drawn so far here, the five districts drawn.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There was I believe there was another one for the Lansing area.

Can you pull that up?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Would it make sense for us just to fill in the blue?

Since we came to consensus on that area a while back? And see where we end up? Or is that just way too farfetched of an idea? The map that we just looked at, the blue lines that had the Districts that we already drew came right up to where the green District ended.

So should we fill in the map with what has previously been drawn? And see where -- see how that would look so we can take care of one of the regions that we already drew.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Perhaps maybe we should review our process a little bit.

Yeah, and Mr. Morgan you are trying to.

>> MR. MORGAN: Trying to load the other one you were describing as well.

I think I have that handy.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Eid was going to ask for another map from the south central area, the Lansing area.

Commissioner Witjes was proposing a you know that we look at or fill in the area and I'm just wondering if maybe just to step back because we did map from the UP you know to where we are now.

And we had a version one and a version three map.

And I'm just wondering if we just in terms of trying to get to Commissioner Witjes' proposal, did we sort of we do we have one map now? Did we sort of blend those two versions? .

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Yes you did.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And we are going up to here great and that is now version three or that is just our version, that is our collaborative map.

So we will just call that is our collaborative map and I'm seeing nodding heads so Commissioner Witjes what you were suggesting was that we with our collaborative map sort of you sort of fill in and help our collaborative map become more full with the other parts is that what you were suggesting?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Somewhat.

Stupid mask.

What I was suggesting is since we have -- with the map that we just saw for a split second, it had blue lines which were districts that were already drawn at this particular point in time.

Well, now we have the purple too.

But the blue butts basically right to where the green stops.

So should we fill those districts in and potentially even the purple and do the blending like we were doing earlier in the north or no?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay excellent question.

I think, yeah, that is kind of where I think we are at.

And do we have, yeah, so how do we answer that question, John? Do we have multiple versions? Like is this one version, the blue line is this one version of the south central area.

>> MR. MORGAN: Looks like there are two versions and may be a third or a fourth version but these are the two I have handy right now.

Did you have a different one in mind? If so I can try to bring it up.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: There was one that had Eaton, Ingham, Clinton, and Shiawassee split up into two Senate Districts. And Clinton and Shiawassee included East Lansing and Ingham in a different district and included central Lansing. And we could fill that in and wouldn't mess with what we have done collaboratively. However, I'm also opening to starting in the Bay Area and going down and filling in the rest of the map or even starting with Newaygo and then filling in that part of the map.

I just thought it would be good to look at what we have drawn to try to consolidate it like how we have for the upper part of Michigan.

>> MR. MORGAN: Did you want me to put the western areas back on for Grand Rapids? That will be four and the Lansing one you are talking about I probably have to find that one.

I know what you are talking about though.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do you guys think? Should I fill in that Lansing area? Or should we go with Bay, Saginaw, Newaygo, that part?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Just flagging that Saginaw is one of the areas that will require closer attention and VRA considerations.

So it's scheduled for this Thursday when Mr. Adelson will be present.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'll try to answer that question Anthony. I love the idea that we would actually leave today and we only got about a half an hour left of mapping but the idea we would have sort of our draft maps with sort of draft numbers that reflect sort of a, yeah, an area.

So I do like the idea of filling it in.

And you know so I think what Dustin was suggesting yeah exactly which part.

So whatever part and whatever I guess because it's your turn Anthony right the idea that you would choose something to help us sort of consent around it.

That is I think if you have a feeling you know about which area to help fill in, that feels like a good way to go.

And I see Commissioner Lange's hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Just going to say I think it might be more productive if we carry on working from that northern area down.

Because we may have to cut in to some of these areas that were done in the blue and the pink to make a whole District.

>> MR. MORGAN: And to Commissioner Lange's point with these out lines, these layers on you have some idea of what you have already taken into account.

So that maybe you will see where you have cross over or where you have overlap I mean.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, so let's go with Newaygo then and we will go down from there.

>> MR. MORGAN: So I have the green and the red are the boundaries of some of the areas you previously considered.

And I'm going to change it from green to blue I think.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Numbers wise do you know how many so we have Ottawa County, Kent County, Ionia, Montcalm and Newaygo left in this area.

Do you know about how many Senate districts we can make out of that area? .

>> MR. MORGAN: I'll have Ken look at that as we are drawing but since this is all unassigned you could create a District of all those counties one time and you would have an idea of how many how much population is in there because none of it will effect what you have drawn.

So for example Newaygo Montcalm and Kent are enough for three districts but as you add other Districts in Ottawa it will change it up a little bit.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Newaygo Montcalm Ionia and Kent and that is 841 so you are looking at three and some districts.

>> MR. MORGAN: If you like I can do that on the screen here and it will just show you, you know, how many districts that would be in those multiple counties.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Sure.

>> MR. MORGAN: So those three that's enough for one whole District plus 192% of another so that is three.

And then you have Ottawa and you want Ionia as well? Ottawa and then you have a little bit that's unresolved there.

So that's three districts worth of population.

Plus you throw in that area and you would have to take something out on the edge but that is basically three districts.

If you go beyond that you would look at a fourth or a fifth.

And you can see how on the layers there is one, two, you know, three districts in that area but you also have the outer area that is not assigned.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay so let's combine Newaygo and Montcalm.

>> MR. MORGAN: Would you like me to use District 33 for this?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That sounds okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: At this point we have not -- we don't have any other preexisting districts.

Okay so that is 116.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's add Ionia to that.

Okay then let's take the rest of Muskegon County.

>> MR. MORGAN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Is that one Township is it in the County?

>> MR. MORGAN: No, that is in Ottawa County.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Interesting, hu, doesn't really matter for these purposes.

Interesting to point out, it's interesting how some of these County boundaries are drawn. Let's take that one County in Ottawa and the counties in northern Kent I'm sorry the Townships in northern Kent.

>> MR. MORGAN: The area that is in this Section?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes and you know let's take the ones that are outlined in the red line to kind of make it congruent with what we drew before and see if that works.

>> MR. MORGAN: It should work.

Pretty close.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So we need 26,000?

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's add those two, yep, right there.

Okay now we are down 11,000.

We are in the correct deviance but wondering if we can get it any lower.

Any advice where to go from here?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: If you are trying to keep it rural and sort of ex urban, yeah, Rockford is more like sort of a maybe Rockford may be a different character than Gratiot and Jen may be more of the same character.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I think if we do that it would put us probably around 3% or so.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So we also be getting a lot of public comment saying to try and blend them in some areas too rural and suburban areas to have the elected official have a foot in both areas so Rockford could definitely work.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Let's assign Rockford.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: From the conversations in Grand Rapids Rockford is really considered part of Grand Rapids or a suburb of Grand Rapids.

I would tend not to take that out of this.

And I would tend to go south most, those two Townships that John has got the pointer on.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Further south is Lowell and I have a memory and I think that is maybe where the line to that red line that we drew Lowell did not want to be associated with Grand Rapids area.

There was more rural.

I have a public comment, I'll try to find it if we need to but I'm pretty sure we got public comment in the portal as well as in person about Lowell.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's do Grattan and Lowell.

That is a little under 12000.

>> MR. MORGAN: You will be isolating Vergennes.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: No, let's take that as well.

>> MR. MORGAN: Got it and you want Lowell village?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> MR. MORGAN: But not Lowell Township.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Correct, well I really don't like splitting the village from the Township.

Hum, no, undo that.

I don't want to do that.

What if we just have Grattan and Vergennes where does that leave us?

>> MR. MORGAN: 1% 3,000 different.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do you think.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: If we take the Lowell Township we will be over. And we have a significant amount of under population in our other districts. So I think it would not be wrong to be over and within the limit, the deviation.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: If we add both that village and the Township how much over on the population would we be?

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: It will add 10,400.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: We will be out of the range necessarily.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: You will be under 4%.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay let's try it.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: Or around 4%.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: 2.8%, okay.

For now I think that's pretty good.

We are going to have to split Grand Rapids you know a few ways that is why I asked you all for the population numbers at the beginning.

Because this leaves us with what another at least two districts in the area.

>> MR. MORGAN: This spreadsheet shows cumulative deviation of the six districts drawn so far.

And that's by over populating the last one slightly.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Not bad, not bad everyone.

I think I'm good with this.

As far as rationale, I think it's -- it meets most of the rationale we said previously when we have drawn it.

It pretty much respects the lines that we've drawn in our first draft.

So I would have the same rationale as what was given for those.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Actually, in the previous draft where the red line kind of intersects in the middle it was to separate districts; is that correct?

>> MR. MORGAN: This is a different District than the previous draft that went all the way over here.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: So could you just provide any additional explanation about.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: So it's an I think it respects communities of interest and the fact that it is a more ex urban District around the greater City of Grand Rapids while still having some diversity as far as the population of the people in that District.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And can you elaborate on how you took into account reflection of the state's diverse populations when drawing this District?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I'm having a hard time knowing how to answer that question.

That is what I asked for clarification on earlier.

Does anyone want to help me on that?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Please repeat the question.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: How did you take into account reflection of the state's diverse populations when drawing this District?

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would say what we did was kept the diversity relatively constant.

In a rural sense.

And avoided the high density City that was close to that area.

Both Rockford and Grand Rapids and East Grand Rapids.

The whole Metro six.

We avoided that and kept the urban together.

>> MR. MORGAN: Commissioner Eid there is a small portion of Township contained within Rockford.

Did you want to put that in the District, the unassigned area around Rockford? It's one census block that is part of the Township out here.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Unassign it and we will put it with whatever we put Rockford with later.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: In terms of process I wonder if it's appropriate at this point as Commissioners do we want to make sure we do delegate that kind of cleanup to our consultants? Because we are going to try before the end of this week try to get as much as we can with this sort of cleanup.

If we can assume we will have some sort of list of the things that were cleaned up or some sort of like decision making that you can help us with at the end of the day.

But like if you all notice these things and bring it to our attention on the day after that could be something we agree on.

I see Commissioner Orton's hand.

Sorry John.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I think that would be great if we can do it for 0 population areas such as water and things like that.

But we don't need to I would think we wouldn't need to make a decision on 0 population.

>> MR. KENT STIGALL: We will not be assigning population. I won't be any way.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm challenged with because we have the differential assignment right so the census blocks may say 0 but we don't we can't be certain of that, is that true?

>> MR. MORGAN: So to answer that question there is not going to be another bit of information about that.

So they're not going to give you a different set of populations, statistics.

If for example in that there are in fact two people in that block.

I don't think that you're not going to get another information about that.

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

More likely they adjusted population you know, between adjacent blocks, nearby blocks then as you go up in the hierarchy of geography it will wash out.

So in this case you really don't have any way of knowing what's there.

The census doesn't provide that original data that they added noise in to.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: We can just assume it's 0 even though we know there is, yeah, potentially.

Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: We can assume it's 0 today but we are looking at a ten year plan.

So people could move into those areas.

>> MR. MORGAN: Yes but at this point you know you're just doing a legal description of it will be for example, the village of Rockford and then the portion of whatever the Township is.

You know, in that area.

It will have a legal description.

People are going to move all the time, yeah.

That does not really impact what you are doing here.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And I'll try to clarify the suggestion that I was making in terms of like cleaning up if there is population but you notice that it wasn't cleaned up or it needs to be cleaned up if you bring it to our attention the next day. Or whenever it's appropriate so we can go through a list, that may be efficient way for us to proceed.

>> MR. MORGAN: Generally we can try to do that for you, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Can you just Zoom out I'm following along on my device here.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: And Commissioner Szetela.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, I actually have to leave a little bit early today so I just wanted to let everybody know I'm heading out and I will see you guys tomorrow in person.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you.

Where are we are we waiting?

>> MR. MORGAN: Next Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: After Commissioner Eid is? Commissioner Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Do you all have a suggested place? Is there a consensus of where we should continue on?

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: There is actually Commissioner Chair Kellom forgive me it's 4:30 and there was a suggestion potentially to look at maybe taking a break here.

How do you feel about that?

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That is fine.

That is absolutely fine.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Okay.

>> MR. MORGAN: You mean a break from the mapping.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Not a recess but a break from the mapping I apologize.

To be clear, yes, to look at our next level of business so I would turn it back over to you Chair Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Rothorn.

Give me a second while I toggle between lots of things on my screen.

So thank you Commissioners for collaborating, for leaning into the process that we are still figuring out and getting some good work done.

As Commissioner Rothorn said, we are going to move on at this time and take a break from mapping.

And I believe we it would be a good idea to move on to agenda 7 we have two sets of minutes to approve today.

Are there any proposed edits to the minutes proposed for either the first or second set of minutes? I'm sorry hold on one second.

Are there any proposed edits to the proposed minutes, there we go, for either the first or second set of minutes for the meeting on August 26th? My apologies, that was a mouthful.

Any I don't hear any proposed edits, okay.

Is there a motion to approve the first set of minutes of the Commissioner meeting held on August 26, 2021 that began at 1:15 at Grand Traverse resort.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Lett and second made by Commissioner Witjes. All in favor of approving the MICRC meeting minutes, please signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes have it and those set of meetings, August 26, 2021 for Grand Traverse at 1:15 p.m. are approved.

May I have a motion to approve the minutes of the second Commission meeting held on August 26, 2021 beginning at 5:05 at Grand Traverse resort?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Lett.

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

>> Second.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. The second is made by Commissioner Lett. Excuse me.

All in favor of approving the MICRC second set of meeting minutes on August 26, 2021 signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

All opposed please raise your hand and say nay.

Moving on to staff reports for the benefit of those watching and listening however you are attending our meeting today there are no staff reports today.

MDOS report.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Chairperson Kellom Commissioner Lange it looks like your picture froze as you were voting on the last item can you verbally indicate your vote?

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yes, my vote was yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you.

Without objection I will ask Sarah Reinhardt from the Michigan Department of State if she has a report.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No reports.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: All right, so there is nothing to object to at this time.

There is no report from MDOS.

The correspondence has been received in advance for our meeting today.

And was provided along with written public comments to the Commissioners and our meeting materials.

It is my understanding that there are also no further or future agenda items to share at this time.

Are there any announcements? I see a hand.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Two hands, yep so Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Orton and then, yeah, Director Hammersmith.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah I just wanted to mention "The Washington Post" this weekend had an Article about Moon.

And the work that she is doing.

So I've got a copy of it.

And I'll get it over to Sue and she can get it distributed to people.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Thank you Commissioner Clark.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: And Commissioner Orton was that the other hand?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yeah.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I have a question about the up coming meetings the next few weeks and Monday we start at Noon and I understand because it takes time to

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.

set up the AV and Tuesdays we are starting at 10 and I remember Commissioner Szetela requested that.

But on Wednesdays it also says we are starting at 10:00 I wonder if there is a reason for that or if we could start at 9.

I feel we need as many hours as possible.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Can you take that Commissioner Kellom? Or do you want me to help facilitate? And I see Commissioner Lange's hand but I can't hear you Chair Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Sorry I'm having issues with my computer today. I see a hand from Commissioner Lange.

If there is a staff hand to address Commissioner Orton's question or a thought.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Yes Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: All of our meetings are starting at 10:00 in the morning because of Commissioner Szetela she requested that. That is when she can get to the meetings.

So that is why the 10:00 a.m. start time.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Another question from Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I don't know that we should be not doing the hours that we can just for one Commissioner.

If enough people can make it and she could join when she can, I just feel like I don't see how we can complete everything we need to without all the hours that we can get.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: I would have to I'll just say it plainly I'm going to defend Vice Chair Szetela like I would defend any of us because we don't know what schedules in life brings.

I would just caution us yes that is one Commissioner but this is a team and I think it matters for us to make those accommodations where we can.

And just thinking of our meetings I'm not sure that that hour will shift us particularly in any more of a productive what am I trying to say direction.

So I think a 10:00 start time is fine.

And for myself and my schedule.

I also appreciate a delayed start time.

Commissioner Lange has a hand.

>> COMMISSIONER LANGE: Yeah, I'm just going to say we were through this conversation weeks ago about this.

The whole Commission voted to approve the 10:00 a.m.

It was actually 9:00 a.m. and this was voted to approve and going back and forth is wish washing I need to stick to a schedule.

I've been rescheduling appointments left and right and need to stick to a schedule.

And I don't think an extra hour is going to matter and I hope I did not freeze during this because my computer has been weird.

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: We can hear you.

Your picture froze but your voice was clear.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: There are no other hands up in the room Chair Kellom.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay anything from staff regarding announce Ms and also Commissioner Orton's question feels like it's left hanging in the balance and I want to make sure there may not be a huge amount of clarity for the 9:00, 10:00 difference but I want to make sure you feel supported in the response that you heard.

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well I disagree.

I think we need as many hours as we can but whatever the majority of the Commission wants is what we do.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Director Hammersmith has her hand up.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Director Hammersmith please proceed.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I have another announcement if we are ready for that.

Okay, I've got a cheering Section beside me.

So we have been struggling with getting the shape files on the website in a timely manner.

There are lots of factors that have gone into this.

However, your staff feels that the most expedient way to get those shape files on the website is to open the my Districting tool that EDS has for posting the shape files so people can see what the Commission has worked on.

Otherwise it's taking two and three days.

It requires creating PDFs.

We have been meeting with DTMB and with MDOS staff.

And this seems to be the best resolution for getting the shape files up so the public can see them in a timely manner.

So the Commission is doing its job in the most transparent way possible.

So if I can use the terms without objection, we will go live on having the my Districting tool open for posting the maps.

What we would like though, and we can add this tomorrow as a conversation around do you want the public to be able to comment on these maps or only see them? So this has implications with another public comment tool that is up and running already.

So the question would be does the Commission want more than one public comment tool running? And we can have this discussion tomorrow.

But just wanted to make you alert to this and to think about it this evening to see what might be the best option and avenue for the Commission.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Mr. Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I think it's an excellent idea to have the conversation tomorrow.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Agreed I'm seeing a lot of nodding heads. It's announce Ms and we have one more announcement from our General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Commissioner Rothorn I cannot resist flagging for the Commission and the public that the responses to the local counsel RFP are expected tomorrow.

So hopefully tomorrow we will be able to provide an update on a number of proposals received to the Commission.

And I believe for purposes of the record, for the meeting approval, the approval of the meeting minutes I think I might be jumping ahead of the Chair on this one.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: That is fine go ahead General Counsel.

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

The Commissioner Lett had moved both motions and was supported by Commissioner Witjes.

I think that we just want to make sure the record was reflecting that.

Thank you so much Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Thank you General Counsel.

Sometimes their voices can merge into this kind of synchronicity so thank you for that. And thank you to Executive Director Sue Hammersmith for bringing that announcement regarding technology and integration, all those things.

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 WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Say it again.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES:

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Witjes moved.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes they both had a quick voice, second made by.

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Commissioner Rothorn.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Commissioner Rothorn thank you.

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

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Meeting is adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Thank you to staff, Commissioners interpreters and everyone who made today happen and all those watching.