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## Affidavit of Freda J. Levenson

I, Freda J. Levenson, having been duly sworn and cautioned according to law, hereby state that I am over the age of eighteen years and am competent to testify as to the facts set forth below based on my personal knowledge and having personally examined all records referenced in this affidavit, and further state as follows:

1. On January 12, 2022, the Ohio Supreme Court entered an order in the above-captioned case, League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Ohio Redistricting Commission, No. 20211193, providing that parties shall file any objections to the revised plan within three days of the revised plan's adoption.
2. I am one of the counsel for Relators in the above-captioned case.
3. Document 1 is a true and correct copy of the Democratic Commission Members' proposed map for Franklin and Hamilton Counties' House and Senate Districts, which was shared on the Ohio Redistricting Commission's ("the Commission") website on January 20, 2022.
4. Document 2 is a true and correct copy of the Republican Commission Members' proposal for Hamilton and Warren Counties, which was shared on the Commission's website on January 20, 2022.
5. Document 3 is a true and correct copy of the Section 8(C)(2) Statement adopted by a majority of the Commission on January 22, 2022.
6. Document 4 is a true and correct copy of the statement entered into the Commission's record by Commission Members Senator Vernon Sykes and House Minority LeaderElect Allison Russo on January 22, 2022.
7. Further, the Ohio Redistricting Commission held a meeting on January 18, 2022 to discuss the districting plans for the Ohio House and Senate. A link to the video recording of the meeting was made available on the Ohio Channel website. An official transcript of the meeting was not immediately available. Given this, counsel for Relators had the meeting transcribed using the following process. Relator's counsel provided the direct link to the video of the January 18, 2022 meeting hosted on the Ohio Channel website to Planet Depos, the deposition service Relators have used in this case, and ordered from them a transcription of the meeting. Planet Depos submitted to Relators a copy of the transcript of the meeting on January 24, 2022. Document 5 is a true and correct copy of a transcription of the Ohio Redistricting Committee's meeting on January 18, 2022.
8. The Ohio Redistricting Commission held a second meeting on January 20, 2022 to discuss the districting plans for the Ohio House and Senate. A link to the video recording of the meeting was made available on the Ohio Channel website. An official transcript of the meeting was not immediately available. Given this, counsel for Relators had the meeting transcribed using the same process previously described. Planet Depos submitted to Relators a copy of the transcript of the meeting on January 24, 2022. Document 6 is a true and correct copy of a transcription of the Ohio Redistricting Committee's meeting on January 20, 2022.
9. The Ohio Redistricting Commission held a third meeting on January 22, 2022 to discuss the districting plans for the Ohio House and Senate. An official transcript of the meeting was not immediately available. Given this, counsel for Relators had the meeting transcribed using the same process previously described. Planet Depos submitted to Relators a copy of the transcript of the meeting on January 25, 2022. Document 7 is a
true and correct copy of a transcription of the Ohio Redistricting Committee's meeting on January 22, 2022.
10. Finally, Relators have delivered to the Court physical DVD copies of native files relied on by Relators' experts when drafting their reports. These include: (1) the shapefiles of the passed House and Senate maps and relied upon by Dr. Christopher Warshaw; (2) the shapefiles submitted by Dr. Jonathan Rodden to the Ohio Redistricting Commission on January 20, 2022 accompanying his proposed plans and relied upon by Dr. Warshaw; (3) block equivalency files for the enacted revised House and Senate plans, along with the aggregated vote totals and relied upon by Dr. William Cooper; and (4) VTD-level shapefiles that include the Commission's September 16, 2021 enacted plan, the January 22, 2022 enacted House and Senate maps, and Dr. Rodden's proposed maps, and relied upon by Dr. Kosuke Imai.
11. The Index below provides a description of each document and states where it appears in the Appendix.

## Freda Levenson

Freda J. Levenson

Signed at $\qquad$ olumbus, Franklin, Ohio , $\qquad$
$\qquad$ -
City County State
01/25/2022
Sworn to and subscribed before me this $\qquad$ day of January, 2022
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Ohio Redistricting Commission January 20, 2022

Proposal for Hamilton and Warren County Ohio House and Ohio Senate districts

House: Hamilton

House: Warren
5 Democrat Leaning districts
2 Republican Leaning districts

0 Democrat Leaning districts
2 Republican Leaning districts

Senate: (both counties) 1 Democrat Leaning district
2 Republican Leaning districts



| Counties | Hamilton |
| :--- | :--- |
| District Type | House |

16-18-20 Data 16-18-20 Data

| ID | Population | Deviation \% | Deviation \# | DEM Index | REP Index |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 122,543 | $2.82 \%$ | 3,357 | 70.31 | 29.69 |
| 25 | 120,544 | $1.14 \%$ | 1,358 | 77.17 | 22.83 |
| 26 | 115,016 | $-3.50 \%$ | $(4,170)$ | 71.62 | 28.38 |
| 27 | 123,894 | $3.95 \%$ | 4,708 | 50.14 | 49.86 |
| 28 | 120,869 | $1.41 \%$ | 1,683 | 51.28 | 48.72 |
| 29 | 113,611 | $-4.68 \%$ | $(5,575)$ | 40.86 | 59.14 |
| 30 | 114,162 | $-4.22 \%$ | $(5,024)$ | 28.97 | 71.03 |

Counties Hamilton \& Warren
District Type Senate

|  |  | 16-18-20 Data |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID |  | Population | Deviation \% | Deviation \# | DEM Index | REP Index

In LWV v. DeWine, Slip Opinion No. 2022-Ohio-65, the Ohio Supreme Court addressed the method by which the Ohio Redistricting Commission determines whether it is in compliance with Section 6(B), Article XI of the Ohio Constitution. According to the Court, this determination requires two calculations. The first is the statewide proportion of districts whose voters favor each political party. "In making this determination, the Commission must determine how voters in the proposed districts are likely to vote in future elections by examining the statewide federal and state partisan election results from the previous ten years." Op. at para. 105. The second calculation is the "statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio." Id. at para. 106. The methodology to make this calculation is to "total[] the votes cast in statewide partisan elections and calculate[e] the percentages of votes received by candidates of each political party." Id. at para. 107. As to this second calculation, the Court concluded that the "commission is required to attempt to draw a plan in which the statewide proportion of Republican-leaning to Democratic-leaning districts closely corresponds to" 54\% Republican-leaning and 46\% Democraticleaning. The Commission refers to the $54 \% / 46 \%$ calculation as strict proportionality. Neither the Constitution nor the decision of the Supreme Court requires adoption of a plan meeting strict proportionality, only that it closely correspond with it.

The Commission attempted to draw a plan in which the statewide proportion of Republican-leaning to Democratic-leaning districts closely corresponds to 54\% Republican-leaning and 46\% Democratic-leaning districts. In doing so, the Commission was mindful that all of Section 6, Article XI of the Ohio Constitution was to be complied with, not just certain sections. Plus, no one division of Section 6 is subordinate to another. The Commission was also mindful that compliance with Section 6 shall not result in violations of Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7 of Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.

During the process of drawing the final adopted plan, all Commission members and their staff participated in the mapdrawing process. All members of the Commission, through their respective staff, met or communicated nearly each day of the process and exchanged proposals. The Commission met several times to discuss specific proposals that had been shared with all members of the Commission and the public. The final adopted plan contains input from all members of the Commission, directly or through their staff.

The final adopted House district plan contains 57 Republicanleaning districts. This corresponds to approximately $57 \%$ of the total number of house districts. The final adopted Senate district plan contains 20 Republican-leaning districts. This corresponds to approximately $60 \%$ of the total number of senate districts. In total, the final adopted general assembly district plan contains a total of 77 Republican-leaning districts and 55 Democratic-leaning districts. This corresponds to approximately 58\% Republicanleaning districts and approximately $42 \%$ Democratic-leaning districts. These percentages differ from strict proportionality by only $4 \%$. The Commission achieved this result by changing eight (8) general assembly districts from Republican-leaning to Democratic-leaning.

These percentages are a result of the Commission's attempt to comply with Article XI, Section 6. The Commission has had dozens of maps submitted to it. However, the Commission's map was the only map that closely corresponds to the Section 6 requirements, while remaining constitutional in all other elements.

The Commission believes that the number of Republican-leaning districts and Democratic-leaning districts closely corresponds to strict proportionality, particularly in light of the distribution of voters and geography of Ohio. Moreover, the final adopted general
assembly plan does not contain any violations of Sections 2, 3, 4, 5 , or 7 of Article XI of the Ohio Constitution and complies with Section 6 of Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.

# OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## Minority Report

Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair
House Minority Leader-Elect Allison Russo, Commissioner
"Attempt" is not a meaningless word and the proportionality requirement is not "superficial." The Ohio Supreme Court told us as much. This Commission has a clear order from the Ohio Supreme Court that we must adopt state legislative districts that reflect the preferences of Ohio voters. However, the map presented and adopted by the Commission today falls far short of that mark and therefore cannot earn our support.

Unequivocally, the Ohio Supreme Court has directed us to draw a map that closely matches statewide voter preferences. As the Court stated, "about 54 percent of Ohio voters preferred Republican candidates and about 46 percent of Ohio voters preferred Democratic candidates. Accordingly, under Section 6(B), the Commission is required to attempt to draw a plan in which the statewide proportion of Republican-leaning districts to Democratic-leaning districts closely corresponds to those percentages." (emphasis added). League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Ohio Redistricting Comm., Slip Opinion No. 2022-Ohio-65, P 108 (2022). This translates to 45 House Democratic seats and 54 House Republican seats, and 15 Senate Democratic seats and 18 Senate Republican seats. Despite this clear order, the Commission has failed to meet those requirements. The result is another gerrymandered map by the majority Commissioners that does not meet the requirements of Article XI, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution.

While the majority may claim it is impossible to draw a proportional map that is compliant with line-drawing requirements, that is simply not the case. In fact, the minority party Commissioners presented various options, including regional county maps and a statewide map, that demonstrate how to draw districts that meet the constitution's proportionality and line-drawing requirements. The minority presented a statewide plan to the Commission that meets all requirements of the Constitution including Article XI, Section 6. The minority Commissioners' staff also testified to the ability to create many variations of compliant maps that would achieve 45 Democratic House seats and 15 Democratic Senate districts if only the majority Commissioners would collaborate and give appropriate guidance. This guidance was withheld. The public has also submitted maps for the Commission's consideration. All of those options have been rebuffed by the majority who also characterized minor issues as unfixable, rejecting offers to work together on a Commission-drawn map. The Court in its order directed that "[i]f it is possible for a district plan to comply with Section 6 and Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, the commission must adopt a plan that does so." Id. at P 88 (emphasis added). As we have seen through this process, it is possible, and the Commission has other plans before it that meet Article XI. It is possible to meet the Court's order; it just appears that the majority of Commissioners do not want to. In fact, the Court in its decision stated that attempt was not an empty act: "The phrase "shall attempt" in Article XI, Section 6 also has a plain meaning: it directs the commission to take affirmative steps to comply with the standards stated in divisions (A) through (C)." Id. P 86. The majority Commissioners have not made an attempt to comply with Article XI, Section 6 and majority map drawers were unable to identify any affirmative steps that they made to draw a more proportional map nor any obstacles preventing them from doing so.

Instead, the majority Commissioners have crafted a plan that does not meet Section 6 requirements and fails to reflect partisan symmetry. The plan adopted today does not have the requisite amount of Democratic-leaning districts the Court directed this Commission to achieve. Further, many of the Democratic-leaning districts it does include are Democratic by razor-thin margins demonstrating a clear intention to favor and disfavor political parties in violation of Article XI, Section 6. Conversely, the Republican-leaning districts in the plan adopted today are overall more safely Republican. Given that there are alternative plans that do not skew districts as the adopted plan does, these appear to be discretionary choices to give further unwarranted advantage to the majority.

From the process to its adoption today, the majority's plan is a clear failure by the Commission to follow the order of the Ohio Supreme Court and the will of Ohio's voters. For instance, no hearing of the Commission since the Court's ruling has allowed for in-person or virtual public testimony to members of the general public. While the Commission has a public comment page on its website, testimony was needlessly limited. The Commission failed to allow public input on a proposed plan - a critical piece of the 2015 constitutional reforms that guaranteed that the public would be able to participate in the map-drawing process, as well as a part of the Commission's own procedural rules. Majority members of the Commission also delayed the release of funding for Commission members to hire a consultant until four days had already passed in the Commission's timeline to adopt a new plan. Staff negotiations were similarly significantly delayed because Majority staff of the Commission members would not commit to meeting the Court's order pertaining to the proportionality required by Article XI, Section 6.

Republican Commissioners did not instruct their staff to comply with the proportionality requirement in the Constitution and the Court order. Instead, districting decisions were declared
unconstitutional without explanation seemingly in order to avoid having to comply with the proportionality requirement in the Constitution. Majority staff said that they needed guidance from the Commission on what they called "subjective" areas of Article XI suggesting that they had not been given such guidance. Staff repeatedly declined to commit to working toward the $54 \%-46 \%$ proportionality requirement as dictated by the Court.

It is shameful that we are here again, adopting yet another unconstitutional map in direct contradiction to the Ohio Supreme Court. Ultimately, this is not an issue of geography or technical inability to draw fair maps; it is a lack of political courage and a blatant disregard for the Court's order and the will of Ohio voters.

We Make It Happen" ${ }^{\text {" }}$
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Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022
MEMBERS PRESENT:
CO-CHAIR SPEAKER ROBERT R. CUPP
CO-CHAIR SENATOR VERNON SYKES
GOVERNOR MIKE DEWINE
AUDITOR KEITH FABER
STATE SENATE PRESIDENT MIKE HUFFMAN
SECRETARY OF STATE FRANK LAROSE
LEADER ELECT ALLISON RUSSO

# Transcript of Meeting 

Conducted on January 18, 2022

PROCEEDINGS
SPEAKER CUPP: I will now call to order this meeting of the Ohio Redistricting Commission. We are joined here today by our new member of the Commission who is House Minority Leader Elect, Allison Russo. Let the record reflect that the existing Commission members were previously sworn in on August the 6th, 2021 and I'll now ask Governor DeWine to administer the oath to our newest member.

GOV. DEWINE: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Representative Allison Russo, House Minority Leader Elect is the appointee to this Commission by Acting Minority Leader Kristin Boggs of the House of Representatives. And let the record reflect this appointment. And I will now ask her to stand.

Please raise your right hand.
I, Allison Russo.
REP. RUSSO: I Allison Russo.
GOV. DEWINE: Do solemnly swear.
REP. RUSSO: Do solemnly swear

GOVERNOR DEWINE: To support the Constitution of the United States.

REP. RUSSO: To support the Constitution of the United States.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: And the Constitution of the State of Ohio.

REP. RUSSO: And the Constitution of the State of Ohio.

GOV. DEWINE: And to faithfully
discharge the duties of the office.
REP. RUSSO: And to faithfully discharge the duties of the office.

GOV. DEWINE: As a member of the Ohio Redistricting Commission.

REP. RUSSO: As a member of the Ohio Redistricting Commission.

GOV. DEWINE: On which I serve.
REP. RUSSO: On which I serve.
GOV. DEWINE: Pursuant to Article 11.
REP. RUSSO: Pursuant to Article 11.
GOV. DEWINE: Section 1.
REP. RUSSO: Section 1.

GOV. DEWINE: Of the Ohio Constitution. REP. RUSSO: Of the Ohio Constitution.

GOV. DEWINE: This I shall do as I shall answer unto God.

REP. RUSSO: This I shall do as I shall answer unto God.

GOV. DEWINE: Congratulations. Thank you.

REP. RUSSO: Thank you. SPEAKER CUPP: Congratulations.

And at this time we'll have staff call
the roll.
STAFF: Co-Chair Speaker Cupp.
SPEAKER CUPP: Present.
STAFF: Co-Chair Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Present.
STAFF: Governor DeWine?
GOVERNOR DEWINE: Here.
STAFF: Auditor Faber?

MR. FABER: Yes.
STAFF: President Huffman?

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Here.

STAFF: Secretary LaRose?
SEC. LAROSE: Here.
STAFF: Leader Elect Russo?
REP. RUSSO: Here.
STAFF: We have a quorum.
SPEAKER CUPP: A quorum is present and we are meeting as a full Commission.

In your folders members, are the minutes of the last meeting on October 28, 2021. Is there a motion to accept the minutes?

SENATOR SYKES: So moved.
SPEAKER CUPP: There is a motion to accept the minutes and I will second that. Are there any objection to the motion or the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are accepted without objection.

At this time $I$ would like to recognize Governor DeWine.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I think it's important, Mr. Chairman, as we start to start with a brief discussion in regard to what our understanding is
of the court decision, the Ohio Supreme Court majority opinion. And I want to go through what I understand it to be and we'll maybe go from there on any kind of discussion.

But I think it is important to take a moment to discuss the holding of the Ohio Supreme Court. We know a lot of that holding was centered on Section 6. Section 6 has three parts with which the Commission must attempt to comply; they are: A, no 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 parts in general election results during the last 10 years favor each political party must correspond closely to the statewide preferences of the voters of Ohio.

And C, the district must be compact.
The Supreme Court spells out in the opinion, you know, what that means. The Ohio Supreme Court has told us that paragraph 86 of that majority opinion that, and I quote:
"Article 11, Section 6, also has a plain meaning. It directs the commission to take affirmative steps to comply with the standards stated in division A through C. Thus, when drawing a district plan the commission must attempt to meet the standards set forth in Section 6."

The Supreme court tells us in paragraph 90 that, and I quote:
"Section 6 speaks not of desire but a direction. The commission shall attempt to achieve the standards of that section. While Section 6 contemplates that the standards set forth in it may not come to fruition, it nevertheless requires the Commission to try to achieve them."

So going back to the term attempt, the Supreme Court goes on to tell us in paragraph 88 that, and I quote: Read together, the first and last
sentences of Section 6 clearly" --

Excuse me.
"Clarify that the standards of Section 6 are subordinate to the map drawing requirements in Section 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. If it is possible for a district plan to comply with Section 6 and Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 the Commission must adopt a plan that does so."

So my understanding is they are giving us instructions in regard to Section 6, what we need to try to obtain, and laid out a percentage in the opinion. But they also say that Sections $2,3,4,5$, and 7 must be met. That we have to check those boxes as well, and that we have to do all we can to then also under Section 6, get to the percentages that are laid out in the Supreme Court -- the Court decision.

Let me also add that the Court makes comments in the ruling in regard to our procedure. And this is -- I'm going to read how, at least I understand it, then I'll stop and let anybody
comment on either the procedure or the end result.
I would interpret what the Court is saying is that each individual commission member should instruct their respective staff members to abide by the Court's ruling, and address the Court's ruling regarding Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution.

So anybody who is drawing a map, anybody who works with any members of this Commission should be instructed by the individual commission members to do that. I would also think that an individual commission member is free to set up a meeting, or call any of the commission members relevant staff, and/or contractors to ask any questions, or discuss any issues the member may have.

Obviously, members should be mindful that no more than three members may be present at any one time when discussing Commission matters. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that these discussions have actually been going on, that those who are actually looking at the maps and
have that data in front of them have been talking among themselves, so I think all of this is being done, and I would like the record to reflect that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SPEAKER CUPP: Thank you, Governor
DeWine. Any other member wish to be recognized at this time?

The Chair recognizes Secretary of State LaRose.

SEC. LAROSE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and colleagues on the Commission. Obviously the work that we have in front of us right now as the commission is vitally important. There is one other thing that is inextricably linked to that though that $I$ want to just comment on for a moment. And that is the administration of an election in a timely and an orderly manner.

And so I think I have a duty to share with all of you the hard facts about administering an election, and just to make sure that we're operating with that in mind. Of course Ohioans deserve an accurate and accessible primary
election, and as this process continues we are starting to become perilously close to reaching that point where that may become logistically impossible.

Let me be clear, the General Assembly has ordered me to conduct an election on May 3rd, and I am committed to making sure that that happens. But without finality on maps, that starts to become mechanically impossible very soon. And so we need to reach that finality as quickly as possible.

Of course, the process of preparing for that election takes weeks, many weeks, not days, and we're already facing statutory deadlines that likely cannot be met. For example, there is a deadline this weekend that by necessity will not be met, whereby we have a responsibility to report to the federal government a thing called the federal write-in absentee ballot, and that's not going to be met because we're not going to be ready to do that this weekend.

There's a reason why historically this
has been a 90 day window between filing and election. If you go visit your county boards of elections, most of them have a 90 day calendar where every single one of those days has with it a checklist of responsibilities that they need to accomplish throughout those 90 days.

I'm confident that our 88 county boards of elections can conduct a successful primary election on May 3rd, but they, these bipartisan hard-working men and women that actually run these selections, they are going to need a little bit of assistance from the General Assembly.

I've asked our legislative leaders for the temporary authority to adjust the administrative deadlines required in state and federal law. Over the weekend my staff has been meeting with their staff, I've delivered a letter to the legislative leaders today and what we're talking about is those administrative deadlines between filing deadline and election day, and there are many of them.

Here are just a few examples.

Programming of districts and voter data. That takes weeks to do once we have the shape files, the actual maps, it takes about three weeks for those programming processes to be carried out. We have to accommodate overseas and military voters. We have to proof and print ballots, notification of the elect doors, testing of election tabulation and reporting systems. This is just a very short list of the many things that have to happen between filing deadline and an election date.

So this is the exact same temporary authority that was granted to my office under Senate Bill 258 which moved the congressional filing deadline to March 4th and so I'm asking for that authority to apply that to the State House and Senate elections as well. Of course, without that, I cannot guarantee that things are going to happen in the way that we expect, and Ohioans have a long history of elections that that are orderly and fair and accessible, and honest, and that's exactly what we're going to deliver once again. Anything short of that benefits no one
and so I want to make sure that we can do our jobs and do them well. And so I thank you for the time, and I appreciate your consideration. SPEAKER CUPP: Any further discussion or comments?

Senator Sykes?
SENATOR SYKES: Thank you Mr. Co-Chair. I would like to also thank the Governor for kind of setting the stage. I think it is important for us as a Commission to make sure it is clear that the public knows that it's clear to us that we know what our marching orders are. And the percentage, the 54/46 percentage goal and objective to try to attempt to achieve is clear that that's the direction we're headed in.

We've got just a few days to make these decisions. I wanted to assure the public that we, at least in our caucus and in conjunction with the other members of the Commission, directed our staffs to start those conversations already. The website is a being re-activated. At this point we have an agreement on the data that we are going to
be using, the 2016 to 2020 statewide elections data.

Funding is being provided so that all operatives will have the proper consultation to get started with and it's important for us to move post haste to make sure that we comply with the court order in a timely fashion.

SPEAKER CUPP: Thank you, Senator Sykes.
Representative Russo?
REP. RUSSO: Thank you, Chair. First of all it is an honor to be a part of this Commission, and I look forward to the hard work that we will be doing in the next several days now because we are at a matter of days to achieve this task, which I think is fully achievable it is hard, but we are smart, we are talented, we are experienced people on this Commission. I know that we can get this work done.

Thank you to the Governor for addressing the Court's decision, and I would like to respond by saying, and reemphasizing that the Court was clear that this Commission is required to attempt
to draw maps with the numbers of districts that closely correspond with the $54 / 46$ breakdown of Ohio voter preferences.

The Court was also clear that attempt is not a meaningless word. The language of Section 6 means that we must do it, unless we cannot do it. And specifically, paragraph 88 says that the term attempt means if it is possible for a district plan to comply with Section 6, and Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, the Commission must adopt a plan that does so.

We know from the prior work of this Commission that there are many maps that have been proposed that meet all of those requirements. And so let's not move forward assuming that attempt is unachievable because it has been proven in prior attempts to actually do this. The language of Section 6 means that we must do it unless we cannot do it. And I know that we all come here today ready to follow the Court's order. This is our second chance to do what is right by Ohioans and deliver bipartisan tenure
maps that followed the Constitution and reflect the preferences of Ohio voters. And we stand ready to conduct open and transparent process that will produce fair maps.

This decision, $I$ just want to point out, we have many members of the public here, would not have been possible without the hundreds of Ohioans who have testified for fair maps and have spent literally years advocating for this. And I just want you to know that when you speak up your voices do make a difference.

So I hope, again, that we are all committed as commission members to uphold the will of the people by drawing maps that gives all communities the equal representation that they deserve and by following what the Court has been very clear in what our mission is.

Thank you.
SPEAKER CUPP: Any further comments? I not, I would just say that we have already begun the work to work cooperatively to implement and conform to the decision of the Court, as we
understand it. And that we'll continue, well aware of the time constraints, which makes this process difficult but not impossible, and so we will all be working diligently to achieve those ends.

Is there any further business to come before this meeting of the Redistricting

Commission? Being none, we will --
I will just say that we will -- Senator Sykes and I will be meeting to discuss a schedule for further meetings of this Commission as the business would warrant us to reconvene in a meeting. And so we will be working that out. Obviously this is a little uncertain process, it's new, as we would say on the court, this is a matter of first impression and so we are kind of feeling our way as we go. But we will be working on a schedule and provide proper notice.

If there is no further business to come before the Commission we will stand adjourned. (Meeting adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, Molly Bugher, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the recorded proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability from the audio recording and supporting information; and that $I$ am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.
Molly Bugher, CDLT-161

DATE: January 24,2022

Conducted on January 18, 2022


Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022

| 19:19 | close | congratulations | 16:20, 17:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 12:2 | 5:7, 5:10 | cupp |
| calendar | closely | congressional | 2:2, 3:2, 5:10, |
| 13:3 | 7:16, 17:2 | 14:13 | 5:13, 5:14, 6:6, |
| call | co-chair | conjunction | 6:12, 11:5, |
| 3:2, 5:11, | 2:2, 2:3, 5:13, | 15:18 | 15:4, 16:8, |
| 10:13 | 5:15, 15:7 | consideration | 18:19 |
| called | colleagues | 15:3 | D |
| 12:18 | 11:11 | constitution | data |
| cannot | come | 4:2, 4:3, 4:5, | 11:1, 14:1, |
| 12:15, 14:17, | 8:16, 17:19, | $4: 7,5: 1,5: 2$, | 15:22, 16:2 |
| 17:6, 17:19 | 19:6, 19:19 | 10:7, 18:1 | date |
| carried | comment | constraints | 14:10, 20:14 |
| 14:4 | $10: 1, \quad 11: 15$ | 19:2 | day |
| case | comments | consultation | 13:1, 13:3, |
| 20:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 20, \quad 15: 5, \\ & 18: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $16: 4$ | 13:20 |
| caucus | 18:19 <br> commission | contemplates $8: 14$ | days |
| 15:18 | commission $1: 8,3: 3,3: 5,$ | 8:14 <br> continue | 12:13, 13:4, |
| cdlt | $\begin{array}{lll} 1: 8, & 3: 3, & 3: 5, \\ 3: 7, & 3: 14, & 4: 14, \end{array}$ |  | 13:6, 15:16, |
| $20: 13$ <br> centered | $4: 16, \quad 6: 7, \quad 7: 9$ | continues | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 16:13, 16:14 } \\ & \text { deadline } \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| 7:7 | 8:2, 8:6, 8:12, | 12:1 | 12:16, 13:20, |
| certificate | 8:17, 9:8, 10:3, | contractors | 14:10, 14:14 |
| 19:22 | 10:9, 10:10, | 10:14 | deadlines |
| certify | 10:12, 10:13, | conversations | 12:14, 13:15, |
| 20:1 | 10:19, 11:11, | 15:20 | 13:19 |
| chair | 11:13, 15:10, | cooperatively | decision |
| 11:8, 16:10 | 15:19, 16:12, | 18:21 | 7:1, 9:18, |
| chairman | 16:17, 16:22, | correct | 16:20, 18:5, |
| $3: 11,6: 19,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 17: 10, & 17: 13, \\ 18: 13, & 19: 8, \end{array}$ | 20:2 | 18:22 |
| $6: 21,10: 20,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 18: 13, & 19: 8, \\ 19: 11, & 19: 20 \end{array}$ | correspond | decisions |
| $11: 4,11: 10$ | committed | 7:16, 17:2 | 15:17 |
| chance | $12: 7,18: 13$ | counsel | deliver |
| 17:21 | communities | $20: 6$ | $14: 21,17: 22$ |
| check | $18: 15$ | county | delivered |
| 9:15 | compact | $13: 2, ~ 13: 7$ course | $13: 17$ |
| checklist | $7: 18$ | course | deserve |
| 13:5 | comply | $11: 21,12: 12,$ | $11: 22,18: 16$ |
| clarify |  | 14:16 | desire |
| 9:2 | $16: 6, \quad 17: 9$ | court $7: 1,7: 7,7: 19$ | 8:11 |
| clear $12: 5,15: 10$, | conduct | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 1, \quad 7: 7, \quad 7: 19, \\ & 7: 21, \quad 8: 9, \quad 8: 20, \end{aligned}$ | dewine $2: 4,3: 9,3: 11$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 5, \quad 15: 10, \\ & 15: 11, \quad 15: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 12:6, 13:8, | $9: 18, \quad 9: 19,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 4,3: 9,3: 11, \\ & 3: 21, \end{aligned} 4: 1,4: 5,$ |
| $16: 22, \quad 17: 4$ | 18:3 | 10:2, 16:7, | 4:9, 4:13, 4:17, |
| $18: 17$ | confident | 16:21, 17:4, | 4:19, 4:21, 5:1, |
| clearly | 13:7 | 18:16, 18:22, | 5:3, 5:7, 5:17, |
| 8:23 | conform $18: 22$ | 19:15 | 5:18, 6:18, |

Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022

| 6:19, 11:6 | duties | experienced | forth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| difference | 4:10, 4:12 | 16:17 | 8:7, 8:15 |
| 18:11 | duty | F | forward |
| difficult | 11:18 | faber | 16:12, 17:15 |
| 19:3 | E | 2:5, 5:19, 5:20 | frank |
| diligently | each | facing | 2:7 |
| 19:4 | 7:15, 10:3 | 12:14 | free |
| directed | either | facts | 10:12 |
| 15:19 | 10:1 | 11:19 | front |
| direction | elect | fair | 11:1, 11:12 |
| 8:12, 15:15 | 2:8, 3:5, 3:13, | 14:20, 18:4, | fruition |
| directs | 6:3, 14:7 | 18:8 | 8:16 |
| 8:2 | election | faithfully | full |
| discharge | 7:14, 11:17, | 4:9, 4:11 | 6:7 |
| 4:10, 4:11 | 11:20, 12:1, | fashion | fully |
| discuss | $12: 6,12: 13,$ | $16: 7$ | 16:15 |
| 7:6, 10:15, | $13: 2,13: 9,$ | favor | funding |
| 19:10 | $13: 20, \quad 14: 7$ | $7: 10,7: 15$ | 16:3 |
| discussing | 14:10 | federal | further |
| $10: 19$ | elections | 7:13, 12:18, | $15: 4, \quad 18: 19,$ |
| discussion | 13:3, 13:8, | 12:19, 13:16 | $19: 6, \quad 19: 11,$ |
| $6: 22,7: 4,15: 4$ discussions | $14: 16, \quad 14: 19,$ | feeling | $\frac{19: 19}{G}$ |
| 10:21 | employed | few | general |
| disfavor | 20:7 | 13:22, 15:16 | 7:14, 12:5, |
| $7: 11$ | end | files | 13:12 |
| district | 10:1 | 14:2 | gives |
| 7:18, 8:6, 9:5, | ends | filing | 18:14 |
| 17:8 | 19:5 | $13: 1,13: 20,$ | giving |
| districts | equal | $14: 10, \quad 14: 14$ | 9:10 |
| 7:12, 14:1, | 18:15 | finality | go |
| $17: 1$ | every | 12:8, 12:10 | 7:2, 7:3, 13:2, |
| division | $13: 4$ | financial | $19: 17$ |
| $8: 4$ | exact | 20:8 | goal |
| doing | 14:11 | first | 15:13 |
| $16: 13$ | exactly | $8: 22,16: 10,$ | god |
| done <br> 11:3, 16:18 | $14: 21$ | $19: 16$ | $5: 4, \quad 5: 6$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:3, } 16: 18 \\ & \text { doors } \end{aligned}$ | example | folders | goes |
| $14: 7$ | 12:15 | 6:8 | 8:20 |
| 14:7 draw | examples | follow | going |
| draw 17:1 | 13:22 | 17:20 | 8:19, 9:21, |
| drawing | excuse | followed | 10:21, 12:20, |
| drawing $8: 5,9: 3,10: 8,$ | $9: 1$ | $18: 1$ | 13:11, 14:17, |
| $18: 14$ | existing $3: 7$ | following $\text { \| } 18: 16$ | 14:21, 15:22 <br> gov |
| drawn | expect | foregoing | 3:11, 3:21, |
| 7:10 during | 14:18 | 20:2 | 4:9, 4:13, 4:17, |

Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022

| 4:19, 4:21, 5:1, | hope | joined | list |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5: 3,5: 7$ | 18:12 | 3:4 | 14:9 |
| government | house | K | literally |
| 12:18 | 3:5, 3:12, | keith | 18:9 |
| governor | 3:15, 14:15 | 2:5 | little |
| 2:4, 3:9, 4:1, | huffman | kind | 13:11, 19:14 |
| 4:5, 5:17, 5:18, | 2:6, 5:21, 5:22 | $7: 4, \quad 15: 8,$ | logistically |
| 6:18, 6:19, | hundreds | 19:16 | 12:3 |
| 11:5, 15:8, | 18:7 | know | long |
| 16:19 | I | 7:7, 7:20, | 14:19 |
| granted | implement | 15:12, 16:17, | look |
| 14:12 | $18: 21$ | $17: 12,17: 19$ | 16:12 |
| guarantee | important | 18:10 | looking |
| 14:17 | 6:20, 7:5, | knows | 10:22 |
| H | 11:13, 15:9, | 15:11 | lot |
| hand | 16:5 | kristin | 7:7 |
| 3:18 | impossible | 3:14 | M |
| happen | 12:4, 12:9, | L | majority |
| 14:9, 14:18 | $19: 3$ | laid | 7:2, 7:22 |
| happens | impression | 9:12, 9:17 | make |
| 12:8 | $19: 16$ | language | $11: 20,15: 1$ |
| hard | individual | $17: 5, \quad 17: 17$ | $15: 10, \quad 15: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11: 19, \quad 16: 12, \\ & 16: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $10: 3, \quad 10: 10,$ | larose | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 6, \quad 18: 11 \\ & \text { makes } \end{aligned}$ |
| hard-working | inextricably | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 7, \quad 6: 1, \quad 6: 2, \\ & 11: 9, \quad 11: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $9: 19,19: 2$ |
| 13:10 | 11:14 | last | making |
| haste | information | 6:9, 7:14, 8:22 | 12:7 |
| 16:6 | 20:5 | law | manner |
| headed | instruct | 13:16 | 11:17 |
| 15:15 | 10:4 | leader | many |
| here | instructed | $2: 8,3: 5,3: 13,$ | $12: 13, \quad 13: 21,$ |
| $3: 4,5: 18,$ | $10: 10$ | $3: 14,6: 3$ | $14: 9,17: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5: 22,6: 2,6: 4, \\ & 13 \cdot 22,17 \cdot 19 \end{aligned}$ | instructions | leaders | $18: 6$ |
| $13: 22,17: 19,$ | $9: 11$ | $13: 13,13: 18$ | map |
| $18: 6$ | interest | least | $9: 3, \quad 10: 8$ |
| hereby | 20:8 | 9:21, 15:18 | maps |
| 20:1 | interpret | legislative | 10:22, 12:8, |
| historically | 10:2 | 13:13, 13:18 | 14:3, 17:1, |
| 12:22 | issues | let's | 17:13, 18:1, |
| history | 10:15 | 17:15 | 18:4, 18:8, |
| 14:19 | J | letter | $18: 14$ |
| holding | january | 13:17 | march |
| honest | 1:9, 20:14 | likely | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 14 \\ & \text { marching } \end{aligned}$ |
| 14:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { job } \\ & \text { 1:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 15 \\ & \text { linked } \end{aligned}$ | $15: 12$ |
| honor | jobs | 11:14 | matter |

Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022


Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022

| ```9:8, 17:9, 17:10 please 3:18 point 12:3, 15:21, 18:5 political 7:11, 7:15 possible 9:5, 12:11, 17:8, 18:7 post 16:6 preferences 7:16, 17:3, 18:2 preparing 12:12 present 2:1, 5:14, \(5: 16,6: 6,10: 18\) president 2:6, 5:21, 5:22 previously 3:7 primarily 7:10 primary 11:22, 13:8 print 14:6 prior 17:12, 17:16 procedure 9:20, 10:1 proceedings 20:3 process 12:1, 12:12, 18:3, 19:3, 19:14 processes 14:4 produce 18:4 programming 14:1, 14:4 proof 14:6``` | proper <br> 16:4, 19:18 <br> proportion <br> 7:12 <br> proposed <br> 17:14 <br> proven <br> 17:16 <br> provide <br> 19:18 <br> provided <br> 16:3 <br> public $15: 11, \quad 15: 17$ $18: 6$ <br> pursuant <br> questions <br> 10:15 <br> quickly <br> 12:11 <br> quorum <br> 6:5, 6:6 <br> quote $7: 22,8: 10,$ $8: 21$ <br> R <br> raise $3: 18$ <br> re-activated $15: 21$ <br> reach <br> 12:10 <br> reaching <br> 12:2 <br> read $8: 22,9: 21$ <br> ready <br> 12:21, 17:20, <br> 18:3 <br> reason <br> 12:22 <br> recognize <br> 6:17 <br> recognized <br> 11:6 | ```recognizes 11:8 reconvene 19:12 record 3:6, 3:16, 11:3, 20:2 recorded 20:3 recording 20:5 redistricting 1:8, 3:3, 4:14, 4:16, 19:7 reemphasizing 16:21 reflect 3:6, 3:16, 11:3, 18:1 regard 6:22, 9:11, 9:20 regarding 10:6 related 20:6 relevant 10:14 rep 3:20, 3:22, 4:3, 4:7, 4:11, 4:15, 4:18, 4:20, 4:22, 5:2, 5:5, 5:9, 6:4, 16:10 report 12:17 reporting 14:8 representation 18:15 representative 3:12, 16:9 representatives 3:15 required 13:15, 16:22 requirements 9:4, 17:14``` | ```requires 8:17 respective 10:4 respond 16:20 responsibilities 13:5 responsibility 12:17 result 10:1 results 7:14 right 3:18, 11:12, 17:22 robert 2:2 roll 5:12 ruling 9:20, 10:5, 10:6 run 13:10 russo 2:8, 3:6, 3:12, 3:19, 3:20, 3:22, 4:3, 4:7, 4:11, 4:15, 4:18, 4:20, 4:22, 5:2, 5:5, 5:9, 6:3, 6:4, 16:9, 16:10 said 20:3 same 14:11 say 9:13, 18:20, 19:9, 19:15 saying 10:3, 16:21 says 17:7``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022


Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 18, 2022


We Make It Happen" ${ }^{\text {" }}$

# Transcript of Meeting 

Date: January 20, 2022
Case: Transcription Services

Planet Depos
Phone: 888.433.3767
Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com
www.planetdepos.com


Transcript of Meeting
Conducted on January 20, 2022

PROCEED NGS
SEN. SYKES: With the secretary, please call
the roll.
SECRETARY: Speaker Co-Chair Cupp.
REP. CUPP: Present.
SECRETARY: Senator Co-Chair Sykes.
SEN. SYKES: Here.
SECRETARY: Governor DeWine?
GOV. DEWINE: Here.
SECRETARY: Auditor Faber?
SEN. FABER: Here.
SECRETARY: President Huffman.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Here.
SECRETARY: Secretary LeRose.
MR. LEROSE: Here.
SECRETARY: And Leader-Elect Russo.
MR. RUSSO: Here.
SECRETARY: A quorum is present, Mr. Co-Chair. SEN. SYKES: We have minutes from the previous meeting included in the packet. Are there any objections to the minutes? Hearing and seeing none, we will accept the minutes as presented.

At this point we'd like to make a few statements and ask for a recess until 3:30. Start with Speaker Cupp.

REP. CUPP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We 00 our staffs have been working not only between the caucuses, but also with the statewide officeholders, beginning to look at various parts of Ohio and see where we can make some modifications so that we can comply with the order of the Supreme Court.

We have produced some proposal -- draft proposal for a Franklin County and Hamilton County, and we have them and are prepared to discuss those at this time what progress we've made; understanding that there has not been an agreement.

There have been collaboration and discussion, but not in agreement between the the various parts of the commission and -- but we understand that -- that maybe you have a different motion at this time, Senator.

SEN. SYKES: Mr. Co-Chair, I move that we take recess until 3:30 for the purpose of reviewing the proposals presented by both the majority and the
minority to see if we can come a little closer for our update today. Is there any objections?

SEN. HUFFMAN: Mr. Co-Chair, I don't have an objection to the recess. I guess I just want to understand if I could kind of just have the floor for one minute.

SEN. SYKES: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. Yeah. So I understood that -- and I also want to commend, I think the last two evenings at least, all -- representatives of all seven commission members have been meeting in the, I think, the Senate minority caucus room having input to various changes and trying to do that, of course, in conformity with the court's order and all with the idea of producing -- complying with the court's order that this be done by Saturday.

And I understood the -- there has been a presentation of suggested changes by members of the, I guess I would say, different folks from the majority in Franklin and Hamilton County. Our folks just received, I guess, kind of a response.

And so it's my understanding that the purpose
of the recess is to examine those proposed changes and proposed response to changes in just those two areas in the next hour. And then we can come back and review them all publicly. Is that what -- where we're at here? SEN. SYKES: Basically, yes.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. Great. We understand that you've indicated that states have been working in both sides, the majority and the minority participation with statewise as well.

And there are just -- what's before the committee right now is not comprehensive, and that does not include all of the considerations; that we just want to make sure either we narrow it down or we, you know, make public all of the considerations.

SEN. HUFFMAN: In what time would we reconvene then?

REP. CUPP: It's. 2:30 now; 4:00? Would 4:00 o'clock be okay with the members?

SEN. HUFFMAN: Whatever the co-chairs tell me, I'll be here.

SEN. SYKES: Okay, well, I'll keep that, I keep a rain check. I'll keep a rain check on that well.

SEN. HUFFMAN: But I would like to know because there are --

SEN. SYKES: 4:00.
SEN. HUFFMAN: 4:00, perfect. All right.
SEN. SYKES: We are now in recess until four o'clock.
[recess]
SEN. SYKES: We're going to call to order the Ohio redistricting commission. Extend apologies to the public. We were not aware that the majority was going to actually have maps available.

We had to take a research recess to make sure the maps from the minority was also distributed, placed on the website and made available for your consumption. At this time we're going to move post-haste to present just brief presentations of these maps.

We have decided to take a regional approach to address this issue. We've had some tentative understandings, but we have not made any final decisions on the -- on the maps. But we wanted to provide an opportunity to give a progress report on where we stand because we're getting closer and closer
to the deadline.
So with that, Speaker, would you want to make the presentation?

REP. CUPP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do. And again, this is a summary presentation.

As Senator Sykes has indicated, there is continuing to work on these and we can consider these drafts and still training input and ideas and comments back and forth.

So I would refer to the one that as a proposal for Franklin and Union Counties, Ohio House and Ohio Senate districts. I will talk mostly about the the House district, of course.

These were drawn with the idea of trying to have compact districts, districts that have some competitive nature to them where possible, and ones that take a step towards the proportionality requirement of the Constitution, as explained by the Ohio Supreme Court.

So in Franklin County, and we had Union County on this because a part of Dublin -- actually all of Dublin in Franklin County and Union County are
together. So we call it the Franklin-Union County one. So the result of that is that there are 11 Democratleaning districts and one Republican-leaning district.

In the -- in the Senate there would be four Democrat-leaning districts in this proposal, and I think the maps have been passed out and you can see what -- what those are. I would then move, Mr. Chairman, to the proposal for Hamilton and Warren County.

And in the House for Hamilton County there would be five Democrat-leaning districts and two Republican-leaning districts. And then in Warren County, which is paired and there's a bit of a -- there would be two -- two Republican-leaning districts in Warren County. It's a little difficult to find significant Democrat population in Warren County.

So in the Senate, in both counting both counties, there's one Democrat-leaning district and two Republican-leaning districts. So these are the proposals that have been exchanged among staff.

And so there is ongoing discussion about that. In fact, there was discussion during our recess here.

And as I understand it, that you have -- and these have been uploaded to the website and as I understand it now, the maps that you're proposing to been uploaded as well. So that's my presentation.

SEN. SYKES: Thank you, Speaker. At this time, we'll call on Chris Glassburn our map drawer on Democratic side to present our counter.

MR. GLASSBURN: Thank you, Co-Chair Sykes and Co-Chair Cupp and members of the commission.

The document you have in front of you with images, the site I'd like to begin with is Hamilton County and has House districts with labels. You'll see numbers more prominently, 29, 25, 24, et cetera.

So the House and Senate Democrats received a proposal concerning Hamilton county yesterday and then discussed that proposal -- from the Republican members and then discussed that proposal last night. The response you have before you again is designed to incorporate that feedback, as well as to maintain a statewide map that is on a trajectory to reach the proportionality specified by the Ohio Supreme Court, 54 percent Republican, 46 percent Democratic.

For the House, Hamilton County features seven House seats in the map that was presented to the -- by the Republican caucus. There were five Democratic and two Republican seats. The Democrats have done the same thing with five Democratic seats and two Republican seats.

We consider that a significant movement on our behalf to the majority in that there are, quite frankly, a limited number of places in which Democratic seats may occur; and this takes one of those House districts off the table to go on this path.

The districts in many ways resemble the districts that were put forward by the Republicans' proposal; some, I believe entirely so. But our our endeavor was to make both the districts more compact and to allow for reasonable compact and representative pairings for Senate districts.

On the next page of your packet, you'll have the Senate pairings. In the Senate map pairings, you will see that there for Hamilton County are two districts within the county, each of which have Democratic indexes in our proposal.

This is a difference from the Republican proposal that had only one. The light blue district to the far east end of the county is a single House district that would connect to Warren County for the purposes of being in the Senate.

In the proposals that have consistently come from the Democratic caucus dating back to prior to the court's decision, it was our view that the most consistent way to represent the communities of Hamilton County was to have a district on the western end that connected through Butler, not through Warren County. However, we have taken the suggestion from the majority and done that by having a district, the light blue district 27, available to Warren County.

Moving on next to the Franklin Union pairings. Once again, the minority sought to make significant concessions to the desires expressed by a majority similar to Hamilton County, it is possible to draw maps that are one seat in the House more Democratic than this map will tally.

And again, we have chosen to accept or to go on the path of what the Republicans have suggested; but
again, that will continue to narrow the options as we proceed through the rest of the state.

The northwest corner attachment of the city of Dublin to Union County with parts of Washington Township, I believe, is identical. The pairings of the Upper Arlington, Hilliard and district, which is District 11, as well as a district to the south of Hilliard for the purposes of a Senate district again are very consistent with what was proposed by the Republican caucus.

However, in the proposals from the majority, there were House dis- -- House district that extended from the from the top of Prairie Township, which is halfway up the western side of the county, went entirely across the southern part of the county, and then went again halfway up Franklin County on the other side. That district concerned us significantly on the compactness and the likelihood of acceptability of that.

As with the majority proposal, there is a district centered on the city -- Grove City that is a extremely close more or less 50 percent plus one vote
type-district, leaning Democratic. However, the majority proposals have continued to seek to draw districts of that nature.

There is undoubtedly going to be competitive districts and should be competitive districts through this state. But if we have repeated 50 percent plus one over and over and over, there will become a point where the court's concerns regarding asymmetry of districts, whereas one party has a disproportionate number of seats that are close to 50 percent versus the other party, will come into play. And so I just throw that out as a word of caution.

Additionally, as you will see in the Senate pairings for these House districts, the minor tweaks that we have made allowed for in the House districts have allowed for significantly more compact Senate districts. There is now the nearly identical northwestern union northwestern Franklin Union County pairing, there is a southern half of Franklin County, and then there are much more compact and similar districts in the north, central, and northwest.

Co-Chair Sykes, if there's anything further
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than I have omitted, I would be happy to address any error at this point.

SEN. SYKES: At this time, are there any questions to either either of the presenters, Speaker Cupp, Co-Chair Cupp or Chris Glassburn about the maps? Again, this is to provide a status report and update of where we stand. The staffs have been working together.

This is the first time $I$ believe in the history of the state that Republican and Democrat staff have been working together on maps. It's a herculean task, but I think we're up to trying to make sure we comply with the court order or the questions to the presenters.

SEN. FABER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Glassburn, thank you for your work on this. The one thing that I'm missing is your indexes for competitiveness and for other factors on your map that we did get from the -- the Cupp-introduced proposals. Do you have those that we could take a look at those? Apparently you had them because you made reference to them a couple of times.

MR. GLASSBURN: Mr. Auditor, we, in the
interest of having greater ability to share and discuss these maps, constructed them through the popular Dave's Redistricting app. That data set is close but not exact upon a match of the Oakerd [ph] file.

We have not made the conversions to the Oakerd file, but my compatriot on the staff side, Randall Route [ph], is working on that as we speak and we'll be happy to share that with you. The links to these maps on Dave's Redistricting app are, I believe, available and being circulated. So that will also

SEN. FABER: Saving -- Mr. Chairman, saving me from having to go to Dave's and do the math and do the calculations you'll submit to us --

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes, we will.
SEN. FABER: -- copies of those indexes for each one of these proposed districts House and Senate?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes. Yes, Mr. Auditor. We certainly intend to do that again in the interest of complying with the time deadlines we are putting together as much as we can as we iteratively go here.

SEN. FABER: Then a follow-up, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate you doing this. I appreciate again. In
the past, we've worked together and I appreciated that. Then I appreciate it now.

Can you tell me what the big difference is? Let's just start with Franklin County. What is the big difference? You kind of went through some summaries, but in the districts it looks like -- and maybe I'm at a loss, but the Cupp version just seems to be easier to read because I think he got rid of some precincts or did different colors.

But it looks like the maps are very similar in most of the areas. Is it that you guys just made adjustments here and there or -- or did you make wholesale changes that should be of note that are going to raise community issues?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs and Mr. Auditor, the largest changes that occurred in Franklin County occurred in the southern portion of the county, primarily concerning what we have labeled districts 10 and 5; that being the city, the district centered on Grove City and then the district that has in the corner Canal, Winchester Grove Port, Reynoldsburg, and other communities.

Historically, that eastern-southeastern district has had some odd shapes moving north. However, we were not looking to maximize that historical precedence of seeing how far we could take it. We try to, again, maintain the majority's desire for a district of the nature of that Grove City there is.

At the same time combining more like communities than dissimilar communities, and we believe this is both more compact and it does a better job of uniting communities that are more similar than the previous map, which we again appreciate. But it stood out to us as something that needed to be corrected.

SEN. FABER: So the big thing then, if $I$ translate it in the Cupp version of -- the Republican version, House District five on their labeling would encompass a U-shape around southern Franklin County.

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. FABER: And you guys divided that up into two different districts. I assume going more into City of Columbus to pick up votes, pick up people?

MR. GLASSBURN: The districts as drawn by that -- that were presented by the Republican commission did
go into Columbus in that manner. However, the nature of the, if you will, of the voters that are picked up, there are more from the German Village neighborhood, which we thought was a more appropriate pairing.

SEN. FABER: German Village with rural
southern Franklin County?
MR. GLASSBURN: Relative to the choice that was made in choosing predominantly urban neighborhoods in Columbus, German Village was a closer fit.

SEN. FABER: Okay. So Mr. Chairman, just looking through the rest, it looks like on the northern parts -- and again, I'm only doing an eyeball comparison; you guys have the data neighborhood by neighborhood -- but it looks like the northern maps are essentially the same. Am I right on that?

It looks like the northern -- northern districts, your eight, your eight, looks to be about -I mean, they're very similar. Maybe a little bit different here and there; nine, four, three -- seven is significantly different; 11 is somewhat different; six looks to be a little different.

MR. GLASSBURN: The southern half of the
county, Mr. Auditor, has differences of varying significance. The northern part of the county, the differences are very minimal, as a general statement.

The map that you have is -- was modified. We took the proposal that the Republican commissioners sent us and took that as the working document and modified that proposal to be this.

SEN. FABER: Okay. So we'll look at the data when you submit over the --

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. FABER: -- to see the comparisons. Thank you.

MR. GLASSBURN: Thank you.
SEN. SYKES: Leader Russo?
REP. RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. Following along that same point of discussion, I just want to narrow in again on the District 7 district -differences. Is it correct that in the Democratic proposal that we have put back, we have tried to maintain the community of Clintonville together in a compact district and then it swings around and I believe it picks up Grandview Heights, correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: That's correct.

REP. RUSSO: Okay. And then one other question again, going back to this, this the changes that we made in the southern part of the county. And I will note I happen to currently represent one portion of this district.

What we attempted to do, particularly in District 10, which is the district centered on Grove City, was to incorporate Prairie and Pleasant Townships, which are very similar communities, integrated into that Grove City community. They share a school district.

They share many of the community resources together to put those communities together because they are like communities, both functionally but also in terms of how they they currently operate and are also currently represented; correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Leader Russo, and this to the co-chairs -- that's how I view this district. One person's opinion is that, again, the southwest corner of the county is now more or less in one seat, and that -- that clearly is an area that shares values and
community.
It's not always possible to have 100 percent of a district be identical in its nature, but to the extent that we can both make districts more compact and more communities or limit the number of diverse from each other communities, that is a potentially worthwhile goal.

REP. RUSSO: And as a reminder, while we do have 11 quote-unquote Democratic seats in our map, we have also made District 10 , which is that Grove City Center district. It is very close to the 50 percent, so very competitive; correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: To Leader Russo and the cochairs, yes, that is an accurate assessment. Again, the Sykes -- Sykes 15 map by comparison, instead of choosing Union County, chose Pickaway and had 12 out of 12 House seats being Democratic, and none of those 12 were particularly close to 50-50.

This is a significant departure in that there are there is one Republican index seat and there is an additional seat that is a razor-thin margin.

SEN. SYKES: Mr. Glassburn, in your initial
presentation, you used the word "compromise" several times. Was that on both sides in the negotiations with that on both sides?

MR. GLASSBURN: So to the co-chairs, Senator Sykes, on a staff level, that is what we have endeavored to do.

As I have alluded to multiple times, there is a legal pathway to -- to matching the proportionality described by the Supreme Court of 54-46. That is something that we do not view as something that can be ignored or dismissed. As we go along, we are trying to find ways to work together.

But by taking a regional approach, you also subject the process to limiting your choices as you make concessions along the way and compromise for both -- for -- for any party, any kind of negotiation. And so this is a starting point that we are comfortable. That's why we proposed it.

But there are choices that and compromises that have been made that are in this and it is still on a trajectory to reach that 45-15 proportionality. But that path has narrowed considerably in the process of
making these choices.
SEN. SYKES: Mr. Glassburn, to -- correct me if I'm wrong, but to illustrate four decisions are made in trying to make sure we comply with the court order, in Hamilton County, there was a compromise that you end up with 5-2 -- five Democratic House seats and two Senate -- two Republican seats.

But the pairing of the Senate districts was different in the two -- different in the two proposals and in the Republican proposal, the pairing would lead to just one Democratic seat and then with the Democratic proposal, it would mean two.

And so this is an example, I believe, of what the court means that you should -- you should comply with the proportionality if you can comply. And this would be an easy way to comply, not changing the configuration of the overall districts, the House districts, but just dealing with the pairing itself.

And that's why we're recommending this particular change.

MR. GLASSBURN: To Senator Sykes and the cochairs and the commission, the Senate pairings that we
have recommended in Hamilton County again are consistent with being on a pathway to 45 House seats that are Democratic and 15 Senate seats that are Democratic statewide.

We are very concerned that failing to do that will not put the final product on a trajectory to meet that -- that prerogative or that goal that has been set forward by the Supreme Court.

And so that is certainly an issue that will have to be further discussed to ensure compliance with the decision.

SEN. SYKES: Are there any additional questions? President Huffman.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Senator Sykes. Thanks for your work on this issue. A couple of issues I want to ask about. So first on the if we can go to Franklin County, which I know includes about 60,000 in these maps, 60,000 people in Union County, but I'll call the Franklin County map if that's all right. On the map that I have, which is this what I'm holding up here for, I guess, for lack of a better term.

And then I have the the proposal that majority
caucus has proposed -- now, these changes from the map previously adopted by the commission. The first question $I$ have is there's a -- on the majority map, there's a District 25 there. Well, there's 25, 16, 3 and 15 -- 6, 3 and 15.

Well, I can't quite follow where the numbers are on on your map. Can you tell me --I'm not -- I'm not sure if we have one because we've got a 7 up there someplace and I want to make sure we have the same numbers we're working on.

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes. So as to the Co-Chairs, Senator Huffman, the maps we have in front of you, again, our caucuses were not expecting it to be -- we were not made -- we were not aware that there was going to be a presentation at this meeting in advance.

So in the interest of making sure we had a document available, we recreated Senate districts by combining House districts on a house district map. The numbers are not meant to be and do not conform with the numbering patterns for the state; and quite honestly, in the absence of knowing the other districts of the state, it's a little bit of a meaningless exercise. But
yes, we will endeavor to be more consistent.
But we have, again, in these proposals taking the map files that are presented to us. We draw from those files and try to reuse the numbering scheme that is within the files that have been sent to us.

In this case, though, to try to have something here in rapid fashion, we combined the House district map quickly to create recreate the Senate seats.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. So Mr. Chairman, so the 7 that's in the upper right hand corner, that's not in reference to a Senate district; that's left over from my House seat.

MR. GLASSBURN: Correct. So if you have 12 House seats since Franklin County will go first, if you combine in our house map, I believe it's District 7, 8 and 4. We use the number from District 7 and just combined the -- literally combined the House districts into district -- House district 7.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay, so I --
MR. GLASSBURN: Again, I apologize for the confusion.

SEN. HUFFMAN: We're -- no, that's fine. And
this is helping me understand what I'm -- what I'm looking at. So the 7 that is in the northeast corner of this, even though it's what's on District 4, that was just a 7 that you took from the House district down here.

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. So these don't correspond to actual Senate district numbers; correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Correct. We are not --
SEN. HUFFMAN: And if I may, Mr. President or Mr. Senator, maybe a future Mr. President, the -- we are -- you are mindful. I think all the commission is mindful that the actual numbers of the Senate districts are also in in some respects are dictated by the Constitution, in other words; and that has to do with senators that are within a four-year term, are entitled to have the same number assigned to them because I think we had an issue with that back in September.

Does that make sense what I'm saying
MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs, yes, Senate President Huffman. We are -- we are aware. I believe none of the Franklin County Senate members are going to
be assigned a district within carrying their number, so I wasn't as particularly concerned, but maybe I'm omitting one of them in my mind at this time.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Well, I know that Senators
Kunze, Craig and Maharath are all -- well, Senator Kunze, excuse me, would be the only one that's in mid. So I'm not sure whether her district is 16 or not. At least that's what the House or the -- the majority map had. But let's set that issue aside.

MR. GLASSBURN: We are generally aware of this issue, yes.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay.
MR. GLASSBURN: And again, with proper time and vetting and not submitting draft proposals between each of the caucuses --

SEN. HUFFMAN: Fair enough.
MR. GLASSBURN: -- products before the commission will be a more finished product.

SEN. HUFFMAN: I guess speaking of that, I guess I'm I'm a little confused about the Dave's Redistricting in this. There's -- there's a animal, by the way, called -- I think it's called the Legislative
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Redistricting Committee -- legislative task force on redistricting, which has been in place for several decades.

Each caucus is given a certain amount of resources and then they can hire staff and get equipment, things like that. I think the Democrat caucus was given about a half a million dollars, including recently at the request of the House minority leader, an additional $\$ 120,000$ to hire outside counsel or outside consultants. I think it's Haystacks [ph] out of Washington, D.C.

Shouldn't they be able to produce maps that you don't have to go to redistricting -- Dave's Redistricting to do? Are they not being used to do that?

MR. GLASSBURN: So Senator Huffman into the co-chairs -- both the House and Senate caucuses hired me in this round to assist them with the production of maps. Again, we use both tools of Maptitude and Dave's for different tasks.

Dave's is useful for showing in quick fashion folks maps and letting them be able to view it on
multiple devices in a way that Maptitude doesn't naturally facilitate. But for final products, yes, and for determining actual indexes for compliance or for the Oakerd actual files that we use Maptitude for that purpose.

But today has -- today has unfolded in a fashion that has been unplanned.

SEN. HUFFMAN: I get that, for all of us, I think. But the Haystacks group in Washington is able to provide expertise about the indexes and things like that. That's that's who you're using for that?

MR. GLASSBURN: Haystack is not under contract, to my knowledge, with any party for the Democratic members of the commission.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay, well, then I was misinformed.

So the indexes that, in reference to Auditor Faber's questions that you are working on, these are -these would comply or be the same kind of data that's attached to the majority proposal, which was earlier submitted; is that right?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. And you've had a chance to look at the majority proposal for Franklin County?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. And do you agree that the majority proposal gives in Franklin County out of 12 seats, 11 Democrat and one Republican in the House?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes,
SEN. HUFFMAN: And that -- that is one less Republican-leaning seat than what the map was at the commission passed; is that correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: And then as it relates to the Senate, the four Franklin County Senate seats, all four of those would be Democrat-leaning seats and zero would be Republican-leaning seats.

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: That's under the majority proposal?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. And that's also one less Republican Senate seat than the previously passed map; is that correct?
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MR. GLASSBURN: Yes. That is my understanding.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. And then in the -- in the -- in the Hamilton-Warren County area -- I guess for purposes of this discussion, we're treating these as kind of one county; e obviously know Hamilton and Warren are two different counties -- the Hamilton County map out of seven seats -- well, we're going to we're going to combine Hamilton and Warren -- or the Hamilton County portion of it has five Democrat-leaning districts and two Republican in the House; is that correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: And from the previous map, the Republicans lose one seat in Hamilton County also?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. And then no change to the -- to the Senate map in terms of partisan; correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Correct.
SEN. HUFFMAN: All right. So that that adds up to a loss of three Republican seats from the previous map; correct.

MR. GLASSBURN: Two House and one Senate,
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right.
SEN. SYKES: Yes, yeah, okay. Just a couple other brief questions, Mr. Chairman, I'll -- real quick.

I guess I was intrigued a little bit and we've had these kinds of questions from members of the -- or suggestions from members of the public when we they talk about their neighborhoods and what who they have things in common with.

But maybe it wasn't as stark, especially now that we're actually drawing districts. But I was intrigued by Auditor's Faber's questions about areas that were the same.

Are you telling me that lack of demographic -demographic diversity is actually a quality that you striving for and drawing these districts?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs and President Huffman. We are striving to have similar communities. Community is defined by all kinds of metrics, such as Leader Russo alluding to the school district in southwest Franklin County. Racial, if that's your question, of racial, it's not my assignment.
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SEN. HUFFMAN: It's not my question.
MR. GLASSBURN: We are not seeking to have no diversity of -- of communities in any district. We are seeking to not have districts that go in narrow strands going halfway around the edge of a county. We are concerned that that will not meet compactness.

We are concerned about going great distances to bring communities that are not neighboring together purely to reach an index point.

SEN. HUFFMAN: If I could follow up, Mr. Chairman. So, yeah. We understand $6(C)$ of Section VI of the Constitution requires that the districts be compact, so I'm not talking about compactness. It certainly isn't strictly a racial question.

But it seems to me in your answer to question to Senator Faber that you wanted to make sure that communities that were alike in whatever way it is, that you try to keep those communities together in drawing the district.

So that seems to me -- and that's why I tried to use a very general term demographic diversity versus anything in particular. But am I -- am I wrong about
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that? That that quality, in fact, is what you try to use when you were drawing these districts?

MR. GLASSBURN: I think the -- to the cochairs and to President Huffman, I think there is a natural assumption that communities that are geographically closer together are more likely to share common interests, whether they be different in other manners or not.

Again, having a house district go from Reynoldsburg to Brown Township on the other side of the county in a narrow line is hard to understand as a community of interests, or that it would be easy or possible for representative to represent that much of a -- of a line around the county.

So we sought, again, to take that to honor the majority's interests and requests about the district concerning Grove City and create a more coherent southwestern seat and a more coherent southeastern seat.

It's not that much more complex or deeper than that level of analysis, to be honest.

SEN. HUFFMAN: Okay. Just a couple more
follow-ups, Mr. Chairman. I understand last night or last two nights that representatives of all seven commission members have been meeting in the Senate minority caucus room, discussing all of the issues that are relevant regarding our project here, the issue before us. Is that correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Co-chairs, Senate President, yes.

SEN. SYKES: Okay. Have any of the commission members been in the room to discuss that with any of the -- as part of this?

MR. GLASSBURN: There were not -- co-chairs and to the Senate president -- there were not members of the commission present for any discussions between staff, I believe, until this afternoon when we had the briefest of times together, maybe 15 combined minutes in which $I$ don't believe any of the members of the commission were there for more than 60 seconds.

SEN. SYKES: Okay. Was there any time when any of the commission members were in there together there?

MR. GLASSBURN: Not -- certainly not more than three, and I don't believe more than two at once.

SEN. SYKES: Okay. Did Representative Russo and Senator Sykes come in and visit with them, with the folks, the seven member representatives of the commission members?

MR. GLASSBURN: Leader Russo -- to the cochairs and Senate president -- Leader Russo, Co-Chair Sykes and Co-Chair Cupp each were present for brief periods of time this afternoon. Again, the purpose of that or the contents of that meeting was to try to discuss the map that is -- the Democratic reply map. And then we came back to this public session.

SEN. HUFFMAN: I don't have any other questions. Thank you.

SEN. SYKES: Auditor Faber?
SEN. FABER: I don't know that it's my questions, specifically regarding these two sets of maps, but they are generally applicable because they apply to how these are drawn. And because I know you've been a good resource, as I said last time, you were helpful to us.

One of the things that I'm struggling with is trying to understand the rules. Okay, we all believe,
and I think the Supreme Court was very clear that you can't violate Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7 to comply with 6 (B) .

MR. GLASSBURN?: Yes.
SEN. FABER: So we're all in agreement on that.

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
SEN. FABER: And so when we talk about splits and all of those things, do you guys have a master list of things you can and can't do?

For example, you can't split a county more than once. You can't split certain cities. You can't -is there a master list that you could prepare and give to all seven of us so that we know when you're going through this why, when we suggest if you just did this, it's a bad idea.

I know we've had this conversation. There were discussions before. I just think that would be helpful -- as a collective group of our seven brains here in a room.

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs and to the auditor, I do not have any written list of that nature.
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You know, the Supreme Court did weigh in on this topic as to what it felt was acceptable or not acceptable without giving, in terms of community preservation, in compliance with, say, Section 3 and 4.

I -- I don't have an inventory of those items. If we had such an inventory, I will tell you it would be in the hundreds, if not thousands of, and so

SEN. FABER: Ok. Well, at some point we're going to have to make sure whatever we draft doesn't violate Section 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. The Supreme Court is very clear on that in paragraph 88 of its opinion.

And so then I must also then bounce back to Section 6 because Article 6 isn't just about this representational attempt to try and closely compare, I think Rep- -- sorry, Senator -- Senate President Huffman mentioned that you have Sections A, B and C.

A says that you're not supposed to draw a district primarily to favor or disfavor a political party.

B says that's the -- you've got to try and closely compare the whole map -- sorry about that -and then the next is, the next is -- the next is
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Section B, and then you've got -- that we've talked about this is the ratio, and then C, it's got to be compact.

And so when we come up with a final map, we're going to have to comply with all those things, right? MR. GLASSBURN: Correct.

SEN. FABER: We don't just get to pick and choose.

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs, to the auditor, I firmly agree.

As I've alluded to or stated outright, we on the Democratic -- the Democratic Commission members, my advice to them continues to be that it is more than possible to follow 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 to meet the ratio established by the court and to do it in a manner that is consistent with compactness and the values that are expressed throughout the the Constitution on this matter.

But as I've stated before, there are a limited number of ways to do it. And as you forsake those options as you go through the state, you will increasingly have less options in other -- as we
approach other counties or however we further this process.

SEN. FABER: I agree. Final comment --
SEN. SYKES: I want to remind the members that the main reason Mr . Glassburn is here is to answer questions about the map.

SEN. FABER: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I'm not trying to believe he is one of the most helpful people I've had in this entire process. And so I consider his expertise something that I -- I respect. So that's why I'm asking these questions.

And so when we go to the next level of trying to do this -- and certainly you're right. It's -- you make a decision here, it's like a big balloon, you push here, it's going to pop out someplace else.

And as we go through this process, I'll be candid. We've had concerns about maps that have been submitted by the public in maps that have been submitted by any place. Even I believe the map that was -- the map maker that was cited in the Supreme Court opinion, as I looked at his proposed map, it was not a 54 -- Mr. Reardon or I might be saying his name -- it
was not a 54 or 55 map. It was a 57 or 58 map.
And so I think that enhances the difficulty of complying with all of those things. And certainly, I believe there was testimony -- very clear testimony in front of this body from various experts during the first round and certainly testimony in front of the Supreme Court by the general from Brigham Young that talks about where Ohioans live and the difficulty in drawing maps not to gerrymander to draw a preferred map for the purposes of of disenfranchising people based on their choice of where they live.

Democrats tend to cluster in urban core areas. Republicans tend to be more diverse around the state. That's just the reality of where -- where people are in Ohio.

And so it's going to make meeting 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 much more difficult without avoiding splits unnecessarily of counties or cities or townships or those kind of things.

And so I know that's the challenge you have, and they call them our seven-brain trust is trying to work through. And so I thank you for your efforts.
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MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs and to the auditor briefly, thank you for the comments.

As we have proceeded in this from -- from our side, we have talked about in broad terms how we believe meeting the proportionality while complying with the other sections of the Constitution as possible.

We've talked about the options. Again in the presentations that we have made today regarding Franklin County and Hamilton County, we believe that our replies are consistent with still meeting those goals without taking egregious and -- egregious steps or community splits to to to reach that goal.

But if the -- if these counties, as we're talking about them, are prioritized the way they are, you are forsaking some of your options by making these choices.

SEN. SYKES: Any additional questions? And just want to make note that we want to make sure, Mr. Co-Chair, that we both in agreement with the agenda and what's in the package was posted on the website. We want to make sure that so that we can continue with
good collaboration.
REP. CUPP: Yes, I concur.
SEN. SYKES: Any additional questions?
SEN. FABER: This isn't for Mr. Glassburn;
this is a question for us as a body. We've now heard proposals on from two of the major -- I don't want to say friction areas or conflict areas; I assume the committee is going to work again tonight and hopefully we will have presentations for the remainder.

We still have, I assume, Summit County, Cuyahoga County, Northwest Ohio, Dayton. I know I'm forgetting some place -- Northeast Ohio, Southwest Ohio. At some point we need to get this train on the -on the rails to get ready to land. I'm now combining trains and airplanes [sic], but we want to land this plane on Saturday or thereafter.

Which brings me to a follow-up question for the committee, and maybe we don't need to answer it. There has been a lot of dispute as to what the date that we need to comply with. Reading the Supreme Court rules of superintendence, it basically says complying with this court's order, if it happens on a Saturday,
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you get to Monday.
I don't know whether our date -- we've had this discussion -- is Saturday or Monday. I would prefer we shoot for Saturday. But having said that, I think that's an area that certainly our crack people are out there having conversations on.

SEN. SYKES: Mr. Auditor, we have made that request. We have taken the position and announced to the public that we anticipate completing our work on Saturday; and until or unless we hear something different, then that is the timetable that we've accepted and adopted.

SEN. FABER: Mr. Chairman, on that issue, I guess I'm consulting with my legal counsel. We understand that this is a Saturday deadline and if -if we all agree, usually deadlines motivate people to make decisions, but I would -- I'm going to request that that be made public or there be some analysis in the next.

Maybe by tomorrow so all seven commission members can make the same conclusion. So we'll -- I'll ask my legal counsel to flesh that out a little bit.

SEN. SYKES: Governor DeWine?
GOV. DEWINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Glassburn, thank you for your work. I know everybody is working on these maps and is putting in a lot of time. So we're we're grateful for that.

I wonder if you could give us a -- based on the work that you all have done so far any kind of timeframe -- just kind of follows up the last two questions -- but you know how long going through the state region by region and then coming up with a final product; you have any clue about how long just mechanically that takes.

I'm not talking about any anything that we do to slow it out, but just mechanically, you're going through and covering each area like you've done today with these two major areas

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs. Governor, again, thank you for the kind remarks. The timeline is concerning. I can assure you from a staff perspective there is not a lack of motivation to get this done.

You know, speaking for myself, I took a quick two hour nap between 4:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. today.
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That's my sleep. So there's there's no lack of commitment to get this done.

I wish I could give you a more concrete answer. The way that we came to this endeavor here was the majority sent a proposal and we responded to it.

It would be -- we have tried in those conversations again to get greater understandings about what we're trying to achieve, not just statewide but within each region, so that when we do do map drawing, that those efforts are not wasted or going to goals that aren't going to be sought.

But we have not always gotten to that metric and that would be helpful to expediting this process, but right now, that's how it's unfolded so far.

GOV. DEWINE: So if I could just follow up with that. So what you're saying is that there's -there's not disagreement about the overall goal. What you're saying is that when you get to region by region, then obviously there becomes becomes nuances and maybe even more of a nuance difference. Is that right?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs and to the governor, we are -- we are on our side doing our best
to work in good faith and negotiate cooperatively. From our view, the goal has not been explicitly agreed to. And that has slowed the process at times.

GOV. DEWINE: So I don't mean to interrupt you, but -- so what do you need from these seven members?

MR. GLASSBURN: Again, we believe it is possible, following the rules and following the compactness and the values that are in this amendment to comply with the proportionality.

We believe we can demonstrate that and have demonstrated that to your staff. Not having certainty about that goal, whether we are going to achieve that proportionality or not, causes a lot of consternation and unnecessary levels of back and forth that preclude us from talking to the next region because we're still arguing about the current region as if it's a life and death matter.

GOV. DEWINE: But we all know that when you get done with each region, they all have to add up right.

MR. GLASSBURN: That is not an explicit
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statement that any of the negotiators have offered us.
SEN. FABER: Okay. I understand. I'll go back, though, to what I said in this meeting when we started, that my understanding of the court decision is the same as I think was just expressed ten minutes or so ago by Auditor Faber, which is simply these numbers.

The goal is to get close to these numbers we can to get those numbers if we can. But we also know that we cannot violate the other sections. I haven't heard anybody on this panel disagree with that, and I'm not -- I'm not arguing with you.

I'm just trying to help this process forward and see what we need to do to help you and your Republican counterparts to move this ball down -- down the field, because I don't think we disagree. I haven't heard any disagreement about from this seven people about what the goal should be

MR. GLASSBURN: To the co-chairs. Governor, again, we believe -- on our side, we have demonstrated that that is in fact doable, possible to meet the proportionality and be consistent with the other provisions in the Constitution; again, and that if that
is possible, we should endeavor to do so.
That has not been the instruction that has been expressed by the other map drawers and folks we are working with and that has consistently been an obstacle. So if that --

GOV. DEWINE: Well, that would -- that would be my instructions. I -- I don't -- I haven't heard anybody say it shouldn't be the instructions.

SEN. SYKES: Leader Russo.
REP. RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. So, Mr. Glassburn, to be clear, when we were talking about the 54 or 46 proportionality, in addition to meeting the other sections of the Constitution and technical requirements, that translates -- in your opinion, all of those things can be met to translate to 45 House seats and 15 Senate seats. Is that correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: For to the co-chairs, Leader Russo, 45 Democratic-leaning House seats, 54 Republican-leaning House seats; 18 Republican-leaning Senate seats, 15 Democratic Senate seats. Yes, we believe that is possible.

REP. RUSSO: And as a follow-up, has there
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been discussion or agreement or you feel direction from the commission and the members here explicit to getting to those goals and those being the numbers that we should be striving to achieve as we go through this map regionally?

MR. GLASSBURN: To co-chairs, and again Leader Russo, again, I was very aware of and appreciated and heard the governor's comments previously.

But in the negotiations up until this point, that is not been what has been expressed by the other side and has been a a direct obstacle in progress.

REP. RUSSO: Thank you.
SEN. SYKES: And again, I would reiterate the example I used, before just a pairing of the Senate districts, pairing of the House districts to create Senate districts in Hamilton County, which is a simple thing to do.

There's reluctance to accept that when we can do it and meet all of the other requirements as just an example of the challenges that we have so far in this process. Are there any additional questions?

We would like to note that instead of
adjourning today, we were going to recess because our time is short and we want to make sure we provide adequate notice and we will as soon as we can. But the meeting is recessed until 9:30 tomorrow morning at the call of the chair.

Any additional questions? Any additional questions? If not, the meeting is now adjourned.
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| disagreement | $26: 7,26: 11$, <br> $26: 15$, <br> 6.16, | done 10.4 | easy |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 17, \quad 49: 16 \\ & \text { discuss } \end{aligned}$ | $26: 15, ~ 26: 16$, $26: 18, ~ 27: 3$, | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 16, \quad 10: 4, \\ & 11: 13, \quad 46: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 23:16, 35:12 |
| 3:12, 15:1, | 27:4, 27:8, | $46: 15,46: 20$, | edge |
| 36:10, 37:10 | 28:1, 28:7, | $47: 2, \quad 48: 20$ | efforts |
| discussed | 33:20, 34:3, | down | 42:22, 47:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9: 16, \quad 9: 17, \\ & 24: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 34: 19, & 35: 9, \\ 35: 16, & 39: 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 13, \quad 27: 4, \\ & 49: 14 \end{aligned}$ | egregious |
| discussing | districts | draft | 43:12 |
| 36:4 | 7:12, 7:15, | 3:10, 28:14, | eight |
| discussion | 8:3, 8:5, 8:11, | 39:9 | either |
| 3:15, 8:21, | $\begin{array}{ll} 8: 12, & 8: 14, \\ 8: 19, & 9: 12, \end{array}$ | drafts | $5: 13,14: 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 8: 22, & 19: 16, \\ 32: 4, & 45: 3, \end{array} 51: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 19, \quad 9: 12, \\ & 10: 11, \quad 10: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $7: 8$ <br> draw | else |
| discussions | $\begin{array}{ll} 10: 13, & 10: 15, \\ 10: 17, & 10: 21, \end{array}$ | $11: 18,13: 2,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 15 \\ & \text { employed } \end{aligned}$ |
| 36:14, 38:18 | 10:17, 10:21, 13:3, 13:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 3, \quad 39: 17, \\ & 42: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $53: 6$ |
| disenfranchising $42: 10$ | $13: 8, \quad 13: 14,$ | drawer | encompass |
| disfavor | $\begin{array}{ll} 13: 15, & 13: 17, \\ 13: 21, & 15: 16, \end{array}$ | $9: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 16 \\ & \text { end } \end{aligned}$ |
| 39:18 | 13:21, 15:16, | drawers $50: 3$ | 11:3, 11:10, |
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| 23:5 | excuse | faber's | fine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| endeavor | 28:6 | 30:18, 33:12 | 26:22 |
| 10:15, 26:1, | exercise | facilitate | finished |
| 47:4, 50:1 | 25:22 | 30:2 | 28:18 |
| endeavored | expecting | fact | firmly |
| 22:6 | 25:13 | 8:22, 35:1, | 40:10 |
| enhances | expediting | 49:20 | first |
| 42:2 | 47:13 | factors | 14:8, 24:16, |
| enough | expertise | 14:17 | 25:2, 26:14, |
| 28:16 | 30:10, 41:10 | failing | 42: 6 |
| ensure | experts | 24:5 | fit |
| 24:10 | 42:5 | fair | 18:9 |
| entire | explained | 28:16 | five |
| 41:9 | 7:18 | faith | 8:11, 10:3, |
| entirely | explicit | 48:1 | 10:5, 17:15, |
| 10:14, 12:15 | 48:22, 51:2 | far | 23:6, 32:9 |
| entitled | explicitly | 11:3, 17:4, | flesh |
| 27:16 | 48:2 | 46:7, 47:14, | 45:22 |
| equipment | expressed | 51:20 | floor |
| $29: 6$ | 11:17, 40:17, | fashion | $4: 5$ |
| error | 49:5, 50:3, | $26: 7,29: 21$ | folks |
| 14:2 | 51:10 | 30:7 | 4:19, 4:20, |
| especially | extend | favor | 29:22, 37:3, |
| 33:10 | 6:9 | 39:18 | 50:3 |
| essentially | extended | features | follow |
| 18:15 | 12:12 | 10:1 | 25:6, 34:10, |
| established | extent | feedback | 40:14, 47:15 |
| 40:15 | 21:4 | 9:19 | follow-up |
| et | extremely | feel | 15:21, 44:17, |
| 9:13 | $12: 22$ | 51:1 | $50: 22$ |
| even | eyeball | felt | follow-ups |
| 27:3, 41:19, | 18:12 | 39:2 | 36:1 |
| 47:20 | F | few | following |
| evenings $4: 10$ | faber | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 1 \\ & \text { field } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 16, \quad 48: 8 \\ & \text { follows } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { \| } 4: 10$ <br> event | $2: 10, \quad 2: 11$ | field $49: 15$ | follows $46: 8$ |
| event <br> 53.10 53.13 | $14: 14,15: 11,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:15 } \\ & \text { file } \end{aligned}$ | 46:8 <br> force |
| $53: 10,53: 13$ everybody | 15:15, 15:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { file } \\ & \text { 15:4, } 15: 6 \end{aligned}$ | force $29: 1$ |
| everybody $46: 3$ | $17: 13,17: 18$, $18: 5,18: 10$, | 15:4, 15:6 <br> files | forgetting |
| exact | 19:8, 19:11, | 26:3, 26:4, | 44:12 |
| 15:3 | 34:16, 37:14, | 26:5, 30:4 | forsake |
| examine | $37: 15, \quad 38: 5,$ | final | 40:20 |
| 5:1 | 38:8, 39:8, | 6:19, 24:6, | forsaking |
| example | 40:7, 41:3, | 30:2, 40:4, | 43:16 |
| 23:13, 38:11, | $41: 7,44: 4,$ | 41:3, 46:10 | forth |
| $51: 14, \quad 51: 20$ | $45: 13,49: 2,$ | financial $53: 7$ | $7: 9, \quad 48: 15$ <br> forward |
| exchanged 8:20 | $49: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 7 \\ & \text { find } \end{aligned}$ | forward $10: 13,24: 8,$ |
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| 49:12 | 18:9 | go | grateful |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| four | gerrymander | 10:11, 11:21, | 46:5 |
| 6:5, 8:4, | 42:9 | 15:12, 15:20, | great |
| 18:19, 23:3, | getting | 18:1, 22:11, | 5:6, 34:7 |
| 31:13 | 6:22, 51:2 | 24:16, 26:14, | greater |
| four-year | give | 29:13, 34:4, | 15:1, 47:7 |
| 27:16 | 6:21, 38:13, | 35:9, 40:21, | group |
| franklin | 46:6, 47:3 | 41:12, 41:16, | 30:9, 38:19 |
| 3:11, 4:20, | given | 49:2, 51:4 | grove |
| 7:11, 7:20, | 29:4, 29:7 | goal | 12:21, 16:20, |
| 7:22, 11:15, | gives | 21:7, 24:7, | 16:21, 17:6, |
| 12:16, 13:18, | 31:5 | 43:13, 47:17, | 20:8, 20:11, |
| 13:19, 16:4, | giving | 48:2, 48:13, | 21:10, 35:17 |
| 16:16, 17:16, | 39:3 | 49:7, 49:17 | guess |
| 18:6, 24:17, | glassburn | goals | 4:4, 4:19, |
| 24:19, 26:14, | 9:6, 9:8, 14:5, | 43:12, 47:10, | $4: 21,24: 21$ |
| 27:22, 31:2, | $14: 15,14: 22$ | 51:3 | $28: 19,28: 20,$ |
| 31:5, 31:13, | $15: 14, \quad 15: 17,$ | going | $32: 3,33: 5$ |
| 33:21, 43:10 | 16:15, 17:17, | 6:8, 6:10, | $45: 14$ |
| franklin-union | 17:21, 18:7, | 6:15, 13:4, | guys |
| 8:1 | 18:22, 19:10, | 16:13, 17:19, | 16:11, 17:18, |
| frankly | 19:13, 20:1, | 20:3, 25:14, | 18:13, 38:9 |
| 10:9 | 20:18, 21:13, | 27:22, 32:7, | H |
| friction | 21:22, 22:4, | 32:8, 34:5, | half |
| $44: 7$ | 23:2, 23:21, | 34:7, 38:14, | 13:19, 18:22, |
| front | $25: 11, \quad 26: 13$ | $39: 9,40: 5,$ | $29: 7$ |
| 9:10, 25:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 20, \\ & 27: 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 15, \quad 42: 16, \\ & 44: 8,45: 17, \end{aligned}$ | halfway |
| 42:5, 42:6 full | $27: 9,27: 20$, $28: 10, ~ 28: 13$, | $\begin{array}{ll} 44: 8, & 45: 17, \\ 46: 9, & 46: 14, \end{array}$ | $12: 14, \quad 12: 16,$ |
| 53:8 | 28:17, 29:16, | 47:10, 47:11, | $34: 5$ |
| functionally | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 12, \quad 30: 22, \\ & 31: 3, \quad 31: 7 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 13, \quad 52: 1 \\ & \text { qood } \end{aligned}$ | $3: 11,4: 20,$ |
| $20: 15$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 3, & 31: 7, \\ 31: 11, & 31: 16 . \end{array}$ | good $37: 19, \quad 44: 1$ | $8: 8,8: 10,9: 11,$ |
| further | $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 11, & 31: 16, \\ 31: 19, & 32: 1, \end{array}$ | $37: 19,44: 1,$ $48: 1$ | 9:15, 10:1, |
| $13: 22, ~ 24: 10$, $41: 1,53: 12$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 19, & 32: 1, \\ 32: 12, & 32: 15, \end{array}$ | gotten | 10:20, 11:9, |
| 41:1, $53: 12$ future | $32: 12, ~ 32: 15$, $32: 18, ~ 32: 22$, | $47: 12$ | 11:18, 23:5, |
| future 27:11 | 33:17, 34:2, | gov | $\begin{array}{ll} 24: 1, & 32: 5, \\ 32: 6, & 32: 8, \end{array}$ |
| G | 35:3, $36: 7$, | $2: 9,46: 2,$ | 32:9, 32:14, |
| general | $37: 5, \quad 38: 4,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 47: 15, & 48: 4, \\ 48: 19, & 50: 6 \end{array}$ | $43: 10,51: 16$ <br> hamilton-warren |
| $42: 7$ | $38: 7,38: 21$, | governor | $32: 3$ |
| generally | 40:6, 40:9, | 2:8, 46:1, | hand |
| 28:10, 37:17 | $44: 4, \quad 46: 3$ | 46:17, 47:22, | 26:10 |
| geographically | $46: 17,47: 21$ | governor's | happen |
| 35:6 | 48:7, 48:22, | 51:8 | 20:5 |
| german | $49: 18,50: 11$ | grandview | happens |
| 18:3, 18:5, | 50:17, 51:6 | $19: 22$ | 44:22 |
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| ```happy 14:1, 15:8 hard 35:11 haystack 30:12 haystacks 29:10, 30:9 hear 45:10 heard 44:5, 49:10, 49:16, 50:7, 51: 8 hearing 2:21 heights 19:22 help 49:12, 49:13 helpful 37:20, 38:18, 41:8, 47:13 helping 27:1 herculean 14:10 here 2:7, 2:9, 2:11, 2:13, 2:15, 2:17, 5:4, 5:20, 8:22, 15:20, 16:12, 18:19, 24:21, 26:7, 27:5, 36:5, 38:19, 41:5, 41:14, 41:15, 47:4, 51:2 hereby 53:2 hilliard 12:6, 12:8 hire 29:5, 29:9 hired 29:17 historical 17:3``` | ```historically 17:1 history 14:9 holding 24:20 honest 35:21 honestly 25:20 honor 35:15 hopefully 44:8 hour 5:3, 46:22 house 7:11, 7:13, 8:10, 9:12, 9:14, 10:1, 10:2, 10:10, 11:3, 11:19, 12:12, 13:14, 13:15, 15:16, 17:15, 21:17, 23:6, 23:17, 24:2, 25:18, 26:7, 26:12, 26:14, 26:15, 26:17, 26:18, 27:4, 28:8, 29:8, 29:17, 31:6, 32:10, 32:22, 35:9, 50:15, \(50: 18\), 50:19, 51:15 however 11:12, 12:11, 13:1, 17:2, 18:1, 41:1 huffman 2:12, 2:13, \(4: 3,4: 8,5: 6\), \(5: 15,5: 19,6: 1\), 6:4, 24:13, 24:14, 25:12, 26:9, 26:19, 26:22, 27:7,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 10, \quad 27: 21, \\ & 28: 4, \quad 28: 12, \\ & 28: 16, \quad 28: 19, \\ & 29: 16, \quad 30: 8, \\ & 30: 15,31: 1, \\ & 31: 4,31: 8, \\ & 31: 12,31: 17, \\ & 31: 20,32: 2, \\ & 32: 13,32: 16, \\ & 32: 19,33: 18, \\ & 34: 1,34: 10, \\ & 35: 4,35: 22, \\ & 37: 12,39: 16 \\ & \text { hundreds } \\ & 39: 7 \end{aligned}$ $9: 19,20: 9$ increasingly $40: 22$ <br> index $\begin{array}{ll} 10: 22, & 14: 16 \\ 15: 15, & 30: 3 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| job $1: 20, \quad 17: 9$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 36: 1, & 36: 2, \\ 37: 19, & 46: 8 \end{array}$ | limited $10: 9,40: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 19, \quad 13: 15, \\ & 14: 20, \quad 15: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | lead | limiting | 16:11, 18:8, |
| keep | 23:10 | 22:14 | 20:4, 21:10, |
| $5: 21, \quad 5: 22$ | leader | line | 22:20, 23:3, |
| $34: 18$ | 19:14, 20:18, | 35:11, 35:14 | 25:14, 43:9, |
| kind | 21:13, 29:9, | links | 45:7, 45:18 |
| 4:5, 4:21, | 33:20, 37:5, | 15:8 | maharath |
| 16:5, 22:16, | 37:6, 50:9, | list | 28:5 |
| 30:19, 32:5, | 50:17, 51:6 | 38:9, 38:13, | main |
| 42:19, 46:7, | leader-elect | 38:22 | 41:5 |
| 46:8, 46:18 | 2:16 | listed | maintain |
| kinds | leaning | 53:10 | 9:19, 17:5, |
| 33:6, 33:19 | 8:3, 13:1 | literally | 19:20 |
| know | least | 26:17 | major |
| 5:14, 6:1, | $4: 10, \quad 28: 8$ | little | 44:6, 46:16 |
| 24:17, 28:4, | left | 4:1, 8:15, | majority |
| $32: 5,37: 15$, | 26:11 | 18:18, 18:21, | $3: 22,4: 19,$ |
| 37:18, 38:14, | legal | 25:22, 28:20, | 5:8, 6:10, 10:8, |
| 38:17, 39:1, | 22:8, 45:14, | 33:5, 45:22 | 11:12, 11:17, |
| 42:20, 44:11, | 45:22 | live | 12:11, 12:20, |
| 45:2, 46:3, | legislative | 42:8, 42:11 | 13:2, 24:22, |
| 46:9, 46:21, | 28:22, 29:1 | long | 25:3, 28:8, |
| 48:19, 49:8 | lerose | 46:9, 46:11 | 30:20, 31:2, |
| knowing | 2:14, 2:15 | look | 31:5, 31:17, |
| $25: 21$ | less | 3:7, 14:19, | 47:5 |
| knowledge | 12:22, 20:21, | 19:8, 31:2 | majority's |
| 30:13 | $31: 8,31: 20$, | looked | 17:5, 35:16 |
| kunze | 40:22 | 41:21 | make 5.7 5:13 |
| 28:5, 28:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { let's } \\ & \text { 16:4, } 28: 9 \\ & \text { letting } \end{aligned}$ | looking | $\text { 3:1, } 3: 7, \quad 5: 13,$ |
| L |  | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 3, \quad 18: 11, \\ & 27: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $10: 15, \quad 11: 16,$ |
| labeled | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { letting } \\ & 29: 22 \end{aligned}\right.$ | 27:2 <br> looks | 14:11, 16:12, |
| labeling | level | $16: 6,16: 10,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 21: 4, & 22: 15, \\ 23: 4, & 25: 9 \end{array}$ |
| $17: 15$ | $22: 5, \quad 35: 21,$ | $18: 11, \quad 18: 14,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 4, \quad 25: 9, \\ & 27: 19, \quad 34: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| labels | levels | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 16, \quad 18: 17, \\ & 18: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 39:9, 41:14, |
| $9: 12$ | $48: 15$ | lose | 42:16, 43:19, |
| lack | life | $32: 14$ | 43:22, 45:17, |
| 24:21, 33:14, | 48:17 | loss | 45:21, 52:2 |
| $46: 20,47: 1$ land | light | 16:7, 32:20 | maker |
| $44: 14,44: 15$ | 11:2, 11:13 | lot | 41:20 |
| largest | likelihood | $44: 19, \quad 46: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { making } \\ & 23: 1,25: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:16 |  | 48:14 | 43:16 |
| last | likely | M | manner |
| 4:9, 9:17, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 35: 6 \\ & \text { limit } \\ & 21: 5 \end{aligned}\right.$ | made $3: 13,6: 14,$ | $18: 1,40: 15$ manners |
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| ```narrowed 22:22 natural 35:5 naturally 30:2 nature 7:16, 13:3, 17:6, 18:1, 21:3, 38:22 nearly 13:17 need 44:13, 44:18, 44:20, 48:5, 49:13 needed 17:12 negotiate 48:1 negotiation 22:16 negotiations 22:2, 51:9 negotiators 49:1 neighborhood 18:3, 18:13, 18:14 neighborhoods 18:8, 33:8 neighboring 34:8 neither 53:5 next 5:3, 10:18, 11:15, 39:22, 41:12, 45:19, 48:16 night 9:17, 36:1 nights 36:2 nine 18:19 none 2:21, 21:17,``` | 27:22 <br> north <br> 13:21, 17:2 <br> northeast <br> 27:2, 44:12 <br> northern <br> 18:11, 18:14, <br> 18:16, 19:2 <br> northwest <br> 12:3, 13:21, <br> 44:11 <br> northwestern <br> 13:18 <br> note <br> 16:13, 20:5, <br> 43:19, 51:22 <br> notice <br> 52:3 <br> nuance <br> 47:20 <br> nuances <br> 47:19 <br> number <br> 10:9, 13:9, <br> 21:5, 26:16, <br> 27:17, 28:1, <br> 40:20 <br> numbering <br> 25:20, 26:4 <br> numbers $\begin{aligned} & 9: 13, \quad 25: 6, \\ & 25: 10, \quad 25: 19, \\ & 27: 8, \quad 27: 13, \\ & 49: 6, \quad 49: 7, \\ & 49: 8, \quad 51: 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ 0 <br> -'clock $5: 18,6: 6$ <br> oakerd $\begin{aligned} & 15: 4, \quad 15: 5, \\ & 30: 4 \\ & \text { objection } \\ & 4: 4 \\ & \text { objections } \\ & 2: 21, \quad 4: 2 \\ & \text { obstacle } \\ & 50: 5,51: 11 \end{aligned}$ | ```obviously 32:5, 47:19 occur 10:10 occurred 16:16, 16:17 odd 17:2 offered 49:1 officeholders 3:6 ohio 1:3, 3:7, 6:9, 7:11, 7:19, 9:21, 42:15, 44:11, 44:12, 44:13, 53:20 ohioans 42:8 ok 39:8 okay 4:8, 5:6, 5:18, 5:21, 18:10, 19:8, 20:2, 26:9, 26:19, 27:7, 28:12, 30:15, 31:1, 31:4, 31:20, 32:2, 32:16, 33:2, 35:22, 36:9, 36:19, 37:1, 37:22, 49:2 omitted 14:1 omitting 28:3 once 11:16, 36:22, 38:12 one 4:6, 7:10, 8:1, 8:3, 8:18, 10:10, 11:2, 11:19, 12:22, 13:6, 13:9,``` | ```14:15, 15:16, 20:2, 20:5, 20:19, 20:21, 21:20, 23:11, 25:8, 28:3, 28:6, 31:6, 31:8, 31:20, 32:5, 32:14, 32:22, 37:21, 41:8 ones 7:16 ongoing 8:21 only 3:5, 11:2, 18:12, 28:6 operate 20:16 opinion 20:20, 39:11, 41:21, 50:14 opportunity 6:21 options 12:1, 40:21, 40:22, 43:8, 43:16 order 3:8, 4:14, 4:15, 6:8, 14:12, 23:4, 44:22 other 12:16, 13:10, 14:17, 16:21, 20:2, 21:6, 25:21, 27:15, 33:3, 35:7, 35:10, 37:12, 40:22, 41:1, 43:6, 49:9, 49:21, 50:3, 50:13, 51:10, 51:19 otherwise 53:7 out 8:6, 13:12,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 17:12, 21:16, | particularly | 29:10 | 21:2, 35:13, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29:10, 31:5, | 20:7, 21:18, | pick | 40:14, 43:7, |
| 32:7, 41:15, | 28:2 | 17:20, 40:7 | 48:8, 49:20, |
| 45:6, 45:22, | parties | pickaway | 50:1, 50:21 |
| 46:14 | 53:6 | 21:16 | post-haste |
| outcome | partisan | picked | 6:15 |
| 53:7 | 32:17 | 18:2 | posted |
| outright | parts | picks | 43:21 |
| 40:11 | 3:7, 3:16, | 19:22 | potentially |
| outside | 12:4, 18:12 | place | 21:6 |
| 29:9, 29:10 | party | 29:2, 41:19, | prairie |
| over | 13:9, 13:11, | 44:12 | 12:13, 20:9 |
| 13:7, 19:9, | 22:16, 30:13, | placed | precedence |
| 26:11 | 39:19 | 6:13 | 17:4 |
| overall | passed | places | precincts |
| 23:17, 47:17 | 8:6, 31:10, | 10:9 | 16:8 |
| P | 31:21 | plane | preclude |
| package | past | 44:16 | $48: 15$ |
| 43:21 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 16: 1 \\ & \text { Dath } \end{aligned}\right.$ | play | predominantly |
| packet | path | $13: 11$ | $18: 8$ |
| $2: 20, \quad 10: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 11, ~ 11: 22, \\ & 22: 22 \end{aligned}$ | pleasant <br> 20.9 | prefer $45: 4$ |
| page | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 22: 22 \\ & \text { pathway } \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 9 \\ & \text { please } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 4 \\ & \text { preferred } \end{aligned}$ |
| $10: 18, \quad 53: 10$ | $22: 8,24: 2$ | please $2: 2$ | preferred $42: 9$ |
| $1: 21,53: 8$ | patterns | plus | prepare |
| paired | $25: 20$ | $12: 22,13: 6$ | $38: 13$ |
| 8:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { penalty } \\ & 53: 3 \end{aligned}$ | point | prepared $3: 12$ |
| pairing 13:19, 18:4, | people | $3: 1,13: 7$, $14: 2,19: 16$, | prerogative |
| 23:8, 23:10, | 17:20, 24:18, | 22:17, 34:9, | $24: 7$ |
| 23:18, 51:14, | $41: 9, ~ 42: 10$, $42: 14$, $45: 5$, | 39:8, 44:13, | present |
| $51: 15$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 42: 14, & 45: 5, \\ 45: 16, & 49: 16 \end{array}$ | $51: 9$ | $2: 5, \quad 2: 18,$ |
| pairings | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 16, \quad 49: 16 \\ & \text { percent } \end{aligned}$ | political $39 \cdot 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 15, \quad 9: 7, \\ & 36: 14, \quad 37: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:17, 10:19, | percent $9: 22 . \quad 12: 22$ | $39: 18$ | $36: 14,37: 7$ |
| 11:15, 12:5, | 9:22, 12:22, | pop | presentation |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 14, \quad 23: 22 \\ & \text { panel } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 13: 6, & 13: 10, \\ 21: 2, & 21: 11 \end{array}\right.$ | 41:15 popular | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 18, \quad 7: 3, \quad 7: 5, \\ & 9: 4, \quad 22: 1, \quad 25: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 49:10 | perfect | 15:2 | presentations |
| paragraph | $6: 4$ | population | $6: 16,43: 9,$ |
| $39: 11$ | periods $37: 8$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 8: 16 \\ & \text { port } \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 9 \\ & \text { presented } \end{aligned}$ |
| part | perjury | port | $12.22 .3 \cdot 22$ |
| 7:21, 12:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { perjury } \\ & 53: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 16:21 <br> portion | $\begin{array}{ll} 2: 22, & 3: 22, \\ 10: 2, & 17: 22, \end{array}$ |
| $36: 11$ | person's | $16: 17,20: 5 \text {, }$ | $26: 3$ |
| participation | 20:20 | 32:9 | presenters |
| $5: 8$ | perspective $46: 19$ | position $45 \cdot 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 4, \quad 14: 13 \\ & \text { preservation } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23:20, 34:22 | ph | possible | 39:4 |
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| president | proper | 30:5, 37:8 | rain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:12, 24:13, | 28:13 | purposes | 5:22 |
| 27:10, 27:11, | proportionality | 11:5, 12:8, | raise |
| 27:21, 33:17, | 7:17, 9:21, | 32:4, 42:10 | 16:14 |
| 35:4, 36:7, | 22:8, 22:21, | push | randall |
| 36:13, 37:6, | 23:15, 43:5, | 41:14 | 15:6 |
| 39:15 | 48:10, 48:14, | put | rapid |
| previous | 49:21, 50:12 | 10:13, 19:19, | 26:7 |
| 2:19, 17:11, | proposal | 20:14, 24:6 | ratio |
| 32:13, 32:20 | 3:10, 3:11, | putting | 40:2, 40:14 |
| previously | $7: 10,8: 5,8: 8$, | 15:19, 46:4 | razor-thin |
| 25:2, 31:21, | 9:15, 9:16, | Q | 21:21 |
| $51: 8$ | 9:17, 10:14, | quality | reach |
| primarily | $10: 22,11: 2 \text {, }$ | $33: 15, \quad 35: 1$ | $9: 20,22: 21,$ |
| $16: 18,39: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 20, \quad 19: 5, \\ & 19: 7, \quad 19: 19, \end{aligned}$ | question | $34: 9,43: 13$ |
| prior | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 7, \quad 19: 19, \\ & 23: 10, \quad 23: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $20: 2, \quad 25: 3,$ | read |
| prioritized | $\begin{array}{ll} 23: 10, & 23: 12, \\ 24: 22, & 30: 20, \end{array}$ | 33:22, 34:1, | $16: 8$ |
| $43: 15$ | $31: 2,31: 5,$ | 34:14, 34:15, | reading |
| proceed | $31: 18,47: 5$ | 44:5, 44:17 questions | ready |
| 12:2 | proposals | 14:4, 14:12, | 44:14 |
| proceeded | $3: 22, \quad 8: 20$ | 24:13, 30:18, | real |
| 43:3 | 11:6, 12:11, $13: 2,14: 18,$ | $33: 3,33: 6$, | 33:3 |
| process | $\begin{array}{ll} 13: 2, & 14: 18, \\ 23: 9 . & 26: 2 . \end{array}$ | 33:12, 37:13, | reality |
| 22:14, 22:22, | $\begin{array}{ll} 23: 9, & 26: 2, \\ 28: 14, & 44: 6 \end{array}$ | 37:16, 41:6, | 42:14 |
| $41: 16,47: 13,$ | proposed | 41:11, 43:18, | reardon |
| $48: 3,49: 12,$ | 5:1, 5:2, 12:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 3, \quad 46: 9, \\ & 51: 21, \quad 52: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 41:22 <br> reason |
| 51:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 16, \quad 22: 18, \\ & 25: 1, \quad 41: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 52:7 | 41:5 |
| produce | proposing | quick | reasonable |
| 29:12 | proposing $9: 3$ | 29:21, 33:4, | 10:16 |
| produced | provide | 46:21 | received |
| 3:10 | $6: 21, \quad 14: 6,$ | quickly | 4:20, 9:14, |
| $4: 15$ | $30: 10,52: 2$ | 26:8 | $53: 9$ |
| product | provisions | quite $10: 8,25: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recently } \\ & 20.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24:6, 28:18, | $\begin{gathered} 49: 22 \\ \text { nen } \end{gathered}$ | 25:20 | recess |
| 46:11 | public | quorum | $3: 2,3: 21, ~ 4: 4$, |
| production | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} 5: 14, & 6: 10, \\ 33: 7, & 37: 11, \end{array}\right.$ | $2: 18$ | $5: 1,6: 5,6: 7$ |
| $29: 18$ <br> products | $41: 18,45: 9,$ | quote-unquote 21:9 | $6: 12,8: 22,52: 1$ recessed |
| 28:17, 30:2 | publicly | R | 52:4 |
| progress | $5: 4$ | racial | recommended |
| $51: 11$ | purely | 33:21, 33:22, | $24: 1$ |
| project | 34:9 | 34:14 | $23: 19$ |
| 36:5 | purpose | $44: 14$ | reconvene |
| prominently | 3:21, 4:22, | 44:14 | $5: 15$ |
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| 47:16, 47:18 | seek | $8: 4,8: 17,9: 14$, | several |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| says | 13:2 | 10:17, 10:19, | 22:1, 29:2 |
| 39:17, 39:20, | seeking | 11:5, 12:8, | shapes |
| 44:21 | $34: 2,34: 4$ | 13:13, 13:16, | 17:2 |
| scheme | seems | 15:16, 23:7, | share |
| 26:4 | 16:7, 34:15, | 23:8, 23:22, | 15:1, 15:8, |
| school | 34:20 | 24:3, 25:17, | 20:11, 20:13, |
| 20:12, 33:20 | sen | 26:8, 26:11, | 35:6 |
| seat | 2:2, 2:7, 2:11, | 27:8, 27:13, | shares |
| 11:19, 20:21, | 2:13, 2:19, | 27:20, 27:22, | 20:22 |
| 21:20, 21:21, | $3: 20,4: 3,4: 7$, | 29:17, 31:13, | shoot |
| 23:11, 26:12, | $4: 8,5: 5,5: 6$, | $31: 21,32: 17$, | 45:4 |
| 31:9, 31:21, | 5:15, 5:19, | $32: 22,36: 3$, | short |
| $32: 14,35: 18$, | $5: 21,6: 1,6: 3$, | $36: 7,36: 13$, | 52:2 |
| 35:19 | $6: 4,6: 5,6: 8$, | $37: 6,39: 15$, | should |
| seats | 9:5, 14:3, | 50:16, 50:20, | 13:5, 16:13, |
| 10:2, 10:4, | 14:14, 15:11, | 51:14, 51:16 | 23:14, 49:17, |
| 10:5, 10:6, | 15:15, 15:21, | senator | 50:1, 51:4 |
| 10:10, 13:10, | 17:13, 17:18, | 2:6, 3:19, 7:6, | shouldn't |
| 21:9, 21:17, | 18:5, 18:10, | $22: 4,23: 21$, | $29: 12, \quad 50: 8$ |
| 23:6, 23:7, | 19:8, 19:11, | 24:14, 25:12, | showing |
| 24:2, 24:3, | 19:14, 21:22, | 27:11, 28:5, | $29: 21$ |
| 26:8, 26:14, | 23:2, 24:12, | $29: 16,34: 16,$ | sic |
| $31: 6,31: 13$, | 24:14, 26:9, | $37: 2,39: 15$ | 44:15 |
| $31: 14,31: 15$, | 26:19, 26:22, | senators | side |
| $32: 7,32: 20$, | 27:7, 27:10, | $27: 16, \quad 28: 4$ | 9:7, 12:14, |
| 50:16, 50:18, | 28:4, 28:12, | sense | 12:17, 15:6, |
| 50:19, 50:20 | 28:16, 28:19, | 27:19 | $35: 10,43: 4$, |
| seconds | $30: 8,30: 15$, | sent | 47:22, 49:19, |
| 36:18 | $31: 1,31: 4$, | 19:6, 26:5, | 51:11 |
| secretary | $31: 8,31: 12$, | 47:5 | sides |
| 2:2, 2:4, 2:6, | $31: 17,31: 20,$ | september | $5: 8, \quad 22: 2,22: 3$ |
| $2: 8,2: 10,2: 12$, | $32: 2,32: 13,$ | $27: 18$ | signature-oso |
| $2: 14,2: 16,2: 18$ | $32: 16,32: 19$, | session | $53: 15$ |
| section | $33: 2,34: 1$, | $1: 2,37: 11$ | significance |
| 34:11, 38:2, | $34: 10,35: 22,$ | set | $19: 2$ |
| $39: 4,39: 10,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 36: 9, & 36: 19, \\ 37: 1 . & 37: 12 . \end{array}$ | $15: 3,24: 7$ | significant |
| $39: 13, \quad 40: 1$ | $37: 1,37: 12 \text {, }$ | $28: 9$ | 8:16, 10:7, |
| sections | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 14,37: 15, \\ & 38 \cdot 538 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | sets | 11:16, 21:19 |
| 39:16, 43:6, |  | 37:16 | significantly |
| 49:9, 50:13 |  | seven | 12:17, 13:16, |
| see |  | 4:11, 10:1, | $18: 20$ |
| $3: 7,4: 1, ~ 8: 6$, | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 7,43: 18 \\ & 44: 3,44: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 18:19, 32:7, | similar |
| 9:12, 10:20, | $45: 7,45: 13$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 36: 2, & 37: 3, \\ 38 \cdot 14 & 38 \cdot 19 \end{array}$ | $11: 18,13: 20,$ |
| 13:13, 19:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 7,45: 13 \\ & 46: 1,49: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $38: 14, \quad 38: 19$ | $16: 10,17: 10,$ |
| $49: 13$ <br> seeing | $50: 9, \quad 51: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 20,48: 5 \\ & 49: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $18: 18, \quad 20: 10,$ |
| $2: 21,17: 4$ | senate | 49:16 | 33:18 |
|  | 4:12, 7:12, | $42: 21$ | simple |
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| simply | southwest | statements | summary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49:6 | 20:20, 33:21, | 3:2 | 7:5 |
| since | 44:12 | states | summit |
| 26:14 | southwestern | 5:7 | 44:10 |
| single | 35:18 | statewide | superintendence |
| 11:3 | speak | 3:6, 9:20, | 44:21 |
| site | 15:7 | 24:4, 47:8 | supporting |
| 9:11 | speaker | statewise | 53:4 |
| six | 2:4, 3:3, 7:2, | 5:9 | supposed |
| 18:20 | 9:5, 14:4 | status | 39:17 |
| sleep | speaking | 14:6 | supreme |
| 47:1 | 28:19, 46:21 | step | 3:9, 7:19, |
| slow | specifically | 7:17 | 9:21, 22:9, |
| 46:14 | 37:16 | steps | 24:8, 38:1, |
| slowed | specified | 43:12 | 39:1, 39:10, |
| 48:3 | 9:21 | still | 41:20, 42:7, |
| some | split | 7:8, 22:20, | 44:20 |
| 3:8, 3:10, | 38:11, 38:12 | 43:11, 44:10, | sure |
| 6:18, 7:15, | splits | 48:16 | 5:13, 6:12, |
| 10:14, 16:5, | 38:8, 42:17, | stood | 14:11, 23:4, |
| 16:8, 17:2, | 43:13 | 17:11 | 25:8, 25:9, |
| 27:14, 39:8, | staff | strands | 25:16, 28:7, |
| 43:16, 44:12, | 8:20, 14:9, | 34:4 | 34:16, 39:9, |
| 44:13, 45:18 | 15:6, 22:5, | strictly | 43:19, 43:22, |
| someplace | 29:5, 36:15, | 34:14 | 52:2 |
| $25: 9, \quad 41: 15$ | 46:19, 48:12 | striving | swings |
| something | staffs | $33: 16,33: 18 \text {, }$ | $19: 21$ |
| 17:12, 22:10, | 3:5, 14:7 | 51:4 | sykes |
| 26:6, 41:10, | stand | struggling | $2: 2,2: 6,2: 7,$ |
| 45:10 | 6:22, 14:7 | 37:21 | 2:19, 3:20, 4:7, |
| somewhat | stark | subject | 5:5, 5:21, 6:3, |
| 18:20 | 33:10 | $22: 14$ | 6:5, 6:8, 7:6, |
| soon | start | submit | 9:5, 9:8, 13:22, |
| $52: 3$ | $3: 2,16: 4$ | $15: 13,19: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 3, \quad 19: 14, \\ & 21.15 \end{aligned}$ |
| sorry | started | submitted | $21: 15,21: 22,$ |
| $39: 15,39: 21$ | $49: 3$ | $30: 21, \quad 41: 18,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 5, \quad 23: 2, \\ & 23: 21, \quad 24: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| sought | starting | $41: 19$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 23: 21, & 24: 12, \\ 24: 14, & 33: 2, \end{array}$ |
| $11: 16,35: 15,$ | $22: 17$ | submitting | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 24: 14, \quad 33: 2, \\ & 36: 9, \quad 36: 19, \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| $47: 11$ <br> south | state $1: 3 . \quad 12: 2$ | $28: 14$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 36: 9, & 36: 19, \\ 37: 1, & 37: 2, \end{array}\right.$ |
| south $12: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 3, \\ & 13: 6, \\ & 14: 2, \end{aligned}$ | suggest <br> 38:15 | $37: 7,37: 14,$ |
| southeastern | $13: 6,20, ~ 25: 22, ~$ | suggested | $41: 4,43: 18,$ |
| 35:18 | 40:21, 42:14, | $4: 18, \quad 11: 22$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 44: 3, & 45: 7, \\ 46: 1, & 50: 9, \end{array}$ |
| southern $12: 15, \quad 1$ | $46: 10$ stated | suggestion <br> 11:12 | $51: 13$ |
| 16:17, 17:16, | 40:11, 40:19 | suggestions | T |
| 18:6, 18:22, | statement | $33: 7$ | table |
| 20: 4 | 19:3, 49:1 | summaries $16: 5$ | 10:11 |
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| take | terms | 13:5, 15:2, | tools |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:20, 6:12, | 20:16, 32:17, | 16:5, 18:11, | 29:19 |
| 6:17, 7:17, | 39:3, 43:4 | $38: 15,40: 21$, | top |
| 14:19, 17:4, | testimony | 41:16, 42:22, | 12:13 |
| 35:15 | 42:4, 42:6 | 46:9, 46:15, | topic |
| taken | thank | 51:4 | 39:2 |
| 11:12, 45:8 | 3:4, 7:4, 9:5, | throughout | towards |
| takes | 9:8, 14:14, | 40:17 | 7:17 |
| 10:10, 46:12 | 14:15, 19:11, | throw | township |
| taking | 19:13, 19:15, | 13:11 | 12:5, 12:13, |
| 22:13, 26:2, | 24:14, 37:13, | time | 35:10 |
| 43:12 | 42:22, 43:2, | 3:13, 3:18, | townships |
| talk | 46:2, 46:3, | 5:15, 6:15, 9:5, | 20:10, 42:18 |
| 7:12, 33:8, | 46:18, 50:10, | 14:3, 14:8, | train |
| 38:8 | 51:12 | 15:19, 17:7, | 44:13 |
| talked | thanks | 28:3, 28:13, | training |
| 40:1, 43:4, | 24:15 | 36:19, 37:8, | 7:8 |
| 43:8 | thereafter | 37:19, 46:4, | trains |
| talking | 44:16 | 52:2 | $44: 15$ |
| 34:13, 43:15, | thing | timeframe | trajectory |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46: 13, \quad 48: 16 \\ & 50: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 5, \quad 14: 16, \\ & 17: 13, \quad 51: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $46: 8$ <br> timeline | $9: 20,22: 21$ |
| talks | things | $46: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 6 \\ & \text { transcribed } \end{aligned}$ |
| $42: 8$ | 29:6, 30:10, | times | $1: 22$ |
| tally | 33:9, 37:21, | $14: 21,22: 2,$ | transcriber |
| 11:20 | 38:9, 38:10, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 22: 7, \quad 36: 16 \\ & 48: 3 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $53: 1,53: 2$ |
| tape-recording | $\begin{array}{lr} 40: 5, & 42: 3, \\ 42: 19, & 50: 15 \end{array}$ | $48: 3$ <br> timetable | transcript |
| $\begin{aligned} & 53: 9 \\ & \text { task } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:19, } 50: 15 \\ & \text { think } \end{aligned}$ | timetable $45: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 1 \\ & \text { transcription } \end{aligned}$ |
| $14: 11, \quad 29: 1$ <br> tasks | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 9, \quad 4: 12, \quad 8: 6, \\ & 14: 11, \quad 16: 8, \end{aligned}$ | today $4: 2, \quad 30: 6,$ | $53: 9$ |
| $29: 20$ | $14: 11, ~ 16: 8$, $27: 12, ~ 27: 18$, | 43:9, 46:15, | translate $17: 14,50: 15$ |
| technical | 28:22, 29:6, | 46:22, 52:1 | translates |
| $50: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 10, \quad 30: 9, \\ & 35: 3, \quad 35: 4 . \end{aligned}$ | together | $50: 14$ |
| tell | $\begin{array}{ll} 35: 3, & 35: 4, \\ 38: 1, & 38: 18, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 1,14: 7, \\ & 14: 10,15: 20, \end{aligned}$ | treating |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 5: 19, & 16: 3, \\ 25: 7, & 39: 6 \end{array}$ | $39: 15,42: 2,$ | $16: 1,19: 20,$ | 32:4 |
| telling | 45:5, 49:5, | 20:14, 22:12, | tried $19: 19,34: 20,$ |
| 33:14 | 49:15 | 34:8, 34:18, | $47: 6$ |
| ten | thought | 35:6, 36:16, | true |
| 49:5 | 18:4 | 36:20 | 53:8 |
| tend | thousands | tomorrow | trust |
| $42: 12,42: 13$ | 39:7 <br> three | $45: 20,52: 4$ <br> tonight | 42:21 |
| tentative | $18: 19,32: 20,$ | $44: 8$ | try |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 18 \\ & \text { term } \end{aligned}$ | $36: 22$ | took | 17:4, 26:4, |
| $24: 21,27: 16,$ | through | $19: 5,19: 6,$ | $35: 1, \quad 37: 9,$ |
| $34: 21$ | 11:11, 12:2, | 27:4, 46:21 | $39: 14,39: 20$ |
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| trying | union | 17:15 | way |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4:13, 7:14, | 7:11, 7:20, | versus | 11:9, 22:15, |
| 14:11, 22:11, | 7:22, 11:15, | 13:10, 34:21 | 23:16, 28:22, |
| 23:4, 37:22, | 12:4, 13:18, | vetting | 30:1, 34:17, |
| 41:8, 41:12, | 21:16, 24:18 | 28:14 | 43:15, 47:4 |
| 42:21, 47:8, | uniting | vi | ways |
| 49:12 | 17:10 | 34:11 | 10:12, 22:12, |
| tweaks | unless | video-recorded | 40:20 |
| 13:14 | 45:10 | 1:1 | we'll |
| two | unnecessarily | view | 9:6, 15:7, |
| 4:10, 5:2, | 42:18 | 11:8, 20:19, | 19:8, 45:21 |
| 8:11, 8:14, | unnecessary | 22:10, 29:22, | we're |
| 8:18, 10:4, | 48:15 | 48:2 | 5:4, 6:8, 6:15, |
| 10:5, 10:20, | unplanned | village | 6:22, 14:11, |
| 17:19, 23:6, | 30:7 | 18:3, 18:5, | $23: 19, \quad 25: 10,$ |
| 23:7, 23:9, | until | 18:9 | 26:22, 32:4, |
| 23:12, 32:6, | 3:2, 3:21, 6:5, | violate | 32:7, 32:8, |
| $32: 10,32: 22$, | 36:15, 45:10, | 38:2, 39:10, | 33:11, 38:5, |
| 36:2, 36:22, | 51:9, 52:4 | 49:9 | 39:8, 40:4, |
| 37:16, 44:6, | update | visit | 43:14, 46:5, |
| 46:8, 46:16, | 4:2, 14:6 | 37:2 | 47:8, 48:16 |
| 46:22 | uploaded | vote | we 've |
| type-district $13: 1$ | 9:2, 9:3 | 12:22 | $\begin{array}{ll} 3: 13, & 6: 18, \\ 16: 1, & 25: 8 \end{array}$ |
| U | upper $12: 6,26: 10$ | voters 18:2 | $33: 5, \quad 38: 17,$ |
| u-shape <br> $17: 16$ \left\lvert\, $\begin{array}{ll}\text { urban } \\ 18: 8,42: 12\end{array}\right.$ |  |  | 40:1, 41:17, |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 43: 8, & 44: 5, \\ 45: 2, & 45: 11 \end{array}$ |
| under | use | W | website |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 12, \quad 31: 17, \\ & 53: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 16, \quad 29: 19, \\ & 30: 4, \quad 34: 21, \end{aligned}$ | want | $6: 14,9: 2,$ |
| understand | $35: 2$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 4: 4, & 4: 9, \\ 7: 2, & 19: 13, \end{array}$ | 43:21 |
| $3: 17,4: 5,5: 6$, | useful | $24: 16, \quad 25: 9$ | weigh $39: 1$ |
| 9:1, 9:2, 27:1, | $29: 21$ | $41: 4,43: 19,$ | went |
| 34:11, 35:11, | using | $43: 22,44: 6,$ | $12: 14,12: 16$ |
| 36:1, 37:22, | $30: 11$ | $44: 15, \quad 52: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 14, \quad 12: 16, \\ & 16: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $45: 15,49: 2$ <br> understanding | usually | wanted | 16:5 <br> western |
| 3:13, 4:22, | V | warren | $11: 10, \quad 12: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32: 1, \quad 49: 4 \\ & \text { understandings } \end{aligned}$ | values | $\begin{array}{ll} 8: 8, & 8: 12, \\ 8: 15, & 8: 16 \end{array}$ | whatever $5: 19,34: 17,$ |
| 6:19, 47:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 22, ~ 40: 16, \\ & 48: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 15, \quad 8: 16, \\ & 11: 4, \quad 11: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $39: 9$ |
| understood | various | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 14, \quad 32: 6, \\ & 11: 1, \end{aligned}$ | whereas |
| $4: 8,4: 17$ | 3:7, 3:16, | 32:8 | 13:9 <br> whether |
| undoubtedly $13: 4$ | 4:13, 42:5 | washington | $28: 7,35: 7,$ |
| unfolded | varying 19:1 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 12: 4, & 29: 11, \\ 30: 9 \end{array}\right.$ | $45: 2, \quad 48: 13$ |
| $30: 6,47: 14$ | version | wasted | whole $39: 21$ |
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| wholesale | Z | 24 | 57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:13 | zero | 9:13, 53:17 | 42:1 |
| winchester | 31:14 | 25 | 58 |
| 16:21 | \$ | 9:13, 25:4 | 42:1 |
| wish | \$120,000 |  | 6 |
| 47:3 | $29: 9$ | 11:14 | 6 |
| within | 29.9 0 | 29 | 46:22 |
| 10:21, 26:5, | 0 | 9:13 | 6 (b |
| 27:16, 28:1, | 00 | 3 | 38:3 |
| 47:9 | $3: 4,5: 17,6: 3,$ | 3 | 6 (c |
| without 39.3 42:17, | $1$ | $3: 2,3: 21$ | $34: 11$ |
| 39:3, 42:17, | 1 | 30 | 60 |
| 43:12 | 1- | $3: 2,3: 21$, | 36:18 |
| wonder | 53:20 | 5:17, 52:4 | 60,000 |
| 46:6 | 10 | 4 | 24:17, 24:18 |
| $13: 12,22: 1$ | 16:18, 20:8, | 4 | 7 |
| words | $21: 10$ 100 | 5:17, 6:3, 6:4, | 74 |
| 27:15 | 21:2 | 46:22 | 53:15 |
| work | 11:2 | 427563 | 8 |
| 7:7, 14:15, | 8:2, 12:7, | 53:20 | 88 |
| 22:12, 24:15, | 18:20, 21:9, | 427653 | 39:11 |
| 42:22, 44:8, | 31:6 | 1:20 | 9 |
| 45:9, 46:3, | 12 | $22: 21,24: 2,$ |  |
| 46:7, 48:1 worked | 21:16, 21:17, | $50: 15, \quad 50: 18$ | 52: 4 |
| 16:1 | 26:13, 31:5 | 46 |  |
| working | 21:15, 22:21, | 9:22, 22:9, |  |
| 3:5, 5:7, 14:7, | $24: 3,25: 5,$ | $50: 12$ |  |
| 14:10, 15:7, | 36:16, 50:16, | 5 |  |
| 19:6, 25:10, | 50:20 | 5 |  |
| 30:18, 46:4, | 16 | 16:19 |  |
| 50: 4 | 25:4, 28:7 | 5-2 |  |
| worthwhile | 18 , | 23:6 |  |
| 21:7 | 50:19, 53:8 | 50 |  |
| written | 2 | 12:22, 13:6, |  |
| 38:22 |  | 13:10, 21:11, |  |
| wrong | $5: 17$ | 21:18 |  |
| 23:3, 34:22 | $20$ | 53 |  |
| Y | 1:5 | 1:21 |  |
| Yeah | $2022$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 9: 21, \quad 22: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4: 8, \quad 33: 2, \\ & 34: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 1:5, 53:17 | $41: 22,42: 1$ |  |
| yesterday | $1: 5,53: 20$ | 50:12, 50:18 |  |
| 9:15 | 1:5, 53:20 | 55 |  |
| young |  | 42:1 |  |
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A P P E A R A N C E S

ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSION:
SPEAKER ROBERT R. CUPP, Co-Chair
SENATOR VERNON SYKES, Co-Chair
HOUSE MINORITY LEADER-ELECT ALLISON RUSSO
GOVERNOR MIKE DEWINE
SECRETARY OF STATE FRANK LAROSE

STATE AUDITOR KEITH FABER
SENATE PRESIDENT MATT HUFFMAN

MAPMAKERS:
RAY DIROSSI

BLAKE SPRINGHETTI
CHRIS GLASSBURN

PR OCEED N E G S

SPEAKER CUPP: Good afternoon. Being past the hour of 9:30 a.m. on this date, the Ohio Redistricting Commission will come to order.

We have essentially the order of proceedings this afternoon will be a presentation of District -General Assembly District Plans, the ones drawn by the Republicans will go first, and then -- the ones by the Democrats will go first, and when each is up, questions will be in order. We ask those questions be confined to understanding the maps, clarity and knowledge about the facts of the maps. And then, once both presentations are concluded, I would ask that if members have any questions of either of any of the map drawers about any of the maps so that we have a clear opportunity to have a discussion about -- about the maps. And this is what we -- Senator Sykes and I agreed to.

And after that, we will recess for 15 minutes more or less. Hopefully hold it to that amount of time. And then, we will reconvene for further action of the in discussion of the Commission.

So with that, do you have anything you want to

```
add to that?
                            SENATOR SYKES: No, Mr. Chairman, I think we're
ready to rock and roll.
    SPEAKER CUPP: All right. Let's do it.
    So I ask Ray DiRossi and Blake Springhetti if
you would come forward and explain the --
    (Pause.)
    SPEAKER CUPP: Yes, I am reminded I forgot to
call -- have -- to have the rollcall, so at this time,
will Staff please call the roll.
    STAFF: Co-Chair Speaker Cupp.
    SPEAKER CUPP: Present.
    STAFF: Co-Chair Senator Sykes.
    SENATOR SYKES: Present.
    STAFF: Governor DeWine.
    GOVERNOR DEWINE: Here.
    STAFF: Auditor Faber.
AUDITOR FABER: Yes.
STAFF: President Huffman.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Here.
STAFF: Secretary LaRose.
SECRETARY LAROSE: Here.
```
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STAFF: Leader-Elect Russo.
LEADER-ELECT RUSSO: Here.
STAFF: Speaker, you have a quorum.
SPEAKER CUPP: Thank you.
At this time, we'll be in ease for a few moments.
(Pause.)
SPEAKER CUPP: At this time, we'll ask Mr. Springhetti and Mr. DiRossi to come forward and explain the map that they have drawn to present to the Committee. You want to come up and use the podium if that's convenient.

MR. DIROSSI: Good morning or good afternoon, whichever is applicable.

So I think you have a lot of information and packets before you, so I'll be referencing some of that information, and I'll also be talking a little bit about some of the other information that we have provided to the staff of the seven members of the Commission as well as to the public.

Maybe just kind of talk a about little bit about our process. We have been actively engaged daily
and around the clock with the staff of all seven members of the Commission, including Blake and myself. We have been hosted in the Senate Minority conference room for the last three days on -- well, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and we have also been providing information or proposals that have then come before the Commission on three or four of those days. I want to talk a little bit about that. Some of the handouts that we gave in the map that now is going to be before you or is before you.

On Wednesday, at our staff meeting, we provided an information and comprehensive proposal for Frank -Franklin and Hamilton County. And those proposals which were put together with the statistical information, index information, graphical representations, as well as I believe block assignment files for the public and for all the members were provided to our counterparts, and we had a very good discussion on those. Those two counties would move two Democrat leaning or two Republican leaning seats to two Democrat leaning seats in the House, and one Republican leaning Senate district to a Democratic leaning Senate district in the Senate.

So that is a very substantive step, and that came from early on in our staff conversations. We systemically talked about the regions of the State and individual counties, and what configurations of districts could be agreed to, or what could be put forward for the Commission's consideration. So that was our Tuesday Franklin and Hamilton County information. Moving a total of three districts.

On Thursday, we were able to meet the next day on and deal with Lorain County. And that same type of information was provided to the Commission members. In this instance, the collective staff for all of the members identified one House district that could be moved at to a Democrat leaning House district, and one Senate district that could be moved to a Democrat leaning Senate district. And so that was also provided, and also made public through some statistical information, graphical information, and block assignment files.

The next day, we submitted a comprehensive proposal for Cuyahoga and Summit County, and another very substantive step towards -- towards our goals. Two
additional House Districts that were in the inactive map Democrat leaning were moved to be -- I'm sorry, Republican leaning were moved to be Democrat leaning, and one additional Senate district which was Republican leaning was moved to be Democrat leaning.

Now, I think it's worth noting, and I don't know if -- if you could very easily flip to the information that you have in -- in front of you. But if you look at the Districts in Cuyahoga and Summit County, I think it's notable to point out, and I will be flipping here as well, there are a total of five Senate Districts that have footprints in those two counties with a little bit in Geauga left over. And we talked a lot about that in September about why that was.

Under the proposal that was put forward, all 15
House Districts would be Democratic leaning, and all five Senate Districts would be Democrat leaning. So we will have a total of 30 Districts in that footprint, and all -- all of them will be Democratic leaning.

Similarly, if you look at the proposals in
Franklin County, I think you will see similar statistical information. There is one House district
that is paired with Union County in the inactive map. A number of the Districts were modified by -- by the staff and proposed, and those were pending for your approval. But I think we will have in the House will have 11 Democrat leaning House Districts and four Democrat leaning Senate Districts out of that entire footprint. So there's only one Republican leaning House district remaining, and it is primarily based outside of Franklin County. It is in Union County.

The last piece of information which was probably sent by us this morning was a geography change in West Central Ohio, and this -- this should not come to any shock to the Commission members because I know it was worked on in September by my counterparts in the Senate Democratic Caucus, the House Democratic Caucus, and some of the other members of the Redistricting Commission.

These changes in West Central Ohio do not move any Districts between the Republican or Democrat leaning Districts tallies, they have no impact on that. It is just better to align the geography to a more historic nature of the House and Senate Districts in West Central

Ohio.

These are the four key days, the four key proposals that were put forward that addressed and made very substantive changes towards compliance of the court. And in total, are compliant. And they will move again a total of five House Districts from the Republican leaning to Democratic leaning column, and three Senate Districts from the Republican leaning column to the Democrat leaning column for a total of eight.

I -- I -- there might be questions. I want to let -- give Blake a chance to articulate and go through anything he would like to say to the Commission, and we'll be happy to answer questions.

MR. SPRINGHETTI: Yeah, I would just say that a key -- a key piece of this was there is a lot of collaboration and a of back-and-forth, and I think in the final map that is before you that we are presenting, we were able to take some recommendations from several members of the Commission, including the Democrat side, particularly in Franklin County. So with that, $I$ concur in Ray's statements, and I think there will be a time
for $Q$ and A shortly hereafter.
SPEAKER CUPP: Are there questions for these two witnesses at this time on this map?

Senator Sykes?
SENATOR SYKES: Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. Thank you all for your work as well as for your presentation here today.

The Ohio Supreme Court has clearly directed us to meet Article XI, Section 6 of the Constitution, unless there is some technical requirements that would get in the way. And so given that your map does not meet that proportionality, can you let us know what technical requirements prevented you from meeting that proportionality.

MR. SPRINGHETTI: Co-Chair Sykes, and members of the Commission, I would say that the map that we're presenting to you does comply with the court order, and I would say that given the time frame, we did the best we could, and we haven't seen a map yet that gets down to 54 in the House that is compliant with the Constitution. And so I would say we -- we did comply with court order.
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SPEAKER CUPP: Follow-up, please?
SENATOR SYKES: Yes. Well, if we could offer a change that could help you get closer to that proportionality, would you be open to it?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: Co-Chair Sykes, and members of the Commission, I -- I think I would defer to the members of the Commission on -- on whether they would be open to such proposal.

SENATOR SYKES: Okay.
SPEAKER CUPP: Okay. The Chair recognizes Senator Huffman.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Oh, no, I'm sorry.
SPEAKER CUPP: Oh, okay.
The Chair recognizes Representative Russo.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Thank you to both of you. I know this has been a very long, gruelling several days with very little sleep. So to all of our staff that have been working on this map -- on these maps, I'd like to say thank you for that because this has not been an easy task.

I am curious, specifically did you start with the map that was thrown out as unconstitutional as your
template to make these changes, and you know, specifically what steps did you take to test whether or not those Districts within that map that was thrown out by the court could actually move to the 54 percent Republican, 46 percent Democratic ratio?

MR. DIROSSI: Co-Chairs and Leader Russo, I would say the first day that the staff met was very productive because we talked a lot about logistical things, we talked about data, we talked about how to share files, we talked about meeting schedules. And specifically to data sharing, we came to an understanding of what data each was using, which was very similar already, and we talked about how we were going to measure the Districts using the '16, '18 and '20 election data. And so that as one side was sharing the proposal and was saying that the district was 50.5 percent Republican, because we are dealing with slim margins in many of these cases, that the other side would see that and would correspond.

So I think we came to an understanding of that very quickly, and I think that was able to facilitate a little bit of back-and-forth especially in Franklin

County where, as Blake said, a number of the counterproposal geography changes were incorporated into the proposal before you.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: A follow-up, please, through the Chair.

That hasn't answered my questions, but I do appreciate that you did come to an agreement about which data file to use regarding the '16, '18, '20 data. Did you start with the template of the map that was thrown out as the starting point to make the changes to get to the court's order of the 54-46 proportionality?

MR. DIROSSI: Again, to the Co-Chairs and to Leader Russo, at that first meeting, we also talked -went through most of the State and talked about the regions where the September 15 th map that was put forward by Senator Sykes and Leader Sykes differed from the inactive map that was before the court, and we identified all of these counties where we thought there were Republican leaning seats that could be moved to Democrat leaning seats. We worked on those as time permitted, and brought many of them forward, if not most of them forward, that we thought were viable, or that
were or there was agreement with the other side. So I don't know if I'd say we started with any specific map. Those -- those agreements and those proposals then were put into a map that was the inactive map, but all of these major urban areas that we're changing are the product of those conversations.

MR. DIROSSI: Follow-up, please.
So to get -- and attempt to the get to the 54-46 proportionality, were there specific tests or steps that you took? Because it sounds like you didn't start from scratch; that you started from the basic premise of the adopted map, and making adjustments there. You know what -- what were some of the tests or what prevented you from getting to the 54-46 proportionality?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: So to the Co-Chairs, Leader-Elect Russo, I would just say that we were instructed to use the base map because -- to the first point of your question, we were instructed to use the base map as a starting point because it was what was most familiar, and it was something that we -- was clear that complied with Sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. So just
to answer the first piece of that.
You want to take the second piece?
Is that responsive enough or is there a
follow-up?
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: It doesn't really answer my question. But I do have one more follow-up question. I'm going to shift gears a little bit because you talked a lot about the previous --

SPEAKER CUPP: Representative Russo.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: -- thank you through the Chair.

You talked a lot, about you know, some of the collaboration, and to me, collaboration is two-way, not one-way. And we did have some discussions about Franklin County specifically. And one of the biggest concerns that we had in Franklin County was the district, which $I$ believe in your map is Districts 5, which runs all the way from Reynoldsurg, and sweeps around to Perry Township, and then, it has district 10, which is centered on Grove City. And so you drew that so that it had a proportion Democratic index of 5 -- for the district 5 that is sweeps all the way across

Franklin County of 51.76. And then, the Grove City centered district has a Democratic index of 50.12. And specifically in the conversations that we had, we were trying to understand why you had not created instead a Grove City Centric district that included Perry and Pleasant Township which share interests in those communities including school Districts and some other resources. And you had connected those all the way to the eastern side of the county.

Can you tell me, you know, why in drawing those two Districts in that way, why that was necessary, because in doing so, you actually decreased the Democratic index. Why was that necessary?

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs and Leader Russo, so thank you for that explanation.

I mean, I think the main goal of the conversations were to move the one district in Franklin County from a Republican leaning district to a Democrat leaning district. That seemed very obvious and very agreed to by all the staff that were talking on behalf of all of you. So we have achieved that goal.

Grove City and Jackson Township are very
well-integrated, and we -- we kept them together in a district.

I also would point out that in Franklin County, and I know you're very familiar with it as well, if you look at the 12 districts that -- House districts that make up that footprint and ignore Union County, Columbus is a dominant entity in Central Ohio, and many of these districts in the county are made up almost entirely of, or significant portions of the City of Columbus.

If you took away Columbus out of Franklin County, and you looked at what is left, you will see that some districts only have 10 or 11,000 people, only 10 percent of the population.

The district that you're referring to is made up primarily of non-Columbus areas. It is specifically Canal Winchester, Grove City, Prairie Township, things that are not Columbus. So we thought that was important, and $I$ think that's the rationale.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: I'll come back. I want to give other Commission members opportunity to ask questions.

SPEAKER CUPP: All right. Other --
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GOVERNOR DEWINE: Chairman --

SPEAKER CUPP: Other questions?
Governor DeWine.
GOVERNOR DEWINE: Chairman.
First of all, thank you all for your work. I know you've labored hard the last few days. We appreciate it very much, both Democrat and Republican side.

When we started these sessions after the Supreme Court decision, I think we went through this, and everyone agreed that the goal should be the 54 percent, 46 percent split that the Supreme Court talked about. But I think we also, under Section 6, but I think we also all agreed, according to the Supreme Court decision, that we could not violate any of the other provisions, and that the Section 6 was subordinate to those others, but that there had to be certainly very serious attempt made to try to get to the 40 -- 54-46. So am I to assume by your -- your testimony that you could not get a higher number than you did in regard to the 42 , or lower number than the 57 , because to do that would have violated some of the other
sections?
MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs, and the Governor, yes, there are a number of provisions in the Constitution other than Section 6 that are very obvious whether or not you're violating them. And then, there are a number of subjective ones that you, the Redistricting Commission, and ultimately the Supreme Court, need to opine on and give direction on.

We -- it is very easy for us to make sure when we can see in a map a violation of something that is night and day. An easy thing to know. Like a population. But there are a number of subjective things. And the districts that were put forward we think meets all of the tests, both subjective and specific, and that is what we had, and that is what the Republican and Democratic staff worked on for these last five days so far. So I think that's where we are, and I would say yes.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Okay. The answer to my question is yes then?

MR. DIROSSI: Yes.
GOVERNOR DEWINE: Okay. Thank you.

SPEAKER CUPP: Any questions? All right. Representative Russo.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
One additional question. Were you ever advised that Section 6, the proportionality piece, was not possible?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, to
Leader-Elect Russo, I was not instructed that it was impossible.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Okay. Thank you.
SPEAKER CUPP: All right. If there are no further questions, we thank you. And you may be -- may be seated here for a while till we get done with the next presentation, and then, there may be some questions.

At this time, we'd call Chris Glassburn to present the map that you were working on.

MR. GLASSBURN: Co-Chairs Cupp and Sykes, and members of the Commission, my name is Chris Glassburn. I am here to present the Democratic proposal.

The Democratic House plan provides for the ratio outlined in Section 6 of 45 Democratic seats and

54 Republican seats, as well as the Senate ratio of 18 Republican seats, and 15 Democratic seats. As has been noted, we have over the past week had significantly more extensive conversations about Franklin and Hamilton Counties than other parts of the State. And so the counties in those footprints are more similar between the two proposals than other parts of the State that we have not discussed as much.

As last time $I$ was before you, we have maintained to -- to walk through the State here a little bit. The preferences as we understood them of the majority in Franklin County and Union -- the Union County footprint, in that there was a desire for a -one of the 12 seats in that footprint to be Republican, and one of those to be very competitive centered on Grove City. We worked on the Grove City seat to ensure greater compactness, and to create a district that is more centered solidly on the southwest part of the county than going across the border of the entire county from side-to-side. But there are still 11 out of 12 Democratic House seats, and four out of four Democratic Senate seats in this proposal.

One of the things I would note here is that it is possible with Franklin County if it's paired in a different footprint to have 12 out of 12 seats in the House be Democratic. And we have chosen not to do that again to be consistent with the Majority's wishes. But that is eight seat outside of the 45 which we have identified for you that is possible in the House that is not drawn.

Similar story, I'll move to Hamilton County again because we've talked about that before. We have presented a five Democratic, two Republican House seat configuration. It was possible to draw six Democratic and one Republican. Again, we have chosen in cooperation with the Majority to try to have one less seat in that county. Again, outside of the 45, we've identified for you.

In that proposal, we have made -- we have a handful of differences that are primarily centered on in our map Districts 26 and 28 in the north central part of Hamilton County, but otherwise, the districts are almost -- almost identical. And the Senate pairing of the far eastern district, House district with Warren County is
the same.

There is a difference in our proposal in the Senate districts in that the Republican proposal has only one Republican state -- has a Republican and a Democratic one and one in Hamilton County. In the Democratic proposal, we have two Democratic Senate seats. We have not seen -- we understand the Majority's wishes to have one and one, but we have not seen an alternative Senate district to be presented in another part of the State to compensate to allow for that to happen. And so we have maintained two Senate seats in Hamilton County that are Democratic to sustain the 15-seat ratio as the Court has instructed.

Moving in between to Montgomery County. The footprints of the House and Senate districts are different between the two caucuses. The Majority proposal has a very Democratic seat and a 50 plus 1 Republican -- I'm sorry, Democratic seat. Whereas, the Democratic proposal has three House seats that are Democratic within Montgomery County.

So that is one of the places in the State where there is a -- an additional Democratic seat that is not
reflected in the Republican proposal that contributes to our proposal having 45 as opposed to a lower number. Both proposals have a Democratic to varying degrees leaning Senate district centered on Dayton inside of Montgomery County.

Moving to Southeast Ohio, we have in the Democratic proposal a Democratic House seat centered on Athens, which contains Athens County, Hocking County, and a partial of Ross County, which concludes the City of Chillicothe. This again is a additional House Democratic seat does not exist and is part of the difference between the two maps. The similar seat in the Republican proposal shares a similar construction in that there are three whole counties instead of two whole counties and one partial county. So the -- the splitting of community threshold is the same in both of those seats.

Stark County, Mahoning County and Trumbull Counties all have one Democratic House seat and zero o Democratic State Senate seats in those areas, and the difference is primarily between the two proposals lie in the nature of the one House seat in Stark County
centered on Canton as to whether that is more of a 50 percent plus 1 seat or whether it's a slightly more Democratic seat.

Moving north to Summit, Cuyahoga, Portage and Lake, I'm going to talk about these in two groupings. There are different Senate pairings. So in the Majority map, Summit and Cuyahoga Counties are paired together for Senate purposes, and so -- and in the Democratic proposal, Cuyahoga and Lake, and then, Cuyahoga and Portage are chosen.

With the Democratic proposal by virtue of choosing Summit with Portage, there are two Democratic Senate seats out of two in that footprint, and with the Cuyahoga and Lake, there are four out of four Democratic Senate seats in that footprint. That leads to a difference between the two proposals of the Democrats having six proposed Democratic Senate seats in the northeast corner, versus five for the Republicans, and that is another source of the differences between the numbers in this map.
While those regions of those four counties
share 15 House seats that are Democratic, between those
counties, the configuration of those are very different. In the Cuyahoga, Summit alone of the Republican proposal, there are seven Democratic House seats that are within one -- that are between 50 and 51 percent Democratic. In the Democratic map for the entire state, there are only five, and two of those are located in Hamilton and Franklin County, and reflect previous discussions we've had with the Majority. So the nature of the competitiveness as to whether all of the seats are on one side or another is different categorically.
Moving to -- excuse me, to the west, Lorain

County here, we have two -- between in that Senate district involving Lorain, there is one Democratic Senate seat and two House districts -- excuse me -- for each proposal, but again, the nature of those districts are different. The Republican proposal makes one of the Democratic seats 50 percent plus 1, and the Democratic proposal does not do that. The Democratic proposal in this case also only includes one county with Lorain; whereas, the Republican proposal includes two.

Finally, I will get to Lucas County. Again, there are different Senate pairings, so it's not quite
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apples to apples. However, in the Senate and House districts that start -- that involve Lucas County, the Republican map has one Senate seat and three Democratic House seats. In the Democratic map, there are four. So that's another one of the counts that is different. Four seats that are Democratic in the House in Lucas County.

So as I've gone through the State, you may have noticed that I've primarily referred to the urban counties in this discussion. The maps that we have before you from the House reflect some of the conversations that we had with some members of the Commission from prior to the Supreme Court decision. Our maps would benefit greatly from additional feedback from Republican Commission members or their staffs on the Republican districts. Because of the focus of this Commission on the modification of these seats, naturally, the attention has been more on whether there are Democratic seats or creation of Democratic seats and less on these other areas of the State. But every area of the State has importance and deserves consideration. We would very much welcome additional feedback on the
other parts the State primarily that I've not discussed in this presentation.

SPEAKER CUPP: Are there questions from the Commission from Mr. Glassburn -- or Mr. Glassburn?

President Huffman.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thanks, Speaker Cupp.
Thanks for your presentation and your explanation of the work that you've done here.

A few questions. And the first is I want to talk about some of the districts regarding their compactness. And you understood that not only does the Constitution say, but the Court, in its decision, instructed that Section $C$ of the Article XI, 6(C), excuse me, was to be followed in drawing these maps. Is that correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. And I want to draw your attention first to your proposed Senate District 6, and I think we have a map of that. And while he's -while Adam is setting that map up --and why don't you -- why don't you put it over in this area so the Commission can see, and if Mr. Glassburn wants to see
also.
And as I -- if $I$ have this right, and this -this was the map I had beforehand. I think the colors kind of blend in, but $I$ think $I$ got it right. But this proposed Senate District 6 starts at the northern border of Hamilton County, goes north three counties through Butler, Preble, Darke, and then, east through Miami and Champaign, and then, further north through Logan and Hardin to the southern border of Hancock County. And I -- my first question is did you consider the mandate in $6(C)$ when -- when drawing this district?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to
President Huffman, the nature of this district --
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Well, if just you -- if you would --

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes, yes, yes.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay.
MR. GLASSBURN: The answer is yes, we considered it --

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. And what did your analysis show?

MR. GLASSBURN: Well, in this Senate district
in particular, we have whole counties with one county fragment. And so preservation applicable subdivision certainly is one way to look at compactness. But I'm going to come back to, quite frankly, the -- the straightforward explanation as to the nature of that seat. We have not gotten prior to on our side your State-wide map and the limited proposal concerning a handful of seats and in West Central -- Northern West Central Ohio. We have not received any feedback from the Majority as to how they would like to go about this region.

There is a House district that is part of -that is Butler County, Preble in our map, and Darke, that is a legacy of our previous proposals of having a Senate district, instead of going from Warren County, go through Butler and those area. This is precisely the kind of thing where if we work together and had additional conversations about the area, I'm sure we could improve upon this.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: As -- as it sits, though, do you consider this to meet the Constitutional mandate of compactness?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to Senate President, we have as -- as Ray and -- sorry, Mr. DiRossi mentioned before, we have measures that are explicitly clear. Did you divide this county or not? Then, we have measures of compactness. We have, as the Majority has expressed interest in competitiveness; that we require the Commissions' feedback to tell us what your assessment are of those. If you're asking my personal opinion, is that district consistent with rural districts we have seen previously and in other maps? Just by virtue of those are primarily counties that have 40 to 50,000 folks in them? Yes, that is a -- that is a -- in the realm -- that is in the range of compactness you will sometimes see in rural counties.

But as I've stated before, we want a product that works for all Ohioans. If we can improve upon this, we want the Majority's feedback as to how to go about this. We simply in our negotiations haven't talked about this region of the State at all, and we're looking -- we would welcome that feedback.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Follow-up, Mr. Chair. SPEAKER CUPP: Senator.
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PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yes. So -- so the -- I -just to be clear, though, Butler County is a county that has I think 380,000 people, and Miami County is 110,000. So these aren't all small rural counties like you might find in Southeastern Ohio. But as I understand it, you're the map drawer, you're the expert. And are you concluding that this district meets the standard of compactness?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to President Huffman, Butler County has to have a Senate district within it, so there is a remnant portion that has to go somewhere. That remnant portion is less than 20,000 folks. So you're right that Miami County is larger than the rest at in the 80 to 100,000 range. I forget the exact number off the top of my head. We are -- we are dealing with less compact, less dense communities when we're talking about Western Ohio. So again, $I$ come back to is this sufficiently compact for a rural district with preserving whole counties, and only one county split? Yes. Can we improve upon it? Yes. And we would like to do that with you.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. Great. May I
continue, Mr. Chairman?
SPEAKER CUPP: Yes, Senator.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you.
So just sticking with this district for a
second. District 6 is the current holder of that district is Senator Antani. Senator Antani was elected in 2020, and as you know, under Section 5 of the Constitution is entitled to stay in the Senate at least another two years, and is also entitled to have the same district number, number 6, and also is entitled to represent the district that has the largest portion of his population that elected him. And District 6, as is assigned here, doesn't have anybody who elected Senator Antani to the Senate. And/or if $I$ have that wrong, the largest portion certainly isn't in the Section 6 that you have. Isn't that an unconstitutional violation under Section 5?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, and to Senator President Huffman, my understanding is that Senator Antani's current district has one House seat inside of Montgomery County, and a portion, and then, goes out Preble, Darke and Miami. And my -- I -- if I
made a mistake as to that, then we will gladly correct it.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay.
MR. GLASSBURN: The district that that held has about 168,000 folks in it --

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yes
MR. GLASSBURN: -- Whereas, the district inside of Montgomery County that we have drawn has 163 or so thousand. So if we need to address the numbering scheme there, we would gladly fix that.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Mr. Chair, could I follow up then?

SPEAKER CUPP: You may proceed.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yeah, just for the Commission's edification, this is a Senate district map for 2002 to 2012. Senator Antani's District 6 is wholly within Montgomery County. And if -- if you take that as a given, you can look at the map if you want, or check the Secretary of State website. Given that, isn't this drawing that you're submitting here tonight for District 6, that's unconstitutional, isn't it?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Senate

President Huffman, we are here seeking to work in good faith with the Majority.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: I appreciate that. This is simple yes, no question, I think.

MR. GLASSBURN: If we go back-and-forth pointing at each other on numbering errors or a census block being wrong, we're not going to get to a product together. So we need to keep working interactively to ensure that we get to a constitutional product, not just based on Section 5, but on all the sections of the Article. So yes, this is something that needs to be corrected prior to adoption.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Fair enough. Okay. And similarly, the section, or Senate District 10 currently occupied by Senator Hackett. He also was elected in 2020. And Senate district 10 is under your map, so I understand it includes Greene County, which he represents. He lives -- he lives in Madison County, and his current district is Madison, Clark and Greene. Your map, your District 10 has him representing much of Montgomery County and Greene County. He wouldn't live there, but he'd still be entitled to represent that, but
his -- the majority of people he elected, again under Section 5 of the Constitution, live in another district. In fact, they live on -- in your map, they live under in District 27.

So isn't it true -- and without regard to we want to work together and come up with a mutual product, and all that, isn't it true that that portion of your map, Section 10, as drawn is unconstitutional?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Senate President, again, in the counts that we attempted to do of the incumbent members that have two years remaining, we counted Greene County as having a larger portion of his seats. If we have made a mistake, we will reassign the number to the district that has the majority of District 10 as it exists today.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. I wanted to have a couple more questions about compactness. And Adam, if you could just put up the next map. You can pick whichever one you want there.

So I'm going to show you a couple of the individual House maps that were drawn by you. This one is -- I can't see it from this far away -- 55, which is
in Lorain County. And as you can see, that stretches across the Lake from Lorain County all the way through Erie, and has a substantial amount of the -- the shoreline similar to a much maligned congressional district from ten years ago, actually.

In your analysis of Section 6(C) of the Constitution, Article XI, do you consider this a compact district?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to the Senate President Huffman, with Lorain County having two-and-a-half House seats, a district must leave and go to another county. The Majority proposal goes not to one but to two different counties partially. We chose to do one because we believed that that was more consistent with the Constitution. The nature of that means that more population will be in whichever county you pick, whether that be Huron -- or Erie in this case. So the communities in Erie County, you cannot move further west without including them until you get to the third township block. So yes, we have in Erie County a relatively compact seat.

As you look at the Lorain County portion of
this, there are the City of Vermilion, which is in both counties. Again, with Vermilion being in both counties, they are treated as separate cities, we understand. But again, when you're looking at what might be similar communities, Vermilion being with Vermilion makes some sense.

And then, we connected the City of Lorain, which happens to be a very dense population area. So about -- depending on how much you weight or underweight districts, you're looking at at least 50,000 people in both of these counties. So by the nature, whichever district. If you went from the south, you would still have a district that is not a whole county for either, and it would be even more elongated if you went in a -went along the southern border through the less populated rural parts of Lorain County.

So yes, actually, we do think this is the most compact, if you were going to go from Lorain to Erie, this is the most compact way to do it.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. Well, I'd ask you to compare as we're working collaboratively --

MR. GLASSBURN: Sure.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: -- ask you to compare that to the Republican version of that that does not stretch this same district over the lake.

Could you put up the Delaware County district, please.

Now, this is a district in Delaware County where it appears that there's several jurisdictions that have been left out and lots of bites taken out of it. And again, I'll ask you the primary question. First, in -- in analyzing Section 6(C) of Article XI of the Constitution, do you consider this to be a compact district?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to President Huffman, to answer your question about Lorain County comparing the two plans, $I$ believe the district that the Majority drew with Lorain County that goes out to Erie and Huron is wider geographically than the district we have proposed.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Right.
MR. GLASSBURN: With that said, to answer your question about Delaware, what you see here is a similar situation in terms of the development of this county as
to what we see in Franklin County. West -- moving from the east side to the west, we have the northern part of Westerville, we have Columbus, the name of the township north of Columbus escapes me at the moment, we have Liberty Township, we do not have the City of Jerome inside of that, but we have the contiguous portion of Liberty, and we have the contiguous portion of the city of Delaware with the provision that noncontiguous fragments of communities are treated as separate communities. No community is actually split. But I grant you this looks a lot like Franklin County districts we're used to seeing, but that is the nature of the development of this county. So yes, we do between the preservation of political subdivisions, and this is about 12 miles tall and about 12 miles wide. This is a relatively compact district as well.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: And could you -- would you compare that to the Majority Republican version of Delaware County essentially has six townships to the east and southeast, and the remaining townships that appears -- that appears to, at least in terms of compactness, the Majority version in Delaware County
would be better, don't you think?
MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to President Huffman, we had very brief conversations about Delaware County with the Majority. Ultimately, we decided on both fronts that we did not see the way to draw a Democratic index seat based on the three years that we've talked about; '16, '18, '20. So aside from that concept we've had no back-and-forth on this. If there are better ways to draw Delaware County, or any county for that matter, we want to have that discussion, but we want to do so in a way that gets to the constitutional results.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Fair enough. Could you put the next one up.

I think this is House District 23, which appears to start off there -- I think that's in Lake County and ends up in Eastern Cuyahoga County. Am I right?

MR. GLASSBURN: That is correct.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Do you think this district complies with Article XI, 6(C) mandate -- in the Court's mandate to us to ensure that all districts are compact?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to
President Huffman, for the Democratic proposal, in order to achieve the 15 Democratic seats in the Senate, we saw -- and to reach 45 in the House consistent with the Majority's wishes in Hamilton and Franklin, we saw that we needed to create a footprint of Cuyahoga and Lake to create four Senate districts in that footprint, and 11 House seats out of 12 that were Democratic. If we'd like to reduce that to 10 , we can offset that in another place. Again, there is an additional one in -- in Hamilton County, for example. Let's talk about this in specific to answer your question.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yes.
MR. GLASSBURN: Representative Dan Troy
represents the district that this is most based on currently in Lake County. Lake County for a few decades is has had two House seats in it. The House seat that Mr. Troy currently represents has the -- in terms of western portion of Lake County, the communities you see there, and then, it goes across the top of the City of Mentor using that little community which is Mentor on the Lake, and then Mentor is divided, and can connect to
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Painesville. To make the populations balance for because all of the districts, the House districts inside of that footprint have to be very close to the maximum for those two counties to pair, we were looking to decrease the amount of the City of Mentor so that the numbers could work for everywhere. But fundamentally, you have whole communities inside of Cuyahoga County, and you have the City of Mentor split as it is in the current map from 2010 with the same communities from the current map in 2010. So that was how we sought to do this. If there was again a better way to reach the threshold in the footprint of Cuyahoga and Lake, we would love to work with you on that.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: A follow-up, can I continue, Mr. Chairman?

SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Huffman.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you.
I'm trying to understand, and I don't want to misstate what you said, but when you started your answer, I think what you said is, We were trying to draw a Democratic Senate seat, and it was necessary to draw a district like this in order to draw that Democratic
seat. Is that right?
MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to President
Huffman. It is necessary in Northeast Ohio if you're trying to reach the proportionality to have six out of six Democratic Senate seats between the four counties I've described. Not five out of five. It is not necessary and specific to draw this seat as it is drawn to achieve that outcome. However, we were seeking to preserve within Lake County the existing boundaries that had been in the district together, and do so in a manner that was consistent with Lake County having both of its House seats joining with Cuyahoga County. So the least disruptive within Cuyahoga County way to do this and to preserve the Lake County portion as the seat that currently exist was this. But as I've stated before, we would love to work with you on ways to improve this.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: You mentioned
Representative Troy --
MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: I mean, we're -- you're not drawing any House districts based on what current members there may be or not be; is that correct?
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MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to President Huffman. Our understanding of the mandate is to reach 15 Democratic Senate seats and 45 House. I referred to Representative Troy in the range that that is where he currently represents to give folks an idea of what we're talking about, and why these communities -- that district as it exists today, why these communities are chosen.

It is not necessary to reach 45 House seats across the State, to draw 11 out of 12 Democratic in the footprint of Cuyahoga and Lake County. It is necessary, though, that we have chosen that as one of the 45 we have presented to you. There are other options that you could choose aside from this, and we would welcome that discussion.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you. May I continue?
SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Huffman.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you.
I want to look at some -- a few other things that I think are specific constitutional violations, and these are items that had been presented to me, and I'll just ask the Commission to review Article XI, Section

3(D) (3). And first in Franklin County, my understanding that House District 6 splits Columbus and Prairie Township C, and under that provision, that is a violation of the Constitution. Do you have any response to that?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-, Chairs to Senate President Huffman. In Franklin County, we have talked to prior to the Supreme Court's ruling, but we have also talked with your staff. The layers on the maps do not perfectly match when you do minor civil divisions, precincts, et cetera. If we have made an error in splitting Prairie or any other of those townships contiguous portions, we would love to correct that error with you, but we did not see any error of that nature, but we would love to correct it.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. Let me -- if I could I'm going to just for a minute, I -- one of the things I'm concerned about is whether your efforts which have been Herculean certainly over the last several days, whether they may be fraught with problems regarding data. You mentioned in your testimony recently that you were using a dataset from Dave's Redistricting, which
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was close but not exact. Is -- is that something -- did I get that right; that was your testimony here Thursday?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Senate President Huffman. For the purposes of quickly sharing documents, we have used Dave's Redistricting app. We are on our side, our members, the Commission members, our staff, and our members at this point are fully educated and aware that Dave's is not a substitute for the 16 to 20 Acord (phonetic) file. What we've presented here today, when we say there are 45, and 15, 45 House and 15, that is based off an Acord data, not based off of Dave's Redistricting or any other source.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay. Good. So -- so without regard to whether a mistake was made, and whether the mistake is easily fixable, isn't it true that the splitting of Columbus and Prairie Township C within a representative district is forbidden by Article XI, section 3(D) (3) of the Constitution? Isn't that true?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and Senate President. Ohio precincts vary in size from -- and Secretary LaRose would know better than I, 500 people do
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as many as 2,500 people. We're talking about very large 100,00 plus House seats and 300,000 plus Senate seats. If there is a precinct that is out of place, we would gladly fix that. And it is highly unlikely that a single precinct will derail the ability to move a seat to whatever column it needs to be. So yes, if there are errors, those need to be resolved.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay.
MR. GLASSBURN: We are not aware of that error, but we will be happy to look at Prairie C, I believe you said, and --

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Columbus and Prairie Township C.

MR. GLASSBURN: Yes.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: All right.
MR. GLASSBURN: We would love to look at that, make sure both sides agree on the borders of those communities, and make that --

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yeah, and the same issue --
MR. GLASSBURN: -- perfectly right.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: -- in House District 10
also. So that's another issue.

Turning to Cuyahoga County --
SPEAKER CUPP: If I -- if I might. I think Representative Russo has been trying to get the floor here for a moment --

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay.
SPEAKER CUPP: -- then we'll come back.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: All right.
SPEAKER CUPP: Representative Russo.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you Mr. Glassburn. I again commend the work and the long hours that you have given to this Commission.

I want to follow up. So it sounds, you know, in listening to the questions from my colleague here on the Commission, that you believe this map does contain districts that are compact and meet that requirement of the Constitution, correct?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to Leader Russo, yes. Again, we have a -- we have explicit mandates on certain ways to go about this. A mathematical definition of compactness isn't one of them. We want to make districts as compact as possible, but we do feel we have met that threshold.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Okay. Follow-up through the Chair.

SPEAKER CUPP: Representative Russo.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Noting some of the technical issues, for example, the labeling issue in the Senate districts that were pointed out by my colleague, the Senate President, if those were technical -- were corrected, would this still be a proportional-- meet the proportional requirements of the Constitution?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to Leader Russo, to the best of my knowledge, nothing that has been stated or questioned so far is a threshold question as to whether 45 House seats or 15 Senate seats can be achieved. If we are -- if we are at the point that we are fine tuning precincts and census blocks, we're in a great spot, but -- but we are not at that proportionally in terms of agreeing on a unified map. If we could get to that point, and then, get these other issues worked out, I don't see any reason why as I said not only can we reach this threshold, but we have some choices in the House about how we do that. So yes, I do believe we have done so, and nothing so far that we have discussed
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prevents us from getting to there.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Through the Chair. To Mr. Glassburn, so do you believe that if we fail to be given or you be given the opportunity to attempt to do that, would we have achieved what the goal of this committee was, which was to follow the decision of the court and to reach proportional representation with the maps that this Commission eventually will get to voting on?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and to Leader Russo. As I am -- I am sorry if I'm belaboring a point here. As I mentioned in our last meeting, we has prior not had an explicit goal of getting as close to proportionality as possible amongst the map drawers. We feel that we have not only demonstrated in this proposal that 45 House seats and 15 Senate seats are possible, but that there are multiple ways to go about it. And so if -- if it was not possible to draw 45 House seats, or 15 Senate seats, I think we would be in a different place, but it is. So no, I'm not sure we are at that point where we have because we're not -- we're not attempting collectively to reach 45. We have some of us
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are and some of us aren't.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you.
SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Faber. Or used to be Senator Faber. Auditor Faber.

AUDITOR FABER: I have a couple of what I would call 30,000 foot questions before I get to some specific in your map, if you'll bear with me. If you don't feel comfortable answering those, please demur.

First, when I look at this process, I recall you testifying on Thursday indicating that you guys had a map. We asked for it. Friday came and went, I sat in my office twiddling my thumbs. Didn't get a map. Thought we were going to get a map Friday to take a look at. Then, Saturday came. We got the first map from you guys around 10:00-ish, give or take, and we got an amended map because there were some errors in some of the Senate issues in your original map, give or take at noon. And I may be a little off. My people may not get it quite as promptly as some others.

I'm a little concerned that we are now at 4:26 before our midnight tonight deadline, and we're talking about taking about making amendments. I have instructed
my staff, and $I$ know my staff has played in good faith, and I'm not commenting anybody else's staff, about trying to make some of these changes and these adjustments throughout the process. It appeared to many of us that because we wouldn't say that we absolutely were going to do a 45-54 map, that somebody took their ball and went home.

But I digress from that for a second. Talking in general looking at your map and the Republicans' proposed map, I noticed something that was at least in my initial suggestion as to how we get to this solution. An approach that we looked at designating a certain number of solid $R$ and sold $D$ seats, and then, look at the competitive seats. It appears that's what you've done to some extent. Would you agree with me on that?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Auditor Faber. To the first portion of your comments, I very much share your frustration. Our goal as this process is to move along was not to any point put forth proposals that didn't have significant feedback, if not agreement. And so in that process, I think all of us have waited longer than we wanted to wait on different
timelines in this.
To the latter part about competitive seats, again, in our House proposal, in our Senate proposal, to the extent that we have talked in-depth about regions, we have sought to have seats that both parties have generally agreed upon, and we have work towards competitive seats.

AUDITOR FABER: Well, and I appreciate that, but I'm just looking at the Republican proposal and the Democratic proposal, and $I$ don't think they are that far apart when I look at the numbers. I have a Republican proposal that was 28, 56, 15, and you guys were 36, 10, 53 on the competitive versus the solid Rs and Ds. So those two numbers are relatively close. Then, the question $I$ have as I go through the maps, and I call this the Montgomery Burns District, because it looks to me like Montgomery Burns from the Simpsons.

MR. GLASSBURN: We can change the color yellow Mr. Faber if you prefer it something else.

AUDITOR FABER: I just looked at that and it's certainly a cartoon character.

And I look at that district, and that appears
to me to be drawn as you said for the purposes of drawing a Democrat Senate district. I think that's what you said. And if I heard that wrong, correct me. But my concern with that is Section 6(A) of the Constitution says we're not going to draw districts primarily to benefit one party or another, and what you're doing is taking Lake County, and certainly, representative of Troy proves that people can win districts even if the index is against them, because $I$ think you tried to draw it as a Democrat seat. I know I was told our map drawer tried to draw that as a Democrat seat to keep him in a Democrat seat, and it was just simply not able to do that within the boundary of Lake County.

And you're shaking your head yes for the record.

So apart -- apparently, what we did was go in and pick and choose communities to try and up the Democratic index to dump that into a state Senate district that now tells me that Lake County Republicans are going to, by the very nature, be represented by a Democrat. So how do you say to those people in that area that we're not drawing a district to
disenfranchise, as Justice Brunner made very clear she had equal protection concerns about how you drew maps too; that you are not violating the Constitution's equal protection clause by intentionally drawing a district to disenfranchise all those fine Republicans in Lake County.

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Auditor Faber. Let's -- let's address Lake County in this -this part first, and then, I'll get to your I think larger question.

To have 15 Democratic Senate seats, I am saying yes, there must be four of those at least to our -- to what we have identified. And if there's a better way to do it, again, we're very open. Four seats between Lake County and Cuyahoga. What $I$ am not saying and is not fundamentally true is this seat in particular does not need to be the one first off that goes to Cuyahoga County. It can be entirely in Lake County. And this House seat in of itself does not need to be Democratic to ensure that that Senate ratio still happens. This is Democratic because we have made choices in other parts of the State to honor what the Majority has asked to not
draw Democratic seats elsewhere.
AUDITOR FABER: So again, I'm going back to
what you're saying, and I'm extrapolating that across the State because I know we had the same conversation if I went to the Hamilton County districts. In your map, you take two Hamilton County districts, and the one I'm concerned about is the western side of Hamilton County, which is a very strong Republican township, and you dump it into inner city dip -- inner city -- two inner city Cincinnati districts. They don't have a whole lot in common if you know anything about those divides out in Hamilton County. And basically tell those Republicans that you're going to be in a Democratic district because we needed to hit more Democratic district to hit some superficial ratio. That's effectively what -- when I look at the decisions that are being made all over the map, we keep making decisions to hit some number. Not to link redistricting. So why would you not respond to that question that effectively what you're doing, and by the nature what we're doing, because frankly in many areas, I think we've got agreement, like in Hamilton -I mean Franklin County and other areas, we're
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effectively taking districts and gerrymandering them to hit some Democratic ratio because it's very difficult to do that with where Ohioans live around Ohio naturally. So we're having to draw spaghetti districts or out -out districts out to move things outside the area to pick people up. And I need look no further than what you guys have proposed with regard to the Athens district, where you go in and try and cobble together Democrat areas in subsections of county and lump those all together with what $I$ call the spaghetti methodology without drawing competitive districts, just to hit another Democrat number.

Am I missing something? I know -- I know that's what we all kind of -- I don't want to say nudge, nudge, wink, wink, or trying to figure out how to do, but isn't that to be honest what we're really doing here?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Auditor Faber. There are somewhere on the order of 47, 48, 49 places that you could draw Democratic House seats throughout the State of Ohio. There are 15 out of 15 locations you can draw Democratic Senate seats.
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As to in specific do I agree with your assessment of Athens County and Hocking County being dissimilar or fundamentally dissimilar from the City of Chillicothe? That may be one where the two of us agree to disagree. However, it is not necessary, or -- and I believe we have in our proposal gone a long way to demonstrate it's -- it simply is not necessary to gerrymander or do dramatically strange things to achieve the proportionality as outlined in the Supreme Court. Quite frankly, in the districts, one of the districts that's Democratic in both proposals, but if you want to talk about long, strange lines, it's the Eastern Hamilton County seat that registers as one of those 50 percent plus 1 Democratic seat. That was drawn by the Republican staff. Not us. And so if we want to again get to the most coherent, most representative way to get as close to this ratio as possible, we can do that. And we have choices about how we do that.

AUDITOR FABER: I have -- Mr. Glassburn, because I do not want to take up all of your time because --

MR. GLASSBURN: Sure.
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AUDITOR FABER: -- I'm optimistic and hopeful that maybe you'll have some comments that you'd like to see improved on the Republican maps since that's the template that we seem to have no Constitutional variations at this point with, other than the ratio.

I would -- I would -- I don't want to take up all my time as to where we go, but $I$ do want to make one other point. I don't know if I'm the only one who caught this because I like ratios and I like competitive seats. I went through and looked at all your competitive seats and all their -- all the Republicans submitted map competitive -- I guess they're us and everybody now because we're all working together. But I found it odd -- I assume it was an accidental, but if it's not accidental, certainly, it could be argued that it was done to influence the map for political purpose.

On the Senate map that you presented, almost all of the competitive seats happen to be even numbered seats. I assume you're not doing that to influence elections for political purpose by putting all of the competitive seats in that area that are Democrat seats up in presidential elections because of different
turnout models, or different hopes as to who the presidential candidates should be versus randomly letting those apply. I assume that was an accidental oversight and not an intent, because if it was an intent, it's clearly done in violation of $6(A)$. But I digress. I don't know if I'm the only one who made that observation, but it seems to me to be unusual enough that I thought I would point it out.

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Auditor Faber. I think there were three things in there. As to the numbering issue, again, we're striving to make sure that we produce maps that are in accordance with all sections. The numbering is the last part of the process, and quite frankly continues to occur in the 2 a.m. to 4 a.m. range as we go through this process. So the -- the only nefarious intent in there is between the sixth bottle and the seventh bottle of coffee from the downstairs vending machine.

As to the question of competitiveness, I think I'm speaking accurately for our sign, and that we don't inherently have, and we embrace competitiveness. The House districts, though, are tremendously, in terms of
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the two plans, are very far apart on that issue. In the Republican proposal, 12 of the 42 Democratic seats are drawn between 50 and 51 percent. There are only five again in the Democratic proposal, and only -- and two of those five were at the Majority's request. It's not necessary to even do five. Again, we're not looking to have none, but the Republican proposal has zero Republican seats in that narrow range. Our proposal also has zero. And part of that is because this geography is State, but it is not the geography of the State that we have 12, or 15 , or 14 Democratic seats that are at 50 percent plus 1. So they're -- they're a little bit different things.

The last thing I would ask or respond to is we want to work back-and-forth. You mentioned the topic of how do we do that in the remaining hours we have this evening. If -- my recommendation or response would be that because of the Senate question, we need to resolve the Senate ratio question because that determines the footprint of what counties are paired. And so whichever maps, I believe there will be the Democratic maps, are consistent with those pairings, may be the furthest
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along towards -- but whether it's the Democratic or Republican maps, we just need to get this -- get feedback to each other and keep moving. So I -- I appreciate your sentiment.

AUDITOR FABER: Thank you. And again, I want to be done because I want to get us moved on to where we can do what we need to do. But I -- I have a different count on competitive. Using your -- your map I have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- nine lean Dem and one lean Republican on your map. And again, it depends on what numbers you use as competitives. I'm using roughly five points. And so again, I don't think that's too far off where the Republican map numbers are. I agree, it's probably easier to draw competitive districts with what we're doing by concentrating Democrat seats in all of our metropolitan counties because that's where we're picking up the Democrat seats. But that's by its very nature going to be more of those competitive seats are going to have a slight $D$ lean versus a strong $D$ lean when you spread it out. But that's kind of the nature of those communities too, by the way, based on how they vote. And that tends to tell
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you where people are and how they get there.
And so I digress, and I have other things, but for the purposes of trying to move us along.

SPEAKER CUPP: And in trying to move us along, I think we're going to go to our third step here. You've been up at the podium for quite a while, so we'll ask Mr. DiRossi and Mr. Springhetti --

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: I -- I was interrupted in my -- I have two I think of my most significant issues - -

SPEAKER CUPP: All right --
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: -- I guess I'd like to ask
--

SPEAKER CUPP: -- Senator, you may go ahead.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: -- this witness about. I'll try to be very quick.

Again, under Section 3(D) (3), there is a prohibition about splitting more than one municipal corporation or township. And we talked a little bit about the Columbus and Prairie Township, and you indicated well, we can fix that. But in House district 14, you -- your map splits both Cleveland and Brook

Park, and assuming you're not going to take Cleveland out if -- if Brook Park is wholly contained in House District 14, that district would be substantially overpopulated, probably up to 5 percent. And that population has to go somewhere right in the middle of Cuyahoga County, which has a balloon effect throughout several districts.

And I'll also point out you have the same problem in House District 17 in Cuyahoga County where you split both Cleveland and Warrensville Heights. Warrensville Heights, if that was wholly contained inside the district, in other words, to achieve constitutionality, that would be heavily overpopulated. And that's not simply well, let's just reassign a number or move a line. That's redrawing Cuyahoga County, and probably the ripple effect out to much of Northeast Ohio.

Did you realize you have those constitutional defects when you submitted this map?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Senate President Huffman. The maps put forward in the Supreme Court's decision and that we have put forward we believe
are consistent in how the Court has approached this. We believe it's consistent with how constitutions spell things out. We also believe it is consistent with the way the Majority has drawn their maps. Metropolitan cities have more fragments in them, significantly more fragments in them in all of the maps than the minimum. So if the Commission wishes to discuss that, I think that's more of a discussion of the rules in terms of between you among yourselves as between what $I$ had to offer on this.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Well, Mr. -- Mr. Glassburn, to be fair, the Constitution says and this Supreme Court decision said, These requirements also must be met that not more than one municipal corporation or township may be split per representative district. So that's not an aspirational goal. It's not if we want to do it. We have to do that. And there's clear violations in here that are not easily fixed.

Now, you may not. My question was did you realize that there were these constitutional violations in House District 14 and 17 when you submitted this map?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, to Senate
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President. Again, our assessment of how Cuyahoga County is drawn is consistent with the Court's decision, and we believe that that is constitutional.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: You think these are
constitutional?
MR. GLASSBURN: As drawn, that is our response. PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Very good.

SPEAKER CUPP: All right. I think -- Senator
Sykes?
SENATOR SYKES: Yeah, I'm --
SPEAKER CUPP: Okay. I think we should move on now because time is escaping. So if there are any further questions for Mr. Springhetti and Mr. DiRossi, if you want to come back up and join Mr. Glassburn, anybody has questions for any of them, we'll -- we'll do it that way to make sure we get all the information out that we -- we need before we take a recess.

Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Thank you Mr. Co-Chair, and thank you all for making your presentations.

I just want to make a comment for
clarification. You know, it was -- it was never our
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intention, the Democrats on this Commission, it was never our intention to produce a map because we were directed by the Court for the Commission to reduce the map. Not that have the Democratic map and a Republican map. And that's why I recommended that we deal with the regional concept, regional process, because we couldn't come initially with -- up with an agreement on what map to start from. Not between the two parties.

And so the regional process that started with the Hamilton County and Franklin County as have been divulged here today has a lot of similarities between the two plans. Not until just a day or so ago was I told that it was a feeling that we could not meet the proportionality requirements. When we had our last meeting, we raised that issue, and the Governor himself also wanted to make sure it was clear that that was the direction given to the staff to, in fact, fulfill that requirement unless there were some technical requirement violations.

And so our objective all along has been to demonstrate that that could be achieved, the proportionality goals or objectives in Section 6 could
be achieved, and meet all of the other requirements as well.

So not until just a day or so ago were we looking at trying to have to put a map together ourselves, but still, our goal was not to produce necessarily a map that would not have any -- would be free from any errors. Our objective here in this hearing today, and in this process, has always been to prove and identify that we could produce a map that met all of the technical requirements, as well as proportionality goals and objectives.

And so an example of every decision that's made has an impact on the rest of the map. And an example was the pairing in Hamilton County of the House districts to create Senate districts. Your pairing came up with, in fact, producing one Republican and one Democrat a district. And our pairing, just by changing the order of those districts, to the House district, you would end up with one additional Senate district, two Senate districts. So it demonstrates that you could, in fact, increase the number of Senate districts using the basic framework and the building blocks, the House
building blocks that existed in the plan. So our objective has always been to simply demonstrate that you could -- that we can, in fact, come to the proportionality requirement to meet all of the other guidelines. And so all over our map, all over the State of Ohio we have demonstrated in the example of our map of how that can be done.

So again, our objective is not to produce an error=free example for you, but to demonstrate that by using a different strategy, a different combination of districts, different proportional parts of districts, we can meet that requirement.

I just want to make sure that that was clear.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Mr. Co-Chair, could I -could I respond to that in brief because, and I appreciate --

SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Huffman.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you.
Senator Sykes' explanation of their
expectations and intent especially in the last week or so. But for those who don't know, there's an animal called the Legislative Committee on Redistricting and

Reapportionment, which has existed in Ohio law for longer than I've been around. That's for sure.

And this entity at the -- is formed, members are appointed, and amounts of money are given to each of the two caucuses. The Republican and Democratic Caucus, in this case. And that money is to be used by those caucuses for the purposes of drawing maps, doing analysis, whatever it is that they want that to be done, that's within the guidelines of the statute. And in fact, both sides initially were allocated, I think, $\$ 200,000$. The Democratic Caucus asked for additional dollars, and on two occasions, and we agreed. In fact, the Democratic Caucus was allocated $\$ 500,000$. The Republican Caucus 200, of which we spent 120, mostly because we used in-staff people and were able to save money, and the Democratic folks decided not to do that. We didn't have to agree to give them additional money to hire outside consultants, but we did.

Now, whatever the current intent is of the leaders of the Democratic party, or the Democratic caucuses, which I don't doubt a bit because I -- I know Senator Sykes, and I -- he would state that clearly.

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

The system in place is for both sides to have the assets they need to analyze these issues and put them forward. And to draw maps if they -- if they so choose. So I don't -- I want to make clear here that both sides had equal opportunity to put ideas forward, put constitutional maps forward. And in -- in fact, allocation-wise, the Democratic party had more than twice as much as the Republican party.

So and I also want to say, Mr. Co-Chair, that these other things, as I was explaining to Mr. Glassburn, these other requirements, for example, about not having two more, two municipal corporation and townships split in one place, that was a central purpose of the criticism of how maps were drawn in the past. And $I$ sat in a room till very late in the evening in December of 2014 with Leader Schiavoni, and Leader Budish, and President Faber, while we negotiated all this.

And what they wanted to do is make sure that as an example, that we couldn't split more than one township and one municipal corporation in each state rep district, and that was very important.
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Now, I have a different opinion than the Supreme Court about the applicability of Section 6, but my opinion doesn't count, and there's thus. So we're dealing with what the opinion of the court is, but the rest of this isn't just, Well, we're going to cast it aside, because it was a central part of making this issue in 2014.

So I guess that's my speech if -- if we get to make speeches.

SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Just to reply. And I'm not saying that we should not meet those requirements. Those requirements are important. And I'm not saying that -- I'm saying that we don't have to demonstrate that. What we need to demonstrate is how we can meet the requirements of the proportionality along with the other technical requirement. If that's possible. To see if that's possible. And that believe in the map that we've presented demonstrate in all over the State of Ohio how you can make different decisions in combining in redistricting apparatus that you can end up with satisfying the proportionality as well as meeting
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the -- the requirements.

SPEAKER CUPP: Representative Russo.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you. I want to go back to I think something Mr. DiRossi, through the Chair, something Mr. DiRossi said earlier.

You said that you needed guidance from the Commission on what you would call more subjective parts of the Constitution that were contained in sections other than Section 6. Are you indicating that you did not get the direction that you needed from this Commission on how to follow what you consider those more subjective decisions in other parts outside of Section 6?

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs and Leader-Elect Russo.

The staff brought to the Commission a number of proposals around the state and major urban areas and other areas of the state. It is for the Commission members to make the decisions on whether they meet objective and subjective criteria, whether they should be adopted, amended or discarded. So that's what I was
referring to when $I$ said that we were provided that, and you had to make the guidance, you had to make the decision. It's not -- not for the staff of you to make the decision for you.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Okay. So to be clear, through the -- the Chair, through Mr. DiRossi, you don't feel that you got that guidance clearly from this Commission, correct?

MR. DIROSSI: I think -- through the Co-Chairs, and again to the Leader. I think you're doing it now. You're making the decisions and you're weighing the option and you're making those decisions now, and you will make the decisions.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: So after the maps that have been submitted before us.

One follow-up question as well. I'm going to go back to this issue of partisan symmetry. And in the decision, specifically in paragraphs 121 and 122, the Court has this lengthy discussion and recognition that partisan asymmetry of the overturned map, that they go back and they talk about this issue. And they point out that when you have massive asymmetry, it is a huge
warning sign that you are favoring one political party over another. So I would like to go back, and I would direct the Commission members to the two spreadsheets that we have provided, our staff have provided to us, but really look at -- and I'm just going to use the House maps as an example here. Look at the partisan index, the Dem partisan index for the districts that have been drawn for both the Dem proposal as well as the Republican House proposal. And as been previously pointed out in the Dem proposal, we submit a 45 House seats, eight of those House seats have a Dem index that is between 50 and 52, zero of the Republicans between the 50 and 52. And in the Republican proposal, they have only indicated 42 Democratic leaning districts. 14, however, of those fall between 50 and 52 for the Democratic index. And again zero on the Republican side. So that is a significant difference. We've 45 total seats versus 42, and of the ones between 50 and 52, eight in the Democratic proposal versus 14.

So effectively, you know, you are creating districts with less opportunity for clearly perhaps Democrats to sit into those seats.

And so my question is why were those -- you know, and I'll -- I'll ask each of the mapmakers why were some of those decisions made, and what explains that huge difference, and you know, does this create -again, go back to that issue of partisan symmetry where if we've got huge discrepancy, it is an indicator and a flag that some districts were drawn to favor one party over the other.

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, to Leader-Elect Russo, the decisions were centered around complying with the court order and closely -- closely corresponding with Section 6. And we did that. We moved five seats closer that are Democratic leaning in the House map, three Senate seats Democrat -- Democrat leaning. So that was the fundamental reason in my drawing of -- of the decisions in the -- in the results of the map that we are putting forward.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: All right. Mr. -- go ahead.

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs and to Leader-Elect Russo. I mean, part of looking at the State as a whole, there were -- if you're asking if we

## Transcript of Hearing

Conducted on January 22, 2022
were identifying collectively as a staff a district that might favor Republican by 53 percent and trying to make it a Democratic leaning seat, yes, it is moving to the other side of the ledger, so I think that's why there is an absence of those seats on the Republican side because they are identified by the staff, they were -- they were modified to make Democratic leaning, so that's why they are not there anymore.

So I'm not sure that a -- if you're asking if a 53 percent Republican leaning seat that becomes a 48 percent Republican leaning seat is makes it easier for a Republican to win, I mean, it just doesn't -- wouldn't make sense to me.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Mr. Glassburn, you have a response?

MR. GLASSBURN: So I'm trying to do something to answer questions on the fly.

So to the Co-Chairs and Leader Russo, I believe I stated before, but I'll make clear if I didn't, the nature -- as stated a number of times -- The nature of Ohio is that we do have Democrats in certain areas, and we have Republicans in other areas. And sometimes that
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political geography bumps up. And so it is clear that there will be some more Democratic seats closer to that competitive mark than Republican seats. But there is a substantial difference between there being a dozen on one side and zero on the other, versus having five, or again, it could be as low as two or three on the Democratic side. The notion that when you do that aggregate completely across a dozen seats, that that has no impact on the State-wide is -- is hard to reconcile with the Court's decision.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: A quick follow-up.
And you know, I ask this question because it appears to me in the Democratic districts that you have put -- the Democratic leaning districts that you have put forth that there has been an intentional approach to drive as many of those close to 50 to technically say that you have created a Democratic leaning district without actually in good faith creating as many

Democratic leaning districts that are possible due to the proportional requirement in the Constitution. And I will use as an example, again, going back to Franklin County, we have two seats in the southern part of

Franklin County. One centered on Grove City, one that is in more of the southeastern corner of Grove City. Those two districts could have been drawn. There's no technical reason that $I$ can understand that they should have not have been drawn to not create the issue that forces both of them to be close to 50.

And so I'm wondering, you know, did -- did you take steps to in both meeting the overall proportional requirements of -- the Constitutional proportional representation requirements of the Constitution, did you take steps to also ensure that you were not getting too far in the -- in the partisan asymmetry bias that naturally exists here in the State of Ohio?

MR. DIROSSI: We said directly that --
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Yes. Yes, I heard you.
MR. DIROSSI: Well, I think as we all just answered the question, I mean there are geography issues and there are -- I would use Senate District 13 in Northern Ohio. A district that as was adopted by the committee was 50.87 percent Republican with two whole counties, not nearly an overwhelming Republican district. The geography is challenging there with
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populations in the county and the surrounding counties. And to make that a Democratic leaning district, which we were able to do, required splitting an additional county. But it was very -- I mean, the hours of work just to make that sounds very simple, but it is not. And so when we -- whether we ended at 49.2 , or 49.8 , or 49.9, or 48.2, when you finally get over the hurdle to go under 50, and everything else balances, and everything else matches, $I$ would move on to another district.

SPEAKER CUPP: Let me -- I in a minute if I might, I want to ask a follow-up question to something that was raised earlier in trying to get away from this question of how partisan is partisan enough, I guess. I want to go back to House District 14 and House District 17, in Cleveland and Brook Park that were split in the -- in the map that we've seen that Mr. Glassburn talked about. He indicated, if $I$ got it correctly, that that is not -- those -- those splits are not violations of the Ohio Constitution requirements on line drawing and split limitations. What is -- what is your take on that?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: Co-Chair Cupp, to the members of the Commission, I disagree with -- with Mr. Glassburn's assumption in view of the Constitution.

MR. DIROSSI: I would have the same conclusion that it is not permissible under the Ohio Constitution.

SPEAKER CUPP: In other words, it would be fatal errors if all the line drawing and antisplitting requirements were to be met before the proportionality issue is reached?

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs and the members, those are direct violations of explicit -- of explicit do not dos. And so yes, those would be fatal.

SPEAKER CUPP: Okay. Thank you.
Auditor Faber.

AUDITOR FABER: Just two things. Following up on Leader Russo's comments, and I -- I had some of the same concerns until I actually went back and compared both maps. And as Mr. DiRossi or one of -- one of you, I don't remember which one said it, indicated effectively this process started with the presumption that we were going to draw more, as I said, wink, wink nudge, nudge, more Democratic seats. And in doing that
in Mr. Glassburn and the Democrats' proposed map, my count has ten competitive seats. One Republican, nine Democrat. And that's within my very tight range. The Republicans had 14 Democrat competitive seats and one Republican seat. There is a wide difference of five on the competitive nature. Could other things have been done? Yeah, but the problem is when you start going the other route, and try and draw safe seats, now you're drawing for political advantage. And frankly, we heard literally weeks of testimony about how competitive seats are better than noncompetitive seats. And I can't believe we're actually having an argument that if you draw too many competitive seats, it somehow adverse to one side.

We have Dan Troy's district that represents a district that's held by a Republican index seat that's held by Democrat. Candidates matter, campaigns matter, elections matter, and frankly, the election environment matters. As I look back over the 20 years that I've been looking at districts, as a legislator and somebody who's talked about this process, I remember areas, entire areas of the State where people used to say you
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could never elect a -- fill in the blank, Republican or Democrat. They have now switched to now you can never elect the opposite party. That changes. Elections matter. Demographics matter. Changes in policy and politics matter. In four years or ten years, my guess is we're going to look at some of these same districts that we think are very competitive, and we're going to look and say well, that's not a competitive district anymore because things changed. And that's why this arbitrary percentage to me is a little bit suspect.

Having said that, I'll ask all the line drawers' question. Paragraph 126, the Supreme Court's opinion, they cite Professor Rodden. Specifically they cite and indicate That professor Rodden's map that he had presented was constitutional or would have been constitutional as an example of what could have been done. Specifically, have you looked at Professor Rodden's map? Not the new one that was just filed by the plaintiffs, but Professor Rodden's map in the Supreme Court?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, to Auditor Faber, yes, I've looked at both Rodden 1 and Rodden 2.
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AUDITOR FABER: Well, my understanding is that Rodden 1 was essentially 57 Republican index. Am I correct on that?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, Auditor Faber, yes.

AUDITOR FABER: So the court has indicated thus that at least in that context, the 57 would have been constitutional on the House side. Now, I think he did have an 18 on the Senate side? Am I right on that?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, Auditor Faber. Yes.

AUDITOR FABER: Thank you.

MR. DIROSSI: If I could just add one thing to that. There were also constitutional violations in that map that were found as well.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Co-Chair --

SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Huffman.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: I guess to clarify, and you tell me if I'm wrong. This is a professor I think from Stanford University submitted this map, the Supreme Court said, Hey, look at this so you could do this. And then, just a few days ago, the professor decided, yeah,
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actually, what $I$ submitted wasn't constitutional, and sent in a new one; is that right? Is that Rodden 2?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, to
President Huffman. That's correct.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: And in fact, Rodden 2 also
has constitutional problems, correct?
MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, to
President Huffman. Rodden 2 actually has more
constitutional violations than the map proposed by the Democrats today.

MR. SPRINGHETTI: And you're not even a professor, are you?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: I'm not.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Okay.
SPEAKER CUPP: He may be after this experience.
Any further -- Representative Russo.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, through the Chair.

I want to go back -- you know, there -- there has been discussion about this issue of splitting, and again, $I$ acknowledge in both the Rodden maps that there are community splits there, and the -- the court upheld
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it also as constitutional. So again, one of those things that the Commission probably should have discussed and provided some clear directions since it seems to be somewhat gray based off what was upheld in the courts and what has been written in the Constitution. But you know, we had pointed out, or I just am curious. In House District 36, which I believe is in Montgomery County, and I think it's 36 on the map that you have submitted, there are two noncontiguous pieces of Dayton. Can you explain why that was done and does that meet the requirements of the Constitution?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the leader. Are you referring to the -- I believe it's Ward 2 which is the northern part of Dayton which is the mostly the airport area in the -- in Vandalia and the surrounding area that is noncontiguous to the main body of Dayton?

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Sorry, I'm trying to pull up my map. Just started to refresh.

MR. SPRINGHETTI: If that's what you're referring to, obviously those are noncontiguous pieces of the city, so under the Constitution, they -- they are separate political subdivisions and can be divided into
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different districts without violating any provision of the Constitution.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: I'm not sure that that's the area that we're referring to, sorry. I want to go back.

Actually, I'll move on. If some -- if Commissioner has another medium, I'll pull up specifically which piece we're referring to.

SPEAKER CUPP: I'm not seeing any hands, so go ahead and check.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Well, unfortunately, I cannot pull up my map to bring it up more clearly, so I will follow up and make sure that we get that map.

I'm sorry, Chris, Mr. Glassburn, did you have it?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs, Leader Russo, I believe there are few examples of these, but I'm -- I am aware off the top my head of two. There's one in the Dayton area on the southern side of Dayton; that there's one chunk, of a considerably large chunk of Dayton that is part of that district that is South Dayton, that the the two portions of Dayton do not touch each other in
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that House seat.
There's a much smaller example of this being
Cuyahoga County where the district that has Parma and Brooklyn has little fragments of Cleveland attached to it. Those fragments don't touch each other inside of Cleveland.

SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Thank you. Thank you, Co-Chair.

MR. DIROSSI: I apologize, could I just --
SPEAKER CUPP: I'm sorry --
MR. DIROSSI: -- briefly respond. No, that's


SPEAKER CUPP: Mr. DiRossi.

MR. DIROSSI: -- slow on the draw.
To the Co-Chairs. Just to point out in the Cleveland seat that those fragments are to keep Democrat House members in separate districts and not pair them. That's the reason. And it is permissible under the Constitution.

SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Mr. Co-Chair, the question I
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have has to do with the strategy for trying to come up with a map for the State of Ohio. The Democrats used kind of different strategy and different approach. You became somewhat familiar with it because of your meetings together. Do you feel if you had adopted some of the strategy of putting districts together, senate districts, based on the building blocks of House -- of the House districts, or certain counties putting pairing certain counties together, similar to the strategy that was used by Democrats, do you think you could have reached the goal, that goal of proportionality, come closer to that goal of proportionality?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: Co-Chair Sykes, members of the Commission, I would just say that that would be pure speculation, so I don't know that $I$ would be able to give you a yes or no answer there. And that the -- to this point, I've not seen a map that is constitutional that moves down to the numbers that were referenced earlier today.

SENATOR SYKES: Follow-up, please.
SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Sykes.

SENATOR SYKES: I'm not speaking necessarily of
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a total map that's constitutional. I'm thinking of maybe just sections, counties, the way you put counties together forming districts, the way you put districts together, House districts to pair, city districts. Do you think if you had used the strategies by the Democrats, you could have obtained, become that closer to the proportionality goals and objectives?

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs and members of the Committee. I think working around the clock all the staffs for the last nine-and-a-half days, we have come very far, and I think we would be -- we have come as far as we can to the best of your ability, and we have had substantial benefits to reach compliance with the court order. I cannot speculate if we had done anything different at any point in the process. I think we did very well considering the circumstances.

SENATOR SYKES: Okay.

SPEAKER CUPP: Representative Russo.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, going back to that point to what Mr. DiRossi said, I will use the district that we presented in our Democratic map for Athens, that Athens Centric
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Democratic District. We demonstrated that that district can be drawn, meet constitutional requirements, and can add an additional Democratic seat to reach closer to the proportional goals the 54-46.

Is there reason that you did not draw that district, or attempt to draw it?

MR. DIROSSI: So not -- to the Co-Chairs and to the members, and to the leader. I don't want to repeat myself, but we walked around the State and focused on major urban areas and major places for advancement towards the court order, and incrementally over a number of days made substantial progress to do that. I don't recall specifically when Athens or if Athens came up in that instance. And so we focused on the ones that we focused on and brought them to you and to the other members. And I'm not sure. I think now I'm repeating myself. So that's the best $I$ can answer you.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: So through the Chair.
Mr. DiRossi, so I'm to be clear, you did not attempt to add an additional Democratic seat where one was possible and constitutional? That is what you're saying; you just didn't attempt it?
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MR. DIROSSI: I -- I don't recall. I remember working on a number of areas. I don't recall if we worked on Athens County. But I wasn't the only one working on it. There were several different people working on maps.

SPEAKER CUPP: Okay. Are there any further questions?

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Yes.
SPEAKER CUPP: Governor DeWine.
GOVERNOR DEWINE: Mr. Chairman, question for Republican counsel, but let me -- let me first state what I -- my understanding of where we are in this -- in this discussion.

Looking at the House, Democrat map is 45
Democrats district favoring them. Republican has 42.
Correct so far? Three apart where we are now.
Republican counsel says we can't get to 45 without violating the other provision of the Constitution. Is that correct --

MR. DIROSSI: Yes.
GOVERNOR DEWINE: -- statement, correct statement?
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MR. DIROSSI: Yes, sir.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Democrat say that we can get to 45, and that we've done so, and that we don't violate what we -- in doing that, we didn't violate the other provisions. Democrat counsel, is that correct? If not jut tell me what is.

MR. GLASSBURN: Governor DeWine, that is correct. The only addition $I$ would offer is again we believe on the House count that there are at least two other options available of additional seats to choose from.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: I am not sure I understood what you said. Say that again. I didn't understand.

MR. GLASSBURN: From our perspective of the 45 seats in the House, the House Democrat seats, we believe there are at least two other seats that could have been drawn Democratic so that if there is an issue, and we wished to substitute one seat that we find more palatable, then we can do that. We have some optionality on the House. And yes, Governor.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: And counsel -- if I could just continue, Mr. Chairman.
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You've heard what Republican counsel say about what they believe is the violation of the other provisions, or at least one of the other provisions in what you have done. Well, why do you think that they were wrong? Why do you think yours is constitutional?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chair and to the Governor, we believe ours is constitutional because we are we are attempting and achieving that proportionality, but we believe individually the districts are sufficient. But let's for sake --

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Hold on. I'm sorry --
MR. GLASSBURN: Yes, sir.
GOVERNOR DEWINE: Because you're hitting the proportionality, and what else did you say was the rest of that, I'm sorry?

MR. GLASSBURN: We have sufficiently and we have constitutionally followed the other requirements for each of the districts individually in the plan as a whole. But for sake of argument, if your question is, for example, if we had the Cuyahoga, Summit configuration that the Majority plan has, that doesn't change in that that doesn't change the number of seats
in the House side of the plan. It changes whether there are 14 or 15 Democratic Senate seats, but it doesn't change it. There are options within the House plans to get to that 45 number different ways.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: But what we have in front of us is basically two different proposals, is the point. MR. SPRINGHETTI: Yes.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: And I think the real
disagreement seems to me is over whether the Democrat proposal violate the -- violates other provisions other than Section 6.

So I want to go back to Republican counsel. I want you to summarize for us why you think their proposal violates some of those sections. And I -- I'd just like to hear it back-and-forth one more time because I'm --

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chairs, to Governor DeWine. I would say there are at least four very clear constitutional violations of Article XI, Section 3 (D) (3) in the House map, and at least four violations in the Senate map of Article XI, Section 5 . And those are very clearcut violations. And I think
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what we just heard from Mr. Glassburn is that essentially, that from their point of view, those violations do not matter in their goal to a specific number, which I'm -- I think is contrary to what the court ordered us to do.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Mr. Glassburn, do you want to respond to that?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and Mr. -- to the Governor. Absolutely not. We are very clear that Section 6 is subordinate to the 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. I am saying we disagree on the specifics of individual districts. I will tell you we think the configuration of the third Lorain County House seat in your map does not follow the rules. But putting that specifics aside, what I'm trying to also say is that we may have some disagreements on these -- this here about here, but there are many ways to achieve the 45, and I believe we can work amongst ourselves to have -- if there is a concern about Cuyahoga County, we can draw Cuyahoga County, we can in a theory use the same proportionality as the map proposed by the Majority in that region, and would still arrive at the same outcome of 45 House
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seats. So what I'm saying is that there are multiple ways to achieve this. You have some choices. We can better put together documents to show those choices in relatively short order. But you have choices about that.

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask one additional question.

Counsel, so you say you can -- what -- what I'm hearing you say is you can -- you can fix this problem -- these problems? Is that what you're saying?

MR. GLASSBURN: To the Co-Chairs and Governor --

GOVERNOR DEWINE: Are you don't really think they're problems?

MR. GLASSBURN: We don't agree on the identification of the problems, but I'm saying for the sake of moving forward, there are alternative ways to achieve the outcome so that if there is a way to go about it where we agree that there are no violations, I believe there are multiple ways to do that. So I do think it is possible even with us not agreeing on that set of the rules.
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GOVERNOR DEWINE: Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
SPEAKER CUPP: Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair.
Again, thank you all. It's been a long time. Really appreciate it.

I just want to just revisit the ruling and that you -- we've got to attempt, at least attempt, to meet the proportionality requirements. And so I'm just wondering trying to -- what evidence do you have that you attempted to do it? What restrictions were there that prevented you from doing it, particularly in the Hamilton County which is pairing it the House district would give you another Senate Democratic district, how -- what stopped you, what prevented you from doing that?

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs and Senator Sykes, we have done nothing but attempt for the nine -the last nine-and-a-half days every -- every ounce of our effort collectively and individually, and all of the other staff have been towards complying with the court rulings. Everything we've done has done that. So that's just my life for the last nine-and-a-half days
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would be my evidence that we complied.
Not trying to be flip, but $I$ don't know how better to answer the question.

SENATOR SYKES: I think one of the ways to prove that you attempt to do it is to identify what prevented you from doing it. And so that's what the question is. What prevented you from doing it?

MR. DIROSSI: To the Co-Chairs, again, I've asked repeatedly to see a map that has no constitutional defects that I can identify. I have not -- I have not seen that map. I have worked on our own proposals with the Democratic staff and with the Republican staff and the Commission members, and those have been put forward, and I don't know how to answer the negative of -- of the question, but that's what we've done.

SENATOR SYKES: Whether you see it or not does not prevent you from having to comply with the requirement. So again, just asking you to be clear, what prevented you from actually accomplishing the goal?

MR. SPRINGHETTI: To the Co-Chair, to the members of the Commission, maybe I can take a stab at that.
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I would say to this point, what prevented us is that we've seen one map that is supposedly this -- this number, and it has constitutional defects. Several. And we've seen other maps that get to the same number we're at, and the House map in particular, and those maps have even more constitutional defects. And you have one before you that is very close to the numbers that partisan line that I think you're seeking. And the map that we're putting forth is very close to that, without constitutional defects. So I think we are complying with the court order.

SENATOR SYKES: If I could just one last follow-up.

SPEAKER CUPP: All right.
SENATOR SYKES: Auditor Faber, I think, indicated that maybe we should start with the map that you're presenting because it doesn't have any constitutional violations, and see if we can change it, if we can improve it upon it. Okay. So again, I just go back to the same example. By pairing -- using your own map as an example, a recommendation, for an amendment to change the pairing in Hamilton County to
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produce an additional Democratic Senate district. What prevents you from doing that?

SPEAKER CUPP: I think you've given the answer that you can give and one -- and are able to in responding to the question.

SENATOR SYKES: Thank you --
SPEAKER CUPP: So Senator, I think they've -I think they responded the best they can.

SENATOR SYKES: Thank you. I appreciate that.
SPEAKER CUPP: All right. Seeing no -- no
other questions, at this time, the Commission will recess for about 15 minutes, and then, we'll reassemble.
(A brief recess was taken.)
SPEAKER CUPP: The Redistricting Commission will come back to order.

The Chair recognized Senator Huffman for a motion.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission adopt the plan identified as January 22nd Statewide House Districts and Senate Districts as reflected in the documents Statewide House Districts and Statewide Senate

Districts in the meetings tab of the Redistricting Commission website.

SPEAKER CUPP: Is there a second to the motion? I will second the motion.

Discussion.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: I'll just say briefly, without belaboring it, this is the plan that was -- has been described by Messrs. DiRossi and Spring --

MR. SPRINGHETTI: Springhetti.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: -- hetti. I apologize.
And of course, these are the various changes that were submitted over the past four, five days to all the members of the Commission. And they're, as I said, reflected on the website.

SPEAKER CUPP: Further discussion.
If not, are we ready to vote?
Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair.
And just two issues. For the record, we still think that there is sometime to dispute, to collaborate, between the two parties to try to come closer on the map, to make some progress on our collective
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collaboration.
And second, one simple fact is that just can't be overlooked, and that's that the Constitution provisions as interpreted by the court required the -the Commission to attempt to comply with the proportionality goals. This requirement -- this requires evidence, and it requires more than just saying I tried. And for that reason, I'm going to oppose this plan.

```
SPEAKER CUPP: Further discussion?
```

If not, the staff will call the roll.
STAFF: Co-Chair Speaker Cupp?
SPEAKER CUPP: Yes.
STAFF: Co-Chair Senator Sykes.
SENATOR SYKES: No.
STAFF: Governor DeWine.
GOVERNOR DEWINE: Yes.
STAFF: Auditor Faber.
AUDITOR FABER: Yes.
STAFF: President Huffman.
PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yes.
STAFF: Secretary LaRose.
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SECRETARY LAROSE: Yes.
STAFF: Leader-Elect Russo.
LEADER-ELECT RUSSO: No.
STAFF: Co-Chair Cupp, the vote is 5-2.
SPEAKER CUPP: The vote is 5-2. The motion has been adopted by a simple majority, and therefore, the district plan that has been adopted will be in effect for four years rather than ten years.

And the Constitution requires that a statement be issued in this case. Is there a motion? Senator Huffman with the motion.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I move that the Section $8(C)(2)$ statement, which I believe has been distributed to members of the Commission, and without, of course, reading it, it's a over two-page document, be adopted by the Commission. And --

SPEAKER CUPP: And it's been -- it's been moved and seconded. And I -- I'm not sure it has been apologize.

PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: I apologize.
SPEAKER CUPP: We'll take -- we'll be at ease
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for a few moments while members have a chance to read it.
(A brief recess was taken.)
SPEAKER CUPP: The Board has had a chance to read the statement. It's been moved and seconded, and it'll be adopted.

Is there discussion?
Without seeing any request for discussion, the staff will call the roll, please. STAFF: Co-Chair Speaker Cupp. SPEAKER CUPP: Yes. STAFF: Co-Chair Senator Sykes. SENATOR SYKES: No.

STAFF: Governor DeWine. GOVERNOR DEWINE: Yes. STAFF: Auditor Faber. AUDITOR FABER: Yes. STAFF: President Huffman. PRESIDENT HUFFMAN: Yes. STAFF: Secretary LaRose. SECRETARY LAROSE: Yes. STAFF: Leader-Elect Russo.
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LEADER-ELECT RUSSO: No.
STAFF: A vote of 5-2, Mr. Co-Chair.

SPEAKER CUPP: There was a vote of 5-2. The statement has been adopted.

Is there further business?
The Chair recognizes Representative Russo.
REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Mr. Co-Chair, I move to submit a declaration on behalf of Co-Chair Senator Sykes and myself.

SENATOR SYKES: Second.
SPEAKER CUPP: It's been moved and seconded. Has it been distributed?

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: I --
SPEAKER CUPP: The Committee will be at ease for a few moments while members have a chance to read it.
(A brief recess was taken.)
SPEAKER CUPP: The statement has been distributed and will be accepted as submitted.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to read the statement into the record, please.
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SPEAKER CUPP: Representative Russo will proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE RUSSO: Thank you.
Members of this Commission, as well as those of us who have joined to watch these proceedings, I would like to remind everyone that attempt is not a meaningless word, and the proportionality requirement is not superficial. The Ohio Supreme Court has told us as much. And there have been many moments within the course of this work that we have been doing where I felt a little bit like I am a mom with my two teenagers when I ask them to fold and put away the laundry, and they simply have stuffed it into their drawers and called the job done.

This Commission has had a clear order from the Ohio Supreme Court that we must adopt state legislative districts that reflect the preferences of Ohio voters. However, the map presented and adopted by the Commission today falls far short of that mark, and therefore, cannot earn our support.

Unequivocally, the Ohio Supreme Court has directed us to draw a map that closely matches statewide
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voter preferences, and as the court stated, about 54 percent of Ohio voters preferred Republican candidates, and about 46 percent of Ohio voters preferred Democratic can dotes. Accordingly, under Section 6(B), the Commission is required to attempt to draw a plan in which the statewide proportion of Republican leaning districts to Democratic leaning districts closely corresponds to those percentages. This translates to 45 House Democratic seats, and 54 House Republican seats, and 15 Senate Democratic seats, and 18 Senate Republican seats.

Despite this clear order, the Commission has failed to meet those requirements. The result is another gerrymandered map by the Majority commissioners that does not meet the -- meet the requirements of Article XI, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution. And while the Majority may claim it is impossible to draw a proportional map that is compliant with line drawing requirements, that is simply the case. In fact, when they pointed out that the Rodden map, the second submission was nonconstitutional, they did not point out how it was nonconstitutional. In fact, the Minority
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party commissioners presented various options, including regional county maps and a statewide map that demonstrate how to draw districts that meet the Constitution's proportionality and law -- line drawing requirements. The Minority presented a statewide plan to the Commission that meets all requirements of the Constitution, including Article XI, Section 6. The Minority Commissioner staff also testified to the ability to create many variations of compliant maps that would achieve 45 Democratic House seats, and 15

Democratic Senate seats if only the Majority Commissioners would collaborate and give appropriate guidance. This guidance was withheld.

The public has also submitted maps for the Commission's consideration. All of those options have been rebuffed by Majority who also characterized minor issues as unfixable, rejecting offers to work together on a Commission drawn map.

The court in its order directed that if it is possible for a district plan to comply with Sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, the Commission must adopt a plan that does so. And as we have seen throughout this process,
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it is possible. And the Commission has other plans before it that meet Article XI. It is possible to meet the court's order. It just appears that the Majority of the Commissioners do not want to do it.

In fact, the Court, in its decision, stated that attempt was not an empty act. The phrase, shall attempt in Article X1, Section 6 also has a plain meaning. It directs the Commission to take affirmative steps to comply with the standards stated in divisions A through C. The Majority Commissioners have not made an attempt to comply with Article X1, Section 6, and Majority mapmakers were unable to identify any affirmative steps that they made to draw a more proportional map nor any obstacles preventing them from doing so. Instead, the Majority Commissioners have crafted a plan that does not meet Section 6 requirements, and fails to reflect partisan symmetry. The plan adopted today does not have the requisite amount of Democratic leaning districts the court directed this Commission to achieve. Further, many of the Democratic leaning district the Court directed this Commission to achieve -- sorry, further,
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many of the Democratic leaning districts it does include are Democratic by razor-thin margins demonstrating a clear intention to favor and disfavor political parties and in violation of Article XI, Section 6.

Conversely, the Republican leaning districts in the plan adopted today are overall more safely Republican. And given that there were alternative plans that do not skew districts, as the adopted plan does, these appear to be discretionary choices to give further unwarranted advantage to the Majority.

And from the process to its adoption today, the Majority's plan is a clear failure by the Commission to follow the order of the Ohio Supreme Court and the will of Ohio's voters. For instance, no hearing of the Commission since the court's ruling was allowed for in-person or virtual public testimony to members of the general public. And while the Commission has a public comment page on its website, testimony was needlessly limited. The Commission failed to allow public input on a proposed plan, a critical piece of the 2015

Constitutional Reforms that guaranteed that the public would be able to participate in the map drawing process,
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as well as a part of the Commission's own procedural rules.
Majority members of this Commission also
delayed the release of funding for Commission members to hire consultant until four days had already past in the Commission's time line to adopt a new plan. Staff negotiations were similar -- similarly significantly delayed because Majority staff of the Commission members would not commit to meeting the court's order pertaining to the proportionality requirement of Article XI, Section 6.

Republican Commissioners did not instruct their staff to comply with the proportionality requirement in the Constitution and the court order. Instead, districting decisions were declared unconstitutional without explanation seemingly in order to avoid having to comply with a proportionality requirement in the Constitution. Majority staff said that they needed guidance from the Commission on what they call subjective areas of Article XI suggesting that they had not been given such guidance. Staff repeatedly declined to commit to working toward the 54 percent, 46 percent
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proportionality requirement as dictated by the court.
It is shameful that we are here again adopting
yet another unconstitutional map in direct contradiction
to the Ohio Supreme Court. Ultimately, this is not an
issue of geography or technical inability to draw fair
maps. It is a lack of political courage, and a blatant
disregard for the court's order and the will of the Ohio
voters.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
SPEAKER CUPP: Thank you for your opinion.
Is there any further business to come before
the Commission?
If not, is there a motion to -- is there a
motion to adjourn?
Second?
I'll second the motion.
Is there any objection?
Without objection, the Commission is hereby
adjourned.
(Off the record.)

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
I, Jerome E. Harris, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the recorded proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability from the audio recording and supporting information; and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

## Crane \&. Harris

Jerome E. Harris, CDLT-204
January 25, 2022

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

| A | absolutely | 84:17, 85:12, | adverse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ability | 55:5, 99:9 | 88:1, 88:8, | 85:13 |
| $50: 5,93: 12,$ | accepted | 90:6, 102:19 | advised |
| $112: 9, \quad 117: 5$ | 109:19 | adam | 22:4 |
| able | accidental | 30:20, 38:17 | affirmative |
| 8:9, 11:19, | 62:14, 62:15, | add | 113:8, 113:13 |
| 14:21, 57:12, | 63:3 | 5:1, 87:13, | after |
| 73:15, 83:3, | accomplishing | 94:3, 94:20 | 4:18, 20:9, |
| 92:15, 104:4, | 102:19 | addition | 77:14, 88:15 |
| 114:22 | accordance | 96:8 | afternoon |
| about | 63:12 | additional | 4:2, 4:6, 6:13 |
| 4:11, 4:14, | according | 9:1, 9:4, 22:4, | again |
| 4:16, 6:17, | 20:14 | 25:22, 26:10, | 11:6, 15:12, |
| 6:21, 6:22, 7:8, | accordingly | 29:14, 29:22, | 24:5, 24:10, |
| 8:3, 9:14, 14:8, | 111: 4 | 32:18, 44:10, | 24:13, 24:15, |
| 14:9, 14:10, | accurately | 71:19, 73:11, | 26:10, 28:15, |
| 14:13, 15:7, | 63:20 | 73:17, 83:3, | 28:21, 34:18, |
| 15:14, 17:8, | achieve | 94:3, 94:20, | 38:1, 38:10, |
| 17:12, 17:14, | 44:3, 46:8, | 96:10, 100:7, | 40:2, 40:4, |
| 20:13, 23:4, | 61:8, 67:12, | 104:1 | 41:9, 44:10, |
| 24:10, 27:5, | 99:17, 100:2, | address | 45:11, 51:10, |
| $30: 10,32: 10$, | 100:18, 112:10, | 36:9, 58:8 | $51: 18,56: 3,$ |
| $32: 18,33: 18$, | 113:20, 113:22 | addressed | $58: 14,59: 2,$ |
| 33:19, 34:17, | achieved | $11: 3$ | $61: 15,63: 11,$ |
| 36:5, 38:17, | 18:21, 52:14, | adjourn | $64: 4,64: 6,$ |
| 40:9, 41:14, | 53:5, 70:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:14 } \\ & \text { adiourned } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 65: 5, & 65: 10, \\ 65 \cdot 12 & 66 \cdot 17 \end{array}$ |
| 41:21, 42:15, | 71:1 | adjourned <br> 116.19 | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 12, \quad 66: 17, \\ & 69: 1, \quad 72: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| $43: 3,43: 7$, $44: 11, ~ 47: 6$, | achieving $97: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116: 19 \\ & \text { adjustments } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 1, \quad 72: 8, \\ & 77: 10, \quad 78: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| $44: 11, ~ 47: 6$, $48: 18,50: 1$, | 97:8 acknowledge | $16: 12, \quad 55: 4$ | $79: 5,81: 6,$ |
| 51:19, 52:21, | $88: 21$ | adopt | 81:21, 88:21, |
| 53:17, 54:22, | acord | 104:19, 110:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 1, \quad 96: 8, \\ & 96: 13 . \quad 101: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $55: 2,56: 2$, $56: 4,58: 2$, | 49:9, 49:11 | 112:21, 115:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 13, \quad 101: 5, \\ & 102: 8, \quad 102: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 56:4, 58:2, | across | adopted | $103: 19, \quad 116: 2$ |
| $59: 7,59: 11$, $61: 12,61: 18$, | $17: 22, ~ 23: 19$, $39: 2,44: 20$, | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 12, \\ & 82: 19, \\ & 82: 22, \end{aligned}$ | against |
| 66:15, 66:18, | 47:10, 59:3, | 107:6, 107:7, | 57:9 |
| 66:20, 74:11, | 81:8 | 107:16, 108:6, | aggregate |
| 75:2, 77:21, | act | 109:4, 110:18, | 81:8 |
| 83:18, 85:10, | 113:6 | 113:18, 114:6, | ago |
| 85:21, 88:20, | action | 114:8 | 39:5, 70:12, |
| 97:1, 99:16, | 4:20 | adopting | 71:3, 87:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 99: 19, \quad 100: 4, \\ & 100: 19, \quad 104: 12, \end{aligned}$ | actively | $\begin{aligned} & 116: 2 \\ & \text { adontion } \end{aligned}$ | agree $50: 17, \quad 55: 15$ |
| $111: 1,111: 3$ | 6:22 actually | $37: 12,114: 11$ | $61: 1,61: 4,$ |
| absence | $14: 4, \quad 18: 12,$ | advancement | 65:14, 73:17, |
| 80:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 5, \quad 40: 17, \\ & 42: 10, \quad 81: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 94:10 advantage <br> 85:9, 114:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 15, \quad 100: 19 \\ & \text { agreed } \\ & 4: 17,8: 5, \end{aligned}$ |

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

| ```18:20, 20:11, 20:14, 56:6, 73:12 agreeing 52:17, 100:21 agreement 15:7, 16:1, 55:21, 59:21, 70:7 agreements 16:3 ahead 66:14, 79:19, 90:10 airport 89:14 align 10:21 all 5:4, 7:1, 7:17, 8:12, 9:15, 9:16, 9:19, 12:6, 13:18, 15:18, 16:4, 17:18, 17:22, 18:8, 18:20, 18:21, 19:22, 20:5, 20:14, 21:14, 22:1, 22:11, 26:19, 28:9, 33:16, 33:19, 34:4, 37:10, 38:7, 39:2, 43:22, 45:2, 50:15, 51:7, 55:21, 58:5, 59:16, 60:10, 60:14, 61:20, 62:7, 62:10, 62:11, 62:13, 62:18, 62:20, 63:12, 65:16, 66:11, 68:6, 69:8, 69:16, 69:20, 70:20, 71:1, 71:10, 72:4, \(72: 5,74: 17\),``` |  | $114: 7$ always $71: 8, \quad 72: 2$ amended $54: 16, \quad 76: 22$ amendment $103: 22$ amendments $54: 22$ among $68: 9$ amongst $53: 14, \quad 99: 18$ amount $4: 19, \quad 39: 3$, $45: 5, \quad 113: 19$ amounts $73: 4$ analysis $31: 21, \quad 39: 6$, $73: 8$ analyze $74: 2$ analyzing $41: 10$ animal $72: 21$ another $8: 21, \quad 25: 9$, $27: 19, \quad 28: 10$, $29: 5, \quad 35: 9$, $38: 2, \quad 39: 12$, $44: 9$, $50: 22$, $57: 6, \quad 60: 12$, $78: 2, \quad 83: 9$, $90: 7, \quad 101: 14$, $111: 14, \quad 116: 3$ answer $11: 14, \quad 17: 1$, $17: 5, \quad 21: 19$, $31: 18, \quad 41: 14$, $41: 20, \quad 44: 12$, $45: 20, \quad 80: 17$, $92: 16, \quad 94: 17$, $102: 3, \quad 102: 14$, $104: 3$ answered $15: 6, \quad 82: 17$ | ```answering 54:8 antani 35:6, 35:14 antani's 35:20, 36:16 antisplitting 84:7 any 4:13, 4:14, 10:13, 10:19, 16:2, 20:15, 22:1, 32:9, 43:9, 46:21, 48:4, 48:12, 48:14, 49:12, 52:19, 55:19, 69:12, 69:15, 71:6, 71:7, 88:16, 90:1, 90:9, 93:15, 95:6, 103:17, 108:8, 113:12, 113:14, 116:11, 116:17, 117:7 anybody 35:13, 55:2, 69:15 anymore 80:8, 86:9 anything 4:22, 11:13, 59:11, 93:14 apart 56:11, 57:16, 64:1, 95:16 apologize 91:10, 105:10, 107:20, 107:21 app 49:5 apparatus 75:21 apparently 57:16 appear 114:9 appeared 55:4``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

| appears | argued | 62:19, 63:3 | avoid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41:7, 42:21, | 62:15 | assuming | 115:16 |
| 43:16, 55:14, | argument | 67:1 | aware |
| 56:22, 81:13, | 85:12, 97:19 | assumption | 49:8, 50:9, |
| 113:3 | around | 84:3 | 90:18 |
| apples | 7:1, 17:19, | asymmetry | away |
| 29:1 | 54:15, 60:3, | 77:20, 77:22, | 19:10, 38:22, |
| applicability | 73:2, 76:18, | 82:12 | 83:13, 110:12 |
| 75:2 | 79:10, 93:9, | athens | B |
| applicable | 94:9 | 26:8, 60:7, | back |
| 6:14, 32:2 | arrive | 61:2, 93:22, | 19:19, 32:4, |
| apply | 99:22 | 94:13, 95:3 | $\begin{array}{ll} 34: 18, & 51: 6, \end{array}$ |
| 63:3 | article | attached | $59: 2,69: 14,$ |
| appointed | 12:9, 30:13, | 91:4 | $76: 4, \quad 77: 17,$ |
| 73:4 | 37:11, 39:7, | attempt | $77: 21, \quad 78: 2,$ |
| appreciate | 41:10, 43:21, | 16:8, 20:18, | $79: 5, \quad 81: 21,$ |
| 15:7, 20:7, | 47:22, 49:17, | 53:4, 94:6, | 83:15, 84:17, |
| 37:3, 56:8, | 98:19, 98:21, | 94:20, 94:22, | 85:19, 88:19, |
| 65:4, 72:16, | 111:16, 112:7, | $101: 8, \quad 101: 17,$ | 90:5, 93:20, |
| $101: 6, \quad 104: 9$ | $113: 2,113: 7$ | $102: 5, \quad 106: 5$ | 98:12, 103:20, |
| approach | 113:11, 114:4, | 110:6, 111:5, | 104:15 |
| 55:12, 81:15, | 115:10, 115:20 | 113:6, 113:7, | back-and-forth |
| 92:3 | articulate | $113: 11$ | $11: 17,14: 22,$ |
| approached | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 12 \\ & \text { aside } \end{aligned}$ | attempted $38: 10,101: 11$ | $37: 5,43: 8,$ |
| 68:1 appropriate | 43:7, 47:14, | attempting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:15, } 98: 15 \\ & \text { balance } \end{aligned}$ |
| 112:12 | 75:6, 99:14 | 53:22, 97:8 | 45:1 |
| approval | asked | attention | balances |
| $10: 3$ | 54:11, 58:22, | $29: 18, \quad 30: 18$ | 83:8 |
| arbitrary | 73:11, 102:9 | audio | ball |
| 86:10 | asking <br> 33.8, 79.22 | $117: 5$ | $55: 7$ |
| area | $\begin{array}{ll} 33: 8, & 79: 22, \\ 80: 9, & 102: 18 \end{array}$ | auditor $3: 8, \quad 5: 17$ | balloon |
| $\begin{array}{ll}29: 20, & 30: 21, \\ 32: 16, & 32: 18,\end{array}$ | 80:9, 102:18 aspirational | $3: 8,5: 17$, $5: 18,54: 4$, | $67: 6$ |
| $32: 16, ~ 32: 18$, $40: 8,57: 22$, | $68: 16$ | $\begin{array}{lll}5: 18, & 54: 4, \\ 54: 5, & 55: 16,\end{array}$ | base |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 40: 8, & 57: 22, \\ 60: 5, & 62: 21, \end{array}$ | assembly | $54: 5,55: 16$, $56: 8,56: 20$, | 16:18, 16:20 |
| $89: 15, \quad 90: 4$ | 4:7 | 58:7, 59:2, | based |
| 90:19 | assessment | 60:18, 61:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 5,10: 8, \\ & 37: 10,43: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| areas | 33:8, 61:2, | 62:1, 63:9, | 44:15, 46:21, |
| 16:5, 19:15, | 69:1 | 65:5, 84:14, | $49: 11, \quad 49: 12,$ |
| 26:20, 29:20, | assets | 84:15, 86:21, | $65: 22, \quad 89: 4,$ |
| 59:21, 59:22, | 74:2 | 87:1, 87:4, | $92: 7$ |
| 60:9, 76:18, | assigned | 87:6, 87:10, | basic |
| 76:19, 80:21, | 35:13 | $87: 12,103: 15,$ | 16:11, 71:22 |
| 80:22, 85:21, | assignment | $106: 18,106: 19,$ | basically |
| $\begin{aligned} & 85: 22, \quad 94: 10, \\ & 95: 2, \quad 115: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $7: 16, \quad 8: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 16,108: 17 \\ & \text { available } \end{aligned}$ | 59:12, 98:6 |
| aren't | $\begin{aligned} & \text { assume } \\ & 20: 19,62: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $96: 10$ | bear <br> 54:7 |
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| 18:5, 18:22, | close | 87:10, 88:3, | 19:19, 32:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19:9, 19:16, | 45:3, 49:1, | 88:7, 90:16, | 34:18, 38:6, |
| 23:16, 26:9, | 53:13, 56:14, | 91:16, 93:8, | 51:6, 69:14, |
| 40:1, 40:7, | 61:17, 81:16, | 94:7, 98:17, | 70:7, 72:3, |
| 42:5, 42:7, | 82:6, 103:7, | 99:8, 100:11, | 92:1, 92:11, |
| 44:20, 45:5, | 103:9 | 101:16, 102:8 | 93:10, 93:11, |
| 45:8, 59:9, | closely | cobble | 104:15, 105:21, |
| 61:3, 82:1, | 79:11, 110:22, | 60:8 | 116:11 |
| 82:2, 89:21, | 111:7 | coffee | comfortable |
| 93:4 | closer | 63:17 | 54:8 |
| civil | 13:3, 79:13, | coherent | commend |
| 48:10 | 81:2, 92:12, | 61:16 | 51:10 |
| claim | 93:6, 94:3, | collaborate | comment |
| 111:17 | 105:21 | 105:20, 112:12 | 69:21, 114:18 |
| clarification | co-chair | collaboration | commenting |
| 69:22 | 3:3, 3:4, 5:11, | 11:17, 17:13, | 55:2 |
| clarify | 5:13, 12:5, | 106:1 | comments |
| 87:18 | 12:15, 13:5, | collaboratively | 55:17, 62:2, |
| clarity | 69:19, 72:14, | 40:21 | 84:16 |
| 4:11 | 74:9, 84:1, | colleague | commission |
| clark | 87:16, 91:9, | 51:13, 52:6 | 1:1, 2:2, 3:2, |
| 37:19 | 91:22, 92:13, | collective | 4:4, 4:21, 6:19, |
| clause | 97:6, 101:4, | 8:12, 105:22 | $7: 2,7: 6,8: 11,$ |
| 58:4 | 102:20, 105:18, | collectively | $10: 13, \quad 10: 17$ |
| clear | 106:12, 106:14, | 53:22, 80:1, | $11: 13,11: 20,$ |
| 4:15, 16:21, | 107:4, 108:10, | $101: 19$ | $12: 16, \quad 13: 6,$ |
| 33:4, 34:2, | 108:12, 109:2, | color | 13:7, 19:20, |
| 58:1, $68: 17$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:7, 109:8 } \\ & \text { co-chairs } \end{aligned}$ | 56:18 | $21: 7$, $29: 13$, $29: 19$, $29: 15$, |
| $70: 16, ~ 72: 13$, $74: 4,77: 5$, | co-chairs | colors | 29:13, 29:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 74: 4, \quad 77: 5, \\ & 80: 19, \quad 81: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 6, \quad 15: 12, \\ & 16: 16, \quad 18: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $31: 3$ columbus | $\begin{array}{ll} 29: 17, & 30: 4, \\ 30: 22, & 47: 22, \end{array}$ |
| $89: 3, \quad 94: 19,$ | 21:2, 22:7, | columbus $1: 10, ~ 2: 5$, | 49:6, 51:11, |
| 98:19, 99:9, | 22:18, 31:12, | 19:6, 19:9, | 51:14, 53:8, |
| 102:18, 110:15, | $33: 1$, $35: 9$, $35: 18$, $36: 22$, | $19: 10,19: 17$ | 68:7, 70:1, |
| 111:12, 114:3, | $35: 18,36: 22$, | $42: 3,42: 4$ | 70:3, 76:8, |
| 114:12 | 38:9, 39:9, | 48:2, 49:16, | 76:12, 76:17, |
| clearcut | 41:13, 43:2, | 50:12, 66:20 | 76:19, 77:8, |
| 98:22 | 44:1, 46:2, | column | 78:3, 84:2, |
| clearly | 47:1, 49:3, | 11:7, 11:9, | 89:2, 92:14, |
| 12:8, 63:5, | 49:20, 51:17, | 50:6 | 102:13, 102:21, |
| $73: 22,77: 7$, | $52: 10,53: 10$, $55: 16,58: 7$, | combination | 104:11, 104:14, |
| 78:21, 90:12 | $\begin{array}{ll} 55: 16, & 58: 7, \\ 60: 18, & 63: 9, \end{array}$ | $72: 10$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 104: 19, & 105: 2, \\ 105: 13, & 106: 5, \end{array}$ |
| cleveland | $67: 20,68: 22$ | combining | 107:15, 107:16, |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 66: 22, & 67: 1, \\ 67: 10, & 83: 16, \end{array}$ | $76: 15,77: 9,$ | $75: 21$ come | $110: 4, \quad 110: 15,$ |
| 91:4, 91:6, | 79:9, 79:20, | $4: 4,5: 6,6: 9,$ | 110:18, 111:5, |
| 91:17 | $\begin{array}{ll} 80: 18, & 84: 10, \\ 86: 21, & 87: 4, \end{array}$ | $6: 11,7: 6,$ | 111:12, 112:6, |
| clock | 86:21, 87:4, | 10:12, 15:7, | 112:18, 112:21, |
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|  |  | 103:11 comprehensive 7:12, 8:20 concentrating 65:15 concept $43: 8,70: 6$ <br> concern $57: 4, \quad 99: 19$ <br> concerned $48: 18,54: 20,$ $59: 7$ <br> concerning $32: 7$ <br> concerns $17: 16,58: 2,$ $84: 17$ <br> concluded $4: 13$ <br> concludes $26: 9$ <br> concluding <br> 34:7 <br> conclusion <br> 84:4 <br> concur <br> 11:21 <br> conference <br> 7:3 <br> configuration <br> 24:12, 28:1, <br> 97:21, 99:12 <br> configurations $8: 4$ <br> confined $4: 10$ <br> congressional <br> 39:4 <br> connect <br> 44:22 <br> connected <br> 18:8, 40:7 <br> consider <br> 31:10, 32:21, <br> 39:7, 41:11, <br> 76:12 <br> considerably <br> 90:20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| cupp | 47:5 | 89:14, 89:16, | definition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:3, 4:2, 5:4, | cuyahoga | 90:19, 90:20, | 51:20 |
| 5:8, 5:11, 5:12, | 8:21, 9:9, | 90:21, 90:22 | degrees |
| 6:4, 6:8, 12:2, | 27:4, 27:7, | deadline | 26:3 |
| 13:1, 13:10, | 27:9, 27:14, | 54:21 | delaware |
| 13:13, 17:9, | 28:2, 43:17, | deal | 41:4, 41:6, |
| 19:22, 20:2, | 44:6, 45:7, | 8:10, 70:5 | 41:21, 42:8, |
| 22:1, 22:11, | 45:12, 46:12, | dealing | 42:19, 42:22, |
| 22:18, 30:3, | 46:13, 47:11, | 14:17, 34:16, | 43:3, 43:9 |
| 30:6, 33:22, | $51: 1,58: 15$, | 75:4 | delayed |
| 35:2, 36:13, | 58:17, 67:6, | decades | 115:4, 115:8 |
| 45:16, 47:17, | 67:9, 67:15, | 44:16 | dem |
| 51:2, 51:6, | 69:1, 91:3, | december | 65:9, 78:7, |
| 51:8, 52:3, | 97:20, 99:19 | 74:16 | 78:8, 78:10, |
| 54:3, 66:4, | D | decided | 78:11 |
| 66:11, 66:14, | daily | 43:4, 73:16, | democrat |
| 69:8, 69:11, | 6:22 | 87:22 | 7:19, 7:20, |
| $72: 17,75: 10$, | dan | decision | 8:14, 8:15, 9:2, |
| $76: 2,83: 11$, | 44:14, 85:15 | 20:10, 20:15, | 9:3, 9:5, 9:17, |
| 84:1, 84:6, | darke | 29:13, $30: 12$, | 10:5, 10:19, |
| 84:13, 87:17, | 31:7, 32:13, | 53:6, 67:22, | 11:9, 11:20, |
| 88:15, 90:9, | $31: 7$, $35: 22$ | 68:13, 69:2, | 15:20, 18:18, |
| 91:7, 91:11, | data | 71:12, 77:3, | 20:7, 57:2, |
| 91:14, 91:21, | 14:9, 14:11, | 77:4, 77:18, | 57:10, 57:11, |
| 92:21, 93:18, | $14: 12, \quad 14: 15$ | $81: 10,113: 5$ | $57: 12, \quad 57: 21,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 95: 6, \quad 95: 9, \\ & 101: 3 . \quad 103: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 8,48: 21,$ | decisions | $60: 9,60: 12,$ |
| 101:3, 103:14, | $49: 11$ | 59:16, 59:17, | $62: 21,65: 16,$ |
| 104:3, 104:7, | dataset | 75:20, 76:13, | 65:17, 71:17, |
| 104:10, 104:14, | 48:22 | 76:20, 77:11, | 79:14, 85:3, |
| 105:3, 105:15, | date | 77:12, 77:13, | 85:4, 85:17, |
| 106:10, 106:12, | 4:3 | 79:3, 79:10, | 86:2, 91:17, |
| 106:13, 107:4, | dave's | 79:16, 115:15 | 95:14, 96:2, |
| $107: 5,107: 18$, $107: 22, ~ 108: 4$, | $48: 22,49: 5,$ | declaration | 96:5, 96:15, |
| $107: 22, ~ 108: 4$, $108: 10, ~ 108: 11$, | $49: 8,49: 12$ | 109:8 | 98:9 |
| 109:3, 109:11, | day | declared | democrats |
| 109:14, 109:18, | 8:9, 8:20, | 115:15 | 4:9, 27:16, |
| 110:1, 116:10 | 14:7, 21:11, | declined $115: 21$ | $80: 21, \quad 85: 1,$ |
| curious | days | decrease | 88:10, 92:2, |
| $13: 21,89: 7$ current | $7: 4,7: 7,11: 2,$ | 45:5 | 92:10, 93:6, |
| current $35: 5,35: 20$, | $13: 17,20: 6,$ | decreased | 95:15 |
| $35: 5, ~ 35: 20$, $37: 19, ~ 45: 9$, | 21:17, 48:19, | 18:12 | demographics |
| $45: 10, \quad 46: 21$ | 87:22, 93:10, | defects | 86:4 |
| 73:19 | 94:12, 101:18, | 67:19, 102:10, | demonstrate |
| currently | 101:22, 105:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 103: 3, ~ 103: 6, \\ & 103: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $72: 2, \quad 72: 9,$ |
| $37: 14, \quad 44: 16,$ | dayton | defer | 75:14, 75:15, |
| 44:18, 46:15, | 26:4, 89:10, | 13:6 | $75: 19,112: 3$ |
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| demonstrated | differed | 15:12, 16:7, | disfavor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53:15, 72:6, | 15:16 | 18:14, 21:2, | 114:3 |
| 94:1 | difference | 21:21, 33:3, | dispute |
| demonstrates | 25:2, 26:12, | 66:7, 69:13, | 105:20 |
| 71:20 | 26:21, 27:16, | 76:5, 76:15, | disregard |
| demonstrating | 78:17, 79:4, | 77:6, 77:9, | 116:7 |
| 114:2 | 81:4, 85:5 | 79:20, 82:14, | disruptive |
| demur | differences | 82:16, 84:4, | 46:13 |
| 54:8 | 24:18, 27:19 | 84:10, 84:18, | dissimilar |
| dense | different | 87:13, 91:10, | 61:3 |
| 34:16, 40:8 | 24:3, 25:16, | 91:12, 91:14, | distributed |
| depending | 27:6, 28:1, | 91:15, 93:8, | $107: 14, \quad 109: 12,$ |
| $40: 9$ | 28:10, 28:16, | 93:21, 94:7, | $109: 19$ |
| depends | 28:22, 29:5, | 94:19, 95:1, | districting |
| 65:11 | 39:13, 53:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 20, \quad 96: 1, \\ & 101: 16, \quad 102: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 115:15 |
| derail | 55:22, 62:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 101: 16, ~ 102: 8, \\ & 105: 8 \end{aligned}$ | districts |
| $50: 5$ | $63: 1,64: 13,$ | 105:8 <br> disagree | $1: 4,8: 5,8: 8,$ |
| described | $65: 7,72: 10,$ | disagree | $9: 1,9: 9,9: 12,$ |
| 46:6, 105:8 | $72: 11,75: 1,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 61: 5, & 84: 2, \\ 99: 11 \end{array}$ | $9: 16, \quad 9: 17,$ |
| deserves | 75:20, 90:1, | disagreement | 9:18, 10:2, |
| $29: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 3, \quad 93: 15, \\ & 95: 4, \quad 98: 4, \quad 98: 6 \end{aligned}$ | disagreement 98:9 | $10: 5,10: 6,$ |
| designating $55: 12$ | difficult | disagreements | $10: 22,11: 6,$ |
| desire | 60:2 | 99:16 | 11:8, 14:3, |
| 23:13 | digress | discarded | 14:14, 17:17, |
| despite | 55:8, 63:6, | $76: 22$ | 18:7, 18:11, |
| 111:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 66: \\ & \text { dip } \end{aligned}$ | $79: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 5, \quad 19: 8, \\ & 19: 12, \quad 21: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| determines | 59:9 | discretionary | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 12, ~ 21: 13, \\ & 24: 19, \end{aligned} 24: 20,$ |
| development | direct | $114: 9$ | 25:3, 25:15, |
| $41: 22,42: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 3, \quad 84: 11, \\ & 116: 3 \end{aligned}$ | discuss $68: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 14, \quad 28: 15, \\ & 29: 2, \quad 29: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| dewine $3: 6,5: 15$, | directed | discussed | $30: 10,33: 10,$ |
| $5: 16, \quad 20: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 8, \quad 70: 3, \\ & 110: 22, \quad 112: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 8, \quad 30: 1, \\ & 52: 22, \quad 89: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 40: 10, & 42: 12, \\ 43: 22, & 44: 7, \end{array}$ |
| $20: 3, ~ 20: 4, ~$ 21. | $\begin{array}{ll} 110: 22, & 112: 19, \\ 113: 20, & 113: 22 \end{array}$ | 52:22, 89:3 discussion | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 22, ~ 44: 7, \\ & 45: 2, \quad 46: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 19, \quad 21: 22, \\ & 95: 8, \quad 95: 9, \end{aligned}$ | direction | $4: 16,4: 21$ | $51: 15,51: 21,$ |
| 95:10, 95:21, | 21:8, 70:17, | 7:18, 29:10, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 52: 6, & 57: 5, \\ 57 \cdot 8 & 59 \cdot 5 \end{array}\right.$ |
| 96:2, $96: 7$, | $76: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 10, \quad 47: 15, \\ & 68: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 57: 8, & 59: 5, \\ 59: 6, & 59: 10, \end{array}$ |
| 96:12, 96:21, | directions $89: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 8, \quad 77: 19, \\ & 88: 20, \quad 95: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 59: 6, & 59: 10, \\ 60: 1, & 60: 4, \end{array}$ |
| 97:11, 97:13, | 89:3 | $105: 5, \quad 105: 15,$ | $60: 5, \quad 60: 11,$ |
| $98: 5, ~ 98: 8$, $98: 18, ~ 99: 6$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { directly } \\ & 82: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $106: 10,108: 7$ | $61: 10,63: 22,$ |
| $100: 6,100: 13,$ | directs | 108:8 | 65:15, 67:7, |
| 101:1, 106:16, | 113:8 | discussions | 71:15, 71:18, |
| 106:17, 108:14, | dirossi | 17:14, 28:8 | 71:20, 71:21, |
| 108:15 | 3:13, 5:5, 6:9, | disenfranchise | $72: 11, \quad 78: 7$ |
| dictated | 6:13, 14:6, | 58:1, 58:5 | 78:14, 78:21, |
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|  |  |  | ```easily 9:7, 49:15, 68:18 east 31:7, 42:2, 42:20 eastern 18:9, 24:22, 43:17, 61:12 easy 13:20, 21:9, 21:11 edification 36:15 educated 49:8 effect 67:6, 67:16, 107:7 effectively 59:15, 59:19, 60:1, 78:20, 84:20 effort 101:19 efforts 48:18 eight 11:10, 24:6, 78:11, 78:19 either 4:14, 40:13 elect 86:1, 86:3 elected 35:6, 35:12, 35:13, 37:15, 38:1 election 14:15, 85:18 elections 62:20, 62:22, 85:18, 86:3 elongated 40:14 else 56:19, 83:8, 83:9, 97:14``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| else's | error=free | 72:6, 72:9, | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55:2 | 72:9 | 74:11, 74:20, | faber |
| elsewhere | errors | 78:6, 81:21, | $3: 8,5: 17,$ |
| 59:1 | 37:6, 50:7, | $86: 16, \quad 91: 2,$ | $5: 18,54: 3,$ |
| embrace | 54:16, 71:7, | $97: 20,103: 20,$ | 54:4, 54:5, |
| $63: 21$ | 84:7 | $103: 21$ | 55:17, 56:8, |
| employed | escapes | examples | 56:19, 56:20, |
| 117:7 | $42: 4$ | 90:17 | 58:8, 59:2, |
| empty | escaping | excuse | 60:19, 61:19, |
| 113: 6 | 69:12 | 28:11, 28:14, | 62:1, 63:10, |
| end | especially | 30:14 | 65:5, 74:17, |
| 71:19, 75:21 | 14:22, 72:20 | exist | 84:14, 84:15, |
| ended | essentially | 26:11, 46:15 | 86:22, 87:1, |
| 83: 6 | 4:5, 42:19, | existed | 87:5, 87:6, |
| ends | 87:2, 99:2 | 72:1, 73:1 | 87:11, 87:12, |
| 43:17 | et | existing | $103: 15,106: 18$ |
| engaged | $48: 11$ | 46:9 | $106: 19,108: 16,$ |
| 6:22 | even | exists | $108: 17$ |
| enough | 40:14, 57:8, | 38:15, 47:7, | facilitate |
| 17:3, 37:13, | 62:18, 64:6, | 82:13 | 14:21 |
| 43:13, 63:7, | 88:11, 100:21, | expectations | fact |
| 83:14 | 103:6 | 72:20 | 38:3, 70:17, |
| ensure | evening | experience | $71: 16,71: 21$, |
| 23:16, 37:9, | 64:17, 74:15 | 88:15 | 72:3, 73:10, |
| 43:22, 58:20, | eventually | expert | 73:12, 74:6, |
| 82:11 | 53:8 | 34:6 | 88:5, 106:2, |
| entire | ever | explain | 111:19, 111:22, |
| $10: 6,23: 19,$ | $22: 4$ | 5:6, 6:9, 89:10 | 113:5 |
| $28: 5, \quad 85: 22$ | every | explaining | facts |
| entirely | 29:20, 71:12, | $74: 10$ | $4: 12$ |
| 19:8, 58:18 | 101:18 | explains | fail |
| entitled | everybody | 79:3 | 53:3 |
| 35:8, 35:9, | 62:13 | explanation | failed |
| 35:10, 37:22 | everyone | 18:15, 30:8, | 111:13, 114:19 |
| entity | 20:11, 110:6 | 32:5, 72:19, | fails |
| 19:7, 73:3 | everything | 115:16 | 113:17 |
| environment | 83:8, 83:9, | explicit | failure |
| 85:18 | 101:21 | 51:18, 53:13, | 114:12 |
| equal | everywhere | $84: 11$ | fair |
| 58:2, 58:3, | 45:6 | explicitly | 37:13, 43:13, |
| 74:5 | evidence | 33:4 | 68:12, 116:5 |
| erie | 101:10, 102:1, | expressed | faith |
| 39:3, 39:17, | 106:7 | 33:6 | 37:2, 55:1, |
| 39:18, 39:20, | exact | extensive | 81:18 |
| 40:18, 41:17 | 34:15, 49:1 | 23:4 | fall |
| error | example | extent | 78:15 |
| $48: 11, \quad 48: 13,$ | $44: 11, \quad 52: 5,$ | $55: 15, \quad 56: 4$ | falls |
| 48:14, 50:9 | 71:12, 71:13, | extrapolating $59: 3$ | 110:19 |
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| familiar | finally | 94:15 | forming |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:21, 19:4, | 28:21, 83:7 | fold | 93:3 |
| 92:4 | financial | 110:12 | forth |
| far | 117:9 | folks | 55:19, 81:15, |
| 21:17, 24:21, | find | 33:12, 34:13, | 103:9 |
| 38:22, 52:12, | 34:5, 96:18 | 36:5, 47:5, | forward |
| 52:22, 56:10, | fine | 73:16 | 5:6, 6:9, 8:6, |
| 64:1, 65:13, | 52:15, 58:5 | follow | 9:15, 11:3, |
| 82:12, 93:11, | first | 36:11, 51:12, | 15:16, 15:21, |
| 95:16, 110:19 | 4:8, 4:9, 14:7, | 53:6, 76:12, | 15:22, 21:13, |
| fatal | 15:13, 16:18, | 90:13, 99:14, | 67:21, 67:22, |
| 84:7, 84:12 | 17:1, 20:5, | 114:13 | 74:3, 74:5, |
| favor | 30:9, 30:18, | follow-up | 74:6, 79:17, |
| 79:7, 80:2, | 31:10, 41:9, | 13:1, 15:4, | 100:17, 102:13 |
| 114:3 | 48:1, 54:9, | 16:7, 17:4, | found |
| favoring | 54:14, 55:17, | 17:6, 33:21, | 62:14, 87:15 |
| 78:1, 95:15 | 58:9, 58:17, | 45:14, 52:1, | four |
| feedback | 95:11 | 77:16, 81:11, | 7:7, 10:5, |
| 29:14, 29:22, | five | 83:12, 92:20, | 11:2, 23:21, |
| 32:9, 33:7, | 9:11, 9:17, | 103:13 | 27:14, 27:21, |
| 33:17, 33:20, | 11:6, 21:17, | followed | 29:4, 29:6, |
| 55:20, 65:3 | 24:11, 27:18, | 30:14, 97:17 | 44:7, 46:5, |
| feel | 28:6, 46:6, | following | 58:12, 58:14, |
| 51:22, 53:15, | 64:3, 64:5, | 84:15 | 65:9, 86:5, |
| 54:7, 77:7, 92:5 | 64:6, 65:9, | foot | 98:18, 98:20, |
| feeling | 65:12, 79:13, | 54:6 | 105:12, 107:8, |
| 70:13 | 81:5, 85:5, | footprint | 115:5 |
| felt | 105:12 | 9:18, 10:6, | fragment |
| 110:10 | fix | 19:6, 23:13, | $32: 2$ |
| few | 36:10, 50:4, | 23:14, 24:3, | fragments |
| 6:5, 20:6, | 66:21, 100:9 | 27:13, 27:15, | 42:9, 68:5, |
| 30:9, 44:16, | fixable | 44:6, 44:7, | 68:6, 91:4, |
| 47:19, 87:22, | 49:15 | 45:3, 45:12, | 91:5, 91:17 |
| 90:17, 108:1, | fixed | 47:11, 64:20 | frame |
| 109:15 | 68:18 | footprints | 12:18 |
| figure | flag | 9:12, 23:6, | framework |
| 60:15 | 79:7 | 25:15 | 71:22 |
| file | flip | forbidden | frank |
| 15:8, 49:9 | 9:7, 102:2 | 49:17 | 3:7, 7:12 |
| filed | flipping | forces | franklin |
| 86:18 | 9:11 | 82: 6 | 7:13, 8:7, |
| files | floor | foregoing | 9:21, 10:8, |
| 7:16, 8:19, | 51:3 | 117:3 | 11:21, 14:22, |
| 14:10 | fly | forget | 17:15, 17:16, |
| fill | 80:17 | 34:15 | 18:1, 18:17, |
| 86:1 | focus | forgot | 19:3, 19:10, |
| final | $29: 16$ | $5: 8$ | $23: 4,23: 12,$ |
| 11:18 | focused | formed | 24:2, 28:7, |
|  | 94:9, 94:14, | 73:3 |  |
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| 42:1, 42:11, | geauga | 36:4, 36:7, | 100:18, 103:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44:5, 48:1, | 9:13 | 36:22, 37:5, | goal |
| 48:7, 59:22, | general | 38:9, 39:9, | 18:16, 18:21, |
| 70:10, 81:21, | 4:7, 55:9, | 40:22, 41:13, | 20:11, 53:5, |
| 82:1 | 114:17 | 41:20, 43:2, | 53:13, 55:18, |
| frankly | generally | 43:19, 44:1, | 68:16, 71:5, |
| 32:4, 59:20, | 56:6 | 44:14, 46:2, | 92:11, 92:12, |
| 61:10, 63:14, | geographically | 46:19, 47:1, | 99:3, 102:19 |
| 85:9, 85:18 | 41:17 | 48:6, 49:3, | goals |
| fraught | geography | 49:20, 50:9, | 8:22, 70:22, |
| 48:20 | 10:11, 10:21, | 50:14, 50:16, | 71:11, 93:7, |
| free | 15:2, 64:10, | 50:20, 51:10, | 94:4, 106:6 |
| 71:7 | 81:1, 82:17, | 51:17, 52:10, | goes |
| friday | 82:22, 116:5 | 53:3, 53:10, | 31:6, 35:22, |
| 54:11, 54:13 | gerrymander | $55: 16,56: 18,$ | $39: 12,41: 16,$ |
| front | 61:8 | $58: 7,60: 18,$ | $44: 20, \quad 58: 17$ |
| 9:8, 98:5 | gerrymandered | 61:19, 61:22, | going |
| fronts | 111:14 | $\begin{array}{ll} 63: 9, & 67: 20, \\ 68: 11 . & 68: 22 \end{array}$ | 7:9, 14:14, |
| 43:5 | gerrymandering | $68: 11,68: 22 \text {, }$ | 17:7, 23:19, |
| frustration | $60: 1$ | 69:6, 69:14, | 27:5, 32:4, |
| 55:18 | getting | 74:11, 80:14, $80: 16, \quad 83: 17,$ | $32: 15, ~ 37: 7$, $38: 20$, |
| fulfill | 16:14, 53:1, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 80: 16, ~ 83: 17, \\ & 85 \cdot 1 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $38: 20,40: 18$, |
| 70:17 | 53:13, 82:11 | $90: 16, \quad 96: 7$ | $48: 17,54: 13$, $55: 67.5$ |
| fully | give | $96: 14, \quad 97: 6,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 6, \quad 57: 5, \\ & 57: 20, \quad 59: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 49:7 | 11:12, 19:20, | 97:12, 97:16, | $59: 13, \quad 65: 18$ |
| fundamental 79:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 8, \quad 47: 5, \\ & 54: 15, \quad 54: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 99:1, 99:6, | $59: 13,65: 18$, $65: 19,66: 5$, |
| fundamentally | 73:17, 92:16, | 99:8, 100:11, | 67:1, 75:5, |
| 45:6, 58:16, | 101:14, 104:4, | glassburn's | $\begin{array}{ll} 77: 16, & 78: 5, \\ 81: 21, & 84: 21 \end{array}$ |
| 61:3 | 112:12, 114:9 | $84: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 21, \quad 84: 21, \\ & 85: 7, \quad 86: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| funding | given | go | $86: 7, \quad 93: 20$ |
| 115:4 | 12:11, 12:18, | $4: 8,4: 9,$ | $106: 8$ |
| further | 36:18, $36: 19$, | $11: 12,32: 10,$ | gone |
| 4:20, 22:12, | 51:11, $70: 17,73: 4$, | $32: 15,33: 17$, | $29: 8,61: 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 8, & 39: 19, \\ 60: 6, & 69: 13, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 17, \quad 73: 4, \\ & 104: 3, \quad 114: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $34: 12,37: 5$, | good |
| 88:16, 95:6, | $115: 21$ | 39:11, 40:18, | 4:2, 6:13, |
| 105:15, 106:10, | gladly | 51:19, 53:17, | 7:18, 37:1, |
| 109:5, 113:20, | 36:1, 36:10, | 56:15, 57:16, | 49:13, 55:1, |
| 113:22, 114:9, | 50:4 | 60:8, $62: 7$, | 69:7, 81:18 |
| 116:11 | glassburn | 63:15, 66:5, | gotten |
| furthest | 3:15, 22:16, | 66:14, 67:5, | 32: 6 |
| 64:22 | 22:18, 22:19, |  | governor |
| G | 30:4, $30: 16$, | 79:5, 79:18, | $3: 6,5: 15,$ |
| gave | $31: 16,31: 18,$ | $83: 8,83: 15,$ | $20: 3,20: 4,$ |
| 7:8 | $31: 22,33: 1,$ | $88: 19, \quad 90: 4,$ | 21:3, $21: 19$, |
| gears | $34: 9,35: 18,$ | 90:9, 98:12, | 21:22, 70:15, |
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|  |  | identified $8: 13, \quad 15: 18$, $24: 7,24: 16$, $58: 13, \quad 80: 6$, $104: 20$ identify $71: 9,102: 5$, $102: 10, \quad 113: 12$ identifying $80: 1$ ignore $19: 6$ impact $10: 20, \quad 71: 13$, $81: 9$ importance $29: 21$ important $19: 18, \quad 74: 22$, $75: 13$ impossible $22: 9, \quad 111: 17$ improve $32: 19, \quad 33: 16$, $34: 20, \quad 46: 16$, $103: 19$ improved $62: 3$ in-depth $56: 4$ in-person $114: 16$ in-staff $73: 15$ inability $116: 5$ inactive $9: 1, \quad 10: 1$, $15: 17, \quad 16: 4$ include $114: 1$ included $18: 5$ includes $28: 19, \quad 28: 20$, $37: 17$ including $7: 2, \quad 11: 20$, | ```18:7, 39:19, 112:1, 112:7 incorporated 15:2 increase 71:21 incrementally 94:11 incumbent 38:11 index 7:15, 17:21, 18:2, 18:13, 43:6, 57:9, 57:18, 78:7, 78:11, 78:16, 85:16, 87:2 indicate 86:14 indicated 66:21, 78:14, 83:18, 84:19, 87:6, 103:16 indicating 54:10, 76:10 indicator 79:6 individual 8:4, 38:21, 99:11 individually 97:9, 97:18, 101:19 influence 62:16, 62:19 information 6:15, 6:17, 6:18, 7:5, 7:12, 7:14, 7:15, 8:7, 8:11, 8:18, 9:8, 9:22, 10:10, 69:16, 117:6 inherently 63:21 initial 55:11 initially 70:7, 73:10``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| inner | issue | 59:17, 65:3, | 46:11, 46:14, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59:9 | 50:19, 50:22, | 91:17 | 47:11, 57:7, |
| input | 52:5, 63:11, | keith | 57:13, 57:19, |
| 114:19 | 64:1, 70:15, | 3:8 | 58:5, 58:8, |
| inside | 75:7, 77:17, | kept | 58:14, 58:18 |
| 26:4, 35:21, | 77:21, 79:5, | 19:1 | large |
| 36:7, 42:6, | 82:5, 84:9, | key | 50:1, 90:20 |
| 45:2, 45:7, | 88:20, 96:17, | 11:2, 11:16 | larger |
| 67:12, 91:5 | 116:5 | kind | 34:14, 38:12, |
| instance | issued | 6:21, 31:4, | 58:10 |
| 8:12, 94:14, | 107:10 | 32:17, 60:14, | largest |
| 114:14 | issues | 65:21, 92:3 | 35:11, 35:15 |
| instead | 52:5, 52:18, | know | larose |
| 18:4, 26:14, | 54:17, 66:9, | 9:7, 10:13, | 3:7, 5:21, |
| 32:15, 113:15, | $74: 2, \quad 82: 17$ | 12:12, 13:16, | $5: 22,49: 22,$ |
| 115:14 | 105:19, 112:17 | 14:1, 16:2, | 106:22, 107:1, |
| instruct | it'll | 16:13, 17:12, | 108:20, 108:21 |
| 115:12 | 108:6 | 18:10, 19:4, | last |
| instructed | items | 20:6, 21:11, | 7:4, 10:10, |
| 16:18, 16:19, | 47:21 | 35:7, 49:22, | 20:6, 21:16, |
| 22:8, 25:13, | itself | $51: 12,55: 1$, | 23:9, 48:19, |
| 30:13, 54:22 | 58:19 | 57:10, 59:4, | 53:12, 63:13, |
| intent | J | 59:11, 60:13, | 64:14, 70:14, |
| 63:4, 63:5, | jackson | 62:8, 63:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 20, \quad 93: 10, \\ & 101: 18, \\ & 101: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 63:16, 72:20, | $18: 22$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 69: 22, & 72: 21, \\ 73: 21, & 78: 20, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 101: 18, & 101: 22, \\ 103: 12 & \end{array}$ |
| $73: 19$ | january | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 21, \quad 78: 20, \\ & 79: 2, \quad 79: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103: 12 \\ & \text { late } \end{aligned}$ |
| intention$70: 1, \quad 70: 2,$ | $1: 11,104: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 2, \quad 79: 4, \\ & 81: 12, \quad 82: 7, \end{aligned}$ | late <br> 74:15 |
|  | $117: 16$ | $88: 19, \quad 89: 6,$ | 74:15 <br> latter |
| intentional | jerome | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 19, \quad 89: 6, \\ & 92: 15, \quad 93: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $56: 2$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 22, \quad 42: 5, \\ & 117: 2, \quad 117: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 92:15, $102: 2, ~ 102: 14$ | 56:2 <br> laundry |
| intentionally$58: 4$ |  | knowledge | 110:12 |
|  | job | 4:11, 52:11 | law |
| ```58:4 interactively``` | 1:20, 110:14 | L | 73:1, 112:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 8 \\ & \text { interest } \end{aligned}$ | 69:1 | labeling | layers |
|  | joined | 52:5 | 48:9 |
| interest$33: 6,117$interests | 110:5 | labored | leader |
|  | joining | $20: 6$ | $14: 6,15: 13,$ |
| interests 18:6 | $46: 12$ | lack | $\begin{array}{lll} 15: 16, & 18: 14, \\ 51 \cdot 17 & 52 \cdot 10 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18: 6 \\ & \text { interpreted } \end{aligned}$ | jurisdictions | $116: 6$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 51: 17, & 52: 10, \\ 53: 10, & 74: 16 . \end{array}$ |
| interpreted $106: 4$ |  | lake | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 10, \\ & 77: 10, \\ & 70: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| $66: 8$involve | 58:1 | $27: 14,39: 2$, | 84:16, 89:12, |
|  | jut | 41:3, 43:16, | 90:16, 94:8 |
| involve 29:2 | 96:6 | 44:6, 44:16, | leader-elect $3: 5,6: 1,6: 2,$ |
| involving | K | 44:19, 44:22, $45: 12, \quad 46: 9$ | $16: 17,22: 8,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28: 13 \\ & \text { ish } \end{aligned}$ | keep |  | 76:15, 79:10, |
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| 79:21, 107:2, | legislative | 66:19, 86:10, | 28:13, 28:19, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107:3, 108:22, | 1:4, 72:22, | 91:4, 110:11 | 39:1, 39:2, |
| 109:1 | 110:16 | live | 39:10, 39:22, |
| leaders | legislator | 37:21, 38:2, | 40:7, 40:16, |
| 73:20 | 85:20 | 38:3, 60:3 | 40:18, 41:14, |
| leads | lengthy | lives | 41:16, 99:13 |
| 27:15 | 77:19 | 37:18 | lot |
| lean | less | located | 6:15, 9:14, |
| 65:9, 65:10, | 4:19, 24:14, | 28:6 | 11:16, 14:8, |
| 65:20 | 29:20, 34:12, | locations | 17:8, 17:12, |
| leaning | 34:16, 40:15, | 60:22 | 42:11, 59:10, |
| 7:19, 7:20, | 78:21 | logan | 70:11 |
| 7:21, 7:22, | let's | 31:8 | lots |
| 8:14, 8:16, 9:2, | 5:4, 44:11, | logistical | 41:8 |
| 9:3, 9:5, 9:16, | 58:8, 67:14, | 14:8 | love |
| 9:17, 9:19, | 97:10 | long | 45:13, 46:16, |
| 10:5, 10:6, | letting | 13:17, 51:11, | 48:13, 48:15, |
| 10:7, 10:19, | 63:3 | 61:6, 61:12, | 50:16 |
| 11:7, 11:8, | liberty | 101:5 | low |
| 11:9, 15:19, | 42:5, 42:7 | longer | 81:6 |
| 15:20, 18:18, | lie | 55:22, 73:2 | lower |
| 18:19, 26:4, | 26:21 | look | 20:21, 26:2 |
| 78:14, 79:13, | life | 9:9, 9:20, | lucas |
| 79:15, 80:3, | $101: 22$ | $19: 5,32: 3,$ | 28:21, 29:2, |
| 80:7, 80:10, | limitations | $36: 18, \quad 39: 22,$ | 29:6 |
| 80:11, 81:14, | 83:21 | $47: 19, \quad 50: 10$ | lump |
| 81:17, 81:19, | limited | 50:16, 54:9, | $60: 9$ |
| 83:2, 111:6, | 32:7, 114:19 | 54:13, 55:13, | M |
| 111:7, 113:19, | line | 56:11, 56:22, | machine |
| $\begin{aligned} & 113: 21, \quad 114: 1 \\ & 114: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 67:15, 83:20, | 59:16, 60:6, | $63: 18$ |
| least | 84:7, 86:11, | 78:5, 78:6, | made |
| $35: 8,40: 10,$ | 103:8, 111:18, | 85:19, 86:6, | 8:17, 11:3, |
| $35: 8,40: 10$, $42: 21, ~ 46: 12$, | 112:4, 115:6 | 86:8, 87:21 | 19:8, 19:14, |
| 55:10, 58:12, | lines | looked | 20:18, 24:17, |
| 87:7, 9 | 61:12 | 19:11, 55:12, | 36:1, 38:13, |
| 96:16, 97:3, | link | 56:20, 62:10, | 48:11, 49:14, |
|  | 59:18 | 86:17, 86:22 | 58:1, 58:21, |
| $101: 8$ | listening | looking $33: 20,40: 4$ | 59:16, 63:6, |
| leave | literally | $40: 10,45: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 12, \quad 79: 3, \\ & 94: 12, ~ 113: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| 39:11 | $85: 10$ | 55:9, 56:9, | $113: 13$ |
| ledger | little | 64:6, 71:4, | madison |
| 80:4 | 6:17, 6:21, | 79:21, 85:20, | 37:18, 37:19 |
| left $9: 13, \quad 19: 11$ | $7: 7, \quad 9: 13,$ | $95: 14$ | mahoning |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 9: 13, & 19: 11, \\ 41: 8 & \end{array}\right.$ | 13:17, 14:22, | looks | 26:18 |
| legacy | 17:7, 23:10, | $42: 11,56: 16$ | main |
| $32: 14$ | 44:21, 54:18, | lorain | 18:16, 89:16 |
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|  |  | massive <br> 77:22 <br> match <br> 48:10 <br> matches <br> 83:9, 110:22 <br> mathematical <br> 51:20 <br> matt $3: 9$ <br> matter $43: 10,85: 17,$ $85: 18,86: 4,$ $86: 5,99: 3$ <br> matters $85: 19$ <br> maximum $45: 3$ <br> maybe $\begin{array}{ll} 6: 21, & 62: 2, \\ 93: 2, & 102: 21, \end{array}$ $103: 16$ <br> mean 18:16, 46:20, $59: 22,79: 21 \text {, }$ $80: 12,82: 17 \text {, }$ $83: 4$ <br> meaning $113: 8$ <br> meaningless $110: 7$ <br> means $39: 16$ <br> measure $14: 14$ <br> measures $\begin{aligned} & 33: 3, \quad 33: 5 \\ & \text { medium } \\ & 90: 7 \\ & \text { meet } \\ & 8: 9, \quad 12: 9, \\ & 12: 12, \quad 32: 21, \\ & 51: 15, \quad 52: 8, \\ & 70: 13,71: 1, \\ & 72: 4,72: 12, \\ & 75: 12,75: 15, \\ & 76: 20, \quad 89: 11, \\ & 94: 2, \quad 101: 8, \end{aligned}$ | ```111:13, 111:15, 112:3, 113:2, 113:16 meeting 7:11, 12:13, 14:10, 15:13, 53:12, 70:15, 75:22, 82:8, 115:9 meetings 92:5, 105:1 meets 21:14, 34:7, 112:6 members 4:13, 6:19, 7:1, 7:17, 8:11, 8:13, 10:13, 10:16, 11:20, 12:15, 13:5, 13:7, 19:20, 22:19, 29:12, 29:15, 38:11, 46:22, 49:6, 49:7, 73:3, 76:20, 78:3, 84:1, 84:10, 91:18, 92:13, 93:8, 94:8, 94:16, 102:13, 102:21, 105:13, 107:14, 108:1, 109:15, 110:4, 114:16, 115:3, 115:4, 115:8 mentioned 33:3, 46:17, 48:21, 53:12, 64:15 mentor 44:21, 44:22, 45:5, 45:8 messrs 105:8 met 14:7, 51:22, 68:13, 71:9, 84:8``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| methodology | moments | 11:5, 14:4, | narrow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60:10 | 6:6, 108:1, | 18:17, 24:9, | 64:8 |
| metropolitan | 109:15, 110:9 | 39:18, 50:5, | naturally |
| 65:16, 68:4 | money | 55:19, 60:5, | 29:18, 60:3, |
| miami | 73:4, 73:6, | 66:3, 66:4, | 82:13 |
| 31:7, 34:3, | 73:16, 73:17 | 67:15, 69:11, | nature |
| 34:13, 35:22 | montgomery | 83:9, 90:6, | 10:22, 26:22, |
| middle | 25:14, 25:20, | 104:19, 107:13, | 28:8, 28:15, |
| 67:5 | 26:5, 35:21, | 109:7 | 31:13, 32:5, |
| midnight | 36:8, 36:17, | moved | 39:15, 40:11, |
| 54:21 | 37:21, 56:16, | 8:14, 8:15, | 42:12, 48:14, |
| might | 56:17, 89:8 | 9:2, 9:3, 9:5, | 57:20, 59:20, |
| 11:11, 34:4, | more | 15:19, 65:6, | 65:18, 65:21, |
| 40:4, 51:2, | 4:19, 10:21, | 79:13, 107:18, | 80:20, 85:6 |
| 80:2, 83:12 | 17:6, 23:3, | 108:5, 109:11 | nd |
| mike | 23:6, 23:18, | moves | 104:20 |
| 3:6 | 27:1, 27:2, | 92:18 | nearly |
| miles | 29:18, 38:17, | moving | 82:21 |
| 42:15 | 39:14, 39:16, | 8:8, 25:14, | necessarily |
| minimum | 40:14, 59:14, | 26:6, 27:4, | 71:6, 92:22 |
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| $45: 19,45: 20$ | 103:1, 105:6 | 7:20, 15:19, | 105:4, 106:2, |
| $50: 11, \quad 52: 19,$ | saying | 15:20, 22:22, | 109:10, 111:20, |
| 57:1, 57:3, | 14:16, 58:11, | 23:1, 23:2, | 116:15, 116:16 |
| 68:13, 76:5, | 58:15, 59:3, | 23:14, 23:21, | seconded |
| 76:7, 77:1, | 75:12, 75:13, | 23:22, 24:3, | 107:19, 108:5, |
| 82:14, 84:19, | 75:14, 94:22, | $25: 7$, $25: 19,11$, | 109:11 |
| 84:21, 86:11, | 99:11, 100:1, | 25:19, 26:17, | secretary |
| 87:21, 93:21, | 100:10, 100:16, | $\begin{array}{ll} 26: 20, & 27: 13, \\ 27: 15 . & 27: 17 \end{array}$ | $3: 7,5: 21,$ |
| 96:13, 105:13, | $106: 7$ <br> says | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 15, \\ & 27: 22, \\ & 28: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 22, \quad 36: 19, \\ & 49: 22, \quad 106: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 115: 18,117: 4 \\ & \text { sake } \end{aligned}$ | says $57: 5,68: 12$, | $28: 9,28: 17,$ | $107: 1,108: 20,$ |
| $97: 10, \quad 97: 19,$ | 95:17 | 29:4, 29:6, | 108:21 |
| $100: 17$ | schedules | 29:17, 29:19, | section |
| same | 14:10 | 32:8, 38:13, | 12:9, 20:13, |
| $8: 10,25: 1,$ | scheme | 39:11, 44:3, | 20:16, 21:4, |
| 26:16, 35:9, | 36:9 | 44:8, 44:17, | 22:5, 22:22, |
| 41:3, 45:9, | schiavoni | $46: 5,46: 12$, $47: 3,47: 9$, | 30:13, 35:7, |
| 50:19, 59:4, | 74:16 | $\begin{array}{lll}47: 3, & 47: 9, \\ 50: 2, & 52: 13,\end{array}$ | $35: 15,35: 17$, |
| 67:8, 84:4, | school | 50:2, 52:13, 53:16, 53:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 10, \quad 37: 14, \\ & 38: 2, \quad 38: 8 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 84:17, 86:6, | 18:7 | $53: 19,55: 13,$ | $39: 6,41: 10,$ |
| 99:20, <br> $103: 4,22$, <br> $103: 20$ | scratch | $55: 14, \quad 56: 2,$ | $47: 22,49: 18,$ |
| 103:4, 103:20 | 16:11 seat | $56: 5,56: 7,$ | $57: 4,66: 17,$ |
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| 80:4, 80:5, | sit | 47:19, 52:4, | south |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 81:5, 81:7, | 78:22 | 52:20, 53:22, | 40:12, 90:21 |
| 85:14, 87:8, | sits | 54:1, 54:6, | southeast |
| 87:9, 90:19, | 32:20 | 54:16, 54:19, | 26:6, 42:20 |
| 98:1 | situation | 55:3, 55:15, | southeastern |
| side-to-side | 41:22 | 59:14, 59:17, | 34:5, 82:2 |
| 23:20 | six | 60:2, 62:2, | southern |
| sides | 24:12, 27:17, | 70:18, 79:3, | 31:9, 40:15, |
| 50:17, 73:10, | 42:19, 46:4, | 79:7, 81:2, | 81:22, 90:19 |
| 74:1, 74:5 | 46:5, 65:9 | 84:16, 86:6, | southwest |
| sign | sixth | 89:3, 90:6, | 23:18 |
| 63:20, 78:1 | 63:17 | 92:5, 96:19, | spaghetti |
| signature-mig2k | size | 98:14, 99:15, | $60: 4, \quad 60: 10$ |
| 117:13 | 49:21 | 100:2, 105:22 | speaker |
| significant | skew | somebody | 3:3, 4:2, 5:4, |
| 19:9, 55:20, | 114:8 | 55:6, 85:20 | $5: 8,5: 11,5: 12$, |
| 66:9, 78:17 | sleep | somehow | $6: 3,6: 4,6: 8$, |
| significantly | 13:18 | 85:13 | 12:2, 13:1, |
| 23:3, 68:5, | slight | something | 13:10, 13:13, |
| 115:7 | 65:19 | 16:21, 21:10, | 17:9, 19:22, |
| similar | slightly | 37:11, 49:1, | 20:2, 22:1, |
| 9:21, 14:13, | $27: 2$ | $55: 10, ~ 56: 19$, $60: 13, ~ 76: 4$, | $22: 11, \quad 30: 3,$ |
| 23:6, 24:9, | slim | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 13, \quad 76: 4, \\ & 76: 5, \quad 80: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 30: 6, & 33: 22, \\ 25:- & 36 \cdot 12 \end{array}$ |
| $26: 12, ~ 26: 13$, $39: 4,40: 4$, | 14:17 | $\begin{array}{ll} 76: 5, & 80: 16, \\ 83: 12 & \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 2, \quad 36: 13, \\ & 45: 16, \quad 47: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $39: 4, ~ 40: 4$, $41: 21, ~ 92: 9$, | slow | sometime | 45:16, 47:17, |
| 41:21, 92:9, 115:7 | 91:15 | $105: 20$ | $51: 2,51: 6$, $51: 8,52.3$ |
| similarities | small $34: 4$ | 105:20 | $\begin{array}{ll} 51: 8, & 52: 3, \\ 54: 3, & 66: 4, \end{array}$ |
| 70:11 | smaller | 33:14, 80:22 | 66:11, 66:14, |
| similarly | 91:2 | somewhat | 69:8, 69:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9: 20, \quad 37: 14, \\ & 115: 7 \end{aligned}$ | sold | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 4, \quad 92: 4 \\ & \text { somewhere } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 17, \quad 75: 10, \\ & 76: 2, \quad 83: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:7 } \\ & \text { simple } \end{aligned}$ | $55: 13$ | somewhere $34: 12, \quad 60: 19,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 76: 2, & 83: 11, \\ 84: 6, & 84: 13, \end{array}\right.$ |
| 37:4, 83:5, | $55: 13,56: 13$ | 67: 5 | 87:17, 88:15, |
| 106:2, 107:6 | solidly | sorry | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 9, \quad 91: 7, \\ & 91: 11, \quad 91: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| simply | $23: 18$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 9: 2, & 13: 12, \\ 25: 18, & 33: 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 11, \\ & 91: 21, \\ & 92: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $33: 18, ~ 57: 12$, $61: 7,67: 14$, | solution | $\begin{array}{ll} 25: 18, & 33: 2, \\ 53: 11, & 89: 17, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 21, \\ & 93: 18, \\ & 95: 61, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll} 61: 7, & 67: 14, \\ 72: 2, & 110: 13, \end{array}$ | 55:11 | $90: 4, \quad 90: 14$ | $95: 9,101: 3,$ |
| 111:19 | some <br> $6: 16,6: 18$, | 91:11, 97:11, | 103:14, 104:3, |
| simpsons | $7: 8, \quad 8: 17$ | 97:15, 113:22 | 104:7, 104:10, |
| 56:17 | $10: 16, \quad 11: 19$ | sought | 104:14, 105:3, |
| since | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 10,16: 13, \\ & 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 10,56: 5 \\ & \text { conndc } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 105: 15, & 106: 10, \\ 106: 12, & 106: 13, \end{array}\right.$ |
| 62:3, 89:3, | $17: 12, \quad 17: 14,$ | sounds | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 12, \quad 106: 13, \\ & 107: 5, \quad 107: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 114:15 | 18:7, 19:12, | $16: 10,51: 12$, $83: 5$ | $107: 22,108: 4,$ |
| single $50: 5$ | 20:22, 22:14, | source | 108:10, 108:11, |
| 50:5 sir | $\begin{array}{ll} 29: 11, & 29: 12, \\ 30: 10, & 40: 5, \end{array}$ | 27:19, 49:12 | 109:3, 109:11, |
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| 109:14, 109:18, | spring | staffs | 52:12, 80:19, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110:1, 116:10 | 105:8 | 29:15, 93:10 | 80:20, 111:1, |
| speaking | springhetti | standard | 113:5, 113:9 |
| 63:20, 92:22 | 3:14, 5:5, 6:9, | 34:7 | statehouse |
| specific | 11:15, 12:15, | standards | 2:3 |
| 16:2, 16:9, | 13:5, 16:16, | 113:9 | statement |
| 21:15, 44:12, | 22:7, 66:7, | stanford | 95:21, 95:22, |
| 46:7, 47:20, | 69:13, 79:9, | 87:20 | 107:9, 107:13, |
| 54:6, 61:1, 99:3 | 84:1, 86:21, | stark | 108:5, 109:4, |
| specifically | 87:4, 87:10, | 26:18, 26:22 | 109:18, 109:21 |
| 13:21, 14:2, | 88:3, 88:7, | start | statements |
| 14:11, 17:15, | 88:11, 88:13, | 13:21, 15:9, | 11:22 |
| 18:3, 19:15, | 89:12, 89:19, | $16: 11, \quad 29: 2$ | statewide |
| 77:18, 86:13, | 92:13, 98:7, | $43: 16,70: 8$ | 104:20, 104:22, |
| 86:17, 90:8, | 98:17, 102:20, | 85:7, 103:16 | $110: 22, \quad 111: 6$ |
| 94:13 | 105:9 | started | 112:2, 112:5 |
| specifics | square | 16:2, 16:11, | statistical |
| 99:11, 99:14 | 2:4 | 20:9, 45:19, | 7:14, 8:17, |
| speculate | stab | 70:9, 84:20, | 9:22 |
| 93:14 | 102:21 | 89:18 | statute |
| speculation | staff | starting | 73:9 |
| 92:15 | 5:10, 5:11, | 15:10, 16:20 | stay |
| speech | 5:13, 5:15, | starts | 35:8 |
| $75: 8$ | 5:17, 5:19, | 31:5 | step |
| speeches | 5:21, 6:1, 6:3, | state | $8: 1,8: 22,66: 5$ |
| $75: 9$ | 6:19, 7:1, 7:11, | $1: 4,3: 7,3: 8$, | steps |
| spell | 8:2, 8:12, 10:2, | 8:3, 15:14, | 14:2, 16:10, |
| 68:2 | $\begin{array}{ll} 13: 18, & 14: 7, \\ 18: 20, & 21: 16 . \end{array}$ | 23:5, 23:7, | $82: 8, \quad 82: 11,$ |
| spent | $\begin{array}{ll} 18: 20, & 21: 16, \\ 48 \cdot 9 & 49 \cdot 7 \end{array}$ | $23: 10,25: 4$ | $113: 9,113: 13$ |
| 73:14 | $48: 9,49: 7,$ | $25: 10, \quad 25: 21,$ | sticking |
| split | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 1, \quad 55: 2, \\ & 61: 15, \quad 70: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $26: 20,28: 5$ | $35: 4$ |
| $20: 12, \quad 34: 20,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 61: 15, & 70: 17, \\ 76: 17, & 77: 3, \end{array}$ | $29: 8,29: 20,$ | still |
| $42: 10,45: 8,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 17, \quad 77: 3, \\ & 78: 4, \quad 80: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $29: 21, \quad 30: 1,$ | $23: 20,37: 22,$ |
| $67: 10, \quad 68: 15,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 78: 4, & 80: 1, \\ 80: 6, & 101: 20 \end{array}$ | $33: 19, \quad 36: 19,$ | $40: 12,52: 8,$ |
| $74: 13, \quad 74: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 6, \quad 101: 20, \\ & 102: 12, \quad 106: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $47: 10, \quad 57: 18,$ | $58: 20,71: 5$ |
| $83: 16, \quad 83: 21$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 102: 12, & 106: 11, \\ 106: 12, & 106: 14 \end{array}$ | $58: 22,59: 4$ | $99: 22, \quad 105: 19$ |
| splits | 106:12, 106:14, | 60:21, 64:10, | stopped |
| 48:2, 66:22, | $106: 20,106: 22,$ | 64:11, $73: 22,5$, $74: 21$, | $101: 15$ |
| 83:19, 88:22 splitting | $107: 2, \quad 107: 4$ | $73: 22, ~ 74: 21$, $75: 19, ~ 76: 18$, |  |
| 26:16, 48:12, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 108: 9, \quad 108: 10, \\ & 108: 12, \quad 108: 14, \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 76: 19, & 79: 22, \\ 82: 13, & 85: 22 \end{array}$ | straightforward |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 16, \quad 66: 18, \\ & 83: 3, \quad 88: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 108:16, 108:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 13, \quad 85: 22, \\ & 92: 2, \quad 94: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 5 \\ & \text { strange } \end{aligned}$ |
| spot | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 20, ~ 108: 22, \\ & 109: 2,112: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 95:11, 110:16 state-wide | 61:8, 61:12 |
| $52: 16$ spread | $115: 6, \quad 115: 8 \text {, }$ | state-wide | strategies |
| spread $65: 20$ | $115: 13,115: 18,$ | stated | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 5 \\ & \text { strategy } \end{aligned}$ |
| spreadsheets | 115:21 | 33:15, 46:15, |  |

## Transcript of Hearing

Conducted on January 22, 2022


Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

| 99:12 | 104:6, 104:9, | 77:9, 77:10, | 56:15, 62:10, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tells | 104:18, 105:18, | 80:4, 82:16, | 63:15, 76:5, |
| 57:19 | 107:12, 109:20, | 86:7, 87:8, | 77:6, 77:9, |
| template | 110:3, 116:9, | 87:19, 89:8, | 88:17, 94:18, |
| 14:1, 15:9, | 116:10 | 92:10, 93:5, | 113:10 |
| 62: 4 | thanks | 93:9, 93:11, | throughout |
| ten | 30:6, 30:7 | 93:15, 94:16, | 55:4, 60:21, |
| 39:5, 85:2, | theory | 97:4, 97:5, | 67:6, 112:22 |
| 86:5, 107:8 | 99:20 | 98:8, 98:13, | thrown |
| tends | therefore | 98:22, 99:4, | 13:22, 14:3, |
| 65:22 | 107:6, 110:19 | 99:12, 100:13, | 15:9 |
| terms | thing | 100:21, 102:4, | thumbs |
| 41:22, 42:21, | 21:11, 32:17, | 103:8, 103:10, | 54:12 |
| 44:18, 52:17, | 64:14, 87:13 | 103:15, 104:3, | thursday |
| 63:22, 68:8 | things | 104:7, 104:8, | 7:5, 8:9, 49:2, |
| test | 14:9, 19:16, | 105:20 | 54:10 |
| 14:2 | 21:13, 24:1, | thinking | tight |
| testified | 47:19, 48:17, | 93:1 | 85:3 |
| $\text { 112: } 8$ | 60:5, 61:8, | third | till |
| testifying | 63:10, 64:13, | 39:20, 66:5, | 22:13, 74:15 |
| 54:10 | 66:2, 68:3, | 99:13 | time |
| testimony | $74: 10,84: 15,$ | thought | $4: 19,5: 9,6: 5,$ |
| 20:19, 48:21, | $85: 6,86: 9,89: 2$ | $15: 18, \quad 15: 22,$ | $6: 8,11: 22,$ |
| 49:2, 85:10, | think | 19:17, 54:13, | 12:3, 12:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 114: 16, \quad 114: 18 \\ & \text { tests } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 2, \quad 6: 15, \quad 9: 6, \\ & 9: 10, \quad 9: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 63:8 <br> thousand | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 20, \quad 22: 16, \\ & 23: 9, \quad 61: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:9, 16:13, | 10:4, 11:17, | 36:9 | 62:7, 69:12, |
| 21:14 | 11:22, 13:6, | three | 98:15, 101:5, |
| th | 14:20, 14:21, | 7:4, 7:7, 8:8, | 104:11, 115:6 |
| 15:15 | 18:16, 19:18, | 11:8, 25:19, | timelines |
| thank | 20:10, 20:13, | 26:14, 29:3, | 56:1 |
| 6:4, 12:5, | 20:14, 21:14, | 31:6, 43:6, | times |
| 13:15, 13:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 17, \quad 30: 19, \\ & 31: 3, \quad 31: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 63: 10, & 65: 9, \\ 79: 14, & 81: 6, \end{array}$ | $80: 20$ today |
| 13:19, 17:10, | $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 3, & 31: 4, \\ 34: 3, & 37: 4, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 14, \quad 81: 6, \\ & 95: 16 \end{aligned}$ | today |
| $18: 15, ~ 20: 5$, $21: 22, ~ 22: 3$, | $34: 3, ~ 37: 4$, $40: 17,43: 1$, | $95: 16$ threshold | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 7, \quad 38: 15, \\ & 47: 7, \quad 49: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| $22: 10, \quad 22: 12,$ | 43:15, 43:16, | 26:16, 45:12, | $70: 11,71: 8$, |
| 35:3, 45:17, | 43:20, 45:20, | $51: 22, \quad 52: 12,$ | 88:10, 92:19, |
| 47:16, 47:18, | $\begin{array}{ll} 47: 20, & 51: 2, \\ 53: 19 . & 55: 21 \end{array}$ | $52: 20$ <br> through | 110:19, 113:18, |
| 51:9, 51:10, | $\begin{array}{ll} 53: 19, & 55: 21, \\ 56: 10, & 57: 2, \end{array}$ | $8: 17, \quad 11: 12$ | 114:6, 114:11 together |
| $54: 2,65: 5$, $69: 19,69: 20$, | $57: 9,58: 9,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 8: 17, & 11: 12, \\ 15: 5, & 15: 14, \end{array}\right.$ | together |
| 69:19, $69: 20$, $72: 18, ~ 76: 3$, | $59: 21,63: 10,$ | $15: 5,15: 14$, $17: 10,20: 10$, | $\begin{array}{ll} 7: 14, & 19: 1, \\ 27: 7, & 32: 17, \end{array}$ |
| $76: 4,84: 13$, | 63:19, 65:12, | 23:10, 29:8, | $37: 8,38: 6$, |
| 87:12, 88:17, | 66:5, 66:9, | $31: 6,31: 7$, | 46:10, 60:8, |
| 91:8, 93:19, | 68:7, 69:4, | 31:8, 32:16, | 60:10, 62:13, |
| 101:1, 101:2, | $69: 8,69: 11,$ | $39: 2,40: 15,$ | 71:4, 92:5, |
| 101:4, 101:5, | 73:10, 76:4, | 52:1, 53:2, | 92:6, 92:9, |
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| 93:3, 93:4, | translates | two | 115:15, 116:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100:3, 112:17 | 111:8 | 7:18, 7:19, | under |
| told | treated | 7:20, 8:22, | 9:15, 20:13, |
| 57:10, 70:13, | 40:3, 42:9 | 9:12, 12:3, | 35:7, 35:17, |
| 110:8 | tremendously | 18:11, 23:7, | $37: 16,38: 1$, |
| tonight | 63:22 | 24:11, 25:6, | 38:3, 48:3, |
| 36:20, 54:21 | tried | 25:11, 25:16, | 66:17, 83:8, |
| took | 57:9, 57:11, | 26:12, 26:14, | 84:5, 89:21, |
| 16:10, 19:10, | 106:8 | 26:21, 27:5, | 91:19, 111:4 |
| 55: 6 | troy | 27:12, 27:13, | understand |
| top | 44:14, 44:18, | 27:16, 28:6, | 18:4, 25:7, |
| 34:15, 44:20, | 46:18, 47:4, | 28:12, 28:14, | 34:5, 37:17, |
| 90:18 | 57:8 | 28:20, 35:9, | 40:3, 45:18, |
| topic | troy's | 38:11, 39:13, | 82:4, 96:13 |
| 64:15 | 85:15 | 41:15, 44:17, | understanding |
| total | true | 45:4, 56:14, | $4: 11, \quad 14: 12,$ |
| 8:8, 9:11, | 38:5, 38:7, | 59:6, 59:9, | $14: 20, \quad 35: 19$ |
| 9:18, 11:5, | 49:15, 49:19, | 61:4, 64:1, | 47:2, 48:1, |
| 11:6, 11:9, | 58:16, 117:3 | 64:4, 65:9, | 87:1, 95:12 |
| 78:18, 93:1 | trumbull | 66:9, 70:8, | understood |
| totals | 26:18 | 70:12, 71:19, | 23:11, 30:11, |
| 1:5 | try | 73:5, 73:12, | 96:12 |
| touch | 20:18, 24:14, | 74:12, 78:3, | underweight |
| 90:22, 91:5 | 57:17, 60:8, | 81:6, 81:22, | 40:9 |
| toward | 66:16, 85:8, | 82:3, 82:20, | unequivocally |
| 115:22 | 105:21 | $\begin{array}{ll} 84: 15, & 89: 9, \\ 90: 18, & 90: 22, \end{array}$ | $110: 21$ |
| towards | trying | $96: 9, \quad 96: 16,$ | unfixable |
| 8:22, 11:4, | 18:4, 45:18, | $\begin{array}{ll} 96: 9, & 96: 16, \\ 98: 6, & 105: 19, \end{array}$ | $112: 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 56: 6, \quad 65: 1, \\ & 94: 11, \quad 101: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $45: 20,46: 4$ | $105: 21, \quad 110: 11$ | unfortunately <br> 90:11 |
| 94:11, 101:20 township | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 51: 3, \quad 55: 3, \\ & 60: 15, \quad 66: 3, \end{aligned}\right.$ | two-and-a-half | unified |
| $17: 19,18: 6,$ | $66: 4, \quad 71: 4,$ | 39:11 <br> two-page | $52: 17$ |
| 18:22, 19:16, | 80:2, $80: 16$, | $107: 16$ | union |
| $39: 20,42: 3$, $42: 5,48: 3$, | $83: 13, ~ 89: 17, ~$ $92: 1, ~ 99: 15$, | two-way | $\begin{array}{ll} 10: 1, & 10: 9, \\ 19: 6, & 23: 12 \end{array}$ |
| $42: 5, ~ 48: 3$, $49: 16, ~ 50: 13$, | 92:1, 99:15, $101: 10,102: 2$ | 17:13 | 19:6, 23:12 university |
| 59:8, 66:19, | tuesday | type | 87:20 |
| 66:20, 68:14, | 7:4, 8:7 | 8:10 | unless |
| 74:21 | tuning | U | 12:10, 70:18 |
| townships | 52:15 | ultimately | unlikely |
| 42:19, 42:20, | turning | 21:7, 43:4, | 50:4 |
| 48:12, 74:13 | 51:1 | 116:4 | until |
| transcribed | turnout | unable | 39:19, 70:12, |
| 1:22, 117:5 | 63:1 | 113:12 | 71:3, 84:17, |
| transcriber | twice | unconstitutional | 115:5 |
| $117: 1$ | 74:8 | 13:22, 35:16, | unusual |
| transcript | twiddling | 36:21, 38:8, | 63:7 |
| 117:3 | 54:12 |  | unwarranted |
|  |  |  | 114:10 |

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on January 22, 2022

| upheld | violate | want | 68:4, 69:16, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88:22, 89:4 | 20:15, 96:3, | 4:22, 6:11, | 93:2, 93:3, |
| urban | 96:4, 98:10 | 7:7, 11:11, | 100:18 |
| 16:5, 29:9, | violated | 17:2, 19:19, | ways |
| 76:18, 94:10 | 20:22 | 30:9, 30:17, | 43:9, 46:16, |
| use | violates | 33:15, 33:17, | 51:19, 53:17, |
| 6:11, 15:8, | 98:10, 98:14 | 36:18, 38:6, | 98:4, 99:17, |
| 16:18, 16:19, | violating | 38:19, 43:10, | 100:2, 100:17, |
| 65:11, 78:5, | 21:5, 58:3, | 43:11, 45:18, | 100:20, 102:4 |
| 81:21, 82:18, | 90:1, 95:18 | 47:19, 51:12, | we'll |
| 93:21, 99:20 | violation | 51:21, 60:14, | 6:5, 6:8, |
| using | 21:10, 35:16, | 61:11, 61:15, | 11:14, 51:6, |
| $14: 12,14: 14,$ | $48: 4,63: 5,$ | 61:20, 62:6, | 66:6, 69:15, |
| $44: 21,48: 22,$ | $97: 2, \quad 114: 4$ | $62: 7,64: 15,$ | $104: 12, \quad 107: 22$ |
| $65: 8,65: 12,$ | violations | $65: 5,65: 6,$ |  |
| $71: 21,72: 10$, | 47:20, 68:17, | $68: 16, \quad 69: 14,$ | $5: 2,12: 16,$ |
| 103:20 | 68:20, 70:19, | $69: 21, \quad 72: 13,$ | 16:5, 33:19, |
| V | 83:19, 84:11, | $73: 8,74: 4$, | 34:17, 37:7, |
| vandalia | $87: 14$, <br> $98: 19,9$, <br> $88: 21$, | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 9, \quad 76: 4, \\ & 83: 12, \quad 83: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 40: 21, & 42: 12, \\ 46: 20, & 47: 6, \end{array}$ |
| $89: 15$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 98: 19, & 98: 21, \\ 98: 22, & 99: 3 . \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 83: 12, & 83: 15, \\ 88: 19, & 90: 4, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 20, ~ 47: 6, \\ & 50: 1,52: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| variations | 100:19, 103:18 | $94: 8, \quad 98: 12,$ | $53: 21, \quad 54: 21,$ |
| 62:5, 112:9 various | virtual | 98:13, 99:6, | 57:5, 57:22, |
| 105:11, 112:1 | $114: 16$ | 101:7, 113:4 | $58: 14,59: 20,$ |
| vary | virtue $27: 11,33: 11$ | 38:16, 55:22, | $60: 16,62: 13,$ |
| 49:21 | vote | 70:16, 74:19 | 63:11, 64:6, |
| varying | 65:22, 105:16, | wants | 65:15, 65:17, |
| vending | 107:4, 107:5, | 30:22 | 66:5, 75:3, |
| 63:18 | 109:2, 109:3 | ward | 75:5, 85:12, |
| vermilion | voter | 89:13 | $\begin{array}{ll} 86: 6, & 86: 7, \\ 90: 4, & 90: 8, \end{array}$ |
| 40:1, 40:2, | 111:1 | $78: 1$ | $103: 5, \quad 103: 9$ |
| 40:5 | 110:17, 111:2, | warren | we've |
| vernon | $111: 3,114: 14,$ | 24:22, 32:15 | $24: 10, \quad 24: 15$ |
| version | 116:8 | warrensville | $28: 8,43: 7,$ |
| $41: 2,42: 18,$ | voting | 67:10, 67:11 | $\begin{array}{lr} 43: 8, & 49: 9, \\ 59: 21, & 75: 19 \end{array}$ |
| $42: 22$ | 53:8 | watch | $78: 17, \quad 79: 6,$ |
| versus | W | 110:5 | $\text { 83:17, } 96: 3,$ |
| 27:18, 56:13, | wait | $12: 11, \quad 17: 18,$ | $101: 8, \quad 101: 21,$ |
| 63:2, 65:20, | $55: 22$ | $17: 22,18: 8,$ | $102: 15,103: 2,$ |
| 78:18, 78:19, | waited | $18: 11, \quad 32: 3,$ | $103: 4$ |
| $81: 5$ viable | 55:22 walk | 39:2, 40:19, | website |
| viable | walk | 43:5, 43:11, | 36:19, 105:2, |
| $15: 22$ view | 23:10 | 45:11, 46:13, | 105:14, 114:18 |
| view | walked | 58:13, 61:6, | wednesday |
| 84:3, 99:2 | 94:9 | 61:16, 65:22, | 7:4, 7:11 |
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| 100,000 | 163 | 26 | 99:17, 99:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34:14 | 36:8 | 24:19, 54:20 | 111:8, 112:10 |
| 11 | 168,000 | 27 | 46 |
| 10:4, 23:20, | 36:5 | 38:4 | 14:5, 15:11, |
| 44:7, 47:10 | 17 | 28 | 16:9, 16:14, |
| 11,000 | 67:9, 68:21, | 24:19, 56:12 | 20:12, 20:18, |
| 19:12 | 83:16 | 3 | 94:4, 111:3, |
| 110,000 | 18 | 3 (d) (3 | 115:22 |
| 34:3 | 14:14, 15:8, | $48: 1,49: 18,$ | 47 |
| 117 | $23: 1,43: 7,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 1, \\ & 66: 17, \quad 98: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 60:19 |
| 1:21 | 87:9, 111:10 | 30 | 48 |
| 12 | 2 | 1:12, 4:3, 9:18 | 60:19, 80:10 |
| 19:5, 23:14, | 2 | 30,000 | $48.2$ |
| 23:20, 24:3, | 1:12 | $54: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 7 \\ & 49 \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:15, $44: 8$, | 2,500 | 300,000 | $49$ |
| $47: 10,64: 2$, $64: 11$ | 50:1 | 50:2 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 60: 19 \\ & 49.2 \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| 120 | 20 1014 , | $\begin{array}{lll}36 & \\ 56 \cdot 12 & 89: 7\end{array}$ | 49.2 |
| 73:14 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1: 11, & 14: 15, \\ 15: 8, & 43: 7, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 12, \quad 89: 7, \\ & 89: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 49.8 |
| 121 | 49:9, 85:19 | 380,000 | 83:6 |
| 77:18 | 20,000 | 34:3 | 49.9 |
| 122 77 | 34:13 | 4 | 83:7 |
| $77: 18$ 126 | 200 | 4 | 5 |
| 126:12 | 73:14 | 54:20 | 5-2 |
| 13 | 2002 $36: 16$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 107: 4, & 107: 5, \\ 109: 2, & 109: 3 \end{array}$ |
| 82:18 | 2010 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 18, \quad 33: 12 \\ & 42 \end{aligned}$ | 50 |
| $14$ $64: 11, \quad 66: 22,$ | 45:9, 45:10 | 20:21, 64:2, | 25:17, 27:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:11, } 66: 22, \\ & \text { 67:3, } 68: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $2012$ | 78:14, 78:18, | 28:4, $28: 17$, $61: 13,64: 3$, |
| 78:15, 78:19, | 36:16 2014 | $95: 15$ 427653 | 64:12, 78:12, |
| 83:15, 85:4, | 74:16, 75:7 | 427653 $1: 20$ | 78:13, 78:15, |
| 98:2 15 | 2015 | 43215 | 78:18, 81:16, |
| 4:18, 9:15, | 114:20 | 2:5 | 82:6, 83:8 |
| 15:15, 23:2, | 2020 | 45 | $33: 12,40: 10$ |
| 25:13, 27:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 5,35: 7, \\ & 37: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 22:22, 24:6, | 50.12 |
| 44:3, 47:3, | 2022 | 24:15, 26:2, | 18:2 |
| 49:10, 49:11, | 1:11, 117:16 | $\begin{array}{lll} 44: 4, & 47: 3, \\ 47: 9, & 47: 12, \end{array}$ | 50.5 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}52: 13, & 53: 16, \\ 53: 19, & 56: 12,\end{array}$ | 204 | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 9,47: 12, \\ & 49: 10, \quad 49: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 14:16 |
| 58:11, $60: 21$, | 1:22, 117:15 | 52:13, 53:16, | 50.87 |
| 64:11, 98:2, | 22 104 , | 53:18, 53:22, | 82:20 |
| 104:12, 111:10, | $1: 11, ~ 104: 20$ 23 | 55:6, 78:10, | 49:22 |
| 112:10 | 23 $43: 1$ | $78: 17$, $95: 17, ~ 96: 14$, $96: 38$, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 14: 14, \quad 15: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 25 | $\text { 96:14, } 98: 4,$ | 28:4, 64:3 |
| $43: 7,49: 9$ | 117:16 |  | 51.76 |
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## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Freda J. Levenson, hereby certify that on this 25th day of January, 2022, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing affidavit and appendix to be served by email upon the counsel listed below:

Bridget C. Coontz, bridget.coontz@ohioago.gov
Julie M. Pfeiffer, julie.pfeiffer@ohioago.gov
Michael Walton, michael.walton@ohioago.gov
Counsel for Respondents Ohio Governor DeWine, Ohio Secretary of State LaRose, and Ohio Auditor Faber

Phillip J. Strach, phil.strach@nelsonmullins.com
Thomas A. Farr, tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com
John E. Branch, III, john.branch@nelsonmullins.com
Alyssa M. Riggins, alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com
Counsel for Respondents House Speaker Robert R. Cupp and Senate President Matt Huffman

Erik Clark, ejclark@organlegal.com
Counsel for Respondent Ohio Redistricting Commission
/s/ Freda J. Levenson
Freda J. Levenson (0045916)
Counsel for Relators

