



State Representatives Tavia Galonski & Richard Brown

Sponsor Testimony on House Bill 483

House Democratic Compromise Congressional District Map

Representative Tavia Galonski, D-Akron

Chairman Wilkin and members of the committee, thank you for allowing us to present sponsor testimony on House Bill 483, a compromise congressional map that sets the framework for a clear path to what the voters expect of us—a bipartisan, 10-year map.

We know what Ohioans want to see because they've told us:

They demanded fair districts at the ballot box, overwhelmingly passing constitutional reforms in 2015 and 2018 that mandate how we should draw districts that fairly represent our state.

Just last week, we heard hours of testimony from Ohioans concerned with the partisan map in HB 479 that unduly favors Republican candidates 13-2, splits up our largest counties, and isn't very compact.

Ohioans want, to the extent possible under the constitution, to see our largest counties kept whole with our largest cities as anchors to those districts.

They want a map that ensures that communities that live, work and play together stay together.

They asked for a compact map with easily understood boundaries.

And, finally, Ohioans told us they want to see a map that reflects the preferences of voters. Not just the voters whose candidate wins statewide office, but also reflective of the 45% of Ohio voters who consistently prefer a different candidate.

We heard those concerns, and we believe our map under HB 483 lives up to these principles.

This map is fair, compact and keeps communities together.

It meets the requirements laid out in the constitution for drawing a congressional map.

It protects the idea of one person, one vote, with zero population deviation in nearly all districts, with 13 districts having populations of exactly 786,630 and two districts having a deviation of -1 person.

It complies with the Ohio Constitution and federal laws, including laws protecting racial and minority voting rights.

While Ohio will no longer have a majority minority district, this compromise map does include three minority opportunity districts because we drew boundaries that are compact, that keep

our largest cities whole, and do not break apart communities where Black Ohioans live as in the partisan Republican map.

At every point, we were intentional about addressing the concerns shared by Ohioans. We were thoughtful in how we approached splits, and at every step, considered how we could create a proposal that could put us on a clear path to our and Ohioans' ultimate goal of a bipartisan, 10-year map.

Our map is not partisan. It does not contort our districts to maximize partisan advantage. It is a compromise, one that ensures Ohioans who share a community can decide who represents them.

That's what Ohioans wanted when they overwhelmingly passed reforms in 2015 and 2018. That's the opportunity this map affords them. It is our hope that our final map lives up to that expectation.

The last thing we need is the majority party rushing through a partisan, four-year map that invites a veto from the governor or a referendum by the more than 70 percent of voters who twice demanded fair districts.

We have to get this right. This is the compromise to get us there.

With that, I will turn it over to my colleague and joint-sponsor, Rep. Brown, to walk through more aspects of our proposal.

Rep. Richard Brown, D-Canal Winchester

Chair Wilkin and members of the committee, I, too, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on our compromise map, HB 483.

As was said before, this proposal is a direct response to the many concerns Ohioans testified on during our committee hearings last week.

Red flags immediately went up when Ohioans saw that many of our largest counties were carved up, communities with many shared interests splintered away from each other in the proposal presented last week.

Ohioans told us in no uncertain terms that they wanted to see communities stay together, especially cities in our largest counties. Splitting them apart doesn't allow for better representation. In fact, it prevents communities from having the representation they deserve.

Our map corrects these issues and complies with all the requirements included in the Constitution in regard to splits.

Under our proposal, our largest cities are kept whole and anchor congressional districts as Ohioans intended.

Article XIX, Section 2 (B) (4) (a) of the Ohio Constitution requires that if a city is located in a county that exceeds the population of a congressional district, a significant portion of that city

must be contained in a single congressional district. This provision currently only applies to Franklin County.

Under our proposal, District 3 meets this requirement by including over 60 percent of Columbus, comprising 550,256 residents. Additionally, this section of the Constitution also states that the district may include other municipalities or townships within the county that have similar interests, meaning they are communities that live, work or play together.

Article XIX, Section 2 (B) (4) (b) of the Ohio Constitution requires that, based on their population, there are two cities - Cincinnati and Cleveland – that must remain whole within a congressional district.

- District 1 includes all of the City of Cincinnati as well as the surrounding communities with shared interests. Again, allowing communities that live, work and play together to stay together and be represented together.
- District 11 does the same for the City of Cleveland, again also including communities with shared interests to be represented together.

Article XIX, Section 2 (B) (5) of the Ohio Constitution requires that 65 counties not be split, 18 counties may be split once and 5 counties may be split twice. Our map exceeds these goals with 74 counties kept whole, 14 counties split once, and 0 counties split twice.

Table of County splits

| Index | Split Counties | Explanation |
|-------|----------------|---|
| 1 | Ashland | Split once to achieve population balance between District 7 and District 13. |
| 2 | Clinton | Split once to achieve population balance and compactness between District 2 and District 8. |
| 3 | Cuyahoga | Split once to achieve population balance and compactness between District 7 and District 11. All of District 11 is kept wholly in Cuyahoga County. |
| 4 | Franklin | Split once to achieve population balance and compactness between District 3 and District 12. All of District 3 is kept wholly in Franklin County. |
| 5 | Greene | Split once to achieve population balance between District 8 and District 10. |
| 6 | Hamilton | Split once to achieve population balance between District 1 and District 8, while keeping all of Cincinnati whole along with adjacent suburbs. All of District 1 is kept wholly in Hamilton County. |
| 7 | Holmes | Split once to achieve population balance between District 6 and District 13. |
| 8 | Lorain | Split once to achieve population balance between District 7 and District 9 while keeping cities and larger municipalities whole. |
| 9 | Mahoning | Split once to achieve population balance while keeping communities in Trumbull County and in Youngstown together. |
| 10 | Marion | Split once to achieve population balance and compactness between District 4 and District 12. |
| 11 | Ross | Split once to achieve population balance and compactness between District 2 and District 4. |
| 12 | Stark | Split once to achieve population balance between District 13 and District 15. All of Canton is kept whole in District 15. |
| 13 | Washington | Split once to achieve population balance and compactness between District 2 and District 6. |
| 14 | Wyandot | Split once to achieve population balance between District 4 and District 5. |

Article XIX, Section 2 (B) (6) of the Ohio Constitution requires that parts of a district within a county be contiguous. Our map complies with this requirement.

Article XIX, Section 2 (B) (7) of the Ohio Constitution requires that no two districts can have the same 2 counties split unless one of the counties has a population of 400,000. None of our districts have this.

Article XIX Section 2 (B) (8) of the Ohio Constitution requires that when possible one whole county must be included in every district. Seventy-four counties are kept whole in our map including the larger counties Lucas, Montgomery and Summit.

Article XIX, Section 1(C)(3) of the Ohio Constitution, which applies when a map does not garner adequate minority party support, prohibits unduly favoring a party and unduly splitting communities. Our map does not unduly favor parties. It favors the Republican party slightly, because that is what the Republican party is due based on the share of votes its candidates have earned in this state. Our map also does not unduly split communities. For example, Toledo is kept whole, Akron is kept whole, Dayton is kept whole and are combined with their surrounding areas to create districts that make sense.

Our map adheres to all constitutional requirements voters set for us and provides greater balance among districts according to the preferences of Ohio voters.

The map is a 9-6 Republican to Democratic map based on the Dave's Redistricting App composite index of six races from 2016 to 2020. The races included are U.S. Senate 2016, President 2016, Attorney General 2018, Governor 2018, U.S. Senate 2018, and President 2020.

Our map is also significantly more compact than the House Republican proposal, which sees a number of districts contorting themselves in unnatural directions and a sprawling district along Ohio's eastern border that clearly does not pass the eye test, or for that matter, any other measure of compactness

Every one of our districts passes the eye test. And when you get into the numbers, this is confirmed.

There are a large number of measures of compactness. Two of the most common are Reock, Polsby-Popper.

The Reock test is the ratio of the area of the district to the area of the minimum enclosing circle – that is the smallest circle that can entirely contain the district. The measure ranges from zero to one, with one being the most compact.

The Polsby-Popper test is similar. It is based on the ratio of the district area to the area of a circle with the same perimeter as the district. The measure also ranges from zero to one, with one being the most compact.

We ran compactness reports on both plans using the Maptitude for Redistricting software package, and these measures confirm what our eyes have already told us—that our map is significantly more compact than the House GOP map.

Using the Reock test, where higher scores are better, our plan has an average of 0.43 compared to 0.38 in the Republican plan. Our worst district under the Reock test is CD 9 with a score of .28, more than twice the score of the worst district in the Republican plan, CD 6, with a Reock score of 0.13.

The results are similar using the Polsby-Popper test. Again, higher scores are better. Our average score is 0.21 compared to 0.12 in the Republican plan. Our worst district using this test is CD 7 with a score of 0.21. The worst district in the Republican plan is again CD 6, with a score of 0.12.

Another commonsense way of measuring a district's compactness is computing the driving distance between the two furthest apart points in the district.

The average drive distance in our map is 95.4 miles. The average in the Republican map is 116.3 miles. In our map, the district with the longest drive distance is CD 5 at 183.5 miles. In the Republican map, the longest drive distance is in CD 6 at 286.7 miles.

We're under the gun to pass a bipartisan, 10-year map. To get there, we're going to need to compromise. The proposed map in HB 483 is a compromise. It's fair, compact and keeps communities together. Our proposal meets the constitutional standards voters set for us without unduly favoring one party over another.

Democrats listened to the voters, incorporated their feedback, and have a realistic compromise that can pass with bipartisan support.

What we do in the coming weeks will shape our politics for the next decade or more. Moving forward with a compromise map protects against a veto from the governor. It protects against voter referendum on the map. It protects against districts that unduly favor one political party at the expense of all Ohioans.

This process only works with compromise.

Again, we thank you for your time today and welcome any questions you have on this compromise proposal.