Ohio Redistricting Commission 3-27-2022 PART 1 & 2
https://ohiochannel.org/video/ohio-redistricting-commission-3-27-2022

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:00:00] The meeting of the Ohio Redistricting Commission will come to order. We are currently in the meeting, which began on March 26th and was recessed. Without objection the recess meeting will be officially adjourned. Hearing no objection the recessed meeting is now officially adjourned. I now call to order the March 27th, 2022 meeting of the Ohio Redistricting Commission, and I will ask the staff to please call the role

clerk [00:00:32] Co-chair of Speaker Cupp (Present) Co-Chair Senator Sykes (Present) Governor DeWine (present) Auditor Faber (here), President Huffman (here) Secretary LaRose (here) and Leader Russo (here) Mr. Co-Chair a quorum is present.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:00:47] All members of the commission are present, at this time we will have a presentation from the independent mapmakers. They are virtual in room 116 of the Statehouse, and we ask that our audience today refrain from loud noise out of respect for the independent mapmakers and the persons watching the proceedings remotely on the Ohio Channel and commission members, please make sure that your microphone is on when talking and speak into the microphone so that all can hear. This time, I will turn this over to Dr. Johnson and Dr. McDonald and for an update.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:01:30] Thank you co-chair and commissioners. And Dr. Johnson and I will make separate presentations of course, as we have done on. The progress that we've made to date is that we've learned from our last meeting yesterday. We now have two plans that we have checked and verified that they do compile up to Senate plans. And so we've independently done that. We've fine tuned those plans some as well, and they do take different approaches. So we'll discuss those different approaches. And I also had an opportunity to take a look at this swapping out of Union combined with Franklin County, instead using Pickaway and Madison to combine with Franklin. I'll start there first. I know we've shared maps and statistics with you. Just the high level view on that is that it can work. It doesn't substantively affect the proportional balance of the two parties, the number of districts, and it doesn't affect any of the competition or symmetry issues that the court has raised. So it's something that we could do with that plan and with all the other plans. I would also say that while we have done some fine tuning on our our maps, I think if we were really polishing these maps, we could improve county splits and compactness. And do, you know, look for those sorts of things at this point, but we want some guidance from you on the, the point where we have a disagreement about our two maps. And again, just to, I think, fairly characterize our disagreement of trying to do this as best I can because we do have a disagreement. Most of the state, we have different approaches. So our disagreement really centers down in the southeast, excuse me, southwest part of the state and between Montgomery and whether or not you go into Green with the extra district that has to cross over, which is what I do and or into Preble which is what Doug Johnson does. And but we have large amount of agreement, even though we've had different approaches, we have been working through this and adopting each other's approaches throughout the state. And although our symmetry issues, the districts that are contributing to your symmetry are a little bit different in some parts of the state and they they may behave in different ways, you know, by and large were some of that's just more of a function of the different choices that we made in those regions. It's not really a disagreement about how we could do things. And so when I talk about the disagreement that we do have and we do are seeking guidance from you on this, on which direction to go on, we could easily swap out like my approach to

Montgomery with the rest of Doug's map, where you could take my map in whole or we could take my map and swap and Doug's approach where you could in the southwest part of the state, or you could take Doug's approach in whole so, although there are different approaches, I think there's overall there's a lot of agreement between us and there's so on the rest state, it's really a matter of taste as to and again, we're not privy to all of your considerations of how you would approach things and how you think about them. So but I would characterize it more of that sort of your opinion about the rest of the state is really related to that. So I think with that, why don't I just stop before we actually present you with the question that we want to present to you and just see if you have any questions for us at this point?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:05:48] Well, let me just very briefly summarize the three, I guess, four, three maps that they have before them from us. One, the document just to remind you from yesterday that the one the Dr. McDonald two worked on primarily puts Cuyahoga with Lake and then has, as he described the Montgomery with Green. And then the one that I primarily worked on has Cuyahoga with going down to Summit and then has, as you mentioned, Montgomery going to Preble County. And then you have the third map that Dr. McDonald worked quite quickly today to get before you, where you have the House version of it and the Senate.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:06:32] House and Senate

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:06:34] Where Senate versions of Franklin pairing with Madison, Pickaway versus the first two maps of Franklin paired with Union. So those are the three sets of maps, each one having a House and Senate map before you that you have today that kind of highlight the different, the differences and the questions that we run into. So I'm just trying to get here. So with that, we're happy to answer questions you have and then we can get in.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:07:03] Are there questions from the commission for the map drawers? Hearing none, so I guess you might just get in to it all.

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:07:14] Yes.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:07:14] You want to start with your approach?

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:07:19] Sure, I think that the key thing that each of these maps highlights is number one, just choices, some of which I don't think have have huge constitutional or Supreme Court order related questions. They're things like in the map that goes Cuyahoga to Lake you get an extra competitive or even extra democratic district in that area. In the map that goes Cuyahoga to Summit, that last Senate Democratic seat comes in Toledo. It's the second seat in Toledo instead of just one. So we end up with the same number of Democratic seats in both the House and Senate maps kind of the magic number that's been referred to. It's just on the Senate side. It's in a different part of the state than where we where they do differ is in the symmetry side. The Cuyahoga with Lake, I get you one more competitive Republican seat, essentially a safe Republican seat comes down into the the competitive range, which improves the symmetry. All the other places, we're actually where we both on that and in the latest versions is in Mahoning. We get to there's a second map in the Cuyahoga to Summit, the second, I'm sorry, the second competitive Republican seat in the Cuyahoga, the summit map by making changes purely within Mahoning County or in the case of the Cuyahoga to Lake, make it to a third competitive Republican seat.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:09:07] Actually, it's a Democratic seat in my map, so it's really right on the cusp. You can either make some very minor changes and you could go either way with that particular district. Yeah.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:09:19] And and that really highlight that in some of the other places highlight the question that we raised before and we posed to you. And it's one of the questions we have for you, which is the tradeoff between compactness and and partisan balance and symmetry. So I think that the court order is very clear on the magic number. You know, we need to hit the 45/54 and the 18/15, and we need to have good symmetry as well. But when we get into the do, we have three, we have two or three or four competitive Republican seats versus three or four Democratic seats. Does compactness come into that decision? I think the court made very clear in its earlier rulings when it was when there were five or eight competitive Democratic seats and no competitive Republican seats. You know, regardless of compactness, that was not acceptable. But when we start getting into these ranges of three, one or two, the then how far can we go in the compactness question to achieve better symmetry? So that's a key question that we have a disagreement on, and we look for your direction and on that question. Then as you may recall, we have the the pending question from the last meeting that you were. I don't know if the mediation has happened or not, but about whether you wish to share with us the Senate addresses and have us do that Section 5 analysis or not. Any other questions?

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:11:06] I don't know if it came up in the mediation, but I did raise the question last time about the 20, 52 to 55 percent range and what we may wish to approach from on those ranges. Comments last yesterday that we were to disregard any districts there are key primary focus should be in the 48 to 52 percent partisan index range. But if there is any guidance further that you wish to get to us than that, then we'd like to hear it.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:11:42] And then actually the comment about the last meeting triggers, we should report back to you that the Cuyahoga to Lake and map that Dr. McDonald prepared does meet Senator Huffman's request for the the Northeast to have the the 7 counties and 21 seats and 7 Senate seats in that area, that that is, that is embodied in that Cuyahoga to Lake Map

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:12:07] and I know we're like going back and forth. But just to add one more thing, I yesterday when we talked about this, I characterized or we characterize, someone did. That the district that went from Cuyahoga to Lake is a competitive district, and it has a local boundary split because I've found another opportunity to create a competitive democratic district elsewhere. I decided to no longer have that to be a competitive seat, and I now that that district, as it spans the two counties, no longer splits any localities in that area.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:13:02] So we have a pretty good summary, I think I think we're both comfortable with that summary of where we're at and the questions and directions we're looking at from you. We we do not have a combined map, as you're aware, getting these maps prepared and ready to present to you when right down to the wire for this meeting. So we did get them done for this meeting, but we did not have time to then negotiate and go through and come to any kind of agreement of one joint map, in part because we're looking for direction from you on these questions that may be better answered by the commission than by us.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:13:40] Leader Russo,

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:13:43] Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. I do have a question for you in terms of you're talking about some of the trade offs, you know, making the decision to do the Cuyahoga/Lake pairing versus Cuyahoga/Summit County pairing. And you indicated that there might be some trade off, potentially with compactness. And you know, I will note that, you know, compactness is weighted equally 6C as the Constitution is 6A and B. So some of these issues around symmetry certainly, the proportionality issue is all related to meeting the requirements of 6A. But when you say that, what do you mean? Are that? I mean, are these huge trade offs, small trade offs? And you know, I would also note that to my knowledge, at least in any of the decisions that I've read, you know, the court hasn't raised issues so far about compactness. So we just assume that that has been met and not an issue previously. So can you just talk about that a little bit in when we talk about compactness, another overall map, compactness, scores, et cetera. Can you explain that just a little bit?

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:14:59] Can I first could answer that question? Because I haven't had a chance to talk about what I think is the issue in Montgomery and Greene County. I think that if you look at the map that I provided you and I can blow it up and we can look at it in more detail. And if you compare it to Dr. Johnson's map, I am absolutely convinced that it is more compact than his map. I don't know if someone wishes to argue with that. That's fine. But I do think I have a compact solution that creates a another competitive Republican district in that 48 to 52 range. So it's it's and that district, that's the difference between our maps. Dr. Johnson has three Democratic leaning districts in that range and two Republican. I have three Democratic and three Republican there. Some of them are coming from different parts of the state, but that's when we come down to it. And this is where we have had. Our disagreement is that he believes that my district is somehow non-compact. And again, I I think if we show them to you, I think you would agree with me that there is no trade off here and that indeed, because between Greene and Montgomery County, you have six districts. You not only is there no compactness issue with the House districts, it also creates two very compact Senate districts because you can create two, sit two Senate districts entirely contained within those two counties. So I just want to make clear that Dr. Johnson believes that there is a compactness issue here and that somehow this compactness issue is driving a trade off between the competition. I do not believe that in the least. I believe very strongly that are you in this case, you can have your cake and eat it too, because I think you get both compact solution and a solution that creates that third district that will give us even symmetry around for three Democratic and three Republican seats.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:17:07] Yeah, I would say one just is that as you as you all are extremely aware, this is a very fast moving process. And literally, we finished getting the maps ready just shortly before this meeting. So we haven't run, you know, compactness reports and compared the numbers on compactness yet and done those kinds of quantitative analysis. Now, compactness is not a purely quantitative measure. You can certainly with what they euphemistically call the intraocular test, meaning you just look at it and see what you think is a valid is one valid measure compactness. But we can do a systematic approach of looking at maps. We can give you specific numbers. You know, we have a disagreement over them, the Montgomery/Greene thing that you know, when we look at the full ripples and analyze the compactness of all the districts that get touched by that it it is an interesting question whether it will end up being better or worse. Certainly, the the district in my map is not competitive Green is much more compact than the

competitive district that crosses over, Dr. McDonald could be right that it could be offset by another district. We don't know at this point because we have not had the chance to do that analysis of the whole map. And you know, and if you would like to see it, we can show you that the Mahoning switch is a good example of the trade off since it's really simple. It's two districts in one county. You draw them one way and they're significantly more compact. But neither one is competitive. You change them and one becomes competitive. There's it can either go all the way to a competitive D seat, or it can just go to be a competitive R seat, depending on the mix you need for the rest of the state. But if you'd like to see one example of where we can show that, but it really is, I think Dr. McDonalds is right, ultimately, it's a overall picture of the ripples that come out of this. But I think overall more competitive districts well or a more competitive Republican districts to bring you better symmetry is going to decrease your compactness. In my my opinion, Dr. McDonald disagrees and could be right once we had more time to dig into it. But my belief is that it does lead to more to less compactness. So the court has been very clear that in a total in a near total lack of symmetry, which the earlier plans had. That greatly outweighed compactness. Now, as we get closer to perfect symmetry, I think compactness becomes more of a consideration in the balancing of six figures to succeed. And so that's where I think the question is posed to, you know, how to handle, how to handle that tradeoff, whether you want us to get to symmetry and then, as Dr. MacDonald's saying, just kind clean up where we can without impacting symmetry that can be your direction. Or if there is a concern that maybe going to perfect symmetry is, well, perfect symmetry among the competitive seats is going too far. If without really a district by district, look at the ripple effect of on compactness of that change. But that was a long winded answer. I hope that.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:20:28] I want to make clear. We could take Dr. Johnson's map for the rest of the state and implement it and plop in this section of the southwest corner of the state. Because, you know, there will be some issues about how you go about balancing some districts. I mean, but for the most part, this is isolated. This is a very isolated approach. We take a very similar approach in Hamilton County, for example, a very similar approach in the rest of the south part of the state. So it's this is a choice. It's very much concentrated in this one area. On if if you think that Dr. Johnson has taken a good compact approach to the rest of the state, that's fine. And we but we could we really do need guidance because I'm not going to give up on this on this district in Greene and Montgomery, I believe not only is it on adhering to the requirement to have symmetry, but it is also more compact than the the version that Dr. Johnson has produced. And I'm happy to show it to you. I firmly believe that this district, you will look at it and you will realize the impact on the Senate districts and you will will realize that this is a compact solution, not just for the House districts, but for the Senate districts.

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:21:50] Co-Chair Sykes, thank you, co-chair of the independent made drawers have outlined, you know, several decisions that we need to make in order for them to continue to make progress. They have made significant progress, but we have just one day left and I think we should just look at the outline that they've presented to us and take it one at a time and see and proceed to make decisions so that we can give them the guidance they need to complete this project by sometime tomorrow. That is my suggestion. First, we outline each of their points and then and then decide on what guidance we want to give them on each of the items.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:22:42] Further discussion, it would seem to me that we're not going to be able to be make very useful decisions unless we do see the outlines. And it may be that we also need to take a look at the statistics as well. So I think you said you're able to blow up these areas to to show us because all I have is a little tiny map and

I can't even quite, it's actually kind of blurry. So if you could, why don't you start with whichever one you want to start with? And let's take a look.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:23:17] Sure, I'll be happy to go first, because I do believe that this is a good solution, so again, we're looking in the to move some zoom around just for a second. Excuse me. All right. So here we go. As I said, there are six districts that fit within Montgomery and Greene. These irregularities that you're seeing have solely to do with local political boundaries, which we know in Ohio are not compact. So this is compliance with the Constitution to get these shapes and the district in question is this District 38, this 48.6, if I can, you know, blow up it a little bit more on this 48.6 is the partisan performance of that district, so it fits within the 48 to 52 range. That's 48 percent democratic performance, which has been going on that because the focus has been more on the democratic. So that's why we did Democratic. We could have flipped around as a Republican, but that's what this is. It's a forty eight point six percent Democratic performance district, so that makes it a competitive Republican district. And then in the Senate map, right?

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:24:40] I mean, which? Which district? Number, and I don't know if you have ability.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:24:45] It's this District 38, it's this [speaking simultaneously]

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:24:47] its not visible from where I'm sitting. As to what the district numbers are,

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:24:52] yeah, it's unfortunately it's [inaudible]. So I can't I'd have to make the font much bigger on the if you want. But it's it's this one that crosses the boundary, the border. It's the only one that can that will cross the border. So it's takes a portion of Montgomery and it crosses over onto the northern part of Greene County.

State Auditor Keith Faber [00:25:14] It would be the light blue.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:25:16] It's this light blue. It yeah, Maptitude chooses its colors for you automatically so. There's also a kind of light blue off in the western part, and that's where we're going to see the difference between Dr Johnson's approach, and it's probably best for just for him to show it to you rather than for me to characterize it. But this is this is my approach. Again you get two nice compact Senate districts in this by combining three House districts, you know, twice, so you get three and three. So you get two Senate districts here as well. I could show those, but I think you can. You've got the other map and you can take a look at yourself, they're bigger districts, because they're conglomerates of three districts.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:26:01] I just want to ask Dr. McDonald to clarify one thing you said this shapes. These are driven by the local jurisdictions. I don't think fifty-nin...39 isn't, is it?

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:26:10] Yeah, that's totally driven by, yeah, it's locality boundaries.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:26:14] That Dayton That's the city of Dayton.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:26:20] But, yeah, I mean, it's there has to be a split of Dayton. So yes, but the reason why it's funneled in like that is because of Dayton. Yes.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:26:31] But District 39 is not following any local jurisdiction borders.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:26:35] Yeah on the northern half of it it is,

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:26:36] Oh yeah, north, but the south is...[speaking simultaneously]

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:26:38] it's not, no.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:26:38] ...the south, and it's not. I mean, this is a good example of this. The southern portion 39 is purely looking that way for, yeah, for competitiveness reasons or simply symmetry,

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:26:54] Symmetry reasons actually, that's not competitiveness reasons that symmetry reasons for 39, 38 is in, you know, entirely local boundaries there, except where it needs to bleed over for population balance. And I don't even mean I can pull up that.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:27:09] Yeah. Why don't you put the county subdivision lines on.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:27:12] The county subdivision lines. I don't think it's it's, you know, it is coming into Dayton for that purpose, right? But I'm trying to take it in in a reasonable manner.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:27:25] I agree. I just want to highlight that you're definitely right the north of that District 39 is driven by the odd parts of the north of 39 are certainly local jurisdiction borders, but where 40, 39, and 38 come together is purely for symmetry reasons. That is that.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:27:43] Yeah, that's right. It's not competition that's driving that particular choice, or. No,.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:27:48] It's symmetry, right?

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:27:49] Symmetry. No, it's it's the proportionality. So if I can't get, I have to balance out 39 and 41 because they're also highly competitive. They're at 52.2 And 52.5 percent. So I've got, you know, there's trying to balance out as best as I can, so I know I can get to proportional seats in there as well.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:28:16] No, I agree. And I think this is a good this and appreciate him walking through this. And it is a good illustration of. This undeniably improves the symmetry by adding another Republican competitive seat, and you get a very different shape. So let me, for comparison, show you the other one. And this is the other map, and. So you can see where in that map there's a seat coming down from. Let me make my numbers bigger. Sorry with that, one second. So in this case, Greene is completely separate, as you can see. So 70 is a very safe Republican district entirely and Greene 35 is a fit. The numbers are the district number in the Democratic average share of the vote. So you get a 53.8, 53.8t and then a 62.8. So there's no nothing close to a

competitive Republican district here, fully admit that. But this is where we disagree on that, the how compactness is driving it. Thirty seven does have the the piece coming down similar to the northern piece of the district, Dr. McDonald was just showing. But that is following the the township orders, there you see, the red lines are that the township and city and village lines. And so that does explain it, but instead it stops. It actually does follow the local jurisdiction line instead of coming all the way across and cutting Dayton in half, as is the other map does in order to give the other map is putting thirty five in Dayton and then over in the Greene, Greene County. Instead of pulling the extra population from this county into Greene, this map is taking the western portion of Montgomery county and taking it over into Preble and then down south. So as we zoom out, this is to present all the sites that you can see instead of having all the districts contained in Montgomery and Greene. This approach does lead to one House seat leaving Greene and going out to Fayette and Clinton, and in the Senate district, similarly is Greene, Fayette, Clinton and then it continues to the south and then the western side of Montgomery County with Preble goes down in the Butler. So that portion of Butler, Preble, that portion of Montgomery and then Miami make up the Senate district. So he's right. Containing Montgomery and Greene and all the districts within them as they show up at work and his map. He does get a competitive Republican district that does improve symmetry there. But I think you can see where we disagree on our interpretation and our and our view of compactness and in how the districts match up there, which is why we're we're bringing it to you two to have any direction you might share.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:31:35] So please notice that Dr. Johnson doesn't care a bit about the non compact portion that he in Butler and he's creating that he's forced to create by his solution. He doesn't, you know, he can't create three nice Senate districts that are within these two counties. He's got this Trenton addition. So I would argue, I think, quite correctly, that the solution that I have overall is much more compact than this solution that Dr. Johnson is providing you. If I could, can I share something else with him because I want to show them my Preble district? OK

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:32:16] Of course. But just let me answer that point.

State Auditor Keith Faber [00:32:18] Can I just help you with pronounciation. It's Preb-le, not Pray-ble

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:32:21] Preble, Sure. My apologies to the people there, the good citizens there.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:32:25] Just just to highlight on that one quick point that the borders down here of 44, 46, 39, 45 all exactly follow the local city, village and township lines. So where there is any bit of non compactness, that is because the local jurisdictions are non-compact, there's no no choices or divisions or, or symmetry questions driving any compactness issues down here.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:33:03] But there is a solution that gets a much more compact. So if I can share that and show them the I'm going to mispronounce it again Preble.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:33:11] Preble

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:33:19] Preble, [inaudible background wispering from commission members] So I will back out a little bit and show you what I do. I don't have to do that. I don't have to take that portion out. So my my western district here is entirely

composed of two entire whole counties and two very square townships. So I have nothing of that on a non compact configuration for that district that is Preble,

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:33:50] Except that the odd shaped pieces from that you were saying in my piece are in District 48 in this map.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:33:57] Well, again, it's also affecting 47 because these these things can't be done independently. And so the district that you are forced to draw there is a district that is non-compact because you've got to have certain amount of population there. I don't have to have that population. So I'm able to get it two whole counties where you have to go in and start doing these, splitting out the towns and the cities in order to get to your target population, I don't have to do that. So again, I feel very strongly that the solution that I have here is very compact compared to the solution that Dr. Johnson is presenting to you.

[00:34:41] So you can see we have a disagreement, as I mentioned, we have not had the time to run the compactness reports, so you can make a decision without having the statistical numbers and compactness. You can wait until we have those numbers to add to this description, but we we welcome your direction on this.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:35:03] I think Russo leader, Russo was first.

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:35:09] Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen. Just so that I have in my head. So the differences here seem to be that one option going into Greene County essentially adds another competitive Republican district, correct? Another Republican district addressing some of the issues and concerns about symmetry. The compactness question seems to be a bit of a question mark to me because, you know, frankly, as I look at it, I think going into Greene County, you know, especially once we consider the impacts on the Senate district seem to make more sense. But I think the bigger question also that I have, and I'm just recalling back from some of the public meetings that we had in this particular area is that when this issue was actually debated at those public meetings and there was a lot of response from the public in combining Montgomery, a Montgomery County district with Greene County, because those communities of essentially, you know, because of urban and suburban sprawl have gone into the Greene County District set, for example, Beaver Creek, as opposed to that, seems to make more sense than I think having some portions of Dayton go into Preble County, which is very rural. So to me, just even from a community. Just thinking about what makes sense from a community perspective, going into Greene County seems to make more sense.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:36:50] Senator Huffman,.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:36:54] Yeah, this is a I guess, just a sort of a general question, you both use the word compactness or I guess words compact compactness study, and I guess there is the eye test. I I picked up that part. But is there some? Academic measure or scientific formula or something like that, that is we I've heard of that, but I don't I've heard of a couple of names, but what is the calculation that you would do for, that?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:37:32] We actually have been talking about that the last couple days. One of the challenges is there's what you say, there's 30 some odd calculations,.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:37:39] 100 I think is what someone has actually identified.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:37:42] Yeah, there's there's probably three to five that are the most commonly cited in part because they're just the fastest to run. And so what typically is done and weigh in if you disagree with me on this, what's typically done is you run the three or four or five tests and see if they consist. Generally, they will consistently come out identifying districts as compact or not compact. There are certainly certain shapes that will kind of stump one formula or another in that, and that's where you really are left with just the eye test. But yes, there are three or four or five tests we can run that will give you numbers. And if they all or almost all agree on what is considered compact or not compact, they're very handy just forewarn you, sometimes they don't all agree, and then they don't really help you very much in looking in a certain district, do you agree with that?

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:38:38] Yeah, they all measured different aspects of what people think of as compactness. So usually courts will just come down to does it look compact to me? I mean, that's basically what it has. And I I'm not familiar with Ohio's Supreme Court decisions on compactness. I don't believe that there are any of that explicitly tell us, give us guidance as to which measure would be appropriate for the state of Ohio. Some states do have it in their constitutions, a specific measure. Some have been interpreted by courts to require a certain measure, but that, to my knowledge, I don't believe that that is the case in Ohio.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:39:18] Co-Chair Sykes,

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:39:20] thank you, co-chair. It was you all's strategy to convince us that you don't you don't always disagree. You don't always agree. Believe me, you've done that today, you. But you know, I would think that the pairing would that in Greene County with the idea of creating one more competitive Republican seat would be my vote. And I just think we ought to try to move with it as if we can, as diligent as we can to try to resolve this issue. It seems that there definitely have convinced us that they're at an impasse themselves and they're reaching to us to resolve this issue and they need it to move on. So I'm suggesting Mr. Co-Chair here that we devise a process to move forward.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:40:20] Yeah, I think devising a process is a key part of this because from here, looking at the map up there and looking at our little map here, it's which is even blurry. It's really kind of hard to tell what all is involved with, even without the with, particularly without the political subdivision lines mapped in. And then there's the whole question of, you know, the the the the the partisan Index and whether or not these are sort of the kind of a uniform mix or whether you have, you know, very strong Democrat part that's mixed in with a very strong Republican part, which means you have sort of a real clash rather than you have a community of interest. So, so a process to sort of figure that out rather than simply here on the spur of the moment seems to me to be the prudent thing to do. But I am open to what others might think. So it may. So I think what would make me comfortable is if I had a blowup of that section with the political subdivision in it and the statistics in it and and have a little bit of time here tonight to to take a look at that one. And then we have what, two more as well. So I don't know whether we need to, you know, should probably have all of that together. Go through these and then look at it. And if we have come back, we have some questions we can ask and then maybe make some determination. I think we're in the process where of course, nothing is final until everything is final. So it doesn't it doesn't impede coming back and taking another look at this. I would think so. That's my thoughts on it. I certainly like to hear what other members of the commission want to do. Co-Chair Sykes,

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:42:30] Mr. co-chair. You know, I think that, you know, we don't have very many days left in just one day, in fact. So, you know, I'm committed and I think we all are committed to making decisions on on to give them the guidance that they need. So I think we need to take whatever time is necessary to go through this so that we can give them the guidance so they can continue to work to completion.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:42:58] And I'm certainly willing to do that tonight. Once we go through all of these, get the maps, get the statistics, get an hour or two recess and we can come back and make a decision.

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:43:12] OK.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:43:13] I mean, that's my thought. I don't know what the rest of the members want to do.

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:43:18] Mr Co-Chair would agree with that. That would be afford us a pathway to continue to work.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:43:29] Anybody else? Silence?

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:43:31] No, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you. I mean, maybe we can resolve the other issue that we negotiated through mediation. We can let folks know that in addition and I have an additional question which can be not, doesn't need to be answered until tomorrow, but something that I'd like to have.

[00:43:54] So, see, I thought we'd get the report from the independent map drawers. And and we can move on to the other other part. So that is, as I understand it, Montgomery county is one. There's also Cuyahoga and Franklin County, I think. Or is there Franklin County, Auditor Faber,

State Auditor Keith Faber [00:44:24] just going back to to Mr. President Huffman's comment. I am concerned that by complying with the agreement that we reached on the locations, it may change the two analysis. And so they may want to see those addresses and figure out what they can do with that when they're trying to figure out some of these other disputes. And so that may change where they go from that perspective.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:44:55] Right, I think it's a that's a reasonable point, do we want to move on, take a look at Cuyahoga pairing with Lake or Summit I think? Representative Russo, er, Leader Russo

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:45:10] Well, I would like to caution us in that because again, we we want to be very clear that we don't taint decisions of mapmakers in terms of complying with the Constitution based on incumbent addresses. So I think that the, you know, the consensus that we came to address that concern, inserting that before, I think this decision is made would change that. And that would not be the consensus agreement that we came to. That said, you know, it may be possible that there are versions of the map because it, my understanding of this issue is it it's pretty isolated in its impact. So you can have a combined version that goes one way combined version that goes the other way. But in, it's pretty concentrated within that area so that it doesn't have

impacts on the rest of the state. Is that correct? For a combined map, once you do a map, merge.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:46:16] Which issue are you talking about are you talking about the [speaking simultaneously]

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:46:18] So the Montgomery, no the Montgomery, Greene County, Montgomery, Preble County issue. It's isolated, correct?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:46:26] Yes, it doesn't ripple up to say, Franklin County or into Toledo, but it pretty much everything on that west end of the state as Dr. McDonald was just showing with the Senate districts and then down in the south. We're very similar in Hamilton, so it doesn't really ripple into Hamilton very much. But but essentially everything from Hamilton to Toledo to the edge of Franklin and not into Toledo or Franklin.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:46:57] I think ideally for us, you would pick one of the two maps and we would just move forward on that map, but it would be possible to take one version of the map and cut this out. Cookie cutter it out and plop it in whatever direction that the commission wishes to go for the Montgomery/Greene issue. So Dr. Johnson's right, this is isolated, are issues elsewhere, I think we were in agreement on how to approach that either one of our approaches are going to comply with the Constitution and the court to best our ability in the limited time that we have. So it really just comes down to for us, I think it's this decision, and I do agree that if you do wish to look at the incumbents, but I don't know if that's what you wish to do. It may be somewhat advantageous for us to look at our two approaches and see which would be best to accomplish that goal. But my preference is that we just take one map and start running with it, and it may be. There's still adjustments that could be made. We can still make improvements. We know that we've talked with your mapping consultants and your staff, and they are in agreement with us. That's one of the reasons why we haven't run these compactness reports is because we we kind of know that it's kind of for the whole statewide compactness. It's meaningless in some respects at this point. That's what the consultants have been saying. Doug.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:48:38] So I think it's our job to evaluate these things, not to take the staff's word for it

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:48:43] And you've said you already said it here in this very meeting, so now you're you're you're disagreeing with yourself. You said earlier that, you know, we're going to continue to work on these maps and that we're going to fine tune them like this so.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:48:56] That has nothing to do with taking the staff's word on that the maps or compact.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:49:02] No, that we can improve the compactness.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:49:04] Oh, OK.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:49:05] That we're not done, and so a compact overall compactness of the map right at this moment is a bit misleading because we know that if we're given more time to continue working on this map, we can take advantage of certain aspects and look at some alternatives. And again, look at the incumbent locations. That's not going to be necessarily on that. We could accommodate those sorts of things. So. But

the most important thing for I think for us is that we're here now at seven p.m. on and we have a limited amount of time tonight and then a limited amount of time tomorrow. So if I, from my perspective, anyone who wants to come down and take a look at the maps, I'm we're happy to walk you through and you could see it up close and we could pan around. You could see it. I know we could bring some of the commissioners in. I think some of the commissioners already have an idea of what they want to do on how they would vote on the maps. So maybe they don't need to come down here and maybe it's like a short recess. We could show you and give you the information you need to see and then you could get back into session and vote on the maps. So that would be my recommendation on to you on how I think we could best accommodate your interests and being able to view the maps rather than produce some maps, print them out given to you, produce reports. Everything else, we can do that right here in the room.

[00:50:39] Yes I would agree, we're happy to address whatever the needs, however, the commission wishes, whether you want to come down to look at them or whether you want us to run the numbers and give you those numbers where we're at your discretion.

Co-Chairs [00:50:58] [inaudible off-mic wispering]

State Auditor Keith Faber [00:51:35] Are we holding up on whether we're going to give them recommendations on Dayton or Cleveland, if we are, I'm for the the the Greene County, but I want to see some other stuff before we get to that.

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [00:51:48] Are we are we? Could we take a poll of people?

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:51:54] Well, well, I was just going to ask if there's other comments here from the commission members. Senator Huffman.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:52:01] Thanks. I appreciate that. I think what you've identified is, well, there's three or four key questions that are locations that we need questions answered. And I'm I don't know enough about the House districts. I know enough about Senate districts because, well, because I'm in the Senate, I guess. And but these look, there are a lot of different Senate districts. It's not just in Hamilton County, in northeast Ohio. I mean, these these two Senate maps are extraordinarily different. You know, the Terry Johnson, I'll call it that it's district T on one map and then it's split up between G and Y. On the other map. But those four counties have been paired together in all three of the Republican maps that the commission passed in both of the Democratic maps that were passed. And Mr Johnson has that same district drawn. Mr McDonnell doesn't. However, Mr McDonald has the same northeast. I shouldn't say same but general footprint that we adopted in the third commission map. Mr Johnson doesn't. So I mean. Are these look really, really different, not just different in three or four places? Could you react to that?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:53:38] Yes, Senator Huffman, you're correct that the challenge in this is was not very coherently trying to discuss on the Montgomery/Greene question is that there's a lot of people in a lot of districts right there in Montgomery and Greene in the Dayton area. And then there's and the impacts of what happened in those house districts, as you can see, impact the Senate districts there as well. Once the Senate districts start getting touche, well, you just need to impact two or three Senate districts and you're up to, you know, Hancock and Putnam County, and you're over to Ross and Vinton County. And so in those either for lack of a better word, the circle around Franklin, those all the small

counties that are between Franklin and Greene and between, you know, Franklin and and Stark, those get impacted immensely and rotated around immensely, depending on which decisions you make in each region. The key thing in why we don't focus on them all that much is it is two things. Number one, they're they're all fairly small counties So they are from a map makers perspective, from our perspective, for the most part, fairly straightforward to move around. And they're fairly flexible. As you know, part of our description is independent. We are not familiar with the past maps. We are not familiar with the senators and the history and the ties of all that. So when we look at it from the constitutional factors, these these counties can move around a lot other than Section 5, obviously, that we're not looking at at this point. But yes, as we move those around, those are big changes, they're just not big constitutional changes other than Section 5, but they are big community changes, as you know.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:55:31] And just to also underscore something, it takes time to look at those changes. So if if you want us to explore how we can improve Section 5, then we need to get working on that. And if we need to take. So again, I we have a clock and I just really want to implore upon you that we really need guidance from you. We sought that yesterday. I'm begging you today to give us guidance.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:56:09] Senator Huffman follow up.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:56:12] Yeah, I appreciate the time factor here, and I noticed that you both used letters versus numbers and you're both aware, aren't you, that these term limited and excuse me, midterm senators, the 16 elected senators are not only entitled to represent a district that has the largest population who elected them. You know that part, right? Yes.

map makers [00:56:42] Yes.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:56:42] And and that their district has is has to have its requirement in the Constitution that it has the same number, district number. You know, that's also a requirement.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:56:56] Yes, that's actually why we use the letters because we don't know where the senators live and we're not looking at the current map. As part of this drawing, we use the letters as a signal that that step is still there still lies down the road.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:57:09] Ok, All right. Very good.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:57:17] Auditor Faber,

State Auditor Keith Faber [00:57:23] I just and again, I go back to this Dayton state and split where you split it four times and I'm having a tough time, and maybe this is something that one of our staff or experts can help me with. How are we complying with section 3D of the Constitution by splitting Dayton four times? Isn't there generally a presumption that where you've got a city that's bigger than one representation, you put as many communities within that representation as possible before doing splits? It seems to me like you're unnecessarily splitting a municipality to get a desired result, but again. I think that's a question that I have on how we do that.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:58:04] We relied upon your staff who have told us that if the locality is below the threshold to have a single district within sight of it, then you are free to split it as many times as you feel necessary to do so.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:58:24] Well, let me.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:58:25] Generally what her rule has been.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:58:28] Let me agree with the conclusion but clarify how we got to that, which is there is there is a provision saying you are to attempt to minimize the splits about that size, but it's not required like it is for others. So in the goal of hitting the the magic number and achieving symmetry, we have felt that that over weighted the attempts to minimize the over numbers, overall numbers. But so I think we're at the same conclusion. We're not disagreeing on that. But the how we got there is that balance of the court order and the constitutional provision versus the attempt to language.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:59:04] And I would suspect, though, if we tried to draw a single district for Akron or any of these places, there's so many other local local government units around those that it it's really hard to put the puzzle pieces together. It really is. So I don't even know what you're suggesting if you were to order us to look at this and try to resolve Akron in a single district. I don't even know if it's feasible to do it, given how the puzzle pieces have to fit together.

State Auditor Keith Faber [00:59:39] Which? Mr. Chair is exactly the issue that we're struggling with. Again, just my guidance to you from my perspective, is you are to comply with Article two, three, four or five and seven. And attempt to comply with Article 6A, 6B and 6C, you don't get a choice on complying with two, three, four or five and seven. And so. I'm going to have to have a clear understanding of these, these issues as we move forward. But where you can draw an entire district within a municipality or city, I think that's what the Constitution says you're supposed to do. Maybe I'm misreading this, but I just went back and reread it. And it's when you have communities that are less than those totals that you get to split them or you have split rules. But maybe I'm missing this and I'm happy to have a conversation with staff to get a clear understanding of this from a legal opinion

Dr. Michael McDonald [01:00:40] Akron's the only community that's split. And so I, as you're suggesting, we're probably going to have to split other localities so it becomes a choice of where you're going to go with the splits. And so I again, these puzzle pieces don't fit together very well. So the geography is extremely challenging in Ohio. So I, we could spend some time doing it. I think we could. Um, not get a map out and could spend some time doing it, but I don't think there's enough time for us at this point to explore all of these options that you're presenting us with.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:01:24] Mr. Co-Chair.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:01:28] First

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [01:01:29] Sure, I just want to clarify that Section 3D-3 says one split per district only it's it's not about one split in a city, but it's one split per district. And so when we talk about some of these larger cities, if you try to do what the Senate or Auditor Faber is suggesting, then you get into multiple splits of other localities within the district. So that is the balance there. So it is still absolutely achieving the

requirements of the Constitution and that section in particular. So I just want to clarify that that is what the requirement is.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:02:09] Senator Huffman,.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:02:10] Thank you. Have either of you done a count of the number of county splits in the number of local jurisdiction splits in either the Senate or the House map?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:02:27] I have not.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:02:29] No, and as we have mentioned, we believe that once we can get direction from you, we can start working on seeing how we can minimize those issues and improve compactness. It's hard for us to know what to do at this point without your direction.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:02:55] All right, so we've taken a look at Montgomery. Where else, where do you want to go next? Map drawers

Dr. Michael McDonald [01:03:06] Well, and it's really up to you as far as I see it, I mean, our this is our only point where we have differences in terms of the substantive issues that in our respect that the court has presented to us. On the other, when the Constitution, the others are just a matter of choice between you. So as I see it, I mean, do you wish to go combine Cuyahoga with Lake? Or do you wish to combine with the district crossover into Summit on when we show that that we can show you those maps. But I'm also sensitive to the fact that you've already said that you can't see these over the television screen. So I I think if the maps of that we provide you are not sufficient. Probably the most efficient use of our time at this point is for you to come down here and we can show you what the differences are on a big screen. And you can see and you can ask us to point around on the map where these differences are.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:04:21] If you're like we can Cuyahoga you as much as we can on these screens and you can make a determination whether that gives you enough of the big picture. I think Cuyahoga is a bigger picture question for you. It's not down to how is Dayton split like, like Montgomery was, but. Whatever your preferences, but we were happy to show it now or have you come down whatever is your preference?

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:04:47] Is this 40 for the count for the Senate now? Wow,.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:04:53] All right. So I think my preference would take a quick look at it on the big screen here and then we can maybe follow up with by either coming down. I guess I'm I'm not so good at working on things on the screen. I like to see them, you know, in a static form, but maybe others are able to do that. So.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:05:18] We do have the color printer down here. If you want to take a brief break, we could print out an in-depth F11 zoomed in on that area if that would be useful for you.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:05:28] That's a. My question, are you able to zoom in on an area and print it out, so it's big enough? I mean, it doesn't have I mean, if you have, you have a zoom in area that's, you know, eight and a half by 11. That's probably good

enough. I don't mean a huge map. I just need something where you can distinguish between these and see the political subdivision lines.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:05:50] Yes, I think in 15/20 minutes we could zoom in on issues areas and and have those for you.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:05:58] Senator Huffman, Senator Huffman.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:05:59] I hope

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:05:59] Well I don't, I just I want to get back to this local splits issue and I Section 3 D of the Constitution, Section 3D-3 says. Not more than one municipal corporation or township may be split per representative district. That's a constitutional requirement. There's no maybe this, maybe that close to anything like that that is a constitutional requirement. So do you know, as do either of, you know, as you sit here, whether Mr. McDonald knows about his map or Mr. Johnson knows about his map in those 99 state representative districts? Have you considered or calculated what whatever term you want to use, whether those 99 districts have more than one municipal corporation or township divided?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:07:13] We we certainly have been considering that and working hard to avoid that. I can't promise that we haven't had an inadvertent slip. As you know, many of these particular municipal corporations have some very odd borders. So I think this is what Dr. McDonald was referring to. We haven't done the like run the computer reports go through block by block and confirm them. But as we've been drawing, these have been aware of that requirement and working hard to comply with it. And we believe we have to complied with it.

Dr. Michael McDonald [01:07:45] And and your consultants and staff have been looking at these issues as we have been mapping and they have pointed them out to us where we have made those mistakes or errors there. It's also important understand there's an interpretation of the Constitution, so the reports will be a bit meaningless. And so in that interpretation is, is that like, for example, in the extreme with a locality like Columbus, you've got a city that has multiple small pieces that that are all over the place. They're embedded in other localities they without, you know, their noncontiguous, are not attached to the city. That's very common throughout the state. Columbus is just an extreme example of it. You've got a city that also crosses county boundaries. And so those pieces where they're fragmented in that way are treated differently. They're not considered to be part of the whole. They are part of the fragment. And so the interpretation is, is that we can put those but on the software that we use doesn't, doesn't know that they don't know which pieces go together like that. And so the reports that we would produce will be highly misleading because they are they'll count any of these pieces that are all over the state as a split, even though they're not treated as a split when we are actually doing the mapping.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:09:29] OK and Mr. Mr. Co-Chair, just those exceptions to the rule. But just I want to quibble about language. Those aren't interpretations. Those are specific exceptions listed in the Constitution. The city of I think it's Bellevue, Ohio, lies in four different counties. But if you split it in all the four counties, it's not counted as a split. For purposes of Section 3D-3 and just some of the townships in Franklin County, there's bits and pieces all over. Those aren't splits Bexley's wholly within the city of Columbus. So I get that, but that does not mean that we can otherwise violate that specific provision of the Constitution. I think you both know that. And I guess this is the

the difficulty in producing a map that doesn't violate the Constitution cannot be overstated here. And the difficulty that you two gentlemen have been presented with in a short period of time. Some have said mapmakers here locally have said and others people nationally that Ohio has the most complicated redistricting rules in the country. Maybe that's just an overstatement because we're all from Ohio and we're proud of that? I'm not sure. But anyway, so I know that it's extraordinarily difficult. In fact, these maps generally when they're created and in Ohio, are created over several weeks and months. Even though we didn't get the census data until the end of August and our map was voted out first one September 15th. They're doing that, preparing and looking at all. Those maps went on for several weeks prior to that because we could kind of estimate population. So trying to come up with a completely different map over a space of four or five days in and complying with the Constitution is going to be difficult. But we have to comply with the Constitution, including that very difficult part of it. So I just wanted to say that that I know it's you're doing yeoman's work. And I the last question, you may want to assign this to somebody else or staff, but I would like to know the local splits for both county and city. Because even though it's not a hard and fast rule, we would like to minimize those splits. The the Senate map on the third plan had 15 counties splits and only six local splits, and because that was an aspirational goal of Section three, we worked hard to reduce those. I don't have the number for the a House, but it would be good for that, whatever ultimately comes out of this sometime tomorrow to have that number. So the commission could evaluate it. Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:12:27] Further discussion? The commission will stand at ease for a moment. [commission stands at ease]

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:14:55] The commission will come back to order. I just wanted to to clarify the the question, the issues that you're asking for some decision or direction tonight. We obviously have Montgomery County. You mentioned Cuyahoga County and two approaches there, and I think I understood that you would like to have some direction for that one. What was the third one?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:15:23] Including the question of Franklin with Union versus Franklin with Madison Pickaway.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:15:29] All right. So there's not a question in Lucas. It's not a question in Mahoning. Yeah.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:15:37] Well, Mahoning is kind of a secondary issue. I think it's a much simp- we didn't put it in the list of the three big questions because it's a simple yes and no thing that has no ripple effects at all. But Lucas is actually tied in the Lucas configuration is actually tied into the the the Cuyahoga, the decision. So that is we'll show you all that at once. And that's a yes/no, either way, because we have to get to 18/15 somehow and those two areas are locked together.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:16:09] All right. The Co-Chair Sykes and I have talked and we think maybe the and we'll throw it out to the commission here. We think maybe the best approach is to recess for an hour and a half. And during that time, members can get printouts as us older folks with bifocals and then and get the report that we have the statistics, consult with staff and whatnot, and then convene here back again in an hour and a half and hopefully be able to give some direction. But so any member of the commission have any different request. Representative Russo has a different request.

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [01:17:02] Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. Listen, I just want to be very clear here. I think these map makers are perfectly capable of producing constitutionally compliant maps. The issue here is decisions that we need to make that are slowing them down. And this feels like we are just throwing sand in the gears here. I think we as a commission, we have to make decisions and we may not agree on the decisions, but we need to be making decisions. That is what slowing these map makers down is our inability to tell them what our decision is. I think if you polled everyone here, what the decision is about Montgomery/Greene versus Montgomery/Preble, everybody has an opinion about this.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:17:47] I don't,

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [01:17:48] Vote for it,

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:17:49] I don't.

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [01:17:50] But I will stop and say I think an hour and a half is excessive. We should be able to assess this pretty quickly within an hour. Some of us actually have laptops here in front of us and we're looking at this as we're going through. This should not take an hour and a half to make these decisions.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:18:10] All right, you can make your decision quicker then. Any objection, any further objections to recess for an hour and a half and do what I suggested and come back and see what guidance we can provide.

State Auditor Keith Faber [01:18:22] Mr. Co-Chair, I have no objection to the recess. 9 o'clocks, fine. I'll be up here all night doesn't matter. But I want to go back to the question, I assume. We have the Huffman, mediated agreed upon solution. I go back, I think when you dump that information in there. It may change some of the suggested outcomes for these guys as to what they're going to do and what I because I agree with that with Leader Russo, I do not want us dancing on the head of a pin to an incomplete task tomorrow. And so if we are going to put information that's going to change, particularly some of these districts and some of the pairings, ultimately, I think we need to get that done before we we resolve other minor issues. And so I think that information needs to be input. I think it needs to be discussed and that may dictate some of the solutions that we're talking about here before we start going down a route to make all the decisions, only to have them all done and done and have to restart. And so I think we ought to get that information to them and let them start doing that while we're working on whatever else we're going to be looking at. There's one other thing to keep in mind, and I say this to all my commission friends. The Constitution is a baseline minimum, whatever map we pass has to be constitutional. But passing a map is a game of addition. You need for votes. And there are going to be factors that are going to determine whether members decide to vote for or against any particular map. And it may be an interpretation of this district or that district, or whether there was a better map to be had. We've seen that, I would argue, in votes that have occurred in this commission already. So I think we need to be working to try and find a solution that's going to garner minimum of four votes. And that's something that we ought to keep in consideration as we move forward with a constitutional map being the baseline minimum

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:20:42] [off mic] Thought, you know, so before, Auditor Faber suggested the general consensus, [inaudible] consensus Oh, we can give you.

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [01:21:13] [offmic] Yeah, yeah, yeah, we agree. We agree with this. Which is. That does put it here. We agreed upon completion of the indepenet. When they finished the independent. I mean, complete put together then [inaudible]

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:21:39] [off mic] part of drafting the map whatever sequence [inaudible] [simultaneously speaking]

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [01:21:43] [off mic] Yes, yes, absolutely. I agree, I agree. I agree.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:21:49] All right. We have a question or we have an issue about that came up in the meeting yesterday about considering in incumbents that are not term limited or Senate incumbents that are in midterm in consideration of those in drafting the map, provided that does not cause a violation of the Constitution. So we have been mediated this issue. I believe we've come to a consensus on it and believe a copy has been provided. Except I can't find my final copy here, but I know what it is. So. So Senator Huffman, you want to proceed here?

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [01:22:39] Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. And so as the Speaker mentioned, there was an earlier version of this. My Democratic colleagues had asked for changes to this and we did those and we now have a unanimous about that. Let the bells ring a unanimous agreement on this motion. So I move that upon completion of the independent map driers merger of their independent versions of the House and Senate maps and prior to any presentation to the Commission, the independent map drawers shall consider the residents locations of non terminated, non term limited House and Senate incumbents and Senate incumbents in mid-term in drafting a commission map and, where possible, without violating violating constitutional principles. Avoid pairing incumbents and also drawing districts such that senators protected under Section 5 of Article 11 of the Ohio Constitution no longer live in the district they represent. Incumbents will be identified as House or Senate, and no other identifying information shall be used.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:23:57] There's a motion is there a second? I'll second it. Is there any objection, co-chair Sykes

Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes [01:24:04] Just a comment. You know, I took a position against including the information about incumbents. I don't think that they should be considered at this particular time. But I do agree that we should at least allow the independent map makers drawers to actually put together their recommendation. And then at that particular time, they as they continue to draft the maps that they would include the information dealing with incumbents and make adjustments as long as they comply with the Constitution, make adjustments, as indicated by the statement that was read by by Senator Huffman.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:24:57] So the motion is to adopt the statement as a consensus document. Is there any objection to the statement as presented in and all parties should have a written copy. Any objection? Without objection, it will be adopted as a consensus statement and direction to the map drawers. So at this time, then we will recess until 9 o'clock. Governor DeWine

Governor Mike DeWine [01:25:28] Clarification as far as we go through again the issues that we're supposed to be looking at in the next hour and a half?

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:25:36] Yes, they are.

Governor Mike DeWine [01:25:37] Besides the Montgomery County, Greene County,

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:25:41] we're looking at the Cuyahoga County pair with Lake, or pair with Summit and the Franklin County going out county that it's one of the districts or the district its paired with

Governor Mike DeWine [01:25:55] but not Mahoning County?

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:25:59] Nope, they thought. They said they could resolve that, but I'll I'll throw it back to the map drivers to make sure we have the right ones we're looking at

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:26:09] Yes, I would add the Mahoning question to that. The reason we didn't highlight is one of the three is that the Mahoning is a real quick yes/no. I think that's a much simpler question than anything else in Mahoning. For example, Mahoning has no impact on the Senate map at all so that there would be a fourth, but hopefully much easier question.

Dr. Michael McDonald [01:26:29] I don't understand what the question is to them about Mahoning. We both have a highly competitive district in Mahoning. We'll use that because because it could be drawn either way, depending on the decisions that you make as a commission. My preference would be just to use that feature of that particular district to create a competitive district. Either way, to help with the symmetry issue. So I until we know what it is that you wish to do, I would just, you know, wait until we know your direction and then we could make a more informed question to you about that particular district.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [01:27:14] I guess my preference was that I think Mahoning is a good example of the compactness versus improving the symmetry question. I was going to propose that, that you take a look at that and and weigh in on it.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [01:27:26] All right. Suggest for those of us who need a printed map and the folk blown up for that so we can see that area. Let's do that. Whether we make a decision tonight, we'll leave that to after we take a look at it and come back. So why don't we do that so we can get on with our work here? Without further objection or discussion, we'll be in recess until 9:00.

[recess]

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:00:00] To the recess, the Ohio Redistricting Commission will come back to order during the time we were in recess. Many or all of us, depending, had a chance to take a look at the draft maps for the Montgomery County area in Cuyahoga Summit Lake County area, as well as the Franklin County. And so the map drawers the independent map drawers are looking for some guidance from this commission on how they should proceed so we can take the Montgomery County one first if we wish. And in that case, there are is the Johnson proposal and the McDonald proposal. Is there any discussion or a motion from anyone?

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:01:12] Mr. Speaker, I will move that the proposal that pairs, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I move that the proposal that pairs Montgomery County with Greene County, and I think that is the McDonnell proposal be accepted by the commission as the direction moving forward.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:01:36] There's a motion. Is there a second second?

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:01:38] Second.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:01:38] It's been moved in second discussion? Chair recognizes President Huffman.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:01:44] Thank you, Mr. President and I, as I mentioned to the break, I think the mapmakers have done a terrific job. A lot of work in a short amount of time. We looked real quickly with cities, townships and villages. There are about 3200 in the state of Ohio. I don't know whether that makes you feel better or worse with all of that. And of course, there are 88 counties and we talked about the preferences for other jurisdictional lines school districts of which there are over 600 in Ohio and there are some other districts too the probably aren't as relevant, but so there's a tremendous amount of work to do. But as it relates to this particular motion, to be honest with you, I don't know what the ramifications of this are. I appreciate that in a sitting there at the desk. There's we'd like to know this or we'd like to know that, but I don't know how that plays out through the state. I really don't. And I guess it was my expectation that at some point the mapmakers would make, present a map to us and to say what we need to know whether you want to do this or that. I don't know the answer to it. So in short, I'm a no on this. I don't know how it gets resolved between the map makers, but I can't say yes on something when I don't know what the result of it is.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:03:20] Further discussion Secretary LaRose

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:03:23] Similar to the Senate President looking at the two proposals, I'm inclined to lean toward one or the other, and I'm inclined to lean toward the one that goes into Greene County. But the time to analyze this and actually cast a vote on whether, you know, that's the one I want to go with or not is not something I'd be prepared to do tonight

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:03:44] Further discussion, governor DeWine,

Governor Mike DeWine [00:03:48] Yeah, I have that really the same position. I I don't think we know enough, not just on this one, frankly, but on on the other ones as well. So I will vote no, although I think that. You know, just on its face with what we know, it does make it certainly more sense to have Greene County in with Montgomery County than it does for Greene County or for that, excuse me for that Senate talking about the Senate district now and for that Senate district to go basically from Fairborn down to the southern part of Jackson County. So.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:04:31] Further discussion. Auditor Faber

State Auditor Keither Faber [00:04:40] my view on this is that I agree with all the comments. I also think that it's important that they complete the other task before we know the variables. But if they need a decision to move forward now, I have no problem for the

reasons the Governor just articulated of suggesting that they do the Greene County. So I'm going to I'm going to vote that. That's OK from my perspective to do the Greene County, but I reserve the right to revisit this as we get to see more details

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:05:10] any further discussion? Senator Sykes.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:05:13] I agree with the Auditor Faber. What we're doing now is giving them marching orders so that they can continue to work. We still have a vote to approve any plan that comes forward. We trying to make some preliminary decisions that they need to make at this particular time so that we can move forward. So I'm encouraging the members to do that because of the short timetable that we have, and we've taken some time to review the proposal. And once we have one united unified map will be better able in the position to make a decision about the total maps that we have before us. But I'm encouraging everyone to take a position to help us keep moving in the right direction to complete our task by tomorrow.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:06:14] Further discussion, Representative Russo Leader Russo,

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:06:18] thank you, co-chair. You know, I would just like to comment that in the last two maps Republican members, the Republican generated maps went with Preble County in this election, so I'm a little perplexed. You know why today? Maybe you vote no on this pairing with Greene County, but you know, saying that you don't have the information or don't know what the impacts are. We've seen in previous maps what the impacts are when you pair Montgomery County with Preble County, Montgomery County with Greene County because these have been decisions that we've had to make in the past with these maps. You know, I would also just ask what information is missing that you don't have now that we didn't get in the two hours that we were in a break that would be necessary other than simply where incumbents live, which, you know, has been very clear by the courts that where incumbents live shouldn't matter in terms of, you know, picking how these districts are drawn. And certainly in terms of what the question is here, which is it's going to overall impact overall symmetry within the map. That's not a reason to pick one way or the other based on incumbents. So I'm again a bit perplexed and what information is still needed to move this forward to make a decision

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:07:42] any further discussion?

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:07:45] I think the co-chair, I think the question is between whether we vote on something or not. It sounds like there was general agreement that leaning more towards taking it from Montgomery into Greene County. But I think that there are some of us who just don't want to cast a vote for something where we haven't been able to fully analyze it. So if we're just given the map maker some opinions, OK, if it's a vote that we're casting, it's a separate matter.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:08:17] Further discussion. Oh,.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:08:22] I can.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:08:24] Senator Sykes,

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:08:24] Yeah, I can agree with that. We gave them some a similar discussion or a suggestion last evening using their best judgment. This time they

asked for some guidance and if we could tell them to use the guidance to use Greene at a particular time, but we're not ready at all. No, none of us are ready to actually vote on a plan because we don't have a complete plan in front of us, but I think we'd be remiss if we did not give them some indication of where we might lean in this particular, this particular situation, so they can continue their work

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:09:10] further discussion.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:09:13] Mr Chairman. Follow up on with the co-chair said. I think it seems to be that consensus here, but I think some of us are just, you know, feel reluctant, not just on this one, but on on one involving Summit County to cast a vote where we, you know, basically say that this is we have enough information to make that decision. I think, you know, I think there's consensus here seems to be leaning towards doing that. Maybe that it maybe that is enough information to mapmakers at this point about taking a formal vote.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:09:56] President Huffman

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:09:57] Yeah, I think the issue is if if there was a vote taken and at some point there was amendments to the proposed map, which assuredly there will be someone that this commission will argue, Well, you already voted for this yesterday. Why are you voting to change it today? That's that's obviously the problem. And I will say some of the things that the governor has said about this. I'll say some of those things about Northeast Ohio since it's what I said yesterday, which in the in the map that we drew those seven Northeast County 21 Rep. Districts and seven Senate districts seemed to be a good. But I'm not ready to take a vote that says that's the way I want it to be, because that's what it will count as when we come to look at this. So everyone, I think can comment and say whatever it is they want. Maybe that's helpful to the map makers. In the end, someone has to have. There has to be a consensus for us to get a a commission map.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:11:05] Leader Russo,

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:11:06] I thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. So, you know, I would ask the mapmakers, Do you feel that you are getting a sense of any direction at all from this commission to be able to move forward?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:11:19] So, Leader Russo, members of the commission. Yes, we don't we don't need a formal vote in motion and second, all that if it's a general sense of the the, I guess the strongest curiosity of the commission that works for us, I think.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:11:35] I agree with that. And we certainly want to get the other direction and information, we have not yet seen that information on the Senate incumbent residences yet, so we can't even start beginning to look at that until we get that information. So just being able to move forward for us, I think, is important that you give us a sense of the direction we want to go and we're going to look at the additional information and we're going to continue to fine tune these maps. We may decide that for whatever reason, the sense of the commission can't be met in that direction, so we're still open to moving in other directions. If that's required,

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:12:27] then based on Mr. Co-Chair, I will withdraw my formal motion for a vote and ask the map makers to move forward with what they feel is the general sense of the commission.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:12:44] And I would just add that I've had a chance now to take a look, and I noticed there's multiple incumbents in that area paired together and not one party, the other. It's kind of a bipartisan pairing, and I think that's a that's a problem. So well, let's move on then to Cuyahoga County, and maybe members can express their sense about that.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:13:15] Mr. Co-Chair, just before we go forward, I'm I'm getting handed documents, I think, by the Democratic staff, but I'm not sure what they are. Anybody be able to fill us in here, what's been put down in front of us? And is this something that we're going to be asked to talk about today?

Unidentified [00:13:36] [inaudible off mic chatter]

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:13:40] All right. These are blow up.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:13:43] Oh, these were the handouts I came down and asked for it during the break. Is that right? Right?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:13:50] I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:13:53] Oh yeah, those are the maps that Speaker Cupp requested, and we just wanted for completeness for everybody to have that information as well.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:14:04] That's good because I got mine about 20 minutes before 9:00.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:14:09] Well, I got mine now.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:14:10] So all right. All right. So let's see if that's what that is. Let's move on to the Cuyahoga County area then. Anybody want it? Secretary LaRose

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:14:20] Yeah, I'll kick the conversation off on this Speaker. So we were looking at two options. I went downstairs and sort of looked over the shoulders of our map maker's. They showed one option where Cuyahoga County has an exit into Summit County and then another option where Cuyahoga County has an exit into Lake County. I think that, you know, looking at all of those again, not necessarily wanting to cast a vote on one particular plan for Cuyahoga County tonight. But I do think that the one that that causes Cuyahoga County to exit out into Lake County is the leader of the two options

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:15:02] for their discretion, comments anyone Leader Russo

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:15:07] Mr. Co-Chair. I would agree with that. I actually think this is something that we have come to some sort of consensus on in the past, at least in past versions of maps from both Democrats and Republicans have taken

this approach of of going from Cuyahoga to Lake County. Because I think that we have found both sets of map makers have found that it it solves multiple issues.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:15:39] Further discussion. I would I would just note, and I'm not sure which is the right direction, but Cuyahoga County appears to have six incumbents paired for no constitutional reason that I'm aware of yet. Maybe there will be one, but. All right.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:16:05] I would tend to also, Mr. Co-Chair, to agree to Lake County pairing to support that version of the map.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:16:19] All right. I think you've heard from members of the commission that have an opinion on it, so well, let you sort of take it to their. And then there is the Franklin County one, which I think we have a blow up of now. Any comment on Franklin

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:16:50] Speaker, I'll kick this one off again, if that's right. Again, recognizing that these were drawn incumbent agnostic, I guess you could say that that is going to require some work to look at the double bunking in that kind of thing. I think that the the version of the map that has Franklin County exiting into Union County is is preferable versus the version of the map that has Franklin County picking up parts of Madison and Pickaway or all of Madison and Pickaway and parts of Franklin. I think it was. So the option where Franklin County connects with union in the northwest county corner of the county, essentially the Dublin area would be would be preferable to me, but again, not something I'd be prepared on on voting on tonight.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:17:42] Any further discussion? Senator Sykes

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:17:49] co-chair, I would I would I would agree with that.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:17:57] Does agree? I believe

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:18:00] does agree. Yes.

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:18:07] Mr. Co-Chair

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:18:10] Leader Russo.

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:18:10] Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. I may be one of the members on this commission that people would guess would have the strongest opinion about this. But I will tell you that on the whole, both options, I think, have pros and cons. And on the whole, I don't see large differences between either option. So if there are other compelling reasons to do this, you know, the impact on Franklin County itself and the districts within Franklin County seemed to be on the whole, pretty balanced. You know, some good things, some bad things doesn't really differ between the two.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:18:51] Anything further? All right, I guess that's the information that's available to provide to you for your decision making on this. It may depend on what happens elsewhere as you begin to draw things out.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:19:08] Chairman?

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:19:09] Governor Duane,

Governor Mike DeWine [00:19:10] if we also have the one Mahoning Valley. Mahoning County

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:19:18] All right. That is an issue that came up, although I think they said it wasn't one of their top issues, but if you have a comment on that. Go right ahead.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:19:30] I'm looking for my map here look like the one version has, Mr McDonald can correct me, but I believe his version has Columbiana County and Carroll County together, is that correct?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:19:52] Sorry, I couldn't hear the question.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:19:53] Yeah, my my fault, I wasn't speaking in the microphone. I believe the the one version has Carroll and Columbiana County together. Is that correct? That'd be 64.

Unidentified [00:20:14] [inaudible]

Governor Mike DeWine [00:20:16] Oh, McDonald, I'm sorry. Yeah.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:20:21] It just [inaudible]. Yeah, it there's yes. We don't. Yes, Columbiana is to the South, but it doesn't actually you have to. The Mahoning isn't just quite populis enough to support one entire district, so yes, there's the version that I have crosses over into Columbiana to round up population. It's an unavoidable one,.

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:20:51] Yea actually, that that actually is a is a function of the decision of, Cuyahoga with Lake. It's not driven, the Mahoning decision.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:21:01] Mahoning [inaudiblt due to audio echo] that then?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:21:03] Exactly.

Governor Mike DeWine [00:21:04] OK. OK. All right. I don't have anything else then

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:21:13] Anything further?

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:21:14] Nothing, O'Mahony, nothing, right?

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:21:20] All right, so I think we have minutes to approve think I missed that. When we started,

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:21:32] Well, the question of when our map makers are going to get incumbent data. I know that we had gone through the mediation process to determine sort of how they would get incumbent data. But I think that if there's one thing that's going to scupper this process, it's the double bunking of dozens and dozens of incumbents. I think the sooner that they can get the incumbent data anonymized just by House and Senate would be better for them. So perhaps maybe they can get a fresh start bright and early tomorrow morning trying to work at fixing those double bunking scenarios that have caused a lot of concern for a lot of us.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:22:10] All right. We will work with our staff and where the data is to try to get it to him so that we have that

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:22:17] If I could,

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:22:18] yes. Co-Chair Sykes

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:22:21] Yeah In our agreement, you know, we indicated that as soon as we have a unified plan that they would be able to put that information in there. So again, we're anxious and moving forward as soon as we can. The sooner the more progress that we make, the sooner we'll be able to consider the incumbency issue.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:22:45] Well, Mr. Co-Chair, I and we can read the motion that I read. The plan is to be drawn with the incumbent information. There's not they're not supposed to draw a plan. And then there's a plan and then you put the incumbent information and it's supposed to be considered when drafting the plan. I guess I just want to make sure the map makers do that. And that also includes House incumbents, not just the Senate incumbents.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:23:17] For clarification,

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:23:18] this is I think this has helped us quite a bit,

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:23:21] I think. And if you could hold, please. This is an important issue.

Dr. Michael McDonald [00:23:26] oh I'm sorry.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:23:26] We're trying to address because we've gone through mediation on this and want to make it clear upon completion of the independent map drawers merge merger of their independent versions of the House and Senate maps, so as soon as that is completed, that merger is completed on the then you will continue.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:23:50] But before there's any presentation of a merg—

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:23:54] The motion also clearly says that they have to consider those incumbent residences while drafting their plan. Now if if what you're saying is that's now not true because we decided they could put a plan together, put those and then change the plan, then if they needed to. Well, then we can change the motion and go back to the way it was before. But clearly they're supposed to consider the incumbent residences while drafting the plan. That's what the motion says that you agreed to.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:24:29] I think it's clear, you know, what does that two components? The first part of the set of the motion upon completion of the independent map drawer's merger of their independent versions. What does that mean?

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:24:47] All right. The independent map dryers shall consider the residents locations of non-term, term-limited House and Senate incumbents and Senate incumbents in mid-term in drafting a commission map

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:25:00] when they drafted.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:25:01] Okay, if if, if you want to argue this point, we can take this out and we can just start over with a with a new direction. So clearly, what they're supposed to do in drafting the map is make sure before they come back to us whether they do it before they merge their plans, while they're merging their plans or after they've merged their plans. But in drafting the map and before they come to us, that's supposed to be a consideration.

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:25:34] I agree that is before they come to us. I agree that's in the proposal, but they're not to include the incumbency information until they have completed upon completion of the independent map drawers merger of their independent versions of the House and the Senate maps prior to any presentation to the Commission. So once once they merge their plans, then they would add the incumbency that data or information in there, and that would be before they would present any such plan to this body.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:26:22] It are the map makers unclear about this, as I say, we're dancing on the head of a pin here,

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:26:28] but I think we're fine. I think this is important words, but the final result is the same either way. I don't think.

Senate President Sen. Matt Huffman [00:26:36] fair enough

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:26:39] Here's a.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:26:44] Auditor Faber,

State Auditor Keither Faber [00:26:46] Thank you I just want to make sure we're clear on where we're going here. I assume they now have enough information to merge their plan and give us a unified plan, but I don't just make sure we're clear on this. That's not a plan for us. Ultimately, we're going to take a look at it, and I assume we're all going to have hundreds of suggestions to modify or adjust here and there and there and here before we land to where this commission is going to have a combined plan. So we're going from two theoretical plans to where you guys get agreement, at least in concept. But as I was just going through these maps and I didn't necessarily hear that from the governor, but maybe I did. There might be some county pairings that make more sense and other issues that may or may not change, the ratios may or may not change the numbers, but certainly you're going to find when you're putting things together and you're drafting this plan overnight or tomorrow morning that there may be things that you need to move around to make your two plans work. And I just looked at an area that I know very well Northwest Ohio. Your two plans are very different on how you treat different county pairings in that area, but it doesn't change one iota of what you do for the ratios or any of those other issues. And you're going to have to find a compromise and figure out which ones on first and how you land there. But I think that's easily going to be where you come and give us something new to look at tomorrow morning.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:28:10] All right. I'm sorry Secretary LaRose

Secretary of State Frank LaRose [00:28:13] Yeah. So as they go through the work of merging two maps into one with the guidance that we've given them, I think that obviously

time being of the essence that we should be ready to provide them that incumbency data as soon as they need it. And I think that that means that our staffs and this is probably going to be House and Senate staffs because they have this have a spreadsheet of. Street address, city, state zip, without name and without party, and they'd be ready to get those CSV to those guys effectively so that they can load them up, is that I mean, is that what you guys need as far as addresses for incumbents?

Dr. Douglas Johnson [00:28:58] Yeah, I mean, if your staff has them geo coded, there are already dots on the map, a layer we can just add in, that'd be even better, but we can work from that. We were with our staff to get the format very quickly.

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:29:11] All right now, are we ready to approve the minutes from the preceding committee, meeting there before you in your folder?

Co-Chair Sen. Vernon Sykes [00:29:23] I so move

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:29:23] It's been moved. Is there a second?

Minority Leader Rep. Allison Russo [00:29:27] Second

Co-Chair Speaker Robert Cupp [00:29:27] Are there any additions corrections to the minutes? Are there any objections to the minutes that objection? Without objection the minutes will be approved. So then if there's nothing else to come before the commission this evening, I would entertain a motion to recess until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock and we probably will not convene. But if there's something that comes up that we need to, you know, a virtual call or something that would give us the ability to do that. So without without objection, we will recess this evening's meeting until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow when we have a scheduled four meeting of the commission Hearing no objection. The commission stands in recess.