

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF OHIO, *et al.*,

Relators,

v.

OHIO REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2021-1193

BRIA BENNETT, *et al.*,

Relators,

v.

OHIO REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2021-1198

THE OHIO ORGANIZING
COLLABORATIVE, *et al.*,

Relators,

v.

OHIO REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2021-1210

DOCUMENTS PRODUCED IN DISCOVERY — APPENDIX OF

EXHIBITS Volume 7 of 13

(counsel listing on next page)

Freda J. Levenson (0045916)
ACLU of Ohio Foundation, Inc.
4506 Chester Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44103
Tel: 614-586-1972 x 125
flevenson@acluohio.org

David J. Carey (0088787)
ACLU of Ohio Foundation, Inc.
1108 City Park Avenue, Suite 203
Columbus, OH 43206
(614) 586-1972 x2004
dcarey@acluohio.org

Alora Thomas (PHV 22010-2021)
Kelsey Miller*
Julie A. Ebenstein (PHV
25423-2021)
American Civil Liberties Union 125
Broad Street
New York, NY 10004
(212) 519-7866
athomas@aclu.org
jebenstein@aclu.org

Robert D. Fram (PHV 25414-2021)
Donald Brown** (PHV 25480-2021)
Joshua González (PHV 25424-2021)
Juliana Goldrosen (PHV 25193-2021)
David Denuyl (PHV 25452-2021)
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
Salesforce Tower
415 Mission Street, Suite 5400
San Francisco, CA 94105-2533
(415) 591 6000
rfram@cov.com

DAVE YOST
OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL
Michael J. Hendershot (0081842)
Michael A. Walton (0092201)
Bridget C. Coontz (0072919)
Julie M. Pfeiffer (0069762)
30 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215
Tel: (614) 466-2872
Fax: (614) 728-7592
Michael.Hendershot@OhioAttorneyGeneral.gov
Michael.Walton@OhioAGO.gov
bridget.coontz@ohioago.gov
julie.pfeiffer@ohioago.gov

Counsel for Respondents
Governor Mike DeWine, Secretary of State
Frank LaRose, and Auditor Keith Faber

W. Stuart Dornette (0002955)
Beth A. Bryan (0082076)
Philip D. Williamson (0097174)
TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
425 Walnut St., Suite 1800
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3957
T: (513) 381-2838
dornette@taftlaw.com
bryan@taftlaw.com
pwilliamson@taftlaw.com

Phillip J. Strach (PHV 25444-2021)
Thomas A. Farr (PHV 25461-2021)
John E. Branch, III (PHV 25460-2021) Alyssa
M. Riggins (PHV 25441-2021) NELSON
MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP 4140
Parklake Ave., Suite 200
Raleigh, North Carolina 27612
phil.strach@nelsonmullins.com
tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com
john.branch@nelsonmullins.com
alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com
T: (919) 329-3812

Counsel for Respondents
Senate President Matt Huffman and
House Speaker Robert Cupp

James Smith*
Megan C. Keenan (PHV 25410-2021)
L. Brady Bender (PHV 25192-2021)
Alexander Thomson (PHV 25462-2021)
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
One CityCenter
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4956
(202) 662-6000
mkeen@cov.com

Anupam Sharma (PHV 25418-2021)
James Hovard (PHV 25420-2021)
Yale Fu (PHV 25419-2021)
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
3000 El Camino Real
5 Palo Alto Square, 10th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112
(650) 632-4700
asharma@cov.com

Madison Arent*
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
The New York Times Building
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10018-1405
(212) 841 1000
marent@cov.com

Counsel for Relators
League of Women Voters et al.
**Pro Hac Vice Motion Forthcoming*
***Pro Hac Vice Motion Pending*

Abha Khanna (PHV 2189-2021)
Ben Stafford (PHV 25433-2021) ELIAS
LAW GROUP
1700 Seventh Ave, Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
akhanna@elias.law
bstafford@elias.law
T: (206) 656-0176
F: (206) 656-0180

John Gilligan (Ohio Bar No. 0024542)
Diane Menashe (Ohio Bar No. 0070305)
ICE MILLER LLP
250 West Street, Suite 700
Columbus, Ohio 43215
John.Gilligan@icemiller.com
Diane.Menashe@icemiller.com

Counsel for Respondents
Senator Vernon Sykes and
House Minority Leader Emilia Sykes

Erik J. Clark (Ohio Bar No. 0078732)
Ashley Merino (Ohio Bar No. 0096853)
ORGAN LAW LLP
1330 Dublin Road
Columbus, Ohio 43215
T: (614) 481-0900
F: (614) 481-0904
ejclark@organlegal.com
amerino@organlegal.com

Counsel for Respondent
Ohio Redistricting Commission

Aria C. Branch (PHV 25435-2021)
Jyoti Jasrasaria (PHV 25401-2021)
Spencer W. Klein (PHV 25432-2021)
ELIAS LAW GROUP
10 G St NE, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002
abbranch@elias.law
jjasrasaria@elias.law
sklein@elias.law
T: (202) 968-4490
F: (202) 968-4498

Donald J. McTigue* (Ohio Bar No. 0022849)
**Counsel of Record*
Derek S. Clinger (Ohio Bar No. 0092075)
McTIGUE & COLOMBO LLC
545 East Town Street
Columbus, OH 43215
dmctigue@electionlawgroup.com
dclinger@electionlawgroup.com
T: (614) 263-7000
F: (614) 368-6961

Counsel for Relators
Bria Bennett, et al.

Peter M. Ellis (0070264)
Counsel of Record
M. Patrick Yingling (PHV 10145-2021)
REED SMITH LLP
10 South Wacker Drive, 40th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 207-1000
Fax: (312) 207-6400
pellis@reedsmith.com
mpyingling@reedsmith.com

Brad A. Funari (PHV 3139-2021)
Danielle L. Stewart (0084086)
Reed Smith LLP
225 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Tel: 412-288-4583
Fax: 412-288-3063
bfunari@reedsmith.com
dstewart@reedsmith.com

Brian A. Sutherland (PHV 25406-2021)
REED SMITH LLP
101 Second Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 543-8700
Fax: (415) 391-8269
bsutherland@reedsmith.com

Ben R. Fliegel (PHV 25411-2021)
REED SMITH LLP
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: (213) 457-8000
Fax: (213) 457-8080
bfliegel@reedsmith.com

Alicia L. Bannon (PHV 25409-2021)
Yurij Rudensky (PHV 25422-2021)
Michael Li (PHV 25430-2021)*
Ethan Herenstein (PHV 25429-2021)
BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE
AT NYU SCHOOL OF LAW
120 Broadway, Suite 1750
New York, NY 10271
Tel: (646) 292-8310
Fax: (212) 463-7308
alicia.bannon@nyu.edu

Counsel for Relators
Ohio Organizing Collaborative et al.
**Pro Hac Vice Motion Forthcoming*

**DOCUMENTS PRODUCED IN DISCOVERY –
APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS**

Volume 7 of 13

Index of Documents

| ITEM | FILE NAME | BATES RANGE |
|-------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 290 | SOS_000092 | SOS_000092-120 |
| 291 | SOS_000121 | SOS_000121-155 |
| 292 | SOS_000156 | SOS_000156-213 |
| 293 | SOS_000214 | SOS_000214-228 |
| 294 | SOS_000229 | SOS_000229-268 |
| 295 | SOS_000269 | SOS_000269-293 |
| 296 | SOS_000294 | SOS_000294-347 |
| 297 | SOS_000348 | SOS_000348-354 |
| 298 | SOS_000355 | SOS_000355-356 |
| 299 | SOS_000357 | SOS_000357-374 |



OHIO SENATE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus Plan Description

Article 11 of the Ohio Constitution outlines the process for the creation of districts of the Ohio General Assembly. § 03, § 04, and § 06 outline the rules for the House of Representatives, Senate, and additional district standards. The House and Senate map plan presented seeks to maximize compliance with all three of these sections.

All House and Senate districts within these plans adhere to the requirement of plus or minus five percent population deviation. Each district is contiguous and surrounded by a single, non-intersecting line. Districts were drawn to comply with all applicable provisions of the constitutions of Ohio and the United States and of federal law, including those concerned with the protection of minority voting rights. The Census block and district listings presented, also known as an equivalency file, is the official legal definition of districts. However, for ease of use, a series of maps and plain language descriptions of districts are included.

The House of Representatives map plan was created by first using the largest county by population, Franklin County, and creating eleven whole member districts within the county and the remainder of the county within one single additional district. This process was repeated from largest to smallest by population for each of the remaining 21 counties with more than one house ratio of representation. This resulted in the creation of the first 77 districts. Two whole county districts (Richland and Wayne) were created. The remaining twenty districts were created from whole counties, municipalities, and townships.

For each municipality in excess of one House of ratio of representation, as many whole House seats were created as were possible within the boundaries of the municipality. The remainder of the municipality was contiguously included in only a single House district. The remaining municipal corporations and townships of the county were then combined without splitting to form districts.

By following this protocol, the House of Representatives map plan fully complies with all requirements of § 03 Divisions (A), (B), (C) and (D). In plain language, this plan does not illegally split a single contiguous municipality or township in any district in the entire state. Counties are split to the minimum amount necessary to allow for population requirements. Only 12 of 64 counties with less than one full ratio of representation are split between two districts.

The plan makes zero use of the provisions of Division (E) and therefore has no requirement for a written statement of explanation. In plain language, this map plan makes zero illegal community splits. The House of Representatives plan also was created to enable maximum compliance with § 04 for the creation of Senate districts.

The Senate map plan was created under a similar protocol as the House plan, adhering to the provisions of § 04. Districts were drawn to comply with all applicable provisions of the constitutions of Ohio and the United States and of federal law, including those concerned with the protection of minority voting rights. Each of the Senate districts is composed of three House districts. Counties and contiguous municipal corporation sections with more than one House ratio of population were combined into as many Senate

districts within its borders as possible. The remainder of the county or contiguous municipal corporation portions were included into a single Senate District. The remainder of the state was combined in such a manner as to not split a single contiguous municipal corporation or township.

Senate Districts were created from largest to smallest county by population for each of the 24 counties with at least a single House district. This resulted in the creation of the first 28 Senate districts. Counties are split to the minimum amount necessary to allow for population requirements. Only 7 of 80 counties with less than one full Senate ratio of representation are split between two districts.

As was the situation in the 2010 reapportionment plan, Northeast Ohio presents an impossibility for full compliance for each county with more than one ratio of representation. In compliance § 04 (B)(3), the minimum of a single county, Trumbull County, has each of its two House districts in two separate Senate districts.

While complying in full accordance with § 03 and § 04, the House and Senate plans attempted to comply with the provisions of § 06. No measures were taken that violate the district standards described in § 02, 03, 04, 05, or 07.

To meet the standards of § 06 (A) and (B), districts were created so as to closely match the voter preferences for candidates as expressed in statewide partisan elections of the past decade. To determine compliance, two measures were undertaken.

First, each of the plans were created using the election data of the 2021 Ohio Common Unified Redistricting Database (CURD), which contained election results for the 2016, 2018, and 2020 statewide elections. Each of those election vote totals were combined to determine a total Democratic and Republican vote share. This enabled districts to be "indexed" by a single number.

Second, to determine the precise number of target districts with a majority of voters for each party, an aggregate ratio of Democratic and Republican districts needed to be calculated. This concept has also been called representational fairness.

The simple vote total of each eligible election from 2012 to 2020 resulted in a ratio of 45.9% Democratic, 54.1% Republican. This ideal ratio equates to 45 Democratic index and 54 Republican index House of Representatives seats. The ideal ratio also equates to 15 Democratic index and 18 Republican index Senate seats.

| Year | Democrat | Republican | Dem. Vote | Rep. Vote |
|------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2012 | Obama | Romney | 2,827,709 | 2,661,439 |
| 2012 | Brown | Mandel | 2,762,766 | 2,435,744 |
| 2014 | FitzGerald | Kasich | 1,009,359 | 1,944,848 |
| 2014 | Pepper | DeWine | 1,178,426 | 1,882,048 |
| 2014 | Carney | Yost | 1,149,305 | 1,711,927 |
| 2014 | Turner | Husted | 1,074,475 | 1,811,020 |
| 2014 | Pillich | Mandel | 1,323,325 | 1,724,060 |
| 2016 | Clinton | Trump | 2,394,164 | 2,841,005 |
| 2016 | Strickland | Portman | 1,996,908 | 3,118,567 |
| 2018 | Cordray | DeWine | 2,067,847 | 2,231,917 |
| 2018 | Dettelbach | Yost | 2,084,593 | 2,272,440 |
| 2018 | Space | Faber | 2,006,204 | 2,152,769 |
| 2018 | Clyde | LaRose | 2,049,944 | 2,210,356 |
| 2018 | Richardson | Sprague | 2,022,016 | 2,304,444 |
| 2018 | Brown | Renacci | 2,355,923 | 2,053,963 |
| 2020 | Biden | Trump | 2,603,681 | 3,074,418 |
| | | | 30,906,645 | 36,430,965 |

Ratio: 45.9% 54.1%

Senate: 15.1 17.9

House: 45.4 53.6

The House map plan, as offered, has 44 Democratic index and 55 Republican index House seats. The Senate map plan as offered has 14 Democratic index and 19 Republican index Senate seats. Each of these plans represents the third closest result to ideal ratios possible:

| Closest Ideal Ratios | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Senate | House |
| 15 D : 18 R | 45 D : 54 R |
| 16 D : 17 R | 46 D : 53 R |
| 14 D : 19 R | 44 D : 55 R |
| 17 D : 16 R | 47 D : 52 R |
| 13 D : 20 R | 43 D : 56 R |

These map plans also attempted to meet the standard of § 06 (C) concerning compactness. The preservation of political subdivisions is a key principle of compactness. However, some political subdivisions are inherently irregularly shaped or are not contiguous. The preservation of these communities is essential in § 03 and § 04 and could not be compromised. These map plans seek to

minimize community splits to the greatest extent possible. Where possible in accordance with the constitution, districts were made compact.

These map plans adhere to the spirit of the reforms passed overwhelmingly by the voters of the State of Ohio. This a starting proposal by the Members of the Senate Democratic Caucus. No group or organization has reviewed the map plans. Improvements and suggestions are welcomed.

An Additional Note on Representational Fairness:

If only the 2016-2020 races provided in the CURD data set were selected, the ratio would increase Democratic ratio by one House seat and reduce the Republican ratio by one House seat. The Senate ratio remained the same.

| Year | Democrat | Republican | Dem. Vote | Rep. Vote |
|------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2016 | Clinton | Trump | 2,394,164 | 2,841,005 |
| 2016 | Strickland | Portman | 1,996,908 | 3,118,567 |
| 2018 | Cordray | DeWine | 2,067,847 | 2,231,917 |
| 2018 | Dettelbach | Yost | 2,084,593 | 2,272,440 |
| 2018 | Space | Faber | 2,006,204 | 2,152,769 |
| 2018 | Clyde | LaRose | 2,049,944 | 2,210,356 |
| 2018 | Richardson | Sprague | 2,022,016 | 2,304,444 |
| 2018 | Brown | Renacci | 2,355,923 | 2,053,963 |
| 2020 | Biden | Trump | 2,603,681 | 3,074,418 |
| | | | 19,581,280 | 22,259,879 |

Ratio: **46.8%** **53.2%**

Senate: **15.4** **17.6**

House: **46.3** **52.7**

Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus

Testimony of Randall Routt, Minority Caucus Policy Advisor

Co-Chair Cupp, Co-Chair Sykes and members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission, thank you for the opportunity to speak about the redistricting plan as presented to you today. I'd like to take some time to walk you through how this plan was generated in compliance with, and in the spirit of, constitutional reforms to Ohio's redistricting process.

To draw the House map, we first looked at the largest county in the state by population, Franklin County, as required by the Ohio Constitution. Franklin County has a population of 1,323,807, which allowed us to create 11 districts within it. We drew the remainder of the county within one additional district. We then repeated the process for the other 21 counties in the state with more than one House ratio of representation – in other words, for the other 21 counties in Ohio whose populations are large enough to contain more than one House district. We did so from the largest county to the smallest, resulting in the creation of the first 77 districts. Two additional districts encompassing entire counties – Richland and Wayne – were then created. Finally, the remaining 20 districts were created by combining whole counties, municipalities and townships.

As you will see, our House map fully complies with all constitutional redistricting requirements. It does not illegally split a single contiguous municipality or township in any district in the state. It splits counties as little as possible, and only to allow for population requirements: Only 12 of the 64 counties with less than one House ratio of representation are split between two districts. Our map also makes zero illegal community splits.

We used the same process to draw Senate districts, each of which must encompass three House districts. We started the process with the 24 counties in the state comprised of at least one House district, which resulted in the creation of the first 28 Senate districts. We then drew the remaining five districts by minimizing county splits. In our map, only seven of the 80 counties with less than one Senate ratio of representation are split between two districts.

Representational Fairness

The Ohio Constitution, Article 11, Section 6 also requires that districts closely match the voter preferences for candidates as expressed in statewide partisan elections of the past decade. Or, as we have heard from last week's testimony, representational fairness. In short, our General Assembly districts should roughly match the way Ohio voters have indicated their preferences over the past decade.


We calculated this in two ways. First, we used data from the 2021 Ohio Common Unified Redistricting Database to determine a total Democratic and Republican vote share. We then looked at the simple vote totals of each eligible election (every partisan, statewide election) from 2012 to 2020, which resulted in a ratio of 45.9% Democratic and 54.1% Republican voters split over the last 10 years. For purposes of map drawing, this would mean that a map that would most closely match the call of Ohio voters would include 45 likely Democratic and 54 likely Republican seats in the House of Representatives, and 15 likely Democratic and 18 likely Republican seats in the Senate. Our House map includes 44 likely Democratic districts and 55 likely Republican districts. Our Senate map includes 14 likely Democratic districts and 19 likely Republican districts.

Compactness


As we heard repeatedly in testimony last week, the Ohio Constitution also requires that General Assembly districts are compact and keep communities of interest within the same district. It is important to note that many subdivisions are irregularly shaped or are simply not contiguous. The map before you today minimizes community splits to the greatest extent possible.


In summary, these map plans adhere to the spirit of the reforms passed overwhelmingly by the voters of Ohio as well as with federal law, including with provisions concerning the protection of minority voting rights. It is merely a starting proposal by the members of the Senate Democratic Caucus. No outside group or organization has reviewed the maps before you in advance of our submission to the Commission and the public today. In addition to my testimony, I am providing a more detailed description of our plan and additional materials. I'd be happy to take any questions and also have our consultant, Chris Glassburn with Project Govern, here to help answer your questions as well. Thank you.


- Shall release to
the public





House Plan Statewide Map























Senate Plan Statewide Map







| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 16-20DemP | 16-20RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | 114,024 | -4.33% | 45.27% | 7.91% | 3.70% | 76.30% | 23.70% | 74.55% | 25.45% |
| 2 | 118,703 | -0.41% | 24.95% | 3.83% | 6.46% | 61.23% | 38.77% | 57.25% | 42.75% |
| 3 | 113,829 | -4.49% | 16.43% | 3.87% | 6.09% | 61.31% | 38.69% | 56.27% | 43.73% |
| 4 | 114,236 | -4.15% | 57.13% | 6.21% | 3.25% | 86.65% | 13.35% | 87.70% | 12.30% |
| 5 | 113,334 | -4.91% | 30.17% | 7.52% | 7.95% | 75.72% | 24.28% | 73.89% | 26.11% |
| 6 | 114,574 | -3.87% | 5.60% | 4.31% | 12.46% | 67.96% | 32.04% | 62.10% | 37.90% |
| 7 | 113,635 | -4.66% | 5.70% | 3.85% | 12.18% | 62.11% | 37.89% | 55.69% | 44.31% |
| 8 | 114,557 | -3.88% | 7.19% | 5.84% | 8.82% | 59.42% | 40.58% | 54.96% | 45.04% |
| 9 | 113,894 | -4.44% | 15.82% | 11.43% | 3.61% | 51.04% | 48.96% | 52.31% | 47.69% |
| 10 | 113,806 | -4.51% | 12.18% | 5.35% | 2.90% | 53.94% | 46.06% | 53.60% | 46.40% |
| 11 | 113,571 | -4.71% | 14.35% | 4.78% | 4.93% | 71.84% | 28.16% | 72.15% | 27.85% |
| 12 | 124,183 | 4.19% | 28.53% | 3.22% | 1.74% | 49.91% | 50.09% | 52.84% | 47.16% |
| 13 | 113,299 | -4.94% | 55.46% | 7.63% | 3.52% | 82.97% | 17.03% | 85.02% | 14.98% |
| 14 | 113,239 | -4.99% | 77.79% | 3.10% | 3.79% | 93.34% | 6.66% | 94.13% | 5.87% |
| 15 | 113,446 | -4.82% | 19.95% | 23.47% | 3.49% | 68.17% | 31.83% | 72.28% | 27.72% |
| 16 | 118,290 | -0.75% | 8.89% | 7.91% | 4.31% | 57.00% | 43.00% | 58.90% | 41.10% |
| 17 | 123,088 | 3.27% | 3.98% | 3.43% | 3.77% | 64.21% | 35.79% | 60.67% | 39.33% |
| 18 | 120,566 | 1.16% | 3.99% | 3.34% | 4.32% | 50.96% | 49.04% | 50.40% | 49.60% |
| 19 | 114,881 | -3.61% | 16.75% | 4.88% | 2.58% | 53.67% | 46.33% | 56.99% | 43.01% |
| 20 | 123,802 | 3.87% | 23.06% | 2.36% | 3.36% | 54.15% | 45.85% | 54.14% | 45.86% |
| 21 | 124,877 | 4.77% | 53.93% | 2.63% | 4.22% | 88.10% | 11.90% | 87.08% | 12.92% |
| 22 | 122,848 | 3.07% | 39.03% | 2.21% | 4.22% | 73.80% | 26.20% | 73.34% | 26.66% |
| 23 | 122,833 | 3.06% | 16.84% | 1.86% | 7.04% | 60.46% | 39.54% | 58.19% | 41.81% |
| 24 | 122,398 | 2.69% | 51.52% | 3.96% | 1.77% | 80.24% | 19.76% | 78.50% | 21.50% |
| 25 | 122,538 | 2.81% | 36.77% | 5.11% | 4.83% | 74.52% | 25.48% | 74.00% | 26.00% |
| 26 | 114,104 | -4.26% | 18.70% | 3.25% | 3.40% | 68.93% | 31.07% | 63.88% | 36.12% |
| 27 | 118,283 | -0.76% | 8.74% | 2.40% | 3.81% | 51.52% | 48.48% | 45.35% | 54.65% |
| 28 | 113,517 | -4.76% | 21.09% | 3.56% | 6.99% | 58.52% | 41.48% | 53.41% | 46.59% |
| 29 | 115,096 | -3.43% | 34.33% | 5.40% | 3.93% | 56.26% | 43.74% | 54.42% | 45.58% |
| 30 | 124,703 | 4.63% | 3.92% | 1.23% | 1.53% | 29.45% | 70.55% | 26.41% | 73.59% |
| 31 | 124,746 | 4.67% | 16.55% | 1.87% | 2.24% | 53.37% | 46.63% | 57.02% | 42.98% |
| 32 | 121,169 | 1.66% | 34.40% | 2.93% | 6.61% | 73.53% | 26.47% | 74.57% | 25.43% |
| 33 | 123,147 | 3.32% | 4.53% | 1.51% | 2.94% | 44.08% | 55.92% | 44.58% | 55.42% |
| 34 | 125,014 | 4.89% | 5.09% | 1.76% | 4.90% | 53.84% | 46.16% | 51.44% | 48.56% |
| 35 | 116,227 | -2.48% | 20.11% | 3.01% | 2.40% | 55.33% | 44.67% | 53.48% | 46.52% |
| 36 | 114,161 | -4.22% | 38.75% | 5.16% | 2.00% | 71.88% | 28.12% | 72.39% | 27.61% |
| 37 | 120,274 | 0.91% | 28.87% | 2.68% | 2.82% | 53.21% | 46.79% | 52.67% | 47.33% |
| 38 | 124,965 | 4.85% | 7.67% | 2.54% | 2.81% | 35.71% | 64.29% | 34.30% | 65.70% |
| 39 | 114,924 | -3.58% | 8.53% | 2.55% | 4.70% | 41.49% | 58.51% | 37.50% | 62.50% |
| 40 | 124,943 | 4.83% | 6.95% | 6.60% | 2.62% | 51.91% | 48.09% | 52.64% | 47.36% |
| 41 | 113,695 | -4.61% | 29.29% | 6.63% | 1.20% | 66.68% | 33.32% | 68.59% | 31.41% |
| 42 | 113,691 | -4.61% | 34.47% | 6.59% | 2.76% | 71.69% | 28.31% | 72.64% | 27.36% |
| 43 | 121,663 | 2.08% | 4.32% | 4.96% | 1.59% | 40.35% | 59.65% | 41.03% | 58.97% |
| 44 | 123,092 | 3.28% | 8.48% | 5.40% | 8.00% | 41.36% | 58.64% | 36.82% | 63.18% |
| 45 | 118,335 | -0.71% | 12.66% | 6.81% | 3.06% | 38.51% | 61.49% | 37.07% | 62.93% |
| 46 | 115,456 | -3.13% | 8.27% | 4.00% | 1.70% | 31.09% | 68.91% | 31.50% | 68.50% |

| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 16-20DemP | 16-20RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 47 | 120,154 | 0.81% | 2.00% | 1.64% | 2.81% | 24.75% | 75.25% | 27.30% | 72.70% |
| 48 | 115,405 | -3.17% | 4.16% | 1.83% | 1.73% | 37.25% | 62.75% | 39.36% | 60.64% |
| 49 | 113,789 | -4.53% | 2.84% | 1.55% | 0.73% | 34.57% | 65.43% | 37.41% | 62.59% |
| 50 | 119,055 | -0.11% | 17.54% | 3.43% | 1.12% | 51.85% | 48.15% | 53.05% | 46.95% |
| 51 | 124,221 | 4.22% | 10.90% | 15.37% | 1.81% | 53.31% | 46.69% | 54.81% | 45.19% |
| 52 | 123,858 | 3.92% | 9.42% | 5.58% | 1.73% | 51.34% | 48.66% | 54.64% | 45.36% |
| 53 | 123,450 | 3.58% | 2.87% | 4.08% | 0.70% | 33.21% | 66.79% | 37.66% | 62.34% |
| 54 | 119,403 | 0.18% | 2.27% | 1.98% | 2.25% | 28.21% | 71.79% | 26.27% | 73.73% |
| 55 | 122,934 | 3.14% | 5.92% | 3.23% | 11.94% | 40.95% | 59.05% | 36.21% | 63.79% |
| 56 | 117,995 | -1.00% | 3.85% | 5.55% | 1.57% | 42.47% | 57.53% | 43.97% | 56.03% |
| 57 | 114,608 | -3.84% | 6.14% | 1.86% | 2.01% | 43.70% | 56.30% | 44.46% | 55.54% |
| 58 | 114,241 | -4.15% | 7.72% | 4.32% | 1.57% | 47.71% | 52.29% | 51.66% | 48.34% |
| 59 | 114,373 | -4.04% | 22.88% | 5.71% | 0.66% | 50.57% | 49.43% | 54.88% | 45.12% |
| 60 | 114,720 | -3.75% | 5.54% | 3.17% | 11.99% | 51.90% | 48.10% | 46.64% | 53.36% |
| 61 | 124,216 | 4.22% | 2.46% | 1.97% | 3.99% | 38.30% | 61.70% | 35.00% | 65.00% |
| 62 | 123,334 | 3.48% | 2.29% | 2.22% | 2.10% | 35.88% | 64.12% | 32.64% | 67.36% |
| 63 | 122,701 | 2.95% | 1.43% | 1.30% | 0.71% | 23.20% | 76.80% | 24.62% | 75.38% |
| 64 | 113,746 | -4.56% | 14.11% | 2.05% | 1.06% | 52.43% | 47.57% | 56.99% | 43.01% |
| 65 | 113,359 | -4.89% | 3.18% | 1.22% | 0.52% | 35.30% | 64.70% | 40.91% | 59.09% |
| 66 | 118,120 | -0.89% | 1.93% | 2.30% | 1.79% | 39.19% | 60.81% | 39.81% | 60.19% |
| 67 | 116,797 | -2.00% | 1.07% | 1.42% | 1.02% | 31.54% | 68.46% | 33.44% | 66.56% |
| 68 | 124,574 | 4.52% | 6.18% | 2.05% | 4.06% | 40.60% | 59.40% | 40.64% | 59.36% |
| 69 | 123,374 | 3.51% | 1.48% | 0.97% | 0.50% | 24.82% | 75.18% | 29.01% | 70.99% |
| 70 | 114,724 | -3.74% | 6.37% | 2.93% | 5.41% | 42.31% | 57.69% | 39.06% | 60.94% |
| 71 | 114,996 | -3.52% | 7.24% | 2.18% | 3.50% | 49.57% | 50.43% | 51.93% | 48.07% |
| 72 | 119,225 | 0.03% | 3.52% | 1.40% | 0.85% | 37.58% | 62.42% | 39.64% | 60.36% |
| 73 | 124,900 | 4.79% | 9.93% | 2.31% | 2.83% | 41.90% | 58.10% | 40.51% | 59.49% |
| 74 | 123,963 | 4.01% | 10.63% | 3.24% | 1.03% | 39.61% | 60.39% | 41.12% | 58.88% |
| 75 | 125,067 | 4.93% | 4.48% | 1.94% | 3.49% | 31.05% | 68.95% | 30.66% | 69.34% |
| 76 | 124,277 | 4.27% | 3.37% | 5.31% | 2.66% | 46.98% | 53.02% | 47.08% | 52.92% |
| 77 | 123,957 | 4.00% | 6.30% | 3.63% | 0.79% | 41.38% | 58.62% | 44.13% | 55.87% |
| 78 | 124,936 | 4.82% | 10.09% | 1.73% | 0.88% | 29.84% | 70.16% | 33.23% | 66.77% |
| 79 | 116,894 | -1.92% | 2.08% | 1.94% | 1.11% | 31.19% | 68.81% | 33.21% | 66.79% |
| 80 | 114,974 | -3.53% | 3.02% | 1.55% | 1.77% | 26.88% | 73.12% | 26.59% | 73.41% |
| 81 | 122,903 | 3.12% | 11.06% | 2.47% | 1.00% | 26.82% | 73.18% | 28.01% | 71.99% |
| 82 | 123,379 | 3.52% | 2.67% | 1.29% | 0.50% | 27.16% | 72.84% | 32.01% | 67.99% |
| 83 | 119,984 | 0.67% | 1.04% | 2.63% | 0.47% | 28.15% | 71.85% | 34.59% | 65.41% |
| 84 | 123,022 | 3.22% | 4.02% | 0.89% | 0.59% | 28.60% | 71.40% | 32.92% | 67.08% |
| 85 | 123,089 | 3.27% | 4.93% | 0.95% | 0.67% | 29.15% | 70.85% | 35.89% | 64.11% |
| 86 | 121,472 | 1.92% | 2.47% | 0.90% | 0.42% | 24.92% | 75.08% | 31.59% | 68.41% |
| 87 | 119,370 | 0.15% | 1.99% | 4.57% | 1.60% | 27.73% | 72.27% | 28.14% | 71.86% |
| 88 | 124,727 | 4.65% | 5.27% | 1.20% | 0.66% | 28.93% | 71.07% | 37.10% | 62.90% |
| 89 | 121,594 | 2.02% | 4.59% | 1.98% | 0.64% | 27.19% | 72.81% | 31.05% | 68.95% |
| 90 | 117,082 | -1.77% | 1.05% | 1.36% | 0.62% | 23.74% | 76.26% | 27.18% | 72.82% |
| 91 | 113,358 | -4.89% | 5.08% | 1.67% | 1.67% | 42.46% | 57.54% | 49.57% | 50.43% |
| 92 | 116,634 | -2.14% | 1.58% | 0.84% | 0.68% | 26.82% | 73.18% | 32.52% | 67.48% |

| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 16-20DemP | 16-20RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 93 | 121,655 | 2.07% | 3.33% | 6.06% | 0.79% | 33.78% | 66.22% | 36.78% | 63.22% |
| 94 | 122,470 | 2.76% | 2.14% | 0.78% | 0.45% | 24.57% | 75.43% | 30.16% | 69.84% |
| 95 | 122,123 | 2.46% | 2.61% | 1.56% | 1.01% | 21.50% | 78.50% | 23.37% | 76.63% |
| 96 | 122,431 | 2.72% | 0.92% | 1.91% | 0.68% | 18.56% | 81.44% | 19.73% | 80.27% |
| 97 | 114,286 | -4.11% | 2.43% | 1.28% | 0.63% | 22.01% | 77.99% | 24.55% | 75.45% |
| 98 | 121,856 | 2.24% | 1.49% | 6.10% | 0.59% | 27.96% | 72.04% | 30.39% | 69.61% |
| 99 | 122,017 | 2.38% | 2.83% | 3.13% | 0.77% | 36.70% | 63.30% | 39.55% | 60.45% |

| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 2016-2020DemPct | 2016-2020RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 346,556 | -3.08% | 28.68% | 5.17% | 5.44% | 65.48% | 34.52% | 61.88% | 38.12% |
| 2 | 342,144 | -4.31% | 30.08% | 5.97% | 8.04% | 75.74% | 24.26% | 72.95% | 27.05% |
| 3 | 342,086 | -4.33% | 9.51% | 7.00% | 8.23% | 58.24% | 41.76% | 54.58% | 45.42% |
| 4 | 351,560 | -1.68% | 18.46% | 4.43% | 3.22% | 57.63% | 42.37% | 59.00% | 41.00% |
| 5 | 339,984 | -4.92% | 51.29% | 11.30% | 3.60% | 82.00% | 18.00% | 84.77% | 15.23% |
| 6 | 356,259 | -0.36% | 9.68% | 5.39% | 3.57% | 58.92% | 41.08% | 59.08% | 40.92% |
| 7 | 369,245 | 3.27% | 27.03% | 2.77% | 3.96% | 64.21% | 35.79% | 64.38% | 35.62% |
| 8 | 368,828 | 3.15% | 20.15% | 1.86% | 4.73% | 58.86% | 41.14% | 58.27% | 41.73% |
| 9 | 359,040 | 0.41% | 35.65% | 4.11% | 3.34% | 74.29% | 25.71% | 71.64% | 28.36% |
| 10 | 346,896 | -2.98% | 21.28% | 3.78% | 4.89% | 55.22% | 44.78% | 50.66% | 49.34% |
| 11 | 359,831 | 0.64% | 2.98% | 1.47% | 2.05% | 27.21% | 72.79% | 26.74% | 73.26% |
| 12 | 370,929 | 3.74% | 18.54% | 2.18% | 4.57% | 59.39% | 40.61% | 60.09% | 39.91% |
| 13 | 350,662 | -1.93% | 29.20% | 3.60% | 2.41% | 58.86% | 41.14% | 58.18% | 41.82% |
| 14 | 354,613 | -0.82% | 7.53% | 2.67% | 4.27% | 39.75% | 60.25% | 36.90% | 63.10% |
| 15 | 352,329 | -1.46% | 23.17% | 6.61% | 2.22% | 62.36% | 37.64% | 63.67% | 36.33% |
| 16 | 369,897 | 3.45% | 4.67% | 4.62% | 1.68% | 42.78% | 57.22% | 44.01% | 55.99% |
| 17 | 356,883 | -0.19% | 9.82% | 5.42% | 4.27% | 37.31% | 62.69% | 35.25% | 64.75% |
| 18 | 348,249 | -2.60% | 8.24% | 2.27% | 1.20% | 40.60% | 59.40% | 42.80% | 57.20% |
| 19 | 371,529 | 3.91% | 7.70% | 8.23% | 1.41% | 45.86% | 54.14% | 49.03% | 50.97% |
| 20 | 356,623 | -0.26% | 3.57% | 2.18% | 5.04% | 30.91% | 69.09% | 29.27% | 70.73% |
| 21 | 342,360 | -4.25% | 14.87% | 4.03% | 1.10% | 50.10% | 49.90% | 54.36% | 45.64% |
| 22 | 347,580 | -2.79% | 4.66% | 1.61% | 1.64% | 40.68% | 59.32% | 43.96% | 56.04% |
| 23 | 354,620 | -0.82% | 4.27% | 3.51% | 1.45% | 41.04% | 58.96% | 42.70% | 57.30% |
| 24 | 363,872 | 1.77% | 6.12% | 2.25% | 5.32% | 39.97% | 60.03% | 38.01% | 61.99% |
| 25 | 367,507 | 2.78% | 2.06% | 1.48% | 1.08% | 28.47% | 71.53% | 29.73% | 70.27% |
| 26 | 351,811 | -1.61% | 1.69% | 1.89% | 1.31% | 34.28% | 65.72% | 35.70% | 64.30% |
| 27 | 372,848 | 4.28% | 5.85% | 1.78% | 2.47% | 35.79% | 64.21% | 36.73% | 63.27% |
| 28 | 371,153 | 3.80% | 5.95% | 2.25% | 1.85% | 30.45% | 69.55% | 31.50% | 68.50% |
| 29 | 367,190 | 2.69% | 4.50% | 3.50% | 0.76% | 24.27% | 75.73% | 25.86% | 74.14% |
| 30 | 364,740 | 2.01% | 3.22% | 1.12% | 0.61% | 27.65% | 72.35% | 33.94% | 66.06% |
| 31 | 360,088 | 0.71% | 2.07% | 1.63% | 0.56% | 26.98% | 73.02% | 31.81% | 68.19% |
| 32 | 358,917 | 0.38% | 4.04% | 1.13% | 0.92% | 31.59% | 68.41% | 38.36% | 61.64% |
| 33 | 362,619 | 1.42% | 3.32% | 4.19% | 1.01% | 29.62% | 70.38% | 32.01% | 67.99% |

Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus
Senate Districts Legal Description

Senate District 1:

House Districts 87, 89, 93

Senate District 2:

House Districts 43, 76, 77

Senate District 3:

House Districts 1, 2, 3

Senate District 4:

House Districts 10, 11, 12

Senate District 5:

House Districts 4, 5, 6

Senate District 6:

House Districts 35, 36, 37

Senate District 7:

House Districts 55, 56, 97

Senate District 8:

House Districts 27, 28, 29

Senate District 9:

House Districts 13, 14, 15

Senate District 10:

House Districts 38, 39, 71

Senate District 11:

House Districts 16, 17, 19

Senate District 12:

House Districts 81, 96, 98

Senate District 13:

House Districts 22, 23, 33

Senate District 14:

House Districts 63, 64, 86

Senate District 15:

House Districts 24, 25, 26

Senate District 16:

House Districts 7, 8, 9

Senate District 17:

House Districts 30, 47, 80

Senate District 18:

House Districts 51, 65, 99

Senate District 19:

House Districts 40, 41, 42

Senate District 20:

House Districts 69, 70, 73

Senate District 21:

House Districts 44, 45, 46

Senate District 22:

House Districts 67, 68, 79

Senate District 23:

House Districts 48, 49, 50

Senate District 24:

House Districts 18, 20, 21

Senate District 25:

House Districts 52, 53, 54

Senate District 26:

House Districts 59, 60, 66

Senate District 27:

House Districts 61, 62, 78

Senate District 28:

House Districts 31, 32, 34

Senate District 29:

House Districts 74, 75, 95

Senate District 30:

House Districts 82, 88, 92

Senate District 31:


House Districts 83, 84, 90


Senate District 32:


House Districts 85, 91, 84

Senate District 33:


House Districts 57, 58, 99







House Map



| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 2016-2020DemPct | 2016-2020RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 114,024 | -4.33% | 45.27% | 7.91% | 3.70% | 76.30% | 23.70% | 74.55% | 25.45% |
| 2 | 118,703 | -0.41% | 24.95% | 3.83% | 6.46% | 61.23% | 38.77% | 57.25% | 42.75% |
| 3 | 113,829 | -4.49% | 16.43% | 3.87% | 6.09% | 61.31% | 38.69% | 56.27% | 43.73% |
| 4 | 114,236 | -4.15% | 57.13% | 6.21% | 3.25% | 86.65% | 13.35% | 87.70% | 12.30% |
| 5 | 113,334 | -4.91% | 30.17% | 7.52% | 7.95% | 75.72% | 24.28% | 73.89% | 26.11% |
| 6 | 114,574 | -3.87% | 5.60% | 4.31% | 12.46% | 67.96% | 32.04% | 62.10% | 37.90% |
| 7 | 113,635 | -4.66% | 5.70% | 3.85% | 12.18% | 62.11% | 37.89% | 55.69% | 44.31% |
| 8 | 114,557 | -3.88% | 7.19% | 5.84% | 8.82% | 59.42% | 40.58% | 54.96% | 45.04% |
| 9 | 113,894 | -4.44% | 15.82% | 11.43% | 3.61% | 51.04% | 48.96% | 52.31% | 47.69% |
| 10 | 113,806 | -4.51% | 12.18% | 5.35% | 2.90% | 53.94% | 46.06% | 53.60% | 46.40% |
| 11 | 113,571 | -4.71% | 14.35% | 4.78% | 4.93% | 71.84% | 28.16% | 72.15% | 27.85% |
| 12 | 124,183 | 4.19% | 28.53% | 3.22% | 1.74% | 49.91% | 50.09% | 52.84% | 47.16% |
| 13 | 113,299 | -4.94% | 55.46% | 7.63% | 3.52% | 82.97% | 17.03% | 85.02% | 14.98% |
| 14 | 113,239 | -4.99% | 77.79% | 3.10% | 3.79% | 93.34% | 6.66% | 94.13% | 5.87% |
| 15 | 113,446 | -4.82% | 19.95% | 23.47% | 3.49% | 68.17% | 31.83% | 72.28% | 27.72% |
| 16 | 118,290 | -0.75% | 8.89% | 7.91% | 4.31% | 57.00% | 43.00% | 58.90% | 41.10% |
| 17 | 123,088 | 3.27% | 3.98% | 3.43% | 3.77% | 64.21% | 35.79% | 60.67% | 39.33% |
| 18 | 120,566 | 1.16% | 3.99% | 3.34% | 4.32% | 50.96% | 49.04% | 50.40% | 49.60% |
| 19 | 114,881 | -3.61% | 16.75% | 4.88% | 2.58% | 53.67% | 46.33% | 56.99% | 43.01% |
| 20 | 123,802 | 3.87% | 23.06% | 2.36% | 3.36% | 54.15% | 45.85% | 54.14% | 45.86% |
| 21 | 124,877 | 4.77% | 53.93% | 2.63% | 4.22% | 88.10% | 11.90% | 87.08% | 12.92% |
| 22 | 124,439 | 4.41% | 35.21% | 2.00% | 3.95% | 68.98% | 31.02% | 67.31% | 32.69% |
| 23 | 121,242 | 1.73% | 20.44% | 2.07% | 7.36% | 64.16% | 35.84% | 63.01% | 36.99% |
| 24 | 115,950 | -2.72% | 53.32% | 3.85% | 3.30% | 85.22% | 14.78% | 83.66% | 16.34% |
| 25 | 120,325 | 0.96% | 34.22% | 5.27% | 3.43% | 67.48% | 32.52% | 66.50% | 33.50% |
| 26 | 113,278 | -4.96% | 22.78% | 3.27% | 3.25% | 71.48% | 28.52% | 67.06% | 32.94% |
| 27 | 116,917 | -1.90% | 8.77% | 2.44% | 3.53% | 51.44% | 48.56% | 45.30% | 54.70% |
| 28 | 120,629 | 1.21% | 19.71% | 3.46% | 7.17% | 58.24% | 41.76% | 52.74% | 47.26% |
| 29 | 120,408 | 1.03% | 33.28% | 5.29% | 3.80% | 55.45% | 44.55% | 53.52% | 46.48% |
| 30 | 123,132 | 3.31% | 3.96% | 1.24% | 1.55% | 29.59% | 70.41% | 26.53% | 73.47% |
| 31 | 124,746 | 4.67% | 16.55% | 1.87% | 2.24% | 53.37% | 46.63% | 57.02% | 42.98% |
| 32 | 121,169 | 1.66% | 34.40% | 2.93% | 6.61% | 73.53% | 26.47% | 74.57% | 25.43% |
| 33 | 123,147 | 3.32% | 4.53% | 1.51% | 2.94% | 44.08% | 55.92% | 44.58% | 55.42% |
| 34 | 125,014 | 4.89% | 5.09% | 1.76% | 4.90% | 53.84% | 46.16% | 51.44% | 48.56% |
| 35 | 116,227 | -2.48% | 20.11% | 3.01% | 2.40% | 55.33% | 44.67% | 53.48% | 46.52% |
| 36 | 114,161 | -4.22% | 38.75% | 5.16% | 2.00% | 71.88% | 28.12% | 72.39% | 27.61% |
| 37 | 120,274 | 0.91% | 28.87% | 2.68% | 2.82% | 53.21% | 46.79% | 52.67% | 47.33% |
| 38 | 124,965 | 4.85% | 7.67% | 2.54% | 2.81% | 35.71% | 64.29% | 34.30% | 65.70% |
| 39 | 114,924 | -3.58% | 8.53% | 2.55% | 4.70% | 41.49% | 58.51% | 37.50% | 62.50% |
| 40 | 124,943 | 4.83% | 6.95% | 6.60% | 2.62% | 51.91% | 48.09% | 52.64% | 47.36% |
| 41 | 113,695 | -4.61% | 29.29% | 6.63% | 1.20% | 66.68% | 33.32% | 68.59% | 31.41% |
| 42 | 113,691 | -4.61% | 34.47% | 6.59% | 2.76% | 71.69% | 28.31% | 72.64% | 27.36% |
| 43 | 121,663 | 2.08% | 4.32% | 4.96% | 1.59% | 40.35% | 59.65% | 41.03% | 58.97% |
| 44 | 124,374 | 4.35% | 8.43% | 5.36% | 7.94% | 41.21% | 58.79% | 36.72% | 63.28% |
| 45 | 118,018 | -0.98% | 12.69% | 6.83% | 3.06% | 38.54% | 61.46% | 37.09% | 62.91% |
| 46 | 114,491 | -3.94% | 8.30% | 4.02% | 1.69% | 31.14% | 68.86% | 31.56% | 68.44% |

| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 2016-2020DemPct | 2016-2020RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 47 | 120,154 | 0.81% | 2.00% | 1.64% | 2.81% | 24.75% | 75.25% | 27.30% | 72.70% |
| 48 | 115,405 | -3.17% | 4.16% | 1.83% | 1.73% | 37.25% | 62.75% | 39.36% | 60.64% |
| 49 | 113,789 | -4.53% | 2.84% | 1.55% | 0.73% | 34.57% | 65.43% | 37.41% | 62.59% |
| 50 | 119,055 | -0.11% | 17.54% | 3.43% | 1.12% | 51.85% | 48.15% | 53.05% | 46.95% |
| 51 | 119,225 | 0.03% | 3.52% | 1.40% | 0.85% | 37.58% | 62.42% | 39.64% | 60.36% |
| 52 | 123,858 | 3.92% | 9.42% | 5.58% | 1.73% | 51.34% | 48.66% | 54.64% | 45.36% |
| 53 | 124,221 | 4.22% | 10.90% | 15.37% | 1.81% | 53.31% | 46.69% | 54.81% | 45.19% |
| 54 | 123,450 | 3.58% | 2.87% | 4.08% | 0.70% | 33.21% | 66.79% | 37.66% | 62.34% |
| 55 | 122,934 | 3.14% | 5.92% | 3.23% | 11.94% | 40.95% | 59.05% | 36.21% | 63.79% |
| 56 | 119,403 | 0.18% | 2.27% | 1.98% | 2.25% | 28.21% | 71.79% | 26.27% | 73.73% |
| 57 | 114,608 | -3.84% | 6.14% | 1.86% | 2.01% | 43.70% | 56.30% | 44.46% | 55.54% |
| 58 | 117,995 | -1.00% | 3.85% | 5.55% | 1.57% | 42.47% | 57.53% | 43.97% | 56.03% |
| 59 | 114,373 | -4.04% | 22.88% | 5.71% | 0.66% | 50.57% | 49.43% | 54.88% | 45.12% |
| 60 | 114,241 | -4.15% | 7.72% | 4.32% | 1.57% | 47.71% | 52.29% | 51.66% | 48.34% |
| 61 | 114,080 | -4.28% | 5.55% | 3.22% | 11.86% | 51.19% | 48.81% | 45.93% | 54.07% |
| 62 | 124,856 | 4.76% | 2.45% | 1.93% | 4.10% | 38.90% | 61.10% | 35.55% | 64.45% |
| 63 | 123,334 | 3.48% | 2.29% | 2.22% | 2.10% | 35.88% | 64.12% | 32.64% | 67.36% |
| 64 | 122,701 | 2.95% | 1.43% | 1.30% | 0.71% | 23.20% | 76.80% | 24.62% | 75.38% |
| 65 | 113,359 | -4.89% | 3.18% | 1.22% | 0.52% | 35.30% | 64.70% | 40.91% | 59.09% |
| 66 | 113,746 | -4.56% | 14.11% | 2.05% | 1.06% | 52.43% | 47.57% | 56.99% | 43.01% |
| 67 | 116,797 | -2.00% | 1.07% | 1.42% | 1.02% | 31.54% | 68.46% | 33.44% | 66.56% |
| 68 | 118,120 | -0.89% | 1.93% | 2.30% | 1.79% | 39.19% | 60.81% | 39.81% | 60.19% |
| 69 | 124,574 | 4.52% | 6.18% | 2.05% | 4.06% | 40.60% | 59.40% | 40.64% | 59.36% |
| 70 | 123,374 | 3.51% | 1.48% | 0.97% | 0.50% | 24.82% | 75.18% | 29.01% | 70.99% |
| 71 | 114,724 | -3.74% | 6.37% | 2.93% | 5.41% | 42.31% | 57.69% | 39.06% | 60.94% |
| 72 | 114,996 | -3.52% | 7.24% | 2.18% | 3.50% | 49.57% | 50.43% | 51.93% | 48.07% |
| 73 | 124,900 | 4.79% | 9.93% | 2.31% | 2.83% | 41.90% | 58.10% | 40.51% | 59.49% |
| 74 | 123,963 | 4.01% | 10.63% | 3.24% | 1.03% | 39.61% | 60.39% | 41.12% | 58.88% |
| 75 | 125,067 | 4.93% | 4.48% | 1.94% | 3.49% | 31.05% | 68.95% | 30.66% | 69.34% |
| 76 | 124,277 | 4.27% | 3.37% | 5.31% | 2.66% | 46.98% | 53.02% | 47.08% | 52.92% |
| 77 | 123,957 | 4.00% | 6.30% | 3.63% | 0.79% | 41.38% | 58.62% | 44.13% | 55.87% |
| 78 | 124,936 | 4.82% | 10.09% | 1.73% | 0.88% | 29.84% | 70.16% | 33.23% | 66.77% |
| 79 | 116,894 | -1.92% | 2.08% | 1.94% | 1.11% | 31.19% | 68.81% | 33.21% | 66.79% |
| 80 | 114,974 | -3.53% | 3.02% | 1.55% | 1.77% | 26.88% | 73.12% | 26.59% | 73.41% |
| 81 | 122,903 | 3.12% | 11.06% | 2.47% | 1.00% | 26.82% | 73.18% | 28.01% | 71.99% |
| 82 | 123,379 | 3.52% | 2.67% | 1.29% | 0.50% | 27.16% | 72.84% | 32.01% | 67.99% |
| 83 | 119,984 | 0.67% | 1.04% | 2.63% | 0.47% | 28.15% | 71.85% | 34.59% | 65.41% |
| 84 | 123,022 | 3.22% | 4.02% | 0.89% | 0.59% | 28.60% | 71.40% | 32.92% | 67.08% |
| 85 | 123,089 | 3.27% | 4.93% | 0.95% | 0.67% | 29.15% | 70.85% | 35.89% | 64.11% |
| 86 | 121,472 | 1.92% | 2.47% | 0.90% | 0.42% | 24.92% | 75.08% | 31.59% | 68.41% |
| 87 | 119,370 | 0.15% | 1.99% | 4.57% | 1.60% | 27.73% | 72.27% | 28.14% | 71.86% |
| 88 | 124,727 | 4.65% | 5.27% | 1.20% | 0.66% | 28.93% | 71.07% | 37.10% | 62.90% |
| 89 | 121,594 | 2.02% | 4.59% | 1.98% | 0.64% | 27.19% | 72.81% | 31.05% | 68.95% |
| 90 | 117,082 | -1.77% | 1.05% | 1.36% | 0.62% | 23.74% | 76.26% | 27.18% | 72.82% |
| 91 | 113,358 | -4.89% | 5.08% | 1.67% | 1.67% | 42.46% | 57.54% | 49.57% | 50.43% |
| 92 | 116,634 | -2.14% | 1.58% | 0.84% | 0.68% | 26.82% | 73.18% | 32.52% | 67.48% |

| District | Population | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 2016-2020DemPct | 2016-2020RepPct |
|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 93 | 121,655 | 2.07% | 3.33% | 6.06% | 0.79% | 33.78% | 66.22% | 36.78% | 63.22% |
| 94 | 122,470 | 2.76% | 2.14% | 0.78% | 0.45% | 24.57% | 75.43% | 30.16% | 69.84% |
| 95 | 122,123 | 2.46% | 2.61% | 1.56% | 1.01% | 21.50% | 78.50% | 23.37% | 76.63% |
| 96 | 122,431 | 2.72% | 0.92% | 1.91% | 0.68% | 18.56% | 81.44% | 19.73% | 80.27% |
| 97 | 114,286 | -4.11% | 2.43% | 1.28% | 0.63% | 22.01% | 77.99% | 24.55% | 75.45% |
| 98 | 121,856 | 2.24% | 1.49% | 6.10% | 0.59% | 27.96% | 72.04% | 30.39% | 69.61% |
| 99 | 122,017 | 2.38% | 2.83% | 3.13% | 0.77% | 36.70% | 63.30% | 39.55% | 60.45% |

| District | Populatio | Deviation | 18+ BVAP | 18+ HVAP | 18+ AVAP | BidenPct | TrumpPct | 2016-2020DemPct | 2016-2020RepPct |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 342,360 | -4.25% | 14.87% | 4.03% | 1.10% | 50.10% | 49.90% | 54.36% | 45.64% |
| 2 | 369,897 | 3.45% | 4.67% | 4.62% | 1.68% | 42.78% | 57.22% | 44.01% | 55.99% |
| 3 | 346,556 | -3.08% | 28.68% | 5.17% | 5.44% | 65.48% | 34.52% | 61.88% | 38.12% |
| 4 | 356,883 | -0.19% | 9.82% | 5.42% | 4.27% | 37.31% | 62.69% | 35.25% | 64.75% |
| 5 | 342,144 | -4.31% | 30.08% | 5.97% | 8.04% | 75.74% | 24.26% | 72.95% | 27.05% |
| 6 | 350,662 | -1.93% | 29.20% | 3.60% | 2.41% | 58.86% | 41.14% | 58.18% | 41.82% |
| 7 | 356,623 | -0.26% | 3.57% | 2.18% | 5.04% | 30.91% | 69.09% | 29.27% | 70.73% |
| 8 | 357,954 | 0.11% | 20.72% | 3.75% | 4.85% | 54.99% | 45.01% | 50.32% | 49.68% |
| 9 | 339,984 | -4.92% | 51.29% | 11.30% | 3.60% | 82.00% | 18.00% | 84.77% | 15.23% |
| 10 | 354,613 | -0.82% | 7.53% | 2.67% | 4.27% | 39.75% | 60.25% | 36.90% | 63.10% |
| 11 | 356,259 | -0.36% | 9.68% | 5.39% | 3.57% | 58.92% | 41.08% | 59.08% | 40.92% |
| 12 | 367,190 | 2.69% | 4.50% | 3.50% | 0.76% | 24.27% | 75.73% | 25.86% | 74.14% |
| 13 | 368,828 | 3.15% | 20.15% | 1.86% | 4.73% | 58.86% | 41.14% | 58.27% | 41.73% |
| 14 | 367,507 | 2.78% | 2.06% | 1.48% | 1.08% | 28.47% | 71.53% | 29.73% | 70.27% |
| 15 | 349,553 | -2.24% | 36.46% | 4.13% | 3.32% | 75.11% | 24.89% | 72.71% | 27.29% |
| 16 | 342,086 | -4.33% | 9.51% | 7.00% | 8.23% | 58.24% | 41.76% | 54.58% | 45.42% |
| 17 | 358,260 | 0.20% | 2.99% | 1.48% | 2.06% | 27.26% | 72.74% | 26.78% | 73.22% |
| 18 | 347,580 | -2.79% | 4.66% | 1.61% | 1.64% | 40.68% | 59.32% | 43.96% | 56.04% |
| 19 | 352,329 | -1.46% | 23.17% | 6.61% | 2.22% | 62.36% | 37.64% | 63.67% | 36.33% |
| 20 | 372,848 | 4.28% | 5.85% | 1.78% | 2.47% | 35.79% | 64.21% | 36.73% | 63.27% |
| 21 | 351,560 | -1.68% | 18.46% | 4.43% | 3.22% | 57.63% | 42.37% | 59.00% | 41.00% |
| 22 | 351,811 | -1.61% | 1.69% | 1.89% | 1.31% | 34.28% | 65.72% | 35.70% | 64.30% |
| 23 | 348,249 | -2.60% | 8.24% | 2.27% | 1.20% | 40.60% | 59.40% | 42.80% | 57.20% |
| 24 | 369,245 | 3.27% | 27.03% | 2.77% | 3.96% | 64.21% | 35.79% | 64.38% | 35.62% |
| 25 | 371,529 | 3.91% | 7.70% | 8.23% | 1.41% | 45.86% | 54.14% | 49.03% | 50.97% |
| 26 | 362,619 | 1.42% | 3.32% | 4.19% | 1.01% | 29.62% | 70.38% | 32.01% | 67.99% |
| 27 | 363,872 | 1.77% | 6.12% | 2.25% | 5.32% | 39.97% | 60.03% | 38.01% | 61.99% |
| 28 | 370,929 | 3.74% | 18.54% | 2.18% | 4.57% | 59.39% | 40.61% | 60.09% | 39.91% |
| 29 | 371,153 | 3.80% | 5.95% | 2.25% | 1.85% | 30.45% | 69.55% | 31.50% | 68.50% |
| 30 | 364,740 | 2.01% | 3.22% | 1.12% | 0.61% | 27.65% | 72.35% | 33.94% | 66.06% |
| 31 | 360,088 | 0.71% | 2.07% | 1.63% | 0.56% | 26.98% | 73.02% | 31.81% | 68.19% |
| 32 | 354,620 | -0.82% | 4.27% | 3.51% | 1.45% | 41.04% | 58.96% | 42.70% | 57.30% |
| 33 | 358,917 | 0.38% | 4.04% | 1.13% | 0.92% | 31.59% | 68.41% | 38.36% | 61.64% |

Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus Map Plan Legal Description

House Districts

District 1

Franklin County (part)

Bexley, Whitehall

Columbus Precincts

27C, 45K, 47D, 47E, 47F, 47B, 27E, 27F, 27D, 27B, 27A, 45H, 44E, 48A, 47C, 47A, 34D, 45F, 45A, 34A, 68D, 45B, 45M, 45O, 45C, 68A, 45N, 34E, 34F, 84A, 34B, 34C, 84C, 84B, 26A, 46J, 84H, 46C, 46H, 46D, 68C, 68B, 84G, 84F, 84E, 26B, 46A

Columbus Partial Precincts

45D

Non-contiguous portions of Jefferson Township, Mifflin Township and Truro Township within the listed boundaries.

District 2

Franklin County (part)

Gahanna, Reynoldsburg, Canal Winchester (Franklin)

Columbus Precincts

86G, 86I, 86J, 86F, 86E, 86H, 45G, 86D, 46K, 46G, 46M, 46F, 46L, 46I, 46E, 45I, 45L, 45J, 45E

Contiguous Jefferson Township

Non-contiguous portions of Jefferson Township, Madison Township and Truro Township within the listed boundaries.

District 3

Franklin County (part)

New Albany, Westerville (Franklin)

Columbus Precincts

73J, 82H, 82M, 82F, 82G, 82J, 62C, 73E, 73C, 73A, 82A, 82C, 82B, 73F, 73D, 73B, 73K, 73I, 73H, 73M, 73G, 82D, 82L, 73L, 82K, 82O, 82E, 82I, 82N, 61D, 66B, 66E, 66D, 66F, 62E, 62B, 66A, 66C, 81B, 62D

Plain Township

Non-contiguous portions of Blendon Township and Sharon Township within the listed boundaries.

District 4

Franklin County (part)

Columbus Precincts

42A, 03B, 06A, 25C, 06C, 06B, 25D, 25E, 25G, 25H, 25B, 25F, 23D, 56B, 56D, 56E, 26C, 83I, 83E, 83J, 83C, 83F, 83B, 04B, 04C, 03A, 04A, 55D, 07D, 55B, 07E, 07B, 07C, 83G, 83D, 83H, 56C, 42D, 56A, 23A, 43D, 23C, 43C, 83A, 02A, 03C, 13A, 16A, 17A, 13D, 13C, 13B, 17D, 17B, 17C, 24C, 24A, 24E, 43E, 24D 24B, 25A, 04D, 05B, 05D, 55C, 07A, 55A, 06E, 06D, 05C, 05A, 06F

Columbus Partial Precinct

62B

Contiguous Mifflin Township

Non-contiguous portions of Clinton Township and Mifflin Township within the listed boundaries.

District 5

Franklin County (part)

Minerva Park

Columbus Precincts

22E, 22F, 42E, 52A, 52C, 52E, 52B, 30C, 30B, 53F, 53G, 30D, 30E, 30A, 54C, 54D, 53A, 53C, 53H, 80A, 80F, 80E, 80B, 42C, 42B, 52D, 52G, 52F, 54F, 81A, 81E, 54B, 54E, 61A, 54A, 61C, 53B, 53E, 61B, 81D, 81C, 43B, 19D, 22G, 19G, 22A, 22B, 22C, 21B, 22D, 52H, 80C, 80D, 62A, 18A, 18F, 18B, 18D, 19H, 19E, 19C, 19F, 19B, 19A, 18C, 18E, 43A

Columbus Partial Precinct

66B

Non-contiguous portions of Blendon Township, Clinton Township, and Sharon Township within the listed boundaries.

District 6

Franklin County (part)

Upper Arlington

Columbus Precincts

64B, 64E, 64A, 64D, 64C, 64G, 60E, 60G, 60B, 60C, 59A, 59E, 63C, 59B, 70B, 59D,
70D, 63A, 60D, 60A, 33F, 33C, 33B, 33J, 15B, 70A, 70C, 64F, 64H, 63G, 63H, 63D,
63B, 63F, 63E, 21F, 21E, 21C, 39C, 39D, 15A, 20B, 70E, 20C, 20A, 39B

Non-contiguous portions of Clinton Township and Perry Township within the listed boundaries.

District 7

Franklin County (part)

Riverlea, Worthington, Dublin (Franklin)

Columbus Precincts

74F, 74D, 74G, 74H, 74E, 74B, 65D, 65A, 74C, 74A, 65B, 65F, 65G, 65E, 59C, 59F,
60F, 72A, 72D, 72B, 71F, 71E, 71C, 69K, 21D, 21A, 65C, 72E, 72G, 72C, 72F, 71A,
71B, 71D, 69F

Non-contiguous portions of Brown Township, Perry Township, Sharon Township and Washington Township within the listed boundaries.

District 8

Franklin County (part)

Hilliard, Marble Cliff, Valleyview

Columbus Precincts

57A, 10B, 57F, 75A, 75C, 75B, 77C, 10D, 10E, 77F, 69I, 69M, 69L, 75I, 75G, 75F,
75E, 75D, 75H, 76E, 76F, 76D, 76A, 76C, 76B, 76G, 57G, 57B, 57C, 57E, 77A, 57D,
77B, 77D, 77E, 69A, 69H, 69B, 69C, 69N, 69G, 69D, 69J, 69E

Contiguous Norwich Township

Non-contiguous portions of Brown Township, Franklin Township, Norwich Township, Perry Township, and Washington Township within the listed boundaries.

District 9

Franklin County (part)

Columbus Precincts

78A, 78B, 79C, 87B, 87D, 87A, 67H, 67A, 87C, 87E, 79A, 67G, 67I, 67C, 67D, 67F,
78H, 78D, 78F, 78G, 78C, 78I, 67B, 78E, 79B, 67E, 58C, 36C, 36E, 36D, 36A, 32C,
36B, 58F, 11A, 11B, 58I, 58E, 58B, 11C, 11E, 58D, 11D, 32A, 32B, 32D,

Pleasant Township, Prairie Township

Non-contiguous portions of Franklin Township within the listed boundaries.

District 10

Franklin County (part)

Grandview Heights, Grove City, Urbancrest

Columbus Precincts

58H, 58K, 31B, 58G, 31D, 38A, 37D, 58A, 31A, 38B, 10B, 10C, 38C, 09A, 10A,
37C, 33I, 33H, 33A, 33G, 33D, 37E, 58J, 31E, 31C, 14D, 14F, 14G, 37B, 37A, 09B,
14A

Jackson Township

Non-contiguous portions of Franklin Township within the listed boundaries.

District 11

Franklin County (part)

Obetz

Columbus Precincts

49E, 49F, 49G, 49H, 49C, 49B, 49D, 49A, 29D, 50A, 50B, 50C, 50D, 50E, 51C, 40A,
39A, 33E, 40B, 14C, 40C, 12A, 41B, 41G, 41D, 41I, 41H, 41E, 41F, 41A, 41C, 16B,
16E, 02F, 14E, 14B, 29C, 01C, 01B, 02B, 02C, 29A, 29B, 01A, 03D, 08C, 02D, 08G,
08E, 02E, 08D, 08B, 08H, 12D, 08A, 12E, 08F, 12C, 12B, 16F, 16C, 16D, 51B

Hamilton Township

Non-contiguous portions of Madison Township within the listed boundaries.

District 12

Pickaway County

Franklin County (part)

Groveport

Columbus Precincts

86B, 86C, 85 B, 51A, 85A, 85C, 85E, 85D, 86A, 44D, 44G, 48E, 48D, 44H, 48B,
35D, 51D, 35A, 35B, 35C, 44F, 44B, 28E, 28F, 44A, 44C, 28B, 28C, 28A, 48C, 28D

Columbus Partial Precinct

45D

Non-contiguous portions of Madison Township within the listed boundaries.

District 13

Cuyahoga County (part)

Bratenahl

Cleveland Precincts

13P, 13L, 13O, 13M, 12S, 03O, 03K, 03I, 03Q, 05R, 07J, 05Q, 07D, 05G, 05A, 05S,
07V, 07A, 07C, 03L, 10I, 10J, 10L, 10N, 10O, 08O, 10Q, 10S, 08R, 10F, 10E, 08Q,
08J, 08M, 08P, 08N, 10P, 08D, 08I, 08H, 08L, 08K, 08E, 08F, 08A, 10R, 10V, 10G,
08G, 10T, 08B, 08C, 09S, 09V, 09M, 09X, 09C, 09N, 09W, 09B, 09A, 10B, 09G,
09J, 09F, 09D, 10D, 09E, 10M, 10C, 10U, 10H, 13E, 13N, 12O, 13D, 12B, 12C, 12R,
12Q, 14H, 14G, 12P, 12N, 12M, 05B, 05E, 05F, 07U, 07L, 07B, 07R, 07E, 10A,
09T, 07H, 09U, 10K

Cleveland Partial Precincts

12L, 03G, 03F, 05D, 09Q, 09O, 09K, 03M, 03P, 03E, 05I, 07T, 07Q, 07P, 07F

District 14

Cuyahoga County (part)

Cleveland Precincts

12L, 05C, 12I, 12H, 12F, 12G, 02A, 02C, 05J, 12J, 12K, 05K, 05O, 12E, 12D, 06B, 05N, 05P, 02B, 02D, 02E, 02F, 02G, 02H, 02P, 02S, 02T, 06L, 06E, 01C, 02Q, 01B, 01O, 01T, 01E, 01I, 01R, 01H, 01M, 02K, 04L, 04O, 02M, 02N, 02L, 04J, 04S, 04R, 01D, 01A, 01G, 01S, 01K, 01Q, 01F, 01J, 01L, 01P, 01N, 06R, 06U, 09P, 09L, 06D, 06O, 07I, 09H, 09I, 04Q, 06A, 06F, 04A, 04D, 04C, 04P, 06P, 02O, 02I, 02U, 02V, 02W, 02J, 02R, 04T, 04N, 04M, 04U, 04F, 04E, 04I, 04H, 04K, 04G, 06T, 04B, 05L, 05M, 05I, 07T, 05H, 06J, 06H, 07S, 06G, 07O, 07G, 06M, 06I, 06N, 07M, 07N, 07K, 09R, 06Q, 06S, 06K, 06C

Cleveland Partial Precincts

03F, 05G, 05D, 09Q, 09O, 09K, 05B, 05I, 07T, 07Q, 07P, 07F

District 15

Cuyahoga County (part)

Cleveland Precincts

03R, 14F, 03N, 14P, 15M, 15K, 15F, 15J, 13K, 13H, 13G, 13F, 13C, 12A, 16H, 16A, 16K, 11A, 11B, 11G, 17L, 16C, 17F, 17H, 17E, 16D, 16G, 16B, 16P, 17I, 16N, 16K, 17M, 17A, 17B, 11F, 11K, 11E, 11C, 11L, 15I, 13J, 13I, 13B, 13A, 11P, 11O, 11I, 11D, 14E, 15H, 15R, 15G, 15L, 14A, 14B, 14L, 14D, 14K, 14M, 14N, 03S, 03B, 03M, 03J, 03C, 14C, 14J, 14I, 14O

Cleveland Partial Precincts

15E, 15P, 16O, 16J, 11H, 11J, 17J, 17R, 17Q, 17P, 17O, 17S, 15Q, 03D, 03H, 03G, 11N, 03P, 03E

District 16

Cuyahoga County (part)

Brook Park, Brooklyn, Fairview Park, Linndale, Middleburgh Heights, Parma Heights

Cleveland Precincts

15O, 15A, 15B, 15N, 16E, 16F, 16M, 16L, 16I, 17N, 17C, 17D, 17G, 03A, 15D, 15C, 11M

Cleveland Partial Precincts

15E, 15P, 16O, 16Q, 16J, 11H, 11J, 16C, 17J, 17R, 17Q, 17P, 17O, 17S, 17A, 15Q, 03D, 03H, 11N

District 17

Cuyahoga County (part)

Bay Village, Lakewood, Rocky River, Westlake

District 18

Cuyahoga County (part)

Berea, North Olmsted, Olmsted Falls, Strongsville

Olmsted Township

District 19

Cuyahoga County (part)

Brooklyn Heights, Cuyahoga Heights, Garfield Heights, Newburgh Heights, Parma

District 20

Cuyahoga County (part)

Bedford Heights, Brecksville, Broadview Heights, Independence, Maple Heights,
North Randall, North Royalton, Seven Hills, Valley View, Walton Hills

District 21

Cuyahoga County (part)

Cleveland Heights, East Cleveland, Highland Hills, Shaker Heights, South Euclid,
Warrensville Heights

District 22

Cuyahoga County (part)

Chagrin Falls, Gates Mills, Euclid, Highland Heights, Hunting Valley (Cuyahoga),
Lyndhurst, Mayfield, Mayfield Heights, Moreland Hills, Pepper Pike

Chagrin Falls Township

District 23

Cuyahoga County (part)

Beachwood, Bedford, Bentleyville, Glenwillow, Oakwood, Orange, Solon, University Heights, Woodmere

Summit County (part)

Macedonia, Northfield, Twinsburg

Sagamore Hills Township

Non-contiguous portions of Twinsburg Township within the listed boundaries.

District 24

Hamilton County (part)

Elmwood Place, St. Bernard

Cincinnati

Non-contiguous portions of Springfield Township within the listed boundaries.

District 25

Hamilton County (part)

Addyston, Cheviot, Cleves, North Bend, Elmwood Place, St. Bernard

Cincinnati

Non-contiguous portions of Springfield Township within the listed boundaries.

District 26

Hamilton County (part)

Norwood

Cincinnati

District 27

Hamilton County (part)

Amberley, Deer Park, Fairfax, Golf Manor, Marimont, Newtown, Reading, Silverton, Terrace Park, Village of Indian Hill

Anderson Township, Columbia Township, Sycamore Township

Non-contiguous portions of Symmes Township within the listed boundaries.

District 28

Hamilton County (part)

Arlington Heights, Blue Ash, Evendale, Glendale, Lincoln Heights, Lockland Loveland (Hamilton), Montgomery, Sharonville, Woodlawn, Wyoming

Non-contiguous portions of Springfield Township and Symmes Township within the listed boundaries.

District 29

Hamilton County (part)

Greenhills, Forest Park, Mount Healthy, North College Hill, Springdale

Colerain Township

Non-contiguous portions of Crosby Township and Springfield Township within the listed boundaries

District 30

Hamilton County (part)

Harrison

Delhi Township, Green Township, Harrison Township, Miami Township, Whitewater Township

Non-contiguous portions of Crosby Township within the listed boundaries

District 31

Summit County (part)

Barberton, Mogadore (Summit), Tallmadge (Summit)

Akron Precincts

07H, 06M, 07F, 06A, 06K, 06G, 06L, 06J, 06H, 06E, 06C, 10F, 06B, 06I, 06D, 10G, 10M, 10E, 10I, 10K, 07I, 07J, 07B, 07K, 07C, 05E, 07G, 07M, 07L, 05J, 07E, 07D, 05A, 05G, 05M, 05L, 05H, 06F, 10A, 05I, 10D, 05K, 10J

Akron Partial Precincts

09H, 10H, 05B, 05N, 10C, 09G, 07A, 03L

Coventry Township

Non-contiguous portions of Springfield Township within the listed boundaries

District 32

Summit County (part)

Akron Precincts

09D, 01E, 08L, 08B, 08M, 09B, 09J, 09K, 09F, 09E, 04D, 03J, 04J, 04G, 04M, 04P,
04B, 04I, 02K, 02G, 02C, 10B, 05F, 05D, 05C, 02E, 02M, 02H, 02D, 02B, 02L, 02I,
02J, 02F, 02A, 03M, 01L, 01B, 03N, 01M, 10L, 09I, 09A, 09C, 03A, 03F, 03K, 03G,
04L, 04A, 03C, 03B, 03H, 03I, 03E, 03D, 01A, 04N, 04F, 08C, 08D, 08H, 08A, 08F,
04C, 04O, 08J, 08I, 08N, 08O, 08D, 08E, 08G, 08Q, 04E, 04H, 01C, 08K, 01D, 01K,
01G, 01I, 01J, 01F, 01H

Akron Partial Precincts

09H, 10H, 05B, 05N, 10C, 09G, 07A, 03C, 04K

Non-contiguous portions of Cuyahoga Falls within the listed boundaries

Non-contiguous portions of Bath Township within the listed boundaries

District 33

Summit County (part)

Boston Heights, Clinton, Fairlawn, Green, New Franklin, Norton, Peninsula, Richfield

Copley Township, Northfield Center Township, Richfield Township,

Non-contiguous portions of Bath Township and Springfield Township within the listed
boundaries

District 34

Summit County (part)

Hudson, Munroe Falls, Reminderville, Silver Lake, Stow, Twinsburg Heights

Contiguous portion of Cuyahoga Falls

Twinsburg Township

District 35

Montgomery County (part)

Kettering, Moraine, Oakwood

Contiguous portion of Trotwood

Non-contiguous portions of Riverside within the listed boundaries

Contiguous portion of Jefferson Township

Non-contiguous portions of Miami Township within the listed boundaries

District 36

Montgomery County (part)

Dayton Precincts

11A, 02A, 17B, 17A, 03H, 05E, 17C, 17D, 13A, 15D, 01A, 01D, 07B, 05A, 01C,
05B, 05C, 04A, 04C, 04B, 01E, 23A, 01B, 04D, 08C, 09A, 08B, 09D, 08D, 08A, 10A,
10C, 12D, 02B, 12B, 03E, 12C, 09C, 09B, 10E, 20B, 10D, 20A, 20C, 12A, 11B, 11D,
02D, 02C, 11C, 20D, 14A, 14C, 14D, 15C, 15B, 15A, 06A, 21B, 14B, 19D, 19B, 19C,
06B, 06C, 19A, 06D, 21C, 22C, 07A, 13B, 05D, 22A, 22B

Dayton Partial Precincts

03A, 03G

Non-contiguous portions of Trotwood within the listed boundaries

Non-contiguous portions of Jefferson Township within the listed boundaries

District 37

Montgomery County (part)

Huber Heights, Vandalia

Non-contiguous portions of Clayton, Dayton, Riverside within the listed boundaries

Dayton Precincts

100, 03J, 03K, 03C, 03L, 03I, 18C, 03F, 03D, 16D, 21A, 16E, 16C, 16B, 16A, 18A,
18B, 18D, 03B

Dayton Partial Precincts

03A, 03G

Harrison Township

Non-contiguous portions of Butler Township within the listed boundaries

District 38

Montgomery County (part)

Brookville, Englewood, Farmersville, Germantown, Miamisburg, New Lebanon, Union,
West Carrollton

Non-contiguous portion of Clayton within the listed boundaries

Clay Township, German Township, Jackson Township, Perry Township

Non-contiguous portions of Butler Township and Miami Township within the listed
boundaries

District 39

Greene County (part)

Bellbrook, Wilberforce, Xenia

Caesars Creek Township, Spring Valley Township, Sugarcreek Township, Xenia Township

Montgomery County (part)

Centerville

Washington Township

District 40

Lucas County (part)

Oregon, Ottawa Hills, Sylvania

Toledo Precincts

01H, 01G, 01F, 01C, 01A, 20C, 23C, 23B, 03E, 03F, 19E, 19D, 20F, 20D, 20A, 20E,
20B, 03D, 03C, 03B, 23L, 23J, 19A, 18E, 18C, 18D, 18A, 19B, 19C, 18F

Toledo Partial Precincts

23D, 03A, 01D

Jerusalem Township, Sylvania Township

District 41

Lucas County (part)

Toledo Precincts

01I, 01E, 01J, 12G, 21E, 21D, 21H, 21C, 21F, 23G, 21G, 23F, 12A, 21J, 21A, 9B,
21B, 3G, 21I, 09F, 02E, 02A, 04F, 04E, 02C, 02B, 22C, 22B, 09D, 09C, 09H, 09G,
03K, 09E, 11H, 11C, 09A, 10E, 11B, 11F, 11D, 11E, 03J, 03I, 03L, 10A, 04A, 10G,
03H, 04C, 04D, 04B, 11A, 04G, 01B, 22G, 22H, 22E, 22D, 22A, 23E, 22F, 22I, 23H,
23K, 23A, 23I, 12C, 12F, 13G, 13E, 13D, 10B, 10F, 10G, 10H, 08H, 10I, 10D, 08F,
10C, 08E, 02D, 04H, 02F

Toledo Partial Precincts

23D, 03A, 01D

District 42

Lucas County (part)

Toledo Precincts

12B, 12D, 12E, 12H, 13A, 13B, 13C, 13F, 13H, 14A, 14B, 14C, 14D, 14E, 14F, 14G, 14H, 14I, 15A, 15B, 15C, 15D, 15E, 15F, 15G, 15H, 15I, 16A, 16B, 16C, 16D, 16E, 16F, 16G, 16H, 16I, 16J, 17A, 17B, 17C, 17D, 17E, 17F, 18B, 24A, 24B, 24C, 24D, 24E, 24F, 24G, 24H, 24I, 24J, 24K, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F, 5G, 5H, 5I, 5J, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D, 7E, 7F, 7G, 7H, 7I, 7J, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8G

District 43

Fulton County

Lucas County (part)

Maumee, Swanton (Lucas), Waterville, Whitehouse

Harding Township, Monclova Township, Providence Township, Richfield Township, Spencer Township, Springfield Township, Swanton Township, Waterville Township

District 44

Butler County (part)

Monroe, Sharonville (Butler)

Liberty Township, West Chester Township

District 45

Butler County (part)

Hamilton, Fairfield

Ross Township

Non-contiguous portions of Fairfield, Hanover Township and St. Clair Township within the listed boundaries

District 46

Butler County (part)

Middletown (Butler), Trenton

Madison Township, Milford Township, Wayne Township

Non-contiguous portions of Hanover Township and St. Clair Township within the listed boundaries

District 47

Preble County

Butler County (part)

Oxford

Morgan Township, Oxford Township, Riley Township

Darke County (part)

Arcanum, Greenville, Union City, Versailles

Allen Township, Brown Township, Butler Township, Greenville Township, Harrison Township, Jackson Township, Liberty Township, Mississinawa Township, Neave Township, Patterson Township, Richland Township, Twin Township, Van Buren Township, Wabash Township, Washington Township, Wayne Township, York Township

District 48

Stark County (part)

Canal Fulton, Massillon, Navarre

Bethlehem Township, Lawrence Township, Pike Township, Sandy Township, Sugarcreek Township, Tuscarawas Township

Contiguous portion of Jackson Township

Non-contiguous portions of Perry Township within the listed boundaries

District 49

Stark County (part)

Louisville, Meyers Lake

Lake Township, Marlboro Township, Nimishillen Township, Osnaburg Township, Paris Township, Washington Township

Contiguous portion of Canton Township, Perry Township and Washington Township

Non-contiguous portions of Plain Township within the listed boundaries

District 50

Stark County (part)

Canton, North Canton

Contiguous portion of Plain Township

Non-contiguous portions of Canton Township and Jackson Township within the listed boundaries

District 51

Portage County (Part)

Garrettsville, Hiram, Mantua, Mogadore (Portage), Windham

Atwater Township, Charlestown Township, Deerfield Township, Edinburg Township,
Freedom Township, Hiram Township, Mantua Township, Nelson Township, Palmyra
Township, Paris Township, Randolph Township, Suffield Township, Windham Township

Stark County (part)

Alliance

Lexington Township

Non-contiguous portions of Washington Township within the listed boundaries

Geauga County (part)

Burton, Hunting Valley (Geauga) South Russell

Auburn Township, Bainbridge Township, Burton Township, Newbury Township,
Parkman Township, Russell Township, Troy Township

District 52

Lorain County (part)

Elyria, North Ridgeville, Oberlin, Sheffield, South Amherst

Amherst Township, Carlisle Township, Elyria Township, New Russia Township, Sheffield
Township

District 53

Lorain County (part)

Avon, Avon Lake, Lorain, Sheffield

District 54

Huron County

Lorain County (part)

Amherst, Grafton, LaGrange, Vermillion (Lorain), Wellington

Brighton Township, Brownhelm Township, Camden Township, Columbia Township,
Eaton Township, Grafton Township, Henrietta Township, Huntington Township,
LaGrange Township, Pittsfield Township, Rochester Township, Wellington Township

District 55

Warren County (part)

Lebanon, Mason, South Lebanon

Deerfield Township, Turtlecreek Township, Union Township

District 56

Warren County (part)

Carlisle, Franklin, Maineville, Morrow, Springboro (Warren), Waynesville

Cleercreek Township, Franklin Township, Hamilton Township, Harlan Township, Salem Township, Washington Township, Wayne Township

District 57

Lake County (part)

Eastlake, Kirtland Hills, Kirtland, Lakeline, Timberlake, Waite Hill, Wickliffe, Willoughby Hills, Willoughby, Willowick

Concord Township, Leroy Township

Non-contiguous portions of Painesville Township within the listed boundaries

District 58

Lake County (part)

Fairport Harbor, Grand River, Madison, Mentor, Mentor-on-the-Lake, North Madison, North Perry, Painesville, Perry

Madison Township, Perry Township

Non-contiguous portions of Painesville Township within the listed boundaries

District 59

Mahoning County (part)

New Middletown, Poland, Sebring, Youngstown

Beaver Township, Berlin Township, Coitsville Township, Ellsworth Township, Green Township, Goshen Township, Milton Township, Poland Township, Smith Township, Springfield Township

District 60

Mahoning County (part)

Campbell, Canfield, Lowellville, Struthers

Austintown Township, Boardman Township, Canfield Township, Jackson Township

District 61

Delaware County (part)

Columbus (Delaware), Delaware, Westerville (Delaware)

Orange Township

Contiguous Liberty Township

Non-contiguous portions of Berlin Township, Delaware Township and Genoa Township within the listed boundaries

District 62

Delaware County (part)

Ashley, Dublin (Delaware), Ostrander, Powell, Shawnee Hills, Sunbury

Berkshire Township, Brown Township, Concord Township, Harlem Township, Kingston Township, Marlboro Township, Oxford Township, Porter Township, Radnor Township, Scioto Township, Thompson Township, Trenton Township, Troy Township

Orange Township

Contiguous Berlin Township and Genoa Township

Non-contiguous portions of Delaware Township and Liberty Township within the listed boundaries

Morrow County (part)

Cardington, Mount Gilead

Bennington Township, Caanan Township, Cardington Township, Gilead Township, Harmony Township, Lincoln Township, North Bloomfield Township, Peru Township, Troy Township, Washington Township, Westfield Township

District 63

Clermont County (part)

Loveland (Clermont), Milford, New Richmond,

Miami Township, Ohio Township, Pierce Township, Union Township

District 64

Brown County (part)

Georgetown, Mount Orab, Ripley, Sardinia

Clark Township, Franklin Township, Green Township, Jefferson Township, Lewis Township, Perry Township, Pike Township, Pleasant Township, Scott Township, Sterling Township, Union Township, Washington Township

Clermont County (part)

Batavia, Bethel, Felicity, Owensville, Williamsburg

Batavia Township, Franklin Township, Goshen Township, Jackson Township, Monroe Township, Stonelick Township, Tate Township, Washington Township, Wayne Township, Williamsburg Township

District 65

Ashtabula County (part)

Andover, Conneaut

Andover Township, Cherry Valley Township, Colebrook Township, Dorset Township, Monroe Township, New Lyme Township, Pierpont Township, Richmond Township, Wayne Township, Williamsfield Township

Trumbull County (part)

Cortland, Newton Falls, Lordstown, West Farmington

Bazetta Township, Bloomfield Township, Braceville Township, Bristol Township, Brookfield Township, Champion Township, Farmington Township, Fowler Township, Greene Township, Gustavus Township, Hartford Township, Johnston Township, Kinsman Township, Mecca Township, Mesopotamia Township, Newton township, Southington Township, Vernon Township, Vienna Township

Contiguous Warren Township and Weathersfield Township

District 66

Trumbull County (part)

Girard, Hubbard, Niles, Warren

Howland Township, Hubbard Township, Liberty Township

Non-contiguous portions of Warren Township and Weathersfield Township within the listed boundaries

District 67

Ashland County

Medina County (part)

Chippewa Lake, Gloria Glens Park, Lodi, Seville, Spencer, Wadsworth, Westfield Center

Chatam Township, Guilford Township, Homer Township, Litchfield Township, Spencer Township, Wadsworth Township, Westfield Township

Contiguous Lafayette Township and York Township

District 68

Medina County (part)

Brunswick, Medina

Brunswick Hills Township, Granger Township, Hinckley Township, Liverpool Township, Medina Township, Montville Township, Sharon Township

Non-contiguous portions of Lafayette Township and York Township within the listed boundaries

District 69

Licking County (part)

Granville, Heath, Newark, Pataskala, Reynoldsburg (Licking)

Etna Township, Granville Township, Harrison Township, Jersey Township, Newark Township, St. Albans Township

Non-contiguous portions of Madison Township and Newton Township within the listed boundaries

District 70

Fairfield County (part)

Baltimore, Bremen

Amanda Township, Berne Township, Clearcreek Township, Hocking Township, Richland Township, Rushcreek Township, Walnut Township

Non-contiguous portions of Liberty Township within the listed boundaries

Licking County (part)

Buckeye Lake, Hanover, Hebron, Johnstown, Utica

Bennington Township, Bowling Green Township, Burlington Township, Eden Fallsbury Township, Franklin Township, Hanover Township, Hartford Township, Hopewell Township, Liberty Township, Licking Township, Marry Ann Township, McKean Township, Monroe Township, Perry Township, Union Township, Washington Township

Contiguous Madison Township and Newton Township

Perry County

District 71

Greene County (part)

Beavercreek, Bowersville, Cedar, Fairborn, Jamestown, Yellow Springs

Bath Township, Beavercreek Township, Cedar Township, Jefferson Township, Miami Township, New Jasper Township, Ross Township, Silvercreek Township

District 72

Portage County (part)

Aurora, Kent, Ravenna, Streetsboro, Sugar Bush Knolls, Talmadge (Portage)

Brimfield Township, Franklin Township, Ravenna Township, Rootstown Township, Shalersville Township

District 73

Fairfield County (part)

Columbus (Fairfield), Lancaster, Lithopolis, Pickerington

Bloom Township, Greenfield Township, Pleasant Township, Violet Township

Contiguous Liberty Township

District 74

Clark County (part)

Enon, New Carlisle, Springfield

Bethel Township, German Township, Mad River Township, Moorefield Township, Pike Township, Springfield Township

District 75

Champaign County (part)

Mechanicsburg, North Lewisburg

Goshen Township, Rush Township

Clark County (part)

South Charleston

Green Township, Harmony Township, Madison Township, Pleasant Township

Madison County

Union County

District 76

Wood County (part)

Bowling Green, Fostoria (Wood), Grand Rapids, Haskins, Millbury, North Baltimore, Northwood, Perryburg, Rossford, Tontogany, Walbridge, Weston

Bloom Township, Center Township, Grand Rapids Township, Henry Township, Jackson Township, Lake Township, Liberty Township, Middleton Township, Milton Township, Montgomery Township, Perry Township, Perrysburg Township, Plain Township, Portage Township, Washington Township, Weston Township

District 77

Erie County

Ottawa County

Wood County (part)

Luckey, Pemberville

Freedom Township, Troy Township, Webster Township

District 78

Richland County

District 79

Wayne County

District 80

Darke County (part)

Adams Township, Franklin Township, Monroe Township

Miami County

District 81

Allen County

Putnam County (part)

Columbus Grove, Kalida, Ottoville, Pandora

Greensburg Township, Jackson Township, Jennings Township, Monroe Township,
Monterey Township, Palmer Township, Perry Township, Pleasant Township, Riley
Township, Sugar Creek Township, Union Township

District 82

Columbiana County

Jefferson County (part)

Amsterdam, Bergholz, Empire, Irondale, Stratton, Toronto, Wintersville

Brush Creek Township, Elk Township, Island Creek Township Knox Township, Ross
Township, Saline Township, Springfield Township

District 83

Tuscarawas County

Carroll County

District 84

Coschocton County

Muskingum County

District 85

Jackson County (part)

Coalton, Jackson

Coal Township, Franklin Township, Jackson Township, Liberty Township, Lick Township,
Scioto Township, Washington Township

Ross County

Pike County

District 86

Adams County

Brown County (part)

Byrd Township, Eagle Township, Huntington Township, Jackson Township

Jackson County (part)

Oak Hill, Wellston

Bloomfield Township, Hamilton Township, Jefferson Township, Madison Township,
Milton Township

Scioto County

District 87

Hancock County

Hardin County

Putnam County (part)

Leipsic, Ottawa

Blanchard Township, Liberty Township, Ottawa Township, Van Buren Township

District 88

Belmont County

Harrison County

Jefferson County (part)

Adena, Dillonvale, Mingo Junction, Mount Pleasant, New Alexandria, Rayland,
Richmond, Smithfield, Steubenville

Cross Creek Township, Mount Pleasant Township, Salem Township, Smithfield
Township, Wayne Township, Warren Township, Wells Township

District 89

Crawford County

Marion County

Wyandot County (part)

Nevada, Upper Sandusky

Antrim Township, Crane Township, Eden Township, Jackson Township, Marseilles Township, Mifflin Township, Pitt Township, Richland Township, Salem Township

District 90

Holmes County

Knox County

Morrow County (part)

Bloomfield Township, Chester Township, Congress Township, Franklin Township, Perry Township

District 91

Athens County

Hocking County

Morgan County

Noble County (part)

Caldwell, Noble

Belle Valley Township, Brookfield Township, Enoch Township, Jackson Township, Olive Township, Sharon Township

District 92

Guernsey County

Monroe County

Noble County (part)

Caldwell, Noble

Beaver Township, Buffalo Township, Elk Township, Jefferson Township, Marion Township, Sarahsville Township, Stock Township, Seneca Township, Wayne Township

Washington County

District 93

Sandusky County

Seneca County

Wyandot County (part)

Carey

Crawford Township, Ridge Township, Sycamore Township, Tymochtee Township

District 94

Gallia County

Lawrence County

Meigs County

Vinton County

District 95

Logan County (part)

Belle Center, Bellefontaine, DeGraff, Russells Point, West Liberty, West Mansfield

Bloomfield Township, Bokes Creek Township, Harrison Township, Jefferson Township,
Lake Township, Liberty Township, McArthur Township, Miami Township, Monroe
Township, Perry Township, Pleasant Township, Richland Township, Rushcreek Township,
Union Township, Washington Township, Zane Township

Shelby County

Champaign County (part)

St. Paris, Urbana

Adams Township, Concord Township, Harrison Township, Jackson Township, Johnson
Township, Mad River Township, Salem Township, Urbana Township, Wayne Township

District 96

Auglaize County

Logan County (Part)

Lakeview

Stokes Township

Mercer County

Van Wert County

District 97

Clinton County

Fayette County

Highland County

District 98

Defiance County

Henry County

Paulding County

Williams County

District 99

Ashtabula County (part)

Ashtabula, Geneva, Edgewood, Geneva-on-the-lake, Jefferson, North Kingsville, Orwell, Roaming Shores

Ashtabula Township, Austinburg Township, Denmark Township, Geneva Township, Harpersfield Township, Hartgrove Township, Jefferson Township, Kingsville Township, Lenox Township, Morgan Township, Orwell Township, Plymouth Township, Rome Township, Saybrook Township, Sheffield Township Trumbull Township, Windsor Township

Geauga County (part)

Aquilla, Chardon, Middlefield

Chardon Township, Chester Township, Claridon Township, Hambden Township, Huntsburg Township, Middlefield Township Montville Township, Munson Township, Thompson Township

Senate Districts Legal Description

Senate District 1:

House Districts 59, 60, 66

Senate District 2:

House Districts 43, 76, 77

Senate District 3:

House Districts 1, 2, 3

Senate District 4:

House Districts 44, 45, 46

Senate District 5:

House Districts 4, 5, 6

Senate District 6:

House Districts 35, 36, 37

Senate District 7:

House Districts 55, 56, 97

Senate District 8:

House Districts 27, 28, 29

Senate District 9:

House Districts 13, 14, 15

Senate District 10:

House Districts 38, 39, 71

Senate District 11:

House Districts 16, 17, 19

Senate District 12:

House Districts 81, 96, 98

Senate District 13:

House Districts 22, 23, 33

Senate District 14:

House Districts 63, 64, 86

Senate District 15:
House Districts 24, 25, 26

Senate District 16:
House Districts 7, 8, 9

Senate District 17:
House Districts 30, 47, 80

Senate District 18:
House Districts 51, 65, 99

Senate District 19:
House Districts 40, 41, 42

Senate District 20:
House Districts 69, 70, 73

Senate District 21:
House Districts 10, 11, 12

Senate District 22:
House Districts 67, 68, 79

Senate District 23:
House Districts 48, 49, 50

Senate District 24:
House Districts 18, 20, 21

Senate District 25:
House Districts 52, 53, 54

Senate District 26:
House Districts 87, 89, 93

Senate District 27:
House Districts 61, 62, 78

Senate District 28:
House Districts 31, 32, 34

Senate District 29:

House Districts 74, 75, 95

Senate District 30:

House Districts 82, 88, 92

Senate District 31:

House Districts 83, 84, 90

Senate District 32:

House Districts 57, 58, 99

Senate District 33:

House Districts 85, 91, 84



OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMISSION MEETING

TO:: Members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission

FROM: Speaker Robert Cupp, Co-Chair
Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair

DATE: Thursday, September 9, 2021

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Finan Hearing Room (Room 126)
Senate Building
Ohio Statehouse
1 Capitol Square
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4275

AGENDA

The Ohio Redistricting Commission will meet to hear testimony on state redistricting plans pursuant to Article XI of the Ohio Constitution and Commission rules.

Please complete and submit a witness information form to testimony@redistricting.ohio.gov in advance of testifying.

Senate Contact: Giulia Cambieri, (614) 644-5533
House Contact: Aaron Mulvey, (614) 466-8759

MINUTES OF THE OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
FRIDAY, AUGUST 31, 2021, 1:00 PM
OHIO STATEHOUSE, RICHARD H. FINAN HEARING ROOM,
ONE CAPITOL SQUARE, COLUMBUS, OHIO

Members Present:

- Governor Mike DeWine, member of the Ohio Redistricting Commission pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution
- Auditor of State Keith Faber, member of the Ohio Redistricting Commission pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution
- Secretary of State Frank LaRose, member of the Ohio Redistricting Commission pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution
- Speaker of the House of Representatives Robert R. Cupp, appointed to the Ohio Redistricting Commission by the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution
- Minority Leader Emilia Strong Sykes, appointed to the Ohio Redistricting Commission by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution
- Senate President Matt Huffman, appointed to the Ohio Redistricting Commission by the President of the Senate pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution
- Senator Vernon Sykes, appointed to the Ohio Redistricting Commission by the Minority Leader of the Senate pursuant to Article XI, Section 1 of the Ohio Constitution

Members Absent:

- None

A. Co-Chair Cupp called the meeting to order

B. Roll Call

With seven members in attendance, Co-Chair Cupp declared a quorum present.

C. Minutes

Co-Chair Cupp asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2021 minutes. President Huffman so moved and Co-Chair Sykes seconded. With no objections, the minutes were approved.

D. Adoption of Rules

Co-Chair Cupp asked for a motion to adopt the Rules of Commission. The motion was offered by Co-Chair Sykes and seconded by President Huffman. Before the roll was called,

Co-Chair Cupp reviewed a number of rule highlights. With no objections, the rules were adopted.

E. Other Business – Regional Hearing Expenses


Co-Chair Cupp asked for a motion that expenses incurred by Commission members and their designated staff for mileage and supplies in conjunction with the regional hearings held August 23-27, 2021 be reimbursed, with the approval of both Co-Chairs. A motion was made by Co-Chair Sykes and seconded by President Huffman. With no objections, the motion passed.


F. Other Business – Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus Map Presentation


Co-Chair Cupp asked if there was further business to come before the Commission. Co-Chair Sykes announced he would like to present a map from the members of the Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus. Co-Chair Sykes and Randall Routt testified on the map. Co-Chair Cupp asked if there were any questions for the witness. No members of the public wished to testify.


G. The Commission Adjourned


Prior to adjournment, various members of the Commission discussed their views as regarding the role of the Commission and appropriate next steps. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned.











Planned Parenthood Advocates of Ohio

Chair Cupp, Chair Sykes, and the members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission, my name is Sierra Dobbs-Brown, and I've lived in Columbus, Ohio, for nearly 26 years—my whole life. Currently, I live in Clintonville. I live near a Whitt's Frozen Custard; I live near a Lucky's market; I live near more antique shops than anyone needs, and I also live near the Whetstone Park of Roses and library. This is somewhere I have gone often, this is somewhere I walk to, this is somewhere I see as a pillar of my community, yet this is somewhere that is not in my district. I'm represented by Senator Andrew Brenner in a district that picks up a small chunk of my more progressive community and sprawls all the way up to Mansfield, Ohio, where there are folks with very different priorities and needs than Clintonville.

Aside from being someone who can't seem to leave this wonderful state, I am also the Central Ohio Regional Field Manager with Planned Parenthood Advocates of Ohio. We have been in these halls countless times, year after year, to speak to members of this legislative body about the 30 attacks we've seen on reproductive freedom since 2011—only to see this body vote in opposition to the wants and needs of Ohioans time and time again. And I'm here again today, on behalf of Planned Parenthood Advocates of Ohio and the hundreds of thousands of supporters we represent.

Ohioans overwhelmingly support access to abortion, but when our district lines were drawn to keep one party securely in power, Ohioans lost. We lost the fair and equitable representation from our elected officials that we are promised as the foundation of a successful democracy. And since 2011, Ohio has lost half of the abortion providers in our state. This loss is directly related to the onslaught of attacks abortion providers have been under at the whim of this legislature.

All people, regardless of our race, gender, socioeconomic status, or zip code, deserve to be able to make decisions for our health care. Yet, when district maps were created that dilute our vote, anti-abortion extremism that is out of touch with what Ohioans want and need only went further. Young people, Black folks, other communities of color, and queer people are all disproportionately impacted by laws that chip away at our access to abortion. And when we look at the racial and partisan gerrymandering that happened in 2011, these are also communities that were intentionally cracked apart to take away their power.

I stand before this commission today to state clearly that Ohioans want and need access to abortion. But because Ohio politicians have been picking their voters for the last decade, these needs have not been reflected by this elected body. I hope that as you move forward in the process of redistricting, Ohioans will receive the fair representation we all deserve. And in turn, we will have a legislature that is proudly fighting to ensure each person can access the health care they need—including and especially access to abortion and all reproductive health care. I thank you for your time, and I welcome any questions you may have.

September 9, 2021

To: Ohio Redistricting Commission members and,
Co-chairs: Senator Vernon Sykes and OH House Speaker Robert Cupp

Thank you for allowing me to submit written and verbal testimony to the Ohio Redistricting Commission. My name is anastasia birosh, and my pronouns are ze/zir/zirs. I currently vote in OH House District 70, OH Senate District 22, and OH Congressional District 16. Brunswick is divided between two OH House Districts (69 & 70) and two Congressional Districts (7 & 16). It's time that Brunswick be in one OH House District and one Congressional District.

I testified before this commission on August 27th in Akron, and I am back because I care greatly about having competitive OH Senate and OH House districts. I acknowledge that my white privilege affords me the opportunity to travel to and attend these hearings occurring in the late morning and announced at the last possible minute.

I am grateful that on it's website, the Ohio Redistricting Commission has a Public Input Tab that when clicked displays a list of all maps submitted to the commission. I would like to draw the commissions attention to Ohio Senate and Ohio House maps proposed by Geoff Wise, Ph.D. Engineer by day, and concerned citizen by night. He has come up with proposed maps that even I, ordinary citizen understand. He was even responsive though hurried when I called him with a few questions last night! It was easier to speak with him than any of my representatives!

What he did with his proposal was no small feat considering the gerrymandered districts drawn up behind closed doors in 2011. In his comments and explanation of the quantitative analysis methodology, he clearly explains how Senate incumbency complicates fixing these gerrymandered districts. And, due to this and other factors tradeoffs and compromise will be necessary.

In the end though, his concern as mine are drawing more equitable and competitive maps than we were presented with in 2011.

Sincerely,

anastasia birosh
4264 N. Shire Ln.
Brunswick, OH 44212-2575
PH: 216-255-4410
Email: abirosh@gmail.com

TESTIMONY
Ohio Redistricting Commission
Testimony of Mindy D. Hedges, Private Citizen

Co Chairs Senator Sykes and House Speaker Cupp, and members of the newly formed Ohio Redistricting Commission Governor Mike DeWine, House Minority Leader Emilia Sykes, Secretary of State Frank LaRose, Senate President Matt Huffman, and Auditor Keith Faber.

Thank you for hearing my previous testimony last week, when I told you about my rural area and that I'm sort of a fish out of water. But as a reminder, my area is in a very wealthy county, but our rural area is still without much internet access, water or sewage, renewable energy resources, garbage, healthcare facilities or transportation, because our Ohio House and Senate representatives know they don't have to care about any of their rural voters. They have their campaigns signed, sealed and delivered by a gerrymandered vote.

But about this process you have been going through to ensure a fair mapping procedure. I normally don't like to begin any discussion with a negative, but I am disappointed with how this process has progressed, to

this point, and am concerned, therefore, with the process in general.

Almost less than 24 hours to call this meeting with testimony. On what?

There is no map yet. And then only 4 hours to ask us for testimony again, with no map? It has made me and many others wonder whether this will be a fair mapping assessment and completion, or whether it will be reduced to back-room antics and more gerrymandered, unfair, embarrassing and undemocratic districts. But, you see, the voters do have the upper hand. Don't ever forget that over 70% of Ohio voted to redistrict. They were sick of being laughed at by the entire country because their district quacked or slithered. They were sick of being ignored by their representative. They were sick of their needs not being met by someone who had no clue even where their Ohio town was on the map.

But I am more than this negativity. I am a positive person normally. I believe you will do the right thing for your state, your communities, your friends, and your families. These actions are not driven by a democracy in action, and this is not the kind of government you want to hand down to your children or grandchildren. This is not what we were handed by our grandparents.

Let's be real. This appears to be more fascist than it is democratic. Make the right choice. And start by really discussing this with your neighbors on both sides of the aisle, and listen to the hundreds who testified over the past 10 sessions. We did this because we wanted OUR Ohio back. We wanted it to prosper; not shrink in wealth. We wanted it to grow; not diminish. And we want it to increase in resources for our children and grandchildren so they can also prosper. Our younger generation is leaving Ohio because of the politics. Help us grow it again!

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request.

Name: Mindy Hedges

Email: mindy.hedges@gmail.com

Date: September 9, 2021

Deidra M Reese,
Columbus Ohio Coordinator
Ohio Unity Coalition
6457 Albany Pond
New Albany, Ohio 43054
614-563-0549

My name is Deidra Reese, this testimony is offered on behalf of the Ohio Coalition on Black Civic Participation/Ohio Unity Coalition regarding the Ohio Redistricting Process.

It is our belief that Democracy is a fundamental cornerstone of America. Though we are still a nation seeking to be a more perfect union, we were built on solid ideals of freedom, liberty, and the concept of true representation.

Ohio voters spoke loudly when they passed not one but two constitutional amendments changing the way district lines are drawn for legislative and congressional district maps. While no process is perfect, the new process offers a great improvement of the past process for drawing district lines by two major elements. 1) Keeping communities together and 2) requiring bipartisan support of maps.

The OCBCP/Ohio Unity Coalition engages in black voter participation in elections with the goal of electing candidates who will best represent their interests, however; if politicians are able to select their voters through gerrymandered districts based on partisan criteria, it undercuts the true purpose of our voting process.

We are aware that Ohio will lose one congressional seat due to the 2020 Census, and we are particularly sensitive to the lack of representation of people of color in our legislative bodies. Currently, there is only one majority minority district in Ohio, and only two districts represented by people of color in the United States Congress from Ohio. In the Ohio General Assembly there are 20. This is a representation of 12.5% and 15% representation, respectively. According to the 2020 Census, the Ohio minority population is 24% including African American, Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islander and Native Americans.

While the current minority representation of the population is underrepresented in the General Assembly by 6% and 9% in the Congress, this is an opportunity to consider districts that reflect the true population of the people who live in the districts, as well as the issues and concerns that bind them together by their experiences. Race, ethnicity, economic status, and educational attainment are often factors that are similar enough to require a voice that will represent a unique and needed view in the halls of government.

The United States Supreme Court does not allow race as *the primary* basis for the drawing of legislative districts, however; it does allow consideration of race as *a criterion*, along with other issues of common interest. In a season of significant racial and economic disconnect and division, it is imperative that there be voices to raise issues and voice concerns of a significant portion of the citizens of the state of Ohio. It is my sincere hope that as the Commission conducts its work, that there is consideration for at least one majority-minority congressional district in our state.

There have been very spirited discussions and issues that have centered on sensitive historical and current racial dynamics that require a voice in policy debate and discussion, but more importantly

- 20 minorities in the Ohio GA?

- she asks "don't adopt a color-blind approach"

Thank you commission members for the opportunity to speak today on the redistricting process. My name is Ann Shroyer and I live in Westerville the 68th State Legislative District, the 19th State Senate and I live in the 12th Congressional which is a classic gerrymandered shape running from Mansfield to Clintonville. And as I pointed out in Lima, my city of about 41,000 is cut into 2 state rep districts, 2 state senate districts even though we are only 12.7 square miles.

The importance of fairly drawn districts cannot be overstated. When district lines are drawn to give extreme advantage to one party or another, then the true constituents of that legislator are the large donors and lobbyists who donate/bribe with enough money to bend the ear and get the attention of elected officials. It should be the residents of a district who have the attention of their elected officials, not groups looking to profit from our tax dollars and state laws.

These unfairly drawn lines leave voters with no real representation. We demand a fair and transparent process to end this

For one example, my county has the highest COVID vaccination rate in the state of Ohio, yet we are represented by a State Senator who has been railing against vaccines and masks for much of the pandemic.

The state government is beset by a MASSIVE bribery scandal, and yet almost the entire state legislature and senate was re-elected, because gerrymandered districts guarantee their seats are safe thanks to gerrymandered districts.

I will finish with what I said in Lima 2 weeks ago.

The lack of true representation thanks to unfairly drawn districts can be seen thus - 90% of Ohioans – including 87% of gun owners in Ohio approve of universal background checks, and yet this gerrymandered state legislature has made NO MOVEMENT on passing it – because the majority have major donors in the gun lobby. Columbus OH has over 142 homicides this year, most of them by firearm and many guns purchased with no background check at the perpetual gun show on the east side, but the gerrymandered legislature continues to do nothing to pass

background checks. The legislature did pass a Stand Your Ground/ Kill at Will bill last Christmas – at the height of COVID deaths in the state, the priority was to protect shooters. The only proponent testimony given at the hearing was from a gun lobbying group. The gun lobbying groups pay a lot of money directly and through independent expenditures to our lawmakers and get their bills passed, while mothers mourn their dead children or are shot in the torso and leg while holding their child and running from gunshots in a neighborhood. Mothers are shot and killed with their infant children by domestic abusers and Aisha's Law never made it out of committee in the Senate - and a mother mourns her daughter who died by gun suicide less than an hour after purchasing the gun despite attempts by family to keep her safe because an Extreme Risk Protection Order cannot get passed in this gerrymandered state. We have an entire family shot and killed in a murder suicide in Avon Lake – less than 2 miles from my son's grandparents - 2 days ago – maybe ERPO or Aisha's Law could have saved those children and their mother, but those bills do not have a well financed lobbying group to get a lawmaker's attention, so they die in committee. Maybe if more mothers had a huge budget for donating to campaigns, we could save lives with common sense legislation that the majority of Ohioans want. Or maybe fair districts would give mothers a voice in the state house. Mothers will continue to show up and we DEMAND that we have fair districts to elect lawmakers motivated by their voters who are hurting and not gun lobby groups. We DEMAND fair districts so legislators who are responsive to voters can pass legislation that saves lives including the average 929 Ohioans who die by suicide by gun EVERY YEAR. We DEMAND that there is a transparent and fair process for drawing new district lines. Gerrymandering is killing Ohioans.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Ann Shroyer

randomann@gmail.com

Westerville, Ohio

September 9, 2021

Comparison of OCRC, Sykes, and Wise district plans

Geoff Wise, Ph.D.

Cincinnati, OH

Submitted 9/7/21

Background


- Article XI of the Ohio Constitution substantially reforms the 2021 process for drawing Ohio Statehouse boundaries
 - The process is charged to an Ohio Redistricting Commission (ORC) comprised of 7 state leaders, with the intent of bipartisan collaboration that does not favor or disfavor a party
 - Multiple constraints were added to minimize slicing of counties, large municipalities, and communities of color
 - Delay in receipt of US Census data has compressed the time to finalize maps
- The ORC has not produced a map by the 9/1/21 deadline
 - The 8/31/21 public meeting of the ORC failed to even set a timetable for meeting the second-round 9/15 deadline
- Several maps were submitted via the ORC's public input portal by 9/1
 - Of particular note were two maps from:
 - ORC co-chair Vernon Sykes (Democrat)
 - the **Ohio Citizens' Redistricting Commission**, a left-leaning public advocacy group associated with the constitutional reform advocates
 - These maps were guided by Article XI principles, but have some drawbacks

Why another map?


- The dynamics of the 8/31/21 ORC meeting suggest we are far from a collaborative bipartisan process to meet the mandated deadline
 - As of 9/5/21, there have been no plans proposed from the Republican members of the ORC
- I have analyzed the Sykes and OCRC maps and determined that they have emphasized proportionality over district competitiveness.
 - They also appear unclear on Senate incumbency
- I am therefore proposing a more competitive map that also strikes a more natural balance between GOP and Dem interests.
- To correct weaknesses in my pre-9/1/21 submission, I have redrawn several districts to increase minority empowerment and minimize big-city splits, and specified Senate incumbency

A comparison of my plan to OCRC and Sykes is presented in this document


Visual comparison - Statehouse



Wise




OCRC



Sykes

Visual comparison – State senate


*I assigned the OCRC Senate district numbers to line up with House numbers.
The OCRC plan did not attempt to satisfy Article XI section 5.*



See p. 15 for Dayton discussion

Wise

OCRC




Sykes

Quantitative analysis methodology

- My maps, tweaked from my 8/31 submission to improve minority representation, were generated in Dave's Redistricting Analysis (DRA), a common platform for re-districting efforts
- To compare key metrics of map quality, the Sykes and OCRC maps were loaded into DRA from the .csv / .txt files posted to redistricting.ohio.gov/public-input
- According to [DavesRedistricting.org](https://davesredistricting.org), DRA uses the 2020 Census for precinct shape and demographics. The anticipated GOP/Dem two-party vote splits are a composite of the 2016 and 2020 presidential elections, the 2016 and 2018 U.S. Senate elections, and the 2018 Governor + Attorney General election.
- I have a personal contact at DRA who would be happy to walk the ORC through any questions on the analysis algorithms.

Analysis: competitiveness, minority power



We can significantly increase the number of competitive districts

Detail: Competitive districts

Ohio House

| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| >55% Dem | 22 | 28 | 26 |
| 50-55% Dem | 23 | 14 | 17 |
| <i>Likely DEM</i> | <i>22 - 50</i> | <i>28 - 46</i> | <i>26 - 48</i> |
| 45 – 55% | 28 | 18 | 22 |
| 50-55% GOP | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| >55% GOP | 49 | 53 | 51 |
| <i>Likely GOP</i> | <i>49 – 77</i> | <i>53 – 71</i> | <i>51 - 73</i> |

Ohio Senate

| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| >55% Dem | 9 | 11 | 11 |
| 50-55% Dem | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| <i>Likely DEM</i> | <i>5 - 18</i> | <i>11 - 16</i> | <i>11 - 15</i> |
| 45 – 55% | 9 | 5 | 4 |
| 50-55% GOP | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| >55% GOP | 15 | 17 | 18 |
| <i>Likely GOP</i> | <i>15 – 24</i> | <i>17 – 21</i> | <i>18 - 22</i> |

More seats in play = stronger campaigns & candidates = better government.

Analysis – District shape


| Know It When You See It scores | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|--------------------------------|------|------|-------|
| House KIWYSI compactness | 56 | 56 | 52 |
| Senate KIWYSI compactness | 53 | 62 | 48 |

For the Senate, I get dinged for:

19: capturing city of Delaware with a N. Columbus district

4: bundling SE Butler w/ N. Hamilton

14: Keeping S. Ohio river area together



| # of Big City splits | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|----------------------|------|------|-------|
| Columbus | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| Cleveland | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Cincinnati | 3** | 4 | 2 |
| Toledo | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Akron | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Dayton | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Parma | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canton | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Youngstown | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lorain | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hamilton | 0 | 0 | 0 |

** A tiny piece of Cincinnati was used to foster a competitive GOP district in eastern Hamilton County.


| Rural county splits* | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|----------------------|------|------|-------|
| House | 15 | 21 | 12 |
| Senate | 7 | 9 | 6 |

*Splits are inevitable in urban and suburban counties⁹

Analysis: partisan bias

- **The main focus of map-making is how votes will translate into seats**
 - Often illustrated as a x-y plot of votes → seats (see next 2 pages)
 - Precincts can be “horse-traded” to manipulate this within the politically relevant range
 - To achieve a biased “gerrymandered” result
 - To enforce legal requirements
 - To correct for random fluctuations
 - Making districts more competitive will make the seats more responsive (stronger than proportional) to vote swings
 - Mandating proportionality will
 - Force a “bend” in the votes-seats curve
 - Make it harder for GOP- or Dem-leaning (unbalanced) states to achieve 50% seats at 50% votes
- All three plans have reasonable predicted votes → seats in the politically relevant range
 - Refer back to slide 9 for expected seats table
 - See next two pages for seats-vote curve comparisons

Analysis: Partisan bias via seats(votes) curves




Analysis: Partisan bias via seats(votes) curves

Seats-Votes Curve: **Wise Senate**

Seats-Votes Curve: Senate-OCRC


Seats-Votes Curve: Sykes Senate Update Sept 2



Comments on design choices


- District-drawing creates tradeoffs among representation, district shape, partisan bias and competitiveness
- Adhering to municipal non-splitting will drive down compactness and the flexibility to tradeoff other considerations
- Increasing the number of competitive seats naturally makes the seats more responsive to votes (greater than proportional)
- Given the “creative” shapes of 2011 districts and the above constraints, it is unrealistic to also solve perfectly for Senate incumbency

Why OCRC scores better on Senate representation for nonwhites: Dayton option



My map pulls district 37 in with 71 & 72 to form a GOP-leaning competitive district. 38+39+40 form a competitive Dem-leaning district with a 32.4% Black population, which is strong but does not qualify as a minority district.

OCRC's map combines 70, 71, 72 Dayton-area House districts into one 37.5% Black Dem-heavy Senate district, surrounded by an irregular, elongated GOP-dominated district (69 + 73 + 74)



I decided to split Dayton's 2 Statehouse districts into separate Senate districts to increase competition and compactness. The ORC is welcome to reverse the Senate assignments of 37 and 39 if keeping communities together is higher priority. OCRC's excessive partitioning of Cleveland and Akron may have also been done to boost minority vote power.

14

Assigning Senate “incumbency” (Article XI, Section 5)




“At any time the boundaries of senate districts are changed in any general assembly district plan made pursuant to any provision of this article, a senator whose term will not expire within two years of the time the plan becomes effective shall represent, for the remainder of the term for which the senator was elected, the senate district that contains the largest portion of the population of the district from which the senator was elected, and the district shall be given the number of the district from which the senator was elected. If more than one senator whose term will not so expire would represent the same district by following the provisions of this section, the plan shall designate which senator shall represent the district and shall designate which district the other senator or senators shall represent for the balance of their term or terms.”

The extreme 2011 Senate district shapes create problems for assigning old districts to new ones.
For 11 districts in my plan, the mapping appears straightforward; see next page.
For most other districts, it is less clear-cut but there appears to be a lead choice.


The unavoidable problem is in Cuyahoga County. The 2011 map packed Dems (with addition of a western Lake County House district) into three deep blue Senate districts to create a snaky, near-tossup district 24, making it difficult to map onto compact shapes..

See next page for details and a possible solution.


Urban detail: Toledo area



Proposed Horse Map



R Proposed Service Map



©2021 CALIPER

**PROPOSED GENERAL ASSEMBLY DISTRICT PLAN
AS SUBMITTED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2021**

Pursuant to the 2020 U.S. Census, the population of Ohio as of April 1, 2020 was 11,799,448.
The target population for each district is therefore 119,186.

Statistical Information – Proposed Ohio House Districts

| House District | Population | Deviation |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1 | 115,498 | -3.09% |
| 2 | 117,559 | -1.37% |
| 3 | 114,104 | -4.26% |
| 4 | 114,500 | -3.93% |
| 5 | 116,735 | -2.06% |
| 6 | 115,517 | -3.08% |
| 7 | 115,170 | -3.37% |
| 8 | 115,189 | -3.35% |
| 9 | 120,997 | 1.52% |
| 10 | 113,326 | -4.92% |
| 11 | 114,236 | -4.15% |
| 12 | 113,760 | -4.55% |
| 13 | 125,131 | 4.99% |
| 14 | 125,032 | 4.90% |
| 15 | 121,266 | 1.75% |
| 16 | 124,466 | 4.43% |
| 17 | 125,057 | 4.93% |
| 18 | 125,133 | 4.99% |
| 19 | 122,894 | 3.11% |
| 20 | 124,638 | 4.57% |
| 21 | 125,069 | 4.94% |
| 22 | 124,488 | 4.45% |
| 23 | 124,607 | 4.55% |
| 24 | 123,469 | 3.59% |
| 25 | 123,568 | 3.68% |
| 26 | 124,802 | 4.71% |
| 27 | 116,286 | -2.43% |
| 28 | 114,050 | -4.31% |
| 29 | 114,653 | -3.80% |
| 30 | 113,811 | -4.51% |

**PROPOSED GENERAL ASSEMBLY DISTRICT PLAN
AS SUBMITTED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2021**

| | | |
|----|---------|--------|
| 31 | 120,524 | 1.12% |
| 32 | 122,094 | 2.44% |
| 33 | 121,516 | 1.95% |
| 34 | 124,667 | 4.60% |
| 35 | 116,217 | -2.49% |
| 36 | 123,669 | 3.76% |
| 37 | 113,816 | -4.51% |
| 38 | 121,180 | 1.67% |
| 39 | 124,846 | 4.75% |
| 40 | 113,280 | -4.96% |
| 41 | 113,996 | -4.35% |
| 42 | 115,350 | -3.22% |
| 43 | 115,929 | -2.73% |
| 44 | 123,601 | 3.70% |
| 45 | 123,466 | 3.59% |
| 46 | 121,870 | 2.25% |
| 47 | 114,507 | -3.93% |
| 48 | 125,053 | 4.92% |
| 49 | 114,715 | -3.75% |
| 50 | 113,841 | -4.48% |
| 51 | 125,115 | 4.97% |
| 52 | 124,642 | 4.58% |
| 53 | 121,772 | 2.17% |
| 54 | 121,704 | 2.11% |
| 55 | 120,633 | 1.21% |
| 56 | 124,848 | 4.75% |
| 57 | 124,277 | 4.27% |
| 58 | 116,273 | -2.44% |
| 59 | 123,124 | 3.30% |
| 60 | 113,964 | -4.38% |
| 61 | 113,860 | -4.47% |
| 62 | 124,425 | 4.40% |
| 63 | 113,544 | -4.73% |
| 64 | 119,565 | 0.32% |
| 65 | 120,269 | 0.91% |
| 66 | 116,342 | -2.39% |
| 67 | 118,575 | -0.51% |
| 68 | 115,385 | -3.19% |

**PROPOSED GENERAL ASSEMBLY DISTRICT PLAN
AS SUBMITTED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2021**

| | | |
|----|---------|--------|
| 69 | 114,369 | -4.04% |
| 70 | 116,643 | -2.13% |
| 71 | 115,026 | -3.49% |
| 72 | 123,934 | 3.98% |
| 73 | 123,976 | 4.02% |
| 74 | 121,534 | 1.97% |
| 75 | 116,122 | -2.57% |
| 76 | 116,198 | -2.51% |
| 77 | 124,936 | 4.82% |
| 78 | 116,894 | -1.92% |
| 79 | 117,815 | -1.15% |
| 80 | 124,211 | 4.22% |
| 81 | 120,211 | 0.86% |
| 82 | 115,817 | -2.83% |
| 83 | 113,996 | -4.35% |
| 84 | 118,816 | -0.31% |
| 85 | 115,560 | -3.04% |
| 86 | 114,486 | -3.94% |
| 87 | 113,433 | -4.83% |
| 88 | 113,965 | -4.38% |
| 89 | 115,986 | -2.68% |
| 90 | 115,793 | -2.85% |
| 91 | 114,286 | -4.11% |
| 92 | 119,113 | -0.06% |
| 93 | 117,981 | -1.01% |
| 94 | 121,777 | 2.17% |
| 95 | 124,663 | 4.60% |
| 96 | 123,941 | 3.99% |
| 97 | 121,818 | 2.21% |
| 98 | 113,571 | -4.71% |
| 99 | 125,112 | 4.97% |

**PROPOSED GENERAL ASSEMBLY DISTRICT PLAN
AS SUBMITTED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2021**

Statistical Information – Proposed Ohio Senate Districts

| Senate District | Population | Deviation |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1 | 350,024 | -2.11% |
| 2 | 348,113 | -2.64% |
| 3 | 346,752 | -3.02% |
| 4 | 368,937 | 3.18% |
| 5 | 370,237 | 3.55% |
| 6 | 353,702 | -1.08% |
| 7 | 358,623 | 0.30% |
| 8 | 342,514 | -4.21% |
| 9 | 371,839 | 3.99% |
| 10 | 347,791 | -2.73% |
| 11 | 342,626 | -4.18% |
| 12 | 348,862 | -2.43% |
| 13 | 371,529 | 3.91% |
| 14 | 353,762 | -1.06% |
| 15 | 347,161 | -2.91% |
| 16 | 341,322 | -4.54% |
| 17 | 351,380 | -1.73% |
| 18 | 374,237 | 4.66% |
| 19 | 341,395 | -4.52% |
| 20 | 367,328 | 2.73% |
| 21 | 372,601 | 4.21% |
| 22 | 351,811 | -1.61% |
| 23 | 375,296 | 4.96% |
| 24 | 370,789 | 3.70% |
| 25 | 351,356 | -1.73% |
| 26 | 352,334 | -1.46% |
| 27 | 369,619 | 3.37% |
| 28 | 368,277 | 3.00% |
| 29 | 354,275 | -0.92% |
| 30 | 370,381 | 3.59% |
| 31 | 343,595 | -3.91% |
| 32 | 363,768 | 1.74% |
| 33 | 357,212 | -0.10% |

**PROPOSED GENERAL ASSEMBLY DISTRICT PLAN
AS SUBMITTED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2021**

Ohio's 33 Senate districts are comprised of the following Ohio House districts.


| | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Senate District 1: | House Districts 81, 82, 83 | |
| Senate District 2: | House Districts 43, 76, 89 | |
| Senate District 3: | House Districts 4, 5, 6 | |
| Senate District 4: | House Districts 44, 45, 46 | |
| Senate District 5: | House Districts 38, 39, 80 | |
| Senate District 6: | House Districts 35, 36, 37 | |
| Senate District 7: | House Districts 27, 54, 55 | |
| Senate District 8: | House Districts 28, 29, 30 | |
| Senate District 9: | House Districts 24, 25, 26 | |
| Senate District 10: | House Districts 70, 71, 75 | |
| Senate District 11: | House Districts 40, 41, 42 | |
| Senate District 12: | House Districts 84, 85, 86 | |
| Senate District 13: | House Districts 51, 52, 53 | |
| Senate District 14: | House Districts 62, 63, 90 | |
| Senate District 15: | House Districts 1, 2, 3 | |
| Senate District 16: | House Districts 10, 11, 12 | |
| Senate District 17: | House Districts 91, 92, 93 | |
| Senate District 18: | House Districts 56, 57, 99 | Assigned to Senator Cirino |
| Senate District 19: | House Districts 60, 61, 98 | |
| Senate District 20: | House Districts 73, 74, 97 | |
| Senate District 21: | House Districts 19, 20, 21 | |
| Senate District 22: | House Districts 66, 67, 78 | Assigned to Senator Romanchuk |
| Senate District 23: | House Districts 13, 14, 18 | |
| Senate District 24: | House Districts 15, 16, 17 | Assigned to Senator Dolan |
| Senate District 25: | House Districts 7, 8, 9 | |
| Senate District 26: | House Districts 77, 87, 88 | Assigned to Senator Reineke |
| Senate District 27: | House Districts 22, 23, 31 | |
| Senate District 28: | House Districts 32, 33, 34 | |
| Senate District 29: | House Districts 47, 48, 49 | |
| Senate District 30: | House Districts 94, 95, 96 | |
| Senate District 31: | House Districts 50, 68, 69 | |
| Senate District 32: | House Districts 64, 65, 72 | Assigned to Senator O'Brien |
| Senate District 33: | House Districts 58, 59, 79 | |

All of the above assignments of Senators are made pursuant to Section 5, Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.


Maps

9/9/21 2pm ORC public hearing
Geoff Wise, Cincinnati OH


2011 Senate



Wise House




Wise Senate




STAPLES

STAPLES


OCRC House




OCRC Senate



Sykes Senate



Sykes House



Comparison of OCRC, Sykes, and Wise district plans

Geoff Wise, Ph.D.
Cincinnati, OH
abridged from 9/5/21 ORC submission

1

Here we are ..

- 9/1 milestone missed
- 6 days to 9/15
 - We need a map compliant w/Article XI
- Are the Sykes and OCRC* maps the best we can do?
 - Compact
 - POC voting power
 - Competitiveness, fairness
 - Senate Incumbency

*Ohio Citizens' Redistricting Committee

2

Approximate time spent on this effort: 70 hours

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Reading background material | 6 | Pre-Census prep work 26 hours Started 8/13/21 |
| Offering Columbus my help | 4 | |
| My pre-map technical public input | 8 | |
| The 8/24 UC sausage show | 8 | |
| Learning to use Dave's Redistricting | 0.1 | |
| Creating House map version 1 | 10 | Census data required Started 8/25/21 14 hours |
| Optimizing v1 | 14 | |
| House → Senate conversion | 2 | |
| "Senate incumbency" joy | 3 | |
| Prep for 9/5 submission and 9/9 hearing | 15 | |

3

Visual comparison - Statehouse



4

Visual comparison – State senate



5

Quantitative analysis methodology

- Several public sites available
 - I used Dave's Redistricting Analysis (davesredistricting.org)
- Data sources
 - 2020 Census
 - 2016 – 2020 Pres-Sen-Gov-AG election results (56/44)

6

Analysis (Wise vs. OCRC vs. Sykes)

- District shapes
- Minority power
- Competitiveness
- Votes → Seats
- Incumbency

7

Analysis – District shape

| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|------------|------|------|-------|
| Columbus | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| Cleveland | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Cincinnati | 3** | 4 | 2 |
| Toledo | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Akron | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Dayton | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Parma | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canton | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Youngstown | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lorain | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hamilton | 0 | 0 | 0 |

** A tiny sliver of Cincinnati was used to foster a competitive GOP district in eastern Hamilton County.

| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| House | 15 | 21 | 12 |
| Senate | 7 | 9 | 6 |

*Splits are inevitable in urban and suburban counties

8

Analysis – District shape

House KIWYSI compactness: 56, 56, 52
Senate KIWYSI compactness: 52, 62, 74

For the Senate, get ding-dong for 19, 1, 19

| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|------------|------|------|-------|
| Columbus | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| Cleveland | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Cincinnati | 3** | 4 | 2 |
| Toledo | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Akron | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Dayton | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Parma | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canton | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Youngstown | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lorain | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hamilton | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| House | 15 | 21 | 12 |
| Senate | 7 | 9 | 6 |

9

Analysis: competitiveness, minority power

We can significantly increase the number of competitive districts

10

Blah blah blah ...

HOW MANY SEATS DO WE GET??

11

How you EARN seats

| Ohio House | | | | | Ohio Senate | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------------|-------|-------|--|--|
| | Wise | OCRC | Sykes | | Wise | OCRC | Sykes | | |
| Likely DEM | 22-30 | 28-36 | 26-35 | Likely DEM | 9-18 | 11-18 | 11-15 | | |
| >55% Dem | 22 | 28 | 26 | >55% Dem | 9 | 11 | 11 | | |
| 50-55% Dem | 23 | 14 | 17 | 50-55% Dem | 5 | 3 | 3 | | |
| 45-55% | 28 | 18 | 22 | 45-55% | 9 | 5 | 4 | | |
| 50-55% GOP | 5 | 4 | 5 | 50-55% GOP | 4 | 2 | 1 | | |
| >55% GOP | 49 | 53 | 51 | >55% GOP | 15 | 17 | 18 | | |
| Likely GOP | 43-37 | 52-42 | 52-73 | Likely GOP | 15-24 | 17-22 | 17-17 | | |

More seats in play = stronger campaigns & candidates = better government.

12

Analysis: partisan bias

- The main focus of map-making is how votes will translate into seats
 - Often illustrated as a x-y plot of votes → seats (see next 2 pages)
 - Precincts can be “horse-traded” to manipulate this within the politically relevant range
 - To achieve a biased “gerrymandered” result
 - To enforce legal requirements
 - To correct for random fluctuations
 - Making districts more competitive will make the seats more responsive (stronger than proportional) to vote swings
 - Mandating proportionality will
 - Force a “bend” in the votes-seats curve
 - Make it harder for GOP- or Dem-leaning (unbalanced) states to achieve 50% seats at 50% votes
- All three plans have reasonable predicted votes → seats in the politically relevant range
 - Refer back to slide 11 for expected seats table
 - See next two pages for seats-vote curve comparisons

13

The downside of “proportionality”

This example: 15 Congressional districts

14

The downside of “proportionality”

Do we really want only two competitive Congressional seats?
Who gets ‘em?

15

Analysis: Partisan bias via seats(votes) curves

16

Analysis: Partisan bias via seats(votes) curves

17

Comments on design choices

- District-drawing creates tradeoffs among representation, district shape, partisan bias and competitiveness
- Adhering to municipal non-splitting will drive down compactness and the flexibility to tradeoff other considerations
- Increasing the number of competitive seats naturally makes the seats more responsive to votes (greater than proportional)
- Given the “creative” shapes of 2011 districts and the above constraints, it is unrealistic to also solve perfectly for Senate incumbency

18

Why OCRC scores better on Senate representation for nonwhites: Dayton option

My map pulls district 37 in with 71 & 72 to form a GOP-leaning competitive district. 38+39+40 form a competitive Dem-leaning district with a 32.4% Black population, which is strong but does not qualify as a minority district.

OCRC's map combines 70, 71, 72 Dayton-area House districts into one 37.5% Black Dem-heavy Senate district surrounded by an irregular, elongated GOP-dominated district (69 + 73 + 74).

I decided to split Dayton's 2 Statehouse districts into separate Senate districts to increase competition and compactness. The OCRC is welcome to reverse the Senate assignments of 37 and 39 if keeping communities together is higher priority. OCRC's excessive partitioning of Cleveland and Akron may have also been done to boost minority vote power.

19

Assigning Senate "incumbency" (Article XI, Section 5)

Article XI, Section 5 of the Ohio Constitution states that the General Assembly shall divide the state into Senate districts, and that the boundaries of such districts shall be as compact as possible, and shall not be so drawn as to give any person or persons an undue influence in the election of Senators. The General Assembly shall also provide for the election of Senators at large, and the election of Senators from the counties of Hamilton, Franklin, Lucas, and Montgomery. The General Assembly shall also provide for the election of Senators from the counties of Hamilton, Franklin, Lucas, and Montgomery. The General Assembly shall also provide for the election of Senators from the counties of Hamilton, Franklin, Lucas, and Montgomery.

My plan:
Good for most incumbents
Collateral damage from Cuyahoga snake#24

20

Putting OH Senators in their places

Colored = Wise plan
Black district lines = 2011 map

✓ = reasonable 1:1 match
? = imperfect. ? placed in area that seems best overlap
○ = "orphan" seat

Hamilton, Franklin, Lucas, and Montgomery counties can be mapped reasonably well.

See next page for addressing Cuyahoga County and the "orphan" seat.

21

Fixing incumbency problems from 2011 gerrymandering

- Conflict in new #26 from old 22 & 26.
 - Reineke (22) in Tiffin
 - Romanchuk (26) in Ontario
- Who loves Bellefontaine more?
- Sen. Dolan (snake#24) → 21, 23, 24, or 25
 - 3 open seats
- Current 4, 8, 12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 26, 28, 30 are OK, not great
 - see previous page

22

It's the 4th quarter

- Obviously biased maps
- "The Democrats' maps"
- Plan C

23

It's the 4th quarter

- Obviously biased maps
- "The Democrats' maps"
- Plan C

24

Files to accompany this submission

- .csv file of precincts → districts for both House and Senate
- Excel file with raw statistical data supporting this analysis

Links to Wise maps on Dave's Redistricting app:
 Wise competitive House map
<https://davesredistricting.org/map/viewmap/f8133db6-fa78-4c13-8ac5-d49cf9f3ad09>
 Wise competitive Senate map
<https://davesredistricting.org/map/viewmap/ee043422-043d-43af-8058-d65e67847d5e>
 My reports of OCRC and Sykes maps to ORA are below as well:
 OCRC House: <https://davesredistricting.org/map/viewmap/0d8ea07-8a9f-4293-a984-88a0938330f0>
 OCRC Senate: <https://davesredistricting.org/map/viewmap/c081a613-1734-8a97-03c4465-9a3a06>
 *Sykes House: <https://davesredistricting.org/map/viewmap/0a5a5030-0c39-4830-bc33-4393-a0071189>
 *Sykes Senate: <https://davesredistricting.org/map/viewmap/4ee831e1-a038-451a-8385-975486251132>

*these are from Sykes version 2, posted between 9/1 and 9/5/21, which appear similar to 8/31 version!

25

Approximate time spent on this effort: 68 hours

| | | |
|--|------------|---|
| Reading background material (Article XI, public literature on redistricting state-of-the-art) | 6 | Pre-Census prep work 26.1 hours Started 8/13/21 |
| Contacting my House/Senate reps and OCRC members to offer my technical assistance – no positive response received | 4 | |
| Capturing my technical assistance as public input to submit to the OCRC | 8 | |
| Preparing to speak and attending the 8/24 UC hearing | 8 | |
| Learning to use Dave's Redistricting | 0.1 | |
| Creating House map version 1 | 10 | Census data required Started 8/25/21 41.5 hours |
| Converting House v1 to Senate v1 | 1 | |
| Optimizing House for competitiveness, minority splits, etc | 14 | |
| Converting House v2 to Senate v2 | 0.5 | |
| Addressing the "Senate incumbency" problem | 3 | |
| Preparing this summary | 13 | Completed 9/5/21 |


Respectfully submitted September 7, 2021
 I did not coordinate with any groups or persons in creating these maps or analyses. Any errors are my sole responsibility.

26

Appendix


- Sykes v1 vs. Sykes v2
- Zoom-ins on urban areas
 - (See earlier for Dayton and Cleveland)

27



28


Urban detail: Hamilton county




Cuyahoga and Montgomery counties are compared on pp. 14 & 17

29


Urban detail: Franklin county



30





31




32

Is Huffman's plan any better? NO !!




Analysis: Wise vs. Huffman Senate


Seats-Votes Curve: Wise Senate




Seats-Votes Curve: Huffman-Senate



Huffman House



Huffman Senate





OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING

TO:: Members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission

FROM: Speaker Robert Cupp, Co-Chair
Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair

DATE: Sunday, September 12, 2021

TIME: 4:00 PM

LOCATION: Washington Township RecPlex West (Auditorium)
965 Miamisburg Centerville Road
Dayton, Ohio 45459

AGENDA

The Ohio Redistricting Commission will meet to hear public testimony on the Commission's introduced state redistricting plan pursuant to Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.

Senate Contact: Giulia Cambieri, (614) 644-5533
House Contact: Aaron Mulvey, (614) 466-8759

Ohio Redistricting Commission Testimony
September 12, 2021
Dr. Tommie R. Radd
1075 Arcaro Court
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

My name is Dr. Tommie R. Radd. I vote in Ohio Senate District 3, House District 19 and Congressional District 3. I testified on August 27th in Mansfield and on September 9th in Columbus and submitted testimony. The reason I'm here is to give public record feedback on the maps this commission approved in a partisan 5-2 vote and voice my extreme disappointment in the commissions apparent inability to work in a bipartisan manner, follow the letter and spirit of the law, and follow the rules required in the 2015 constitutional amendment voted by over 70% of the citizens of Ohio. Based on nonpartisan Fair Districts analysis, your map of September 9th is unacceptable, especially in the areas of representative fairness, minority representation and compactness explained as follows.

Proportionality (Representative Fairness)

Your maps scores low in Proportionality (Representational Fairness) using Dave's Redistricting App. **Ohio's average map-wide Democratic two-party vote share is 46.38%, the Republican 53.62%** based on the statewide vote over the past decade.

There are 99 Ohio House seats. The number of Democratic House seats closest to proportional is 46 and the number of Republican House seats closest to proportional is 53 (**46 Democratic leaning districts; 53 Republican leaning districts**). The likely outcome from Your Map is **32 Democratic leaning districts and 67 Republican leaning districts (32.32% Dem.; 67.67% Rep).**

There are 33 Ohio Senate seats. The number of Democratic Senate seats closest to proportional is 15 and the number of Republican Senate seats closest to proportional is 18 (**15 Democratic leaning districts; 18 Republican leaning districts**). The likely outcome from Your Map is **10 Democratic seats and 23 Republican seats (30.30% Dem.; 69.69% Rep.)**

Minority Representation

Your maps appear to inappropriately "pack" minorities into Ohio House districts. Members promoting Your map have stated for the record that they failed to examine the racial composition of their map per your direction. This flagrant omission is disrespectful of the Ohio Constitution, the federal Voting Rights Act, minority communities, and all Ohio voters.

Compactness

Compactness measures how "sprawling" or "oddly shaped" a district is. At the individual House district level, certain anomalies are evident regarding a lack of compactness.

Your map discounts the gerrymandering issues impacting Gahanna presented in public testimony on August 27th in Mansfield. Several Gahanna citizens spoke to this problem, plus submitted a map for our community. Our input and requests were ignored. These are examples:

- Racial gerrymandering to the Airport continues to be an issue
- Seltzer Road is split down the middle
- Gahanna Jefferson Public Schools are split between multiple districts

In addition, the minority party proposed map submitted on August 31st addresses gerrymandering concerns per our testimony by:

- Having No Racial gerrymandering to the airport
- Representing all of Gahanna in one district
- Drawing the lines along natural boundaries such as the expressway

The majority map submitted on September 9th ignored Gahanna gerrymandering, discounted the minority map corrections, and continues the gerrymandering of Gahanna. The gerrymandering of Gahanna, my community Needs To Stop!

Each commission member is constitutionally responsible for the Ohio Redistricting process, maps and end results. Everyone on this Commission is accountable for the way you conduct yourselves and work transparently with the process. That hasn't happened. You have intentionally proposed a map to continue giving the majority party a super majority. Your maps insult our intelligence.

Your Charge was to Work Together to Produce FAIR, COMPETITIVE MAPS. Citizens with NONE of YOUR RESOURCES such as Dr. Geoff Rice who testified on September 9th produced a fair option. Actions speak louder than words. It is shameful and dishonest what you are doing. We will not stand by quietly.

Gerrymandering is cheating. To gerrymander to create and maintain a super majority in the Ohio House and Senate is WRONG. That is the reason the citizens of Ohio stepped up to fix this problem and hold you accountable. Ohioans voted for You to fix this unfairness and stand for ALL people now. This Redistricting Commission has a responsibility to draw fair maps per the Letter and the Spirit of our Ohio Constitutional Amendments as demanded by the voters.

You have until September 15th to determine your legacy. How will your children, grandchildren and the historians rate you? Will you be a cheater? Will you be a statesman? Your final map and vote will tell ALL the answer.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today,

Tommie R. Radd

Dr. Tommie R. Radd
614-607-1373
tradd@wowway.com

Testimony
Ohio Redistricting Commission
September 12, 2021

Kathleen Gmeiner, JD, MHSA
kgmeiner@att.net
614-444-9868

Good afternoon Co-chairs Cupp and Sykes and Commission members. Thank you for the opportunity to address the maps that are at the heart of Ohio's decennial redistricting process.

My name is Kathleen Gmeiner. I live with my husband William Todd in House District 17 on the Southwest side of Columbus. I was born and raised in Dayton, Ohio, lived for brief periods in Cincinnati and Toledo, lived outside the state for about 22 years, and have lived in Columbus since returning to Ohio in the year 2000. I am now retired, but my professional career brought me to the Ohio Statehouse on many occasions between 2000 and 2019. Despite the pandemic and my concern for my safety, during the summer and fall of 2020 I helped people register to vote at numerous events in Columbus which I organized together with the League of Women Voters. I will be commenting on the Commission's map and in part contrasting it with aspects of maps proposed by the Democratic Caucus, and maps by Geoff Wise and Pranav Padmanabhan who were jointly awarded first prize in the Fair Districts Legislative Mapping Competition hosted by Fair Districts.

First, however, let me say that my observations of our state and our electoral process is that it is becoming increasingly polarized and less reflective of the desires of the voters at large which is why getting this redistricting process right is so important. In many of Ohio's districts the primary election is the *real* election, because the distribution of voters is not competitive. When elections get settled at the primary, many voters start losing interest in the electoral process. The elected officials become primarily responsive to their political base, not to all their constituents, and the people who vote in the primaries are a much smaller number who may not reflect the mainstream. As a result we are seeing more and more that other than the budget, the legislation that is being introduced and garnering the lion's share of attention of the Ohio General Assembly is not legislation that arises from people's concerns but is legislation that is driven from a national political agenda, such as the recent spate of so-called voter reform legislation.

Now to the maps. The districts that are drawn should be compact, competitive and reflect communities of interest. It should respect governmental boundaries—counties, cities and

townships. The voting pattern of Ohio has been roughly 55% Republican and 45% Democratic, and the Ohio General Assembly should reflect this voting behavior. Unfortunately, the map that has been put forward by the Commission does not meet these standards and it shows in the expected outcome of the House and Senate seats.

Let me start with observations about Franklin County with which I am most familiar. You will note that that the Commission map combines the northwest corner of Franklin County with a large part of Union County to its north and west. The only reason to do this is patently partisan, as this part of northwest Franklin County, held by Republicans in the early part of the last decade, was captured by a Democrat in 2018, who was re-elected in 2020, while Union County has traditionally vote Republican.

As mentioned above, I live in current District 17 much of which is incorporated into the new District 6. The Commission map grabs a densely populated 100 square block area, shaped like a finger, out of the logical boundaries of what should be a compact District 6 and joins it to District 1 to the east. Given the voting propensity of new District 1, this appears to be a classic effort to pack Democratic votes into District 1, that will likely vote Democratic. These become “wasted” Democratic votes. The Commission’s map also creates an oddly shaped District 10 that winds around the southwest and west of the county designed to assure that the district which has been Republican for the last decade remains Republican. The Democratic Caucus plan also appears to cross the southern Franklin County line which should not be necessary but has no obvious intrusions into Franklin County districts such as the 100 square block west side grab in the Commission map. The map drawn by Geoff Wise keeps all districts within the boundaries of Franklin County.

Using the scoring mechanism of Dave’s Redistricting App, the software tool used by the Commission, the Democratic Caucus and the winners of the Fair Districts contest, the Commission map lags behind the other three significantly. Here is the bottom line: in the Commission’s map, there are 56 Republican House seats and 11 seats that lean Republican, while there are 23 Democratic seats with 8 that lean Democratic. Only 1 House seat is really competitive. In the Senate there are 18 Republican seats and 5 that lean Republican and 7 Democratic seats and 1 that leans Democratic. Only 2 Senate seats are truly competitive. That’s a 67%/31% breakout in the House and a 70%/24% breakout in the Senate. Not even close to the 55%/45% Republican/Democratic voting behavior of the state.


Geoff Wise proposed a map with a 54%/39% breakout in the Senate and a 54%/34% breakout in the House. Pranav Padmanabhan proposed a map with a 58%/33% breakout in the Senate and a 63%/32% breakout in the House. The Wise map shows 12 competitive House seats and 2

competitive Senate seats, while the Padmanabhan map shows 5 competitive House seats and 3 competitive Senate seats. This contrasts to only 2 competitive seats in the Senate and one in the 99 member House in the Commission's map.


The Wise and Padmanabhan maps are much closer to the states voting behavior. It can be done. The Commission would do well to accept or borrow heavily from them.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.


Commission Map—Franklin County




Democratic Caucus Map – Franklin County



Geoff Wise Map – Franklin County



Pranav Padmanabhan – Franklin County



Testimony Before the Ohio Redistricting Commission, September 12, 2021

By Richard Gunther, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Ohio State University

Good afternoon.

I am Richard Gunther, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Ohio State University. I am also one of the five negotiators¹ who produced a draft of what is now Article XI of the Ohio Constitution, as ratified by over 71% of the voters of Ohio in 2015. I am here in my capacity as a political scientist with considerable experience in redistricting, as well as a co-author of the constitutional provisions that must be followed in drawing new House and Senate district lines

I will address several of the criteria set forth in the Ohio constitution by the 2015 reforms, and the extent to which the map proposed by Ray DiRossi and the Republican House and Senate caucuses meets those criteria.

The criteria set forth in the constitution are (1) that districts have roughly equal population size, (2) conformity with the Section 3 rules concerning the splitting of counties, municipalities and townships, (3) compliance with the rules set forth in Section 6(A) and (B), commonly referred to as “representational fairness,” (4) compliance with the Voting Rights Act, and (5) compactness. All of them are important, but I will focus my attention on compliance with the VRA and the rules included in Section 6(A) and (B).

Let me begin with what are commonly referred to as the “representational fairness” criteria—set forth in Section 6(A) and 6(B) of Article XI. Section 6 begins by stating that “the Ohio redistricting commission shall attempt to draw a general assembly district plan that meets all of the following standards...”

Note that the constitution does not state that the Redistricting Commission *can*, *may* or *might* attempt to meet these criteria—it says that it *shall* attempt to draw district boundaries that meet these criteria. This is not an option. ***Shall means shall***. And in light of the discussion last Thursday of the status of Section 6, it should be pointed out that the word “aspirational” does not appear anywhere in the Ohio constitution, nor is it implied.² It is required that the rules in Section

¹ The other members of the negotiating team were former Senator Jeff Jacobson, Representative (now Senator) Vernon Sykes, House Republican Caucus counsel Mike Lenzo and House Democratic Caucus counsel Sarah Cherry. We deliberated over reforms in Ohio’s procedures and criteria for drawing General Assembly district boundaries between November 21 through December 4, 2014.

² Section 9 of Article XI further strengthens this constitutional commitment to representational fairness. It states that “if the [Ohio] Supreme Court, in considering a plan passed in the absence of support from at least two members of the Commission from the minority party, determines that both of the following are true, the court shall order the commission to adopt a new General Assembly district plan in accordance with this article:

- (i) The plan significantly violates those requirements in a manner that materially affects the ability of the plan to contain districts whose voters favor political parties in an overall proportion that corresponds closely to the statewide political party preferences of the voters of Ohio, as described in division (B) of Section 6 of this article.
- (ii) The statewide proportion of districts in the plan whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favors each political party, does not correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.” [XI (9)(D)(c)(I and ii)]

Finally, Section 8(C)(2) states that “A final general assembly district plan adopted under division (C)(1)(a) or (b) of this section [i.e., which lacks bipartisan support] shall include a statement explaining what the commission determined to be the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio and the manner in which the statewide proportion of districts in the plan

6 be adhered to.³ These rules are not optional, to be ignored according to the whims or partisan interests of the Ohio Redistricting Commission.

And what are these Additional District Standards? 6(A) states that “No general assembly district plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party.” And 6(B) makes it quite clear what not favoring a party means: “The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party shall correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.”

In the five general elections that have taken place over the past decade, Republican candidates for President, U.S. Senator, Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor, Attorney General and Treasurer have received 54.2% of the votes cast by Ohio voters, while Democratic candidates for those offices have received 45.8% of the votes cast. To ensure that one political party is not unduly favored over another, the partisan make-up of Ohio's districts should mirror the partisan make-up of Ohio's voters—that is, for the House, the statewide map should include approximately 54 districts that whose voters lean towards the Republican party (54.5%), and 45 that lean Democratic (45.5%), and for the Senate, there should be approximately 18 districts leaning Republican (54.5%) and 15 democratic. (45.5%).

How does the DiRossi proposal stack up against this constitutional standard? The widely used website Dave's Redistricting App estimates that it would create 67 Republican districts and just 32 Democratic-leaning districts. That is even worse than our current gerrymandered map. And the Senate map is worse still—it would create 25 Republican districts and only 8 Democratic leaners. In short, it unduly favors one political party and is flagrantly unconstitutional.

The shortcomings of the DiRossi plan go beyond these highly biased, partisan outcomes. In response to a question from a member of the Commission, DiRossi stated that the drawing of this map did not include an assessment of the extent to which the partisan tilt of the districts did or did not “correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio” since it did not even examine data concerning the partisan orientation of the districts. In short, it paid no attention to Section 6's requirement that the commission “shall attempt” to draw a representative map that does not favor or disfavor a political party.

What about compliance with the Voting Rights Act? At this point, we don't know, since DiRossi admitted that in drawing these maps no demographic information was included in the data used to draw district boundaries. Federal law requires that state legislative districts cannot violate the 1965 Voting Rights Act (VRA) and they must be drawn in a manner to ensure that voters of color can elect representatives of their choosing. Accordingly, no judgment concerning the legality of this map can be made in the absence of such information. In the meantime, we must reassert the basic principles regarding the VRA: Minority vote dilution by packing or cracking must be avoided. Both of these kinds of gerrymandering minimize the voting strength of minority communities.

By completely ignoring the VRA and the requirements of Section 6(A) and 6(B), the DiRossi maps are simply unconstitutional. How could they be the maps chosen by the Ohio Redistricting

whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party corresponds closely to those preferences, as described in division (B) of Section 6 of this article.”

³ In doing so, it must avoid violating other sections of Article XI. As stated in Section 6, “Nothing in this section permits the commission to violate the district standards described in Section 2, 3, 4, 5 or 7 of this article.”

Commission as its nominees for adoption as the framework for electoral competition over the next decade?

The 2015 amendments to the Ohio constitution were endorsed by overwhelming majorities of both houses of the General Assembly and by over 70 percent of Ohio's voters. I am hopeful that the Ohio Redistricting Commission will reach a bipartisan consensus and adopt district boundaries for the Ohio House and Senate in a manner that respects both the letter and the spirit of those reforms.

APPENDIX: Article XI, Section 6(B)

“The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party shall correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.”

How Section 6(B) is Intended to Work

The first step is to calculate the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio as reflected in ballots cast for the candidates of each major party for President, United States Senator, Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Auditor and Treasurer over the past decade. That calculation (based on the official election results as published by the Ohio Secretary of State) is presented in the following table.

Votes for Statewide Offices over the Past Decade

| Democratic Candidates | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| President | 2,697,260 | | 2,394,164 | | 2,679,165 |
| Senator | 2,645,901 | | 1,996,908 | 2,358,508 | |
| Governor | | 1,009,359 | | 2,067,847 | |
| Sec of State | | 1,074,475 | | 2,049,944 | |
| Attorney General | | 1,178,426 | | 2,084,593 | |
| Auditor | | 1,149,305 | | 2,006,204 | |
| Treasurer | | 1,323,325 | | 2,022,016 | |

GRAND TOTAL of votes cast for Democratic candidates 2012-2020: **30,737,400**

| Republican Candidates | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| President | 2,593,779 | | 2,841,005 | | 3,154,834 |
| Senator | 2,371,230 | | 3,118,567 | 2,057,559 | |
| Governor | | 1,944,848 | | 2,231,917 | |
| Sec. of State | | 1,811,020 | | 2,210,356 | |
| Attorney General | | 1,882,048 | | 2,272,440 | |
| Auditor | | 1,711,927 | | 2,152,769 | |
| Treasurer | | 1,724,060 | | 2,304,444 | |

GRAND TOTAL of votes cast for Republican candidates 2012-2020: **36,379,803**

Democratic share of votes cast for statewide offices $(30,737,400 \div 67,117,203) = 45.8\%$

Republican share of votes cast for statewide offices $(36,379,803 \div 67,117,203) = 54.2\%$

Thus, the grand total of votes for Republican and Democratic candidates for statewide offices over the past decade indicates that Ohio voters supported Republican candidates over Democratic candidates by a margin of 54.2% vs. 45.8%.

Accordingly, for the map to be representationally fair, that is, not gerrymandered, the share of Ohio House of Representatives districts whose voters lean toward Republican candidates should be as close to 54.2% as possible, while 45.8% of these districts should lean toward Democratic candidates.

The second step is to create a partisan index for each of the districts that have been drawn based on the same statewide election results. This involves aggregating those same data for each of the districts in the map. This step determines the likely partisan lean in each district.

This seems like a lot of work, but computer programs used to draw district maps can easily accomplish this task.


Then simply count the number of districts that lean toward one party or the other.

After this has been done, it will be easily possible to determine which maps most closely correspond to the partisan preferences of Ohio's voters over the previous decade.


Using these data, the goal should be to create a map in which approximately 54% of the districts have a pro-Republican partisan index and 46% have a pro-Democratic partisan index based on the last decade's election results.

Note that Section 6(B) of Article XI does not imply that each individual district should internally mirror this statewide ratio, which cannot occur because of how Republican and Democratic voters are unevenly distributed across the state.

Instead, it is the *statewide* share of districts leaning toward one party or another (based upon previous voting behavior over the previous decade) that should correspond to this statewide pattern of partisan preferences.



Senate Republican's Proposal



Flanagan Proposal

Ohio Townships Map

Click on your county or scroll down to view the counties in alphabetical order.
Township websites that have been provided to the OTA are linked to each individual township.

U.S. HOUSE




Draft Testimony for Chris Glassburn

September 13, 2021

- Co-Chair Cupp, Co-Chair Sykes and members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission, thank you for the opportunity to speak about the changes we are proposing to the Commission's redistricting plan. My name is Chris Glassburn and I am with Project Govern and am a consultant and map drawer for the Ohio Senate Democratic Caucus.
- Our amendment used the commission map as the base. We used the same approach as the commission map to address the drawing of Senate districts in Northeast Ohio. However, in doing so, we were able to keep the city of Solon whole, unlike the commission map, which splits it.
- I'll go into more detail, but before I do, I want to emphasize that overall, we enhanced constitutional compliance by reducing splits of cities and counties throughout the state. We eliminated the commission's single split of a township in Stark County. We increased the number of competitive seats, and our map is closer to the proportionality required by Article 11, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution than the commission map.
- This amendment is further evidence that we are serious about enacting a 10-year map. The map presented by Senate Democrats two weeks ago resulted in 44 likely Democratic House seats and 14 likely Democratic Senate seats. Our amendment today would result in 42 likely Democratic House seats and 13 likely Democratic Senate seats.
- As with our first proposal, the districts were drawn in compliance with the Voting Rights Act to ensure minority communities can select their candidate of choice.
- I would also like to make a note about maps that have been submitted to the Commission that have emphasized competitiveness. We have taken those maps into careful consideration. Dave's Redistricting is an incredibly useful tool, however, it cannot verify that a proposed map is compliant with the Ohio Constitution. For example, the Geoff Wise map that won the Fair Districts competition scored very well on competitiveness. However, it had over 50 violations in splitting certain political subdivisions that are not always able to be seen on Dave's Redistricting.


Franklin County

Proposal



12 Dem Districts (w/ Pickaway)


Commission



10 Dem Districts


NE Ohio

Proposal



19 Dem Districts


Commission



14 Dem Districts


Cuyahoga County

Proposal



10 Dem Districts
(D23 split between Summit and Geauga)


Commission



9 Dem Districts (w/ #15 on the edge)


Lorain County

Proposal



2 Dem Districts


Commission



1 Dem District

Summit and Portage County


Proposal



4 Dem Districts

(blue part D23 in the North is shared with Cuyahoga County)


Commission



2 Dem Districts


Stark County

Proposal



1 Dem District (D+6.6%)


Commission



1 Dem District (D+3.2%)


Trumbull and Mahoning County

Proposal



2 Dem Districts


Commission



1 Dem District


Hamilton County

Proposal



5 Dem Districts


Commission



4 Dem Districts


Montgomery County

Proposal



3 Dem Districts


Commission



1 Dem District


Lucas County

Proposal



3 Dem Districts


Commission




3 Dem Districts

NW Ohio

Proposal




Commission




NE Ohio

Proposal (5 Dem Districts)




Commission (3 Dem Districts)




Central Ohio

Proposal (4 Dem)




Commission (3 Dem)




SW Ohio

Proposal (3 Dem)



Commission (1 Dem)



WITNESS INFORMATION FORM

Please complete the Witness Information Form before testifying:

Date: September 13, 2021

Name: Laura Irvin

Are you representing: Yourself ☒ Organization ☐

Organization (If Applicable): _____

Position/Title: Owner Happy Trails BnB

Address: 221 Elm

City: Oberlin State: OH Zip: 44074

Best Contact Telephone: 214-415-4761 Email: laura.irvin1959@att.net

Do you wish to be added to the committee notice email distribution list? Yes ☒ No ☐

Business before the committee

Legislation (Bill/Resolution Number): Republican Redistricting Map

Specific Issue: Gerrymandering

Are you testifying as a: Proponent ☐ Opponent ☒ Interested Party ☐

Will you have a written statement, visual aids, or other material to distribute? Yes ☒ No ☐

(If yes, please send an electronic version of the documents, if possible, to the Chair's office prior to committee. You may also submit hard copies to the Chair's staff prior to committee.)

How much time will your testimony require? 3 minutes to read

Please provide a brief statement on your position: Gerrymandering is wrong. The citizens of Ohio voted for Fair Districts and that is what we want.

Please be advised that this form and any materials (written or otherwise) submitted or presented to this committee are records that may be requested by the public and may be published online.

Opponent Testimony of
Laura Irvin
221 Elm Street
Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Not in support of the Gerrymandered Republican drawn State House Map.

Thank you for showing up today to hear the testimony of your constituents.

I am from Lorain County. In 10 of the last 11 or more presidential elections, voters in our county have voted for the democratic candidate. We are a democratic county. In Lorain County we have 7 county wide elected officials who are Democrats and we have 4 county wide elected officials who are Republicans – one of which is the coroner. Until the last election all county wide electeds were Democrats. I'm sure you have heard about the shenanigans that have been going on between the two newly elected Republican commissioners. Hiring lovers, firing lovers, hiring campaign managers, firing campaign managers, hiring campaign donors, firing campaign donors, hiring people who are unqualified, firing some of those people. One republican commissioner telling the other to resign. The list of their scandals goes on as a soap opera. Needless to say, not a whole lot is getting done in Lorain County because of the two republicans and their foolishness. They are of the same ilk as the republicans in Columbus who cheat us out of tens of millions of dollars through First Energy dark money back room dealing and school vouchers to ECOT. But With all of their mischievousness and pain they have caused our county, I don't figure that they will be re-elected. I digress to point out that when Republicans are in charge they cheat, and cost us time and money - just as you are doing with the drawing of these maps.

The way the Republicans have drawn Lorain County is a perfect example of gerrymandering. Putting Lorain City and Elyria in the same district is a textbook example of packing a district. You have packed the democratic and minority votes. The spirit and intent of the voters was to end gerrymandering. We want competitive districts. We want districts that reflect our community. We want districts that reflect our voting patterns. We should have at least two competitive districts if not three in Lorain County. You have drawn zero competitive districts in Lorain.

For House District 53, you have drawn Vermilion in the same district as Willard. Tell me what connection the people in Vermilion on Lake Erie have to do to farmers in Willard. Vermilion's main revenue is from tourism. Vermilion's businesses are in the boating industry with a focus on boat repair, boat sales, marinas, fishing charters, docks and boat storage. Willard is a small rural farming community. What do the people in Oberlin who work for one of the most prestigious colleges in the country, that is known for the Allen Art Museum and music conservatory, have in common with the farmers in Huron which by the way is Ohio's number one county in producing vegetables? We are not talking apples and oranges here we are talking

tractors and soy beans vs. Mozart and museum tours. Both are good, but they don't go together. They shouldn't be represented as one community because they are not one community. Oberlin should be represented by the same person who represents Lorain County Community College in Elyria. Oberlin is 8 miles from Elyria, Oberlin is 46 miles from Willard.

I would add that our state is a purple state – not a red state. The only reason people think we are a republican state is because our state legislature is so gerrymandered. We should have at least 44 Democratic house seats and at least 15 Democratic Senate seats. Aren't you tired of the extremists in your party dictating how you can vote? Don't you want to win fair and square? Don't you feel dirty when you cheat? What do we have to do to make you want to be fair, to make you want what the people in our state voted for? We voted for a fair process. We voted for a fair map. That is what we deserve.

Redistricting Commission Testimony
County Councilperson Dale Miller
September 13, 2013

Speaker Bob Cupp, Senator Vernon Sykes, Members of the Redistricting Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Ohio Redistricting Commission. My first comment is that the available maps and block lists are not well-designed for public use. More detailed maps, along with precinct lists, which can be cross-referenced against publicly available maps would be better.

I am speaking this afternoon to call your attention to the egregious deficiencies in the draft map for Cuyahoga County. The proposed map is not at all compact; it mercilessly chops up Cleveland into disorganized little bits, and distributes those bits to numerous districts with no regard whatsoever to natural communities. Proposed districts such as #13 and #14 would serve well as instructional examples for Gerrymandering.

I call your attention in particular to the plight of the West Park community, which comprises Cleveland Wards 16 and 17 on the far west side of the city. As I understand the proposed map, each of the two wards would be chopped up and distributed among at least three different State Representative Districts. The West Park area has been a coherent and well-defined neighborhood for at least 100 years. It is geographically small in size, with a population of about 45,000 people, less than 40% of the target population of a State Representative District. There is no valid reason why it should not be included in a single State Representative district.

The voters of the State of Ohio overwhelmingly passed constitutional amendments designed to make State Representative and State Senate districts compact and politically fair. This proposed map does neither. It draws lines that split up communities and organizes districts in ways that make no sense from a perspective of easily understandable community representation and it creates a set of districts that will likely have a political result that differs widely from the overall division of popular votes among candidates of the two major parties.

I call upon you as Redistricting Commission members to fix this map and create districts that reflect the popular will in reforming the redistricting process—districts that are compact, respect natural communities, and are politically fair. I close by reminding you that even if you cannot bring yourselves to be politically fair, you can still create a map that is advantageous to the majority party, while still cleaning up the distorted shapes and dismembered communities found in the current draft map. Please at least do that much.

Thanks very much for your attention and consideration of my testimony.

Testimony To The Ohio Redistricting Commission

Stephen Michael Kellat

September 13, 2021

I will confine my remarks to issues with boundary lines on the proposed map. That would be the most profitable use of time.

The redraw of the lines to the 32nd senatorial district creates problems. Although the lines were redrawn to include the majority of the district's population they presently *exclude* the currently serving senator, Sandra O'Brien, who has more than two years remaining on her term. The redrawn lines deprive the people in the newly-drawn 32nd district of the services of a state senator as the Republican Party would need to decide how to fill the vacancy that was created as no other senator would be living nearby to plausibly represent that district. Senator O'Brien's currently neighboring senator, Senator Jerry Cirino, lives in Lake County and faces a redrawn map that sharply changes his district to the point that *he would become the new senator representing Mrs. O'Brien*. That the Republican Party is depriving itself of the services of one of its first-term state senators is baffling.

Turning to the proposed map for the House we see an unusual tentacle slithering into Ashtabula County. This particular line lumps communities like Harpersfield, Austinburg, Eagleville, Rock Creek, Geneva, and Geneva on the Lake into a district with Lake County communities instead of being included with neighboring communities in their own county. Part of the problem with this horrible tentacle is that while it includes the Village of Rock Creek in that Lake County-based district it leaves Trumbull Township to its west between it and the Geauga-Ashtabula County line *in a completely different district*. Overall this does not help community cohesion in the largest county of our state.

All of the maps that have been proposed have frankly taken a jigsaw to Ashtabula County. The current working proposal snakes a tentacle from Lake County into it. The Senate Democratic caucus map chopped the county into an east-west split. The winners of the public mapmaking contest took an approach splitting the county diagonally with the split running from Orwell in the southwestern corner to Conneaut in the northeastern corner.

Ashtabula County has its own more natural split. The main population centers and affinity communities are the cities of Geneva, Ashtabula, and Conneaut. All three are north of Interstate Route 90. The National Weather Service splits the county using I-90 as the dividing line when it gives forecasts for "Ashtabula Lakeshore" and "Ashtabula Inland".

I urge that you consider sticking with the more natural split used by the National Weather Service. Our population follows that split just as much as our weather does. Our county isn't large enough to support a single House district but you can at least break us up in ways that respect our traditions, history, and culture.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Good afternoon, my name is Tom Jackson, from Solon, Ohio.

Ohioans overwhelmingly voted to fix our broken system of map making. Ohioans are tired of the status quo of rigged, partisan maps that protect supermajorities and interfere with good governance.

Ohioans overwhelmingly voted for fair maps. I recognize the complexities of creating truly representative maps, but did you even try? There's no fairness or progress in your map. I'm outraged that you put forward maps that are worse, not better than the current ones.

This so-called "working document" needs significant improvement to clear the lowest threshold of being constitutional and consistent with what Ohioans voted for.

In evaluating the map, I considered three factors that I believe are essential to have a Legislature that can produce good public policy.

1. First, keep core communities together. There is no valid reason to divide towns and cities.
2. Second, the maps must proportionally represent the diverse views of our state.
3. Finally, and perhaps most importantly—the maps must allow for and incentivize competition, collaboration, and compromise to bring forth the best people and the best ideas

In all three areas, the proposed maps are even worse than the status quo. I'm asking you to do better.

It selectively divides core communities and packs others.

As a Solon resident, I resent that my community is one of those selected to be divided and cracked (maybe I should be proud). I moved to this city in part because of its diversity and strong sense of community that brings together people from all types of backgrounds. We share a top school district, public library, a wonderful community center and municipal services. We have shared interests around public safety, good roads, quality schools, and a strong local economy. We have a proud history of working together and coming together as a community. Why would you divide this city in half—other than to crack the growing majority of Democratic leaning voters? I can only assume you're upset at the results of recent elections.

Robert M. Howard Testimony to The Ohio Redistricting Committee for Cleveland Hearing 9.13.2021

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this effort. My name is Robert M. Howard. I live and vote in the 75th House and 18th Senate District in Franklin Township, OH. I would like to comment on the issue of redistricting of the Ohio House and Senate, specifically to oppose the first draft maps recently released by the Commission, and to call for maps that do a much better job of representing the voters of Ohio.

I have spoken with several of my friends and neighbors about both the process and the need to respect Ohio's voters. The newly issued maps are designed to promote the interests of the existing legislators and their sponsors, rather than to allow Ohio's voters to have their votes counted with equal weight, i.e., one person, one vote. Specifically, the new House and Senate districts should respect Ohio's constitutionally required characteristics of proportionality, compactness, and minority representation. The maps as proposed by the Republican members of the Commission do not represent Ohio's voters fairly or reasonably, nor are they likely to produce representative legislative bodies to help shape both the government and the economy of Ohio to benefit all of us. Instead, these maps are clearly designed to shape the environment to favor some voters and ignore others.

This effectively means that the legislators will continue to choose their voters, rather than be chosen by the voters – all the voters, not just those they expect to support them. As you might deduce from these remarks, I do not think Ohio and its citizens are well served by a system based on distorting districts in order to distort outcomes. I believe in fair elections, even or especially those that result in the election of a group of legislators who fairly represent the values and interests of the whole of Ohio, not just select interest groups.

The future of Ohio is in the balance, and these are difficult, demanding and trying times. ^{we} ~~new~~ will all benefit from a legislative process that draws from the entire population of the state, where representatives of the great variety of interests, knowledge bases, and potential solutions can be fairly debated, and where legislators are incentivized to fashion workable compromises rather than narrowly defined benefits that are targeted to meet the specific interests of individual companies, groups or individuals.

Ohio's legislative districts at all levels should strive for balanced and competitive districts, which can foster contests, which will improve the chances for innovation, growth and adaptation that will yield better ideas, laws and outcomes for all of Ohio. I ask you to reconsider, and to produce maps that have a chance to lead to such systematic improvements that will benefit all Ohioans.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request.

Name Robert M. Howard Email murnhoward@gmail.com
Address 6318 Lakeview Drive Phone 330-931-1186
City Ravenna, OH Zip 44266 Date 9.12.2021

Testimony for COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING September 13th in Cleveland

My name is Gerald Barna. I am currently in Ohio House District 57, Ohio Senate District 13, and Congressional District 7. I have been a resident of the city of Avon for 18 years and lived in Lorain County for over 50 years. I was employed at the NASA Glenn Research Center and retired after 40 years of service. I served in a number of engineering, project management, and senior management positions in my career at NASA. After retirement I was consultant for a number of small businesses and non-profit organizations for 15 years. I learned many lessons in solving difficult issues during my career. As an individual I have tried to effectively utilize this experience in support of the 2021 Ohio Redistricting process.

Initially, I focused on issues affecting Avon and Lorain County. I testified in previous hearings to identify and address the major issues of the current House District 57. Some of these issues were the following: District 57 is not compact and has convoluted boundaries; Avon has no shared interests with most of the communities in the district; Avon has very strong shared interests with communities such as Avon Lake and other Lorain County communities which are currently in adjacent districts; and North Ridgeville in Lorain County is split which opens a path to Avon. In reviewing the Commission Maps introduced on September 9th, I believe that these issues have been resolved in the formation of District 52.

In reviewing the Commission introduced House and Senate Maps overall, my focus was on compactness, retaining counties, cities, and townships in their entirety where possible, and insuring there are shared interests of the various entities within a District. In particular, I believe that these shared interests are critical to achieving effective representation in the General Assembly.

While I can evaluate these factors for District 52, I am not sufficiently knowledgeable of the communities in many of the other Districts in the State where inputs from those living in the District need to be heard. From an overall evaluation of the Commission introduced Maps, there are many districts which do not appear to satisfy the criteria previously discussed. My concerns are reinforced by the apparent increase in resulting representation by Republicans in the House and Senate which I believe is contrary to effective government. For these reasons I cannot support adoption of the Commission introduced Maps unless there are major modifications.

I urge the Republicans working on the 2021 Redistricting to negotiate in good faith and that both Republicans and Democrats be willing to compromise to achieve General Assembly Districts which will be good for 10 years. Anything else will be extremely detrimental to Ohio and its citizens.

Gerald Barna

Testimony for the Hearing on the Proposed General Assembly Maps

Cleveland, September 13, 2021

Commission members,

Thank you for your time. My name is Debbie Dalke, and I live in Bowling Green, in Wood County. Wood County now has too many people for one state house district, and so must be split. As I said at the Toledo hearing, if a community must be divided into multiple districts, the people who live there should have a voice in how this is done. I am here today to raise my voice.

The population issue with Wood County could be resolved by carving out a small segment and keeping Wood County largely intact. This is my preferred solution. The commission chose to accept the Huffman map, which divides Wood County in half. The western half of Wood County was lumped into a district with a piece of Lucas County and a slice of Hancock County. This district, District 43, would be my new house district. It is not compact, and it unnecessarily splits Hancock County. Hancock is small enough to be fully contained within a state house district.

The Huffman house map also isolates me from my community. I live about a mile southwest of the city limit, on the other side of the boundary that divides Wood County in two pieces. I have a Bowling Green zip code and I live in the Bowling Green school district. The vast majority of my business is conducted in Bowling Green and my husband pays Bowling Green city taxes. There is not a valid reason for putting me in a different house district.

I am also concerned about your redistricting process. Ray DiRossi, while introducing the Huffman maps to the commission (September 9th), said he was instructed by legislative leaders to draw maps without utilizing demographic or racial data. Mr. DiRossi also stated that the maps fully complied with the requirements in the Ohio constitution. I believe these two statements are contradictory, which I will explain.

Article XI, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution states that a district plan should “correspond closely” to the statewide voting preferences over the previous 10 years. If, as Mr. DiRossi claims, voting patterns were not looked at when the maps were evaluated, then the map makers could not have adhered to this section of the constitution.

Article XI, Section 3 of the Ohio Constitution states that district plans should comply with federal law. A relevant federal law is the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Section 2 of this act prohibits policies that “deny or abridge” the right to vote based on race. A report that accompanies the 1982 extension of the act listed factors that might violate the act. Specifically mentioned was the creation of unusually large voting districts (<https://www.justice.gov/crt/section-2-voting-rights-act#sec2>). Mapmakers know they can minimize the voting power of a demographic group by packing a district with those individuals. If the Huffman maps were drawn, as claimed, without evaluating the racial composition of the districts, then we cannot know if some of the districts adversely impact people of color.

The League of Women Voters sponsored a map making competition using publicly available districting software. Dr. Christopher Cusack, an emeritus professor of geography, evaluated the maps for compactness, splitting of communities, correspondence of districts to voting patterns (proportionality), impact on minority representation, and competitiveness. The official Huffman were compared to the contest winners, and the Huffman maps ranked noticeably lower on compactness and proportionality. I’ve included a link to the video so you can view the analysis of your maps and hopefully, take the League’s superior maps under consideration. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wbqSCVZ3Gdk>

In conclusion, this redistricting process is a slap in the face to the 70% of Ohioans who voted for the redistricting reforms. The Republican engineered maps give even more power to Republican candidates, while claiming that voting patterns were not considered. Those maps are more politically biased than the ones we currently have. Private citizens were able to produce maps that better fit the constitutional criteria than your maps, and they did so in a more timely manner, and at no cost to the taxpayers.

David Winston, a redistricting consultant in the 1990's, said the following about his work: As a mapmaker, I can have more of an impact on an election than a campaign, more of an impact than a candidate. When I as a mapmaker have more of an impact than the voters, the system is out of whack." Cited in *Fight Club politics: How partisanship is poisoning the house of representative*, by Juliet Eilperin.

Your system IS out of whack. Please reject the proposed gerrymandered maps.

Thank you again.

Debbie Dalke

15325 Sand Ridge Road, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

419 353-0401 ddalke@defiance.edu



Members Brief

An informational brief prepared by the LSC staff for members and staff of the Ohio General Assembly

Author: Emily E. Wendel, Attorney
Reviewer: Amber Hardesty, Division Chief

Volume 133 Issue 15
April 29, 2020

Redistricting in Ohio

Every ten years, Ohio must adopt new district maps for the purpose of electing members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Ohio Senate, and the Ohio House of Representatives. This brief provides an overview of redistricting in Ohio, compares the separate constitutional processes for General Assembly and congressional redistricting, explains some essential district-drawing concepts, and summarizes several landmark U.S. Supreme Court rulings concerning redistricting.

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Redistricting basics..... | 1 |
| Redistricting processes at a glance..... | 2 |
| District-drawing concepts | 4 |
| Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases | 7 |

Redistricting basics

Ohio elects its members of the U.S. House of Representatives, its state senators, and its state representatives from districts with roughly equal populations, giving each person's vote the same amount of influence. Every ten years, Ohio must redraw its congressional and General Assembly districts based on the latest population data from the U.S. Census in order to maintain population equality between districts and, in some cases, to change the number of congressional districts to match the new number of representatives to which Ohio is entitled.

The Census Bureau releases new population data for redistricting purposes by April 1 of each year ending in 1 (such as 2021), and the Ohio Constitution provides deadlines in the fall of that year to adopt new district maps based on the data. The new maps must be in place in time to nominate congressional and General Assembly candidates in the primary election held the next year. When that year is a



Congressional Districts
2011-2021

presidential election year, candidates must file their papers based on the new district map as early as mid-December of the year ending in 1.¹

Redistricting processes at a glance

The state uses two separate processes for General Assembly and congressional redistricting. The voters approved a constitutional amendment implementing a new General Assembly redistricting process in November 2015, and a separate constitutional amendment prescribing a new congressional redistricting process in May 2018. The following table compares several major aspects of the processes. For detailed explanations of the General Assembly and congressional redistricting procedures, please see LSC's final analyses of [H.J.R. 12 of the 130th General Assembly](#) and [S.J.R. 5 of the 132nd General Assembly](#), respectively.

| General Assembly Districts | Congressional Districts |
|--|---|
| Who draws the districts | |
| Ohio Redistricting Commission | General Assembly |
| Required bipartisan vote | |
| Four of seven members of the Commission, including at least two members who represent each of the two largest political parties represented in the General Assembly | $\frac{3}{5}$ of the members of each chamber of the General Assembly, including at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the members of each of the two largest political parties represented in the chamber |
| Deadline to adopt a plan | |
| September 1 of a year ending in 1 | September 30 of a year ending in 1 |
| Impasse procedure | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The deadline is extended to September 15. ▪ If the Commission adopts the plan only by a simple majority vote, the plan must be replaced after four years. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ohio Redistricting Commission must adopt a plan by a bipartisan vote by October 31. ▪ If the Commission fails to do so, the General Assembly must adopt a plan by November 30. ▪ If the General Assembly adopts the plan only by a simple majority vote, it must follow |

¹ 13 U.S.C. 141(c); Ohio Constitution, Articles XI and XIX (effective January 1, 2021); and R.C. 3513.05. Ohio's current district maps are available from the Ohio Secretary of State [here](#). The Bureau has asked Congress to extend the redistricting data delivery deadline to July 31, 2021, because of the COVID-19 pandemic. U.S. Census Bureau, *U.S. Department of Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross and U.S. Census Bureau Director Steven Dillingham Statement on 2020 Census Operational Adjustments Due to COVID-19* (April 13, 2020).


| General Assembly Districts | Congressional Districts |
|---|--|
| | additional district standards, described below, and the plan must be replaced after four years. |
| Population equality between districts | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District populations must be substantially equal. ▪ No district may contain a population of less than 95% or more than 105% of the ideal district population. | Not specified (see “ Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases, ” below) |
| District standards considered | |
| <p>Mandatory standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contiguity ▪ Boundary must be a single nonintersecting continuous line ▪ Keep counties, municipal corporations, and townships whole, based on a specified procedure ▪ Each Senate district must consist of three contiguous House districts <p>Standards the Commission must attempt to follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party. ▪ The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party must correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio. ▪ Districts must be compact. | <p>General standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contiguity ▪ Boundary must be a single nonintersecting continuous line ▪ Compactness ▪ Keep counties, municipal corporations, and townships whole, based on a specified procedure <p>Standards the General Assembly must follow if it does not pass the plan by the required bipartisan vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The plan must not unduly favor or disfavor a political party or its incumbents. ▪ The plan must not unduly split governmental units, giving preference to keeping whole, in the order named, counties, then townships and municipal corporations. ▪ The General Assembly must attempt, but is not required, to draw districts that are compact. |
| Legal challenges | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ States that the Ohio Supreme Court has exclusive, original jurisdiction in any challenge. ▪ Requires the Ohio Redistricting Commission to amend the plan or adopt a new plan, as | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ States that the Ohio Supreme Court has exclusive, original jurisdiction in any challenge. ▪ Requires that, if a plan, district, or group of districts is ruled unconstitutional, the General |

| General Assembly Districts | Congressional Districts |
|--|--|
| <p>applicable, if a plan, district, or group of districts is ruled unconstitutional.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibits a court from ordering the implementation of a plan not approved by the Commission. Prohibits a court from ordering the Commission to adopt a particular plan or to draw a particular district. Prescribes the available remedies in the event that the Court determines that a General Assembly district plan adopted by the Commission does not comply with the constitutional district standards. | <p>Assembly must adopt a new plan within 30 days after the appeal deadline expires or after the order is issued, if it is not appealable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires the Ohio Redistricting Commission to adopt a plan not later than 30 days after the General Assembly's deadline, if the General Assembly misses the deadline. Requires the new plan to remedy any legal defects, but to include no other changes. |

District-drawing concepts

Contiguity and continuous boundary lines


Every congressional and General Assembly district in Ohio must be contiguous, meaning that it is a single, unbroken shape, with no “islands” of territory that do not touch the rest of the district. Each district’s boundary also must be a single nonintersecting continuous line. This standard prevents, for example, the creation of “donut” districts, with one district entirely surrounding another.²



² Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 3(B)(3) and art. XIX, sec. 2(B)(3) (effective January 1, 2021).


Compactness

A district is considered compact if it has a minimal distance between all parts of its territory. Multiple methods exist to measure a district's compactness, such as calculating the total length of its perimeter (a shorter perimeter meaning a more compact district), or calculating the average distance between locations on the outer edges of the district and the center of the district (a shorter average distance meaning a more compact district).




Under the Ohio Constitution, the Ohio Redistricting Commission must attempt to draw compact General Assembly districts, but it is not explicitly required to do so. On the other hand, congressional districts must be compact, except that under the modified district standards that apply if the General Assembly fails to pass a district plan by the required bipartisan vote, the legislature must attempt to draw compact districts, but is not required to.³

Keeping political subdivisions whole



Ohio's congressional and General Assembly redistricting processes both place a priority on keeping counties, cities, villages, and townships together within one district. Splitting a political subdivision is necessary when, for example, its population exceeds the ideal district population. But, the Ohio Constitution includes procedures to minimize any unnecessary splitting.

Under both redistricting processes, a political subdivision is considered to be split if any contiguous portion of its territory is not contained entirely within one district. If a political subdivision has an island of territory that does not touch the rest of the subdivision, putting the island in a different district is not considered splitting the political subdivision (see above). Further, if a city, village, or township has territory in more than one county, drawing the district line along the county line is not considered splitting the city, village, or township.⁴




³ Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 6 and art. XIX, secs. 1(F)(3)(c) and 2(B)(2) (effective January 1, 2021).

⁴ Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 3(D) and art. XIX, sec. 2(C) (effective January 1, 2021).

Packing and cracking

Two district-drawing practices, commonly called packing and cracking, can give one group less influence than another. At one extreme, when a group is “packed” into a single district, it makes up a supermajority within the district, but is less able to influence the outcome of elections outside that district. Conversely, when a group is “cracked” among many districts, it makes up only a minority of the vote in each district, and is less able to influence the outcome of elections in any district. In some redistricting cases, packing and cracking have given rise to claims of unlawful gerrymandering (see “**Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases**,” below).



Political considerations

The Ohio Constitution includes two separate standards for the inclusion of political considerations in the drawing of district maps. For a General Assembly district plan, the Ohio Redistricting Commission must attempt to adopt a plan (1) that is not drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party, and (2) in which the statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party corresponds closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

For a congressional district map, the Ohio Constitution specifies that if, under the impasse procedure, the General Assembly passes a redistricting plan by a simple majority vote instead of by the required bipartisan vote, the plan must not unduly favor or disfavor a political party or its incumbents.⁵

Majority-minority districts

The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment and the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) prohibit any district plan from denying or abridging citizens’ right to vote on account of race, color, or status as a member of a language minority group. The U.S. Supreme Court has developed a test to determine whether a district map dilutes minority voting strength in violation of the VRA by cracking a minority population among multiple districts, as described above. Essentially, the test examines whether (1) the minority group is “sufficiently numerous and compact to form a majority in a single-member district,” (2) the minority group is “politically cohesive,” meaning its members tend to vote similarly, and (3) “the majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it . . . usually to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate.”⁶

In order to remedy a case of minority vote dilution, a court may require the adoption of a majority-minority district, in which a sufficient population of a minority group exists to allow the group to elect its candidate of choice. Currently, no court has expressly required Ohio to

⁵ Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 6 and art. XIX, sec. 1(C)(3)(a) and (F)(3)(a) (effective January 1, 2021).

⁶ 52 United States Code 10301; *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 50 (1986); and *Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 264 (1977).

create majority-minority congressional or General Assembly districts. A state may draw majority-minority districts voluntarily in order to remedy past discrimination. However, in some circumstances, the courts have overturned plans that included voluntarily created majority-minority districts because creating those districts amounted to unconstitutional racial gerrymandering.⁷

Other common concepts

The Ohio Redistricting Commission and the General Assembly might consider other district-drawing concepts in creating district maps, so long as the constitutional requirements are met. For example, some states use criteria such as preserving communities of interest in a single district or maintaining previous district lines to the extent feasible. The National Conference of State Legislatures offers several useful references on these topics, including a 50-state survey of redistricting criteria and [The Redistricting Glossary](#).⁸

Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases

The following cases represent a sample of the landmark U.S. Supreme Court rulings on congressional and state legislative redistricting. This list is intended to provide a basic foundation for understanding some of the legal discussions surrounding redistricting. However, the list is not exhaustive, and it does not include later rulings that have added nuance to these decisions.

Population equality

- *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964) – Held that the population of congressional districts in the same state must be as nearly equal as practicable.
- *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964) – Specified that the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment requires states to draw legislative districts that are substantially equal in population.
- *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) – Held that congressional districts must be mathematically equal in population, except as necessary to achieve a legitimate state objective.

Racial and language minorities

- *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986) – Held that the VRA requires that a majority-minority district be drawn to remedy minority vote dilution if (1) the racial or language minority group is “sufficiently numerous and compact to form a majority in a single-member district,” (2) the minority group is “politically cohesive,” meaning its members tend to vote similarly, and (3) the “majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it . . . usually to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate.”

⁷ *Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146 (1993); *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996); *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899 (1996); and *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama*, 135 S.Ct. 1257 (2015).


⁸ National Conference of State Legislatures, [NCSL’s Redistricting Webpages](#).

- *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993) – Held that districts violate the Equal Protection Clause if they cannot be explained on grounds other than race.
- *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900 (1995) – Specified that a district is unconstitutionally racially gerrymandered if race is the “predominant” factor in drawing its lines.
- *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996) – Found that if race was the predominant factor in drawing a district, the district cannot be justified by the VRA unless there is a strong basis in evidence that drawing the district was reasonably necessary to avoid denying or abridging equal voting rights.

Partisan gerrymandering

- *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 139 S.Ct. 2484 (2019) – Found that partisan gerrymandering represents a political question on which the federal courts cannot rule because there is no credible way to define and measure fairness in the political context.

Proposal Overview of Senate Districts




Commission Overview of Senate Districts




NW Ohio

Proposal (1 Dem District)




Commission (1 Dem District)




NE Ohio

Proposal (5 Dem Districts)




Commission (3 Dem Districts)




Central Ohio

Proposal (4 Dem)




Commission (3 Dem)




SW Ohio

Proposal (3 Dem)



Commission (1 Dem)





OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING

TO:: Members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission

FROM: Speaker Robert Cupp, Co-Chair
Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair

DATE: Tuesday, September 14, 2021

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Ohio House Finance Hearing Room (Room 313)
Ohio Statehouse
1 Capitol Square
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4275

(The Commission will receive testimony onsite in Columbus)

Washington State Community College
Arts & Science Building, Auditorium
710 Colegate Drive
Marietta, Ohio 45750

Map: <https://www.wscc.edu/about/campus-map/>

(The Commission will also receive testimony remotely that is offered onsite in Marietta)

AGENDA

The Ohio Redistricting Commission will meet to hear public testimony on the Commission's introduced state redistricting plan pursuant to Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.

Senate Contact: Giulia Cambieri, (614) 644-5533

House Contact: Aaron Mulvey, (614) 466-8759

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|----|
| 1 | ✓ | Nazeena | Alvi | | self | |
| 2 | ✓ | Dean | Barbo | | self | |
| 3 | ✓ | Amina | Barhumi | | self | |
| 4 | ✓ | Katie | Barnes | | self | |
| 5 | ✓ | Nick | Bates | | self | |
| 6 | ✓ | Cathy | Becker | | self | NO |
| 7 | ✓ | Lonnie | Bowling | | self | |
| 8 | ✓ | Rachel | Bownman | | Our Future Ohio | |
| 9 | ✓ | Jeniece | Brock | | self Vice Chair OCKC | |
| 10 | ✓ | Kathryn | Brown | | self | |
| 11 | ✓ | Phillip | Brown | | self | NO |
| 12 | ✓ | Maria | Bruno | Public Policy Director | Equality Ohio | |
| 13 | ✓ | Akii | Butler | | self | |
| 14 | ✓ | Brian | Campbell | | self | |
| 15 | ✓ | Juliet | Cattaneo | | self | |
| 16 | ✓ | Susan | Cavanaugh | | self | |
| 17 | ✓ | Kobe | Christian | | self | |
| 18 | ✓ | Janet | Ciccone | | self | |
| 19 | | Alex | Clark | | Self | NO |
| 20 | | Cheryl | Claypoole-Beall | | self | NO |
| 21 | | Caroline | Cook | | self | NO |
| 22 | | | | | | |
| 23 | ✓ | Terrilyn | Copeland | | self | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----|
| 24 | ✓ | Tony | D/Ambrosio | | self | |
| 25 | ✓ | Tala | Dahbour | | self | NO |
| 26 | ✓ | Tony | D'Ambrosio | | self | |
| 27 | ✓ | Scott | DiMauro | President | Ohio Education Association | |
| 28 | ✓ | Mary | Earle | | | |
| 29 | ✓ | Pamela | Easterday | | self | |
| 30 | ✓ | Karen | Elliott | | self | |
| 31 | ✓ | Kristina | English | | self | |
| 32 | ✓ | Josh | Flory | | self | |
| 33 | ✓ | Kelley | Freeman | State Field Manager | NARAL Pro-Choice Ohio | |
| 34 | ✓ | Kelley | Freeman | | self | |
| 35 | ✓ | Ismael | Gad | | self | NO |
| 36 | ✓ | John | Gray | | self | |
| 37 | ✓ | Sam | Gresham | | self Chair Common Cause | |
| 38 | ✓ | Richard | Gunter | | self | |
| 39 | ✓ | Carolyn | Gutjahr | | self | NO |
| 40 | ✓ | Ruth | Hardy | | self | |
| 41 | ✓ | Brad | Henry | | self | |
| 42 | ✓ | Donna | Hermann | | self | |
| 43 | ✓ | Jona | Hilario | | self | |
| 44 | ✓ | Derrick | Holmes | Rev. | self | |
| 45 | ✓ | Caitlin | Johnson | | Policy Matters Ohio | |
| 46 | ✓ | Laura | Joseph | | self | |
| 47 | ✓ | Joel L. | King | Rev. | self | |
| 48 | ✓ | Mitchell | Kingsley | | self | |
| 49 | ✓ | Michael & Connie | Kline | | self | |

44
SS

25 - Competitive
74 41 - R
Remainder 32 - D

45-SS (~~46-5~~ 48-52)
Common Cause favors
7 more days.

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 50 | ✓ | Richard | Kunkel | | self | |
| 51 | ✓ | Mia | Lewis | miss deadline. | self | Common Cause Ohio |
| 52 | | Zaiba | Malik | ↳ another week | self | NO |
| 53 | | Carolyn | Manda | | self | |
| 54 | | Kevin | Mayhood | | self | |
| 55 | | Wendy | Mizanin | | self | NO |
| 56 | ✓ | Greg | Moore | | self | |
| 57 | | Meryl | Neiman | | self | |
| 58 | ✓ | David | Niven | | self | |
| 59 | ✓ | David | Pepper | | self | |
| 60 | ✓ | Dawna | Peterson | | self | |
| 61 | ✓ | David | Pickut | | self | |
| 62 | ✓ | Rima | Rizek | | self | |
| 63 | ✓ | Tom | Roberts | | self | |
| 64 | ✓ | Erin | Ryan | Managing Director | Women's Public Policy Network | |
| 65 | ✓ | Debra | Saunders | | self | |
| 66 | ✓ | Debbie | Schmieding | | self | |
| 67 | ✓ | Molly | Shack | | self | Ohio Org. Collaborative |
| 68 | ✓ | Katy | Shanahan | <u>Don't miss deadline</u> | self | All on the Line |
| 69 | ✓ | Gwendolyn | Short | | self | |
| 70 | ✓ | Harriet | Slive | | self | |
| 71 | ✓ | Samina | Sohail | | self | |
| 72 | ✓ | Percy | Squire | Counsel | Armour v Ohio plaintiffs (1991) 175 F.Supp. — | 15th A VRA |
| 73 | ✓ | K. (Cheena) | Srinivasan | | self | |
| 74 | ✓ | Melissa | Sull | | self | |
| 75 | ✓ | Paul | Szymanowski | | self | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|---------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----|----|
| 76 | ✓ | Chris | Tavenor | | self | OEC | |
| 77 | ✓ | Richard | Topper | | self | | |
| 78 | ✓ | Louise | Valentine | | self | | NO |
| 79 | ✓ | Joan | Van Becalaere | Rev | self | | NO |
| 80 | ✓ | Stiepan | Vlahovich | | self | | |
| 81 | ✓ | Sarah | Warner | | self | | NO |
| 82 | ✓ | Andre | Washington | | self | | |
| 83 | ✓ | Thomas | West | President | Ohio Legislative Black Caucus | | |
| 84 | ✓ | Andrea | Yagoda | | self | | |
| 85 | ✓ | Jay | Zenitsky | | self | | |
| 86 | ✓ | Susan | Linden | | self | | NO |
| 87 | ✓ | Ruth | Hanley | | | | |
| 88 | ✓ | Anesa | Miller | | | | |
| | ✓ | Teresa | Fedor | Sen. | | | |
| | ✓ | John | Caruso | | | | |
| | ✓ | Jeff | Seaver | | | | |
| | ✓ | Stephen | Steele | | | | |

Michael Ahern


Timothy O'Hanlon


Travis Martin


Jen Miller


Monica ~~Lira~~ Lira
Mindy Hedges


- horse D. 24 in Hamilton County




















Testimony Before the Ohio Redistricting Commission, September 14, 2021

Good morning.

I am Richard Gunther, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Ohio State University. I am also one of the five negotiators who produced a draft of what is now Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.

I am here in my capacities as a political scientist with considerable experience in redistricting, as a co-author of the constitutional provisions that are to be followed in drawing new House and Senate district lines, and as a member of the OCRC who participated in creating the House and Senate maps that we are considering today.

In creating these maps, we followed the relevant criteria set forth in the Ohio Constitution following the 2015 redistricting reforms. The maps that we are presenting to you today strictly adhered to and meet all of these criteria.

First, as required in Section 3(B) the districts for both the Ohio House and Senate are all roughly equal in population size. None of them deviates from the relevant ratio of representation by more than the 5 percent allowed by the Constitution.

Second, in compliance with rules relating to the splitting of counties, townships and municipalities, as set forth in Sections 3(C) and 3(D), considerable effort went into the preservation of political subdivisions and communities of interest.

Indeed, we went far beyond what is normally expected of redistricting processes by undertaking a rigorous assessment of what communities the voters of Ohio wanted to remain intact. This involved nine public meetings with 494 Ohio citizens between May 13 and August 27 of this year at which they discussed their preferences in considerable detail. This was followed by the submission of 2,350 maps by Ohio citizens of their respective neighborhoods and preferences for district boundaries. While it was not always possible to reconcile those preferences with the requirements of the Ohio constitution, we made more of an effort to respect these wishes than is characteristic of most other redistricting processes.

Moreover, we strictly adhered to all of the rules relating to the splitting of counties, townships and municipalities that are set forth in Sections 3(C) and 3(D) of Article XI. These splitting decisions are described in considerable detail in the report that we are submitting to the Ohio Redistricting Commission. Our maps include not one single violation of those requirements.

Third, we strictly adhered to the requirements set forth in Section 6(B), which states that "The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party shall correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio."

In the five general elections that have taken place over the past decade, Republican candidates for President, U.S. Senator, Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor, Attorney General and Treasurer have received 54.2% of the two-party vote share cast by Ohio voters, while Democratic candidates for those offices have received 45.8% of the two party vote share.

To ensure that the partisan makeup of Ohio's districts mirrors the partisan preferences of Ohio's voters, the statewide map should include approximately 54 districts whose voters lean towards the

Republican party (54.5%), and 45 that lean Democratic (45.5%), and for the Senate, there should be 18 districts leaning Republican (54.5%) and 15 Democratic. (45.5%).

How does our map stack up against this constitutional requirement? Among the 99 House districts, 55 (or 55.6%) include voters who have supported Republican candidates over the past decade, while 44 (or 44.4%) have leaned Democratic.

With regard to Senate districts, 18 (or 54.5%) lean Republican and 15 (45.5%) lean Democratic. Both of these sets of district boundaries are remarkably close to the partisan orientations reflected in the votes cast for the two parties over the previous decade.

Accordingly, this map does not favor one party over the other and we are in full compliance with section 6(A) which states “No general assembly district plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party.”


The merits of our plan with regard to minority representation will be discussed more extensively by my OCRC colleague Tom Roberts, President of the Ohio State Conference of the NAACP.

But at this point let me summarize by pointing out that in drawing district boundaries considerable effort was made in locating communities of color in districts that avoid packing and cracking. Accordingly, our House map creates 15 districts with a substantial ability for Black voters to influence election outcomes and be represented electorally, and 6 Senate seats where the same is true.


The final criterion [Section 6(C)] calls for the creation of compact districts. Given the absence of agreed upon indicators of compactness, we rely upon the eyeball test and common sense in judging the maps that we include in the Appendix. As can be seen, the overwhelming majority of districts are, indeed, compact.

Overall, our map does an excellent job of complying with each and every criterion set forth in the Ohio Constitution. It is not a Democratic map. It is not a Republican map. It is fair map that will allow the voters of Ohio to elect representatives who accurately reflect their political preferences. We urge you to adopt this as the institutional framework for electoral competition in Ohio over the next decade.


Bronzeville (60P1+3)




LINDEN (Sykes 3+5)




S. LINDEN (sykes 3+5)




E. LIVINGSTON (GOP 1+2)




E. LIVINGSTON (sykes 3+12)




Hilltop (60P 1+6)



Hilltop (sykes 8+9)




Dayton
Fairview / Riverdale (sykes 35 + 38)




Cinci

Kennedy HTS (GOP 25 + 27)



Cinci
Kennedy HTS (sykes 25 + 27)



Article XI, Section 1 | Ohio Redistricting Commission

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

(A) The Ohio redistricting commission shall be responsible for the redistricting of this state for the general assembly. The commission shall consist of the following seven members:

- (1) The governor;
- (2) The auditor of state;
- (3) The secretary of state;
- (4) One person appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives;
- (5) One person appointed by the legislative leader of the largest political party in the house of representatives of which the speaker of the house of representatives is not a member;
- (6) One person appointed by the president of the senate; and
- (7) One person appointed by the legislative leader of the largest political party in the senate of which the president of the senate is not a member.

No appointed member of the commission shall be a current member of congress.

The legislative leaders in the senate and the house of representatives of each of the two largest political parties represented in the general assembly, acting jointly by political party,

shall appoint a member of the commission to serve as a co-chairperson of the commission.

(B)(1) Unless otherwise specified in this article or in Article XIX of this constitution, a simple majority of the commission members shall be required for any action by the commission.

(2)(a) Except as otherwise provided in division (B)(2)(b) of this section, a majority vote of the members of the commission, including at least one member of the commission who is a member of each of the two largest political parties represented in the general assembly, shall be required to do any of the following:

- (i) Adopt rules of the commission;
- (ii) Hire staff for the commission;
- (iii) Expend funds.

(b) If the commission is unable to agree, by the vote required under division (B)(2)(a) of this section, on the manner in which funds should be expended, each co-chairperson of the commission shall have the authority to expend one-half of the funds that have been appropriated to the commission.

(3) The affirmative vote of four members of the commission, including at least two members of the commission who represent each of the two largest political parties represented in the general assembly shall be required to adopt any general assembly district plan. For the purposes of this division and of Section 1 of Article XIX of this constitution, a member of the commission shall be considered to represent a political party if the member was appointed to the commission by a member of that political party or if, in the case of the governor, the auditor of state, or the secretary of state, the member is a member of that political party.

(C) At the first meeting of the commission, which the governor shall convene only in a year ending in the numeral one, except as provided in Sections 8 and 9 of this article and in Sections 1 and 3 of Article XIX of this constitution, the commission shall set a schedule for the adoption of procedural rules for the operation of the commission.

The commission shall release to the public a proposed general assembly district plan for the boundaries for each of the ninety-nine house of representatives districts and the thirty-three senate districts. The commission shall draft the proposed plan in the manner prescribed in this article. Before adopting, but after introducing, a proposed plan, the commission shall conduct a minimum of three public hearings across the state to present the proposed plan and shall seek public input regarding the proposed plan. All meetings of the commission shall be open to the public. Meetings shall be broadcast by electronic means of transmission using a medium readily accessible by the general public.

The commission shall adopt a final general assembly district plan not later than the first day of September of a year ending in the numeral one. After the commission adopts a final plan, the commission shall promptly file the plan with the secretary of state. Upon filing with the secretary of state, the plan shall become effective.

Four weeks after the adoption of a general assembly district plan or a congressional district plan, whichever is later, the commission shall be automatically dissolved.

(D) The general assembly shall be responsible for making the appropriations it determines necessary in order for the commission to perform its duties under this article and Article XIX of this constitution.

Article XI, Section 2 | Representation

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

Each house of representatives district shall be entitled to a single representative in each general assembly. Each senate district shall be entitled to a single senator in each general assembly.

Article XI, Section 3 | Requirements for drawing House of Representatives districts

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

(A) The whole population of the state, as determined by the federal decennial census or, if such is unavailable, such other basis as the general assembly may direct, shall be divided by the number "ninety-nine" and by the number "thirty-three" and the quotients shall be the ratio of representation in the house of representatives and in the senate, respectively, for ten years next succeeding such redistricting.

(B) A general assembly district plan shall comply with all of the requirements of division (B) of this section.

(1) The population of each house of representatives district shall be substantially equal to the ratio of representation in the house of representatives, and the population of each senate district shall be substantially equal to the ratio of representation in the senate, as provided in division (A) of this section. In no event shall any district contain a population of less than ninety-five per cent nor more than one hundred five per cent of the applicable ratio of representation.

(2) Any general assembly district plan adopted by the commission shall comply with all applicable provisions of the constitutions of Ohio and the United States and of federal law.

(3) Every general assembly district shall be composed of contiguous territory, and the boundary of each district shall be a single nonintersecting continuous line.

(C) House of representatives districts shall be created and numbered in the following order

of priority, to the extent that such order is consistent with the foregoing standards:

(1) Proceeding in succession from the largest to the smallest, each county containing population greater than one hundred five per cent of the ratio of representation in the house of representatives shall be divided into as many house of representatives districts as it has whole ratios of representation. Any fraction of the population in excess of a whole ratio shall be a part of only one adjoining house of representatives district.

(2) Each county containing population of not less than ninety-five per cent of the ratio of representation in the house of representatives nor more than one hundred five per cent of the ratio shall be designated a representative district.

(3) The remaining territory of the state shall be divided into representative districts by combining the areas of counties, municipal corporations, and townships. Where feasible, no county shall be split more than once.

(D)(1)(a) Except as otherwise provided in divisions (D)(1)(b) and (c) of this section, a county, municipal corporation, or township is considered to be split if any contiguous portion of its territory is not contained entirely within one district.

(b) If a municipal corporation or township has territory in more than one county, the contiguous portion of that municipal corporation or township that lies in each county shall be considered to be a separate municipal corporation or township for the purposes of this section.

(c) If a municipal corporation or township that is located in a county that contains a municipal corporation or township that has a population of more than one ratio of representation is split for the purpose of complying with division (E)(1)(a) or (b) of this

section, each portion of that municipal corporation or township shall be considered to be a separate municipal corporation or township for the purposes of this section.

(2) Representative districts shall be drawn so as to split the smallest possible number of municipal corporations and townships whose contiguous portions contain a population of more than fifty per cent, but less than one hundred per cent, of one ratio of representation.

(3) Where the requirements of divisions (B), (C), and (D) of this section cannot feasibly be attained by forming a representative district from whole municipal corporations and townships, not more than one municipal corporation or township may be split per representative district.

(E)(1) If it is not possible for the commission to comply with all of the requirements of divisions (B), (C), and (D) of this section in drawing a particular representative district, the commission shall take the first action listed below that makes it possible for the commission to draw that district:

(a) Notwithstanding division (D)(3) of this section, the commission shall create the district by splitting two municipal corporations or townships whose contiguous portions do not contain a population of more than fifty per cent, but less than one hundred per cent, of one ratio of representation.

(b) Notwithstanding division (D)(2) of this section, the commission shall create the district by splitting a municipal corporation or township whose contiguous portions contain a population of more than fifty per cent, but less than one hundred per cent, of one ratio of representation.

(c) Notwithstanding division (C)(2) of this section, the commission shall create the district

by splitting, once, a single county that contains a population of not less than ninety-five per cent of the ratio of representation, but not more than one hundred five per cent of the ratio of representation.

(d) Notwithstanding division (C)(1) of this section, the commission shall create the district by including in two districts portions of the territory that remains after a county that contains a population of more than one hundred five per cent of the ratio of representation has been divided into as many house of representatives districts as it has whole ratios of representation.

(2) If the commission takes an action under division (E)(1) of this section, the commission shall include in the general assembly district plan a statement explaining which action the commission took under that division and the reason the commission took that action.

(3) If the commission complies with divisions (E)(1) and (2) of this section in drawing a district, the commission shall not be considered to have violated division (C)(1), (C)(2), (D)(2), or (D)(3) of this section, as applicable, in drawing that district, for the purpose of an analysis under division (D) of Section 9 of this article.

Article XI, Section 4 | Requirements for drawing Senate districts

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

(A) Senate districts shall be composed of three contiguous house of representatives districts.

(B)(1) A county having at least one whole senate ratio of representation shall have as many senate districts wholly within the boundaries of the county as it has whole senate ratios of representation. Any fraction of the population in excess of a whole ratio shall be a part of only one adjoining senate district.

(2) Counties having less than one senate ratio of representation, but at least one house of representatives ratio of representation, shall be part of only one senate district.

(3) If it is not possible for the commission to draw representative districts that comply with all of the requirements of this article and that make it possible for the commission to comply with all of the requirements of divisions (B)(1) and (2) of this section, the commission shall draw senate districts so as to commit the fewest possible violations of those divisions. If the commission complies with this division in drawing senate districts, the commission shall not be considered to have violated division (B)(1) or (2) of this section, as applicable, in drawing those districts, for the purpose of an analysis under division (D) of Section 9 of this article.

(C) The number of whole ratios of representation for a county shall be determined by dividing the population of the county by the ratio of representation in the senate determined under division (A) of Section 3 of this article.

(D) Senate districts shall be numbered from one through thirty-three and as provided in Section 5 of this article.

Article XI, Section 5 | Changes in boundaries of Senate districts

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

At any time the boundaries of senate districts are changed in any general assembly district plan made pursuant to any provision of this article, a senator whose term will not expire within two years of the time the plan becomes effective shall represent, for the remainder of the term for which the senator was elected, the senate district that contains the largest portion of the population of the district from which the senator was elected, and the district shall be given the number of the district from which the senator was elected. If more than one senator whose term will not so expire would represent the same district by following the provisions of this section, the plan shall designate which senator shall represent the district and shall designate which district the other senator or senators shall represent for the balance of their term or terms.

Article XI, Section 6 | Additional district standards

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

The Ohio redistricting commission shall attempt to draw a general assembly district plan that meets all of the following standards:

(A) No general assembly district plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party.

(B) The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party shall correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

(C) General assembly districts shall be compact.

Nothing in this section permits the commission to violate the district standards described in Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7 of this article.

Article XI, Section 7 | Political subdivision boundaries to be used

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

Notwithstanding the fact that boundaries of counties, municipal corporations, and townships within a district may be changed, district boundaries shall be created by using the boundaries of counties, municipal corporations, and townships as they exist at the time of the federal decennial census on which the redistricting is based, or, if unavailable, on such other basis as the general assembly has directed.

Article XI, Section 8 | Impasse procedure

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

(A)(1) If the Ohio redistricting commission fails to adopt a final general assembly district plan not later than the first day of September of a year ending in the numeral one, in accordance with Section 1 of this article, the commission shall introduce a proposed general assembly district plan by a simple majority vote of the commission.

(2) After introducing a proposed general assembly district plan under division (A)(1) of this section, the commission shall hold a public hearing concerning the proposed plan, at which the public may offer testimony and at which the commission may adopt amendments to the proposed plan. Members of the commission should attend the hearing; however, only a quorum of the members of the commission is required to conduct the hearing.

(3) After the hearing described in division (A)(2) of this section is held, and not later than the fifteenth day of September of a year ending in the numeral one, the commission shall adopt a final general assembly district plan, either by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B)(3) of Section 1 of this article or by a simple majority vote of the commission.

(B) If the commission adopts a final general assembly district plan in accordance with division (A)(3) of this section by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B)(3) of Section 1 of this article, the plan shall take effect upon filing with the secretary of state and shall remain effective until the next year ending in the numeral one, except as provided in Section 9 of this article.

(C)(1)(a) Except as otherwise provided in division (C)(1)(b) of this section, if the commission adopts a final general assembly district plan in accordance with division (A)(3) of this section by a simple majority vote of the commission, and not by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B)(3) of Section 1 of this article, the plan shall take effect upon filing with the secretary of state and shall remain effective until two general elections for the house of representatives have occurred under the plan.

(b) If the commission adopts a final general assembly district plan in accordance with division (A)(3) of this section by a simple majority vote of the commission, and not by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B) of Section 1 of this article, and that plan is adopted to replace a plan that ceased to be effective under division (C)(1)(a) of this section before a year ending in the numeral one, the plan adopted under this division shall take effect upon filing with the secretary of state and shall remain effective until a year ending in the numeral one, except as provided in Section 9 of this article.

(2) A final general assembly district plan adopted under division (C)(1)(a) or (b) of this section shall include a statement explaining what the commission determined to be the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio and the manner in which the statewide proportion of districts in the plan whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party corresponds closely to those preferences, as described in division (B) of Section 6 of this article. At the time the plan is adopted, a member of the commission who does not vote in favor of the plan may submit a declaration of the member's opinion concerning the statement included with the plan.

(D) After a general assembly district plan adopted under division (C)(1)(a) of this section ceases to be effective, and not earlier than the first day of July of the year following the year in which the plan ceased to be effective, the commission shall be reconstituted as provided

in Section 1 of this article, convene, and adopt a new general assembly district plan in accordance with this article, to be used until the next time for redistricting under this article. The commission shall draw the new general assembly district plan using the same population and county, municipal corporation, and township boundary data as were used to draw the previous plan adopted under division (C) of this section.

Article XI, Section 9 | Jurisdiction of Supreme Court; effect of determination of unconstitutionality

Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting

Effective: 2021

(A) The supreme court of Ohio shall have exclusive, original jurisdiction in all cases arising under this article.

(B) In the event that any section of this constitution relating to redistricting, any general assembly district plan made by the Ohio redistricting commission, or any district is determined to be invalid by an unappealed final order of a court of competent jurisdiction then, notwithstanding any other provisions of this constitution, the commission shall be reconstituted as provided in Section 1 of this article, convene, and ascertain and determine a general assembly district plan in conformity with such provisions of this constitution as are then valid, including establishing terms of office and election of members of the general assembly from districts designated in the plan, to be used until the next time for redistricting under this article in conformity with such provisions of this constitution as are then valid.

(C) Notwithstanding any provision of this constitution or any law regarding the residence of senators and representatives, a general assembly district plan made pursuant to this section shall allow thirty days for persons to change residence in order to be eligible for election.

(D)(1) No court shall order, in any circumstance, the implementation or enforcement of any general assembly district plan that has not been approved by the commission in the manner prescribed by this article.

(2) No court shall order the commission to adopt a particular general assembly district plan

or to draw a particular district.

(3) If the supreme court of Ohio determines that a general assembly district plan adopted by the commission does not comply with the requirements of Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7 of this article, the available remedies shall be as follows:

(a) If the court finds that the plan contains one or more isolated violations of those requirements, the court shall order the commission to amend the plan to correct the violation.

(b) If the court finds that it is necessary to amend not fewer than six house of representatives districts to correct violations of those requirements, to amend not fewer than two senate districts to correct violations of those requirements, or both, the court shall declare the plan invalid and shall order the commission to adopt a new general assembly district plan in accordance with this article.

(c) If, in considering a plan adopted under division (C) of Section 8 of this article, the court determines that both of the following are true, the court shall order the commission to adopt a new general assembly district plan in accordance with this article:

(i) The plan significantly violates those requirements in a manner that materially affects the ability of the plan to contain districts whose voters favor political parties in an overall proportion that corresponds closely to the statewide political party preferences of the voters of Ohio, as described in division (B) of Section 6 of this article.


(ii) The statewide proportion of districts in the plan whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party does not correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.


Article XI, Section 10 | Severability


Ohio Constitution / Article XI General Assembly Redistricting


Effective: 2021


The various provisions of this article are intended to be severable, and the invalidity of one or more of such provisions shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions.






















House ^D42 | 57
 Sen 13 | 20

Proposal Overview




Commission Overview




NE Ohio

Proposal



19 Dem Districts


Commission



14 Dem Districts


Cuyahoga County

Proposal



10 Dem Districts
(D23 split between Summit and Geauga)


Commission



9 Dem Districts (w/ #15 on the edge)


Lorain County

Proposal



1 Dem District


Commission



1 Dem District


Summit and Portage County

Proposal



4 Dem Districts
(blue part D23 in the North is shared with Cuyahoga County)


Commission



2 Dem Districts


Stark County

Proposal



1 Dem District (D+6.6%)


Commission



1 Dem District (D+3.2%)


Trumbull and Mahoning County

Proposal



2 Dem Districts


Commission



1 Dem District


Franklin County

Proposal



12 Dem Districts (w/ Pickaway)


Commission



10 Dem Districts


Hamilton County

Proposal



5 Dem Districts


Commission



4 Dem Districts


Montgomery County

Proposal



3 Dem Districts


Commission



1 Dem District


Lucas County

Proposal






3 Dem Districts

Commission

















































3 Dem Districts


































| Population | | | Shapes | | Partisan Lean | | |
|------------|---------|--------|---|---|---------------|--------|------|
| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | 01 |
| Un | 0 | | | | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 1 | 350,024 | -2.11% | ✓ | ✓ | 26.03% | 71.01% | 2.96 |
| 2 | 348,113 | -2.64% | ✓ | ✓ | 43.58% | 53.68% | 2.74 |
| 3 | 346,752 | -3.02% | ✓ | ✓ | 52.54% | 45.06% | 2.39 |
| 4 | 368,937 | 3.18% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.86% | 61.89% | 2.25 |
| 5 | 361,748 | 1.17% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.38% | 62.28% | 2.33 |
| 6 | 362,191 | 1.30% | ✓ | ✓ | 48.68% | 48.77% | 2.55 |
| 7 | 358,623 | 0.30% | ✓ | ✓ | 34.72% | 63.05% | 2.23 |
| 8 | 342,514 | -4.21% | ✓ | ✓ | 40.65% | 57.16% | 2.19 |
| 9 | 371,839 | 3.99% | ✓ | ✓ | 71.89% | 25.77% | 2.33 |
| 10 | 347,791 | -2.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 36.38% | 61.06% | 2.57 |
| 11 | 342,626 | -4.18% | ✓ | ✓ | 62.60% | 34.52% | 2.88 |
| 12 | 348,862 | -2.43% | ✓ | ✓ | 24.18% | 73.25% | 2.57 |
| 13 | 371,529 | 3.91% | ✓ | ✓ | 47.03% | 50.26% | 2.71 |
| 14 | 353,762 | -1.06% | ✓ | ✓ | 28.59% | 69.09% | 2.32 |
| 15 | 347,161 | -2.91% | ✓ | ✓ | 78.67% | 19.16% | 2.17 |
| 16 | 341,322 | -4.54% | ✓ | ✓ | 46.03% | 51.73% | 2.23 |
| 17 | 351,380 | -1.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 28.87% | 68.88% | 2.25 |
| 18 | 374,237 | 4.66% | ✓ | ✓ | 40.94% | 56.45% | 2.62 |
| 19 | 341,395 | -4.52% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.94% | 61.81% | 2.25 |
| 20 | 367,328 | 2.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 33.40% | 64.22% | 2.39 |
| 21 | 371,242 | 3.83% | ✓ | ✓ | 76.30% | 22.07% | 1.63 |
| 22 | 351,811 | -1.61% | ✓ | ✓ | 34.32% | 63.13% | 2.55 |



| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | Op |
|----|----------------|--------------|---|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| 18 | 374,237 | 4.66% | ✓ | ✓ | 40.94% | 56.45% | 2.62 |
| 19 | 341,395 | -4.52% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.94% | 61.81% | 2.25 |
| 20 | 367,328 | 2.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 33.40% | 64.22% | 2.39 |
| 21 | 371,242 | 3.83% | ✓ | ✓ | 76.30% | 22.07% | 1.63 |
| 22 | 351,811 | -1.61% | ✓ | ✓ | 34.32% | 63.13% | 2.55 |
| 23 | 372,971 | 4.31% | ✓ | ✓ | 81.71% | 15.98% | 2.31 |
| 24 | 372,031 | 4.05% | ✓ | ✓ | 52.30% | 45.23% | 2.47 |
| 25 | 351,356 | -1.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 66.63% | 30.93% | 2.44 |
| 26 | 352,334 | -1.46% | ✓ | ✓ | 32.41% | 64.48% | 3.11 |
| 27 | 372,061 | 4.06% | ✓ | ✓ | 45.46% | 52.50% | 2.05 |
| 28 | 368,277 | 3.00% | ✓ | ✓ | 57.51% | 39.98% | 2.51 |
| 29 | 354,275 | -0.92% | ✓ | ✓ | 41.81% | 55.48% | 2.71 |
| 30 | 370,381 | 3.59% | ✓ | ✓ | 36.41% | 61.06% | 2.53 |
| 31 | 343,595 | -3.91% | ✓ | ✓ | 33.12% | 64.25% | 2.63 |
| 32 | 363,756 | 1.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 46.54% | 50.85% | 2.60 |
| 33 | 357,212 | -0.10% | ✓ | ✓ | 44.05% | 53.61% | 2.34 |
| | 357,559 | 9.21% | ✓ | ✓ | 45.25% | 52.31% | 2.44 |







Notes



- The 9.21% population deviation is within the 10% threshold tolerated by the courts.
- Eighteen districts lean Republican, seven lean Democratic, and eight fall in the 45–55% competitive range.
- There are three majority-minority districts.


| Population | | | Shapes | | Partisan Lean | | |
|------------|---------|--------|---|---|---------------|--------|-------|
| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | Other |
| Un | 0 | | | | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 1 | 115,498 | -3.09% |  |  | 78.10% | 19.63% | 2.28 |
| 2 | 117,559 | -1.37% |  |  | 75.10% | 22.81% | 2.09 |
| 3 | 114,104 | -4.26% |  |  | 83.28% | 14.60% | 2.12 |
| 4 | 114,500 | -3.93% |  |  | 52.01% | 45.85% | 2.14 |
| 5 | 116,735 | -2.06% |  |  | 53.05% | 44.55% | 2.41 |
| 6 | 115,517 | -3.08% |  |  | 52.81% | 44.39% | 2.80 |
| 7 | 115,170 | -3.37% |  |  | 73.34% | 23.94% | 2.72 |
| 8 | 115,189 | -3.35% |  |  | 61.23% | 36.40% | 2.38 |
| 9 | 120,997 | 1.52% |  |  | 66.14% | 31.64% | 2.22 |
| 10 | 113,326 | -4.92% |  |  | 43.95% | 53.70% | 2.35 |
| 11 | 114,236 | -4.15% |  |  | 53.91% | 44.03% | 2.06 |
| 12 | 113,760 | -4.55% |  |  | 39.17% | 58.51% | 2.31 |
| 13 | 124,554 | 4.50% |  |  | 69.89% | 27.32% | 2.79 |
| 14 | 123,319 | 3.47% |  |  | 89.53% | 8.58% | 1.89 |
| 15 | 125,088 | 4.95% |  |  | 49.12% | 48.11% | 2.77 |
| 16 | 121,879 | 2.26% |  |  | 52.18% | 45.77% | 2.05 |
| 17 | 124,819 | 4.73% |  |  | 42.28% | 55.79% | 1.93 |
| 18 | 125,064 | 4.93% |  |  | 55.54% | 41.78% | 2.68 |
| 19 | 124,679 | 4.61% |  |  | 71.01% | 27.26% | 1.73 |
| 20 | 125,098 | 4.96% |  |  | 85.67% | 12.08% | 2.25 |
| 21 | 121,930 | 2.30% |  |  | 85.67% | 12.93% | 1.40 |
| 22 | 124,633 | 4.57% |  |  | 71.58% | 26.65% | 1.77 |


| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | Op |
|----|---------|--------|---|---|--------|--------|------|
| 22 | 124,633 | 4.57% |  |  | 71.58% | 26.65% | 1.77 |
| 23 | 122,775 | 3.01% |  |  | 48.99% | 49.14% | 1.87 |
| 24 | 123,469 | 3.59% |  |  | 71.31% | 26.11% | 2.57 |
| 25 | 123,568 | 3.68% |  |  | 78.46% | 19.52% | 2.01 |
| 26 | 124,802 | 4.71% |  |  | 65.78% | 31.74% | 2.48 |
| 27 | 116,286 | -2.43% |  |  | 42.51% | 55.37% | 2.12 |
| 28 | 114,050 | -4.31% |  |  | 51.13% | 46.74% | 2.13 |
| 29 | 114,653 | -3.80% |  |  | 43.63% | 54.21% | 2.16 |
| 30 | 113,811 | -4.51% |  |  | 27.83% | 69.90% | 2.27 |
| 31 | 124,467 | 4.43% |  |  | 44.97% | 52.68% | 2.35 |
| 32 | 122,679 | 2.93% |  |  | 57.43% | 40.14% | 2.42 |
| 33 | 123,791 | 3.86% |  |  | 62.70% | 34.51% | 2.79 |
| 34 | 121,807 | 2.20% |  |  | 53.88% | 43.73% | 2.38 |
| 35 | 121,171 | 1.67% |  |  | 43.73% | 54.04% | 2.23 |
| 36 | 114,991 | -3.52% |  |  | 48.40% | 48.73% | 2.87 |
| 37 | 125,125 | 4.98% |  |  | 36.55% | 61.21% | 2.24 |
| 38 | 122,075 | 2.42% |  |  | 67.16% | 30.19% | 2.65 |
| 39 | 116,366 | -2.37% |  |  | 37.69% | 60.02% | 2.29 |
| 40 | 113,280 | -4.96% |  |  | 51.20% | 45.88% | 2.92 |
| 41 | 113,996 | -4.35% |  |  | 75.01% | 21.91% | 3.08 |
| 42 | 115,350 | -3.22% |  |  | 65.22% | 32.09% | 2.69 |
| 43 | 115,804 | -2.84% |  |  | 41.88% | 55.69% | 2.43 |


| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | Of |
|----|---------|--------|---|---|--------|--------|------|
| 43 | 115,804 | -2.84% | ✓ | ✓ | 41.88% | 55.69% | 2.43 |
| 44 | 123,479 | 3.60% | ✓ | ✓ | 37.50% | 60.19% | 2.31 |
| 45 | 123,466 | 3.59% | ✓ | ✓ | 36.45% | 61.31% | 2.24 |
| 46 | 121,992 | 2.35% | ✓ | ✓ | 33.64% | 64.14% | 2.22 |
| 47 | 115,739 | -2.89% | ✓ | ✓ | 38.50% | 58.62% | 2.88 |
| | | | | | | | |
| 48 | 113,975 | -4.37% | ✓ | ✓ | 38.06% | 59.46% | 2.48 |
| 49 | 124,561 | 4.51% | ✓ | ✓ | 49.25% | 47.96% | 2.78 |
| 50 | 113,841 | -4.48% | ✓ | ✓ | 32.41% | 64.78% | 2.81 |
| 51 | 125,115 | 4.97% | ✓ | ✓ | 59.88% | 37.17% | 2.95 |
| 52 | 124,642 | 4.58% | ✓ | ✓ | 43.22% | 54.54% | 2.24 |
| 53 | 121,772 | 2.17% | ✓ | ✓ | 40.85% | 56.12% | 3.03 |
| 54 | 121,704 | 2.11% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.34% | 62.31% | 2.35 |
| 55 | 120,633 | 1.21% | ✓ | ✓ | 25.62% | 72.14% | 2.23 |
| 56 | 124,454 | 4.42% | ✓ | ✓ | 44.48% | 53.06% | 2.46 |
| 57 | 124,671 | 4.60% | ✓ | ✓ | 40.16% | 57.24% | 2.60 |
| 58 | 116,292 | -2.43% | ✓ | ✓ | 64.16% | 33.51% | 2.33 |
| 59 | 123,105 | 3.29% | ✓ | ✓ | 40.19% | 57.70% | 2.11 |
| 60 | 113,964 | -4.38% | ✓ | ✓ | 39.51% | 58.42% | 2.07 |
| 61 | 113,860 | -4.47% | ✓ | ✓ | 39.94% | 58.03% | 2.03 |
| 62 | 124,425 | 4.40% | ✓ | ✓ | 30.76% | 66.67% | 2.57 |
| 63 | 113,544 | -4.73% | ✓ | ✓ | 24.43% | 73.20% | 2.36 |

| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | OT |
|----|---------|--------|---|---|--------|--------|------|
| 62 | 124,423 | 4.40% |  |  | 30.70% | 69.07% | 2.37 |
| 63 | 113,544 | -4.73% |  |  | 24.43% | 73.20% | 2.36 |
| 64 | 124,731 | 4.65% |  |  | 53.76% | 43.98% | 2.26 |
| 65 | 117,013 | -1.82% |  |  | 37.17% | 60.14% | 2.70 |
| 66 | 116,342 | -2.39% |  |  | 37.30% | 60.35% | 2.35 |
| 67 | 118,575 | -0.51% |  |  | 33.26% | 64.05% | 2.69 |
| 68 | 115,385 | -3.19% |  |  | 36.06% | 61.45% | 2.48 |
| 69 | 114,369 | -4.04% |  |  | 30.71% | 66.70% | 2.60 |
| 70 | 116,643 | -2.13% |  |  | 35.96% | 61.48% | 2.56 |
| 71 | 115,026 | -3.49% |  |  | 33.09% | 64.26% | 2.65 |
| 72 | 122,012 | 2.37% |  |  | 48.58% | 48.56% | 2.86 |
| 73 | 123,971 | 4.01% |  |  | 39.34% | 58.35% | 2.31 |
| 74 | 121,539 | 1.97% |  |  | 29.15% | 68.42% | 2.43 |
| 75 | 116,122 | -2.57% |  |  | 40.36% | 57.15% | 2.49 |
| 76 | 116,323 | -2.40% |  |  | 45.98% | 50.94% | 3.09 |
| 77 | 124,936 | 4.82% |  |  | 31.80% | 65.48% | 2.72 |
| 78 | 116,894 | -1.92% |  |  | 31.87% | 65.48% | 2.64 |
| 79 | 117,815 | -1.15% |  |  | 30.16% | 67.21% | 2.64 |
| 80 | 124,211 | 4.22% |  |  | 24.92% | 72.60% | 2.47 |
| 81 | 113,487 | -4.78% |  |  | 28.91% | 67.82% | 3.27 |
| 82 | 122,541 | 2.81% |  |  | 24.02% | 73.25% | 2.73 |
| 83 | 113,006 | 4.25% |  |  | 25.22% | 71.76% | 2.81 |

| ID | Total | +/- |  |  | Dem | Rep | Op |
|----|---------|--------|---|---|--------|--------|------|
| 76 | 116,323 | -2.40% | ✓ | ✓ | 45.98% | 50.94% | 3.09 |
| 77 | 124,936 | 4.82% | ✓ | ✓ | 31.80% | 65.48% | 2.72 |
| 78 | 116,894 | -1.92% | ✓ | ✓ | 31.87% | 65.48% | 2.64 |
| 79 | 117,815 | -1.15% | ✓ | ✓ | 30.16% | 67.21% | 2.64 |
| 80 | 124,211 | 4.22% | ✓ | ✓ | 24.92% | 72.60% | 2.47 |
| 81 | 113,487 | -4.78% | ✓ | ✓ | 28.91% | 67.82% | 3.27 |
| 82 | 122,541 | 2.81% | ✓ | ✓ | 24.02% | 73.25% | 2.73 |
| 83 | 113,996 | -4.35% | ✓ | ✓ | 25.33% | 71.76% | 2.91 |
| 84 | 118,816 | -0.31% | ✓ | ✓ | 19.68% | 77.88% | 2.43 |
| 85 | 115,560 | -3.04% | ✓ | ✓ | 25.02% | 72.09% | 2.89 |
| 86 | 114,486 | -3.94% | ✓ | ✓ | 28.36% | 69.24% | 2.40 |
| 87 | 113,433 | -4.83% | ✓ | ✓ | 29.63% | 67.24% | 3.13 |
| 88 | 113,965 | -4.38% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.65% | 60.84% | 3.50 |
| 89 | 115,986 | -2.68% | ✓ | ✓ | 43.18% | 54.08% | 2.74 |
| 90 | 115,793 | -2.85% | ✓ | ✓ | 30.13% | 67.93% | 1.95 |
| 91 | 114,286 | -4.11% | ✓ | ✓ | 23.52% | 74.09% | 2.39 |
| 92 | 119,113 | -0.06% | ✓ | ✓ | 32.49% | 65.28% | 2.23 |
| 93 | 117,981 | -1.01% | ✓ | ✓ | 30.50% | 67.35% | 2.15 |
| 94 | 122,131 | 2.47% | ✓ | ✓ | 43.70% | 53.51% | 2.78 |
| 95 | 124,027 | 4.06% | ✓ | ✓ | 30.43% | 67.10% | 2.47 |
| 96 | 124,223 | 4.23% | ✓ | ✓ | 35.28% | 62.37% | 2.35 |
| 97 | 121,818 | 2.21% | ✓ | ✓ | 31.27% | 66.31% | 2.42 |





high votes re  Effect - show to show
I'm no stranger
- Try valiantly for ^{stay} ^{keep} ^{P. S. 1/2}
a worthwhile cause
I don't like to fail
Strive and spend yourself
for a mission that
matters

- bipartisan compromise
for 10 yr map
- believed all along - but all things
apparently those efforts have
fallen short - not
enough other members willing to ^{keep trying}
- Casting my vote
with great unease
- Fear we'll be
back here very soon

Frank LaRose
Ohio Secretary of State

- shortcomings in this
may be many but
they pale in
comparison to the
the shortcomings in
this process

- Some members worked
in good faith - Others
have not - didn't have
to be this way
- but have soon - task of
- Oct 1st - The process
will be very different

- Boggs / Jerrells
Dist 3 and 1

- Leland / Miller
Dist 7

- Adams / Miranda
Dist 28 and 29

Frank LaRose
Ohio Secretary of State

© GCC/IBT 930 M



House District Thresholds

125,000 High
113,000 Low

57-
20-13

Frank LaRose
Ohio Secretary of State





OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

Minority Report

September 15, 2021

Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair

House Minority Leader Emilia Strong Sykes, Commissioner

The state legislative district plan adopted by the Republican members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission egregiously violates the anti-gerrymandering provisions of the Ohio Constitution. These anti-gerrymandering provisions were enshrined in the Ohio Constitution just six years ago for state legislative districts by the overwhelming majority of Ohio voters. Gerrymandering is defined by the Merriam-Webster dictionary as “the practice of dividing or arranging a territorial unit into election districts in a way that gives one political party an unfair advantage in elections.” Simply put, gerrymandering is partisan unfairness. The Ohio Constitution requires partisan fairness.

Article XI of the Ohio Constitution is clear in its provisions that dictate the drawing of our state legislative maps. It requires that the maps respect the existing boundaries of counties, townships, and municipalities. It also requires that the maps reflect the statewide political preferences of Ohio voters over the previous decade of partisan statewide elections. Unfortunately, the maps adopted by the Commission’s Republican majority today do neither.

Voters never intended for Republicans to draw themselves another ten years of gerrymandered districts and give themselves another decade of unchecked power.

Article XI, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution contains two new elements not met by the Republican drawn district maps. Part (A) and Part (B) of Section 6 are important guardrails, not aspirational goals, which ensure that the main purpose of the reform effort in 2015 is met by the Commission's majority. Districts must be drawn to meet the requirements of the Constitution – taking into account compactness and contiguousness – including the fairness concept demanded by voters that is enshrined and enforced in Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 6. Subsection (A) of Section 6 states that “No general assembly district plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party.” In contrast, the maps adopted today go to absurd lengths to create a Republican monopoly on legislative power that they have not earned at the ballot box.

Subsection (B) of Section 6 also states that “the statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party shall correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.” The district maps adopted by Republicans today in no way reflect the statewide preferences of voters in Ohio and do not closely correspond to the statewide election results of the last ten years. Subsections (A) and (B) cannot be read separately. Subsection (B) is important because it creates the litmus test for what constitutes primarily favoring or disfavoring a political party. No reasonable person would interpret the maps adopted by the Commission today as reflecting the will of Ohioans and not primarily favoring one party over another, as required in Section 6, Subsections (A) and (B).

In Ohio, over the past decade, the Republican Party won 54% of the statewide partisan general election votes, while Democrats won 46%. See Appendix A. These calculations were

presented to the Commission in extensive witness testimony as well as by researchers at Ohio University (OU) as part of the contract between the Legislative Task Force on Redistricting and OU to produce the Ohio Common Unified Redistricting Database. The election results are not in dispute. They are also publicly available on the Ohio Secretary of State's website. One does not need to be as expert to know the statewide partisan election results. Hundreds of Ohioans were able to draw maps in the constitutionally appropriate timeframe.

Legislative maps would closely correspond with these statewide voter preferences. If they yielded close to 45 House districts that would likely be won by Democratic candidates, 54 House districts that would likely be won by Republican candidates, 15 Senate districts that would likely be won by Democratic candidates, and 18 Senate districts that would likely be won by Republican candidates. The Republicans on the Commission, in a naked attempt to maintain a gerrymandered, unearned supermajority, drew and adopted districts that would likely yield 34 Democratic House districts, 65 Republican House districts, 8 Democratic Senate districts, and 25 Republican Senate districts. The Senate district numbers in the map approved today are even worse than under the current maps approved in 2011, which were so egregiously gerrymandered that they inspired voters to go to the polls twice to put fairness and equity in our redistricting process via constitutional amendments.

In the interest of fairness, bipartisanship, and the realities of geography, demography, and politics, the Democratic members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission produced maps that followed the constitutional demands of proper district drawing, including Art. XI, Section 6 (A) and (B), which were ignored by Republicans. These three maps, respectively, produced 14 likely Democratic Senate seats and 44 likely Democratic House seats, 13 likely Democratic Senate seats and 42 likely Democratic House seats, and 13 likely Democratic Senate seats and 42 likely

Democratic House seats. These correspond closely to the ratio of proportionality that the Ohio Constitution prescribes in Art. XI, Section 6. The Democratic members of the Commission and their staff worked tirelessly to incorporate Republican feedback into the mapmaking process while also drawing maps that adhere to the requirements of the Ohio Constitution in Art. XI, Section 6. The Democratic members of the Commission produced three separate map plans that did not disproportionately favor either party, that did represent the will of voters demonstrated over the previous decade of statewide partisan elections, and met the criteria of limiting splits of communities.

Throughout the process, Republicans appeared to follow a playbook of delay and deflection. They used as much time as possible before deadlines, skipped deadlines, and then offered unconstitutional map plans and unacceptable ultimatums to Democratic members of the legislature and the Commission. Their actions included a last-minute attempt this spring to change the Constitution to give themselves control of the process; delaying the convening of the Commission until early August; dragging their feet on approving the Commission's rules; blaming the census data delay for not convening the Commission before August 6; purposely missing the September 1 constitutional deadline for releasing a plan, holding hearings, and adopting a plan; and feigning interest in a compromise before the September 15 deadline but only offering gerrymandered maps. See Appendix B. Republicans did not demonstrate good faith participation in the process. Democratic solutions went unheeded while the Republicans made only token changes to their maps that appeared designed to protect their incumbents. This culminated again in heavily gerrymandered maps, in their second offering, sent to Democratic Commission members and staff late on September 14, the night before the constitutional deadline.

Their latest maps would produce 9 likely Democratic Senate districts and a single, additional 50-50 toss-up Republican-leaning Senate district. The remaining 23 Senate districts were drawn clearly to favor the Republican Party. It would produce 32 likely Democratic House districts and 5 toss-up Democratic-leaning House seats. This plan, like the first plan put forward by Republican map drawers, does not reflect the statewide political preferences of Ohio voters because it creates a higher proportion of Republican districts than the proportion of votes they earn in Ohio.

The GOP-adopted map lays out an absurd description of how it allegedly meets the requirements of Section 6(B). The voters of Ohio do not favor Republicans in a range of 54% to 81%.

We, the two members of the minority party, could not in good conscience violate the voters' will as expressed by the redistricting reforms approved in 2015 and 2018, nor could we ignore the Ohio Constitution's clear language that legislative district maps must correspond closely to the statewide preferences of voters as measured by the statewide partisan general election results over the past ten years. The plan adopted by the majority violates that requirement. In fact, the Republican members did not demonstrate any attempt to meet the requirements. For these reasons, we are voting against the maps the majority of the Commission is choosing to adopt.

APPENDIX A

| Year | Democrat | Republican | Dem. Vote | Rep. Vote |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2012 | Obama | Romney | 2,827,709 | 2,661,439 |
| 2012 | Brown | Mandel | 2,762,766 | 2,435,744 |
| 2014 | FitzGerald | Kasich | 1,009,359 | 1,944,848 |
| 2014 | Pepper | DeWine | 1,178,426 | 1,882,048 |
| 2014 | Carney | Yost | 1,149,305 | 1,711,927 |
| 2014 | Turner | Husted | 1,074,475 | 1,811,020 |
| 2014 | Pillich | Mandel | 1,323,325 | 1,724,060 |
| 2016 | Clinton | Trump | 2,394,164 | 2,841,005 |
| 2016 | Strickland | Portman | 1,996,908 | 3,118,567 |
| 2018 | Cordray | DeWine | 2,067,847 | 2,231,917 |
| 2018 | Dettelbach | Yost | 2,084,593 | 2,272,440 |
| 2018 | Space | Faber | 2,006,204 | 2,152,769 |
| 2018 | Clyde | LaRose | 2,049,944 | 2,210,356 |
| 2018 | Richardson | Sprague | 2,022,016 | 2,304,444 |
| 2018 | Brown | Renacci | 2,355,923 | 2,053,963 |
| 2020 | Biden | Trump | 2,603,681 | 3,074,418 |
| | | | 30,906,645 | 36,430,965 |

Ratio: **45.9%** **54.1%**

Senate: **15.1** **17.9**

House: **45.4** **53.6**

APPENDIX B

Ohio House of Representatives
Representative Emilia Sykes
Minority Leader



Ohio Senate
Senator Kenny Yuko
Minority Leader

June 11, 2021

Governor Mike DeWine
Vern Riffe Center
77 S. High St, 30th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Governor DeWine,

We write to urge you to convene the Ohio Redistricting Commission and call its first meeting so that work can begin immediately to prepare for the drawing of fair districts for the next decade. Under Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 3(C), the Redistricting Commission must be convened by the Governor. As you know, the Redistricting Commission has the responsibility for determining boundaries of the 99 House of Representatives districts and the 33 Ohio Senate districts. The Commission also must plan for its possible role in the creation of congressional districts. This will set the foundation for our state's form of democratic government for the next 10 years.

The final round of census enumeration and demographic data will be delivered in mid-August and there is much preparation to do over the next two months. Legislative leaders will need to appoint members to the commission and name co-chairs. The commission must adopt rules, hire staff, create a budget, and plan and build a system that allows the public to submit district plans. All of this work, which requires time and significant deliberation, must take place before the Commission begins its task of drawing and adopting maps. We also must provide adequate information and notice to allow for full public participation in the process as required by the constitution.

So that we can begin the work of creating fair districts for our state, we ask you to convene the Redistricting Commission and set its first meeting as soon as possible. We do not want this important work to be conducted at the last minute behind closed doors. Thank you for your time and urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Emilia Sykes in black ink.

Emilia Sykes
Minority Leader
Ohio House of Representatives

Handwritten signature of Kenny Yuko in blue ink.

Kenny Yuko
Minority Leader
Ohio Senate

Article XI, Section 8(C)(2) Statement

Pursuant to Article XI, Section 8(C)(2) of the Ohio Constitution, the Ohio Redistricting Commission issues the following statement:

The Commission determined that the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio predominately favor Republican candidates.

The Commission considered statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years. There were sixteen such contests. When considering the results of each of those elections, the Commission determined that Republican candidates won thirteen out of sixteen of those elections resulting in a statewide proportion of voters favoring statewide Republican candidates of 81% and a statewide proportion of voters favoring statewide Democratic candidates of 19%. When considering the number of votes cast in each of those elections for Republican and Democratic candidates, the statewide proportion of voters favoring statewide Republican candidates is 54% and the statewide proportion of voters favoring statewide Democratic candidates is 46%. Thus, the statewide proportion of voters favoring statewide Republican candidates is between 54% and 81% and the statewide proportion of voters favoring statewide Democratic candidates is between 19% and 46%. The Commission obtained publicly available geographic data for statewide partisan elections in 2016, 2018, and 2020. Publicly available geographic data for those elections was not available for elections in 2012 and 2014. Using this data, the Commission adopted the final general assembly district plan, which contains 85 districts (64.4%) favoring Republican candidates and 47 districts (35.6%) favoring Democratic candidates out of a total of 132 districts. Accordingly, the statewide proportion of districts whose voters favor each political party corresponds closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

The final general assembly district plan adopted by the Commission complies with all of the mandatory requirements of Article XI, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 of the Ohio Constitution. The Commission's attempt to meet the aspirational standards of Article XI, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution did not result in any violation of the mandatory requirements of Article XI, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 of the Ohio Constitution.



OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

MONDAY, AUGUST 23, 2021
REGIONAL HEARING - CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY
AGENDA

- I. Welcome
- II. Call to Order & Attendance
- III. Overview
- IV. Public Testimony
- V. Adjourn



Redistricting in Ohio

Every ten years, Ohio must adopt new district maps for the purpose of electing members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Ohio Senate, and the Ohio House of Representatives. This brief provides an overview of redistricting in Ohio, compares the separate constitutional processes for General Assembly and congressional redistricting, explains some essential district-drawing concepts, and summarizes several landmark U.S. Supreme Court rulings concerning redistricting.

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Redistricting basics..... | 1 |
| Redistricting processes at a glance | 2 |
| District-drawing concepts | 4 |
| Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases | 7 |
| 2020 U.S. Census delays..... | 8 |

Redistricting basics

Ohio elects its members of the U.S. House of Representatives, its state senators, and its state representatives from districts with roughly equal populations, giving each person's vote the same amount of influence. Every ten years, Ohio must redraw its congressional and General Assembly districts based on the updated population data in order to maintain population equality between districts and, in some cases, to change the number of congressional districts to match the new number of representatives to which Ohio is entitled.



Congressional Districts
2011-2021

The U.S. Census Bureau releases new population data for redistricting purposes by April 1 of each year ending in 1 (such as 2021), and the Ohio Constitution provides deadlines in the fall of that year to adopt new district maps (but see “**2020 U.S. Census delays**,” on page 8). The new maps must be in place in time to nominate congressional and General Assembly candidates in the primary election held

the next year. When that year is a presidential election year, candidates must file their papers based on the new district map as early as mid-December of the year ending in 1.¹

Redistricting processes at a glance

The state uses two separate processes for General Assembly and congressional redistricting. The voters approved a constitutional amendment implementing a new General Assembly redistricting process in November 2015, and a separate constitutional amendment prescribing a new congressional redistricting process in May 2018. The following table compares several major aspects of the processes. For detailed explanations of the General Assembly and congressional redistricting procedures, please see LSC's final analyses of [H.J.R. 12 of the 130th General Assembly](#) and [S.J.R. 5 of the 132nd General Assembly](#), respectively.

| General Assembly Districts | Congressional Districts |
|--|---|
| Who draws the districts | |
| Ohio Redistricting Commission | General Assembly |
| Required bipartisan vote | |
| Four of seven members of the Commission, including at least two members who represent each of the two largest political parties represented in the General Assembly | ¾ of the members of each chamber of the General Assembly, including at least ½ of the members of each of the two largest political parties represented in the chamber |
| Deadline to adopt a plan – see “2020 U.S. Census delays,” below | |
| September 1 of a year ending in 1 | September 30 of a year ending in 1 |
| Impasse procedure | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The deadline is extended to September 15. ▪ If the Commission adopts the plan only by a simple majority vote, the plan must be replaced after four years. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ohio Redistricting Commission must adopt a plan by a bipartisan vote by October 31. ▪ If the Commission fails to do so, the General Assembly must adopt a plan by November 30. ▪ If the General Assembly adopts the plan only by a simple majority vote, it must follow additional district standards, described below, and the plan must be replaced after four years. |

¹ 13 United States Code (U.S.C.) 141(c); Ohio Constitution, Articles XI and XIX; and R.C. 3513.05. Ohio's current district maps are available from the Ohio Secretary of State [here](#).


| General Assembly Districts | Congressional Districts |
|---|--|
| Population equality between districts | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District populations must be substantially equal. No district may contain a population of less than 95% or more than 105% of the ideal district population. | Not specified (see “ Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases ,” below) |
| District standards considered | |
| <p>Mandatory standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contiguity Boundary must be a single nonintersecting continuous line Keep counties, municipal corporations, and townships whole, based on a specified procedure Each Senate district must consist of three contiguous House districts <p>Standards the Commission must attempt to follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party. The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party must correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio. Districts must be compact. | <p>General standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contiguity Boundary must be a single nonintersecting continuous line Compactness Keep counties, municipal corporations, and townships whole, based on a specified procedure <p>Standards the General Assembly must follow if it does not pass the plan by the required bipartisan vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan must not unduly favor or disfavor a political party or its incumbents. The plan must not unduly split governmental units, giving preference to keeping whole, in the order named, counties, then townships and municipal corporations. The General Assembly must attempt, but is not required, to draw districts that are compact. |
| Legal challenges | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the Ohio Supreme Court has exclusive, original jurisdiction in any challenge. Requires the Ohio Redistricting Commission to amend the plan or adopt a new plan, as applicable, if a plan, district, or group of districts is ruled unconstitutional. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the Ohio Supreme Court has exclusive, original jurisdiction in any challenge. Requires that, if a plan, district, or group of districts is ruled unconstitutional, the General Assembly must adopt a new plan within 30 days after the appeal deadline expires or |

| General Assembly Districts | Congressional Districts |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibits a court from ordering the implementation of a plan not approved by the Commission. Prohibits a court from ordering the Commission to adopt a particular plan or to draw a particular district. Prescribes the available remedies in the event that the Court determines that a General Assembly district plan adopted by the Commission does not comply with the constitutional district standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> after the order is issued, if it is not appealable. Requires the Ohio Redistricting Commission to adopt a plan not later than 30 days after the General Assembly's deadline, if the General Assembly misses the deadline. Requires the new plan to remedy any legal defects, but to include no other changes. |

District-drawing concepts


Contiguity and continuous boundary lines

Every congressional and General Assembly district in Ohio must be contiguous, meaning that it is a single, unbroken shape, with no “islands” of territory that do not touch the rest of the district. Each district's boundary also must be a single nonintersecting continuous line. This standard prevents, for example, the creation of “donut” districts, with one district entirely surrounding another.²



Compactness


A district is considered compact if it has a minimal distance between all parts of its territory. Multiple methods exist to measure a district's compactness, such as calculating the total length of its perimeter (a shorter perimeter meaning a more compact district), or calculating the average distance between locations on the outer edges of the district and the center of the district (a shorter average distance meaning a more compact district).



² Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 3(B)(3) and art. XIX, sec. 2(B)(3).

Under the Ohio Constitution, the Ohio Redistricting Commission must attempt to draw compact General Assembly districts, but it is not explicitly required to do so. On the other hand, congressional districts must be compact, except that under the modified district standards that apply if the General Assembly fails to pass a district plan by the required bipartisan vote, the legislature must attempt to draw compact districts, but is not required to.³

Keeping political subdivisions whole




City A - Split

City B - Not Split

Ohio's congressional and General Assembly redistricting processes both place a priority on keeping counties, cities, villages, and townships together within one district. Splitting a political subdivision is necessary when, for example, its population exceeds the ideal district population. But, the Ohio Constitution includes procedures to minimize any unnecessary splitting.

Under both redistricting processes, a political subdivision is considered to be split if any contiguous portion of its territory is not contained entirely within one district. If a political subdivision has an island of territory that does not touch the rest of the subdivision, putting the island in a different district is not considered splitting the political subdivision (see above). Further, if a city, village, or township has territory in more than one county, drawing the district line along the county line is not considered splitting the city, village, or township.⁴




City C - Split

City C - Not Split

Packing and cracking

Two district-drawing practices, commonly called packing and cracking, can give one group less influence than another. At one extreme, when a group is “packed” into a single district, it makes up a supermajority within the district, but is less able to influence the outcome of elections outside that district. Conversely, when a group is “cracked” among many districts, it makes up only a minority of the vote in each district, and is less able to influence the outcome of elections in any district. In some redistricting cases, packing and cracking have given rise to claims of unlawful gerrymandering (see “**Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases,**” below).



Packed

Cracked

³ Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 6 and art. XIX, secs. 1(F)(3)(c) and 2(B)(2).

⁴ Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 3(D) and art. XIX, sec. 2(C).

Political considerations

The Ohio Constitution includes two separate standards for the inclusion of political considerations in the drawing of district maps. For a General Assembly district plan, the Ohio Redistricting Commission must attempt to adopt a plan (1) that is not drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party, and (2) in which the statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party corresponds closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

For a congressional district map, the Ohio Constitution specifies that if, under the impasse procedure, the General Assembly passes a redistricting plan by a simple majority vote instead of by the required bipartisan vote, the plan must not unduly favor or disfavor a political party or its incumbents.⁵

Majority-minority districts

The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment and the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) prohibit any district plan from denying or abridging citizens' right to vote on account of race, color, or status as a member of a language minority group. The U.S. Supreme Court has developed a test to determine whether a district map dilutes minority voting strength in violation of the VRA by cracking a minority population among multiple districts, as described above. Essentially, the test examines whether (1) the minority group is "sufficiently numerous and compact to form a majority in a single-member district," (2) the minority group is "politically cohesive," meaning its members tend to vote similarly, and (3) "the majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it . . . usually to defeat the minority's preferred candidate."⁶

In order to remedy a case of minority vote dilution, a court may require the adoption of a majority-minority district, in which a sufficient population of a minority group exists to allow the group to elect its candidate of choice. Currently, no court has expressly required Ohio to create majority-minority congressional or General Assembly districts. A state may draw majority-minority districts voluntarily in order to remedy past discrimination. However, in some circumstances, the courts have overturned plans that included voluntarily created majority-minority districts because creating those districts amounted to unconstitutional racial gerrymandering.⁷

Other common concepts

The Ohio Redistricting Commission and the General Assembly might consider other district-drawing concepts in creating district maps, so long as the constitutional requirements are met. For example, some states use criteria such as preserving communities of interest in a single district or maintaining previous district lines to the extent feasible. The National Conference of

⁵ Ohio Const., art. XI, sec. 6 and art. XIX, sec. 1(C)(3)(a) and (F)(3)(a).

⁶ 52 U.S.C. 10301; *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 50 (1986); and *Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 264 (1977).

⁷ *Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146 (1993); *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996); *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899 (1996); and *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama*, 135 S.Ct. 1257 (2015).

State Legislatures offers several useful references on these topics, including a 50-state survey of redistricting criteria and [The Redistricting Glossary](#).⁸

Selected U.S. Supreme Court cases

The following cases represent a sample of the landmark U.S. Supreme Court rulings on congressional and state legislative redistricting. This list is intended to provide a basic foundation for understanding some of the legal discussions surrounding redistricting. However, the list is not exhaustive, and it does not include later rulings that have added nuance to these decisions.

Population equality

- *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964) – Held that the population of congressional districts in the same state must be as nearly equal as practicable.
- *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964) – Specified that the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment requires states to draw legislative districts that are substantially equal in population.
- *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) – Held that congressional districts must be mathematically equal in population, except as necessary to achieve a legitimate state objective.

Racial and language minorities

- *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986) – Held that the VRA requires that a majority-minority district be drawn to remedy minority vote dilution if (1) the racial or language minority group is “sufficiently numerous and compact to form a majority in a single-member district,” (2) the minority group is “politically cohesive,” meaning its members tend to vote similarly, and (3) the “majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it . . . usually to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate.”
- *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993) – Held that districts violate the Equal Protection Clause if they cannot be explained on grounds other than race.
- *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900 (1995) – Specified that a district is unconstitutionally racially gerrymandered if race is the “predominant” factor in drawing its lines.
- *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996) – Found that if race was the predominant factor in drawing a district, the district cannot be justified by the VRA unless there is a strong basis in evidence that drawing the district was reasonably necessary to avoid denying or abridging equal voting rights.

Partisan gerrymandering

- *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 139 S.Ct. 2484 (2019) – Found that partisan gerrymandering represents a political question on which the federal courts cannot rule because there is no credible way to define and measure fairness in the political context.

⁸ National Conference of State Legislatures, [NCSL’s Redistricting Webpages](#).

2020 U.S. Census delays

The Ohio Constitution requires Ohio to use population data from the U.S. Census to draw General Assembly and congressional districts, except that if the federal census is unavailable, the General Assembly may designate another data source by law.⁹ Federal law requires the Census Bureau to provide the states with the necessary population data for redistricting by April 1 of a year ending in 1.¹⁰ After receiving the data in April, Ohio's contractors typically are able to incorporate the data into a computerized map drawing database and deliver the database in July, allowing state officials to begin creating proposed district maps.

However, because of delays related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Census Bureau announced that it could not provide the population data to the states by April 1, 2021. The Bureau promised to provide the data in a legacy format by "mid-to-late August 2021," and in a newer format by September 30, 2021.¹¹ Ohio's contractors are able to use the legacy format data to create the map drawing database, but still will need time after the data arrives to complete and deliver the database. This delay could create significant difficulties in meeting Ohio's constitutional redistricting deadlines in 2021.

⁹ Ohio Const., art. XI, secs. 3(A) and 7 and art. XIX, sec. 2(A).

¹⁰ 13 U.S.C. 141(c).

¹¹ U.S. Census Bureau, *U.S. Census Bureau Statement on Release of Legacy Format Summary Redistricting Data File* (March 15, 2021).

REPEALED. County and township treasuries.

§5

(1851, rep. 1933)

(7) One person appointed by the legislative leader of the largest political party in the senate of which the president of the senate is not a member.

REPEALED. What officers may be removed.

§6

(1851, rep. 1933)

The legislative leaders in the senate and the house of representatives of each of the two largest political parties represented in the general assembly, acting jointly by political party, shall appoint a member of the commission to serve as a co-chairperson of the commission.

REPEALED. Local taxation.

§7

(1851, rep. 1933)

(B)(1) Unless otherwise specified in this article, a simple majority of the commission members shall be required for any action by the commission.

Article XI: Apportionment***Persons responsible for apportionment of state for members of General Assembly.***

§1 (A) The Ohio redistricting commission shall be responsible for the redistricting of this state for the general assembly. The commission shall consist of the following seven members:

(1) The governor;

(2) The auditor of state;

(3) The secretary of state;

(4) One person appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives;

(5) One person appointed by the legislative leader of the largest political party in the house of representatives of which the speaker of the house of representatives is not a member;

(6) One person appointed by the president of the senate; and

(2)(a) Except as otherwise provided in division (B)(2)(b) of this section, a majority vote of the members of the commission, including at least one member of the commission who is a member of each of the two largest political parties represented in the general assembly, shall be required to do any of the following:

(i) Adopt rules of the commission;

(ii) Hire staff for the commission;

(iii) Expend funds.

(b) If the commission is unable to agree, by the vote required under division (B)

(2)(a) of this section, on the manner in which funds should be expended, each co-chairperson of the commission shall have the authority to expend one-half of the funds that have been appropriated to the commission.

(3) The affirmative vote of four members of the commission, including at least two members of the commission

who represent each of the two largest political parties represented in the general assembly shall be required to adopt any general assembly district plan. For the purpose of this division, a member of the commission shall be considered to represent a political party if the member was appointed to the commission by a member of that political party or if, in the case of the governor, the auditor of state, or the secretary of state, the member is a member of that political party.

(C) At the first meeting of the commission, which the governor shall convene only in a year ending in the numeral one, except as provided in Sections 8 and 9 of this article, the commission shall set a schedule for the adoption of procedural rules for the operation of the commission.

The commission shall release to the public a proposed general assembly district plan for the boundaries for each of the ninety-nine house of representatives districts and the thirty-three senate districts. The commission shall draft the proposed plan in the manner prescribed in this article. Before adopting, but after introducing, a proposed plan, the commission shall conduct a minimum of three public hearings across the state to present the proposed plan and shall seek public input regarding the proposed plan. All meetings of the commission shall be open to the public. Meetings shall be broadcast by electronic means of transmission using a medium readily accessible by the general public.

The commission shall adopt a final general assembly district plan not later than the first day of September of a

year ending in the numeral one. After the commission adopts a final plan, the commission shall promptly file the plan with the secretary of state. Upon filing with the secretary of state, the plan shall become effective.

Four weeks after the adoption of a general assembly district plan, the commission shall be automatically dissolved.

(D) The general assembly shall be responsible for making the appropriations it determines necessary in order for the commission to perform its duties under this article.

(1967, am. 2015)

Ratio of representation in house and senate.

§2 Each house of representatives district shall be entitled to a single representative in each general assembly. Each senate district shall be entitled to a single senator in each general assembly.

(1967, am. 2015)

Population of each House of Representatives district.

§3 (A) The whole population of the state, as determined by the federal decennial census or, if such is unavailable, such other basis as the general assembly may direct, shall be divided by the number "ninety-nine" and by the number "thirty-three" and the quotients shall be the ratio of representation in the house of representatives and in the senate, respectively, for ten years next succeeding such redistricting.

(B) A general assembly district plan shall comply with all of the requirements

of division (B) of this section.

(1) The population of each house of representatives district shall be substantially equal to the ratio of representation in the house of representatives, and the population of each senate district shall be substantially equal to the ratio of representation in the senate, as provided in division (A) of this section. In no event shall any district contain a population of less than ninety-five per cent nor more than one hundred five per cent of the applicable ratio of representation.

(2) Any general assembly district plan adopted by the commission shall comply with all applicable provisions of the constitutions of Ohio and the United States and of federal law.

(3) Every general assembly district shall be composed of contiguous territory, and the boundary of each district shall be a single nonintersecting continuous line.

(C) House of representatives districts shall be created and numbered in the following order of priority, to the extent that such order is consistent with the foregoing standards:

(1) Proceeding in succession from the largest to the smallest, each county containing population greater than one hundred five per cent of the ratio of representation in the house of representatives shall be divided into as many house of representatives districts as it has whole ratios of representation. Any fraction of the population in excess of a whole ratio shall be a part of only one adjoining house of representatives district.

(2) Each county containing population of not less than ninety-five per cent of the ratio of representation in the house of representatives nor more than one hundred five per cent of the ratio shall be designated a representative district.

(3) The remaining territory of the state shall be divided into representative districts by combining the areas of counties, municipal corporations, and townships. Where feasible, no county shall be split more than once.

(D)(1)(a) Except as otherwise provided in divisions (D)(1)(b) and (c) of this section, a county, municipal corporation, or township is considered to be split if any contiguous portion of its territory is not contained entirely within one district.

(b) If a municipal corporation or township has territory in more than one county, the contiguous portion of that municipal corporation or township that lies in each county shall be considered to be a separate municipal corporation or township for the purposes of this section.

(c) If a municipal corporation or township that is located in a county that contains a municipal corporation or township that has a population of more than one ratio of representation is split for the purpose of complying with division (E)(1)(a) or (b) of this section, each portion of that municipal corporation or township shall be considered to be a separate municipal corporation or township for the purposes of this section.

(2) Representative districts shall be drawn so as to split the smallest possible

number of municipal corporations and townships whose contiguous portions contain a population of more than fifty per cent, but less than one hundred per cent, of one ratio of representation.

(3) Where the requirements of divisions (B), (C), and (D) of this section cannot feasibly be attained by forming a representative district from whole municipal corporations and townships, not more than one municipal corporation or township may be split per representative district.

(E)(1) If it is not possible for the commission to comply with all of the requirements of divisions (B), (C), and (D) of this section in drawing a particular representative district, the commission shall take the first action listed below that makes it possible for the commission to draw that district:

(a) Notwithstanding division (D)(3) of this section, the commission shall create the district by splitting two municipal corporations or townships whose contiguous portions do not contain a population of more than fifty per cent, but less than one hundred per cent, of one ratio of representation.

(b) Notwithstanding division (D)(2) of this section, the commission shall create the district by splitting a municipal corporation or township whose contiguous portions contain a population of more than fifty per cent, but less than one hundred per cent, of one ratio of representation.

(c) Notwithstanding division (C)(2) of this section, the commission shall create the district by splitting, once, a single county that contains a population

of not less than ninety-five per cent of the ratio of representation, but not more than one hundred five per cent of the ratio of representation.

(d) Notwithstanding division (C)(1) of this section, the commission shall create the district by including in two districts portions of the territory that remains after a county that contains a population of more than one hundred five per cent of the ratio of representation has been divided into as many house of representatives districts as it has whole ratios of representation.

(2) If the commission takes an action under division (E)(1) of this section, the commission shall include in the general assembly district plan a statement explaining which action the commission took under that division and the reason the commission took that action.

(3) If the commission complies with divisions (E)(1) and (2) of this section in drawing a district, the commission shall not be considered to have violated division (C)(1), (C)(2), (D)(2), or (D)(3) of this section, as applicable, in drawing that district, for the purpose of an analysis under division (D) of Section 9 of this article.

(1967, am. 2015)

Population of each Senate district.

§4 (A) Senate districts shall be composed of three contiguous house of representatives districts.

(B)(1) A county having at least one whole senate ratio of representation shall have as many senate districts wholly within the boundaries of the

county as it has whole senate ratios of representation. Any fraction of the population in excess of a whole ratio shall be a part of only one adjoining senate district.

(2) Counties having less than one senate ratio of representation, but at least one house of representatives ratio of representation, shall be part of only one senate district.

(3) If it is not possible for the commission to draw representative districts that comply with all of the requirements of this article and that make it possible for the commission to comply with all of the requirements of divisions (B)(1) and (2) of this section, the commission shall draw senate districts so as to commit the fewest possible violations of those divisions. If the commission complies with this division in drawing senate districts, the commission shall not be considered to have violated division (B)(1) or (2) of this section, as applicable, in drawing those districts, for the purpose of an analysis under division (D) of Section 9 of this article.

(C) The number of whole ratios of representation for a county shall be determined by dividing the population of the county by the ratio of representation in the senate determined under division (A) of Section 3 of this article.

(D) Senate districts shall be numbered from one through thirty-three and as provided in Section 5 of this article.
(1967, am. 2015)

Representation for each house and senate district.

§5 At any time the boundaries of senate districts are changed in any general assembly district plan made pursuant to any provision of this article, a senator whose term will not expire within two years of the time the plan becomes effective shall represent, for the remainder of the term for which the senator was elected, the senate district that contains the largest portion of the population of the district from which the senator was elected, and the district shall be given the number of the district from which the senator was elected. If more than one senator whose term will not so expire would represent the same district by following the provisions of this section, the plan shall designate which senator shall represent the district and shall designate which district the other senator or senators shall represent for the balance of their term or terms.
(1967, am. 2015)

Creation of district boundaries; change at end of decennial period.

§6 The Ohio redistricting commission shall attempt to draw a general assembly district plan that meets all of the following standards:

(A) No general assembly district plan shall be drawn primarily to favor or disfavor a political party.

(B) The statewide proportion of districts whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party shall correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

(C) General assembly districts shall be compact.

Nothing in this section permits the commission to violate the district standards described in Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7 of this article.
(1967, am. 2015)

REPEALED. Provided additional senators for districts with a ratio of representation greater than one.

§6a
(1956, rep. 1967)

Boundary lines of House of Representatives districts.

§7 Notwithstanding the fact that boundaries of counties, municipal corporations, and townships within a district may be changed, district boundaries shall be created by using the boundaries of counties, municipal corporations, and townships as they exist at the time of the federal decennial census on which the redistricting is based, or, if unavailable, on such other basis as the general assembly has directed.
(1967, am. 2015)

Determination of number of House of Representatives districts within each county.

§8 (A)(1) If the Ohio redistricting commission fails to adopt a final general assembly district plan not later than the first day of September of a year ending in the numeral one, in accordance with Section 1 of this article, the commission shall introduce a proposed general assembly district plan by a simple majority vote of the

commission.

(2) After introducing a proposed general assembly district plan under division (A)(1) of this section, the commission shall hold a public hearing concerning the proposed plan, at which the public may offer testimony and at which the commission may adopt amendments to the proposed plan. Members of the commission should attend the hearing; however, only a quorum of the members of the commission is required to conduct the hearing.

(3) After the hearing described in division (A)(2) of this section is held, and not later than the fifteenth day of September of a year ending in the numeral one, the commission shall adopt a final general assembly district plan, either by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B)(3) of Section 1 of this article or by a simple majority vote of the commission.

(B) If the commission adopts a final general assembly district plan in accordance with division (A)(3) of this section by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B)(3) of Section 1 of this article, the plan shall take effect upon filing with the secretary of state and shall remain effective until the next year ending in the numeral one, except as provided in Section 9 of this article.

(C)(1)(a) Except as otherwise provided in division (C)(1)(b) of this section, if the commission adopts a final general assembly district plan in accordance with division (A)(3) of this section by a simple majority vote of the commission, and not by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B)(3) of Section 1 of this article, the plan shall take

effect upon filing with the secretary of state and shall remain effective until two general elections for the house of representatives have occurred under the plan.

(b) If the commission adopts a final general assembly district plan in accordance with division (A)(3) of this section by a simple majority vote of the commission, and not by the vote required to adopt a plan under division (B) of Section 1 of this article, and that plan is adopted to replace a plan that ceased to be effective under division (C)(1)(a) of this section before a year ending in the numeral one, the plan adopted under this division shall take effect upon filing with the secretary of state and shall remain effective until a year ending in the numeral one, except as provided in Section 9 of this article.

(2) A final general assembly district plan adopted under division (C)(1)(a) or (b) of this section shall include a statement explaining what the commission determined to be the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio and the manner in which the statewide proportion of districts in the plan whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party corresponds closely to those preferences, as described in division (B) of Section 6 of this article. At the time the plan is adopted, a member of the commission who does not vote in favor of the plan may submit a declaration of the member's opinion concerning the statement included with the plan.

(D) After a general assembly district plan adopted under division (C)(1)(a)

of this section ceases to be effective, and not earlier than the first day of July of the year following the year in which the plan ceased to be effective, the commission shall be reconstituted as provided in Section 1 of this article, convene, and adopt a new general assembly district plan in accordance with this article, to be used until the next time for redistricting under this article. The commission shall draw the new general assembly district plan using the same population and county, municipal corporation, and township boundary data as were used to draw the previous plan adopted under division (C) of this section.

(1967, am. 2015)

When population of county is fraction of ratio of representation.

§9 (A) The supreme court of Ohio shall have exclusive, original jurisdiction in all cases arising under this article.

(B) In the event that any section of this constitution relating to redistricting, any general assembly district plan made by the Ohio redistricting commission, or any district is determined to be invalid by an unappealed final order of a court of competent jurisdiction then, notwithstanding any other provisions of this constitution, the commission shall be reconstituted as provided in Section 1 of this article, convene, and ascertain and determine a general assembly district plan in conformity with such provisions of this constitution as are then valid, including establishing terms of office and election of members of the general assembly from districts designated in the plan, to be used until the next time for redistricting under

this article in conformity with such provisions of this constitution as are then valid.

(C) Notwithstanding any provision of this constitution or any law regarding the residence of senators and representatives, a general assembly district plan made pursuant to this section shall allow thirty days for persons to change residence in order to be eligible for election.

(D)(1) No court shall order, in any circumstance, the implementation or enforcement of any general assembly district plan that has not been approved by the commission in the manner prescribed by this article.

(2) No court shall order the commission to adopt a particular general assembly district plan or to draw a particular district.

(3) If the supreme court of Ohio determines that a general assembly district plan adopted by the commission does not comply with the requirements of Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7 of this article, the available remedies shall be as follows:

(a) If the court finds that the plan contains one or more isolated violations of those requirements, the court shall order the commission to amend the plan to correct the violation.

(b) If the court finds that it is necessary to amend not fewer than six house of representatives districts to correct violations of those requirements, to amend not fewer than two senate districts to correct violations of those requirements, or both, the court shall

declare the plan invalid and shall order the commission to adopt a new general assembly district plan in accordance with this article.

(c) If, in considering a plan adopted under division (C) of Section 8 of this article, the court determines that both of the following are true, the court shall order the commission to adopt a new general assembly district plan in accordance with this article:

(i) The plan significantly violates those requirements in a manner that materially affects the ability of the plan to contain districts whose voters favor political parties in an overall proportion that corresponds closely to the statewide political party preferences of the voters of Ohio, as described in division (B) of Section 6 of this article.

(ii) The statewide proportion of districts in the plan whose voters, based on statewide state and federal partisan general election results during the last ten years, favor each political party does not correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

(1967, am. 2015)

Severability provision.

§10 The various provisions of this article are intended to be severable, and the invalidity of one or more of such provisions shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions.

(1967, am. 2015)

REPEALED. Senate districts.

§11

(1967, rep. 2015)

REPEALED. Change of district boundaries of senate districts.

§12
(1967, rep. 2015)

REPEALED. Jurisdiction of Supreme Court, effect of determination of unconstitutionality; apportionment.

§13
(1967, rep. 2015)

REPEALED. District boundaries until January 1, 1973.

§14
(1967, rep. 2015)

REPEALED. Severability provision.

§15
(1967, rep. 2015)

Article XII: Finance and Taxation

Poll taxes prohibited.

§1 No poll tax shall ever be levied in this state, or service required, which may be commuted in money or other thing of value.
(1851, am. 1912)

Limitation on tax rate; exemption.

§2 No property, taxed according to value, shall be so taxed in excess of one per cent of its true value in money for all state and local purposes, but laws may be passed authorizing additional taxes to be levied outside of such limitation, either when approved by at least a

majority of the electors of the taxing district voting on such proposition, or when provided for by the charter of a municipal corporation. Land and improvements thereon shall be taxed by uniform rule according to value, except that laws may be passed to reduce taxes by providing for a reduction in value of the homestead of permanently and totally disabled residents, residents sixty-five years of age and older, and residents sixty years of age or older who are surviving spouses of deceased residents who were sixty-five years of age or older or permanently and totally disabled and receiving a reduction in the value of their homestead at the time of death, provided the surviving spouse continues to reside in a qualifying homestead, and providing for income and other qualifications to obtain such reduction. Without limiting the general power, subject to the provisions of Article I of this constitution, to determine the subjects and methods of taxation or exemptions therefrom, general laws may be passed to exempt burying grounds, public school houses, houses used exclusively for public worship, institutions used exclusively for charitable purposes, and public property used exclusively for any public purpose, but all such laws shall be subject to alteration or repeal; and the value of all property so exempted shall, from time to time, be ascertained and published as may be directed by law.

(1851, am. 1906, 1912, 1918, 1929, 1933, 1970, 1974, 1990)



**OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
WITNESS & MEDIA INFORMATION FORM**

Please complete the Witness & Media Information Form before testifying/recording

Date of hearing/location for which testimony is being submitted: _____

Name: _____

Are you representing: Yourself: ☐ Organization: ☐

Organization (If Applicable): _____

Position/Title: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____ Email: _____

Will you have a written statement, visual aids, or other material to distribute?

Yes: ☐ No: ☐ (If yes, please provide written or electronic copies to the co-chair)

Please be advised that witnesses may be asked to limit their testimony in the interest of other witnesses and time constraints of the Commission.

Media Only

If you are present on behalf of a media organization, please indicate your request to record:

Audio record: ☐ Video record: ☐ Broadcast/Streaming: ☐

Please be advised that this form and any materials (written or otherwise) submitted or presented to this Commission are records that may be requested by the public and may be published online.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Freda J. Levenson, hereby certify that on October 22, 2021, I caused a true and correct copy of the following documents to be served by email upon the counsel listed below:

- 1. Affidavit of Freda J. Levenson**
- 2. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 1 of 13**
- 3. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 2 of 13**
- 4. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 3 of 13**
- 5. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 4 of 13**
- 6. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 5 of 13**
- 7. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 6 of 13**
- 8. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 7 of 13**
- 9. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 8 of 13**
- 10. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 9 of 13**
- 11. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 10 of 13**
- 12. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 11 of 13**
- 13. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 12 of 13**
- 14. Evidence of Relators, Documents Produced in Discovery, Volume 13 of 13**

DAVE YOST
OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL
Bridget C. Coontz (0072919)
Julie M. Pfeiffer (0069762)
Michael A. Walton (0092201)
Michael J. Hendershot (0081842)
30 E. Broad St.
Columbus, OH 43215
Tel: (614) 466-2872
Fax: (614) 728-7592
bridget.coontz@ohioago.gov
julie.pfeiffer@ohioago.gov
michael.walton@ohioago.gov
michael.hendershot@ohioago.gov

*Counsel for Respondents Governor Mike DeWine,
Secretary of State Frank LaRose, and
Auditor Keith Faber*

W. Stuart Dornette (0002955)
Beth A. Bryan (0082076)
Philip D. Williamson (0097174)
TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
425 Walnut St., Suite 1800
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Tel: (513) 381-2838
dornette@taftlaw.com
bryan@taftlaw.com
pwilliamson@taftlaw.com

Phillip J. Strach (PHV 25444-2021)
Thomas A. Farr (PHV 25461-2021)
John E. Branch (PHV 25460-2021)
Alyssa M. Riggings (PHV 25441-2021)
Greg McGuire (PHV 25483-2021)
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP
4140 Parklake Ave., Ste. 200
Raleigh, NC 27612
phil.strach@nelsonmullins.com
tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com
john.branch@nelsonmullins.com

alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com
greg.mcguire@nelsonmullins.com
Tel: (919) 329-3812

Counsel for Respondents
Senate President Matt Huffman and
House Speaker Robert Cupp

John Gilligan (0024542)
Diane Menashe (0070305)
ICE MILLER LLP
250 West St., Ste., 700
Columbus, OH 43215
john.gilligan@icemiller.com
diane.menashe@icemiller.com

Counsel for Respondents
Senator Vernon Sykes and
House Minority Leader Emilia Sykes

Erik J. Clark (0078732)
Ashley Merino (0096853)
ORGAN LAW LLP
1330 Dublin Rd.
Columbus, OH 43215
Tel: (614) 481-0900
Fax: (614) 481-0904

Counsel for Respondent Ohio Redistricting Commission

/s/ Freda J. Levenson