

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

MICRC

02/24/22 10:00 am Meeting

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: I'm confirming we don't see our Chair currently, correct? She told me she might be late.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: We have a quorum if you would like to start.

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Good morning, Commissioners; and good morning, Michigan.

As Vice Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:00 a.m.

This Zoom webinar is being live streamed on YouTube at Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission YouTube channel.

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.

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

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

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available at [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) for viewing at a later date and this is a nice, new website by the way.

This meeting also is being transcribed and those closed captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on [Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://Michigan.gov/MICRC) website along with the written public comment submissions.

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

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

For the purposes of the public watching and for the public record I will now turn to the Department of State staff to take note of the Commissioners present.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Good morning, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. Because we are all attending the meeting remotely, please disclose you are attending remotely and as well as your physical location you are attending from.

City, County or Township.

I will start with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present; attending the meeting from Huntington Beach, California.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Good morning. Present remotely attending from Detroit, Michigan.

Brittini Kellom?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present; attending from Lee County, Florida.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present; attending Remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

>> VICE COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: Present; attending remotely from Lansing, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present; attending remotely from Highland Township, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Lansing, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present; attending remotely from Saginaw Township, Saginaw Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

Dustin, if you are talking, we can't hear you right now.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I came back.

I'm Present; attending remotely from Howell, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you. 11 Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

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

>> COMMISSIONER ROTHORN: If Commissioner Kellom is present she might be here now just joined.

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I will return to Commissioner Kellom.

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: As a reminder to the public watching, You can view the agenda at Michigan.gov/MICRC.

I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda. So moved. Motion made by Commissioner Witjes. Seconded by Commissioner Lett. Is there discussion or debate on the motion? Or any amendments to the meeting agenda? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I'd like to motion to add resolution 20220217 to the agenda.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, could you say the number again? I'm trying to make sure I'm looking at the right thing.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Resolution 2022.02.17 resolution for consent for terms and Wagner versus MICRC.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have a second for that amendment?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion to amend by Commissioner Eid, seconded by Commissioner Lett to add agenda or resolution 200217 authorize consent judgment of Wagner versus MICRC any discussion or amendment on that? Okay, we can go ahead and vote on the amendment at this time all in favor of amending the agenda to add resolution and I know you didn't specify where you want it to go Anthony but I'm going to put it as 6C is that acceptable? All in favor raise your hand and say aye. Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay the ayes prevail and the amendment to the agenda is adopted are there any additional amendments? So I will make amendment to request to amend the Robert Patwell.

Commissioner or I'm sorry, Executive Director Hammersmith, what was the item you wanted to add with respect to the Robert agreement? I just want to make sure I understand.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: It would just be an amendment to the resolution so we can address that I believe when we get there.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, anything else we need to add to the agenda? I know we had some things come up overnight.

All right, Commissioner Witjes, I see you.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Last meeting I did request something be added into the agenda for us to talk about getting a 7% raise to combat inflation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: It's actually on there.

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

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I must have missed it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: After the recess under the Glengariff there is an item on there.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Got it, sorry.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No worries.

Let's move back to the prime motion to approve the meeting agenda as amended.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Lett all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

All right the ayes prevail and the agenda is adopted. Thank you, everybody.

All right, at this point we are going to begin the public comment pertaining to agenda topics portion of our meeting. Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with the public comment pertaining to agenda topics.

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

I will call on your name and the staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the zoom app to unmute your mic and speak. If you on the phone, a voice will say that the host would like you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute.

I will call on you by your name or the last four digits of the phone number. Also please note if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for 3-5 seconds, we will move on to the next person in line and then return to you after they are done speaking.

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

You will have one minute to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer.

First in line to provide public comment is Mr. James Galant. Please allow a moment for our staff to unmute you.

>> Hello, this is James Galant, Marquette, these are my opinions.

I've asked the Commission to please consider expanding the public comment at the meetings now back to the two and probably to three minutes, you know we are looking at three minutes to be standard across the Open Meetings Act.

I would ask this Commission to vote to request that Commissioner Lange would expand upon her what she was sanctioning of the Chair and the bullying charges.

What she exactly meant by that because you know bullying is somebody overstepped their authority and somebody's rights got violated except for you know your side agreements allows that to continue and it's still bullying, it is having a discussion before a motion.

That is allowing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Mr. Gallant. Next in line the Anthony Skinnell.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Madam Chair, Mr. Gallant had I believe about ten seconds left.

I don't know if his signal cut out or he is experiencing technical difficulties Mr. Gallant can you hear us? Unfortunately we can no longer hear you.

It appears your audio may have cut out.

So per your instruction Madam Chair we will move on to the next participant.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, if he happens to call back, I have no problem putting him back on and let him finish his additional ten seconds so just let me know if that happens.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Absolutely.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Mr. Skinnell.

>> Good morning MICRC thank you so much.

That's happened to me before I've been cutoff and sadly, I did not get any time reclaimed, but hey it's water under the bridge.

But you know, I see you missed on the agenda the 7%, wow, you know I would like 7% but I'm missing on the agenda I'm not seeing it, maybe it's in the fine print for each plan adopted this is bullet point 16 in your amendment for each plan adopted the Commissioner shall issue a report that explains the basis on which the Commission made its decisions.

In achieving compliance with the plan requirements is Ms. Reinhardt going to explain your decision making basis in the back room and approve it by the speed of light dark of night do you know what I mean? That is what I'm curious about, this explanatory report. I don't see how this has not come up yet.

You talked about raises rules disbandment, everything.

So also, I wish all the litigants against you success and I wish you success in filling your FOIA requests.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Mr. Skinnell. Next in line is Howard Baron.

>> Can you hear me?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes, we can.

>> Very good.

So my name is Howard Baron, a VNP volunteer on February 10 you discussed your term of office.

Paragraph 18 says the term of the Commission shall expire once the Commission has completed its obligation for a census cycle.

But not before any judicial review of the redistricting plan is complete.

As Commissioner Witjes said the objective phrase is census cycle.

Your term expires when the census cycle will be completed in November 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.

The final time your maps will be used.

In a few months the Commission should go dormant keeping only a skeleton staff and your lawyers on retainer.

Also realize another state might ask you to visit them to provide your redistricting expertise.

From 2017-2021 both VNP and this Commission actively consulted with the 2010 Commissioners from both California and Arizona.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you for addressing the Commission. Next in line is Sonia Patrick.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That participant is not present.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, and did Mr. Gallant call back in by any chance?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: He did.

I will prompt him to unmute.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay.

>> Hello, James Galant again. Sorry about that, my phone shut off and but you know as I was saying please consider expanding the comment time now you only got a few people participating from now on and go back to the regular meeting schedule like it was before and go to three minutes because that would be fair.

And also, I'd ask you to please consider requesting that Commissioner Lange would expand on her definition of bullying when she went...

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Mr. Gallant.

That concludes our public comment for this morning. However, I would like to mention that all e-mailed and mailed public comment is provided to the Commission before each meeting. And Commissioners also review the public comment portal on [www.Michigan.gov/MICRC](http://www.Michigan.gov/MICRC) on a regular basis. We appreciate everyone who provides public comment in whatever way you choose to do so. And invite you to keep sharing your thoughts especially if you would like to share the ways that you think the MICRC processes or procedures could have been good or could have been more effective.

First item on the agenda is unfinished business 5A contract, change notice for Federal Compliance LLC, which was discussed at our last meeting. Without objection I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to present this agenda item.

Please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Good morning, Commissioners, I hope you are doing well today.

Before you is a resolution 20220210.

Let's see I have a typo on that.

Please accept the Scribner's correction there. And the issue is extending contracts to the point where we hope litigation might be complete for the current two-year cycle and also the four-year cycle coming up, so it would cover 2022 and 2024.



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

We have an option on the contract to extend through February 28th, 2024, that's two-one year options to extend.

I think it would make sense to also approve a useful life extension to this contract through September 30th, 2025.

It would get the Commission through that fiscal year.

It would also get through the 2024 election cycle.

So the first two election cycles might be most likely to bring litigation.

We will also update the staff contact information for that contract at the present time we are including both Edward and myself.

So we are both in the communication loop with all the consultants.

So that is the resolution put before you.

It's 20220210.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions or comments for our Executive Director? If not, I would entertain a motion to adopt resolution 202202310 contract change notice for Federal Compliance.

Motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none it's moved and seconded to approve resolution 20220210 contract change notice for Federal Compliance LLC all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

And Commissioner Vallette if you could just verbally indicate an aye or a nay.

I did not see your hand go up on either.

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Aye.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Aye thank you very much.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Ask Commissioner Wagner too please.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Wagner? Commissioner Wagner could you indicate your vote?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioner Wagner if you are speaking, we are unable to hear you.

Commissioner Wagner may be experiencing technical difficulties.

I will connect with her offline.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, so the ayes prevail and the motion is adopted. Next on our agenda is unfinished business item 5B contract change notice for Election Data Services.

Without objection I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to present this item.

Hearing no objection please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: On the EDS contract would mirror the Federal Compliance, both were initiated at the same time and the resolution asks again to extend through February 28, 2024.

Initiating those two one year provisions then approve a useful life extension through September 30, 2025, and update the staff contact information.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay any questions for Executive Director? All right if not I would entertain a motion to adopt resolution 20220211 contract change notice for Election Data Services.

Motion made by Commissioner Witjes seconded by Commissioner Lett.

Any discussion or debate on the motion? It is moved and seconded to approve resolution 20220211 contract change notice for Election Data Services all in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

Janice, I see you too.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay and then Commissioner Wagner, I'm going to see if you can verbally indicate again.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: She had to step away for a moment.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, the ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Next on our agenda is new business item 6A budget recommendations.

Without objection I will ask Executive Director Hammersmith to present this item.

Hearing no objection please proceed Ms. Hammersmith.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: So I presented some recommendations on the budget.

What we have quickly discovered is our litigation contract amounts are inadequate for the litigation that is happening at the present time.

And as we anticipate going forward.

So if you look at the column noted as recommended adjustments it's the second column from the right, I'm recommending we reduce staff salaries by just over 103,000.

Due to General Counsel leaving her position at the end of this week.

Actually tomorrow.

I have reduced 11,376 in travel costs.

We had that amount in hotel rooms that were billed to the Commission and I have reassessed those to EDS and Federal Compliance and their help with the mapping process.

We did book rooms for them because we wanted them to be able to get the state rate.

So the legislative services Bureau couldn't separate those bills so we will do an accounting adjustment.

But again that is to remove 11,376 from the Commissioners' travel and put that travel expense into EDS and Federal Compliance

Going down the list then, when you get into the consultants, I am recommending adding 250,000 to each of the litigation and local counsel contracts.

The local counsel has utilized 71% of its budget.



So this month of February there's a lot of activity with litigation.

I anticipate that the share of what is remaining in the contract will be utilized

So what this does to the budget, again, is about a net 400,000 increase in the budget. If you can see, if you go all the way to the left and look down at the bottom you can see our total expenses per the budget less the appropriation initially, we had an 826,900 shortfall.

With these adjustments just under 400,000 this budget shortfall will be a little over 1.2 million.

Because of this, we are in active conversation with how best to approach the legislature on requesting these funds.

And I will anticipate the first question how do we know how much we are going to need for litigation and the answer is we don't know.

This is a best guess depending on where we are right now versus where we may be in the future.

So is this a one and done? I hope it is.

But certainly if litigation continues, those costs will be increased and we may have to go back to the legislature again to cover those costs.

So I would entertain any questions you might have on the budget as a whole.

And then we will look briefly at the resolutions addressing this.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any questions? All right I'm not seeing any questions right now.

There we go Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to move that we approve the budget changes that Suann just presented to us.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Second.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we actually have several separate resolutions.

So why don't I go through them and then Doug if you are in favor, you can make a motion on them, does that make sense?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, that is fine.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion or resolution 20220213 to approve the first amendment to the Baker Hostetler agreement.

I'm sorry I skipped one let's go back.

First one is 20220212 approve the second amendment for the Fink Bressack PLLC contract. I would entertain a motion to adopt that resolution.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Lett seconded by Commissioner Weiss to adopt resolution 20220212 approval of the second amendment for the Fink Bressack PLLC contract is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none it is moved and seconded to adopt the resolution 20220212 second

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.

approve second amendment for the Fink Bressack contract all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

And I acknowledge you, Janice.

All oppose raise your hand and say nay.

And Erin Wagner, I see you on the phone if you could verbally indicate.

We can't hear you Erin if you are speaking.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: She may still be away.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right, it is the ayes prevail and the motion is adopted

I would entertain a motion to approve resolution 20220213 approval of first amendment for Baker Hostetler contract.

Motion made by Commissioner Lett.

Seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? All right it's moved and seconded that we adopt resolution 20220213 approval of first amendment for Baker Hostetler contract all in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Commissioner Wagner just checking to see if you are available.

Okay sounds like she is still away from the computer.

So the ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted

I will entertain a motion to approve resolution 20220214.

Executive Director Hammersmith?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: This is the one resolution that I would like to ask for an amendment.

Currently our paralegal is capped at 20 hours per week due to the backlog in the FOIAs and prior to this time she was not assisting with FOIA.

She was only assisting with research for litigation.

So we have this backlog of FOIAs MDOS has requested that assistance from the Commission.

And they are very generous agreement to take over the FOIAs for the Commission.

So I think that is the least we can do is try to help them.

Initially at 20 hours per week this contract the current contract amend would have lasted through September.

Obviously if we double the hours over the next quarter, it will probably shorten the length of the contract to June 30th or may extends further depending on the level of work.

Right now there is a backlog and that extra help is needed so we would like to also add to this resolution to amend the hours from up to 20 hours per week to up to 40 hours per week.

>> CHAIR SZETELA:

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would move to amend the contract from 20 to 40 hours per week.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, seconded by Commissioner Clark so we have a motion and a second by motion by Commissioner Lett to amend the under lying Robert half contract for paralegal services to permit up to 40 hours a week instead of 20 hours per week seconded by Commissioner Clark.

General Counsel did you have a comment on this.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I did thank you so much Madam Chair and good morning to the Commission today.

Just to clarify the addition to the hours there is not a FOIA backlog.

The two remaining productions relative to e-mail records should go out before my tenure ends tomorrow.

I think what the Executive Director is referring to is related to the FOIA litigation which is almost 4,000 documents that we received last Thursday, last Thursday or Friday.

So and my concern and I know I sent e-mails yesterday to Robert half and perhaps the Executive Director received responses to those.

I did not.

Was the concern was whether ex extending the hours up to the 40 hours would require additional changes in that purchase order.

And again I have not received verification on that at all yet.

But I just wanted to highlight those two issues for the Commission's benefit, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you General Counsel.  
Executive Director?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I just also want to mention we are not going to do anything that triggers benefits.

So if we have to back it off, we will.

But, again, the up to 40 would allow for that flexibility.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so we have a motion and a second to amend resolution 20220214 with respect to Robert half Government paralegal services to increase the amount of time permissible up to 40 hours.

Any discussion or debate on that motion?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I apologize for the interruption just for clarification purples the Executive Director received confirmation going up to 40 hours modifying the contract terms was acceptable to the vendor, or no? Because I have not received that confirmation.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: She is saying she has not received confirmation.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Okay.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay any discussion or debate on the amendment? All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay the amendment is adopted at this point we will move back to the main resolution which is 20220214 Robert half Government paralegal services as amended.

All in favor of adopting that resolution please raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

Janice could you, thank you.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

All right the resolution is adopted

Moving on to the next item on our agenda we have I would entertain a motion to approve resolution 20220215 adopt budget recommendations for the 2022 fiscal year.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Witjes is there any discussion or debate on the resolution? Commissioner Vallette? Is that a mistake?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, I saw it go up and down up and down.

All right all in favor.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That was early voting.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All in favor of adopting resolution 20220215 adopt budget recommendations for the 2022 fiscal year raise your hand and say aye.

Opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted

All right, next on our agenda is we are, I'm missing one here.

Amendments to the policies and procedures.

I will hand that over to Sue Hammersmith if there are no objections.

Executive Director Hammersmith would you like to proceed?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Yes.

So with our General Counsel leaving, I started to look through the policies and procedures and nearly every policy and procedure references General Counsel in some respect.

And should a future Commission also have a General Counsel it's probably important to leave that in.

So what I did was create a resolution 20220216 that acknowledges the terms shall refer to the responsibilities of the position versus a specific employee after February 25th.

And it will include what Fink Bressack is doing for the Commission and that is resolving any legal issues that may arise.

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 also acknowledges that the Michigan Department of State is serving as the FOIA or public records coordinator and in the role of parliamentarian.

We thought it was important to amend the FOIA policies and are on Fink Bressack desk and the staff reviewed and made several changes to those policies and we are awaiting Fink Bressack's response then. We will have that on the next meeting agenda for the Commission to discuss.

Additionally, there are a few amendments that will be required to the rules of procedure. And as you know, the Commission needs three day notice in order to amend the rules of procedure.

So I went ahead and created a resolution that can be utilized at the next meeting on March 10th.

And that would show after the FOIA policies are adopted what changes could be made to the rules of procedure.

So they are in sync with each other.

So just one resolution here for approval and letting you know that FOIA procedures and processes in the written summary and the forum are all in review and we will bring those back next time with a resolution to also amend the rules of procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry I was on mute.

Any questions for Ms. Hammersmith? All right so just to clarify Executive Director, the resolution is for consideration at the next meeting so we have time to go over the policy changes is that accurate?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: We have one resolution for consideration on March 10.

We also have resolution 20220216, that can in general clarify what our policies refer to when they refer to General Counsel.

And the duties and responsibilities of that position.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so you're looking to have that one adopted today?

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: Correct the 20220216.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: 16 so I have that one open.

So I would entertain a motion to adopt resolution 20220216 policy procedures and updates.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Curry is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Okay it's been moved and seconded by Commissioner Lett and Commissioner Curry to adopt resolution 20220216 policies and procedures update.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted.

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

All right, so at this point we have a little bit more time before we are supposed to go into closed session at 11:00 a.m. so I'm going to jump into our next agenda item and we will just go as far as we can up until 11:00 then we will go back to the closed session.

All right so we have the agenda item added by Commissioner Eid which is 6C consideration of the resolution 20220217 Commissioner Eid did you want to comment on that?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You can just make a motion if you want to do that instead whichever way.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I don't really have much to say about it. General Counsel do you have anything you want to say about this? .

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel did you have anything to add?

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

Yes, the proposed resolution would authorize a consent judgment the terms are contained within.

Which was negotiated between on your behalf between the parties is of course up to the Commission whether to adopt the terms or not.

I would also like to highlight that Michigan Department of State given that they will be processing those records was also consulted in regard to those terms and are also in agreement.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, so at this point I would entertain a motion to adopt resolution 20220217 resolution to authorize consent judgment terms in Wagner versus MICRC.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Lett seconded by Commissioner Clark.

So we've had any discussion or debate on the resolution? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes, thank you.

I've reviewed the resolution or I mean excuse me the agreement of the litigation and it appears to me to be equitable.

I think it resolves it on a fair basis for both the Plaintiff and the Defendant, the Defendant being us.

And it should resolve it.

I'm assuming that with the increase in the Robert half worker that we should be able to meet it without any further issues.

And I would urge everybody to vote in its favor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments on the resolution? All right all in favor of adopting resolution 20220217 resolution to authorize consent judgment terms in Wagner versus MICRC raise your hand and say aye.



Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the resolution is adopted.

All right, at this point we are going to move on to new business agenda item 6E, Glengarriff Group Michigan Voters Survey.

And actually it looked like we had a guest on this Edward do we have our guest available on this? Or do we need to wait?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: He is scheduled to come, Commissioner Szetela, at 12:15 so he will be there at that time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay so we will jump over that item.

And then we will go on to new business agenda item 6F.

Commission salary changes.

And Commissioner Witjes in particular you asked for this agenda item so I will invite you or any other Commissioner who is interested in speaking on it to go ahead and share your thoughts.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sure.

So first off, I apologize I did not scroll down far enough looking at the agenda.

But my basic thoughts were that we extend the salary increases to staff to combat inflation with the current state of economy currently and feel it should be awarded to all of us especially for some of us who have this as our only current salary at this particular point in time.

That's basically all I have to say about it.

It's of course up to all of us as a body and not just me.

But if anyone wants to say anything about it go ahead.

That's how I feel about it.

And I will vote in favor for it but again I will stand by whatever one else says.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Clark?

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, my opinion on this is that I don't believe we should have a salary increase.

Based on our workloads diminishing at this point in time. And I don't think it's the prudent thing to do at this point.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments? Commissioner Rothhorn?

>> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: I'm not in favor of the 7% increase.

I don't think we should reduce the salary.

I think we should keep the salary at the level we are at as long as we are employed.

But I think excuse me, yeah, but I think the idea that, yeah, we have Commissioners who want to reduce our salary.

We have Commissioners that want to increase it.

I feel like keeping it the same at this point feels like a good compromise.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Any additional comments? Commissioner Kellom?

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

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I would support the increase based upon what Commissioner Witjes said.

In light of the fact that just to restate what he said that some of us this is their, this is their sole employment at the moment.

And there is inflation.

So I would actually support Commissioner Witjes' suggestion based upon his reasoning. Thank you, Commissioner Witjes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so looks like everybody else is done commenting so I will add my two cents just from a business perspective businesses are doing salary reviews at this point and the inflation rate is historically high at least in my lifetime where I have been adult to be aware of it, I should say.

So my understanding is the inflation right now is 5.9 which is quite high.

And is impacting people and that by failing to increase the salaries or effectively reducing salaries because of the inflation rate so I'm certainly in favor of making that adjustment.

I think it's fair to raise it 7% when the inflation rate is about 6%.

So those are my thoughts.

Commissioner Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: And I just wanted to quickly add some of us have to support households, some of us are not able to have a spouse or someone else to I'm not getting into any one's financial situation but just bring awareness to you know many Commissioners are coming from a variety of backgrounds.

That's it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so I would consider a motion if we have someone interested in making a motion at this point and we can just go ahead and vote on it.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Move we increase Commissioner salaries by 7%.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Do we have a second? Commissioner Curry I see that you have seconded it so we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes to raise Commissioner salaries and it is seconded by Commissioner Curry.

All in favor please raise your hand and say aye.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Role call.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Can you do roll calls.

>> Indicate your support with the motion with a yes or a no vote.

I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Rebecca Szetela? .

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Yes.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: No.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

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

- >> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Doug Clark?
- >> COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry?
- >> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Anthony Eid?
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: We skipped Doug.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: We got Doug.
- >> COMMISSIONER EID: Okay, I'll say yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?
- >> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Steve Lett?
- >> COMMISSIONER LETT: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?
- >> COMMISSIONER ORTON: No.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?
- >> VICE CHAIR ROTHORN: Yes.
- >> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: By a vote of 8 yes to 3 no, the motion carries.
- >> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you everybody.

All right at this point we are going to move on to the next few items on our agenda and try to move through those.

And first is approval of the meeting minutes from the February 10th meeting held via Zoom and were provided to the Commission prior to this meeting and posted on the website.

Are there any edits to the meeting minutes from February 10, 2022? All right did you say something Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Move to adopt.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We have a motion by Commissioner Witjes to adopt the meeting minutes from February 10, 2022, do we have a second? Commissioner Curry has seconded that motion.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the meeting minutes are adopted.

All right at this point we are going to move on to staff reports.

Executive Director I think we will take your staff report and then we will see where we are at in terms of time.

So Executive Director Hammersmith please proceed.

>> MS. SUANN HAMMERSMITH: I will be quick.

First, I want to acknowledge that this is our General Counsel Julianne Pastula last meeting and thank her for the year plus of service and wish her well this future endeavors she chooses to go forward with.

I want to also mention that resolutions 20220205-09 were provided based on motions that were made after resolutions were produced prior to the last meeting and I sent those out.

And I believe those are already posted to the website.

And then for April meeting locations, the Commission has approved the dates and have not approved the locations for April 14, Cadillac place in Detroit and April 28th for the AG auditorium in Lansing.

So if the Chair could ask for a motion to approve those locations, that would end my report.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Executive Director.

So I would entertain a motion to approve setting our meeting locations at the Cadillac place in Detroit and April 14th and the AG auditorium in Lansing on April 28th.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Motion made by Commissioner Witjes and seconded by Commissioner Curry.

All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

Okay the ayes prevail and the motion is adopted.

Thank you, Ms. Hammersmith.

General Counsel, did you have a report?

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: I do not.

Thank you for asking.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, without objection I'll ask our communications and Outreach Director Edward Woods III to provide a report.

Please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Ms. Szetela.

Just want to let the Commission know we appreciate you doing these media reviews and requests.

We have politically speaking as you know it took off last week and want to thank Commissioner Szetela, Commissioner Eid, and Commissioner Witjes for that as well. On the website really want to give a shout out to the staff at MDOS.

Particularly Nelson for the changeover.

We were one of the first ones to go over the changeover with the website.

And the platform.

So you've seen that as well, so just want to give a shout out to Nelson for helping us with that and basically doing the yeoman's effort in terms of getting that to carry over.

And then last but not least we wanted to just provide a short video to thank Julianne Pastula as our General Counsel and we kind of put together just to say thank you, so if you will allow me, I will share it at this time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead, Mr. Woods.

[ Soft music playing ]

Brought a tear to my eye.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Edward are you going to post that so everybody can have a copy.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Of course Commissioner Lett, of course of course that would be a better win than the Spartans are providing at this point.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Let's not get nasty.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Those are fighting words.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I'm cheering for them too but it's just not helping me.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: General Counsel.

>> MS. JULIANNE PASTULA: Thank you Madam Chair and thank you very much.

That was very thoughtful and I appreciate it.

They are beautiful photos from a year.

I know that everyone year plus that everyone will remember.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, Director Woods back to you.

Do you have anything else you want to report on at this time?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No, I'm just looking forward to Mr. Czuba's report at 12:15 and I think you will be too.

Just a lot of great information.

But also hearing directly from Michiganders regarding the success of the Commission validates a lot of your work.

So I'm just happy that will be the last thing on the agenda as a result of this efficient meeting.

So thank you very much.

I appreciate the time.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay thank you.

Ms. Reinhardt did you have a report you wanted to give, a brief one possibly?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No report.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: No report okay.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Excuse me Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Yes.

>> EDWARD WOODS: Friendly reminder those who have not responded to Good Marketing if you can do so, we are trying to finish our lessons learned report and they

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.

sent out invitations to interview Commissioners and if you have not responded, if you can respond so that we can meet our timelines.

And then they are also working on the Commission report.

And as you know we gave an extra week for descending report an extra week.

So just want to remind those that are eligible to submit to send reports and they are due next week, they are due next week.

And then we will have a draft to present to the Commission.

And in two weeks and our goal is to have the final copy done by the end of March as relates to the Commissioner report.

Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you.

Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I would encourage anybody who is considering not doing that interview to reconsider.

It's a very comfortable space in which to do the interview and allows you to give your thoughts on what's good, what could be improved, et cetera.

It was a very comfortable and a very affirming interview to work with Good Marketing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Lett.

All right at this time it is 10:52 and are supposed to be in a closed session at 11:00 a.m. in accordance with 6.2.5 of MICRC rules of procedures and purposes not inconsistent in Detroit Inc versus Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission, 163823 and resolution 20220201, adopted February 10, 2022. A closed session of the MICRC is called to begin Thursday 24, at 11:00 a.m. with its attorneys being General Counsel Julianne Pastula as well as representatives from local counsel Fink Bressack LLC and litigation counsel Baker Hostetler LLP for the purposes of discussing pending litigation being Van Marian versus Benson, et sec, USDC West Michigan case number 1:22CV54. And the League of Women Voters of Michigan versus Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission, Michigan Supreme Court Docket 164022.

The online streaming of the open meeting will resume at the conclusion of the closed session. And we will all now move to the closed session with the start time being 11:00 a.m.

So that gives people a few minutes to get up and stretch their legs if they would like to do so.

Commissioner Witjes then Commissioner Rothhorn.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I was going to say Director Woods was waving his hands.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you so much.



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

I just want to remind the public that we are looking for improved hash tag improve MICRC and if you have any comments or suggestions, please go to the public comment portal and submit your improvement.

We are accepting that through the end of this month.

We want to ensure that the public is also included in the lessons learned.

Once, again, the public by more than 61% empowered the Commission and it would only be right if the public provided suggestions on how we can improve.

If you do not have access to the Internet, you can mail it at MICRC, PO Box 30318, Lansing, Michigan 48909.

Once, again, if you need to mail it to it MICRC, PO Box 30318, Lansing, Michigan, 48909.

We want to improve the process and make it better, it will take the public to be included.

So we encourage you to submit your comments as quickly as possible. But we are doing this through Monday, February 28th. Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, anything else? Commissioner Witjes, are you saying something?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sorry, I lost my mouse.

I don't see a Zoom invite for the closed session.

I could just be missing it.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sarah, I did ask and she did send it out but came...and it might have been after the meeting started so just check your in box again.

It should be in there.

But it was definitely this morning and I think it might have even been once we already began.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: All right, thank you.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, see you guys in five minutes

[ Recess for closed session meeting ]

....

.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Sarah, do we have enough people on to start?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, we do have a quorum.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you. All right, I would like to call this meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission back to order. Would the Department of State please call the roll?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Commissioners, please say present when I call your name and also, please disclose where you are attending remotely from. I will call on Commissioners in alphabetical order starting with Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present; and I am joining the meeting from Huntington Beach, California.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Juanita Curry? Anthony Eid? Anthony, I see you in the meeting. If you are talking, you might still be muted. We can return to Commissioner Eid.

Brittini Kellom?

>> COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Rhonda Lange?  
Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Present; and attending from Lee County, Florida.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present; attending remotely from Battle Creek, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

Rebecca Szetela?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Present; attending remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Janice Vallette?

>> COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present; attending from Highland, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Erin Wagner?

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Present; attending remotely from Eaton County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss:

>> COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present; attending remotely from Saginaw Township, Saginaw, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present; attending remotely from Howell, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: And I will return to Anthony Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Present; attending remotely from Detroit, Michigan.

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

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. All right. We will pick up where we left off. Moving on to new business agenda item 6 and what is now E, Glengariff Group, Michigan voters' survey. And without objection I will ask our Communication and Outreach Director Edward Woods III to provide information about this item. Please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you, Commissioners. Happy to present to you the President of the Glengariff Group, Richard Czuba, who is no stranger to us. As you know he did our presurvey and now he is back to do our post survey. So without further ado let's welcome Ms. Czuba to the dais or the podium in this virtual space. Thank you, Richard.

>> RICHARD CZUBA: Thank you, everybody. Good afternoon. Thank you for having me back.

What I'd like to do is go through the post survey that we conducted just as a reminder as a pollster I'm the geek who has to remind everybody, this is a 600 sample survey. There is a live operator and a registered Michigan voters and conducted February 11th-14th.

Has a margin of error plus or minus 4%.

25% of the interviews were conducted on a landline telephone, 75% were conducted on cell phone telephones.

So I'd like to do is go through the key results here and try to provide a little context dating back to the benchmarking survey we presented in the survey to you.

Let's start with just the basic question of what percentage of voters actually knew something about redistricting changes occurring in Michigan.

In the post survey that is 41%.

58% of the voters did not know anything.

That's actually a decline from the benchmarking survey.

And it's about a 12% drop from last spring.

But I think we need to look a little deeper to understand where that shift occurred.

We asked the question of voters how engaged are you in the political process.

And it's not going to surprise anybody but only 20% said they are very engaged.

58 percent said they are somewhat engaged.

16% said they are not really engaged and 6% said they are not engaged at all.

The shift in awareness occurred amongst those people who are just somewhat engaged which is a very large group of 58%.

What we saw was amongst those who are very engaged in the political process, there was no statistical change in their knowledge or familiarity with the redistricting changes in Michigan.

But amongst those who are somewhat engaged, it dropped from 53 to 44%.

And I think that can be attributed to the fact that the further you are from an event that a voter participates in, IE, the 2018 election where they voted the more distant it becomes to them.

Unless you are very engaged in the process.

And let me give you an example of what I mean by that.

We asked those voters if they have heard of the Commission itself.

And 35% of the overall Michigan voters have heard of the Commission.

That is an increase from the benchmarking survey.

It's about 11% increase.

But if you were not aware of redistricting changes in general 82% of those voters are aware of the Commission.

We saw your awareness of the Commission amongst the very engaged, increased from 33.7% to 52%.

Amongst those who are somewhat engaged, the awareness of the Commission itself went from 23% to 36% and if you're not at all engaged there was no change in your awareness of the Commission.

So where you -- where the Commission increased its awareness was amongst those people who are very engaged.

As we go through these survey results, I think you will see that those are the people who are most engaged with you, who participated the most.

And I don't think you know given my experience in polling in Michigan I don't think it should be a surprise to anybody that there is a narrow band of individuals of voters in this state who are highly engaged in the political process

I think one of the interesting differences I see, I saw here amongst those voters who are aware of the Commission was amongst strong democratic voters and independent voters.

We saw double digit increases in your awareness.

But amongst those strong republican voters, there was only a 3% increase in the awareness of the Commission.

I think one of the themes I saw in this is that even those strong republican voters who are very engaged in the process did not we will see in the numbers were not overly engaged with the Commission itself in the way that independents and democrats were.

So I'm going to -- as we move forward one of the things, we did was we asked people who were aware of the redistricting process a whole series of questions.

If you were not even aware of the process, it did not make sense to ask questions of them where they knew nothing about redistricting.

So they were screened out of a series of questions.

We asked those people and I will call them the aware voters, we asked those aware voters what their opinion was of the Commission itself.

Whether it was positive or negative.

And 50.8% have no opinion.

They have heard of you.

They may have been following you but they don't have an opinion of what the Commission has done but 34% had a positive opinion versus only 12 percent who had a negative opinion.

That is a 3 to 1 ratio.

For those who know something can form an opinion they had a good opinion of you, of what the work the Commission has done.

We asked in an open ended question and it's in the report, I know you have been it's been given to you, if they said positive, we wanted to know why it was positive.

If it was negative, we wanted to know why it was negative.

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

We've coded their responses in the report.

You can go look at those.

Frankly it's not unusual to see these responses.

And we coded them in the language they use.

I think that is important to know that we did not makeup this long.

That is the language they were offering us.

But, you know, 34% of these respondents had a positive reaction.

And that's the number one reason at 27% was they believe the Commission is fair and unbiased.

Conversely only 12% of respondents had a negative perception.

And the number one answer there is it was kind of two answers that split these folks.

One was they thought the Commission was not doing a good job.

And, second, was they thought the maps were not fair.

But, again, that is 12% of these respondents.

So we asked these aware voters whether they approve or disapprove of the work the Commission has done.

For those respondents that were aware 34% approve of the performance, 18% disapprove.

48% aware of the Commission could not offer an opinion on the Commission's performance.

Not surprisingly I think those respondents who are most engaged in the political process were the ones most likely to offer an opinion.

And amongst those very engaged in the political process they approve by a margin of 38 to 26 but even there 36% did not offer an opinion or could not offer an opinion.

That was the highest level of disapproval at only 26%.

As you go down through the rest of these voters, it drops precipitously into the teens for disapproval. Those who are somewhat engaged approved by a margin of 35 to 16.

And 49% could not offer an opinion.

We asked these aware voters how closely they were paying attention to the work of the Commission.

8.1% of them said they paid very close attention.

That represents overall 3.5% of the state's population or the state's voters.

51% of aware voters said they paid some attention and that represents 22% of all of the state's voters.

So those who are paying very or some attention over all represents one quarter of the state's voters.

When we look how close you were paying attention it's the very engaged.

71% of them were paying very or some attention to your work.

If you're somewhat engaged only 59%.

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 then it drops if you are not very engaged in the political process but were aware only 26% were paying attention to the work.

And if you're not engaged at all, only 20%.

So again what we see repeatedly here is that the voters who are most engaged in the political process were the ones paying attention.

And I don't think that is a surprise to anybody as you look at these numbers.

So in the benchmarking survey we did last spring we asked voters what was most important to them.

Which elements of what you were doing as a Commission was most important to them.

And we came back to those.

And on those very important elements we asked the voters who were aware of your work to tell us if they disapprove or approve of your performance on each of those metrics.

There were 7 different metrics.

And I can say that on all 7 at least a plurality approved of the work of the Commission on all 7 metrics.

There was in five of the 7 a majority of those voters approved.

And let me start with the first three metrics because they all come in at 60 and 61% approval compared to only 17 to 19% disapproval.

And those are making sure that the Commission designed the districts rather than politicians.

The approval of the Commission came in at 61-17.

Making sure neither party gets an unfair advantage by gerrymandering districts.

The approval came in at 61 to 19.

And the third making sure that Michigan voters not elected officials have input and designing new districts the Commission was showed approval at 60% to 18%.

That level of approval decreases a little bit on the next couple. 57 to 20.

Making sure maps were designed in public view so that all sides could watch the deliberations.

55 to 20.

Making sure that citizens had input into the design of the new districts through public meetings, public comment portal, the mapping portal that allowed everyone to make comments about the maps.

Those are really strong numbers frankly on those five metrics.

The voters who were aware of you on these metrics gave you strong scores.

The scores decreased a little.

And it wasn't a decrease in positive or negative.

It was a decrease in the number who could make an opinion even.

On the question of making sure communities with common historical and cultural economic interests are put in districts together instead of divided to weaken their voices.



It's the communities of interest metric.

And on that it was 48 to 19.

22% could not make a -- provide an answer.

Then the final metric making sure the Commission was transparent in how they make decisions.

46% approve but 29% disapproved.

This was the metric with the highest disapproval rating of 29%.

One of these metrics I feel really, I really need to point out because we saw very large statistical difference amongst one demographic and that was on the communities of interest metric and that was 48 to 19.

22% just didn't know.

But there was a very statistically significant difference between Caucasian and African/American voters on this one.

If you are a Caucasian voter, you rated the Commission 53 to 14 in approval.

But African/American voters rated the Commission 31 to 54 disapprove on the community of interest metric.

And I feel I need to point that out.

So let's take a look at where they were following you and how they were following, you know, interacting with the Commission.

Again we are talking about the aware voters.

80% of them followed you on the news media.

28% that represents 10% of the voters were looking at the Commission's website.

Let me say for a website that has been up for less than a year to have 10% of the voters say they have looked at your website, I think that deserves some congratulations.

I think it's the very engaged voters who we see 44% of those people who are very engaged in the process said they have looked at your website.

And I think that's really an interesting number that stuck out to me.

People who said they viewed virtual or in person presentation was 20% of aware voters.

That represents 6.8% of the population.

13% watched a meeting online of aware voters.

That's just over 4% of the general population, of the voter population.

8% of the aware voters provided public comment before the Commission or submitted written comments.

And only 2.9% of aware voters attended one of the meetings.

But if we look at those who are very engaged in the process, the numbers shift dramatically here.

Those who are very engaged, 29% were part of an online meeting.

8% attended a public hearing.

44% looked at your website as I mentioned before.

18% provided comment. 35% viewed you virtually.

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

I think in this environment that 35% who viewed you virtually of the very engaged voters talks about the importance of putting these meetings up and online.

But as you look at those who are less engaged you will see drastically lower levels of engagement amongst them.

One other things I want to point out.

And I mentioned this earlier.

While republicans and democrats were nearly equal in their viewing through online meetings or using the website, democratic voters were significantly more likely to either attend a public meeting or offer comment.

So in terms of how they were engaging you, democrats were more likely to engage you in that fashion.

Let's talk about engagement on social media.

We asked a series of were you engaged in any of these with the Commission.

51.5% of aware voters did not engage in any way on social media on any of the platforms.

26% engaged on Facebook.

18% engaged with the mapping portal.

Your online mapping portal.

12% engaged with the public comment portal.

11% on Twitter and 10% on YouTube and 8% on Instagram.

That's the aware voters.

If you look at those who are very engaged which again were the people who were interacting with the Commission 36% on Facebook, 22% with the mapping portal, 21% public comment, the public comment portal, 18% on Twitter, 21% on Instagram.

But, again, it was the very engaged people and when it comes to social media, I don't think this is a surprise to anybody the younger the respondent the more likely they engaged with you via social media in some form for example if you are 18-29 and paying attention only 36% did not use social media.

If you're over 65 and engaged with the Commission nearly 60% did not use social media, that is an important difference here.

We asked these aware voters if they recall seeing or hearing any advertisements.

34.9% so 35% do recall seeing or hearing an advertisement.

16% on television.

13% Internet.

11% on the radio.

5% on newspaper.

1.6% through billboards.

One of the really interesting things I see in these numbers is despite higher levels of democratic and independent engagement, traditional republican voters were the most likely to have seen or heard something in terms of an advertisement.

So they were seeing it and hearing it, they just were not necessarily engaging.

And I think that is an interesting finding here.

So let me get down to some of the kind of bottom line numbers here.

Because we came back and we asked the aware voters did the Commission succeed or fail in giving Michigan citizens a greater role than the politicians in designing the districts? And by a margin of 50 to 22 better than 2 to 1 they said the Commission did succeed.

But again 28% of these aware voters could not even offer an opinion.

We asked these aware voters what recommendations they have moving forward for the Commission to improve the process.

And the overwhelming number one answer at 27% was helping keep people be more involved.

Keeping them informed, being more involved.

We do a lot of this kind of work for Government organizations to help them test pre and post advertising.

And it's always the number one issue that comes back.

Well, you should do more.

You should spend more.

You should you know I did not see anything so obviously you weren't doing anything.

Even though we know you were, in this case I think it speaks to how difficult it is to reach voters.

You frankly need very large projects.

And I think, you know, we have a lot of experience across Government that it takes a lot of money to motivate, reach out and talk to voters.

And that's not always available frankly.

So at the end of the survey we came back and we asked all voters whether they were aware of the Redistricting Commission or not.

We asked all voters.

Whether or not the redistricting or whether or not Michigan should continue to allow the Commission to redraw the state's maps or should we go back to allow elected representatives in the state legislature to redraw the maps.

And there's no contest here.

By a margin of 65 to 10 Michigan voters say the Commission should continue to do this work.

And if they are aware of the Commission and aware of the work you've done, by a margin of 80 to 5 those voters say the Commission should continue to do the work.

And I want to point out here this is across the political spectrum.

And it is democrats, it is independents, it is republicans more than a majority of every partisan affiliation says the Commission should continue to do this work.

And I think let me just say I do a lot of this.

I've been doing it for a long time.

I just want to throw some kudos your way for being willing to publicly Judge yourself in this fashion by going back to the voters and asking them what they think.

I think these numbers to some degree show the challenge of any public entity to reach and motivate voters.

And that's reflected in these numbers.

But what I also see in these numbers is that those who are aware of what you are doing by pretty significant margins approved of what you were doing.

With some exceptions.

And with that I'll be happy to take questions.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right Commissioners anybody have any questions?  
Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: First off, I would like to thank you for this analysis. I agree that it is important from where we started and ended but one of the first is that overall engagement, not engagement but overall the number of people that have heard of us have went down.

Was that a statistically significant correlation from the prior survey? Or do you just attribute it to being a different group of people survey?

>> RICHARD CZUBA: No, that is a statistically significant drop.  
It is a 12% drop.

The margin of error is plus or minus 4%.

So there was a drop over all amongst voters and voters over all who were aware of the redistricting changes in Michigan.

And as I said I think we can attribute that partially to those who are not aware, those who are not engaged and don't closely follow politics or Government.

The further away they became from their interaction, which was the actual vote, the less aware they were of the change that was made.

It speaks to the difficulty any entity has in reaching voters who simply just aren't daily engaged.

And I remind people every day, a lot of us live and breathe this kind of work every day. There is a whole lot of voters who just they -- their engagement is to come in and vote and then they move on with their lives.

And I think that's part of the example here of the Commission's work.

Their engagement was to make the decision and a lot of them just simply moved on with their lives.

But you know 25% they stayed engaged.

They stayed engaged in what you were doing.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, any other questions? You guys are quiet today.  
All right, Edward, is there anything else you would like to add?

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.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: No. I would like to thank Mr. Czuba for coming on and alert the public we will be doing a press conference at 2:00 p.m. and Mr. Czuba will go in detail and also will be available to answer questions from members of the press with regards to this data, this virtual press conference will be available on our Facebook channel and then we will upload it to our YouTube channel.

Once again taking place at 2:00 p.m.

Thank you, Mr. Czuba, for coming and joining us today.

And I just echo the great news by a margin of 65.5% to 10.1%, that's more than six times Michigan voters say the state should continue with you, the MICRC.

So kudos to you for your outstanding job and fine work that you have done in this inaugural process of creating maps for Michigan's Congressional, State Senate and State House districts.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you Mr. Woods and Mr. Czuba.

And at this point we will move on to the next item on the agenda correspondence. Correspondence received in advance of our meeting today was provided along with written public comments to the Commissioners in our meeting materials.

In addition to the items discussed on the meeting agenda today, agenda items for the March 10th meeting will include the election of a Chair and a Vice Chair.

Are there any other agenda items that Commissioners would like to have added to future agendas? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah, can we add a discussion to increase the public comment up to two minutes?

>> CHAIR SZETELA: You are kind of going in and out, but you wanted to talk about increasing the public comment time to two minutes? Can you give me a thumbs up? Executive Director Hammersmith, can we add that to the next agenda item? Good? All right, Commissioner Witjes?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I got just in regards to that, is that something we can handle right now? Because I'm in favor of that as well.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: We certainly could have a motion and a vote on it right now. We have enough people.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I think I'm going to do that.

I think that Mr. Gallant needs some good suggestions and points saying that the amount of public comment has indeed gone down significantly.

Three minutes I believe is a little too high.

I believe two minutes is fair.

So with that said I will make a motion to increase the public comment time to two minutes going forward.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Increase the public comment and a second by Commissioner Weiss. Any discussion or debate on the motion? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm not in favor of that.

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

I think we have seen from our experience that whether you have two minutes, three minutes or one minute or whatever point you want to get across can be gotten across in one minute and I think that has been proved out by the numerous comments we already received.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, any additional comments? General Counsel?

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

It looks like the timing for the public comment is set forth in the rules, so that would need to go through the notice.

So it would be appropriate to provide the notice orally at this meeting to be acted upon at the next meeting.

It is in Section 12.1 Subpart D of the rules of procedure.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, in light of that, Commissioner Witjes, would you like to withdraw your motion and we will just treat it as a notice?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: That works for me. I will withdraw my motion.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Okay, all right. Any other future agenda items? Okay, are there any announcements?

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: I again want to thank Julianne for all of her hard work. And I wish her all the best in her future endeavor.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Commissioner Witjes.

All right, and as items on the agenda are completed and the Commission has no further business a motion to adjourn is in order.

>> COMMISSIONER WITJES: So moved.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Witjes, thank you very much.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Curry's hand was up, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry, did you have announcement?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, not a motion or an announcement, I just want to thank Julianne for all of the things she has helped me with and wish her the most success wherever she goes.

>> CHAIR SZETELA: All right, so we have a motion by Commissioner Witjes. Can we get a second? Seconded by Commissioner Weiss.

We have a motion to adjourn. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

Aye.

All opposed raise your hand and say nay.

The ayes prevail and the meeting is adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Thank you, everybody.