

Ohio Redistricting Commission 01-20-2022 all

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:00:01] Will the secretary please call the roll.

Clerk [00:00:05] Speaker Co-Chair, Cupp.

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [00:00:07] Present.

Clerk [00:00:08] Senator Co-Chair Sykes.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:00:11] Present.

Clerk [00:00:11] Governor DeWine.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:00:13] Here.

Clerk [00:00:13] Auditor Faber.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:00:15] Here.

Clerk [00:00:15] President Huffman.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:00:16] Here.

Clerk [00:00:17] Secretary LaRose.

Sec. of State Frank LaRose [00:00:17] Here.

Clerk [00:00:17] Leader-Elect Russo. A quorum is present, Mr. Co-Chair.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:00:29] We have minutes from the previous meeting included in the packet. Are there any objections to the minutes? Hearing and seeing none, and 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. Let's start with the- Speaker Cupp.

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [00:00:59] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are - our staffs have been working in 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, a draft proposal for 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's has been collaboration in this discussion, but not an agreement between the various parts of the commission. And, but we understand that that maybe you have a different motion at this time, Senator.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:02:11] Mr. Co-Chair, I move that we take a 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.

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [00:02:34] [indecipherable].

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:02:35] Is there any objections?

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:02:38] Mr. Co-Chair, I don't have an objection to the recess. I guess I just want to understand - if I could, could I just have the floor for one minute?

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:02:48] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:02:48] OK, I 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 the court's order and all with the idea of 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?

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:04:06] Basically, yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:04:07] OK, great.

[00:04:08] We are, the staff, as you've indicated, the staff have been working in both sides, the majority and the minority participation, with statewides 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 that either we narrow it down or we, you know, make public all of the considerations.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:04:37] And what time would we reconvene then?

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [00:04:47] It's 2:30 now.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:04:52] 4:00? Would 4:00 o'clock be OK with the members?

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:04:58] Whatever the Co-Chairs tell me, I'll be here.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:05:02] OK, well, I'll keep that, I'll keep a rain check, I'll keep a rain check on that.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:05:07] Well, but I would like to know because there are-

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:05:09] 4:00.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:05:10] 4:00, OK perfect.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:05:11] All right. We are now in recess until 4:00.

Recess [00:05:21] [Recess].

[00:05:21] 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 the 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 posthaste 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 are closer and closer to the deadline. So with that, Speaker, would you want to make a presentation?

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [00:06:30] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do. And again, this is a summary presentation, as Senator Sykes has indicated. There is continuing work on these and we can consider these drafts and still trading input and ideas and comments back and forth. So I would refer to the one that says proposal for Franklin and Union Counties, Ohio House and Ohio Senate districts. I will talk just 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 it was explained by the Ohio Supreme Court. So in Franklin County, we had Union County on this because a part of Dublin, actually all of Dublin in Franklin County and Union County are together. So with the Franklin Union County one. So the result of that is that there are eleven Democrat leaning 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 those are. I will 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 Republican leaning districts in Warren County. It's a little difficult to find a significant Democrat population in Warren County. So in the Senate, in both, kind of 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 that the maps that you're proposing have been uploaded as well. So that's my presentation.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:09:50] Thank you, Speaker. At this time, we'll call on Chris Glassburn, our map drawer on the Democratic side, to present our counter.

Chris Glassburn [00:10:11] 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, etc. So the House and Senate Democrats received a proposal concerning Hamilton County yesterday and then discussed that - 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, fifty four percent Republican, forty six 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 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, they 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 the 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, a 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 continue 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 where 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 than I have omitted, I would be happy to address any.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:17:50] At this time, are there any questions to either either of the presentors? Speaker Cupp, Co-Chair Cupp, or Chris Glassburn about the

maps? Again, this is to provide a status report, an update of where we stand. The staffs have been working together. This is the first time, I believe, in the history of the state, the Republican and Democratic 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. Are the questions to the presentors? Yes.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:18:35] 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 in your math that we did get from the the Cupp introduced proposals. Do you have those that we can take a look at those? Apparently you had them because you made reference to them a couple of times.

Chris Glassburn [00:18:53] 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 dataset is close but not exact upon a match of the OCRD file. We have not made the conversions to the OCRD file, but my compatriot on the staff side, Randall Route, is working on that as we speak and we we'd 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 -

Auditor Keith Faber [00:19:31] 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-

Chris Glassburn [00:19:37] Yes, we will.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:19:38] Copies of those indexes for each one of these proposed districts, House and Senate.

Chris Glassburn [00:19:42] 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 [indecipherable] go here.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:19:53] 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, and I appreciate it now. Can you tell me what the big difference is? Let's just start in the 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 a bit lost, but the Cupp version just seems to me easier to read because I think he got rid of some precincts and did different colors. But it looks like the maps are very similar in most of the areas. Is it 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:20:41] 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 District 10 and 5, that being the city, the district centered on Grove City and then the district that has in the corner Canal Winchester, Groveport, 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 can take it. We try to again maintain the majority's desire for a district of the nature 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.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:21:53] So, the big thing then, if I translate it, in the Cupp version, of the Republican version, House District 5 on their on their labeling would encompass a U-shape around Southern and Franklin County.

Chris Glassburn [00:22:07] Yes.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:22:08] And you guys divided that up into two different districts. I assume going more into City of Columbus to pick up votes, to pick up people?

Chris Glassburn [00:22:16] The districts as drawn by, that were 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.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:22:39] German village with rural southern Franklin County?

Chris Glassburn [00:22:43] Relative to the choice that was made in choosing predominantly urban neighborhoods in Columbus, German village was a closer fit.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:22:54] OK, so Mr. Chairman, just looking through the rest of this, 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 districts, your 8, their 8 looks to be about- I mean, they're very similar. Maybe a little bit different here. They're 9, 4, 3, 7 is significantly different. 11 is somewhat different. 6 looks to be a little different.

Chris Glassburn [00:23:31] 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.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:24:02] OK. So we'll look at the data when you submit over the-

Chris Glassburn [00:24:06] Yes.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:24:07] To see the comparisons. Thank you.

Chris Glassburn [00:24:09] Thank you.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:24:13] Leader Russo.

Minority Leader-Elect Rep. Allison Russo [00:24:15] 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:24:45] That's correct.

Minority Leader-Elect Rep. Allison Russo [00:24:46] OK. And then one other question again, going back to this, this southern, 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:25:38] Leader Russo and to the Co-Chairs, that's how I view this district. If you're- one person's opinion is that, again, the southwest corner of the county is now more or less in one seat. And 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.

Minority Leader-Elect Rep. Allison Russo [00:26:18] And as a reminder, while we do have eleven quote unquote Democratic seats in our map, we have also made District 10, which is that Grove City centered district. It is very close to the 50 percent, so very competitive. Correct?

Chris Glassburn [00:26:40] To Leader Russo and the Co-Chairs, yes, that is an accurate assessment. Again, the Sykes-Sykes 15 map by comparison, instead of choosing Union County, chose Pickaway and had twelve out of twelve House seats being Democratic, and none of those twelve 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.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:27:17] 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:27:33] 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 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 a 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.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:28:50] Mr Glassburn to, correct me if I'm wrong, but to illustrate for decisions are made in trying to make sure we comply with the court order, in

Hamilton County, there was a compromise that he ended up with five-two, 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 would mean two. And so this is an example, I believe, of what the court means that 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:30:02] To Senator Sykes and the Co-Chairs, 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.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:30:43] Are there any additional questions? President Huffman.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:30:48] Thank you, Senator Sykes. Thanks for your work on this issue. A couple of issues I want to ask you 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 it 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 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, 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 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:32:02] Yes, so to the Co-Chairs, Senator Huffman, the maps we have in front of you again, our caucuses were not expecting 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.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:33:16] OK, so that was, 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 a House seat.

Chris Glassburn [00:33:27] 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 in two districts, House District 7.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:33:50] OK, so again-

Chris Glassburn [00:33:52] I apologize for the confusion, we're trying-

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:33:52] No, 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:34:07] Yes, sir.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:34:08] OK, so these don't correspond to actual Senate district numbers. Correct?

Chris Glassburn [00:34:12] Correct.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:34:13] We we are not in, 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:34:50] 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 ommitting one of them in my mind at this time.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:35:13] 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:35:31] Are generally aware of the issue, yes, and again, with proper time and vetting and not submitting draft proposals between each of the caucuses,

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:35:40] Fair enough,

Chris Glassburn [00:35:41] Products before the commission will be a more finished product.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:35:43] I guess, speaking of that, I guess I'm a little confused about the Dave's Redistricting and this. There's there's an animal, by the way, called I think it's called the Legislative Redistricting Committee.

Other [00:35:57] Legislative Task Force.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:35:58] 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 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:36:40] So Senator Huffman and to 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 OCRD actual files that we use maptitude for that purpose. But today has, today has unfolded in a fashion that has been unplanned.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:37:31] I get that for all of us, I think. But the Haystacks group in Washington is able to provide expertize about the indexes and things like that. That's that's who you're using for that?

Chris Glassburn [00:37:43] Haystack is not under contract, to my knowledge, with any party, for the Democratic members of the commission.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:37:51] 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:38:11] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:38:11] OK. And you've had a chance to look at the Majority proposal for Franklin County.

Chris Glassburn [00:38:18] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:38:19] OK. And do you agree that the majority proposal gives, in Franklin County, out of twelve seats, eleven Democrat and one Republican in the House?

Chris Glassburn [00:38:34] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:38:35] And that is one less Republican leaning seat than what the map was that the commission passed. Is that correct?

Chris Glassburn [00:38:43] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:38:43] 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. That's under the majority proposal.

Chris Glassburn [00:38:57] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:38:58] OK. And that's also one less Republican Senate seat than the previously passed map. Is that correct?

Chris Glassburn [00:39:05] Yes, that is correct.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:39:06] And then in the, in the Hamilton, Warren County area, I guess for purposes of this discussion, we're treating these as kind of one county. We obviously know Hamilton and Warren are two different counties. The Hamilton County map out of seven seats, well, 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:39:41] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:39:42] And from the previous map, the Republicans lose one seat in Hamilton County also.

Chris Glassburn [00:39:48] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:39:49] OK. And then no change to the to the Senate map in terms of partisan. Correct?

Chris Glassburn [00:39:55] Correct.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:39:56] All right. So that that adds up to a loss of three Republican seats from the previous map. Correct?

Chris Glassburn [00:40:03] Two House and one Senate.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:40:05] Right.

Chris Glassburn [00:40:05] Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:40:06] Yeah. OK. Just a couple other brief questions, Mr. Chairman, I'll be 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 others favors 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 in drawing these districts?

Chris Glassburn [00:40:51] 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, if racial assignment.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:41:13] It's not my question.

Chris Glassburn [00:41:18] We are not seeking to have no diversity of communities in any districts. We are seeking to not have districts that go in narrow strands going half way 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.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:41:50] Follow up, Mr. Chairman? So, yeah, we understand 6C of section 6 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 tried 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 that? That that quality, in fact, is what you tried to use when you were drawing these districts?

Chris Glassburn [00:42:42] I think the- to, the Co-Chairs 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 a representative to represent that much of a line around the county.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:43:22] True.

Chris Glassburn [00:43:23] So we saw it, 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. OK.

Chris Glassburn [00:43:47] 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:44:11] Co-Chairs, Senate President, Yes.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:44:12] OK. Have any of the commission members been in the room to discuss that with any of the, as part of this?

Chris Glassburn [00:44:21] 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:44:43] OK, was there any time when any of the commission members were in there together?

Chris Glassburn [00:44:49] There, not, certainly not more than three, and I don't believe more than two at once.

Chris Glassburn [00:44:56] OK. Representative Russo and Senator Sykes come in and visit with them, with the folks, the seven members, representatives of the commission members.

Chris Glassburn [00:45:07] Leader Russo, to the Co-Chairs 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 actually the Democratic reply map. And then we came back to this public session.

Chris Glassburn [00:45:30] Good, I don't have any other questions. Thank you.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:45:42] Auditor Faber.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:45:44] I don't know that it's specific, that my questions are 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, and 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. 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 6B.

Chris Glassburn [00:46:14] Yes.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:46:14] So we're all in agreement on that.

Chris Glassburn [00:46:16] Yes.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:46:17] 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 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:46:54] To the Co-Chairs and to the Auditor. I do not have any written list of that nature. 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 and compliance with, say, sections 3 and 4. I don't have an inventory of those items. If we had such an inventory, I will tell you we would be in the hundreds, if not thousands of, and so.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:47:26] Okay, 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. 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 our Rep, I'm sorry, 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 got to try and closely compare the whole

map, sorry about that, and then the next is the next is- the next is Section B, and then you've got that we've talked about, this is the ratio and then C is 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?

Chris Glassburn [00:48:28] Correct.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:48:29] We don't just get to pick and choose

Chris Glassburn [00:48:32] To the Co-Chairs, to the Auditor. I firmly agree. As I've alluded to or stated outright, we on the Democratic, or 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.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:49:24] I agree. Final comment?

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:49:26] A point of to reminding members that the main reason Mr. Glassman is here is to answer questions about the map.

Auditor Keith Faber [00:49:33] And I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to, I believe he is one of the most helpful people I've had in this entire process. And so I consider his expertize something that 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 and maps that have been submitted by anyone even, I believe the map that was, the map maker that was cited in the Supreme Court opinion, is I looked at his proposed map. It was not a 54- Mr. Riordan or 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 from 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 disenfranchizing 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, 5, 6, and 7 much more difficult without avoiding splits unnecessarily of counties or or cities or townships or those kind of things. And so I know that's the challenge you have and this, I call them seven brain trust, is trying to work through. And so I thank you for your efforts

Chris Glassburn [00:51:26] 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 is 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 community, egregious steps or community splits to reach that goal. But if the, if these counties, as we were talking about them, are prioritized the way they are, you are forsaking some of your options by making these choices.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:52:21] 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 packet and what's posted on the website. We want to make sure that so that we can continue with good collaboration.

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [00:52:48] Yes, I concur.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:52:51] Any additional questions?

Auditor Keith Faber [00:52:55] This isn't for Mr. Glassburn, this is a question for the rest of the 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. You know, we still have, I assume, Summit County, Cuyahoga County, Northwest Ohio, Dayton. I know I'm forgetting someplace, northeast Ohio, southwest Ohio. At some point we need to get this train on the rails to get ready to land. I know I'm combining trains and airplanes, 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 superintendents that basically says complying with this court's order if it happens on a Saturday, you get to Monday. I don't know whether our date, and 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.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:54:17] 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 will accepted adopting.

Senate President Matt Huffman [00:54:37] Mr. Chairman, on that issue, I guess I'm consulting with my legal counsel. We understand that this is a Saturday deadline. And, 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.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:55:10] Governor DeWine.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:55:12] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Glassman, thank you for your work. I know everybody is working on these maps, is putting in a lot of time. So we're grateful for that. I wonder if you could give us, based on the work that you all have done so far, any kind of timeframe. This 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? Do 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.

Chris Glassburn [00:56:03] To the Co-Chairs, to the 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. That's my sleep. So 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 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.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:57:16] So, if I could just follow up with that. So what you're saying is that 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 nuances and maybe even more of a nuanced difference. Is that right?

Chris Glassburn [00:57:39] To the Co-Chairs and to the Governor. 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. So that-

Governor Mike DeWine [00:58:00] So I don't mean to interrupt you. So what do you need from these seven members?

Chris Glassburn [00:58:07] 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.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:58:48] But we all know that when you get done with each region, they all have to add up, right?

Chris Glassburn [00:58:54] That is not an explicit statement that any of the negotiators have offered us.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:59:02] OK, 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 10 minutes or so ago by Auditor Faber, which is simply these numbers, the goal is to get as 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 it from this seven people about what the goal should be.

Chris Glassburn [00:59:55] To the Co-Chairs, the 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 is not the case-

Governor Mike DeWine [01:00:27] Well that would be my instructions. I know, I haven't heard anybody say it shouldn't be the instructions.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [01:00:36] Leader Russo.

Minority Leader-Elect Rep. Allison Russo [01:00:41] Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. So, Mr. Glassman, to be clear, when we were talking about the 54-46 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?

Chris Glassburn [01:01:06] Four, 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

Minority Leader-Elect Rep. Allison Russo [01:01:19] And as a follow up, has there been discussion or agreement, or useful 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?

Chris Glassburn [01:01:42] The 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 has not been what has been expressed by the other side and has been a direct obstacle in progress.

Minority Leader-Elect Rep. Allison Russo [01:02:01] Thank you.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [01:02:04] 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 will go into recess because our time is short and we want to make sure we provide adequate notice and we will as soon as we can with the meeting is recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Co-Chair Speaker Bob Cupp [01:03:08] At the call of the Chair.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [01:03:11] And the call of the Chair. Any additional questions? If not, the meeting is now adjourned.