

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.

ICRC

02/18/21 Meeting

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

>> Steve: Good morning, everybody.

As Chair of the Commission, I call this meeting to order of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission.

This Zoom Commission meeting is being live streamed to 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 MI to find the link for viewing on other platforms.

A live stream today includes closed captioning.

We have ASL interpretation available for this meeting.

If you would like easier viewing options for the ASL interpretation on your screen, please e-mail us at [redistricting@MI.gov](mailto:redistricting@MI.gov) and we will provide you with additional viewing options.

Similarly if you would like access to translation services during the meeting please e-mail us at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov) on details how to utilize language translation services available for this meeting.

Translation services are available for both Spanish and Arabic.

Please e-mail us and we will provide you with a unique link and call-in information.

This meeting is being recorded and will be available at [redistricting MI.org](http://redistricting MI.org) for viewing at a later date.

This meeting is also being transcribed and those transcriptions will be made available and posted on [redistricting Michigan.org](http://redistricting Michigan.org) along with written public comment submissions.

Members of the media who may have questions before, during or after the meeting should direct those questions to communications and outreach director Edward Woods III at Woods E3 at [Michigan.gov](http://Michigan.gov).

For purposes of the public record and for members of the public watching, I will now ask the Department of State staff to take note of the members of the Commission present.

Sally.

>> Sally: Good morning everyone Commissioners when I call your name if you could please unmute yourself and say present and the city or county you are attending remotely from that would be great.

Doug Clark.

>> Present, I'm attending remotely from Rochester Hills, Michigan.

>> Sally: Juanita Curry.

>> Present and I'm attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.  
>> Sally: Anthony Eid.  
>> Present attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.  
>> Sally: Brittini Kellom.  
>> Rhonda Lange.  
>> Present, attending remotely from Reed City.  
>> Sally: Steve Lett.  
>> Present and I'm attending from Lee County, Florida.  
>> Sally: Cynthia Orton.  
>> Present, attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.  
>> Sally: MC Rothhorn.  
>> Present, attending remotely from Lansing, Michigan.  
>> Sally: Rebecca Szetela.  
>> Present, attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.  
>> Sally: Janice Vallette.  
>> Present, attending remotely from Highland, Michigan.  
>> Sally: Erin Wagner.  
>> Present, attending remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.  
>> Richard Weiss.  
>> Present and attending remotely from Saginaw, Michigan.  
>> Sally: Dustin Witjes.  
>> Present; and I'm attending remotely from Ann Arbor, Michigan.  
>> Sally: There is a quorum present.  
>> Steve: Thank you we have 12 of the 13 Commissioners present and as Sally indicated that is a quorum.

At this time we would have public comment but I am informed that there are that no one has signed up for public comment but for those of you who may not have joined us previously, I have a few comments on how we conduct our public comment portion of these virtual meetings.

Because this is a virtual meeting members of the public have to sign in advance in order to address the Commission.

If you do sign up you will have two minutes to speak to us.

Public comment sign up links are posted on redistricting Michigan social media pages on Facebook and Twitter at redistricting MI.

And you can e-mail our office at [redistricting@Michigan.gov](mailto:redistricting@Michigan.gov).

If you would like to submit your thoughts or comments to the Commission you can do that at [redistricting.gov](http://redistricting.gov) and they will be provided to the Commission.

We will now move on to the agenda that everybody should have received. Are there any additions that we would like to add to the agenda at this time?  
Sue.

>> Sue: I don't have additions but I would like to -- I do want to mention that most recent update to the agenda that was sent last night added a third person to the California Commission panel and then we also want to remove in 13C the good marketing proposal.

>> Steve: So 13C will not be addressed today.

>> Sue: Parts of C will be however the good marketing proposal we want removed.

>> Steve: All right.

Anybody else have anything to add or delete or change?

Okay I would entertain a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

>> Anthony: So motioned.

>> Second.

>> Steve: Anthony and I saw Erin raise her hand as a second all in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

It is approved.

Okay, next is review of the previous minutes from February 11, 2021.

Are there any first off are there any corrections?

Okay the only thing I saw reading through them was on the 5th page under number four.

A couple of typos revised communications needs a Y make it policy and right below that procurement review needs to spell out policy.

Other than that, if we have no corrections, I would entertain a motion to adopt the minutes as presented MC motion, Doug second.

All in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

They are approved.

Any correspondence Sue that we need to discuss today?

>> Sue: There is no correspondence today.

>> Steve: So the public knows we did receive one correspondence that I will make some comment on.

So that people know that we really do read them.

And this one had to do with the communities of interest.

And this individual's thoughts on how to do mapping.

We are clearly under the constitutional amendment as to the things that we have to consider, and as such we will, in fact, consider those when we are doing our mapping as well as the voting rights act.

Executive director report, Sue.

>> Sue: Good morning again Commissioners.

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

And thank you for your continuing work to for fair nonpartisan redistricting provided for your discussion today are three resolutions one is for adopting the FOIA guidelines and procedures which is Freedom of Information Act.

Adopting a communication plan and also adopting the procurement review procedures and guidelines.

We are moving along with our process for selecting consultants. The internal staff committee met yesterday and I will get the Rankings and rationale report and those proposals to the mapping committee by tomorrow. So you will have plenty of time to review them for your meeting, which is next Tuesday afternoon from 1-3 on February 23rd.

The plan is for the committee to bring their recommendations for bidder presentations back to this group next Thursday and then have those presentations the following Thursday which would be March 4th.

Yesterday afternoon was the deadline to receive bids for VRA legal counsel however we didn't receive any bids so our internal staff committee is meeting this afternoon and we are going to look at ways to move forward with seeking VRA counsel, so we will get back with the Commission next week on some options for ways to seek consultants to fill this gap that we have.

Also I've provided today the Princeton budget memo. It gives you a sense of what they felt might be the costs for this Commission. As we get our mapping proposal and other consultant proposals in, we can build out our budget more effectively knowing those numbers. So those are just for your review. We won't have any discussion today on that.

And lastly our ice breaker for today is what three words best describe you? And do I have a volunteer to start today? Or Commissioner Dustin can you start us?

>> Dustin: Sure.

So three words that describe me would be, I'm thinking, outgoing.

Outgoing.

Loyal.

And patient.

>> Sue: All good qualities.

Thank you, Richard, how about you?

>> Richard: That's a tough one.

I guess it's all on who you talk to.

If you are asking somebody else.

I guess I'm not really sure.

Give me a few minutes to think about this one.

>> Sue: Okay Doug are you ready?

>> Doug: Yeah, I am.

This was a tough one to come up with.

I thought that the number one would be very analytical in things that I do.

I'm very dependable.

And very motivated in getting things done when they are assigned to me.

So I would say those are the three qualities.

>> Sue: Thank you we have seen those Cynthia how about you?

>> Cynthia: I'm going to say kind.

And organized.

And then I'm going to steal Dustin's and say loyal.

That is a good one.

>> Sue: Okay thank you very much.

Good qualities.

Erin what would you say?

>> Erin: I ask my kids this and they said mother of six.

>> Sue: That is three words.

>> Erin: That is three words and that is what they came with.

I came up with detailed oriented, diligent, and friendly.

>> Sue: Thank you.

Those are good qualities.

How about you Juanita?

>> Juanita: Oh, I thought about that when you said that.

I think one of them would be creative.

Another would be to I enjoy learning.

And another one would be friendly.

>> Sue: Okay thank you Juanita, nice qualities.

Steve, how about you?

>> Steve: I would say calm.

Persistent and kind of a phrase able to look at both Sides of a question.

>> Sue: Okay, good qualities again.

Janice, how about you?

>> Janice: Tenacious, perceptive, and emphatic.

>> Sue: Thank you Janice nice qualities, how about you Anthony?

>> Anthony: Well thank you for the question.

I think these go a long way in helping the public know us and help us to get to know each other since we are having to meet over Zoom.

For me I'd say I'm a leader.

I'm confident and I'm empathetic.

>> Sue: Okay, excellent qualities.

Thank you.

How about you MC?

>> MC: I'll go with curious.

Grateful.

And in process.

>> Sue: Aren't we all?

Thank you.

Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Hard one.

I could probably come up with a hundred.

But first I'd say honest.

Empathetic.

And then a fighter in the sense that no matter what life throws at me I never quit so that's it.

>> Sue: Okay, those are good qualities.

How about you Rebecca?

>> Rebecca: Sorry taking myself off mute.

I would say tenacious, cheerful, and I would also say independent.

>> Sue: Okay Richard I'm back at you.

Thank you, Rebecca, good qualities.

>> Richard: Well I guess I probably consider hardworking if I say I'm going to be there I will be there.

Try to think a problem through before I do anything with it.

And I guess that's about it.

You know, I have not given that much thought.

>> Sue: Well those are good qualities and it's real interesting to see how the Commissioner's qualities all strengthen each other because we are all different in many ways.

Let's talk to staff too.

Julianne.

>> Julianne: Good morning Commissioners.

I know in my interview I highlighted technical skills, communication skills.

And hard work.

But for my personal qualities I would highlight inquisitive, adventurous, and positive.

>> Sue: And how about you Edward?

Thank you.

>> Edward: Thank you, Sue, good morning Commissioners, how are you?

>> Good morning.

>> Edward: Beautiful smiles thank you the three things that came to mind is driven collaborative and engaging.

>> Sue: Thank you Edward.

Those are qualities that I might say about myself.

I guess we are pretty compatible, here aren't we?

But I'm thinking enthusiasm, integrity, and kind.

And I hope to always be kind to people.

And in everything I do.

So I want that to be the way that I work with others.

So thank you very much everybody for sharing your qualities today and remember my virtual door is always open.

Call me, text me, e-mail me any time that you have a question or I can be of service.

Thank you.

.  
>> Steve: Okay anybody have any questions for Sue?

Not seeing any hands flagging me down we will move on to Julianne's report, Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you very much.

Today I'm excited to continue the discussion on FOIA procurement in the communications policies.

We will start but likely not finish the overview of the Constitution which will include the Subsection 13 criteria.

The next three items that the Commission can expect to see from me will be the memo on the census issues.

This will address timing of the data release, its impact on the Commission, and the options moving forward.

But most likely it will be a privileged and confidential memorandum to have a closed session and discuss legal strategy.

And the second is a records retention policy I mentioned in the past.

And the third item would be the conflicts of interest policy. And just for a couple examples, Commissioners would be in a conflict of interest under the following circumstances: If they, members of their family, partners, or close associates could personally or professionally benefit directly or indirectly, financially, or otherwise, from their position on the Commission, whether they use their position on the Commission to the disadvantage of detriment to a third-party.

Soliciting or obtaining preferential treatment.

And if circumstances arise to compromise appear to compromise the ability to make unbiased decisions.

Now all of these items complement the code of conduct that you have already adopted.

That will also include the policy that I'm speaking of will also include the standards of conduct and disclosures as well as the provisions to effectuate subsection 3E of the Constitution vacancy of office provisions.

I just wanted to give you kind of an overview of what to expect in that policy and I look forward to bringing it to you in the very near future.

Thank you.

>> Steve: Thank you.

Any questions from any Commissioner for Julianne?

Okay, communications and outreach.

Edward.

>> Edward: Thank you, Mr. Chair, good morning, everyone, once again.

Just excited next week you know we have our pictures and video being taken.

Next week so just want to remind you of your times and if you have not had a chance to provide me with your script, to please do so no later than today.

But looking forward to building up our website and getting people a chance to get to know you.

There has already been requests to actually Detroit free press wants to put up a Commission page to identify who you are and how to engage in the process as you request that we receive this week.

So far from our outreach to county Governments, townships as well as cities we have received more than 50 requests for presentations and they are still coming in.

So I will be getting with you later this week, beginning of next week to see on your availability to appear virtually for these meetings as well.

We continue to meet with statewide organizations that have ideas.

With regards to our work and getting more people involved so if you are a statewide organization and you're interested and helping us get the word out, increase awareness and engagement for redistricting, please give us sent me an e-mail at Woods EIII@Michigan.gov for any and all statewide organization we want to be as inclusive as possible, have you on a mailing list so that you can share with your members or affiliate organizations the great work that is being done by this Commission.

Later today we will be talking about the policy, communication policy as Julianne mentioned earlier.

We will be talking about our potential public hearing locations.

And sites as well as dates.

And then our statement of work as relates to what we need to get done in our communications and outreach update.

I want to give a special thanks out to Sally and Sarah, Jake, and Chad with the Department of State.

I identify for the record and place on the record, Mr. Chair, the great work that was done by the University of Michigan students.

There were six students that participated.

And putting together the communities of interest for the University of Michigan.

Not for the Commission, for the University of Michigan.



As a project and just wanted to make sure that their names are entered in the record.

Thank you so much for this opportunity.

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

>> Steve: Does anybody have any questions for Edward?

I have one.

I read I saw a headline I believe it was in the state journal about we are going to run out of money.

Did you read that?

>> Edward: Yes.

>> Steve: Are we having -- are we keeping track of articles that we see come out in the publications?

Do we have a clipping service or anything like that?

>> Edward: We will have critical mentions available but right now I have an excel spreadsheet and I can share that with you after the meeting for those that are interested.

>> Steve: The other thing for I think might be helpful for everybody because if you don't take the state journal or other publications, you don't necessarily are not able to read what they are writing and they don't always show up on the Internet.

If we have if you are doing something where we can have access to those articles, that would be nice.

>> Edward: I can work on that for you.

>> Steve: With those comments anybody else have any questions?

Okay, Secretary of State staff updates, Sally, are you still with us?

>> Sally: Commissioners I'm still with you but I don't think MDOS has any specific updates for today.

But as always you know reach out if you have any questions.

>> Steve: You're not going to talk about computers today?

>> Sally: Well, it's my understanding you all should have them.

So and Sue is nodding her head so that means I'm right.

So hopefully that you're able to get them set up within the next week or so.

But you know of course we have Sue or myself if you have issues with that.

>> Steve: Well mine is being held at the Austin building and I'm supposed to pick it up Monday and meet with John who is going to take care of me so.

>> Sally: Perfect.

>> Steve: Okay we will make a note of that.

Michigan Department of State has nothing new.

Okay, unfinished business.

FOIA procedures guidance resolution 2021-3.

I assume Julianne is going to do that.

>> Julianne: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

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 before you have draft two of the FOIA procedures that we went through in great detail last -- at the last meeting the modifications to draft two was changing the street address to our PO box.

Updating the e-mail address which I actually will update again to MICRC-FOIA@Michigan.gov and thank you to the MDOS team particularly Nelson for getting this set up so quickly and so efficiently.

And the only other change in the document was on page four to reflect that the executive director will process the appeals.

Other than that, there are no changes to the document that was before you.

And I'm happy to answer any questions or entertain additional revisions.

But I received no revisions over the course of the week.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Okay, does anybody have any questions regarding the FOIA policy procedures and guidelines that we looked at last week?

And a couple of minor corrections were made?

Anybody have anything?

All right I would entertain a motion to approve adopt I guess the procedures and guidelines as amended.

Erin.

You're making the motion or you got a question?

>> Erin: I was motioning.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> I will second.

>> Steve: Cynthia second and all those in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

It is adopted unanimously.

All right, key provisions of constitutional amendment and census timing general counsel.

Where did you go?

There you are.

You're doing this Julianne?

>> Julianne: Yes, Mr. Chair.

I am.

I believe that is a new business item.

>> Steve: Oh, I'm sorry.

>> Julianne: Looking at my agenda thank you.

>> Steve: We are back to communication policy resolution.

Is that you also Julianne?

Or Ed, Edward he has himself unmuted and that gives me a clue.

See how quick I am?

>> Edward: Very quick and adept but I want to thank Sue and Julianne for the help as well as department of state.

There is a PO box number and this is getting back to Commissioner Lange to make sure those who do not have Internet access have a way to mail something in. And the PO box number is something that is dedicated solely to the Commission work. So we place that in there knowing that that was better than the street mail address so we wanted to share that with you and that is why the whole number two under presentations is highlighted as a request.

And then going under media releases there was a great discussion last week with regards to what would be the best way to make sure there is some type of input from the Commission before things go out and so what we have written is the MICRC will designate an individual member of the Commission for the communications and outreach department to review and approve press releases.

Individual members shall receive press releases prior to dissemination and they are coordinated.

So basically the policy will identify a member of the Commission who will review and approve press releases at the discretion of the Commission.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Edward: Without changes.

>> Steve: Has everybody had a chance to look at those and are there in I -- any questions for Edward?

>> Doug.

>> Doug: As part of this today, are we going to identify that individual, Edward?

>> Edward: I would hope so, yes.

>> Doug: Okay when we do I have a suggestion.

>> Steve: Any other questions?

All right.

Is identifying the individual need to be in here?

Or do we want to adopt this and then identify the individual?

>> Julianne: Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Yes.

>> Julianne: I would suggest doing those as separate resolutions that way if the individual needed to change the policy would remain intact and you would just be voting on the identity of the individual.

>> Steve: I agree.

Take a motion to adopt the communications policy as presented.

Janice I'll take you as the motion er and Doug as the second.

If there is no further discussion all in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

All opposed the same sign.

It is adopted.

Okay, now, Doug.

>> Doug: Yes.

I would like to recommend an individual, but I'd like to hear from that individual as well. As I recall, Juanita has a background in communications and public relations. And I think it may benefit us to use her knowledge and expertise in this area. But I'd like to get her input on that.

>> Steve: Juanita, they are calling for your expertise and comments on the communication policy.

>> Juanita: If you all will excuse me for a minute and something hit me for a moment. Well first of all I think Mr. Woods is doing a great job so far. I was wondering when it came to, I remember when I think it was either Cynthia or one of the I'm having a little strange feeling hitting me, but anyhow I was wondering if it was possible if we could -- if we would be able to have a billboard put up in that area where was it Cynthia or one of the women that said that they were out in the rural and so that they needed some information or someone to get some literature or something out there so they would know.

So just a thought.

Did you all understand?

>> Steve: That would be something that we could consider and take a look at and that would be something I think Edward could investigate.

And come back with what that may look like.

At some point.

>> Juanita: Yeah, okay right now that's it for right now.

I'm having some kind of little funny feeling so I hope it's not a hot flash.

>> Steve: I guess my question is the person whoever this is going to be what do we anticipate they are going to be doing for the Commission in addition to what Edward you are doing?

>> Edward: Mr. Chair, I think the concern was making sure that someone saw the press release before it went out.

Last week if I did not capture that correctly I'll defer to Commissioner Clark but I just know that was the concern.

You know I would be drafting it, I would be putting it together, I would be ensuring the quotes.

But it's just having someone fly spec it to make sure that the voice of the Commission is adequately represented in the statement.

And it's also goes with regards to my contract to making sure I'm in compliance as well.

>> Steve: Juanita, is that something you would be willing to do?

>> Juanita: Yes.

>> Steve: Rebecca I saw your hand fly up.

>> Rebecca: Yeah, I was just going to ask if he is looking for a single person or is he looking for like a couple people?

Like sort of you know you can contact these three people and have them fly spec it?

>> Edward: I was looking for a single person you know just in time but if the Commission feels there should be like a rank order just in case someone is not available, that might be a great suggestion, Commissioner Szetela so thank you for that insight.

>> Steve: Okay Juanita has -- is willing to do it.

Assuming we vote her in.

Is there someone who would like to be -- I think back up is a good idea, is there someone who would like to volunteer to back up Rebecca?

>> Rebecca: Yeah, I can be the backup.

>> Steve: Okay, who I would think would be sufficient, but somebody else wants to get in line.

Julianne you've got your go ahead.

>> Julianne: Yes, Mr. Chair, I would be prepared to read the motion for you.

I jotted it out when the time is appropriate.

I know the discussion is ongoing.

>> Steve: Well, I think we are -- Doug.

>> Doug: The only comment I wanted to make and I want to add on to what Edward was saying one of the reasons we are taking this approach is to ensure we have some checks and balances.

>> Right.

>> Doug: Yes so, I just wanted to reiterate that from last week.

Okay I'm all set.

>> Steve: Okay, any other discussion?

If not, we will have Julianne read the motion go right ahead Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you the motion would be presented February 18th of 2021 resolved that the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission approves the designation of the following individual members under subpart six of the communications policy.

Being Juanita Curry.

And the alternate Rebecca Szetela with no attachments to the motion.

>> Steve: Any discussion on the motion?

Entertain a motion, I would entertain a motion to adopt.

Erin, I see a hand as a motion.

Doug, second.

Any further discussion?

If not all in favor raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

All opposed the same sign.

Motion is adopted.

We have a reviewer and an alternate reviewer.

Very good.

Okay, well break is up but we just got started so we are going to not do that unless somebody really wants to take a break.

Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: I think at the moment it might be a good idea to take a quick break so everybody can regroup if that is okay.

>> Steve: Sure, absolutely.

I'm not changing anybody to their desk.

Or their computer or anything else.

We will take ten minutes.

9:46.

Be back.

>> Rhonda: Thank you.

[ Recess until 9:46 a.m. ]

While we are waiting for Julianne to come back, she is next on the hit parade.

And speaking of our general counsel, she seems to have magically appeared.

We are up to your procurement review procedures and guidelines.

>> Julianne: Wonderful.

Let me share my screen.

And it's a very short slide deck, only ten slides to run through the policy that we distributed.

This is draft two of the policy dated February 12th.

And the purpose would be to utilize taxpayer dollars with integrity and accountability.

While fostering transparency and uniformity in procurement.

It would apply to the Commission members staff as well as any individual participating in the procurement process for the MICRC.

There are three thresholds, three tiers.

I'll say 4999.99 and below no bid would be required.

That is an informal contract.

5,000 to 49,999.99 would be three informal bids are required.

I inserted the word informal there for clarity and distinction between the formal solicitation process for procurements 50,000 and above the three places I would like to insert the word informal is here in support subpart C one and subpart C5B and part E one and I will cover each of those as they come up on the slides.

This procurement policy would allow for the MICRC to participate in existing State of Michigan contracts and each would require a solicitation manager to be identified for the convenience of not only for the public but for the Commissioners as well. It would also

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.

provide for emergency contracting powers, that I would recommend putting in a maximum amount for that ability.

For immediate delivery of goods or services, those would be reported to the MICRC at its next regular meeting for action to ratify within the following two weeks with appropriate documentation.

The RFP process this is for 50,000 and above threshold.

It would be the process that you're currently going through for the VRA and the line drawing and mapping technical services, they would be posted for a minimum of 17 days.

Opportunity for bidder questions.

The establishment of a committee of members of the Commission to review.

The committee will meet in open session and forward its recommendation to the full Commission who will by majority vote select the bidders and determine the final award.

The second level the middle tier again the three informal bids would be 5,000 to just under 50,000 which is reflected in subpart C4B of the policy.

The Commission would approve issuance of that request by majority vote.

It would be posted for a minimum of seven days.

There may be bidder questions in responses available but they are not mandated.

It's discretionary.

We would still conduct an internal staff review.

And the MICRC would meet in open session to discuss, review and by majority vote approve the final award.

The final tier would be contracts of just below 5,000.

No bid or posting is required.

That would be the executive director procuring the best value for the MICRC.

The accountability provisions would be the cumulative limit for anyone vendor, cannot exceed the informal contracting threshold.

And the executive director would prepare a monthly report to the Commission identifying what was procured, the actual cost and any other relevant information such as due diligence in that process.

The evaluation guidelines are set out in subpart D.

Which is on page three of the policy.

It requires disclosure of actual or potential conflicts of interest for anyone evaluating, reviewing the procurements.

Performing the duties impartially and without bias, upholding ethical standards and reporting any contact during the procurement process from either bidders or third parties on behalf of the bidders to general counsel.

So that I can send a letter.

Or a phone call most likely both.

The respecting confidentiality of documents excuse me until they are discussed in an open meeting and evaluating each bid on the merits and applying that the criteria consistently among those bids.

Awards are final decisions.

All contract and activities they must be authorized by resolution.

No award or decision is final until a resolution is adopted and the successful bidder is notified by the MICRC. Again, being a public body, all of your decisions are made collectively, not independently. So this is a critical distinction for not only the Commissioners but for the bidders that we will be doing business with as well.

The MICRC shall award procurements requiring that is above the 50,000 threshold and between the 5,000 and 50,000 threshold based on the most responsive proposal received from a responsible vendor that provides the best value and I've inserted the definitions for those work criteria in subpart E1.

Which best value how that is arrived at examining the components of the proposal including price, expertise, supply, timeliness and Michigan economic impact and compliance with the relevant law.

Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets the mandatory requirements in a responsible vendor is a vendor that demonstrates and has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation.

And that would conclude my remarks summarizing the policy as always, I'm available for questions, comments or additional revisions thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> Steve: Doug.

>> Doug: Julianne, I have a couple questions.

When you use the word solicitation manager, are you referring to a purchasing agent?

>> Julianne: So Doug that is an excellent question.

What that would refer to is either a purchasing agent that is handling the RFP process for the larger contracts or it would be someone internal such as the executive director that would be handling those -- the middle threshold.

So it could be either.

And there would be some you know there would be some flexibility there Doug but it would be clear who was handling that particular procurement or solicitation.

>> Doug: Okay another question is there are a number of places lawsuit the document where you refer to three bids are required.

Sometimes we don't get three responses back with the bids so how do we handle that?

>> Julianne: So that distinction Doug that was where I wanted to add the word informal to further distinguish it from the formal RFP process so these would be the more informal bids and I would propose if we did not receive three bids from a seven day posting on our website that the MICRC through its executive director could engage in direct solicitation.



>> Doug: Okay.

>> Julianne: Or have the ability to choose between the bids presented if the Commission would be so comfortable with those selections. I could prepare that language.

>> Doug: Yeah, sometimes I think three bids being required just does not -- won't handle our situation so and my final question is on C4. You have a yellow Mark with a dollar amount missing. Is there a recommendation on that dollar amount?

>> Julianne: I would recommend in the area of 25,000. But again that would just be -- that would just be a starting point for the discussion. And by the Commission and direction from the Commission on what would be a comfortable number. Again, the informal contracting process is below 5,000. So I felt that 10,000 was very close to that amount. Again, it's the comfort level of the Commission for this check and balance. And I would welcome that discussion and that guidance as to that number.

>> Doug: Okay, but the 25,000 you're talking to, gets in to our second tier, really. I mean it's a considerable amount of money. I mean, the way I read this is we are saying the executive director can go on their own and authorize 25,000 if that was the amount, is that true, Julianne?

>> Julianne: Yes, and again it's just a proposal. So if the Commission again if it does not want emergency contracting provisions such as this, again with 18 hour notice we can convene a meeting of the full Commission so there are other options that exist. It's that this option in the event of emergency for emergency provisions so I wouldn't imagine that it would need to be exercised that frequently.

>> Doug: I mean I don't have a dollar amount in mind but I thought 25 was kind of high.

Any way I think Rhonda had a question as well. I'm finished.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Cynthia had her hand way up long before me so I would like her to go first.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: I have a different question but along these lines what do we think an emergency procurement might entail?

>> Steve: Anybody.

>> Julianne: That's an excellent question.

So again when we are talking about vendors or supplies or things that we can prepare for and plan for, those would definitely not be emergencies.

So I think the example I'm most familiar with, with emergency provision of services is either to deal with something that arises that is unexpected.

It would be if that there was an issue with one of the meeting spaces that something needed to be procured for the Commission immediately, something like that or what I'm familiar with emergency provision of legal services where you don't have the luxury of time to be able to go through a fuller process if your answer is due in 21 days.

So those types of things would be two examples off the top of my head.

I hope that is helpful.

>> Edward: One of the things we also discussed knowing we are doing public hearings and traveling and something was to take place where we need some additional say a bus breaks down or we have some technology issues that we need to address ASAP because of the requirement in our Constitution, those would be some of the things that would happen if someone is not able to fulfill their obligation.

>> Steve: Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: So then how much -- what is the top limit of what the something like that might cost?

I think is where we should consider.

>> Julianne: I think that the Commission can discuss or again we can put in a number that you would be comfortable with.

That would be above the 5,000 really would be the only perimeter that I would recommend.

Again, I put up the 25,000 as a discussion starting point.

And certainly any number below that, that the Commission is comfortable with that you decide on would be appropriate and I would welcome that.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Just one quick question.

On the three different tiers, how did you come up with those numbers for the amount for each tier?

>> Julianne: That is an excellent question Rhonda the tiers match the state level that way we can capture the formal procurement process for 50,000 and above.

>> Steve: Doug.

>> Doug: Yeah, Julianne, going back to a dollar amount, does the state have an emergency procurement dollar amount?

>> Julianne: They and normally there is not a limit on emergency procurement dollar amounts.

But I felt that that might not be appropriate that the Commission might want to set a limit for that.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Julianne: But certainly you don't need a limit.

Again, because when you are doing with emergency situations.

>> Doug: You just don't know how long, yeah.

>> Julianne: Right, for emergency provisions generally there isn't a limit because you don't know what it's going to take to address that emergency.

So generally best practice is to not set a limit which is also appropriate if the Commission.

>> Doug: Yeah.

>> I would almost recommend we take that route not to set a limit because we don't really anticipate using this.

It's an emergency situation so that would be my recommendation is not to set a limit.

Change the verbiage but that is up to the group.

>> Steve: Anybody else have a question?

I guess I have a question.

Is there any reason why it could not be the executive director and the emergency delivery couldn't be in conjunction with a Commission member?

It's not like we don't have immediate communication with everybody.

>> Julianne: I want to.

>> Steve: We set a person for the press releases.

>> Julianne: Correct.

And the distinction I would make is that an individual Commissioner can't unless you want to delegate that authority but then those meetings would need to be open.

So I think we really run in to a situation there whereas the media releases is more of a review where here it would if I understand you correctly, Steve, it's more they would be approving it and really an individual Commissioner the way the Commission is set up, it can't bind the full Commission.

I do hear what you're saying though about having some -- another check and balance there.

But I think that would to formally designate somebody to do that would take that procurement that portion of the procurement authority away from the full Commission.

>> Steve: Okay, any other questions?

Doug.

>> Doug: I just want to say Steve I thought that was a good thought to add that check and balance.

But apparently from an Open Meetings Act situation and legally we are probably better off not doing that so I think it's a good thought.

Everything we do we should have checks and balances particularly financially.

>> Is there a way around that, Julianne?

>> Julianne: .

>> Doug: An easy way.

>> Julianne: Around the open meeting, no, no.

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

If you are asking a way around -- so if you were going to delegate that authority even specifically for emergency contracting activities, that individual would be acting on behalf of the Commission.

So that would be required to comply with the Open Meetings Act and all of those important transparency provisions.

What we have got in the policy instead is they would be reported any emergency procurements would be reported to the Commission at the very next meeting.

The next regular meeting.

And detailing the circumstances and the particulars of the procurement, the actual cost, the rationale, all of those things.

>> Doug: Would it benefit us then to when we do make these emergency procurements to always ensure there is a clause that the ICRC can negate the contract if they so choose?

>> Julianne: That would be difficult to get somebody to procure to provide goods if there was the chance that that could be done because the goods -- whatever we are procuring whether it be goods or services under an emergency context would need to be immediately provided.

And I fear that if there was such a disclaimer in the -- in that contract language that that would really chill people's willingness to participate in that.

Rather than the next regular meeting we could change to immediate disclosure if that would be more helpful to the Commission.

>> Doug: I was just searching for ways to get checks and balances in there, that's all. Just to protect us.

Not the Commission but all of us, you know.

>> Julianne: Uh-huh.

>> Doug: So I mean it may not be workable in this situation so that is what I was searching for.

>> Doug: That is the only comment I had.

>> Steve: Excuse me, Anthony.

>> Anthony: So what kind like you know generally when we are saying emergency procurements, what qualifies?

You know, I am having trouble for seeing a circumstance where there would be an emergency where we have to spend more than, I don't know, 10,000 you know if a bus breaks down or we need a new venue somewhere for whatever reason, or if I don't know if the place, we book has a power outage and we need to pick a new place on the fly, you know besides circumstances like that, I don't know what would qualify as an emergency.

>> Steve: I think you answered your own question.

I mean who knows.

That is why you put emergency.

You don't list things.

If you list things, they are not emergencies.

I'm not being facetious I mean it's something that you don't know and the suggestion here is to have the ability for the executive director to have someone that's there to make that decision as you say on the fly.

>> Anthony: Right I understand that but I think the point of contention that we are having so far is the dollar limit we are setting on this.

Whether we want it to be the 25,000 that is our general counsel originally had as a starting point or as Doug said more recently make it unlimited.

So I think to help determine that number is there any like, like you said it's an emergency so we don't know but generally speaking with the state where it is unlimited, how often is this used?

>> Julianne: So and I definitely agree with Steve's comments.

As well as the observations that you've made Anthony so generally governmental units or public bodies, we reserve these rights to deal with threats to public health, welfare, or safety.

So the Commission's operations we would want the emergency provisions to be able to deal with any obstacles that arise to you being able to do your work.

That would be again not in the general course of business.

So these would be unanticipated, unexpected, and due to the timing of them would require immediate that they immediately be addressed.

And much like everything else coming before the Commission, it really is on a case-by-case basis.

Whether we knew or how it needs to be addressed.

But and that is another reason that generally emergency contracting provisions don't have dollar limits.

Because you don't know what that emergency need is going to be.

So that way it gives you the most flexibility.

I hope that was responsive.

>> Steve: Cynthia you had your hand up.

>> Cynthia: Well, one thing I want to say is I think our biggest obstacle right now to us being able to do our work is probably our limited budget so I think that is part of the problem that we are having with setting a blank check as emergency.

I don't feel comfortable with that.

But I don't know what the answer is.

I'm wondering if maybe Edward and Julianne and Sue could come up with some emergency scenarios or things that they think we might run in to and then put a dollar amount to that.

So that we would have some idea of what we might be talking about.

>> Steve: Any other comments?

Any response Julianne, Edward, or Sue?

>> Julianne: So we have been discussing and that's how we arrived at the recommendation to start the conversation with 25,000.

Again balancing how these things are normally done.

But respecting the unique circumstances of the Commission.

Certainly if you wanted some scenarios it would be very hard to attach a dollar amount. With any precision.

But certainly some estimations could be if that information would be useful, we would be happy to prepare that.

>> Steve: Well, would a proposal be to table this until the next meeting? Allow the executives of our Commission to come up with something and bring it back? Anthony.

>> Anthony: If we do that, how about you know so we don't use up a whole bunch of our time at our next meeting discussing this again, it would be nice if we had you know, a couple proposals, one with like unlimited amount.

Like how Doug and our general counsel was saying and then go on with that dollar amount and then we can just decide then and there.

>> Steve: You're making that as a motion?

>> Anthony: Yes.

>> Steve: Is there a second?

Dustin has seconded.

Any discussion?

All in favor of that motion raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

All opposed the same sign.

Okay the motion is to bring this back next week with a couple scenarios, dollar amount and what the emergency would be and/or no dollar amount.

And we will vote on it.

Okay.

Constitutional amendment and census timing.

Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Let me share my screen here and again as I indicated earlier it's unlikely that we will be able to get through the whole presentation today but we shall begin it and I know Sue will keep me honest on my time.

Okay what I would like to do today is to go through just an overview of some of the key constitutional provisions in article four, section six of the Constitution which created the MICRC.

So how did we get here?

On the left we have the infamous 1812 drawing of the state Senate districts outside of Boston.

The Governor that signed the bill into law was Elbridge Gerry spelled with a G and resembles a salamander and so we have gerrymandering and historical negative connotation of the corruption of the democratic process relative to drawing districts. On the right we have the portion of the Michigan Congressional districts that were part of a challenge on a 2017 lawsuit brought by the league of women voters against Secretary Benson and we will touch on that later in the presentation.

It's not an isolated issue.

I had many examples that I could have chosen from to show you on the slide what I selected on the left is the Texas 35th Congressional district.

This district was upheld in 2018 by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The lower Federal Court held that it was a constituted racial gerrymandering against Latino and African/American voters.

The U.S. Supreme Court reversed and it held that only one district and it was a house district was violated the voting rights act.

So the one on the left was upheld by the Supreme Court.

The map on the right from Pennsylvania 7th Congressional district did not go to the U.S. Supreme Court but the Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that that map constituted, that it was illegal and unconstitutional after the legislature failed to submit an updated plan the Court imposed this particular district.

So background on redistricting.

Nationwide every ten years.

Following the census.

So that the political offices can reflect the population of the state.

In November 2018 in Michigan we had the passage of the proposal 18-2.

Changing the Michigan Constitution to make citizens responsible for drawing the lines.

This was a significant shift.

The control from redistricting from the state legislature to this Commission and it also established strong public participation and transparency during the redistricting process.

The goals for the slide deck today is to cover the following select provisions of section 7 as key dates.

I've removed subsection 8 from my slide deck because it's something Edward will be addressing later in this meeting.

Subsection 9 dealing with additional public hearing dates after a plan and proposed plans have been identified and then again going into subsection 13 criteria.

The key dates in subsection 11 the first was already met when this inaugural Commission was seated and took the oath of office on September 17th.

The next Commission must be convened on or before October 15th of 2030.

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.

Additional dates and subsection 7 on or before November 21st is the constitutional deadline.

We will definitely be discussing that more later the Commission shall adopt redistricting plans for state Senate districts, state house of representative districts as well as Congressional districts.

Which there are currently 14.

Michigan is expected to lose at least one seat this redistricting cycle.

It's important to note that in 2020 after the 2020 census we lost a seat and that was the fourth decade in a row that Michigan had lost a seat.

So if we lose another seat this cycle, it will be a trend over the last half century.

Going on to the census data.

So the population counts are required to be given to the president.

The original deadline from the Bureau was designated to be is December 30th.

The updated deadline is on or before April 20th.

The redistricting counts used to redraw legislative state legislative districts not Congressional that original deadline was on or before March 31st and to put it in context the previous -- the previous legislative redistricting Commission in Michigan had that data on March 11th of 2011.

So last week the U.S. census Bureau announced a new timeline for redistricting count data to go to the states on or before September 30th.

This creates critical timing issues and we've already started to discuss this and we will definitely continue to discuss it under subsection 14 there needs to be at least 45 days of public comments prior to the vote to adopt a final plan.

Before the November 1st deadline.

That date as we've indicated in the past is Friday, September 17th of 2021.

We now expect our census data by September 30th, '2021.

So this is an untenable situation.

And attention there.

So I want to say, again, at this point I know I mentioned it last meeting.

And I will mention it again today that there are options to address the delay.

That I will present to the Commission.

For discussion.

And make a recommendation and we can have that discussion in the near future.

I will bring those options before you in a privileged and confidential document where we will most likely have our first closed session to explore those options.

Now, given recognizing and respecting those critical timing issues, I did want to highlight, again, that it's critically important that we continue the work.

There are other constitutionally mandated triggers.

Again, the informational public hearings that Edward will detail in his presentation later when he presents those proposed dates and locations to you.



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

But that the work we must continue the work while we are addressing the issues that were definitely brought to the forefront last week.

Subsection nine deals with proposed plans and public hearings, five are required. At least five public hearings.

After the Commission adopts proposed plans at least one for each district.

Those plans must be published in advance of the public hearing.

And there was a notation in the Constitution that each Commissioner may only propose one plan for each type of district being Congressional, state house and state Senate.

That brings us to subsection 13 criteria.

Did anyone have any questions at this point before we start a new section?

If not, I will continue.

>> Rebecca: I have one question this is Commissioner Szetela what is the difference between the two types of data we are getting the one from April 30th is that just like general counts and the data we are expecting in September is I'm guessing more granular broken down by ethnicity and what not is that the difference?

>> Julianne: That is some of the differences yes.

So the data that goes specifically to the executive branch is to apportion the 435 Congressional seats so we need that data in order to do that.

The redistricting data that we are now expecting at the end of September under the most recently announced deadline would be that more granular and that data must be overlaid with our state election data as well to be useful to the Commission.

So hopefully that helped distinguish those two data sets even further for you.

>> Rebecca: Yes, thank you.

>> Julianne: Any other questions that I can respond to at this point before we get into the criteria?

Okay.

>> Steve: Anthony.

>> Anthony: That data that is now not due until the end of September, that would include the data down to the voter block level, correct?

>> Julianne: To the census block.

The voter data would be something that the State of Michigan would hold, not the Federal Government.

Okay, let me go back here.

Pardon me.

And we were apparently if we go okay, there we are.

So the subsection 13 criteria, the Commission is required to follow it per the Constitution.

The 7 criteria are listed in the order of priority.

In the Constitution they are annotated by letters we will use numbers for the purposes of the PowerPoint just for ease of reference.

And I did want to note that it will be a challenge to reconcile the conflicts intentions that exist between the criteria during the mapping process.

So the Commission is lucky to have them in a ranked order.

Some states do not enjoy that level of specificity or focus.

So going into the criteria, the first criteria deals with equal population, the voting rights act, and Federal laws.

There it was a series of Supreme Court cases in the 1960s starting with Baker versus Carr in 1962.

Prior to that the courts had stayed away from these what they consider political questions.

And they entered the field during those cases in the 1960s equal population rose as the most fundamental requirement.

And the Court in those decisions set standards for Congressional and legislative redistricting.

So we will start with the Congressional standard.

Set forth in West Bury versus Sanders in 1964.

This was a case in Georgia where one Congressional district had three times the population of another Congressional district.

So they allege that this denied them the full benefit of the right to vote.

The lower Court while acknowledging that it was an issue, concluded it was a political question and declined to offer any resolution.

The U.S. Supreme Court reversed and instituted the strict standard of population of equality for Congressional standards again for those 435 districts that we were just talking about a few moments ago.

This standard is based on Article 1, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

As to legislative standards for equal population this is the Reynolds versus Sims case also in 1964.

In this case it comes from Alabama.

Both houses in Alabama had not been reapportioned since 1903.

The result was after the 1960 census data the largest Senate district had approximately 41 times the population of the smallest Senate district.

In the largest house district had approximately 16 times the population of the smallest district.

So that led the U.S. Supreme Court to identify the substantial equality standard and they base those holdings on an equal protection on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

Deviations.

Only in the legislative standard of substantial equality.

This case in 1973 was a Connecticut voter challenge that the deviations were larger than the equal protection clause and it also split too many town boundaries.

The Supreme Court held that the redistricting board was not required to justify deviations of this percentage.

So Justice Brennan in his dissent did amazing survey of legislative plans the Court with dealt with over the years and alleged it established a 10% threshold where total deviation is 10% or less are presumptively constitutional but subsequent case law demonstrated that the ten% is not a safe harbor there is a rebuttable presumption by providing other evidence that the even if the deviation is less than 10 percent it still could have been held on illegitimate factors that predominated the redistricting process.

So over the next course of cases the Court majority endorsed the rule and followed the rule that justice Brennan dissent accused them of following.

So recent cases on equal population there is a Texas case from 2016 where the challenge was that total population included nonvoting residents such as illegal immigrants, children, and prisoners and that imbalanced the voting, it diluted the vote of registered voters in certain districts based on those population inequalities.

The Supreme Court in that case excuse me, they indicated that total population is a permissible metric to arrive at the one person one vote standard. Indeed historically that has been what is used.

The Harris case from 2016 the Supreme Court this was a challenge against the Arizona independent redistricting Commission maps that was there was a 14th amendment equal protection challenge that the maps, the districts were insufficiently equal.

And the Court held that the Plaintiffs failed to show that it was more probable than not that the deviation was based on illegitimate redistricting factors so the Arizona maps were upheld as well.

They found that the it was a good faith effort to comply with the voting rights act even though partisanship played some role.

The intent was not there.

Let's see.

Moving on to the voting rights act.

That prohibits any states or political subdivisions with voter qualifications standards, practice or procedures that abridge a citizen's right to vote based on race color or member in a minority language group.

Section two mandates that district lines cannot be drawn to dilute minority voting power. There is political subdivisions can comply with subsection two by creating majority minority districts where minority group would compose a majority of that district's total population.

The two things to be concerned about with minority majority excuse me minority districts is cracking where you dilute the voting power of a minority or the opposing party's supporters across many districts you crack them up or you pack them all into one district which also dilutes their voting power.

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

And I wanted to note that to comply with the 14th amendment and the voting rights act race must be considered.

So that minorities votes are not diluted but the Court has been very clear throughout their cases that race cannot be the predominant factor.

And Sue has just given me my three minute warning which I very much appreciate.

The voting rights act I think we will be able to finish the voting rights act, I will endeavor to do that.

Section two is again the nationwide ban on discriminatory practices.

Section three is bail in provisions where courts may order preclearance be obtained under Section five.

And Section 4B is a two part preclearance formula that was recently struck down in a landmark Supreme Court case.

Shelby county versus holder in 2013.

So the Court recognized key facts including minority voter turnout exceeded nonminority turn out in five of the six states originally covered by preclearance under Section five.

The Court did not strike down Section five.

What the Supreme Court did was it held the coverage formula in Section 4B was outdated because it relied on data from the in a formula imposed when the act was adopted and so it ruled Section 4B unconstitutional.

So what would the impact of the Shelby county holding be in Michigan?

We had two townships.

That were covered.

Buena Vista and Clyde and the practical impact is now the State of Michigan the school districts or the counties that those townships are seat in would not have to go through preclearance for any voting changes.

I would note too that those two townships are the only non-state and non-county areas that were covered by preclearance here we have the voting rights act all post Shelby county decision did was take out that Section 4B criteria.

So again, they did not strike down Section 5.

Congress can adopt another formula.

But the Court noted in its opinion that it would have to be an extraordinary measure that addressed a direct extraordinary problem that currently exists.

And I think I'll stop there and we can go on to the other criteria.

Hopefully at a later date.

The first criteria, again, is the goals set in the U.S. Constitution and the voting rights act that are mandatory.

They are the preeminent criteria nationwide.

The second criteria down are traditional redistricting principles that are used in standard methods for redistricting.

So I look forward to sharing those with you in the future.

.  
>> Steve: Thank you Julianne.

Any questions for her based on this presentation before we move on?

Okay Cynthia I think you beat out Anthony by about a second.

>> Cynthia: Well, it does not have to be answered now but perhaps next time when we have time.

I don't know what preclearance means when you are in this case.

>> Julianne: Preclearance and I'm happy to address it more fully but preclearance was an application you made to a Federal entity the department of justice to get your proposed voting changes approved.

So it would be closing polling locations, moving polling locations all of those kinds of things so anything that would affect the election process in those designated areas that were subject to preclearance.

And many cases have asked for bail in under Section three to mandate Section five preclearance and the courts have been reluctant to do that.

So hopefully that helps, Cynthia.

It was a formal process.

>> Steve: It made making changes to the voting scheme almost impossible for those that required preclearance from the justice department.

Anthony.

>> Anthony: Julianne, how long do you approximate it will take to get through the whole slideshow that you repaired?

.  
>> Julianne: I believe Sue Ann allotted me 15 minutes which I snuck an extra five because we were ahead of schedule as I always do.

So I would think another 20 but as the criteria go down through 7, they become much less dense as far as the topic and the background.

So really the first two or three I think are the bulkiest, the heaviest so I would estimate another 15-20 minutes Anthony.

>> Anthony: You know, I think that this information is some of the most important not only for us but also for the public.

I don't know how long we have the Michigan Department of State staff with us today.

But I know this meeting goes on until Noon.

And looking forward on the agenda we have the California Commission from 11 to Noon.

But if it's at all feasible I would like to motion to extend this meeting from adjourning at Noon to adjourning at 12:30 or 12:45 so you can get through the rest of that presentation.

>> Steve: We will have to have Sally have some input here.  
Sally?

>> Sally: Good morning everybody.

I would recommend although Anthony I completely hear you.

I would recommend that Julianne picks it up at the next Commission meeting.

It's difficult for us to extend meetings at the last-minute.

And your recent meetings have been going so on schedule that you know, I don't know that myself or other members of the team planned for this to go over so if that is okay with the Commission that is what I would recommend.

>> MC: I heard Rebecca say she is not feeling well and I know I'm hanging on by a thread too I would appreciate if we were able to -- really looking forward to hearing the rest of the meeting but I would respectfully request we try to end on time if possible, because of sickness.

>> Steve: Okay, is that okay with you Anthony?

>> Anthony: Yeah, I withdraw that motion.

>> Steve: Okay.

>> Julianne: And just very briefly again it's just an overview.

It's there will be many more opportunities to receive the information and receive it in an again, I'm giving an overview.

There is extensive detail on each of these that but I wanted to just give a broad stroke over it so I appreciate the opportunity and I look forward to finishing in the future.

>> Steve: Okay, moving on Edward, Julianne stole some of your time so talk fast.

>> Edward: Well, that's what teams do.

Just as an informational item just want to share that we are going out for bid with regards to market research and a multimedia education campaign.

And we will be presenting that information to you next week.

Just as an informational item.

And then the names that I wanted reference for the record from the University of Michigan center for local, state, and urban policy are Monica Anderson, Christian Colan, Kaitlyn Poyer, Natalie Fitzpatrick, Clarie Nutson, Jordan Daniel Lipert, Ryan Scott Wook and their advisors Debra Horner and Tom Evako.

If you look at your screen we can talk about these public hearings and if you can nod your head to let me know if you can see them at this time.

Is everybody able to see?

Okay great.

Thank you because it's a little different on my computer.

And so I just want to make sure that you are able to see it.

All right the requirement.

Hold on.

I don't think it's moving with me.

For whatever reason.

So let me move this here.

All right are you able to see the requirement.

Perfect.

Before Commissioners draft any plan, this is according to the Constitution, I mean the Constitution the Commission shall hold at least ten I repeat ten public hearings throughout the State of Michigan.

The purpose of these public hearings are the first round of public hearings is one inform the public about the redistricting process.

Two, purpose and responsibilities of the Commission.

Three, solicit information from the public about potential plans.

Right now we are working on getting communication assets as you know next week, we are doing our photos and our videos.

We are working on branding.

Part of the statement of work deals with statewide marketing research.

Deals with identifying key messages.

And developing a key communication plan the other thing from last week our Michigan Department of State told you that we were doing a public comment tool.

We need all of these assets to ensure that our public hearings can function smoothly an order.

Also effectively and efficiently.

Part of our outreach strategy is to reach out to local and county Governments.

As I've shared with you, we met with the Michigan township association.

The Michigan association of counties.

And the Michigan municipal league and we have more than 50 responses of presentations that will take place in March. To increase awareness of the work of the Commission and how people can participate but also the public hearings.

In April we want to work with statewide organizations and their affiliates.

So yesterday our executive director Sue Hammersmith worked with the Michigan nonprofit association.

We want to work with the Michigan State University extension center.

We are looking at working with united way and many other statewide organizations including the league of women voters and Michigan as well as the farm Bureau association.

So we are trying to cast a wide net and if there is any statewide organization or affiliate that wants to connect with us, please send notifications through our website so I can reach out to you.

We want to cast as wide as a net possible in working with statewide organizations and their affiliates and doing outreach opportunities in April.

And then in May prior to our public hearings getting started, we want to go to different areas and where our public hearings are located as an informal meetings where maybe

one or two people and just drive people and build momentum for people to come to the public hearings.

These community based outreach may not be something that is unique statewide but might be unique to that community and we want to make sure we are reaching out to them and encouraging them to come to the public hearings and provide their input.

So those are the strategies that we are working on.

While we are trying to get our communication plan established and moving in this order. Once again this is all being done to increase public comment and increase engagement with the Commission.

Public hearing criteria.

We have two things.

The Commission shall conduct its hearing in a manner that invites wide public participation in the state.

We want to make sure that the facility can host the most amount of people that we can get to come if we have COVID-19 guidelines we want to make sure we can do it.

We are looking at our layout for each and every one of these public hearings that is theatre style and theatre style is just mainly seats, no tables.

And whatever guidelines that are in place national, state or even in the county we want to make sure that we follow that.

But we include as a facility that can hold as many people as possible.

The second thing is we are to use technology to provide contemporaneous public observation and meaningful public participation in the redistricting process during all meetings but also our public hearings.

So this is what we did.

So based upon this information and looking across the state, we want to propose 15 locations for the first round of public hearings.

And 7 locations for the second round of public hearings.

Once again, the minimum was ten.

We want to offer 15.

For the second round the minimum was five.

We would like to offer 7.

Here are the proposed locations.

And cities and the date.

And this is based on when we could get the information back with regards to the public comment to being fully operational as well as having a communication plan and our messaging fully operational.

We want to start the first week in May.

The reason why Gaylord is highlighted because we want to use that as the first and second areas relates to public hearing.

So May 4 we go to tree top resorts in Gaylord, Michigan.



It's a central spot in northern Michigan where we can get people to come.

I'm having said that the day before we would fan out to areas outside of Gaylord.

Alpena to the east and Traverse City to the west and anything kind of in between to let people know about the public hearing that will be taking place in Gaylord and driving people there especially in rural areas to know about the public hearing.

Once again part of the outreach strategy starting with local Governments in March.

Working with statewide organizations and their affiliates in that area.

And then getting down to community-based organizations is what we want to do prior to the meeting.

On May 6 we go to Marquette and Northern Michigan University and then on the way between May 4 and May 6 we would fan out in the UP and to have once again connecting with grass roots organizations and driving them to the meeting, letting them know that we are there and how they can participate.

On May 11th we will look at Benton harbor at lake Michigan college for the site. Once again, the same strategy we are doing in Gaylord and Marquette we do the same in Benton Harbor, St. Joe County, Van Buren County and Cass Counties, making sure we reach out to those rural areas and drive them to the meeting on May 11th.

May 12th we will look at the lakeshore convention center in Muskegon.

On same strategy Grand Rapids would be another spot for the second.

And looking at the DeVos Center on May 13th and Ann Arbor we would be at the University of Michigan on May 17th once again same outreach strategy as before in all the other locations.

May 18th the Lansing center first and second public hearing would both would take place in Lansing.

Then in Midland at the great hall banquet, convention center on May 19th and Flint is the first and second public hearing would be at the Dort Financial Center.

And then the following week we would start in Southfield at south field pavilion May 25th and Dearborn at the Ford Conference Center and Novi for first and second public hearing at Suburban Collection Show Place. Then in Detroit we would be at the TCF Center, also known as Cobo Hall for the first and second public hearing. At Warren we will be at MRCC Banquet Center for first and second public hearing. And then for the last public hearing for the first round we are looking at Port Huron at the Blue Water Convention Center.

So this is my report.

I can take any questions and comments, Mr. Chair, at this time.

>> Steve: Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Okay, a couple of things.

And I appreciate you putting in all the work.

And I understand about the size to fit as many people as possible.

First, I don't think that within our budget if we are talking about bussing people, the rural people to these big places, when I'm looking at the layout, we have a big gap in the northern area where there is nothing.

So to get to some of these places it's going to be at least an hour or more drive.

And I don't really see how it's feasible to depending on how many people either want to go if you are talking about bussing people to pay to have people bussed.

And secondly, I discussed this before, my concern is and I know a lot of these bigger theatres and stuff are found more in the cities, bigger populations, this, and that.

But I'm also concerned with the makeup.

Actually the political makeup of it I feel like people are going to feel dis -- disenfranchised for their political view because I'm seeing these areas, voting areas, leaning politically one way and I'm not trying to bring politics into it, I'm trying to look at everything from the middle of the road and how other people might feel.

So I think that we can do better.

I mean, I understand what the COVID and we have to separate and this and that.

But I still have that in my mind where the rural areas might not bring in as many people, so we may not need as big of arena.

I know I made the suggestion before I said about the University in Marquette, Ferris state has a University also that might be an option and that is in a rural area that is close to four other counties.

So I just want to make sure that when we do these meetings it's proportionate to the whole state.

And I understand about the sizes.

And everything of it.

I'm just me personally I'm not thrilled with all of the locations.

And the locations that I guess there is too much of a divide.

For what I would like to see.

I would like it to be a little more inclusive, I guess.

But that's my opinion and I just wanted to put it out there.

Thank you.

>> Steve: I think everybody is attuned to getting a diverse set of places to be.

And I think that we as a Commission would be open, at least I certainly would be, I hope Edward would be, if you have Rhonda, if you have some suggestions, you mentioned Ferris state.

Other suggestions let get them out there.

I don't think Edward or Julianne or Suann have a lock on what is a good idea and I would say that for the rest of the Commission, if you have areas that you think will be appropriate let's look at them.

Nothing is cast in stone yet.

>> Edward: Want to reiterate these are just proposed you know locations.

And just you know really trying to cast that net.

But I think Ferris state would be a great location to identify that spot.

That is there.

And so if we were to add that, would that suffice the concerns of the Commission?

>> Steve: Well, I think that we need to take a look at others.

I mean we can look at Lake Superior state we can look at Grand Valley.

We can look at western.

I mean there are all kinds of places we can look at.

So I don't know that that's the key is well I want this place or I want that place.

I think the key is let's try to be as fair as possible.

And cast as Edward as you said cast a wide net and see how we do that.

I mean, clearly you go up into northern Michigan around Traverse City it's going to be republicans.

No question.

So some places it's going to be democrats, IE southeast Michigan.

So okay Anthony you had your hand up.

>> Anthony: Yeah, I really like this plan actually.

I think it's ambitious.

I think it you know it's going to be -- it's going to take a lot of work for us to do of course.

But you know that is what we signed up for.

And I for one want to totally up for it.

I think it does you know cast a pretty wide net.

I mean, there are places in northern Michigan, there are places in you know the middle of Michigan, western Michigan, eastern Michigan, southeastern Michigan.

And I think generally this list that Edward came up with is you know proportional to where the people are.

I think keeping in mind where the people are is something that we also need to consider because you know the more people that are in a certain area, you know the more we will have to take that into consideration because the first criteria of our Constitution is making sure that each district has the same size population.

So I definitely agree that we can add places or, you know, change the venues and stuff like that.

But I think on a more broad and big picture look at it I think this is exactly what we need to do.

You know, it's definitely ambitious but it's doable.

>> Steve: Okay, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca: Yeah, I was just going to add that I think the focus is not so much on what the particular alignment politically is.

It's more are we focusing on the population and can the population get there?

And I think sort of a target that I personally think is reasonable is can we do all of these areas cover about an hour drive to get to it, are we covering the whole state within about an hour drive which I think for the most part we are except maybe that one area which would sort of hit like Traverse City Mount Pleasant Ferris state area that I don't know if the two that we have the Grand Rapids and Gaylord if what the distance is for drive time between those versus Saginaw if that is kind of covering that ballpark. So I'm sort of leaning to maybe dropping one more site into that upper area of the lower mitten to see if maybe we can get closer to get people there. Because we do want -- we don't want people to have to drive five hours to potentially come to a meeting if we can avoid it because we will have declining participation.

>> Steve: All good points, Cynthia.

>> Cynthia: That is kind of what I was thinking is to try to get the majority of the state within an hour or so drive.

So I think that we should add something there to equal it out.

>> Steve: Okay, we are coming up, to our time to talk to California.

Edward, any finishing words?

>> Edward: How about we just move this to next week so we can kind of get it approved and identify it an additional spot if there is any other concerns, if they could just give them to me real quick so I can bring back the desire of the Commission. But at the time I'm just hearing something in that lower area that I heard from Commissioner Szetela, Commissioner Orton and Commissioner Lange so if there is any other feedback or comment just let me know so I can provide this back for the Commission.

>> Steve: Send an e-mail to Edward if you have some concerns.

I think we have said kind of the same thing here is we want to be covering the state. We don't want to have people driving for hours at a time and so we got to kind of work on where we are going to be.

Rhonda.

>> Rhonda: Just real quick all of the dates that you have up there, I know you had said something to me before about this, are these all during the week or are there any weekend dates on those?

>> Edward: Those are all during the week.

Monday through Thursday.

>> Steve: Okay, Princeton budget memo.

Can we -- who is going to do that Sue?

>> Sue: I just wanted to provide it for your information.

>> Steve: Okay it's provided.

Upcoming meeting agenda topics, is there something that we need to pay attention to specifically right now about that?

Or can we put that to the end if we need to?

>> Sue: We can put it at the end.

>> Steve: All right, I know several of us are the cold has affected us.

Do we need to take five minutes here?

Okay, we are going to take a five-minute break and we will come back and talk to California.

Welcome California.

We will see you in five minutes.

[ Recess until 11:04 a.m. ]

How is the meeting going?

>> Steve: How is the weather in California?

>> Beautiful as you can see.

>> Steve: That could be background.

>> You have little faith.

I think it's going to be a sunny day today.

>> Steve: You are not here for my introduction, I'm in Florida.

>> Cynthia: Oh, you are cheating.

>> Cynthia: I suffered through too many Michigan winters coming to see you guys.

>> And I've been there for about 15 years so I understand it.

>> Steve: I lived in Michigan all my life so I'm familiar with the process.

We got everybody back?

Rebecca is back, Anthony we are waiting for Anthony.

So Steve I think you were Chairing last time are you guys not rotating?

>> Steve: Not rotate correct.

They made me do it for six months.

Then we are going to take another look at it I guess is what we are going to do.

>> Okay.

All right is back and let's get back to full view and once again welcome to Cynthia, Vince and who else?

>> Nina.

>> Steve: There you are.

My pictures move randomly just so.

Julianne.

>> Julianne: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to inform the Commissioners and our invited guests of make the following statement to say good morning again to the Commissioners and welcome to our panelists.

Before we begin the discussion, I would like to highlight that the MICRC is currently in the bid review process for both voting rights act legal counsel as well as the line drawing and redistricting technical services.

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.

Given that our bid process has not concluded, please do not identify any individual vendors or persons that you may have had direct experience within your past work. I would ask that the presentation and any questions of our panel focus instead on the process.

These comments focusing on process could include the way in which you interacted with the mappers, not who those mappers were or whether they did a good job. I know our Commissioners have many questions about what it is like to work with mapping company and mappers in general.

Thank you for your understanding and thank you again for the generous donation of your time.

Sue?

>> Sue: Yes, and I just wanted to welcome our California friends.

Cynthia Dai thank you so much for setting this up and for moderating the panel.

We appreciate you being here.

Vince Barabba who is also a former Commissioner from the 2010 California Commission.

And then with him today is Tamina Alon, she just disappeared for me.

>> The bottom there.

>> Sue: Okay, so and Tamina was part of the mapping team however is no longer with that company.

But I know our Commissioners wanted to know about process and how best to work with the mappers and how best to determine the most qualified mappers.

So we thank you for being here and Cynthia take it away.

>> Cynthia: Great.

Thank you so much for having us back Commissioners.

So I thought what we would do is try to spend half our time in kind of moderated Q and A kind of take you through some basics and I'm sure you have tons of questions of your own that we hope to get to.

I just wanted to remind you that the 2010 California Commission was under severe time and money constraints.

And we did not have much of either.

We were required to use the state contracting process RFP process for any external vendors.

And you have met Vince and me but just briefly Tamina was of course part of our Intrepid team of mappers.

All female team which I think was an industry first.

And she is also an attorney who happens to know a little bit about voting rights, which was pretty darn convenient.

And she currently on her day job leads the policy and planning division for across the bay for contra Costa county.

So that is a little bit about Tamina.

So I'm going to jump right in.

And like I said hopefully get to your specific questions as soon as we can.

So the choice of a technical line drawing consultant was one of our first controversial decisions.

That we made as a Commission.

And it also was one of the important decisions that required a super majority vote.

And that meant that three of each partisan affiliation had to vote for it to pass.

It ended up being a unanimous decision.

But as you know gerrymandering is a partisan blood sport and most of the firms that were consultants in the mapping field were generally affiliated with one party or the other.

And so it has gotten a little bit better now but certainly it's back in 2010 that was the case.

That was pretty much the only way lines were drawn.

Were in smoky back rooms with the exception of Arizona.

So as you might expect that was something that colored the decisions that we made.

So Vince some of your fellow republicans had some concerns about our decision and wondering if you would share your take on what you remember about our decision and remember to unmute yourself.

>> Vince: Whoa, can you hear me?

>> Yes.

>> Vince: Well the interesting thing was that as that was -- discussion was going on among the different groups, it kept reminding me that as the since the Commission had people from both political parties involved, I was much more concerned over which firm had the most experience with the data that we would have to use.

And their knowledge about the complexities of the state of California.

And I think that the quality of the firm became more important to me and I think eventually to the rest of the group which led to that unanimous decision.

Was that the it was the quality of the firm, not whether they had republican or a democratic background.

>> Cynthia: Sure, so just to give everyone some context, we -- because we had no money, the amount that was set for the budget was below what most large national redistricting firms would be willing to do a state as big as California for.

So we actually only had two bids.

I hear your bidding process is going more robustly which is good to hear.

And one of the firms was actually disqualified for unresponsive bid.

So that was kind of the start of things.

So Tamina do you want to kind of share, give us a little more color on what the controversy was about?

And how your mapping team tried to address Commissioner concerns?

>> Tamina: Good morning Commissioners very nice to be with you this morning. There was controversy in the very beginning when we were going to be selected and then initially when we were selected about the partisanship of the firm that I was working for, the group that I was working for.

We are all declined to state voters and not politically affiliated with anybody and apparently this was something that just was unheard of and so we actually got a question.

The lead consultant we were at a meeting and they said to her so can you prove that you're not democratic?

And she looked at me and I looked at her like I don't exactly know how to prove I'm a negative and I'm not something.

That was a type of questioning that we received.

There was some concern that we were tied to some democratic person and who was actually not a member of our team.

Who we knew from academic studies that we had done before and worked with.

But was not a member of our team but I guess because they were looking for somebody partisan maybe who was a partisan man on the team who could be the ringleader that is, I guess who you know pressing questions were coming after.

But I think for us it was just about saying this is what our experience was.

This is what are the things we have done in the pasts.

We are social and data scientists so not really in the politics field.

It was very new for me to be even a conversation because numbers are very -- weren't very political in my mind.

It was looking at the data and presenting the data.

So I think the Commission handled it.

It was interested from my seat it was a conversation but I understood immediately that okay we are in the world of politics now and this is kind of part of it.

So we went along and just answered questions the best we could in order to restore our you know put to bed any doubts that anybody had and really give confidence to the Commissioners of our ability to do the work.

>> Cynthia: Thanks Tamina and just to be clear the Commission certain Commissioners insisted that the firm cut ties with the only man who was affiliated with the firm who happened to be a democrat.

And that was what got some folks over the hump and ended up with a unanimous decision.

So just a warning that even when people are not partisan it's going to be seen through a partisan lens.

So the Commission realized early on that it could leverage our technical consultants expertise for more than just operating GIS software.



Vince, what were some of the other ways that the CRC utilized our teams' knowledge?

>> Vince: Well, given the experience that the group that we selected had with the existing statewide database, and their understanding of the VRA legal implementation, that was very helpful to us in addressing a very complex issue which was how to deal with these complex issues.

And the -- their expertise in that area really helped us with the preclearance process. And also very helpful in determining locations for these public meetings which this group just discussed earlier today.

Which I think we found to be the quality of those public meetings probably gave us more insight into what our assignment how to complete our assignment success through than probably anything else we ever did.

>> Cynthia: Yeah, and I'll add that you know, there were specific things that were helpful as I mentioned.

Tamina is an attorney with VRA experience and she wasn't the only one on the team. So their actual experience with VRA implementation was something that in addition to our VRA counsel helped us get fast preclearance since California was a state subject to Section five preclearance, it's no longer relevant as you hopefully have learned.

Also, because of their familiarity with the state we asked them to help us find the best locations for public testimony.

And did quite a bit of work in figuring out average driving distances.

For most Californians so we could pick the best locations that were most accessible for the most number of Californians.

They helped us kind of break up the state into some logical regions to literally break down the problem.

And help us divide and conquer a little bit and also provided overviews every time we went to a new location to provide an overview of the region that we were in.

Because there are actually many different Californias and kept track of all of the communities of interest, all the testimony that we got which I ended up being a couple thousands, I think.

And another hard task was actually numbering all the districts.

Which maybe you can shed some light on how difficult that task was.

And also maybe comment on what most mapping teams could or should assist with these kinds of tasks.

We threw a lot at you.

>> Tamina: Sure, I think one thing that was useful is that our team was very familiar with the census data.

And you know we are a census data shop and we know a lot about the different tabulations and different tables that are available.

And so we pretty much knew where to look and how to parse the data for anything that the Commission wanted to look at.

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.

Another thing I think that we did that was that really worked well is we divided the state into several regions and then we had mappers assigned to each of the regions so we have specialized.

So for example I was one of the regions I was in charge of was the San Francisco bay area.

And so I knew the background, what was going on there.

I knew some of the communities of interest.

I had you know traveled widely in the region.

I actually live in the region.

And so I knew what was going on there.

And what the different areas were.

And so when the Commission traveled to an area that I was in charge of I would be able to brief them on what is going on in the area.

What some of the different pockets of populations were.

And then of course as the community of interest testimony would come in, I had some idea of what they were talking about because folks get very granular talking about their neighborhoods and their areas and are not used to talking about it in terms of spatial this is the street and boundary that cords off what my neighborhood is.

They just happen to know they love the place they live and it's in this general area.

And so helping being familiar with the area and being able to specialize on a particular part was really useful for me.

So for example, I would not -- I was not the main mapper in Los Angeles so I knew much less about the Los Angeles mapping because the person who was in charge there was really able to go in and do a lot of deep dive work in that particular region.

>> Cynthia: Great and comment on whether you think mappers should or could you know should always respond to these kinds of requests?

>> Tamina: So it depends.

I think the mapper's job is to provide the Commission with the best data that they possibly can in order to make a decision.

The Commission is going to be having to defend their maps.

They are going to have to say where a line, this is why this line is where it is.

And so the line drawer's job is to say here is the data.

Here are the options.

Excuse me.

And here is all the information that you can use to make that decision.

The line drawer's job is not to make that decision for the Commission.

Excuse me.

It's 8:00 a.m. over here, sorry.

And so really, it's just the line drawer has to be careful to say you know this is what I can do really to arm the Commission with the best data that they can have without saying

well I think you should go this way or I think you should go that way because that is not a decision for the line drawers to make.

Line drawers do not go in and say well we heard this public, this community of interest testimony and so we have to draw the line this way or we have to draw a line that way. That is not something that is purview in the work of what they should do, that is what the Commission is seated for.

>> Cynthia: Thanks, so you guys will remember that before we actually receive the census data and we are all waiting this year, but California always has to wait the longest.

We are always the last one to get our census data because the state is so big. So before we receive the census data the CRC held a service of public hearings just like you will be required to do.

Vince, what do you remember the Commission doing during this initial phase?

>> Vince: I remember traveling a lot.

What we had the 34 of these meetings and the one example that really stands out in my memory was the meeting in northern California.

What sometimes is called the Marysville area.

And as we expected there was a lot about the needs of farmers and cattle ranching in that area.

And we did not have enough but the thing that bothered us that was our first meeting and we didn't have a lot of time to publicize it so we were concerned that some people might have been left out of the meeting so we asked are there any groups that should be here?

And this one tall man got up and said well, yeah, he says there is a -- one of the groups that you need to talk to is the seek community.

I think that kind of stunned the Commission because we were not aware of how many seeks were in the state of California but this gentleman pointed out they brought rice farming to the area and there was about 10,000 seeks living in the area and that we saw them as really critical components of the community.

And as soon as that was finished a woman got up and said and don't forget the Mung community because they are farmers as well and their farms are really major making major contributions to the area.

That is data that never would have shown up in any of the databases that were made available to us.

And it's interesting that the when we finally got through drawing that district it was partially described as assembly district three characterized by inland Agriculture of crops such as rice and almonds but it includes a large seek community as well as Mung farmers in that area.

And that to me was really the essence of the importance of these meetings and brought out something that was not available in the traditional data that is made available to the Commission and we got more of that in each of the meetings that we had.

>> Cynthia: Right so definitely in the early phase you know since we did not actually have census data at that point it was much more about understanding what communities we were dealing with and each area and generally the tenor of the testimony was generally don't split us.

So.

>> Vince: Having spent some time in Michigan and even and when I was a census director I was invited to a meeting and it was of the group of middle eastern people in the area and I couldn't believe how many people of Middle Eastern descent were at this meeting that I was attending.

So that is a good example of an area that I would think is going to be really kind of important for the Commission to address to.

And I would only point out one of my colleagues at General Motors who is now involved with the University of Michigan is Alan Turfe. I think lives in Northville. He is probably more knowledgeable about that community than anybody could possibly be.

And he would be someone you might want to consider a discussion in how to address the issues that reflect that community.

>> Cynthia: And Tamina, as a mapper, what were the biggest challenges or concerns during this early phase?

>> Tamina: During the early phase, the focus is really on getting communities of interest testimony, getting the testimony, and getting it mapped out on the maps so what we would do is folks would come in the hearing and say here is where the boundaries of the mung community are.

And then we would say okay is it This Street and This Street and we would actually live map while we were there and click on the census blocs does this look right, is in the area and wanted to get geographically and spatially what the area looked like.

I think it's a very important to know what the limitations of your data sets are.

As Commissioner Barabba said you can say this is how many the census will count for example Asian population but cannot tell you a language minority group.

And so you can use ACS data but really when you have to get down in the granular communities it really takes the community coming out and saying this is where these little pockets of community are that need to be kept together.

And these are areas that maybe identified as a census as we have something in common but really, we don't.

So really getting all of that testimony together it's challenging when you don't have the census data yet because you can't redistricting is a population game.

And so being able to say well this is the number of people who live in this particular area is really important.

And so not having that it would be difficult for the Commissioners who wanted to know well exactly how many people live in this area that the Mung community wants to keep together, can they fit in a district.

We would not be able to tell them that information yet so that was the challenge.

But really what we focused on was getting all of that community of interest data into the database and put together so that when we did have the population data that came in, we could overlay those boundaries and give them the information that they need for population.

>> Cynthia: Perfect.

So like the ICRC the CRC is composed of individuals selected to be different, in our case 14.

Vince, tell us how the Commission leveraged the knowledge of each Commissioner to divide and conquer a very large state.

>> Vince: I think we are good at did vying it but nobody ever conquers it.

We broke it down into nine regions and we had a person of the Commission who lived in that region and a person on the Commission who was not a resident of that Commission get together and take a close look at what should be considered within that area.

In my case, the town I live in happens to be right on the Monterey Bay and the more we looked into what was going on in our area and what we had in common it became very clear that the two counties of Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay when a district was drawn should be together because they surrounded Monterey Bay and were we able to do that so all of the state districts and the Congressional districts created a district that completely surrounded Monterey Bay which is of keen interest to all the people who live there.

And it was those kinds of discussions based on the knowledge of the individual who lived there as well as the other person looking and questioning that led to the kind of districting that we eventually drew.

>> Cynthia: Yep, and I was on the team of course that looked at the San Francisco bay area and so Tamina what was it like to handle direction from the two-person regional teams?

>> Tamina: The two-person regional teams were great.

I actually did work with both Commissioner Dai and Commissioner Barabba on their separate regions and it was really great to be able to do a deeper dive in to those particular areas.

For example, Commissioner Barabba region he was just talking about was subject to Section five of the voting rights act.

Is an area that you cannot retrogress and Commissioner Barabba said okay well these are this is the testimony that we've heard, these are the areas we want to keep together. It was, you know I was able to say okay well here is the Section five area.

Here is what must be done in order not to retrogress and so how would you like to combine the community of interest with this legal mandate that we have to bring together?

So you can really get down on to the street level.

You can really get down into the smaller communities, working with a smaller group instead of working for your 14 bosses at once you only have two.

And really getting to know some of the really smaller areas where you are going to move those blocks because in the end when it comes to that line where the boundary of that district is going to be that is what folks are concerned about so we really need to know what is going on at that block level and at That Street level so it's really great to have the Commissioners to be able to look in, think, ask questions at that level and go back and think about them and come back and say okay to me I thought about this, what would happen -- what would the map look like if we moved this area over here or we moved this area over here and I can move those areas around in live time for them and they can take a look and see how that would inform their decision so being able to move quickly, live map and do a lot more very specific smaller line drawing was capable was available because we had those smaller teams.

>> Cynthia: Yeah, and I also note in addition to having kind of an experienced you know person and someone with fresh eyes on each region we also made sure there was one person that these were multi partisan teams.

So whoever was assigned to the region were not of the same parties.

The ability to be nimble I don't know what the rules are in Michigan but for us in California three Commissioners makes a meeting which would have acquired public notice and all that so by making them two persons that we were able to meet on the side and you know, let Tamina crunch the numbers and it just gave us a little more flexibility before she would come back in front of the full Commission and present the results of all the crunching.

And for Tamina we made her redraw the bay area like at least three times to try to figure out how do we not cross the golden gate bridge and not splitting a large community and another part of the bay and it was very challenging.

So we did that offline.

And we were able to present the tell the full Commission we tried everything in order to meet those constraints.

So the California Constitution provides six rank ordered line drawing criteria highly similar to Michigan's Constitution.

Beginning with of course equal population one person one vote.

And how did the second criteria which is adherence to the voting rights act affect the line drawing, Tamina?

>> Tamina: Well, it's everything really.

You really have to start with the voting rights act.

Because for Section five for example you're given these immovable puzzle pieces which you have to start from.

So the Section five said okay you cannot you have a population of minority of this particular percentage in this area and you may not draw a new district which dilutes that population or makes it any less.

So in other words we have to start there because every single district that you draw is going to bump up against its neighbor and have a ripple effect on the ones moving forward so you really have to start with the number one your voting rights analysis so you have to have your voting rights attorneys on board.

Who can tell you about just what is going on in that area.

Has there been a racially polarized voting analysis that has been done on that area, what does that particularly look like?

So that you are able to make your discussions about your legally required district and that is where you are going to start and you will bill off of those so you will build out from those particular districts and the district next to it and the district next to it.

If I were to start in the northern part of the state on the left hand side and just start working down the state, then when I came to these immovable puzzle pieces then there would be no way I would be boxed in and there would be no way for me to meet those populations so really you need to start with the things that you can't change and then move on to the things that you can change later on.

The Section two districts are then next and would be the majority minority districts. Again looking at the RPB analysis, can you draw districts which would fit within this particular Section of the voting rights act, what would they look like, what are the different options for those because if you can do those then those would then be the second piece that you would then build and build around.

>> Cynthia: Vince, do you have any comments?

>> Vince: Yeah, as a specific example you know as I indicated we were trying to keep Monterey and Santa Cruz together but there was a military base that was in Monterey county which had been de-Commissioned.

That base at the time the count was made had significant amount of minority population. But when it came to the that we had to match and but when it came to the new census that population was not there so Tamina had a real interesting job of trying to keep the counties together but she had to reach further eastern to the east to pick up the more of a minority population.

So we could meet the voting rights act.

It became a real complex issue which for which she did a very nice job.

>> Cynthia: And I will note that Section five of the voting rights act has been struck down so it does not apply.

But you guys will still have to deal with Section two.

And we had real challenge in southern California which is very dense.

And when we looked at the census data you know the different minority populations were color coded and I always said oh, my gosh this looks like a Jackson Pollock painting so it was extremely challenging to draw Section two districts that would make everyone happy.

We actually had to knock heads and make the various groups work it out with each other.

In some areas.

Because we knew we were going to make some group really, really unhappy.

And we had to also kind of thread the needle between the number of majority minority districts that certain groups wanted us to draw.

And what was legally possible.

We ended up drawing a lot of what are called opportunity districts.

So where citizen voting, age population is not quite 50% but pretty close.

And also keeping in mind that the census traditionally under counts underrepresented communities, might have even, you know, actually been a majority minority district even though we were not seeing that in the census data.

And so it was kind of this line between drawing enough districts but not too many. And since we did not get sued by any of these groups, we considered it a major success at the end.

Last question.

At several points in the process the Commission had to literally go back to the drawing board especially after our first draft maps were released and tomatoes started being thrown at our first attempt.

Vince, how did the Commission work with our technical consultants to handle conflicting testimony and map options as you remember it?

>> Vince: Well, we would look at the concerns that were expressed by these groups and then we would identify changes that would have to occur in meeting that particular concern.

That meant that taking an area already in an existing district and moving it to another district.

The consultants at that time our line drawing experts, would have to go into the database and make the changes and display them to us so that we could determine that if this requested change was just meeting this requirement identified by an individual, had a negative effect on how we were meeting our other requirements and so it was the dialog that took place between their expertise and getting the data and showing us the alternatives that would have to be made to meet this requirement and whether trying to meet that additional requirement had a negative effect on what our whole requirement set was.

And that was an interesting discussion because as you can imagine there were a lot of people who wanted to have certain things done.



But the ability to see those consequences of what those changes would be quickly was very helpful in finally deciding which ones to go with.

>> Cynthia: Great, and Tamina how did you imagine conflicting directions from individual Commissioners and the Commission as a whole?

>> Tamina: Well, first I think it's important to point out the line drawers really have to understand it is the Commission who are their bosses.

Every break of every public hearing there is a line of people just to be in our ears, tell us where they wanted things put, you know and of course we just say that's great for public testimony.

You should go and fill out the speaker card and tell the Commission this.

But there were a lot of folks who have a lot of really strong feelings about where things are going to be so it's very important to go back to the Commission and you know when they are wrestling with an area to make sure that you clarify what that -- what the instruction is.

So I would sit there and I would say, okay, so, Commissioner, just to be clear, your instruction is that you want me to move this block of 680 people out of area A and you want me to move it into area B and you would like to see what happens when this happens.

I will take that back and I will move it and see where everything goes.

When you are doing these types of moves it's really like a wedding seating chart.

So if Aunt Gertrude can't sit next to Aunt Mary, she has to sit somewhere else. So Aunt Mary is going to be on table three and all the sudden, you know, Richard can't sit next to Ilene, and you know everything moves around that way. And so it was our job to come back and say, okay, we move this 680 person block out of area A into area B and depending on where this -- whoever gets displaced on the outside rim, because we added 680 people, we have to take out 680 people, who -- here are the possibilities for what can be moved in that area.

Again it was not our decision to make of which one to say.

We said you can take 680 people out of this Section of Area B and to area C or take 680 out of area B and move it to area D and this is what it would look like and how it would affect the rest of your map that you have already drawn.

And then it will be the Commission's choice to say in discussion how they wanted to move forward with that.

>> Cynthia: Okay so I think we have given you hopefully a good flavor of the process and I want to make sure to open it up and let you guys ask whatever burning question you have.

So Steve do you want to moderate this part.

>> Steve: Doug, go right ahead.

>> That was very informative I have a number of questions the first one has to be directed to Tamina.

And what I'm looking at is what is the base line that you establish when you begin to redistrict?

So day one when you start to redistrict and put maps together what is the base line? Based on your conversation my understanding was it's the pieces you can't move and you built out of that.

My thoughts always were gee our number one priority is population and you divide the state up somehow into 13 districts for the Congressional seats.

And then you start moving the pieces around.

So could you comment on that?

Then I have some comments on process as well.

>> Cynthia: Actually let me intercede.

There was a when we started the drawing there was this kind of unspoken you know thought, do we start from scratch or do we start from existing districts and although it was funny, we never actually voted on it and became really apparent to us as we looked at the map we were going to have to start from scratch and that was because decades of gerrymandering made the existing map just crap.

It completely unreflective of the population and so we kind of organically just started from scratch and this is something I know this is what the Commissioners had on their mind go Tamina.

>> Doug: I have a comment and we will reduce districts and we can't start from the existing districts.

>> You will probably have to start from scratch also.

>> Doug: Correct Tamina can you talk about the base line.

>> Tamina: Base line is one person one vote and it's population.

The problem is we had a very short timeline and we did not have the census and did not have the population.

Normally the which you start a redistricting you say okay we have the census data.

The most recent census data 2020 and the census data 2020 says we have X number of people in the population of Michigan we are growing to divide that by the number of districts we want and that is the ideal population for each district and that what we have to shoot for.

We did not have the data yet but we had to start doing some work so we said okay let's look at some of the areas that we need that we wouldn't be able to move any way and what they would do to effect the decision we will make down the road.

And like was said Section five is not a problem for you so you won't have the immovable puzzle pieces but you will start looking at what are the communities of interests and pockets that might form a district to so when you come to those areas it might be a little easier for you to work with. And the Section two areas are definitely going to determine how some areas look which are going to affect other areas. And you are absolutely right the ideal population is the place to start.

>> Doug: Okay, but then when you get the census data, how do you overlay that into the equal pieces that you need to?

>> Tamina: So what the software we use aptitude for redistricting but there are many different softwares out there and what the software allows you to do is gather different census blocks in a geography and area and tell you how many people live in that area. So one of the things that is probably helpful for the Commission to do if you have not done already is just take a look at the population density as it is now. Maybe use the I would use ACS2019 data instead of the last 2010 census data since folks shift around so so much but for example looking in California a lot of our population is in the south.

Our northern counties are very sparsely populated.

And so that's going to tell me already as a line drawer that my districts up in the north are going to be much, much larger looking than the ones in the south.

Because I have to reach into very many areas in order to find the population that I need. And most of the public who comes out is not going to understand that.

They will say how come they have such a big district and we have such a tiny district and why does it look this way because census blocks tend to look strange sometimes so it's I think it's very useful to get an idea what the population looks like, what the moves have been, over the past ten years and so you have an idea of kind of where things are going to shape out.

>> Doug: Okay can we talk a little bit about process?

I'm interested in the interface of the Commissioners to the redistricting technicians, okay?

We have 13 Commissioners.

And I understand you broke things into regions I'm not sure we can do that because of our Open Meetings Act because I think we have to have open meetings for all this redistricting work.

But how would -- how did your Commissioners as a group say okay redistricting technician, I want to make this adjustment and take a look at what the results are.

Do they -- and this may not be your question Tamina, it may be Cynthia's or Vince's, do they come together and say yeah, let's make this change as a group?

Or do they independently come back to people?

And to the technicians and say let's take a look at this and look at that and so forth?

>> Tamina: The Commission really focused on transparency so they did all of their work all of that type of direction as a full board.

So it would be a discussion of the full board and saying well I think we should move this, no I don't think we should move this who thinks we should move this so at the very end come to a final decision and then the Chair of the board would say okay yes this is what we decided we would like you to try.

But it was definitely not something that we did offline.

We did not do any line drawing offline.

It was all things that the public could view.

And so everything was outdone in the public hearing space.

Instead of you know in those separate smaller groups.

Separate smaller groups were more study groups to look at particular areas and what would happen if you moved certain things around but when we actually did the line drawing and made the decisions of where those lines were going to go all of that was done live.

>> Doug: That was done live but you had these like subcommittees these regions that would independently drop back to the Commission some recommendations.

>> Cynthia: For example we had this challenge in the San Francisco bay area where we got very strong public input not to cross the golden gate bridge and really the other side of the golden gate bridge is very rural.

It's quite different.

But we had these very large communities of interest that we also were told not to split. And so these were two kind of competing constraints.

So we would get direction from the full Commission.

Go find out what our options are to note cross the golden gate bridge and not split these communities and I and Connie would go off with Tamina and we would try to see what we could do.

And bring the options back to the full Commission.

I would also note that our Commission chose to work by consensus.

Which, you know, we define as, you know, the will of the Commission becomes apparent and it's not necessary to take a vote because it's pretty obvious which way that is going to go.

So we tried as much as possible to speak with one voice.

To make it really clear to our mapping team what the Commission wanted.

But in general you know if one Commissioner wanted to see a particular option done, unless there was a huge objection, we would ask our mappers to do that, you know.

We knew we needed a super majority vote at the end and we wanted everyone to be satisfied that you know we had explored all the options.

>> Doug: Okay, so I'm going to direct this towards Julianne our attorney here.

I look at the way they did the region analysis, these two people groups as similar to our subcommittees which we always had to have is in the Open Meetings Act, Julianne, if we decided to take that an approach would we have to take these two people subcommittees for the regions in Open Meetings Act for everything they do?

>> Julianne: So that's an excellent question.

And I'm happy to look at that and bring you back your answer.

>> Doug: That is no differ than the subcommittees we working on now.

>> Cynthia: In California three people is a meeting that is why we had two person teams.

>> Doug: I done think we have the criteria.

>> Julianne: We have quorum requirements and that so I would like to bring back the options and look at that because it's for the Commission to decide how they are going to conduct their business and I think that is the larger question that the Commission that this Commission would need to address.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Cynthia: I would note Michigan is substantially smaller than California so it may not be as necessary too.

>> Julianne: In our Open Meetings Act and I know yours has a different name and they are different so your population in 2010 was 37 million and 37.25 or something and we are the tenth largest state just around nine or over nine million so there is quite significant differences at a variety of levels but I hear your question Doug and I'm happy to put together a writing for the Commission to consider.

>> Doug: Yeah, okay one last question Tamina.

So you are recommending as a base line we start with the nonmovable pieces and then we build out from there.

But at some point, in time like I may have asked this before but at some point in time we've got to apply the census data and so how and we know we are going to probably reduce down to 13 districts or so.

So how do we apply that initially?

Even though we know one of the criteria is we have to keep those nonmovable pieces together?

>> Steve: I think she said there are Section five is no longer applicable.

So there are no nonmovable pieces anymore.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Steve: Am I incorrect in that Tamina?

>> Tamina: You are right the part you will look at is Section two now and those are majority minority districts and counsel feel free to jump in on this.

So basically, you're looking at the population and you're actually using the census data. You are using the census data from as soon as you can get it because that is going to tell you what the population is you can move around and what the different break downs for VRA for section two would be for you to look it and you don't have I'm moveable puzzle pieces but areas could be subject to Section two of the voting rights act which your counsel will point out to you these are the areas and are the ones you would probably start with because you need to make sure that those are legally sufficient areas before you move on to other ones which have more options.

>> Concentrated areas of minority population which, of course, is all of Detroit so.

>> Doug: Okay.

>> Vince: Let me just add as the person somewhat familiar with the census, this particular census is going to be very difficult to deal with because of all the problems they ran in to in the actual collection of the data and all the things that are going on while they were trying to do their job.

So I think these meetings where you go out and listen will probably be much more important to you in getting at least a beginning of a sense of what the districts might look like so that when the data does finally show it and it will be much more limited in its characteristics that you will at least be able to meet the equal count in each of those districts.

But I think you are going to have to rely more on listening to people from the areas as to how you might want to put them together.

>> Cynthia: Vince has a really good point I was enumerator this summer and I will tell you in the rush of the census to try to complete to meet the former president's deadline, there were whole areas where we did not collect characteristics of people.

So you will just not you will only have population count.

You will not know the characteristics of those folks.

So Vince is totally right so you are going to have to rely on public testimony to literally give color to some of that testimony.

>> Steve: Not wanting to cut us short and I'm not going to but we've got three or four minutes left.

MC.

>> MC: In particular with was there a time when you as the 14 Commissioners of California as you were doing these, I believe 34, yeah, public gatherings testimony did you go out as a full 14?

Did you ever find that you got feedback or like if you didn't go out as 14 did you get feedback that that like where the rest of the Commission?

>> Cynthia: We always did.

That was a decision we made as a Commission because like yours our Commission was designed to be diverse and represent the you know look like California.

And we felt it was really important to go out in public and look like California wherever we went.

And I don't know what the 2020CRC is going to do especially since everything is virtual you kind of have lots of choices in how you want to do that but that was a decision we made.

>> And the line drawers accompany it every year.

>> MC: Got positive feedback in general the idea that the full Commission was represented at each one of those with the line drawers was well received; is that correct?

>> Cynthia: People liked looking at us and seeing faces that represented them.

>> Steve: Erin did I see your hand up?

Okay, Anthony.

>> Anthony: I think that was a great presentation.

And I also think those were great questions MC.

I was going to ask some that you already asked, Doug.

But I just have one more for Vince.

I'm wondering how did y'all deal with combining smaller communities of interest together?

Communities that might be vocal and that they are a community of interest and they are a community of interest but may not be large enough to say have their own district?

You mentioned the monk farmers a couple times and just wondering where did you combine them so they were satisfied?

>> Vince: Well, that was really one of the more difficult activities.

As you've identified but what you ended up doing is you had to step back and look at the big picture.

I mean in the case of that example with the Mung farmers we figured since that whole area related to farming that it was a good idea to bring them in even know they were in the northern part of the district and the seeks were in the southern part of the districts the fact that it was not just that they were a group of mung but they were also farmers so it was the combination of characteristics that allowed us to bring it together.

>> Anthony: Thank you that answers my question.

Thanks a lot for that.

And you also said that the main thing you got from the communities of interest were essentially you know keep them together and not to you know put a line between them?

>> Cynthia: But also who they wanted to be with.

What surrounding communities did they have a natural affinity for that they shared common interests that having the same representative would allow them to have more effective representation.

>> Vince: I recall one meeting in Long Beach and Long Beach is a very complicated community and it had many different interest groups.

But the group that we talked to in a large meeting in city hall said keep our different groups together because we find interest in going through the different activities on the weekends each of these groups do and that makes it living in Long Beach an interesting place to live.

So that was another example of it was a community of interest of saying our community of interest is the differences because we enjoy being part of that community that has the differences.

So it's very important to be very attentive that when people are telling you things because in that case, we actually made the distinction in Long Beach to keep the entire city together even though it had a wide range of different communities of interest.

>> Steve: Okay I want to take MC I want to take yours and if we have more questions, I think we can e-mail some or figure out another way to ask California to enlighten us further and maybe even get them back here again since they enjoy our cold weather.

MC.

>> MC.

>> Cynthia: Especially virtually.

>> MC: The question is in relationship to the sort of the let's say the well-resourced communities of interest and the ones that aren't as well-resourced was it apparent to you like there were some that were that say were louder or that were easier to hear from?

And was there something that you did in order to help create a balance sort of like trying to figure out which ones, yeah, were sort of, yeah equal.

>> Cynthia: Yeah, it's really important not to just listen to the loudest voices in the room.

You are going to naturally hear from the groups that are well financed and have resources.

And you know, did statewide maps on their own and presented them to us.

I mean it's important to listen to those groups because there is a reason they are well financed because they are generally larger groups.

However, like we never actually heard directly from the mung farmer I mean other people stood up and spoke for them which was you know fabulous and we heard from some very small groups where only one person came, you know.

But you know, we used and maybe Tamina can comment on this but you know whatever data we could to try to back that up and try to map that out.

Do you want to comment, Tamina, on some of the really small groups like Somali refugees and the Armenia's in LA?

>> Tamina: Sure just that it's not a popularity contest and communities of interests are not weighted more heavily than others and we would have groups that came out all wearing the same premade red T-shirts that had like their slogan on it and line the halls of the hearing room and they all 20 of them gave the exact same testimony about where the community of interest is.

And I would map that community.

And then we would have one person come out from you know a poorer Section of San Francisco and say I live in the western edition, this is what my community is.

And there are a bunch of us, we are all at work right now but you know this is what the community is.

And we map the community in the exact same way.

So the community testimony would be respected either way regardless of how many folks actually came out.



Of course the Commissioners would see the number of people who were there but what it looked like when it came down to the maps was these are the different communities that were testified about.

>> Vince: I would add as far as expenditure of funds the one place where you really want to put most of your expenditures is in these meetings.

Because you will hear things there that you would not hear any place else.

>> Cynthia: Yeah, so anything you can do to make it easier for, you know, underrepresented communities to have a say and you got to remember a lot of them are not politically sophisticated and going through a public and doing public testimony is something they have never done in their lives.

How can you make it easier?

So you know we did things like you know making sure our materials are available in multiple languages.

And key meetings where you know we knew about the region we were going to and had interpreters on hand.

And you know we worked with community organizations that were well respected.

Who we knew could represent their communities and organize them.

I know that voters not politicians is working to try to organize some of these smaller communities of interest.

And the Commission our Commission was happy to sub grant some of the money we had left from the grant that allowed us to travel to other states.

To help support that.

So we actually gave the count Michigan votes organization some money to help support these smaller communities to train them how to give public testimony.

How to map their communities.

And anything you can do as the ICRC to help facilitate that, to make sure you get the data you need to make informed decisions I think is really important.

>> Steve: Thank you.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Cynthia and Tamina and Vince for coming and sharing with us.

It's clear to me that some of the things we are doing is we are on the right track.

And we haven't thought of everything that we ought to be doing.

And that's to be expected.

I think we -- I think I can say if we could send you three or one or whatever some e-mails with questions you might consent to answer them for us.

And maybe we can prevail on you to come back at a later date once we figure out how much we don't know and then see what we can do.

But we really, really appreciate you coming and it's been very interesting and you have been very you know enlightening.

And with that we are kind of at the end of our time since we had already asked our people at that control the meetings if we could run over and we have already done that so I would entertain a motion to adjourn from somebody.

Anthony motion, Rhonda second all in favor.

>> Anthony: A quick comment or announcement before we end, I just wanted to say that yesterday the, sorry, can you all hear me still?

>> Steve: Yes, go ahead.

>> Anthony: Yesterday there was a live stream of the Michigan nonprofit association and Sue was on there for a moment and I thought she did a very good job.

The two major questions they had that I listened to were when we are going to when and where we are going to have these meetings and then also asked about you know what we are going to do with the census delay.

So I think we should continue to talk about those things and hopefully answer some of those questions at the next meeting.

>> Steve: Okay, all in favor of adjourning raise your hand.

[ Hands raised ]

Thank you again, California.

>> Thank you for having us.

>> It's our pleasure.

>> Good-bye.

[ Meeting concludes at 12:08 p.m. ]