

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

11/17/22 1000 Council Meeting

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

>> Good morning. Hello. Can you hear me?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: We can hear you Juanita and good morning, Steve and Juanita.

>> Good morning to each of you.

>> Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: That makes nine and think we have a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Good morning. As Vice Chair of the Commission, I call the meeting of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 10:11 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@michigan.gov or for additional viewing options or details for accessing language translation services for this meeting.

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

This meeting is also being recorded and will be available at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC for viewing at a later date.

This meeting also is being transcribed and those closed captioned transcriptions will be made available and posted on 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, 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 Executive Director for the Commission at WoodsE3@Michigan.gov or 517-331-6309.

For the public watching and the public record I will turn to the department state staff take note of the commissioners present.

>> SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

Good morning, Commissioners. Please say present when I call your name. Because

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

we are 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 you are attending from.

Doug Clark.

>> COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present, attending 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, everybody, present, attending from Detroit, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Brittini Kellom?

Rhonda Lange?

Steve Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Good morning. I'm attending remotely from Jasper, Florida.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Was that Jasper?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: That's correct.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Cynthia Orton?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: MC Rothhorn?

Rebecca Szetela?

>> COMMISSIONER 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 Charlotte, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Richard Weiss?

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

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Dustin Witjes?

Nine Commissioners are present and there is a quorum.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Ms. Reinhardt. As a reminder to the public watching you can view the agenda at www.Michigan.gov/MICRC. I would now entertain a motion to approve the meeting agenda

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Seconded.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I'm sorry I did not see who moved the motion

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: It was Steve.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: The motion has been made by Commissioner Lett and seconded by Commissioner Szetela. Is there any discussion?

>> Yes, there is a discussion I did not make that motion. I know I normally do

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: I thought it was you.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I believe it was Commissioner Eid.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I'm sorry the motion was made by Commissioner Eid. And the motion is seconded by Commissioner Szetela. Is there any discussion or debate on the motion? Hearing none it is moved and seconded that the agenda be adopted. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail, the motion is adopted. Okay before we move on to public comment, let me make one administrative note. Since our Chair is not here today, without objection I've asked Anthony Eid, Commissioner Eid, to back me up should I have to leave the meeting for any reason. Let's move on to public comments. Without objection we will begin the public comment pertaining to the agenda topics portion of our meeting. Hearing no objection, we will now proceed with public comment.

>> Individuals who have signed up and indicated they would like to provide live remote public commentary to the Commission will now be allowed. I will call your name and our staff will unmute you. If you are on a computer, you will be prompted by the Zoom app to unmute your microphone and speak. If you're on the phone a voice will say that the host wants you to speak and prompt you to press star six to unmute. I will call on you by name or the last four digits of your phone number. Also please note that if you experience technical or audio issues or we do not hear from you for three to five seconds, we will move on to the next person and then return to you after they are done speaking. If your audio still does not work, you can e-mail redistricting@Michigan.gov and we will help you trouble shoot so you can participate during the next public comment period at a later meeting. You will have two minutes to address the Commission. Please conclude your remarks when you hear the timer. First in line to provide public comment today is James Galant.

>> Hello, James Galant, Marquette County Suicide Prevention Coalition. These are my opinions. Commissioners, please refer an apparent collusion to enter false statements upon the record of the MICRC public records by resolution to the Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel concerning at least two statements contained in your document Commissioners orientation and research materials from September 17, 2020. First there is a statement that says that quoting Roberts rules of order a motion to table kills a motion. That statement is false because in the introduction of Roberts Rules of

Order 2010 it states that is a common misuse of the motion to table. It is clearly in the book. Second, the gerrymandering project reported a Commissioner's guide to redistricting in Michigan says that the Michigan Commission on legislative apportionment which is unconstitutional by the Michigan Supreme Court and that is not true. Because the Michigan House fiscal agency report states that the Michigan support Court has determined that this Commission the Michigan Independent Redistricting Commission was already contained in the Constitution in 1963. And that therefore it was appropriate for the ballot initiative proposal that was the Voters Not Politicians cross complaint in 2018. So please refer this, these facts and I sent this all in e-mail. It's in your comments. Please refer this officially formally to the Attorney General for review and investigation and possible criminal prosecution for all of the members involved including the Secretary of State Joyce Benson and Dana Nessel, Michigan State University, University of Michigan, Princeton University and the others that are listed, they all got packed in then it got just right.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Mr. Galant. We will now move on to Anthony Skinnell.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: You should be unmuted and you are invited to address the Commission there Skinnell.

>> Thank you can you hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you. Well, Commission you had the elections with your maps and you know congratulations on that. But we elected a Congress person and I did not see hide nor hair of them and did not campaign in my community to try to get a vote. So I don't know, maybe that is an effect of your maps, maybe not. Another note I don't know, it's just like kind of in terms of what Mr. Galant often brings up I don't understand how you vote on motions because it seems like people want to say something but one Commission will say well, I call the question. Well I don't really think that is how it works. You are supposed to vote on a motion and discussion and that is how you determine if everyone has said everything they need to say. You have not done it once yet and I don't think you will start. Lessons learned I thought the lessons learned was mostly excuses learned. I mean, there was very few lessons in there, very large number of excuses for why you did whatever you did. And I don't know you didn't include anything about the software not on the software the website map making that you made available to the public. You didn't have anything about that, that I noticed. And then one more thing one of the Commissioners in there said you have one republican and one democrat attorney and I think that is completely arbitrary and a fake independent Commissioner who said that. Anyone who is promoting democrat or republican you are not independent. Thank you very much.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you very much, Mr. Skinnell. Next in line to speak today is Robert. You should be unmuted at this point. Please feel free to address the Commission.

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

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay that concludes our public comment. Please feel free to e-mail public comments to the Commission at redistricting@Michigan.gov we appreciate who offers public comment in whatever way you choose and invite you to keep sharing your thoughts especially if you like to share ways that the MICRC processes or procedures have been good or could be more effective. So let's move on in our agenda to unfinished business. First item under unfinished business in the agenda is our fiscal year 23 budget update. Without objection I will ask our MICRC Executive Director Edward Woods III to present this item. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Executive Director Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Are you able to hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, we are Edward.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: And you are able to see my screen? Wonderful. Budget process. As many of you know, last month we took the opportunity to explain the constitutional requirements as relates to the budget process for fiscal year 23. In working with Commissioner Steven Lett, our legal liaison and attorneys from Fink, David and Nathan Fink we reached out as a courtesy to state intentions to the appropriations chairs for the Senate as well as for the House. Yesterday I repeat yesterday we received a phone call from the appropriation office requesting a meeting today to talk about the budget. And that will take place at 2:30. Once again we received a phone call yesterday for a meeting today at 2:30 p.m. to meet with the Senate appropriations Chair. And then also yesterday we received a letter from the Chair of the House apropos from the House apropos to meet on Tuesday, next week Tuesday to discuss as well. As we shared last week in going over the constitutional requirements, we highlighted the Constitution with regards to the requirements of the annual budget as well as the process for a supplemental, if the annual budget does not cover enough. So that will be our focus on when we meet today as a constitutional requirement. As we shared last week, the voter intent as relates to ballot proposal, 2018-02. And then also as relates to democracy. So that's kind of where we are in the budget process. As you already know, you were provided authorization to sue. But as you know and being elected, I should say being selected as Independent Commissions and knowing our values, our preference has always been to do it in a deliberate and amenable process. And so that's why we provided the courtesy and we are trying to work as we know when the voters put in this Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission they had no desire, I repeat no desire for partisan bickering. But they wanted to make sure that we add fair maps with citizen input so we tried to make sure that we have not announced or threatened or do anything that would create disruption in our relationships and meeting

our constitutional requirements in terms of being professional and being courteous. We have stuck with that. We have not resorted to name calling. We have not accused or made any windows or anything along those lines. Our whole process, our whole approach was to honor our values and to represent what the public wanted as it relates to a fair and independent nonpartisan Commission. So that has been our approach with regards to the budget process. We will meet with Senator Stamos and meet with representative Whiteford and then provide a report. If there are any questions, I can take them at this time but Commissioner Lett is here as well as David and Nate Fink if there is something I missed or needs to be added. I see Commissioner Wagner has her hand up, Commissioner Clark?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I did not see that Erin or Commissioner Wagner go ahead and proceed.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: I have one question Edward what time is that meeting next Tuesday with the House?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: 11:30.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: All right thank you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: And it's just with representative Whiteford as the House appropriation Chair. It's not a subcommittee or anyone else.

>> COMMISSIONER WAGNER: All right thank you.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: You're welcome.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Anybody else have anything they want to add?
Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you, Commissioner Clark. Do we have any contingency plans in place in case this discussion is not as fruitful as we hope?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid, the Commission has given us, you know, the opportunity, you know, to pursue remedies including litigation. And so that would be obviously the last step. That's not the step we want to take but it is an option that the Commission has made available to us.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Lett or Juanita, I cannot see you on the screen. Do you have any comments to make?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No I don't have any comments at this time. Thank you, Chair Doug.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay, Steve?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No, I think Edward has summarized where we are at. I know they wanted or Edward at least request that I participate in the meeting by phone or virtually and the powers to be that the state wanted to have a face-to-face meeting so that is what will take place. I'm sure that with our representatives that are lined up to be there, we will be more than adequately represented and so it will be interesting to see what comes of it.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay, thank you Steve. David Fink, you have a comment?

>> DAVID FINK: I wanted to say thank you to Edward for his summary and also want to note that due to the work that Edward has been doing in moving this forward and the Commission that I don't think Edward mentioned this just now and I think it's important that you know that there is a proposed supplemental budget adjustment from the budget office that has been submitted to the legislature on November 4th for 1.5 million. That said, we don't even know if the legislature will be in session between now and the end of the year. So we are very much looking forward to our meeting today and hearing from State Senate where they see the State Senate appropriations committee whether they see the likelihood of addressing this issue.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Mr. Fink. Are there any other comments?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Yes, I just want to make sure we have not I understand what Mr. Fink says we have not been, officially notified of that that is why I was not sure on my end just so we have an understanding.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay.

>> David Fink: It's a matter of public record that there is a request, yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Are there any other comments? Or questions? Okay thank you. Next on our agenda is on the unfinished business portion of the agenda and lawsuits. Without objection I will ask Commissioner Steve Lett, our legal liaison, to present this along with our attorneys from Fink Bressack. Hearing no objection please proceed Commissioner Lett.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Can everybody hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, we can.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay you guys are Sarah is muting and unmuting me because my phone is not doing that automatically so I never know when I am on or not on. The latest and greatest is that Baker Hostetler are in discovery and Baker Hostetler has asked us for some further transcripts. Evidently the Plaintiffs have requested copies of all the transcripts. And I noted an e-mail today that those have been provided with the exception of four or five and had some questions on how they were transcribed but other than that, that is I believe the AG case. So it's just moving along. I know there was -- there is a scheduling order in place. And I think either Nate or David could speak more to that. But basically things are proceeding in the normal course of business as far as lawsuits go. That's all I have.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay thank you, Steve. Do you have anything to add, Nate or Dave Fink?

>> I'm sorry.

>> I was able to join by video. I can provide -- can you all hear me.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> Nathan Fink: Good morning, everyone I don't have much to add I apologize which was transitioning from my phone to the computer and I heard most of what Commissioner Lett said and I don't really have much to add to it. I think he mentioned the Banerian case but if he did not mention that case, we sent a message to the Commission the Supreme Court of the United States just last week issued an order dismissing as moot the Plaintiff's appeal of the three Judge panel's denial of their motion for preliminary injunction. The case now goes back to the District Court to the panel of the Western District of Michigan. We don't know what the Plaintiffs intentions are if they intend to move forward with that case, that is the case that is challenging the Congressional map. We will let you know when we get a better sense of whether the Plaintiffs do intend to move forward with that case or perhaps would dismiss. And I know that Commissioner Lett summarized where we were on the AG case and don't have much to add on that. We will be in touch with you we and/or the Baker firm, folks will be in touch with you I think fairly soon about possibly scheduling depositions and that sort of thing. But we are not quite in that excuse me in that phase yet.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you, Nate. Juanita, again, I cannot see you. Do you have any comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, no comments at this time. I'm just listening closely to what you're saying.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay thank you Juanita. Anthony?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Hey I couldn't hear all of what.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Your audio is not coming through Anthony.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: One moment. Is that better, can you now?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: That is better.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I couldn't hear exactly what Commissioner Lett was saying so this is a redundant comment I apologize. Mr. Fink, there had been conflicting reports on the various papers around here on the status of the Banerian case. So was the dismissal from the Supreme Court, was it just on that like appeal of preliminary injunction? Or was it like I don't know the legal jargon but was it like the whole case? You just told us that it's going back to the District Court. I guess my question is what could possibly happen from here in that case?

>> NATHAN FINK: I understand there being confusion here. Frankly I think if you ask most lawyers including litigators, they wouldn't necessarily be able to give you an answer because the procedural posture of this particular case in these types of cases is pretty unique. And to answer your question the whole case has not been dismissed. The only issue that was before the District Court on the three Judge panel back earlier this year was the question of whether a preliminary injunction would be entered that would require the Commission to redraw the Congressional maps in advance of these elections that we just had. The three Judge panel denied that motion. Hadn't decided the substantive issue of whether to dismiss the case yet. There was not a motion

pending before the Court on that issue yet. And there still is no motion on that question yet. The only issue is whether the preliminary injunction was and it was denied and they appealed that order to the Supreme Court. And again it's a unique sort of circumstance where they get to appeal directly to the United States Supreme Court on that issue. And so they did that. Appealed to the Supreme Court. This order that we got last week which we had briefed the issue with the Baker folks that led the briefing on it that the parties had briefed the issue before the Supreme Court, they issued in a one line order last week that the appeal of the preliminary injunction ruling was dismissed. And the practically speaking that means that the District Court's ruling denying the injunction was affirmed. But the case itself is still alive. And so if the Plaintiffs decide to go forward with the case, they could still pursue that. We don't know what their position is on that at this particular moment. We should know fairly soon. And we will certainly let the Commission know right away. But that hopefully clarifies some of the confusion.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, thank you that really does clear it up. I appreciate that, thanks.

>> Nathan Fink: Great.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I see no other hands Steve do you have any final comments?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: No. That was a very long winded explanation of a one line sentence from the Supreme Court, thanks.

>> I have one comment.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Go ahead David.

>> Did Commissioner Lett say my son is long winded?

>> Because if so, I think my father would see that as a complement. If you know anything about him and stuff.

>> David Fink: The Apple did not fall far from the tree.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay thank you. Any other comments? Okay, next on or agenda under unfinished business is our dormancy plan and our reactivation plan, without objection I will ask Commissioners Clark and Commissioner Lett to present this item. Hearing no objection we will proceed. So let me make the first comments and then I will have the Commissioner Lett make additional comments.

>> Commissioner Lett Ms. Reinhardt, myself and some of the technical people at the state got together and discussed the plan and particularly the technical aspect of the plan and we have a really good understanding of how they work and the procedure and process that it complies with our needs. So with Commissioner Lett did and I reviewed Commissioner Lett and I discussed is we took the original draft we had of the talking points and dormancy and reactivation plan and Commissioner Lett put that in more legalized terms. And the way it was done was that he made it to the procedures document. That is what was explained to the Commissioners this morning and I'm not

sure all of you had time to look through it. But I would like you to at your convenience and do you have any other comments Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: It's over to me?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Okay absent a couple of technical changes I'm going to make where I talk about Constitution 1963 as amended, I'm going to put in there the specific amendment and number we have all become familiar with and use. And I just didn't have it in front of me when I was typing the document but it's in its final form as far as I believe is good to go and just and I mean just received an e-mail from Mike Brady and the pertinent part of the e-mail says in the event the Commission adopts this document please be advised that the Michigan Department of State cannot presently commit to it without first consulting with our own legal counsel and AG office as to the documents constitutionality. Thankfully the question of dormancy is not yet right. This e-mail is certainly not a surprise to me nor should it be a surprise to the Commission. We have talked I have talked along with Commissioner Clark, with our counsel and certainly there is an internal debate as to doing this. So I think the process is to clean up a little bit of the language, very, very, very minor. And then move forward with it I think in order to get an opinion from the Secretary of State and the AG we will need to adopt it. As Mike says we are not in a position where we have to do that today. Plus we don't -- I need to do a little cleanup but I think within my anticipation would be we put out a final proposal language for adoption at the next meeting so that everybody can take a look at it and make what comments they want and talk about it at the meeting after that I think would probably be the technically best way to do it and that way it would be posted to the public and have everybody have an opportunity to comment on it. Back over to you, please.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I agree with you Commissioner Lett. Commissioner Szetela you have a comment.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Did you want us to submit comments back to you and Doug on this? Or do you want to discuss comments now? I just had there is two little typos I found so those I will just send to you. But I had some concerns about 3.3.1 where we reference expenses and the dormant period as being you know potentially reimbursable but I don't know how we would do that if we no longer have a budget in dormancy. So do you want me to send those comments over to you and Steve? Steve and Doug? Or.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, why don't you just send it to Commissioner Lett and myself.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I will do that.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: That is the easiest and simplest way to do that.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Am I still on?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, you are.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Commissioner Szetela, the language I know the language you're referring to. And Edward brought that up too and may want to clarify that. That doesn't mean that expenses, however dormant I don't anticipate expenses while we are document but it was meant if we come out of dormancy and what expenses we have at that time would be covered. So I think that is a good point. I will need to clear that up and make sure that is clear. If we are dormant there are no expenses period.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you otherwise I think it's a really good document so nice work, guys.

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Send that to me anyway Rebecca so that I've got it.

>> VICE CHAIR SZETELA: I will.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Any other comments on the subject? Okay we will get that revised document out and put it on the agenda for next meeting.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Eid has his hand up.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Do we have a general idea about when you know this actually might become a thing and we might actually go into dormancy? I think when we got the scheduling hearing for the agi case a couple weeks ago and that had us in litigation until at least I believe it was June but I may be wrong. So I think that would be the minimum. Do we have a better timeframe of when this might actually you know be a thing we are looking at doing?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I recall Commissioner Eid that went in the fall of next year but that is just a projection. I'm not sure we can have a solid answer on that. Any other comments? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: I'm all set.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Curry do you have any comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Not right now. Oh, one thing I do have one comment, our next meeting will convene on what day?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: We will talk about it when we get to agenda item on the 2023 meeting calendar but the next one is scheduled for December 15th right now.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Next on the agenda we will move to new business and census resolutions and without objection I will ask Executive Director Woods to present this item. Hearing no objection please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: I see Ms. Reinhardt has her hand up.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes Ms. Reinhardt please.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you Mr. Chair. I had invited Rob Surber with DTMB and the Commission may be familiar with Mr. Surber as he talked to the Commission in the past on redistricting data. Some time ago now but you all should be

familiar with him. I invited him to join this conversation which is scheduled for 11:00. I don't think he has joined yet at this time. And I would encourage you all to wait for him to be present to continue this conversation in case you have additional questions about the data that he could answer for you.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay then without objection, can we adjust the agenda and move on to item 6B? And 6C then we will come back to 6A at some point in time and allow Mr. Surber to discuss that please. Any objections to that? Eek, so let's move on to our next agenda item then, which is 6B which is Sigma request. And without objection I will ask Executive Director Woods to present this item. Hearing no objection please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you Commissioner Clark. We've had two requests, I should say one, one formal request as relates to access to our Sigma. Sigma is the financial data that records our expenditures and how every penny is being spent by the Commission. We received one request from the Senate fiscal agency. And I shared with them that we would need a formal letter request and it did not come directly from them. It actually came through the legislative services Bureau. And they wanted to have access to our funds or what have you. I said we needed a formal request and that that needed to be voted on by the Commission. That was not something that I could authorize on behalf of the Commission. And so as a result of not receiving the formal request, it's not being presented today. As all of you know, all of our funding, all of our money is an open record. We have nothing to hide. We have a clean audit. We do our financial reports. Our quarterly reports. And are listed on the website so anyone can see how every penny is being spent by the Commission. And if there is information they wanted to have or more specific they could send an e-mail and ask us. With regards to a request but I have received nothing and no follow-up. But did want to acknowledge that it did come indirectly through the legislative services Bureau. But at this time have not received a formal request from the Senate fiscal agency. As we all know we are part of the legislative Branch and the independent part of that Branch. And so as a result we are here to cooperate and assist and provide information in an open and transparent manner. We have established that through our public records request and established that through the media and our follow-up. And so just not knowing enough about that and with regards to the formal request having not received it or it's not being brought to you today but did want to acknowledge that for the public record. Commissioner Clark?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, so I had one comment to make and open it up for further discussion. It's my opinion that as we get these requests that we should deal with them on an individual basis. That we should not approve any motion that is a blanket motion that allows anybody to have access to these records whenever they want. We should be able to get individual requests. We should be able to get a reason why they want it. So we can understand what their objective is before we authorize

access to the data. So that's my comment relative to this subject. Are there any other comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I would say that I agree with Doug about the -- how we take care of the MICRC records.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Curry. Anybody else have any comments? Okay, so when we do get a formal request Edward, I would recommend that you bring that forward to us. As a Commission, thank you. The next item on new business agenda item is item 6C which is our 2023 meeting calendar. Without objection, I'll ask Executive Director Woods to present this item. Hearing no objection, please proceed, Mr. Woods. As we have one meeting left that is scheduled for this year. And I think you have some comments on the 2023 calendar year.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Well, thank you Commissioner Clark. If I can there is actually two requests in terms of Sigma requests. The second one comes from the office of financial management. And they have a new employee. And apparently the former employee had access to that information. The person having responsibility say they need it for payroll processing. I asked the question of our payroll as you know is being done through Kelly Services, you know, not by the state, what was the purpose? And I have not received an answer. So just wanted you to know that a former employee had access. Now they are trying to get something for a new employee. But they haven't made it clear as to why they need access even though payroll is processed through Kelly Services. So I was looking for some direction from this Commission how you would like me to proceed.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Any comments on that? Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: What do they need -- did they say in their request, you have two requests do either of them say what exactly they need access to the Sigma database for?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Once again the fiscal agency has not submitted a request. They sent an e-mail to legislative services Bureau. That's why I'm not bringing that to your attention. The second one came from the office of financial management. And they are saying they need the request for payroll. And that's when I sent the e-mail back saying our payroll is processed through Kelly Services. You know, is this germane to us as it's relevant and I have not received an answer.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Orton did you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER ORTON: I kind of had the same question. But, it seemed a little odd to me that they want this when like you say we are paid through Kelly. So the question I do have is if you receive -- since we are not meeting so often if you do receive requests that have -- that need to be met timely, is there a way that we can give authorization for that without a meeting? Like through e-mail? Could you ask through e-mail and we each answer? Or is that not okay? Because that would be Commission business, I guess so it would need to be in a public meeting.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: So if there is a timely.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Mr. Brady has a comment relative to this. Let's hear his comment and we will come back to you Commissioner Orton.

>> MIKE BRADY: Good morning, Mike Brady from the Secretary of State. I appreciate the question although I did not raise my hand to respond to it but instead to offer a broader context with respect to this and I think that it was the last topic as well just a Sigma request and requests along those lines. I will note that in our experience it's a pretty standard request and there are some organizations that regularly make requests of not just salary but also expenditures and you know travel reimbursement, mileage et cetera. And it will regularly go to you know every department. And so from my experience the Department of State. The case law and otherwise is those are absolutely public records because they are talking about reimbursement of taxpayer dollars.

Notwithstanding Commissioner Clark's you know prior statement and his preference to not have a blanket approval, I would note that that, you know, the end result there is an argument that would simply for stall the public gaining access to say it's taxpayer dollars were spent and whether it's perhaps not more efficient for Commissioner Orton's perspective simply to authorize Edward forgive me Director Woods to you know treat these as public records that everyone else in Government treats them as. So just some background perspective.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Brady. Let me come back to you, Commissioner Orton.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: So yes, I guess my real question is since it's all public record why do people need to request? Why can't they just access it?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Remind you this is access to Sigma which is our accounting system through the state that runs through legislative services Bureau. That's what they want access to. I mean we are more than happy to share the information. We are more than happy to receive the calls and ask and give the information. That's not the issue. The issue is they want access to the system which requires them to have our approval. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I will make a motion to have that approval for the request based on what Mr. Brady just told us.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Is this a blanket approval or a specific request?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Not blanket approval but for the two requests that have come in.

>> MIKE BRADY: If I may clarify forgive me in is Mike Brady again.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, Mike.

>> MIKE BRADY: So we don't though we regularly again along with the department receive request for the information I don't recall ever receiving a request for someone to access Sigma itself. So that is an important distinction. I don't know how someone can access it without giving them the password. And that is, I would say, not a good idea. And Commissioner Szetela and others are nodding their head. So I'm not entirely clear on what the request is there and specific confidence in Director Woods in terms of handling those but making the distinction between whether there is approval for the information to go out the door versus whether there is approval for someone to gain access to a system which has an internal purpose and function. In terms of the interplay between Kelly Services and otherwise, since you use a third-party vendor Kelly Services to provide some of these services to the Commission the person making the request, I can see to make the request to Kelly Services, they have a private entity and not bound by our understandings of public records. They are bound in a contractual way to you as their client. And so I would expect Kelly Services would have to decline that and have to look to you and you can make the information available. If someone asks you and well, we want the information, we don't actually have it we have Kelly Services, that may be technically accurate in terms of you rely on a third-party, in this case private vendor to provide the service. You do actually have control over that and can certainly direct your vendor to release information to you or not. Or release information to the public. Which I think I'm wondering if that is part of the interplay of the question and whether it's a little bit something along those lines versus the Department of State and the department at the state and other governmental entities are then kind of services that Kelly Services provides, we have staff in house providing that so we actually have no questions asked 100% control and possession of the documents. And this makes sense and trying to think through where the questions are coming from and which may or may not be helpful.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I appreciate Mr. Brady and what Commissioner Eid is doing to try to move it along but I think just in the interim let's just identify the purpose behind these requests and deal with it at the next meeting would be the best way to go. That way we can have more information and adequately represent the request and then we can talk to Mr. Brady and others just to make sure this makes sense before we move forward. I just wanted to be clear and I did not authorize anyone access without coming to the Commission. And believe this needs to be a discussion item. So I will press to get the information that has been requested and bring it to the Commission for approval. But I think at this point that might be the best way to handle it. Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Eid, with your support we can just move this to the next meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, I withdraw my motion.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay thank you Commissioner Eid. The most reasonable thing to do, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. I will address the 2023 meeting. This is a tentative calendar and this is something that we will look at because people need to check their schedules including the Michigan Department of State as well as each of the Commissioners. No one has seen this. But it's been based upon feedback in terms of meetings. How many times we should meet and along those lines and like I said this is tentative, subject to change. But at this point knowing we have some Court dates coming up, and some things along those lines I'm recommending that we meet every other month and this will also give us time to do our financial reports obviously because we have not spent any money in October. We do not have a financial report for October for the fiscal year but once again these are tentative dates for consideration. People can loop back with us and let us know but it also gives us enough time to do the financials because of the closing getting closing and working with insight three with the Commission. So the dates are the third Thursday of every other month. So January 19, March 16, May 18, July 20, September 21 and November 16. I know this is new information for everyone so we will be sure to share it and check with all of our respective stakeholders and then bring back a calendar for action at the next meeting. If there is any questions, I can take them at this time.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Mr. Woods. I do have one comment. It's my understanding that initially we had two meetings a month scheduled. Then we knocked it down to one meeting a month and made a decision that if it wasn't needed it would be cancelled prior to the meeting. And I feel we should schedule one a month and make a determination on that standard and not deviate from that standard so that is my opinion on that. I would like to get some other people's opinions.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: I agree with you, Chairman. This is Juanita Curry.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Curry. Commissioner Eid, do you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I also agree. I think meeting once a month quite frankly might be the minimum of how often we should meet given we are still being paid for this job. I know there is not a lot of work to be done but a lot of things can happen in a month. If new litigation gets filed or there are updates to our litigation that we should inform the public about. I think once a month is the safer way to go. Then if we like how, you just said Commissioner Clark if we don't need the meeting, we can cancel it. But having it scheduled I think is the better way to go.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: I do too. Ms. Reinhardt, you have a comment.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Yes, I would like to note for the record that Commissioner Kellom has joined at 11:01 a.m. Commissioner Kellom can you tell us where you are joining remotely from.

>> CHAIR KELLOM: Good morning I'm joining remotely from Wayne County, Michigan.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments relative to the 2023 calendar? Or any motions? Well I would like to put forward a motion then. I would like to put forward a motion we have one scheduled meeting for each month of the calendar year and the Executive Director and the Chair of this should make a determination at least a week ahead of time whether or not we will continue with the meeting for that month.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Clark we do have in our rules and procedures a process for cancellation. So if we can just stick with that and then we can bring back a calendar next month that has a meeting once a month for consideration.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay.

There is a motion on the table and I saw Commissioner Weiss seconded it. I want to withdraw that motion at this point. And we will bring the calendar forward next month and we will talk to you. Any other comments? Okay, we need to go back to census resolution. Ms. Reinhardt, has Mr. Surber joined us yet?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: He has.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay so without objection I will ask Executive Director Woods to present the census resolution item again. Hearing no objection please proceed, Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you very much. Michigan Department of State reached out to the Commission with regards to some issues regarding the census resolutions. And that also includes to split precincts that Commissioner Szetela requested at the last meeting to be a part of this agenda. And we felt the best people to address those issues were Mr. Rob Surber from DTMB and Kim Brace from Election Data Services. And if we can have Mr. Surber kind of layout the request or some of the concerns that were raised. And there Mr. Brace can share how we worked together as a team to get those resolved and then if the Commission has any questions, Commissioner Clark, I'm sure one or both of these distinguished gentlemen can answer them. So without further ado let's invite Mr. Surber to layout the requests that were made then we can talk about the process.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay, thank you, Mr. Surber you have the floor.

>> Throughout the last cycle we have worked very closely to build the data that is consistent with the precincts over the course of the last decade for election results. And those election results are very much tied to the actual precinct boundaries that are, you know, mapped within each City and Township in the state. During a reapportionment or redistricting process, we know that there are quite a few locations around the state that actually for equal population or in the case of House and Senate District, State House and Senate districts, have to, you know, maintain a certain amount of population to have not as much deviation between the districts. And in that regard, there are times when the precincts do get split. And that it does create quite a bit of work for the townships, the cities to be able to, you know, run the elections and make modifications

to the data. So one of the requests is to be able to have a smoother process next time is to be able to ensure that we address with the Census Bureau the actual precinct and make sure the data is more accurate related to some of the Tiger files and the data that we are seeing in some of the split blocs and so forth around the state. And we have had conversations with them. But there are challenges. And we are wanting to be able to sort of address that more consistently with -- for next time. And it will require some additional work throughout the decade to clean up the information and make sure next time the information is more accurate for doing this work. It's not something that can be done, you know, last-minute. It needs to be done over the course of time so that the data is going to be more accurate. So I don't know, I will stop there. And can see if we can you know open it up for some additional contact questions.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: So my understand Mr. Surber this is a long-term project and not a quick fix thing.

>> That is right.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Mr. Brace, do you have any comments on that.

>> Mr. Brace: He is correct it's a long-term process. We have done this in a number of different states and it basically follows some of the Census Bureau programs that are key towards this area. And there are two major programs that the Bureau does. One is called the bloc boundary suggestion program. And the other one is the reprecincting program. The bloc boundary suggestion program basically takes place in the year ending in five in a gross sense. And the reprecincting is basically done in the year ending in eight where they collect and gather the precincts at that point in time to go into the Tiger files. What we have found in working with a number of different states is both parts of that program are critical. And the state did not do the bloc boundary suggestion program as I recall this last decade. But I would certainly recommend that that take place. And part of that at this point in time is to get to these things that Rob had outlined. We worked with Rob in terms of what we knew that a Census Bureau was having and it is an issue that basically comes up with the state has its own set of data geography that may or may not correspond to census geography. And we use census geography for doing the redistricting. This is more critical particularly when Township boundaries may not follow the same line in both files, the state file or the Tiger file as well as City boundaries. City boundaries are more suspect but we have found in other states that the Bureau basically did Township boundaries back in the 1970s and in many instances never updated them. So in New England we found a number of instances where we had voters on the wrong side of the Township boundary and it was simply the Bureau had not kept up with and adjusted the Township boundary to ground truth with the better set of geographies and the better set of aerial photography that's available. So the whole phase one program, the BBSP can be utilized to try to look at these issues. And try to correct them early in the decade, mid-decade. I did talk with the Census Bureau yesterday. They have not really announced yet these two

programs. But they are anticipating it being on a similar timetable that they did last decade. So I think from planning purposes, from your standpoint we should be looking at, you know, funding Secretary of State, funding whomever to do phase one and make use of all the good data that you have as well as the better geometry that is available. And try to get some corrections within the burrito get things correct and accurately depicting on the aerial photography that we now have.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Brace. Commissioner Szetela, you have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes. I mean I think this is important to raise this issue to the full Commission. Because I was aware that we have received some municipalities that have expressed concern about their precincts being split. But I honestly am not even sure that even if we you know had the technological capability at this point to fix anything I don't think legally we could. I think our maps have been approved and you know, unfortunately there are these errors that effect certain areas but I don't think the Commission, you know, has the ability to go back in and adjust those boundaries any way even if we were to get different information and Mike Brady I don't know if you are prepared to weigh in on that or not. It's my understanding our maps have been approved and we can't just go back and adjust them if we unfortunately created an unintended situation with a particular precinct being split.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Szetela. Rob Surber, I have a question for you. Who should take the lead on this? What is your recommendation?

>> ROB-SURBER: I will sort of say this. In the past what we have done is the group that has sort of worked on some of these data issues and we provided some of this information was the sort of the bipartisan group that you know, sort of worked on the data to some degree over the last decade. And in my role, I'm the nonpartisan designee for the Census Bureau. And I helped facilitate that process. I don't do all the work but I help facilitate that. So for lack of a better word I probably would be the de facto Census Bureau contact because that is officially sort of my role and my hat I wear in that. But, you know, that would be maybe at least a starting point in that discussion.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you. Commissioner Eid?

>> COMMISSIONER EID: Yes, this is very informative. Thank you both Rob for being here today to educate us and educate the public as well. I agree with what Commissioner Szetela said. I think it's, you know, too late to do anything for now. But you know for this cycle for the maps we already passed, excuse me. But I think that part of our position while we are still in them is figuring out how to make this easier for the next Commission in 2030. So perhaps something we could do is put together like just a recommendations or something like that to give to the State of Michigan in order to smooth out the process for next time. Whether that be doing those two Census Bureau mechanisms that Mr. Brace had mentioned. Or other mechanisms to make it easier so that the next Commission has the most accurate data possible. It's probably

what we should do. In addition to this, I do have another question that relates to precincts. And it relates to precincts given that we might see a large influx of mail in voting now that just now proposal two passed and 2018 proposal three passed. Remember we did have some issues with the 2020 election data given that there was a large amount of mail-in voting. And if my memory serves me correctly the mail were assigned to specific precincts. So I'm wondering is there a plan or a mechanism in place for ten years down the road when they do this again to get those mail-in ballots assigned to precincts or just generally what can we do to make sure the next Commission has the most accurate data possible?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Clark?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: That is something the Michigan Department of State will address during their report that Commissioner Eid referenced with regard to absentee ballots.

>> MIKE BRADY: I prefer to address it now.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: He wants to address it now Commissioner Clark?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Mr. Brady?

>> MIKE BRADY: Mike Brady Michigan Department of State. I wanted to address now in real time for anyone who is listening and don't want there to be a gap of what could create miss information. Commissioner Eid, I appreciate your question. The question is your understanding is incorrect. Every absentee ballot is now and has forever been assigned to a specific precinct by law under the Michigan election law. An individual voter cannot change the prop two in 2018 prop 2 and 18-3 what changed is the ability of voters to not need to have a reason. No reason absentee. Folks who were called but before that they had to and were very specific reasons or ways in which voters could qualify for an absentee ballot. One is that you know you had to be absent from your jurisdiction on the day of the elections. Another was an age threshold. Maybe certain medical conditions. So it was more limited. But then and now if voter wants an absentee ballot, they contact their own City or Township clerk. And the City or Township clerk sends them the ballot that is appropriate for their specific, not just City or Township but the part of their City or Township where they live. So we thought that there are 1520 different cities and townships across the State of Michigan. And that Michigan administers elections and in a decentralized way through 1520 local clerks. In contrast to that many jurisdictions there are 5,000 unique approximately 5,000 unique ballot styles for every statewide election. So which of the 5,000 do you get, the one that your clerk gives you for your specific address when you request it from your clerk then you return your absentee ballot to your clerk. And it is counted by your clerk. So all of that is done in and has always been and is currently under law and that is not affected by prop 2022-2 that was just enacted by the people of the state. Again I appreciate the

question. Wanted to address it in real time. So there is no you know gap in time for anyone who may be watching now and has to sign off before MDOS gives the update.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Mr. Brady. Ms. Reinhardt, do you have a comment?

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: I do. I just wanted to kind of elaborate on what Commissioner Eid spoke about with this impacting the next Commission. So the issue of splits is something that we've had several meetings on in the past year. One of which we actually invited Commissioner Szetela and Executive Director Woods to participate in to talk about possible ways that the Commission and the group which Mr. Surber is a part of could resolve these issues. And the understanding was that of course, the maps as they currently exist, which the Commission created and approved, those you know we are not able at this point to fix any sort of splits or edit them in any way. But as Mr. Surber alluded to and Mr. Brace, this is a process that takes a lot of time. So if the Commission wanted to act to fix the data so that the subsequent Commission does not encounter the same difficulty with splits, causing additional difficulties after the next cycle once new maps are drawn for townships and cities and clerks to have to deal with that. That would be something that you all would have to approve now to help out the next Commission. I hope that kind of helps clarify. But what Commissioner Szetela said earlier that we are unable to edit current maps or fix any splits is accurate and we will ask for help in assisting to fix the data for the next Commission and subsequent maps that would be drawn.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. I'm sure all 13 of us would be available and willing to help if you need it. Commissioner Curry, do you have any comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Commissioner Lett do you have any comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: Can you hear me?

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: We can now.

>> COMMISSIONER CURRY: No, I'm listening to everything so maybe present it the next time we meet.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Great Commissioner Lett do you have a comment? So my understanding from the conversation is that there is no immediate action that we as a Commission will take. But we will be willing to assist you and work with you to make things better as we move forward. Is that a correct assumption? Okay all right great thank you very much Mr. Surber and Mr. Brace we appreciate your help.

>> KIM BRACE: Thank you.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay next on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the October 27 meeting the draft minutes were provided to the Commission before the meeting and are posted on our website. Are there any edits to the minutes.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Commissioner Clark that will have to happen at the next meeting.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay.

Then we will bypass that. The next item we've got is our Executive Director report. There is an Executive Director report today without objection I will ask Executive Director Woods to provide his report. Please proceed Mr. Woods.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: Thank you. Is everybody able to see my screen. Our website in terms of actual hits seven 2% went to the final District maps then the 17% was the next highest was the District maps by county. So in terms of our website these are the top two places where people are going to access it. I don't think that is a surprise to anyone considering the election cycle. Website updates I'm working with MDOS on the website challenges. You will notice today I want to thank MDOS for the transcripts are up. And so as we keep moving forward, we will resolve those issues that I first mentioned when I did the Commissioner attendance report. And then when I also mentioned when I did the catalog of meetings. So we are just in the process of getting those resolved so that everything is there. And it also as I shared earlier that we didn't miss anything or any links as a result of changing platforms. The website platform. So looking to have that all updated shortly. The quarterly reports once again are up. We did put up a preliminary report for the fourth quarter of 2022 fiscal year 2022. We will do a final report once the books are closed, once the books are closed, but those quarterly reports which provide the financial information and a summary of the Commission meetings are located off the website, off the website. And you will see the quarterly report for each quarter that the Commission has received funding that is available on their website. There is a close up event, a close up event with the University of Michigan. Michigan State and Voters Not Politicians from seven-8:30 p.m. I repeat from 7:00-8:30 p.m. on November 30th, on November 30th which is a Wednesday. And they are going to do a presentation on the performance of the Commission maps. They will do a presentation on the performance of Commission maps as a virtual seminar that will take place once again, once again Wednesday, November 30th from 7:00-8:30 p.m. We had some presentations that are continuing to go and Commissioner Eid has done presentation. Can you remind me where you were the last presentation that you did? I think you had some one that reached out to you.

>> COMMISSIONER EID: I haven't had any this past month. I was at Menlo college last month but we mentioned that at the last meeting.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: So nothing since Menlo great. And Commissioner Szetela did one with the California Redistricting Commission yesterday; is that correct?

>> COMMISSIONER SZETELA: Yes, it was actually with the San Francisco Redistricting Commission.

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: San Francisco in California they do have municipal Redistricting Commissions and I did one for the county roads association of Michigan on efforts on outreach to get people to do public comments and how the Commission managed the public comment process at our public hearings. Our media request, our

media requests are getting are dealing with how the maps performed. Some of the media requests we are getting are dealing with how the maps performed. We are getting in terms of associated press, Gongwer and articles and obviously people are looking at the national reports of the Commission's work. And once again, once again want to applaud the Commission for an outstanding job that they have done and making Michigan a national model, a national model with regards to redistricting. So once again give yourself a Patti Philips on the back with regards to the process. As we all know when we emphasize and talk about the process, the way that the maps were drawn was that the Commission followed the seven ranked I repeat the seven ranked redistricting criteria where competition where I repeat competition was not one of the criterias. And so we are sharing that information, how the Commission did its work. And that's something that the media has been inquiring. You will continue to see articles about it and will continue to reach out to you with regards to sharing that information. If there is any questions, Mr. Chair, I can take them at this time.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Any of the Commissioners have questions for Mr. Woods?

>> MR. EDWARD WOODS: And one last thing I would like to share, you know, I want to thank Commissioner Lett and our attorneys Dave and Nathan Fink. We spent a considerable amount of time in addressing the fiscal year 23 budget process. According to the values of the Commission in terms of being amicable, professional, in our interactions and trying to seek a resolution so I just want to thank Commissioner Lett as well as David and Nathan Fink for the support and the Commission as a whole as relates to this process that is where a considerable amount of our time has been spent in trying to navigate and hopefully resolve this issue real soon.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Mr. Fink do you have a question or a comment?

>> DAVID FINK: Yes, first I have to thank Mr. Woods for that acknowledgment. I'm not sure we deserve it. But I do want to say that some time ago the Commission dealt with a question of whether or not to create a process in which one Commissioner or two Commissioners, one Commissioner in this instance would serve as a liaison, keeping in regular contact with the lawyers. And at the time it was proposed I know there was some that opposed it and I just wanted to say to all of you that it has been a fantastically successful process from our perspective. It has allowed us to regularly meet with Commissioner Lett and Mr. Woods. And much more effectively communicate the status of what is going on in all of our litigation and we have the kind of guidance we need just in terms of information. He is not making decisions. The Commission makes decisions. But Commissioner Lett has done a fantastic job in meeting with us and doing that and we are very grateful for that.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Mr. Fink. Any other comments?

>> Am I on.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Yes, you are.

>> Thank you, David, for your kind comments. I would like to say that I think that and if any of the Commissioners think that we are not being open enough let us know. I know one of the areas that some of the Commissioners felt in the past was there were things that were being decided by either the executive or the General Counsel, whoever, that the Commission were not fully appraised on, I think I have attempted to be as open and transparent as I can be without going into private session on litigation that we have not needed to do that and we haven't done that. And I think it's worked out well with there were some concern whether or not we should hire another General Counsel, which would have been a laborious process. And it really worked out well with David and Nate. And so if people have questions on what we are doing, just ask. Because the reports that I make and the reports that I hear David and Nate make, that is what we talk about. So you're getting the full Monty, that is it.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you Commissioner Lett. Are there any other comments? Let's move on to our next agenda item which is our legal liaison report. Commissioner Lett, is there any additional legal information to report today?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: Nothing that hasn't already been said multiple times.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Okay, thank you very much. Any questions for Commissioner Lett? We will move on to the next subject which is our MDOS updates. Without objection I will ask Mike Brady or Sarah Reinhardt. Without objection Ms. Reinhardt.

>> MS. SARAH REINHARDT: No updates from MDOS today.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Thank you very much and our next agenda is correspondence and it was provided with written public comments to the Commissioners in our meeting materials. Future agenda items are there any agenda items the Commissioners would like to have added to future agendas? Commissioner Lett? You have a comment?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: None other than the obvious which would be the continued budget problems, but we will report on those as they come up. Probably give an update after today's meeting.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Correct and throughout today's meeting I think we identified two other items we will bring up in future meetings. One is the 2023 meeting calendar and the other is the dormancy plan and reactivation plan. So any other comments? All right let's move on to announcements. Are there any announcements from any of the Commissioners? Commissioner Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: It's 60 degrees in Ocala, Florida right now.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: That's great. Commissioner Curry, do you have any comments? Any announcements? Then let us move on to adjournment. As the items on the agenda are completed the Commission has no further business. A motion to adjourn is in order. May I have a motion to adjourn? Mr. Lett?

>> COMMISSIONER LETT: So moved.

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 CURRY: Second.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: Commissioner Lett submitted a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Orton seconded that motion. All in favor raise your hand and say aye.

>> Aye.

>> VICE CHAIR CLARK: All opposed raise your hand and say nay. The ayes prevail.
The meeting is adjourned. At 11:40 a.m. Thank you.